

REAL PROPERTY COMMITTEE

5:00 p.m., Monday, April 9, 2012

The regular meeting of the Real Property Committee was held at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, April 9, 2012 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmember Buckhannon and Stone, Chair Loftus, Administrator Tucker, Assistant to the Administrator Dziuban and City Clerk Copeland; a quorum was present to conduct business.

1. Chair Loftus 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 Buckhannon moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of March 13, 2012 as submitted; Councilmember Stone seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION: Councilmember Buckhannon moved to reorder the agenda to address Item 6A, New Business – Discussion of Municipal Parking Lot Lease at this point in the meeting; Councilmember Stone seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6.A. Discussion of Municipal Parking Lot Lease

Administrator Tucker stated that Mr. Schupp has another commitment this evening and was pleased that the Committee was able to accommodate it. The Administrator commented that the Chair had asked that Mr. Schupp attend this meeting since the lease on the municipal parking lots expires at the end of September 2012. At that time, the City will have three (3) options, i.e. (1) put the contract out to bid, (2) decide to operate the lots, or (3) re-negotiate with the existing vendor. The Administrator referred the Committee to confidential information related to revenues under the current contract Mr. Schupp had provided to aid in the decision process.

Administrator Tucker recounted that Mr. Schupp had approached the Committee about a year ago with the request to make the term of the parking lot lease consistent with the term on the contract he has with the City for removing trash from and filling holes on the beach. At that time, City Council was not interested in having the terms coincide and denied his request.

Chair Loftus reported that Council had made certain assumptions on the parking lot when the Public Safety Building was under construction, and, therefore, the City agreed to a contract that has worked in favor of the lessee. Mr. Schupp added that the lease was negotiated at the beginning of the recession as well when no one knew what to expect.

Mr. Schupp offered a new proposal for the Committee to consider that would pay to the City one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) plus fifteen percent (15%) of the revenues. He reminded the Committee that the only expense to the City for the parking lots is minor lot and shed maintenance; he added that he pays his employees and the necessary insurance coverage required by the City. Mr. Schupp noted that, in the thirteen or fourteen years he and Rick Linville have had the lots, there have been no problems for the City.

Administrator Tucker mentioned that the Committee did not have to make a decision at this meeting since the contract will not expire until the end of the season, but noted that the lots hold one hundred (100) fewer vehicles than before the construction of the Public Safety Building. If the City was interested, it could expand the use of the parking lots to a twelve (12) month contract, asking Mr. Schupp to do other things there. Mr. Schupp added that he and Mr. Linville had discussed the possibility of adding chain link fencing to store boats from the end of September to the beginning of March.

At the request of the Chair, Administrator Tucker read Mr. Schupp's proposal into the record:

"William Schupp, Schupp Enterprises, requests an extension of the current City parking contract to include one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) base plus fifteen percent (15%) over the base for a one (1) year extension concurrent with the beach collection contract that expires in September 2015."

Mr. Schupp stated that his proposal could be for one (1) year or year-to-year, whatever pleased the Committee.

Chair Loftus asked Mr. Schupp's opinion of the impact of raising the fee one dollar (\$1.00) to six dollars (\$6.00). Mr. Schupp replied that the increase would cause people to seek other parking options; plus he would need to have one thousand dollars (\$1,000) in singles to make change as needed throughout the day. He related to the Committee that the County Park had increased its rate to eight dollars (\$8.00).

The Chair remarked that the City's costs to provide services continue to increase, and the City was looking to increase revenues to avoid a tax increase on its citizens.

Councilmember Stone asked how many employees Mr. Schupp hired; Mr. Schupp said he has three (3) employees and that he is in and out during the day.

Councilmember Buckhannon said that he liked the idea of the parking lots being a revenue source twelve (12) months a year. In addition to the idea of boat storage, Chair Loftus asked if the lot could be used for recreational vehicles (RVs); the Administrator said that the code would have to be amended to allow for RVs, but it could be done. Councilmember Buckhannon stated that he thought the City could get a grant to add electricity to the lot and work with the Water and Sewer Commission to add water and sewer connections.

