1	
2	JOINT MEETING OF THE
3	COASTAL MARSHLANDS and SHORE PROTECTION COMMITTEE
4	July 28, 2023
5	9:30 o'clock A.M.
6	
7	
8	
9	GEORGIA DNR COASTAL REGIONAL OFFICE
10	One Conservation Way
11	Susan Shipman Building
12	BRUNSWICK, GEORGIA 31520
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	LORA H. CARTER Certified Court Reporter
21	15 Jerico Marsh Road Midway, Georgia 31320
22	912.663.2468 loracarter1234@comcast.net
23	toracarter 1234@Conicast.net
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
4	WALTER RABON, CHAIRMAN BRAD BROOKSHIRE
5	CHAD BARROW DAVIS POOLE
6	DR. VALERIE HEPBURN
7	
8	
9	COASTAL RESOURCES STAFF PRESENT:
10	KARL BURGESS JILL ANDREWS
11	JOSH NOBLE PAUL TOBLER
12	DOUG HAYMANS DEB BARREIRO
13	DIANA PATRICK BETH BYRNES
14	
15	
16	
17	Also in Attendance:
18	
19	ROBIN LEIGH, Attorney General Office
20	ANDREA HARTUNG, Attorney General Office
21	CORPORAL COLTE SHASKE, DNR Law Enforcement
22	
23	
24	
25	

	1
2	2
	3
4	4
ļ	5
,	6
-	7
8	3
(	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
	4
1	5
1	6
	7
	8
	9
_	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

[NOTE: A meeting having previously been scheduled as stated in the caption, proceeds as follows:]

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Good morning. Let's call the meeting to order. Welcome to everyone.

I would like to introduce Corporal Shaske, our law enforcement officer that's in attendance.

And then I will introduce myself, I'm Walter Rabon, the Interim Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources, and a quick few bullets about myself. I've been with the Department for a little over thirty years now, serving in various roles. I do reside in Mansfield, Georgia up in Jasper County. The most important points I have to cover is my three sons have provided me with five grandchildren under the of age 2, and expecting a sixth in November. Now my wife is off my list, and I have covered the important stuff. But I will say it is an honor to serve with this Committee and to be a part of it today.

And as we move forward, we've got a very robust agenda. The order for the projects are as stated on the agenda. Today we have seven projects, four SPA applications and three CMPA applications.

The first project is a Shore Protection Act for the City of Tybee Island, construction and maintenance of a public amenities, Atlantic Ocean, Tybee Island, Chatham County, Georgia.

The second project, the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act, Bryan County Engineering Department, construction and maintenance

of a public marina and public amenities at an existing commercial facility, Bryan County, Fishermen's Co-Op, Kilkenny Creek, Bryan County, Georgia.

The third Item Is a Coastal Marshlands Protection Act, the City of Brunswick, Brunswick outfall improvements, City of Brunswick, Glynn County.

The fourth project, Coastal Marshlands Protection Act, John H. Irby and Sarah C. Irby, construction of a bulkhead, 260 West  $10^{\mathrm{th}}$  Street, Sea Island, Georgia, Black Banks River, Glynn County, Georgia.

The fifth project Is the a Shore Protection Act, Happiest
Camper, LLC, removal and installation of native landscaping, 110
East Twenty-Seventh Street, and a portion of the East
Twenty-Seventh Street right of way, Atlantic Ocean, Sea Island,
Glynn County, Georgia.

Our sixth project will be a Shore Protection Act, John C. Shelton, and Pamela A. Flick, removal and installation of native landscaping, removal of a portion of sandbags, and installation of a retaining wall, pool and spa, pool deck and coping, fire pit, and fencing, 4212 Thirteenth Street, Atlantic Ocean, St. Simons Island, Glynn County, Georgia.

And lastly, the seventh item will be Shore Protection Act, VMG properties, LLC, removal and installation of native landscaping and installation of a pool and spa, pool deck, house deck, and fencing, 826 Park Way, Atlantic Ocean, St. Simons

1	Island, Glynn County, Georgia.
2	And at this time, I would ask for a motion to approve the
3	minutes from the May 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 meeting.
4	MR. BARROW: I make a motion we approve the minutes from the
5	May 19 <sup>th</sup> meeting.
6	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: We have a motion.
7	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Second.
8	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: We have a second. Any
9	discussion?
10	[NOTE: No response.]
11	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: No discussion.
12	All in favor say aye.
13	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
14	MR. POOLE: Aye.
15	DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
16	MR. BARROW: Aye.
17	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed?
18	[NOTE: No response.]
19	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: The motion carries.
20	Deb Barreiro will now present the City of Tybee Island's
21	project.
22	MS. BARREIRO: Thank you.
23	The Shore Protection Act Permit 169 authorized the
24	construction of most of the City of Tybee Island's public dune
25	crosswalks.

The primary purpose of the public dune crosswalk structure is to provide access to the beach while maintaining the stability of any sand dunes it traverses. SPA Permit 169 did not authorize the construction of benches, pavilions, or swings.

I would like to present Alan Robertson. He's the agent for the City of Tybee, and he will be presenting it.

MR. ROBERTSON: Good morning, everyone. It's always a pleasure to be in front of you, and I appreciate your support of the City of Tybee Island as they try to improved resiliency of the island generally.

In this instance, as Deb said, we're looking for a permit to basically cover the various structures that are currently on the island, on the beach, and the crosswalks. Having not been here in history, I couldn't speak to how this all came to be. But what we're asking for are four projects.

We currently have benches on the crosswalks. We would like to maintain those. We removed a few of them when we maintained some crosswalks in the event of a beach nourishment. We would like to replace those.

We have two pavilions. One is on the north end and one Is on the south end. We would like to maintain those. We have swings up and down the beach, mostly at the crosswalk entrances. They have fallen into disrepair, and as the dunes have accreted, some of them have been lost to the dunes. We would like to replace and maintain some of those.

And fourthly, traditionally we have had three vendors of seasonal rental equipment, and of chairs and umbrellas. They keep their boxes on the beach. They store the umbrellas. They put them out every day during the season.

In the past, they individually have come to the DNR for a letter of permission every year. The City of Tybee would like to take that over and manage that.

The benches on the crosswalks, we have a lot of public comment on this; all very much in favor. We currently have two benches on every crosswalk, and they are towards the beach end of the crosswalks.

What we're asking for is maintenance of one bench on crosswalks in the residential areas. They are an amenity that have been enjoyed primarily by the elderly and the handicapped. And that's who has come out in support of this.

There's a long history of this. They've been there twenty plus years. Everybody speaks to the memories of being able to sit and enjoy the beach even if they can't quite get to the sand.

They currently are on the beach end of the crosswalks. In working with DNR Staff, we would like to maintain them a 100 feet landward of the most seaward dune. It keeps them out of the sand-sharing system. They've all been marked. I've looked at them personally. They are all terrific views, ocean breeze; everything that people could want.

We ask for one because two create too much congestion as

people are trying to get on the crosswalks and cross over. We say the south side because of the sun, just to keep it out of their faces.

We're proposing that they are built exactly as they are today, to the same specifications.

The swings are the same way. We would intend to simply replace what is existing there. Once again, they were put on the beach at the ends of the crosswalks. Working with DNR Staff, we're proposing that they be placed in residential areas, and in a manner that would minimize any potential impact to nesting sea turtles. That would be an obvious issue for any structures on the beach, would be getting in the way of nesting sea turtles.

We think that we've done a nice job at minimizing that risk.

The two pavilions, one is at 19<sup>th</sup> Street. One is up at North Beach. Nice size pavilions, again, offer shade and a nice place for primarily elderly and handicapped. Sometimes children's groups are hosted there. They are both extremely landward of the seaward dune; not really in the sand-sharing system at all. We would like to be able to maintain those.

And then finally, as I said, this is an example of the kind of rental equipment we have on the beach. Every season, primarily from St. Patrick's day to just after Labor Day, it's chairs and umbrellas, and you've seen the size of the boxes for storage.

Once again, the City believes that it has more control over

the placement of those boxes, where they are done, how close they are, and how much space it all takes up.

I believe the DNR gains in this by holding a city municipality responsible rather than three individual vendors.

The City perfectly well understands that were you to grant this application, the onus is them to make sure that things are done right, and maintained right. And we will put the processes into place to make sure that's done.

The total impact is minimal because it's up and down the three, three and a half miles of beach that we have.

MS. BARREIRO: Thank you, Alan.

Public notice of the Shore Protection Committee ran from June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023 through July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Public comments received during the public notice period included 159 form letters. There were two different actual versions of pretty much the same form letter. 33 emails, 8 individually written comments. The two form letters were supportive of the benches with most of the public comments referring to personal enjoyment of the public beach. Most of the letters also supported the swings.

There were 8 comments in favor of maintaining the pavilions. Four comments were critical of the storage of rental equipment on the beach. One individual also express concern for the impacts to sea turtle nesting habitat from the installation of swings on the beach.

The agent has provided written comments for the comments received during the public notice.

