

MARCH 3, 2009

The Board of County Commissioners, Manatee County, Florida, met in SPECIAL SESSION in the Administrative Center, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Bradenton, Florida, at 1:05 p.m.

Present were Commissioners:

Gwendolyn Y. Brown, Chairman
Carol Whitmore, First Vice-Chairman
Donna Hayes, Second Vice-Chairman
Lawrence E. Bustle, Jr., Third Vice-Chairman
John R. Chappie
Ron Getman
Joe McClash

Also present were:

Ed Hunzeker, County Administrator
Tedd Williams, Jr., County Attorney
Susan G. Romine, Board Records Manager,
representing R. B. Shore, Clerk of Circuit Court

Invocation by Ms. Brown.

AGENDA

Agenda of March 3, 2009.

[BC20090303DOC001](#)

MANATEE BEACH PIER

Charles Hunsicker, Natural Resources Director, reported on the status of the existing Manatee Beach Pier, noting the structural deterioration by the elements over this last year has been such that the pier is no longer structurally sound to remain open to the public for risk of catastrophic failure of the structure on its own accord. This opinion has led to the closure of the pier until repair or replacement. He reviewed the recommendation from Bridge Design Associates and considered the alternatives which are demolition, repair and replace, or remove and rebuild.

Discussion: There is a potential for injury to anyone using the pier; etc.

Brian Rheault, Bridge Design Associates, used a slide presentation depicting the existing pier condition with extensive damage and deterioration including fatigue cracking, fissures, exposed reinforcement material, and cracked concrete which indicates huge movement in the past few months. He indicated the pier is not safe enough even for pedestrian walking due to the risk of failure.

Mr. Rheault provided an overview of recommendations which include pier repair requirements with an estimated cost of \$1.7 million, and 9-12 months construction time. Two recommended replacement options were reviewed: Option 1 - removal and replacement of the existing pier (7-foot elevation, 18 feet wide, 200 feet long) with an estimated cost of \$2 million, and 6-8 months construction time; and Option 2 - removal of existing pier and replacement with a conventional pier (15-foot elevation, 18 feet wide, 200 feet long) for a 50-year flood event with an estimated cost of \$1.5 million, and 4-6 months construction time.

Mr. Rheault explained the three pile cross elevation of a conventional style pier, as well as the precast pilings, concrete cap, removable wood grading, and the wood railing. A 15-foot elevation is recommended to provide for the 50-year storm event rather than the existing 7-foot elevation. The American Disabilities Act requirements regarding elevation were reviewed. The indicated construction times are after receipt of state permits. Bridge Design Associates recommended Option 2.

Mr. Rheault stated repair of the pier could possibly extend the life 5-10 years. Option 1 replacement would be more susceptible to wave action due to the elevation but would have 30-plus-years of life. Option 2 is predicted to have 30-plus-years of life and better survival due to the higher elevation.

Discussion: Construction costs include removal of old pier; funding from beach renourishment and tourist development; estimated construction costs do not include engineering and permitting; permitting and design cost (\$92,112) has been approved and is budgeted; direction to continue the design and permit process; the decision to build will be presented at a later time with identified funding; voting on completion of the permit application; estimate of construction costs not a contract price; at least four months required to complete environmental permitting, prepare bid documents, and advertise for bids; etc.

Mr. Hunsicker discussed the permitting process which began in September 2008, and noted the application will be submitted following the decision made this date. There are sufficient funds in tourist development funds for construction of the pier.

Discussion: Why permit and design without a plan to build; vote on construction of the pier today and make a decision regarding design and building; reserve right to identify funding source; intention of the Board is to build the pier and go through the necessary procurement process; etc.

Motion was made by Mr. McClash to accept Option 2, to go forward with replacement of the existing pier with a conventional pier, and expedite it as soon as possible. The motion was seconded by Ms. Whitmore and carried 7 to 0.

Mr. Rheault explained the process to remove the wood grading. The wood planks can be removed and stored to save repair costs caused by storm surges. Removal of the planks will relieve a significant amount of pressure on the pier from wave action.

Discussion: Similar pier at Vero Beach; other bridge enhancements such as lighting bollard; design and build discussion; move forward; etc.

Mr. Hunsicker stated the current pier is a footprint over an existing groin. The pier is short (300 feet) and does not expand to a viable fishing area. The design could be extended 400 feet from shore to sea which would increase and enhance the recreational value.

Mr. Huzeker requested the procurement ordinance and competitive process be brought back to include detailed information and noted, if possible, it will be placed on the consent agenda for approval.

Mr. Rheault recommended proceeding with the permit process for the 300 feet with a future modification to accommodate the 400-foot pier.

Discussion: Bid documents should include the option for the pier extension; etc.

Rick Spandoni, Coastal Planning, discussed the permit process through the Department of Environmental Protection and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed conventional pier reduces the number of pilings from 64 to 22. The additional pier extension would not create the same impact as the existing structure and would obtain a positive review. Material for an artificial reef could be placed at the end of the pier to attract fish for anglers.

Motion was made by Mr. McClash and seconded by Mr. Bustle, to authorize staff to extend the pier up to 120 feet and bring that option back.

Discussion: Demolition process; some demolition material will be used on permitted artificial reefs to reduce the demolition costs; benefit and cost relationship of the pier extension; popular surfing area; material would be placed only at the end of the pier for safety consideration; restaurant next to the pier is owned by the County and presently leased; etc.

Following discussion, the motion carried 7 to 0.

[BC20090303DOC002](#)

Bruno Alia, Holmes Beach resident, expressed concern over the sudden decision to close the pier. He suggested establishing criteria and forecast data that would allow the pier to remain open during lower stress times, and to regulate it with a gate and enforcement.

[BC20090303DOC003](#)

Rich Freeman, Holmes Beach resident, commented on what a jewel the pier is to the community and questioned why it was left to deteriorate considering the amount of property taxes received from the island.

[BC20090303DOC004](#)

MEETING ADJOURNED

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Adj: 2:33 p.m.
/njh

Minutes Approved: April 2, 2009