



2017 Meet the Candidates Night

Candidate Responses

Parking for Off-Island Visitors

Particularly during the Summer high-season and on festival weekends in the Spring and Fall, the Town has a shortage of off-street parking to accommodate Off-Island visitors. This problem may have increased in the past year, because the re-building of the 4.5-mile Central Reach beach has made Holden Beach an even more attractive destination for Off-Island visitors. Currently, the Town has a limited number of off-street parking spaces (all free parking) and generally permits parking on the right-of-way on most streets other than Ocean Boulevard. This means that during busy times, many Off-Island visitors park off the pavement in front of private homes. In general, do you Favor or Oppose continuation of the existing rules that allow off-pavement parking by visitors in front of private homes on many streets other than Ocean Boulevard.

Joe Butler – OPPOSE - I served on the Community Advisory Committee, for parking, which is a sub committee of the Planning and Zoning Board. With the support of town representatives and a review of all current public parking locations the committee determined that there is sufficient public parking spots for visitors. During this review the group also identified other town owned properties that have the potential to be converted to additional parking. The committee recommended the following : 1. Develop a public parking map, along with color keyed signs to direct visitors to the parking locations on the east and west side of the island. 2. Better organize current public parking locations. 3. Property owners throughout the island have the right to preserve their right-of-way area to include items that indicate parking is not available. The item must not create a safety hazard and must not impeded traffic as indicated in the current right-of- way ordinance. 4. Paid parking should only be considered after the recommendations have been implemented and monitored.

John Fletcher – OPPOSE - We have a large number of available parking spots, but have not done a good job of identifying their location. Neither the State nor the County have offered to purchase land on the Island on which they could build a parking lot for day visitors. The County did purchase a large plot of land on the mainland just west of the causeway, but that land does not have access to the waterway except through a large marsh. If we are to increase the available public parking spaces, it should not be at the expense of our home owners who work hard to maintain the beauty of their properties. In any event we should make it clear which parking spaces are allowed for the public's use.

Peter Freer – OPPOSE – I oppose parking on the right-of-way in front of private homes. There are many public parking spaces available that may not be as close to the beach as wanted but these parking spaces do not impose on homeowners property. A possible action may be to highlight the available parking by way of updating the Towns website and by adding signage that identifies less known parking. There is a Citizen Advisory Committee that has been looking at parking and they should be presenting their findings to the Board soon.

Pat Kwiatkowski – OPPOSE – The current rules result in too much right of way parking on streets with heavy bicycle and pedestrian traffic, creating unsafe situations. There are less used side streets on the island that could be used more than they are. We need to review all existing parking opportunities and evaluate options for 1. safety; 2. proximity to walkways; and 3. proximity to services to determine the best areas to specify for free street parking. Perhaps the County would be open to establish off island parking options with shuttle service to beach locations agreed between the Town and County.

Ken Kyser – NO OPINION - At this point in time I could go either way. We have a Community Advisory Committee that is reviewing the whole parking issue and will be making its recommendations to the board. I will wait for those recommendations to be made and comments from the public, town staff, and the other board members to decide what is best for the town.

Regina Martin – FAVOR – Favor until we have the report from the Advisory Board. I will note not all those park are Off-Island visitors. I see residents that live off the Beach front often using visitor parking. We definitely need more parking options. Looking forward to the report from Advisory Board.

Mike Sullivan – OPPOSE – I am opposed to parking in the right of way. I am unaware of any other municipality that allows this practice and, thereby, places this burden on its property owners or renters. Furthermore, the practice is unnecessary. The review conducted by the Parking Advisory Committee has, in my opinion, established that, even with prohibiting parking in the right of way, there is currently adequate public parking available to reasonably meet the needs of visitors and guests. This is a quality of life issue on which I stand squarely on the side of the Holden Beach property owner.

Specifically, would you Favor or Oppose using paid parking mechanisms (e.g. pay and display systems) that are used in some beach communities to help defray the cost of providing off-street parking, port-a-potties etc. for Off-Island visitors?

Joe Butler – OPPOSE - Before proceeding with paid parking mechanisms I recommend implementing the recommendations from the Community Advisory Committee.

John Fletcher – FAVOR - I would be in favor of making annual parking stickers available (or pay and display systems) for off island visitors to cover the costs associated with providing the parking and clean up which is often necessary when they leave at the end of the day.

Peter Freer – FAVOR - I am generally in favor of paid parking if it has a positive affect on the budget. I also agree that paid parking would be a good way to pay for visitor ammenities such as port-a-potties, etc .

Pat Kwiatkowski – NO OPINION - I need more specifics to form an opinion, but I do have reservations. There will still be heavy traffic competing for limited premium spaces, which could lead to altercations (and illegal parking when drivers get fed up looking for a legal place). Renters also use on island parking-how will they feel about parking fees when they have already paid for a week or more stay?

Ken Kyser – NO OPINION – This issue should be reviewed by a Community Advisory Committee to see if it could be done and cost effective. If it could be done and is cost effective then yes I would be in favor of it.

Regina Martin – OPPOSE – Think parking should be free.

Mike Sullivan – FAVOR – Yes. I believe that the people who enjoy the beauty and amenities that Holden Beach offers, without paying taxes, fees or rent for their enjoyment, should contribute to defraying the costs associated with the services provided for their benefit. Parking fees are a very small price for visitors to pay.

Specifically, the BOC has established a Community Advisory Committee to study the Off-Island Visitor Parking Issue, and provide advice and recommendations. Do you Favor or Oppose this approach?

Joe Butler – FAVOR - After serving on this committee, and having an opportunity to review what other islands and communities are doing it broadened my perspective on this issue. The parking issue has been with us for a number of years, especially the right-of-way parking issue in front of private homes, and our decisions need to be in the best interest of all of our citizens. We also need better organization to accommodate our visitors.

