

PLANNING COMMISSION
October 17, 2018

AGENDA

The Isle of Palms Planning Commission will hold its regular meeting on Wednesday, October 17, 2018 at 4:30 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room, second floor, 1207 Palm Boulevard.

A. Call to order and acknowledgment that the press and the public were duly notified in accordance with state law

B. Public comments

C. Approval of minutes: September 19, 2018

D. Old business: 4:35PM- discuss outfall RFP response with Thomas and Hutton

5:00PM- discuss outfall RFP response with Weston and Sampson

5:25PM- discuss making a recommendation regarding outfall RFP

Update on sewer expansion MOU

E. New business

F. Miscellaneous business

G. Adjourn

MINUTES OF THE ISLE OF PALMS
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
October 17, 2018

The Isle of Palms Planning Commission met in the City Hall conference room, 1207 Palm Boulevard on October 17, 2018 at 4:30 p.m. Members attending included Ron Denton, Richard Ferencz, Bill Mills, Lewis Gregory and Lisa Safford; the Director of Planning Douglas Kerr was present as well. Vince DiGangi and Phillip Pounds were absent. Mr. Ferencz acknowledged that the press and public had been notified of the meeting and the agenda for the meeting was posted in City Hall and the Building Department to comply with the Freedom of Information Act.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

With no public comments offered, Mr. Mills moved for the approval of the September 19, 2018 minutes as submitted; Mr. Ferencz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF OUTFALL RFP RESPONSE WITH THOMAS AND HUTTON

Mr. Rick Karkowski with Thomas and Hutton thanked the Commission for having them back and discussed in greater detail how his team envisioned approaching the drainage outfall problems. He stated that, with just a simple inspection of the size of the pipes and the acreage of the basins the pipes are trying to service, it was clear that the infrastructure was undersized. Additionally, he said that access to maintain the facilities was challenging, and he thought it would be prudent to provide improvements that make maintaining the facilities easier going forward. He explained that, if chosen, his firm would look at options to be able to detain more water, to possibly add diversions to the system, to provide more outfalls, and to increase the carrying capacity of the system, possibly by opening channels, and adding lift or pump stations.

Mr. Ferencz asked what the logical first phase of the project would be, if the City were to proceed with Thomas and Hutton. Mr. Karkowski answered that he thought the logical break point would be after the investigative work was done, and concepts were developed and reviewed, and a path forward was agreed upon. He indicated that this would include tasks 1 through 4 in the scope of work of the RFP, plus a portion of pricing options included in task 7.

The Commission thanked the Thomas and Hutton representatives for coming.

DISCUSSION OF OUTFALL RFP RESPONSE WITH WESTON AND SAMPSON

Mr. Bob Horner of Weston and Sampson thanked the Commission for having them back. He stated that, since the last time they met, he has had a chance to discuss the permitting hurdles with OCRM staff and anticipates that the bulk of the permitting challenges would be inland from the OCRM critical area; therefore, he does anticipate major permitting issues.

Mr. Kerr stated that, between the two proposals the City received, the expense associated with permitting was dramatically different, maybe up to 400% deviation; he asked if it were safe to assume that the permitting expense the project incurred should be the same regardless of which firm the City chose. Mr. Horner answered that the permit cost would be same; however, if one design was to disturb more critical area, it could trigger a more intensive permitting process. In that circumstance, it could be that one design would be costlier to permit than another.

Mr. Ferencz asked if Weston and Sampson anticipated hiring a third party to handle the permitting or if they anticipated handling this with their staff. Mr. Horner answered that they could engage a third party to handle this portion of the project, but for, the level of permitting they were expecting the project to include, he did not anticipate the need to do this but expected to handle permitting with their staff.

Mr. Lewis asked what the permitting cost would include and whether or not this was fees paid or cost associated with work to be done. Mr. Horner answered that, if the project was disruptive to critical area, it could need to include a contribution to the mitigation bank, but he did not anticipate this being the case. Therefore, he anticipated the bulk of the cost would be time and work associated securing the permits, not permit fees.

