

REAL PROPERTY COMMITTEE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 15, 2017

The regular meeting of the Real Property Committee was held at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 15, 2017 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Mayor ProTem Harrington and Rice, Chair Bergwerf, Administrator Tucker, Assistant Administrator Fragoso and City Clerk Copeland; a quorum was present to conduct business.

1. Since the Chair was running late, Vice Chair Rice called the meeting to order and acknowledged that the press and public were duly notified of the meeting in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

2. Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of May 8, 2017 as submitted; Vice Chair Rice seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION: Vice Chair Rice moved to re-order the Agenda to take up Item 6 under New Business after Citizens' Comments; Councilmember Harrington seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Upon her arrival, Chair Bergwerf apologized for being tardy and added that she had a difficult time finding a place to park, referencing that the Conference Room was filled with people.

Elizabeth Campsen, 32 Intracoastal Court, opined that the issue of overflow parking from the marina could be attributed to the unlimited non-resident boat launching. When the City approved an increase in launch fees in May 2016, Council also discussed the practice of selling annual launch passes to non-residents; the Mayor stated then that he wanted to discuss it with the marina manager because he was of the opinion that selling annual launch passes to non-residents made managing the parking on the site impossible. To-date the practice has not changed; she recalled asking the Committee to set reasonable operational restrictions on non-resident launching, which, as landlord, the City has the right to do. In conclusion, Ms. Campsen stated that the residents will be "voting on whether to spend five million dollars (\$5,000,000) to redevelop the marina and that, at the stakeholder meeting, every resident stated that their Number One concern was resident access."

Randy Bell, 22 – 41st Avenue, stated that residents agreed that the marina was overcrowded and that parking should be contained to the marina property, but, instead, the City continues to add businesses. The many businesses operating there have created the overflow parking problem on parts of 41st Avenue and Waterway Boulevard, which the City has made Resident Only Parking. He voiced the opinion that Council's primary focus should be on the quality of life for the residents before revenue generation. He said that he did not understand why boondocking kept coming up for discussion; he thought this meeting was the fifth time. He urged the Committee and the balance of Council to set priorities that would put the residents first; he also stated that the City should stop looking for opportunities to bring more people who increase traffic issues to the island.

Dudley Spangler, 408 Ocean Boulevard, also asked why the Committee kept bringing up something that the residents have made clear that they oppose, i.e. any type of storage in the municipal parking lot was not supported by residents. He noted that the lot was not set up for overnight parking, and he opined that to do this would put a strain on City services, public safety and public works. He also voiced concern about the liability that the City could face. He said that Wild Dunes does not allow its residents to store their boats in their yards, but the City was willing to store them in the heart of the business district. On the subject of extending the period of time that the parking kiosks would be operational, he stated that he was opposed. Since, in the off-season, the Front Beach businesses struggle financially, he asked that the City survey the Front Beach businesses to get their perspective on lengthening the pay-to-park timeframe since their businesses would be affected and that a revenue projection be prepared for the additional month versus the cost of retaining Beach Services Officers.

Bill Campbell of 34 – 42nd Avenue was pleased to hear that the fuel island will not be relocated as a part of the Marina Redevelopment Project, but he voiced concern that the current plan has three (3) staging lanes for the boat ramp. He suggested that boats should form one (1) line for the ramp with boats entering one (1) at a time, as the next in line, when a lane opens up.

