

PUBLIC MEETING  
FOR THE SOUTHERN PALM BEACH ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE  
SHORELINE STABILIZATION PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
STATEMENT

January 7, 2015

5:30 p.m to 7:13 p.m.

Town of Palm Beach Council Chambers

PRESENTED BY:

Garett Lips, US Army Corps of Engineers

1 MR. LIPS: All right, everybody, we're  
2 going to get started tonight.

3 We're here for the public meeting. This  
4 is a forum for you all to be able to express  
5 your concerns or issues, any kind of statements  
6 for the draft of the Environmental Impact  
7 Statement we just released. We made it  
8 available December 12th.

9 My name is Garret Lips. I'm the project  
10 manager with the Army Corps of Engineers. Just  
11 introductions, we have Susan Kaynor who is the  
12 chief of the Palm Beach Gardens office right  
13 here. We have some other people who have  
14 helped in developing the EIS. Tom Pierro --  
15 you guys want to stand up just so you know --  
16 everybody knows who to ask if you have problems  
17 or questions -- Stacey, Lauren, Brad. So if  
18 you have questions about the project once we  
19 get through all the -- through the presentation  
20 you can ask these people.

21 Why we're here is so you, the public,  
22 stakeholders, can express concerns and be  
23 involved in our federal process which is this  
24 Environmental Impact Statement. We do have a  
25 court reporter right here. She's going to be

1 recording everything that's made orally,  
2 including my presentation. Once we get through  
3 all the -- oral comments they'll be a time, if  
4 you're not comfortable giving oral comments,  
5 she'll be available and you can speak to her  
6 directly, or you can make written comments.  
7 Anywhere in the back there's paper and pens  
8 available. We encourage you to make your  
9 comments orally, written or through the court  
10 reporter. Please be sure to sign in if you  
11 haven't already. We're keeping a tally of the  
12 attendance. If you want to make oral comments  
13 make sure you made it noted on the sign-in  
14 sheet. The time limit is going to be three  
15 minutes as it is currently posed.

16 This is just a basic outline of the  
17 presentation. It's going to be quick, 10 or 15  
18 minutes. There's just six components,  
19 basically. I am going to go through each one  
20 of these real briefly.

21 All right. Basically we're here because  
22 of NEPA. NEPA is the National Environmental  
23 Policy Act which requires government agencies,  
24 federal government agencies, when they  
25 undertake an action you should involve the

1 public. You should be transparent and you  
2 should work with the stakeholders at every  
3 chance you get.

4 So you may ask why is the Corps involved.  
5 At this point it's because the projects that  
6 the Town and the County, two projects, two  
7 separate projects by two separate entities, are  
8 being considered under one EIS. And that's --  
9 it's our discretion to do that. It allows  
10 streamlining and to expedite, you know, instead  
11 of doing two separate EIS's. But, anyway,  
12 their projects have proposed structures,  
13 filling and dredging within tidal waters and  
14 that's why the Corps of Engineers is involved.  
15 And for these structures, fill and dredging,  
16 they actually need a permit and that's our  
17 role.

18 NEPA is the reason we're here. This is a  
19 quick rundown of the different types of NEPA  
20 classes of action. Typically Environmental  
21 Impact Statements are for the very large  
22 projects that have potentially significant  
23 effects on the human environment. Most of the  
24 projects that we review in the Palm Beach  
25 Gardens Permits Office are environmental

1 assessments. It's really tied to the magnitude  
2 of impact, or potential magnitude of impact.

3 You may ask yourself why we have to do  
4 Environmental Impact Statements. The Corps of  
5 Engineers is responsible for determining the  
6 level of significance. So a couple of years  
7 ago we received these applications and we made  
8 that significance determination and said, yes,  
9 in fact, Environmental Impact Statement would  
10 be the appropriate cause of action because of  
11 the changes in the shoreline and based on  
12 conditions of the shoreline.

13 Just so you know, the EIS is really a tool  
14 for our decision making it's -- it's there as  
15 the foundation -- it's supposed to be an  
16 analytical and scientific basis for our  
17 decision which comes eventually after the EIS  
18 process is completed.

19 So this is just a check back on our little  
20 agenda. This is -- we're going to get into the  
21 EIS process right now, and the steps that are  
22 involved in that.

23 So just so you know, the Corps of  
24 Engineers is the lead federal agency. We  
25 weren't notified by any other federal agency

1           that they wanted to be a cooperating agency  
2           with us. We didn't invite any either, and  
3           that's more of a federal process if, like, they  
4           would be part of the project and they would be  
5           potentially adopting our EIS if it was  
6           necessary. But at this point we're not  
7           considering any cooperating agencies.

8           If you remember, for those of you who were  
9           here last -- for the scoping meeting, it was in  
10          August of 2013, if you want to look at the  
11          yellow box up on the top, and where we are now  
12          is the yellow box there on the right  
13          (Indicating).

14          So here's a Notice of Availability that we  
15          published in the Federal Register which  
16          triggers the 45-day comment period for the EIS.

17          We are required to submit the document,  
18          make it available to all you stakeholders and  
19          all the agencies prior to the Notice of  
20          Availability. So if you are on the stakeholder  
21          list you probably received notification of  
22          that.

23          January 26th is the end of the common  
24          period for the draft Environmental Impact  
25          Statement.

1           Looking forward the final -- based on  
2           comments received tonight, based on the amount  
3           of additional analytical work we might need to  
4           do, based on comments, based on alternatives  
5           that may be brought forward tonight, anything  
6           like that could change these dates that we have  
7           forecast right here. But as -- between  
8           scoping, the scoping meeting and tonight, what  
9           we did was go through these phases right here  
10          (Indicating) where we had to acquire the data,  
11          we had to find out what's out there, what  
12          environmental resources, culture resources. We  
13          did a whole evaluation of everything that was  
14          in the project area and then we cataloged it  
15          all in the draft Environmental Impact Statement  
16          that you all received.

17                 So what's your role as the stakeholders?  
18                 We are encouraging you to express your views on  
19                 the DEIS, Draft Environmental Impact Statement,  
20                 and our current understanding. We wrote it.  
21                 We're on the record. This is our understanding  
22                 of what's going to be occurring, what the  
23                 projects are and the effects and those  
24                 alternatives and the impacts associated with  
25                 alternatives. So we want you to provide your

1 feedback. You can check our data. We're  
2 wanting you to do that. You have questions  
3 about the way we assess something, let us know.  
4 If you are aware of other information that may  
5 be useful, please let us know. We're going to  
6 continue on with the proposed project. These  
7 are just the basic elements of the project just  
8 so you have an understanding of what we're  
9 talking about.

10 So this is the overall view (Indicating).  
11 There's the two projects. You'll see if you  
12 orient yourself to the north, the Lake Worth  
13 Pier is right here (Indicating). Lantana, the  
14 public beach, is down here (Indicating). The  
15 Town of Palm Beach line is right about here  
16 (Indicating). So the section on the north  
17 between -- just south of Lake Worth Pier down  
18 to the County Town line is all beach and dune  
19 proposed sand placement. There is some dune.  
20 There's some sand in the water. But for the  
21 most part it's a long -- which is less than  
22 about a 2-mile limit -- and then as you hit the  
23 Town of South Palm Beach the County project  
24 picks up and they proposed some coastal  
25 armoring and some beach and dune restoration as

1 well.

2 The one thing you should know is that  
3 during the scoping meeting, if you were here,  
4 is that the original plan by the Town was to  
5 utilize upland mined sand. Since that day we  
6 were notified that the Town's preferred source  
7 is actually offshore dredge material which  
8 would be obtained from a borrowed area north of  
9 the inlet, I believe. The method with where  
10 they would obtain the fill is they would dredge  
11 it from an offshore borrow area, transport it  
12 to the beach, somewhere in midtown, stock pile  
13 it temporarily and then truck it to Reach 8.  
14 That's their proposed -- it's an important  
15 thing because originally the plan -- we just  
16 want to make sure you're aware that that has  
17 changed. But we -- in the draft we also  
18 included upland mine as an alternative for fill  
19 material. However, the prefer plan by the Town  
20 has been changed.

21 And for the County they still propose  
22 upland mine sand because they're not using  
23 dredge material.

24 This is a basic rundown of some of the  
25 elements more -- with more detail. And these

1 are range monuments based on the FDEP monuments  
2 on the beach. You'll actually get more detail  
3 on the exhibits in the back. But the basic  
4 change that you should be aware of is that  
5 dredged sand is now preferred for the Town.

6 This is just a general depiction of, I  
7 know it's difficult to see, but that's just the  
8 general outline of what -- you can see a little  
9 fill template here (Indicating), and then down  
10 here there's seven groins, they're very, very  
11 small, I'm sorry to have to do that to you but  
12 you'll get more detail in the back.

13 Just a quick cross section of what it  
14 would look like. This is at the address near  
15 3120 South Ocean Boulevard. This is a cross  
16 section so you're looking from the south north  
17 and the dune is over here (Indicating), so  
18 there's a modest amount of fill that will be  
19 placed in the dune area. As it goes out  
20 there's a high tide line about here, so this  
21 amount of fill would actually be in the water.  
22 It's just slightly different than what the  
23 existing profile is. There's more detail in  
24 the back.

25 This cross section (Indicating) actually

1 we put in here so you can see what coastal  
2 armoring structure looks like, what it would  
3 look like if it was constructed this way. So  
4 these groins made of concrete would be driven  
5 into the ground, seven of them, and it's based  
6 about 300 feet apart or so and they'd be  
7 sticking out roughly about three feet more or  
8 less.

9 MR. VOICE: Level with the berm.

10 MR. LIPS: Level with the berm. These are  
11 -- these are proposed for the County project,  
12 and the Town doesn't have any of these  
13 proposed.