Mr. Schupp said that he looked forward to working with the Committee on an agreement that was good for everyone.

3. Citizens' Comments

SCE&G Request for Easement for Underground Power Line and Riser (pole) on 1303 Palm and #8 and #10 Thirteenth Avenue by Westy Westmoreland and Corey Touard.

Administrator Tucker introduced Mr. Westmoreland, who has appeared before the Committee in the past, and Mr. Touard, who is with the design office of transmission projects.

Mr. Westmoreland explained that the reason for their visit to this meeting was to discuss an opportunity to bring a second transmission source to the island; the City will benefit significantly in reliability. In 1991 the first transmission source was brought to the island, and it is the overhead line across Hamlin Creek coming into the substation to the rear of City Hall. Presently, the island has a one-way feed, which is very reliable, but, if the line is lost, SCE&G can seldom support the electrical load to the island. Due to a number of factors, SCE&G now has the opportunity to bring a second transmission line to the City that would be substantially underground. Drawings are attached to the historical record of the meeting.

Mr. Touard reported that, in 2006, SCE&G went through a siting study, which is a public works workshop with public involvement, where routes are defined; at the time, SCE&G was looking for a second line to the Hamlin substation. As negotiations proceeded with the Town of Mount Pleasant, the question arose about placing the line underground. Mr. Touard explained that SCE&G does not normally put the lines underground due to the substantial increase in costs associated with underground lines; normally a third party pays for the cost difference between underground and overhead. Through the negotiations with Mount Pleasant, the agreement was reached for the Town to provide the rights-of-way and future substation sites in exchange for undergrounding the line. With the innovations to drilling underground since 2006, a loop can be established by including the Isle of Palms with the Hamlin line originally proposed.

After an extended conversation about the route of the line, Mr. Touard and Mr. Westmoreland agreed to have SCE&G's engineers look into the feasibility of the line running along the property line between 1301 and 1303 Palm Boulevard to the substation behind City Hall. The Committee was more agreeable to this proposal than the original plan from SCE&G that would require easement from #8 and #10 Thirteenth Avenue that would render #8 Thirteenth as unbuildable.

Mr. Touard said that SCE&G would need to have the right-of-way documents signed in two (2) months.

Mr. Touard and Mr. Westmoreland will attend the Ways and Means Committee meeting on April 24th to review the revised proposal with all of Council.

Chair Loftus asked whether SCE&G would do the work or would the work be outsourced. Mr. Touard said that the work would be performed by Cornerstone Engineering; Administrator Tucker reminded Mr. Touard that Cornerstone would have to have a business license from the City of Isle of Palms.

4. Comments from Marina Tenants – None

5. Old Business

A. Update on Beach Restoration Shoal Management Project

Administrator Tucker reported that as of Thursday, April 5th, Baker Infrastructure Group has moved eighty-one thousand three hundred eighty-four (81,384) cubic yards of sand and expects to reach eighty-six thousand (86,000) cubic yards and finish tomorrow, April 10. The engineer has advised that the City has harvested as much as should be harvested from the shoal.

Chair Loftus asked how the restoration area had held up through the storm over the weekend; the Administrator responded that the beach endured extreme high tides under a full moon in addition to the storm, and the real issue is where the water would have been had the project not taken place.

B. Update of Marina Dredging

1. Status of City's Project

As Jack Walker of GEL approached the Committee, Administrator Tucker reported that the dredging for the City's area has been completed and the work the City authorized to correct the silting from the drainage easement has been completed. The adjacent property owner wanted additional dredging around his dock and has paid the contractor to do that work and will pay the City for the additional cubic yards associated with the disposal.

Mr. Walker stated that Mr. Smith engaged Marcol for an additional seven (7) hours, and the work has been completed. Marcol was delaying demobilization until the Morgan Creek Harbor Association (MCHA) made its decision; Mr. Walker has learned that MCHA will not be able to dredge this year so the contractor has started to demobilize today.

