

**JOINT MEETING OF THE
COASTAL MARSHLANDS and SHORE PROTECTION COMMITTEE**

Friday, March 7, 2025

9:30 a.m.

**Georgia DNR Coastal Regional Office
Susan Shipman Environmental Learning Center
One Conservation Way
Brunswick, Georgia**

Debbie Gilbert, RPR, Certified Court Reporter, B-515

Gilbert & Jones

Certified Court Reporters

P. O. Box 1894 (31521)
1607 Norwich Street
Brunswick, GA 31520

gilbertandjones1@gmail.com
912.264.1670

P. O. Box 14515 (31416)
7505 Waters Avenue, F3
Savannah, GA 31406

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

WALTER RABON, Chairman
BRAD BROOKSHIRE
DR. VALERIE HEPBURN
DAVIS POOLE
CHAD BARROW

COASTAL RESOURCES STAFF PRESENT:

MR. DOUG HAYMANS
MR. PAUL TOBLER
MR. JOSH NOBLE
MS. DEB BARREIRO
MS. JILL ANDREWS
MS. BETH BYRNES
MS. CHEYENNE OSBORNE

ALSO PRESENT:

MS. ANDREA HARTUNG
Deputy Attorney General
MS. ROBIN LEIGH
MS. CLAIRE PROVANO
KYLE PEARSON
KATE IANNUZZI

PROCEEDINGS

* * *

CHAIRMAN RABON: Good morning.

SPEAKERS: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN RABON: I would like to call our meeting to order, the March 7th, 2025 CMPC meeting.

We have a few guests that I would like to introduce really quick. First and foremost, we have our two deputy commissioners somewhere in here. In the back, we have Thomas Bernard, who is over operations, and Trevor Santos, who is over our administrative services, just wanted them to come down and let y'all put some faces with some names.

I know many of you interact with them, sometimes daily, sometimes weekly, anyway faces with the names. Appreciate all that they do to support the Department of Natural Resources as well as this committee from time to time. I think on the phone from the attorney general's office, we have Robin Leigh, Andrea Hartung and Claire Provano with us as well.

In the back of the room with your law enforcement division, we have Sergeant Tim

1 Morris and Game Warden Lucas Bernard, and then I
2 also think on the phone we have our DNR
3 executive's counsel, Kyle Pearson and Kate
4 Iannuzzi with us.

5 With that, if you will bear with me, let
6 me go through the order of projects as they are
7 stated in our final agenda. Today we have eight
8 projects total. Six will be through CMPA
9 applications and then we've got two shore
10 protection applications as well.

11 The first one will be Coastal Marshland
12 Protection Act, James H. Alexander, Leo K.
13 Sheehan and Margaret B. Sheehan. It's for
14 construction and maintenance of a golf cart
15 bridge and shared private dock. This is at 10
16 and 12 Horsepen Point Drive, Horsepen Creek,
17 Tybee Island, Chatham County, Georgia.

18 The second is the Coastal Marshlands
19 Protection Act, Sorry Charlie's Oyster Company,
20 LLC. Construction and maintenance of a
21 commercial dock on the Bull River, Chatham
22 County, Georgia.

23 Our third will be the Coastal Marshlands
24 Protection Act, Blue Moon Marinas, LLC and that
25 is construction and maintenance of a private

1 marina and bank stabilization project at an
2 existing commercial facility located at 3110
3 River Drive, Thunderbolt, Wilmington River,
4 Chatham County, Georgia.

5 And fourth project will be a Coastal
6 Marshlands Protection Act, located at East River
7 or for East River Street, LLC, and this is for
8 construction of a public access boat dock
9 located at 620 River Street East, Savannah
10 River, Savannah, Georgia, Chatham County,
11 Georgia.

12 Our fifth project will also be a Coastal
13 Marshland Protection Act, Vaden Enterprises,
14 LLLP, and this is for fill of coastal marshland
15 for construction of a residential driveway
16 located at 113 Meriwether Drive, Dutch Island,
17 Grimball Creek marshes, Chatham County, Georgia.

18 Our sixth project will be also for Coastal
19 Marshlands Protection Act, City of Brunswick,
20 west Brunswick drainage improvement, City of
21 Brunswick, Glynn County, Georgia.

22 Our seventh project will be for the Shore
23 Protection Act, PPHP, LLC, installation of a
24 pool and spa patio, portion of a paver walkway
25 and fencing located at 105 East 35th Street, Sea

1 Island, Glynn County, Georgia.

2 And then finally our eighth project will
3 also be for Shore Protection Act, Glynn County
4 Board of Commissioners, Coast Guard Park
5 enhancements, located at 4101 First Street, St.
6 Simons Island, Glynn County, Georgia.

7 At this time, I would like to call for a
8 motion to approve the minutes from our November
9 the 15th, 2024 meeting.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Make a motion to
11 approve the minutes of the November 15th, 2024
12 meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion. Can I
14 get a second?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a second. That
17 being, any discussion? Hearing none, all in
18 favor.

19 SPEAKERS: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed? The motion
21 is passed.

22 I will now call on Deb Barreiro, who will
23 introduce our first project of the day.

24 MS. BARREIRO: Good morning.

25 SPEAKERS: Good morning.

1 MS. BARREIRO: Our first project today is
2 a CMP application for James Alexander, Leo
3 Sheehan and Margaret Sheehan.

4 This is always embarrassing.

5 MS. DIANA PATRICK: We're having some
6 issues with Zoom now, sorry.

7 MS. BARREIRO: Surely. Next slide,
8 please.

9 MS. DIANA PATRICK: Hold on a second, Deb.

10 MS. ANDREWS: We don't have any of our
11 Zoom attendants.

12 MR. HAYMANS: Are we getting them back?

13 CHAIRMAN RABON: How long will it take to
14 get them back?

15 MS. ANDREWS: We don't have a connection
16 out here. Zoom is not connecting.

17 MS. DIANA PATRICK: It was connected when
18 I first got in here.

19 CHAIRMAN RABON: Can we get them on the
20 phone?

21 MR. HAYMANS: Yes, we can.

22 CHAIRMAN RABON: Get them on the phone.

23 MR. HAYMANS: Give them a call. Just dial
24 them up and put them on a speaker phone until
25 they get connected.

1 CHAIRMAN RABON: I know that the
2 Department of Natural Resources is the only
3 agency, entity that has any kind of technical
4 issues ever. We apologize.

5 MS. ANDREWS: We're going to go ahead and
6 start the meeting and put you on the speaker
7 phone.

8 MS. BARREIRO: Good morning.

9 CHAIRMAN RABON: Good morning.

10 MS. BARREIRO: I'm going to wait for the
11 PowerPoint or should I just go?

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: We've got copies in front
13 of us.

14 SPEAKER: Zoom is not responding. We're
15 hosting.

16 MR. HAYMANS: It's working now.

17 MS. BARREIRO: Thank you. Our first
18 project today is a CMPA permanent application
19 for a golf cart bridge and a private shared
20 dock. The project is located at 10 Horsepen
21 Point Drive and 12 Horsepen Point Drive, and
22 with that, I'm going to let Dan Bucey, who is
23 the agent for the applicant, take it from here.

24 CHAIRMAN RABON: We've got them.

25 MR. DAN BUCEY: There you go.

1 Good morning. Dan Bucey with Resource and
2 Land Consultants. With me today is the
3 applicant, Mr. Sheehan and Mr. Alexander and Jud
4 Turner, counsel for the applicants.

5 As Deb said, the proposed project is
6 located at Horsepen Creek. The dock application
7 that is before you today has already been
8 approved by the Corps of Engineers, the
9 provisional Section 10 permit, back on August 15
10 of 2023.

11 The proposed dock will originate uplands
12 known as Parcel A, which will be accessed by a
13 wooden bridge spanning a manmade tidal ditch
14 beginning at the lot line for Lot 5 and Lot 6.

15 As you know, this was before you
16 previously, and since that time we've come back
17 with a modified application to further minimize
18 the size of the structure.

19 The proposed wooden bridge is six feet
20 wide by 174 feet long with access to Parcel A
21 and the dock would originate from seaward of
22 Parcel A, consisting of the 740-by-4-foot
23 walkway, 15-by-20-foot, 300 square foot covered
24 fixed deck, 120-foot square -- foot gangway and
25 8-foot-by-30-square-foot floating dock.

1 The fixed deck will extend
2 approximately -- go back to the other slide.
3 The fixed deck would extend approximately 28
4 feet beyond mean low water at a location
5 Horsepen Creek at approximately 98 feet wide --
6 excuse me, 93 feet at mean low water and the
7 floating dock would extend 18 feet beyond mean
8 low water at a location that is 78 feet wide at
9 mean low water.

10 The total structure proposed would be
11 4,664 square feet, which is a significant
12 reduction in the size from the previous
13 proposal.

14 There's been many public comments about --
15 MS. DIANA PATRICK: Are you missing a
16 slide?

17 MS. BARREIRO: We're trying to get to the
18 end of the PowerPoint, the slides that were
19 added yesterday. Keep going, four more slides I
20 think.

21 MR. DAN BUCEY: We had prepared some
22 exhibits that showed some of the other locations
23 of existing docks to address the navigation
24 concerns.

25 This particular dock has had a registered

1 surveyor conduct a bathymetric survey which
2 clearly shows the, you know, extent of our dock
3 at the different tide levels.

4 Based on aerial imagery, there's 32 docks
5 on Horsepen Creek, an additional two docks that
6 have been authorized but have not yet been
7 constructed, and if I was able to access our
8 slides, you would clearly see that the vast
9 majority of the docks on this particular creek
10 are much further affecting navigation than the
11 proposed dock.

12 MR. HAYMANS: I think it's in your
13 handouts.

14 MS. BARREIRO: It is.

15 MR. HAYMANS: Slides B and C, so they are
16 all seeing what you're talking about.

17 MS. BARREIRO: He just continues through
18 those, I think.

19 MR. DAN BUCEY: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Tell us what
21 you're looking at? The public can't see.

22 MR. DAN BUCEY: We took aerial photography
23 of the Horsepen area and we took photos
24 representing at high tide and low tide and we
25 took measurements around the clearances around

1 the existing docks to, you know, show that
2 there's many, many docks in that particular area
3 are having significant effect on navigation, and
4 our dock is probably going to be one of the few
5 that's actually positioned correctly based on
6 bathymetric survey.

7 Most notably Dock Number 3, which would be
8 the second dock from the entrance to the tidal
9 creek, totally spans the low tide channel where
10 you would have to go underneath the dock at low
11 tide, half tide and then the rising tide also.

12 So our bathymetric survey shows there's
13 plenty of room to get around our dock. There
14 is -- my notes -- at mean low water the proposed
15 dock will be 45 feet of clearance between the
16 nearest downstream dock and 68 feet between the
17 nearest upstream dock at mean low water, so it's
18 our contention that this dock will not
19 unreasonably obstruct the flow of navigational
20 waters within the affected area.

21 I'm going to turn it over to Jud Turner,
22 counsel for the applicants.

23 MR. JUD TURNER: Thank you, Dan, and thank
24 you, members of the committee, Commissioner, and
25 staff for working with us to come back after

1 November.

2 I'm going to be brief and I'm not going to
3 have slides you have to find, but if you have a
4 navigation question, I will obviously -- that's
5 what those were designed to address and, of
6 course, Dan is still available for that if you
7 have questions, but I really just wanted to --
8 Jim, Jim and Leo are there.

9 This has been a ten-year journey for them
10 and so I'm not going to give you a play-by-play
11 on all those years, but it really -- I think
12 it's important to recognize, you know, that over
13 this journey this issue of the hammock -- and
14 this picture right here is a good visual.

15 I might get you to move one more -- move
16 one more slide. These are -- can I do that
17 here? Let me see.

18 Okay, this is a good visual. So we talked
19 a lot about hammocks and I know the coastal
20 marshland protection where we're having this
21 issue of ownership that often comes up, the
22 committee is well aware of that and staff is
23 well aware of that.

24 I want to make sure that the hammock we're
25 talking about, the .97-acre hammock is that --

1 you can see it best here. It's the upland and
2 you see that straight tidal ditch that goes
3 through there, and so this whole hammock, this
4 whole peninsula is what is called Horsepen
5 Hammock, and if you go back 2018 when the law
6 department confirmed ownership of that eastern
7 left side hammock that we're talking about
8 accessing with the bridge, that ownership
9 question had to be confirmed before the sale of
10 that portion of the -- of the upland to my
11 clients, and so this took a long time, a lot of
12 effort, and you'll see all those smaller
13 hammocks out towards the water.

14 Ownership is not confirmed in those, and
15 so one of the minimization efforts that we have
16 done with this dock application is to avoid
17 crossing those.

18 So just for the record, you know, this was
19 all -- if you go back to the king's grant at
20 issue that transferred this property to private
21 ownership in 1758, it was of all this island or
22 peninsula, which it calls Horsepen Hammock, and
23 so it's sometimes confusing I think in the
24 public comments as if there is an ownership
25 question -- there is not -- and there's an

1 impact to these smaller hammocks that are in
2 jurisdiction -- there is not.

3 And so from a minimization standpoint,
4 which is what's important for the act, you know,
5 this is the second set of reductions in the dock
6 that has occurred, and the placement and
7 configuration of that dock took a lot of effort,
8 and the biggest minimization effort is the fact
9 that these two applicants are not applying for
10 two docks and two bridges to that eastern
11 hammock. They are combined. They are doing one
12 so that in itself is a major minimization
13 benefit, and then we are now -- the dock portion
14 and the walkway portion is under the SOP square
15 footage restrictions, so to the extent there was
16 some question of minimization in November, while
17 we wouldn't agree that it wasn't minimized, my
18 client is happy to get under the SOP for
19 purposes of the square footage on the dock.

20 And to clarify, that bridge, once that
21 six-foot wide wooden bridge over to that upland,
22 the earthen path for the golf carts to access
23 the dock is not going to be paved. It's not
24 going to be impervious.

25 It's going to require some removal of some

1 dead wood that has fallen in Matthew I think and
2 some slight trimming, delineations occurred so
3 that we know where to avoid any marsh
4 encroachment on that upland, and so I think we
5 are at the place, we hope, and that -- there is
6 no question of minimization, which is what I was
7 here to talk about.

8 Dan has addressed the navigation issue so
9 those public interest factors under 12-5-286(g),
10 I mean, there -- and all three of those, there
11 is -- there are not -- is not an unreasonable
12 impact to any of those public interest factors,
13 and so we are hopeful today is the day that the
14 committee can respond favorably to this
15 application for Mr. Alexander and Mr. Sheehan.
16 Thank you.

17 MS. BARREIRO: Public notice of the
18 Coastal Marshlands Protection Committee ran from
19 February 7, 2025 through February 21st of 2025.
20 31 e-mailed comments were received in response
21 to the public notice representing the viewpoints
22 of 58 individuals.

23 Ten comments were supportive of the
24 applicants and/or their application for the
25 private shared family dock. Five of those

1 stated that the proposed dock location on
2 Horsepen Creek the waterway was not navigable at
3 mean low water; right. One comment recognized
4 the value of a shared dock. Another supported
5 the process by which the project has been
6 reviewed and another supported private property
7 rights. One commenter suggested that all of the
8 existing docks on the eastern side of the creek
9 caused sedimentation along the eastern side of
10 the creek bank and resulted in the channel's
11 migration toward the western side of the
12 Horsepen Creek.

13 14 email comments with a total of 20
14 signatures in opposition to the project cited
15 various comments including the proposed dock --
16 dock's impact on navigation, concerns about
17 structure, about the structure potentially
18 creating a navigational obstacles at mean high
19 water so vessels, including barges that maintain
20 docks on the waterway, walkway orientation, such
21 as east and west orientation of the walkway,
22 potentially accumulating rack and the increased
23 risk of habitat loss for species of marsh birds
24 in the vicinity of the structure.

25 The proposed bridge to the hammock also

1 raised concerns about clearing of the upland
2 component on the marsh hammock, the impact of
3 clearing and grading potentially increasing
4 erosion and sedimentation from the hammock as
5 well as the lack of alternative locations
6 provided for the project.

7 A concern raised the issue of coast-wide
8 impact for CMPA or CMPC approval of the bridge
9 to the hammock.

10 The remaining 28 individuals signed a
11 petition opposing the project. The petition was
12 circulated among Tybee residents with access to
13 Horsepen Creek. The petition commented on the
14 channel's westward migration, questioned the
15 validity of the applicant's bathymetry and
16 stating that recent mean low water observations
17 at the project site are not consistent with the
18 applicant's findings.

19 Additionally, petition raised concerns
20 that potential modification of the existing
21 private dock structures in the vicinity of the
22 proposed shared private dock may be challenged
23 as a result of the permanent structure
24 potentially occupying the navigable channel at
25 this location.

1 Should the committee determine that the
2 proposed project is in the public interest,
3 department and staff recommend the following
4 standard and special conditions.

5 The elevated walkway may not traverse
6 upland or hammocks not owned by the applicants.
7 The permittee shall coordinate with the
8 department prior to construction to confirm the
9 walkway will not traverse uplands east of the
10 hammock. The permittee will also provide copies
11 of a binding covenant that runs with the land in
12 favor of the state prohibiting the construction
13 of further private docks from the parcels
14 referenced in the deeds submitted in association
15 with this permit application for 12 Horsepen
16 Point Drive and 10 Horsepen Point Drive and a
17 fee simple instrument deed executed January 5th,
18 2020 and recorded January 16th, 2020 in Book
19 1886, Page 140 through 142.

20 Permittee may be required to provide
21 post-construction survey to the Georgia
22 Department of Natural Resources that complies
23 with the Plat Act. The permittee must install
24 manatee awareness signage consistent with Fish
25 and Wildlife and Georgia Department of Natural

1 Resources.

2 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Deb. We will
3 now enter into the public comment portion of the
4 meeting.

5 I just want to remind all of the speakers
6 this is your opportunity to speak to the
7 project. We will limit -- that mike -- we will
8 limit your discussion to three minutes.

9 We will allow for someone to give their
10 three minutes to one individual. And then I'm
11 assuming that everyone who wishes to speak to
12 the project had an ample opportunity to sign up
13 for it at this time.

14 With that being said, I will now call on
15 Mr. Andrew Watson to come speak, and for the
16 record Mr. Daniel Tuberville has given Mr.
17 Watson his three minutes to speak.

18 MR. ANDREW WATSON: I have a
19 presentation --

20 CHAIRMAN RABON: Please step to the podium
21 so that we can get everything on the record.

22 MR. ANDREW WATSON: I have a presentation.
23 I have it on disk or if we could hook up. I
24 don't know if you could put a disk in.

