

REAL PROPERTY COMMITTEE
9:00 a.m., Thursday, September 8, 2016

The regular meeting of the Real Property Committee was held at 9:00 a.m., Thursday, September 8, 2016 in Council Chambers of City Hall, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmembers Rice and Harrington, Chair Bergwerf, Administrator Tucker, Assistant Administrator Fragoso and Clerk Copeland; a quorum was present to conduct business. Kirby Marshall of ATM was also present.

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 August 33, 2016 as submitted; Councilmember Harrington seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Citizens' Comments

Margaret Mitchell, 39-25th Avenue, said that she is one (1) house away from the end of 25th Avenue that has been mentioned as the location for a fishing pier. Since moving to the island, she has taken her grandchildren there and they have tried to fish, but they have never been successful because of the volume of debris. Lines get caught and have to be cut; in addition, the drainage in that area is "terrible;" people have used the area to park and dumped their trash in residents' yards. She stated that she hoped Council would find a location for a fishing pier that was more appropriate.

Laura McMaster, 2801 Palm Boulevard, voiced her opinion on the poor condition of the public restrooms and showers in the rear; she said that she was in disbelief that the City would pay to have a mural painted on it when the other problems are so severe.

Bill Russell 29-25th Avenue, expressed agreement with Mrs. McMaster's comments about the public restrooms.

Bill Campbell, 34-42nd Avenue, has reviewed the most recent conceptual drawing of the marina redevelopment plan, and he has concerns and observations he hopes the Committee will consider. He remarked that the demand for parking at the marina changes from hour-to-hour and day-to-day and month-to-month; in his opinion, flexibility was the key to meeting those demands as they change. He stated that he was a proponent of leveling the parking lot, paving it and using white paint to mark parking spaces; a vehicle, boat and trailer easily extend to thirty feet (30 ft.) and maneuvering around the trees and berms only slow the process of getting one's boat into the water. The perimeter of the marina ideally should be drive in and back out. He indicated that he does not understand the need for a dedicated bike path and/or bike parking; he believes that the current park space is sufficient and should not be increased. He also was opposed to dedicated golf cart parking and the pedestrian boat ramp bridge; he could not imagine how a bridge would accommodate a twenty-foot (20 ft.) sail boat with a thirty-five-foot (35 ft.) mast. He believed that the fuel dock should remain where it is today and away from the launch area. For the docks that

go out from the boat ramp, he thought they should flare out as they extend into the creek, giving the boater as many negotiating options as possible. He concluded by saying that he was a proponent of the existing marina, grading and paving the current parking lot, eliminating the trees, berms and other restrictions and painting parking spaces. (The full text of Mr. Campbell's comments and drawings are attached to the historical record of the meeting.)

Mr. Russell cautioned that paving the parking lot would be "a huge source of pollution."

Stuart Colman, 10 Live Oak Drive, stated that he had sent the Committee members an email explaining his reasons for believing that the fuel dock was poorly placed and should be re-located away from high traffic and high hazard areas. He also indicated that a park was not needed on the Intracoastal Waterway, but the area should have one (1) walkway, not two (2); in his opinion, it was an unnecessary duplication and expense. Mr. Colman also questioned why there were two (2) ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant ramps on the creek-side of the marina.

4. Comments from Marina Tenants

A. Status of Off-site Parking Experiment

Carla Pope and Jay Clarke, Morgan Creek Grill, addressed the Committee, and Ms. Pope stated that the restaurant had continued the parking experiment up to the stormy Memorial Day weekend; employees returned to 41st Avenue on the holiday weekend. She indicated that her primary problem had been staffing the shuttle; with the number of employees at the restaurant, the shuttle driver worked an eight-hour (8 hr.) shift because shifts do not necessarily coincide. Her calculations show that the shuttle driver had cost the business one hundred fifty dollars (\$150) a day.

Mr. Clarke asked whether the City had received any calls about the employee parking from the neighbors of the Rec Center, and the Administrator said there had been none.

Councilmember Rice stated that she had received complaints about employee parking on 41st Avenue, and, in her drive-bys of the Rec Center, she has not seen cars parking there. She said that she does not feel that the experiment got a fair trial period, but that the City and the tenants must develop a workable plan for next season.

Ms. Pope answered that employees only parked there on the weekends and commented that she did not think all of the possibilities for alternative parking had been tried. She repeated that running the shuttle was an added expense for the restaurant and another category of employee to be supervised, combined with the already difficult task of hiring staff to come to the island to work.

