



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MARINE ADVISORY BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 2023 – 6:00 P.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance
January-December 2023**

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| Ted Morley, Chair | P | 4 | 0 |
| Steve Witten, Vice Chair | P | 4 | 0 |
| Michael Boyer | P | 3 | 1 |
| Tyler Brunelle | P | 2 | 0 |
| Robyn Chiarelli | A | 2 | 2 |
| Barry Flanigan | P | 4 | 0 |
| Robert Franks | P | 4 | 0 |
| Elisabeth George | P | 4 | 0 |
| James Harrison | P | 3 | 1 |
| Brewster Knott | P | 3 | 1 |
| Norbert McLaughlin | P | 4 | 0 |
| Noelle Norvell | A | 2 | 2 |
| Ed Rebholz | P | 1 | 0 |
| Robert Washington | P | 1 | 0 |

As of this date, there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Andrew Cuba, Marine Facilities Manager
Jonathan Luscomb, Marine Facilities Supervisor
Sergeant Travis O’Neil, Fort Lauderdale Police Department
Mayor Dean Trantalis, City of Fort Lauderdale
Carla Blair, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Flanigan, seconded by Mr. Franks, to make the following communication to the Commission [with attachments]:

In light of several past, current, and potential waiver requests for mooring piles extending beyond Code distance to allow for perpendicular docking of vessels into the New River, which have the potential to impede navigational safety of larger vessels transiting the New River, the Marine Advisory Board requests that the Commission issue a suspension of issuing waivers for extensions of moorings

beyond Code on the New River Corridor until the Commission can add the issue to their Conference Agenda and/or hold a public workshop.

The goal is to discuss the issue and find a balance that thoughtfully allows property owners to maximize the use of their property while taking into consideration the specific and varied conditions on the New River and facilitating the safe navigation to the commercial vessels further west on the river.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Morley called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. and roll was taken.

II. Approval of Minutes – March 2, 2023

Motion made by Ms. George, seconded by Vice Chair Witten, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. Statement of Quorum

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

IV. Introduction of New Members

- **Ed Rebholz**
- **Robert Washington**

New Board members Robert Washington and Ed Rebholz introduced themselves at this time.

Chair Morley welcomed Fort Lauderdale Mayor Dean Trantalis to the meeting.

V. Waterway Crime & Boating Safety Report

Sergeant Travis O'Neil of the Fort Lauderdale Police Department's Marine Unit reported the following activity from March 2023:

- 64 citations
- 44 calls for service

Sgt. O'Neil noted that the calls for service included two reports of stolen jet skis and two vessel break-ins. No Garmin devices were stolen in March.

Mayor Trantalis requested clarification of the general nature of citations. Sgt. O'Neil explained that these are often wave violations. A citation may be a written ticket or a warning. The Marine Unit seeks to educate boaters before they issue citations.

Mayor Trantalis advised that he receives a number of complaints from residents on the west side of the Intracoastal Waterway with regard to the effect of waves and speed on their vessels and floating docks. Sgt. O'Neil confirmed that the Idle Speed Zone from the Middle River north to the Coral Ridge Yacht Club is one of the City's more regularly patrolled areas.

- **United States Coast Guard Staff Introduction**

Due to a scheduling conflict, this Item was delayed to a future meeting.

VI. Dock Waiver – 1180 North Federal Highway (Unit 1502 / Slip 7) / Renee Biron

Akbar Mondel, representing the Applicant, stated that the waiver request is for the installation of a low-profile boat lift which would be perpendicular to the dock. The boat lift is 34 ft. long by 30 ft. wide and includes wood pilings. The boat lift platform would not extend beyond the length of the boat and provides additional stability and safety for the vessel. He showed renderings of the proposed configuration, noting that his company has installed other boat lifts on other slips within the same condominium which also extend beyond the 25 ft. setback limit.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if a boat is currently docked in the subject slip. Mr. Mondel confirmed that the boat the Applicant plans to place on the lift is already docked there.

Mr. Harrison observed that the waiver request is for 41.6 ft. while the boat lift would only extend 34 ft. into the waterway. Mr. Cuba pointed out that there is a marginal dock extending from the property line, which is included in the 41.6 ft. measurement. It was clarified that the requested new mooring pilings would be installed at 41.6 ft. into the waterway, which would be a variance of 16.6 ft. past the setback limit.