25 MS. DIANA PATRICK: USB?

1 MR. ANDREW WATSON: Yes.

2 Good morning, everyone. Good morning,
3 committee. Good morning, Leo and James.

4 We have several concerns with this dock.
5 And if you go to the next page. I've listed the
6 three concerns that the CRD and the DNR asked us
7 to concern ourselves with when we discussed this
8 project.

9 First, it's the design of the project is
10 such that no unreasonable harmful obstruction
11 and this has to do with navigation, the second
12 being there is no unreasonable or harmful
13 increased erosion due to the dock being there
14 and finally to wildlife.

15 So I'm going to talk to each one of these
16 if I can.

17 The next slide, over the last few years,
18 we built our dock -- by the way, my name is Andy
19 Watson. I live at 1109 --

20 MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Watson, if you'll speak
21 in the microphone.

22 MR. ANDREW WATSON: I have to talk in the
23 microphone. I live at 1109 Venetian. My
24 brother Allen Watson is with us. He lives at
25 1111. These are the two properties directly

1 across from where the Sheehan dock would be
2 built. Together we own about eight acres of
3 that marshland property in Horsepen basin.

4 In the last few years, specifically during
5 the last two renourishment events on Tybee
6 Island, the sediment from those two
7 renourishment events settled on the eastward
8 side of Horsepen Creek, so much so I'm at mean
9 low water tide 12 feet from the water and you
10 can see at the bottom on the right or in the
11 center that's my dock.

12 If I were to ask, much like my brother
13 has, and move out one-quarter of the distance
14 into the channel, I would take about 30 feet
15 from where my dock is now, which would reduce --
16 and it depends on the bathymetry of the creek
17 obviously because, between 78 feet being what he
18 said it was and 64 in my area, we're now looking
19 to between 20 and 30 feet of distance between
20 our two docks unless, you know, if there were
21 two boats parked at either dock.

22 The crux of it is we're about to renourish
23 again. We must renourish on Tybee in the next
24 couple of years or we're going to lose the east
25 side of Tybee. That renourishment event is

1 again going to deposit silt on our east side and
2 further cut Horsepen Creek to the west, and if
3 you don't think it's been cutting to the west,
4 there was an oyster rig there just to the north
5 of where that tributary is that is now gone.
6 The oyster rig was protecting from erosion.
7 It's no longer there. The creek is moving to
8 the north.

9 As such, he is going to move or where he
10 places his dock, that effective channel is going
11 to, just like the one upstream or downstream
12 rather, the Everett dock, that is going to move
13 right under him and into the basin.

14 That's Number 1.

15 If I can go to the next slide. That is
16 our dock at the top of the screen on the right.
17 At mean low water, I'm 12 feet from the line.
18 Allen to the middle of the screen has moved out
19 30 feet his dock in the last six years.

20 You can see where it's cut migrating the
21 river to the west. Next slide, please.

22 This is one of our concerns, and it has to
23 do with navigation. We will reduce the
24 navigation. We have two boats upstream that
25 have a beam of ten feet or greater. One of them

1 is a 50-foot trawler, and they would be very --
2 it would be very difficult to get out of there.

3 Rack and debris retention, someone brought
4 this up earlier. I want you to realize that
5 what they are building crosses the entire basin,
6 and I'm talking to Deb and I'm talking to my --
7 and I should be talking to you guys, the
8 committee.

9 I want you to consider an event because
10 this has happened three times, the last of
11 which, Debbie. Debbie pushed enough rack up
12 into the Tybee Creek basin, and it was two feet
13 above the floodplain. It went under my house.

14 The rack, the Tybee basin would be
15 completely blocked and the height of his dock is
16 the height of what Debbie came in at.

17 Matthew and Irma were the other two. Rack
18 completely comes in. It would stop right there.
19 It would drop. You would have a marsh kind of
20 erosion, stagnant water area probably several,
21 several hundred feet in front of that dock, if
22 we had that event.

23 Finally, the next slide -- and you can see
24 what happens. Those two pictures on the right,
25 by the way, are of the eroded area where rack

1 had built up on Allen and I's dock. You can see
2 what happens to the area. It becomes stagnant
3 water if the rack is not able to get out.

4 She says I have about a minute left. By
5 the way, the last slide, oh, the slide before,
6 just shows you in the blue -- I apologize for
7 doing that. I am going to show a video that
8 shows that area.

9 We have wood storks. We have roseate
10 spoonbills. We have herons. Obviously they all
11 use that tributary, especially in the off season
12 you can see them glide in there but they use it
13 for feeding. I'm going to show you a video of a
14 pod of porpoises, which comes to the entrance to
15 that video. They perch --

16 CHAIRMAN RABON: Wrap up your comments.
17 Get to the end.

18 MR. ANDREW WATSON: Last thing I will show
19 you the video. That pod of porpoises is there
20 all the time, every week. They herd the shrimp
21 up. They go in. If you will press play at the
22 bottom of that. There's the pod of porpoises.
23 They herded the shrimp in that tributary and
24 then they dive themselves up in there. They do
25 it weekly. This is the first time I've been

1 able to catch it because I can't get down to the
2 dock.

3 Just to conclude, we showed you three
4 reasonable reasons for there being a lack of
5 mitigation for these three items that you guys,
6 the committee, said you needed to address, so
7 with your permission, I will conclude with we
8 really do not believe this is in the public's
9 best interest to affect that basin, the
10 navigability and the wildlife in that area.

11 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Mr. Watson.
12 Now call on Charles Watson, you've got three
13 minutes.

14 MR. CHARLES WATSON: I would like to give
15 the rest of my time to him. My concern is
16 three-fold, one, of course, is the environmental
17 impact of such a long stretch of dock out to the
18 waterway, and when I first moved here, I sat on
19 his dock and we were just watching the creek go
20 by and I had never seen one before, but I
21 realized that it was a black skimmer, and he was
22 shooting along the creek very fast, and if you
23 know what those are, they have a bill, their
24 bottom bill sits in the water as they fly, and
25 then their head snaps down when they catch a

1 fish. That's just part of the beauty of the
2 environment we live in there.

3 Of course, the second point I wanted to
4 make is the navigability. That is going to be
5 so close to our dock that it's going to be hard
6 for people to get through there and I know that
7 waterway is used at night.

8 My third point is aesthetic. This is
9 right outside my bedroom window. This is what I
10 would wake up to every day. I love watching the
11 marsh. I can lay in bed and watch it a long
12 time. I don't want to see a dock out there.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, sir. Mr.
15 William Fleetwood?

16 MR. WILLIAM FLEETWOOD: William Fleetwood.
17 I -- just upstream of this is our dock and we
18 have a number of vessels that go by. I can't
19 really add to Andy's presentation except to say
20 if you remember the video and the video
21 presentation, you will see that this particular
22 dock permit application calls for a dock kind of
23 cattywampus directly across from the existing
24 dock, the Watsons' docks and it intrudes into
25 the channel about 28 feet or more if there's a

1 boat tied to the outside of it, and if there's a
2 boat tied to both docks, the Watsons' dock and
3 the proposed, there is very little space to get
4 between.

5 In the event the course you would have to
6 take is going to be an S-shaped zigzag, which is
7 certainly doable. It's not pleasant, but with
8 the right size of boat, it can be done.

9 With a larger vessel with tide and wind
10 being what they are, you could have a hazard, so
11 we believe that the proposed dock is an
12 obstruction to the navigation of the creek, the
13 safe navigation. It's just on the wrong side of
14 the creek, directly opposite of the docks.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you. Mr. Bill
17 Walsh.

18 MR. BILL WALSH: I'm Bill Walsh. I've
19 lived on Horsepen Creek for over 80 years, and
20 the creek is constantly changing. I'm retired
21 with a US Coast Guard license with a towing
22 endorsement, and there is an obstruction that
23 will be a bottleneck were those docks to be
24 built in that position.

25 I also have a boat with a 11 feet beam

1 upstream and my neighbor has a boat with a
2 larger beam than I have and trying to get those
3 boats through there in certain conditions, it's
4 just unsafe and the dock shouldn't be built in
5 that location. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, sir. And then
7 lastly, Ms. Alice Keyes.

8 MS. ALICE KEYES: Good morning,
9 Commissioner. Thank you so much to the
10 committee for the opportunity to be here today.

11 My name is Alice Keyes, and I'm the Vice
12 President of Coastal Conservation with 100 Miles
13 coastal advocacy organization for 100-mile
14 coast.

15 I'm here today to ask you to deny this
16 multi-faceted application. The project proposed
17 would negatively impact the public marshlands
18 and the shared resources and is not in the
19 public interest.

20 I have several concerns to express to you
21 today. Misters Watson and Mr. Fleetwood covered
22 the navigation issue pretty well.

23 So I'm going to spend my time talking
24 about the impact that the project would have on
25 the hammock and the marshlands.

1 The proposed vehicular bridge would harm
2 the marshlands and unreasonably interfere with
3 wildlife habitat of the Horsepen Creek basin and
4 ecosystem.

5 Construction granted to marsh hammocks has
6 not been a practice endorsed by the Department
7 of Natural Resources. In fact, it has been a
8 concern for over a decade. In 2002, the DNR
9 commissioned the Coastal Marsh Hammocks Advisory
10 Council, and these researchers and biologists
11 reported that bridging hammocks leads to seven
12 primary concerns that degrade the quality of the
13 ecosystem and the sense of place, including but
14 not limited to the degradation of coastal
15 marshlands, view shed that are objectionable to
16 surrounding residents, and the loss of critical
17 local nesting and roosting habitat for
18 endangered and threatened species.

19 The proposed project is also designed to
20 dissect the hammock and is clearly within the
21 CMPA buffer area.

22 Clearing of maritime brushes, trees and
23 vegetation would affect the marshland view of
24 nearby neighbors and the quality of the hammock.
25 It would also increase erosion and sedimentation

1 to the creek and lead to the loss of the
2 protective function that these marsh hammocks
3 provide to the upland landowners.

4 It would be impossible for the property
5 owners to treat, to restore the area to
6 preconstruction stage because they would have to
7 maintain the path as it's currently proposed.

8 While Mr. Alexander may own the hammock to
9 which the bridge is proposed, ownership does not
10 require this committee to allow permanent impact
11 to the public marshlands for private access.

12 So I beg -- so I urge you to request this
13 project be denied because it fails to include
14 any alternatives of feasibility investigations
15 that are required by Section (b)(8) of Georgia
16 Code 12-5-286 and has been requested by CRD
17 staff at the November 2024 meeting.

18 So again, we ask this committee to deny
19 the permit. Approving a project of this nature
20 and scale would establish a destructive
21 precedent for future permitting and would cause
22 unnecessary harm to the natural resources and
23 the good that this committee is here to protect.

24 Thank you again for the opportunity to
25 speak.

1 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you. At this time
2 would the agents like to respond to the public
3 comments?

4 MR. DAN BUCEY: Any chance of getting our
5 slides that were at the end pulled up.

6 CHAIRMAN RABON: That's a good question.
7 We will see.

8 MR. DAN BUCEY: If we could see those, it
9 is so clear that the vast majority of the
10 existing docks on that creek extend well into
11 the waterway, and in one case in the second dock
12 coming up from Tybee Creek, it's a hundred
13 percent over the channel. You would have to go
14 underneath the dock at low tide to get up that
15 creek.

16 SPEAKER: But you have to have 12 foot of
17 width to get through.

18 MR. DAN BUCEY: We have 58 feet --

19 CHAIRMAN RABON: Talk to the committee,
20 and any public comments need to be made from the
21 podium. Thank you.

22 MR. DAN BUCEY: So this dock would
23 otherwise just be just outside the current SOP,
24 which was -- is the threshold for, you know, a
25 revocable license from the staff level.

1 We've got plenty of room between our dock
2 as proposed. Based on a bathymetric survey,
3 which is scientific data, not just a napkin
4 drawing.

5 CHAIRMAN RABON: Mr. Bucey, if you want to
6 pause, we are getting there, Josh?

7 MR. NOBLES: No, sir, we don't have
8 network access, which is where it's located so
9 we will have to rely on the package, just the
10 committee, two sets of drawings. One is at high
11 tide. One is at low tide and it's not to scale
12 that's favorable to reading it. I guess if you
13 blow it up.

14 CHAIRMAN RABON: Can you describe the
15 sheet that you would like us to look at?

16 MR. DAN BUCEY: Our Sheet Number is -- low
17 tide assessment, Figure 2 out of 10.

18 CHAIRMAN RABON: 2 out of 10, Tide
19 Assessment, 2 of out 10; is that correct?

20 MR. DAN BUCEY: Yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN RABON: The committee found that.
22 Describe what we're looking at.

23 MR. DAN BUCEY: So at the bottom of the
24 page, Dock Number 1 has been authorized but not
25 yet constructed.

1 If you look at that eastern shoreline
2 that's where the channel is. That dock, based
3 on this photograph with a GIS overlay, looks to
4 be at least 50 percent out into where the
5 channel is at this particular tide.

6 Up to the next dock, Dock Number 2, same
7 thing. Now it's existing, but it's halfway into
8 what's left at low tide, and Dock Number 3,
9 towards the top of the page, is entirely across
10 the channel at low tide, which is in this
11 picture right here. That's Dock Number 3.

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: Do we have that picture
13 in our packet?

14 MR. DAN BUCEY: We do not. No, it's not,
15 so that dock is entirely across the channel at
16 low tide and high tide there's plenty of water
17 to get by, around it, but at low tide, half tide
18 or whatever that is, you can't get anywhere.

19 Ours is sitting on the western shoreline,
20 so if you go to Figure 3 of 10 on the low tide
21 assessment, you will see our proposed dock.

22 Now this particular one I think is --
23 might have the longer floating dock. So this
24 footprint wasn't revised by our dock. We've
25 reduced the size of our floating dock, and you

1 can see -- can we go back to the dock drawing on
2 the presentation?

3 MS. BARREIRO: Back one.

4 MR. DAN BUCEY: There you go, so you can
5 see the distances at mean low water distances
6 from the southern end of the fixed deck and also
7 from the -- where the floating dock is to the
8 dock across the stream, so there's the distance
9 between 45 feet and is that 58 feet?

10 SPEAKER: 68.

11 MR. DAN BUCEY: So I don't see how that
12 could be an impediment to navigation. If you
13 can't get your boat through 45 and 58 feet and
14 the area where the actual water is but you can
15 somehow get through a ten-foot piling space
16 under somebody else's dock, for the -- you know,
17 some of the commenters mentioned we can get
18 through it because it's a 10-foot space and what
19 about the vertical glimpse, so there is no
20 doubt -- and if we go further upstream, you can
21 see almost every dock is projecting much further
22 out into the waterway at low tide.

23 Again, we are very confident that this is
24 not going to affect navigation. This is the
25 very same in character with every dock that's

1 permitted under the programatic revocable
2 license permit through this office.

3 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you.

4 MR. ANDREW WATSON: Can I respond to that?

5 CHAIRMAN RABON: No, sir. Deb, any staff
6 response from public comments.

7 MS. BARREIRO: Nothing in addition to what
8 I've already stated.

9 CHAIRMAN RABON: At this time we will --
10 any deliberations from the committee, any
11 questions?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Can I ask, Dan,
13 you've responded somewhat, you've responded
14 somewhat to the navigation question, but you've
15 not responded to the marsh impact, the building
16 of the bridge over the hammock. Is there
17 comment from either you or Deb about those
18 concerns?

19 MR. DAN BUCEY: So what -- let's talk
20 about the bridge first. The activity that's
21 been permitted by the committee many times in
22 the past, once we get -- Ms. Keyes spoke about
23 the development of the island (unintelligible)
24 and the hammock advisory council many, many
25 years.

1 We're not developing on this island.
2 We're just providing access across it to get to
3 our dock to access the water for water-
4 dependent purposes.

5 The path is going to be at grade pervious,
6 a hundred percent pervious. So view shed is --
7 there is no clearing that's going to -- nothing
8 constructed that anyone is going to see, so view
9 shed from the neighbors to this, you know,
10 activity on the hammock, which is limited only
11 to the at-grade path is not -- should not be a
12 concern or have a negative effect.

13 The bridge itself is across an old manmade
14 mosquito ditch I'm assuming for whatever reason
15 they cut it. Spoil piles are still out there on
16 that island from where it was dredged and then
17 from there we're accessing our dock, which would
18 otherwise meet programatic revocable license for
19 which docks are issued every day. We've reduced
20 the width to get us under 3,000 square feet, 740
21 square feet, which is a longer dock, but I
22 permit docks like that all the time that are not
23 before y'all because they are exempt.

24 Marsh rack, no different effect than the
25 other 32 docks that are already out there, and,

1 you know, wildlife has already developed,
2 there's houses all along that section and
3 multiple docks there. Dolphins are going to
4 continue to come up the waterway. This dock is
5 not going to stop them.

6 Any other particular area?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Is it the
8 applicant's intent to continue the notion of
9 using of golf cart on the path up until the
10 point of the extension out to the dock?

11 MR. DAN BUCEY: Yes, for the -- onto the
12 hammock to the dock access area.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: But not onto
14 the dock.

15 MR. DAN BUCEY: It won't fit on the dock.
16 We have four feet.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: The language
18 still implies golf cart but -- and obviously we
19 as a committee had a lot of concern about golf
20 carts driving over the marsh.

21 MR. DAN BUCEY: Yes, ma'am, just to the
22 beginning of the -- onto the hammock.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Hammock.

24 MR. DAN BUCEY: Loading gear, so forth,
25 and then pedestrian out to the dock.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: So, Dan, in
2 summary from the last time we were here, the
3 changes from what I could tell is the narrow
4 portion of the dock that goes out to the actual
5 creek has been reduced from six to four.

6 MR. DAN BUCEY: Correct.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: What other
8 changes have taken place, I think, the dock from
9 what I could tell --

10 MR. DAN BUCEY: Floating dock has been
11 reduced, yes, sir, and I think the total impacts
12 went from somewhere in the mid-6,000 range down
13 to 4664 where we're at now.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: That's all.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: This really is
16 a question for Deb and staff, so when we
17 considered this project in November, it met none
18 of the minimization standards for all three
19 conditions.

20 We've reduced the width of the dock access
21 from six to four and we've made the dock itself
22 a little smaller, and now it suddenly meets all
23 of the conditions with language that says "the
24 applicant contends."

25 Help us understand how those changes move

1 it from having harmful impact on navigation,
2 wildlife and erosion to suddenly not having any
3 harmful impact.

4 MR. NOBLES: I think, Dr. Hepburn, what
5 you're speaking to is the standard operating
6 procedure that we have that we use to regulate
7 docks through multiple actions, other docks that
8 are exempt from the Shore Protection Act?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: No, I'm
10 speaking to the public interest considerations.

