



**Town of Hilton Head Island  
WILLIAM HILTON PARKWAY GATEWAY  
CORRIDOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Wednesday, May 8, 2024, 1:00 PM  
Minutes**

**1. Call to Order**

Mayor Perry called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM. Present were: Mayor Alan Perry, Chairman; Diederik Advocaat; Edward C. Warner, Jr.; and Willie Young. Absent were: Charles P. Walczak and Henry Ford, Alternate.

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

**a. Regular Meeting Minutes of April 10, 2024**

Mr. Warner made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, at which time Mr. Advocaat asked that a sentence on Page 3 describing a discussion with the consultant concerning a 4-lane bridge in the minutes of the April 10, 2024 meeting be struck. Mayor Perry asked for a review of the recording to provide more clarification, so the Motion by Mr. Warner was amended to approve the minutes with the following condition: that the recording be reviewed and the sentence in question be clarified. The motion was seconded by Mr. Advocaat and unanimously adopted.

**b. Special Meeting Minutes of April 22, 2024**

Mr. Warner made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, at which time Mr. Advocaat questioned whether the Committee had approved Mr. Colin moving forward with a meeting with Beaufort County and SCDOT concerning the Alternatives as stated in the minutes of the April 22, 2024 meeting. Mayor Perry asked for a review of the recording to provide more clarification, so the Motion by Mr. Warner was amended to approve the minutes with the following condition: that the recording be reviewed and the question of approval be clarified. The motion was seconded by Mr. Advocaat and unanimously adopted.

**3. Unfinished Business**

**a. Update on Project Progress**

Shawn Colin, Assistant Town Manager - Community Development, noted that Mr. Nohren and his team would be going through a more in-depth evaluation, but he presented a brief review of the scope of work and progress made. In addition, he would share the

responses on the Alternatives received from SCDOT at the Committee's request, as well as SCDOT responses to bridge rehab vs. new bridge, and safety information.

He pointed out that the authorizing resolution for this Committee was to perform 4 key functions, 3 of which have been completed, with the 4th to move through the scope of work to make sure it is executed in accordance with the scope that the Committee and Town Council had adopted, and that is now in progress.

**b. Update on Committee Requests**

At the last meeting, the Committee requested that there be an evaluation of Alternatives that were developed independently by Lochmueller, as well as the proposed Alternative called the Express Bypass, and labeled Bypass 3.1.

Mr. Colin reported that in accordance with the request from the Committee, a trip was made to Columbia last Wednesday. Alternatives #1, #2, #3, and #4 that were identified in the Lochmueller presentation, both on April 10 and April 22, were shared with the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) in advance of the trip. The other Alternative not recommended by Lochmueller, but recommended for submission to SCDOT for response was the Bypass 3.1 that has been discussed for some time. After review, feedback from SCDOT regarding Alternatives was provided at the meeting. They also provided some information related to the bridge rehab vs. a reconstruction or new bridge, and did a thorough review of the Alternatives to provide technical evaluation and feedback related to feasibility or viability of the Alternatives to advance.

Mr. Advocaat questioned why all the Alternatives are being discussed with SCDOT when the Committee is still reviewing these. Mr. Colin explained he was working under the unanimous direction of the Committee to have these Alternatives vetted and to provide feedback. Mayor Perry and Mr. Advocaat disagreed on what had been agreed by the Committee to seek from the SCDOT and also the role of individual committee members who discuss matters outside the meeting, which may be construed as representing the Committee as a whole.

Mr. Colin reiterated that the direction supported by the Committee was to have the Alternatives vetted and request a response from SCDOT, but there was no direction on the method used to obtain that information, therefore a meeting was held in Columbia at which the feedback requested was obtained. He reported the general feedback was technical in nature related to project implications for costs, implication to the Environmental Assessment (EA) and timing, implications to funding, and then also, feasibility to advance through Federal Highway Administration. As a result of the discussion held on May 1, the SCDOT drafted a response letter, which was officially submitted by their Deputy Secretary of Transportation and Chief Engineer. A copy of the letter dated May 2, 2024, from the SCDOT was received after the agenda packet had been published to the public, however, a copy of that letter is attached to the Minutes and

made a part hereof, and a copy was provided to all Committee members.

