

**Public Comments on Safety and Security Policies Draft v 121616—Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Substance of Comment</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
11/21/2016	Director 1	Use of "SIC" instead of "SI Community" on p 14 in Mission Statement	<i>Corrected typo with a new draft</i>
11/21/2016	Director 1	Discussion in Addendum 4 about scanning driver's licenses disclosure	<i>Under review; Director 1 and EFH agreed on some substitute language</i>
11/15/2016	Property Owner 1	I would like to add that it is very much appreciated that steps have been taken to involve those you cannot be in physical attendance with the call-in feature. My only critique here is that although Janet was clearly heard through the receiver on my office phone (from where I listened in PA), the other speakers would cut in or out 1/3 to 1/2 of the time. It wasn't a complete loss of the other speakers, but the static or "fuzz" garbled their speaking to make it very difficult to follow much of the interaction. My wife was listening from our home phone and she had the same complaint. So, thank you to the Board for adding the call-in feature, now please work on the clarity of the speakers.	<i>Not a Safety and Security Issue, and already responded to by J Gorski</i>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 2	Thanks to the group and Board for a thorough investigation and Draft. My vote would be to implement.	<i>Acknowledgment sent 11/25/16</i>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 3	I think the materials are quite thorough. There is reference in the body of the draft to "distributing rules and regulations". I think this is a baseline obligation that warrants consideration on an annual or biannual basis even to longstanding members of the community. I am assuming violators may claim "ignorance of the law". While this may occur no matter how well SIPOA deploys the "rules and regulations", we ought to make certain that we have made every effort to notify property owners just what those "rules and regulations" are. Another means to this end might be similar to a corporate "Ethical Business Conduct" policy whereby all employees, in this case property owners, are asked to execute a document agreeing to honor the rules and regulations as stated. While unlikely to stand up in a court of law, it may reinforce the seriousness of the subject and likelihood that its intent will be communicated to owners' guests. With respect to the above, providing similar materials to renters is a MUST! Given the year to date data as presented, it is apparent that visitors/renters generate the	<i>No response possible until we get a sender email address</i>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>majority of violations. Inclusion of materials in their rental packages seems appropriate. I'm sure we can present the "rules" and consequences for violations in a positive light to support maintaining our community. After all, while on the Island, they are an extension of our community. On a personal basis, within the bicyclist passing rule section, I would like to suggest that while it is illegal to pass a cyclist at a tree median using the same lane as the cyclist, passing a cyclist by using the ONCOMING LANE, is an even more dangerous act, which warrants considerably greater punitive damages. As someone who bikes on the island often, I am appalled by the number of people who lack the patience to wait. Seeing no traffic in the ONCOMING LANE, they decide to speed up and pass the cyclist using the opposite lane. I witnessed a near head on collision a few days ago, caused by someone in a hurry, passing in the ONCOMING LANE only to meet an SUV approaching the median from the other side. In all honesty, I think our contractors are more judicious in their honoring the rules and regulations, especially with respect to bikers, than are property owners/renters/visitors. I will defer to the Safety Committee to determine how best to address this issue. Let's not wait until we have a tragedy to warrant resolving this matter.</p>	
11/22/2016	Property Owner 4	I have scanned the new policy and it appears to be well written and comprehensive.	<i>Acknowledgment sent 11/25/16</i>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 5	Very fine and thorough job of explaining and clarifying rules and reasons for them.	<i>Acknowledgment sent 11/25/16</i>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 6	I live off of long bend drive the light that illuminates our area had been out for at least a month could someone see that the bulbs get replaced. Thank u Property owner at heron villa	<i>11/23/16 Referred to Heather Paton, who in turn referred the PO to the Heron Villas property manager</i>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 7	Handicap Parking at North Beach: Please simplify procedure. Perhaps a monthly pass can be issued or a weekly pass, rather than a daily pass.	<i>Responded 11/25/16. Not sure what this means, but will refer to Heather Paton; not a security policy issue.</i>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 8	Under the new section regarding "traffic stops" other than radar detected speeding, it appears that the SSF would observe and record the infraction, but not pursue. How would the offender receive a ticket? As a comment: I am not sure what benefit is derived from operating " speed traps" while parking on side roads	<i>Acknowledged and responded on 11/25/16</i>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>adjacent to SBI Road. Also, Friday evening (6:00pm) while returning from town, I was on SBI Road then turned onto Baywood heading for home. As I approached the stop sign at the intersection with Cap'n Sams, I saw two parking lights in the distance. It was the SSI patrol vehicle on the side of the road, presumably observing the three way stop for violators. On my way in I passed no cars on either SBI Road or on Baywood. I would think the POA funds could be better utilized.</p>	
11/22/2016	Property Owner 9	<p>I would like some clarification on what this statement means:  Page 11, Definitions, SI Community Property, "other than the property owned by....., and certain private property owned by regimes and associations"  Can you please give some examples of regime private property? So, these types of property are exempt from receiving parking security enforcement? Would driveways owned by regimes be considered private property? Hence no security enforcement for someone unknown to the owner being able to park in these driveways?  Page 27, Addendum 6, item D, section iii, "Exercising parking control in regime/association lots requires clear communication..... Is a regime/association driveway considered the same as a regime/association lot?"</p> <p><i>PO 9 responded on 11/25 to the acknowledgment:  On Nov 25, 2016, at 13:13, PO again wrote: Mr. Houff,</i></p> <p>Thank you for your response. My questions were somewhat confusing. I may be completely off base here, but it appears reading the new security rules, regimes are becoming more and more "separate" and treated differently than other homes on the island. I don't understand this although there may be reasons that are unknown to me. I am concerned about this since no matter where we live we all pay the same SIPOA fee thus we should all receive the same security benefits.</p> <p>I guess my question boils down to this: since I live in a regime, will I still receive the same security services as single family homes do? Reading through the security changes, it appears regimes are not considered "POA</p>	<p><i>11/25/16 acknowledged and responded, and also included H. Paton and Allan Keener on the response.</i></p> <p>I am a member of the SIPOA Board of Directors and the Chair of the Legal Committee. I am also the person selected by the Board to review the Public Comments submitted in connection with the draft Safety and Security Policy. I wanted to thank you for your comment, and to assure you that it will be taken into consideration along with the other comments we receive, when the Board makes its final decision. However, with regard to your specific requests for clarification, I can provide you with some general information, but for specifics I think it would be better for me to refer your question to two persons: Heather Paton, the SIPOA Executive Director, and Allan Keener, the President of COVAR. However, here is what I know about your questions: Your questions had to do with requesting some examples of regime private property, and specifically whether driveways owned by regimes would be considered private property, and more specifically for whether there would be security enforcement for someone unknown to the "owner" being able to park in these driveways. The answer really depends on what you mean by a "driveway" and what specific regime you have in mind. SIPOA Security may respond in some instances in parking lots that are otherwise private property in regimes (an example could be the Pelican Watch Parking</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>property" thus I will not receive the same type of security benefits?  I am a full-time resident of Tarpon Pond. We do not have a parking lot but individual driveways which are common property. Reviewing the new security rules, it appears anyone (I.e. rental visitors) could park in anyone else's driveway, in their yards, etc. and security couldn't be called to address these types of issues? The words " clear communication between security and governing bodies" has me asking these questions.  COVAR (from what I've read and heard at meetings) seems to be geared more towards rental villa owner issues (not full time villa owner issues such as rental visitors parking wherever they choose to) so they wouldn't be of help with this question.  Thank you!  PO 9</p> <p><b>PO 9's next response was on 11/25/16 as follows:</b></p> <p>Thank you! It gets a bit crazy here during the summer months since there are more and more visitors to the island so that is my reason for asking these questions!</p> <p><b>PO 9 responded for the last time to Heather and Allan Keener's responses on 12/1/16:</b></p> <p>Thank you!</p>	<p>Lot) for persons illegally parked, but there would have to be a clear communication from the regime to security that the vehicle in question was not there legitimately visiting some property owner. If you mean by a "driveway" a piece of roadway that leads directly and only to a single property or dwelling within a given regime or association, then security would likely respond if the specific property owner of the driveway called and also if the regime and SIPOA had an agreement about response. I cannot be any more specific than that, other than to say that once one turns off of a SIPOA street (e.g. Seabrook Island Road or High Hammock) and into a regime parking lot, the question of whether those secondary roads or parking lots are SIPOA Community Property or private regime property depends on the Regime or Association. As I noted above I will submit your question to Heather Paton and Allan Keener, who may be able to provide you with more information about specific regimes. I have included both of them on this email, and I have set out your email below. Should you have any additional questions, please submit them via the <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> email address or to me directly at <a href="mailto:efh@efhesqpc.com">efh@efhesqpc.com</a> Thanks again for your interest and comment</p> <p><b>PO 9 responded on 11/25 and EFH responded again, as follows:</b></p> <p>--I can assure you that there is no intent to treat regime property owners differently from other property owners except where the covenants, bylaws and regime documents require a different treatment. But let me see if we can get a more complete answer to your questions.</p> <p><b>Heather Paton responded to PO 9 on 12/1/16:</b></p> <p>As Ed Houff indicated, I can provide some</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>additional clarification regarding your question about regime driveways.</p> <p>Some associations/regimes, such as Pelican Watch, Dune Loft, Bay Pointe or Creek Watch, have driveways/parking areas that serve all their units and which are association common property. Others, such as Tarpon Pond or Sealoft, have streets that are owned by SIPOA and driveways (either private or association property) leading to the individual units.</p> <p>In the first case, Security can patrol the driveway/parking area, but without guidance from the association board or management, has no way of knowing if a car with a pass or barcode is parked legally or not. For example, a car with a barcode might not be registered to an address in that association, but could belong to an authorized guest or visitor of an owner there. If an association notifies us of an illegally parked vehicle that they know is not associated with an authorized guest, Security will follow up with the owner of the vehicle.</p> <p>In the case of associations similar to yours, Security patrols the roads regularly. If vehicles are illegally parked on the SIPOA roadway, or if they have invalid barcodes or passes, Security enforces the appropriate rules. Just as with non-regime/association single family homes, Security doesn't generally inspect individual driveways. If cars are parked in private driveways and have valid barcodes or guest passes, Security considers those vehicles to belong to authorized guests of the property owner, unless the owner contacts Security to indicate otherwise.</p> <p>I know in the past, there were some issues with parking in driveways of properties near your home. As I recall, those vehicles had SIPOA owner barcodes, and merely by observing the vehicles in the driveway, Security had no way of determining if the vehicles belonged to the</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>owners of the properties or if the owners had authorized parking there on a temporary basis. We rely on owners to let us know if someone uses their driveway without permission. I hope this helps answer your questions. Please contact us if you need more information.</p> <p><b>Allan Keener also responded on 12/1/16:</b></p> <p>I completely agree with Heather Paton's response, but have some additional clarification to provide. SIPOA Security is responsible for enforcing overnight boat parking rules throughout SIPOA whether at a single family residence or in an association/regime. Also, for your information, I am attaching a SIPOA map that shows those roadways within associations/regimes that are SIPOA property and, therefore, subject to the same enforcement protocols as all other SIPOA roadways (for instance, Seabrook Island Road). I would be remiss if I did not also respond to your concerns over COVAR limiting its representation to rental villa owners. Rest assured that we strive to represent all of the 41 associations/regimes within the Town of Seabrook Island and that our programs and publications, to include "COVAR Corner" in the <i>Seabrooker</i>, are focused on addressing the concerns and interests of all villa owners, both resident and non-resident. If you are on Seabrook Island on December 10th, I invite you to attend the COVAR Meeting at the Lake House, Live Oak Hall, 10 AM-Noon, where our program will be focused on meeting and hearing from candidates for election to the SIPOA Board and Nominating Committee, respectively. If the COVAR Board and I can be of any further service, please do not hesitate to call upon us. Best regards,</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			Allan Keener President, COVAR
11/22/2016	Property Owner 10	<p>Overall, well done and comprehensive. Do have several questions and comments.</p> <p>1) How are the private security folks currently under contract screened? Would it be desirable for the Seabrook Island community to know who these folks are, what screening/testing/certification processes they have undergone, and what additional training, abilities, skills, etc. are either required for employment or desirable from a law enforcement perspective?</p> <p>2) At what point does the Seabrook Island security yield to other law enforcement entities? Should there be a paragraph or explanation in the policies which make clear jurisdictions, any overlap or sharing of authority, and when other situations override or take priority over our contract security folks?</p> <p>3) In my experience, most university and college security are trained law enforcement professionals, and are certified to carry firearms in the course of their duties. Are any of our security folks certified to carry and utilize firearms should any violence or possible criminal incidents occur within the appropriate jurisdictions? If not, should they be? Given the nature of our community with a high number of guests, workers, visitors, etc. other than part time or full time residents, should this be a consideration? Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p><b>PO 10 again responded on 11/26/16 as follows:</b></p> <p>Mr. Ed Houff: Thanks very much for your responses to my questions. Just an additional comment/question regards your response to my question 3 regards firearms. Should Seabrook Island have any instances of violence or problems requiring a certified law enforcement presence, what is your projected or required response time from transitioning from the SIPOA security to a responsible law enforcement entity? My concern is that in these cases, response time must be rapid to prevent further injury, damage, or even death. It seems reasonable to have the</p>	<p><b>Response on 11/25/16 to PO 10:</b></p> <p>I am a member of the SIPOA Board of Directors and the Chair of the Legal Committee. I am also the person selected by the Board to review the Public Comments submitted in connection with the draft Safety and Security Policy. I wanted to thank you for your comment, and to assure you that it will be taken into consideration along with the other comments we receive, when the Board makes its final decision.</p> <p>You asked some specific questions, and I wanted to provide you with some of the answers, although the final answers will be developed as the Board takes all of the comments into consideration and considers its final draft:</p> <p>1. You asked about the screening of the security force currently under contract. That is a matter of importance to the Board, and we are now considering a revised Request for Proposal that will set out in greater detail the screening requirements along the lines that you outlined in your note.</p> <p>2. Your second question dealt with determining the point at which our security force "yields" to civilian law enforcement entities and whether there should be clearer guidance published about this issue. It is a great question and one that we will have to give a little more thought, I think. The fact is that our security force are not Police Officers, and so do not have authority to enforce anything other than the SIPOA Rules and Regulations, so that if there is a more serious confrontation or emergency our force will be on the scene as the likely first responders but only for purposes of evaluating the situation and attempting to maintain security, control and separation of the incident from the surrounding</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>services of off duty law enforcement personnel on call to resolve or prevent such incidences if SIPOA does not want to assume liability for such services from a contractor. We live in a new paradigm regards security and safety. Many if not all the old rules no longer apply. It takes just one incident for Seabrook Island to go from a secure peaceful community to one where this premise is challenged or even questioned. Some food for thought as you and the Board refine the security policy.</p> <p>Thanks again for your thoughtful and quick response!</p> <p>Sincerely PO10</p>	<p>area until law enforcement, fire, rescue or other services arrive. But we will think more about how to define that.</p> <p>3. Your third question had to do with carrying firearms. Our Security Force DOES NOT carry firearms, and given their mission and the enormously increased costs of insurance and labor costs associated with having a security force composed of members who are authorized to carry firearms, we have not considered it a necessity or even desirable in many instances. But again, it is a question that the Board should and will address as we consider the next draft. Should you have any additional questions, please submit them to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a>, or send them to me directly before November 30 if possible. Thanks again for your comment.</p> <p><b>Acknowledged and responded 11/26/16:</b></p> <p>Good morning. I hope you had a good Thanksgiving. Thanks for your follow-up. I think your comments and questions are very thoughtful ones that I will certainly pass on to the Board as a whole for consideration. I think we all agree that the safety and security environment has a very substantial potential to change in an instant, and the Board is working hard to strike a balance between being a welcoming community and at the same time providing the safety and security to Property Owners and Seabrook Island Community visitors that we all value. The issues you raise are important and we will consider them.</p> <p>I don't know the answer to your question about response times. There is a Charleston County Sheriff's officer on duty at Freshfields for at least some portion of every day, and when that person is on duty he/she is available on call to our community as a first responder. Also, as you have probably seen in the safety and security</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>policy draft, the Board generally wants the SIPOA Security Force to also respond simultaneously to an emergency call to help stabilize and confine any security threat and maintain traffic control and assist civilian law enforcement as they can. But I recognize that that response may not really address the question that you raise. I will see if I can get more specific information about response times and availability. And I also understand that you would like to see the Board take another look at whether there should be someone associated with or on call to the Security Force who has the ability and training to have a weapon available should that be needed. We will look at these issues.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any additional questions, and thanks for being involved and commenting.</p>
<p>11/22/2016 and 11/28/2016</p>	<p>Property Owner 11</p>	<p>"Trailers, boats, motorhomes are not allowed to be parked in driveways or on the roads of Seabrook. A storage and parking area is provided off SIPOA Maintenance facility (on Seabrook Island Road between Old Drake and Royal Pine Drives). For details and to make arrangements to use this storage/parking, please call the Seabrook Island Security Gate at 843-768-6641."</p> <p>Are these rules applicable to regimes such as Creek Watch Villas and to be enforced by the Seabrook Security Force (SSF)? We have never had trailers or boats in our so-called drives or parking lots; some park small boats in their garages. However, one of our owners drives from Michigan in his van and uses it as his day-to-day means of transportation. What is the definition of a motorhome and how does it differ from an upscale van (e.g., Mercedes 3500 Sprinter Van), if at all? The van is too tall to easily fit in his garage and is usually parked at the end of our regime and away from the villas. To date, only one person has "clucked" about the van. Thank you for your attention to clarifying this housekeeping detail.</p> <p><b>PO 11 sent another email on 11/28/16 as follows:</b></p>	<p><b>Acknowledged and responded on 11/25/16</b></p> <p>I am a SIPOA Board member and the person designated by the Board to initially review all of the comments submitted to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> about the new draft safety and security policy. I received your post, which was as follows (<i>post is in the column to the left here</i>)</p> <p>Because this is not specifically related to the new draft security policies, I am referring this question to Heather Paton, SIPOA's Executive Director, and if she thinks it appropriate, to the Safety and Security Committee for review and action.</p> <p>You should receive a response from Heather shortly (probably Monday, 11/28, because SIPOA offices are closed today. If you have any additional questions or you do not receive a response, please let me know.</p> <p><b>Heather Paton responded on 11/28/16 as follows:</b></p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>Kind Persons</p> <p>In July 1995, the Creek Watch Villas Owners Association (CWVOA) granted a boat launch easement to the Seabrook Island Property Owners Association (SIPOA) (Easement available on request). The easement was granted and accepted upon seven (7) terms and conditions. The restrictions outlined in paragraph “f” of the document for boat size (14 feet or smaller) and motor size (15 horsepower or smaller) are frequently ignored. Several of our owners have noticed twenty-some feet motorboats with at least 100 horsepower motors being launched from the ramp. Unfortunately, the SI security folk (i.e., SSF) reportedly deny that they have any role in enforcing this restriction and view this as a Creek Watch problem.</p> <p>It is unclear (to me) if SSF randomly patrol or if only SI owners use this boat ramp; likewise, I doubt that SIPOA issues trailer decals for using the boat launch area. Steve Hirsch has been most diligent in posting appropriate signs at the boat launch area outlining the restrictions and gently suggesting that CWVOA parking lots, swimming pool, bath rooms, and showers are not SIPOA property. We appreciate these efforts.</p> <p>In summary, we are recommending that SSF help enforce the well-known, thoughtful restrictions at the boat launch easement. These restrictions are for SIPOA to have enforced and not CWVOA. If you have any questions, please me know.</p> <p><b>Property Owner 11</b></p> <p><b>PO 11 responded further to Heather on 11/28/16:</b></p> <p>Heather,</p> <p>Thank you for your thoughtful insights about vans (e.g., Sprinter Vans) on Seabrook Island. Although I did not have any insights into the deliberations of The Safety &amp; Security Committee about this issue, I did follow the same logic in assuring [another property owner at Creek Watch] last winter that the Sprinter Van was not a motorhome and was parked far away from her daughter’s villa to be of little concern to her. I also noted that we in [our] pod did not find our neighbor’s van to be aesthetically unpleasing.</p>	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Several months ago, I spoke with the Creek Watch residents who complained about the Sprinter Van. It’s been a while, but I seem to remember that these people visit for several months over the winter, and were upset about the aesthetics of the van parked in the lot. I went to the site to take a look. It was parked in the lot on the right side of the entry about ½ way down, in the 1220 -1230 area.</p> <p>The Safety &amp; Security Committee had discussed vehicle types about a year ago, specifically the terms “RV” and “Vans”. They considered an RV to be a large motor home that people could travel and live in - not a primary method of transportation. They are often larger than the Sprinter vans – although the Sprinters come in several sizes and with multiple interior options. They determined that the Sprinters could be considered as passenger vans and not RVs, because many people use them as their primary transportation vehicle.</p> <p>After speaking with the Creek Watch callers about their concerns, I raised the question again with the Committee just to be sure we were on the same page. They reiterated the same definition.</p> <p>The Creek Watch Sprinter van is the only one I’ve heard complaints about to date, but as the vehicles become more widely used, we may anticipate other people expressing concern. I’d be happy to bring this up with the Committee for review again if you feel that this is an immediate concern for Creek Watch.</p> <p>Heather</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>I feel quite comfortable with the decision that The Safety and Security Committee rendered and see no reason to ask you for another review</p> <p>Enforcement of the boat size and motor horsepower at the Boat Launch Easement is a much more important issue with our Board and many of our owners. I have sent two emails to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a>. about this issue; one bounced back (to me) after several days because it was too long—sorry, I included a copy of the easement.</p> <p>If you do not have this second email, may I forward you a copy and attach the easement?</p> <p>Property Owner 11</p>	
