## **REAL PROPERTY COMMITTEE**

9:00 a.m., Thursday, July 7, 2016

The regular meeting of the Real Property Committee was held at 9:00 a.m., Thursday, July 7, 2016 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmembers Harrington and Rice, Chair Bergwerf, Administrator Tucker, Assistant Administrator Fragoso and City Clerk Copeland; a quorum was present to conduct business.

1. Chair Bergwerf called the meeting to order and acknowledged that the press and public had been duly notified of the meeting in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

## 2. Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes

MOTION: Councilmember Rice moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 2, 2016 as submitted; Councilmember Harrington seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### 3. Citizens' Comments

Stuart Colman of 10 Live Oak Drive asked why the City was applying for a grant to provide dockage for transient boaters when the marina was purchased to provide water access to island residents.

Jay Clarke, owner of Morgan Creek Grill, reported that he has a meeting with Ledford's Termite Control relative to the restaurant's termite bond inspection. He stated that the area underneath the restaurant has been cleaned out, but there was still a problem with the floor under the walkin freezer.

City Administrator Tucker stated that the floor there was rotted; she also noted that the termite bond would not be issued since it was wet under the restaurant.

Mr. Clarke questioned if Ledford's might issue a bond excluding the area under the freezer; he also acknowledged that the runoff from the building goes into the sandy soil beneath the restaurant and needs to be diverted.

Councilmember Rice stated that she had heard that the opportunity to use the IOP Water and Sewer's property on Waterway Boulevard for marina employee parking has been guashed.

Mr. Clarke reported that the restaurant is going to experiment with having employees to park at the Recreation Center on 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue and trolley them to the restaurant. He continued to advocate for filling in the ditch along 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue on the marina property for employees to park.

In Councilmember Rice's opinion, using the Recreation Center for marina employee parking was simply moving the parking problem from one (1) location to another; she suggested that the employees get annual parking passes to park in the municipal lot and be shuttled to the marina from there.

Mr. Clarke said that everyone involved should be open to all ideas.

Councilmember Harrington understood that no dialogue had taken place at the Water and Sewer Commission's Board meeting, and he was not willing to give up the idea without a reason. He added that, for him, filling in the 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue ditch at the marina would be a step toward beautifying the marina.

## 4. Comments from Marina Tenants

Operations Manager at Morgan Creek Grill Carla Pope reported that the restaurant had received a warning for its music recently, but, according to all of their equipment readings, the noise level was well within limits. The caller had not identified himself or given an address or neighborhood from which he was calling so that the restaurant could know where to look for the problem to take corrective measures. Ms. Pope opined that a complainant should be required to provide his location on the island so that an officer can determine the validity of the call. In this instance, the officer, personally, did not think a noise violation was occurring, but he had to issue the warning.

#### 5. Old Business

## A. Continuation of Charrette with ATM on Marina Redevelopment Plan

Administrator Tucker announced that Mr. Marshall of ATM was on his way but held up in traffic; she suggested that Item A be delayed until his arrival.

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to reorder the Agenda to proceed with Item B under Old Business; Councilmember Rice seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

## B. Update on the Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plan

In an effort to have accurate maps for Charleston County Consolidated Dispatch, OCRM and the Beach Management Plan, it has been necessary to go to the beach to ensure that the markers identifying the access paths match the street identifications. To do this has taken a long time and has slowed the process. Once it has been corrected, the draft can be submitted to OCRM.

## C. Update on Handicap Accessibility to the Beach

The Administrator asked that Directors Pitts and Kerr join the discussion as she explained that the City cannot provide the flat access to the beach that most people envision because the topography of the island is not flat.

Director Kerr stated that a boardwalk can go over the dune, but it cannot go beyond the seaward side of the primary dune. OCRM has stated that they would not approve Mobi-mat to go to the hard sand; it must always end on soft sand.

The plan is to improve the beach accesses at the Sea Cabins, 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 31A and 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. OCRM determined that the Mobi-mat on the soft sand at 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue was not in compliance, and the Administrator asked that it be removed.

