

MINUTES
OAK ISLAND TOWN COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARINGS & REGULAR MEETING
June 14, 2016 – 6 P.M.
OAK ISLAND TOWN HALL

Present: Mayor Cin Brochure, Mayor Pro Tempore Jim Medlin, Councilors Sheila M. Bell, Charlie K. Blalock, Loman Scott and Jeff Winecoff, Interim co-Manager Lisa P. Stites, CMC, Town Attorney Brian Edes and Administrative Support Specialist Debbie Lasek.

Mayor Brochure called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin gave the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

COUNCIL REPORTS (MAYOR AND COUNCIL)

Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin attended the groundbreaking for Pine Forest Plantation and said he feels it will be a good thing for Oak Island. Councilor Winecoff reported on the first graduating class of the Citizens Academy, and congratulated participants and staff. Mayor Brochure said she had been advocating in Raleigh twice last month advocating for sand, and hopefully next year the Town will have money for funding.

PUBLIC HEARING 1: Mayor Brochure said the purpose of the Public Hearing is to receive citizens' comments on beach nourishment and potential funding methods.

Ruth Somers, 1608 E. Yacht Drive: Ms. Somers said she has lived here since 1973. Regarding beach plan funding, she said she knows the ocean is dynamic and that storms come and go, sometimes along with houses. People who build on the oceanfront accept that risk and others build away from the ocean. With the growth of Oak Island has come the necessity of the water system and sewer system, the addition of fire and rescue and the building of state-of-the-art buildings. Recent attempts to replace the sand can run up to \$67 million. This is a working class beach, and many don't have the money to stay here. There have been many suggestions as to where this money can come from like the federal government and day trippers, but residents are taxed from everywhere. She said the state owns the beachfront and the Town does not, and a vote should be put before the people.

Richard Bunce, 125 NE 26th Street, written comments as provided: As usual Town officials and their surrogates discussing beach nourishment quickly roll out the scare tactics with dramatic pictures and wild predictions. For instance the costs experienced up the coast were mostly legal costs reflecting a failure of Federal, State, and Local governments to create effective Statutes and Ordinances for removal of dangerous structures and not due to a lack of nourishment. Thankfully there is another way forward. Managed retreat is being implemented in communities that recognize the folly of paying ever increasing dollars to place sand on the beach that is very likely to become less and less effective particularly in the face of significant sea level rise. It is surprising that in the several presentations and online materials about the Town's beach nourishment planning, sea level rise was not mentioned. I asked Mr. Ravella about his assumptions after his presentation a couple weeks ago and he admitted that in the cost estimates presented the assumption for sea level rise was zero but would be in a future estimate. It seems the point was to include enough to get the permits and not necessarily the true cost. This sounds a lot like the recent wastewater project and we know how that turned out. I know there are many environmentalists in Town regularly speaking on such issues would be disappointed to hear that as should all property owners who would be on the hook to pay even greater costs for a beach nourishment project that a Corp of Engineers report from the early 2000s stated would be ineffective in the presence of significant sea level rise. Think sea wall around the entire island without the tax base of a New Orleans to pay for it.

On the specifics of the potential funding mechanism for the project, the cost versus benefits for property owners is very unbalanced. Take the case of an undeveloped and unbuildable oceanfront parcel assessed at as little as \$20K. They would I suspect pay the additional \$32/yr. for decades for a shot at having a buildable parcel valued worth hundreds of thousands in the end. Their beachfront neighbors with \$1M assessed value on their developed and rebuildable parcel with little to lose or gain in the same period would be paying \$1,600/yr. A \$1M parcel over on the waterway would pay \$800/yr. for beach nourishment while watching the unmet threat of sea level rise in the waterway. That hardly seems well thought out or equitable.

Helen Cashwell, 3407 E. Yacht Drive: Ms. Cashwell said that again there is the drumbeat of doom and gloom; Council has spent almost half a million dollars trying to justify the inevitable. If any Council members had read the land use plan, they would know that the public wants the beaches taken care of. The Town has allowed cut-throughs on dunes and failed to maintain the sand fences, and has failed miserably at enforcement of ordinances that protect the dunes. If the Town believes in this project, raise the taxes; taxes would at least be tax deductible. She asked Council to please make a decision tonight or forget it and move on.

Jay Railey, 1304 W. Yacht Drive: Mr. Railey sent an open letter of support for the development line, and has attended a workshop and corresponded with Peter Ravella. The development line and beach nourishment are intertwined. Should the development line be approved, additional development will generate additional property taxes, accommodations taxes, sewer connection fees, etc. He suggested reallocating accommodation taxes so that a larger portion goes to beach renourishment. He owns two such properties and would gladly pay more taxes to accelerate this development. He is an engineer, and says the original study of 14 years ago was based upon engineering. He advocates using a construction management approach for quality control to avoid problems that they encountered with the sewer project.

Carol Painter, 306 Ocean Drive: Ms. Painter said the Town is at a crossroads; years ago, Long Beach decided not to build a sewer system when grants were plentiful, and they all know the results. Also, in the 80s, the Town declined a federal beach plan. Now, federal funds for new projects have dried up; let's don't be a day late and millions of dollars short again. The beach is our number one asset and our economic engine; folks need to realize that if the beach is destroyed, it will be a financial nightmare for those remaining. The number one duty of the Council is to protect the health, safety and welfare of its citizens. Beach nourishment works, and she used the East Beach area in the 70s as an example and spoke of receiving free sand. Virtually all North Carolina beach towns have a project in existence or in planning, and most use property tax dollars for matching funding. Dunes are scarped on sections of our beach, and the Town needs a significant and sustained source of funding for beach nourishment and will need to match potential funding from the County and the State.

Peter McGrath, 157 NW 1st Street: Mr. McGrath said he opposes beach nourishment. The tax burdens and expenses of the sewer system placed a burden of hardship on this town, and beach nourishment will do the same. This is a blue collar community, not Cape Cod or the Hamptons. He asked Council not to "drink the Kool-Aid" on the beach replenishment program.

