

**PUNTA GORDA ISLES  
CANAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
FEBRUARY 17, 2011**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Thomas McAlear, Acting Chairman  
Nancy Dauster, James Hoffman, David McBride,  
Charles Thomas, James Thompson

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bill Dixon

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Rick Keeney, Public Works Director  
Randy Brodersen, Canal Maintenance Supervisor  
Gary Disher, Project Manager

**CALL TO ORDER/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- A. Roll Call
  - 1. Election of Officers
    - Mr. Rick Keeney, Public Works Director, opened the floor for nominations for Chairman.
    - Mr. McAlear NOMINATED Mr. Dixon as Chairman.
    - Mr. Thompson MOVED, Mr. McBride SECONDED to close the nominations. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
    - As there were no other nominations, Mr. Dixon was re-appointed Chairman by acclamation.
    - Mr. Keeney opened the floor for nominations for Vice Chairman.
    - Mr. Thomas NOMINATED Mr. McAlear as Vice Chairman.
    - Mr. Thompson MOVED, Mr. McBride SECONDED to close the nominations. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
    - As there were no other nominations, Mr. McAlear was appointed Vice Chairman by acclamation.
- B. Next Scheduled Meeting
  - 1. Monday, March 21, 2011

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A. January 20, 2011 Minutes
  - Mr. McBride MOVED, Mr. Thompson SECONDED approval of the January 20, 2011 minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**REPORTS**

- A. Permits Authorized by City Staff for Installation of Docks, Lifts, Outpilings, etc.
  - Mr. Randy Brodersen, Canal Maintenance Supervisor, reported ten permits were issued in January 2011.

- B. Budget Utilization Report – January 2011
- C. Seawall and Seawall Cap Replacement Status Reports
  - Mr. Brodersen displayed overheads of the January 2011 Budget Utilization Report and Seawall & Seawall Cap Replacement Status Reports, as delineated in the agenda material, offering to answer any questions.
  - Mr. McAlear commented the reports seemed to be fairly straightforward.

#### NEW BUSINESS

- A. Budget Preparation – Fiscal Year (FY) 2011/2012
  - Mr. Keeney reminded members budget preparations were underway, announcing members were welcome to meet with Public Works Department staff regarding same. He requested members advise him of any special projects.
  - Mr. McBride asked if staff was aware of any projects or items of which the Committee was not aware.
  - Mr. Keeney replied the important issue was seawall and seawall cap footage. He explained the Committee could then determine how aggressive they wished to be with respect to replacement. He recalled Mr. Thompson had expressed concern with regard to mangrove trimming in Ponce de Leon Inlet, stating staff was looking into how far back the mangroves could be trimmed, dependent upon land ownership beyond same.

**Note: Ms. Dauster arrived at the meeting at 1:43 p.m.**

- Mr. McBride asked if any other elements related to the Geographic Information System (GIS) program were necessary to maintain same.
- Mr. Keeney replied absolutely, stating the Committee would hear a GIS presentation later in the meeting. He clarified staff would include any requested items in the budget and seek the Committee’s favorable recommendation to City Council.
- Mr. McAlear suggested the Committee move to the next item as he felt same could result in a budget request.
- Mr. Thompson asked how recommendations relative to the annual assessment fee were handled, i.e., by staff or by the Committee.
- Mr. Keeney replied the dollar amount would be dependent upon the above mentioned footage and how aggressive the Committee wished to be.
- B. Discussion on Hiring Consultant to Review Assessment Fee Methodology
  - Mr. McAlear recalled the Committee had briefly discussed hiring a consultant to review methodology at their previous meeting.
  - Mr. McBride noted his comment relative to hiring an outside consultant was intended to be more general in nature, acknowledging the methodology issue would certainly qualify for same.

- Mr. McAlear clarified Mr. McBride was recommending a specific dollar amount be set aside for a line item such as “consultant fees,” perhaps in the amount of \$10,000 to \$15,000.
- Mr. McBride agreed, expressing uncertainty with regard to a reasonable dollar amount.
- Mr. Thompson pointed out designation of funds for a consultant would lessen the dollar amount which could be applied to seawall replacement.
- Mr. Keeney cautioned he believed a very basic study would most likely entail costs of \$25,000 at a minimum. He confirmed if a study was not undertaken, those funds could be reallocated to seawall repair, for example.
- Mr. McAlear noted the most recent engineering study was \$25,000.
- Mr. McBride MOVED, Ms. Dauster SECONDED to add a budget line item for a consultant for special project work in the amount of \$25,000 to \$30,000.
- Mr. Hoffman clarified the Public Works Department did not currently have a consultant on retainer.
- Mr. Keeney agreed, stating staff would need to issue a specific Request for Proposal (RFP).
- Mr. Thomas questioned the source of funding for the above mentioned engineering study.
- Mr. Keeney replied funds were transferred from elsewhere in the budget as there had not been a specific line item at that time.
- MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

##### A. Condominium Assessment Methodology

- Mr. McAlear stated he did not believe the current methodology was equitable. He provided a detailed review of the Committee’s discussions held over the past several meetings, stating he believed this issue should continue to be discussed until a conclusion was reached. He opined there would be significant controversy between the “small” versus “big” lots.
- Mr. Thomas asserted the obvious answer was to change to a linear foot methodology, stating the change could be implemented for condominiums initially. He noted a consultant’s report recommending same may prove helpful in doing so.
- Mr. McBride suggested a consultant’s report should take into consideration the difficulties associated with making such a change and the costs associated with same.
- Mr. Thompson interjected charging a base \$6.25 per foot throughout the Canal Maintenance Assessment District (CMAD) would realize an additional \$1 million in revenue annually.