14 So we're going to get into the major  
15 sections of the EIS. For the Corps of  
16 Engineers the purpose and need is a big, very  
17 important detail that we -- we base everything  
18 on what the goal of the project is, what the  
19 desired outcome that the applicant wants. So  
20 when we get to purpose and need we do a long  
21 detailed evaluation of what the actual purpose  
22 is, the need, and what the hope to goal is.  
23 From there we -- we come up with alternatives  
24 and we always include a no action, what would  
25 happen if you left it status quo. But the

1 alternatives are based on the purpose and need.  
2 There's a whole bunch of information in the  
3 draft document about all the alternatives that  
4 we considered. We considered six of them. And  
5 then moving on into the draft document we talk  
6 about what's -- what's out here, what's in the  
7 project area, all the resources, human  
8 resources, culture resources, environmental,  
9 aquatic resources, all those things that we  
10 have to identify those to make sure we assess  
11 those if they're going to be potentially  
12 impacted.

13 So then once we have those resources  
14 identified then we go through and figure out  
15 what would happen to these resources if the  
16 project was constructed or if any alternatives  
17 were constructed as well. So we -- so we're  
18 always comparing apples to apples when it comes  
19 to alternatives and the effects. So we can say  
20 if you did this one, this would happen; if you  
21 did what the applicant proposed, this would  
22 happen, so we can see what's going to occur and  
23 make sure that we're on the track of having a  
24 project that's not contrary. And in these  
25 environmental consequences we look at direct,

1 indirect and the cumulative. For any  
2 endangered species we had to do required  
3 consultations, essential fish habitat.

4 And then the last part is mitigation. How  
5 do you offset the potential adverse effects.

6 Basic understanding of the project  
7 purpose, the draft has the Town's and the  
8 County's project purposes written out as they  
9 prepared them in their permit applications.  
10 This is just summarized just so you have an  
11 understanding of the basic concept of what  
12 they're trying to achieve.

13 So when we talk about purpose and need and  
14 we talk about potential alternatives that would  
15 be potentially viable we ask ourselves is it  
16 reasonable and would it meet the project  
17 purpose. So if it is reasonable, it can built  
18 considering the amount of money that's  
19 potentially budgeted, it has to be reasonable,  
20 then we would consider that as a potentially  
21 viable alternative.

22 In our draft we're going to go through  
23 these different alternatives and they're  
24 discussed in detail in the draft. There's six  
25 of them.

1           So when we talk about the affected  
2           environment these are some examples of what we  
3           see when we go out there. We see how the human  
4           environment here with the, you know,  
5           residences. We got the dune. We have  
6           intertidal beach. We have rock line. We have  
7           sea turtle nesting habitat. We have near shore  
8           hard bottom. We have all those things. That's  
9           just to name a few.

10           This information is tied to the near shore  
11           hard bottom that's been mapped over consecutive  
12           years. I know it's very hard to see but you  
13           can generally see the outline of what the  
14           proposed project and these squiggly purple and  
15           red and blue lines represent hard bottom lines  
16           that were delineated between 2012 and, I think,  
17           2003 or so -- about 12 years -- 10 years of  
18           data. So we have all that information and we  
19           included it in the EIS.

20           Environmental consequences, we're looking  
21           at direct, indirect and cumulative. The direct  
22           effects of where the fill placed in the  
23           footprint of the construction, the construction  
24           toe, the footprint, that's the direct. When  
25           you think about where is that sand going to go

1           once the tide hits it and gets into the  
2           littoral system and starts moving as the  
3           natural coastal processes occur, those are the  
4           indirect effects.

5                     And we've done some modeling assessment,  
6           we have an understanding of where that sand is  
7           potentially going to be spread to.

8                     And the cumulative, those are -- which  
9           result from the incremental, we have a whole  
10          list of, in the draft, of all the potential  
11          cumulative effects.

12                    We are including all these effects  
13          analysis for each alternative. So we have,  
14          what we're aware of are swimming and nesting  
15          sea turtles, is a big component of this  
16          project, we have loggerhead critical habitat  
17          which is a new resource that recently came in  
18          that we're going to have to consult for which  
19          wasn't identified during scoping because it  
20          wasn't part of the Endangered Species Act at  
21          that time. That's a new factor we're bringing  
22          in to the draft. And we have Acropora. We did  
23          a Acropora study. No Acropora, which is a  
24          federally listed coral and were not found in  
25          the project area.

1           Other resources, Piping Plover, animals  
2           that use -- small birds that utilize the  
3           shoreline. West Indian Manatee transit the  
4           area. And the Red Dot which is another type of  
5           shore bird, another thing that recently became  
6           listed under the Endangered Species Act. And  
7           we have included that in our evaluation as  
8           well. So there has been some changes since  
9           scoping.

10           Moving along in our itinerary we're going  
11           to open it up for questions about the EIS  
12           process. At this point we want to limit it to  
13           that. Just so everybody is clear where we are,  
14           where we came from and where we're going. So  
15           we're going to have -- the next slide is  
16           actually about the future milestone. So if you  
17           have questions about the process, if I wasn't  
18           clear just, you know, feel free to ask about  
19           what's next if you're not clear.

20           MS. ERICKSON: I have a question. Having  
21           been involved in many --

22           MR. LIPS: Is it possible to use the  
23           microphone?

24           MS. ERICKSON: Having been in -- for the  
25           record, my name is Karyn Erickson. I'm a

1 coastal engineer with Erickson Consulting  
2 Engineers. I've served as the engineer of  
3 record on a number of projects that involved  
4 Environmental Impact Statements and  
5 Environmental Assessments through the NEPA  
6 process, and also as a consulting engineering  
7 firm with the Savannah Corps of Engineers.

8 Each of these processes we were involved  
9 and participated throughout the process all  
10 major stakeholder groups whether it was  
11 Autobahn, Southern Environmental Law Center or  
12 a specific special interest group such as the  
13 Save Our Shoreline Coalition. And in this case  
14 we have a scoping meeting that occurred one  
15 time in August which was about 15 months ago,  
16 and since that time rather than be involved in  
17 this process through the development and  
18 decision making on data sets that drove  
19 hundreds of thousands of dollars in numerical  
20 modeling with results that we may or may not  
21 agree with we're being presented with a draft  
22 final EIS without that participation and I find  
23 that that's very unusual and I'm disappointed  
24 that the public hasn't been involved up to this  
25 point.

1 MR. LIPS: Okay.

2 MS. ERICKSON: That's my statement.

3 MR. LIPS: Thank you.

4 Any other questions or comments?

5 MR. BONANO: I have a question. I don't  
6 think I have to go up to the mike. I have a  
7 statement I'd like to make later on. But right  
8 now the question. I'm confused -- by the way,  
9 my name Charles Bonano. I've been on A1A for  
10 the last 30 consecutive years, domiciliary 15  
11 of those years in South Palm Beach and the last  
12 15 years at 3360 South Ocean Boulevard. I'm  
13 confused. The sand, as I understand it, is  
14 sand that the Town of Palm Beach is  
15 recommending. That's what I understood when I  
16 walked through that door. That was different  
17 sand than the County sand.

18 MR. LIPS: You mind speaking on the  
19 microphone? He's handing it to you there on  
20 your left.

21 MR. BONANO: Sorry about that. Do I have  
22 to repeat everything, or can I just keep going?

23 MR. LIPS: Keep going.

24 MR. BONANO: Anyway, my name is Charles  
25 D. Bonano. I reside at 3360 South Ocean

1 Boulevard. I've been on the barrier island for  
2 30 years and I've also been on the ocean for  
3 over 50 years and I've been through this kind  
4 of thing up in Cape Cod and so forth and so on.

5 When I came through the door tonight it  
6 was my understanding that the -- my question is  
7 about the sand and then I'd like to make my  
8 statement. It was my understanding that the  
9 sand was approved or met the approval of the  
10 Town of Palm Beach but wasn't necessarily the  
11 sand that the -- that Palm Beach County would  
12 have supplied or recommended. Is that still  
13 the case or has something changed?

14 MR. LIPS: Well, we can -- I can answer  
15 that, but, yeah, that's really a comment for  
16 just after this because we're just trying to go  
17 through --

18 MR. BONANO: Then I'll get right to my  
19 statement to conserve time.

20 MR. LIPS: Okay. We're going to call --  
21 we're go through the list of people who -- who  
22 are on the list to make comments, or we're just  
23 going to call them off one by one if you don't  
24 mind so we can keep on track. We're getting to  
25 the point where we're going to make public

1           comments just after we're there.

2                   MR. BONANO: All right. Well, I had a  
3           statement to make, I'll make it later on.  
4           Whatever you wish.

5                   MR. LIPS: Okay. Just hold that thought.  
6           Right now -- there's four ways to comment on  
7           the draft. You can do it publicly. You can  
8           comment, you know, we have forms here you can  
9           make. We have a court reporter, or you can  
10          mail in comments to us directly. You can email  
11          right here (Indicating).

12                   Right now we are transitioning to  
13          stakeholder comments.

14                   MR. EUBANKS: I have one more quick  
15          question. I hate to interrupt. John Eubanks  
16          for the record.

17                   I had a quick question, and this goes back  
18          to the process not the public comment because  
19          we'll get into that in a minute. But my  
20          question was you had mentioned in here a couple  
21          of things that there's been some changes made,  
22          there have been some things added, and I was  
23          wondering, okay, now that we've made those  
24          changes where are those going to be reflected  
25          in the draft EIS? Will people get a chance to

1 see those, and will there be any other time to  
2 make additional comments because right now it  
3 looks like we only have one, and now I'm coming  
4 to learn from what Ms. Erickson is saying that  
5 normally there's a little more give and take  
6 and some of those things are even addressed  
7 before this. So it's just a procedural  
8 question, I guess, if you will, if there is any  
9 changes do we get to see them, and do we get to  
10 comment on it?