The hydrographic survey was done on March 29th, and Mr. Walker displayed the survey for the Committee to see the areas that had gotten additional dredging time for hard materials. The areas that did not reach project depth were those areas where dense materials had accumulated and were discussed at the March meeting.

The total spoil removed was nineteen thousand eight hundred thirteen (19,813) cubic yards, so the City will be refunded its deposit for the difference to twenty-eight thousand (28,000) cubic yards, or approximately twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000).

Mr. Walker stated that the project is complete and should be considered a success.

2. Report on Meeting with Morgan Creek Harbor Association

Administrator Tucker reported that she and the Mayor had met with the Morgan Creek Harbor Association (MCHA) to discuss whether they could get everything together to use the contractor on-site and the spoil site the City is using. According to Mr. Walker, MCHA has notified the contractor that they are not prepared to go forward now, so he is demobilizing; neither the Administrator nor Mr. Walker have been contacted directly by MCHA.

MOTION: Councilmember Stone moved to reorder the agenda to address item 6C – Repairs to the Tidal Wave Dock; Councilmember Buckhannon seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. C. Repairs to the Tidal Wave Dock

Administrator Tucker recounted that the Committee had authorized the replacement of the floating docks for Tidal Wave Watersports at the March meeting. In the course of dredging, the pilings, particularly one, for the stationary dock were found not to be as deep as expected, so a void was created when the area was dredged and the stationary part is now tilted. Since that happened, the dock has been closed. It has been determined that the problem was not the fault of the dredger, but, in removing the sand they were hired to remove, the stability of the stationary dock was compromised.

Since that time, the City has been trying to get quotes to repair the stationary section of the dock; the Administrator emphasized that, even if the City goes forward to repair the dock, the need to replace the docks altogether. She noted that the stationary dock was to slated to have design and permitting done in this budget year with construction of a new stationary and floating dock in FY13; the dock is beyond its useful life and still needs to be replaced. Tonight, the goal is to get the Tidal Wave business operational on that dock; the best that can be done now is a repair to make the dock safe and usable in this season and to move forward in the next fiscal year with design, permitting, and replacement all in the same year.

Three (3) vendors went to the site to determine what must be done, but only one (1) submitted a price – that was R.L. Morrison for nineteen thousand four hundred seventy-nine dollars (\$19,749). The price does not include any surveying that might be necessary or incidental costs; therefore, the completed costs may be higher. The other contractors who looked at the dock were Dock Masters and American Dock and Marine. Mr. Morrison has informed Mr. Walker that the pilings that are being stored for the City cannot be used here because they are too long and the diameter is too large; to cut them down and transport them to the site would be more costly than purchasing the used pilings that are guaranteed to be undamaged.

Administrator Tucker suggested that this decision is imminent because Tidal Wave is working out of temporary quarters until such time as the repairs are made.

Mr. Walker said that Michael Morrison had told him that, once a decision is made, it will be seven to ten (7-10) days before he is on-site to start to work.

Michael Fiem asked how long the work would take once Morrison mobilizes. He also thanked both Brian Berrigan, Marina manager, and Jay Clarke, proprietor of Morgan Creek Grill, for accommodating the Tidal Wave business.

Mr. Walker estimated two to three (2-3) days, but said he would contact Mr. Morrison to find out. Mr. Leigh said the floating dock would be ready by the end of the week.

Chair Loftus reminded Mr. Fiem that any vote of this Committee had to be affirmed by both Ways and Means and City Council, meaning that the contract award would be after April 24th.

When asked the source of funds for the repairs, Administrator Tucker responded either the Marina fund or Capital Project fund because the funds for design and permitting were used on the floating dock repairs.

Councilmember Buckhannon asked about the balance remaining in the dredging project budget and repeated that the City would be getting a refund from the Corps of Engineers to add to that balance. He remarked that the repairs are a result of the dredging project; Administrator Tucker agreed that was a good source.