Councilmember Harrington asked whether any progress had occurred in City dialogues with the IOP Water and Sewer Commission about using their property on Waterway Boulevard for marina employee parking, but Administrator Tucker informed him that they have not changed their position.

Chair Bergwerf commented that it might be a good idea to attend the Water and Sewer Commission's meeting on Thursday.

Administrator Tucker noted that the subject of attending IOP Water and Sewer Commission meetings was discussed at the Public Works Committee meeting earlier in the week; they suggested that Councilmembers attend the Water and Sewer Commission meetings on a rotating basis. They also thought that, by doing so, the City might develop a better line of communication with the Commission.

B. Comments from Morgan Creek Grill

Having been assured that all Committee members received a meeting packet containing the photographs submitted by Morgan Creek Grill (MCG), Jay Clarke, owner, stated that the pictures of the standing water under the restaurant were self-explanatory. The packet also included pictures of the walk-in freezer; the unit is in very poor condition, but he thought that the structure under it was more problematic due to condensation leakage from the walk-in that has been going on for years. Mr. Clarke reported that they had temporarily reinforced the kitchen floor with steel, so it is not in danger of falling in. The floor preparation room closer to the dining room has also rotted. In order to keep the restaurant from closing for a month or more for repairs, Mr. Clarke proposed to go to the area where the concrete slab was poured at the end of the building and construct an elevated loading dock area with a walk-in refrigerator-freezer and then they could demolish and remove the shed. The restaurant would continue to operate up to the point of actually moving into the space; at that point, they would demolish the floor inside the restaurant and do the needed repairs.

Mr. Clarke reported that he has hired Joe Tucker to do some preliminary work and to prepare estimates so that more detailed information can be provided for the October meeting.

Ms. Pope noted that the structural repairs were done about eight (8) years ago; she added that management has maintained the walk-in freezer to the best of its ability. She reminded the Committee that such a piece of equipment has a certain life expectancy, and this one (1) has far exceeded what would be expected. This unit was in use at the restaurant when Morgan Creek Grill signed the lease, and it is on the list of assets the City owns. She stated that the walk-in is in a state of failure.

For the drainage under the building, Mr. Clarke has been working with Director Kerr and a couple of contractors regarding a solution, which he believed has been found. The current solution is to install a storm drain grate at the loading dock at MCG and another pipe from that box into the restaurant to connect only with the downspouts and the air conditioning condensation drainage. Director Kerr has contacted Charleston County, and they have given verbal approval of the plan. Mr. Clarke has gotten an estimate of twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000) for the job and a two-day (2 day) time frame, but he was unsure if the work would have to be approved by the Real Property Committee.

Once the drainage under the building is resolved, Ledford's will treat the building and issue the termite bond.

Administrator Tucker asked Mr. Clarke to clarify his comment “approved by the Real Property Committee,” and she opined that, before the work could be done, there was some kind of permitting process relative to stormwater runoff.

Director Kerr explained his understanding that, once a plan was developed, it would need to go back through the Stormwater Division of Charleston County for a final approval.

According to the Administrator, if the plan was a modification to the drainage system to prevent further erosion on the bulkhead and the recommendations from all of the entities that presented on the bulkhead erosion, she was not sure what Mr. Clarke thought the Real Property Committee would need to approve.

Mr. Clarke said that he needed to get a clear scope of work and a solid cost in order to determine who would pay for the work.

Additionally, the Administrator asked whether Mr. Clarke was expecting the City to pay for the replacement of the walk-in freezer, and he indicated that MCG had not ruled that out since it is the City’s asset and is included in the lease. Mr. Clarke commented that, if the lease issues could be resolved, MCG might fund that expense; he remarked that, in his mind, the issues related to the lease have not been resolved, and he hopes to re-start those negotiations at the October meeting. He expects to get outside input about what should be included in the lease that might be helpful in decision-making to ensure that the lease is fair to both MCG and the City.

5. Old Business

A. Continuation of Charrette with ATM on Marina Redevelopment Plan

Chair Bergwerf commented that Mr. Marshall had been given even more input to consider in the redevelopment plan.

