TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND
Disaster Recovery Commission Work Session Meeting
Thursday, June 23, 2011

Members Present:	Thomas C. Barnwell, Ray C. Faust, Thad M. Gregory, Meredith I. Harlacher, Russell M. Hildebrand, Ward N. Kirby
Members Absent:	Donna Lowman
Council Members Present:	No council members present.
Town Staff Present:	Scott Liggett, Jeff Buckalew, Jennifer Lyle, Jill Foster, Paul Rasch, Michelle Harrigan, Tom Fultz, Bonnie Evans, Brian Hulbert, Bob Klein
Public Present:	L. Baldwin (Crowder Gulf), M. Gorczynski (Palmetto Hall), A. Schumacher & B. Sharp (Palmetto Dunes), S. Slovensky (Indigo Run), M. Christopher (Chaplin Park), D. Dennis (Port Royal), S. Warren (Shipyard), C. Kelley & G. Bread (CSA Sea Pines) and R. Deal (CoC)

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Kirby called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

2. **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT COMPLIANCE** – Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Chairman Kirby asked if anyone had any questions, changes or corrections regarding the minutes from the October 14, 2010 Work Session Meeting. There being no discussion, Chairman Kirby asked for approval of the minutes as presented. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Thomas Barnwell and seconded Merry Harlacher. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **APPEARANCE BY CITIZENS** –
   Mr. Bob Sharp, GM Palmetto Dunes – (comment made during Debris Management Plan review; after Mr. Hulbert's discussion) Mr. Sharp began by saying his comment was not to support one side or the other, but he wanted to point out that though the staff attorney indicated that the roads that are private are by choice, it should be noted that the roads are all still regulated by the Town. If anyone wants to build a building on one of those roads, even though private, it is strictly regulated by the Town and permission has to be attained, as is the same with all the natural resources, so the Town does have an interest in our private roads.)

   Ms. Sally Warren, GM Shipyard – (comment made at conclusion of Debris Management Plan review)
   Ms. Warren stated that she personally participated in the preliminary discussions before this new recommendation for handling debris came forward. She feels that standing back and looking at all the information, there is a difference between the day-to-day operations and a disaster, and the optimal way to handle this is to have one entity – the Town. If the discussion is about economic impact, then it goes way beyond moving the debris trucks out of here and getting it done quickly and efficiently. This was considered when debris management was originally brought before the Commission and now it seems that the Town is more focused on how it will pay for the non-reimbursable 25% of costs. She pointed out that a disaster is an extraordinary circumstance and it needs to be dealt with in an extraordinary manner. She commended the Commission for taking the position they have and expressed her hope that they will not veer from the original plan. She confirmed that her management people are aware of what is under consideration and they are awaiting the outcome of further discussion.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Before proceeding with the meeting, Chairman Kirby stated that Scott Liggett requested discussion item #4 under A. Debris Management Plan be considered second, rather than fourth. There was no objection to the adjustment of discussion items.

A. Debris Management Plan – This is a continued discussion from the October, 2010 meeting. Mr. Scott Liggett, Director Public Projects & Facilities began by thanking the Commission and in particular those who agreed to have their terms extended beyond their normal service period to help drive the Debris Management discussion to its appropriate destination. He also stated that he was in agreement with the self-imposed deadline by both staff and the Commission to have all matters regarding this topic concluded by March of 2012, as well as the possibility of meeting with more frequency to do so.

Scott introduced the discussion by explaining that the topics for this meeting are to deal with questions that have been presented with particular regard to the current policy for private road clearing after. Staff believes that the Town is still at a position where the existing policy and the agreements that generated from it has created the potential to over-extend the Town and it is uncertain as to whether the Town can achieve the current endeavor. At this time, staff is presenting a revised policy with the intent to strike a new balance between what the Town would like to do and what it can realistically handle. Once everyone comes to terms on revisions, the policy will be adjusted as well as the subsequent agreements. Scott then turned the floor over to Jennifer Lyle.

Jennifer Lyle, Assistant Town Engineer, gave a brief history of the Debris Management Plan to-date. The policy the Town has currently in place was approved by Town Council in 2007. There were several Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) and Right-Of-Entry forms signed with the private property communities in 2003 and 2004 to clear the roadways, remove debris from the platted road network right-of-ways and pick up segregated debris piles at the edge of the roadway. In 2010 a new policy was presented to the Disaster Recovery Commission for the private property owners to cost share up to 25% of the total cost, assuming FEMA would pay up to 75%. That proposal was not moved forward.

