

**TOPSAIL ISLAND
SHORELINE PROTECTION COMMISSION
WORKSHOP**

March 13, 2017 - 9:00 a.m.
Surf City
Town Hall

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Steve Smith called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

PRESENT:

Chairman Steve Smith – Topsail Beach
Michael Curley - Topsail Beach
Dick Peters- North Topsail Beach
Jerry Patton – Topsail Beach
Michael Benson – North Topsail Beach
Hiram Williams- Surf City
Dick Macartney- North Topsail Beach
Mark Price - Onslow County
David Ward – Surf City

Liaisons:

Stuart Turille – North Topsail Beach
Larry Bergman – Surf City
Mike Rose - Topsail Beach

II. Approval of Agenda:

Mr. Ward made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Peters seconded the motion. The motion was carried.

III. CRC Publications:

Mr. Smith spoke about the publications that were available through the CRC webpage as review material for the workshop.

IV. Comments from CRC Advisory Council members and other experts:

Mr. Moore informed the Committee that Mr. Gorham resigned from his position as Chairman of the CRC and that Renee Cahoon, who was Vice-Chair, will be acting as Chair.

V. Public Comments:

No comments were made from the public.

VI. TISPC Member Comments – Suggested Changes to CRC and NC Regulations

A. North Topsail Beach

Mr. Macartney said the requirement for Terminal Groins was his concern. He stated that the Town is required to do a full environmental impact study (EIS) even though it's a cookie cutter item and there is no time line for the project. Mr. Macartney felt that is an unnecessary burden to the Town and the process for terminal groins, used as an emergency response, should be reviewed.

B. Onslow County

Onslow County had no comments.

C. Pender County

There was no Representatives from Pender County in Attendance.

D. Surf City

Mr. Bergman stated that he reached out to his staff about any issues or concerns they had. He stated that the Building Inspector suggested the CRC review the rule requiring adjacent property owners to be notified before issuing a CAMA permit. Mr. Bergman stated that it is misleading and confusing to the adjacent property owners because it gives them the impression they have to approve the project. While they can comment about the project, it does not require their approval before issuance of a permit. Mr. Bergman said the Building Inspector questioned the need to even notify the adjacent owners. Mr. Williams agreed with the Surf City Building Inspectors suggestion. David Ward added to that the rule against cantilevering into the 60' setback on the oceanfront. He stated that cantilevers used to be allowed, but that rule was being abused with excessive cantilevers. Mr. Ward said he could understand putting a cap on it, for example allowing a two foot (2') maximum cantilever, but a small encroachment should be considered.

E. Topsail Beach

Mr. Rose said he reached out to staff as well as the Commissioners for their suggestions and/or concerns. The feedback was that the rules were difficult to navigate through for the average person wanting to develop. So a summary or guide of some sort would be helpful. Also, some of the rules were vague or not self-explanatory. He cited the rule allowing the impervious surface to be covered more than 30% if an "innovative design" is submitted and the rule prohibiting disturbance to other dunes unless it's not practical to build. Mr. Rose said these rules are left up to interpretation and questioned who makes the final call. Mr. Rose also spoke about the rule prohibiting sand to be placed on the backside of a frontal dune. One would assume adding sand to the frontal dune would only increase the

stability and protection the dune provides. Mr. Rose added that he has had discussions with CAMA officials who are unclear why this rule is in effect or the history of why it was written. Chris Gibson noted that Division of Coastal Management (DCM) seemed supportive of modification of this regulation because in their opinion it doesn't make sense.

F. Commission Guest

Mr. Gibson stated that the rules regulating the size of sandbags are an issue as well. If you are using sandbags to protect one house it would make sense to use the 3'X5' sandbags, but if you are protecting a whole row of houses it would make sense to use revetment or geotubes. Mr. Turille agreed with Mr. Gibson. He stated that it would have been the best and most cost effective solution for North Topsail Beach to use at the North End. Mr. Turille said there was discussion about using them but discussion stalled. Mr. Moore said that the issue with those large sandbags comes with the removal of them.

VII. OLD BUSINESS:

No Old Business to discuss.

VIII: NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Gibson spoke about the proposed regulations regarding shrimping trawling. He believes they will have a potential impact on the island down the road. He talked about the proposed regulations designating all waters other than primary, as secondary nursery areas. Mr. Gibson said this will add another layer of comments from various agency's during the permitting process. He also noted that if shrimping is limited to three (3) days a week and daytime only, it will decimate the shrimping industry. Mr. Smith stated that he received a resolution opposing these regulations from Senator Cook and forwarded it to the Committee members. Mr. Price said that Onslow County has already approved and signed the resolution opposing the new regulations.

Mr. Gibson spoke about a proposed bill exempting all sediment criteria rules from Cape Lookout, Diamond and Frying Pan Shoals. He cautioned the Committee about supporting any kind of project with no testing done first.

Mr. Gibson briefly spoke about the requirement of multibeam surveys. He believes the rule should be looked at because the surveys are expensive and unnecessary.

The last rule Mr. Gibson spoke about was concerning the use of disposal sites. He stated that the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) has 100 year easements for their disposal sites. In the past, a person could use the disposal sites by signing a consent agreement. Now the ACOE is saying they will no longer allow their disposal sites to be used, even with consent agreements. Mr. Gibson said in most cases they don't own the property, they only have an easement and so they shouldn't be governing who can use the sites.

Mr. Williams discussed his frustration with having people in positions with the State that don't have the knowledge or training to review the information submitted with permit applications. Mr. Gibson believes this has been caused by downsizing. Essentially less people are left to do the same amount of work and more. Therefore, people don't have the training or expertise for the position they are put in. Mr. Williams said he would like to see training and make them prove they have the expertise for the position they are in. Or rely on the stamped studies and plans submitted by the applicants.

V. OPEN FORUM:

Mr. Macartney discussed with the Committee the meeting some of the members attended in Raleigh. He said they met with Representatives lobbying for Beach Nourishment funding. Mr. Macartney stated that the Representatives had no ideas on where to look for additional funding besides the Shallow Draft Inlet (SDI) Fund. Senator Brown spoke about expanding that fund.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Broadhurst discussed gathering data regarding the number of visitors to Topsail Island and their home states. They believe, and Senator Brown agreed with them, that this information would be helpful when lobbying for beach nourishment funding.

VI. Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be on March 23rd at North Topsail Beach Town Hall at 2pm.

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Williams made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Ward seconded the motion and it was carried.

Adopted this the _____ day of _____, 2017.