Mr. Marshall recalled that the topic at the previous meeting had been moving forward, and they presented a proposal to the City to do which included a number of specific tasks; those are as follows;

- Task 1 – Site and Bathymetric Survey – to get detailed information on the topography, the levels of stormwater and waste water intakes, as well as bathymetric surveys of Morgan Creek and the Intracoastal Waterway to make sure the dock alignments, etc. are viable.
- Task 2 – Preliminary Engineering Overview, Plan Refinement and Hard-line Drawing – to use information gathered in Task 1 to develop a hard-line plan for the property by digitizing and refining redevelopment plan for specific quantity take-offs and cost estimating.
- Task 3 – Refined Cost Estimate – Can the City afford it? Should it be phased in any particular way?
- Task 4 – Schematic Design – To bridge the gap from the planning process into the preliminary design process to include civil, grading and stormwater plans, utility plans, landscaping plan and marina plans.
- Task 5 – Presentation of Findings

Councilmember Rice asked what had been budgeted for engineering for the plan.

Administrator Tucker noted that the work product from this proposal would not include bidable documents.

Councilmember Rice then asked what would be necessary to take that next step, and Mr. Marshall said that the work from this proposal would be at a thirty percent (30%) design level; at this point, minor changes could still be made.

According to the Administrator, the amount budgeted for FY17 for engineering and design was three hundred fifty thousand thirty-three dollars (\$350,033); this amount was intended to get the City a full design package. Since she was unsure about how much of that budget had been spent to date, she stated that the bulkhead assessment had been budgeted at fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000), but the actual cost from the bid that was accepted was nine thousand dollars (\$9,000); therefore, that money could be moved to help to pay for final design costs if needed.

Since the contract amendment to move forward was listed on the Agenda without the total dollar amount of eighty-seven thousand one hundred dollars (\$87,100), Administrator Tucker advised the Committee that the Agenda could be amended to include the amount or, in an effort to preserve the integrity of transparency, the Committee could set a Special Meeting with the details of the amendment clearly stated on the Agenda.

Councilmember Rice asked Mr. Marshall for his feedback from Mr. Campbell's comments regarding the location of the fuel dock. In response, Mr. Marshall said that he had spoken with Marina Manager Berrigan, and the plan, as shown on the drawing, indicates an easy access from the marina office straight to the fuel dock. The dock could be extended slightly toward the Dewees Marina side and the fuel shifted a little in that direction to assuage some of the congestion issues; from an operations standpoint, that seemed to make sense. On the other hand, Mr. Marshall said he was not sure that it poses a significant congestion issue because he thinks there is adequate room in the creek to come around to access the fuel dock.

Mike Pickett, marina dock master, agreed that the fuel dock was close to the boat ramp; he has seen the heavy traffic on the boat ramp on normal and holiday weekends. Being as close to the boat ramp as shown on the conceptual drawing, he stated that the fuel dock and the boat ramps will be clogged up every weekend.

When asked about the idea of splaying out the docks on either side of the boat ramp, Mr. Marshall said that he had discussed this with Mr. Berrigan, and he wanted to retain as much dockable space as possible on either side and being perpendicular to the ramp accomplishes that. Since residents and marina tenants have made it clear that they prefer a three (3) lane ramp, ATM will create gangway access close to where they are now to open up more dock space that is wider and more robust than shown on the current drawings.

The Committee agreed to hold a Special Meeting at 9:00 a.m., Friday, September 16th in Council Chambers.

MOTION: Chair Bergwerf moved to re-order the Agenda to address Item D under Old Business at this time; Councilmember Rice seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. Re-consideration of dock location of fishing pier grant

Based on citizens' comments at the Council meeting of August 23rd, the consensus of Council was not to construct a fishing pier at the end of 25th Avenue, but to use grant funds on a dock at the marina, as originally planned, to reduce the overall cost of the redevelopment project.

Mr. Marshall reminded the Committee that, although matching funds are not a requirement for the grant, they are looked upon favorably.

When Councilmember Rice asked that the fishing pier have some shade for the residents, Mr. Marshall said that to do that might require an additional float and some roofing which will increase the cost.

MOTION: Councilmember Rice moved to submit an application for a Shore-based Saltwater Fishing Grant for up to \$100,000 for a fishing pier on the floating dock on the Intracoastal Waterway at the IOP Marina; Chair Bergwerf seconded.

AMENDMENT: Councilmember Harrington moved to amend the motion and to approve up to \$20,000 as a match for the Shore-based Saltwater Fishing Grant; Councilmember Rice seconded and the amendment PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

VOTE on the AMENDED MOTION: The vote PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Discussion of Public Restrooms and of landscape conditions at Front Beach

As background, Chair Bergwerf stated that the City had looked to Charleston County to make a substantial contribution to the construction of new public restrooms, but the City did not have majority support on County Council to get approval.

