

**REAL PROPERTY COMMITTEE**  
5:30 p.m., Thursday, October 3, 2013

The regular meeting of the Real Property Committee was held at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, October 3, 2013 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmember Buckhannon and Loftus, Chair Stone, Administrator Tucker, Assistant to the Administrator Dziuban and City Clerk Copeland; a quorum was present to conduct business.

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

**2. Approval of Previous Meetings' Minutes**

**MOTION: Councilmember Buckhannon moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of September 5 and the Special Meeting of September 19, 2013 as submitted; Councilmember Loftus seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

3. **Citizens' Comments - None**

**4. Comments from Marina Tenants**

Jay Clarke of Morgan Creek Grill asked that the issue of control of the docks assigned to the restaurant be added to the agenda for the November meeting. He indicated that he might suggest installing a gate to control the regular abuse by boaters who are not customers of the restaurant.

Chair Stone stated that he had heard a favorable report and looked forward to a proposal.

**5. Old Business**

**A. Status of Tidal Wave Watersports Dock Replacement**

Administrator Tucker noted that this has been an evolving circumstance as efforts are made to come up with a mutually agreeable alternative that will allow for the replacement of the TidalWave dock and be comfortable for the immediately adjacent property owners. Shortly before the meeting, John Shaffer provided two (2) additional alternatives for consideration; the Administrator explained that other alternates have not been discussed in depth because, once put on paper, the options were not cost-effective or feasible.

The email Mr. Shaffer sent to the stakeholders, as well as the additional drawings are attached to the historical record of the meeting. These drawings came out of the Special Meeting of September 19<sup>th</sup>, subsequent conversations with stakeholders and an early morning meeting with Mike Malley of TidalWave, Phillip Smith and Mr. Shaffer today.

Alternate 4 is a minor tweaking of Alternate 1; the pierhead has been shifted into the line of sight and align it with the existing pierhead so as to impact the view from the Smith's as little as possible; the pierhead has been reduced to twenty feet by twenty feet (20 ft. X 20 ft.); and the ten foot by ten foot (10 ft. 10 ft.) platform at the shore connection has been eliminated to reduce

project costs. The total project cost for this alternate is two hundred ninety-three thousand four hundred nine dollars (\$293,409), including a twenty percent (20%) contingency.

Alternate 5 is based on Marina Manager Berrigan's suggestion to explore the option of a shorter, more direct connection of the fixed walkway to the bulkhead. The footprint of the pierhead was not moved any further north than the existing one due to navigation safety concerns, leaving some space remaining between the south end of the Morgan Creek docks and the new structure. Mr. Shaffer stated that he believes that it is unwise to put in a new structure in exactly the same footprint. In this drawing the pierhead is sixteen feet by sixteen feet (16 ft. X 16 ft.), which is smaller than ideal; it also considers the construction of a small building on the upland from which to conduct some of the operations. The cost estimate does not explore the costs associated with that, particularly improvements to parking area and the fence in order to accommodate it. With this alternate, the costs of the marine construction are reduced to two hundred fifty-nine thousand dollars (\$259,000) with a twenty percent (20%) contingency. Mr. Shaffer stated that this is a compromise, and he is not sure that it is an ideal situation for the parties involved, but it does replace the existing structure, maintains some navigation room, locates the pierhead in the line of sight from the Smith's property and takes advantage of the deeper water on the north end. Mr. Shaffer pointed out that, if the City considers this alternate, the area is very much under-utilized and would relieve some of the parking pressure that exists at the marina. He concluded that no consensus was reached today in his meeting.

The option referred to as August 26, 2013 is another idea Mr. Shaffer has had; once he applied costs to it with replacing the finger piers and other improvements is likely four hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$425,000). He stated that he does not have a clear recommendation, but indicated that all parties had made a good faith effort to reach a consensus.

Councilmember Buckhannon asked about the reduction in size of the pierhead from Alternate 4 to Alternate 5. Mr. Shaffer stated that it was simply to show it smaller for less of an impact on the Smith's view, and he thought it could serve temporarily until the upland improvements were made. Mr. Shaffer added that it is larger than the covered space they have today, that it is the normal size for a covered pierhead for the Waterway and it reduces the project cost. Increasing it to twenty by twenty (20 X 20) would not significantly increase the project costs which are between two hundred fifty and three hundred thousand dollars (\$250,000-\$300,000).