Director Kerr stated that he had hoped to get the mat to about ten feet (10 ft.) of the hard sand at 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue. The contract for paving the handicap space at 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue has been executed, and the City will be apply again for the grant for a parallel path at that path.

Director Pitts indicated that he has a meeting next week with the Mobi-mat representative about much wider matting that would support the weight of emergency vehicles.

Director Kerr said that he has experimented with wooden planks for a handicap accessible path that can be driven on and requires less maintenance.

Director Kerr also indicated that staff is looking into having the City's landscape contractor include the maintenance of the beach access paths on a regular and routine basis.

# D. Status of Funding for Beach Restoration, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO Underwater Archaeologist)

The Administrator said that she was pleased to hear from FEMA regarding the beaches; this is the only worksheet that has received any feedback on the proposed borrow site. The State's Underwater Archaeologist, under the auspices of the State Historic Preservation Office, has located Civil War artifacts in the borrow site. The City's engineer hopes to mitigate this finding without having to locate another borrow site; if the City has to find a new borrow site, all of the preliminary testing that has already been done will have to be repeated at the new site and will cost about twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000). Staff hopes to have a figure for consideration at the Ways and Means Committee meeting.

Administrator Tucker also reported that included in the FY17 state budget is thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000) for the state's beaches that could be used to pay for the twenty-five percent (25%) local match for FEMA funds.

Kaley Walker, General Manager for Morgan Creek Grill, voiced a general concern over the confusing and congested traffic at the marina, and she knew that the trailers on Waterway Boulevard were a problem. She stated that she did not want to see the marina redevelopment plan completed to only have the same parking issues that exist today.

Mr. Clarke commented that the restaurant has not extended its footprint at the marina, but their volume of customers and number of employees have increased.

Chair Bergwerf commented that the parking at the marina has three (3) components, the City, the marina and the restaurant, making it a complicated issue; she noted that each entity was going to have to give a little.

## A. Continuation of Charrette with ATM on Marina Redevelopment Plan

Mr. Marshall reviewed the new plan with the Committee that includes all of the input from the prior meeting. He stated that, coming onto the site, there is a wide bike path going all the way to the waterfront; the first right takes vehicular traffic directly to the store. The second right is for boat-trailer access to fuel and the boat ramp and staging for a two (2) lane boat ramp; fifty-eight (58)

Real Property Committee July 7, 2016 Page 4 of 13

car/trailer parking spaces are provided. The third drive path is an exit only from the boat ramp. Guests going to Tidal Wave or the restaurant would be totally separate from any boat/trailer traffic by following the road from the entrance straight toward the water and the park along the Intracoastal Waterway. ATM has provided a good deal of golf cart parking at the restaurant. The waterway pedestrian path goes completely around the marina approximately eight to ten feet (8-10 ft.) wide with a walkover bridge at the boat ramp.

The existing TidalWave dock would be converted to a public City dock, perhaps a public fishing dock. The existing Intracoastal docks would be brought back to shore slightly with the finger piers removed, and Morgan Creek Grill would retain space for side-tie docking. TidalWave would be moved to a dock to the right of its present location with a floating area that could be for a building as they now have and another floating dock for their patrons. All of the ramps would be completely ADA compliant.

Mr. Marshall stated that the Dewees Harbor Master was much happier seeing bigger separation from TidalWave and all of the activity associated with it. He stated that, with this design, the marina is more resident-friendly and the park along the Intracoastal Waterway and the boardwalk will be very inviting. Residents who want to put their kayak or paddleboard in the water can launch from the City dock from a low profile floating dock.

When asked by the Chair to compare current parking to parking as envisioned in the plan, Mr. Marshall reported that the plan provides for fourteen (14) more trailer spaces with a total of fifty-eight (58) and two (2) less vehicle spaces at one hundred fifty-eight (158); in addition the site will have fifty-three (53) golf cart parking spaces. The new configuration will be well-marked, therefore, more organized and less confusing than today.