Robert Butt, 7003 E. Beach Drive: Mr. Butt said he would like to thank previous Council for having the foresight in retaining Moffatt & Nichol and PARC. He moved to the beach because they love it, but in the 14 years of ownership they have seen dramatic changes to the beach. Doing nothing to the beach is not free. He said he is asking Council for three things: raise his taxes, have day trippers contribute to maintaining the beach, and go back to Brunswick County and the State as they all benefit from the beach. Preserving the beach is required.

Kelley Germaine, 6610 Kings Lynn Drive: Ms. Germaine reminded everyone of the public input survey results of the CPAC committee; the majority of those almost 2,000 surveys came from full-time residents, who reported that the top asset of the island was the beach. Funding for beach renourishment was also a key factor. Putting a plan together will cost money, but it is well-spent to protect our most important economic asset of the beach. All parts of the island will be impacted if we lose our beach, and she asked Council to proceed ahead with no delay.

Dara Royal, 216 NE 47th Street, written comments as provided: I encourage Council to move forward with the next phase in designing and permitting a beach nourishment project along the shoreline with a static vegetation line, or with a development line as the case may be in the future. Council can do that by approving the old business item on tonight's agenda for a shoreline monitoring program and by adding an agenda item to direct Moffitt & Nichol to provide Council with a proposal to do the work necessary to obtain permits for sand to place on the beach. Fund balances and in-coming revenues in accommodations tax fund accounts are and will be available in amounts sufficient to cover 100% of the costs of these two items going forward. I am adamantly opposed to using an across the board ad valorem tax levy to pay for construction of any future beach nourishment project that may be permitted as a result of that process. I wholeheartedly support using Special Assessment Benefit Districts to generate a portion of the local cost share for construction of future beach nourishment projects. And the Town has the authority to levy assessments for that purpose prior to the construction of a project per SL 2007-161. Here's an example of how it might work to raise \$1 million: There are 44,000 linear feet of shoreline with a static vegetation line. 44,000 times \$24 per linear foot is \$1,056,000. About 90% or 39,600 linear feet of adjoining property is in private ownership.

1st District Oceanfront pays	\$15 per linear foot	times 39,600	= \$594,000
2nd District Second Row pays	\$ 9 per linear foot	times 39,600	= \$356,000
	\$24 per linear foot	times 39,600	= \$950,400

About 10% or 4,400 linear feet of adjoining property is publically owned – mostly street-end public accesses. 4,400 times \$24 is \$105,600. The remaining property in the Town (island and mainland) not included in the first two districts comprises 80% of the tax base. Considering the amount to be raised (\$105,600), an ad valorem Municipal Service District would be the most efficient collection mechanism. 3rd District the rest of Town pays .0056055 ad valorem tax levy = \$105,600...which is a little more than ½ cent on the tax rate. The Corps' cost-benefit analysis model for Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Projects uses Oceanfront and Second Row properties because those are the properties that benefit the most economically from beach nourishment protection. The Corps' cost-benefit analysis model also recognizes residual recreational benefits, but caps the amount of recreational benefits that can be used to justify a project. Accommodations taxes can be used to pay a portion of the local cost share representing those recreational benefits. Round up to a full penny on the tax rate for the 3rd District the rest of the Town pays to supplement those funds. It is a fair and equitable distribution of the costs for the benefits.

Let's total the revenues generated thus far with just 2% Accommodations tax revenues:

1st District Oceanfront	\$15 per linear foot	times 39,600	= \$594,000	39%
2nd District Second Row	\$9 per linear foot	times 39,600	= \$356,000	24%
3rd District the rest of Town	.01 ad valorem tax levy		= \$188,386	12%
2% Accommodations Tax	annual revenue		= \$375,000	25%
Total			\$1,513,786	100%

If you need more dollars, multiply by that factor in each category to raise the target amount. But what about the beach area not impacted by a static vegetation line on the west end of the island? 4th District Eastern Channel Project. Thank you for your consideration.

Lynn McDowell, 6407 Tortoiseshell Court: Ms. McDowell said she agrees that the beach is our primary asset and that although she cannot say how to do it, renourishment must be considered. She feels the day trippers must contribute and the accommodations tax could be increased. Property tax, if needed, should

be even with the entire town, as the whole town benefits from the beach. She is encouraged that discussions continue with the State, as the beach is a State property and thus the State has some responsibility in paying for their own property. Also, an engineered beach would be covered by FEMA; everyone should consider that FEMA is seriously underfunded and may not be there when we need them.

Henson Frost, 105 SW 3rd Street: Ms. Frost said she was there to express her deep sadness as to how the Council is conducting themselves, and how they have apparently forgotten who they represent. She said they have forgotten the thousands of residents who live here and have no desire to be a mini Myrtle Beach. The landscape of the beach has changed, and soon regular citizens will be forced to move due to higher and higher taxes. She said this is a tourist and business town, and the citizens contribute nothing to the growth of this town, per one Councilman, and it is time for them to pay their fair share. To some, Oak Island is peace and tranquility, and is why so many moved here. Whether you agree with beach nourishment or not, she hopes everyone agrees that this scheme has been concocted and shoved down their throats to make the citizens pay for something that will only benefit the wealthy rental owners and realtors. She said this Councilman bullies other members to vote with him and has said that citizens would not have a vote on this matter. She suggested taking the project off full boil and putting it on simmer, and she has heard enough from the Beach Committee.

Kelly Caudill, NE 3rd Street: Ms. Caudill said she hopes that there will be a slow-down but she asks that the beach be protected. Per the “ice cream seller,” the beach is much better at Caswell. She would like to slow down and have a concerned citizens committee formed. She made notes of a simple plan in Switzerland; they buy a sticker once a year for their vehicle. Everyone would have to buy a sticker to drive through town, and she would like to ask for a committee to be formed to generate a plan to make money, instead of it always being the people who live here. Having people allowed to generate plans to get money would be beneficial, as opposed to assessments which would have to occur every year. She said she does not disagree with renourishment, but believes the Town needs to think of generating plans to bring money in that would be beneficial.

Betty Hupp, 7916 E Yacht Drive: Ms. Hupp said that Moffitt Builders has built two houses ocean side, three stories high, with pools in the dunes. The hull of a pool must be impervious; most of those lots are covered with hard surfaces with parking underneath. She said most beach front properties are business, and are rentals and that most people who live here reap nothing from beach renourishment. The beach will always be there, but maybe not those houses. She said that none of the islanders should pay for sand that will wash away; however, if they choose to do so, the oceanfront first row business should be taxed much higher than the woods.