Salah H. Hibri, a lawyer from The Mason Law Firm, P.A., introduced himself as the attorney for Phillip and Kathy Smith of 8 Intracoastal Court relative to the nuisance created by the noise generated by Tidal Wave Watersports. The Smiths have been residents of the island for twenty-seven (27) years. By way of background, Mr. Hibri stated that Tidal Wave is a jet-ski and parasailing business that caters to visitors to the island; they currently have sixteen (16) jet skis, a parasailing boat and two (2) other boats and their hours of operation are 8:00 a.m. til dusk. They operate forty to fifty feet (40 – 50 ft.) from the Smith's dock; the noise generated by the operation constantly disturbs the Smiths' right to enjoy their back yard and dock and is a clear nuisance. The zoning for Tidal Wave is the lowest commercial zoning (GC1) the City has, and the City Code states the following:

“Purpose. The purpose of the GC-1 general commercial district is:

- a. To encourage the development of a less densely constructed, economically healthy business environment with family-oriented businesses directed primarily to island residents in buildings designed and sited to accommodate automobile and pedestrian traffic.
- b. To discourage uses which generate noise, vibration, glare, dust and odor or are offensive to the health, safety and morals of a residential, family-oriented community.”

Mr. Hibri continued by quoting from the Real Property Committee meeting of August 3, 2016:

“Administrator Tucker noted that the IOP Marina was not a commercial marina as were others in the Charleston area; . . . she questioned that Tidal Wave would increase its business if relocated to one of the larger marinas. She pondered whether Tidal Wave had outgrown the IOP Marina.”

Mr. Hibri pointed out that the operations of Tidal Wave Watersports do not adhere to the City's zoning code in that their customers are visitors to the island and the noise produced by the business is clearly "offensive to the health . . . of a residential, family-oriented community."

In addition to the zoning code violations, Mr. Hibri indicated that Tidal Wave Watersports was also in violation of its lease in that the business "far exceeds the parking limitations;" the lease provides Tidal Wave with ten (10) parking spaces, two (2) for employees and eight (8) for customers; with nineteen (19) watercraft and forty to fifty (40 – 50) customers at a time, their business occupies many more parking spaces than ten (10). He also stated that other businesses at the marina, i.e. the marina store and restaurant, do not want Tidal Wave Watersports as their neighbor due to the noise levels they generate. According to Mr. Hibri, the Smiths are unable to enjoy their yard and dock and their proximity to Tidal Wave has reduced the value of their home; when their house was for sale, they did not receive one (1) offer and the reasons cited by prospective buyers was the nuisance created by the noise from the business next door. According to Mr. Hibri, the obvious solution is for the City to act to move Tidal Wave Watersports a reasonable distance away from the Smith's residence; in his opinion, the City cannot allow and facilitate the operation of a business that clearly does not follow the City's zoning code. Mr. Hibri stated that, if the City does not act, the Smiths will have no alternative but to take legal action against all parties to abate the nuisance created Tidal Wave Watersports and to recover damages; he stated that the Smiths were asking that the City take action to avoid further action on his part.

Dr. Alfred Dawson of Intracoastal Court stated that he was an expert on water quality and to allow overnight camping on the island would create water quality issues for the City. He reported watching campers pull out of camping areas with no facilities that dump sewage on the road as they travel, creating the possibility of an ecoli outbreak; visitors and islanders walk barefoot on the City's streets. When references are made that the island was going to be like Myrtle Beach, he reported that Myrtle Beach has often had its beaches closed to swimmers due to water quality issues, and he does not want to see the same thing to happen here. On the issue of trailers parking on Waterway, he suggested moving the sidewalks further from the road so that vehicles with trailers could park four feet (4 ft.) from the road.

6. New Business

Consideration of use of City property to generate revenue in the off-season

- A. Expanding the parking season by two weeks in the spring and in the fall**
- B. Alternate uses of municipal parking lot, such as boat storage and small RV parking**

Chair Bergwerf stated that Council was constantly thinking of ways to generate revenue in order to avoid a property tax increase and to maintain the services the City provides; they never want to cut off conversation or someone's idea(s).