The disaster assistance policy from FEMA (July 2007) for debris removal basically states that removal from private property is generally the responsibility of the property owner. However, if we have a legal interest and can prove that it will eliminate any immediate threats to life, public health and safety, significant damage to improve property, or ensure the economic recovery to benefit the community at large, they will be considered part of the Community Assistance Program.

Our existing, approved policy is for the law enforcement and emergency vehicles to return in Phase I which is the emergency push. Phase II is to clear out the storm-generated debris from all the public and private roadways, access-ways and any property in which the Town has a legal interest. During this phase, a debris management official will determine the number of passes and sweeps.

All the changes in the proposed policy are in Phase II. The first change is that there would be a standard procedure for the collection limiting the passes to two (2) after the initial push is collected. This is not necessarily a 100% limitation and would depend on the type of storm. The second change is that the private property owners would reimburse the Town at an amount not to exceed 25% of the Town's cost, which is essentially 25% of the total. There are several ways this could work. Assuming that FEMA would pick-up 75% of the cost, the Town would be left with the remaining 25%, of which the private property owner's would then pay 25% or 6.25% of the overall (total) cost. There is also the possibility of FEMA looking at the private property cost sharing as being insurance for the cost. This would mean FEMA would take the 6.25% off the top of the total, leaving 93.75%, of which the Town would then pay

25%. Any changes to the policy would have to be presented to Town Council for approval and would require revisions to the MOAs and Rights-of-Entry currently in place with the PUDs.

The current MOAs have 5 distinctive check boxes for each community. Some were for land use for a debris management location, the main segment was for road clearance and burnable debris removal which states that the Town would clear two (2) lanes of traffic and induce a sequent clearance of the travel-ways and pick up the debris from the right-of-ways. Other check boxes were for use of staging areas for equipment, materials and personnel. It was determined last year that the Town would not be utilizing land within the PUDs for staging. Jennifer concluded her overview stating that these changes, if adopted and passed by Council, would be reflected in the revised MOAs. She opened the discussion for questions and/or comments.

Chairman Kirby started off by stating that this proposed policy flows counter to what the Commission proposed and what Council acted on in 2007. If a major event hit the Island, instead of having each POA or individual try to manage their debris clearance and removal, it would be best if one entity be responsible for that. It was decided that the Town should be that entity. Based on the memorandums that have been sent to the Commission members and the information thus far presented, it seems that is no longer a "concrete" decision. The decision to have the Town serve as the single entity was to keep from having multiple contractors, both working for the POAs and private individuals, stepping over each other to clear and remove debris. Chairman Kirby also commented on the change that calls for having a decision made after a preliminary assessment as to whether the storm was bad enough to have the Town clear some or all private roads at the Town's expense. This is again in direct contradiction to what was decided.

The Commission brought up the issue of payment of property taxes. It was pointed out that regardless of where the residents live, they are all citizens of the Town. Should not then everyone be treated the same when it comes to the question of debris management? If every road has to be labeled, and the Town, County and State roads have already been identified, how would a road like Queens Folly be identified? It certainly would play a role in the access to entities for public health and economic recovery since there is a storm drain at the end of the road. To make a policy requiring the property owners to pay more simply because they live in a PUD does not bode well. Regarding the changes as to whether the Town would pick up part or all of the cost based on the damage assessment, it seems to be a poor choice to have a plan that called for "heat of the moment" decisions, rather than sticking with one that has the plan laid out in advance.

Scott jumped in at this point to agree that the proposed revised policy is absolutely a retreat from the previous position. He stated that the policy being proposed is mindful of and linked to the Town Code concerning Nuisance Abatement. There are two separate decisions in the proposed policy that rests with the Town Manager after the damage assessment is complete: 1. Do we remove the debris or not? and 2. Do we excuse the property owner from the cost of that service? These two distinct actions are linked back to the Code, and are in turn linked back to the FEMA requirements as to how they recommend communities in our circumstance should have to deal with these things. Scott asked the Commission and audience to also keep in mind that staff is trying to keep this consistent with a non-declared event as well. One of things that cannot be done is to structure a policy that goes one way for one thing (i.e. a Federally declared disaster with FEMA money available) and a different way for something else (i.e. a non-declared disaster with only Town money available).