Mr. Kerr commented that one of the tasks included in the RFP was to assist in securing grant funding, and he asked how Weston and Sampson typically handled this. Mr. Horner answered that they did have projects that they monitored for grant funding opportunities, and, if a grant becomes available, they would contact their client and agree to pursue a grant. He explained that he thought the primary funding sources for this project would be the Rural Infrastructure Authority (RIA) grants and FEMA Pre-disaster Mitigation Grants, and he has experience with both.

Mr. Horner emphasized that he knew public projects were always scrutinized for their expense, and he has focused on simple, but cost effective, ways to implement improvements over time. Mr. Petrakis added that he felt that it was important for the City to recognize that infrastructure projects like this not only had an upfront cost, but

also a life-cycle cost that would include maintenance. If the City chose to pursue a design that involved work in the critical areas it would have a very high life-cycle cost.

Mr. Ferencz asked if there was a logical first phase of the project that could be initially agreed upon. Mr. Horner answered yes and distributed a cost sheet associated with a phased approach. He explained that, in this approach, he proposed to initially do tasks one through four of the RFP, but he broke the surveying expense up to be less up-front cost with the bulk of the surveying done during the final design phase of the project.

The Commission thanked Mr. Horner and Mr. Petrakis for coming and discussing the project.

DISCUSSION OF A RECOMMENDATION REGARDING OUTFALL RFP

Mr. Kerr explained that a recommendation would go through City Council's committee process and ultimately to Council. He asked if the Commission felt like they were able to make a recommendation at this point.

Mr. Mills asked who on the City staff would be working on this project; Mr. Kerr answered that he would probably be the point of contact for the design phases of the project, and then, ultimately, it would be a combination of him and the City Hall staff dealing with the construction of the projects. When Mr. Mills asked if Mr. Kerr had an opinion about the two proposals, he answered that he felt that Thomas and Hutton envisioned a more robust project, and, while he appreciated Weston and Sampson's more economical approach, he wondered if it would ultimately provide the same drainage relief as the project Thomas and Hutton was proposing.

Mr. Denton also felt that Thomas and Hutton was envisioning a much more comprehensive solution and that it might be shortsighted to think that a more economical solution would be effective in the long run.

Ms. Safford liked the idea of being less intrusive in the critical areas, but she wondered if it was realistic to think that they could leave the channel that crosses the golf course as narrow as it currently is.

Mr. Ferencz thought it would be short-sighted to improve the infrastructure leading to the outfall and then realize the flow at the end of the outfall, because the flow to the outfall has been increased.

Mr. Mills for an explanation of the process for their recommendation to be placed before City Council. Mr. Kerr envisioned the Planning Commission's recommendation going to

the Public Works Committee, and then the Public Works Committee's recommendation going to Ways and Means, and then Ways and Means' recommendation going to full City Council for approval.

Mr. Mills moved to recommend that the City engage Thomas and Hutton for the work outlined in the RFP and their proposal for the outfall work; in addition for the City to initially enter into a contract for the first four tasks identified in the RFP plus the work associated with determining construction costs included in task seven in the amount of approximately \$101,000. Lisa Safford seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

UPDATE ON SEWER EXPANSION MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Mr. Kerr reported that, since their last meeting, he and Interim City Administrator Fragoso had met with Ms. Tucker who provided all of the information that had been gathered to facilitate entering into a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the Sewer Commission regarding the shared goal of having every property served by public sewer. He said that he had discussed the finalization of the Sewer Masterplan Update being done by Thomas and Hutton, and they stated that they were lacking a few pieces of information from the IOPWSC. Once they get that information, they could complete the project within a few weeks.

He stated that he would keep the Commission posted as work progresses on this task.

ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard Ferencz, Chairman