Mayor ProTem Harrington stated that he had spoken with the manager of the Cracker Barrel on Highway 17 and learned that they operate six hundred fifty (650) stores and have allowed boondocking in their parking lots for sixty years (60 yrs.). According to the local manager, the chain has not had any serious problems, and, in Mount Pleasant, the restaurant hosts six or seven (6 – 7) small campers a week. In the Councilmember's opinion, the subject of boondocking deserves

reasonable discussion as a demonstration project; if problems occurred, it would be a dead issue. Additionally he noted that the City would incur no expense to allow overnight parking and, with the parking lot's proximity to the Police Department, it could be easily supervised and monitored.

Mayor ProTem Harrington repeated that City Council was looking for new ways to generate revenue in order to postpone a property tax increase for as long as possible.

For Councilmember Rice, the issue was how the City wants the public to envision the Isle of Palms; she said the vision was not of small campers or RVs parked in the center of town; she added that she was "conflicted" about boat storage in the municipal lot as well. She stated that she was interested in beautification of and additions to the island to draw visitors and vacationers; she wanted to draw residents and visitors to the beach. If Council were to decide to use the parking lot for boat storage, it needed to have an idea of the amount of revenue that could be generated.

Since Wild Dunes property owners are not allowed to store their boats on their property, they might consider the opportunity to store their boats on the island as a service; Chair Bergwerf asked if there was any way to find out how Wild Dunes residents would be interested. She thought more research was needed to learn what storage facilities in Mount Pleasant charge and an estimate of how many boats the municipal lot might hold.

Anticipating the question, Assistant Fragoso called several facilities and learned that many have a six month (6 mo.) waiting list, charges range from fifty to two hundred fifty dollars (\$50 – 250) per month and boat owners must provide certificates of liability insurance. Depending on the size of the boats, the municipal parking could hold as many as one hundred (100) boats.

Councilmember Rice stated that no plan to generate revenue from boat storage or boondocking would be in place for the coming off-season.

Mayor ProTem Harrington stated that, if boat storage were approved, island residents would be served first.

Randy Bell asked from the audience for definitions of resident and property owner.

Before any decision was made, Councilmember Rice wanted to see a cost/benefit analysis.

As the discussion concluded, Administrator Tucker asked whether staff was to research boat storage or camper parking, and the consensus of the Committee was to look into boat storage.

As the discussion moved to extending the period that the parking kiosks would be operational, Chair Bergwerf recalled seeing a small group of women in late February or early March who had come to Front Beach for lunch and had stopped her asking where they paid to park; they were surprised that they did not have to pay. She also reminded those present that residents can park in the municipal lot at no cost assuming that their vehicle is properly credentialed.

MOTION: Mayor ProTem Harrington moved to extend the time that the parking kiosks are operational by 2 weeks earlier in March and 2 weeks later in October; Councilmember Rice seconded.

Councilmember Rice noted that people who come to the island now expect to pay to park; therefore, she had no problem with extending the time that people pay-to-park by a month, and a conservative estimate of revenue to the City was twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) per week. She did ask whether consideration could be given to free parking at the kiosks after 5:30 p.m. or 6:00 p.m., the time people frequently go to Front Beach for dinner. She did not want this action to be detrimental to the Front Beach businesses.

Administrator Tucker stated that her understanding when this topic was originally brought forward was that all kiosks on the island would become operational two (2) weeks earlier in the spring and remain operational two (2) weeks later in October. Listening to later discussions, she asked for clarification on which kiosks were to be operational longer; was it only the kiosks at Front Beach?

Mayor ProTem Harrington thought that cutting off the kiosks at 6:00 p.m. could be handled without too much ado; he stated that, in his opinion, Council has a fiduciary responsibility to residents to pursue revenue in every form to avoid a tax increase.