Chair Bergwerf sought confirmation that the plan does not increase the dock space for transient boats. After speaking with Marina Manager Berrigan, Mr. Marshall reported that, when transient boats dock at the marina today, they are typically docked on the outside of the Morgan Creek dock, and that is what is reflected in the grant application. He also pointed out that the IOP Marina only sees transient boats early in the spring before the boating season and in the fall after boating has wound down; these transients would represent "snow birds" headed south for the winter and north for the summer.

Chair Bergwerf stated that the City was applying for a grant that would defer a huge amount of the cost of replacing the docks at the marina of which residents will have primary use nine (9) months of the year.

Mr. Berrigan substantiated the statement that the marina has very few transients during the high boating season.

Responding to Councilmember Rice, Mr. Marshall told her that double restrooms would be near the boat ramp behind the Morgan Creek Grill sound stage.

When the subject of showers came up, Jay Clarke suggested that showers could be installed behind the stage with the restrooms and Morgan Creek Grill would be responsible for maintaining them.

Real Property Committee July 7, 2016 Page 5 of 13

Mr. Berrigan informed the Committee that the marina often gets weekly rentals when it is not transient season and many are island residents; he indicated that he would use the space that was BIG eligible for transient use year-round. He said that, in his opinion, this was the best redevelopment plan to-date.

Referring to Kaley Walker's comments, the new plan has more dedicated restaurant parking than they currently have. Mr. Berrigan repeated that the marina was purchased for the island's residents, and it happens to have a restaurant on the property; it is not a restaurant that happens to have a marina on the property. He stated that the primary objective is to provide water access on the northern end of the island for residents and to maintain that. He stated that the restaurant employees use fifty-five (55) parking spaces while the marina employees use fifteen (15) spaces; therefore, something must be resolved about where all of these employee vehicles are going to be parked.

Chair Bergwerf reiterated that the problems at the marina are complex, and, over a period of time, conversations were held with everyone who wanted to talk and to provide input. Once the dry-stack was dispensed with, all of the bases have been covered; it has been made user friendly for the residents; it has been made much more efficient, much safer and, hopefully, federal money will defray some costs. She noted that the City still must figure out how it is going to finance its matching funds and that will be a challenge.

When the City purchased the marina initially, a referendum was passed by the residents to go forward, and it involved borrowing money; additionally the City wants thriving businesses there since they will be the ones to pay off the debt.

Administrator Tucker reported that this newest plan was discussed at the Public Works Committee the previous evening, and she was specifically asked to convey the concerns about the plan voiced by the two (2) Committee members who were in attendance. She made copies of the meeting audio and distributed a copy to each member of this Committee; the concerns centered on whether the redevelopment plan was a plan for the residents or a plan for the tenants. The Administrator opined that some of the comments made in this meeting have responded to those concerns.

In the Administrator's mind, one (1) issue remained to be clarified, and it was that the grant terms would not be violated if a resident or a day transient boat was allowed to use the transient docks if there were no transient tenants in the moment. Administrator Tucker reminded Mr. Marshall that the language in the grant application is for "dedicated transient docks" which implies that they cannot be used by any boat other than a transient boat.

Mr. Marshall stated that alternate uses are allowable on dedicated transient docks so long as it does not displace an eligible transient boater seeking to use the dock. If a resident boater were docked on the outside of the transient dock, and a transient boater were to arrive at the marina seeking to dock, technically, the resident boater could be asked to relocate if there was no other dock space available for the transient boater.

Real Property Committee July 7, 2016 Page 6 of 13

Also in the Public Works Committee meeting, statements were made that the BIG grant application increases the amount of transient docking space at the marina; Administrator Tucker asked Mr. Marshall to clarify that as well.

Mr. Marshall recalled speaking with Mr. Berrigan when the City decided to apply for BIG funds and asking him where transient boats were docked currently, and ATM assigned the transient docking space based on that conversation.