Councilmember Stone commented that the lease states that Tidal Wave does not owe rent during this time period. The Administrator explained that this marina tenant has a different payment structure from other tenants at the marina.

MOTION: Councilmember Buckhannon moved to recommend to the Ways and Means Committee the award of a contract to R.L. Morrison & Sons, Inc. for the repairs to the Tidal Wave stationary dock to be paid from the balance in the dredging budget; Chair Loftus seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. C. Review of Modified Landscape Architect Plan for 1207, 1301 and 1303 Palm Boulevard

Administrator Tucker stated that this item was on the agenda in hopes that Kelly Messier would be in attendance for the discussions with SCE&G to get an idea of the impact of their plan on her plan for these properties. Until the SCE&G plan is finalized, the plans for the properties are on hold.

D. Review of Operating and Capital Budgets for FY 2012-2013

Assistant Dziuban said that the Capital Expenditures are displayed with their funding sources for the first time.

Capital Projects – Front Beach Area, including public restrooms, parking meters and parking lots

No changes

Beach Restoration and Monitoring

Special Projects

2008 Project (final report only) Addition to the budget	\$ 5,000
Post-project requirements for FY12 Shoal Management Project Reduced from \$100,000; includes 2 lighting surveys and 1 compaction survey with possible tilling	15,000

Isle of Palms Marina

Construction of new watersports/waverunner dock As discussed earlier in the meeting	150,000
--	---------

Chair Loftus questioned that the construction of new watersports dock took into account the fact that the floating docks are being rebuilt now; therefore, the cost to rebuild the stationary dock would be one hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000). The Assistant confirmed that the amount was the staff's estimate of the costs.

The Chair noted that the Shoal Management Project is nearing completion yet the budget for the coming year has six hundred thousand dollars (\$600,000) for another project in FY13; he asked the Administrator what was the funding source for this project. Administrator Tucker responded that the source is unknown at this time, but she was confident that, when all expenses for the Shoal Management Project are paid, there will be more money remaining in the 2008 restoration fund to be used for a future project. The Administrator contended that for the City to be prepared for another project in FY13 or FY14, the City would need to begin developing a budget and to meet with the stakeholders to ensure that adequate funds were available.

Chair Loftus voiced his opinion that a project would be necessary in FY14, not FY13. Councilmember Stone stated that, if an amount is not included in the FY13 budget, the City will come up short of money in FY14 when time to execute does come.

Councilmember Buckhannon agreed that the amount should remain in the budget until the City's entire budget is available for review and discussion at the workshop.

Assistant Dziuban explained that the monitoring expense had been so dramatically reduced by the less strict monitoring demands placed on the permit than what the City had anticipated in putting the project budget together.

Municipal Accommodations Fee Fund Expenditures - Front Beach Area

Front Beach Miscellaneous and Contingency Reduced based on actual	\$ 2,000
--	----------

State Accommodation Tax Fund Expenditures – Public Restrooms/Front Beach Area

Water and sewer Increased based on actual	14,000
Maintenance and service contracts Increased based on actual	10,000
Insurance Increased based on actual rate increase from SMIRF	2,594

Beach Restoration Fund Revenue

Donations of Cash Expected residual from private contributions to 2008 project	400,000
---	---------

Councilmember Stone pointed out that these are available funds for a future project.

Marina Fund Expenditures – no significant changes

As requested by the Chair, staff reviewed the two (2) advertising lines in marina budgets; the line under “General and Administrative” provides money to be spent on advertising at the City’s discretion, and advertising line under “Marina Operations” is a requirement of the lease and can be spent at the marina manager’s discretion. The City spends its advertising funds on the annual registering of the five (5) domain names for the marina.

Chair Loftus questioned the need for the City to spend five thousand dollars (\$5,000) to advertise the marina; Assistant Dziuban agreed that the amount could be reduced, but she thought the City should continue to register the marina’s domain names. The City holds approximately ten (10) total domain names.