VOTE: The motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Comments from marina tenants

Michael Fiem and Jamie Kahn, McCullough Kahn law firm, came forward to address the Committee; Mr. Kahn stated that he was present to represent Tidal Wave Watersports. He stated that he has known the Fiem brothers for ten (10) years and has found them to be professional and courteous business owners who take their job seriously. The comment made earlier about Tidal Wave customers urinating off the dock was news to Mr. Fiem; if he had seen such an incident, he would have asked the customer to leave and called the police. He voiced the opinion that Mr. Smith was not speaking for other residents of Intracoastal Court and that he was "unhappy with where he chose to build his house and is seeking to hold others responsible." Mr. Kahn noted that Tidal Wave has operated in the current location in the IOP Marina since 1992; therefore, when Mr. Smith purchased the lot and when he constructed his home, Tidal Wave was operating as it does today. He selected the last residential lot adjacent to the marina on the Intracoastal Waterway in a no-wake zone; Mr. Kahn stated that on any weekend boats are lined up in that area "with music blaring."

On the subject of zoning, Mr. Kahn contended that, if Tidal Wave was not in compliance, the entire marina was out of compliance based on the provisions cited. As to nuisance, Mr. Kahn contended that Tidal Wave is not a nuisance; he repeated that the issue is that Mr. Smith is not happy with the decision he made when building his home. The Tidal Wave operation is within reasonable limits based on its location on the Intracoastal Waterway; they are within the limits of the lease in terms of parking because the majority of their patrons are shuttled to the marina by Wild Dunes. Mr. Kahn noted that Mr. Smith's daughters worked at Tidal Wave for years.

Michael Fiem stated that they believe that they have always operated within the limits of their lease and believe that they have done nothing wrong. The statement that other marina tenants do not want Tidal Wave near their locations is not the case; Mr. Fiem noted that the closer their business is to the mouth of the marina the greater the safety risk. He stated that they are happy where they are currently located and do not know if they would be open to relocating.

Representing Morgan Creek Grill were Jay Clarke, owner, Carla Pope, Operations Manager, and John Dodds, attorney. Ms. Pope apologized for creating a nuisance as they repeatedly asked for intervention at the marina relative to the parking issues between tenants this season. She explained that the problem has been from a trickle-down effect, starting with the residents' desire to contain the marina parking to the marina site; she explained that the elimination of overflow parking created "something of a pressure valve inside the marina" since the same number of people were coming to the marina to jet ski, dine and launch their boats. For five to six years (5 – 6 yrs.), the Fiem brothers, Brian Berrigan and Morgan Creek Grill management have cooperatively worked to rearrange the parking within the marina, disregarding the specific terms of the leases; up to this point, they have successfully managed parking to everyone's satisfaction primarily through time management. Prior to Memorial Day, Mr. Berrigan and Mr. Clarke met to devise a way to use the area behind the green fence for management parking to avoid employees using spaces in the main parking area, and it was decided that Morgan Creek Grill needed four (4) spaces and signage was installed for other tenants. There was apparently a misunderstanding between the two (2) gentlemen about what Morgan Creek needed and what it was given; Mr. Clarke tried to communicate with Mr. Berrigan via email, but Mr. Berrigan did not respond. At this time, Mr. Clarke thought there was a real problem and reached out to the City for mediation. The restaurant would like to go back to the plan that was in place last year when the tenants shared the available parking to everyone's benefit. When the communication "fell apart," management at the restaurant thought they had no alternative but to turn to the landlord for assistance.

Mr. Clarke recalled the discussion with Mr. Berrigan and was confident that he had indicated that the restaurant needed six (6) spaces behind the fence since they have ten to twelve (10 – 12) managers working in the course of a day. According to Mr. Clarke, Mr. Berrigan has had spaces blocked off during Morgan Creek business hours which were, in the past, shared use spaces, in addition, he has twice moved signs denoting parking for Morgan Creek Grill closer to the restaurant, eliminating parking spaces for restaurant patrons. He added that he has had loss of business from the reduced number of parking spaces and has received complaints from customers.

