

**BURNT STORE ISLES
CANAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING
APRIL 13, 2010**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Gary Brewster, Chairman
Norman Ashworth, Joseph Gil, Leslie Totten, Frank Wiechec

OTHERS PRESENT: Randy Brodersen, Canal Maintenance Supervisor
Dennis Murphy, Growth Management Director
Mark Gering, City Engineer
Rick Keeney, Public Works Director
Councilmember Bill Albers

CALL TO ORDER/ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Roll Call
- B. Next Scheduled Meeting - Tuesday, May 11, 2010 - 1:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Regular Meeting of February 9, 2010
 - Mr. Brewster noted two corrections to the second paragraph of page two.
 - Mr. Totten MOVED, Mr. Wiechec SECONDED approval of the February 9, 2010 minutes as amended. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CANAL MAINTENANCE MONTHLY REPORTS

- A. Permits Authorized by City Staff for Installation of Docks, Lifts, Outpilings, etc.
 - Mr. Randy Brodersen, Canal Maintenance Supervisor, announced 4 permits were issued in February 2010, adding none were issued in March 2010.
- B. Budget Utilization Report
 - Mr. Brodersen displayed an overhead of the Budget Utilization Report, as delineated in the agenda material, stating a Statement of Work (SOW) was recently submitted for a seawall which failed on Port Bendres.
 - Mr. Brewster commented the rainy season would soon commence. He acknowledged dollars lagged behind actual work completed; however, he was surprised that the budget report did not reflect seawall replacement completed in January, questioning the reason for same.
 - Mr. Brodersen explained when looking at expenditures from the seawall cap replacement, the dollar amount included seawalls and seawall caps and everything pertaining to them. He clarified he made every attempt to ensure the accuracy of the Budget Utilization Report.
 - Mr. Brewster opined based on the linear feet of seawall cap replaced and the current price for same, more funds should have been expended.

- Mr. Brodersen stated many of the caps replaced were adjacent to vacant lots which kept the cost down per foot, adding the rainy season would increase the amount of necessary work.
- Mr. Gil stated the number for linear feet of cap replacement delineated in the agenda material was in addition to the 600 linear feet of seawall replacement as caps were included in same.
- Mr. Brodersen explained that line item referred only to seawall cap replacement.
- Mr. Gil clarified seawall replacement included the cap, stating in actuality there were over 2,000 feet of new seawall cap.
- Mr. Brodersen agreed.
- Mr. Brewster asked if costs were running lower than expected.
- Mr. Brodersen replied he believed the majority of work done to date had been on vacant lots, which was less costly, stating the budget was based on projected worst case scenarios.
- Mr. Gil noted a large inventory of identified seawall caps were in need of replacement.
- Mr. Brodersen agreed.
- Mr. Gil mentioned trying to accelerate the work for the remaining locations to get caught up was discussed at a previous Burnt Store Isles Canal Advisory Committee (BSI CAC) meeting, asking where progress stood.
- Mr. Brodersen replied more crews had been assigned and were making good progress, however, a number of seawalls fell due to heavy rains in Punta Gorda Isles (PGI), resulting in a reassignment of work crews.
- Mr. Brewster cautioned when the now identified 108 feet of seawall was replaced, the allotted annual linear feet of seawall replacement budgeted would be exceeded. He added another failure would cause staff to tap into the seawall cap replacement budgeted monies, opining that scenario was inevitable, and work would not be able to be accelerated.
- Mr. Brodersen advised a budget transfer would not be difficult.
- Mr. Gil agreed, stating he simply wished to ascertain how much of the 1485 linear feet of cap replacement was a result of the acceleration previously discussed.
- Mr. Brewster noted a catastrophic event would result in the need to borrow funds, or more likely, work would be stopped when budgeted funds were exhausted.
- Mr. Gil opined the more likely scenario would be the money running short.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Report on Charlotte County Survey Equipment

- Mr. Dennis Murphy, Growth Management Director, reported he spoke at length with Mr. Steve Ford, Charlotte County Surveyor, with regard to bathymetric equipment, adding he advised the Global Positioning System (GPS) equipment had been returned to the Geographic Information System (GIS) group. He stated the bathymetry units were antiquated and had thus been surplused out. He clarified Charlotte County no longer had the ability to conduct bathymetry work for the City, adding the only options would be to go out for bid or use the surveying library that Procurement has for companies that specialize in bathymetry.
- Mr. Gil asked if the equipment retired by Charlotte County was the equipment used to map Alligator Creek.
- Mr. Murphy replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Brewster asked if Charlotte County had any plans to replace retired equipment.
- Mr. Murphy replied Charlotte County had decimated their survey group from four surveying crews with three to five individuals and three office staff members down to two staff members and no field crews, adding all work was being contracted out.