Mr. Franks asked what type of lighting or reflection device would be used to ensure the boat is visible from the waterway at night. Mr. Mondel replied that the boat would be within the mooring pilings. Reflectors could also be placed on these pilings.

Chair Morley added that in this case, the permitted structure would include the entire length of the vessel and the access to it, which requires a greater distance into the waterway. The request does not appear to encroach past the property's submerged land.

Mayor Trantalis requested clarification of the property located across the canal from the subject site. It was noted that this is George English Park, which is one of the City's

designated waterskiing areas. The waterway in this area is 381 ft. across at its widest point.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair Morley opened the public hearing. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on the Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

It was noted that the subject vessel was no larger than other boats docked at the same site.

Motion made by Vice Chair Witten, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Witten requested clarification of the point at which the Board would have been unlikely to approve the request. Chair Morley stated that when reviewing waivers, the Board typically considers the intent of the property owner and the problem they are trying to solve, as well as how this problem has been solved by other nearby property owners in the past. If the request is consistent with the size of the boat that will be docked in a particular space, this is usually approved.

Chair Morley added that the Board cannot implement a blanket standard for an area. He pointed out that the request remains within the submerged land owned by the condominium; had the request been for a 65 ft. boat lift or a double boat lift, it would have extended beyond the property's submerged land rights and could interfere with navigation on the waterway.

VII. Dock Waiver – 831 Solar Isle Drive / Philip G. Mayon Jr. & Oma Jean Mayon

This Item was deferred to a later date.

VIII. Dock Waiver – 777 SW 6th Street / Andrew J. Schein, esq. as agent for Edward Kirwin

Chair Morley noted that this is the third time a request for the subject property has come before the Marine Advisory Board (MAB). He provided some background information for the new Board members, explaining that the waivers for 777 and 801 SW 6th Street are adjacent properties owned by members of the same family. Both previous requests for waivers for these properties were denied by the Board.

Chair Morley continued that the Applicant and his representative have worked with the Board, the City, and neighbors of the subject properties to determine what can be done to address their issues without interfering with their neighbors' properties or the safety of

navigation. Both properties are located on a portion of the New River that is often used by vessels to pass one another and to “lay up” while waiting for the bridge to open. The Board has discussed this particular area in detail at previous meetings.

Andrew Schein, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation to the Board, stating that the subject area of the New River is not a No Wake Zone and that speeding regularly occurs there, resulting in excessive wakes that can be damaging to boats docked nearby.

Mr. Schein recalled that the Board has discussed a potential moratorium on dock waivers on the New River, with the possibility of exceptions in extraordinary circumstances. He asserted that the conditions at the Applicants’ locations constitute extraordinary circumstances. The waterway width at the location would be 250 ft. to 290 ft. The Applicant’s proposed pilings would permit a navigable waterway of 165 ft., which Mr. Schein described as striking a balance between the accommodations of property owners and navigation.

Mr. Schein showed renderings of the property and the proposed plans, noting that the pilings would be located further south than the tip of the boat.

Mayor Trantalis asked what had changed since the previous iterations of the waiver requests. Mr. Schein replied that the request has been reduced by 10 ft. The first two requests were for 65 ft. and 60 ft. respectively. The current request would place the pilings at 50 ft., which he felt was more favorable to navigation than to accommodation of the property owner.

Chair Morley recalled that during the first presentation of the Application, there had been some discussion of reducing the request to 50 ft. The vessel proposed to be docked at the site is the same 45 ft. vessel that is currently docked there.

Mr. Schein continued that the Applicant would not be able to stipulate to a request that the boat not extend beyond the pilings, as the boat currently docked on the property extends beyond the pilings. He stated that the Applicant may be able to stipulate to “some other reasonable restriction.”

Mr. McLaughlin recalled that one of the Board’s objections to the previous Applications was that the pilings would not prevent wakes from moving the boat docked at the subject site. Another concern was for commercial vessels in the “Little Florida” area of the New River, which have to lay over on the side of the waterway to allow other vessels to pass them. He felt a larger vessel was docked at the Applicant’s property, it could block commercial traffic. He concluded that the only way to prevent wakes in the area would be to implement a No Wake Zone.