Mr. Dodds reported that he has looked at the leases, and he believes that the intent is for the tenants to work together to share the parking to accommodate customers and employees "subject to the control and direction of the marina manager." At this time, he stated that he was unsure about who the marina manager actually was. From studying the restaurant lease and the marina lease, he said that there was "an obligation to work with one another to ensure that the interests of all the tenants are protected." He commented that the management of Morgan Creek respects the need of the residents to eliminate overflow and trailer parking on Waterway Boulevard and 41st Avenue. He stated that the restaurant's concern was that they were not getting the level of communication and cooperation from the marina manager; they then looked to the lease for a remedy. With the City as the landlord, they are reaching out for help; they would like for the City to assign a staff member to meet with and assist with mediating the situation. He reported that,

on June 2, 2017, they received a letter from the attorney for the marina manager stating that they could no longer park in the shared marina area, which he believes is contrary to the provisions of their lease; parking for the restaurant will be restricted to the thirty-five (35) spaces assigned to it in the lease. It also stated that, if employees or customers park in the shared area, the vehicles will be towed.

Administrator Tucker responded that, if the City were to become involved in settling the dispute, its position would be to stay in compliance with the leases with the City; the City has not been a party to any agreements made between tenants. She stated that, whenever staff or Council has been asked to adjudicate agreements between tenants, its response has consistently been that each tenant has assigned parking and that they should not go outside of these boundaries.

Mr. Dodd contended that the lease provides for not only specific parking for each tenant but also a large area of shared parking. According to Mr. Dodd, the City names the marina manager under the terms of the restaurant lease, and the marina manager is the person making those decisions. He said that, if that person is not filling his/her obligation to cooperate and communicate with the other tenants for the benefit of all of the tenants, perhaps the City should consider appointing a new marina manager.

Mr. Clarke stated that when they signed the lease for the restaurant, Brian Berrigan was an employee of the City serving as marina manager, and they feel their lease is being violated by the actions of the marina manager. He indicated that they are at an impasse with the marina manager based on the lack of communication.

The Administrator stated that Mr. Berrigan has never been an employee of the City.

Councilmember Rice opined that this conflict points to the real need for the marina redevelopment plan.

Responding to Mr. Dodd, the Administrator said that she would send a communication to all marina tenants that it would be in their best interests to work together to solve the parking issues. She commented that the intent of the lease is that Brian Berrigan is the marina manager.

Mr. Berrigan stated that he has been advised to speak guardedly without his attorney present, but he did explain that this disagreement started with threats and promises to move employees off the marina parking lot. He said that he has photographs of Morgan Creek employees parked all over the lot on Memorial Day weekend and every subsequent weekend. He recommended that Mr. Dodd contact Gray Taylor, his attorney.

5. Old Business

A. Discussion of expectations with new City-wide landscaping contract with Tom Murray, Regional Manager of The Greenery

Administrator Tucker apologized to Mr. Murray and noted that he has been extremely patient waiting his place on the Agenda; the Administrator commented that she had not expected to have "a full house" for this meeting. In addition, she noted that this meeting between the City and its

new landscape contractor was unusual; however City Council made a policy change at a visioning meeting last year where they decided that they wanted the City's properties to look much better than they have under the most recent landscaper. The benchmark established was the Recreation Center which has a full-time groundskeeper. Based on comments from Councilmembers, the understanding is that the City wants to do more than the regular things that are in the contract; since the City does not have landscape personnel, staff will be listening to the recommendations from the new contractor.

Councilmember Rice indicated that she was interested in what they thought needed to be addressed and some kind of timeline.

Mr. Murray said that he was pleased to be back on the island since they had the contract several years ago. He explained that The Greenery is a horticulturally based company and everything they do will be based on sound horticultural practices; both he and his partner have horticultural degrees. He stated that, in order to get back to sound maintenance practices, there was much work to be done. In the first thirty (30) days of the contract, they will make the rounds of City properties and will provide the City with a report on their finds, for instance, the problems with the irrigation system and how much it would cost to repair it, as well as improvements they believe would be beneficial and the identification of problem areas that they feel will be difficult or impossible to maintain in their current state and prevent them from reaching the City's goal. They will then meet with the City to look at enhancements and to prioritize them for implementation and location; they have an in-house designer and pest and disease management division. By the spring of next year, citizens should begin to see the turnaround. He thought that flower design could be improved upon by using plants that thrive in the beach environment, and the floral design will begin in July.