11 MR. LIPS: The Corps of Engineers' process  
12 in the Jacksonville District is we do a scoping  
13 meeting, everybody contributes their ideas and  
14 their issues that they have with the proposed  
15 project, they identify the concerns, express  
16 whatever they need, whatever they feel is  
17 appropriate. We take that information, we  
18 compile it, we go through it and then we  
19 include it in the draft Environmental Impact  
20 Statement and that's where we are tonight. So  
21 everything we have that was contributed during  
22 the scoping is what you see in the draft. So  
23 that helped evolve that document. The  
24 Jacksonville District doesn't engage with, you  
25 know, public -- NGOs and things like that, you

1 know, the comment period is where we'll always  
2 consider comments but we're not going to reach  
3 out and hold forums other than the scoping  
4 meeting that we had.

5 MR. EUBANKS: That leads me to just two  
6 quick comments. One, I didn't see the SOS.  
7 Was that in there, the alternative, their  
8 alternative that's actually defined in there?

9 Two, the second issue was I understand  
10 you're not reaching out to folks but apparently  
11 somehow something else is now going to be in  
12 there or considered just in the comments you  
13 made, in the opening comments, that's all I was  
14 asking. Those things that have been added,  
15 those things that have been added into the  
16 draft, well, that means then it's a different  
17 draft, that's all I'm questioning.

18 MR. LIPS: No. No. Just to clarify,  
19 those issues are what we uncovered during the  
20 time period between scoping and right now. So  
21 we found new information so we included it in  
22 the draft. If we didn't include it we'd have  
23 to go back. But at this point we uncovered  
24 those new issues between scoping and now we've  
25 included that so we are covered. We're not

1 going to go back and have to do anything more  
2 with the draft at this point. So they're  
3 not -- they're not new -- when I say "new" at  
4 the time of scoping they weren't -- they  
5 weren't available. They weren't protected  
6 under the Endangered Species Act. They are now  
7 and we included them in the draft so that's  
8 what I'm referring to is the new regulations  
9 and new laws that came in that were related to  
10 those resources.

11 But there is another opportunity for  
12 comments, is at the final impact, final EIS.  
13 So after this we're going to take all the  
14 comments, go through it. We're going to revise  
15 the draft, incorporate appropriate comments  
16 that we're going to consider and then, you  
17 know, we'll have another opportunity for  
18 comment at the final Environmental Impact  
19 Statement. We'll release that. There's going  
20 to be an NOA. I had the -- I had the -- Just  
21 one thing, the notice of availability is right  
22 now tentatively schedule for June, 2015 so at  
23 that point if that schedule holds they'll be  
24 another 30-day comment period for the final  
25 Environmental Impact Statement.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question.  
2 Would you clarify -- my question is did I  
3 understand that there will be no changes to the  
4 draft?

5 MR. LIPS: No, that's not correct. The  
6 draft is what we have tonight. That's our  
7 current understanding and our -- all the  
8 information we compiled is in there; however,  
9 things that you guys express, and stakeholders  
10 and federal agencies, this is just a draft so  
11 once we release it we're looking for input.  
12 We're looking for feedback on -- did we get it  
13 right? Do we need to look somewhere else? Did  
14 we miss anything? So, yes, if we uncover  
15 those things we are going to update the draft  
16 once it goes to final between the draft  
17 Environmental Impact Statement and the final  
18 which would be sometime in the summer of this  
19 year we would be adjusting the draft and making  
20 it morph into the final with all the  
21 information that you guys provided and any kind  
22 of new information that we uncover between now  
23 and then.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, very  
25 much.

1                   MR. LIPS: Sure. Anybody else on the  
2 process because otherwise we'll go right in to  
3 the public oral comments.

4                   We're going to ask that you step up to the  
5 mike or we have the mobile microphone. It's  
6 going to be -- just make your statement. It's  
7 going to be three minutes and we'll go through  
8 the list of people -- we're not going to  
9 have -- it's not going to be a feedback.  
10 You're going to make your statement. She's  
11 going to record it and then we'll go on to the  
12 next person.

13                   The first person, Todd Rimmel. If you  
14 don't mind, state your name.

15                   MR. REMMEL: Good evening. I'm Todd  
16 Rimmel. I'm the current coastal preservation  
17 liaison for the Surfrider Foundation.

18                   I just had a -- we had a comment in  
19 regards to the offshore borrow areas. The plan  
20 proposes using sand from the north borrow Area  
21 1, south borrow Area 2, south borrow Area 3,  
22 or, quote, any offshore sand source that is  
23 consistent with the BMA cell-wide sediment  
24 quality specifications. And I think the  
25 criteria is a bit more stringent than the

1 original Reach 8 sand quality. I think a  
2 couple of the borrowed sites previously  
3 explored for Reach 8 wouldn't meet the grain  
4 size or Munsell requirements of the current  
5 BMA, but I feel it's worth asking what the new  
6 criteria will mean in terms of sand sources  
7 that can be used. Thanks.

8 MR. LIPS: Thank you. Michael Sharp. Is  
9 that right?

10 MR. VOICE: My name is Michael Sharp. I  
11 live here in Palm Beach at 225 Dunbar Road.

12 I read certain parts of the draft  
13 Environmental Impact Statement and it seems to  
14 indicate that the Town of Palm Beach has  
15 adopted, as its preferred choice, Alternative 2  
16 in your plan. And a further statement I saw  
17 that sort of disturbed me was that there's no  
18 need to consider further the SOS plan. My  
19 question is why? The plan, Alternative Number  
20 2, provides for just dune restoration which at  
21 best gives you 15-year storm protection, from  
22 what I understand, versus the Town and other  
23 parts, all other parts really, other than Reach  
24 8, the objective is to get 25-year storm  
25 protection, i.e. beach restoration, not just

1 dune restoration.

2 Also, the proposal, the supposed proposal  
3 that's been chosen as Alternative 2, and I  
4 don't know if the Town decides this or you have  
5 the ability to guide the Town to a more  
6 sensible solution, the proposal uses an  
7 inferior quality of sand, smaller grain size  
8 and that requires more sand to be used. That,  
9 as I understand it, could result in problems in  
10 obtaining permits and, perhaps, another  
11 Surfrider litigation redux. I don't think we  
12 want that. I think we want a solution for  
13 Reach 8 that is the same as what's provided for  
14 South Palm Beach, Lantana and Manalapan. I  
15 don't understand why the difference, and I  
16 don't understand if the Town has chosen that  
17 inferior plan why you, The Army Corps of  
18 Engineers, hasn't educated the Town as to what  
19 would really be best.

20 The SOS plan, which I have some  
21 familiarity with, would provide 25-year storm  
22 protection versus a temporary fix. We tried  
23 the temporary fix in the past, in 2006, with  
24 the same inferior type of sand and sand size  
25 that is being proposed now. It washed away.

1 It accomplished nothing. To do the same thing  
2 over and over again and spend a lot of money  
3 just doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to me.  
4 Mined sand, as I understand it, could be more  
5 consistent in terms of grain size and if what  
6 is proposed is an average grain size of  
7 .25 millimeters when what's really desirable is  
8 grain size of 38 to 42, .38 to .42 millimeters,  
9 why aren't we going for what's desirable so  
10 that we can adopt a solution that has some  
11 chance of being successful in the years ahead?  
12 Thank you.

13 MR. LIPS: Thank you.

14 MR. LIPS: Robert Davidson.

15 MR. DAVIDSON: I'll speak after Karyn  
16 Erickson.

17 MR. LIPS: Okay. Connie Gaskway  
18 (phonetic).

19 MS. GASKWAY: Good evening. My name is  
20 Connie Gaskway (phonetic). This is what the  
21 County, the sand that the County received after  
22 it guaranteed that they were going to get good  
23 quality sand (Indicating), and this was placed  
24 on Carlin Park Beach (phonetic). It's nothing  
25 but mud. And you could see here that they're

1 giant scarps. I think with the EIS and the  
2 borrow areas that they have I think the only  
3 thing that's going to be really a solution to  
4 Reach 8 is using the up loose sand source and  
5 make sure that it's washed and make sure that  
6 random truckloads need to be inspected, but  
7 it's the only thing -- you're going to be  
8 paying a lot more money for it once but it's  
9 going to stay on the beach. It's not going to  
10 cause the environmental impact that the other  
11 alternatives are and it is good quality sand.  
12 Borrow areas 2 and 3 are a disaster. To be put  
13 on -- and we're going to find out about borrow  
14 Area 1, whether it's good or not, because  
15 there's pictures here that show it's still  
16 black. So my proposal is the original one  
17 using the upland sand source and washing it.  
18 Thank you.

19 MR. LIPS: Thank you for your comment.  
20 Buck Carlton.

21 MR. CARLTON: Buck Carlton down in the  
22 southern part of Palm Beach.

23 I think we've got a flawed plan here. I  
24 think we need to talk about consequences.  
25 We've already run through and have been shot

1 down by the Florida Department Judicial Branch  
2 for having a plan that calls for dredged sand  
3 and calls for miniscule sand. So why do I go  
4 through it again? We don't want to go through  
5 it again because we don't want litigation.