Should the Committee find in the interest of the public interest, Department Staff to Committee make the following standard and special conditions associated with this project.

No. 1, dune crosswalk benches are authorized on permitted City of Tybee public access crosswalks in residentially zoned areas at Chatham Avenue, 13<sup>th</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Street, 11<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and 6<sup>th</sup> Street, as well as the ADA dune crosswalk at Eastgate.

To maintain the integrity of the seaward dunes, no crosswalk bench shall be located closer than 100 feet landward of the landward toe of the most seaward dune, as verified in the field by the Department prior to construction.

All permitted benches must be constructed on the south side of the dune crosswalk.

No more than one bench may be constructed on a permitted City of Tybee dune crosswalk. Each crosswalk bench will be no larger than 8' by 4'. No more than 3' by 8' of decking associated with extending the crosswalk on the southern side of the crosswalk is authorized to support the bench and the safety railings associated with each bench. No additional support pilings are authorized in association with the construction of these benches. The underside of the stringers associated with

the permitted benches must be no less than 3 feet above the existing vegetation of each location.

All existing benches shall be brought into compliance with the special conditions of this permit when maintenance is performed.

The two existing octagonal, covered pavilions associated with the existing public dune crosswalks located at 19<sup>th</sup> Street and North Beach can be maintained in their current footprint.

All swings shall be no less than 90 feet landward of the current ordinary high water line, no less than 10 feet seaward of the seaward toe of the most seaward dune, and may be no closer than 100 feet from the terminal end of the City of Tybee dune crosswalk. All existing swings that do not meet the criteria must be removed by cutting supports at the ground level using hand tools only. The lumber must be disposed of at an upland facility.

To help minimize risks to nesting sea turtles, the bottom of the swing must not rest on the beach.

No concrete is authorized in the construction of the permitted swings.

An annual assessment of the swings shall be conducted prior to sea turtle nesting season to identify any swings that do not meet the above criteria. The identified swings will be relocated or removed from the beach prior to May 1<sup>st</sup>.

All licensed beach rental vendors may place no more than two

1	10' by 15' by 4' wooden storage containers, no closer than
2	50 feet seaward of the seaward toe of the most seaward dune, and
3	not less than 100 feet landward of the ordinary high water at
4	each approved location.
5	No beach rental vendors are authorized to drive on the beach
6	under the permit. Each vendor must contact the Department for
7	individual beach driving authorizations prior to placing and
8	removing equipment.
9	In the case of an anticipated storm event, the City of Tybee
10	shall ensure that all beach rental vendors remove all
11	recreational equipment and storage containers.
12	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Deb.
13	All right. Is there anyone that wishes to speak to this
14	project that did not sign up ahead of time?
15	We've got one speaker, Ms. Jane Fraser.
16	Let me remind all of our speakers, please keep your comments
17	specific to the project that's being reviewed at this time, and
18	please keep your comments to three minutes or less.
19	Ms. Fraser.
20	MS. FRASER: I will not be commenting on this project.
21	Thank you very much.
22	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay. Thank you.
23	Does the agent or the staff have any other topics they would
24	like to discuss?
25	[NOTE: No response.]

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, are there any questions or comments from the Committee?

MR. POOLE: I have a few, if I may.

Alan, so in today's environment, the vendors that are there, are they under a contract with the City of Tybee or a letter of permission?

MR. ROBERTSON: They are under a business license. So they apply in the City every year for a business license. They tell us where they're going to place, what equipment they're going to place, when they're going to place it.

Up to this point, they submit a letter of permission request to Deb or the DNR's approval of that.

MR. POOLE: Got it. And so if that relationship goes away, the City of Tybee takes it over. And so one more question would be will the locations vary on a day-by-day basis; or, are they going to be established?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, sir. The starting -- we have to develop a process by which the City manages this. We will start with their existing locations as you see them today, and as they have traditionally been.

You see the special conditions. What will be new is Deb, and probably Mark Dodd will come out every spring. The City tills the beach every spring in anticipation of turtle nesting season. Mark comes out and does a compaction test. Probably Deb will come out with him, and we'll not just do the compaction

test, but we will identify where the rental boxes are, how are the swings doing with the high tides and the dunes, and what conditions are your crosswalk benches in.

That's the intention. We will probably do that February or March.

MR. POOLE: Okay. No more questions.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Mr. Barrow.

MR. BARROW: Yes, I have questions for the applicant.

You're talk about maintenance of these once you get these done.

What are the inspection intervals? Is this yearly, annually, or I mean, quarterly?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, the inspection cycles are annually. We typically go out in the spring, getting ready for the season. We examine the crosswalks, primarily the decking and handrails to see what kind of shape they're in.

What Is most impactful is in the middle of the island, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, that's where the dunes accrete dramatically, if you've been down there. They are the highest dunes. They grow quickly. We always have to watch that the crosswalk meets its function, and does not clog up with sand. Occasionally what we have to do is take off the seaward end and lift it up three feet, and extend it out over the dune where the dune wants to grow.

We do that every, we do that every spring.

MR. BARROW: Thank you. Also you mentioned about some

1	swings, some existing swings that need to be removed. How many
2	of those do you know you need to do away with?
3	MR. ROBERTSON: Well, the intention Is we would remove all
4	of the swings, just to start from scratch.
5	MR. BARROW: Gotcha.
6	MR. ROBERTSON: And then we would build where the Committee
7	would allow us to build.
8	MR. BARROW: And the last question. When Is all this work
9	going to take place?
10	MR. ROBERTSON: If the Committee approves this, there's a
11	30-day stay. So that would be you are effectively into Labor
12	Day. Working with the staff, if they would allow us to build
13	during the end of turtle season, which Is November 1 <sup>st</sup> , we
14	could do some of the benches because they are way landward of the
15	seaward toe of the dune. But it could be that we would do it in
16	the offseason, say between November 1 <sup>st</sup> and March. We
17	typically go to May 1 <sup>st</sup> , which Is the start of the turtle
18	season.
19	Everything we do Is always off turtle season.
20	MR. BARROW: Thank you.
21	DR. HEPBURN: Just following up on Mr.Poole's inquiry about
22	the vendors, the proposal that you've submitted says you will do
23	up to three vendors.
24	MR. ROBERTSON: Yes.
25	DR. HEPBURN: But I don't see anything in the special

_	
1	conditions that we are limiting them. So it's possible that the
2	City could decide this is a pretty good deal. We could put more
3	vendors out here.
4	MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, highly unlikely.
5	DR. HEPBURN: True. But is it appropriate for us to
6	potentially impose that limitation in keeping with the
7	applications?
8	MS. BARREIRO: One thing that was considered is that the
9	locations that are identified in the permit are in the commercial
10	district. And the commercial vendors are limited to the
11	commercial district with their business licenses.
12	DR. HEPBURN: That is true, Deb. But would it you could
13	have five vendors.
14	MS. BARREIRO: True.
15	MR. ROBERTSON: Tybee has a Tybee has, currently on its
16	municipal code, it has an ordinance that there will be no more
17	vendors. That can always change.
18	DR. HEPBURN: Right. I mean, I'm sort of thinking forward.
19	Again, I think you intend to limit it; just wanted to be sure
20	that we don't inadvertently let a subsequent administration be
21	less conscientious.
22	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any other questions or
23	comments?
24	DR. HEPBURN: I'm just curious; not that it's relevant to
25	this, how did all of this happen without being permitted over the

years that --

MS. BARREIRO: Over the years during the off season, I would say that there were downtimes. And people looked to do things that maybe filled their days. And maybe afforded them amenities that they did not know or chose not to get authorized. They did not consult with us. But during the past decade, our relationship with the City of Tybee has improved greatly. And we have the support of the city manager, the acting city manager, and the mayor. And we've been given the opportunity to work with the consultant who actually coordinates with us on a regular basis, which Is much different than in the past.

It was always something that was tacked on to the additional responsibilities of someone else's job. And they had enough to do with their job let alone to coordinate with the Department on a regular basis.

So, having had the opportunity to work with the contract consultant at the City on their request has really facilitated helping the City move forward, and bring all the projects into compliance.

MR. POOLE: One more thing. To Dr. Hepburn's comments, these are -- in reading through the comments, it looks like they've been there for decades.

MR. ROBERTSON: They have been. They have been.