Mr. Colin reviewed in detail the comments from the SCDOT letter that were specific to each Alternative. He noted that Alternatives #2, #3, and #4 are very low on feasibility or viability to be able to advance based upon the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and to get these through Federal Highways with minimizing impacts. These were the 3 Lochmueller Alternatives.

Questions concerning whether SCDOT provided a breakdown of the \$425M cost estimate and the size bridge this encompassed were addressed by Mr. Colin. He indicated the cost estimate is based upon the configuration that is included in the EA, with the project being a 6-lane bridge, with a barrier between eastbound and westbound traffic, including 2-10' shoulders, one in each direction operating as breakdown lanes, with 6' shoulders on the interior, having been reduced from 10' shoulders. It includes a 12' bike and pedestrian pathway along the bridge. He indicated those are the elements that are included, with mitigation also included that is the original mitigation that the SCDOT and County had worked on, but in his opinion may not be enough. Mr. Colin indicated he had not requested detailed breakdown of every line item in the \$425M estimate for this project, especially since no Alternative has yet been selected, and he suggested that at this point it would be beneficial to look at the comparative assessment between Alternatives to understand what the approximate cost of each might be. As the EA progressed, he noted that cost was not a factor in the initial assessment done to vet Alternatives, but instead was brought in as a secondary criteria, along with other items, as you work through the NEPA process. He noted there is still an element remaining that is required by the NEPA process, and that is a value engineering. Once an Alternative is selected, there is an advance made through Federal Highways and there is a value engineering that must be done to identify where there may be additional cost-savings for the project.

Mr. Colin identified those attending the meeting in Columbia from the Town as being: Mayor Perry, Town Manager Marc Orlando, Councilman Alex Brown, Shawn Colin, and Thomas Boxley, Chairman of the Community Development Corporation. From the County, those attending were: John Robinson, Interim Administrator, Joe Passiment, Chairman of Beaufort County Council, and Jared Fralix, PE, Assistant County Administrator-Infrastructure. Mr. Advocaat noted for the record that he considered the trip premature and suggested another trip be made after the Committee's evaluation. Mayor Perry noted Mr. Advocaat's concerns. A question concerning reducing the width of the 3 lanes was answered by Mr. Colin, who indicated that had been suggested in a previous conversation with SCDOT several years ago, and the response was concerns about the volume and speed associated with the bridge, and about freight traffic requiring a 12' foot lane width. Simply re-striping to accommodate 3-lanes on the existing bridges would not provide a breakdown lane. The SCDOT suggested that the County with Town support could submit a design exception that they could possibly support to reduce on Jenkins Island the 2 interior lanes in each direction to 11', but 12' lanes on the outer lanes should be maintained for freight traffic.

A motion was made by Mr. Advocaat that the Committee fully consider the horizontal bypass, and he would like Lochmueller to include in full detail in their evaluation. Mr. Young seconded the motion. Mayor Perry noted this could be done for discussion, but if it involves an increase in cost, then it must go back to Town Council for approval. Mr. Advocaat indicated he had been given a proxy from Mr. Walczak, who had indicated his approval. Mayor Perry noted that Mr. Walczak had given no notice of his proxy. Mayor Perry indicated while the Committee had not yet been given the Lochmueller presentation, he was unclear whether this would be beneficial at this point. Discussion followed concerning the viability of considering this prior to the Lochmueller presentation and the SCDOT response as to their findings. Mr. Colin offered to provide information to help make an educated vote, and he requested that Mr. Nohren and any member of the Lochmueller team to provide their opinion on this alternative from an engineering standpoint and state whether or not they believe it is a feasible alternative to advance. In response to Mr. Advocaat's request for an immediate vote, Mayor Perry called for a vote. The motion passed 3-2, with Mr. Advocaat, Mr. Young, and Mr. Advocaat voting by proxy on behalf of Mr. Walczak in favor. Those opposed were Mayor Perry and Mr. Warner.

Mr. Colin noted the Express Bypass 3.1 that was most recently submitted was provided to SCDOT for their input and feedback and assessment on viability for advancement. Due to the significant amount of impact to the Stoney Community, they thought this would trigger a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and would increase significantly the environmental impacts. See full SCDOT comments in Letter dated May 2, 2024, as noted before and attached to the minutes.