In response to the Commissioners asking why the Town was retreating from its former position, Scott explained it was due to the concern of the Town being over-extended, both from a practical and financial standpoint. He stated that the current policy essentially places the Town in a position of "being everything to everybody", so the attempt is to structure the framework of the policy so that the POAs need to consider that they may be responsible for a piece of the work associated with their private roads and need to have a contingency plan in place if that happens.

Chairman Kirby pointed out that there are other private roads on the Island that are not behind gates and asked how this revised policy would address those roads. Scott replied that to the extent that the Town does not have agreements to pursue them, it requires a right-of-entry to access any private property. That again is consistent with the FEMA policy. It's not a question of whether the Town can physically perform the work; it is a question of whether the Town can incur the cost of providing that service to private property. Staff feels that leaving those decisions with the Town Manager at the time of the event will allow him to gauge what the financial exposure of the Town is and make the determination then, in response to that specific event, as opposed to saying now that the Town will or will not pursue one or more of these actions. The private property always has been and likely always will be a matter of legal permission before the Town just charges down a privately owned road.

The Commission asked about the issue of cost benefits. If all citizens inside and out of the PUDs pay taxes based on the same scale to the Town, County and State, then in this scenario the benefits flow to the Town and the people outside of the PUDs in that anything inside the PUDs, including public or semi-public access, are not supported. So again this situation means that the PUDs get no relief whatsoever. Either the debris behind the gates should be cleared and picked-up the same as outside and the cost shared by everyone equally, or the PUDs should get some sort of a credit for the fact that they are providing all those roads that everyone can use. The proposed cost sharing just does not make logical sense.

Scott responded that revised policy creates the specter or the potential that the Town would be doing less rather than more, but he could not say that the PUDs would get no service or that they would get free service. However, it is still the position of staff that the Town should not speak in absolute terms that it will do "everything" and incur 100% of the costs. This is the dilemma before us.

Chairman Kirby stated that the two issues should be separated. On the one hand, all residents are citizens of the Town whether they live behind gates or not, with an obligation to pay taxes, therefore supporting the idea that everyone should be treated the same. On the other hand, how the Town covers the cost of debris removal is a separate issue that needs to be looked at from the Town's perspective. From the last meeting, the Commission recognized the need for the citizens to pick up the non-reimbursable cost of a major event, but it needs to be spread out equally, with everyone getting equal services. The example was given that if there was a shortfall $50 million, where is that money going to come from? It is going to come from all the citizens of Hilton Head Island, as well it should.

Another question was "How does the Town intend to collect the cost to the individual property owners?" Upon Scott's reply that they would have to refer to with the Town's attorney, the question continued, "Would it be by selected taxation of a community or by an individual tax?" Scott stated that he does not believe that this policy is meant to say that the Town is going to assess the individual property owners. The entities that the Town is partnering with are the POAs since they actually own the roads on which we are trying to provide the service. It is not the intent to leave the Commission with the impression that the property owners should expect a bill. Commissioner Hildebrand emphatically stated that if the POA pays, he pays! And if there is a Town shortfall, he pays again, along with everyone else. And that is the point. All of the property owners are citizens and all will pay in some way or another, but the cost-sharing revision aimed at the private sector compels them to pay twice.

Scott pointed out that the legal aspects of private property vs. public property, land owner vs. participating member or POA member is all in the staff's stream of consciousness as they deal with the ordinances, policies and ultimately FEMA. He said he does not dispute the trickle down of where ultimately the money may come from, but we do need to purposely separate the entities that the Town is dealing with. In so far as how the Town would go about attempting to collect, either forcibly or otherwise, or excuse any of the costs associated with the work, he would have to defer to Brian Hulbert, the Town's staff attorney, for a detailed response.

Commissioner Hildebrand went on to say that if we specifically look at the language in the FEMA program, and we talk about what FEMA says, FEMA is a Federal agency overlooking a vast number of entities in 50 states and trying to create a policy that will spread across the country. Hilton Head Island is not. Hilton Head came to be when Charles Fraser created these communities. In addressing these issues, we need to do so with the full knowledge that Hilton Head is different and if we have time to prepare, and we do, then steps should be taken to build reserves for just this type of situation.