6 Now the second thing that's wrong with  
7 this plan is we have 25-year plans for half of  
8 Palm Beach and 15-year plans, which really  
9 isn't a plan because it hardly even gets you to  
10 a hurricane status. Now I think 100 years ago  
11 when they put people in the lower parts of the  
12 Titanic and they were allowed to drown and the  
13 people with more money were getting lifeboats,  
14 we're looking at the same thing here. The  
15 question is if you have something this divisive  
16 that is so discriminatory you're obviously  
17 going to have a lawsuit. You're going to have  
18 a lawsuit when people are shot down with sands  
19 coming through the ground from the water before  
20 and you're going to have lawsuits from the  
21 people who discriminate against. What does  
22 this mean? This means we're going to have  
23 another six years of litigation. We're going  
24 to have another four years of probing. We're  
25 going to be ten years out. We're three years

1           overdue already for a major hurricane and we  
2           are not talking about a cent. We're talking  
3           about life safety. We're talking about over a  
4           billion dollars in property that's going to be  
5           destroyed. We're talking about 2,000 people  
6           living there who are going to be at risk for  
7           their lives and if the Corps of Engineers  
8           cannot tell the Town Council -- it's not the  
9           Town, it's the Town Council -- that if they  
10          don't come up with a plan that meets a 25-year  
11          protection for everybody in the Town and for  
12          the County of the Town of Palm Beach then they  
13          are not going to be considered. They shouldn't  
14          even be considered. It's crazy. Anyway, thank  
15          you.

16                 MR. LIPS: Thank you. John R. Umbrowski.

17                 MR. EUBANKS: It's Eubanks. The  
18          attorneys have bad handwriting but that may be  
19          the worst I've seen.

20                 For the record, my name is John Eubanks,  
21          and actually I represent Buck Carlton who just  
22          spoke so passionately as you can see.

23                 We also provided you -- I emailed you last  
24          night -- a rather lengthy, detailed letter  
25          asking some of the same things. I won't go

1 through all of it but I do want to touch on  
2 some of those things.

3 As you can tell, people like Buck, they're  
4 excited because, look, we talk about dredge  
5 materials, we talk about sand and everything  
6 else, they look out their window and they see  
7 the ocean versus what's left of the beach and  
8 they go "The ocean is winning and it's going to  
9 win unless we do something." And as you can  
10 tell Buck and many others have said the same  
11 thing, look, let's put in place a plan which is  
12 very similar to the rest of the Town that  
13 provides for a 25-year storm period and the  
14 protection from that. And there's no reason,  
15 they don't see any reason, why we shouldn't do  
16 that.

17 Now the problem is, looking through the  
18 six alternatives you've given and the reason I  
19 asked about the SOS plan because I didn't see  
20 it in those six, none of those do what is being  
21 done for the rest of the Town for the 25-year  
22 storm period. So what he would urge is,  
23 obviously, let's do the same thing we're doing  
24 for the other parts of the Town. Not only has  
25 he urged it as you've seen from my packet,

1           there's a letter from the Town Council itself  
2           back in April saying, hey, we would ask you,  
3           United States Army Corps of Engineers, to give  
4           the same consideration, give the same  
5           consideration, SOS has brought this to us, we  
6           want you to give the same consideration and, in  
7           fact, look at the 25-year storm protection. So  
8           we'd ask you to do that too.

9           The second issue is we've all talked about  
10          and I'm sure we'll talk about it again is the  
11          quality of sand. Clearly it doesn't mean  
12          anything if we get loose sand that you have to  
13          put two to three tons more on the beach  
14          expecting a lot of it to wash away. Most of  
15          the people in this room probably saw in 2006  
16          offshore dredge materials go on to Reach 7, I  
17          think it was, and 85 percent of it washed away  
18          in less than three years. That's huge. Nobody  
19          wants a repeat of that. Nobody also wants a  
20          repeat of the Surfrider Foundation where we  
21          spent years and we end up in litigation because  
22          whether it's your permit what my understanding  
23          is there's still going to be some other permits  
24          out there that will have to come back through  
25          FDEP and if we're putting poor quality sand on

1 and then if we're being told it's because it's  
2 cheaper than it's not cheaper because, you  
3 know, the old adage is you buy cheap you may  
4 have to buy twice, and if the problem is if  
5 it's all going to wash away it's going to  
6 create those type problems.

7 The other aspect is just looking at it why  
8 would the Town of Palm Beach allow itself to  
9 be -- do something different than the County.  
10 The County is, in fact, using upland mined  
11 sand. The County is, in fact, using sand of a  
12 better quality and it's going to stick. It's  
13 going to settle better. It's not going to be  
14 as much problem with the hard bottom. There's  
15 not going to be any problems with native  
16 species. I don't know why the Town would  
17 actually say, well, we really would prefer  
18 something that's -- from everything we've  
19 seen -- is a lot -- is a lot inferior. So at  
20 the end of the day I think everybody who's  
21 involved in this, everybody who looks out their  
22 -- out their window is not looking for the  
23 quick fix. They're looking for the correct fix  
24 and we would ask you guys go back through the  
25 process, look at it again, look at the SOS plan

1           which is the only one that seems to start from  
2           the provision of providing a 25-year storm  
3           period protection. Look at it again and look  
4           at the issue of using the upland sand versus  
5           repeating the same thing over and over again  
6           with the inferior sand. I appreciate it.  
7           Thank you.

8                     MR. LIPS: Thank you for your comment.  
9           Sorry for messing up your name.

10                    MR. EUBANKS: That's all right.

11                    MR. LIPS: Richard Hunegs.

12                    MR. HUNEGS: Thank you. My name is  
13           Richard Hunegs and I'm a resident of 3360 South  
14           Ocean Boulevard. As an active participant,  
15           that is our condominium, as an active  
16           participant in what will be the project,  
17           because we've given Town access over our  
18           property to do the work that we're now  
19           discussing, they're going to build a temporary  
20           road through our property, this is the third  
21           time they've done it with our property, and I  
22           think it's fair to say that we've been ready  
23           and quick to try and provide the access  
24           necessary to the beaches for all the  
25           condominiums in our area. We have an agreement

1 with the Town that was carefully drawn by the  
2 Town and I executed it on behalf of 3360  
3 because I'm the president of that condominium.  
4 We've been through this as -- as counsel just  
5 reported to you a few moments ago -- more than  
6 once. The last time was the fiasco of 2006.  
7 And I call it a "fiasco" because, again, we  
8 used the wrong sized sand from the wrong  
9 borrowing sites and -- and we don't need to  
10 repeat that more than once, I don't think. It  
11 was costly, expensive and we all, as taxpayers,  
12 paid for that.

13 Going back even a little further than that  
14 we've had litigation over those kinds of  
15 issues. As I've been told by the Town Manager  
16 and others that litigation cost the Town \$1  
17 million in attorney's fees and costs, but it  
18 doesn't begin to touch on the real costs which  
19 were probably another \$3 million in the effort  
20 to put the sand on the beach that was the wrong  
21 size, incorrect, and once again left us with  
22 barren and dangerous beaches and dunes that  
23 expose the ownership of the condominiums and  
24 homes along this beach.

25 So once again, as I see it -- I'm just

1 going to read some of this to try and shorten  
2 up my statement -- once again, as I see it, the  
3 Town of Palm Beach is about to engage in an  
4 Atlantic shoreline project that is both high  
5 risk and expensive. Speaking for more than  
6 1,000 people who belong to and are members of  
7 the SOS we propose a far sounder, less riskier  
8 plan that in the long run is no more expensive  
9 and gives far greater protection. As in all  
10 scientific discussions one must be sure that  
11 comparisons of data are accurate or the  
12 conclusions to be drawn will be erroneous and  
13 that's your business and I understand that. As  
14 an engineer that's your coin of the realm.  
15 That is your knowledge. Fortunately we have a  
16 historical precedent to look to here in Palm  
17 Beach as a comparison to the present Town plan  
18 and that's the 2006 fiasco. It was a failure,  
19 a blatant failure and a waste of money and the  
20 proof of that was the judgment made by a  
21 hearing officer who said not only was it an  
22 abysmal failure but that it impaired the  
23 environment and caused an environmental  
24 disaster because we used the wrong size sand  
25 and we're about to try it and do it one more

1 time. So if we go back to those kinds of  
2 lessons apparently -- apparently the Town  
3 hasn't learned that and apparently we need to  
4 repeat that at least once more. I learned in  
5 playing baseball that three strikes and you're  
6 out. I think in a fiasco like this probably  
7 one strike and you're out. I don't know that  
8 the Corps of Engineers would want to approve a  
9 program that repeats that kind of disaster.  
10 I'm sure you don't want to be complicit in it.  
11 I think that's why you want to hear from all of  
12 us to make your own determination as to whether  
13 or not this plan is a sound plan. We have  
14 hired a coastal engineer who has worked for us  
15 for a very long time because this has been a  
16 struggle for the Town and for the Town's  
17 citizens, what to do, how to do it, and make  
18 sure that we don't repeat the old mistakes. To  
19 sustain her credentials, she's worked for the  
20 Town and has produced the most successful  
21 efforts in the Town's past in terms of  
22 engineering beaches. She can tell you about  
23 that and I'm sure at the appropriate time  
24 you'll call on her and allow her to testify.  
25 So rather than have multi-million dollar

1           fiascoes repeated again for the Town we'd  
2           almost rather have you do nothing, absolutely  
3           nothing, and then see what the consequences  
4           are.