Mr. Colin noted that Alternatives #2, #3 and #4 were given very low feasibility to advance, and there are statements from SCDOT that they would be eliminated, as is the case with the Express Bypass that was presented. What was submitted to SCDOT was exactly the same as what was submitted to the Town for consideration, and this is the response from SCDOT. They do not believe that the Express Bypass is a viable option on many counts, including property impact, environmental impact, cost, timeframe, and would not advance this. Federal Highways would likely reject this option if submitted due to the additional TCP impact, as it would be counter to their objectives of avoiding or minimizing property impacts and mitigating, in that order. He asked for Mr. Nohren's professional engineering opinion on the feasibility of this alternative advancing.

Mr. Nohren indicated that would be a part of his presentation later on the Agenda. Although it was not included in the scope of services, Lochmueller experts, Loren and Chad, and from traffic perspective it was also considered, and Lochmueller's would be provided.

Mr. Advocaat expressed concern about the independent consultant being privy to the in-depth conversations that have taken place with SCDOT and their findings. Mr. Nohren advised that the information developed by Lochmueller was completed before seeing the SCDOT document that was emailed to him today, and today's presentation would be their independent viewpoints on the Bypass.

Mr. Colin reiterated that he could not modify the scope of work just at the direction of this Committee, as the scope was approved by Town Council. The Committee's charge was to work with the consultant to move forward consistent with the scope of work they created. Before a contract amendment could be executed to evaluate this alternative, Town Council approval would be needed.

Mr. Colin continued with his presentation of the Alternatives which the Committee asked be vetted through SCDOT, as there have been some questions related to a bridge rehab vs. a new bridge, SCDOT was asked about the design cost and construction implications related to bridge rehabilitation vs. new bridge. He noted the existing bridge is approaching 70 years in its lifecycle and is nearing the end of the design lifecycle of 70-75 years set by SCDOT. Their response was that bridge rehabilitation could be performed, but their preference is for a new bridge. Mr. Colin also showed a slide of a Heat Map and Collision Data outlining a significant amount of traffic incidents or collisions from 2016 to 2024 through the bridge corridor section and also as you approach the Stoney Community. The detailed response from SCDOT, Heat Map, and Collision Data are all shown on the slides presented by Mr. Colin and included in the agenda packet. These were presented to provide reasons for advancing a project to put in place a mechanism to provide improvements in this area, including reducing speeds, traffic calming, and providing a safer transportation system through this area. He reviewed the Town Council Authorized Scope of Work, which included an independent study by a consultant to review all the assumptions, methodologies, and come up with what they believed for alternatives to advance for this project. They were encouraged to develop their own ideas and recommend their own alternatives, which in Mr. Colins's opinion has been done. The proposed plans have to pass NEPA review, and any additional impacts, including safety and other items that are considered by Federal Highway. He noted that wha Lochmueller has done is look at the alternatives and viability and ability for them to move through the NEPA process and have alternatives that are supported by Federal Highway. The anticipation for completion was set at 6 months. He briefly reviewed the Tasks, noting those completed, ongoing, provided by staff, or in progress.

**c. Presentation of Findings - SCDOT Seismic Study Review**

Mr. Nohren noted the members of the Lochmueller team joining the meeting remotely - Kate, Michelle, Chad, and Loren and new team members, Jason Hickle, structural department manager who helped perform the analysis of existing bridge data, and Shawn Dykes, in-house transit expert, who provided input on the Memorandum regarding the feasibility of trying to maintain 4-lanes west of Squire Pope. Mr. Nohren began his presentation, which is included in the agenda packet, and included an outline of the completion data for Tasks #1, #2, #3, #4 and #5, with an overall completion progress of 80%. Mr. Advocaat asked to see the live modeling of the area Hilton Head Plantation to Moss Creek, and Mr. Nohren indicated that is a part of Task #4, with VISSIM and Synchro modeling included for the entire study area. Mr. Nohren moved into Task 1.8, which is the SCDOT Seismic Study Review Findings, which was approved by the

Committee and Town Council. He explained this was a review only of the SCDOT approved US 278 Bridge Seismic Study, approximately 1800 pages in total, dated April 2020, which was received by Lochmueller on April 15, 2024. The focus for Lochmueller was on the detailed Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) to provide their input. He reviewed the 3 options considered, rehabilitation and seismic retrofits or construction of a new 6-lane structure similar to the SCDOT Preferred Alternative.

**d. Presentation of Finding - Technical Report**

Detailed review findings and key observations for Options 1, 2 and 3 can be found in the presentation included in the agenda packet. In summary, Mr. Nohrens stated Lochmueller does not recommend rehabilitation and/or retrofit options be pursued. Questions from Committee members were addressed by the Lochmueller team.