John Fletcher – FAVOR - Community Advisory Committees are an outstanding source of information as to what the property owners, especially the residents, desire in preserving our Family Beach. Many of our owners have special knowledge of the issues the Board of Commissioners face. The sewer system evaluation Committee is an excellent example where residents and non-resident owners completed a thorough evaluation of the risks facing the Town by the design of the sewer system.

Peter Freer – FAVOR - The BOC should always solicit input and the Community Advisory Committees are a focused way to acheive public input. Holden Beach has residents have diverse skills and experiences and the town has and should continue to benefit from these resources.

Pat Kwiatkowski – FAVOR - CACs bring local experience, understanding and perspective to decisions. Even if the CAC recommendations don't fully meet expectations, the data the committee gathers and organizes will be ready for evaluation by a larger group if needed.

Ken Kyser – FAVOR – It is almost always better to have a diverse group review issues and make recommendations to the board. The best ideas come from honest open group discussions where any and all ideas and options are discussed and the best of these are recommended to the board.

Regina Martin – FAVOR – Great idea. Do not believe there should be a BOC member on that Committee as they are task with providing advise to the Board.

Mike Sullivan – FAVOR - I'm in favor. I believe that it is always a good thing to have community input when making policy decisions that will impact the residents, property owners and renters of Holden Beach. Advisory committees are an efficient and focused means of obtaining vital community input.

Beach Protection

1. *Central Reach Project.* The Central Reach Project (beach nourishment for 4.5 miles between 240 OBE and 780 OBW) was approved and completed over the past year at a cost of about \$15 million. Do you think the Project was Effective or Not Effective in protecting the beach and the Town?

Joe Butler – EFFECTIVE - Being a home owner on the east end of the island I have witnessed the positive benefit of the Central Reach Program. Beach erosion and potential storm damage will continue to be a major concern for our citizens and its imperative that we continue to financially plan to support additional funding for sand replenishment projects.

John Fletcher – EFFECTIVE - The re-nourishment of the 4 1/2 miles of beach, called the Central Reach Project, provided 1.3 million cubic yards of sand to our beach. Cost was \$11.54 a yard including the \$2.5 million set up charge. This amounted to about 150 feet of new beach with a 6-8 foot depth. That section has protected the center of the Island through two recent Hurricanes. Without that protection, our frontal dune, which was breached multiple times by Hurricane Mathew, would have been seriously damaged as a result of especially high tides which over-washed even the newly placed sand.

Peter Freer – EFFECTIVE - The Central Reach Project was greatly need to replace the sand that had eroded over the years and to insure that a breach did not occur (around the Beach Mart) that would split the island. Also, it's believed that the recent storms would have had a much more negative affect on the island if we had not put additional sand on the Central Reach (and East End) beach.

Pat Kwiatkowski – EFFECTIVE – Cost aside, replenishing sand to a long stretch of beach in combination with revegetation and sand fences was the appropriate reaction to the increasing beach erosion. In future the Town should set aside money annually to fund future renewals from savings.

Ken Kyser – EFFECTIVE – More sand on the beach provides a greater barrier to the damage that can be done by the Ocean during a storm. Not only does it protect the ocean front homes but also the road, water lines and sewer lines. In reality it helps protect all of us, maybe not directly but indirectly.

Regina Martin – EFFECTIVE – Beach looks great. Healthy and growing. Some of the dune structures taken out in Matthew are starting to reform. The sand fencing and the plantings are all adding in the growth.

Mike Sullivan – EFFECTIVE - The effectiveness of the project is beyond question. The beach is now 60-90 feet wider than it formerly was and the initial formation of dunes, an essential component of ocean front stability, has begun. The beach is the lifeblood of the town and we must do everything we can to maintain and protect it. The only misstep in the process was the Town's use of an overly broad and intrusive document requesting easements, into perpetuity, from the oceanfront property owner's. Some property owner's were, rightfully, concerned and frightened, by the extent of the rights they were being asked to relinquish, and refused to sign the easement document. The Board of Commissioner's responded, to this legitimate concern, by authorizing the commencement of legal action against Holden Beach property owners which would have given the Town, court authorized authority to needlessly encroach on the home owners property rights. I am proud to say the the Holden Beach Property Owners Association, of which I am a Director, hired an attorney to protect the interests of all the affected property owners, by working collaboratively with the Town Attorney. As a result, the easement document was modified and made far less intrusive and all necessary documents were voluntarily signed and returned by the property owners, thereby, the threat of legal action was removed and the project was able to proceed to a successful end.

2. *East End Reach*. Over the past year, the Town used sand from the state, county and local community Lockwood Folly dredging project to nourish the East End beach from the end of the Island to the start of the Central Reach (around 240 OBE) at a cost to the Town of about \$76,000. Do you think the Project was Effective or Not Effective in protecting the beach and the Town?

Joe Butler – EFFECTIVE - As previously stated, we will need an organized plan in place to financially support beach replenishment projects. Lockwood Folly dredging, and other identified locations such as the Central Reach project for sand harvesting need to be an ongoing.

John Fletcher – EFFECTIVE - USCOE was scheduled to dredge the inlet crossing (where the ICW crosses entry of LFI) as they do every second year. The ICW was becoming clogged with sand at the crossing. The Federal Government pays for that dredging. Working with the Corps, the BOC approved a \$76k expenditure to double the sand taken from the crossing (130k cu yds versus 65k cu yds) and to pump it onto the east end of the beach to allow re-nourishment of the half mile section from 240 OBE to 339 OBE (Amazing Grace). Cost for this sand was \$058c per yard. This action off-set any annual erosion for this portion of the beach but also protected it through these most recent hurricanes. Annual or semi-annual placement of 130,000 cubic yards of dredged sand on this eastern reach area will protect this portion of the beach. This can be from the crossing dredging or from dredging of the inlet channel just off shore. Cost is very reasonable.