Steve Foster, 6634 Kings Lynn, which he said is not a beach front home: Mr. Foster said that retreat was not possible; who would buy the houses? Assessments were a disaster last time and they are not tax deductible. With tax increases, a \$200,000 house with an 8% tax increase would be about \$161 a year. A 5% increase would be about \$100 per year. However, the consequences of doing nothing will be dire. Houses that sit in the surf can linger for years, and litigation to remove them is extremely costly. Debris would also be in the surf. Prices of houses town-wide would be affected. Tourism and accommodations taxes would decrease. Town infrastructure would be gone and replacing that, along with debris removal, would result in enormous debt for the Town. He said disaster by way of erosion is a constant factor. Mr. Foster said the Town Council is responsible for the public welfare and safety; anything less is irresponsible.

Denise Ribble, 407 E. Oak Island Drive: Ms. Ribble said she thinks the Council has been forthwith in looking on how to potentially fund renourishment and for these additional sources to be investigated and pursued is an obligation of the Council. She said seeking out permits should be looked into, prior to

voting on beach renourishment, and that the Council should slow things down. An across-the-board tax for the citizens is really irresponsible considering the tax base, and the argument is that first row businesses benefit the most. She recommended postponing voting on this matter tonight, as the Council will not have time to respond to the many suggestions that have been made as they will not have time to respond fully. She moved here in 2006, and has seen her taxes go up exponentially and cannot afford continued increases. The assessment is injudicious, and expects them to put into place a system for potential cost over-runs and change orders which would create additional burdens for all of them.

Marge Bell, NE 3rd Street: Ms. Bell said she does not have tons of data, but speaks from a heart-to-heart perspective. This island has people that cannot absorb any more increases in their taxes. She said renourishment, on the heels of the sewer debacle, is outrageous. She said she does not know what “you all” have done, but times are changing. Just because they have never charged for day trippers or parking, change is not just something that you carry in your pocket and they need to encourage change. She believes renourishment should happen, but she predicts the figure will be double or triple the figures that were given. They must, must, must find other ways of paying for this. She reminded the Council that they represent the citizens. There are wealthy people here, but that is a small percentage of people here. She retired here after working since age 14, and every time she turns around it is “more money.” All around us, towns are charging for parking, and she asks that they do what is right for the majority of the citizens here. The additional fees must be capped.

Vicky Sturgill, 3370 Willow Circle: Ms. Sturgill deferred her time to next speaker, Barry Golob.

Barry Golob, 6615 W. Beach Drive: Mr. Golob said he is an attorney that protects consumers by working with generic drugs for cost savings for all people. He wanted to speak on behalf of all property owners. The Council has the responsibility to protect all property owners’ rights, and refusing to pass a beach renourishment project is in direct contravention. The Council must stop its “wait and see” approach. Many people say the Town should slow down, but it has been 15 years and the beach is in a state of disaster. Many of the Town residents are under this complete misperception that those north of Oak Island Drive have no responsibility; this logic is completely wrong. The misperception is that the beachfront homeowners got themselves into this and it does not affect anyone else. Beach renourishment and the tax assessment is personal to everyone. If the beach disappears, then the houses in the wooded section will be worth a quarter of the value. Without taxes, all Town services will decrease. The Rec Center and the parks and the roads will all suffer. Taxes subsidize all of these services. The business district will all suffer; they will not be able to stay open without the summer tourism. Mr. Golob said that if the beach vanishes, the whole Town will suffer and property values will plummet no matter where you live on the island. Living here has costs associated with it; that is a fact of life. The Town cannot afford the beach project, but the only way to pay for it is with a tax. The oceanfront people would pay more than ten times the other areas. For those on a fixed income, he pointed out that the tax increase would be \$13.42 per month. Everything goes up over time, and beach nourishment is a necessary evil in this town and they all must do their part. So, if they choose not to pay the monthly cost of about \$13, costs and taxes will skyrocket much more than this small amount. He said securing the beach and taxing as appropriate is needed at this time.

Joe Stanton, 110 E. Beach Drive: Mr. Stanton said in the 100 block of East Beach, there are 21 houses and eight of them are owned by older people. This isn’t the beautiful beach it used to be. He said 40% of those 21 houses are not rented and are owned by older people like him. This new proposal would make his taxes go up over \$900. He has dropped his flood insurance, his wind and hail coverage, and his neither his Social Security nor retirement have not gone up. They cannot afford this. The proposal made by the lawyer and his firm is basically the same thing they had in 2001; stick it to the ocean front and second row people. The beach renourishment from then is gone, and the Town would be throwing away money.

The bond for the school, the sewer and the nourishment would almost 1/3 of a billion dollars. He thinks all property owners should be able to vote for this, not just real estate interest. His friend Steve Foster mentioned Surf City and Topsail Beach; that land is basically just above sea level, and thank goodness they don't own property there; no wonder they needed beach renourishment.

Bob Carpenter, 126 NE 36th Street: Mr. Carpenter said he feels there should be a middle ground between the two groups; he has been collecting facts and thoughts and talking to people. He shared data regarding the make-up of Oak Island. He said at least 37% of the permanent residents are over age 62 and on Social Security. The PARC plan showed additional funding would be required from the State or County. The Beach & Inlet committee seems to want to tell the citizens they don't know what they need to do. It seems all the risk for doing nothing is absorbed by the Town, and he would like to look at how to mitigate that risk and explore other ways to raise revenue. The Accommodations taxes should be looked at to ensure 100% of funds are being collected. Developing a plan that has a shortfall will not ensure the State or the County will assist us. It is not easy to work with State or Federal officials. He questioned as to why the general public are limited to four minutes when those that make a presentation advocating other plans have an unlimited amount of time. He thinks that there must be "buy in" from other sources, and not tax first and ask questions later.