Mr. Berrigan stated, that based on the way the application is written, the dedicated transient docking space would not be increased from what it is now. He added that, if the amount of space were increased, it would not be a bad thing; it would only increase the amount that would be eligible for the grant. He also noted that transient boaters do not come in vehicles and do not place demands on the upland side of the marina; they come to spend money on the island.

Councilmember Rice reported that she is a frequent user of the marina, and, when she was there over the past weekend observing the activity at the ramp, she was amazed that there were no accidents. She voiced the need to make the marina safer as quickly as possible. She commented that she was getting a lot of pushback about going from a three (3) lane boat ramp to a two (2) lane ramp and asked Mr. Marshall to explain why ATM was making that recommendation.

According to Mr. Marshall, with a three (3) lane boat ramp, the industry prescribed amount of parking is twenty to thirty (20-30) parking spaces per lane; therefore, the parking needed for a two (2) lane ramp is forty to sixty (40-60) spaces. With the new plan, the City is within that range. Any more than that encourages more and more usage that pushes the overflow onto the streets. In addition, site constraints exist; it is not a huge marina so there are waterside constraints as well; a three (3) lane ramp would reduce dock space also. Mr. Marshall stated that the ground-out floating docks on both sides of ramp and the new access points are intended to make the ramp use, loading and unloading more efficient, quicker and safer than today.

Michael Fiem of TidalWave Watersports noted that things happen in spurts at the marina – people typically put their boats in between 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. and take them out between 5:00 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. With that in mind, he thought that during those peak times, a three (3) lane ramp was more necessary than a two (2) lane ramp.

Mr. Berrigan thought Mr. Marshall had made several good points, but he was not fully sold on two (2) is better than three (3). Taking note of the fact that many island residents do not leave a vehicle at the marina but maybe a bicycle of golf cart, he explained that the twenty to thirty (20-30) trailer parking spaces per lane was an industry guideline, not a regulation. He questioned that going to a two (2) lane ramp would increase the backup on 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue. Mr. Berrigan concluded that he was still undecided.

Responding to Mr. Berrigan's question, Mr. Marshall said that the sewer lift station would be going away; it would be replaced with a self-contained individual sewage pump station and grinder systems called an E-1 system that is generally the size of manhole. The systems would be underground, and the manholes would be shielded by landscaping; they will be totally code compliant and efficient.

Councilmember Rice recalled discussions about a sense of arrival or a sense of space; she asked where that stood.

The discussions have included enhanced landscaping as one enters the site and around the dumpsters to mask them as much as possible, and creating appropriate, well-appointed signage consistent with the new park-like development.

As the Chair brought the charrette to a close, she stated that all of Council would be very anxious to review this plan at the City Council meeting of July 26<sup>th</sup>.

#### 6. New Business

## **Bulkhead Assessment RFP - Interviews of Finalists**

Administrator Tucker made a "huge apology" to the next four (4) presenters for running forty-five minutes (45 min.) behind schedule.

The Administrator directed attention to the legal-sized schedule that illustrates how well each bidder met the instructions in the RFP; six (6) bidders have been reduced to four (4) for interviews due to the large disparity in costs.

Each representative was asked to tell the Committee about himself, his company and his plan for addressing the erosion problem on the landside of the bulkhead. Each presenter was required to meet with Mr. Berrigan to walk the site and see the problem then respond to the City with what it needed to do.

In introducing Mr. Garcia, Administrator Tucker noted that the proposal from his company was the highest of the bids received.

## Richard Garcia of Lindbergh & Associates, a T.Y. Lin International Company

Mr. Garcia stated that he has been a practicing engineer for thirty (30) years and has been licensed for twenty-five (25) years in South Carolina. He commented that, about twenty (20) years ago, he was working with General Engineering Laboratories who was hired by the City to do an assessment of the site, determine the value and the estimated cost for repairs as the City contemplated buying it. He added that it was a complicated sight and is complicated today.