Peter Freer – EFFECTIVE – Harvesting the sand for the East End beach by the Army Corps of Engineers at the connection of the Intercoastal Waterway and the Lockwood Folly Inlet was extremely budget friendly at \$76,000. The BOC also approved \$35,000 (our local contribution) that dredged the Inlet itself as a start to keeping the inlet open and should allow for harvesting the inlet sand in the future for the East End. The Lockwood Folly Inlet is not only important to safe navigation for Holden Beach boaters but also to allow water to be released from the river and intercoastal waterway during and after a storm that would affect canal property flooding. The BOC also has budgeted \$150,000 for future Lockwood Folly Inlet dredging, that we have done many times, but had not budgeted.

Pat Kwiatkowski – EFFECTIVE – This appears to be a financially and environmentally sound approach that can be routinely repeated according to the dredging schedule.

Ken Kyser – EFFECTIVE – Anytime that we can get sand placed on our beach and have others help pay for it it is a blessing. The people that live on the east end deserve the same protection and services as the rest of the island. They too pay taxes. Also the water line runs under that frontal dune and if lost a lot of home could no longer be used till the towns services could be restored which would be at a great cost.

Regina Martin – EFFECTIVE – Being able to marry the East end project into the Central Reach was a great benefit to the Island. Our Beach strand looks so good. it has stood up well against the heavy surf from several off shore storms. The ability to get the sand from the Lockwood Folly dredging was a great cost savings and being able to get assistance from the state and local government made this a very cost effective project with great end results.

Mike Sullivan – EFFECTIVE - Yes, the project was effective and, actually, economical as well. The east end beach was enhanced and widened at a cost per cubic yard, which was much less than the cost per cubic yard, for the sand used in the Central Reach Project (CRP). This resulted from the reduced costs associated with using equipment already in place because of the CRP and piggy backing on that project.

3. *Terminal Groin*. Since 2011, the Town has pursued permits for a long-term East End beach nourishment Project that includes a Terminal Groin intended to slow downshore erosion along a portion of that beach. The Town's draft Environmental Impact Statement necessary for the permits was first released in August 2015 and has been pending with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. According to the Town's draft EIS, the Town's long-term funding commitment for the project would be \$30+ million. Please indicate which best describes your position on the Project.

Joe Butler - FAVOR CONTINUATION OF BEACH NOURISHMENT USING SAND FROM DREDGING LOCKWOOD FOLLY INLET, AND OPPOSE BUILDING TERMINAL GROIN - I have a number of concerns pertaining to moving forward with a commitment to the Terminal Groin project. The terminal groin will only have an impact on a half mile of the east end of the island, with no clear understanding of potential impact to the beach strand past that point. Current east end of the island sand re-nourishment from the Lockwood Folly inlet has been effective with minimal cost compared to the 30+ million, along maintaining the groin. We also have an obligation to pay off the balance of the Central Reach project. My understanding is that if we were fortunate enough to find funding to build the groin there is no guarantee that it will work, that it will not create other erosion concerns, that the project will not create other regulatory concerns and we may be required to remove it at our cost. Based on our sand re-nourishment experience on the east end of the island, we know it works for a significant less expense without all of the unknowns.

John Fletcher - FAVOR CONTINUATION OF BEACH NOURISHMENT USING SAND FROM DREDGING LOCKWOOD FOLLY INLET, AND OPPOSE BUILDING TERMINAL GROIN - The Terminal Groin was intended to protect from annual erosion the half mile section of the beach known as the eastern reach (240 OBE to 339 OBE - Amazing Grace). The Terminal Groin was described by the Legislature as an experimental attempt to control annual erosion. It would have no impact on storm erosion and could in fact increase the damage in case of a storm. The permit application states that the Groin would require 150,000 cu yards of re-nourishment every four years. Recent experience shows this re-nourishment is every two years. In many cases, past installations of groins to prevent sectional erosion have resulted on unusually harsh downstream erosion. The recent Bald Head Island Groin was supposed to need re-nourishment every four years but the Island has already applied for permission to dredge the Frying Pan Shoals to gain sand for re-nourishment. The BOC's recent approval of funding to pump dredged sand onto the eastern portion of the island appears to satisfy the impact of annual erosion in that section. The Groin is too risky and far too costly compared to annual re-nourishment from inlet and crossing dredged sand.

Peter Freer - FAVOR CONTINUATION OF BEACH NOURISHMENT USING SAND FROM DREDGING LOCKWOOD FOLLY INLET, AND OPPOSE BUILDING TERMINAL GROIN – The harvesting of sand from the Lockwood Folly Inlet is a much better financial and risk adverse solution than building and maintaining a terminal groin and therefore makes the decision of funding and building the Terminal Groin a moot point. After 2 years of listening to the discussions of building a Terminal Groin I have heard very few arguments for the Groin and many against. I encourage everyone to go to the east end beach and see for themselves.

Pat Kwiatkowski - FAVOR CONTINUATION OF BEACH NOURISHMENT USING SAND FROM DREDGING LOCKWOOD FOLLY INLET, AND OPPOSE BUILDING TERMINAL GROIN – Terminal groins are costly to build and maintain and positive results are not certain. Groins have been known to reduce sand 2 or 3 miles "downstream", which could lead to problems where the island is already somewhat thin. Continuing to replenish the east end via dredging should become part of annual town budgeting in combination with ensuring contributions by the state and county are available (and the dredging gets scheduled). Future major beach renourishments and dune building procedure should be paid from a reserve fund built from annual contributions from revenue collected from rental properties.