MS. BARREIRO: And one of the things was when they were identified, we didn't talk about removing them at that time, but

1	when maintenance would be performed, they would be removed and
2	brought into compliance at that time.
3	So they were built, we saw them and in the effort to maybe
4	work with the City, we identified that as an issue. And then
5	moving forward, we started removing benches. And, you know,
6	we've been removing benches for the last five years during
7	maintenance periods.
8	And then it sort of it hit a critical mass. And that's when
9	the community started to recognize the fact that the benches and
10	swings were going away. And that's when we started to work with
11	the City to figure out how to authorize them.
12	MR. POOLE: Thank you.
13	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any other questions or comments
14	of the Committee?
15	[NOTE: No response.]
16	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, I will entertain
17	a motion.
18	MR. POOLE: I make a motion to approve the City of Tybee
19	Island's construction and maintenances of public amenities
20	Atlantic Ocean, Tybee Island, Chatham County, Georgia with
21	regular and special conditions.
22	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a motion. Do I have a
23	second?
24	MR. BARROW: Second.
25	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a second. Any

1	discussion?
2	[NOTE: No response.]
3	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing no discussion, all in
4	favor say aye.
5	MR. POOLE: Aye.
6	DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
7	MR. BARROW: Aye.
8	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
9	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed?
10	[NOTE: No response.]
11	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, the motion
12	passes.
13	Deb, I believe you've got Bryan County Engineering
14	Department.
15	MS. BARREIRO: Thank you.
16	The next project is Bryan County Engineering, the project is
17	located at Bryan County Fisherman's Co-Op Road on Kilkenny Creek
18	in Bryan County, Georgia.
19	The proposed project Is construct and maintain a public
20	marina, and associated public amenities including a wharf,
21	fishing pier, boat ramp, service docks, recreational trails,
22	wildlife viewing platforms at the existing commercial facility.
23	I would like to introduce Stuart Sligh. He is the agent for
24	the applicant.
25	MR. SLIGH: Thank you, Deb.

Good morning. My name is Stuart Sligh. I am here representing Bryan County, the applicant for the proposed project. I'm also joined by Mr. John Giordano, who Is the project engineer with Thomas & Hutton.

The proposed project Is located at the end of Bryan County Fisherman's Co-Op Road at the site of the old Fisherman's Co-Operative adjacent to Kilkenny Creek in Bryan County, Georgia. The project Is a redevelopment of the old co-op into a recreational public area with water access facilities, fishing pier, and service docks, recreational walking trails, and wildlife viewing platforms.

The co-op ceased operations in the early 2000. The previous CMPA Permit No. 533 was issued in 2006 authorizing a 185-unit condominium development, 1490 feet of floating docks, concrete boat launching pads, and 225 boat dry-stack storage facility on this same site. The project was never initiated and the permit has since expired.

Bryan County purchased the 20-acre site in 2020 as part of their comprehensive plan. The goals were to provide additional public water access facility.

The project includes replacing a 70 by 100-foot wharf within the existing footprint, adding a 30 by 30 covered pavilion. On the north side of the platform, the applicant proposes a 10 by 110-foot long floating dock. On the south side of the platform, the applicant proposes a 10 by 100-foot long public fishing pier.

The applicant also proposes to remove 18,119 square feet of dilapidated dock, concrete retaining wall, and foundation, and an old barge from coastal marshlands as part of the redevelopment.

On the south side of the project, the applicant proposes a four-lane concrete boat ramp with 6 by 120-foot long floating service docks extending north and south at the end of the ramp.

The project also includes elevated board walks, connected to wildlife viewing platforms with benches.

The total impacts to coastal marshlands for the above-described public facilities total 0.75 acres.

The marshlands buffer totals 7.24 acres. The applicant proposes to remove 40,468 square feet of asphalt road and parking, and replace with 46,420 square feet of road, parking, boat trailer parking within the upland buffer.

Other amenities within the buffer include public rest rooms, earthen trails, bio retention swales. Total impact to the marshlands buffer totals 1.4 acres. The remaining 6.18 acres Is to be left in the natural vegetated state.

We agree with Staff's findings and recommendations, and permit conditions. And we're pleased to answer any questions.

MS. BARREIRO: Thank you.

MR. SLIGH: Thank you.

MS. BARREIRO: Thank you, Stuart.

The public notice of the Coastal Marshlands Protection Committee ran from April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023 to May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023. No

comments were received in response to the public notice.

Should the Committee consider the project to be in the public interest, Staff recommends the standard and special conditions.

The permitted facility is for recreational use only.

The proposed 6 by 618-foot pile supported, elevated walkway across vegetated jurisdictional marshlands is not permitted. The applicant must submit a revised plan to the Department depicting this change prior to commencing with construction.

The permittee shall permanently post and maintain an informational display sign for Right Whales. Instructions for installation and placement procedure of this sign are enclosed. The sign must be approved by the Department.

Permittee must install manatee awareness sinage during construction of this facility, and shall adhere to the standard manatee conditions and procedures for aquatic construction as approved by the Savannah District Office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

Permittee may be required to provide a post-construction survey.

Thank you.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: All right. We have two speakers signed up. Is there anyone that did not sign up to speak to the Bryan County project?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

With that in mind, we have Mr.Giordano. Did I butcher that?

MR. GIORDANO: I'm with Stuart. I'm here on behalf of the applicant.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay. Very good. And then Ms. Fraser.

MS. FRASER: I was confused by the card. I want to apologize. It asked me what I was speaking on, and I didn't -- so we wonder if we can improve this card so people who don't know, and like you just did, ask if anyone from the public would like to speak.

Thank you very much. I apologize for taking up your time.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you.

All right. So no public comments. Any questions or comments from the Committee?

MR. POOLE: I have one. Good morning. So today it belongs to Bryan County; correct?

MS. BARREIRO: Yes, it does.

MR. POOLE: The public access point, how does that stay in perpetuity? And I only ask that because I've been involved in one in McIntosh, and it's a county-owned project. But it was put into a trust back in the early 1900s. And it's a great model for public access that can never be converted into private. I'm just curious if this has ever been considered.

MR. SLIGH: I don't know. We can certainly find out. Bryan County is not here today, unfortunately, but we can certainly

1	find out. But I can tell you it was part of their comprehensive
2	plan in 2018 to find public water access. Recreational
3	facilities is a part of their goal.
4	So that's how this came about. And, you know, we certainly
5	think it's a great public project. And how, 50 years from now, I
6	don't know, but it's some sort of trust.
7	MR. POOLE: I would agree. Just look at it.
8	MR. SLIGH: Certainly. We'll certainly follow up and talk
9	about that. Thank you.
10	MR. GIORDANO: I'll add that the access component is a goal
11	of the project.
12	MR. POOLE: Awesome.
13	MR. GIORDANO: As is funding the boat ramps, and the public
14	access facilities.
15	MR. POOLE: Good enough. Thank you.
16	MS. BARREIRO: And any permit would need to be transferred.
17	So it would have to go through legal review as well.
18	MR. POOLE: Awesome.
19	DR. HEPBURN: I just think we commend the County for saving
20	us from a lot of condominiums and putting in a really nice
21	recreational project. So please take back both Mr. Poole's
22	recommendation and our commendations for coming up with it, and
23	Deb for you guys getting rid of that elevated walkway.
24	We appreciate that. That comforts us. And if there aren't
25	other questions, I'm happy to make the motion that we approve it

with the regular and special conditions. Thank you.
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a motion.
MR. BROOKSHIRE: Second.
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any discussion?
[NOTE: No response.]
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing no discussion, all in
favor say aye.
MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
MR. POOLE: Aye.
MR. BARROW: Aye.
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed, like sign.
[NOTE: No response.]
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: The motion carries.
All right. Paul.
MR. TOBLER: Thank you, Commissioner.
So we have a CMPA application. The applicant is the City of
Brunswick. The project locations, there are multiple locations,
on the Back River, and the Marshes of Terry Creek in the City of
Brunswick, Glynn County, Georgia.
One of the project locations is the eastern most terminus of
Parkwood Drive, right next to the St. Marks Towers, the outfall
there. The other six outfalls are located in the Riverside
Subdivision.
The proposed project is to improve all seven stormwater

outfalls within the City of Brunswick, Glynn County, Georgia.

Now I would like to introduce Ben Pierce with GWES Engineering.

MR. PIERCE: Thank you, Paul.

Yes, my name is Ben Pierce. I'm with GWES. We are the engineer of record on the project, representing the City of Brunswick.

And as Paul was mentioning, there are seven total outfalls that the City has programmed to improve; six of which are in the Riverside community, and one is at the end of Parkwood Drive.

This is the improvement schematic here of the outfall at Parkwood Drive to replace the existing head wall with a new head wall with tide gates keeping the existing underground storm sewer system currently in place.

The other community, Riverside, there are several improvements to the existing outfalls. Many are in conditions where there is no in-treatments, no head walls, no in-protection, no erosion protection. And the improvements are going to include in many of these locations improvements to the head wall, replacing the older system, creating a new tide gate at the end of the storm sewer system, and providing some erosion prevention around each outfall.

Over on St. Catherine's Lane, very similar application, replacing the older pipe with a new head wall And a new tide flex tide gate as well as erosion prevention around it.

Very similar situations at Black Beard Circle.

At 5018 Riverside Drive, we've identified some temporary areas outside of the permanent impacts where we're just trying to provide some extra room for construction activities to mobilize.

Again, a very similar situation at the end at 5031 Riverside Drive, just making those outfall improvements.

Sapelo island, Sapelo Island Drive, this is a little bit further out from the paved area, but going and replacing that outfall system with a new head wall, tide flex, tide gate and erosion prevention as well.