Mr. Schein reiterated that the new proposal would keep the pilings further south than the Applicant's boat. He added that commercial vessels already could not lay over in the subject area because boats are docked there.

Mr. Harrison asked if the Applicant would have been willing to stipulate that his boat would not exceed the pilings if they were installed at 60 ft. into the waterway. Mr. Schein recalled that the Applicant had previously agreed to this suggestion. Mr. Harrison pointed out that the key issue is one of enforcement of both wake restrictions and the size of the vessel that could be docked at the subject property in the future.

Mr. Harrison also observed that placing a larger boat at the subject location would serve the same purpose as the narrowing of a roadway for traffic calming purposes, as traffic on the waterway would need to slow down to navigate through a smaller area. He noted that if the Board entertained a waiver request for the opposite side of the waterway as well, this would leave a significantly narrower navigable channel.

Mr. Harrison continued that marine businesses are in favor of greater enforcement in certain areas along the New River, as the waterway's width varies significantly. He again cited the Little Florida area as a particular concern.

Mr. Schein agreed that, if the City limited the size of boats that could be docked in certain parts of the New River, this could be a potential solution. He emphasized, however, that while that may be part of the discussion of overall navigational issues on the New River, it was not consistent with the waiver request before the Board. He added that there was little difference in navigability with regard to the requested waiver, but a significant difference with respect to the owner's ability to tie up the bow of his boat to an additional mooring pile and prevent damage.

Mr. Knott asked why the Applicant would not turn his boat parallel rather than perpendicular. Mr. Schein replied that the owner is a member of a boating family which owns multiple vessels and may wish to dock them on the property.

Mr. Washington requested clarification of how the proposed pilings would be installed. Mr. Schein replied that they would be installed from a barge.

Chair Morley asked Sgt. O'Neil what the Board and the City Commission could do to help the Marine Unit enforce speed regulations on the New River. Sgt. O'Neil replied that the primary issue is the train bridge. If there are not multiple Officers west of this bridge, enforcement can be difficult. He advised that he is working on a traffic calming action plan for the New River.

Sgt. O'Neil continued that another concern is the difficulty of making a stop on the New River. This typically involves tying off to the stopped boat, which is very difficult given the current on the waterway. He is planning to speak to the owners of empty docks on either side of the bridge so stopped boats can be instructed to dock there.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that a major issue on the New River is when a property owner receives a variance and indicates they will not dock a boat larger than a certain size on their property, but does so anyway, allowing larger vessels to create an obstruction. Because the size restriction to which the property owner agreed is not included in Code, this is not regulated. He advised that variances should limit the maximum length to which either a structure or a boat may protrude into the navigable waterway.

Mr. Schein noted that the Applicant does not need a waiver for a larger vessel, but to secure the 45 ft. vessel that is already docked on the property.

Mr. Harrison requested that the Board view a video produced by Steel Towing before they vote on the Application. Chair Morley replied that he did not object to this.

Ms. George asked what could be done to change a waterway speed limit to a No Wake Zone. It was clarified that this would have to be done at the state level and can be a difficult process.

Mr. Brunelle commented that the Applicant had mentioned the Board suggested he reduce the distance of the pilings to a particular length. Chair Morley recalled that when the Application came before the Board for the first time, the Board had asked if the Applicant was open to reducing the proposed length of the westernmost piling to 50 ft. The Applicant's representative had indicated they would not be amenable to this suggestion.

Patience Cohn, representing the Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF), showed a video taken by a towing vessel and a drone on the New River, including the area near the Applicant's property.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair Morley opened the public hearing.

Justin Heuer, private citizen, requested clarification of the reason the Applicant was seeking an extension of the pilings. Mr. Schein explained once more that the intent is to secure the bow of the vessel. Mr. Heuer commented that the Applicant's video had showed damage caused by a wake, which would not be alleviated by the structures. Mr. Schein reiterated that the proposal would allow additional points of contact at the bow.