11 MR. NOBLES: So in the minimization
12 procedures what we have focused on are two
13 things. Number 1 was the dock itself not
14 meeting that standard operating procedure which
15 is how we regulate private docks, so in order to
16 get to that we had to work through those.

17 Through the three public notices that have
18 been done on this project, it has been further
19 minimized down to meet that. You know, with the
20 initial public notice, the dock had proposed two
21 boat hoists, I believe a thousand square feet
22 floating dock. The extent of the waterway
23 through all of these has pretty well been
24 static, right? The project location has shifted
25 south from what was initially presented.

1 The initial project had two bridges, I
2 believe it was two bridges crossing tributaries.
3 The project, the walkway was then shifted south
4 in order to avoid the tributaries, which was a
5 navigation concern at the November meeting.

6 They also moved the project location
7 south, the terminal end, in order to not block
8 the tributary. You will see the mouth of the
9 tributary here, comments were made as relates to
10 the navigability of small vessels, canoes,
11 kayaks, that sort of thing.

12 So then it really boiled down, okay,
13 what's it extend to the waterway at mean low
14 water, you know, what -- that's what we're
15 talking about, mean low water.

16 I hear channel. I hear other docks, but
17 what we were focused on was mean low water,
18 okay, which is an average of all tides over a
19 19-year tidal epic. It's not a -- weather can
20 dramatically impact that, right, so if you take
21 a photo on a hard west wind day versus one
22 that's not, it can be visually dramatically
23 different, so what staff determined in our
24 recommendation as set forth in your report was
25 that it does meet the percentages allowable for

1 navigation concerns in the public interest.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Thanks, Josh.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: I took the
4 opportunity to go back on Google Earth to take a
5 peek at previous years and low water, high
6 water, and it's apparent -- I know there's a
7 concern about this one dock. I would be more
8 concerned all the other docks, especially
9 upstream and downstream, because it does, you
10 know, have a navigation issue, so in high water
11 it doesn't appear to have any from what I can
12 tell.

13 MR. DAN BUCEY: Depending on the draft of
14 the particular boat they would still weave their
15 way around, but at low water it's very evident
16 this is not -- ours is not going to affect, and
17 there's other ones that are definitely
18 affecting.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: I have a
20 question for you, Dan, and I'm sorry, I think
21 you might have mentioned this earlier. How many
22 docks are on this creek total?

23 MR. DAN BUCEY: 32 visible in aerial
24 photography, and I believe two additional ones
25 that have been authorized but not yet

1 constructed.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: I'm sorry,
3 because I think you did answer this, how many
4 docks create a navigation channel less than what
5 is at the Alexander Sheehan dock right now?

6 MR. DAN BUCEY: I don't have an exact
7 number but it's the vast a majority of them. I
8 don't know if any of them that I've seen would
9 meet the current SOP.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: Thank you.

11 MR. DAN BUCEY: And the one that was
12 recently authorized, which will be the first one
13 you come up to as you come up on Tybee Creek on
14 Horsepen doesn't appear on the overlay, and I
15 don't know if they did a bathymetric survey or
16 not.

17 Bathymetric, as Josh pointed out, it's one
18 thing to go out on a particular day and say,
19 okay, the water was here; the water was there.
20 It changes every minute every day. That's why
21 they do it for that full lunar solar epic, and
22 then the surveyor locates that with survey grade
23 equipment so that's an exact number.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: I guess the last
25 question, just more for educational purposes,

1 but the shoring of the floating dock looks
2 like -- and I'm sorry for directional purposes,
3 but it looks like it increased the passing lane
4 or navigational channel from -- I guess this is
5 on -- I don't know what page this is -- project
6 description, the proposed dock it looks like
7 it's 68 feet now or 58 versus --

8 MR. DAN BUCEY: Yes, it's much longer
9 which was reduced -- would have pushed the
10 upstream edge of the floating dock closer to the
11 center line of the channel, which is that dotted
12 line, that switches from the right side to the
13 center line of the creek as you come by.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: So it increased
15 that channel?

16 MR. DAN BUCEY: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any other questions of
19 the committee? At this time I will now
20 entertain a motion.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: I would like to
22 make a motion to approve this project. I would
23 ask that maybe we add an additional special
24 condition and that is to perhaps hire an
25 engineer to look at the longer spacing on the

1 dock pilings to help minimize rack buildup. I
2 know that's not a requirement in today's
3 environment, but it's something we should look
4 at, so I would make a motion to approve with
5 that condition, normal conditions as well as
6 special.

7 MR. HAYMANS: Can Diana capture your
8 special condition so everybody sees it pop up in
9 a Word document, Diane?

10 MS. ANDREWS: We can create it in the next
11 slide.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: You're really
13 pushing the envelope on that technology here,
14 Mr. Director.

15 Can you articulate for Diana what the
16 special condition is?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Would request
18 that they hire an engineer to look at dock
19 piling spacing.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Not request,
21 require.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Require, thank
23 you. To increase the spacing between pilings to
24 minimize rack buildup, especially on the east to
25 west dock.

1 MS. DIANA PATRICK: Can you say it again.

2 MR. HAYMANS: Go slow.

3 MS. DIANA PATRICK: Required to hire an
4 engineer to request to --

5 CHAIRMAN RABON: To reduce the possibility
6 of rack buildup.

7 MS. DIANA PATRICK: I got it.

8 MR. NOBLES: Mr. Poole, were you speaking
9 specifically to the walkway or the bridge and
10 the walkway?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Specifically to
12 the -- specifically to the four-foot walkway on
13 the way out to the creek.

14 MR. NOBLES: Thank you, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN RABON: Would require to hire an
16 engineer to increase the spacing to reduce
17 possibility of rack build up for the four-foot
18 walkway.

19 MR. HAYMANS: Require an engineer, take
20 out the "hire" as well and then Davis needs to
21 check it.

22 MR. NOBLES: Davis, is that --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Spacing of the
24 pilings.

25 MS. ANDREWS: Can you change "would" to

1 applicant "shall" hire an engineer; is that
2 correct, Davis?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Yes.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: We have a
5 motion.

6 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion with
7 special condition attached. Can I get a second?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROOKSHIRE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN RABON: I now have a second. Any
10 further discussion? Hearing none, now call the
11 motion to vote. All in favor, please say aye.

12 SPEAKERS: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Nay.

15 CHAIRMAN RABON: One nay, the motion is
16 carried. Thank you.

17 Moving on to our next project, Sorry
18 Charlie's Oyster Company. I will now call on
19 Paul to present this project.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROOKSHIRE: I'm going to
21 recuse myself from this.

22 CHAIRMAN RABON: Let the record reflect
23 that Mr. Brookshire has recused himself from
24 these deliberations.

25 Go ahead, Paul.

1 MR. TOBLER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

2 Good morning y'all. This is a CMPA
3 application for Sorry Charlie's Oyster Company,
4 LLC. The project location is 230 East Point
5 Drive, Talahi Island on Bull River in Chatham
6 County, Georgia.

7 The proposed project is to construct a
8 commercial dock facility along the Bull River,
9 Chatham County, Georgia.

10 The first public notice of the Coastal
11 Marshlands Protection Committee ran from October
12 3rd, 2024 to November 1st, 2024. 18 comments in
13 opposition and a petition in opposition of 58
14 signatures were received during this first
15 public notice hearing. Two more opposing
16 comments were received after the period expired.
17 The comments expressed concerns with upland
18 zoning regulations, increased traffic and noise,
19 environmental impacts, proximity to extended
20 property lines, proximity to existing adjacent
21 docks and decreased property values for
22 neighbors.

23 The agent responded to all comments
24 received during that first public notice period.

25 So as the committee members will remember,

1 we heard this project for the first time on
2 November 15th of 2024, and CMPC tabled it
3 pending clarification on compliance with local
4 zoning ordinance.

5 Since that meeting, we had a second public
6 notice run from February 1st, 2025 to February
7 15th, 2025.

8 During that notice period we received 11
9 comments in opposition to the project. Several
10 of the comments in opposition were actually
11 received after the public notice period had
12 expired.

13 So the public comments -- I'm sorry, I'm
14 jumping ahead. The comments during the second
15 public notice period in February expressed
16 concerns with zoning regulations, increased
17 traffic and noise, environmental impact,
18 potential of decreased property values,
19 proximity to extended property lines,
20 interference with a potential new dock and lack
21 of inclusion of an upland component.

22 The agent responded to all comments
23 received during the public notice period, and
24 then staff wanted to give you guys a brief
25 overview of the local zoning information. That

1 was the reason we tabled it at the November
2 meeting.

3 I wanted -- we wanted to read y'all the
4 statute, which is OCGA 12-5-286(b)(6), and that
5 statute states a letter from the local governing
6 authority of the political subdivision in which
7 the property is located stating that the
8 applicant's proposed is not violative of any
9 zoning laws.

10 The requirement of this code section has
11 been met, and I would like to take you through a
12 little of the history of this particular
13 requirement.

14 Initially when we received the
15 application, we had a zoning letter dated
16 January 31st, 2024 stating that the project is
17 not in violation of any local zoning ordinances
18 and the letter was not conditioned.

19 On November 1st, 2024, we received a
20 zoning letter that stated they can -- that the
21 local zoning authority can neither approve nor
22 deny the proposed changes to the dock and they
23 fall under the state's purview.

24 We received another letter November 7th
25 that attempted to clarify the role of the county

1 and state in regulating dock structures located
2 over coastal marshlands.

3 Then as I mentioned in the previous slide,
4 that we did have the -- the committee meeting on
5 November 15th, in which it was tabled. And the
6 committee required further zoning clarification.

7 We had that -- the public notice from
8 February 1st to February 15th, in which we
9 received several comments. After -- both during
10 and after the public comment period that ended
11 on February 15th that contained correspondences
12 with the Chatham County Department of Building
13 Safety and Regulatory Services that seemed to
14 refute the official's finding that the project
15 was not violative of the zoning law.

16 The latest correspondence referenced in
17 the comments is dated February 20th, 2025. On
18 February 21st of 2025, we received -- we had --
19 CRD staff had contacted said zoning
20 administrator, and we received confirmation from
21 the assistant director that the project was not
22 violative of zoning law.

23 And now we are here, and now I will pass
24 this project off to the agent, Sam Labarba.

25 MR. SAM LABARBA: Good morning, everyone.

1 I'm Sam Labarba, Labarba Environmental Services.
2 Also here is Harley Krinsky of Sorry Charlie's
3 Oyster Company.

4 At this site nothing has changed since the
5 last meeting as far as the plans for the dock.
6 Currently at the site is a previously existing
7 causeway that has sunken below jurisdictional
8 elevation, which will be replaced with a
9 walkway, but the walkway that is currently there
10 is 383.74 square feet.

11 The fixed deck has pilings and some pile
12 caps and stringers but is in need of repair, and
13 the existing floating dock, which will be
14 removed, is 315 square feet, so the existing
15 dock facility, the walkway will stay and tie
16 into the proposed walkway. The fixed deck will
17 be enlarged and the ramp will stay.

18 The project description for the proposed
19 document, the proposed modifications are to
20 facilitate a commercial oyster operation.

21 The applicant has an active shellfish
22 lease from the state of Georgia as the
23 leaseholder. The applicant received a master
24 harvester certification and shellfish
25 mariculture permit.

1 The applicant is also certified by the
2 Georgia Department of Ag to sell as a shell
3 stock shipper.

4 The proposed commercial dock facility will
5 provide the necessary mooring space and work
6 area for the applicant to harvest and process
7 the oysters from the lease, and the lease is
8 located on Bull River approximately a ten-minute
9 boat ride from this location.

10 The proposed dock facility will consist of
11 a 6-foot-by-421-foot walkway extending from the
12 upland out to a 24-foot-by-32-foot covered fixed
13 deck.

14 On the left side of the fixed deck will be
15 two boat hoists, which will be a 13 and a half
16 feet by 30 feet with a catwalk going down the
17 middle for access to either side. 6-by-32-foot
18 ramp will extend seaward from the fixed deck to
19 access a 12-foot-by-88-foot floating dock.

20 The dock will be located 55 foot from the
21 nearest dock to the west and 208 feet to the
22 nearest dock on the east.

23 Also installed at that facility will be
24 floating upweller. There are several variations
25 of floating upwellers which are used to grow

1 oysters from sea into large enough organisms to
2 take out to the farm.

3 MR. TOBLER: Thank you, Mr. Labarba, and
4 staff would like to recommend that, should the
5 committee determine that the proposed project is
6 in the public interest, the department staff
7 recommends the standard conditions, the Coastal
8 Marshlands Protection Act standard conditions,
9 the standard conditions for the commercial dock
10 and we have no additional and special
11 conditions. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Paul. We have
13 a number of people that have signed up to speak.
14 I'm going to start -- I think this is pronounced
15 Ms. Denise Holdine?

16 MS. DENISE HOLDINE: Holdine, if you don't
17 mind, I will go last. I think there are other
18 people -- does it matter?

19 CHAIRMAN RABON: Let's just keep it in
20 order.

21 MS. DENISE HOLDINE: So, the first thing I
22 wanted to address was the MPC and the language
23 going back and forth. MPC is saying they don't
24 find any violations for the permit, period.

25 They are saying that's for residential.

1 That's not commercial. That's for the permit,
2 and that's as far as they go. The DNR is
3 responsible for the approval here.

4 But you can't have a commercial dock
5 leading out of a residential area. So we would
6 have to wait until they erect it to claim the
7 violation. I live on Lake Drive. I am a
8 retired manager post office operations over
9 Tybee and Savannah.

10 I'm very well aware of the traffic that
11 goes in and out. Lake Drive leads to East
12 Point. It was closed -- East Point was closed
13 years ago to enlarge Highway 80 to four lanes,
14 so the only way into East Point is through Lake
15 Drive.

16 My house is the first house on the right.
17 My kitchen looks out at the street and I see the
18 traffic is already increasing, potholes up and
19 down the street.

20 At the end of the street what used to be a
21 beautiful walk through our neighborhood, we now
22 look over at fine fish, The Boathouse, which has
23 an enormous amount of traffic with a lot of
24 inexperienced boaters that are causing issues,
25 as well as the Bull Street or the Bull Marina,

1 which is supposed to be a small scale, which is
2 very busy now, so the congestion in that short
3 area is definitely an impact on waterways, and
4 noise is again aesthetically not conducive to a
5 neighborhood.

6 I love oysters but not to point where I'm
7 ready to see the traffic go in and out in order
8 to support that.

9 This is a neighborhood with children
10 running through. My grandchild is in my
11 neighborhood. We don't need two-ton, ten-ton
12 trucks making deliveries and pickups one way in
13 and one way out at a dead end street at the end
14 of this. That's all.

15 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you. Ms. Patricia
16 Lucy.

17 MS. PATRICIA LUCY: I defer my time to
18 Luke Graham.

19 CHAIRMAN RABON: Okay, Mr. Luke Graham, if
20 you will limit your comments to six minutes.
21 Let me remind you, please state your full name
22 for the record.

23 MR. LUKE GRAHAM: Thank you. Thanks for
24 your time this morning. I'm Luke Graham,
25 resident at 220 East Point Drive. I live two

1 houses away from the 230 East Point Drive, where
2 the dock is being installed or going to be
3 applied for installation.

4 So in November the committee said there
5 needed to be a clear answer from Chatham County
6 zoning on whether this commercial dock facility
7 was violating any zoning ordinance.

8 To us this is still unclear. This dock
9 applicant, Mr. Krinsky, received a letter from
10 Mr. Marcus Lotson, the assistant director of
11 Building Safety and Regulatory Services in
12 Chatham County, saying that a marine dock would
13 be non-violative of the zoning ordinance, and
14 the February 21st letter confirms this letter
15 was written in response to the question of if a
16 dock would be violative.

17 The dock on the property was built in
18 1975. We already knew that a certain type of
19 dock would be non-violative because one has been
20 on the property for the last 50 years.

21 This letter does not specify what type of
22 dock would be non-violative and under what
23 circumstances.

24 It does not say that the project at hand
25 would be non-violative. When Mr. Lotson was

1 questioned about a commercial dock in a letter
2 sent on February 4th, he confirmed that a
3 commercial dock is not permitted in this zone,
4 Zone CM. That letter is included in the zoning
5 documents that I think that you guys have.

6 Section 4-4 of the zoning ordinance states
7 if either a use or class of use is not
8 specifically indicated as being permitted in a
9 district either as a matter of right or on the
10 approval of the board of appeals, then such use
11 or class of use shall be prohibited in such
12 district.

13 More specifically, use 31(a), marshland
14 agriculture, is allowed in this zone but use
15 31(b), waterfront facilities for the launching
16 and care of marshland agriculture equipment, is
17 not a permitted use.

18 This is confirmed in another letter sent
19 on February 20th from Mr. Lotson that is
20 included in the zoning letters. This is what
21 this is, this project. The commercial dock
22 facility is a waterfront facility to be used for
23 marshland agriculture.

24 Section 3-2 of the zoning ordinance states
25 zoning affects all land and buildings. No land,

1 buildings or structures shall be used; no
2 building or structure shall be erected and no
3 existing building or structure shall be moved,
4 added to or altered except in conformity with
5 these regulations.

6 They could not build a dock or any
7 structure for that matter that does not conform
8 with the regulations. A commercial dock
9 facility on this property for the purpose of
10 marshland agriculture does not agree with the
11 use table that says that waterfront facilities
12 for marshland agriculture are prohibited.

13 We spoke with Mr. Brad Clement,
14 development services for the Metropolitan
15 Planning Commission, to formally appeal the
16 January 24th letter that was mentioned to the
17 Chatham County board of appeals, but we were
18 told that a project site plan has not been
19 submitted. The January 27th letter was
20 inconsequential. It didn't reference their
21 project at all.

22 Given the opportunity, we would like to
23 take this to the zoning board of appeals to get
24 a clear answer, but so far nothing has been
25 written that we can appeal that says that this

1 project or even that a commercial dock facility
2 for marshland agricultural is non-violative.

3 We firmly believe that this does not, in
4 fact, violate -- sorry, we firmly believe that
5 this does, in fact, violate the zoning ordinance
6 of Chatham County but the county keeps writing
7 these vague letters that don't say anything of
8 substance, in our opinion, respectfully, since
9 there is no project site plan for the County.

10 You know, finally my last point is that
11 the dock applicant who is leasing land in the
12 neighborhood has, for this project, has
13 demonstrated that he does not care about the
14 neighborhood or the neighbors.