Councilmember Stone asked whether these two (2) alternates would require permit modifications; Mr. Shaffer responded that he thought a letter modification would suffice since the floating dock is the same size and in the same location, the fixed pierhead is smaller and the fixed walkway is shorter. He stated that OCRM is close to issuing their permit; the water quality certification has been issued by DHEC; the state permit should be coming in a couple of weeks. Mr. Shaffer said that a formal request to modify should not be made until the City has both the state and federal permits; with the permits in hand, negotiation is possible.

At this point, Chair Stone opened the floor for comments from the primary stakeholders in the project, i.e. TidalWave Watersports and Phillip Smith.

Mike Malley, representing TidalWave Watersports, stated that the modifications and changes that have occurred were not at the request of TidalWave or their desire for a new and improved dock; he noted that the dock replacement was in the City's FY14 budget and asked TidalWave what they needed in a new dock to run their business. The sixteen foot by sixteen foot covered work area is smaller than the existing dock and would hurt their ability to provide the same service to the five or six thousand (5,000-6,000) guests that cross their dock annually. He stated that TidalWave Watersports is one of the most searched and found destinations on the Isle of Palms; he remarked that this business attracts people from Seabrook, Kiawah and Folly Beach to the island, specifically to enjoy their activities and ultimately dine and shop on the island. It is the opinion of the TidalWave owners that any improvements made to their business will only serve to improve the impression people have of the Isle of Palms in general. Through all of the dialogues, TidalWave has realized that the business is in a good location in the marina as far as the floating dock's location, and only the fixed pierhead is the object of debate. If the question is to re-locate the business in the marina or to wait for a short-term solution, TidalWave would prefer to make the necessary safety repairs now and delay the replacement for two or three (2-3) years.

Mr. Shaffer stated that the pierhead from Alternate 4 could be used in Alternate 5 and vice versa.

Phillip Smith voiced agreement with Mr. Malley about delaying the project until such time as a plan that was acceptable to all parties was developed. He stated that he had suggested a way to move forward with the project and to save money for the City; the plan was to use the commercial-grade ramp that goes to the dock and access the jet-ski facility off the end of it, which would flip the plan as drawn. He thought good ideas had come from the meeting earlier in the day that are not on paper due to time constraints. Mr. Smith voiced his opinion that the parking lot is under-utilized for the volume of cars there in the summer months; he indicated that the area near the recycling dumpsters is overgrown and not used. He suggested that a private entity be hired to study the parking and the marina and to develop a plan for the best use of space. He expressed the belief that everything could be made to work to everyone's satisfaction given enough time.

Marina Manager Berrigan voiced surprise at TidalWave's stance, but he agreed that it was the right action to address the safety needs now and to delay replacement. He suggested putting some the money earmarked for this project into an overall marina plan; he would like to have support from the City to do what is best for the entire sight.

A brief discussion followed relative to Mr. Berrigan's idea of having the ramp go straight out from the area near the fence and the use of a single ramp. Mr. Malley noted that, with one (1) ramp, TidalWave would not be able to police it to ensure that they are providing family-friendly entertainment; he also stated that a floating dock would not work for the business since it is not located in a "no wake" zone, but on the Intracoastal Waterway where they are regularly rocked by wakes.

Michael Fiem asked whether the design with the straight-out dock kept the business in its present location or moved it towards Morgan Creek Grill. Mr. Berrigan stated that the business

would be inside the green fence. Mr. Fiem stated that he could work with that design, but he would ask for dedicated parking and directional signage.

Except for its proximity to the Smith's property, Mr. Shaffer remarked that the first design was the best option, looking at all of the site constraints, the available budget and working within the existing footprint of the TidalWave dock.

Councilmember Buckhannon stated that Mr. Smith, the owners of TidalWave and the marina manager agree to delay construction of a new dock; he recalled that the issues arose after the permit application was submitted and the design went out for public notice. The Councilmember suggested carrying the three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) budgeted in FY14 to the FY15 budget and possibly adding another two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) to reconfigure the Intracoastal Waterway side of the marina.