MR. TOBLER: Thank you, Ben.

The public notice of the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act Committee ran from June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023 to July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023. One comment was received. The commenter express concerns that having tide control structures on the outfalls would increase the flooding problems during higher than average tides.

The agent provided a written response.

Should the Committee find this in the public interest, Staff recommends the following special conditions.

The permittee will be required to provide a post-construction survey to the Department upon completion of the permitted activity. The survey shall comply with the Georgia Plat Act.

No. 2, dredging in CMPA jurisdictional areas is not authorized with this permit.

No. 3, the permittee must install manatee awareness sinage during construction of the project, and shall adhere to standard manatee conditions and procedures for proper aquatic construction as approved by the Savannah District Office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Georgia Department of Natural Resource.

No. 4, erosion control structures, such as silt fences, must be maintained during construction, and removed immediately once construction is completed at each individual site.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: All right. We one speaker signed up for public comment. Mr.Hunt.

MR. HART: Hart. Didn't I close my A, H A? INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Mr.Hart.

MR. HART: I'm sorry. My wife complains constantly.

I've got some pictures I'd like to pass out just to show you what the flooding situation is. My name is Hal Hart.

I live at 106 Talahi Island Lane in Riverside. I love where I live, I'll tell you. You can talk to anybody on Riverside, and they'll tell you the same thing. It is paradise.

Paradise has its perils, and flooding is one of them.

Hurricanes are another. The pictures I'm passing out are not hurricane pictures. They are 8-foot tides with a nor'easter that kills us. This is a tide table that's marked 8-foot tides. It shamelessly advertises my business. I apologize for that.

I don't know if these projects are going to help my house

1	specifically. The pictures I'm passing out, the road in front of
2	our house, Riverside Drive, goes under water. I've got pictures
3	of people driving through it. I don't know if they don't know
4	about salt water, what it does to a car, but I've replaced brakes
5	on my truck twice. My van, I've replaced brake lines.
6	Hopefully you guys will pass this. I don't know again, I
7	don't know if this will help me. It will help my neighbors, I
8	think. I know Rob has got some questions, legitimate questions.
9	I hope that the City of Brunswick, y'all can coerce the City
10	of Brunswick to raise Riverside Drive. Nobody should have to
11	drive through salt water. And this is as you'll see from the
12	tide tables, it's a coming thing.
13	And climate warming, I don't know if that's I've never
14	seen it. I've lived here all my life. I have never seen so many
15	8-foot tides in what we've had in the last four or five years.
16	It's incredible. And I'm sure it's a cycle, and hopefully it
17	will go back down.
18	But I appreciate speaking in front of you. Any questions
19	you may have for me?
20	[NOTE: No response.]
21	MR. HART: Thank you very much.
22	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Mr.Hart.
23	MR. HART: I appreciate it, Paul.
24	MR. TOBLER: Yes, sir, thank you.
25	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Is anyone else that would wish

to speak to this project?

Would the agent like to respond to the comment? It seems favorable.

MR. BUCEY: Yes. The City of Brunswick is intending to improve the stormwater condition as it's flowing out into the tidal areas. And Mr. Hart is right. Yes, these project areas are not in his area of the neighborhood, but certainly will improve stormwater flow as it goes -- as it's leaving the subdivision out into the marsh as well as preventing the tide from coming back into the stormwater system, which not only has flowing aspects, but also deposit silt and erosion into those storm sewer systems. And that's a continuing maintenance issue.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay. Paul, anything you would like to follow up with?

MR. TOBLER: Just to address one of Mr.Hart's comments. We recently did a jurisdictional determination for a section of Riverside Drive to raise the road. And I'm not sure when that project is coming, but we did the JD line. And they are plaining on raising a section of that road.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any questions or comments from the Committee?

[NOTE: No response.]

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: No questions or comments, I will entertain a motion.

DR. HEPBURN: I make a motion that we approve the project

1	with the special conditions, and hope that the outfalls will work
2	this time as opposed to just sitting there.
3	So thank you.
4	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a motion. Can I get a
5	second?
6	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Second.
7	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, sir. Any
8	discussion?
9	[NOTE: No response.]
10	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing no discussion, all in
11	favor of the motion say aye.
12	MR. POOLE: Aye.
13	DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
14	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
15	MR. BARROW: Aye.
16	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed?
17	[NOTE: No response.]
18	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: The motion carries.
19	Paul, I think you have our next project as well.
20	MR. TOBLER: Thanks again, Mr.Commissioner.
21	This is a CMPA application project. The applicants are John
22	H. Irby and Sarah C. Irby.
23	The project location is 260 West Tenth Street, Sea Island,
24	Black Banks River, Glynn County, Georgia.
25	The project description is the proposed project is to

construct a bulkhead. The proposed project is under a tenth of an acre, and therefore may be considered a minor alteration of the coastal marshlands under the Official Code of Georgia, 12-5-280.

Three CMPC members requested the project be brought before the Committee for a full consideration.

Now I would like to introduce Dan Bucey, the agent from Resource and Land Consultants.

MR. BUCEY: Good morning, my name is Dan Bucey with Resource and Land Consultants. With me today is Judd Turner, counsel for Mr.Irby, that will speak to some of the permit history on this project.

As Paul stated, the project is located on Tenth Street on Sea Island. Some aerial photographs, please note in this particular photograph the existing bulkhead north of Mr.Irby's lot and also south of Mr.Irby's lot.

The project site, Mr.Irby has lived there for close to 50 years, currently landscaped, has a pool and a house, portions of which are in the 50-foot upland buffer that we'll speak to later.

Here's the site plans showing the upland component buffer, would be this red line. And the proposed bulkhead is closely following the jurisdiction line, which is the heavier black line. And you can see existing portions of the pool deck and house are within the 50-foot upland component buffer, along with a small fire pit.

The marshlands component of the project consists of constructing a bulkhead in jurisdiction for shoreline protection along 153 linear feet of the shoreline abutting his lot.

The impacts would be 153 square feet of marshlands with 1.89 cubic yards of backfill below the high tide line, which would be  $12/1000^{th}$  of a cubic foot per running foot along the length of the project.

The upland component of the project consists of the 50-yard area landward of the -- consisting of an existing lawn, landscaping, and existing structures, including a portion of the masonry wall, a dock walkway, concrete pool deck, fire pit, and then portions of residential dwelling.

The activities proposed within the upland buffer include the temporary impacts necessary for the construction of the wall, staging of materials and installation of the tieback system.

The total temporary impacts in the upland component would be 1,033 square feet. The disturbed area would be landscaped with native species upon completion of the bulkhead construction.

No additional structures are proposed within the upland component.

There's some photographs taken by Staff. I think that was January, February of last year, or this year, excuse me.

You see the lawn on this particular photograph. To the right, you can see the neighbor's bulkhead and the difference in the elevation of the lots. And the marsh line for Mr.Irby will

be just down in this general area. There's a nontidal vegetation growing above the marsh line.

These additional photos, we provided to show the need for Mr.Irby's particular situation on his lot.

In the Staff's findings, it was asserted there was no visibly erosion on the property, which is the case. Mr.Irby has a subsidence problem, which shows the purpose and need for this project.

This palm tree has been at this lot. This is not recently planted. This palm tree used to be level along with his lawn and you can see how much it drops off there now.

The second photo to the right, a little hard to see, but this black thing right here is a water junction box that was installed for providing water to the dock that we permitted back in '14, I believe. And when they installed this particular box, the top of that box was level with the decking. And you can see it has dropped over a foot.

When I delineated, re-delineated the property several years ago, the box was actually sloped toward the marsh. So they have leveled it out, but it has significantly dropped.

Here are cracks developing in his pool deck. And you can see they are not on the grout line coming across, which is a good indication of subsidence. There is a very large crack going right down the center, again, across, not on the grout line, but across the center line of the tiles.

The photograph on the right would be the neighbors to the south. And they're both in, I guess, I'll just show the conditions of the neighbors to the north.

At this time, Mr. Turner is going to speak to some of the history of this project.

Judd.

MR. TURNER: Good morning. It's good to see everybody.

Judd Turner representing the Irbys in this matter. And I really just wanted to, first on behalf John and Sarah, we thank the Department for working with us on this, because there's not a complication related to the upland component. We appreciate the ability to process this. It has been a long road for a lot of the bulkhead applicants.

And I know the Department is working procedurally to move from the licensure mechanism that was used historically for bulkheads to coming to you guys of the Committee. And so I know that there are discussions about applicants that have upland components, and therefore some of that work is continuing within the Department. But because Mr.Irby, Sarah and John, don't have anything other than the tiebacks into the upland plan, there's not an upland component complexity.

So we thank you for processing the application. It has been a long road. I think Mr.Irby's original application for licensure is like three years. So I though he reapplied through the permit process in November of last year. So it has been

eight months.

However, the recommendation that came out, and the reason that I'm here to address a few points relates to the Staff's recommendation and findings.