15 When made aware of this dock -- the dock
16 plans were over neighboring property lines and
17 taking away rights of theirs to build their own
18 dock, he made no offer to change anything about
19 the dock plans. The dock plans are the same as
20 they were last time.

21 He didn't get a permit when he started
22 construction on this dock over a year ago. When
23 he was told to use the existing dock for
24 commercial purposes by the DNR, he used it to
25 load equipment on a commercial boat. He misled

1 the Georgia Department of Agriculture to state
2 that the garage and commercial refrigerator were
3 on the 230 East Point Drive instead of 228 East
4 Point Drive, which is residentially zoned, in
5 order to get a shellfish license without proper
6 zoning approval.

7 Within the past week someone has
8 anonymously reported my own personal house for
9 having home renovation done without a permit
10 when it wasn't required.

11 Just the overall point is our neighborhood
12 is not really in a great place right now.
13 Please consider the riparian rights of property
14 owners in that neighborhood. Please deny this
15 project at this specific location.

16 Thanks for your time.

17 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you. I think
18 it's -- is it Mr. Michael Case?

19 MR. MICHAEL CASE: Thank you. My name is
20 Michael Case, and I'm the next-door neighbor to
21 this operation. I will state clearly that we're
22 not opposed to this gentleman making a living.

23 That's not what we're talking about here.
24 We're talking about where he's trying to make a
25 living. That's the issue, and I believe Paul

1 came down, or I'm sorry, I forgot your last
2 name, I should address you with your last name,
3 came down and actually saw the area when he
4 posted the last public announcement about how
5 narrow the road is, and he got to see
6 firsthand -- I happened to be out there in the
7 yard and had an opportunity to talk to him.

8 Secondly, what I believe he didn't mention
9 was I have captured about 30 videos of traffic
10 increasing to include a tractor-trailer already
11 going down there, picking up material. Again
12 we're not against this gentleman making a
13 living, but this is the wrong place to be doing
14 it.

15 And I've lost time with my business to
16 come down here twice. I'm paying attorneys and
17 I'm just -- would ask that you vote against
18 this.

19 It's not necessary and he just needs to
20 find another place to do the operation. Thank
21 you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Mr. Judson
23 Turner.

24 MR. JUD TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner,
25 members of the committee, good to see you again.

1 I'm here on behalf of Mr. Case who just spoke,
2 and really I will be brief. Mr. Graham did a
3 good job walking you through those letters, but
4 what you have in front of you is confirmation of
5 one thing, and that is a dock can be
6 rehabilitated, a marine dock, without a problem
7 from the zoning.

8 You have a letter that says a commercial
9 dock is a problem for zoning, and then you have
10 all sorts of evidence that commercial activity
11 on the upland component, storage, transport.
12 There's no confirmation -- you have no
13 confirmation of zoning. The applicant says they
14 don't have an upland component on it because
15 they are not building a storage facility or a
16 parking lot or something else, but the statute
17 requires zoning to be confirmed for a reason,
18 and this is it.

19 And so what the county has been doing -- I
20 don't know why; we just got retained and we will
21 also be trying to get an answer, too -- but
22 clearly Mr. Lotson is answering specific
23 questions asked of him, so the first question is
24 can we rehabilitate a marine dock. The question
25 that has never been asked by this applicant is

1 does a commercial dock in the CM zone violate
2 zoning. That's as to the dock and then he's
3 never been asked about an upland component
4 because the applicant's position is we don't
5 have an upland component, so you don't have
6 zoning and it shouldn't be on your agenda today,
7 so with that, I will yield the well.

8 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you. Mr. Harley
9 Krinsky.

10 MR. SAM LABARBA: I will respond to his
11 comment.

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: This would be the time to
13 respond to public comment.

14 MR. SAM LABARBA: To start off, in regards
15 to the zoning, I understand there's been back
16 and forth, DNR staff and I believe above the
17 Brunswick level looked into that and interpreted
18 it, and as was shown in the presentation today,
19 the applicant has met the requirement to be
20 brought to the Coastal Marshland Protection
21 Committee.

22 SPEAKER: Sorry.

23 MR. SAM LABARBA: I don't want to get any
24 further into interpreting the county. I just
25 wanted to add that a set of drawings were

1 provided to the county with our request for the
2 original letter. I believe the response from
3 the county was because they don't have zoning
4 authority or any authority over the marsh, they
5 checked with their legal counsel and said that
6 they have the drawings but they won't sign them
7 because it's outside of their purview.

8 In addition to that, before Mr. Krinsky
9 started the business, one of the first thing he
10 did was sat with the Chatham County in their
11 office. We want to get this lease for a
12 shellfish mariculture permit. This is a
13 facility we have available and he was directed,
14 yes, this will be okay, so this whole business
15 venture was undertaken with an understanding
16 with the county of what was going to be going on
17 here.

18 But the rest of the list, in regards to
19 traffic, we reviewed all the videos by Mr. Case.
20 I believe around 95 percent of them were just
21 vehicles, pickup truck. There might have been
22 an SUV in there a couple of times, so it's the
23 normal traffic you would see in any
24 neighborhood, the same vehicle that I drive out
25 front that I'm sure a lot of people drive pickup

1 trucks to their house every day. These are the
2 vehicles that are typically in use of the road.

3 The one instance in which a bigger vehicle
4 was brought in was in direct response to our
5 previous comments, so in the first set of
6 comments we received, part of the complaint was
7 bulk materials being left on the site, so in
8 response to try to make the neighborhood a
9 little happier about the project, Mr. Krinsky
10 sold any bulk equipment he had on the site, so a
11 truck came in one time and took all the
12 equipment away. That's not a regular use of the
13 road.

14 It's standard vehicles that will be used.
15 In terms of traffic from a trailer and boat --
16 there were a few videos that had a boat attached
17 to a vehicle -- the dock is the best solution to
18 that. If they have a dock, the boats will stay
19 in the water. They won't have to trailer the
20 boats in and out of the neighborhood. So that
21 would cut down on traffic immediately.

22 I would venture to say that the
23 neighborhood probably has a bigger impact on
24 roads from Amazon deliveries than a couple of
25 pickup trucks coming to work in the morning and

1 leaving at the end of the day.

2 And in response to us not being willing to
3 work with the community, prior to the first CMPC
4 meeting, we sent out an invitation to everyone
5 in the community to attend a meeting on site.

6 We sent those certified mail, provided
7 receipts to DNR staff. We invited everyone from
8 the community to come out there, look over the
9 operation and, you know, provide us feedback.

10 We only had two people come to the meeting
11 out of the around 60 that we invited. So we
12 tried to reach out at that point, and no one was
13 willing to engage with us, and also yesterday I
14 spoke on the phone with Mr. Case's attorney,
15 Amber Carter, and offered to have a conversation
16 with them. I never received a call back. I
17 think that was two days ago. They haven't
18 responded.

19 We believe we've done our best to try to
20 reach out to the community and try to make
21 everything agreeable. We've done all we can do,
22 and we feel we've met the requirements to the
23 public.

24 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any response by staff to
25 the public comments?

1 MS. ANDREWS: Just for the committee, I
2 think I wanted to clarify, just a couple of
3 things. On behalf of the committee if you will,
4 to make sure that you did have an answer to the
5 zoning, I did reach out the zoning administrator
6 and requested in writing that he confirm his
7 position for the county. That request was
8 specific to a commercial dock facility located
9 230 East Point Drive, so on multiple occasions
10 Mr. Lotson did respond to commercial dock
11 facility, and so I did respond on February 21st
12 back to the department.

13 I believe his letter -- is this the one he
14 sent on the 21st that is in your packet? So he
15 said it was in response to whether his
16 construction renovation of the dock at 230 East
17 Point Drive violated the zoning ordinance and
18 stated that it did not.

19 So Mr. Lotson did share that there had
20 been other communications. I think Mr. Turner
21 correctly pointed out as unique questions were
22 coming into the zoning office unique responses
23 were going out.

24 I understand that there have been
25 additional responses that are not -- questions

1 and responses that are not part of your packet.
2 Mr. Lotson was offered the opportunity to come
3 to the meeting. It's probably not something
4 that he would typically do, but I wanted to
5 point out that we did specifically request
6 clarification on a commercial dock facility at
7 that location.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: So -- and I
9 don't know if Andrea can still hear us or
10 whatever, but do we have input from the attorney
11 general's office about the -- has Chatham County
12 met the burden of the statute and is the
13 attorney general's office willing to tell us
14 that if they have weighed in.

15 MS. ANDREWS: I don't know if they have a
16 way to communicate with us at this point.
17 However, we did have a conversation with them
18 and I believe that the finding was that the
19 January 2024 letter as well as the 2025 letter
20 both met the requirement of the act.

21 CHAIRMAN RABON: Let's ask Andrea if she
22 can --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: I think the
24 challenge for us and for the community certainly
25 is that with each -- to Jud's point, with each

1 passing written word, the story changes each
2 time so we have a couple of things that seem
3 definitive and then a couple of things that
4 aren't as definitive, so that's the question,
5 whether or not we could get as a committee some
6 guidance from the attorney general's office
7 about whether the statutory requirements are
8 met. Yeah, I don't know that she can hear me.

9 MS. DIANA PATRICK: I don't think she can.

10 MS. ANDREWS: Andrea, do you want me to
11 put this on speaker phone or how would you like
12 to do this? Let me put you on speaker phone
13 with the microphone.

14 Andrea, you're on microphone.

15 MS. HARTUNG: This is Andrea Hartung with
16 the attorney general's office, so Valerie, I
17 appreciate you raising this concern and I think
18 I was able to hear most of what you had said so
19 under OCGA 12-5-286 Section (b)(6), the
20 requirement is to have, with any application, a
21 letter from the local governing authority of the
22 political subdivision in which the property is
23 located stating that the applicant's proposal is
24 not violative of any zoning law, and our CRD
25 staff has described today it's been determined

1 that this February 21st letter meets this
2 application sort of conclusion requirement.

3 MS. ANDREWS: Thank you, Andrea.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Thank you,
5 Andrea.

6 MS. HARTUNG: No problem.

7 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any other questions?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: So, Mr.
9 Chairman, I think that the challenge that you're
10 struggling with and I'm sure the community is
11 struggling is with is if, in fact, as staff and
12 the AG's office has stipulated that there's not
13 a zoning problem with respect to the dock and
14 that the jurisdiction is totally CMP driven,
15 then the question is the upland component over
16 which we don't really have any jurisdiction, but
17 the dock by its very nature needs someplace to
18 process what's happening on the dock, and I
19 guess the question maybe to the agent and the
20 applicant is if you have a commercial dock that
21 is properly permitted and properly zoned and you
22 do not have an upland component that you can use
23 for processing and everything else that you're
24 doing there, what happens to the operation?

25 MR. SAM LABARBA: I think the confusion is

1 in the word "processing." So there is no
2 processing of shellfish that takes place on the
3 upland at any time, so the farm is out there on
4 the lease in Bull River. There's a floating
5 platform out there where the staff, two or three
6 people goes out and works the farm, so they will
7 empty the cages and there's a floating platform
8 out there where they will sort them. They use
9 a -- you remember in our first application, we
10 have a tumbler. So that's how they sort the
11 sizes of the shellfish.

12 We had initially planned on having that at
13 the end of the dock but in response to the
14 community not wanting noise or anything like
15 that, we moved that out to the lease facility,
16 so there will be no processing of turning them
17 into another product or even sorting.

18 Anything that comes back to the dock is
19 going to be a full-grown oyster that's ready to
20 ship that gets placed into a freezer and into a
21 truck eventually to its consumer.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: But just to
23 clarify the processing -- but there is
24 commercial activity occurring at the other --
25 the subject address I guess would be 228 East

1 Point.

2 MR. SAM LABARBA: At 228, there is a
3 building.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Commercial.
5 It's not residential. No, no, you're using it
6 as a commercial site.

7 MR. SAM LABARBA: Our application is
8 strictly for 230.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: I understand
10 that, but if you did not have commercial
11 activity available to you at 228 --

12 MR. SAM LABARBA: It would still be landed
13 at this facility and then trucked somewhere
14 else, and I just wanted to clarify, too, when I
15 said freezer and truck, it was not freezer
16 truck. So it's put in a freezer and delivered
17 in a pickup truck, not an oversized freezer
18 truck. It's moved from a freezer to a regular
19 pickup truck that takes it to where it's going.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: So I guess this
21 is to the applicant. I have got three
22 questions. Well, maybe this is to the staff but
23 I think Valerie just kind of answered it, but I
24 just want to be clear in my mind, is there an
25 upland component to this project?

1 MR. SAM LABARBA: No.

2 MR. NOBLES: Mr. Barrow, I would like to
3 point you to Finding Number 31 in your report.
4 There is no upland component to the proposed
5 project.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: And to clarify
7 again, this is all semantics, but there is no
8 upland component for us as a committee to
9 consider. There may be upland activity but
10 that's not within the jurisdiction of the
11 Coastal Marshland Protection Committee and/or
12 Act, but this particular project does not have
13 an upland component.

14 MR. NOBLES: That's correct. Does that
15 make sense to y'all?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: I have a
17 question. So is there commercial activity
18 happening -- I think it was 228 and 230; is that
19 the address?

20 MR. SAM LABARBA: The only project, the
21 only address associated with our project is 230
22 East Point Drive.

23 Our stance is if you get outside of our
24 project, if you are looking at any facility, for
25 example, Brunswick has a dock, DNR has a dock

1 here, which has multiple roads leading here;
2 right. You don't extend out forever because
3 eventually you've got part of the whole world is
4 the upland component.

5 Specific to this project is the way that
6 we believe that DNR interprets the rule and how
7 it's been applied in previous projects. That's
8 the way we submitted it was for this project
9 there is no upland component.

10 And regardless elsewhere there is no
11 construction going on. Isn't that what you're
12 getting at? Is there something being built
13 somewhere else in association with this? No,
14 there's not.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: So would you
16 have a commercial dock at 230 if you did not
17 have activity to support that at 228?

18 MR. SAM LABARBA: Yes, and we discussed
19 this in our response letter to some of the
20 community, so the leases that were set by DNR
21 with the new act that allows commercial harvest
22 of oyster, you can't as an individual who wants
23 to be an oyster farmer, you can't go out and
24 pick where you're going to grow them and say,
25 "Well, this place is very convenient because

1 it's close to my dock." It's kind of a
2 backwards process that you have the lease and
3 you have to find the dock that's within the
4 distance, within the range to get them back
5 before the time expires.

6 So some of the rules are still changing
7 with the shellfish folks, but I believe as it
8 stands now, for summertime harvest, when you
9 harvest an oyster, you have to have it in a
10 mechanical refrigerator within two hours from
11 the time you pick it or else you have to take it
12 and put it back in the river for a set amount of
13 days. I'm not sure how many days, 14 days, so
14 when you locate the lease and basically draw a
15 radius around that lease of how far can I get
16 assuming the second that you take that oyster
17 out, you got to take more out; you can't
18 transfer one at time, so, say, you spend an hour
19 and a half harvesting those oysters, well, now
20 you've got 30 minutes to get to a dock, get it
21 unloaded and bring it to a freezer, and so we
22 have searched the area for another place that
23 this could happen, and there is nothing
24 available for our client. We have not found any
25 alternative docks that would allow the type of

1 access that's needed within the time constraints
2 that's required by law.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: Well, thank you
4 for that, and I think somebody said it earlier,
5 we all like oysters and we want, you know, the
6 applicant to have a business, and I don't think
7 anybody is denying that. I'm just trying to
8 figure out if there's -- you mentioned a freezer
9 truck and a freezer. The separation there,
10 you're putting it into an actual freezer and
11 it's actually on the adjacent property, and I'm
12 just trying to think if there's -- well, I
13 will --

14 MR. SAM LABARBA: I understand, it's the
15 same thought process we went through when trying
16 to find another suitable dock.

17 It's very difficult based on where the
18 lease is. Other oyster farmers are having the
19 exact same problem.

20 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any other questions?
21 Deliberations from the committee? We will now
22 call the question. What will be the will of the
23 committee?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: I make a motion
25 to approve the Coastal Marshlands Protection

1 application for Sorry Charlie's Oyster Company,
2 LLC and using the guidance from the attorney
3 general's office and staff citing 12-5-286(b)(6)
4 I think that requirement has been met. It's
5 obvious today.

6 Therefore, we have a responsibility and
7 obligation, at least, from my perspective to
8 approve this project.

9 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion. Do I
10 have a second?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: I will
12 reluctantly second it. I agree with
13 Commissioner Poole. I think the component, the
14 project itself meets the criteria based on staff
15 recommendation.

16 I continue to believe that Chatham County
17 zoning has both misled the neighborhood as well
18 as us, but based on the attorney general's
19 perspective and staff perspective, I think in
20 keeping with the act and our responsibility, we
21 are sort of hamstrung. It meets the criteria.
22 It meets the test. It's just the tragedy of the
23 adjacency of the neighborhood and how the
24 property is being used so ...

25 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion. I have

1 a second.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Just want to
3 amend that to include the standard conditions
4 for both commercial dock.

5 SPEAKER: I'm sorry, can you repeat that?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: I amend the
7 motion to approve based on standard conditions
8 for both commercial docks as well as CPMC.

9 CHAIRMAN RABON: So we have a motion on
10 the table. We're going to amend that?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Just to include
12 the standard conditions.

13 CHAIRMAN RABON: Just to include the
14 standard conditions.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN RABON: And I have a second on
17 the special conditions. We will now call the
18 question. All in favor say aye.

19 SPEAKERS: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed, like sign?
21 The motion is carried.

22 We're taking a brief pause before we get
23 into the next project to see if we can get our
24 attorney back online.

25 (Recess from 11:22 a.m. to 11:31 a.m.)

1 CHAIRMAN RABON: Let's call the meeting
2 back to order. Our next is with Blue Moon
3 Marinas, LLC and I will now call on Deb to
4 introduce the project.

5 MS. BARREIRO: CMP application from Blue
6 Moon Marinas, LLC, is for proposed project to
7 modify and maintain an existing marina facility
8 on Wilmington River in Thunderbolt.

9 This is also the ICW at this location and
10 it's approximately 200 feet wide. It's located
11 at 3110 River Drive in Thunderbolt. I'm going
12 to ask Dan Bucey, the agent for the applicant,
13 to come up and present.

14 MR. DAN BUCEY: Thank you, Deb. Dan Bucey
15 with Resource and Land Consultants, agent for
16 the applicant. Also with me today is Jason
17 Wald, the marine engineer, and Emile Bootsma,
18 the applicant.

19 This picture shows the history of the
20 site. It's been a commercial marina and fishing
21 facility known as Thunderbolt Fisherman's
22 Seafood that's been abandoned. The applicant
23 purchased and is proposing to modify the
24 existing facility to serve as a private yacht
25 facility.