Councilmember Stone repeated a question from the March meeting about what percentage of the marina docks was insured. Administrator Tucker referred him to the last page of the meeting packet that indicates that the docks should be insured for seventy-five dollars (\$75.00) per square foot and that they are actually insured for sixty dollars (\$60.00) per square foot. He was pleased to see that the City was less self-insured that he had suspected.

E. Consideration of Requested Amendments to Marina Joint Ventures and Marina Outpost Leases

Administrator Tucker recounted that Mr. Berrigan, Gray Taylor, his attorney, and Rhonda Sanders, his accountant, had attended the March meeting and discussed requested amendments to the leases for the marina and the store. Originally the Administrator had planned to first deal with the easier points in the leases and to address the rent adjustment in a second amendment; after explaining her strategy with Mr. Berrigan, he informed her that he would prefer that she reverse her strategy to address the additional rent factor first.

Included in meeting packets was an option for the additional rent component of the leases with Marina Joint Ventures and Marina Outpost and a schedule that depicts the impact on the City if the Committee decides to recommend them for approval. The option set forth in the amendments takes the additional rent to two percent (2%) of gross profit over half a million dollars (\$500,000) on each of the two (2) businesses. The Administrator pointed out that the City is protected when the business grows, and, at the same time, these amendments offer some relief to the tenant for additional cash flow to cover expenses in this down economy. Administrator Tucker reminded the Committee that the City has made adjustments to additional rent components for other tenants in the past. The question before the Committee is whether they are comfortable with accepting the decreased revenues to the City.

Mr. Berrigan thanked the Administrator for the time she and the City staff had put into getting these amendments prepared so quickly and for arriving at a solution that will work for him as a tenant.

Administrator Tucker stated that, if the Committee decides to move the amendments to Ways and Means, the Committee must still deal with the other requests for changes to the leases,

some of which are relatively minor, but others not so minor. The Administrator referred to the request about the maintenance provisions of the lease which will be more difficult to negotiate.

MOTION: Councilmember Stone moved to recommend to the Ways and Means Committee the approval of the amendments to the leases for Marina Joint Ventures and Marina Outpost as written; Councilmember Buckhannon seconded.

Chair Loftus opined that other aspects of Mr. Berrigan's requests should be addressed before the FY13 budget could be adopted. Administrator Tucker responded that the most recent version of the budget assumed that this amendment was adopted, but the maintenance issues have not been addressed and would need to be in the next month. The Administrator explained that the most significant factors to the maintenance issue is that the City is looking at reduced income and increased expenses – decreasing revenue more.

VOTE: The motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Responding to the Chair's request for options other than the one (1) stated in the amendment, the Administrator stated that two (2) options came to mind, i.e. (1) no adjustment and no change and (2) to increase the base rent and to do away with the additional rent component.

Administrator Tucker explained the process that she and the City Treasurer had gone through to arrive at the option in the amendment to come to a reasonable compromise that would protect the City and offer the City income. Before conferring with the City Attorney, the Administrator discussed it with Mr. Berrigan to ensure that it was something that would ease his burden and allow him to grow the businesses; he responded back that he thought the option was workable. The Administrator stated that she and the Treasurer would run the calculations on any other suggestions.

Councilmember Stone expressed a desire to see for both operations to thrive and agreed that the economy was certainly stronger when the leases were initiated. Councilmember Buckhannon agreed that the proposal looks to be a good compromise for both tenant and landlord.

6. New Business

A. Discussion of Municipal Parking Lot Lease – discussed earlier in the meeting

B. Discussion on Charges to Committee from Joint Meeting

- 1. Parking on the Ocean-side of Ocean Boulevard**
- 2. Areas for Visitor Parking**

Administrator Tucker reminded the Committee that, at the City Council meeting, she was tasked with trying to find a consultant to assist the City with the way-finding sign issue, getting an encroachment permit from SCDOT and getting the signs installed. She reported that she has talked with a few people, but had made little progress.