5           Coastal engineers agree that grain size of  
6           sand is critical. And if you look at the grain  
7           size of sand that's proposed here it's a  
8           repetition of 2006. You're going out in  
9           borrowing sites in the ocean when mined sand is  
10          available to you on the land, available to the  
11          Town on the land. And guess what? The County  
12          is using that land-located sand. They're using  
13          it in the Town of South Palm Beach. They're  
14          using it in Boca Raton. They're using it in  
15          Manalapan. So it isn't as though we don't have  
16          experience and the engineers don't have  
17          experience with the nature of the sand that's  
18          required and recommended. This isn't anything  
19          more than science and I don't know why we'd  
20          want to violate the principals of science. If  
21          it means that we're somehow saving money, I  
22          don't see that because we keep repeating the  
23          same mistake every three years. How can we be  
24          saving money? The only way to save money is  
25          not to do it and endanger all the properties on

1 the eastern Atlantic seaboard of the island, or  
2 to do it right once and for all. Coastal  
3 engineers agree that the grain size of the sand  
4 to be used on projects of this kind is critical  
5 to success. The Town's consultants have, once  
6 again, advised the use of the lowest possible  
7 grades of sand to be dredged from the ocean  
8 unlike the County that's getting it from an  
9 on-land site where they can inspect it and see  
10 it. And it's placed on dunes as a band-aid to  
11 solve the critical erosion problem. We  
12 experienced that before. This is the third  
13 time our condominium has given access to the  
14 Town to come through with a proposed repair of  
15 the beaches and dunes. So we have experience  
16 with that, and to use a band-aid for this  
17 critical erosion problem is an absurdity  
18 especially when you've experienced it already  
19 and we've seen the losses and we've seen the  
20 fact that our money has been wasted and washed  
21 out to sea. That has contributed to the  
22 problems that have been pointed out by all of  
23 us who I think are true environmentalists at  
24 heart.

25 It was pointed out by one of the speakers

1 just a few moments ago they don't want a  
2 project that creates and compounds the problems  
3 that you addressed before when you were talking  
4 about nesting turtles and the other sea life  
5 that we need to be concerned about. We put out  
6 our lights on our beach during nesting. We  
7 follow the law. And we're anxious to make sure  
8 we have a beach that the turtles can come on to  
9 and lay their eggs. Those kind of beaches are  
10 disappearing and I think you have recognized  
11 that as a coastal engineer yourself.

12 I'm not sure why we'd want to repeat the  
13 mistakes of the past and do this over and over  
14 again. I don't know why Palm Beach County has  
15 devised a plan that's better than the plan that  
16 the Town of Palm Beach has devised, and the  
17 Town of Palm Beach doesn't want to engage with  
18 the County. The County has offered to do that.  
19 That would solve the substantial part of the  
20 problems that we all are concerned with and  
21 that we all are talking about. Palm Beach  
22 County has gone so far as to go just to the  
23 Town of South Palm Beach to erect -- erect  
24 structures to keep the sand. They have mined  
25 the sand that's of the appropriate size on

1 land. The Corps of Engineers -- the Corps of  
2 Engineers is certainly capable, certainly  
3 capable of devising and adopting the plans that  
4 the -- that the State has put in place and  
5 cooperate with them. And I guess I'd ask the  
6 question what possible excuse could there be in  
7 not asking the County of Palm Beach to  
8 participate with the Town of Palm Beach in  
9 solving this issue and solving this problem  
10 once and for all. It defies for me, it  
11 actually defies common sense, good judgment to  
12 be mired in to these old failed schemes and  
13 just keep doing them over and over again. All  
14 the citizens are sick and tired of that,  
15 watching their money wasted on programs that  
16 don't work. Is it a coastal engineering  
17 problem or is it a Town problem where people  
18 just want to look at the easiest solution and  
19 the cheapest solution rather than the best  
20 solution which over time is the cheapest  
21 solution. So we don't want to be a place that  
22 settles on impoverished ideas. We're capable  
23 of doing better and the proof of that are for  
24 other plans in the same Town where better work  
25 is planned and better work is being done. If

1           you fail in one third of the Town or half of  
2           the Town or two thirds of the Town it's  
3           immaterial, it's a failure. The Town needs  
4           equal protection for all its vulnerable beaches  
5           for the same reason that a team is only as  
6           strong as its weakest link. The Town of South  
7           Palm Beach, as I said, the County of Palm Beach  
8           are, as we speak, implementing a much better  
9           program, infinitely better, and they're doing  
10          it with care. And I've met with the engineer  
11          that's in charge of the projects and he's  
12          available, as you know, to this -- to our Town,  
13          both as a consultant and both as one who will  
14          offer the County assistance.

15                 MR. LIPS: Would you mind wrapping it up?

16                 MR. HUNEGS: I'm going to wrap it up  
17                 right now.

18                 MR. LIPS: Thank you.

19                 MR. HUNEGS: I appreciate that, for your  
20                 generous allowance of time.

21                 Let me say just say this: Here in the  
22                 Town of Palm Beach the conservative thing to  
23                 do, the conservative thing to do is to preserve  
24                 our beaches and to do this correctly one time.  
25                 It's the conservative thing because it's the

1 least expensive in the long run. It's the best  
2 and it provides the protection that people  
3 deserve. So let's allocate our resources  
4 without waste. We, once and for all, need to  
5 have the job done that lasts and is prudent.  
6 Thank you.

7 MR. LIPS: Thank you. Larry Goldberg.

8 MR. GOLDBERG: Hi. My name is Larry  
9 Goldberg. I live at 3360 also where Mr. Hunegs  
10 lives. I will not be as eloquent as him, and  
11 I'll be shorter but I have few things I'd like  
12 to tell you.

13 I submitted comments to you after the  
14 public scoping meeting. My hope was that you  
15 would have an open process which would help  
16 develop much needed shoreline protection.  
17 However, no public progress meeting, as called  
18 for in the CBI scope services, was held to  
19 review the status of project design analysis  
20 and obtain stakeholder input, so now we have to  
21 comment on the finished DEIS report. I'm going  
22 to cover just a few items and I'll give more to  
23 you in writing.

24 You now state that your overall project  
25 purpose you chose a 15-year interval criteria

1 for evaluating upland infrastructure  
2 protection. This is not consistent with  
3 anything that we've received from anybody. The  
4 Woods Hole Group has said that you should have  
5 a 25-year interval for beach restoration and a  
6 15-year interval for sacrificial dunes. Woods  
7 Hole also said that for sacrificial dunes you  
8 need a 17-cubic yard per foot fill. The only  
9 volume where this is achieved in Reach 8 is by  
10 Alternative 7 which is the SOS Erickson  
11 project. However, this is not a dune project.  
12 It's a project for beach nourishment and  
13 stabilization to provide for shoreline  
14 protection. It's intended to establish a new  
15 beach and dune profile in an area where this  
16 has never been done before. You revised your  
17 approach to the analysis of the project. You  
18 originally considered them as similar and said  
19 that they should be evaluated together. Now  
20 you say they're not connected. This flies in  
21 the face of the scope of the FDEP BMA which is  
22 doing inlet-to-inlet analysis and the Woods  
23 Hole Group which recommends, at a minimum,  
24 using groups of reaches for better management.  
25 There should be no gaps in contiguous beach

1 dune projects to ensure that there will be  
2 continuous shoreline protection. The plan that  
3 we have shows two beach nourishment projects  
4 separated by a dune-only project and that  
5 doesn't work, we've seen that before. It just  
6 helps the beach areas wash away. Protection of  
7 this plan, the one that's proposed versus the  
8 continuous beach nourishment project like  
9 Alternative 7, the Erickson Plan, should be  
10 evaluated to determine the best solution. By  
11 excluding the SOS Erickson project and not  
12 modeling its effectiveness you did not get a  
13 clear picture of how that alternative provides  
14 maximum shoreline protection like reduction and  
15 overtopping with minimal hard bottom coverage  
16 and impact on aquatic resources. A detail  
17 analysis of that project must be included in  
18 the final EIS.

19 MR. LIPS: Thank you, very much.

20 MR. BONANO: I introduced myself before,  
21 Charles Bonano, 3360.

22 I guess I now understand why I'm so  
23 confused about the sand. I will just make a  
24 very simple statement and than I want to make  
25 one other comment about an area that didn't do

1 anything in a timely fashion.

2 After listening to everybody here I concur  
3 and I am opposed to the project in Reach 8 as  
4 it stands. The Town needs a 25-year beach and  
5 dune renourishment to protect all of the  
6 investment and residents.

7 In the summertime I -- I spend time in  
8 Gloucester, Massachusetts and I had to go back  
9 to an area after there was an unnamed storm.  
10 It was the perfect storm. And that blasted the  
11 coast and it was on a ledge. With all my years  
12 of being on the ocean and experience with loss,  
13 rip wrap and so forth and the discussion  
14 tonight earlier by the president of our  
15 association about six years and having watched  
16 this beach wash away with or without sand, the  
17 dune wash away, a very dangerous condition  
18 exists. I actually believe there are threat to  
19 life and limb if we have any kind of a major  
20 storm and I can almost assure you that we will  
21 have a storm and we will have a breach in that  
22 area in the next six years if that's what it's  
23 going to take.

24 By the way, does the Corps of Army  
25 Engineers, are you aware that we actually did

1           have a blow through down in the south area of  
2           the island, because we did. It occurred in the  
3           -- in the 90s and it was three or four  
4           buildings south of Dune Deck. It was a sunny  
5           day. It wasn't particularly high winds, and it  
6           was attributed, by the newspapers, to three or  
7           four rogue waves. Now those rogue waves came  
8           up, went right through the beach, blew the  
9           beach away, blew the wall away, went into the  
10          pool, went through the building out on to the  
11          street and when I was coming home from a  
12          haircut and I saw all this green debris out on  
13          AlA I thought that landscapers -- a trailer had  
14          been lost, but it wasn't, it was seaweed. So  
15          we're already there. The next storm that we  
16          have of any -- of any significance along with a  
17          surge we're going to have a breach, plain and  
18          simple. So we not only got to do this, do it  
19          fast, we damn well better do it right. Thank  
20          you.