Michelle Romine, Lochmueller team member, attending the meeting remotely, continued with the 4-Lane Viability Technical Memo (Task 1.3.3). She stated the objective was to perform a cursory, high-level review to determine if one or more select strategies [second bridge, modifications to the existing mass transit system, implementation of a new ferry system, or implementation of a facility usage fee (congestion pricing)] could be implemented to allow for a 4-lane section of William Hilton Parkway between Moss Creek and Squire Pope Road, as included in the Agenda Packet. She outlined the various methods used to arrive at the concluding opinion by Lochmueller that these strategies should not be considered as viable alternatives to be used individually and/or collectively to solely address traffic congestion and mobility related concerns along US 278 within the project study area, to allow a four-lane section to be maintained along US 278 within the study area. Questions from Committee members were addressed by Ms. Romine.

**e. Review of Overall Evaluation Matrix for 4 Alternatives**

Mr. Nohren noted that at the April 22, 2024, meeting, a request was made for a delineation between public and private parcels. With additional information provided by the Town's GIS staff, Lochmueller used that data to determine if that impacted their findings. He pointed out that for Alternative #3, the acreage changed from the April 22 acreage of 1.4, and with the new information, the figure has been reduced to 1.1 acres, which also changes the rankings of the Alternatives. A discussion ensued with Mr. Advocaat reiterating his opposition to the way the rankings were determined, and the Lochmueller team noting that ultimately it was providing the Committee with the information needed to make the final decision and differentiate between the Alternatives through a high level evaluation. However, if desired, they offered to amend the matrix to remove the last 2 rows for scoring and ranking purposes. Mr. Colin noted the scope of work asked for the consultant to determine a way to evaluate, but did not specify exactly how that was to be accomplished. Elements were added that needed to be included in the evaluation, and questions could be made about the conclusions and findings that they have made or presented, but the goal of this Committee is to make sure the project is being executed against that scope of work. When you ask for an independent review based on engineering to provide you with information, this has been done according to the scope of work. You can disagree with some of their conclusions, but not the

methodology. Mr. Advocaat continued to voice his opinion that it was wrong to draw conclusions on the numbers and the Lochmueller team noted this practice has been applied across other projects throughout the country, but it should be considered just another way of screening.

Mr. Colin noted that the first 3 Tasks have been completed to move through the independent review of all Alternatives, including any additional Alternatives Lochmueller thought worthy to advance. He reported that feedback has been obtained from SCDOT at the Committee's direction, and there is an Alternative that is preferred from the SCDOT's feedback, and there are additional design modifications that could be considered to reduce the right of way impacts, further reducing the impact to the TCP and the Stoney Community. He stated that Lochmueller needs to evaluate the downstream impacts to complete the next few Tasks in the scope of work, so the final information can be included in a delivered report. He has asked Lochmueller to move forward with Alternative #1 with design modifications to consider based on the feedback received from SCDOT on the Alternatives, so this could be built into their modeling for VISSIM to fully understand the downstream impacts.

Mr. Colin reminded the Committee that the current Preferred Alternative that the County has recommended as part of the EA document, results in 3.4 acres of total impact to the TCP, with 1.12 acres being privately owned property. The current design as you come on-Island includes 2 left turn lanes from William Hilton Parkway eastbound onto Squire Pope Road, with a design modification being evaluated by SCDOT from a performance and right of way impact standpoint, to reduce those 2 left turn lanes eastbound to 1 left turn lane onto Squire Pope Road. Also, there are currently 2 right turn lanes proposed as you come southbound on Squire Pope Road and right turn onto William Hilton Parkway westbound going off-Island. There has been a design modification request made to SCDOT from the Town and the County to reduce those 2 right turn lanes to 1 right turn lane, again further reducing the right of way impact on the Squire Pope and William Hilton Parkway segment. The third modification is that going westbound off-Island, there is a dedicated left turn only lane that accesses the Crazy Crab Restaurant. There has been a design modification request to shift that westbound and have that turn lane serve all of the driveway points on the southern side. The SCDOT has committed to evaluate those design considerations to see if the right of way and cross-section would be reduced for the roadway need, and therefore reduce the property impacts that is in the EA proposals for the current project. We believe there will be significant reductions if those design modifications are supported, and understanding the relationship between the transportation corridor land use and the performance of the roadway are all considerations. One of the primary goals of Federal Highways is social justice and social impact, so they are significantly interested in alternatives that reduce the impact as much as possible. That is why the other Alternatives that were shared with the SCDOT were unlikely to be feasible from their standpoint. Those are the design modifications that we have requested from SCDOT and are included in the Alternative #1 to move the modeling for the next phase of the project forward at this time.