Director Kerr displayed an aerial map of the island's beach from the County Park to Breach Inlet.

Chair Loftus stated that his concern was maintaining the beach management program; he noted that the City has plenty of parking at Front Beach, but he was only interested in having the minimum number of parking spaces in the Breach Inlet area to remain in compliance.

Director Kerr stated that the County Park, with the number of parking spaces and restrooms, puts the City in compliance with the state's minimum standards for a mile in either direction, and that compliance goes down to about 5th Avenue. The Beach Management Plan coverage ends six hundred sixty feet (660 ft.) west of the 2nd Avenue access path; the area from 2nd Avenue to Breach Inlet is not considered compliant and is intentionally so, because swimming is not allowed in Beach Inlet. Based on Director Kerr's understanding of the state requirements in answering the Chair's question on the least number of spaces to be in compliance would be six (6) cars at 2nd Avenue and ten (10) cars at 4th Avenue. Placing sixteen (16) cars along Ocean will not satisfy the requirement that the parking areas be within five hundred feet (500 ft.) of a beach access path, and the OCRM statute requires a minimum of six (6) cars at each location along with trash receptacles and a walking surface for compliance for one eighth (1/8) of a mile.

Based on that definition, Councilmember Stone asked how the City was now compliant; the Director related that Chris Jones, the City's coastal engineer, inventoried the southern end of the island and states the parking criteria are met by parking on the avenues. Councilmember Stone then argued that the City might be compliant if no parking was allowed on Ocean, parking would continue on 3rd thru 5th Avenues, and no parking would be allowed on Carolina. Director Kerr stated that he thought Mr. Jones had counted spaces on Charleston for 2nd Avenue coverage; Carolina is far enough from the beach access path that the City gains nothing from parking there.

Councilmember Buckhannon asked what the legalities were behind the parking restrictions on Ocean Boulevard. Administrator Tucker explained that the City has maintained that, if it chose to open Ocean Boulevard for parking, it can do so; the Beach Company disagreed and intimated that they would challenge the City position if it did open Ocean up to parking. The Administrator voiced her opinion that representations may have been made when some of those properties transferred from the Beach Company to the individual property owners, but she was unsure whether or not those representations that were verbally made were also in the legal documents. Therefore, those individuals who purchased from the Beach Company may think they have something that they truly do not. The Administrator stated that the City would probably get a legal challenge, but she thought the City was in a good position to defend it. Administrator Tucker continued that the situation is different with some of the access paths, and the difference is that the access paths that are actually extensions of the road and those which are dedicated easements between two (2) properties for access for those properties.

According to Director Kerr, the Ocean Boulevard corridor is all SCDOT road.

Councilmember Stone recalled Dick Watson referencing the Supreme Court case that says parking is within the City's domain to manage, meaning that SCDOT do not have the authority to regulate what the City does. Chair Loftus agrees with Mr. Watson's interpretation.

Chair Loftus suggested putting three (3) parking spaces in each block from 3rd to 5th Avenue on Ocean Boulevard; Director Kerr reminded him that the spaces have to be within five hundred feet (500 ft.) of an access path.

The Chair commented about the issue of fairness that comes up when residents of Palm Boulevard complain that they bear the brunt of the parking while residents on Ocean have no parking. Councilmember Stone drew on his experience as a realtor and dealing with buyers on Palm and Ocean in stating that more buyers on Ocean are looking for year-round residences while more buyers on Palm are looking for rental property.

Chair Loftus pointed out that the lots on Ocean tend to be much deeper with homes set much further from the road than on Palm; he stated again that his goal is to take parking out of the neighborhoods.

Councilmember Buckhannon pointed out that the right-of-way on Carolina Boulevard is not deep enough for a vehicle to be parked four (4) feet from the edge of the road as cars are required to be on Palm Boulevard. He concluded that parking should be prohibited on any street/road where a vehicle cannot be parked four (4) feet from the road which forces parking out of the neighborhoods. Chair Loftus voiced his opinion that people would park in residents' yards to attain the four (4) foot distance and make the problem worse.