Ken Kyser – NO OPINION or HAVE NOT DECIDED – Having been involved in this issue since the very beginning and having gone to many meetings and heard many many experts express their opinions often in opposition to each other I have not decided yet. At this point in time the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is still reviewing the issue and has not approved it. One of the issues that they are evaluating is whether it is a cost effective solution. Even after approval by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers there will be a lot of discussion by the board and town that will take place. The way this is going this same question will be asked of the next commissioners. There will be many options that will have to be reviewed and studied in order to determine how to pay for something that we don't even know how much it will cost. The dredging and beach re-nourishment will most likely be paid for as it is now.

Regina Martin – NO OPINION or HAVE NOT DECIDED – I am waiting for the final report.

Mike Sullivan - FAVOR CONTINUATION OF BEACH NOURISHMENT USING SAND FROM DREDGING LOCKWOOD FOLLY INLET, AND OPPOSE BUILDING TERMINAL GROIN - I am firmly opposed to continuing with the Terminal Groin Project. In my opinion it makes no economic or environmental sense. The purpose of the groin is to trap and accumulate sand on the east end that would otherwise drift westward along the beach. It is estimated that the sand thus accumulated would benefit a small number of homes, perhaps 10-15, the number varies depending on the source. We, as a community, just paid 15 million dollars and had our taxes raised more than 40% to re-nourish the very portion of the beach that would be deprived of its natural accumulation of sand because it would now remain east of the groin. Why would we want to do that? Why adversely affect hundreds of property owners for the benefit of so few. Just doesn't make sense to me. Study after study show that groins do not create new or additional sand. They merely reallocate the available sand. One side of the groin gains sand; the other side loses sand. Additionally, the cost of building and maintaining the groin is prohibitive. The costs estimates vary depending on the sources position on the issue, with the highest estimate in the 30 million dollar range. The Town has a number of capital projects we are in dire need of undertaking, such as the remodeling of the sewer system, and cannot bear the additional tax burden associated with the terminal groin project.

4. *BPART Funding.* Does the Town have adequate procedures in place to reserve BPART Funding for emergency or future beach protection spending?

Joe Butler – INADEQUATE - Beach re-nourishment funding needs to be a separate line item in the annual BPART budget and monitored accordingly.

John Fletcher – INADEQUATE - The Town collected \$1.8 million dollars in rental taxes which are placed in the BPART fund. While approximately \$300,000 of that was shared with the County, \$800,000 of it was identified as necessary to pay Town operating expenses. The current BOC has directed the Town Manager to begin saving 5% of the annual collections in a special account for future beach emergencies.

Peter Freer – INADEQUATE - Not yet, the current board has made some progress but must continue to further control the BPART funds to budget these funds to be only used for beach renurishment and related expenses.

Pat Kwiatkowski – INADEQUATE – There is not a clear policy or annual set aside target. Once it is in place, creating a specific reserve fund would keep the process transparent.

Ken Kyser – ADEQUATE – With the legislation that we recently passed I believe that we do.

Regina Martin – ADEQUATE – THE use of this money is reserved for tourism and sand. The town has used it wisely and our reserve has been maintained as our occupancy taxes have increased.

Mike Sullivan – ADEQUATE - At present, the funds are adequate, but need to grow. We just completed the Central Reach Project and, although no gurantees can be given, it is anticipated that the next re-nourishment won't be necessary for 10 years. During the next 10 years we can systematically rebuild the fund. Additionally, the Town has received monies from FEMA to repair damage caused by Hurricane Matthew. This money was unanticipated when the CRP was funded, so it was not considered as a means of replacing the BPART funds used for the CRP. I'm in favor of using a majority of the approximately 3.5 million dollars of FEMA money to replenish the BPART reserve, however, I also want a portion to fund a 2 cent reduction in property taxes. The FEMA disbursements make this possible by allowing the Town to make a smaller annual transfer of dollars from general revenue funds to BPART. The 2 cent reduction is approximately 9% for overall property taxes, but a 28% REDUCTION IN THE TAX INCREASE DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTEABLE TO THE CENTRAL REACH PROJECT.

Lockwood Folly Inlet

Historically, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had maintained Lockwood Folly Inlet (between the East End of Holden Beach and the West End of Oak Island), but in recent years it has stopped funding the dredging, so the burden of dredging and keeping the inlet open to small boat traffic falls on the state, county and local communities. Over the past two years, the Town has cooperated and shared costs to dredge the inlet, but keeping the inlet passable is an on-going problem. Yes or No, do you think it is important to keep Lockwood Folly Inlet open to small boat traffic? And, if so, what role should the Town play?

Joe Butler - YES – IMPORTANT TO KEEP INLET OPEN - There are many reasons to have a process in place to keep the Lockwood Folly inlet open. It is important for us to work with State, County, Oak Island and other communities to keep the inlet open. Keeping the inlet open not only supports recreation boating, rental properties and property values, but it supports our re-nourishment program for the east end of the island.

John Fletcher - YES – IMPORTANT TO KEEP INLET OPEN - Carolina Beach Inlet Protection Association commissioned an Study of the economic impact of closing their shallow draft inlet. The Study showed a multi million dollar impact on the economy of the island. I believe that the Lockwood Folley Inlet is an very important aspect of the life for people living and renting on Holden Beach. If the inlet were to be abandoned I believe many fishermen, both permanent and visiting would choose other islands for their homes and for their rental vacations. I think property values would be even further depressed. If the State were to approve the installation of jetties to protect inlets, I would want to examine the long term cost. I believe that there would no need for further dredging and the inlet would become a very special place for Charter Captains and professional as well as recreational fishermen.

Peter Freer - YES – IMPORTANT TO KEEP INLET OPEN – The Lockwood Folly Inlet is not only important to Holden Beach boat owners for navigation but also to allow water to be released from the river and intercoastal waterway during and after a storm. The BOC should continue to share in the cost of dredging where the primary reason is for sand harvesting for the east end. Also as I said previously, the BOC has budgeted \$150,000 for future Lockwood Folly Inlet shared cost dredging that the town has done many times but had not budgeted.