Comments and questions were posed by Committee members. Mr. Advocaat reiterated his opinion that this is still premature without finishing the study and looking at the new Alternative being put forth today. Mr. Warner questioned how firm the SCDOT is in their comments, and whether there might be a hesitation on their part. Mr. Colin reported they were not interested at all in advancing Alternative #4, and as mentioned before, money is a consideration, and whether there is another viable solution that minimizes the overall impact and is less expensive. They will consider some additional elements, but the position that has been conveyed to the Town and the County consistently is that those additional costs would have to be borne at the local level. He reported that when talks began about alternatives, they let us know they were not in favor of Alternative #4 with an elevated bypass, but they are willing to understand design modifications proposed from local input in the project.

**f. Observations Related to Southern "Bypass" Alternative**

Ms. Romine continued by noting that although not contained within their scope, Lochmueller did look at the Southern Bypass. She provided a cursory traffic overview, Mr. Jackson provided a cursory engineering overview, and Mr. Costa provided a cursory environmental overview, which are all included in the Agenda Packet. Mr. Advocaat stated his opinion that the critical element is traffic lights that basically stop traffic coming onto Hilton Head Island, and the horizontal bypass which circumvents the traffic lights, should be considered due to less impact on the wetlands and deserves a good look. Concerns were expressed about impact on the wetlands, timing of construction, traffic capacity and signals, and other issues by the Committee members. The Lockmueller team reiterated their opinion that there is no other alignment that could be done that will not have similar or more impacts as what has already been shared with the Committee. Mr. Costa stated that although he could not speak for the Federal Highway Administration, but based on his experience, his professional opinion is that the horizontal bypass would be a difficult project for them to approve. Mr. Colin noted that what he has heard from SCDOT concerning the southern bypass is that it has a very, very small chance, if any, of advancing through the process. Timing of integration of the Windmill Harbour and Moss Creek lights into the adaptive signal system was also discussed. Mr. Advocaat pointed out the Southern Bypass would remove traffic from the regular US 278, and it could be made a toll road if the Town chooses to do so, and would then be a significant source of income.

**4. Appearance by Citizens**

Public comments concerning agenda items were to be submitted electronically via the Open Town Hall Portal. No comments were received through the Portal, and no requests were received to appear before the Committee regarding non-agenda items. Several citizens appeared before the Committee and provided comments.

Christopher Cliffe commented that the SCDOT letter was quite explicit, with the Preferred Alternative being the only solution in their view, with no comments about the Lochmueller proposal, so it would appear they are making it quite clear that they are only prepared to

consider their option. He asked about a time constraint possible on the life span of the EA documents. He mentioned that Craig Winn had made it quite clear that the deficiencies in the McKay bridge had been provided for at a figure of \$40M, but the seismic study numbers revealed today, there is no comparison, and questioned where the \$40M figure came from. He also mentioned that Craig Winn had made it clear that Jenkins Island was not an accident hot spot, but the 6 fatalities shown on accident data presented today all involved DUI, so including accident data in SCDOT's Preferred Alternative is slightly misleading. The 6-lanes being pushed by everyone only pushes congestion further down the road, and the SCDOT Alternative is not a solution at all.

Mr. Baer congratulated the job being done by the Committee to rationalize that the SCDOT plan is the one and only true plan with the studies based on a few key principles of staying in SCDOT's footprint and questioned who authorized this. Secondly, he suggested they have ignored proving the congestion problem has been solved. He questioned where is the stress test if you get more than expected, which he predicted would be 4,000 vehicles per hour and the plan was unproven and would not actually work, and the data has not been presented to support the plan. He noted there is no value being placed on Gullah Geechee land that is being taken, and questions from citizens are being ducked with no answers provided, and called the study the most unscientific study he has ever seen.