1 MS. DIANA PATRICK: Hold on, give me just
2 a second.

3 MR. DAN BUCEY: So the marina will serve
4 the *Blue Moon*, which is a 198-foot yacht with a
5 homeport of Savannah and also for transient, a
6 few transient vessels, based on availability.

7 The *Blue Moon* has been in Savannah for
8 over ten years and has been unable to find a
9 suitable permanent home and has been forced to
10 dock at a variety of temporary sites and
11 locations.

12 The proposed facility, as you can note the
13 existing as you can see, would provide the dock
14 space needed and also the upland area facilities
15 that are necessary to service a boat of that
16 size.

17 U. S. Army Corps of Engineers issued a
18 provisional authorization on September 17th of
19 last year and also a provisional verification to
20 use nationwide 13 for the shoreline
21 stabilization component of the project.

22 Existing facility within jurisdiction, we
23 have a drawing for that. Should be the next
24 one, keep going. I don't know if the existing
25 one is on this slide.

1 MS. BARREIRO: That is the existing one.

2 MR. DAN BUCEY: So the existing facility
3 is 0.29 acres which consists of a concrete pier
4 head, a metal building, timber piles and riprap
5 shoreline protection.

6 You go to the proposed. There you go. As
7 proposed, the marshland component will occupy
8 0.48 acres that includes disassembly of the
9 metal building, replacement of the concrete pier
10 head with a concrete wharf and reconstruction of
11 the metal building in the exact same location,
12 which will be used for storage only.

13 Installation of two gangways to access the
14 floating dock that will replace the existing
15 pier heads, installation of a mooring piling,
16 two sheep pile bulkheads and riprap for
17 additional shoreline protection. Water and
18 electric service will be extended to the dock
19 and to the metal building located within
20 jurisdiction.

21 The upland component is -- there we go.
22 So on this drawing, you can see the concrete
23 wharf, the reconstructed metal building out over
24 that concrete wharf and then parking in a marina
25 service area in that building that's located in

1 the uplands. That building will provide laundry
2 and restrooms for transient motors and crew, and
3 it's going to be serviced by the town of
4 Thunderbolt water and sewer, and as I stated
5 previously, the storage building out on the
6 wharf just has water and electric service. No
7 sewer.

8 Go back to -- yes. Excuse me, go to the
9 plan view of the proposed drawing. There we go.
10 That's it.

11 So as Deb mentioned, the ICW is located at
12 this location. We are hundred feet south of the
13 southern limits of that. It's over 200 feet
14 wide. The proposed marina would extend 98 feet
15 into the river in a location that's over 395
16 feet wide and again a hundred feet south of the
17 channel limits that you can see right there.

18 So based on this location and our design,
19 we're clearly not going to unreasonably affect
20 navigation or flow of navigable water.

21 We're also proposing to augment and put
22 some sheep pile bulkheads, which will eliminate
23 the erosion which will result in not
24 unreasonably increasing erosion or causing areas
25 of stagnant water, and since we're replacing and

1 rehabilitating existing features, existing
2 marina, there's no significant unreasonable loss
3 of marsh or estuarine habitats, mostly pile
4 supported, and, therefore, will have no effect
5 on marine life and wildlife and (unintelligible)
6 water supply.

7 We ask that you approve this subject to
8 the staff's recommended standard and special
9 conditions.

10 MS. BARREIRO: The public notice of the
11 Coastal Marshlands Protection Committee ran from
12 January 29th, 2025 through February 27th, 2025.
13 No comments were received in response to the
14 public notice.

15 Should the committee determine that the
16 proposed project is in the public interest,
17 staff recommends the following standard and
18 special conditions.

19 Permittee is required to provide a
20 post-construction survey that locates the
21 marshland and upland components of the project,
22 shall comply with the Plat Act.

23 Upon completion of construction, the
24 permittee must contact the department for a
25 water bottoms lease.

1 The reconstructed shed on the concrete
2 platform is for storage purposes only.
3 Authorized utilities for the facility include
4 water and electric only, and the installation of
5 any sewage lines in CMPA jurisdiction is
6 prohibited.

7 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Deb. We have
8 no public comment requests so at this time, are
9 there any questions or deliberations of the
10 committee? Hearing none, I now entertain a
11 motion.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Mr. Chairman, I
13 make a motion that we approve the application
14 from Blue Moon Marinas with the standard and
15 special conditions recommended by the staff.

16 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROOKSHIRE: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a second. Any
19 other questions or discussion? Hearing none, we
20 will now call the question. All in favor say
21 aye.

22 SPEAKERS: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed like sign?
24 There is not -- the motion passes.

25 Moving on to our next project, East River

1 Street, LLC. Call on Cheyenne Osborne.

2 MS. OSBORNE: Thank you, commissioners.

3 Good morning, everyone. My name is
4 Cheyenne Osborne. The applicant for this
5 Coastal Marshlands Protection permit application
6 is East River Street, LLC.

7 The project is located at 620 River Street
8 East in the Savannah River in Chatham County.
9 The applicant is proposing construction and
10 maintenance of a public access boat dock seaward
11 of the existing river walk.

12 The project will be constructed in two
13 phases, and I would like to introduce the agent
14 speaking on behalf of the project, Brandon Wall
15 with Sligh Environmental Consultants.

16 MR. BRANDON WALL: Thank you, good
17 morning, and I appreciate the opportunity today.
18 I'm Brandon Wall. I'm with Sligh Environmental
19 on behalf of the agent.

20 As Cheyenne mentioned, the property is
21 located on the eastern end of River Street in
22 downtown Savannah and consists of the
23 construction of a floating dock for public
24 access to River Street.

25 The applicant owns a four-acre site. It's

1 the old Savannah Electric & Power Company
2 headquarters. They are redeveloping that
3 property into a hotel and commercial space. As
4 an amenity to that development, they are
5 proposing to install this floating dock.

6 The -- on the riverfront is the pile-
7 supported river walk platform, underneath sheep
8 pile bulkhead and some riprap.

9 This project was actually permitted back
10 in 2014. We got a permit extension in 2019, but
11 for a variety of reasons, the float was never
12 installed.

13 So basically we're seeking permit
14 reauthorization. There's been no changes to the
15 site plan from what was concluded by the
16 committee in 2014.

17 The total dock will be 360 linear feet,
18 and the floats will provide, as I mentioned,
19 access to this development, but also general
20 public access to River Street on a
21 first-come/first served basis. There won't be
22 any long-term leasing or anything like that.

23 As Cheyenne mentioned, the project will be
24 phased. Phase I will consist of a 12-by-6 --
25 excuse me, a 5-by-12 platform extending off the

1 river walk, and on the upstream side will be a
2 6-by-80 gangway connecting to a 200-foot long
3 floating dock.

4 The floats will extend 20 feet from the
5 face of the river wall or about 40 feet for the
6 sheep pile bulkhead underneath the river walk,
7 and the floats will be 130 feet from the edge of
8 the federal navigation channel. The proposed
9 impacts for Phase 1 total 2,927 square feet.

10 Phase II will be constructed when the need
11 arises for additional mooring space. Phase II
12 will consist of a 30-by-66 gangway extending on
13 the downstream side of the platform and will
14 connect to 160-foot float extension.

15 The proposed impacts for Phase II will be
16 2,112 square feet, and the total impacts for the
17 whole project are 5,039 square feet.

18 MS. OSBORNE: The public notice of Coastal
19 Marshlands Protection Committee ran from
20 November 7th, 2024 through December 6th, 2024.
21 One comment was received with questions
22 regarding the project. The comment has concerns
23 about the need for dock space, verifying the
24 need for space, whether there was potential for
25 reserved use of the dock and concerns regarding

1 the upland component. The agent has provided
2 written responses to the comments.

3 Should the committee determine the
4 proposed project to be in the public interest,
5 department staff to the committee recommends the
6 following special conditions.

7 The floating docks will be constructed in
8 two phases. Phase I will include an 11-and-a-
9 half-feet-by-200-feet concrete floating dock.

10 Phase II will provide additional mooring
11 space by adding an 11-and-a-half-by-160-feet
12 concrete floating dock.

13 Permittee must supply occupancy records
14 deemed adequate for review and approval by the
15 department prior to constructing Phase II.

16 No mooring space will be allowed on the
17 inside of the floating dock adjacent to the
18 river walk, and Number 3, as a public access
19 dock, the mooring space shall remain
20 first-come/first served for guests of the hotel
21 development and the general public.

22 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Cheyenne. We
23 have no one that has signed up to speak from the
24 public. Any questions from the committee?
25 Hearing none, I would entertain a motion.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BROOKSHIRE: I make a
2 motion that we approve Coastal Marshland
3 Protection Act project East River Street, LLC,
4 construction of a public access boat dock, 620
5 River Street East, Savannah River, Savannah,
6 Chatham County, Georgia with the special
7 conditions.

8 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion. Can I
9 get a second?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a second. Any
12 other discussion? Hearing none, we will now
13 call the question. All in favor say aye.

14 SPEAKERS: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed? The motion
16 is carried.

17 Our next project is for Vaden Enterprises,
18 LLLP.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BARROW: Commissioner, I
20 just wanted to recuse myself from this project.

21 CHAIRMAN RABON: Go ahead, Deb.

22 MS. BARREIRO: Thank you.

23 The project is located at -- the project
24 is located at 113 Meriwether Drive, Dutch
25 Island, Chatham County.

1 The proposed project is to fill coastal
2 marshlands for the construction of a private
3 driveway. The proposed project is under a tenth
4 of an acre and is considered minor.

5 I'd like to introduce Russell Parr. He's
6 the agent for the applicant.

7 MR. RUSSELL PARR: Got you. Thank you,
8 Deb.

9 Good morning, my name is Russell Parr. I
10 work for Resource and Land Consultants. I have
11 Dan Bucey from RLC and I believe we have one of
12 the trustees of the Vaden Enterprises coming in
13 now. The project is located on Dutch Island at
14 113 Meriwether Drive.

15 We are proposing a point -- this is Wes,
16 he's one of the trustees of the Vaden
17 Enterprises.

18 The proposed project is a driveway
19 crossing of a tidal ditch that is going to be
20 0.013 acres of impact. The applicant has held
21 interest in the property since 1994. And so the
22 total parcel size is 3.09 acres with 1.57 acres
23 of upland, 0.15 acres of non-tidal freshwater
24 marsh, freshwater wetlands, excuse me, and 1.37
25 acres of coastal marshlands.

1 The coastal marshlands includes 0.97 acres
2 of salt marsh, 0.23 acres of manmade lagoon that
3 you can see there in blue, 0.09 acres of salt
4 pond, which is kind of in that tan color and
5 0.08 acres of manmade tidal ditch, which is the
6 gray in that picture.

7 Throughout the presentation, I will talk
8 about upstream and downstream, but in general
9 that means that the area around the tan salt
10 pond would be the upstream area and the lagoon
11 would be the downstream area.

12 The upland is divided into two areas by
13 the aquatic resources including the tidal marsh,
14 the tidal ditch and the freshwater wetland.

15 Based on our observations, the manmade
16 ditch and upstream CMPA (unintelligible) are not
17 subject to the average daily tide but do receive
18 tidal influence on larger tides.

19 The upland along the Dutch Island and
20 Meriwether Drive is accessible via a 30-foot
21 access easement, but the rear of the upland is
22 not, which necessitates the driveway crossing.

23 So the proposed crossing location is
24 approximately ten feet wide. Again the total
25 impacts are 0.013 acres. The driveway width is

1 20 feet with two-foot grass shoulders.

2 The proposed crossing was designed by a
3 professional engineer with Thomas & Hutton with
4 two 15-inch culverts to maintain the
5 preconstruction flow as required by Chatham
6 County.

7 The slope stabilization measures will be
8 used to make sure that there is no additional
9 erosion. The upland is currently unimproved and
10 fully pervious.

11 The 50-foot marshlands -- the 50-foot
12 marshlands buffer is 0.35 acres. Permanent
13 structures in the buffer will be limited to the
14 driveway and all surfaces will remain pervious
15 following construction.

16 So just to reiterate the compliance with
17 the CMPA and OCGA 12-5-288, I'm going to run
18 through the requirements of the public interest
19 factors.

20 So Number 1, whether or not unreasonably
21 harmful obstruction to an alteration of natural
22 flow of navigational water within the affected
23 area will arise as a result of the proposal.
24 There are no functional navigable waters within
25 the site that will be unreasonably obstructed by

1 this project.

2 Whether or not unreasonable harmful or
3 increased erosion, shoaling of channels or
4 stagnant areas of water will be created. The
5 project has been designed to maintain the
6 hydrologic activity that is currently provided
7 by the ditch and it will not unreasonably
8 increase erosion, shoaling of channels or
9 increase stagnant areas of water.

10 And Number 3, whether or not the granting
11 of a permit and the completion of the
12 applicant's proposal will unreasonably interfere
13 with conservation of fish, shrimp, oysters,
14 crabs or other marine life, wildlife or
15 resources that -- including but not limited to
16 water and oxygen. The proposed culverts within
17 this manmade ditch and the existing flow rates
18 will be maintained. The culvert will not --
19 will allow the passage of any marine animals
20 that currently use the ditch and the existing
21 flow rates will be maintained and not have an
22 unreasonable effect on the water and oxygen
23 supply.

24 So I have a few pictures, and it looks
25 like you can see them pretty well here, but just

1 to kind of give you some context of what we're
2 talking about, that board, you will see it in
3 the other pictures, but it's roughly where the
4 proposed crossing would start.

5 To the left, you do have some freshwater
6 wetland areas. We have a permit to cross those
7 areas from the Corps of Engineers that we
8 received last year.

9 And so just to give you some context, I'm
10 standing in the tidal area looking downstream of
11 the ditch.

12 Let me go back to -- go back one more,
13 please. So this is looking upstream at the same
14 location. The board has not been moved. It's
15 in the same spot.

16 What you see in that ditch is not from a
17 tidal event that day. Just again the context,
18 this is on March 1st during a spring tide and an
19 8.9-foot tide event, so I would expect if you
20 were going to see tide, you would see it now.

21 Obviously -- we're not debating anything
22 about whether it's tidal but just the fact that
23 it's not accessed regularly by average tides.

24 If you will go to the next slide, please,
25 and so on the top picture, you can see on the

1 right, that's the manmade lagoon. On the left
2 where you can see that flag is the terminus of
3 the ditch, and then you can kind of see a deer
4 path right there in the middle, and there is no
5 water that's going in or out of that ditch at
6 this point, and again this is at the peak of an
7 8.9-foot tide.

8 In the bottom picture, you can see I am
9 looking upstream of the ditch. There is no
10 water present, and there is some vegetation in
11 that picture, but we don't have very much tidal
12 marsh vegetation at the crossing location.

13 And so in conclusion, the proposed impacts
14 are limited to .013 acres of manmade tidal
15 ditch. The culverts will maintain the existing
16 marsh (unintelligible) and the rear upland
17 cannot be accessed without crossing these tidal
18 areas or without going through another private
19 property.

20 The proposed crossing is at the narrowest
21 point allowable, and just to reiterate,
22 compliance with the CMPA and the public interest
23 considerations, it does not reasonably interfere
24 with navigation; it preserves the existing
25 hydrology through the properly sized culverts

1 and the placement of the culverts within the
2 manmade ditch will not unreasonably interfere
3 with marine life conservation.

4 And with that, I respectfully ask for
5 approval of the project and any special
6 conditions that are warranted.

7 CHAIRMAN RABON: Deb?

8 MS. BARREIRO: The public notice for the
9 Coastal Marshlands Protection Committee ran from
10 August 2nd, 2024 to August 16th of 2024. No
11 comments were received in response to the public
12 notice.

13 In accordance with OCGA Section
14 12-5-288(b), the decision of whether the
15 proposed project may be approved shall be in the
16 sound discretion of the committee.

17 Should the committee approve this project,
18 it is within the committee's discretion to adopt
19 special and standard permit conditions as it
20 deems appropriate.

21 Special conditions may include the
22 permittee shall be required to provide a
23 post-construction survey. Such survey shall
24 comply with the Georgia Plat Act.

25 Permittee shall be required to maintain

1 tidal flow under the driveway. Permittee shall
2 mark with PVC or other acceptable means the
3 boundary footprint of the constructed driveway.
4 Such markers shall be included on the survey and
5 monitored annually to ensure the permitted
6 footprint of the project is not exceeded, and
7 the applicant shall provide the department plans
8 for routine maintenance of the culvert and
9 project footprint and timely reporting to the
10 department. Such plan must be approved by the
11 department prior to construction.

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Deb.

13 We have no one signed up to speak from the
14 public. Any questions from the committee or
15 deliberations? Yes, ma'am.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Deb or agent,
17 so what is the current use of this property?

18 MS. BARREIRO: The project at 113
19 Meriwether is a vacant lot.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: It's a vacant
21 lot.

22 MS. BARREIRO: It was subdivided from --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: There is no
24 house on it.

25 MS. BARREIRO: Not on 113.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Is there
2 approval by the county to build something on it?
3 There's a lot of wetlands there.

4 MR. RUSSELL PARR: Yes, it is a buildable
5 lot.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: You have
7 approval?

8 MR. RUSSELL PARR: Yes, ma'am.

9 SPEAKER: We submitted a -- my fault.
10 Several years ago a floor plan was submitted
11 to --

12 MR. HAYMANS: Start again. State your
13 name for the record.

14 MR. WES BEAVER: Wes Beaver, so a floor
15 plan was submitted to receive feedback on
16 whether a home could be built on that lot, and
17 we did receive feedback that there's enough
18 uplands and setbacks to build a home there.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Feedback, but
20 you don't have standing approval to do
21 construction at this point in time?

22 MR. WES BEAVER: We have not applied for
23 construction approval, but we did want to get
24 some indication if there was -- we met the
25 setback requirements for uplands.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: And you do have
2 access to the property currently through the
3 easement or the relationship with the other, so
4 you can access the property without this
5 driveway being built?

6 MR. WES BEAVER: No, ma'am. No, ma'am.

7 MR. RUSSELL PARR: I will take this. You
8 cannot access that rear upland portion without
9 crossing this wetland. So you can access the
10 front lot but you cannot access the rear lot.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any other questions?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: I do. The area
14 that you're crossing over that you're requesting
15 to fill marshlands, what's the length and width
16 of that.

17 MR. RUSSELL PARR: I believe it's
18 ten-feet- by-56, 57, maybe. Do we have that
19 on -- 10-by- 56?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: 10-by-56, got it.
21 Have you looked at any other alternate
22 ways to cross over that marshland?