Ted Manos, 3002 W. Beach Drive: Mr. Manos said he lives on second row and also gets social security. The people on the dais are public servants for the Town and are doing a tough job. They are trying to do their best and shouldn't be personally attacked. They earn a small stipend that barely covers their gas expenses. Additionally, there are also hundreds of people in this Town that serve on committees for nothing at all. Not doing anything is a travesty, and the Town will lose everything that is Oak Island if nothing is done. It is easy to get up and say that they don't want to do this or that; the Council was elected by all of us to make decisions. He is asking everyone on the Council to make a decision.

Councilor Winecoff made a motion to close the public hearing. Councilor Blalock seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Councilor Winecoff said he started coming to Long Beach about 30 years ago. There has been not been a tax increase in five years. Bills must be paid, and there is no way around it. He said he believes beach nourishment is needed, and he believes a tax increase is not the way to do it. A full process must be completed before making a decision. He wrote the previous Town Manager in September, and asked to have a serious discussion with County leaders about beach renourishment. The Town Manager advised to hold off; Councilor Winecoff said this was a separate issue from utilities and that it affects tourism. He said the Town should be the leader on this issue. He tried to start this process in September, and not wait until the end of the budget year. He also tried to get all of his facts and discovery; he has read that \$49.62 million in taxes from tourism come to Brunswick County, which is a tax savings of \$428 for every county resident. The top draw in Brunswick County is the beaches. The County gave \$500,000 for the West End project and he thanked them for that, but that is a drop in the bucket when compared to what comes to the County from tourism. In 2014, the County brought in \$496,000,000 in tourism. He thinks it is time for the County to put the necessary money in for beach renourishment, along with the State, in exchange for the money bought in by tourism.

Councilor Blalock commended Councilor Winecoff. He also said he tries to treat everyone with respect, no matter what he thinks about him. This is our problem; quit fighting and blaming each other, and come together to work on the problems.

Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin has listened to all of this, and he is kind of numb. He said he has heard untruths, and he does not understand why they cannot come together in peace to find a solution to their

issues. He does not appreciate having lies told about him. He has been on the Council for seven years, some good and some bad. There has not been a tax increase in all this time. The cost of living has gone up everywhere, not just here. This is an emotional issue. His family didn't move here for the golf courses or the waterway; it was to live at the beach. He realizes that many living here are on a fixed income; he is also on a fixed income, but he wants to maintain the beach and is willing to pay a higher tax in order to do so. They have explored many items that maybe not all the citizens are aware of. Paid parking was explored four years ago, and was removed two years ago as it was something no one wanted to bring up and is a relatively small source of income. He took an oath when elected to serve the people to the best of his ability. He has been accused of dishonest things tonight; he respects everyone's opinions, but they must try to come together to work together. If they don't agree that the beach is the number one resource, they must stop and take another look. He asked them to not beat Council up but to help them find a solution. He is in favor of a tax increase, and believes that they must start tonight to build a fund to handle this beach renourishment. He asked for a 5-cent increase; paid parking will also provide funds. This has been an issue since he's been on Council, and it is time for them to do something about it.

Councilor Scott said that he agrees with his fellow Councilmen, but he has not made up his mind on the tax increase yet. He loves the beach and this town; most everyone here would be hard pressed to say that they came here for a job or anything besides the beach. The beach is what steers the boat, and now is the time they must step up.

Councilor Bell said she feels they need to move forward with monitoring and getting permits, but is not in favor of a tax increase at this time. She says the Town can use the accommodations tax to get started with the monitoring and getting the permit.

Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin made a motion to increase the 2016 ad valorem tax rate by 5 cents, with that increase to be earmarked for beach renourishment. Councilor Scott seconded for the purposes of discussion.

Councilor Winecoff said that he could not go forward without a beach parking plan as part of the plan, and is afraid it will be similar to the sewer project. He said this needs to be done the right way. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin said he is advocating starting the process, and that is all this would be. Councilor Winecoff said he understands, but they paid a gentleman \$100,000 to formulate a plan for beach nourishment, and feels it would be a waste of money if it is not studied. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin said this plan includes taxes. Councilor Blalock said he is in favor of beach nourishment, but feels that they need to get more information first. He is in favor of starting the monitoring, and wants to do one step at a time. Councilor Scott asked for a date as to when a final decision could be made. Ms. Stites reminded Council that a tax rate would need to be done by the end of June for the budget. Councilor Blalock confirmed that the monitoring was a separate issue.

The motion failed with Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin in favor and Councilors Bell, Blalock, Scott and Winecoff opposed.

Council took a recess from 7:35 p.m. to 7:47 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING 2: Mayor Brochure said the purpose of the public hearing was to receive citizens' comments on the FY 2016/2017 budget.

Richard Bunce, 125 NE 26th Street, written comments as provided: I could go on at length about another \$30M plus Town budget but clearly while the voters in Town love to complain about the Town taxes and fees they are unwilling to support any reduction in Town services so they get what they deserve and still

perhaps another major project costing tens of millions of dollars at the start and several times that before it is completed based on the last major Town project. This isn't over. There is one budget item that I would like to discuss however and that is the proposed 1.5% increase in utility monthly fees as opposed to the 3% recommended in the Utility System Financial Feasibility Evaluation over the last several years. Although often described as inflation increases the most recent FFE described them as projected rate increases beyond FY 2016 for planning purposes. What they actually are is a gradual utility rate increase so that in FY2021 when the ~\$2.6M in annual assessment revenue ends there will not have to be a very large single year utility rate increase to meet annual expenses and more importantly the Revenue Bond Covenant Rate Tests. The Town has already failed these important Rate Tests once and likely twice more that some creative accounting fixed. In the most recent FFE the table ended in FY2021 with the Rate Tests once again heading for the fail range and that was at 3% increases per year each year through FY2021. It is not wrong for Town officials to decide on a lower rate increase now for a very likely higher rate increase later however it should be done with everyone including the public knowing that is the choice that is being made. I would strongly suggest that the Town have Raftellis run the Rate Test estimates out through the end of the new Wastewater Project debt service term in FY2036. I did find it interesting that there is no proposed increase in the annual Sewer Treatment Fee (STF aka SDF) but a 1.5% increase in the Wastewater Base rate which is almost entirely the customer payment of their STF obligation by month. Current legal issues be damned. One or two hopefully accounting errors are that the FY2017 proposed Water Fund Water Utility Revenue budget item is ~\$1M or 25% less than the current year estimated revenue. That is a neat trick with a 1.5% rate increase and new software that was supposed to improve the utility billing efficiency. The other is in the table for Wastewater Fund Revenue where the numbers seem unreasonable when comparing the current budget, current estimates, and proposed budget numbers. One more thing, as long as State prohibition against hardened structures on the beach remains in place there will always be a beach on this part of NC. I have lived for 18 years and dozens of first row cottages are now gone in that time. There were no government buyouts and there are no cottage carcasses on the beach.