No. 1, I don't know that this is clearly -- I think the staff's approach was to look for active erosion, and you see that in the context with a tidal creek. But in many of the lots of which we looked at, I mean, he's got bulkheads -- my client has got bulkheads that have been permitted through the licensure procedure on the right and left of him.

And so it not a situation where you have an active eroding bank for a tidal creek, but you have a subsidence problem. And I think the evidence is clear.

I don't know if Staff looked at that. Certainly we were not asked for that evidence in the process. And we were happy to provide it. But as we move from a -- and I understand in my previous life as EPD director, I dealt with that 25-foot buffer that runs landward of the CMPA line.

And so I'd like to just briefly address the two issues. One is that characterization by Staff that this application is an application to fill marshland to put in the bulkhead in jurisdiction for a residential use. And we just object to that characterization.

The statute does provide that language, that fill for an industrial, commercial, or residential use is presumed to be not

in the public interest. But that determination is for this Committee to make.

What would I tell you, however, is we have been consistent in this application, and I believe in the licensure procedures that the staff used prior to look at these bulkheads of which are permitted up and down Sea Island as shore stabilization. And in this case, and in most of the cases that I'm aware of on Sea Island, it's a subsidence question.

Most of them you're going to have a lawn coming down and transitioning into the marsh grass. But that root ball that the picture was shown -- I don't know how to operate this thing -- yeah, that one is, you know, I think it's prototypical evidence of subsidence.

And I don't know how we didn't get that worked out with Staff ahead of time, but we are where we are. I think this evidence is clear. And this is not -- if you think about the purpose of the act, this is not to extend your lawn into the marsh to get more room to build a pool, to build -- to have a larger -- that's what that language in the Act is for.

So stabilize what you have is not that. And it is not contrary to the public interest, and it's consistent with what the staff viewed these other bulkheads that had been permitted through the licensure procedure.

And I would say if this Committee -- and I understand the procedural change to move from a licensure to a permit through

the CMPA and through your Committee. I understand that. But if you were to find that Mr.Irby's is for a residential use, thus contrary to that, I would question every bulkhead on Sea Island underpinning authorization.

I don't think we have that problem, because I think those were appropriately permitted for shore stabilization, and this should be appropriately permitted. But it is unfortunate that we had a recommendation that was not for approval kicked to the Committee, and left this question about residential use.

So that's one.

My second point I need to make is there's a lot of discussion about alternatives. Could you build this wall in the upland? Could you come back a foot and build in the upland? The answer to that is that's not a reasonable alternative for the landowner to need to do.

First, the Irbys would have to get a variance from EPD, which has not been the procedure before. EPD is under -- having been the director and led the agency, I dealt with many of these. In fact, I was director when we reestablished the way to measure the buffer for the marshland. For a while, it was only from wrested vegetation and its application with coast was particularly bad, because in many cases wrested vegetation, as you all know, is out here somewhere in the marsh where the creek is running. But the real CMPA line is where the buffer should be measured from.

So we amended the statute when I was director to recognize that 20-foot upland buffer for E and S protection, measure from the CMPA line. And in that statute, it was anticipated and understood that there will be projects like bulkheads in the jurisdictional marsh that tie back into the buffer. And so in those cases, where there's a Coastal Marshlands permit the E and S requirement, you don't need -- you don't have to get a variance for upland impacts.

So it's anticipated in those amendments that in the case of a buffer -- I mean, in the case of a permit from the Committee, you would also need to get a variance for that tieback.

So but the applicant is in a position, we were clear in our response to comments from the staff on this, that it is not a reasonable alternative to be forced to move into your upland to protect your upland. It actually is more invasive to trench out and do that work, you know, a foot or two back into your upland. You are tying into bulkheads that are on either side of you that are already in jurisdiction.

And furthermore, you've got EPD who is under a strict -when you get a buffer variance, it's not much discretion for the
director. It has to fit in a category. The only category that
I'm aware of is that it would be a structure that has to be in
the buffer. For EPD, I can tell you having talked to Staff,
their answer well, you don't have to be in the buffer. You can
historically put a bulkhead right in the edge of CMPA

jurisdiction.

So, there's no ground for -- so we've got two agency doing this. It needs to be fixed, but it doesn't need to be Mr.Irby who has been trying to follow the law here and get a permit, and do it the right way is left with this recommendation.

So, on behalf of my client, we hope that there's ample evidence of subsidence presented here today for the Committee to find that it is a shore stabilization project. This is not an extension of some lawn into the marsh.

And also, I would ask, as a lawyer, that the Committee find the appropriate additional findings that would be contrary to the characterization this is a bulkhead for a residential use, but instead a shore stabilization.

So thank you for the chance to address those issues. And again, we appreciate working with Staff. I know it's a transition period. So some of these things have to be worked out, but the recommendation does present some challenges as worded.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay. Thank you, Judd. We have one speaker, Mr. Kilgore.

MR. KILGORE: thank you for the opportunity to address this body. I have a fair amount of experience serving on boards, and dealing with rules, laws, regulations, compliance. In my experience, when you begin to grant variances and violations, and permit things that are beyond what the ordinance or the law

permits, then you have an erosion of your authority, and you have -- as has just been pointed out -- that there's bulkheads and structures that have been permitted over time. It's three feet into the JD, into the jurisdictional area today. It's five feet, a month from now. Seven feet, and then ten feet.

At some point you're going to have to say no. And so I'm just -- I'm not here to comment on the Irby application. I had to sign in to speak on some issue. And so I picked the first one.

I understand totally a landowner, a property owner's inclination to maximize the aesthetic appeal of the yard and to protect the property from erosion. So I'm not speaking necessarily in opposition to anything other than we as common citizens look to this agency for enforcement. And when you grant special permits and accommodations, we lose faith and competence in our institutions.

And so I just ask that as you -- this is a relatively new group. And so I just wanted to take the opportunity to say please be mindful of what we as citizens are looking for you to do in terms of enforcement and protection, both under the SPA and the CMPA.

Thank you very much.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Please keep your comments to this project.

MS. FRASER: Thank you very much. My name is Jane Fraser.

I live on the marsh at 16<sup>th</sup> Street on Sea Island. So I am only six blocks from where this project is going to take place.

I am on the marsh, as I said. And I, too, have noticed erosion. And my solution has been native plants, wax myrtles. I lived through two hurricanes. So I saw what the water can do.

So rather than putting a bulkhead, which will be eaten out from underneath -- and by the way, I do believe that Sea Island is subsiding. My neighbor on the 16<sup>th</sup> has a floor which is cracking. So this was not a problem just because of the Irbys' home, but it is a problem on Sea Island.

I don't think bulkheads are the solution. I think that natural vegetation is. We've seen over and over again these applications to destroy the natural habitat. We've seen the disappearance of the wildlife. And so we would hope, too, that this Committee would chose this opportunity. And I agree that Mr.Irby should have the right to protect his property. It is the first time that I have seen an actual bulkhead be proposed in the marsh. To me, it's in the marsh.

I did ask to visit the property. I was not allowed to. And I understand that. They live there. They don't want people coming in their backyard. But I think if you are on the agenda, that you are opening yourself up at least for inspection.

So I would have liked to have seen it before my comments. But because I'm only six blocks up, I'm definitely affected by this bulkhead. And so are my neighbors. One of my neighbors is

my children. They are also on the marsh. So that's four of us.

So thank you very much for your consideration. Thank you for your time.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Ms. Fraser. Does the agent chose to reply?

MR. BUCEY: In response to Ms. Fraser's comment about vegetation, we already have a vegetated shoreline, a little shadowy, but, you know, there's a band of nontidal plants, and the marsh line is just in front of this. There are some myrtles and other, you know, it's heavily vegetated. The problem is not a surface erosion problem. It's an underneath subsidence. The tide comes up; it recedes every day. It pulls those vines out of that soil, and then it collapses.

Now Mr.Irby has a very fine landscaping crew. I did a permit last year that didn't involve the marsh. It was a Corps of Engineers permit only for Mr.Holmes on 29<sup>th</sup> Street. His landscapers are not as good. And you can see multiple pockets where the lawn was actually receded, sloughed off. And they threw some seed on it. But they didn't fix it.

Mr.Irby has a very good landscaper. Otherwise, I'm almost certain we'd have the same visual indicators. I did go to the site on Tuesday. You get down into the last several feet of his lawn. It's like walking on a sponge. That ground underneath is giving, and it will give, and it will continue, and having plants in there is not the answer.

1	Sheet piles driven into the ground to the appropriate amount
2	to keep that water interface from going up underneath the lawn
3	towards his building is the answer.
4	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you. Any responses?
5	[NOTE: No response.]
6	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any questions or comments from
7	the Committee?
8	MR. BARROW: Yes. I have a question for the applicant.
9	First off, when was the house built? And you mentioned 50
10	years ago.
11	MR. BUCEY: I believe Mr.Irby said that he has lived there
12	for 47 or some years, something to that effect.
13	MR. BARROW: And has there been any, I'd say well, living
14	on the marsh myself, obviously settling occurs. And it's just
15	natural, but is there anything abnormal in the housing structure
16	that you guys have noticed in the settling?
17	MR. BUCEY: According to Mr.Irby, besides the cracks in the
18	pool deck, there is one picture that was along a grout line, in
19	the actual entrance from the pool into the house. Nothing else
20	in the house that I'm aware of settling, at least visible at this
21	point, but certainly the pool deck and very significant amount of
22	subsidence is happening closer to the marsh. And it's working
23	its way inlet. So it's only a matter of time, I would assume.
24	MR. BARROW: Thank you.
25	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Other questions or comments.