Commissioner Harlacher agreed with the last statement and stated that the Commission is asking the Town to do the work, document the cost, submit them to FEMA, et al, for reimbursement in accordance with their rules and whatever is not reimbursed, the Town of Hilton Head Island, that is – all of its citizens, pay the difference. At this point, it makes no sense to single out a specific group to pay more.

Brian Hulbert, staff attorney, took the floor and thanked the Commission for their comments. He began by stating that certain citizens and/or organizations elected to be treated differently than the general public when they elected have private roads. The Town has a responsibility and a legal obligation to clear the roads that the Town owns, as with the County, State and Federal governments. The private citizens have the responsibility to maintain and care for their roads. So this is the distinction between the Town-owned roads and the roads owned by the POAs or in certain areas, by the private citizens. That is a responsibility that the Commission is asking the general public to share in this situation. But that is a decision that has to be made at that level based on the recommendation that comes from this Commission. Keep in mind that a very important factor that will be taken into consideration is again the fact that citizens living on a private road in a semi-quasi private community requested to be treated differently. This will also be an important factor in the decision of how to spend the reserves that the Town has to pay for the removal of the debris or what is going to occur in the event of a disaster. That is what has to be treated accordingly.

Chairman Kirby stated that the exact issue the Mr. Hulbert raised what is being debated. In 2007 Town Council agreed to put on the Town the obligation to clear all the roads on the Island. The discussion was that if it was a declared disaster, FEMA would cover the majority of those costs and the Town could get reimbursement from FEMA for those costs on private roads due to health, safety and welfare. The cost amounts were looked at and though they keep growing with inflation, it was relayed by staff that the Town's position was that they would figure out the costs aspects when it happens. Now, the position is the Town won't clear those roads, or maybe the Town will clear the roads and if the Town does clear the roads, these specific people will have to pay. So the bottom line is if the Town was willing to take on this obligation, does not the obligation remain the same?

Mr. Hulbert stated that staff, under Scott's direction, has reviewed the matter and there is concern as to whether or not the Town will have the reserves in the future to pay for this. So there has to be discussion of what is the cost, can the Town afford it and then put the POAs on notice that they may need to have reserves in place to pay for some of the cost. The Commission is absolutely correct in stating that each POA has the right to know if they are going to bear a cost and if they should be preparing for that.

The question was raised by the Commission as to whether there have been any discussions between the Town and the POAs regarding this issue since it was presented in 2010, and if so, what were the results? Jennifer said that staff had contacted the General Managers of the POAs that had MOAs on file with the Town to discuss the change in the policy to pay up to the 25%. A notice went out to the POAs regarding this meeting, but they had previously been informed of the possibility of this change.

The Commission pointed out that the debris in the PUDs is going to be what it is because of Town policy. A tremendous amount of money is being spent by utilities such as Palmetto Electric to bury the electrical lines and the fact that if there is a storm, whether Cat 1 or Cat 5, every tree that is knocked over in a utility easement will pull up a utility, be it electric or a water or sewer line or telephone. These are areas that run through the PUDs and to shift the financial burden to the POAs just because of the location is not

acceptable. If the Town wants to save money, the Town should be looking at the utility easements and taking out selected trees.

The question was asked about the change to have the Town Manager make a decision for or against debris removal on private roads, as stated in the proposed Phase II and why this point is located there rather than having a clear policy up front. Scott replied that this policy is designed to cover non-declared events as well, when there is no recourse for reimbursement. So the Town has to consider what their response would be and what their financial obligation would be. For declared storms, FEMA's recommendation is to maximize reimbursement, so the damage has to be assessed as to whether or not it meets the qualification of an immediate threat and then the decision is made.