Pat Kwiatkowski - YES – IMPORTANT TO KEEP INLET OPEN – Holden Beach small craft owners and charter companies rely on both inlets being navigable. Canal property value could decrease if LFI becomes considered unreliable, and charter companies that cater to renters could move elsewhere and stop servicing HB, reducing the island's attractiveness to some visitors. The Town should continue to contribute a reasonable sum to keeping the LFI open as well as continue to push for government funding.

Ken Kyser - [no response] - I am only in favor of us spending money to keep it open if the dredged material is placed on Holden Beach. Sharing the cost and getting the sand and keeping the inlet open is always a good idea. The sidecast dredge is almost useless. It throws the dredged material back in the water where it is put back in the channel almost as fast as it is removed (a big waste of money). I am not in favor of the sidecast dredge.

Regina Martin - YES – IMPORTANT TO KEEP INLET OPEN – The Town should work with State and local governments to find funds to keep the Inlet open for boaters.

Mike Sullivan - YES – IMPORTANT TO KEEP INLET OPEN – Yes, it is important to keep the inlet open for both recreational and economic reasons. A good number of homes on Holden Beach are situated on canals and the homeowners or renters access the ocean through the inlet. The value of the homes and the tax assessment of those homes would be severely diminished if the inlet becomes and or remains impassable. All property values on the island would be negatively affected. Until we can get our elected officials to apply the pressure necessary to have the Corp of Engineers resume the necessary dredging timetable, we need to continue working with the state, county, and adjacent communities to keep the inlet navigable. I suggest the Town join all similarly situated coastal communities in North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia in seeking assistance from our elected federal officials.

The Town's draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Terminal Groin Project does NOT say that it would keep the Inlet passable for small boats or reduce the need to dredge the Inlet. Do you think building the Terminal Groin would be an Effective way to reduce the need to dredge the inlet?

Joe Butler – NOT EFFECTIVE - There are just too many unknowns to proceed with the Terminal Groin project that I have already provided comments on, that includes an expense that we cannot afford. We have a sand re-nourishment program in place that works with less expense to the citizens.

John Fletcher – NOT EFFECTIVE - The USCOE shallow draft inlet project director is quoted as saying the Groin would more likely cause further damage to the inlet. It is NOT designed to have any impact on the inlet other than maybe slowing somewhat the swing of the inlet to the west. The near shore portion of the inlet will still need to be maintained as it is now.

Peter Freer – NOT EFFECTIVE – Unless the draft Environmental Impact Statement changes, the EIS answers the question -saying the Terminal Groin does NOT say that it would keep the inlet passable for small boats or reduce the need to dredge the inlet.

Pat Kwiatkowski – NO OPINION - I would need to do more reading to have an informed opinion as to whether a groin might help the inlet situation, but even if it did it wouldn't alter my position that a terminal groin should not be pursued.

Ken Kyser – NO OPINION – I am not an expert in that but looking at it logically it seems like it would since it is designed to trap and hold sand.

Regina Martin – NO OPINION – Need to see the final report.

Mike Sullivan – NOT EFFECTIVE - No, in fact the groin may very well worsen the problem that currently exists. The intent of the groin is to inhibit the free flow of sand in its natural pattern, from east to west, and instead have sand accumulate east of the groin. There is a strong possibility that the sands captured by the groin wind up in the inlet rather than on the east end of Holden Beach.

Sewer System Vulnerability

Based upon the report of a Community Advisory Committee and an Independent Engineering Report, the Town purchased back-up emergency generators and critical replacement parts for the four sewer lift stations, and has undertaken a significant project to upgrade the lift stations to make them less vulnerable to catastrophic failure from storm surge flooding. In general, do you think this plan is Effective or Ineffective? Please discuss.

Joe Butler – EFFECTIVE - Based on the risks that associated with potential storm surge flooding three of the four lift stations, and citizens having to potentially leave the island for a number of months until repairs could be made I not only support this project; but identify this as a critical / top priority project. We need a transparent plan in place that not only identifies costs, but an aggressive time line that minimizes exposure.

John Fletcher – EFFECTIVE - The BOC commissioned a Citizen's Committee to evaluate the current risk posed by the engineering design of our sewer system. The Board was very impressed with the study results provided by the Citizen's Committee, but as the project will cost millions of dollars the Board wisely looked for a confirming second opinion. The second opinion from a large engineering firm supported the earlier conclusions and proposed possible options in designing the new stations. The BOC has decided that the best approach is to select an engineering firm to oversee the initial re-engineering of the most vulnerable pumping station (#4) with plans to use lessons learned on the station #4 as a guide to complete the re-engineering of the other three stations. I believe the BOC will press to complete the entire project as rapidly as possible with awareness of the need to get it right this time. The BOC is now evaluating two engineering firms to choose the most qualified to oversee the Sewer Re-engineering Project.

Peter Freer – EFFECTIVE – I ran (with others) on the belief that the current current Sewer System is vulnerable to catastrophic failure from storm surge and based on the effort of the Community Advisory Committee this is now the consensus. Our neighbors also agree because we now know that their sewer systems are elevated. The town has acted immediately with generators and is on the path to mitigate these catastrophic failure risks.

Pat Kwiatkowski – EFFECTIVE – Raising stations 4, 3 and 2 starting with the most at risk is an appropriate plan. Establishing and sticking to a project timeline that achieves the work in the shortest possible time/within the minimum number of hurricane seasons possible is important.

Ken Kyser – EFFECTIVE - If we fail to take action sooner or later the lift stations will flood and it will take weeks or even months to be repaired. During that time you will have to move out of your home.