11/22/2016	Property Owner 12	<p>I think the new security measures as well as the review process is very good. I would support everything currently proposed.</p> <p>Property Owner 12</p>	<p><i>Acknowledged and responded 11/25/16</i></p> <p>I am a SIPOA Board member and the person designated by the Board to initially receive the comments submitted to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> concerning the draft safety and security policies.</p> <p>I wanted to acknowledge and thank you for your submission, and to assure you that your comments will be taken into consideration along with the other comments we receive, when the Board makes its next round of discussions toward a final decision. If you have any additional questions or comments, please send them to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> or directly to me.</p>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 13	<p>I think that access to the island by delinquent owners (both to the SIPOA and delinquent to their regimes if notified by the regime to the SIPOA) should NOT be permitted access to the island; nor should their guests, family members or rentals! Obtaining a "paper pass" is a minor inconvenience and does not have "teeth" in the enforcement of payments to either SIPOA or their Regime.</p> <p>Hardship allowances should be handled by advance request to the SIPOA leadership and/or Regime boards.</p> <p>Property Owner 13</p> <p><i>PO 13 Responded to my acknowledgment as follows:</i></p> <p>Hello Ed,</p>	<p><i>Acknowledged and responded 11/25/16.</i></p> <p>I am a SIPOA Board member and the person designated by the Board to initially receive the comments submitted to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> concerning the draft safety and security policies.</p> <p>I wanted to acknowledge and thank you for your submission, and to assure you that your comments will be taken into consideration along with the other comments we receive, when the Board makes its next round of discussions toward a final decision.</p> <p>However, your comment did touch on an</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>Thank you for your response..</p> <p>I am aware of the current section of the Covenants..which I do disagree with. Which is why I did send in my comments. IF this is S.C. law, to have that clause, I will have to live with it. However, if it i just a Seabrook covenant, then I believe a change is needed.</p> <p>Why should those of us who pay our assessment, have to subsidize those who do not?? These scofflaws still get to enjoy the island and its beauty without having to contribute to the maintenance!</p> <p>It particularly is of issue about those that <b>rent</b> their property <b>FOR PROFIT</b> (at the other property owners expense) allowing their renters to have free access to the island. These owners may pay their club dues, to allow renters access to the island amenities, while not paying the SIPOA or their REGIME.</p> <p>As I mentioned in my original memo, I do favor exemptions in "hardship" cases that are approved by the SIPOA (and a Regime board, if applicable). BUT, if we are making changes, this should be considered.</p> <p><b>PO 13 wrote again on 12/1/16:</b></p> <p>Hello Ed,</p> <p>Is there any results to your research on the topic regarding restriction to island access if assessments are not paid to the SIPOA or Regime?</p> <p><b>PO13 Responded to EFH12/2/16 as follows:</b></p> <p>Thank you very much for your research and reply. I am assuming that "unrestricted access" also means that access to rental "guests" of a property owner is also allowed.</p> <p>As I see it, SIPOA is severely limited in enforcement of assessment collection... we are limited to the owners integrity, since a lien and foreclosure process is time consuming and costly.</p> <p>I am forwarding a copy of your response to the Tarpon Pond board for their edification of your research.</p> <p>Thank you --again.</p>	<p>existing provision of the Covenants and Bylaws, specifically section 3.2.8, which expressly states that even a delinquent property owner cannot be denied the right to access his/her own property. Therefore, SIPOA is not able to completely deny access to delinquent property owners, and essentially has to determine what alternatives exist that will encourage delinquent property owners to become financially current.</p> <p>If you have any additional questions or comments, please send them to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> or directly to me.</p> <p><b>EFH responded to PO 13's 12/1/16 question on 12/1:</b></p> <p>There is nothing definitive as yet. I have asked our counsel to look into it, and at this point the essential legal argument against barring the property owner from access is that it could constitute an unlawful taking of the property without compensation. SIPOA does not have eminent domain powers and the amounts owed would almost certainly constitute a very small percentage of the value of the property. We file liens and collection actions and also foreclosure actions in some cases, but we try to do so carefully and selectively because they are expensive and judges don't like them much. I will see if I can get you a more definitive answer but this is what I have found to date</p> <p><b>EFH further responded to PO 13 on 12/2/16 as follows:</b></p> <p>After further discussions with SC counsel, I think the answer to your question about SC law on this issue is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is generally against SC public policy as announced in the Courts to prevent property owners from accessing their property, particularly their residences, in order to collect a debt, unless you go through the courts in</li> </ol>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>proceedings such as a foreclosure.</p> <p>2. Property rights can only be granted or taken away in restrictive covenants, not bylaws.</p> <p>3. The SIPOA Protective/Restrictive Covenants are silent about access to property in the event of a financial default on assessments, etc., and under the law as I am told it is in SC, if the covenants are silent then the owner has unrestricted access to his/her own property, and the bylaws cannot change that.</p> <p>4. In our instance, the bylaws also state that access to property cannot be denied to a delinquent property owner, and this statement is in accordance with SC law.</p> <p>5. Therefore, while I mentioned a "taking without compensation," and while that is still true, under SC law you would never even get to that point because of all of the other things indicated in 1-4 above.</p> <p>I hope this adequately answers your questions, but let me know.</p> <p><b>EFH responded again to PO 13's 12/2/16 post, as follows:</b></p> <p>You are most welcome. Please understand that I am not a South Carolina lawyer but did speak with our counsel. But this is not an opinion letter. Actually I am not sure that rental guests would be included--the essential point is really a property owner, but I have not done any checking into rental guests of a delinquent property owner.</p>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 14	You need to highlight the changes	<p><b>Obtained email and responded on 11/30/16:</b></p> <p>Thank you for posting a comment about the new draft Safety and Security Procedures on publiccomment@sipoa.org.</p> <p>As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to organize the comments received on the publiccomment@sipoa.org and put them in a form for all of the Board members to review and</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>consider when the Board resumes its study of the issues during the month of December. Your request to have changes highlighted is unfortunately not really possible, because the entire format of the policies is new. The document is designed in several parts, or addenda, that address different subject areas. This document would supplement, but would not replace, the existing Rules and Regulations. While there are some proposed changes, we would hope that the entire document would be evaluated as a whole and comments made from that perspective.</p> <p>I hope this answers your question, but if you have additional comments or questions, please let me know directly or post another comment on <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a>.</p>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 15	I have reviewed your latest email on subject matter. I find nothing that is unreasonable or overly intrusive!	<p><b>Obtained email and responded on 11/30/16</b></p> <p>Thanks for posting your comment about the draft safety and security policies on <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a>.</p> <p>As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated to organize all of the posted comments for the entire Board to review when the Board resumes its discussion of the issues during December. The Board sincerely appreciates your views and your taking the time to respond, and I can assure you that the Board will consider your comments along with the others it receives, when deciding what action to take.</p> <p>If you have additional comments or questions, please post them on <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> or write me directly at this email address.</p>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 16	I agree with proposal except the recommendation of Consultant to have no stop signs. The corner of SIR and St. Christophers Lane is a potentially dangerous intersection. There is a sharp dangerous turn on SIR as it approaches the intersection coming from the Spinnaker beach homes.	<p><b>Acknowledged and responded 11/25/16.</b> I am a SIPOA Board member and the person designated by the Board to initially receive the comments submitted to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> concerning the</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>There can be 2 motor vehicles coming in opposite directions along with bikes and walkers. The stop signs have decreased the speed of the motor vehicles when they approach the intersection and makes it easier to stop quickly if a pedestrian or bicycle happens to be on the road.</p> <p><b>PO 16 responded again after EFH comment:</b></p> <p>Thank you for your clarification. I should have read it more slowly.</p>	<p>draft safety and security policies. I wanted to acknowledge and thank you for your submission, and to assure you that your comments will be taken into consideration along with the other comments we receive, when the Board makes its next round of discussions toward a final decision. However, I do think that you may have mis-understood the intent of the safety and security policies when you made the following comment:</p> <div data-bbox="1430 435 2003 862" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>I agree with proposal except the recommendation of Consultant to have no stop signs. The corner of SIR and St. Christophers Lane is a potentially dangerous intersection. There is a sharp dangerous turn on SIR as it approaches the intersection coming from the Spinnaker beach homes. There can be 2 motor vehicles coming in opposite directions along with bikes and walkers. The stop signs have decreased the speed of the motor vehicles when they approach the intersection and makes it easier to stop quickly if a pedestrian or bicycle happens to be on the road.</p> </div> <p>The consultant did not recommend doing away with stop signs, but with "traffic stops," i.e., the use of a security vehicle to stop a motor vehicle that has committed an apparent violation of the Rules and Regulations. As the latest draft of the policy indicates, the Board believes that traffic stops are important and should be used, but conducted carefully to minimize the potential for a dangerous or escalating problem. I hope this is helpful to you. If you have any additional questions or comments, please send them to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> or directly to me.</p>
11/22/2016	Property Owner 17	1. Speed Cameras: The board shouldn't consider these in	<i>Acknowledged and responded 11/25/16</i>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>the future without a thorough discussion with the community and possibly even putting this to a vote of residents. Speed Cameras should not be a viable option on Seabrook.</p> <p>2. What are the fines for various infractions? Are they posted somewhere else? Shouldn't they be part of any packet of info given to guests/visitors/contractors.</p> <p>3. Are contractors held liable for their employees' vehicle violations? Possibly both the driver and the company should be penalized to further deter.</p> <p>4. If vehicle description and/or license plate can be secured, I would never allow a "chase" within Seabrook. Inviting disaster, not worth it.</p> <p>5. Is a poisonous snake considered "wild animals" that security will handle if a homeowner calls for assistance? If not, who do we call for safe, quick removal?</p>	
11/26/2016	Property Owner 18	<p>Hi Ed-</p> <p>1. I could not get the public comment site to work so I am emailing some thoughts for consideration directly.</p> <p>2. Emergency help and calls for help- I understand the rationale that the security force is not responsible for making the emergency call. My own personal situation several years ago, however, revealed that there was still a need for security to render help. I was in distress and needed to call for emergency help and had left my phone at the house. So, as I approached the gate I briefly stopped and asked them to please call ahead for help and they said they could not do so. I think a small provision for extreme circumstances might be necessary and of course they can document in their log that they met a situation in extreme distress and the request of a homeowner or guest.</p> <p>On two other occasions when power was out on our High Hammock street, our Comcast phone service was affected. I was able to use a neighbor's analog phone to call security to alert them that we had no ability to call for help and nobody could call us. Once again, they refused to help or make a note or even call authorities to alert of this problem. One neighbor was having a medical emergency during this time. We have also alerted Comcast that when their phone service is down, it is dominant and affects our Verizon cell phone service due to the fact that Comcast email and text</p>	<p><b>Acknowledged and responded 11/26/16:</b></p> <p>Thanks for your updated note. I have a few comments in response.</p> <p>First, as you know I am a SIPOA Director. I have been designated by the Board to be the person to receive the public comments on the Safety and Security issues and pass them on to the rest of the Board, so that they can be considered by the full Board when we discuss the next round of revisions before making a final decision. So, my comments are not "Board action," but an initial response to let you know what I think the current rules are and to bring your comments to the attention of the full Board.</p> <p>Second, you raise some interesting and potentially important issues that I wanted to address where I can, as follows:</p> <p>1. The publiccomment@sipoa.org does not seem to be working. I have copied Heather Paton, the Executive Director, on this response with the request that we check this problem out as soon as possible. Thanks for letting us know.</p> <p>2. Emergency response. I think the current draft of the security policies should address the experiences you have had. In an emergency, the first thing any property owner should do is</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>have been partnered up with Verizon. I have called attention to this fact to Verizon headquarters and they say this is a glitch in the system in Seabrook and they are aware of the problem but do not have a fix for it to date. Therefore, if Comcast is down, we can often expect Verizon cell phone and internet service to be down as well. I have had to ride out past Kiawah Estates to nearly Ace Hardware to pick up the tower signal. I have spoken to Andy Gretton (843-266-3217), the dedicated Comcast representative for Seabrook who is aware of this problem but they do not have a fix yet. In light of these problems pertaining to Verizon and Comcast customers, we do need the gate security force to be somewhat sympathetic and helpful, and be our backup for us to get a message to police or medical upon request. To be told that they (Security) are not permitted to use their phone when there is an obvious request to do so in an emergency situation and in this instance, in the middle of the night, was quite distressing. The security force followed the rules but I ended up driving the person for medical help since I was unable to secure an ambulance quickly enough to help them.</p> <p>3. Gate Passes - Can guests of a property owner or rental guests of a property owner call in additional passes for their invited guests and if so is there any limit to the number of passes which can be called in or requested on the internet and for what length of time?</p> <p>4. Can contractors invite or call in passes for their guests and if so, how many and for what length of time?</p> <p>5. List of violations, fines, warnings, suspensions for infractions. I did not see a proposed list of fines for infractions. Are the penalties always the responsibility of the homeowner or are the guests ever responsible for these fines? If the guests fail to pay the fine, is the homeowner or rental property owner or rental company management ultimately responsible for paying the fines and are the respective properties subject to lien? In other words, how is the enforcement and collection of fines/suspensions handled?</p> <p>We like your approach, i.e. that this is a fluid document in progress and made to be amended with the times. Thanks very much for all of the obvious hard work.</p>	<p>call 911--calling Security will only slow down the response. However, the issue you raised about the power and the cell service being out is certainly a unique issue and one that Security should make an effort to address for you if you cannot call 911 yourself. We will address that.</p> <p>3. I have attached a copy of the current Rules and Regulations, which contain a lot of information about gate passes and some information about assessments for violations. Also, as noted in the full version of the draft Safety and Security Policies, Addendum 2 is an excerpt of the Bylaws and Covenants. In short, a property owner who rents their property can be held responsible for unpaid assessments for violations of the Rules and Regulations, and these amounts, if they remain unpaid, could become subject to liens and collection by SIPOA.</p> <p>4. To the best of my knowledge and understanding, contractors have no right or ability to call in "guest" passes or to have "guests" because their only right to be on the Island at all is to conduct business. They have no other rights of access.</p> <p>5. I will ask Heather to address your question as to whether "rental guests" (and not long-term renters) have the ability to call in guest passes. I hope this note provides a reasonable first response to your questions. As I noted at the beginning of this message, the full Board will be informed of your comments and we will take them into consideration as we move forward. Thanks for your support, and have a great holiday season.</p> <p><i>Heather Paton responded as well on 11/28/16, as follows:</i></p> <p>Contractors cannot call in guest passes. They must purchase annual barcodes, or quarterly or daily commercial passes for their vehicle(s) and</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p><b>11/27/16 PO 13 spouse responds</b></p> <p>Thanks very much for your extensive reply. My husband reminded me that our loss of phone service with Verizon/Comcast happened also when we lost electric power for the six hours while Berkeley brought in the new temporary transformers down Main Road to their Kiawah Island site. That was another time that we drove up several miles on Main Road in order to pick up cell phone tower signal. This time it was not an emergency for us but we just wanted to make a phone call to our children to let them know that electric on the island was going to be out for a long time. We did not want them to worry if they could not contact us. There are times when we do feel marginalized with Comcast and Verizon wireless is helpless to intervene. Have a blessed holiday and thanks again for all of the obviously diligent work your team is doing while going over these documents for us. We can't thank you all enough for trying to define and improve them with details so that they are less vague.</p> <p><b>PO 17 spouse further replied to Heather Paton's email, as follows:</b></p> <p>Thanks Heather, I'm good with all that. Sorry, I just failed to look into our other statutes but was focused on the document presented for commentary by Mr. Houff. I can see you are all on top of it. Good job everyone.</p>	<p>have restricted days and hours of access to the Island.</p> <p>Long term and weekly renters/tenants can call in guest passes. The Rules &amp; Regulations section III.A.1. states: Pursuant to rights afforded to Property Owners, Property Owners, Family Unit members and Tenants may authorize Visitor access to the SID. Non-Property Owner Club members may bring guests to the SIC. Members of a Family Unit may authorize the entry of Guests by virtue of their right to exercise the use of privileges afforded to a Property Owner pursuant to Section 4a. Tenants may likewise authorize the entry of Visitors as an implicit right delegated by the renting Property Owner. Property Owners, Family Unit members, Tenants and non-Property Owner Club members are responsible for the behavior of their Guests or Invitees within the SID. Visitors may not authorize access for others.</p> <p>"Tenant" is defined as: "A person renting a property." "Visitor" is defined as: "A person invited by a Property Owner to visit such Property Owner within the SID." "Family Unit" is defined as: "A Property Owner, his/her spouse/declared domestic partner, dependent parents or dependent children, residing with the Property Owner." Please let me know if you need any additional information. Heather Paton, CMCA, AMS, PCAM</p>
11/28/2016	PO 18	<p>Please make the speed signs on the island all uniform. They are different colors, different heights, 15 mph in one direction and 25mph on the same stretch of road in the opposite direction. We also need no passing bicyclists on ALL of our medians in both directions, not just some of them. It is obvious that cyclists are at risk by the lack of public awareness.</p>	<p><b>Replied 11/28/16 as follows:</b></p> <p>As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to respond to comments left at the Public Comment email regarding the draft Safety and Security Procedures. I am compiling all of these and will present them to all of the Board members when</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>the Board meets to consider the next (and hopefully final) draft.</p> <p>Your comment about the STOP signs is one that was addressed at the last Board meeting. Guy Gimson, the chair of the General Operations and Maintenance Committee, discussed the replacement of non-compliant signs with approved reflective signs wherever needed. Additionally, the Safety and Security Committee is aware of the issues regarding the inconsistencies in the speed limits, and also is reviewing the question of additional signs about passing bikers in islands. However, you may be sure that I will pass on your comments to all the Board members so that they have your views. Thanks again for commenting. If you have any additional questions or comments, please submit to publiccomment@sipoa.org or directly to me.</p>
11/28/2016	Property Owner 19	<p>I feel that the revised Safety and Security policy adequately lays out the necessary policies and procedures. The problem that I see is in the level or aggressiveness of the enforcement. I would like for the board to consider that citations involving the payment of fines only be issued in the case of excessive or egregious violations of the rules or multiple violations during a certain period of time.</p> <p>For example, the aggressive enforcement of the speed limits could be tempered with the issuance of a warning and/or a polite request to monitor one's speed. I understand that vehicles, LSV's, bicycles and joggers/walkers all share the roadway and a speeding vehicle is a serious safety concern, but the perception of our island being over regulated and aggressive enforcement is 100% contrary to our advertising and marketing efforts.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Perhaps this is a matter that could be included in an upcoming survey/questionnaire.</p>	<p><b>Responded 11/28/16 as follows:</b></p> <p>Thanks very much for your comment on the draft safety and security policies. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to receive the comments and organize them for distribution to the rest of the Board members, so that they are all available to all Board members when the Board takes up the issue again in December. I will ensure that your comments are included. In the meantime, if you have additional comments or questions, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or to me directly.</p>
11/28/2016	Property Owner 20	<p>I agree with all but the jump starts. Most residents immediately take their vehicle to be repaired. The security</p>	<p><b>Responded 11/28/16 as follows:</b></p> <p>Thanks very much for your comment on the draft</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		vehicles have a simple jump system for the security personnel to quickly jump a vehicle and continue on their patrol.	safety and security policies. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to receive the comments and organize them for distribution to the rest of the Board members, so that they are all available to all Board members when the Board takes up the issue again in December. I will ensure that your comments are included. In the meantime, if you have additional comments or questions, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or to me directly.
11/28/2016	Property Owner 21	I would like to thank the Board for its continued support for the pool at Oyster Catcher. It is a valuable alternative for those of us who like convenience, peace and quiet. I would also like to express my appreciation of the Board's commitment to maintaining the pool. However, I am wondering about a couple of things. First of all, why do we need to replace the deck furniture? I went to the pool yesterday and using a Mr. Clean Magic Eraser, was able to remove virtually all of the discoloration and grime from a lounge. Secondly, while the deck and pool do need periodic maintenance, it appears that neither the deck nor the pool are in bad shape. Given the considerable cost of cleaning up the Island, perhaps this could be delayed a year or so and those funds allocated for clean up.	<b>Responded on 11/28/16 as follows:</b> Thanks for your comment on publiccomment@siopa.org concerning the Oyster Catcher pool. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to receive the comments sent to the public comment mailbox, and to organize them so that all of the Board members will have them available when the Board resumes discussion of the issues in December. While my review is really primarily directed toward the revised draft security procedures, I have copied both John Feldman (Chair of the Finance Committee) and Guy Gimson (Chair of the General Operations and Maintenance Committee) as well as Heather Paton (Executive Director) and Janet Gorski (SIPOA President) and Ed Jones (SIPOA Vice President so that you may receive direct input on your Oyster Catcher Pool comment directly from them if it is appropriate to do so now. If you have additional questions or comments, please post them to publiccomment@sipoa.org.
11/28/2016	Property Owner 22	It appears that we are over complicating the issues by trying to write everything into a set of rules or mission statement. In general, it does make sense but we can never cover all the issues. Do we have anything in place to secure that the temporary or daily passes do actually depart the island on the	<b>Responded on 11/28/16 as follows:</b> Thanks very much for your comment on the draft safety and security policies. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to receive the comments and organize them for distribution to the rest of the