Dara Royal, 216 NE 47th Street, written comments provided as follows: I respectfully encourage Council to adopt the revenue neutral tax rate of .29 which was calculated based on the 2015 revaluation, but was not adopted in the current year's budget for 2015-16. The current and proposed tax rate of .275 is the revenue neutral tax rate that was adopted for the budget in 2011-2012 which was calculated based on the 2011 revaluation, and is the rate that has been adopted in all subsequent budgets. In comparing year to year – apples to apples – changes in the budget, the single most significant clearly identifiable increase in General Fund expenditures in the proposed budget over recent annual budgets is the increase in the General Fund debt service payment. The amount of increase for this year is \$395,415 – which is necessary since all General Fund installment loan debt, except the pier, was refinanced in January to enable repayment in full over the next 5 years rather than the next 6 to 9 years. The debt service payment will then remain stable over the remaining term of the refinancing. Adopting the revenue neutral tax rate of .29 would be a tax rate increase of 1.5 cents, which would yield an additional \$353,225. After diligent review and with amendments to the proposed budget reflecting careful consideration of the Town's genuine needs going forward, Council is still faced with a shortfall in revenues of \$191,000 which must be withdrawn from unassigned fund balance in the General Fund in order to balance the proposed budget. By adopting the revenue neutral tax rate of .29 from the 2015 revaluation, Council could adopt the amended proposed budget without further changes tonight and show a transfer to unassigned fund balance in the General Fund – a deposit of \$161,325 to our emergency 'savings account' rather than a withdrawal of \$191,000. Only time will tell if the revenues and expenditures in the 2016-17 budget will materialize as projected. But a savings deposit with paying down debt early is a better point of departure for the annual budget journey. Thank you for your consideration.

Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin made a motion to close the public hearing. Councilor Scott seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING 3: Mayor Brochure said the purpose of the Public Hearing was to receive citizens' comments on a proposed amendment to Sec. 14-121. – Definitions and Sec. 14-125. - Use and development coverage; to define the Town oceanfront development line and to adopt regulations that all oceanfront parcels shall not build principal structures seaward of the Oak Island, and Coastal Resource Commission adopted, development line.

Dara Royal, 216 NE 46th Street, written comments provided as follows: Last month, I encouraged Council to approach the location of a development line with respect to the building envelope created. The real short-term benefit of replacing the static vegetation line with a development line is the creation a few buildable lots in areas where a development line is at least 60 feet landward of the first line of stable natural vegetation. The long-term benefit will not be realized for those or any oceanfront lots without future beach nourishment. In the Town of Oak Island, in order for an oceanfront vacant lot to be considered buildable for the purposes of levying a sewer assessment, there must be a building envelope at least 20 feet deep plus a 15 foot street-side setback along with the required oceanfront setback from the static vegetation line. A building envelope 20 feet deep plus a street-side setback of 15 feet equals 35 feet. So, a 35 foot development line would make every oceanfront lot buildable, if it is also setback at least 60 feet from the first line of stable natural vegetation. But, of course, you would want a building envelope deeper than 20 feet, if at all possible. Ok, let's double it to 40 feet deep, which is more than the average depth of existing oceanfront houses. A building envelope 40 feet deep plus a street-side setback of 15 feet equals 55 feet. So, a 55 foot development line would make every oceanfront lot buildable to a greater extent than existing oceanfront development, if that line is also setback at least 60 feet from the first line of stable natural vegetation. But what if it's more than 60 feet to the first line of stable natural vegetation from a 55 foot development line? Be grateful. 20 years ago, 90% of oceanfront lots bordering our shoreline were not buildable with a minimum building envelope 20 feet deep and a street-side setback of 30 feet. 20 plus 30 equals 50 feet. Many people have worked diligently since then to position the Town to reverse that fact and make those lots buildable again. I am one of those people. And given my first-hand knowledge and experience, there is nothing in me that could ever approve a development line greater than 55 feet or the distance to the static vegetation line, whichever is farther from the street. And given that it will take 2 to 4 years to obtain permits for sand for beach nourishment, I would not in good conscience be able to approve a development line greater than 35 feet or the distance to the static vegetation line, whichever is farther from the street. I realize you're not me, and it's not my decision to make, it's yours. But I do sincerely and respectfully request that you significantly scale back the proposal on the table for an 85 foot development line.

Kyle Herring, Cape Fear Engineering, 151 Poole Rd., Fayetteville: Mr. Herring said he is here tonight on behalf of the Capel Family, and is here to offer support from them for the new development line. He said he feels the Council has enough information to make the decision and should feel comfortable in making a decision, and the Capel family will provide any support.

Ted Manos, 3022 W. Beach Drive: Mr. Manos said scaling back the development line from 85 feet would wipe out the ability of an untold number of buildings to be able to rebuild and increase the value of their homes, with resulting increases in taxes and income. After spending all night listening to ways the Town needs to make money, he implores them to not waste the time put in by Town staff and the Planning Board in meetings to set the development line at 85 feet, consistent with the 60 foot setback and consistent with what the CRC would pass.

Councilor Bell asked where the 85-foot setback comes from; Mr. Edwards said that Town Planner Jake Vares started out at 70 feet for comparison. The Oak Island oceanfront is not lined up in a consistent manner. When they got to the 85-foot line, it had the least number of nonconforming homes (about 85 properties). Staff proposed keeping the static vegetation line in areas where that is more beneficial. In other areas, moving the development line more seaward worked as a fair and practical way to give property owners their rights back. He stands by the original staff recommendation. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin inquired about the 85 non-conforming structures; Mr. Edwards said they are already non-conforming. Councilor Winecoff said thinks staff has done their homework, and he feels comfortable with the proposal.