Councilmember Rice noted that there were many barren spots on Front Beach and exposed light boxes; she asked if something could be done there before July 4th.

Although Front Beach was one of the most visible areas of the City, it was also the most heavily used, resulting in its looking "beat up," but Mr. Murray thought that certain things could be done. For instance, he suggested in looking at a low voltage LED system using less power, maybe even going to down lights in the palm trees rather than up lights and getting the lighting gear off the ground. He said that type of recommendation would be in the initial report.

Administrator Tucker stated that most of the Front Beach ground lighting has been switched out to LED flush.

Referencing the barren areas, Mr. Murray indicated that they wanted to move away from mulch because it does not stay in place and find something that will thrive in those areas.

As the Regional Manager, Mr. Murray said that he operates from an office off Clements Ferry Road, and that the office services the Isle of Palms, Mount Pleasant, Downtown, Daniel Island and James Island. Seven (7) account managers work under him, and the account manager for the Isle of Palms will be Matt Shelton, and he strictly serves the Isle of Palms and Sullivan's Island. Mr. Murray stated that he would provide the City with a service schedule that would only be altered

by weather; in that case, the City would be notified that service would be a day later, in most cases.

B. Consideration of proposal for beach access signs

Assistant Fragoso reported that the local vendor has agreed to guarantee the price to the fall and has committed to a fifteen (15) day turnaround.

C. Discussion and recommendations related to the IOP Marina

1. Status of Boating Infrastructure Grant (BIG)

Kirby Marshall of ATM stated that, although the awards have not yet been made official, he has received unofficial notification that the City's application was not selected, but, on the other hand, the City has an opportunity to re-submit. He noted that two (2) of the three (3) projects in South Carolina that were selected were re-submittals; the benefit to re-submittal is that the City would have the feedback from Fish and Wildlife about why the application was not chosen and would have the opportunity to address them. If the City chooses to re-submit, the applications are due July 1st; last year's application could be re-submitted as a placeholder, and changes could be made between July 1st and September 8th when they are sent to federal offices. The types of changes he was thinking of would require a substantial simplification of the plan. He explained that the City was trying to maximize the amount of money it could get from the grant with the application submitted last year; one (1) suggestion was to request only the fuel lines and the pumps for a grant amount of two hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$225,000).

Councilmember Rice expressed the opinion that the City should not seek the BIG grant due to the limitations it imposes on the project; she voiced a preference of going forward with the freedom to do more for the residents.

Chair Bergwerf indicated her agreement with Councilmember Rice about the 2016 application for the BIG grant, but she was interested in applying for funds for the fuel lines and pumps. The question was whether a new, simpler application would have the same restrictions as before.

The Chair then asked about the status of the grant for the fishing pier, and Mr. Marshall recalled that the grant was not submitted because the City wanted to wait until it knew about the BIG grant. The grant application has been completed and is ready to be submitted.

Mr. Marshall explained that the original application was for a Tier 2 grant for transient boating infrastructure; a new application for the fuel lines and pumps would be a Tier 1 grant that is administered by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. Under the Tier 1 program, each state is given two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000); DNR retains fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) for administering the program and the balance is grant funds. The awards are determined by a committee of DNR employees and industry professionals that rank the applications, and they fund many applications for marina utilities.

The Chair supported applying for the Tier 1 grant and submitting the grant for the Shore-based Fishing Grant for a City dock.

When Councilmember Rice asked what ATM would charge to prepare the Tier 1 grant application, Mr. Marshall replied that he would need to get back to the City with a formal proposal.