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>expiration of the pass? I also feel that helping to jump start a car is a service we should supply since there is not any close availability for that type of service.</p>	<p>Board members, so that they are all available to all Board members when the Board takes up the issue again in December. I will ensure that your comments are included. In the meantime, if you have additional comments or questions, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or to me directly.</p>
11/28/2016	Property Owner 23	<p>I was in attendance at Ed Houff's presentation of the policy report. In general, I am in agreement with everything that was presented. It is possible that we might benefit from additional personnel to improve enforcement.</p>	<p><b>Responded on 11/28/16 as follows:</b> Thanks very much for your comment on the draft safety and security policies. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to receive the comments and organize them for distribution to the rest of the Board members, so that they are all available to all Board members when the Board takes up the issue again in December. I will ensure that your comments are included. In the meantime, if you have additional comments or questions, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or to me directly.</p>
11/28/2016	Property Owner 24	<p>To SIPOA Board Members: First, my most sincere thanks for the time, effort and thoughtfulness that went into the review of our safety and security on Seabrook Island. I like all of the recommendations the Board has set forth. I'm also glad to have clarified what is appropriate use of our security personnel and what it not. I've heard of people calling for batteries to be charged and groceries unloaded and was frankly shocked to find people would expect such service. I think it will be important to alert the community to this "change" should it be approved. There is an opportunity for the community to help with such things in another fashion. As a law-abiding, rule-following resident, I am very conscious of speed. That said, I have found myself above the 25mph speed after passing through the gate and am frankly grateful for the permanent speed gauge to remind me. It is my experience that excessive speed is the most glaring infraction on the island. It is evident when one is</p>	<p><b>Responded 11/28/16 as follows:</b> Thanks very much for your comment on the draft safety and security policies. As you may know, I have been designated by the Board to receive the comments and organize them for distribution to the rest of the Board members, so that they are all available to all Board members when the Board takes up the issue again in December. I will ensure that your comments are included. In the meantime, if you have additional comments or questions, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or to me directly.</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>trying to enter Seabrook Island Road from a cross street or a driveway. I'm glad to know it is really not as bad as it seems to me based on the data provided. I (along with a vast majority, it seems!!) would rather not use speed cameras since they seem so confrontational. I would be in favor of the modest speed <i>humps</i> (as opposed to <i>bumps</i>) they use in Charlotte. These serve to remind drivers and are not at all difficult to navigate nor will they damage a vehicle. Best regards</p>	
11/28/2016	Property Owner 25	<p><b>Subject:</b> Security Policy  In years past it seems to me that Seabrook Island Security Force (SSF) did not enforce rules and regulations (R&amp;R) unless specifically requested to do so by a homeowner. I suggest that this revised Safety and Security Policy actually specify that SSF will proactively enforce R&amp;R when observed by a security staff or reported by a SBI property owner. For example, the SSF will see beach towels draped over porch rails but never advise the owner/renter unless requested by a neighbor.  Include verbiage for enforcement of all beach rules and regulations, as there appears to be lack of coverage by Town (hard to reach/not open, etc.) Try calling the town and then getting ahold of beach officer-when I called Town staff didn't even know how to, didn't know if they had walkie talkie/cell etc. and <b>could not</b> provide a way for me to reach a beach officer and even suggested me calling the security at the gate. This is an area needing significant improvement.  Include requirement that SSF actually drives through the <b>ALL</b> parking lots of each regime, not just the easy to reach parts, for example in the Fairway One complex, the SSF drives around the traffic circle but does not drive down the other 2 parking lots that run off of the traffic circle.  I'm glad you added the "towing authority" as numerous violations are seen, particularly in summer months.  Can you enhance parking controls to deal with individuals parking their cars in regimes where they are not renting nor visiting?  What does it mean when it states "<b>The SSF DOES NOT RESPOND TO MEDUCARE AIR TRANSPORT</b>" If a</p>	<p><b>Responded on 11/28/16 as follows:</b>  As you may know I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to receive and organize all of the comments on sent on the publiccomment email site relating to the draft Safety and Security Policies, to ensure that each comment gets to every Board member and is available to them when the Board resumes its discussion of these issues in December. Thanks for your comments and observations. The Board will consider your comments along with all of the other comments received. If you have any additional comments or suggestions regarding the security policies, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or directly to me.  Ed  PS: I note that some of your comments raise specific questions about the Town and beach security, which we will explore with the Town. As the draft revised safety and security policies note, enforcement of parking in regime, villa and condominium parking lots involves communication with the affected regime, to ensure that (a) Security Force personnel are authorized and permitted to patrol these areas, and (b) a specific way to determine that a vehicle parked in a regime, etc. parking lot is not an authorized visitor to a regime resident or guest. We continue to work on these areas and are grateful for your input.  Also, the note about MEDUCARE is intended to</p>

Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>helicopter is coming in, wouldn't it be prudent that SSF did assist in area control functions?  In prohibited services -what about "jump starts?" or if this is a service provided, then add that notation.  Did you address contractor personnel who I have seen fishing here during their breaks and on weekends? Or using the beaches on weekends?  Thank you and your time in developing this policy.</p>	<p>convey that if you need MEDUCARE, you should not call Security first, just as you should not call Security if you really need 911. Security would be available to assist MEDUCARE or first responders with traffic control and assistance as needed, but you should not call Security to get MEDUCARE or a 911 response.  EFH</p>
11/28/2016	Property Owner 26	<p>I have lived here for many years, and I have never understood your rules about passes. I am not talking about residents or renters or business that come here on a regular basis. However, it is confusing about access to the occasional worker. I can't really see someone who comes every few weeks to clean or do yard work and who makes sixty dollars, to have to pay a ten-dollar entrance fee. I know that many people call in passes for these people, listing them as friends, because the rules for fees are not understood, or not fair. Some officers, I am sure, know that this goes on and let these people in as friends because that is how the pass has been entered. Some officers are more confrontational, especially if the person listed as a friend is a minority or is driving an old car. I know of people who have been embarrassed, and homeowners who have been rudely chastised by officers who question the legitimacy of the pass that has been called in. Certainly, it is a problem for all concerned and some of those questioned, who are minorities, have been greatly humiliated, and it does not speak well for the officers, even though I can see that they are put in a difficult position. Some homeowners who share services from the same person on the same day try and mitigate the problem taking turns as to who calls in the pass so the person who has the pass is not connected so much to the same person, and will not be scrutinized so closely. In any event the access to the small time cleaner or lawn care person or handyman who is not doing a big business, and is not hauling a trailer etc.is a problem for all concerned. I would not underestimate the racial element. It makes us look really bad. It may seem logical or rule driven to say to the Hispanic woman whose car is filled with mops could not be Mrs. Smith's friend, even though the truth is</p>	<p><b>Responded to on 11/28/16, as follows:</b></p> <p>Thanks for your comment relating to the draft of updated SIPOA Safety and Security Rules. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to organize all of the responses submitted to the publiccomment@sipoa.org email address. I will make sure that your comment is included with the materials that are submitted to all of the Board members before the Board resumes its consideration of the updated security policies. Your comment raises substantial issues that address not only policy but also training and customer service issues, and may be appropriate for consideration now regardless of the direction the Board takes on the draft policies. Therefore, I am sending your comment to the Safety and Security Committee for their consideration as well.</p> <p>If you should have any additional questions or comments, please submit them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or directly to me.</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>that Mrs. Smith does not want to have her labor bill increased by 10 dollars, and the worker is making little enough as it is, while the more presentable person is not challenged as a friend because of their looks. One of these days the specter of racism is going to be raised. Why not give people a certain number passes to be used for personal reasons and services, with appropriate stipulations, and just concentrate on the "big fish"? thank</p>	
11/28/2016	Property Owner 27	<p>At the Get the Scoop meeting in November, I expressed the need for the security guards to be more informed of the SIPOA rules and regs. Their lack of knowledge was evidenced during the summer when, on multiple occasions, security refused to enforce SIPOA and fire regs re renters in the High Hammock regime, stating they were not permitted to interfere with regime regs. A few of the rules included</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Permitting flat-bed trailers to be parked in the regime parking lot (overnite)</li> <li>2. Allowing renters with golf carts to enter through the gates</li> <li>3. Permitting renters to drive around the island on the golf carts.</li> <li>4. Permitting LSV to be charged by the renters by running the extension cords across the sidewalks and/or up the front of the buildings</li> </ol> <p>On every occasion that complaints were made, security responded that they had no authority in the regimes and that we were to call the property manager. These transgressions by the renters ALWAYS occurred on the weekends when it is nearly impossible for resident villa owners to get any satisfaction from property managers until after the weekend.</p> <p>I suggest that every security guard take a written test regarding fire and SIOPA regs, BEFORE they are hired to work on the island</p> <p>I also suggest that property owners be warned against infractions by their renters, and, should they occur, the owners should be fined.</p>	<p><b>Responded on 11/28/2016 as follows:</b>  Thanks for your comment submitted to publiccomment@sipoa.org, and I do recall your comment at the Get the Scoop meeting on November 15. I appreciate your restating it here. I am the Director who has been designated to organize the comments received and put them all in a form that can be supplied to all of the Directors before the Board resumes discussion of the issues in December, so that we can take them into consideration as we consider what action to take on the draft policies and what changes need to be made.  Should you have any additional comments or questions, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or directly to me.</p> <p>Ed</p>
11/29/2016	Property Owner 28	Comments too extensive for this space. Therefore, EFH	<b>Ed Houff Responded on 11/29/16 as follows:</b>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>created a document, which was sent to PO 29, that provided responses to some of PO 29's comments the full text of which appears at pp 33-38 of this document</p> <p>Well, as a non-resident property owner, I reviewed the Updated Security Policies and the "Get the Scoop" presentation on the SIPOA website. If this is really needed, that which you propose is pretty good; however, like so much on SI it is a somewhat restrictive and authoritarian. I offer my comments, attached.</p> <p><i>PO 28 wrote back in response to my 11/29/16 email on 11/30/16 as follows:</i> I got your observations.</p> <p>1. Thanks for pointing out the "professional judgement" wording in Addendum 3. Obviously, I missed it. Personally, I think it should be closer to the "thou shall not" list in Addendum 4, but since this is a "Policy" document, and not a "continuous use" document, it really doesn't matter where it is.</p> <p>Also, since I am a anti-authoritarian, less-prescriptive kind of person, I would not have written: "In responding to an emergency or matter of urgent necessity, where procedures are not otherwise expressly authorized: o The SSF Security Officer must seek guidance from his or her superior before acting; or. . . "</p> <p>I would have said, "Do what is best for the property owners, guests, and the Island." In any case, I 'm certain the SF will do the right thing, no matter what is written.</p> <p>2. Regarding children driving electric vehicles, I have observed this, and it concerns me. Of course, checking driver's licenses at the gate wouldn't fix this. Maybe if the Security Force impounded the vehicle for a week the parents might get the message.</p> <p>3. Regarding obtaining guest passes by contacting the website, would it hurt to add "or by contacting the security gate?" I would hate to have the gate tell me that I have to use the website. Yeah, I know that's not going to happen,</p>	<p>Thanks for your comments sent to publiccomment@sipoa.org. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to organize all of the comments in a format that can be distributed to the entire Board for their consideration when the Board resumes consideration of these issues in December.</p> <p>Your comments are pretty extensive, and I will try to provide some responses by a separate email later this evening. Should you have additional comments or questions, please send them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or to me directly.</p> <p>Thanks again for taking the time to read and comment on the updated draft security policies. I can assure you that all Board members will have the opportunity to read and consider them along with the other comments we have received.</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>but why not cover all the bases?            4. Regarding the "insufficient information to permit access" comment, did we actually quarantine vehicles 29 times this year until a licensed driver could come to move the vehicle? No response required, I will assume "yes."            Oh, and thank you for using the correct term "property owner" rather than "resident," which I find sprinkled throughout too many SI communications.            Don't be concerned about trying to start an argument. These comments were submitted "for what it's worth" (FWIW).            Thank you for allowing property owners to provide input.</p>	
11/29/2016	Property Owner 29	<p>I have reviewed the above-mentioned Draft and have the following comments and questions. I will try to be brief and locate the subject sections by using the outline form designations that you have used in the document, i.e., AD4.5.b.xi = "Addendum 4, 5. The SIPOA Security Force (SSF): its functions, its duties, and its conduct , b. You can expect that the SSF will provide the following services: , xi. Issuing citations ... eyewitnesses...".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After reading the Addenda, and Bylaws, I don't understand how the "guests" would get fined for violations? How and when does the Owner get notified of the violation/citation?</li> <li>• <b>EFH COMMENT: Guests can be issued citations under the Rules and Regulations and are responsible for the payment of any assessments in the first instance. Because Guests must be sponsored by a Property Owner, SIPOA has the necessary information to connect a Guest to a Property Owner, who is responsible under the Bylaws if the Guest does not respond to the citation.</b></li> <li>• I did not see any mention of how SSF will validate/restrict pedestrians or bicycles from entering SID. How is/will that be regulated?</li> <li>• <b>EFH COMMENT: This is an excellent question and one that various Boards and Committees have struggled with for a long time. As a practical matter,</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Responded on 11/30/16 as noted in the red comments inserted into PO 29's email, in addition to the following:</b></p> <p>Thanks for your email to publiccomment@sipoa.org regarding the draft safety and security policies. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to organize the comments and suggestions received through the public comment email site and get them out to all of the Board members to consider when the Board next takes up this issue in December. I have added a few responses below in red for your information, but be assured that the Board will receive and have all of your comments for its consideration.</p> <p>If you have any additional questions or comments, please submit them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or directly to me at this email address.</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>nobody has been able to date to come up with a viable manner of screening pedestrians or bicyclists from entering--at least a method that does not require a separate additional screening post, which means additional personnel, and which does not appear too restrictive. On balance, the perceived risk of a serious security breach seems very low from this source, and so to date the position has been that while it is not encouraged, essentially no steps are taken to curb pedestrians and cyclists. If you have a suggestion, we would love to hear it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In AD4.5.b.xi (Issuing citations ... eyewitness...), how does SSF validate an "eyewitness" account of a violation to then take action?</li> <li>• EFH COMMENT: an "eyewitness account" is really just that--a person who purports to have seen an actual event in real time. An alleged eyewitness is going to be presumed in the first instance to be accurate. The only "validation" that would occur is if the alleged violator were to challenge the eyewitness' account in an appeal from a violation, and the matter would then be up to the entity hearing the violation to gauge the validity and credibility of the eyewitness.</li> <li>• In AD4.8.a.i Interfere, how does SSF interpret "Interfere in any manner with an SSF Officer ..."? Who validates that judgement call?</li> <li>• EFH COMMENT: As with the eyewitness situation above, the officer's report is going to be presumed valid in the first instance, and the only "test" or "validation" that will occur is in the event that the alleged violator chooses to challenge the citation. This is really no different than what occurs if you or I were issued a ticket by a civilian police officer.</li> <li>• In AD4.8.b Bylaws Article 3.2.8, as questioned in my first bullet above. And why is it only under the section pertaining to "Interference"?</li> <li>• EFH COMMENT: Article 3.2.8 is cited in Addendum 1 as a general provision, and was expressly cited in the "interference" policy because it contains express</li> </ul>	