The Commission responded that this brings up two more questions. "How do the PUDS and other private property owners coordinate with that in terms of their preparation?" If the Town decides one way, they must cooperate and work with the Town and the Town's contractor, and if the Town decides another way, they are left to themselves to "pick up the ball". Regardless of which way the Town decides, the private property owners don't have a week to figure that out. The second question is "If the PUDs are cleaning up themselves, do they have access to Town disposal sites or must they have their own disposal sites?" Scott replied that they must have their own. There is no access available for any of the PUDs to use the Town's debris management sites in order to segregate the material that qualifies for reimbursement from FEMA and that which does not. In response, the next question was "Are the PUDs responsible for grinding and/or burning as well, and the disposal of the remains of that process?" Scott stated that the PUDs are responsible from "cradle to grave" for any of the materials that does not qualify for reimbursement and will not be addressed by the Town. To clarify, Commissioner Harlacher said "what you are saying is that the PUDs and other private property owners are accountable to pick up the stuff, store or amass it someplace, grind and/or burn it – if they could can get permits to burn it – and then truck it off someplace and dispose of it". The answer was yes, they have that responsibility. Scott continued that they have that obligation for their own private properties that are non road right-of-ways and lands that the Town has no current interest in or obligation for, so there is presentably some plan that all of the communities have to address their private property and other properties within these gated communities. Scott stated that he did not believe that the policy being proposed today changes that factor at all. In response to the additional question about drainage ways that the Town maintains within the PUDs, Scott said that for any of the areas that the Town has contracts to maintain, the Town would take responsibility to remove blockage in order to restore functionality of those systems.

There was further discussion regarding issues of how and when the Town would access those drainage ways within the PUDs if the PUDs were responsible for clearing the roads, the possibility of private property landing in Town owned property, etc. The Commission took the stand that the bottom line in all of this is that each citizen should be treated equally. The policy currently in place is a good policy, it has survived a multitude of discussions over the last four years and the Town should keep the current policy because it does just what was recommended, and that is to treat each citizen of the Town the same. The Commission reiterated that the current policy that has the Town as the one and only entity to handle this also reduces the confusion and dilemma of having many entities with many contractors stepping over each other to move debris. And again, the Town endorsed this position by means of Council. The Commission asked for confirmation that Phase I has remained unchanged and Scott replied that as it applies to providing access to critical facilities and restoration to those services, yes it remains unchanged.

Scott emphasized the point that staff's intent for this meeting is not to ask or force the Commission to take action on the proposed new policy today. This policy is put forth as an item for continued contemplation and discussion for both staff and the Commission. The primary intent is to reach a more agreeable stand for both sides and in particular to make the PUDs aware that they need to begin to prepare because things may be different for the next hurricane season. Scott said that it is a recognized fact that staff may be obligated to take whatever recommendation the Commission gives, but would like to

continue working towards more common ground on this issue and therefore not make a decision in a hurry.

Moving on to the issue of the number of removal passes, the timing for those and the drop off centers, Chairman Kirby asked first if the Town had made a final decision on whether they will grind or burn the debris. Jennifer responded that it is difficult to select one over the other before the event occurs. She gave an overview of the four (4) types of incineration as listed in the *Debris Removal: Burning vs. Grinding* memo of June 14, 2010 (included in the meeting packet). She said that incineration is a lot faster and cheaper and that if incineration was used, it is recommended that the Town use an above ground burn box rather than a pit due to the high water elevation on the Island. With regard to chipping and grinding, this method produces less air pollution and the potential for water pollution due to ash and the mulch can be used for agricultural purposes or go into the landfills. Jennifer reviewed the grinding method further as outlined in the memo including Exhibit A that shows the cost factor for both types of disposal. She stated that the costs shown include the transport of the remaining product from either grinding or burning to a final disposal site. The current debris management plan and contacts states that the Town prefers chipping and grinding. The purpose of the memo is give additional information to the Commission on the differences, along with costs and to let them know the Town has the option for either or both. Staff's preference is not to focus on one method, but to determine that upon the severity of the event. The question was raised as to securing permission from DHEC for burning. Jennifer stated that any method that was used would have to be approved by DHEC or OCRM.