23 MR. RUSSELL PARR: Yes, sir. We had the
24 consulting engineer look at building a bridge or
25 a bottomless arch culvert that was well over ten

1 X the cost to be able to do that and it kind of
2 makes -- it makes the project not economically
3 viable.

4 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any other questions of
5 the committee?

6 Hearing none, I would now entertain a
7 motion.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Mr. Chairman,
9 based on staff findings that the public interest
10 considerations have not been met, based on, I
11 think our obligation to protect the marshlands,
12 I make a motion that we disapprove this project
13 and encourage the applicants to find another
14 approach that does not fill the marshlands.

15 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion to
16 disapprove. Do I have a second?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a second, any
19 other discussion? All in favor to disapprove
20 the project say aye.

21 SPEAKERS: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed? The project
23 is denied.

24 Now call on Paul Tobler to present the
25 next project for the City of Brunswick.

1 MR. TOBLER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner,
2 pardon me. We have a CMPA application. The
3 applicant is the City of Brunswick. The project
4 location is at three tidal -- or two tidal
5 drainage ditches and one outfall located on the
6 west side of 341 within the City of Brunswick,
7 Glynn County, Georgia.

8 The project proposed is to stabilize and
9 maintain two storm water drainage ditches and
10 install a tide control valve at one existing
11 storm water outfall location within the City of
12 Brunswick/Glynn County, Georgia.

13 And I would like to invite up Mr. Cohen
14 Carpenter, the agent for the project.

15 MR. COHEN CARPENTER: Good afternoon,
16 Commissioner and committee members. My name is
17 Cohen Carpenter. I'm with GWES, the agent for
18 the project. Here with me today is the City of
19 Brunswick, the applicant, Mr. Garrow Alberson,
20 the city engineer and public works director, as
21 well as Mr. Ben Pierce, also with GWES, the
22 engineer of record for this project.

23 So this project, as Paul mentioned, is a
24 combination of projects collectively referred to
25 as improving resilience in west Brunswick.

1 These projects, the design of which was
2 funded through the Coastal Incentive Grant, a
3 NOAA-funded project that is administered through
4 the Coastal Resources Division, and so three of
5 the outfalls here came into consideration for
6 this CMPA permit where there were other multiple
7 outfalls with the ultimate goal of providing
8 some upstream storm water capacity as well as
9 restoring some of the degraded outfall ditches
10 that are within the city's jurisdiction, so I'll
11 start with Palmetto Cemetery ditch.

12 This one, if you are around this area
13 much, as you leave town on 341, this one you've
14 probably seen before.

15 So the Palmetto Cemetery ditch has a road
16 that goes across it, Ross Road, and Ross Road is
17 kind of where you see most of the erosion that's
18 currently occurring, so these pictures do a fair
19 bit of justice to it, but they are certainly
20 pretty visible from the road, and the issue here
21 is a safety concern.

22 The goal with this ditch is to stabilize
23 the banks and restore the previous grades that
24 would have been there in that outfall ditch.

25 So we can go to the next. Okay, so this

1 is the T Street ditch, which is at the
2 neighboring Greenwood Cemetery as well as the
3 entrance to the Brunswick-Glynn Joint Water and
4 Commission Academy Creek wastewater pollution
5 control plant.

6 As you can see here, there is some
7 significant erosion, some varying sized banks to
8 these ditches that are right next to the
9 entrance road, so, again the issue being a
10 safety concern and the goal being to restore
11 those banks and stabilize them.

12 So we can move on to Howe Street. So just
13 an aerial here of the Howe Street outfall. This
14 one is on Georgia Ports Authority property. You
15 can see the outfall there with a red arrow,
16 coming in right behind the Georgia Ports
17 Authority dock, the issue being that this
18 outfall is frequently submerged by tidal waters,
19 which just reduces the upstream storm water
20 drainage capacity and has led to some flooding
21 issues upstream, so the goal here is to replace
22 an existing tide valve with an in-kind tide
23 valve that is functional. The current one is
24 non-functional and allowing storm water to or
25 tidewater to take up capacity within the

1 drainage system.

2 So we can go to the next slide, so the
3 proposed project for the Palmetto Cemetery ditch
4 is going to impact approximately 782 linear
5 feet. 116 cubic yards of material will be
6 removed from the toe of the slope and replaced
7 with a riprap footer, if you will, for toe
8 protection of this slope. Approximately 380
9 cubic yards of fill dirt also will be placed on
10 the banks to restore desired slopes, and 104
11 cubic yards of Flexamat and geotextile fabric,
12 will be installed for bank stabilization.

13 Flexamat, if you are not familiar, is one
14 of several alternatives to traditional hard
15 armoring, which is something that I know the
16 Georgia Coastal Management program really
17 promotes getting away from, hard armoring
18 ditches where it's viable, and the City of
19 Brunswick has done a good job of looking for
20 opportunities to utilize non-hard-armoring
21 solutions to these sort of problems.

22 So Flexamat is sort of a -- has some
23 concrete pads that are in a grid-like fashion
24 that allows you to plant in between in the
25 interstitial space, so it allows a sort of a

1 green type approach, and this is one that we've
2 worked with Coastal Resources Division staff to
3 identify as a good option here.

4 So the total impact will be approximately
5 .16 acres within CMP jurisdiction for this
6 project.

7 If we can go to the next, please.

8 The T Street proposed improvements are
9 very similar. The linear footage of impacts are
10 415. Just to point out, there are currently
11 3258 square feet of riprap located in the ditch.
12 They are not associated with this project. 103
13 cubic yards of material will be excavated from
14 the toe of these slopes and replaced with riprap
15 again for toe protection to allow that material
16 on the -- further up on the bank to rest along
17 that toe and be more stabilized. Approximately
18 480 cubic yards of fill dirt and topsoil will be
19 placed on the banks to achieve the desired
20 slope. 94 cubic yards of Flexamat and
21 geotextile fabric will be installed for the bank
22 stabilization, and then Flexamat as with the
23 Palmetto Cemetery outfall will be planted with
24 native coastal vegetation. Impacts will be
25 approximately .21 acres of CMPA jurisdiction,

1 and I did just want to add that both these were
2 permitted through the Army Corps through a
3 nationwide permit for living shorelines.

4 And we can move on to Howe Street now. So
5 for the Howe Street outfall, again this one is
6 an in-kind replacement of a check valve that
7 will result in approximately .02 acres of
8 impacts which will just be temporary impacts for
9 access to install the check valve.

10 MR. TOBLER: Thank you, Cohen.

11 The public notice of Coastal Marshlands
12 Protection Committee ran from January 29th, 2025
13 to February 27th, 2025 and no comments were
14 received during the public notice period.

15 Should the committee determine that the
16 proposed project is in the public interest, the
17 department staff recommends the following
18 standard and special conditions. Number 1,
19 permittee will be required to provide
20 post-construction survey that complies with the
21 Georgia Plat Act. Number 2, permittee must
22 install manatee awareness signage during the
23 construction of the project that was approved by
24 Savannah District Office of Army Corps, US Fish
25 and Wildlife and Georgia DNR. Number 3, erosion

1 control structures, such as silt fences, must be
2 maintained during construction and removed
3 immediately once construction is complete at
4 each individual site.

5 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Paul.

6 No one has signed up to speak to this
7 project. Any questions from the committee?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: I'm prepared to
9 make a motion.

10 CHAIRMAN RABON: I would entertain your
11 motion.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Mr. Chairman,
13 based on the findings of staff and presentations
14 that we have heard here, I recommend that we
15 approve the City of Brunswick's application for
16 stabilization and maintenance of two storm water
17 drainage ditches and the installation of a tidal
18 control valve at another storm water outfall
19 location with the standard and special
20 conditions as recommended.

21 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion. I have
22 a second. Any other discussion? Hearing none,
23 we will now call the question. All in favor say
24 aye.

25 SPEAKERS: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed like sign?

2 The motion passes.

3 Now call on Beth Byrnes to present the
4 PPHP, LLC project.

5 MS. BYRNES: Thank you, Commissioner.

6 Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Beth
7 Byrnes. The applicant for the Shore Protection
8 Act permit application is PPHP, LLC.

9 If we can go to the next slide. The
10 project is located at 105 East 35th Street on
11 Sea Island. The applicant is proposing
12 installation of a pool and spa, pool coping,
13 patio, portion of a paver walkway, and fencing
14 within the state's Shore Protection Act
15 jurisdiction.

16 I would now like to introduce the agent
17 speaking on behalf of the project, Mr. Dan Bucey
18 with Resource and Land Consultants.

19 MR. DAN BUCEY: Thank you, Dan Bucey,
20 Resource and Land Consultants, agent for the
21 applicant.

22 As you can see on this drawing here, the
23 jurisdiction line is at the rock -- the concrete
24 revetment. Right in front of that revetment is
25 rocks covered by dunes constructed from the

1 ongoing Sea Island beach nourishment programs.

2 Next slide, please. Another view of that.

3 Next slide.

4 So in the area in the foreground between
5 the concrete revetment and the house they are
6 proposing a 380-square-foot pool, 52 square foot
7 of a spa, 135 square foot of the pool coping
8 around it or pool decking, if you will, 22
9 square feet of safety fencing that's now a
10 requirement of Glynn County, 391 square feet
11 lounge and patio area, 175 square foot of
12 pavers.

13 The -- no changes are proposed to the
14 shoreline protection structures in the area.
15 Any temporary disturbances during construction
16 will be restored (unintelligible) the landscape
17 plans submitted to the staff prior to that, and
18 they will be installing underground irrigation
19 as part of the project.

20 Upon completion, 52.74 percent of the
21 jurisdictional area shall remain in the natural
22 or improved topographic and vegetative
23 condition.

24 There's the site plan, if you will,
25 showing the pool. It's pretty tight in there,

1 but it meets the conditions of the permit. We
2 got our county permits, conditional use permit
3 through the beach and dunes zoning ordinance
4 also prior to arriving here. So thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any special conditions,
6 Beth?

7 MS. BYRNES: The public notice of the
8 Shore Protection Committee ran from January
9 14th, 2025 through February 13th of 2025 and no
10 comments were received.

11 Should the committee determine the
12 proposed project to be in the public interest,
13 department staff to the committee recommends the
14 standard and following special conditions.

15 Number 1, in order to minimize the
16 disruption of nesting activity from artificial
17 lighting from the subject parcel, the permittee
18 must comply with the Department of Natural
19 Resources Wildlife Resources Division sea turtle
20 nesting guidelines as well as the lighting
21 ordinance of Glynn County and Sea Island.

22 Number 2, a final landscape plan depicting
23 native coastal vegetation must be provided to
24 the department for approval prior to
25 installation, should the existing lawn be

1 disturbed during installation.

2 Number 3, permittee may be required to
3 provide a post-construction survey that locates
4 the proposed structures indicated in the
5 application materials and such survey shall
6 comply with the Georgia Plat Act.

7 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Beth.

8 No one has signed up to speak to this
9 project. Any questions in our committee?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Just one, Mr.
11 Chairman. Beth or Dan, where is the
12 jurisdictional line? Can you show on the map,
13 just ...

14 MR. DAN BUCEY: Go to the site plan.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: That one?

16 MR. DAN BUCEY: It's the seaward face of
17 that concrete revetment, that's the line plus 25
18 feet landward.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Okay. But
20 nothing in the project proposes crossing --

21 MR. DAN BUCEY: No, ma'am, nothing
22 seaward.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Based on that,
24 Mr. Chairman, I make a motion based on staff
25 findings and recommendations that we approve the

1 project proposed by PPHP, LLC with the standard
2 and special conditions as amended.

3 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion to
4 approve. I have a second, any other
5 deliberations, discussion?

6 Hearing none, we will call the question.
7 All in favor say aye.

8 SPEAKERS: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed like sign?
10 Project is approved.

11 MR. DAN BUCEY: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: Last, certainly not
13 least, we will call on Beth to present the next
14 project for Glynn County Board of Commissioners.

15 MS. BYRNES: Good afternoon again. My
16 name is Beth Byrnes. The applicant for the
17 Shore Protection Act permit application is the
18 Glynn County Board of Commissioners.

19 The project is located at 4101 First
20 Street on St. Simons Island. The applicant is
21 proposing the removal and installation of native
22 landscaping, filling of a wetland, establishing
23 a new beach driving access point, maintenance of
24 an existing crosswalk, installation of sand
25 fencing and a portion of a sand volleyball court

1 within the state's Shore Protection Act
2 jurisdiction.

3 I would now like to introduce the agent
4 speaking on behalf of the project, Mr. Rob Brown
5 with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood.

6 MR. ROB BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Byrnes.

7 I'm Rob Brown with Goodwyn Mills Cawood
8 and I am joined here today by Caitlin Roman from
9 Goodwyn Mills Cawood and the applicant Jason
10 Hagan from Glynn County.

11 Good afternoon, commissioners. So this
12 project site, the area of jurisdiction is
13 consisting of an existing boardwalk on the
14 northern edge of the property. You can see on
15 the right-hand side of that photo, it's a wooden
16 boardwalk, beach access that's currently there
17 existing, and then there's also an existing foot
18 path and plastic mesh matting on the southern
19 end of the property, maritime forest and
20 freshwater wetland area between those two beach
21 access points.

22 The areas of jurisdiction from that
23 photograph, as you can see some of the sand in
24 the dune there, and then there's some wooded
25 area and then an open grass lawn area.

1 Most of the jurisdictional area is within
2 the wooded area, and it's a 25-foot width of
3 that.

4 The overall wooded area ranges from about
5 60 feet on the northern end, 100 feet in the
6 middle, and then 50 feet on the southern end, so
7 the majority of that is actually an upland but
8 the shore jurisdictional area runs through that
9 portion.

10 So I use the clicker here.

11 So here is a drone photograph of the site
12 from September of this past year, 2024, and you
13 can see the dune system that has -- exists
14 currently in the current state, it's a very
15 large vegetated area landward -- I'm sorry,
16 seaward of the dune that's grown considerably,
17 so the project area is the Coast Guard beach
18 park, and we're looking at the jurisdictional
19 area that's adjacent to the park and the sand
20 dune.

21 And I'm going to highlight a couple other
22 photographs later on to show how much accretion
23 has occurred on this part of East Beach compared
24 to just the past six years, but looking back
25 longer than that to the past century ago

1 probably back in 1950s from some aerial imagery
2 that we saw, the far western edge of Coast Guard
3 beach park site is the historical Coast Guard
4 station and the shoreline used to be right up
5 against the historical structure that's the far
6 westernmost part of the park, so there's been
7 tremendous accretion and this wonderful dune
8 system has grown so much just in the last few
9 years so the county is making every attempt to
10 protect that dune field as much as possible with
11 this project.

12 So the project site here you see the
13 aerial imagery just what happened in the last
14 ten years with that tremendous growth of the
15 dune field, about 300 to 500 linear feet across
16 the project site, and then there's the northern
17 beach access, the southern beach access and then
18 the jurisdictional area between the two.

19 So there's a couple of primary areas, the
20 first being the northern beach access. These
21 photos taken this past July from shore SPA
22 Permit 457 that was issued in March 2018, this
23 authorized maintenance of the existing public
24 crossovers on St. Simons Island including this
25 here at Coast Guard park.

1 The existing wooden boardwalk began on
2 upland and leads seaward. It's about 16 feet
3 wide by 150 feet long, totaling 2288 square feet
4 and then it goes 278.75 square feet is within
5 the SPA jurisdictional area as permanent impact,
6 and then the boardwalk terminates into mesh mats
7 that are six and a half feet wide and run 3345
8 feet, and actually due to the maintenance from
9 these mesh mats after this July photo, some of
10 that mesh mat that extended beyond the ordinary
11 high water mark has since been removed so the
12 existing mats are only 300 feet long.

13 The applicant is proposing to demolish the
14 western or landward portion of the beach access
15 so from the top photo to the far end of that
16 photo where the parking lot enters onto the
17 wooden boardwalk, there is a small portion that
18 is just disturbed and compacted soil that
19 they're going to install a concrete sidewalk to
20 connect and make a smooth access from the
21 parking lot to the wooden boardwalk.

22 That's going to result in an additional
23 127 square feet of permanent impact within the
24 jurisdiction and then at the time the project
25 takes place, if there is any mesh mats that

1 extend beyond the ordinary high water mark from
2 its current position, those will be removed.

3 So here's the southern beach access. This
4 is currently a six-foot wide by 200-foot long
5 plastic mesh mats lining a foot path leading
6 seaward from the upland.

7 Our current alignment, as we go along this
8 path, it is entirely on county property on the
9 upland. As we go through the jurisdictional
10 area, it is still entirely on county property,
11 and then 20 feet after you cross into the toe of
12 the dune, after 20 feet in that pathway, it
13 ventures into the St. Simons Land Trust
14 property, and then after 65 total feet from the
15 toe of dune, the entire path is on the Land
16 Trust property, but this path had been there in
17 place and a well used path since, from based on
18 aerial photos, with a mat probably since between
19 2008 and 2015, somewhere in that time range, so
20 over a decade that that path has been in place
21 with the mat, but the path has been in use or
22 shows up in aerial photos dating back to 1999.

23 So to minimize the impact on this new
24 expanded dune field, we wanted to keep the path
25 on its existing footprint as it travels over

1 this dune to avoid creating detrimental damage
2 to the dune by relocating it entirely on the
3 county property.

4 So we had several meetings with the DNR
5 and then St. Simons Land Trust to utilize the
6 majority of this existing path as it lies in its
7 current state.

8 So Land Trust has provided written
9 permission for continued use of the existing
10 path and through a letter of understanding.

11 As the path goes further on from this
12 photo, it does wander into Coast Cottages
13 property, so the proposed -- the applicant is
14 proposing to align the path after we get over
15 the dune and into the dune field so that the
16 segment that is on Coast Cottages property is
17 back onto the Land Trust only property.

18 And this is also going to be added as an
19 additional beach driving access point for
20 emergency vehicles and for county staff because
21 we are going to be creating a new life-saving
22 tower and the headquarters for the lifeguard
23 station, so providing access for emergency
24 vehicles for this -- for this location so that
25 they are not having to use the one that is the

1 northern beach access where pedestrians are
2 walking up and down that path.

3 Here's another photo of that southern
4 beach access back from July. So replacing
5 existing mesh matting with -- or the existing
6 matting with 10-foot wide by a 445-foot mesh
7 mats that will terminate perpendicular with the
8 shoreline seaward of the existing dunes and end
9 at the ordinary high water mark.

10 Temporary impacts associated, there will
11 be some temporary impacts associated with the
12 abandoning and realigning just the portion of
13 the trail that goes into Coast Cottages
14 property, and we are going to realign or
15 straighten out a meander in the bend on that so
16 that overall we will have less total impact
17 through the dune, through the dune field.