Regina Martin – EFFECTIVE – I believe the plan will be effective once in place. I do wish the BOC had taken the recommendations from the Community Advisory Board when it was presented instead of discounting it and spending 50000 on a consultant which came up with the same report. Had they listened to the Advisory Board the project would already be stated on lift station#4.

Mike Sullivan – EFFECTIVE - The plan is effective. However, Implementation of the plan has be woefully ineffective. The independent engineering report was unnecessary and wasteful. It cost approximately \$50,000, took 7 months to produce, delayed any significant progress in improving and protecting the current system and mirrored the Community Advisory Committee Report in all material recommendations. If the current Board members had simply asked the engineering consultant, "Other than raising the vulnerable electrical and pumping components above the Base Flood Elevation, is there a better or more efficient way to protect the current sewer system?" They would have been told no, as reflected by the consultant's report, and should have realized the consulting contract unnecessary and wasteful. Furthermore, If they spoke to the Building Inspector or attended the Sewer Advisory Committee meetings, they would have known that once changes to the existing system began, the reconfigured system would have to conform to code and that also necessitates raising the vulnerable component parts above Base Flood Elevation.

Specifically, do you Favor or Oppose going forward with the planned upgrades to the lift stations?

Joe Butler – FAVOR - I support an elevated design for the lift stations , but I am concerned about the project time line to minimize citizen exposure.

John Fletcher – FAVOR - After my initial review of the pumping stations with the Town staff, I found it hard to believe that the BOC had not previously confirmed their plans with a second opinion. As an economist, not an engineer, I still found the current design seriously flawed in many ways. When I asked why the stations had not been built above ground and shielded by a normal looking structure, I did not get a clear answer.

Peter Freer – FAVOR

Pat Kwiatkowski – FAVOR

Ken Kyser – FAVOR - Strongly in favor, If it would have been up to me we would have taken action based on the sewer advisory committee and we would be bidding the work right now and not the planer/designer.

Regina Martin – FAVOR – WE must do these up grades otherwise we risk being unable to live in our homes if we should get storm surge flooding of our lift stations.

Mike Sullivan – FAVOR - Absolutely, if the sewer system fails the island must be evacuated. Hurricane Matthew flooded lift station #4. Luckily, the flooding was minor, but it highlighted the need to take immediate steps to raise and protect the vulnerable parts of the sewer system. As Chairman of the Sewer Advisory Committee I am proud of the work we did and confident are findings and recommendations were and are solidly based on fact. And, implementation of the recommendations is long overdue.

Party Houses and Noise

In 2016, the Town adopted an objective-based noise ordinance that banned the use of outdoor loudspeaker systems partly in response to concern about so-called Party Houses. Do you think this ordinance has been Effective or Ineffective?

Joe Butler – EFFECTIVE - The complaint level reduction at monthly commissioner meetings has been significantly reduced from previous years. There are still isolated incidents, but we now have an enforcement tool in place that the police department can use.

John Fletcher – EFFECTIVE - In discussions with our police officers I am told that no party has refused to reduce the noise when faced with the noise ordinance consequences. I am not sure any citations had to be issued as a result of any complaints.

Peter Freer – EFFECTIVE - The Chief of Police has also stated that this ordinance has been effective.

Pat Kwiatkowski – EFFECTIVE - I would like to have a second year of good results before stating the existing ordinance and enforcement are adequate.

Ken Kyser – EFFECTIVE – To my knowledge we have not had any complaints about party houses since.

Regina Martin – NOT EFFECTIVE - Never felt there was a real problem with noise. The Town at the direction of the BOC purchased equipment to measure noise after adopting the ordinance. The last time I ask at Town Hall the equipment \$5000 worth had never been used. Good use of taxpayer monies

Mike Sullivan – EFFECTIVE - Based on the reports that Police Chief, Layne makes at the BOC meetings, the ordinance has been effective and noise complaints are at a minimum.

Do you think the Town needs to do more to address the issue of so-called Party or Mega-Houses? If so, what?

Joe Butler - Based on the implementation of the noise ordinance, and enforcement of other current town ordinance's, additional time is required to determine if additional actions are required.

John Fletcher - I do but I am not sure what we can legally do. We are using our noise ordinance, parking ordinances, fire and access requirements to better control use of homes. Our Planning and Zoning Board continues to study the actions of other Islands in hopes of learning of a workable approach to limit unruly parties.

Peter Freer - Yes, the towns does need to do more to proactively ensure that the issues of so-called Party or Mega-House issues are addressed. There has been a lot of activities in other beach communities on this subject and we should see if there are any solutions being implemented at these neighbors that can be used effectively at Holden Beach.

Pat Kwiatkowski - I need more familiarity with what the Town does in terms of permitting for events, managing parking and controlling inappropriate behavior before I can weigh in on this.

Ken Kyser – I am not sure what could be done to legally address this issue. There are not many lots on the island that you can build a Party or Mega House on except the west end and they have their own rules and architecture review board. The only thing that I can see is to pass an ordinance that prohibits combining lots so that the large homes can't be built. Again this is something that we could form a Community Advisory Committee to review to see what other ideas are out there.

Regina Martin – Both the Party and the Mega House issue or non issue really needs to die. I do not believe there is or ever was a true issue with Party Houses across the Island. As for Mega houses even in our current building boom, the largest house build this year is only 4400 sq feet. Not small but certainly not MEGA. Let just move on to more important issues. Like lower taxes.

Mike Sullivan - The Planning and Zoning Board was asked to look at this issue and report to the BOC. The report found that existing zoning laws, town ordinances and CAMA regulations, if properly applied, go a long way in making controlling the expansion and use of "Mega Houses". The P&Z Board made suggestions for augmenting the currently available laws, ordinances and regulations. No action was taken by the BOC. While the concern over "Mega Houses" has lessened in the past 18 months, It does remain an issue the Town must vigilantly monitor.

