

MINUTES OF THE ISLE OF PALMS  
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING  
July 16, 2014

The Isle of Palms Planning Commission held a special meeting in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard on July 16, 2014 at 4:30 p.m. Members attending included Bev Ballow, Ron Denton, Richard Ferencz, Bill Mills, Don Smith and Noel Scott; the Director of Planning Douglas Kerr was present as well. Lisa Safford was absent. The press had been notified of the meeting and the agenda for the meeting was posted in City Hall and the Building Department to comply with the Freedom of Information Act.

The Chairman Noel Scott called the meeting to order.

**REVIEW OF DRAFT MARINA REDEVELOPMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

Mr. Kerr explained that the consultant, John Shaffer, has made revisions to the request for proposals (RFP) that were discussed at the last meeting including the addition of a interim parking plan to address the parking needs in short term.

Mr. Shaffer explained that other changes included switching tasks four and five and a discussion of the consultant fees for meetings.

Mr. Ferencz explained that the draft still had reference to a potential team of consultants, which he would like to delete. Mr. Kerr explained that this revision has been made, but it was made after the distribution of the packets. He handed out a revised copy of the RFP to the members.

Mr. Mills asked Mr. Shaffer if there were firms that he expected could accomplish the tasks outlined in the RFP. Mr. Shaffer answered yes, that he knew of several firms that could be the lead consultant, but that he felt that they would need to involve other agencies to complete all of the work outlined in the RFP.

Mr. Ferencz stated that the RFP included qualifications for the consultant and that he wanted to be sure that the wording of qualifications did not eliminate potential bidders as it reads as though the prime contractor has to meet all of the qualification instead of the prime consultant and his team. Mr. Shaffer agreed that it would be useful to add wording that clarified that the qualifications were to be met by the prime consultant and as well as the subconsultants.

Mr. Ferencz asked what role the Planning Commission will have in this process. Mr. Kerr explained that he did not think this had been decided and that it would be decided as the process moves forward based on suggestions of the chosen consultant.

Mr. Kerr explained that during the budget approval process, the amount allocated to this project was reduced from approximately \$175,000 to \$75,000. He stated that there is concern that the scope of this RFP, as drafted, may exceed the amount budgeted. He explained that because of this, he thought it would be wise to have the bidders show an amount for each task as well as an expected time line. He felt that some of the tasks outlined may extend into the next fiscal year, which could be included in a future budget. The group generally discussed this strategy and agreed that it would be wise to try to work with the chosen consultant to work within the amount budgeted for this year and extend future tasks that exceed the budget into a future fiscal year.

Administrator Tucker explained that the budget is a public document and she would expect that interested bidders would know the amount in the budget prior to bidding, so she believes that they will be prepared to work within the approved amount.

The Commission agreed that if the tasks are to be priced separately, it would be wise to add a clear deliverable for each task and they went through each task and identified an appropriate deliverable to be added.

A member of the audience, Phillip Smith, asked if he could make a comment and Mr. Scott answered, yes. Mr. Smith explained that he was the adjacent property owner on Intracoastal Court and he would like to request that the group consider moving the wave runner operation into the middle of the property where it would not be as disruptive to the adjacent residents.

Mr. Kerr explained that if the group was happy with the draft RFP, it would now have wording regarding the procurement code added, and then be forwarded to the City Attorney for a contract to be drafted and then released for bidders.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to accept the RFP as revised and have it prepared for bidding.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Noel Scott, Chairman