DR. HEPBURN: I would just like to hear the staff talk a little bit about the permitting of the bulkheads on either side of the Irby property, and how the alignment of this proposed project basically squares with those bulkheads.

Obviously that was a process before my time on this board and the Committee. We've exclusively talked about sort of moving in jurisdiction considerations from a staff consideration related to bulkheads to the Committee consideration. And so understanding, when were they permitted and are they in the marsh?

MR. NOBLE: Yes, ma'am, Dr. Hepburn. So we looked into the history on both sites. I probably get it confused from one or the other as far as when they were timed, north and south, but one was 2013. One was 2021.

Those were both -- those projects were both initiated with a request to do a Coastal Marshlands Protection Act jurisdiction line, and subsequently, we issued revocable licensure for a bulkhead on those properties.

Those bulkheads were located just seaward of the line. And so to say whether or not there was visibly erosion at the time, files really didn't reflect that, but the authorizations were for bulkheads to be placed just seaward of the line, with a maximum volume of material which neither project got near that volume. It was a cubic yard per running foot is the acceptable volume. And that's sort of how the Department had limited the seaward

extent of the project into the marsh from the upland previously.

So that's the background and the site history on those that we have.

DR. HEPBURN: So in that respect, how is this different? As you know, I am inclined to support the staff's perspective, but I want to understand what our distinction is relative to this project than, say, the 2021 project.

MR. NOBLE: So we re-examined existing rules and laws. And based upon that examination, the policy has been updated to basically to comply with the requirements of the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act.

So the Committee is going to, most likely, be seeing many more of these very similar types of projects for shoreline stabilization. And, you know, that's what Staff's role is, is to work with applicants in order to determine what sort of technique is to be employed at each site. And so basically that's where we are now versus last year.

MR. TOBLER: And just to add to that, Dr. Hepburn, that as field staff, the lens changes when you know that these are regulated under the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act, like Josh said. So your lens kinda works through the law a little bit differently than it did when it was with the license procedure.

MR. BUCEY: May I?

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Go ahead.

MR. BUCEY: I've been working in the coast here or for

Savannah for 25 years doing this. And I don't even know if I could keep track of how many shoreline stabilization projects that I've permitted through the staff in tidal waters and the Corps of Engineers. And the process to obtain a Corps of Engineer's permit, Section 10-404, typically a Nationwide 13 or 18, and a license from the staff prior to last November, and as Josh had mentioned, the conditions was less than 500 feet, less than a cubic yard per running foot, then it was approved through the license program at a staff level.

The Corps of Engineers' requirement are the same. And anything that exceeded that would have to come to Committee, and I've only had one come to the Committee. And it wasn't because of the threshold. There was a different situation where a couple of trees were involved. So the requirement has always been closely following the shoreline one to two feet out, keep well under those thresholds, and it was permitted, again through the staff and the Corps.

And the only thing different about this, we've already obtained the Corps permit, Nationwide 18. Our numbers are minuscule, 0004, for 1,000<sup>th</sup> of an acre of fill.

When procedures changed, then we submitted the Coastal Marshlands permit last November. So at that time, of course, the status were still the same, plus we followed the shoreline, keep well under the thresholds.

DR. HEPBURN: Thanks, Dan.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Other questions or comments of the Committee?

MR. BROOKSHIRE: What kind of issues does it create for the property on with bulkheads on either side? Does that negatively affect it; or, is it affected at all?

MR. BUCEY: From a high tide and shoreline, or a storm surge prospective, absolutely. That would create a funnel in the storm surge situation that I'm sure would be devastating to his lawn.

MR. BARROW: I have a question for the staff. I'm sorry. I'm trying to understand. You said there was a previous rule of fill rate of one cubic -- is it one cubic yard per running foot? Is that what I heard on the previous determination?

MR. NOBLE: Yes, sir. The management limits for many years with the Nationwide 13 Federal Permitting Guidelines for bank stabilization, which included one cubic yard per running foot.

And that's what the Department had adopted as a policy as how we would manage the shoreline stabilization projects. That's where that value was derived.

MR. BARROW: And what is that rate here with this project?

MR. NOBLE: I think Dan had a very finite note on that.

MR. BUCEY: It's .102 or .012. Excuse me. .012 cubic yards per foot. That's the amount of fill below the tide line. So the finish height will be a couple of feet higher, you know, level it out. But the only point that's regulated is the high tide level.

MR. BARROW: Thank you.

1	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any other questions or
2	comments?
3	[NOTE: No response.]
4	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I will entertain a motion.
5	MR. POOLE: I make a motion to approve this project with two
6	special conditions. Special Condition One, permittee may be
7	required to provide a post-construction survey to the Georgia
8	Department of Natural Resources, Coastal Resources Division.
9	And secondly, the permittee must install manatee awareness
10	sinage during construction of the project, and give standard
11	manatee conditions and procedures required for aquatic
12	construction as approved.
13	And just to note, after a long review of this project I
14	know we've had a lot of questions. What I would consider is
15	incidental fill to protect the property. Subsidence is a real
16	thing. I've got personal experience with that.
17	And then long term, considering the climate change, we'll
18	probable see a lot more of these as Josh noted, and with Mr.
19	Kilgore's respect, each and every project will be reviewed
20	independently.
21	But for this project, I think I make a motion to approve
22	this with the two special conditions.
23	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a motion to approve with
24	two special conditions. Do I have a second?
25	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Second.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a second. Any discussion?

MR. BARROW: I just want to make another comment that, you know, and I'm speaking for myself individually. I take our responsibilities on this board very seriously and in terms of the public about not letting this be a slippery slope. I think the fact that this is an existing residence, obviously we are seeing evidence of subsidence. I think people have a right to protect their property.

As you mentioned, you know, waters are rising, et cetera, but I also do agree there has to be a demarcation line in which, you know -- and I appreciate, you know, the staff in its previous efforts, and rulings, and obviously coming here. I understand this, you know, is going to set a precedent. So I think I just want to go on note that obviously moving forward, you know, this is something that has got to continue to update coming in front of the Committee, but existing residents protecting their property rights, I think it's something we ought to take seriously concern with what's happening.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, sir. Yes, ma'am.

DR. HEPBURN: And also on that note, just to follow up. I am actually going to reluctantly support this. That is not necessarily in my nature, but I do believe that the ground rules have changed a little bit; no pun intended, but since we've moved from licensing to now coming before the Committee -- and also to

both Jack and Jane's point, and others, we live on an island. So it shouldn't come as a surprise to people that, you know, that tides and marshes, and it's getting worse, and we do have climate change, and so on to take on.

So I think we also need to be careful that we don't, you know, build bulkheads everywhere just because people wake up in the morning and suddenly realize they live on an island. I just think we need get higher both as a Committee and a staff to understanding how we're going to deal with these projects, and make it very clear to applicants that with the exception of minimal, you know, potentially purging, we're going to hold strong to the CMPA statute and guidelines if in fact the Committee is going to be doing this. But for the moment, for somebody that has been in this three-year reign, I almost feel like we need to hold them to a permitting standard with the licensure standard under which they originally applied versus potentially the Act's stronger regulatory guidelines which we then need to uphold in future projects, I hope.

If that makes sense. Thank you.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: It did.

MS. FRASER: Would you mind kindly reading the decision, because we could not hear what was being suggested as the special conditions. In other words, what will you be voting on?

MR. TOBLER: Diana, could you pull up the last line of the power point, please. I think that will -- Mr. Poole was reading

the conditions. We have those, as always, drafted.
Thank you.
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: All right. On the screen we
have the two special conditions attached to the motion from
Mr.Davis. Calling the question to a vote, all in favor of the
motion as stated, say aye.
DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
MR. BARROW: Aye.
MR. POOLE: Aye.
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed?
[NOTE: No response.]
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: The motion carries.
DR. HEPBURN: And just to clarify for the members in the
audience, Mr.Chairman, the regular conditions all still apply as
well. These are just the special conditions. So there are a
number of guidelines that go with it.
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Yes, ma'am. Good point.
MR. BUCEY: Thank you.
INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: All right, Beth.
MS. BYRNES: Thank you, Commissioner. And good morning,
everyone. My name is Beth Byrnes.
The applicant for the Shore Protection Act permit
application is the Happiest Camper, LLC. The project is located

at 110 East Twenty-Seventh Street and, a portion of the East

25

Twenty-Seventh Street right of way on Sea Island.

The applicant is proposing removal and installation of native landscaping within the State's Shore Protection Act jurisdiction.