Mr. Garcia indicated that he manages thirty to thirty-five (30-35) individuals, and the company is a multi-disciplinary firm; he employs structural engineers, civil engineers, electrical engineers, mechanical engineers, etc.

The current bulkhead was constructed eight to ten (8-10) years ago seaward of the wooden bulkhead and appears to be in good condition, but it has a couple of areas that need improvement. He stated that a problem causing the settling behind the bulkhead and seepage through the weep holes could be attributed to three (3) things that are:

- It was existing when the City bought the property and is continuing to settle;
- The engineer did not consider all of the elements when the wall was designed; or

• The construction was not in accordance with the engineering plans and specifications.

He is recommending the excavation of a couple of areas behind the new structure to see if the new bulkhead was installed as it was designed and to study records and pictures that would show the same. Mr. Garcia noted that the excavation added to the cost.

He indicated that other disciplines might be involved as well; he pointed out that the downspouts at the restaurant all drain under the building, and it needs to get out somehow. He opined that the drainage from the downspouts is contributing to the material loss in the area of Morgan Creek Grill and urged the City to correct the problem.

Mr. Garcia observed that both fuel and electrical lines go through the bulkhead and the soil is not as compacted as it should be. An electrical engineer would be needed to determine if the transformers need to be raised.

Mr. Garcia said that, when working around buildings in confined spaces, the work tends to be less exact and have more errors. The perimeters of the buildings, areas of high risk, need to be studied to learn if the work of the bulkhead installation was according to specifications.

Items included in his firm's proposal which may not appear in others is a survey to establish a starting point to monitor any future changes as well as excavation in two (2) locations and a cost estimator. The work product would note what problems need immediate attention and which could be postponed.

Mr. Garcia said that he could not imagine that the City would get full reports without doing some excavation at the site. He voiced particular concern about the deck behind the store and the area behind the restaurant.

When asked about the use of divers, Mr. Garcia stated that he has used divers on jobs in the past, but he does not think a diver would be needed in this instance since most of the bulkhead is visible at low tide.

Administrator Tucker noted that Mr. Garcia's proposal did not reference the contract; she, therefore, asked, if he were to be awarded the job, would he be willing to abide by the terms of the contract. He said that he would.

## John Sheridan, The Sheridan Corporation

The Administrator introduced Mr. Sheridan as an island resident and remarked that his bid was the lowest.

Mr. Sheridan said that he was a life-time resident of the Isle of Palms, except for a stint after Hurricane Hugo, and that his father had started the company in 1961. He said that he was a registered professional engineer and a registered structural engineer; the work of his company is based on waterfront design and is frequently done for governmental agencies. He described The Sheridan Corporation as a "Mom and Pop" operation.

Mr. Sheridan informed the Committee that he has visited the marina six or seven (6-7) times at different stages of the tides, and he saw something different each time. He stated that the original timber bulkhead was built with the natural grade sloping toward the bulkhead so that any kind of rain just washes over it. The machine that was used to install the new bulkhead grabs the top of the sheet and puts it down by vibrating and pushing, leaving the top of the bulkhead about a foot above the timber bulkhead. Then a two foot (2 ft.) wide sidewalk was built on top of the corrugated bulkhead. He restated that the original grade was toward the timber bulkhead while the new bulkhead sloped back toward the grade; so ten to fifteen feet (10-15 ft.) from the bulkhead there is a natural grade.

If one were to go under the porch at the store, the ground is about a foot lower than the outside; Mr. Sheridan stated that the ground is not sinking, but there is a natural drop of about twelve inches (12 in.). When the sidewalk was constructed, they should have either towed down about a foot to keep the soil from washing out underneath or they should have built a small retaining wall and then the sidewalk.

At the restaurant, all of the roof drainage is being funneled under the building; he was unable to get under the building, but he saw that the ground was saturated. He stressed the need for it to be corrected.