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>language that in the view of the drafting team, supported the new policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In AD5.3.a.iii Collecting Contractor Fees, what does this mean? Is this referring to the fee that must be paid if a delivery vehicle has more than 2 axles?</li> <li>• EFH COMMENT; Yes, as well as any other contractor or vendor fees that are now collected at the Gate--we want to get the money process out of the gate and to a location where the collection process does not slow the flow.</li> <li>• In AD6.1.c &amp; d "Issuing citations" &amp; "Parking Control", please see my first bullet point.</li> <li>• EFH COMMENT: My response is the same as above.</li> <li>• In AD5.3 &amp; AD6.2 "Access and Flow Control", why are these sections repeated?</li> <li>• EFH COMMENT: These are repeated because, while AD 5 and AD 6 address separate issues, they are also independently important aspects of the consultant's findings.</li> <li>• In AD7.1.d "The SSF also has for its use vehicles that bear the SIPOA name and logo." I recommend an article be added that states "SIPOA marked vehicles should only be used for SSF official business." This will ensure that the SI community knows that the SSF is acting in an official capacity by using SIPOA marked vehicles.</li> <li>• EFH COMMENT: Thanks for this suggestion--it is certainly something that the Board will consider.</li> </ul> <p>I hope that you find these questions and comments helpful. Please let me know if you need any clarification to my suggestions.</p>	
12/02.16	Property Owner 30	<p>This paragraph seems somewhat draconian and unfriendly to the residents.          Suppose my car is disabled at the Lake House at 10 PM on Sunday night? Is it not within the scope of the SSF to transport a resident or residents home until repairs can be</p>	<p>Responded 12/2/16:          Response 1:          Thanks for your feedback and comment posted on publiccomment@sipoa.org. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>made? We don't assume the SSF is a taxi service but some service in unusual situations should be expected from a force we are paying for with dues</p> <p>5. Property owners and members of the SI Community who are not associated with the SSF or SIPOA operations are not authorized to ride in SSF Vehicles unless the SSF driver has communicated with the Shift Supervisor who, in the exercise of his/her professional judgment, authorizes the transportation for an emergency or other matter of urgent necessity, and when other alternatives do not reasonably exist.</p> <p><b>Comment 2 on 12/2/16 (separate email)</b> This paragraph relates to previous comments , what alternative is there on the island? Providing transportation to members of the SI Community unless in an emergency or matter of urgent necessity, and only in the absence of any readily available alternative.</p> <p><b>Comment 3 on 12/2/16 (separate email)</b> In the duties of the the SSF "does and don'ts" there is no mention their being notified of a tree or branch blocking a street or roadway. A situation commonly experienced recently. I believe they should be notified and contact the appropriate service for removal or clearing.</p> <p><b>PO 30 Commented on 12/3/16 after receiving response to Comment 3:</b></p> <p>Thanks for attention and responses.</p>	<p>designated by the Board to organize the responses and comments received on the draft safety and security policy, and to ensure that that they are transmitted to all of the Board members so that they can consider the comments when the Board resumes its discussions later this month.</p> <p>As for your question, I cannot speak for the Board, and the policies certainly cannot address every possible set of facts, but I think it was the intent of the drafters of the policy in this instance to set out a general principle, and then allow for the shift supervisor to exercise discretion in matters of urgent necessity, emergency or in the absence of alternatives. But we will see how the rest of the Board reacts to your comment when the Board resumes its discussions.</p> <p>If you have any additional comments or questions, you should submit them to publiccomment@sipoa.org or you can send them directly to me at this address. Thanks again for your interest.</p> <p><b>Response to Comment 2 on 12/2/16:</b> As I noted in the initial response, I don't think any policy can cover every fact situation, but in the hypothetical you assert (car broken down at the Lake House at 10 p.m.), it seems possible that alternatives could include another person in the residence with a car who could pick up the stranded person, or a neighbor with a car who could be called. Also, depending on the distance, one could consider walking. But I am not taking a position against your point, and I don't speak for the Board. As I indicated in the initial email, we will see how the Board responds to your comments and those of others.</p> <p><b>Response to Comment 3 on 12/2/16</b> Thanks again for your comment. I think that, again, we could not possibly list all of the things</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			that could or should be brought to the attention of the SSF, but I think they would expect to be called if there were an obstruction in the roadway from whatever source it came, and there is certainly no prohibition in the draft policies against calling them to report that kind of event.
12/02/16	Property Owner 31	I am unhappy that security gate personnel will no longer be able to assist residents with issues like jumpstarting cars, lost animals, house checks, etc., according to the new rules. Such emergencies, it seems to me, are very much within the list of appropriate tasks. There really isn't anyone else to call at times, especially if you don't have all day to wait for someone to show up from Charleston. The security people, in my experience, are always compensated for such things, that are a real Godsend when you need help. This informal arrangement has worked just fine throughout the thirty-one years I've owned my house at Seabrook Island. It doesn't need regulating, restricting, or codifying.	<b>Responded on 12/02/16:</b> Thanks for your feedback and comment posted on <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> . As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to organize the responses and comments received on the draft safety and security policy, and to ensure that that they are transmitted to all of the Board members so that they can consider the comments when the Board resumes its discussions later this month. If you have any additional comments or questions, you should submit them to <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> or you can send them directly to me at this address. Thanks again for your interest.
12/02/16	Property Owner 32	Dear Board: My wife and I have been Seabrookers since 2002. Thank you for directing the security department to continue to provide battery "jumping" service for Seabrookers. It is not unusual for part-time residents to return to Seabrook to find a car with a dead battery. We have used this service and are grateful. It supports Seabrook's reputation as a small, friendly community.  To that end, my wife and I are strongly opposed to automated "speed traps" posted around the island. We also live in a busy Northeast community with many of these devices. We love Seabrook because it is not a busy, urban community and is void of automated nuisances. Having automated "speed traps" would certainly detract from the ambiance of the island and be a reminder of the hustle and	<b>Responded on 12/02/16:</b> Thanks for using <a href="mailto:publiccomment@sipoa.org">publiccomment@sipoa.org</a> to submit your comment to the draft safety and security policies. As you may know, I am a SIPOA director and have been designated to organize the comments so that they can be considered by all of the Board members when the Board resumes its discussion of these issues later this month. I can assure you that the Board will see and consider your views.  If you have any additional comments or questions, please send them through the public comment email or directly to me.  Ed Houff