Councilor Scott made a motion to close the public hearing. Councilor Blalock seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING 3 ACTION: Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin made a motion to approve this amendment, section 14-121 and 14-125, as presented and to direct staff to forward the Town's request to the Coastal Resource Commission for consideration at its next meeting. Councilor Scott seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING 4: Mayor Brochure the purpose of the Public Hearing was to receive citizens' comments on a proposed amendment to Sec. 18-669. - Standards for limited residential development; and Sec. 18-663. - Applications for approval; and Sec. 18-670 - Standards for stormwater control measures to require impervious surface areas to be shown on site-plan surveys; and to require professional stormwater engineered design drawings when a new home or an existing home addition would exceed 45% impervious surface coverage. The public hearing for the text amendment is also for. 32-72 – Definitions - and Sec. 32-77 - No clearing without permit – to define clear cutting and to not allow clear cutting without a permit; and to mandate a fine for clear cuttings and the replacement of trees if illegally removed.

There were no public speakers. Mr. Vares summarized the proposed amendment.

Councilor Winecoff commented on sea oaks (live oaks) and the necessity to keep them regardless of the size, and emphasized the need to keep these natural trees on the island. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin asked and Councilor Winecoff answered that not all of them get very thick, even chest high. He feels that they are eliminating the sea oaks before they have the chance to grow bigger, and they are a natural tree that should be allowed to get bigger. Mr. Vares said they could add some language about the live oaks, and added that the certified trees list is referenced in the ordinance, has been adopted and is on line. Councilor Blalock commented that \$500 is the highest penalty that the State would allow them, but Mr. Vares said perhaps it could be made "per tree" and that he could investigate the legalities. Councilor Blalock questioned the practice of leaving only trees at the edge of the lot, and he wondered if palm trees would count as a replacement. Mr. Vares explained the mathematic formula used to determine the number of trees that must be saved, and they are obliged to permit it if they are within the law and are in compliance. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin said that if there are no trees on the lot 5" in caliper, then they could in effect remove all the trees on the lot. Mr. Vares said the Tree Protection ordinance would provide protection in those circumstances, and that the arborist is working on it. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin suggested that perhaps they should wait for further information to take action. He then questioned Mr. Vares about lots recently cleared on Ocean Drive, around 76th or 77th street; there were no trees on those lots, only bushes that had been sculpted by the wind over years. He wondered if those bushes were considered as trees. Mr. Vares said it would depend on the size and the species. Councilor Bell clarified that, unless there were trees, they could bush hog it. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin would like to see a required number of trees be put back on a lot. Mr. Vares said he would add this to the ordinance.

Mr. Edes suggested adding “Live Oaks or any other species” and recommended more specificity in regards to size for enforcement. Councilor Winecoff wanted to address trees that were more established, not necessarily seedlings. He wants to try to get something temporary in place to stop these clear cutting before the new ordinance. Mr. Edes recommended that the staff come up with as much detail as possible as to what would need to happen on a lot. Councilor Scott noted that, on page 20, regarding tree removal, they need to specify that replacements would be living trees. Mr. Vares said that specificity is a good thing, and noted that the draft will be on the website.

Randy Ollice, Paula Circle. He asked if they had considered using the percentage of the area of the lot rather than a number of trees. If there is a giant live oak, one would rather keep it instead of 4-5 small trees, and that this would also handle the issues of palm trees. Mr. Vares said this has been discussed with the arborist under the “canopy” requirements section, and emphasized that there must be a balance between private property and protecting the natural assets of the Town. He wants to avoid a situation that would result in a regulatory taking occurring, and is looking forward to what the tree ordinance says to ensure that this does not happen.

Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin made a motion to close the public hearing. Councilor Scott seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING 4 ACTION: No action taken.

PUBLIC HEARING 5: Mayor Brochure said the purpose of the Public Hearing was to receive Citizens’ comments on a proposed amendment to Sec. 18-117. - Area and height table; residential districts. – Footnote (f) and Sec. 18-118. - Area and height table; nonresidential districts. – Footnote (f) to allow corner lots on the island off dead-end streets that are contiguous to major water bodies to have an eight-foot corner side yard setback.

Dara Royal, 216 NE 46th Street: Ms. Royal said that after talking with staff, she is worried that the way the change in language is worded results in the possible interpretation of the street determining rather than the lot. There are more streets that dead end into water bodies. Most of the SE and SW streets on the West End dead end into Davis Canals; that would make the corner lots on Oak Island Drive have an 8-foot setback. This would ultimately be ill-advised. She is not sure if this not accomplishing what it was intended to do.

Councilor Bell asked Mr. Vares about the setbacks on corner lots; he explained that this provides a bit more flexibility for owners of corner lots. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin clarified they are going from ten to eight for those on the waterway. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin suggested changing it to strictly water lots; Mr. Vares suggested a change that would accomplish this, by adding some additional language. There was further discussion on this topic.

Councilor Bell made a motion to close the public hearing. Councilor Scott seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING 5 ACTION: **Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin made a motion to approve the amendment section 18-117 section 18-118, along with the changes that were recommended by the Town Attorney. Councilor Blalock seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

PUBLIC HEARING 6: Mayor Brochure said the purpose of the Public Hearing was to receive citizens' comments a proposed amendment to Sec. 18-82 (h) – Fences – to adjust the fence height regulations for adjacent lots that are perpendicular to one another. There were no speakers.

Mr. Vares gave a staff summary. The property owner requesting the amendment is present if the Council has any questions.

Councilor Winecoff made a motion to close the public hearing. Councilor Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING 6 ACTION: Councilor Winecoff made a motion to approve the amendment to Sec. 18-82 (h) as presented. Councilor Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

PRESENTATIONS, PROCLAMATIONS AND RECOGNITIONS

1. Oak Island song – Mike Haas (Mr. Haas left the meeting and this will be rescheduled.)
2. Recognition of Oak Island Employees – Mayor Cin Brochure recognized Greg Jordan and Patrick Higgins, Chris Anselmo, the Parks & Recreation department and director Rebecca Squires, and Steve Edwards and his staff. She thanked all staff for what they do.