As for the bulkhead, Mr. Sheridan said that he did not see any indication of piles of dirt adjacent to the seams; he also did not see signs of streaking of water movements.

For him the problem was as basic as sloppiness at the end of the job with the compaction of the earth, sidewalk design and earthwork.

## Jim O'Connor and David Osgood, Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson (JMT)

Mr. O'Connor stated that, although a national company with a lot of expertise, the firm has been in Charleston only three (3) years. Mr. Osgood brought experience working as an engineer with Cape Romaine Contractors; he is very familiar with design, installation and inspection for errors.

Mr. Osgood described bulkhead issues at the marina as "an interesting situation," but he is confident that the problem is what is behind the bulkhead and not the bulkhead itself. He explained that they would do some selective demolition, i.e. cutting cores in selected areas along the wall at the concrete caps to look between the walls. If that can eliminate some of the considerations there, they may need to look into more of a geo-technical aspect; he noted that Mr. Berrigan had recalled that during the installation of the bulkhead, not all of the area between the two (2) walls was filled with backfill. If that is the problem, the cure will be relatively simple.

Mr. O'Connor commented that, with a company the size of theirs, they employ people of many disciplines and can handle the project in-house.

The work product would be a report with recommendations for correcting any problems and biddable specifications eliminating the middle step of hiring a design engineer.

When Mr. Berrigan recalled that Mr. Osgood had mentioned that they would need to excavate, Mr. Osgood commented that they would not excavate, but use a big drill to cut a core in the concrete cap to investigate what is between them. Mr. Berrigan agreed that would give them the information on the type of fill used, and he then asked how they would know whether the tiebacks had been properly installed without excavation.

Mr. Osgood said that, since the wall is not that old, they would have no reason to look at the tiebacks unless they were to see bulging, leaning or bowing.

Mr. Osgood indicated that they would likely do five (5) cores at the locations where the problems are the worst, i.e. behind the store and the restaurant, etc.

## Jonathan Sigman, Collins Engineers, Inc.

Mr. Sigman said that his firm has been in the Charleston market for twenty-two (22) years after starting in Chicago in 1979, and the focus from the beginning has been waterfront engineering. He distributed a set of pictures from a job they are doing in Chatham County Georgia that has problems similar to those at the IOP marina.

Mr. Sigman stated that what appears to be happening at the marina is that the subsiding is coming through the weep-holes; that typically happens when the filter fabric and/or the 57-stone that was to have been put around the weep-holes was not put in or was put in improperly or has become dislodged.

He stated that he was baffled how any architect could drain gutters under the building intentionally as was done at the restaurant.

Referring to the erosion behind the bulkhead, Mr. Sigman told the Committee that he could write ninety percent (90%) of the report now from his initial visual inspection; the only thing he needed to do was to look at the drawings to insure proper construction.

Administrator Tucker thought that, with a price of forty-two hundred dollars (\$4,200), no destructive investigation was included in the bid; if destructive investigation was needed to get a conclusive recommendations for repairs, how much would it add to the expense?

Mr. Sigman stated that the cost to have a contractor come out to move soil for a day would probably be twenty-five hundred dollars (\$2,500). When he was putting together the design documents was when he would include that type of investigational work.

Councilmember Harrington asked how many core samplings he would take, and Mr. Sigman answered, "No more than two, one on a typical area and a second behind the restaurant."

Mr. Sigman stated that his proposal was in response to the RFP as it was presented and that investigational work would be a part of the production and repair documents.

The Administrator explained the process as one where this Committee would make a recommendation to the Ways and Means Committee, which meets the third Tuesday of the month, and

Real Property Committee July 7, 2016 Page 11 of 13

their recommendation would go to City Council for a final award on the fourth Tuesday of the month, July 26, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.

Councilmember Harrington voiced support for JMT, but both Chair Bergwerf and Councilmember Rice disagreed primarily because they had not mentioned the standing water underneath Morgan Creek Grill.

Councilmember Rice expressed appreciation that Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Sigman approached this phase of work as only an evaluation and that any investigational excavation should come with the repair process.