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>bustle residents and visitors wish to forget. Although an anecdotal observation, it seems that when I see a vehicle speeding by our home on SBI Road, it is most often a contractor, landscaper or Club employee yet I rarely see such vehicles stopped by security personnel. Curious!</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide this input!</p>	
12/03/16	Property Owner 33	<p>Am I to understand that when I have a guest and call in for a gate pass I (or my guest) will have to pay \$10? What does the expiration date mean? From when to March 31?</p> <p>PO 34 wrote back on 12/3/16: Thank you. You have cleared up my comment.</p>	<p><b>Responded on 12/3/16:</b></p> <p>Hi. As you may know I am a SIPOA Board member and have been designated to respond initially to comments received on the public comment email and to organize all comments to the draft safety and security policies. So first, thanks for using public comment. However I am unclear about what your comment means. If you are sponsoring a guest as a property owner you can either call in a pass or submit one on the owners' section of the <a href="http://www.sipoa.org">www.sipoa.org</a> website. There is no charge for guest passes. Also, the site offers you the opportunity to establish an expiration date for a guest pass other than a one-day contractor pass. The expiration date is the date after the day he pass begins, to when it is no longer valid for entry. I want to be sure I have responded to what you asked, so if I have misconstrued your question please let me know.</p>
12/05	COVAR 1	<p>Once this matter became a matter of public record, I circulated the attached documents among the COVAR membership, advising them of the opportunity to comment and of both the original and extended comment periods. I do not know what you have received in response to these efforts, but I can tell you in a nutshell what I have. The gravamen of association/regime complaints to me has been that the SSF generally attempts to deflect any responsibility for enforcement of SIPOA Rules and Regulations in associations/regimes back to the associations/regimes</p>	<p>Responded on 12/5/16 as follows:</p> <p>thanks very much. I will add this email to the comments to all directors.</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>rather than dealing with them. In some instances this is warranted with regard to parking violations where it cannot be clearly determined that a vehicle is illegally parked, as Heather Paton recently pointed out in an e-mail to one of our owners and with which I went on record as being in total agreement. However, my experience has been that SSF generally refuses to take action even where it is patently obvious that the vehicle is illegally parked-- contractors repeatedly blocking driveways for extended periods of time, ignoring both the inconvenience to owners and repeated owner requests that they not do so. <i>Also, SSF refuses to enforce overnight parking bans for boats and/or their trailers, flatbed trailers, commercial vehicles, etc., while enforcing them with respect to single family dwellings.</i> Other instances of SSF failure to act have been brought to my attention, but the preceding seem to be the ones that are "sticking in association/regime owners craws."</p> <p>I would ask, as a villa owner, member of the Legal Committee and COVAR President, that the SIPOA Board address the foregoing and similar, related concerns as both a matter of policy and practice at the earliest possible date.</p>	
12//05/16	Property Owner 34	<p>Sometimes I have guests who want to go to the beach, but I don't want to go with them - perhaps I'm busy preparing much for them when they return. Is this OK?</p>	<p>Responded on 12/5/16: Thanks for your comment/question sent to the public comment email address. As you may know I am a SIPOA director and have been designated to respond to questions about the draft safety and security policies.</p> <p>Your question is not one that is raised by the new draft, but I am happy to answer it.</p> <p>The answer to your question is that as a property owner you can sponsor a pass to get your guests onto SI and they can then use the beach even if you are not accompanying them there, so long as they park in the correct parking spaces (beach access parking lots but not the Oyster Catcher lot because that is reserved for owners).</p> <p>If you have any other questions or comments,</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			please let me know.
12/06/16	Property Owner 35	<p>First, thanks to all for the extra effort to get the input from the residents - it's much appreciated.</p> <p>All of the comments below are related to the powerpoint presentation</p> <p><b>Addendum 3:</b> I agree with all bullets on page 10 of the presentation. Seems to be well within the bounds of "reasonableness".</p> <p><b>Addendum 4:</b> Great idea to take the time to establish expectations for what the Security Force should should/not do, especially related to personal services, as well as what is expected of the Seabrook Island community! I agree with all items referenced on page 12 of the presentation - all seem to make sense. Page 13 outlines some of the personal services that obviously evolved over a period of time, and almost certainly seem to be a carry over from the early days of Seabrook. As a relatively new resident (December 2014), I could not imagine calling security to help with groceries or take out the trash. I understand the need to establish and enforce guidelines for security, but as we all know there will ALWAYS be gray areas, no matter how hard we try to make things black and white, and for those gray areas, my only comment would be to error on the side of using sound judgement as dictated by the event.</p> <p><b>Addendum 6:</b> While the consultant recommended against <u>traffic stops</u> by officers, I agree with the Boards position of relative low risk, in most situations - i.e., as outlined on page 19. But once again, good judgement needs should always be used. <u>Motorized pursuit</u> - I agree with the consultant on this one. I do not think the SSF officers should be involved in pursuit in any situations - it's too dangerous for (what I am assuming are) unarmed officers. And in NO situation, should the gatehouse officers attempt to stop a fleeing vehicle - call the County Sheriff's office for assistance in these matters. <u>Speed Cameras:</u> I believe should only be used as a last option to reduce speeding on the island...too much red tape to enforce.</p>	<p><b>Responded 12/6/16</b></p> <p>Thanks very much for submitting your thoughts and suggestions about the draft security policies on the public comment email site. As you may know, I am a SIPOA Director and have been designated by the Board to organize the comments received into a format that can be distributed to the entire Board for their consideration when the Board next resumes discussion on this issue later this month.</p> <p>In reviewing your comments, I wanted to confirm that our Security Force officers are all unarmed, and that as noted speed cameras have been rejected as we try other means of speed limit enforcement. And as you suggest, I think we all agree that good judgment is always going to be a necessary component to every action the Security Force officers take.</p> <p>The Board members really appreciate your taking the time to comment. If you have any additional comments or questions, please put them on publiccomment@sipoa.org or send them to me directly.</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
12/7/16	Property Owner 36	<p>Ed Houff, Here's a contribution to Public Comments on SIPOA proposed security policies. The SIPOA hired MCH Consulting Inc for a 3-day security consulting report. A review of the MCH website shows no experience of consulting with Resort Communities or a successful track record in the Hospitality Industry. <a href="http://mchconsultingservices.com/index.html">http://mchconsultingservices.com/index.html</a> MCH recommended installing speed cameras on Seabrook Island. Such recommendations are a red flag of a lack of understanding of Resort Communities and the Hospitality Industry. SIPOA reliance on a Consultant and Report that would make widely objectionable recommendations tends to diminish trust in the process and recommendations. Page 21 of the Draft Policies overview indicates that the SIPOA may revisit the installation of speed cameras in the future: "the current draft does not include speed cameras as a part of the policy at this time." According to page 18 of the overview: — nearly two-thirds of Enforcement Procedures are due to behavior by Contractors and Guests, — with only one-third of Enforcement Procedures caused by Owner behavior. Property Owners will have to live daily with the changes in Security policies and regulations that are implemented based on the behavior of two-thirds of people who are not Property Owners. As such, changes in Security measures should be made carefully and respectfully by the SIPOA — with maximum input from the people those changes are designed to serve — the Property owners. In "Addendum 4: Customer Service/Customer Relations/Personal Services Communications" the SIPOA states that: "Property Owners, Guests, Contractors and others try to "game the system" by seeking to avoid or ignore the Rules and Regulations, or by claiming special privilege or exceptions from the Rules and Regulations." Such blanket statements as Property Owners trying to "game the system" or claim "special privilege" — without</p>	<p>Responded on 12/7/16 as follows:</p> <p>As I went back to look at your email, your name appeared at the bottom of the email and so I apologize if I missed it the first time. I have reviewed your email again and want to add the following: If you have specific comments or suggestions, please make them and I will ensure that your comments reach all the board members. Moreover, as I have said in my initial email, the content of your original email will be conveyed in writing and in full to all of the Board members. My personal concern with your email is that you also make a number of blanket statements that to me are fairly conclusory and actually contrary to the attitudes that I think most folks have on Seabrook Island. Let me give you a few examples of the kinds of "blanket statements" I am talking about: 1. "SIPOA reliance on a Consultant and Report that would make widely objectionable recommendations tends to diminish trust in the process and recommendations." In fact, SIPOA did not rely solely on the recommendations, which is why you can see on the draft a rejection of speed cameras, a rejection of the recommendation for ceasing traffic stops and a rejection of the recommendation for ceasing pursuit. The Board has attempted thus far to try to take the recommendations, consider them, and adapt them to our community. 2. The speed camera recommendation is one that is no longer in the draft. Nobody can or should make promises that nothing will "ever" occur. 3. "Such blanket statements as Property Owners trying to "game the system" or claim "special</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>any cited examples of behavior — tend to create an “Us vs. Them” adversarial relationship in the decision making process.</p> <p>There are a number of Punitive Measures recommended by the SIPOA to be taken against Property Owners on page 17 of the overview, such as:</p> <p>“A person who refuses to allow a bar code to be affixed to the vehicle will be required to obtain a daily paper visitor’s pass.”</p> <p>There are reasonable and valid safety concerns of Property Owners regarding the prominent display of Barcodes, and punitive measures undertaken by the SIPOA against Property Owners diminish and discredit these concerns. Research indicates that Barcodes can make vehicles targets of crime. For example, The San Francisco Chronicle has conducted investigative reporting into such targeting: <a href="http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/nevius/article/Bar-code-may-give-thieves-clue-car-s-a-rental-6757176.php">http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/nevius/article/Bar-code-may-give-thieves-clue-car-s-a-rental-6757176.php</a></p> <p>Other alternative, effective and more discreet Barcode options could be discussed.</p> <p>The two Draft Policy documents on the SIPOA website contain 58 pages of policy proposals and recommendations that will impact the lifestyle, environment and property values of Seabrook Island. Some of the policy terms used, such as “interfere in any manner” are vague. Because the Policy documents emphasize the “personal liability” of Property Owners to the violations of Others with respect to such terms, very careful consideration and discussion is warranted.</p> <p>These are just some of the concerns a Property Owner can have, however, the concerns of all Property Owners could readily be addressed and resolved with mutual consideration and respect between the SIPOA, Executive Director and Property Owners. A prudent and patient review of draft recommendations as well as an empathetic and respectful implementation of policies and procedures is necessary.</p> <p>Property Owner 36</p>	<p>privilege” — without any cited examples of behavior — tend to create an “Us vs. Them” adversarial relationship in the decision making process.”</p> <p>Frankly, examples of this occur every day, and you have left out the "contractors and guests" portion of the original statement. Some examples: (a) persons making copies of bar codes and putting them in the windows of their cars to get additional vehicles or persons in without permission; (b) refusing to have bar codes attached to vehicles; (c) calling in an event but saying that guests should not be stopped for passes or otherwise checked because such actions will discourage their visitors from ever visiting again.</p> <p>4. "Property Owners will have to live daily with the changes in Security policies and regulations that are implemented based on the behavior of two-thirds of people who are not Property Owners. As such, changes in Security measures should be made carefully and respectfully by the SIPOA — with maximum input from the people those changes are designed to serve — the Property owners.."</p> <p>The Board's establishment of the "public comment" email, and the presentations at both a Board Meeting and the Get the Scoop session--all intended to obtain Property Owner input--are exactly what gave you the opportunity to write this email, but you do not seem to want to give specific recommendations. Please give us recommendations for change rather than broadly based criticism.</p> <p>5. "There are reasonable and valid safety concerns of Property Owners regarding the prominent display of Barcodes, and punitive measures undertaken by the SIPOA against Property Owners diminish and discredit these concerns. Research indicates that Barcodes can make vehicles targets of crime."</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>There is not a single word in the article you cite about bar codes indicating that community bar codes are a source of crime. In fact, the article was about rental car bar code stickers, and the article does not contain definitive information that bar codes for communities or things other than rental cars are more likely to make those cars targets.</p> <p>Nonetheless, your suggestion to make the bar codes less conspicuous is one that has been in part addressed by the removal of "SIPOA" from the sticker. If you have other, more specific suggestions, please send them.</p> <p>Moreover, I think one has to ask the question-- isn't a bar code that does not say where it is from, and is permanently affixed to a vehicle less of a security hazard than a bar code that is loose in a car and can be stolen and then used by a thief or other wrongdoer to enter a limited access community?</p> <p>6. As a final example, you say "These are just some of the concerns a Property Owner can have, however, the concerns of all Property Owners could readily be addressed and resolved with mutual consideration and respect between the SIPOA, Executive Director and Property Owners."</p> <p>I am sure the Board could not agree more. How would you propose that we all come together on this and have "mutual consideration"? I am certain the Board would entertain your participation in the process, beyond this email, if you are willing to join the conversation in a mutually respectful and constructive way. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>
12/7/16	Property Owner 37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a home owner here, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the safety and security policies draft. Please accept and consider these constructive comments and questions as you finalize these documents.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Responded on 12/7/16:</b></p> <p>Thanks for your questions and observations addressed to the draft safety and security policies. As you may know I am a SIPOA director, and have been designated to</p>