21                   MR. LIPS: Thank you, very much. Robert  
22          Davidson.

23                   MR. DAVIDSON: I'm after Karyn Erickson.

24                   MR. LIPS: Heath Chude, C-H-U-D-E.

25                   MR. CHUDE: I'm Heath Chude, 3000 South

1 Ocean Boulevard representing the Bellaria  
2 Condominium. Since so many comments have  
3 already touched on a lot of the points that we  
4 wish to make I'll simply say that we at the  
5 Bellaria are also opposed to the project as  
6 proposed and believe that mined sand must be  
7 used and a 25-year storm protection plan must  
8 be considered.

9 MR. LIPS: Thank you, very much. Dr.  
10 Sanford Kuvin.

11 MR. KUVIN: Good afternoon. There's been  
12 a confluence of problems with the Corps that  
13 brought us here today. We've lived here 50  
14 years. My name is Sanford Kuvin, 149 East  
15 Inlet Drive. I think that it is fair to say  
16 we are on the way to becoming "Palm Beachless"  
17 and unless the Army Corps of Engineers gets  
18 through its bureaucratic mode and gets on to  
19 the common sense that many speakers have  
20 vocalized here today, including Mr. Hunegs, we  
21 will become "Palm Beachless." No matter how  
22 many millions we pour into poor projects we  
23 haven't come up with the right solution. Just  
24 recently, last two weeks, you had the -- the  
25 Corps has had two emergencies. They wanted to

1 take about 10 feet of sand away from the inlet  
2 to allow larger ships to come through on an  
3 emergency basis and that sand which was dredged  
4 by Meek (phonetic, I believe, was supposed to  
5 go south on to our beaches. But it didn't go  
6 south. It went north. Why on earth that sand  
7 went north up you to Calduer Island (phonetic),  
8 where Connie Gaskway showed you that dirt, is  
9 beyond me and nobody seems to know why, or at  
10 least readily why.

11 Another point is that the Corps has  
12 basically ignored the lifeline to Palm Beach  
13 itself namely the sand transfer plant which has  
14 been shut down totally for almost a year now  
15 whereas before it was pumping 220,000 cubic  
16 yards a year, now it's moving virtually nothing  
17 and not the Corps and not the County, not the  
18 Town, knows exactly why. One prominent theory  
19 that's floating about is that the mitigation  
20 reef up in Riviera Beach is -- has pods which  
21 are drawing sand offshore and, therefore, no  
22 sand, or virtually no sand, is coming to the  
23 sand transfer plant.

24 In addition to that the sand transfer  
25 plant actually broke down and has not been

1 repaired in several months. I've called  
2 repeatedly. I've never received one phone call  
3 back from the engineering firm that's dealing  
4 with it. I would imagine the Corps should know  
5 why the electrical system has not been working.  
6 If it is working they've not indicated what was  
7 broken in the first place.

8 The threat to the Town now is getting more  
9 and more serious and certainly more and more  
10 real. We don't want to become "Palmless Beach"  
11 we have to do something proactively. And there  
12 are good people out there that can do that and  
13 create a basis for a 25-year storm and other  
14 things that have been requested but one thing  
15 that has not been suggested is take perhaps a  
16 holiday for a year and just stop this bickering  
17 about who is right and whose got the right  
18 grain size until the companies that this Town  
19 has paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in  
20 consulting fees is allowed to express itself by  
21 consulting.

22 I would urge the Corps to -- years ago it  
23 had a meeting, about two years ago, and said  
24 it's going to be transparent. It hasn't been  
25 transparent. It hasn't been proactive, and it

1           hasn't been communicative to the citizens. And  
2           I think what Mr. Hunegs said, maybe a little  
3           bit facetiously, but I think it has merit, take  
4           a year off and just see what happens and maybe  
5           we can save a few hundred million dollars.  
6           Thank you.

7           MR. LIPS: Thank you. Eileen Curran?

8           MS. CURRAN: I decline and will speak  
9           after Karyn Erickson.

10          MR. LIPS: We only have three more so if  
11          you wanted to do it now I think, you know,  
12          Karyn will have enough time. If we can put her  
13          last --

14          MR. ALLEN: I'll go.

15          MR. LIPS: It's you three.

16          MR. ALLEN: My name is Robert David Allen.  
17          I live at 2100 South Ocean Boulevard in Palm  
18          Beach. The Noble Prize winning economist  
19          Milton Friedman once said that if you put the  
20          federal government in charge of the Sahara  
21          Desert in five years they'll be a sand  
22          shortage.

23          After decades of shoreline mismanagement  
24          by successive Palm Beach governments a Town  
25          named for its beaches now has a beach shortage.

1 No where is the situation more acute than in  
2 the south end of the Town of Palm Beach. Sad  
3 to say, the south end beaches are now in a  
4 death spiral where hard bottom is uncovered.  
5 The hard bottom transforms to habitat which  
6 can't be covered which leads to more adjacent  
7 hard bottom being uncovered and so on ad  
8 infinitum until there is no beach left.

9           Sadly this project being proposed could  
10 have been a win win win where the Town uses the  
11 taxpayers' money efficiently to produce a  
12 successful project, the property owners would  
13 see their beach preserved and their property  
14 value safeguarded, the environmentalists would  
15 have gotten a project with less environmental  
16 impact and the County would have gotten a  
17 compatible project. Instead the Town has  
18 proposed, and the Army Corps has endorsed, a  
19 lose lose lose. The Town will overspend on a  
20 failed project based on inaccurate modeling,  
21 substandard sand and lack of structures. The  
22 property owners will be no better protected one  
23 year after the project than they were before it  
24 started and the environmentalists and other  
25 interested parties will have reason to sue

1           again to preserve the environment. Let's give  
2           this important decision the time it takes and  
3           the facts it needs to get it right. Let's not  
4           rush to judgment. Thank you.

5                   MR. LIPS: Eileen Curran.

6                   MS. CURRAN: My name is Eileen Curran.  
7           I live at 2778 South Ocean Boulevard. I have  
8           lived on the shoreline of this barrier island  
9           in Reach 8 for 25 years. I have watched the  
10          wide beach in front of my home disappear  
11          through erosion and neglect. As a member of  
12          the first Shore Board of the Town of Palm Beach  
13          I learned firsthand from 12 different coastal  
14          engineers, who were from Florida all the way up  
15          to Massachusetts, including Woods Hole  
16          Institute, they said, and they were all in  
17          agreement, dunes are the last line of defense  
18          against hurricanes and catastrophic storms.  
19          These 12 coastal engineers explained that the  
20          function of a sand beach is as a blotter in  
21          absorbing the force of the waves and thereby it  
22          reduces the damage to the dunes which are there  
23          as the last line of defense to upland  
24          properties and to the infrastructure and to the  
25          residents.

1 I want to state my objection to another  
2 dune project that will use minimal grade sand  
3 that is dredged with no beach nourishment in  
4 front of all the dunes on Reach 8.

5 I want to see the United States Army Corps  
6 of Engineers recommend in its EIS the first  
7 beach nourishment using mined sand that will  
8 provide 25-year storm protection for the  
9 homeowners of Reach 8. Thank you.

10 MR. LIPS: Lou Crampton.

11 MR. CRAMPTON: Hi. Good evening. My name  
12 is Lou Crampton. I live at 2335 South Ocean  
13 Boulevard and I'm the chair of the Citizens'  
14 Association of Palm Beach, one of the  
15 commenters on the report. I might be the only  
16 person here to say that I think that in the  
17 context of the process that we're going  
18 through, and I have to say that I spent seven  
19 years at the USEPA so I know a little bit about  
20 how this process works, that it's a positive  
21 document. Clearly the no action alternative  
22 ranks below the various action alternatives  
23 that were outlined and -- the report makes the  
24 case that there's environmental value and even  
25 benefit in moving forward with a significant

1 sand placement project. That's a key finding,  
2 folks. That bloggers well for our future  
3 because if the report had found otherwise the  
4 whole process would stop right here. Nothing  
5 would happen going forward. The bedrock issues  
6 in this report, and there are two of them, one  
7 -- and I read every page of this damn report --  
8 Number 1, sand quality and grain size; and 2  
9 hasn't been touched on, but it's even more  
10 important is hard bottom mitigation. The  
11 report does not supply enough clarity on those  
12 two issues, clearly on sand. There's a huge  
13 amount of confusion about what's going on. I  
14 do recognize that. I mean the report needs to  
15 make clear that the BMA which guides what the  
16 state will permit and what it won't permit  
17 requires sand at a .25 grain size. That needs  
18 to be made a lot more clear, and the report  
19 also needs to be clear about the need for  
20 constant monitoring as Connie Gaskway said of  
21 both the color and the grain size of the sand.  
22 So if the borrow site isn't working then we  
23 switch to mined sand from Ortona.

24 The other issue is hard bottom mitigation  
25 because the report creates confusion on that

1 point especially with respect to the amount of  
2 hard bottom mitigation that the Town is  
3 required to take on and how much hard bottom  
4 mitigation that the County is required to  
5 perform. There is a significant difference  
6 between the two. Something like .5 acres I  
7 think for the Town and something like 4.2 acres  
8 for the County. That's not clear in the  
9 report. At least I didn't get it. At  
10 \$1 million an acre, \$1 million an acre there's  
11 a tremendous savings and a tremendous  
12 difference for our Town.

13 Moreover, because mitigation costs could  
14 be less for us than originally thought, there's  
15 a good possibility that we could ask for more  
16 sand in Reach 8 than we originally thought we  
17 could simply because of the fact that we  
18 thought hard bottom mitigation costs would be  
19 so high.

20 I think -- this is advice to you --  
21 clarifying these points are very important, as  
22 you've seen, to bringing better decisions to  
23 our part of this Atlantic coast. We are, after  
24 all, the Town of Palm Beach, not the Town of  
25 Palm, and we want a solution to our problems

1           that will last for generations to come and can  
2           be built on year after year with confidence for  
3           property owners and for all of the rest of us  
4           who live here. Thank you, very much.