Administrator Tucker explained that the City currently is not contemplating new construction, but is looking to rehabilitate the existing structure as much as the fifty percent (50%) rule will allow; the Mayor has asked for the showers to be removed from the building as soon as possible. The Administrator stated that she sees this task as a two (2) step process; initially a stop-gap measure would be free-standing showers – posts with shower heads attached, and ultimately followed by more permanent and aesthetically pleasing free-standing showers with a deck.

Since Council has accepted that it must live with the existing structure for a few more years, the City has ordered a new appraisal, hoping that the value has increased thereby raising the amount for the fifty percent (50%) rule. In addition, Director Kerr has been researching what must be considered when calculating the fifty percent (50%) rule; he found a recent ruling by FEMA that says repairs and maintenance that do not require a permit do not have to be included in the calculations.

Once the new appraisal is received, Director Kerr will calculate the new fifty percent (50%) value that the City hopes would allow it to make some significant improvements to the building. In the meantime, the City can get work done that does not require a permit and improves the functionality.

Responding to a question about the previous appraisal, Director Kerr stated that the building last appraised for two hundred fifty-three thousand dollars (\$253,000).

Chair Bergwerf asked why staff was not planning to put the final product in place now rather than doing the job twice.

If the City skipped the stop-gap measures, it would construct a deck with free-standing, stainless steel showers similar to those at the County Park.

Director Kerr commented that staff had discussed that, but the City has the permit in-hand and the need to replace the boardwalk, which staff envisioned being a part of the deck for the shower; to do that would mean hiring an architect to design it, go out to bid and construct it. The Director said that he did not think that the full project could be completed for the beginning of next season since staff would be starting from scratch on a likely two hundred thousand dollar (\$200,000) project.

As Councilmember Rice kept insisting on a foot wash as well, Director Pitts explained that the runoff from one would go to Coconut Joe's creating "more serious issues than a clean foot."

Councilmember Rice asked how long the permit for the boardwalk would be viable; Director Kerr said the permit was good for five (5) years initially, but it was now two or three (2-3) years old. Executing a plan has been delayed as decisions were being made about the building because the two (2) projects would have been incorporated into one (1).

Director Kerr confirmed that installing free-standing showers would not be a project that would fall under the fifty percent (50%) rule.

Councilmember Rice asked if there would be a way to construct the temporary free-standing showers so that they would be incorporated into the boardwalk when it was constructed.

If two (2) projects were to be done, Director Pitts was of the opinion that, from a timing standpoint, fifty-five hundred dollar (\$5,500) showers with eight (8) shower heads would take two to three (2-3) months, meaning the City would be without public showers for that period of time. This thought process is what led staff to propose the stop-gap showers with an estimated cost of fifteen hundred dollars (\$1,500) for two (2).

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to approve up to \$3,500 to remove the showers from the public restrooms and to install two (2) temporary free-standing showers with 2 foot washes; Councilmember Rice seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Bergwerf said that she has spent a lot of time thinking about the public restrooms which have two (2) semi-circular vents that vent into the closed attic; she proposed removing the false ceiling, opening it up and installing fans with lights hanging from the top, creating ventilation and a far more pleasant experience and the roof would not have to be raised.

Director Kerr recounted that the staff had looked at a similar plan several years ago; in this plan, the top couple of rows of concrete blocks would be removed and not replaced, leaving the building open for ventilation and light. If any type of fan were installed, the City would likely have to replace it every couple of years.

Next Week, Director Kerr has a meeting scheduled with a general contractor to review the limited scope of work for the public restrooms, and at that time, the Director hopes to have a higher dollar amount with which to work.

Director Pitts noted that the light fixtures need to be replaced, and the work can be done right away. He also repeated that in the budget process, staff had told the Real Property Committee that the City needed a dedicated individual to monitor and maintain the City's properties.

To explain the one hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) included in the FY17 budget for the public restrooms, Administrator Tucker stated that it pays the attendant and buys supplies.

The Administrator stated that there is no contract, but a year-to-year agreement with Sherry Johnson who then hires the personnel to monitor the restrooms; the City has no supervision over these people.

In Councilmember Rice's opinion, the attendants were "clearly not reporting" the maintenance issues on a timely basis.

The Administrator explained that, at times, the problem(s) with the restrooms become a low priority for the Public Works Department, and, because the City does not have someone whose primary responsibility is to inspect the buildings and see that issues are addressed when they occur, a problem may exist for a day or more before Public Works can respond.

Councilmember Rice suggested that the contract with Ms. Johnson should include her taking some responsibility to get problems fixed.