Chairman Kirby said that he had understood at the close of the previous meeting that staff wanted a recommendation or approval from the Commission regarding the Town agreements with the State and the County. Jennifer stated there is a memo in the meeting packet asking for endorsement from the Commission of the Memorandums of Agreement between the County and the State. The State agreement (SCDOT) states that they would reimburse the Town 100% for the initial push (i.e. first pass) for any Federal-aid roads on the Island. For any other sequent passes on State roads, the agreement states the Town would have to be its own entity and would have to pay the 25% left over after FEMA paid 75% of the costs. The County agreement is based on their agreement with the South Carolina Emergency Management office. If the Town cleaned up any County roads, the invoices would be sent to the County who would send it to the State who would then send it to FEMA for reimbursement. The Town would then be reimbursed for their portion. Receiving the Commission's endorsement and getting the agreements in place prevent a situation where the Town could not perform the work and would have to just "sit and wait" for the State and County to arrive to clear the roads and remove the debris. With the agreements in place the Town could proceed with clearing. The County would reimburse expenses at 100% since they would serve as the applicant for reimbursement and the State at 75% since the Town would be the applicant, but going through the State for reimbursement. For clarification, the Commission restated that approval of these contracts means the Town will undertake a 25% part of the cost of clearing State roads if the agreements are signed or if they are not signed, the Town will simply have to wait until the State 'gets around to us". Merry Harlacher moved that the Commission accept the staff's recommendation to endorse execution of both the State and County contracts with the caveat that the Town continues to work on improvement for cost reimbursement. Thad Gregory seconded the motion. Before calling for a vote, the length of the contract was questioned with regard to being locked in without options for an extended period of time. Brian Hulbert responded that either party can opt-out of the agreements with written notice. The vote proceeded and the motion passed unanimously.

Referring to the memo on drop off and collection centers, the Commission asked staff to bring back further clarification on how the sites would be managed if the PUDs did not have access. There seems to be a contradiction between who can use them, i.e. one document says the property owners can bring properly sorted debris using their driver's license for address identification. However, with saying that the PUDs can't use the sites, this creates a situation of who picks up what and where it came from, etc. Commissioner Ray Faust asked if it was necessary to construct a memo stating the differences and/or disagreements with the proposed policy being presented today. After a brief discussion, it was decided

that since staff's recommendation for policy changes are not slated to take effect until 2012, the minutes for the meeting would be a sufficient record to show the Commission's position on the matter as currently presented. Brian Hulbert pointed out that whenever the discussions are concluded and a memo for recommendation to Town Council goes forward, regardless of what that recommendation would be, it is the only memo that is necessary. When also asked by Commissioner Barnwell if there would be anything mentioned in the recommendation memo about outside discussions with POA/PUD management, Brian said there would not, but the minutes or this meeting would reflect that that had been undertaken by staff.

Chairman Kirby stated that it was clear from the comments given today that the Commission does not support the recommendation for a revised policy as presented at this meeting. Regarding further dialogue, it is up to the staff to go back to the "drawing board" to see if they can bring something to the Commission that would be favorable received. It was pointed out that more information needs to be forthcoming about the billing and collection for the deficit amount. Both the Commission and staff agreed that everyone would continue to work together as a group to reach a final recommendation for Council.

B. Disaster Recovery Plan – Jill Foster, Deputy Director of Community Development, gave a brief update on the Plan. The first draft was completed in June of 2009. It is divided into two sections: the Basic Plan and Recovery Functions. The Basic Plan covers the organization of how the Town should be set up for recovery, including policies and operations (in-house functions), responsibilities (County, State and Federal obligations) and the correlation between the entities. The Recovery Functions include 18 different functions such as the duties of the Recovery Manger, business restoration (staff is working closely with the Chamber on this item), public information, community restoration (the largest item), operational support, government liaisons with the County and State (i.e. donations, volunteers, mass care, transportation, security, disaster centers), finance and employee support just to name a few.

Jill went on to say that the areas of Finance, Employee Support, Government Liaison are all well in hand. Public Information is very similar to what is in place for evacuation, just a change in staff. The Community Restoration section still needs a good deal more work and the redevelopment function in particular is the biggest hole. There are some current policies in this section, but they may change with the new Town Council in place and the LMO re-write committee will be heavily involved in narrowing down this function. Another area under Community Restoration is Debris Management which has not yet been completed. Under the Operation Support section, work is still being done on the set up of a temporary Town Hall if an event should destroy the current Town facility. Where the infrastructure should be put (in advance of an event) and the funds for doing so are just a couple of the moving parts that have not yet been pinned down. Another area with a number of moving parts is Staff. Very particular tasks have been assigned to very specific staff. Budget concerns are very high and in recent months just the Community Development department alone has lost 9 staff members which directly impacts emergency permitting and damage assessment. The Town's previous Recovery Manager has left the Town and that position is currently vacant, changing the dynamics for other staff in the recovery area. Jill categorized three areas as "extremely successful" and those are Emergency Permitting, Damage Assessment and Emergency & Infrastructure Repair (working with the utilities). All of these have made adjustments to upgrade systems and improve functionality in spite of losses in staff.