- Mr. McBride reminded members some condominium owners would not be liable dependent upon the wording of their deed of purchase.
  - Mr. Hoffman suggested consideration be given to a per-dock assessment throughout the CMAD including condominiums.
  - Mr. Thompson spoke in favor of placing the issue in the hands of a consultant. He asked Mr. Thomas if he had met with Mr. Steve Fabian relative to his research on this issue.
  - Mr. Thomas replied he had not due to scheduling conflicts; however, he hoped to do so in March 2011.
  - Mr. McAlear concluded the Committee would continue to keep this issue open.
  - Mr. McBride stated he did not feel this should continue to be an agenda item every month to simply have the same discussion with no results.
  - Consensus of the Committee was to not have this item on every agenda unless there was something new to report.
- B. Inclusion into Canal Maintenance Assessment District (CMAD) – Proposed Ordinance
- Mr. Keeney drew members’ attention to a proposed ordinance, as delineated in the agenda material, stating same was developed based on previous discussions with this Committee and the Burnt Store Isles (BSI) Canal Advisory Committee (CAC). He explained City Council had directed staff to amend the proposed ordinance to also allow proration of the amount of fee based on the age of the seawall including waiver of such fee if the seawall and seawall cap had been replaced within the three years preceding the request.
- Consensus of the Committee was to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance.
- C. Update on Seawall & Charlotte County GIS
- Mr. Brodersen introduced Mr. Gary Disher, Project Manager, commending him on the work he had completed on the GIS program. He displayed an overhead of PGI 2010 seawall assessment figures, as delineated in the agenda material, including both seawall caps and seawalls, as well as a comparison in findings between PGI and BSI.
  - Mr. Thompson clarified seawall caps were not always replaced but rather could sometimes be repaired.
  - Mr. McAlear confirmed approximately 90.9 miles of seawall existed in PGI.
  - Mr. McBride confirmed seawalls facing Charlotte Harbor were included.
  - Mr. Disher explained any seawall which was a part of the CMAD had been inspected and counted. He then provided a presentation of aerial photographs of PGI, as delineated in the agenda material, dating back to 1951 and depicting its development starting in 1966. He stated it appeared all seawalls were in place by 1981.

- Mr. Thomas commented it would be impossible to gain regulatory approval to build such a community in the current day and age.
- Mr. Disher noted the aerial photographs were obtained from Charlotte County. He explained documentation such as that being shown this date would help establish when seawalls were constructed or replaced which in turn would determine the life of same.
- Mr. Brodersen pointed out the percentages compared between BSI and PGI were uncannily close.
- Mr. McAlear noted BSI's seawalls were constructed much later than PGI's.
- Mr. Disher then displayed a spreadsheet depicting all data entered thus far, stating same detailed the following: seawall, seawall cap and berm conditions; actions needed; percentages of problem areas; original installation dates.
- Mr. Brodersen mentioned staff hoped to make this information available to the public's view through Charlotte County's web site.
- Mr. McAlear confirmed the entire BSI and PGI canal systems had been covered.
- Mr. Brodersen agreed, adding the next inspection would take place the following winter.
- Mr. Thompson questioned the amount of seawall replaced the previous year.
- Mr. Brodersen replied approximately 6,000 to 7,000 feet.
- Mr. Thomas noted this exercise would allow staff to predict workload with a fair level of accuracy.
- Mr. Disher agreed that was an ultimate goal.
- Mr. Thompson then requested an update on the Vasco Peebles Bridge as discussed at the Committee's previous meeting.
- Mr. Brodersen announced a Florida Power & Light (FP&L) subcontractor had been performing a disconnect on existing power lines over the past few days. He noted City representatives were meeting with FP&L this date to discuss the steps necessary to allow Marine Contracting Group (MCG) to finish working on the bridge.
- Mr. Thompson questioned FP&L's costs.
- Mr. Brodersen replied there were none.
- Mr. Thompson questioned the expiration date of MCG's current contract with the City.
- Mr. Brodersen replied April 2011, confirming bids had been sent out.
- Mr. Thompson then questioned the cost of seawall panels, noting same had been requested at the previous meeting.
- Mr. Brodersen submitted a statement attesting to same into the record, stating the total cost to pour a seawall slab was \$239.17, the per foot cost was \$39.86 and the

previous year's cost was \$191.96. He also submitted a statement of concrete tests from Universal Engineering Sciences into the record, noting same had also been requested.

- Mr. Thomas clarified tests were conducted on a random basis.
- Mr. Brodersen mentioned the crew working on seawall slabs had been working out very well with regard to workmanship.
- Mr. Hoffman confirmed City employees poured the seawall slabs.
- Mr. McAlear then confirmed Mr. Brodersen was aware of the shallow spot in Bass Inlet. He commented on the signage in Ponce de Leon Inlet, requesting the last sign on the left and the sign upon entering be reversed as they were essentially facing the wrong way.

#### **MEMBERS COMMENTS**

- Mr. McAlear welcomed Mr. Hoffman to the Committee.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

- Meeting Adjourned: 3:11 p.m.

---

Thomas McAlear, Acting Chairman

---

Mary Kelly, Recording Secretary