Chair Bergwerf remarked that Ms. Johnson may not be interested in having more responsibility; therefore, this Committee needs to push for an additional employee whose job it would be to maintain City properties in the next budget cycle.

Director Pitts added that, if the City hires a contractor, a City employee needs to oversee the work. For instance, he has been complaining to the landscape vendor for months about the poor job they are doing, but nothing has changed; the contract with them started on June 1, 2013 and includes a clause that the contract automatically renews for four (4) years.

Councilmember Rice supported terminating the existing landscape contract, rebidding the contract and hiring someone local; she recalled that the contract clearly states what the City expects to be done.

To do that, the Administrator explained that the City needs to send them a letter of intent to terminate and to rebid the contract; she noted that staff has been discussing the additional duty of checking the beach accesses once a week to blow the sand off the ADA matting.

Chain Bergwerf then asked about the benches that need to be painted on Front Beach and the dead palm trees.

According to the Administrator, the soil in two (2) of the palm tree wells was tested because the palm trees repeatedly died, and staff has concluded that those two (2) need to be planted elsewhere. The replacement picnic table is at Public Works because personnel has not had time to install it.

As another example showing the need for a general maintenance employee, Director Kerr noted that, if such a person was on staff today to install two showers on a 4x4 post, he would get the necessary parts and do the job in the afternoon. In the current circumstance, the City will get multiple bids and go back through a Committee with a recommendation; according to the Director, it will take twelve (12) hours of staff time to get it authorized, then pay a contractor to do the work.

C. Update on Handicap accessibility to the beach

Director Kerr stated that staff is currently in the process of getting approval at 42nd Avenue; all of the paperwork is assembled and ready to be submitted to OCRM for permitting. The City is asking for permission to put an ADA surface all of the way from where the soft sand stops and the hard sand begins. He noted that handicap accesses are located at Sea Cabins, 21st is happening, 32A, 42nd Avenue and 9th Avenue. The present plan for the 42nd Avenue access is to install one (1) wider path and two (2) parallel paths.

E. Report on Beach restoration and Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plan

Council has approved the Plan and it is now being reviewed by OCRM and is out for public comments on the OCRM website. The City is anxious to get it finalized and approved by OCRM because it is a component of the grant application related to the grant for beach restoration.

On the subject of beach restoration, the Administrator reported that the City is trying to get its permits and trying to secure the Joaquin-eligible portion of the beach restoration expense. Part of that process includes getting comments from various agencies and trying to comply with them; one (1) of those agencies is the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO). When the project was submitted, the City was informed that, since 2008, their office had done some underwater archaeology that found ten of thirteen (10 of 13) ship remnants of the 2nd Stone Fleet which were whaling ships loaded with stones to blockade the Charleston Harbor during the Civil War. Those remnants are where the City needs to borrow sand. When the City first learned of this, Coastal Science and Engineering (CSE), the City's consultant on the restoration project, set out to find

alternate borrow sights; so far the CSE has not found the enough quality sand in an alternate location.

Early in August the City asked for and was granted an audience with SHPO with about twelve (12) people at the table to include the Mayor, Administrator and Assistant Administrator, two (2) members of the City's consulting team, about four (4) people from the State Office of Archives and History, the underwater archaeologist from the University of South Carolina, representatives from the State Emergency Management Division, and the FEMA Regional Director called in. The City staff took with them the core samples that showed what has been found thus far in searching for an alternate site and the importance of finding good, quality sand. The good sand that the City needs in the volume needed is located within what they have designated as a proposed Historic District for the 2nd Stone Fleet; Administrator Tucker explained that a proposed Historic District carries with it the equivalent protection to a historic district that has already been declared. The public still has the opportunity to object via the comment period when it is published in the Federal Register, but this project is not there yet.

The City has offered multiple concessions, such as marking locations where equipment indicates something is under the sand and go around it in the historic district. The City continues to look, but the engineers think it is unlikely that they will find the volume of quality sand in an alternate site.

The City's position was that the project must be done and the City is going to do the project; the City would be happy to work with SHPO like was done when the City dredged up the cannonball. Administrator Tucker said that she had also offered that, if there was something yet to be done, possibly the City could partner in some way for both entities to reach their goal.

From the Administrator's impression of the people in the room, three (3) of the SHPO representatives were listening and thinking in terms of trying to find some kind of solution; one (1) was standing fast in the decision and the underwater archaeologist was just advisory.