ADJUSTMENT/APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Ms. Stites added a #4 to the Consent Agenda regarding the Greenman contract, and New Business #3 to discuss presentation of paid parking. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin would like to add Old Business #2 regarding assistant fire chief and driving town vehicles. Mayor Brochure added a closed session. **Councilor Blalock made a motion to approve the Agenda as amended. Councilor Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS - GENERAL TOPICS & AGENDA ITEMS

John Faulk, 164 NW 2nd Street: Mr. Falk presented ideas regarding the golf course and upcoming events. He also said he would like to thank the Parks and Recreation staff for all of their hard work.

Gail Baker, 110 NE 16th Street: Ms. Baker said they bought their cottage in December 2013, and she moved here permanently in 2015. She has noticed her neighbor's yard is full of junk and has called the Town and left messages with no return call. She is concerned that this situation will attract snakes and rats to her yard. She asked the Town to enforce their ordinances and she provided pictures. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin asked that Mr. Edwards with Development Services follow up.

Roseanne Fortner, 113 Paula Circle, for the Beach Preservation Society: Ms. Fortner invited everyone to attend several events sponsored by the BPS.

Malcolm Morrison, 119 SW 21st Street: Mr. Morrison requested that members of the Council and the public ask our representatives for their support for a DOT survey to gain information about day trippers. This is necessary to assist in getting good data to assist with funding and maintaining our beach. Mayor Brochure added that the Town is working on this; Councilor Blalock added that DOT would be having a presentation on June 22nd.

REGULAR MEETING:

I. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes
 - a. April 12, 2016 (Public Hearings & Regular Meeting)
 - b. May 10, 2016 (Public Hearings & Regular Meeting)
 - c. May 17, 2016 (Special Meeting – Budget Workshop)
 - d. May 25, 2016 (Special Meeting – Budget Workshop)
2. Approval of Budget Ordinance Amendments
 - a. Transfer funds from Accommodations Tax Fund to the Beach Tax Fund to more accurately reflect the activity in these funds
 - b. Transfer funds from Accommodations Tax to General Fund for the purpose of supplementing the pier debt note payment from the General Fund
3. Approval of Resolution of Appreciation for Donation from ADM
4. Approval of Grounds and Rights-of-Way Maintenance Contracts (Greenman)

Councilor Scott made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

II. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

1. Emergency Services Advisory Board: Council unanimously appointed Charles White to a term ending June 2019.
2. Environmental Advisory Board: Council unanimously re-appointed Bob Salemme to a term ending June 2019

III. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

1. Town Manager—Mr. Stites thanked the Beautification club for the donated plants in the Council room. She also echoed Councilor Winecoff's comments on the Citizens Academy. Also, Brunswick County has approved a debris removal contract which will be in place in case of a hurricane for FEMA reimbursement. She also formally introduced the Town's new police chief, Greg Jordan.
 - a. Department Reports are attached and are hereby made a part of these Minutes.
2. Town Attorney-none.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

1. Consideration of Proposal from Moffatt & Nichol to Provide Beach Monitoring Services: **Councilor Bell made a motion to approve the Proposed Beach Monitoring Contract from Moffatt & Nichol to provide Beach Monitoring Services. Mr. Edes added that the state would need to be changed from California to North Carolina in the proposed contract. With this modification, Councilor Blalock seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**
2. Assistant Fire Chief Use of Vehicle: Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin noted that the assistant chief is driving 21 miles to park his truck in Leland. This was approved by the former Town Manager. He has been told to cease and desist, but there has been no formal action taken. Councilor Bell wondered if this decision should be made by the Town Manager and not Council. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin agreed, and Ms. Stites answered that she had looked up the policy, which gives the Town manager the authority to make that decision. Per Councilor Bell, the assistant is not on call at night, lives in Wilmington, parks in Leland at the fire station, picks up his car and then drives to his house. She does not feel that is needed. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin asked Chief Anselmo to address this situation. According to Chief Anselmo, the employee has come back at night and on weekends in early morning hours; this has happened numerous times. Councilor Bell stated that in a budget meeting, the employee stated that this had happened very rarely. The point is that the vehicle is there for him in case he needs to come back quickly. Chief Anselmo said he would not feel as comfortable asking him to come back if he did not have the Town vehicle. He feels that he shares the responsibilities; the chief is more

administrative and the assistant is more involved in operations and personnel. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin said his concern is that taking away a benefit for a good employee is like a pay cut, and he does not feel that it is a justifiable reason to take it away. Councilor Blalock questioned who the benefit is for, and Councilor Bell added that this benefit is only available to this one employee. When Chief Anselmo first asked about this situation and inquired and identified where a safe place would be to park the truck, he knew there were also times when companies they purchase from are in Wilmington. He felt it was more advantageous to be able to do this, and added that this was a salaried employee that is not taking advantage of the situation; the benefit outweigh the return. Councilor Winecoff said that the Town Manager had no right to go over the Council's decision as far as the distance limit to allow it in the first place (20 miles), but that he would support the Manager's decision. Chief Anselmo said that this was discussed with a previous Town Manager, and the Manager at that time and discussed the fact that it was 21 miles. After further discussion, it was decided to leave the decision to the Town Manager.

V. NEW BUSINESS

1. Consideration of the Proposed FY 2016-17 Budget
 - a. Consideration of the proposed Budget Ordinance (including the tax rate)
 - b. Consideration of the Proposed FY 2016-17 Fee Schedule

Councilor Winecoff said, after all the discussions they have heard, he would be in favor of going revenue neutral and not borrowing from the general fund. If they go with the parking proposal, they will need extra money for signage and this would allow for the possibility of looking at the beach nourishment plan. Secondly, with the habitable room issue and the way the sewer system was designed, he would like to see the impact fee of \$880 adjusted to \$1,500. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin said he would try to go back and ask again for a beach renourishment tax and recommend to go revenue neutral at 29 cents with that extra 1.5 cents going to the beach fund. Councilor Blalock asked David Hatten, Finance Director, about the General Fund and the Accommodations Tax. Mr. Hatten suggested that, if they go 1.5 cents, the money would go in the General Fund to transfer to the Accommodations Fund or the Beach Fund, making the funds untouchable.

Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin made a motion to increase the tax rate to .29 to make it revenue neutral, and that 1.5 cents of that be designated for the beach fund.