Chairman Kirby asked if the work being done on community restoration and the review of items by the LMO committee would impact the emergency permitting process that was recommended and put in place. Jill stated that emergency permitting is set-up to be as flexible as possible in order to get the citizens back in their houses quickly. The regular permitting is also trying to be flexible and Jill stated that she doesn't foresee any major changes, though there could be some tweaking procedurally. The Commission requested that the Table of Contents for the Recovery Plan be sent to the members so that they might see the full scope of the items being covered in the Plan. Jill said she would be happy to provide that.

The Commission emphasized that there needs to be clarification regarding the vacant Recovery Manager situation as soon as possible so there is clear line of responsibility and leadership. Chairman Kirby stated that a strong recommendation from this Commission should go to the Town Manager to give priority to filling the Recovery Manager's position or to appoint someone to that position. Jill stated that she would relay that recommendation to Mr. Riley.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Extension of Board member Appointments: Discussions were held between Chairman Kirby, Mayor Laughlin and Greg Deloach regarding 3 members whose appointments will expire on June 30th. Those members are Mr. Hildebrand, Mr. Harlacher and Mr. Gregory. The result was basically to extend the appointments at least to the end of March 2012, with a possibility of a further extension if necessary. Part of the reasoning behind this decision is that the Commission may not need to exist "in perpetuity". The charge of the Commission was to review and recommend a Disaster Recovery Plan and related policies to support the Plan. A lot of work has been completed already and the rest is being actively pursued. Chairman Kirby relayed that part of his discussion with the Mayor was that the Commission members who have been working on this for a number of years need to stay together until there is a firm recommendation to Town Council for Debris Management and also to finalize a recommendation on the Recovery Plan. Consideration was also given to the idea of the members serving as an Ad hoc committee or task force once the formal DRC was dissolved. This would be for the purpose of reviewing similar issues in the future. Until that time, the Commission will continue to function with the current members.

B. Election of Chair and Vice Chair positions – Mr. Barnwell made a motion to keep the same officers that are currently in place, that being Mr. Ward Kirby as Chair and Mr. Merry Harlacher as Vice Chair. Mr. Hildebrand seconded the motion. There being no discussion, Chairman Kirby asked for approval of the motion as presented. The motion passed unanimously

C. 2011 Meeting Schedule – A calendar denoting quarterly meetings was reviewed with the first quarterly meeting being designated in October. Chairman Kirby expressed his concern at waiting that long to continue the debris removal issue, but also stated that the meeting date would be dictated by staff since they had the burden of reworking their proposed policy. The Commission was in agreement to leave the meeting schedule open on an "as needed" basis. The next Annual Meeting is scheduled for April 2012 and that of course would be dependent on whether the Commission stayed intact beyond March of 2012, as mentioned above.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS – There were no announcements, but the Commission asked Paul Rasch, Emergency Management Coordinator, to speak briefly on the predictions for the 2011 Hurricane Season. Before beginning, Paul took a minute to thank the Commission members for continuing to serve and for the progress that has been made. The predictions of this year are very much the same as they were for 2010. One point that Paul emphasized for both those in attendance and the general public is the misunderstanding related to the predictions. Most people look at the predictions and after the season say they were totally off because "nothing much happened". This misconception is based on the fact that the general public equates storms with landfall. For last year, the Hurricane center was absolutely correct. The prevailing fact that is missed is that the majority of those named storms, hurricanes and major hurricanes did not make landfall. So when looking at the predictions, he asked everyone to please remember that it is the storms that are being predicted, not the landfall. As mentioned, the outlook for 2011 is very similar to 2010 and it is hoped that most of those storms will again stay out to sea.

8. ADJOURNMENT – Chairman Kirby adjourned the meeting at 10:53 am.

Respectfully submitted by:
Judith D. Boroski