Since Ways and Means meets on Tuesday, June 20, the Administrator told Mr. Marshall that the City would need the proposal by Friday afternoon to include it in meeting packets; she also asked that he plan to attend the meeting.

Since the City would not know the outcome of the Tier 1 application until the spring of 2018, she recommended that the City should proceed as if it will not receive these grant funds; therefore, the referendum amount should reflect the full cost of the project. Since the City has been successful in obtaining federal grants, the receipts will exceed the toggle for special audits, which will be an additional expense for the City.

2. Location of Tidal Wave Watersports dock

As noted earlier, the most recent iteration of the Marina Redevelopment Plan leaves Tidal Wave in their current location.

Chair Bergwerf and Councilmember Rice want the Tidal Wave dock to become the public fishing dock.

From an access standpoint, Mr. Marshall thought that suggestion was a good fit; he stated it would make for a cleaner and safer access for the general public to fish or sit and watch the dolphins swim by. The reason to leave them in their current location was money; Tidal Wave has infrastructure in the form of a building, point of sale, utilities and covered structures for waiting customers, which are critical to the operation of their business. He recalled that to relocate those to a new location was approximately one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000). Mr. Marshall questioned how much difference would be found in moving Tidal Wave operations about fifty feet (50 ft.) away from residential property on the Intracoastal docks.

Mr. Fiem commented that they originally had one hundred feet (100 ft.) of dock, but only have eighty feet (80 ft.) today; he also expressed concern over the sedimentation on the back side of the Intracoastal dock. He stated that the dredger must have access to the back side of the docks because they use both sides of their dock space; he added that for the sake of security, he would prefer to have direct access to their dock space.

Mr. Marshall responded that, since the Intracoastal dock will be further out into the Intracoastal Waterway, he expected sufficient space behind the docks for a good dredging project. He also thought that an arm off the public gangway would work for Coastal Expeditions.

The Administrator recalled that Council has heard over and over again that any redevelopment or enhancement of the marina should be resident friendly, and the more flexibility Council retains to do that, unencumbered by the limitations/restrictions of grant funding, the easier it will be to give the residents what they want. She commented that, if they pursue the fishing grant and design the one (1) dock to fishing, they will be creating a new use, resulting in that dock being taken out of the equation for solving the problems already existing. She thought the Committee should be looking at a plan without any restrictions other than the City's decision making.

MOTION: Chair Bergwerf moved to make the current Tidal Wave dock a public, community dock that will also incorporate a public non-motorized launch, to relocate Tidal Wave Watersports to the western end of the Intracoastal dock with the appropriate security and Coastal Expeditions will be relocated to the eastern end of the Intracoastal dock access; Councilmember Rice seconded and the motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

3. Parking issues at the site and overflow parking

Discussed earlier in the meeting.

4. Status of Referendum

Administrator Tucker reported that the ordinance for the referendum will be on the Council agenda for First Reading on Tuesday, June 20, 2017.

5. Expectations from ATM for City meetings leading to the referendum date

ATM's proposal should be to assist the City here forward in advance of the referendum with visuals, attendance at meetings, etc. The Committee agreed that the City should hold a minimum of two (2) meetings, one (1) at the marina and one (1) at the Rec Center, with staff meetings prior to each public meeting. Chair Bergwerf stated that she would like to see a visual of the marina as it exists today with an overlay of the redevelopment plan clearly demonstrating the improvements being made. The Committee agreed that they would like a graphic of the design on the website along with a list of frequently asked questions,.

7. New Business

Tenant Rents Report – All tenants were current.

Next Meeting Date: 9:30 a.m., Monday, July 10, 2017 in the Conference Room.

8. Executive Session – not necessary

9. Adjournment

MOTION: Councilmember Rice moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:55 a.m.; Mayor ProTem Harrington seconded and the motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted:

Marie Copeland
City Clerk