Chair Stone added that he would like to see a more comprehensive approach to the matter, and, if the tenants are willing to wait one or two (1-2) years, he too would like to see comprehensive study of the overall project.

Jay Clarke of Morgan's Creek Grill agreed with waiting for a year or so and suggested that the tenants meet and develop a plan to present to Council.

While Councilmember Buckhannon agreed to view the entirety of the marina for a comprehensive plan, everyone should be aware that any project at the marina will have to be done in phases.

Mr. Shaffer agreed that a comprehensive approach was sensible, as well as a consensus-based stakeholder approach. If the safety concerns are addressed, the dock will last for several more years.

Looking back, Councilmember Loftus indicated that the Committee did not communicate well and suggested that, in the future, the stakeholders should be brought in earlier, possibly as an advisory committee.

Administrator Tucker stated that, if the Committee's intention is to re-direct funds from the FY14 budget, a motion should be made to rehabilitate the dock in this fiscal year using a portion of the funds allocated for the dock replacement and move the funds into the next fiscal year. In addition, the Administrator explained that the dock replacement was included in the budget because the replacement had come up on the City's long range capital plan for FY14.

**MOTION: Councilmember Buckhannon moved to allocate funds from the TidalWave dock replacement to address the safety issues of the existing dock and to re-allocate the balance to the FY15 budget to take steps toward a comprehensive plan for the marina site; Councilmember Loftus seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mark Fiem noted that one (1) item in the replacement of the dock was reconfiguring the electrical service for the dock; he asked if that work could still be done, and Administrator

Tucker indicated that would certainly be considered a safety concern to be addressed along with the handrails.

Before proceeding to the next item of business, Councilmember Loftus thanked Mr. Shaffer for his patience and for the excellent work he has done for the City; he added that he hoped the City would have a long-term relationship with Mr. Shaffer and his company.

**B. Consideration of a Feasibility Study for Erosional Area of Breach Inlet and Discussion, if needed, Related to Shoal Management Project on the Beach from 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to Dewees Inlet**

Steven Traynum of Coastal Science and Engineering (CSE) arranged to attend tonight's meeting to discuss issues relative to the island's beach.

Administrator Tucker explained that the Committee has two (2) issues to discuss, i.e. the need for a permit relative to erosion at Breach Inlet and a shoal management project on the northern end of the island. The Administrator recounted that, at the Ways and Means Committee meeting in September, the fact that a permit application was going to cost into the six (6) figures was discussed; staff also informed the Committee that CSE had suggested a feasibility study at this time. The discussion concluded with the Ways and Means Committee sending the item back to the Real Property Committee for further discussions.

Mr. Traynum reported that Dr. Tim Kana was suggesting that, rather than moving forward with a permit, the City should proceed with a channel realignment project, which is similar to an off-shore dredging project in terms of permitting and planning. A channel realignment project involves moving less material and is easier logistically, keeping construction costs lower.

The feasibility study will take the City through the initial steps of a permit application process up to the point where a permit application could be submitted. The study will outline available alternatives, determine how much sand needs to be added to the beach, determine whether sand needs to be put on Sullivan's Island, and involve other people for feedback before submitting an application. CSE will provide a preliminary design for the project that would be ready to go into a permit application, indicating where the channel will be, where sand will be placed on the beach and how it would be configured, as well as an opinion on the cost. In correspondence with the regulatory agencies, an outline would be made listing exactly what is needed to complete the process from submittal of the application and what environmental documents would be needed.

The Administrator summarized that it would not be wasted work and it would demonstrate responsiveness to the erosion at Breach Inlet.

At the moment the only actions that would be allowed immediately are adding more sand to the beach because the water must be within ten feet (10 ft.) of the house. Once it hits that critical line, the homeowner can put in sand bags.

Responding to Chair Stone's question about the ability to scrape, Mr. Traynum stated that scraping is only allowed with a permit or after a storm to restore a dune.

The only other immediate action would be the installment of a revetment if the water is landward of the baseline, but such an action is not allowed per the City's Beach Management Plan.