I would now like to introduce the agent, Dan Bucey, from Resource & Land Consultants to present the project.

MR. BUCEY: Thank you, Beth. Dan Bucey, Resource & Land Consultants, agency for Mr.Costello.

As you can see, the project is located on 110 East
Twenty-Seventh Street. The project will take place on that lot,
also on a portion of the adjacent Sea Island right of way for
which the applicant has already obtained permission.

The subject lot is 58,328 square feet, with 3,767 square feet within jurisdiction. And that project area also includes a 1,494 square-foot portion of the adjacent Sea Island right of way.

As you see on the photograph, the area within jurisdiction was formerly lawn they haven't maintained since they began construction. So there's a lot of weeds growing up. But there is an existing rock revetment underneath the dune line there, and the Shore Protection Act jurisdiction line was properly marked and verified by the Corps -- excuse me -- by the staff.

There is a picture of the back of the dune, and then construction fencing, and then the area here which has been unmaintained since they started construction on the house.

There is a portion of the right of way. It shows the right of way with the existing beach crossover. And that was an access looking back down the south end of the lot.

So the applicant proposes activities to include some minor grading, and install native landscaping within jurisdiction, again both on the subject lot and on the adjacent Sea Island right of way, to kinda tie it all together.

As always, a final landscape plan would be provided to the staff for approval prior to installation.

Thank you.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Dan.

I don't believe we have anyone signed up for public comment on this project.

Do you have comments for this project?

MS. FRASER: Yes. Again, Jane Fraser. And I don't live very far from this project, but of course, as far as I'm concerned, everything that affect the shoreline is going to affect the backside of the island as well.

And I do have some pictures here. And what Mr.Bucey calls weeds, are exactly what I call natural vegetation. It's what's holding this island. And if you fly over it now, you will see that much of the natural vegetation has been ripped out by people who have bought homes here. They wanted to look like New York City or Atlanta.

And this is what holds this island together. So that's my

objection.

I also object to taking out pine trees, which as many of you who have been at the DNR for a while know that the pine trees were the demarcation of the jurisdictional line.

So I know that has been changed now, unfortunately. But of course, as Ms. Campbell wrote, Ms. Campbell unfortunately couldn't be here, but she walks that area every night, knows the birds, knows the birds that are in those trees that are going to be destroyed. The marsh bunnies have no place to live any more. This is their habitat.

And so I feel that it is the job of the Committee to protect this habitat, which in turn is what's holding that island.

I was also told by Mr.Bucey that we're not a barrier island. But I think we are a barrier island. Both ends of Sea Island are shifting constantly. And as we've just heard, the entire island is subsiding and shifting.

So, please don't destroy what is holding our island in place, and try to protect it. This is what the Shore Protection Act is all about.

Thank you very much.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Ms. Fraser.

Beth, if you would present the special conditions, please.

MS. BYRNES: The public notice of the Shore Protection Committee ran from April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023 through April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

Six public comments were received opposing the project. The

2	2
3	3
4	1
5	5
6	)
7	7
8	3
ç	)
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	
2	
2	
2	
2	_

comments included concerns regarding hydrology, the listing of nonnative vegetation in the plant drawings, value of currently landscaped to wildlife and function, and the stability of the dunes.

The agent has provided written responses to the comments.

Should the Committee determine the proposed project to be in the public interest, the Department staff to the Committee recommends the following special conditions.

No. 1, in order to minimize the disruption of nesting activity from artificial lighting from the subject parcel, the permittee must comply with the Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division sea turtles nesting guidelines as well as the lighting ordinance of Glynn County.

No. 2, a final landscape plan must be provided to the Department for approval prior to installation. Only vegetation native to Georgia may be utilized.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Beth.

Mr.Bucey, would you like to respond to public comment?

MR. BUCEY: I think Ms. Fraser was mentioning some pine trees removed. My understanding is pine trees were removed outside of jurisdiction.

I'm not quite sure when I instructed her that Sea Island is not a barrier island, I'm not familiar with that. Certainly it's an island exposed to the sea for sure.

And then as far as the vegetation goes, the area used to be

1	landscaped. It's going to be landscaped. Right now, it's just
2	it has not been maintained, which is typical for these projects.
3	They take several years to build a house on Sea Island. And they
4	will comply with the Act, and everything that is put back will be
5	native, and will be approved by the staff before that is approved
6	and put in the ground. And the root masses, and the
7	stabilization that was there will be replaced in kind.
8	Thank you.
9	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Beth, do you have any comments
10	MS. BYRNES: No.
11	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay. Any questions or
12	comments?
13	MR. POOLE: Just so I'm clear, once the plan is submitted
14	with the native plants, then a revised plan will be sent out that
15	would review the project.
16	MR. NOBLE: Yes, sir, that's correct, Mr.Poole.
17	MR. POOLE: Thank you.
18	DR. HEPBURN: Mine is probably very similar. Most of the
19	comments dealt with concern about nonnative vegetation. And we
20	have cleared that up. It will be native vegetation.
21	MR. BUCEY: Yes, ma'am.
22	DR. HEPBURN: And the bunnies can be happy in it?
23	MR. BUCEY: Yes, ma'am.
24	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any other questions or
25	comments?

1	[NOTE: No response.]
2	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, I'll entertain a
3	motion.
4	MR. BARROW: I make a motion to approve subject to the
5	standard and special conditions.
6	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a motion.
7	DR. HEPBURN: I'll second it.
8	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: We have a second. Any further
9	discussion?
10	[NOTE: No response.]
11	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, all in favor of
12	the motion say aye.
13	MR. POOLE: Aye.
14	MR. BARROW: Aye.
15	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
16	DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
17	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed?
18	[NOTE: No response.]
19	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: The motion carries.
20	Thank you.
21	MR. BUCEY: Thank you.
22	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Beth, I think you have our next
23	project.
24	MS. BYRNES: Again, my name is Beth Byrnes. The applicant
25	for this Shore Protection Act permit application is John C.

Shelton and Pamela A. Flick.

The project is located at 4212 Thirteen Street on St. Simons Island. The applicant is proposing removal and installation of the native landscape plan escaping, removal of a portion of sandbags and installation of a retaining wall, pool and spa, pool deck and coping, fire pit, and fencing within the State Shore Protection Act jurisdiction.

I would now like to introduce the agent, Blake Hightower, from Land Design & Associates to present the project.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Thank you, Committee. Blake Hightower from Land Design & Associates.

As you see, the property on East Beach had a history of emergency authorization for some sandbags being placed. Our project now is to remove a few of -- excuse me -- to remove the walkway that has now been previously removed with the scaffolding you don't see here in this photo. That was previously approved by the DNR.

We were going to excavate a portion of the sandbags that cuts across the property itself. The plan is to install a pool spa and a retaining wall to help reinforce the landward side of the sandbags that do remain, and to have help reinsure the area that we are removing sandbags from to help establish the area for the pool itself.

The area of the property is 6,500 feet. The area of jurisdiction is 1735.

Upon completion, the existing proposed impacts within the jurisdiction will total to 61.6%, and approximately 38% of the State jurisdictional area will remain in the natural or improved vegetated condition.

As you see here, this is the area of a sandbags that we're proposing to remove, and reestablish with the retaining wall. We're planning to run it the entire length of the property line history. The sandbags currently run through the county right of way and into an additional parcel of which during the emergency process, the Sheltons -- John Shelton and Pamela Flick purchased and installed themselves to help create an establishment of the dune line for them and their neighbors behind them.

And here's the plan for this. The fire pit, as mentioned, is not a permanent structure. It's a modular pit, not to be build in permanency in that area, but the sand set pool pavers will allow permeability, along with the native vegetation of which we will provide a completed landscape design upon approval and prior to installation.

I thank you for your time.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay, Beth, please present the special conditions.

MS. BYRNES: The public notice of the Shore Protection Committee ran from June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2023 through July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023. Two public comments were received in opposition of project, and then subsequently withdrawn after stating they had discussions

with the property owner.

The agent has provided written responses to the comments.

Should the Committee determine the proposed project to be in the public interest, the Department staff to the Committee recommends the following conditions.

- 1. In order to minimize the disruption of nesting activity from artificial lighting from the subject parcel, the permittee must comply with the Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division sea turtles nesting guidelines as well as the lighting ordinance of Glynn County.
- No. 2. A final landscape plan must be provided to the Department for approval prior to installation. Only vegetation native to Georgia may be utilized.
- No. 3. Only beach quality sand suitable for the sea turtle nesting, successful incubation and hatchling emergence shall be used on the project site. Fill material must be comparable in both coloration and grain size. All fill material shall be free of construction debris, rocks, or other foreign matter, and shall not contain on average greater than 10% fines (i.e. silt and clay; passing through a No. 2 sieve), and shall not contain on average greater than 5% coarse gravel or cobbles retained by a No. 4 sieve.
- No. 4. Permittee may be required to provide a post-construction survey that locates the proposed structure as indicated in the application materials. And such survey shall

1	comply with the Georgia Plat Act.
2	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Beth.
3	I don't believe we have anyone signed up to speak for this
4	project. Any questions or comments of the Committee?
5	MR. POOLE: No questions.
6	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: No questions. With that, we
7	would entertain a motion.
8	DR. HEPBURN: I make a motion to approve the project for the
9	Sheltons.
10	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Dr. Hepburn. So do
11	I have a second?
12	MR. POOLE: I have a second.
13	DR. HEPBURN: Oh, with the special conditions.
14	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: We have a motion to pass with
15	the special conditions. We have a second. Any discussion?
16	[NOTE: No response.]
17	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none. I call the
18	question. All in favor say aye.
19	DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
20	MR. POOLE: Aye.
21	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
22	MR. BARROW: Aye.
23	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed?
24	[NOTE: No response.]
25	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, the motion

carries.