18 Then any of the area that is temporarily
19 impacted will be replanted with coastal
20 vegetation, and by creating this new mesh mat
21 primary pathway, people will be staying on that
22 path and it will avoid them from venturing into
23 the dunes but we will also be planting
24 vegetation on the edge of the path where we do
25 abandon the portion of the -- what people are

1 currently walking on just to allow that to grow
2 up and then to become stabilized, and we will
3 keep the pedestrians or whoever is walking on
4 this path out of the -- out of the dunes and on
5 this pathway, and because it will be used by
6 county staff and the lifeguards, they will also
7 be able to help to facilitate people staying on
8 this pathway, so the temporary impacts to the
9 dynamic dune field associated with the
10 realignment will be about 7535 square feet. The
11 permanent impact from the matting will be 4450
12 square feet.

13 And this pathway's primary use is that
14 emergency vehicles and from the lifeguards for
15 responding to emergencies.

16 Here is an aerial photo from the Glynn
17 County parcel map and it shows an aerial back in
18 2018, and you can see, if you zoom in very
19 closely, where that existing mesh matting is.

20 It wanders into the St. Simons Land Trust
21 property, and then right after it goes in the
22 Land Trust property, it opens up to the open
23 white sand beaches, but then since 2018 to 2024
24 in the last six years, that much growth has
25 happened in this dune field and just the natural

1 path of people walking through that field, they
2 kind of meander through a certain area, and now
3 if you extend that dash or that solid line that
4 is Coast Cottages parcel and extend it all the
5 way down to the high water mark, ordinary high
6 water mark, that existing foot path has now
7 wandered into their property, and it's only
8 wandered into their property because this dune
9 field has greatly expanded so we're looking
10 to -- the applicant is looking to realign that
11 path to stay off of their property and to avoid
12 trespass onto it, but then we're maintaining the
13 majority of that existing pathway through the
14 existing foot path so we don't damage the
15 integrity of this existing sand dune.

16 And that red line, that is not the
17 proposed path. That is just a measurement to
18 show that that length from that point is about
19 340 feet, just to give dimension.

20 A couple of other things for the project
21 is that there will be installation of 0.03618
22 acres portion that's going to be a sand
23 volleyball court on the seaward side of the
24 project but in the jurisdictional area, so the
25 work in the jurisdictional will include

1 regrading and addition of 200 cubic yards of
2 fill with beach level playing surface. All of
3 it will be beach quality sand per communication
4 and conversations with DNR, and then we will
5 have a finish elevation of nine feet.

6 The installation of the volleyball court
7 will also include 160 linear feet, which has
8 impact of .0034 acres of sand fencing. This is
9 to prevent the wind damage to the landscaping
10 and then for the volleyball court as well and
11 keeping people from the volleyball court outside
12 of the dunes. It's helping to protect against
13 that, and this volleyball court has long been
14 part of the overall site's master plan from the
15 2018 Coast Guard beach park master plan that was
16 developed about six years ago and it's always
17 been at the front side of this site.

18 We looked at a couple other locations
19 possible for the beach volleyball court,
20 including the sand area, and I will highlight an
21 area with another future aerial, but before we
22 get into that, there is a small portion of the
23 jurisdictional area that is freshwater wetland.

24 There will be a temporary impact over the
25 total jurisdictional area of 0.188 acres and

1 this is to include clearing of the vegetation
2 and replacement native dune vegetation, and a
3 portion of that is wetland, 0.024 acres, so the
4 overcall jurisdictional area within Glynn County
5 property is .324 acres but only .024 acres is
6 this freshwater wetland, so that's about seven
7 percent of the total jurisdictional area.

8 The freshwater wetlands is going to
9 require about 95 cubic yards of fill and have a
10 finished elevation of 7.5 feet.

11 The area will be planted with native
12 coastal vegetation, and it was determined it was
13 best to fill this portion of the isolated
14 wetland with fill and then revegetating it so it
15 would not create maintenance issues for having
16 to regularly maintain this vegetation as it
17 continues to grow there, but overall the whole
18 entire jurisdictional area, 0.178 acres will
19 stay in a natural area and remain unchanged. 51
20 percent of the total jurisdictional area and the
21 SPA permit requires at least 33 percent remain
22 in that natural area, and we're at 51 percent.

23 And then another note for the wetland,
24 since we just received communication from the
25 Army Corps, we did receive verification of

1 coverage under Nationwide Permit 42 this week
2 that the corps concurred with our assessment as
3 wetland and agreed with our delineation and that
4 these are isolated wetlands.

5 So here's overall view of the total
6 project areas and our current September 2024
7 drone photograph. So the total area of this
8 property is close to 400,000 square feet. The
9 area that is within the jurisdictional area is
10 14,113 in the county, 1176 square feet in the
11 Land Trust parcel, for a total of 15,289 square
12 feet.

13 Upon completion, the existing proposed
14 impacts within the jurisdiction will total 0.055
15 acres or 15.7 percent of this jurisdictional
16 area and approximately .296 or 84.3 percent will
17 either remain in a natural or improved
18 topographic and vegetative condition, and of
19 that 84.3 percent, the portion that would be 51
20 percent is the unchanged. The other 36 or 33
21 percent is the revegetated.

22 And then just highlighting back with the
23 volleyball alternative that's described in the
24 permit, we did look at the alternate location
25 that's described in the permit.

1 We were looking at possibly looking at the
2 beach. It would be a temporary placement, but
3 as you can see from the photo, the water line
4 from high tide there is very little white beach
5 area, white sand beach, for placing that
6 volleyball court, so we decided it would be best
7 to have a permanent home right at the
8 easternmost edge of this property, and actually
9 I want to go back to one more.

10 Here we go. So the volleyball court
11 itself is not entirely in the jurisdictional
12 area. Only at about a third of the volleyball
13 court extends into the jurisdictional area, so
14 the applicant was trying to maintain the
15 majority of the jurisdictional area in an
16 undisturbed state if it did not need to disturb
17 the area.

18 So the whole northern portion, the
19 northern part of the beach access, you see the
20 red hatching. That red is undisturbed, and then
21 on the southern side, the majority of that is
22 also red and that's undisturbed.

23 It's really the center part of this parcel
24 will be having some vegetation removal and
25 replacement with native dune vegetation to

1 create visibility lines because the new
2 structure that's going to be built on upland
3 here is the Coast Guard or, I'm sorry, life-
4 saving tower and the headquarters for the
5 lifeguards for Glynn County, so they wanted to
6 have visible access to this highly used portion
7 of the beach to communicate safety, but then
8 also to have accessible locations where the
9 public can view the beach and then also have the
10 recreational amenity of the volleyball court
11 right here in the forefront of the project.

12 So the purple is the temporary vegetation
13 will be restored with native dune vegetation and
14 then so that small portion of the volleyball
15 court will be permanent impact of replacement of
16 beach quality sand and then there's permanent
17 impacts where the existing northern and southern
18 beach access points cross over with a slight
19 addition of some addition of concrete from the
20 edge of the wooden boardwalk on the northern
21 access tying that back into the parking lot, and
22 you can see from this diagram and graphic, that
23 portion of the southern beach access that goes
24 across the red, that is shore jurisdictional
25 area that is entirely on county property, and

1 you can see how, as it goes into the dune,
2 that's still on the property, but then it goes
3 into the Land Trust, and then that's on the
4 bottom part of the picture, and as we're going
5 down that existing path, the very bottom part of
6 that kind of like bend and meander, it crosses
7 slightly onto at that property line from the
8 Coast Cottages, extended all to the ordinary
9 high water mark portion of that path, wanders
10 onto their property, so we're proposing to
11 realign the trail through there to get it off of
12 their parcel and then to adjust that path to
13 basically straighten it out so that now we have
14 a much shorter distance that the path is going
15 to be on, so it's less overall permanent impact
16 for southern beach access.

17 The thick black line in the purple that is
18 north of the volleyball court, that is the area
19 where there is freshwater wetland, and that area
20 is totally not -- or all of the area that's
21 freshwater wetland in the jurisdictional area,
22 none of it is on the volleyball court
23 improvement area.

24 And I think that was most of the
25 highlights -- I'm sorry, here is another one.

1 This is a larger more of the landscape rendering
2 from the -- from the project highlighting the
3 limits of disturbance, the areas that are going
4 to be undisturbed in the jurisdictional area,
5 the proposed volleyball and then the new
6 structure county facility, adjacent to there and
7 then the park components of this project.

8 And those are the items that I wanted to
9 highlight about this application. Turn it back
10 over to Ms. Byrnes. Thank you.

11 MS. BYRNES: The public notice of the
12 Shore Protection Committee ran from February
13 1st, 2025 through March 2nd, 2025. Two comments
14 were received and questions regarding the
15 project. One comment was received in support of
16 the project and 34 comments were received in
17 opposition of the project.

18 The agent has provided written responses
19 to the comments. Negative comments include
20 concerns about St. Simons Land Trust property,
21 damage to sand dunes, maritime forest and
22 wetlands, the Georgia Outdoors Stewardship Act
23 funding, harm to wildlife and habitat loss, harm
24 to property values and future beach erosion
25 concerns.

1 Should the committee determine the
2 proposed project to be in the public interest,
3 department staff to the committee recommends the
4 standard conditions along with the following
5 special conditions.

6 Number 1, in order to minimize the
7 destruction of nesting activity from artificial
8 lighting from the subject parcel, the permittee
9 must comply with the Department of Natural
10 Resources Wildlife Resources Division sea turtle
11 nesting guidelines as well as the lighting
12 ordinance of Glynn County.

13 Number 2, because of project may occur
14 between May 1st and October 31st, sea turtle
15 testing season, an individual with the DNR sea
16 turtle cooperators' permit must survey the area
17 prior to the work beginning. All sea turtle
18 nests must be avoided and no activity may occur
19 within 20 feet of a nest area. If a sea turtle
20 nest is within the project realignment of the
21 southern beach access, construction will be
22 required to delay until outside of sea turtle
23 nesting season or a new pathway location must be
24 approved by DNR staff.

25 Number 3, a final landscape plan depicting

1 native coastal vegetation must be provided to
2 the department for approval prior to
3 installation.

4 Number 4, if the location or length of the
5 southern beach access changes, an updated design
6 plan must be submitted to the department 30 days
7 prior to construction.

8 Number 5, the permittee must coordinate
9 with and submit written notification to the
10 department staff for approval a minimum of ten
11 days prior to trimming and vegetation removal
12 activities.

13 Number 6, maintenance trimming is only
14 valid for the life of this permit. Number 7, no
15 root structures in the sand dunes will be
16 trimmed or damaged during the realignment of the
17 southern beach access. All trimmings will be
18 removed to an upland disposal site outside the
19 jurisdiction.

20 Number 8, only beach quality sand suitable
21 for sea turtle nesting season or sea turtle
22 nesting, successful incubation and hatchling
23 emergence shall be used on the project site.
24 Fill material must be comparable in both
25 coloration and grain size. All fill material

1 shall be free of construction debris, rocks or
2 other foreign matter and shall not contain on
3 average greater than 10 percent fines, i.e.,
4 silt and clay, passing through a Number 200
5 sieve and shall not contain an average greater
6 than five percent coarse gravel or cobbles,
7 retained by a Number 4 sieve.

8 Number 9, permittee may be required to
9 provide a post-construction survey that locates
10 the proposed realignment of the southern beach
11 access and volleyball court as indicated in the
12 application materials. Such survey shall comply
13 with the Georgia Plat Act.

14 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, Beth.

15 We have three people that have signed up
16 to speak to the project. If you would, come to
17 the podium. State your name and limit to
18 comments to no more than three minutes.

19 I will first call Mr. Patrick Anderson.

20 MR. PATRICK ANDERSON: Thank you very
21 much. My name is Patrick Anderson. I am a
22 homeowner in the Coast Cottages neighborhood
23 adjacent to the St. Simons Land Trust property
24 and near the Coast Guard station public beach
25 access.

1 I'm also the neighborhood manager for
2 Coast Cottages. I'm here to represent the board
3 of directors and also the 44 homeowners in Coast
4 Cottages.

5 The county proposes to use property that
6 it does not own for a portion of the southern
7 beach access. This property is owned by the St.
8 Simons Land Trust and is commonly known as the
9 Hamby tract.

10 I was the vice president of the Hamby
11 Corporation starting in 1998 and was involved
12 with the gift of land from the Hamby Corporation
13 to the predecessor of the St. Simons Land Trust.

14 At the time we were promised that this
15 land would form a permanent buffer to be
16 maintained in its natural state in perpetuity.
17 The entire Hamby tract was promised this way.

18 Over the years the land accreted as you've
19 seen from the slides and the general public
20 began intruding over the Land Trust land, the
21 Hamby tract on its way to the beach and
22 continuing over our Coast Cottage common areas
23 into the beach.

24 We complained about this intrusion to
25 Glynn County a number of times to no avail.

1 Fast-forward to fall of 2024. Meetings
2 were conducted between the Hamby -- not the
3 Hamby Corporation, I'm sorry -- between the Land
4 Trust, Glynn County and the DNR staff to discuss
5 utilizing the Hamby tract for the southern beach
6 access.

7 The Coast Cottages neighborhood, a major
8 stakeholder in this matter, was not invited into
9 these meetings. We did not even know they were
10 occurring.

11 In no event were we considered, were our
12 voices considered in the matter. This is a
13 betrayal of the trust intended by the Hamby gift
14 of land back in 2000 to the predecessor of the
15 Land Trust.

16 We only learned about it through a public
17 notice some weeks ago. Coast Cottage
18 Neighborhood Association strongly objects to
19 this permit application. We believe the right
20 thing is to keep the public access to the beach
21 totally on Glynn County property.

22 We also suggest that Glynn County to pay
23 back the damage that was allowed over the years,
24 that they restore the Hamby tract to its natural
25 state and honor the trust that was put in place

1 back in the year 2000. The net result of this
2 would be the exact same effect on the
3 environment as long as the restoration is done
4 to the Hamby tract. We are currently in a
5 dialog with St. Simons Land Trust --

6 CHAIRMAN RABON: Mr. Anderson, if you
7 would kind of conclude your comments.

8 MR. PATRICK ANDERSON: And I'm very close
9 to the end. We're currently in dialog with St.
10 Simons Land Trust asking them to pause the
11 letter of understanding. We are requesting a
12 voice in this process as a key stakeholder.

13 Please defer this application so that the
14 44 adjacent homeowners can have their voices
15 properly heard.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you, sir. Ms.
18 Alice Keyes, Keyes. I know that.

19 MS. ALICE KEYES: That's okay. That's all
20 right.

21 Hi. My name is Alice Miller Keyes, and I
22 am with 100 Miles. Thank you again for your
23 time today, Chairman and committee members.

24 100 Miles represents an advocacy network
25 of over 35,000 people across Georgia, and many

1 of whom have very longstanding connections to
2 Coast Guard beach. 100 Miles strongly supports
3 public access to our beaches, especially on St.
4 Simons, one of only four barrier islands
5 accessible by car.

6 We are pleased to see of the plans so far
7 that the new structure will minimize beachfront
8 lighting and will help eliminate the damage to
9 nesting sea turtles and hatchlings.

10 We are, however, in opposition to the plan
11 as it's currently written because it does not
12 balance the desire for a new recreational
13 opportunities and views with the effective
14 efforts to protect the services provided by our
15 natural and very dynamic ecosystems within the
16 critical jurisdictional area.

17 Impact to the jurisdictional area, no
18 matter how small or large, cannot be undone, and
19 this project would fill wetlands, remove
20 vegetation and level the sand dunes.

21 Our natural sand dune system and coastal
22 wetlands offer protection from flooding and
23 storm surge that comprise an essential component
24 of the sand-sharing system.

25 As CRD notes concerning sand dunes, it

1 should be a high priority and their alteration
2 should only be done when absolutely necessary.

3 The project's destruction -- the
4 destruction of wetlands on site will reduce --
5 will result in greater vulnerability to our area
6 from sea level rise.

7 Maritime forests also provide critical
8 shoreline stabilization and protection from
9 wind. They provide essential habitat for high
10 priority species listed in the state wildlife
11 action plan.

12 And unfortunately this project will clear
13 the maritime forest and replant with native
14 grasses, which could permanently impair the
15 stability of the jurisdictional area and
16 eliminate the wildlife habitat it provides.

17 We disagree that this is a good investment
18 of public funds provided by the Georgia Outdoor
19 Steward Act.

20 GOSA, as it's known as, provides public
21 funds that were designed to enhance conservation
22 efforts but this project will only apply those
23 funds to improve parking lots, fill wetlands,
24 destroy maritime forests and build a volleyball
25 court.

1 Simply put, these actions do not meet the
2 true definition of conservation that GOSA fund
3 were intended for and would be a misuse of those
4 public funds.

5 The proposal will transform St. Simons
6 most iconic beach access into a replica of some
7 of the other tourist areas up and down the east
8 coast and in the process damage the very
9 resources which provide valuable services to us
10 all.

11 As you heard, the committee received
12 comments from a great number of people. From
13 our network we got -- we coordinated an online
14 platform and we know that 230 applicants
15 submitted unique comments and concerns through
16 our online platform so I was surprised to hear
17 that only 34 were counted in this project.

18 These folks, like 100 Miles, feel that the
19 project fails to meet the standards set forth in
20 the permitting of the Shore Protection Act, so
21 we urge you to deny application as it currently
22 stands, allow the applicant to go back and
23 evaluate a more balanced alternative to preserve
24 the ecological benefits of this irreplaceable
25 habitat and meet the needs of the island.

1 Thank you again for your consideration.

2 CHAIRMAN RABON: I now call on Mr. Ben
3 Carswell.

4 MR. BEN CARSWELL: Good afternoon. Thank
5 you for your service to state of Georgia and to
6 our coastal communities.

7 I'm Ben Carswell. My career background is
8 in coastal environmental conservation, and I am
9 representing the Coastal Georgia Audubon
10 Society, which I serve as president in a
11 volunteer capacity.

12 Coastal Georgia Audubon is an
13 all-volunteer chapter of National Audubon
14 dedicated to increasing community engagement in
15 coastal bird conservation and environmental
16 stewardship.

17 My comments today build upon the written
18 comments I submitted on behalf of our
19 organization. Our primary concern as it relates
20 to the permit before this committee is the
21 permanent alteration of the shore protection
22 area and associated loss of bird habitat that
23 would result from the construction of volleyball
24 court as proposed.

25 The applicant has simply not presented in

1 their application materials, their responses to
2 comments or here today a compelling case for why
3 the volleyball court must intrude upon the shore
4 protection area as proposed.