Mr. Heuer asserted that the Applicant's boat appeared to be too large for its pier, and that the proposed pilings would hinder traffic on the river. Mr. Schein pointed out that the structures would not hinder traffic when a boat is already docked at the subject location.

Mr. Heuer continued that the Applicant may want to dock a larger vessel on his property in the future. Mr. Schein stated again that the Applicant did not object to the City

Commission restricting the size of a vessel docked at the site. Mr. Heuer stated he did not believe that type of restriction was enforceable.

Chair Morley clarified that he has addressed this issue with an Assistant City Attorney and was informed that if the size limitation is tied to a deed restriction on the property, it can be enforced by Code Enforcement.

Mr. Schein stated again that the Applicant's boat itself is an obstruction on the waterway, and the proposal would only make it safer at its location.

As there were no other individuals wishing to speak on the Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the City Attorney's Office was responsible for enforcing the deed restriction. Chair Morley explained that if a complaint is made about a deed-restricted property, Code Enforcement can measure the vessel and the property to determine if there is a violation of that deed restriction.

Vice Chair Witten observed that securing a deed restriction can be a lengthy process which cannot be undertaken at the MAB level. He did not feel any waivers could be deemed acceptable at the Board level even if a deed restriction is attached. Chair Morley stated that the language of a deed restriction would be up to the City Attorney's Office, outside the Board's purview of advising the City Commission on maritime issues.

Mr. Flanigan observed that wake damage to the Applicant's vessel would be to its stern. He also addressed the concerns of marine businesses in general, stating that obstructing the waterway would make it more difficult for boats to access these businesses on the New River and could divert marine business to other cities. He felt action should be taken to protect the marine industry.

Chair Morley commented that the Board has an equal responsibility to residents, recreational boaters, and the marine industry on the New River.

Motion made by Ms. George, seconded by Mr. Brunelle, to approve.

It was suggested that the **motion** be amended to approve subject to a deed restriction. Mr. Cuba advised that the Board may offer a condition Resolution incorporating any legal tools that may be required for the deed restriction.

Ms. George **restated** the **amended motion** as follows: **motion** to approve with a deed restriction based on the legal requirements as defined by the Commission.

It was asked how a stipulation of this nature would be received by the Commission. Chair Morley stated that the City Attorney's Office would be instrumental in preparing the necessary language.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** failed 5-6 (Mr. Flanigan, Mr. Franks, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Knott, Mr. McLaughlin, and Mr. Washington dissenting).

IX. Dock Waiver – 801 SW 6th Street / Andrew J. Schein, esq. as agent for Christina Kirwin

Mr. Schein, again representing the Applicant, advised that the same presentation would apply to this waiver request as applied to Item VIII.

There being no questions from the Board at this time, Chair Morley opened the public hearing.

Sgt. O’Neil requested clarification of whether or not the property owner in this case owned two sailboats docked on a canal near the subject property. Mr. Schein replied that he did not believe these vessels were owned by his client. Sgt. O’Neil explained that his concern was that the sailboats were at risk or derelict.

As there were no individuals wishing to speak on the Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Vice Chair Witten, seconded by Mr. Boyer, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** failed 5-6 (Mr. Flanigan, Mr. Franks, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Knott, Mr. McLaughlin, and Mr. Washington dissenting).

X. Discussion – Code Enforcement Marine Issues

Chair Morley stated that in the absence of Code Enforcement, the Item would not be discussed.

XI. Old / New Business

Mr. Franks distributed pages addressing Code and regulated navigation on the Miami River, pointing out that Code on that waterway requires the 65 ft. middle of the channel to be maintained at all times. He felt a channel should be similarly designated on the New River, although he acknowledged that this could be difficult due to the widening and narrowing of the waterway.

Mr. Franks continued that he would recommend the City Commission appoint a committee to review issues related to safe navigation on the New River, and that the Commission suspend dock waivers on the New River for one year in order to review current dockage ordinances. He also proposed that the City pursue having the New River designated as a regulated navigation area by the United States Coast Guard, which would include the establishment of a minimum channel width and vessel passing zones.

Mr. Franks continued that the City Commission should encourage input on this issue from “people involved in the river,” including commercial operators, homeowners, and recreational users of the waterway.