Gray Smith commented on time saved eastbound and westbound reported by Lochmueller, using percentages that make it look worse. Today, the eastbound AM in 2045 would be 7 minutes longer if nothing was done, and westbound coming out would be 5 minutes longer and questioned the \$500M being spent for this. He questioned the SCDOT rejection of all Alternatives except their own, and erred at the beginning of this project by ending it at Spanish Wells Road rather than include the adjacent major roadways that are integral to the project, namely Spanish Wells Road and Gumtree Road, which they say cannot be considered as part of the project without greatly extending the time of construction. He commented that as a 12-year Hilton Head Island resident, he is being asked to accept an inferior product at the outrageous cost of \$500M, and he finds this totally unacceptable and asked the Committee to do the same.

Louise Cohen, a native of Hilton Head Island, noted she is a member of the 5th generation of her family. She reminded the Committee members that as they serve and make decisions for other people, they should have a heart and understand how much the highway would affect the community they live in and that was established by their ancestors as their inheritance. Their homes mean as much to them as yours means to you, and she urged them to care about destroying a community, their heritage, and their culture.

Richard Busy expressed his surprise that the bureaucrats in Columbia, the SCDOT, liked their plan the best. He noted they don't live here - we live here. He noted that due to the vote today, he would await an impartial and independent by the consultants on the Horizontal Bypass Plan. However, Mr. Colin has indicated Town Council will need to approve that, and he questioned whether this was just another obstacle, as this was first time any discussion has been held on the Horizontal

Bypass Plan - a plan which connects directly to the Cross Island Parkway, uses almost no private land, is less than half the price of your Plan #4. He pointed out that more than 50% of the traffic coming onto the Island are bound for the Cross Island Parkway, and yet none of the plans, including the State plan, provide a direct link to the Parkway. He could not understand how an 11-lane, aircraft carrier slab, a/k/a the bridges, is in keeping with preserving the character of Hilton Head Island.

Richard Ritter, a member of the Executive Committee of the new Hilton Head-Bluffton branch of the NAAPP, noted they are in the process of drafting and submitting to the Town a letter expressing the concerns of the NAACP about all of the traffic proposals discussed today. The letter must be approved by the membership and then submitted to the State Conference of the NAACP for review and approval, so he could not discuss it in detail. He expected to have the letter ready to be sent to the Mayor within the next 2 weeks. Obviously, the concerns expressed will be about the impact of the plans on the Stoney and Gullah Geechee Community as a whole. He questioned whether it was true that Alternative #1 would have no adverse impact, as they know it will because there are homes on both sides of US 278, as well as business properties, that will be impacted. He noted the Stoney Community is 1 of 14 historic designated communities on Hilton Head Island, putting them in a special place, and his concern is to make sure the interests of this historic neighborhood are being fully accounted for and there are no alternatives that can be discussed and put in place.

Sherry Sherman, President of the NAACP, commented she was new to the Island and wanted the Committee to keep in mind that the Gullah Geechee live here and are impacted by the decisions made by the Committee.

Trey Graves, born and raised on Hilton Head Island, empathized with the Committee over its complex and difficult decision to be made as to how to solve the traffic congestion problem. He pointed out that 90% of the people in the room would not be sitting in that traffic in 2045, but he probably would be. Although the alternative is radical that was proposed decades ago to put another bridge off the Island, not in the same footprint of the Graves Bridge, but somewhere at the end of Beach City Road that could connect to St. Helena Island that would provide 2 entrances and exits onto the Island, act as a great circle to keep traffic moving, and make it easier for the working people coming from Ridgeland and Hardeeville who sit in 4 pinch points before even reaching the bridge. He acknowledged it would be expensive, would have to be a toll bridge, take extensive engineering, would affect the beauty of the Island, but it is not a problem or solution that the majority of the people affected today and making the decisions today will have to deal with when we are your age.

Mr. Colin addressed Mr. Cliffe's question about the life span of the EA by explaining that projects that go through the NEPA process, whether it is an EIS or Environmental Assessment, the information the findings and conclusions are based on has a 3-year life span. So, that expires, then you have to amend or update the information, or potentially go through the entire process again. He indicated the end date for EA is the end of June, 2026.

## **5. New Business**

None.

## **6. Adjournment**

Mayor Perry declared the meeting adjourned at 3:41 PM.

**Approved: June 12, 2024**

The recording of this Meeting can be found on the Town's website at [www.hiltonheadislandsc.gov](http://www.hiltonheadislandsc.gov)