5           MR. LIPS: Thank you for your comment. We  
6           have two more and then Karyn Erickson.

7           MS. GREENBERG: Thank you. My name is  
8           Madeline Greenberg. I'm a property owner in  
9           the Town of Palm Beach in Reach 8 who happens  
10          to also live at 3360 South Ocean Boulevard.

11          First, because of the poor timing of the  
12          holidays and the departure from the standard  
13          protocol that is normally followed for the EIS  
14          process, due to the fact that there are errors  
15          in the profile modeling which would include the  
16          hard bottom and other aspects, I request that  
17          the US Army Corps of Engineers give a 30-day  
18          extension of the public comment period for this  
19          South Palm Beach Island Comprehensive Shoreline  
20          Stabilization EIS Project for Reach 8.

21          I object to the fact that the Town of Palm  
22          Beach and all the alternatives offered by CP  
23          and E for Reach 8 using the lowest standard of  
24          dredge sand which apparently the Town of Palm  
25          Beach has a lower standard than the rest of

1 Palm Beach County for all the beach projects  
2 that they use versus using mined sand, palm  
3 Beach County is using only mined sand in their  
4 preferred alternative and, therefore,  
5 everything being studied for the County is  
6 using mined sand. All of the alternatives  
7 studied for the County and for -- are in that  
8 capacity and yet all the alternatives being  
9 offered for the Town are being offered with  
10 dredged lowest standard. The .25 that was  
11 referred to is the lowest standard. We live in  
12 the Town of Palm Beach which is supposed to be  
13 a premium town. Why is it that Palm Beach  
14 County uses better sand than the Town of Palm  
15 Beach? I think that's pretty disgraceful.

16 I object to the fact that we also -- they  
17 did not consider, in the Reach 8 part of the  
18 project, using groins. They keep referring to,  
19 and it's very confusing to the public, that  
20 there are groins. Those groins are for South  
21 Palm Beach and down for the County portion.  
22 The Erickson plan, the SOS plan, had two groins  
23 in hotspots and yet that was not given  
24 consideration.

25 I'm opposed to the project as it stands.

1 Reach 8 needs 25-year storm protection for this  
2 project and mined sand and the only alternative  
3 submitted to the US Army Corps that offers  
4 25-year storm protection to the upland project  
5 shoreline is the Karyn Erickson SOS Beach  
6 Nourishment Plan. The SOS plan submitted uses  
7 mined sand source, but that's not the way the  
8 Army Corps studied it. The object of the SOS  
9 plan is, as it is submitted, was -- had groins  
10 and mined sand. Town Council on April of 2004  
11 asked the Army Corps to give, quote, equal  
12 consideration, unquote, to 25-year storm  
13 protection to the project shoreline. The  
14 current draft EIS does not give equal  
15 consideration to 25-year storm protection as  
16 the Town Council agreed to give the SOS Beach  
17 Nourishment Plan.

18 I object to the fact that the Town is  
19 using 15-year storm protection. That's what  
20 they applied for and of course 15-year storm  
21 protection is the equivalent of protection from  
22 one tropical storm. They're in the plan that  
23 the alternative that the Town provided there is  
24 some beach in front of two or three condos and  
25 the rest -- in the middle of no where -- and

1 the rest of them -- the rest of the project is  
2 basically dunes. Those two or three condos  
3 that they think they're going to get sand  
4 that's going last, they're dreaming. It's  
5 going to wash away.

6 The last thing that I wanted to say is  
7 that it's very important that the Army Corps of  
8 Engineers listens to the public. It don't use  
9 -- do the wrong project -- I don't -- I think  
10 that you should do the right project and I  
11 think that the Town Council will see in the  
12 wisdom when they do decide to vote for the  
13 right project, it's not more expensive. It's  
14 more expensive to lose the condos and maybe  
15 there's a lot of information that hasn't been  
16 brought out. If you give this 30-day extension  
17 then you will find out there's a great deal  
18 more information than is in that draft EIS.  
19 Thank you for your time.

20 MR. LIPS: Thank you, very much. Karyn  
21 Erickson.

22 MS. ERICKSON: Thank you. As you, I  
23 believe, are aware, Erickson Consulting  
24 Engineers represents the coalition to Save our  
25 Shoreline who is represented earlier by

1 Mr. Richard Hunegs.

2 I'm a licensed professional engineer in  
3 the State of Florida and I have more than 35  
4 years experience in planning, permitting,  
5 environmental impact assessments and statements  
6 through construction of large-scale beach  
7 restoration projects in Florida, North Carolina  
8 and South Carolina.

9 One of these projects was noted was the  
10 Midtown project which was the first restored  
11 beach at the Town of Palm Beach in 1995. That  
12 project was highly successful because while it  
13 was an offshore sand source we looked very  
14 closely and found the coarsest material within  
15 the borrowed site. We didn't compile all of  
16 the sand and mix the fines with the coarse and  
17 it was a very successful project also because  
18 we used structures to slow erosion losses.

19 With respect to the project before us we  
20 received the draft EIS statement for comment  
21 and review after many prior requests for  
22 updates and a preliminary copy of the EIS on  
23 December 8th. A summary of our comments will  
24 be presented tonight with our full written  
25 comments to be submitted in writing prior to

1 your deadline which we would request would be  
2 extended an additional 30 days given the volume  
3 of material which I see is more than 1500 pages  
4 with a number of discrepancies I'll point out  
5 tonight.

6 But a quick brief summary of our findings  
7 is that the plans preferred alternative for the  
8 Town section uses a fine offshore sand source,  
9 quantities that actually approximate very  
10 closely the losses that occurred in the 2012  
11 Hurricane Sandy event. And it excludes any  
12 consideration of groins or structures to slow  
13 sand losses. Further, it does not evaluate the  
14 differences in sediment erosion rates and  
15 longevity nor its impact on the adjacent hard  
16 bottom of using coarser sand at .57 millimeters  
17 or .45 millimeters which is closer to native  
18 sand and the .25 millimeter sand. There's only  
19 one type of sand that was analyzed. In  
20 contrast, the County uses and considers coarser  
21 sand and places their sand at twice the density  
22 that the Town is going to be seeing if this  
23 project were to go forward and they incorporate  
24 structures to slow erosion.

25 In my discussions with the County's

1 representative they state they consider this a  
2 very minor project, and yet their project is  
3 backed by seawalls which they're relying upon  
4 and is twice to four times the project that the  
5 Town will be seeing in this EIS preferred plan.

6 The specifics of our findings are -- in  
7 terms of the evaluation of alternatives, the  
8 SOS alternative which is described in only the  
9 modeling section as Alternative 7 is not  
10 evaluated or represented as stated in the  
11 base -- in the main part of the EIS document.  
12 The SOS preferred project alternative looked  
13 and evaluated three types of sediment and sand  
14 and cost of those and it also considered  
15 overfill factors that are required to  
16 approximate a natural native beach sand such  
17 that one cubic yard of native beach sand often  
18 requires two cubic yards of offshore sand to  
19 behave the same way in an erosion or storm  
20 event. The SOS alternative places volumes and  
21 represents volumes inaccurately. The EIS  
22 states, quote, recognizing SOS's request for a  
23 project with additional storm protection the  
24 Corps of Engineers modified the SOS fill  
25 design. So they took the design that we

1 developed, modified it, greatly reduced it, and  
2 took the sand and reduced the quality  
3 substantially. This is not the SOS alternative  
4 and should be struck in any reference.

5 Specifically, five brief points. The SOS  
6 volume of 99,100 cubic yards was assuming a  
7 three to four-year renourishment with two  
8 structures towards the south end to slow  
9 erosion. It also assumed a coarse sand that  
10 was comparable to Ortona or upland mined sand.  
11 This is a significant discrepancy by modeling  
12 what is referred to as the SOS design using .3  
13 millimeter sand when, in fact, the Town is  
14 proposing sand that could be as fine as a mean  
15 grain size of .25 millimeter; therefore, the  
16 results are not reflective of the Town's  
17 proposal. And when we say "mean" that means  
18 that 50 percent of that sand could be  
19 .1 millimeter, .12., .15, substantially finer  
20 sand. The County's preferred alternative  
21 includes several low profile groins at a  
22 nominal cost of \$100,000 each. Coastal  
23 structures were not assessed or modeled in the  
24 Town's portion of the project as recommended by  
25 the SOS plan. Why is that? The quality of

1 sand, which is a critical component of the SOS  
2 alternative, is not considered. The SOS  
3 alternative is not accurately reflected either  
4 in Alternative 6 which is inferred, which is  
5 the Town and the County's plan with increased  
6 sand volumes as the SOS alternative includes a  
7 dune feature and protective sand in front of  
8 the dune to approximate a 25-year protection.  
9 The average sand volume loss for a 25-year  
10 storm event, which we modeled for the Native  
11 Beach, we didn't assume that the Native Beach  
12 was .3 which is what we assume the modeling  
13 from the results we're seeing in the analysis  
14 in the EIS assumed the Native Beach was much  
15 finer. For that reason we took the natural  
16 beach sand and the models show that you would  
17 expect an average of 12 cubic yards of loss per  
18 foot per year for a 25-year event, that's the  
19 average. The north end is milder so it's a  
20 lower volume. The south end, where you're near  
21 135 and 134 monuments, is higher so this is an  
22 average. In fact, during Hurricane Sandy the  
23 shoreline for this reach eroded 61,000 cubic  
24 yards. The design basis in all the modeling  
25 performed was based on beach profiles that were

1 three years old, they were all pre-Hurricane  
2 Sandy profiles so the beach that would be built  
3 today wouldn't be as wide with just a dune only  
4 as what existed prior to Hurricane Sandy in  
5 November -- which was, I believe, October of  
6 2012.