Councilmember Loftus asked whether Mr. Traynum still believes that Breach Inlet will heal itself over the long term, and he confirmed that he does. He did suggest putting money aside for more frequent monitoring of that area to have comparative numbers to know when it begins to self-correct. Mr. Traynum pointed to aerial photographs showing that sand is moving toward Breach Inlet and the area from 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue down to Front Beach is gaining sand, which further indicates that Breach Inlet will heal. The configuration of the inlet right now is causing it to bypass the south end and go to Sullivan's Island; the realignment project works by pushing sand back to the island.

Responding to Chair Stone's inquiry about what a feasibility study would entail, Mr. Traynum said that it would involve field work, some survey work of Sullivan's Island beach to tie with work done here, a potential layout of where the dredge would go – assuming that is the best alternative, a decision on whether the project would require an ocean-certified dredge or a harbor dredge – a major factor in costs; basically it would be a preliminary design that would make the City ready to submit a permit application without the environmental reports. The feasibility report details the alternatives, gives a probable cost of construction and provides a couple of alternatives; it will include correspondence with the regulatory agencies. The cost associated with the feasibility study is estimated at approximately fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000).

Administrator Tucker stated that the fund has approximately four hundred thousand dollars (\$400,000) in it today. In the Administrator's opinion, the City learned from its 2008 project that it is better to be ready to act and be proactive in a position to act rather than to be reactive if, in fact, the Inlet does not turn around as predicted. If the City does not prepare, there will be some frantic property owners looking to the City to act quickly and there will be no quick solutions that will make a significant difference. The Administrator noted that property owners have been coming to the Building Department looking for assistance; this action would show to them that the City is paying attention to the entire beach, not just reacting to one (1) erosion situation. Since the City does not have any permit preparation, it cannot react at Breach Inlet the way it can in the other problem areas of the beach.

According to Mr. Traynum, if the changes in the Inlet allowed trucks to get to sand that is in the Inlet, it opens up the opportunity to move sand around; there are no critical habitats there with which to be concerned. The feasibility study will also look at the unlikely situation where a sandbar comes close enough to shore or builds up enough to be accessible at low tide, allowing for trucks to get to it to move sand.

Councilmember Buckhannon noted that there are a limited number of properties in this area, particularly at 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenues.

On the subject of increased surveying, Mr. Traynum explained that CSE does a beach survey and a full mapping of the inlet to know where the channels and the shoals are; the work typically takes two (2) days. A quick letter-style report would likely cost six or seven thousand dollars (\$6,000-7,000); a more detailed analysis with a summary report would be closer to ten thousand dollars (\$10,000). Mr. Traynum recommends quarterly monitoring through the winter storm

season; if it determined that the Inlet is healing, the monitoring could be slowed or stopped. If the City decides to proceed with the feasibility study, this information would be included; the cost could be reduced also by performing only the beach and boat work.

Mr. Traynum added that, when he was at Breach Inlet three (3) weeks ago, he could see signs that the dunes are healing.

Chair Stone likes the idea of a feasibility study because it is comprehensive and takes the City to a point where it fully understands whether it needs to react. He noted that the full moons are pulling harder on the tides than he ever remembers. He agrees that monitoring has its merits, but with the increased number, the City will end up spending nearly the same amount of money.

Since the beach is in a constant state of change, Councilmember Loftus said he favors monitoring that will give more timely information; the feasibility study is a one-time event that becomes dated once it is finished.

Assistant Dziuban asked how long the information contained in a feasibility study is considered to be valid, and Mr. Traynum responded that it is good for several years, because the majority of it is focused on detailing an overall conceptual plan and doing the historical analysis to see where the Inlet has been and where the channel has been, doing much of the pre-permit correspondence, etc.

Chair Stone countered that the feasibility study puts the City one (1) step closer to a permit if an action is needed; the monitoring is just data collection, and the City would then need a feasibility study to get to any action. Mr. Traynum remarked that a feasibility study is required for a permit.

According to Mr. Traynum, no information is dated until the City actually receives a permit, then the City has five (5) years with the option to extend another five (5) years if progress is shown.