Councilor Bell then said that \$269,000 would still have to come out of the general fund to balance the budget. Mr. Hatten explained that if they increase 1.5 cents, and wanted to designate the extra money to the beach tax fund, it would be a line item to transfer to the beach tax fund. Again, as Councilor Bell said, there will still be about \$199,000 needed to balance the budget and the tax rate would not be revenue neutral. After further discussion, Councilor Scott asked Mr. Hatten how to make it revenue neutral, and Mr. Hatten said the rate would have to be raised more to make up that \$199,000. **The motion died for lack of a second.**

Councilor Winecoff then made a motion to go to revenue neutral and take the excess money and put it into the General Capital Fund for future use. This would balance the budget without any deductions from the General Fund. Councilor Blalock seconded. The motion passed 4-1 with Councilors Bell, Blalock, Scott and Winecoff in favor and Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin opposed.

Ms. Stites confirmed this was to set the tax rate, not adopt the budget. **Councilor Winecoff made a motion to approve the budget as amended.**

Councilor Scott asked about accommodations tax, currently with 3% set aside for tourism and 2% for beach renourishment; he would like to see if they can get a consensus to change this to 4% for beach nourishment and 1% for tourism. Mayor Brochure added that there was debt service coming out of this at this time. Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin asked if they could do that, and Ms. Stites said some research may be required; it may be able to be accomplished by budget transfer per Councilor Bell. When asked by Councilor Scott how much money this difference would be, Mr. Hatten would need to do a calculation; maybe \$100,000 difference, possibly a bit more. The way he has read the state statute, he does believe that there is a clause that could perhaps some of the 3% money could be moved to the 2% category; again, this needs to be researched. Mr. Edes would not have a formal motion to “tinker” with that change, and would do a budget transfer later. He believes there is a statute that allows that money to be moved later. Mr. Edes said that Council can direct staff to analyze and later bring back a recommendation as to that transfer.

Councilor Bell seconded, and the motion passed with Councilors Bell, Blalock, Scott and Winecoff in favor and Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin opposed.

Councilor Winecoff made a motion to approve the Fee Schedule as amended. Councilor Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

2. Consideration of a Request from Brunswick County to Participate Financially in the Lockwood Folly Inlet: **Councilor Winecoff made a motion to approve spending \$12,500 toward the dredging of the Lockwood Folly Inlet as requested by the Brunswick County Commissioners. Councilor Scott seconded. After discussion, the motion passed unanimously.**

3. Discussion of paid parking proposal from Nicki Cutler: Mayor Pro Tempore Medlin noted that she has come prepared to talk about big money for beach renourishment. The bottom line is, with paid parking, it could bring \$520,000 without enforcement, and \$390,000 with her company doing enforcement. This would be a turn-key operation. For residents, we would have the same system presently in place. Residents who do not want to pay will receive a brown sticker. The static cling stickers would be replaced with decals that would not be able to be removed easily. For day visitors, a hang tag would be used, priced based upon the number of days of use. A 50-cent per transaction fee for local business distributing them would put \$50,000 back in our local economy. There would also be a limited number of season passes. Optimally, they would keep 95% of parking spaces full. They would like to hit the ground running April 1st of this coming year; getting this started is crucial, and she has not discussed anything with staff at this time. There would be minor ordinance changes, including the 72-hour parking in the right-of-way as this would be prohibited. Enforcement would also be part of her business plan; she sent out criteria and got bids back to reflect the full enforcement. She has also established insurance to cover the Town of Oak Island. Mayor Brochure questioned citations; this would go to the Town, and would not be part of her business. She would not be profiting on the resident stickers. Councilor Bell questioned the Civil Citations; Ms. Cutler would only enforce the parking. Mr. Edes said he will need to go through a list of legal issues; one of his concerns in involving a third party, and this will need to go beyond tonight’s discussions. Ms. Cutler is basing her revenue on \$700,000 in sales and is being extremely conservative. Ms. Stites asked about appeals; Ms. Cutler said it has not been discussed with department heads, and that again would be something that staff would still handle. Mayor Brochure asked Mr. Edes about the money going to the State and he explained. Ms. Cutler emphasized that getting the local businesses involved would be important, and there would be guidelines for this. She does not have interest in putting up a pay station. She would continue the practice of residents purchasing tickets at Town Hall. Councilor Scott asked about enforcement by local police; Ms. Cutler did not think that would cost less, but that it would depend on many factors. Councilor Blalock then asked Chief Jordan about the enforcement aspect; although he has not received any information on this plan, Chief Jordan expressed concerns as they

already have problems with enforcement. His department wrote 12 citations last weekend, but there were many more that could have been written. He would have to seriously study this proposal to see how his department would be able to act reliably. Councilor Winecoff said that he rode today with Ms. Stites to review parking issues; one of the things they discussed was sitting down and discussing options. This business would require a media blitz if adopted; they need to get things in the works. Mayor Brochure said has spoken with Ms. Cutler and invited her to come present her proposal; it looks like a great plan, and she thinks it is time to start a discussion and review legal aspects. Mayor Brochure added that she would rather see the business kept local, and she likes the idea of business participation.

Councilor Bell made a motion to go into closed session at 9:48 p.m. to discuss pending litigation and specific personnel pursuant to 143.318-311(a)(3) and (6). Councilor Scott seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Council returned at 10:01 p.m. Mayor Brochure noted that no action was taken in Closed Session.

Councilor Bell made a motion to adjourn at 10:02 p.m. Councilor Winecoff seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Cin Brochure, Mayor

ATTESTED: _____
Lisa P. Stites, CMC
Town Clerk

Clerk's Statement: Minutes are in compliance with the open meetings laws. The purpose of minutes per the open meetings laws is to provide a record of the actions taken by a Council or a Board and evidence that the actions were taken according to proper procedures. All actions of the Council are recorded in the official minutes. Not all portions of Town of Oak Island meetings are recorded verbatim in the official minutes, with general discussion items, reports, presentations, and public comments being paraphrased or summarized in many instances. Public comments in writing should be submitted to the clerk via hard copy, electronic mail, or other means so as to ensure an exact verbatim account. The Town of Oak Island provides full coverage of meetings on Government Channel 8 so that the Citizens and the Public may view and listen to the meetings in their entirety.