7 The second major point is the grain size  
8 which we've discussed, and I'm not going to go  
9 much further than to say that in an offshore  
10 borrow site, and this is why the County is  
11 moving away from the offshore borrow sites in  
12 the north part of Palm Beach County, you find a  
13 large fraction of finds in areas with coarser  
14 material and it tends to be mixed with rock  
15 rubble. And this is exactly what happened at  
16 Reach 6. They had two borrow sites to pump  
17 from. They pumped from the coarser site first  
18 and was supposed to end up with a 2.2 overfill  
19 ratio, twice as much as compatible sand would  
20 be required. Not long in to the borrow site  
21 they hit so much rock they had to abandon that  
22 part of the borrow site. They ended up at a  
23 finer -- they went to the finer site. The  
24 resulting sand on the north part of Reach 7 was  
25 .19 millimeters to .22 millimeters. And that's

1 based on our firm going out and taking multiple  
2 tests. I know for a fact that the DEP and the  
3 Corps and their permit conditions often only  
4 require very minimal testing of the sand as  
5 it's slurried on to the beach. And as Judge  
6 Neal said in his the finding for the challenge  
7 of the Reach 8 permit in 2009, you're not going  
8 to be able to stop a hydraulic dredge to start  
9 testing sand when it's placing sand at  
10 20,000 cubic yards per day. A project that's  
11 75,000 yards or a project up in Reach 7 that  
12 may place 3 or 400,000 cubic yards you don't  
13 turn off a dredge that you're paying \$100,000 a  
14 day to go on standby and 3 to \$5 million to  
15 mobilize. It just doesn't happen. So you need  
16 to know when you're going in to a project that  
17 you have sufficient sand of the quality you  
18 require. Most of these borrow sites we heard  
19 time and time again from the Town we meet the  
20 DEP's requirements for Corps to represent the  
21 borrow site. They meet the minimum  
22 requirement. So as an engineer I never go with  
23 the minimum requirement. I want to have  
24 sufficient coarse to know exactly what's in the  
25 sand source so when I designed the Martin

1 County 4-mile project we required four times as  
2 many coarse and we excluded two thirds of the  
3 borrow site and came up with the best quality  
4 sand and that's what is lacking with looking at  
5 these offshore sites. That's the big problem.

6 Finally, as I noted earlier, the profile  
7 data that was the basis for all the modeling  
8 was pre-storm November 2011. And it states in  
9 the report that while these storms had occurred  
10 and likely contributed to background erosion  
11 rates there was no major hurricanes that made a  
12 direct impact to the project area since the  
13 surveys were evaluated, and they implied that  
14 the loss and the impacts of Hurricane Sandy  
15 were minor and represented average conditions.  
16 Well, 61,000 cubic yards for that reach of  
17 shoreline is not an average condition. And, in  
18 fact, they show no fill necessary near the area  
19 of the Atriums which had the very worst erosion  
20 and has absolutely no dune there now. There's  
21 substantial discrepancies that we would have  
22 addressed if we were part of this process six  
23 months ago and been able to participate when  
24 you set up the modeling. We want to be  
25 constructive. The owners want a beach. They

1 don't want hard bottom in front of their  
2 properties.

3 I have just a couple of more comments and  
4 I will wrap it up.

5 The Town has repeatedly stated that the  
6 purpose of the shore front -- in the Shorefront  
7 Management Plan that was developed in 1998 that  
8 a severe storm impacting the Town representing  
9 a 25-year return event should be the designing  
10 criteria for these beaches. We recognize that  
11 those numbers mean different volumes. What we  
12 recommended is identifying that we have three  
13 reaches along -- three segments along Reach 8  
14 that represent three lines of building and that  
15 you need to designate a baseline in front of  
16 those buildings that would be your protective  
17 shoreline beach. That is where seaward at that  
18 point you would have sufficient sand to weather  
19 between renourishment events and still have  
20 some protection that is sufficient to weather a  
21 25-year storm event. That's consistent with  
22 the Town's independent consultant  
23 recommendation from the Woods Hole Group. They  
24 recommended in this area 17-cubic yards of sand  
25 per foot of shoreline. The SOS plan

1 recommended 16-cubic yards per foot. This is  
2 also similar to what the County will be  
3 receiving to the south. We also though stated  
4 that because our profiles and analysis occurred  
5 before Hurricane Sandy, of course not knowing  
6 Hurricane Sandy would occur, we said that if  
7 any major storm event occurred it would need to  
8 compensate for that volume because the modeling  
9 was based on the protection and condition from  
10 2011 which was also the year and the evaluation  
11 period that was covered in the EIS.

12 With respect to hard bottom acreages we  
13 believe they're biased. They used two  
14 post-hurricane conditions averaging those  
15 acreages to represent the amount of hard  
16 bottoms seaward of Reaches 8 and the South  
17 County. We believe the County also concurs.  
18 There's many, many years of data. It's a  
19 femoral hard bottom meaning the sand moves off  
20 of it and on to it. In 2011 when we evaluated  
21 coverages we came up with 2.25 acres of direct  
22 impact from the project that was proposed as  
23 the SOS plan when the dune still existed prior  
24 to the loss of Hurricane Sandy. And I believe  
25 that if you average all of those years, as I

1 believe the County is also going to suggest to  
2 you in their written statements as we will as  
3 well, you'll find there's significantly less  
4 impact.

5 In general the draft EIS completely fails  
6 to discuss the impact of sand quality on  
7 project performance, on hard bottom impacts and  
8 on costs considering sand quality is a key  
9 engineering consideration and biological factor  
10 in the design of beach restoration projects.  
11 The absence of any analysis and discussion of  
12 this critical design factor is extraordinary  
13 considering the EIS is a principal decision  
14 document for the federal agencies. While the  
15 DEP requires a mean grain size of .25 to  
16 .60 millimeters their goal isn't for the Town  
17 to place the lowest possible quality sand at  
18 .25 but to strive to put coarser cleaner sand.  
19 Recognizing the impact of sand size and  
20 performance on environmental impacts Palm Beach  
21 County has self-imposed specification of .3 to  
22 .7 millimeter grain size again looking to  
23 offshore sand source as a very last resort at  
24 this point due to the problems inherent with  
25 these sites.

1           We did a cost comparison of Ortona sand at  
2           .57 millimeters recently, very recently, and  
3           the unit cost of sand we found for recent  
4           projects in these areas is \$35 to \$70 -- I'm  
5           sorry, \$35 to \$40 per cubic yard. The Stuart  
6           mine source which is used by Indian River  
7           County and many counties where you can specify  
8           the amount of shell content and they screen it  
9           so you exclude finds, you can specify a minimum  
10          of no more than .25 or .3 millimeters is \$32 to  
11          \$35 a cubic yard. Keep in mind oil prices are  
12          plummeting and so is the cost of trucking sand  
13          because as your fuel to fill your car goes down  
14          the fuel to fill the tanks to truck sand goes  
15          down.

16          Finally, offshore sand, poor quality at  
17          .25 average sand size results in a cost of \$30  
18          a cubic yard based on the recent Mid Time  
19          Project or \$46 a cubic yard if you consider the  
20          inconsistency of the sand. So, therefore, in  
21          your table where you state that the Town's  
22          project will only cost \$10 a cubic yard to use  
23          offshore sand is a gross inaccuracy. It  
24          doesn't include the cost of mobilization, the  
25          cost of dredging and hydraulic conveyance, sand

1 placement, grading, site restoration, beach  
2 tilling turbidity nor the cost of the original  
3 sand source investigation which was over  
4 \$2 million to permit and design the offshore  
5 sand source.

6 I'm going to finally conclude by saying  
7 that why would the Town spend two to three  
8 years to develop an EIS at a cost that's  
9 approaching a half a million dollars for a  
10 dune-only project that does not even require a  
11 federal permit because you could have placed  
12 all the sand above mean high water and avoided  
13 this entire process if that is truly what the  
14 intent of the project is to provide protection  
15 to the property owners that is meaningful.

16 That concludes my remarks, and thank you  
17 very much for your time today.

18 MR. LIPS: Thank you. Terry Revele  
19 (phonetic).

20 MS. REVELE: My name is Terry Revele and  
21 I am a resident in Reach 8. I'm just shocked  
22 tonight to find out that the Army Corps of  
23 Engineers could discriminate from one town to  
24 another, that we're not all treated equally  
25 with the same type of sand. I've also found

1 out from one of the Council members just now  
2 that it was our Town staff that decided not to  
3 join in on the County plan and I just am  
4 bewildered. It's just -- it's just mind  
5 boggling that so many things could be  
6 interfering with one another, why we're not all  
7 joined, we're not all together. I don't know  
8 if it's your fault that we're getting different  
9 sand, but I would like to just comment as a  
10 resident.

11 MR. LIPS: Thank you. That's all the  
12 comments that were on the list to be given  
13 orally. So if anybody has any other comments  
14 we have a court reporter here if you don't want  
15 to present them in front of everybody you can  
16 speak to her directly and she'll take them.  
17 Otherwise we don't have any other comments at  
18 this time.

19 We're here until 8:00.

20 (Whereupon, the presentation, comments and questions  
21 are concluded at 7:13 p.m.)

22 (Whereupon, the meeting is concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATION OF REPORTER

THE STATE OF FLORIDA )  
COUNTY OF PALM BEACH )

I, JULIANN ANDOLPHO, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the above-titled MEETING; and that the transcript, Pages 1 through 75, is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

The certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the reporter.

Dated the 13th day of January, 2015

JULIE ANDOLPHO