**MOTION: Councilmember Buckhannon moved to recommend a feasibility study to the Ways and Means Committee; Chair Stone seconded.**

A ten thousand dollar (\$10,000) monitoring would include a survey that would be comparable to what has been done on the north end plus a detailed report; it can be done cheaper if it were to be land-based, a one (1) day survey, from behind the dunes to as far into the water as one can wade. This will tell a lot about the beach condition, but not about the Inlet and the shoals.

Administrator Tucker stated that, if the Committee is interested in doing the additional monitoring as well, it can be accomplished with a modification to the existing agreement for frequency of monitoring.

**VOTE: The motion FAILED on a vote of 1 to 2 with Councilmember Loftus and Chair Stone casting the dissenting votes.**

**MOTION: Councilmember Loftus moved to recommend to Ways and Means that the City increase monitoring in Reaches 1 and 2 to quarterly; Councilmember Buckhannon seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Traynum agreed to have a cost proposal for the Ways and Means Committee meeting.

On the erosion on the north end of the island, Mr. Traynum reported that there are two (2) areas that meet the one hundred foot (100 ft.) triggers to do a project; one (1) area is around Ocean Club, Seascape and the eighteenth (18<sup>th</sup>) green and the other is around Dunecrest Lane. The window for an event could happen is November 1, 2013 to May 1, 2014.

Mr. Traynum stated that he had spoken with Mary Hope Green at the Corps of Engineers who stated that they are ready to issue the permit modification, but she must correspond with the National Marine Fishery Services to inform them that the permit is not going to require biological monitoring, then they will have ten (10) days to comment. He voiced assurance that nothing will interfere with the permit modification being issued, which takes away from the City's concern over using the single event that remains on the permit.

According to Mr. Traynum, the current situation is that the shoal is moving on shore, especially in front of Grand Pavilion, where the beach is building out and areas beside where there is an erosional arc. This takes away some of the concerns for the Dunecrest area, but it could potentially still use additional sand.

The area of Ocean Club and Seascape is a bad spot now, and, unfortunately, the big shoal has not attached yet so the City cannot get land-based equipment out to harvest sand, which is the ideal scenario. The present situation is similar to 2012 where there is enough sand on the beach behind the shoal that has been building from the adjacent areas so a project can just put the sand back. A new project would be of similar scope or potentially larger because there will be more sand by the time the project begins. In 2012, the project was on the tail end of the shoal as the shoal was already spreading out; this event will be on the front end of a shoal and catching the beach before the shoal actually gets there, which is a better position to be because it will re-nourish itself naturally.

In Mr. Traynum's opinion, the biggest question is whether the City wants to move forward with an interim project to buy time for the shoal to completely attach, then see how the beach looks, and whether to use that sand again next year to spread. The shoal should completely attach by the end of the 2014 beach season so that land-based equipment could access that shoal sand and move it around if needed. There is, of course, the possibility that the shoal will attach and begin to spread; however, Mr. Traynum does not think the shoal will attach quickly enough to nourish itself naturally over this winter and fill over the next summer season without the sandbags being compromised or maintained.

Chair Stone noted that, at the moment, the City has one (1) event remaining on its permit, and the permit expires in March 2017. He voiced concern over using that event without having the permit modification in-hand. Mr. Traynum re-assured him that, since it is the federal side of the permit, it cannot be appealed, and he is confident that the City will have the permit before a project could begin.



The Chair questioned how dire the need was for a project; he indicated that he has been to the area of concern and gets a sense that it is beginning to heal with the exception of the area around the eighteen (18<sup>th</sup>) green.

Administrator Tucker noted that Beth Colley, who is responsible for one (1) of the associations in Wild Dunes, was present earlier; she attended the meeting because the membership is pushing her to push the City to take an action. She is calling repeatedly to know when the City is going to act, meaning that there are people who contributed to the 2008 project who are now being affected by this latest shoal attachment.

Mr. Traynum stated that he spoke with her prior to the meeting, and the problem at her regime is a really focused erosional arc right at Ocean Club and Seascape that has been creeping to the west for the past several months. This arc was originally focused at the eighteenth (18<sup>th</sup>) green, but is now at Ocean Club and moving toward Seascape, which might continue. The owners in that area are having to maintain their sandbags which can be very expensive; he commented that he had seen a couple of sand bags at Breach Inlet on a visit a couple of weeks ago – they are going to be destroyed and they are going to wash away. Mr. Traynum was under the impression that the permit for the sandbags expires at the end of 2013; the bags are to be moved at that time, leaving those owners with no protection. He voiced the opinion that the property owners will not remove them and will be fined accordingly.