B. Seawall Evaluation Study

- Mr. Mark Gering, City Engineer, drew members' attention to the Seawall Evaluation Study, as delineated in the agenda material, presenting same in a PowerPoint format. He advised Mr. John Kuretski, Principal Engineer of HDR Engineering, Inc., prepared the report through review of the City's drawings and Mr. Tom Wilcox was the Project Manager who handled the local correspondence. He listed several recommendations as follows: (1) finishing, curing, troweling, edging, and the mix design; (2) weep holes; (3) reinforcing steel; (4) chemical admixtures; (5) panel height; (6) associated costs. He noted current weep holes were at 17 inches below the top of the slab, stating HDR recommended same be dropped 3.5 feet below the seawall cap top in order to reduce the hydrostatic pressure on the landward side of the slab. He stated HDR also recommended a steel trowel finish versus a broom finish, providing a detailed explanation of the reasoning behind same. He went on to say HDR recommended edging the corners and using a curing compound in order to slow the slab's curing process, thereby providing a stronger slab. He mentioned date stamping all repairs and replacements would enable a better tracking system to be tied in with the GIS system when a seawall or seawall cap was last repaired and/or replaced. He then commented on rebar selection, stating through improved technology, MMFX or a similar rebar was considered to be more favorable for a longer seawall slab life,

specifically an increase from 50 to 90 years in longevity. He noted the added cost would be offset from the new procedure of having the rebar ordered by size and then bent to the needed specifications, thereby eliminating City staff from having to expend numerous days performing cutting and bending. He stated HDR recommended changing mix design from 5000 Pounds per Square Inch (psi), to 5500 psi. He reviewed several cost issues as follows: weep hole and finish, negligible cost; steel, \$.20/lb or more but requiring less material and less labor; chemical admixture, \$30 additional per panel. He noted HDR performed an economic analysis, also provided in the agenda material. He concluded with staff's recommendations as follows: (1) incorporate new rebar to greatly reduce rusting and prolong seawall life; (2) switch to 5,500 psi concrete; (3) starting utilizing curing compound; (4) steel trowel surface, edge corners and lower weep holes. He then offered to answer questions.

- Mr. Brewster asked if the soil samples were taken from behind the seawalls.
- Mr. Brodersen responded approximately 10 feet behind seawalls.
- Mr. Gil questioned recommendations regarding the anchoring system.
- Mr. Gering responded the consultants looked at a few different materials such as auger type anchors which were not cost advantageous, advising anchoring was one of the lesser problems to be addressed except where a pool would possibly encroach upon a work area.
- Mr. Gil pointed out excavation of soil behind a seawall essentially meant removing soil in front of the "deadman" which would defeat the engineering idea in that a "deadman" worked most efficiently when being pulled against undisturbed soil. He clarified the effectiveness of the "deadman" was reduced when that soil was disturbed.
- Mr. Gering agreed, stating that was true especially in the short term after the soil had become more compacted. He then said the consultants showed staff various anchoring systems which were costly and would have changed the mode of operation, adding with material currently being used there would be less problems with anchoring in the future.
- Mr. Brewster commented the steel being used seemed to be the most obvious problem.
- Mr. Gering agreed, stating the older rebar parallel to the water line was propagating the crack and leading to additional failure.
- Mr. Gil commented he had been somewhat surprised at the importance placed on weep holes, stating he had never observed drainage through the weep holes in the seawall behind his house. He added the seawall was older and the weep holes might be plugged up and that perhaps something could be done to prevent weep holes from becoming plugged up in the future.

- Mr. Gering pointed out rather than the weep holes being plugged up, the soil could be allowing the water to go down through the ground with no need to go through the weep hole.
- Mr. Gil asked if there was ever an attempt to run a bar through the weep holes to see if they were plugged up.
- Mr. Brodersen advised there was a filter cloth on the back side of the weep holes and any such effort could compromise the filter, thereby allowing dirt into the hole.
- Mr. Gil asked if the filter cloth had been in use with the older seawalls.
- Mr. Brodersen replied staff had always used that method.
- Mr. Totten inquired if there was any discussion on retrofitting new lower weep holes into older walls to extend the life of the wall.
- Mr. Gering replied it would be problematic to cut a new hole in an existing seawall.
- Mr. Brodersen added there were at least a couple miles of older seawalls with no weep holes, and a large portion of those walls had never been replaced.
- Mr. Brewster commented favorably on relatively simple and low cost changes increasing the anticipated seawall life from 50 to 90 years. He then asked if intentions were still to make the seawall panels larger or deeper.
- Mr. Gering replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Gil asked if the recommendations for changes in finishing also applied to new seawall caps.
- Mr. Brodersen replied he believed so, acknowledging same was not spelled out in the report, however, he would ask Mr. Kuretski for his recommendation.
- Mr. Brewster thanked staff, stating he believed the study was well worth the funds expended on same.

C. Budget

- Mr. Rick Keeney, Public Works Director, announced the Finance Department would attend the May or June 2010 Committee meeting to provide a detailed presentation on revenues, expenditures, etc. He noted early projections indicated the same level of service could be attained by utilizing carryover funds and possibly increasing the seawall line item while maintaining the current annual canal maintenance assessment fee of \$400. He concluded the Committee would then be asked to make a recommendation to City Council.
- Mr. Brewster commented he did not understand the aforementioned projections, stating the Committee had made a conscious effort over the past two years to maintain a relatively large amount of reserves to accelerate their programs. He stated he believed funds would be expended by the end of the fiscal year.