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are the employees of Camp St. Christopher and the Seabrook Island Club treated when it comes to infractions while driving to their place of work? Are they considered visitors for the purpose of these documents?</li> <li>• How are their infractions enforced and followed up?</li> <li>• Just so I'm clear, the parking lots at the Seabrook Club are not enforced by the SF under any circumstances?</li> <li>• If someone approaches the gate for entry and has an expired drivers license, is this individual allowed to leave? Is the sheriff's office notified? What is the procedure?</li> <li>• Do federal, state and local governments laws apply in all safety instances? Example, ATV's, "Gators" are not authorized on SC roads, however they are seen on a daily use by maintenance personnel. Should they be properly tagged?</li> <li>• While discussing enforcement on speed limits and other moving violations. What are the devices authorized by SIPOA? Suggest they be spelled out in this document for clarity of all involved.</li> <li>• How long, and who maintains the video used for the surveillance of the pass lane at the gate?</li> <li>• Under Addendum 6, Enforcement Procedures: What type of training is provided to the SF to conduct traffic stops? Is this a reoccurring type training? Is there a certification process?</li> <li>• What type of training is required to operate the radar systems? Is this reoccurring training? Is there a certification process?</li> <li>• Are the radar units calibrated IAW with operating instructions? Is this documented? Who maintains the documentation?</li> <li>• Does someone in SIPOA oversee the SF contract and interact on a daily basis with the contractor? Do they review daily reports that are require to be generated by the SF?</li> <li>• Are security force exercises conducted to maintain the level of performance of the SF personnel? Is this documented?</li> </ul> <p>Are there measures in place to stop fleeing vehicles at the</p>	<p>organize all of the comments and questions into a format that can be reviewed by all the Board members when the Board resumes discussion of these issues later this month. I have responded below to some of the very good issues you raised where I know the answers. Others will have to be more fully addressed by the Board. I do know that the Board is putting together a new RFP for Security Force Services, and I think your comments and question will be very helpful as we work through that process.</p> <p>Thanks again for using the public comment email. If you have any other questions or comments, please don't hesitate to use the site or email me directly.</p> <p><b>Efh also responded to the substantive questions as follows:</b></p> <p>How are the employees of Camp St. Christopher and the Seabrook Island Club treated when it comes to infractions while driving to their place of work? Are they considered visitors for the purpose of these documents? How are their infractions enforced and followed up?</p> <p>EFH COMMENT: Camp St. Christopher and Club employees are subject to the rules just as anyone else driving on the SI Community Property, and may and do receive violation notices. We have not typically had a problem with enforcement as to these two groups, but if necessary we would follow up with their employers.</p> <p>Just so I'm clear, the parking lots at the Seabrook Club are not enforced by the SF under any circumstances?</p> <p>EFH COMMENT: You are correct but I would hesitate a little on the "any circumstances" phrase because there may be some</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
		<p>gate? Should those measures be explained in these documents?</p>	<p>emergencies or matters of urgent necessity where the Club might ask for assistance. Those have not arisen to date. Typically if there is a need for real law enforcement at the Club, they call the Charleston County Sheriff's office.</p> <p>If someone approaches the gate for entry and has an expired drivers license, is this individual allowed to leave? Is the sheriff's office notified? What is the procedure?  EFH COMMENT: My understanding is that if such persons have not actually gotten past the gate, then they are turned around because we don't really have any jurisdiction outside the gate. My understanding also is that if somehow a person is driving inside the gate without a license, the vehicle is quarantined until someone with a driver's license arrives to operate the vehicle.</p> <p>Do federal, state and local governments laws apply in all safety instances? Example, ATV's, "Gators" are not authorized on SC roads, however they are seen on a daily use by maintenance personnel. Should they be properly tagged?</p> <p>EFH Comment: A very good question. LSVs are required to have license tags, and operators are required to have licenses. As I understand it, The ATVs and Gators that service the Club golf courses and are used by landscaping contractors are not supposed to be operated regularly on the roadways, but I really need to check that. In general, as far as licensing, insurance and other safety requirements, all vehicles operating on the SI Community Property are required to comply with SC and federal laws.</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>While discussing enforcement on speed limits and other moving violations. What are the devices authorized by SIPOA? Suggest they be spelled out in this document for clarity of all involved.</p> <p>EFH Comment: The only "devices" now in use for speed limits are motorized patrols and the use of in-vehicle radar. For "other moving violations" the only "devices" in use are motorized patrols. The movable speed warning devices that you see occasionally actually do record vehicle speeds in a way that can be printed, but they don't capture any vehicle images or any identifying information.</p> <p>How long, and who maintains the video used for the surveillance of the pass lane at the gate? SIPOA retains the video, which is overwritten at least periodically. I don't know how often but we will check.</p> <p>Under Addendum 6, Enforcement Procedures: What type of training is provided to the SF to conduct traffic stops? Is this a reoccurring type training? Is there a certification process? EFH Comment: As noted above, the Board is going to be addressing issues relating to certification and training as a part of the new RFP that is being developed.</p> <p>What type of training is required to operate the radar systems? Is this reoccurring training? Is there a certification process? EFH Comment: I don't know the answer but will check.</p> <p>Are the radar units calibrated IAW with operating instructions? Is this documented? Who maintains the documentation?</p>