Mr. Traynum suggested that the City wait as long as possible to maximize the benefit from the sandbags and delay the project as long as possible and still fit it into the window ending May 1, 2014.

Councilmember Loftus voiced concerned over the fact that there are still four (4) years remaining on the permit, leaving only one (1) additional action on the permit. Mr. Traynum clarified that the permit modification will add two (2) events to the permit, and he reassured the Committee that, once the shoal attaches, it will provide the beach with a couple of years of sand.

Councilmember Loftus asked Mr. Traynum what the “drop-dead” date was for a decision on a 2014 project; Mr. Traynum said that the last project took sixteen (26) work days on the beach with about sixty (60) days of preparatory work. Discussions on reopening Baker’s contract are being considered since the action will be under the same permit only amended as to frequency.

Mr. Traynum said that CSE would need to develop a final design and a new set of plans that would outline how much sand could be borrowed from where, which will involve another land-based survey.

Chair Stone asked that, if the Committee was to authorize that now and the City did not see a need for a project until January, to bid in February and March for construction to begin April 1, would the survey still be valid. Mr. Traynum stated that CSE would need two to three (2-3) weeks’ lead time to do the survey, adjust the plans and put into a workable plan. If the project has to be re-bid, CSE would need time to generate new contract documents.

The Administrator stated that the City was hoping to be able to use Baker again because they gave the City a good price and the City had such a successful working relationship with them on the beach. Dialogue has occurred with the City Attorney about whether or not the contract could be re-opened since the work is under an existing permit.

Mr. Traynum said that another land-based survey could be done in a day that would provide information on how much sand is available to move or if the Dunes Crest area is getting any worse. Such a monitoring would cost approximately five thousand dollars (\$5,000), and CSE would provide a letter/report giving the conditions found.

Ms. Colley had said that she prefers the sand bags because they provide guaranteed protection.

The Chair voiced the Committee's consensus agreement to delay action.

Councilmember Loftus suggested that staff communicate with the community association affected to keep them informed on the City's activities.

### **C. Discussion of Municipal Parking Lots**

Councilmember Loftus stated that he had asked that this be placed on the *Agenda* based on public comments at the September City Council minutes; he expressed a desire to know what the City's position/policy is on items being stored on the lots.

Chair Stone recalled getting an email from someone who was concerned; Councilmember Loftus confirmed that this person had spoken at the Council meeting.

Councilmember Buckhannon understood the biggest complaint to be that, if there is to be storage on the lot, it should be moved to the back of the parking lot.

Administrator Tucker reminded the Committee that the "COWs" are about to be mobilized for the improvements to the water tower, so it will be unsightly for a while.

Councilmember Loftus asked whether there was anything in the parking lot contract regarding additional storage of anything other than cars. Chair Stone replied that, as the tenant, it is Mr. Schupp's lot when the contract is in force. Administrator Tucker added that if they are paying to park and it is something that can be parked, it can be parked there.

As far as a recreational vehicle being parked there, the City has an ordinance prohibiting people from living in them on the island.

Once the parking lot reverts to the City, and the City does not store any type of vehicle. Administrator Tucker recalled for the Committee that it had discussed the possibility of using the municipal lots in the off-season for storage and the Committee had decided against it.

### **6. New Business – None**

7. **Executive Session** - not needed

8. **Miscellaneous Business**

**Tenant Rents Report**

Administrator Tucker stated that everyone is up-to-date on monthly rents with October rent due on the tenth of the month. Morgan Creek Grill still owes the balance of their additional rent; they have made a partial payment. TidalWave Watersports has paid their rent through March 2014.

**Next Meeting Date:** 5:30 p.m., Monday, November 4, 2013 in the Conference Room.

9. **Adjourn**

**MOTION: Councilmember Buckhannon moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:20 p.m.; Councilmember Loftus seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted:

Marie Copeland  
City Clerk