Chair Morley pointed out that the MAB’s Charter discusses the issues raised above as a function of the Board. He felt the Board should continue to be the entity to carry this issue forward.

Mr. Cuba recalled that there have been discussions regarding the potential appointment of a committee for the purposes stated above. Mr. Harrison advised that he has prepared a prospective communication to the City Commission addressing the Board’s concerns related to waiver requests. He read the proposed communication to the members at this time.

The Board discussed the proposed communication, with Mr. Harrison noting that MAB members may attend the City Commission’s Conference Agenda meeting or a public workshop to further the conversation on this issue. He explained that his intent was to propose a suspension of waivers until there is more discussion of the issue and the Commission can come to a decision.

Chair Morley advised that the Commission has indicated to the Board that they would like to hold a joint meeting to discuss this issue. He felt a public workshop could be more easily arranged than the appointment of a committee.

Mr. Brunelle requested clarification of the Board’s goal or policy with regard to the approval of docks. He felt there should be a broader discussion of this goal by the Board, as he was not certain the best course of action was placing the New River under the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard.

Chair Morley recalled that the Florida Inland Navigational District (FIND) has previously recommended the designation of a 100 ft. channel. He reiterated that additional public input would provide value to this ongoing discussion.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair Morley opened the public hearing.

Patience Cohn, representing MIASF, read an email she had received from a contractor working on a seawall on the New River, which indicated the property owner proposes to install an observation platform. The structure has already gone through the permitting process.

Chair Morley commented that this structure poses a hazard to navigation, and suggested that the Board consider an additional communication to the Commission related to this issue. It was clarified that boats could not tie up to the structure.

Mr. Brunelle asked how many vessels of a certain size travel the New River. Chair Morley replied that the Coast Guard estimates there are 8500 vessels per month on the waterway. Ms. Cohn further clarified that the daily average is five vessels of 50 m. or more that are under tow.

Mr. Franks asked if the Board could send a communication to the City Commission requesting that the observation platform be reviewed further. Vice Chair Witten pointed out that the Board's discussion of this issue could be characterized as hearsay.

Chair Morley reiterated that the structure has been permitted and is within Code. Mr. Harrison noted that while the proposed communication to the Commission does not address the possibility of changes to Code, this could be discussed further at public meetings.

Mr. McLaughlin asserted that if the Board designates a structure as a hazard to navigation, they have jurisdiction to review it even though it may have been permitted. Ms. George pointed out that the Board has not been officially notified of the proposed structure. Mr. McLaughlin asked if the Board could receive "general notice" of permit requests on waterways, or if they would have any recourse if they became aware of potential hazards. Mr. Cuba replied that while the Board would not have recourse, Ms. Cohn has plans to meet with an Assistant City Manager with regard to the structure.

As there were no individuals wishing to speak on the Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

The Board further discussed what they would like to address through a communication to the Commission, including:

- Diversity of traffic on the New River
- Support of the Marine Unit
- Difficulty in developing a uniform Code for the New River
- Review of existing Ordinances
- Call to action for the Commission

Ms. George recommended that once the communication has been sent to the Commission, the individual Board members reach out to their Commissioners to emphasize the importance of the communication. Chair Morley agreed, pointing out that Commissioners whose districts do not include waterways may be less aware of marine issues.

Ms. George also noted that it could be helpful to provide the Commissioners with numbers and/or images which can strengthen their assertion. Mr. Cuba advised that the video shown earlier in the meeting can be attached to the communication as an exhibit, as can the plans for the proposed observation deck which were shared with the Board.

Chair Morley also emphasized that the next Chair of the MAB, or another representative of the Board, should be present at the Conference Agenda meeting at which the Board's communication is presented.

Mr. Harrison read his proposed communication into the record:

In light of several past, current, and potential waiver requests for mooring piles extending beyond Code distance to allow for perpendicular docking of vessels into the New River, which have the potential to impede navigational safety of larger vessels transiting the New River, the Marine Advisory Board requests that the Commission issue a suspension of issuing waivers for extensions of moorings beyond Code on the New River Corridor until the Commission can add the issue to their Conference Agenda and/or hold a public workshop.