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
			<p>EFH Comment: I don't know the answer but will check.</p> <p>Does someone in SIPOA oversee the SF contract and interact on a daily basis with the contractor? Do they review daily reports that are required to be generated by the SF?  EFH Comment: The Executive Director interacts on a daily basis with the Security Force Supervisor and reviews events as issues arise, including incident reports.</p> <p>Are security force exercises conducted to maintain the level of performance of the SF personnel? Is this documented?  EFH Comment: I don't know the answer but will check.</p> <p>Are there measures in place to stop fleeing vehicles at the gate? Should those measures be explained in these documents?  EFH Comment: I think this is a good question. As I understand it the only measures available at this time are a guard attempting to flag a vehicle down, but nothing more formal than that, along with getting vehicle identifying information. As you probably know, the SF is unarmed and so far as I know there are no plans to change that. How far the SF internal measures of enforcement should be explained is in some respects a policy decision, but certainly one that the Board will consider.</p>

**Comments to Property Owner 28 on Draft Updated Security Policies Including PO comment and EFH Response**

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
------	-----------	----------------------	--------------

Addendum 4 states, in part:

“c. **The SF is not authorized to perform “personal services,”** including but not limited to the following:

- i. **THE SSF DOES NOT RESPOND TO MEDICAL, FIRE OR OTHER PERSONAL EMERGENCIES: CALL 911.**
  - ii. **The SSF DOES NOT RESPOND TO MEDUCARE AIR TRANSPORT” . . .**
- and,
- iv. Changing flat tires”

Well, nothing says “authoritarian” like all **CAPITAL LETTERS**, in **BOLD FONT**, doesn’t it? Consider two scenarios.

Ed Houff: the intent here was certainly for emphasis, but not “authoritarian.” My sense of the Board’s discussions to date, and something that was seen by the consultant over the three days that he observed our security force operation, is that there is a mis-match between SBI visitor and property owner (and mostly property owner) expectations and what is prudent for a security force. This is something the Board will consider.

Scenario 1. Officer comes across two elderly individuals, one male face down on the side of the road, and the other, an elderly female standing alongside. She asks the officer, “Can you help us?” As the policy is written, the officer must say “No. Call 911.”

Ed Houff: With all respect, this really is not accurate or a fair reading of the documents. The intent of the statement, and I think it was explained on slide 13 of the Get the Scoop presentation, is that calling the gatehouse security as the first call in a medical emergency is only going to slow down the response. Calling the Gatehouse puts those officers in a position that they cannot do anything about: they have no ability to convey the information second-hand. In addition, the hypothetical you pose is nothing like the statement. Clearly the security officer would stop and render first responder assistance that could include assisting them to call 911 and stabilizing the situation until qualified medical personnel arrived.

Scenario 2. Officer comes across an automobile on SI Road, with an obvious flat tire. An elderly woman, in a walker, with portable oxygen bottle, is standing alongside the auto. She asks, “Can you help me?” As the policy is written, the officer must say “No. By the way, your car is parked illegally. Please move it, or I will have it towed.”

Ed Houff: Again, I think this is a distinct over-read of the likely response. Of course the Security officer has the discretion to stop and assist, and does anyone seriously think that in the circumstance you described, the Security officer would not respond? I don’t think so. Officers will be trained.

Judging from my interaction with the security force, I can’t imagine them responding as described above, but this list of “thou shall nots” does not provide for exceptions. Would an officer risk disciplinary action to render humanitarian assistance?

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
------	-----------	----------------------	--------------

I urge you to add verbiage similar to: “Officers are authorized to deviate from these guidelines should circumstances warrant to act in the best interests of the property owners, guests, and the Island.” This is consistent with the Mission Statement in Addendum 3.

*Ed Houff: you are correct, that the language you state is consistent with the Mission Statement and the implementation instructions in Addendum 3, and that is what is intended. Moreover, on the current Addendum 3, at page 15 of the document, the following statement appears:*

- *In responding to an emergency or matter of urgent necessity, where procedures are not otherwise expressly authorized:*
  - *The SSF Security Officer must seek guidance from his or her superior before acting; or*
  - *If such guidance is not available, or if in the SSF Officer’s professional judgment, necessity does not allow sufficient time to seek guidance, the SSF Officer should exercise his/her professional judgement in determining the best course of action, taking into consideration what is best for SIPOA as a whole, and the needs of the requestor; and*
  - *Promptly report the action taken to the SSF Officer in charge of the shift, orally and then in writing, and to the SIPOA Executive Director.*

Addendum 4 as states, in part:

**“9. IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING ELECTRONIC COLLECTION AND STORAGE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION**

a. There are valid and important reasons for the SSF, on behalf of SIPOA, to be able to affirmatively identify both the vehicles that are operating on the Seabrook Island Development and the persons who are operating vehicles that are permitted to access the Seabrook Island Development:

- i. To ensure that the operator does in fact have a license to operate a motor vehicle
- ii. To authenticate the individual who is operating the vehicle and match the operator to a property owner requested pass, particularly as to vendor- and contractor -day passes
- iii. For purposes of matching a person to a license plate in the event of a violation of the Rules and Regulations, and ultimately to a property owner or other entity who under certain circumstances may be responsible for any violations.”

Ok, my comments:

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
------	-----------	----------------------	--------------

First,

“To ensure that the operator does in fact have a license to operate a motor vehicle”

Why? Real cops don’t stop everyone to ascertain that they have a license to operate a motor vehicle. Usually, this is requested when there is an apparent violation, or at sobriety checkpoints. What is our experience with unlicensed operators driving amok on our roads? Checking licenses of invited visitors serves to slow down the admitting process, and to leave a bad taste with the visitor. Oh, and since our roads are private, is a driver’s license even needed?

*Ed Houff: without getting into a very involved discussion, respectfully, there is a difference between “Private Property” for access purposes, and being able lawfully to operate a motor vehicle on SIPOA’s roads. This is not YOUR private property, but SIPOA’s. And certainly you could operate the vehicle on your own piece of property without a license, or insurance, but not on SIPOA’s roads. This is clearly a needed protection for everyone. We have had 13 year olds operating LSVs on the roads. Do we have to have a record of disasters to ask people to prove that they are licensed to operate the vehicle. In addition, every one of these folks came from a public highway where a driver’s license is required, and everyone of us is subject to producing it if asked. We have bikers and walkers and joggers of all ages—if the worst happens it would be good if the person operating a vehicle had a license and by extension, likely some level of insurance.*

And isn’t this policy a rather un-American presumption of guilt?

*Ed Houff: I don’t think there is any presumption. It is simply a precaution.*

By the way. You don’t check driver’s licenses in the bar code lane. How do you know bad guys aren’t coming in that way, with a recently revoked driver’s license, or in a stolen car? Or even a homemade bar code, it’s not that hard you know.

*Ed Houff: Persons operating vehicles with bar codes have an obligation to have the bar code information up to date, and there is a way to check that individual after the fact if something happens. Clearly we cannot know everything just because someone has a bar code, but the risk is so much lower in that lane, and in general we know so much more about the people who have bar codes, that it seemed a decent tradeoff. And I am pretty sure you were not suggesting that we should be checking driver’s licenses in the bar code lane.*

“To authenticate the individual who is operating the vehicle and match the operator to a property owner requested pass, particularly as to vendor- and contractor -day passes”

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
------	-----------	----------------------	--------------

Scenario: I call the gate, provide my name, address and PIN and request a pass for my son-in-law, Joe Schlibotnik. Presumably, the officer checks that my name, address and PIN match their records and determines that this is valid request. A few hours later Schlibotnik shows up and asks for his pass. The officer asks for his driver’s license because, hey, this guy could be the jewel thief, Jim Sarmine, who just happened to guess that a guy named Schlibotnik had a pass waiting. Give me a break! What is our experience? How many times have people shown up at the gate and asked for someone else’s pass?

Ed Houff: It is not infrequently the case that the person whose name is on the pass is not the person operating the vehicle. It is simply a check on access.

As for contractors and vendors, do what you want. They are already irritated by POA fees and regulations, and ARC rules; those that continue to do business on SI will do anything to continue their price gouging ways.

“For purposes of matching a person to a license plate in the event of a violation of the Rules and Regulations, and ultimately to a property owner or other entity who under certain circumstances may be responsible for any violations.”

Ok, but if you don’t copy any information from an invited guest’s drivers license, you’ll have a hard time matching the person to a license plate.

Ed Houff: As noted in the presentation and disclosure document, the license plate is captured on video along with video of the person receiving the pass. Because the pass has been called in, it is generally traceable back to the property owner.

Also, how far does a property owner’s responsibility extend for another’s violations?

Ed Houff: See Addendum 1 to the Security Policies, and Section 3.2.8 of the Bylaws. A property owner is legally and financially responsible for their sponsored guests, and may be held financially responsible if the guest is cited and fails to respond.

Addendum 5, in c. Special events, item ii states:

“SIPOA Property Owners should arrange individual passes through the SIPOA website (www.SIPOA.org). “

Again, restrictive and authoritarian. I don’t have internet access at my property. Must I obtain it to request 12 gate passes a year, or may I still call the Security Gate?

Ed Houff: I am not sure what the issue is here, but yes, you can still call gate passes.

Date	Commenter	Substance of Comment	Action Taken
------	-----------	----------------------	--------------

Moving along.

Addendum 6, item 2 “Access and Flow Control,” a. states:

“Individuals with insufficient information or the lack of proper information to permit access must be turned around to go to the end of the traffic line while their problems are addressed.”

Refer to scenario above. My son-in-law, Schlibotnik, drives from Columbia to SI. He has forgotten his wallet, or maybe it was stolen by a pickpocket when he stopped for gasoline. In any case he has “insufficient information or the lack of proper information to permit access,” and he is “turned around to go to the end of the traffic line while their problems are addressed.” (Just like kindergarten). He will stay in this “do-loop” in perpetuity, or until his driver’s license magically appears.

*Ed Houff: I think you are missing the “while their problems are addressed” part of the statement. Is it more fair to everyone else in line to stop everything until the problem is addressed? In the hypothetical you pose, I feel certain that a solution could be found, but not while 29 other people are waiting in line behind him. As for the instances of missing driver’s licenses cited, in event that it is discovered at the gate, then the vehicle is quarantined until a person with a driver’s license arrives to operate the vehicle. If it happens on the roads (as does occur when people are stopped for speeding, etc.) then a citation is issued and my understanding is that the vehicle cannot be moved until a licensed operator appears.*

Of course not, but what is to be done in this situation? He is in violation of **THE LAW**. Is it responsible to turn him loose on the public roads? Should he be held in handcuffs until the real police can come and get him? I don’t know, but sending him to the back of the line is not the answer. What was done with the 29 instances of missing driver’s licenses/registration noted in the 11/15/16 “Get the Scoop” presentation?

In summary, I recommend:

1. The Security officers are trained professionals. Give the officers some room to exercise judgement.
2. Stop checking driver’s licenses, unless the situation really calls for it.
3. Re- think the whole document to provide more flexibility where appropriate.

*Ed Houff: I think we both agree that most of this is about drawing lines, and the Board’s obligation is to draw the line as best we can, understanding that it will never be a perfect line, but we have an obligation to the safety and security of all of the people of the Seabrook Island Community. I appreciate your comments, and the Board members will have the benefit of them as the Board deliberates these issues. Thanks again for taking the time.*

**Copy for Public Distribution—No Commenter Identification—12/16/16**