Beth.

MS. BYRNES: The applicant for this Shore Protection Act permit application is VMG properties, LLC. The project located at 826 Parkway on St. Simons Island.

The applicant is proposing removal and installation of native landscaping, and installation of a pool and spa, pool deck, house deck, and fencing within the State Shore Protection Act jurisdiction.

An additional agent was added to this project to work in conjunction with Land Design Associates. Dan Bucey with Resource Land and Consultants will be speaking on behalf of this project.

MR. BUCEY: Thank you, Beth.

VMG is the applicant for this property located on St. Simons at 826 Parkway. She's proposing the removal and installation of native landscaping, installation of a pool and spa, pool deck, house deck, and fencing within jurisdiction.

The landward area of jurisdiction consists of a lawn.

There's a 30-foot existing cinderblock wall on the seaward side of the property. A portion of a property owner's wall encroached onto the property in jurisdiction as well as the other property line. So they have two encroaching walls.

Here's a picture of the existing conditions. There is the existing house, lawn area, and then the Shore Protection area. So there is a cinderblock wall out in that overgrown vegetation.

So as I stated summary-wise earlier, the specific project description is remove the cinderblock wall, install a 335 square-foot pool and spa, 369 pool deck, 266 square-foot portion of a two-story deck that would be extending off the house, which is landward of the jurisdiction, And a 9-square foot aluminum fence that with surround the perimeter within jurisdiction.

The remaining 535 square feet of land would be restored to at least its current condition or a better condition through the installation of sand and/or native landscaping, or a combination of the two. And as required, the final landscape plan would be submitted to Staff for the approval prior to installation.

Here's a copy of the site plan. The red portion there would be the portion of the decks within the jurisdictional area. The pool and pool deck, and then the remaining areas would be the landscaping that would remain would be improved.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay. Beth, do you have some special conditions?

MS. BYRNES: Yes. The public notice of the Shore Protection Committee ran from June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023 through July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

No comments were received.

Should the Committee determine the proposed project to be in the public interest, Department staff to the Committee recommends the following special conditions.

No. 1. In order to minimize the disruption of nesting activity from artificial lighting from the subject parcel, the

permittee must comply with the Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division sea turtles nesting guidelines as well as the lighting ordinance of Glynn County.

- No. 2. A final landscape plan must be provided to the Department for approval prior to installation. Only vegetation native to Georgia may be utilized.
- No. 3. Only beach quality sand suitable for the sea turtle nesting, successful incubation and hatchling emergence shall be used on the project site. Fill material must be comparable in both coloration and grain size. All fill material shall be free of construction debris, rocks, or other foreign matter, and shall not contain on average greater than 10% fines (i.e. silt and clay; passing through a No. 2 sieve), and shall not contain on average greater than 5% coarse gravel or cobbles retained by a No. 4 sieve.
- No. 4. Permittee may be required to provide a post-construction survey that locates the proposed structure as indicated in the application materials. And such survey shall comply with the Georgia Plat Act.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Thank you, Beth. Anyone wish to make any public comment for this project?

Ms. Fraser.

MS. FRASER: Jane Fraser. My comments are specific to vegetation native to Georgia. It would really be helpful, because I think Ms. Campbell pointed out that the vegetation

suggested for twenty-seventh street was not native to the coast, if your wording read *vegetation native to the Georgia coast*.

I mean things that look beautiful in Atlanta, they aren't necessarily going to hold our coast. This is the goal here, is to hold the sand in place, to hold the marsh in place. So vegetation native to the coastal area rather than just native to Georgia. That's a huge difference. And that is specificity that we need.

Thank you.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Mr.Bucey, do you wish to respond?

MR. BUCEY: Yes, Blake will speak to vegetation.

INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Okay.

MR. HIGHTOWER: So, again, Blake Hightower with Land Design Associates.

For the vegetation native to Georgia, and understanding the coastal piece of it, we do a lot of landscape plans in this area, inspect a lot of plant material for the coastal Georgia. We know what we're doing, what plant material does well here, and survives here. And the plans will reflect that.

DR. HEPBURN: Blake, so are you comfortable with taking that as an amendment if I --

MR. HIGHTOWER: I'm perfectly fine. If you want to say to coastal Georgia. We're going to use what works in this area, and survives salt spray and the soil conditions of what this is.

1	So if it's an amendment to be coastal Georgia plants or just
2	coastal plants in general
3	DR. HEPBURN: Obviously that will potentially affect
4	conditions that we have previously approved in the future.
5	MR. HIGHTOWER: And may I add one more thing to that?
6	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Go ahead.
7	MR. HIGHTOWER: And even native to Georgia, but where our
8	location is and how close we are to north Florida, we use a lot
9	of north Florida, south, plants that have transition to this
10	area. So to your point, I think coastal vegetation rather than a
11	native to the State is more prevalent in this situation.
12	And if that needs to be amended to the last ones, too, or at
13	least for ours.
14	DR. HEPBURN: Maybe we could just ask the staff to look at
15	wording that might be forward thinking, but also to clarify this
16	clearly, you know, to Blake's point. If it's Nassau County grass
17	is probable going to do better than if it's Fannin County grass.
18	MR. HAYMANS: And when the landscape plan comes back to the
19	Committee for the staff to look at, they'll approve
20	DR. HEPBURN: Yes, you can insure that, but maybe the
21	wording might make others feel better.
22	MR. HAYMANS: If you would like that, if you guys could do
23	that, moving forward, we can change to coastal.
24	DR. HEPBURN: Yes. I think that might help. And again,
25	optics and understanding, we trust you guys, but the rest of the

1	folks don't know when it comes back to you that you are making
2	that happen.
3	So, thank you. Thank you, Jane.
4	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Good points.
5	MR. HIGHTOWER: Thank you.
6	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any other questions or comments
7	from the Committee?
8	[NOTE: No response.]
9	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, we will entertain
10	a motion.
11	MR. POOLE: I make a motion that we approve the Shore
12	Protection Act project for VMG Properties, LLC for the removal
13	and installation of native landscaping and installation of a pool
14	and spa, pool deck, house deck, fencing at 826 Parkway, Atlantic
15	Ocean, St. Simons island, Glynn County, Georgia.
16	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: I have a motion.
17	MR. POOLE: And special and standard conditions.
18	DR. HEPBURN: I second it. I'll second it.
19	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: We have a second. Any other
20	discussion?
21	[NOTE: No response.]
22	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none. I will call the
23	question. All in favor say aye.
24	DR. HEPBURN: Aye.
25	MR POOLE: Ave

1	MR. BROOKSHIRE: Aye.
2	MR. BARROW: Aye.
3	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Any opposed?
4	[NOTE: No response.]
5	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Hearing none, the motion
6	carries.
7	I will ask do we have any other business that the Committee
8	wishes to discuss today?
9	I don't see no one ready to speak. I will say that the
10	Chair in his first meeting failed to introduce who is the most
11	important individuals in the room, the attorneys that keep us out
12	of trouble from the AG's office.
13	The Chair would like to recognize Robin Leigh and Andrea
14	Hartung. Thank y'all for being here today with us.
15	And I will thank the Committee. Thank you for making my
16	first Committee meeting very easy and smooth. So with that being
17	said, no other business, we will adjourn the meeting.
18	I would call for that motion.
19	DR. HEPBURN: Motion to adjourn, Mr.Chairman.
20	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: Seconded.
21	MR. BARROW: Second.
22	INTERIM COMMISSIONER RABON: No discussion. All in favor,
23	let's leave.
24	
25	********

1	
2	STATE OF GEORGIA,
3	GLYNN COUNTY.
4	CERTIFICATE
5	
6	I, Lora H. Carter, do hereby certify that the above and
7	foregoing pages is a true, complete, and accurate transcript of the
8	joint meeting as stated the captioned matter.
9	I further certify that I am a disinterested party to this
10	action.
11	This the 19th day of August, 2023.
12	
13	
14	Lora H. Carter
15	
16	Certified Court Reporter 15 Jerico Marsh Road
17	Midway, Georgia 31320 912.442.0399
18	912.663.2468 LoraCarter1234@comcast.net
19	Lord Garter 123 16 comeast. Het
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	