



## Submission of Sworn Public Comment for Public Hearings Legislative and Quasi-Judicial

*The asterisk denotes a required field in order for the comments to be submitted for consideration.*

### Your name\*

MR. BRUCE MURRAY  
Prefix First Name Last Name

### Your address\*

1710 FRANCIS COURT FORT PIERCE  
Street Address City

### Meeting Date\*

OCTOBER 5, 2020

### Agenda Item\*

12.f

### Contact Information

bam36mail@gmail.com 772-285-1755  
Email Phone

Comments at public hearings are limited to **three minutes** per speaker. The decorum policy of the Commission shall apply to all comments, either oral or written, pursuant to Sec. 2-35 of the Fort Pierce Code of Ordinances. Comments read into the record by the City Clerk will be limited to three minutes. Email completed form to: [lcox@cityoffortpierce.com](mailto:lcox@cityoffortpierce.com)

### TESTIMONY/COMMENTS\*

Good evening. You all know where I stand on this item, at least those of you who read your email and prepare for the meeting do. Sorry about that. I am adamantly against this change in the position of the idle speed boundary in Jaycee Park. Prior to posting of the proposed ordinance, I argued increased risk to park users and sailing school attendees, increased risk of liability to the City, high demand on staff and unnecessary cost to implement, expected long delays in FWC, Coast Guard, Corps Of Engineers, and FL DEP approval, and vast public confusion during the review period and possible issues with the Sailing Foundation Agreement to do a useless, meaningless, and unneeded change that is illegal under state statute when passed.

Now that the specific wording of the ordinance is published, I find it hard to believe

I swear or affirm, under oath, that the statement herein is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Please note that this form cannot be submitted using Chrome; you must save and email or use a different browser.

Bruce A Murray

Signature

Save and Print

Submit

**TESTIMONY/COMMENTS (continued)**

that any Commissioner would not find it embarrassing to support it. The preamble uses the same language as the previous ordinance, stating that it is necessary for safety. If 500 feet was necessary for safety, how can 300 feet improve safety when it exposes 50% of the swim area to increased risk, opens the area in front of the sailing club to risk, endangers non motorized users of the smaller protected area, etc.. I have heard absolutely no explanation or argument to support the false premise that this change to 300 feet will create a safer environment than the existing 500 foot barrier, which has received accolades from citizens throughout the city for its safety and park comfort improvement, including in the citizen letter attached to tonight's agenda.

If this proposed ordinance is passed, I can assure you it will face public challenge at FWC on both jurisdictional authority and justification basis immediately.

In your own words:

IF IT AIN'T BROKE, DON'T FIX IT!!

THIS AIN'T BROKE. LEAVE IT ALONE.

Thank you.

Bruce