The goal is to discuss the issue and find a balance that thoughtfully allows property owners to maximize the use of their property while taking into consideration the specific and varied conditions on the New River and facilitating the safe navigation to the commercial businesses further west on the river.

Motion made by Mr. Flanigan, seconded by Mr. Franks, to make that a communication to the Commission.

It was noted that the communication would include the attachments as discussed.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

The Board members also discussed speeds on the New River, recalling that there were previously different speeds for different portions of the waterway, while the current regulations require slow speeds and minimum wakes throughout.

Ms. George advised that she had contacted Mr. Cuba regarding a Commission discussion of boat ramp access for tourists, and asked if any information was available on this topic. Mr. Cuba explained that the City hopes to designate a dock where tourist vessels can pay the City a fee for staging pick-ups and drop-offs there. Because some vessels use the 15th Street boat ramp for this purpose, discussion has focused on this potential location. Letters have been sent to operators telling them to use this location rather than the City's floating docks.

Ms. George explained that this issue also arose at a meeting of the Central Beach Alliance (CBA) with regard to boats using a Water Taxi stop to pick up and drop off large groups of people. The lack of public restrooms at this site has contributed to nuisance behavior. Mr. Cuba requested that photos of the vessel(s) in violation be sent to his office so the City may contact the operator.

Amanda Hammer, private citizen, also expressed concern with charter boats picking up and dropping off passengers, asking where they are permitted to do this. She requested

clarification of why charter vessels are being targeted for enforcement of this prohibition while the same standard is not applied to yachts. She noted that the docking of charter vessels or yachts behind homes is a similar double standard.

Chair Morley noted that the number of passengers boarding and departing commercial vessels at facilities not equipped with public restrooms can contribute to health and hygiene issues.

Ms. Hammer pointed out that the prohibition against using City docks has resulted in charter vessels moving from one location to another to take on or drop off passengers. She added that the proposed solution of a designated City boat ramp could be a successful compromise.

Mr. Luscomb stated that charter vessels are allowed to pick up passengers in one place, such as the City dock at Smoker Park. Operators must call the Dockmaster and make a reservation. While pickup is permitted, staging is not, as the dock follows a tight schedule.

Mr. Luscomb noted that there are significant impacts related to this process, including improper disposal of garbage. Charter vessels can only land at City parks if they have entered into a consent agreement with the City, which requires a competitive bid process. The floating docks on the river cannot be used for this purpose, as they were given to the City using recreational dollars.

Sgt. O'Neil added that there has been a significant influx of charter vessels for parties, and emphasized the importance of these operators entering into agreements for the use of designated areas. This could be a City facility or private property. He pointed out that City facilities are not set up for this type of business access, particularly with staging. It is not the City's responsibility to provide a business with a location.

Chair Morley recommended that in the future, the Board address charter operations within Fort Lauderdale and seek more public comment on both sides of the issue.

Ms. Cohn of the MIAASF reported that the state is considering legislation which would require boaters who are charged with moving violations to take a safe boating course. Chair Morley stated that he was in favor of this, as the recent surge in boat ownership has been accompanied by a similar increase in boating accidents.

Ms. George requested clarification of the age limit at which boaters are not required to wear life jackets. Sgt. O'Neil stated that for boats under 26 ft., passengers 6 years old and under must wear life jackets; for larger boats, no passengers are required to wear them.

Sgt. O'Neil reported that most of the Marine Unit's boats have accumulated roughly 4000 hours. He has been approached by a distributor that is interested in outfitting one of the Marine Unit's boats with motors on consignment for a one-year period. This will help the

distributor collect data about the motors, and maintenance will be free of charge. At the end of the year, the Marine Unit will have the option of purchasing the motors at a discounted rate. Both he and the Fort Lauderdale Police Department are agreeable to this, and he requested that the Board members consider reaching out to their City Commissioners or other contacts in support of the proposal.

Chair Morley stated that his term on the Board will expire after tonight's meeting, and thanked the Board and Staff for the opportunity to serve the community.

Mr. McLaughlin suggested that the Board members be provided with identification in the event they may wish to visit properties that are included on the Agenda.

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]