Administrator Tucker stated that she would be very interested to hear Mr. Berrigan's impression since he met with each man at the marina and has heard their presentation today.

Mr. Berrigan stated that he respectfully disagreed about the excavation work; he thought it should happen first. He did like the scoping idea presented by JMT because he opines that the lack of the proper fabric and stone is the crux of the problem. He added that he does not understand how to get an accurate diagnosis of the problem without looking at the problem in depth. He expressed confidence that any of the four (4) could do the job, but he did like that Collins was involved in a similar project in Georgia. Mr. Berrigan stated that he was familiar with David Osgood's work when he was with Cape Romaine, the premiere waterfront developer in the area, and he believes him to be completely qualified. Although Richard Sheridan has been the most visible at the marina since the RFB was advertised, but Mr. Berrigan remarked that he does not like "a one-man show;" he prefers to work with a firm where the individuals talk and share their expertise.

Assistant Fragoso indicated that she had checked the references for the bidders, and the best references were for Collins Engineers and JMT; Sheridan's references were also good, but it was pointed out to her that his firm does not have the resources of the other firms. References reported that Collins and JMT had generated no change orders and deadlines had been met; JMT's references were impressed with their follow-up after the job was completed.

The Committee agreed that the T.Y. Lin would be eliminated from consideration due to the price.

The Committee noticed that Sheridan had not recommended investigational excavation; he had told the Administrator, in an earlier conversation, that he did not think it was necessary. The Administrator also noted that Sheridan had objected to some of the language in the contract.

Councilmember Rice stated that she had consulted with an island resident who is retired from the marina engineering business; after he reviewed the proposals, he stated that each of the companies were capable and that any investigational excavation should occur during the repair stage of the project because the problem does not appear to be too complicated.

The discussion migrated to the bid process that was estimated to cost the City between eight and ten thousand dollars (\$8,000-10,000); Assistant Fragoso recalled that JMT's representatives stated that their work product would include biddable specifications for the corrective measures.

The Administrator agreed but noted that the same language had not been included in their written proposal.

Councilmember Rice supported the selection of Colling Engineers because she thought they were dealing with a very similar project in Chatham County now.

Mr. Berrigan, on the other hand, thought that Mr. Sigman was too confident when he said that he could write ninety percent (90%) of the report having made a single, fifteen minute (15 min.) visit to the marina.

Councilmember Rice's consultant had agreed that the problem was obvious to anyone in the field and would not take "rocket science" to explain and repair.

Administrator Tucker stated that she liked getting biddable documents when the evaluation was completed, and JTM had stated in their presentation that they would produce them as part of their work product.

Following encouragement from Committee, Administrator Tucker telephoned Mr. O'Connor to confirm that JMT would honor what they had said to provide biddable specifications as part of the final report. Mr. O'Connor confirmed his earlier statement, adding that the specifications would include a description of the problem, the work needed to be done and the products to be used. He commented that construction oversight was not included in the nine thousand dollar (\$9,000) bid.

The Administrator noted that the contract included with the RFP did not include biddable specifications; she, therefore, confirmed that he would be willing to sign a contract that included biddable specifications. He again confirmed that he would agree.

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to recommend the approval of an award of a contract in the amount of \$9,000 to Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson (JMT) for the evaluation and recommendation(s) for repair with biddable specifications related to the problems with the marina bulkhead; Chair Bergwerf seconded and the motion PASSED on a vote of 2 to 1 with Councilmember Rice casting the dissenting vote.

## 7. Miscellaneous Business

**Tenant Rents Report –** Administrator Tucker announced that all tenants were current.

Next Meeting Date: 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, August 3<sup>rd</sup> in the Conference Room.

## **8. Executive Session –** not necessary

Real Property Committee July 7, 2016 Page 13 of 13

# 9. Adjourn

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:37 p.m.; Chair Bergwerf seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted: Marie Copeland, City Clerk