The City has acknowledged the importance of not disturbing the remnants of the ships and not disturbing the stone, but the landscape, which they do not want the City to disturb, has been disturbed for almost two hundred (200) years by storms, other people, and harvesting in the past. Their not wanting the landscape disturbed is the hurdle that must be overcome; it is reasonable not to want to disturb the artifacts, but they contend that the landscape is significant because it speaks to how the Union Navy made the decision of where to sink the ships. It is part of the history and part of the story and to disturb the landscape could compromise that history. The meeting ended with the group gathered wanting to talk among themselves and the City agreeing to pull more core samples looking for an alternate site.

The State Emergency Management person stated that their position was only advisory and he was aware of circumstances where FEMA, and hopefully true of the other permitting agencies, had overridden the decision of SHPO, acknowledging that the overall importance of the project outweighed the objections and the project should be allowed to go forward.

Until yesterday, the Isle of Palms was the only local government that had run into objections from SHPO, but now Edisto Beach, that was prepared to start dredging in November, had their permits in-hand and had submitted their grant application, has had its project stopped by SHPO.

Two (2) municipalities in the state now argue that thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000) was put into the FY17 budget for beach restoration, but State Archives and History apparently intends to block the spending of any of the money.

Now the Administrator needs to send to Senator Campsen an update, copies of some of the letters, etc., and he wants to set a meeting with the Governor's Chief of Staff to resolve the problem.

In the meantime, the Administrator and Assistant Administrator continue to work on the grant application by soliciting letters of support, preparing the budget, starting on the narrative, etc.; the City also needs to gather all of the stakeholders' money for the project.

F. Update on Hurricane Joaquin repairs related to 49th Avenue beach access

Administrator Tucker reported that after Joaquin the City received a project worksheet, the equivalent of a grant, to repair the 49th Avenue beach access; the access continues to hold water today. The City has received the money; a permit request was prepared; the project is out for bid currently.

In a perfect world, the problem needs to be fixed; the standing water is stagnant, attracting snakes, and breeding mosquitoes. There is a conflict on the street about the path – some want it repaired and others do not and some think the problem was caused by other things. Staff is concerned that as soon as heavy equipment is delivered to the site the “fight” will begin; the engineer has told the City that, if it is left alone long enough, it will heal itself. Staff is of the opinion that, because it has implications that may go on for a long time and may become a legal battle, staff needs direction on whether to move forward or not.

Director Kerr stated that, although the City has gotten a permit, they were opposed to it primarily because they want the repairs to be done with a dune being built at the end; OCRM has denied that request. The Director voiced confidence that, if the City proceeds to have the work done, the residents will take issue with the way it was done. He added that the project is costing twice what the City anticipated, but believes it will be reimbursed; over the course of the summer, a viable beach access was created to the left of the trench. Originally the water was flowing into the ocean, but that has completely healed; the depth of the water has been reduced from about five feet (5 ft.) to two to three feet (2-3 ft.) after a rain.

The goal of the project would be to fill in the trench to be even with the road, which is the condition that was there prior to Joaquin.

The Director clarified that OCRM would allow the construction of a dune at the end, but they have not made it a condition of the permit as the residents wanted. The City is opposed to a dune there because it will flood the road.

When asked if anyone supported filling in the trench, Director Kerr indicated that they all want the area filled in, but they also want the berm.

Administrator Tucker said that there was someone on that street who has been on the island for a long time; he remembers that, at one point in the island's history, there was severe erosion in that area that threatened some homes. The fear is the way that the City has proposed to configure the work will exacerbate the erosion threat and that their homes will again be in jeopardy.

The Administrator also noted that some of the residents have banded together and hired an attorney.

6. New Business

A. Consideration of award of a contract in the amount of \$9,620 to Hill Construction for building conditions assessment

This task was approved in the budget to get a document that states the conditions of the City's buildings were to aid staff in planning for and budgeting for maintenance in the future. The City received one (1) response to the RFB, and it is well within budget; Hill Construction has an excellent reputation and was the company that did the assessment for the Town of Mount Pleasant.

MOTION: Councilmember Rice moved to recommend a contract award to Hill Construction in the amount of \$9,620 for a building conditions assessment; Councilmember Harrington seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Miscellaneous Business

Tenant Rents Report

The Administrator reported that all tenants are current with their obligations to the City.

Next Meeting Date: 9:30 a.m., Monday, October 10, 2016 in the Conference Room

8. Executive Session – not needed

9. Adjourn

MOTION: Chair Bergwerf moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:34 a.m.; Councilmember Rice seconded, and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted:

Marie Copeland
City Clerk