Beach Ranger Program

For the 2017 Summer Season, the Town implemented a pilot Beach Ranger Program to patrol the beach strand in vehicles during the day. Do you think that pilot program was effective? Should it be Kept the Same, Expanded or Eliminated for next year?

Joe Butler – EFFECTIVE - There have been numerous positive comments stated at monthly commissioner meetings regarding the pilot program, and I recommend we continue the program.

John Fletcher – EFFECTIVE - While the program had some positive effect, it did not eliminate all large holes in the beach nor did it eliminate all loose dogs on the beach strand. The Town tried to be VERY friendly with notifications to ordinance violators. The Board may need to consider stronger enforcement of the ordinances on beach safety.

Peter Freer – EFFECTIVE – The data from the first summer has supported that this program has been very effective. I support an evaluation as to the need to keep the Beach Ranger Program the same or expand.

Pat Kwiatkowski – EFFECTIVE - I heard nothing but positives about the program and people who were hired. I would definitely continue the program. I would like to see a final report on the 2017 program before deciding whether to keep it the same or expand (either scope or total number of rangers or both)

Ken Kyser – EFFECTIVE - I believed that they improved the beach experience for everyone. I also think that they helped reduce the issues that we had on the beach.

Regina Martin – NO OPINION – Have not seen a report on how effective this program was in its first year so I have no opinion.

Mike Sullivan – EFFECTIVE - The program seemed to be quite effective. It provided a means of enforcing the quality of life issues that are common in beach communities (unleashed dogs, dangerous holes left unattended or unfilled, littering, etc), in a visitor friendly, non confrontational manner.

Town Procedures

Please answer whether you Favor, Oppose or have No Opinion on each of the issues relating to these recently adopted Town Procedures.

1. *Recording Meetings.* Audio recording of all BOC Meetings, and making those recordings and minutes publically available on the Town website?

Joe Butler – FAVOR - This revision offers transparency to all residents to include part time residents and rental home owners. It provides an opportunity for those individuals that cannot attend a meeting to have access to hear what actually took place at the meeting.

John Fletcher – FAVOR - People should not have to attend Board Meetings to learn exactly what was said during the sessions. Audio recordings available to the public would make the meetings available to distant owners who may want to kept abreast of matters the BOC faces each month. While the HBPOA web site and Lou's Views are excellent sources of information about he meetings, actual recordings would be even more helpful

Peter Freer – FAVOR – Transparency is important because participation is vital to the success of the town.

Pat Kwiatkowski – FAVOR – The public expects and appreciates the transparency

Ken Kyser – NO OPINION – I am in favor of recordings and printed copies of all the meetings being made available to the public but am not sure if it can made available on the town web site. I would need info from an IT person to tell me if it could be done. Also is there a demand? So the real answer is I would need more data.

Regina Martin – FAVOR – Great to be able to go back and hear what someone said about a subject.

Mike Sullivan – FAVOR – The more information and public access the better.

2. *Meeting Packages.* Making the BOC Meeting Packages (except for confidential information) available on the Town website before each Meeting?

Joe Butler – FAVOR - This provides individuals attending the meeting with a heads-up on what is going to be discussed, and an opportunity to attend with any comments they may have.

John Fletcher – FAVOR - It has been the attempt of the current BOC to make the BOC business as transparent as possible. I see no reason why the public should not be able to see portions of the packages that are not legally privileged.

Peter Freer – FAVOR - Again, transparency is vital. The BOC meeting packages are also being made available to the Board of Commissioner earlier than before so that there is adequate time to review.

Pat Kwiatkowski – FAVOR - We need this for residents to be able to meaningfully participate in the meetings.

Ken Kyser – FAVOR - I am in fovor of this if it can be reasonably done.

Regina Martin – FAVOR – Great really helpful to those that really want to be involved. Opportunity to call your BOC members and discuss issues with them.

Mike Sullivan – FAVOR - Providing the information before the meeting is helpful and allows for a better understanding of what and why something may be discussed and or voted on.

3. *Community Advisory Committees*. Use of Community Advisory Committees made-up of knowledgeable home and local business owners to provide advice and recommendations to the BOC on specific issues (e.g. Sewer Vulnerability and Parking)?

Joe Butler – FAVOR - Having the opportunity to serve on one of these committees does bring additional experience and insight to help with the overall decision process. Examples are : Lift stations and parking.

John Fletcher – FAVOR - The current BOC established these Committees as a way to gain from property owners information on important issues. The Citizen Committees enable the Board to gain valuable information on significant issues before coming to a conclusion. The Sewer Vulnerability Committee did an outstanding job with their task and I anticipate the Parking Committee will do as well. I plan to ask the Board to utilize Citizen Committees as often as in practical especially when Owner views are important to the issue under review.

Peter Freer – FAVOR – Community input is important and for me is always welcome.

Pat Kwiatkowski – FAVOR – CACs bring local experience , understanding and perspective to decisions. Even if CAC recommendations don't fully meet expectations, the data the committee gathers and organizes will be ready for evaluation by a larger group if needed.

Ken Kyser – FAVOR – It is almost always better to have a diverse group review issues and make recommendations to the board. The best ideas come from honest open group discussions where any and all ideas and options are discussed and the best of these are recommended to the board.

Regina Martin – FAVOR – Great concept, need to learn how to use it better.

Mike Sullivan – FAVOR - There use is an economical and efficient way to tap into the resources the community members can provide. However, the committees are only efficient and economical if there recommendations are put to use.

4. *Town Employees and Officials on Boards.* Preventing Town Employees, Commissioners and other Officials (including spouses) from serving as members or officers of Boards (e.g. Planning & Zoning and Board of Adjustments).

Joe Butler – FAVOR - I am concerned about any potential conflict of interest. The other concern is that other members may not feel comfortable in expressing their opinion with these individuals serving as members.