5 We are not anti-volleyball. It's entirely
6 appropriate for this project to include a
7 volleyball court. In fact, there is an existing
8 volleyball court on the site that is well loved
9 and well used by members of the community, some
10 of whom I happen to know and understand that
11 they didn't ask for this proposed relocation of
12 the court and weren't consulted about it and are
13 actually quite happy with the court in its
14 current location. They deserve to continue to
15 have a community volleyball court on the site.

16 However, to pass muster with you-all, the
17 applicant must demonstrate that filling a
18 wetland, an activity that will require naturally
19 vegetated wetlands and sloughs to be cleared and
20 about 25 to 30 dump truck loads of sand to be
21 placed in the shore protection area, they must
22 show that that does not, to quote the act,
23 unreasonably interfere with the conservation of
24 wildlife.

25 I'm here to point out that doing that

1 would absolutely interfere with the conservation
2 of wildlife and not just any wildlife. This
3 action, if permitted, will remove habitat that
4 is well documented by birders to support at
5 least half a dozen migratory bird species that
6 have been identified by the State as, quote,
7 species of the greatest conservation need and
8 the highest conservation concern category in the
9 State wildlife action plan. These birds include
10 painted bunting, loggerhead shrike, chuck-will's
11 widows, southeastern American kestrel,
12 prothonotary warbler and prairie warbler, and
13 they are identified with this conservation
14 status because their populations are in decline
15 due in large part to habitat loss, which is
16 what's being proposed here. We know that these
17 birds use the area because birders use the area
18 and document these observations on a globally
19 used (unintelligible) science platform called
20 eBird.

21 The recreational use and enjoyment of the
22 site by birders including coastal
23 (unintelligible) Georgia Audubon's members will
24 also be unreasonably impaired by the proposed
25 placement of the volleyball court.

1 These harms are, quote, unreasonable
2 without some reasonable explanation for why it's
3 necessary, yet the applicant has not provided
4 such an explanation for why the site can't
5 continue -- it does now accommodate a volleyball
6 court -- can't continue to accommodate a
7 volleyball court without necessitating these
8 harmful (unintelligible) of the wildlife
9 conservation (unintelligible) of the shore
10 protection area.

11 What would be reasonable would be to
12 adjust the design of this project --

13 CHAIRMAN RABON: Wrap.

14 MR. BEN CARSWELL: Yes, sir. Adjust the
15 design of the project to accommodate the
16 volleyball court outside of the SPA
17 jurisdiction, which I'm certain talented
18 engineers can accomplish and without unnecessary
19 burden.

20 I urge you to decline the permit as
21 proposed.

22 CHAIRMAN RABON: Thank you. Would the
23 agent like to speak to the public comment?

24 MR. ROB BROWN: Sure. The first one with
25 the Hamby tract, I probably need to go back to

1 the image.

2 So from the aerial shown here, the edge of
3 the boat yard that's currently grass in this
4 photo, the edge of that fence line is pretty
5 much right on the edge of the Glynn County and
6 St. Simons Land Trust property, so for an access
7 to the beach currently, the path has kind of
8 wandered on the south side and crossed over and
9 is currently over St. Simons Land Trust
10 property.

11 Part of this project is to completely
12 abandon that. This is in the upland portion so
13 this is why this was not brought up earlier or
14 responded to, but to comment about the -- that
15 tract being a buffer and maintained as a buffer
16 it's going to be completely a buffer in the
17 upland area as it currently is and as it's been
18 since 2001, and it's actually going to be in a
19 better state after this project than it was
20 before since a portion of the path currently
21 goes into the Land Trust property in the upland
22 next to the fence where the boat storage yard
23 was, so we're going to restore that part and
24 then it's not until we get into the dune area
25 that the path or any use of this redesigned

1 Coast Guard beach park project gets into Land
2 Trust properties, and it's only going to go to
3 the Coast Cottages property right now because of
4 the great accretion of sand and this dune
5 system.

6 I think that was the main highlight with
7 that comment, and also that that path as it's in
8 its current state of -- that it's been a mesh
9 mat across the dune in that area for a decade or
10 two, and we were trying to keep it at that
11 current place. The Land Trust was in agreement
12 of that location. And they are fine with us
13 keeping it in that state.

14 It was also recommended and encouraged by
15 DNR representatives when we were on site that it
16 would be ideal to keep that existing path to
17 prevent damage to the dune system.

18 And then also his comment about the --
19 that it was presented or not -- nothing was
20 talked about with the project. It's been
21 presented at several Glynn County Board of
22 Commissioners work sessions, board of
23 commissioner meetings as we've gone through the
24 design stage process of this project.

25 The second comment from 100 Miles, there

1 was several statements in her comment and also
2 what was posted on their Web site about leveling
3 sand dunes for the volleyball court, this is
4 nowhere near what's going to happen. All of the
5 work is landward of the toe of dune, so there is
6 no leveling sand dunes for this project.

7 And the big component with this project
8 and grant is to enhance the parking at this
9 property because currently there is two things
10 that they limit on with number of stalls, number
11 of bathroom stalls and number of parking stalls,
12 so this site during busy summer seasons the cars
13 that are parking in the marshfront buffer along
14 East Beach causeway, parking in the marsh buffer
15 along Ocean Boulevard, because there is not
16 enough parking spots there, so our main goal of
17 this project is really just expanding, building
18 more parking stalls for this property, and then
19 that's part of the other reason that the
20 volleyball court, where the volleyball court is
21 now, it's going to be parking, so that was
22 another thing for why that volleyball court was
23 moved.

24 It was also moved because that was where
25 it was identified in the 2018 master plan, and

1 we looked at that as a more ideal location where
2 it's got a very minimal impact to the shore
3 jurisdictional area.

4 It was identified in our Georgia Outdoors
5 program grant for this project as one of the
6 recreational amenities that's going to be added
7 to the site and maintained on the site.

8 There is other areas, other places that
9 Glynn County owns adjacent to this property on
10 that northern tract north of the northern beach
11 access point. It's called the Bruce's tract,
12 but it's owned by Glynn County. There's areas
13 between wetlands that's upland that would have
14 non-jurisdictional areas that could be a
15 location of a volleyball court, but we did not
16 want to impact that forest area there because we
17 did not want -- that is just a great maritime
18 forest area, and we did not want to put our
19 volleyball court over there.

20 We were trying to find the place that had
21 the least impact, and that's where that location
22 ended up being and let me go to -- so this is
23 the condition of that wetland that's in the
24 jurisdictional area. It's predominantly
25 saplings and vines and shrubs, so it's not what

1 is defined as a maritime forest.

2 There are some larger trees in the upper
3 portion, but this wetland area is nowhere near a
4 maritime forest, and it was identified and
5 confirmed by the army corps that this was an
6 isolated wetland, and they concurred with a
7 nationwide permit application, and I wanted to
8 invite Caitlin Roman to see if she could add a
9 couple other comments or address any other
10 comments.

11 MS. CAITLIN ROMAN: Good afternoon. My
12 name is Caitlin Roman. I work with Dr. Brown.
13 I'm a biologist and was actually one of the ones
14 out of here assessing this wetland and this site
15 for impacts. I just wanted to add onto what Rob
16 was saying with the corps.

17 They concurred with our findings and our
18 assessment of this particular wetland that we
19 found the functional capacity for water storage
20 to be low, and that's based in part on a
21 assessment of the drainage area being more than
22 50 percent unforested due to some of the
23 extensive development.

24 It's not about the site. It's about the
25 watershed that contributes to that area, and so

1 I know one of the comments was about storms and
2 water capacity, but as it stands today, the
3 functional capacity for water storage is low.

4 In addition to that, the final habitat
5 score was also low. We found and the corps
6 concurred with greater than ten percent invasive
7 species, and that's going to be what we do as
8 well, is remove the invasive species and replace
9 them with all native vegetation.

10 In terms of the birding comments, part of
11 the corps process is a Section 6 review, but
12 that is limited only to federal listed species
13 and many of the state listed species in their
14 threatened and endangered species are not
15 federally listed, so the corps reviewed
16 federally listed species and found no likely
17 adverse effects.

18 If there were potential for adverse
19 effects we would not be able to get a permit.
20 So they reviewed it and then in addition to that
21 we reached out to DNR in July of last year to
22 get their take on it and they expressed -- we
23 sent them the project summary and some concept
24 sketches, and their primary concerns were
25 related to lighting for the sea turtles, which

1 we took these concerns and implemented them and
2 will follow their guidance if the project moves
3 forward, but in addition to that, as it relates
4 to birds, there is no concern with habitat loss.
5 Their primary concern was with irresponsible pet
6 owners and unleashed dogs, and so in the interim
7 Glynn County has reached out to DNR.

8 There is already on the books a
9 representative from DNR is going to speak at a
10 commission meeting I think in April and try to
11 work with the leadership in Glynn County to look
12 at their ordinance, but that's really unrelated
13 to this.

14 If you have any specific questions, I
15 would be happy to answer those.

16 CHAIRMAN RABON: Have any response from
17 staff to the public comments? Any questions
18 from the committee?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: I'll start. I
20 wonder if we could pull the map up of the site
21 and just help make sure that everybody
22 understands -- I know it's like who can see --
23 that is the map, no, not that one, the next one.
24 Any way you can blow that up, Diana, so that
25 people could actually -- in the bottom, the

1 jurisdictional line is there in terms of the
2 impact and again the jurisdictional issue is
3 really the volleyball court.

4 Most of the volleyball court is in what --
5 for those of us who are Glynn Countians would
6 describe as the surf sailors property, which is
7 already flat.

8 There's no, you know, habitat there, et
9 cetera, and there is a small amount that crosses
10 into the jurisdictional line, which does not, as
11 I understand it and from walking the site with
12 Beth yesterday, also does not go into that
13 freshwater wetlands footnote.

14 It rained on Wednesday. The freshwater
15 wetlands were dry as dust yesterday. So they
16 are not holding much, if anything, there, but
17 talk a little bit about why it is necessary to
18 cross the jurisdictional line given the -- I
19 know, it's --

20 MR. ROB BROWN: The biggest thing was
21 expanding that parking lot, making it as large
22 as we could, and then it set that building
23 footprint at that location, and then the way
24 that the jurisdictional area bumped out at that
25 one location, we were able to fit the park

1 amenities --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: So that
3 everybody, the rectangle there is the volleyball
4 court and that dotted line, dashed line is the
5 jurisdictional area.

6 MR. ROB BROWN: Yes, that's --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: So that really
8 is the part of the project that is new that
9 crosses the jurisdictional area. The paths and
10 everything else have been there forever, and
11 just for sake of levity, who was the chair of
12 the Land Trust in 2001 when the Hamby tract was
13 done? Duane Harris and the letter of
14 understanding, the former -- former former
15 former CRD director, the letter of understanding
16 to allow the county to use that property has
17 been in place since 2001 from the Hamby tract
18 and from the Land Trust perspective -- I'm a
19 board member -- they are neither for nor against
20 this proposal but would not want to see another
21 cut path that would have to go through the
22 dunes, just using the historic path that has
23 been there and to benefit Coast Cottage, the
24 County's proposal to remove it off the land but
25 not to encourage a new path be cut since that

1 one has been used for an extended period of
2 time.

3 Trying to understand there is a small
4 amount, but is there any way to move that
5 volleyball court so it's just out of the
6 jurisdictional line?

7 MR. ROB BROWN: It's all -- the volleyball
8 court is being elevated up some to match on with
9 the existing footprint of the building because
10 the building is in an AE10 flood zone, so the
11 building structure is built up with one foot of
12 freeboard to 11 feet, so having a smooth grade
13 around the building and then back down to the
14 dune, that area needed to be elevated up, so
15 because it's elevated up, you see that there are
16 some permanent impacts from the edge of the
17 volleyball court down to the straight line of
18 the dots where the sand fencing is, that's
19 grading back down to the natural slope so it
20 would result in having to shift that 20, 25 feet
21 back further with that building already being
22 designed for that location with all of the
23 previous geotechnical borings that were done at
24 that time.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Same basic

1 footprint that is there now. And a sand
2 volleyball court consists of sand. There is no
3 permanent structure underneath it, no paving or
4 anything. It's sand.

5 MR. ROB BROWN: It's going to be beach
6 quality sand because that was a specification
7 requirement from Georgia DNR Coastal Resources
8 Division so it will be a permeable surface. If
9 it rains on it, it's going to drain into the
10 ground. It's just that one segment that's the
11 only part that is going to be non-vegetative.

12 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any other questions from
13 the committee?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: The only one
15 other question is the -- the planting species I
16 know we've got stipulations that would indicate
17 natives that you would need to go through with
18 DNR and make sure. Can you just describe
19 because there are some invasive species out
20 there now, and the maritime forest is some
21 fairly young to certainly not mature slash
22 pines.

23 You're going to take those trees down so
24 that there will be visual sight from the life-
25 saving facility.

1 MR. ROB BROWN: Yes.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: And what will
3 you plant in their place in terms of the concern
4 for habitat.

5 MR. ROB BROWN: So we found -- can I give
6 you the common names? There's dune marsh elder,
7 pink millet grass that are (unintelligible),
8 saltwater cord grass and beach morning glory as
9 the --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Consideration
11 for things with maybe a bit more structure that
12 would be native that would help with bird
13 habitat. No birds can land on millet grass,
14 something like wax myrtles or some other species
15 that might allow restoration of some of the bird
16 habitat.

17 MR. ROB BROWN: In that segment, there's
18 also a lot of wax myrtle in the dune field
19 that's growing and becoming established because
20 there was some sand fencing put in there ten or
21 so years ago which has helped kind of establish
22 that.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Something to
24 consider.

25 MR. ROB BROWN: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: That wouldn't
2 affect sight range but that would help with
3 structure.

4 MR. ROB BROWN: If there would be areas
5 that were kind of more on the periphery of the
6 parts that were replanted, that would be
7 considered more of those type of species but the
8 ones that are kind of in the front sight line
9 from the structure, we would prefer that those
10 would be species that would be more low lying
11 for the visibility access, but if there were
12 some of the portions further from that center
13 part like the --

14 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any other questions?

15 MR. ROB BROWN: If anybody from DNR is
16 kind of like able to assist us with specifying
17 those areas, we definitely would consider that.

18 MS. ANDREWS: We've got a special
19 condition recommendation or --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Yeah, if
21 someone is inclined to make a motion, I would
22 like to suggest we include that as a special
23 condition to work with them to add more
24 additional species that would facilitate
25 replacement of any bird habitat that is removed.

1 MR. HAYMANS: Let's see if we can capture
2 that on the screen so everybody can see it. Do
3 you want to shoot again, please, Valeria?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Applicant shall
5 work with DNR or CRD in the implementation to
6 replace vegetation and trees with -- with
7 habitat suitable for birding for anything that
8 is removed. Bird habitat, more suitable for
9 bird habitat.

10 MS. ANDREWS: Work with CRD to --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: In
12 implementation. Sorry, that's okay.

13 MS. ANDREWS: To replace.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Any vegetation
15 or trees that are removed.

16 MS. ANDREWS: Species more suitable.

17 MS. DIANA PATRICK: Not trees but --
18 excuse me.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: No, replace
20 vegetation and trees that are removed with --

21 MS. DIANA PATRICK: I see.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: With others
23 that are suitable for bird habitat, with others
24 suitable for bird habitat. Can you implement
25 that if we can't read it? Take the more

1 suitable, suitable because I'm not sure what we
2 have out there now, so, no, no other suitable
3 for -- it was just the bird that needed to come
4 out.

5 MS. DIANA PATRICK: Sorry, so much back
6 and forth. Okay, how is that?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Does that work
8 for you, Jill?

9 CHAIRMAN RABON: Entertain a motion with
10 this special condition.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER POOLE: I make a motion
12 to approve the Glynn County Board of
13 Commissioners application, Coast Guard station
14 with standard and special conditions including
15 the most recently added.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: I will second.

17 CHAIRMAN RABON: Hearing no discussion,
18 will call the question to vote. All in favor
19 say aye.

20 SPEAKERS: Aye.

21 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed like sign.
22 This project is approved. That moves us out of
23 our projects.

24 We do have one bit of other business if
25 you need to step out, Mr. Brookshire. Thank you

1 for all your work today. Will now call on
2 Clayton Davis who is going to present a
3 resolution.

4 MR. CLAYTON DAVIS: Thank you,
5 Commissioner.

6 In accordance with (unintelligible) 391-
7 2-3.04, annual rent adjustments for water bottom
8 releases is renewed annually for inflation.
9 Professor of economics at College of Coastal
10 Georgia, Dr. Don Matthews, provided a
11 calculation based on this year's CPI in
12 proposing to adjust the 2024-2025 rate of
13 1417.00 to 2025-2026 rate of \$1463.50. That
14 would be effective 1 July.

15 CHAIRMAN RABON: Hearing the resolution,
16 this does require us to bring this to a vote.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER HEPBURN: Make a motion
18 we approve the revised lease amount based on the
19 recommendation.

20 CHAIRMAN RABON: I have a motion. Can I
21 get a second? Any discussion? Hearing none, we
22 will call the question. All in favor say aye.

23 SPEAKERS: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN RABON: Any opposed to like sign?
25 You have our new resolution. Thank you.

1 With that we will adjourn today's meeting. This
2 makes you appreciate those efficient meetings
3 we've had in the past. Thank you everyone.
4 Thank you to staff.

5 (Meeting concluded at 1:16 p.m.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

2
3 STATE OF GEORGIA:

4 COUNTY OF GLYNN:

5
6 I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was
7 reported as stated in the caption and the questions
8 and answers thereto were reduced to writing by me;
9 that the foregoing 159 pages represent a true,
10 correct, and complete transcript of the meeting given
11 on Friday, March 7, 2025.12 I certify that I am not disqualified for a
13 relationship of interest under O.C.G.A. 9-11-28(c); I
14 am a Georgia Certified Court Reporter here as an
15 employee of Gilbert & Jones, Inc. who was contacted
16 by Diana Patrick with DNR to provide court reporting
17 services for the proceedings; I will not be taking
18 these proceedings under any contract that is
19 prohibited by O.C.G.A. 15-14-37(a) and (b) or
20 Article 7.C. of the Rules and Regulations of the
21 Board; and by the attached disclosure form I confirm
22 that neither I nor Gilbert & Jones, Inc. are a party
23 to a contract prohibited by O.C.G.A. 15-14-37(a) and
24 (b) or Article 7.C. of the Rules and Regulations of
25 the Board.

This the 19th day of March 2025.

20
21 DEBBIE GILBERT, CERTIFIED COURT
22 REPORTER, B-515
23
24
25