Director Kerr countered that the answer was to install "NO PARKING" signs on the neighborhood streets; Chair Loftus was opposed to that idea because it would hurt residents by eliminating parking for guests to their home for a party or a football game, for instance.

Councilmember Stone asked what purpose was served by the City having the Beach Management Plan; Administrator Tucker stated that having the plan means that the City is eligible for grants or other funding that the State of South Carolina might provide for beach-related activities.

On Ocean Boulevard, Director Kerr stated that five (5) beach accesses are sixty (60) feet wide and three (3) are forty (40) feet wide; the 9th Avenue access is a handicapped access, and 5th Avenue is an emergency access.

Councilmember Buckhannon suggested that the City provide parking for two or three (2-3) cars at each sixty (60) foot wide access; the Director reminded the Committee that OCRM requires six (6) spaces within five hundred (500) feet of the beach access to be compliant. Councilmember Buckhannon said that parking on the numbered streets would make up the difference. Director Kerr restated the suggestion as providing a minimum number of parallel parking spaces at the sixty (60) foot wide access paths within the width of the right-of-way and allowing for the balance of needed parking spaces on the numbered streets.

Councilmember Stone reminded the Committee that the City is fully compliant down to 5th Avenue, so parking is only needed at the remaining four (4) accesses. He also stated that Mr. Jones had been very specific in defining the parking availability on 3rd, 4th and 5th Avenues.

Administrator Tucker stated her understanding that the Committee would be swapping parking spaces on Ocean for parking on either the avenues or the residential street; Chair Loftus said that he was trying to reduce the number of parking spaces.

The Chair suggested that the Committee walk the area to determine which avenues would offer safe parking areas.

Councilmember Buckhannon asked what kind of legal interference the City would encounter if it were to put two to three (2-3) parking spaces at the larger access paths as suggested. Director Kerr repeated comments made by SCDOT that they will not let the City reduce parking unless there is a proven safety concern; Administrator Tucker stated that this was why she had thought of trading off spaces on Ocean for residential streets to appease SCDOT. Justification of a safety concern for eliminating parking on the residential streets could well be that vehicles cannot get four (4) feet from the road; Assistant Dziuban remarked that such a move would mean that guests of residents would not be allowed to park on the streets just as daily beach-goers.

Director Kerr commented that these were some of the issues that the Planning Commission confronted – parking for some and not for others, the enforcement, the administration, the signage.

Chair Loftus asked that the Committee ponder tonight's discussions and address again next month.

On the subject of a consultant, the Administrator said that she had called a couple of calls to get an idea of the firms that do this type of work; she has defined the immediate goal and mentioned that the contract could be expanded. In addition she has tried to get an idea of the cost and learned that the cost will likely be between five and ten thousand dollars (\$5,000-\$10,000) for the consultant to identify the way-finding signs, but to also go through the entire process of getting the encroachment permit and the installation of the signs.

**C. Consideration of Award of Contracts in Excess of \$10,000
Repairs to Tidal Wave Dock – handled earlier in the meeting**

7. Miscellaneous Business

Follow up to Request Related to Insurance – discussed earlier in the meeting

Marina Rents Report

Administrator Tucker reported that Morgan Creek Grill has paid everything due the City except for the late fees of seven hundred sixty-five dollars (\$765), but they have acknowledged the fees. Marina Outpost owes fifteen thousand four hundred forty-five dollars (\$15,445) in additional rent, and Marina Joint Ventures owes twenty-five thousand seven hundred four dollars (\$25,704) in additional rent.

Next Meeting Date: 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 8, 2012 in the Conference Room.

8. **Executive Session** – not needed

9. **Adjourn**

MOTION: Councilmember Buckhannon moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m.; Councilmember Stone seconded and the motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted

Marie Copeland
City Clerk