- Mr. Keeney replied the projections were short of any emergencies, noting if carryovers were utilized this year, the funds would not be available the following year.
- Mr. Brewster reiterated he did not believe that would be the case at the end of the current fiscal year.
- Mr. Keeney mentioned the PGI Canal Advisory Committee (CAC) had not yet conducted their budget review; however, they had recommended maintaining their current annual assessment fee.
- Mr. Totten requested an update on the GIS effort, stating it was one of the main drivers for budget planning potential.
- Mr. Keeney replied the effort was moving forward in that Mr. Brodersen and Mr. Gary Disher, a City contracted employee, had met with Charlotte County and had actually been able to perform hands-on work.
- Mr. Totten asked if staff felt the program would provide the necessary tools.
- Mr. Brodersen replied affirmatively.
- Mr. Gil acknowledged specifics remained unknown at this time; however, he opined budget preparations could begin based on current knowledge.
- Mr. Keeney reiterated that would be accomplished with this program.
- Mr. Gil questioned whether the Committee should recommend an increase in order to reserve carry over funds specifically for acceleration of the seawall cap replacement program.
- Mr. Keeney replied the Committee could make that recommendation to City Council; however, the GIS program would not be available in time to back up that recommendation. He clarified the GIS program would take several months to be fully operational with the ability to implement new equipment that would allow measurements, reiterating this process could be ongoing for several months to a year. He noted it would be done utilizing contract help and current staff, explaining hiring an outside firm to do the work could expedite the process but could entail hundreds of thousands of dollars that were not available.
- Discussion ensued with regard to what members felt was a stumbling block based on the continuing unavailability of a GIS program.
- Mr. Brewster acknowledged the data was three years old; however, an eight year program was established two years prior. He clarified the program was running behind, adding that trend was continuing and perhaps worsening.

CURRENT BUSINESS

A. Quasi-Judicial Proceedings

- Mr. Keeney drew members' attention to Resolution #2870-10, as denoted within the agenda material, stating same outlined procedures and rules for quasi-judicial hearings and ex-parte communications. He noted this was being provided to all of the City's advisory boards/committees for informational purposes.
- Mr. Brewster stated he had struggled with the Committee's role in quasi-judicial proceedings in that they acted in an advisory capacity only, confirming they were required to follow quasi-judicial rules. He opined the Committee acted in accordance with the rules outlined.
- Mr. Keeney agreed.
- Mr. Gil recalled the City Attorney had held workshops relative to the Sunshine Law in past years for the City's advisory boards/committees, asking Mr. Keeney to request a similar meeting with the City Attorney relative to the quasi-judicial process.
- Mr. Keeney agreed.
- Mr. Totten expressed confusion with regard to what represented ex-parte communication.
- Mr. Murphy cited an example of an applicant speaking with a committee/board member prior to the advertised public hearing, explaining that member must simply disclose same, on the record, during the public hearing.
- Vice Mayor Bill Albers explained the problem with allowing ex-parte communication was same did not allow an applicant the ability to defend themselves.

B. Ordinance Amendment Relating to Operation & Speed of Boats

- Mr. Keeney drew members' attention to a proposed ordinance, as denoted within the agenda material, relating to operation and speed of boats and designating certain waterways as slow speed/minimum wake and idle speed/no wake zones. He explained certain inconsistencies had existed within the rules and regulations; thus, he had approached the City Attorney with regard to clarifying same and avoiding certain contradictions. He noted the proposed ordinance ensured compliance with the Manatee Protection Program.
- Mr. Gil commended Mr. Keeney on his efforts, stating the proposed ordinance was very specific and had been needed for quite some time.
- Mr. Keeney mentioned some PGI CAC meeting attendees had expressed the desire for idle speed/no wake zones as opposed to slow speed/minimum wake; however, the PGI CAC had not yet made their recommendation to City Council. He clarified he simply

wished to ensure this Committee was aware of actions potentially being taken by the PGI CAC.

- Mr. Gil asked the Chairman to include this discussion as an agenda item within the next few months.
- Mr. Brewster agreed. He then expressed his agreement to the idle speed/no wake wording. He asked if the entrances to Bass and Snook Inlets were in fact marked as no wake zones.
- Mr. Keeney replied affirmatively.

OLD BUSINESS

- Mr. Brewster confirmed there was no old business on the agenda, but requested an update on the lights for the BSI boat lock.
- Mr. Brodersen replied they were on order and would be installed immediately upon receipt.
- Mr. Wiechec asked why the lights malfunctioned so often.
- Mr. Brodersen replied the seals were old, allowing water in and shorting out the lights.

MEMBER COMMENTS

- Mr. Wiechec informed Mr. Brodersen the bumpers at the BSI boat lock were also worn.
- Mr. Gil asked if there were any stimulus monies for repairs to the boat lock.
- Mr. Keeney replied a Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant had been applied for but had been rejected.
- Mr. Murphy advised the City was rewording and resubmitting application for the TIGER grant.

ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting Adjourned: 2:39 p.m.

Gary Brewster, Chairman

Perri Turner, Recording Secretary