John Fletcher – FAVOR - The BOC needs to gain its information from its established supporting Boards (Planning and Zoning, Parks and Recreation and Board of Adjustment) which need to be comprised of people independent of the Town staff or the Board. These Boards are expected to make maximum use of the knowledge possessed by the Town staff but they need to know they are working to support the BOC. Town staff has sufficient work to do and should allow the advisory Boards established by the BOC to complete their tasks without pressure from Town staff.

Peter Freer – [no response] - Although not on the boards, town employees are usually advisors to boards and therefore are important to the process. Also, I am often in the public audience of boards to understand the interaction and nuances and often participate like everyone in the room.

Pat Kwiatkowski – OPPOSE – Just because a resident is a commissioner shouldn't preclude participation in boards. I believe as long as a board is large enough that it cannot be controlled by the number of commissioners or other officials (or spouses) who want to join, the boards should be open to include them. I.e. Control the number rather than forbid.

Ken Kyser – [no response] To serve on a board or committee you should live or own property on the island (town employees can serve since they have knowledge that the committee needs to operate). Commissioners should not serve on committees or other town boards since the other boards or committees may perceive pressure from the board. I don't have a problem with spouses since only recommendations are made.

Regina Martin – OPPOSE – In a community as small as ours I believe we should allow spouses of BOC members to serve on Boards. I do not think a Commissioner should serve on any advisory committee or Board either as a member or officer.

Mike Sullivan – OPPOSE - While I agree with BOC members, and town employees being barred from serving on Town Boards, I oppose barring spouses and family members. I would rather rely on the Board member's ethical and moral compass telling the member when it is time to recuse themselves from a particular issue.

5. *Audit Committee*. Retaining the Audit Committee of the BOC (re-established in 2016; comprised of one Commissioner and two citizen members).

Joe Butler – FAVOR - I recommend we continue the audit committee. Checks , balances and possible recommendations

John Fletcher – FAVOR - The Audit Committee is comprised of one Commissioner and 4 citizen members (Ron Skubic, Ben Burnside, Mark Fleischhauer and Pat Kwitkowski). The Audit Committee meets quarterly with the Town Manager to review carefully the quarterly financial reports and annually to confer with the External Audit Partner on the annual report prepared for the Town. The Board of Commissioners is charged with ensuring that the Town's financed are being managed soundly and legally. The members of the Audit Committee are experienced executives that understand their responsibilities to the BOC and to the Town.

Peter Freer – FAVOR - An Audit Committee is a best practice and are common.

Pat Kwiatkowski – FAVOR

Ken Kyser – NO OPINION – The towns books are audited by a private firm that sends an audit report to the state treasure. The state reviews the report to make sure that we are reporting everything correctly and that the auditor did the audit correctly. This is done yearly. I am not sure why we need another group when we are already being watched over. But if it makes people happy I am okay with it.

Regina Martin – OPPOSE – Really do not think this is a needed committee as we have a CPA firm do an annual audit per State law.

Mike Sullivan – FAVOR - Financial audits and oversight are an essential component of an open and transparent use of the peoples money.

6. *Budget Process*. Does the Town have an adequate process for reviewing budget performance for the current year and/or developing the budget for the next year?

Joe Butler – ADEQUATE - From what I have observed during monthly commissioners meetings to include their open dialogue there appears to be an adequate process in place.

John Fletcher – ADEQUATE - The Budget process has been improved over the past two years and the BOC will continue to improve the process and make it transparent to the Town's tax payers. The BOC is pushing the Town manager to develop the annual budget earlier in the cycle so as to give sufficient time for the Board to study and understand the proposed spending plans.

Peter Freer – ADEQUATE - Reviewing budget performance always should be a work in progress and can definetly improve.

Pat Kwiatkowski – ADEQUATE - As long as we stick to the process, it should work. Of course there is always room for improvement in budget transparency, which should be a continuous goal.

Ken Kyser – ADEQUATE - I believe that all the meetings that we have and the planning that goes into it are adequate.

Regina Martin – ADEQUATE

Mike Sullivan – ADEQUATE - I believe they do. There are a number of open meetings where all aspects of the budget are made public and discussed. More community participation would be beneficial, however, that is on the citizenry rather than the administration.

7. *Review of Town Manager Performance.* Does the Town have an adequate process for reviewing the performance of the Town Manager and the Departments he or she supervises?

Joe Butler – INADEQUATE - Based on comments discussed during monthly meetings I have attended, there appears to be a definite need for a revised process to identify goal alignment, priorities and accountability for town management.

John Fletcher – ADEQUATE - While the Town Manager is now under formal contract and an initial evaluation process was used this past year, I anticipate the BOC will continue to refine the evaluation process and hold the Town Manager to the requirements of the job. It is not the job of the BOC to evaluate the individual staff members as that is the job of the Town Manager.

Peter Freer – ADEQUATE - The process to review the Town Manager was recently updated.

Pat Kwiatkowski – NO OPINION – I need to become more informed on how the Town Manager and other town employees are held accountable and evaluated for performance before forming an opinion. Coming from industry I do believe in formal reviews at mid-year as well as end of year.

Ken Kyser – ADEQUATE – If complaints come in about the town staff then the town manager should be advised. If he fails to correct the issue then the towns manager performance can be reviewed and action can be taken. The town manager works for the board, the town employees work for the town manager

Regina Martin – ADEQUATE – The BOC has to review the performance of the Town Manager. However the Town Manager is responsible for supervising the town Staff.

Mike Sullivan – NO OPINION - Only a current or past BOC member can answer this question. I, as a resident, have never seen any method of evaluation for the Town Manager. Although the appraisal and evaluation itself is cloaked in secrecy, by statute, I think the form and process should be available for review. Then I could, at least, form an opinion on the process if not the evaluation.