

Submitted Online Public Comments

Carteret County Shellfish Lease Hearing

Thursday, March 13, 2025

6:00 PM - 6:35 PM



North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Marine Fisheries
Habitat and Enhancement Section
Shellfish Lease and Aquaculture Program

Submitted Online Public Comments

Carteret County Shellfish Lease Hearing

Arthur, Richard

North Carolina
3/14/2025 15:30

Lease(s) Referenced:
Not Specified

We were contacted by Corey McMann, a neighboring landowner. Cored informed us about a possible Shellfish lease in front of our property. We had no idea what that would mean for us, but we found out it might mean a lot. This property was purchased in 2022 as an investment, it is 79 acres with road frontage and 1000 feet of water front. There is more and more interest in this area for this type of land. This lease if approved would greatly impact our property. Looking at the proposed lease in relation to the property, it looks like a complete blockage of the shoreline. How could a landowner be blocked completely of water access? How could this lease be considered after no prior notification?

Merleon Creech

Terry Arthur

Richard Arthur

Arthur, Terry

North Carolina
3/13/2025 10:38

Lease(s) Referenced:
Not Specified

My Mother owns property at Silver Dollar. Please see Parcel ID # 740400517947000, Account # 30044, Acreage SR 1317 & Adams Creek. We plan to develop this land in the near future. Presently, we are growing trees on the land, however we have had the trees thinned. When we decide to develop this land, we would probably do it in small stages. If oyster leases are granted on the water in front of our land, it would have many restrictions and dictate what and how we can use our land. I am very sorry we can not attend the meeting tonight. Please do not put restrictions on us. We do not want

to be penalized for owning land in Carteret County. Thank you for your consideration. Teresa C. Arthur

Barghouti, Mona

North Carolina
3/10/2025 7:56

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-005BL/24-006WC
24-017BL/24-018WC

Public Comment Opposing Proposed Shellfish Leases -
Jacob Milchuck (24-005BL/24-006WC) and Peerless Oyster,
LLC. Frank Milchuck (24-017BL/24-018WC)

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed shellfish leases in the Jacob Milchuck (24-005BL/24-006WC) and Peerless Oyster, LLC. Frank Milchuck (24-017BL/24-018WC) areas. I believe these leases pose significant risks to our local ecosystem, recreational activities, and overall quality of life.

Firstly, the potential impact on the existing ecosystem is deeply concerning. Shellfish aquaculture, while potentially beneficial, can disrupt natural habitats and water quality. Increased nutrient loading, changes in sediment composition, and the introduction of non-native species are all possible consequences. These changes could negatively affect native fish populations, marine vegetation, and the overall health of our waterways.

Secondly, the proposed leases threaten recreational activities that are vital to our community, such as swimming, boating, fishing, kayaking, etc. The presence of aquaculture operations can restrict access of the land owners to these areas, creating navigational hazards and diminishing the enjoyment of our waterfront. This would negatively impact residents, landowners and tourists who rely on these activities for recreation and relaxation.

Thirdly, the potential impact on property values and the aesthetic beauty of our waterfront should not be overlooked. The introduction of aquaculture infrastructure, such as floats and cages, can detract from the natural beauty of the area. This could have negative consequences for property values and the overall appeal of our community.

Furthermore, I am concerned about the potential for increased boat traffic and noise associated with shellfish farming operations. This could disturb the peace and tranquility of our waterfront, negatively impacting residents and wildlife alike.

Finally, I urge the relevant authorities to conduct a thorough and transparent environmental impact assessment before any leases are granted. This assessment should consider the cumulative impact of multiple leases and engage with all stakeholders, including residents, recreational users, and environmental organizations.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed shellfish leases in the above said locations and urge you to prioritize the protection of our local ecosystem, recreational activities, and community well-being.

Sincerely,
Mona Barghouti

Coates, Vincent

North Carolina
3/13/2025 16:26

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-005BL/24-006WC
24-017BL/24-018WC

In regards to the proposed leases on Adam's Creek, Beaufort, NC. (24-017BL/24-018WC) and (24-005BL/24-006WC). It appears that both of these leases diminish the property values of the adjacent land owners. The leases are too close to shore to allow the property owners to build boat lifts or docks. That is often a very important consideration when buying high value waterfront property.

In addition, the water in these area has a salinity of 16ppt or less. These levels do not naturally supported oyster growth. As a resident of Beaufort I strongly disagree with both of these proposed leases.

Sincerely

Vincent John Coates III.

Daniels, Matt

North Carolina
2/24/2025 12:05

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-007BL/24-008WC

To: Marla Chuffo
Administrative Officer II
North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Marine Fisheries
Shellfish Lease and Aquaculture Program

From: Matt Daniels

504 Foxhall Street

Raleigh NC 27609

Email: tpslbound@gmail.com 919-601-6859

Re: Proposed lease Ralph W. Brittingham Jr; ID 24-008WC;

Associated with lease

ID 24-007BL; North Bay water column Carteret County, 4.22 acres.

I am opposing this proposed oyster lease referred above, I am a member of a club in cedar island if this lease is allowed

it would be unsafe for whoever is working the water during duck season.

I am aware of Senate Bill 410 known as the Marine Aquaculture Development Act on March 28th, 2018 introduced by Senator Bill Cook, Senator Norm Sanderson, and Jerry Tillman. It states in section 113-202.1 (b-3): The leased area must not be within an area traditionally used and available for fishing or HUNTING activities incompatible with by the activities proposed by the leaseholder.

(b-4) Aquaculture use of the leased area must not significantly interfere with the exercise of riparian rights by the adjacent property owners including access to navigation channels from piers or other means of access.

Sincerely,
Matt Daniels

Glennon, Luke
North Carolina
3/14/2025 2:17

Lease(s) Referenced:
Not Specified

While I fully support oyster leases and feel like they should be supported whole heartedly across the state in every form and fashion for not only the economic impact but the amazing environmental benefits. And I have personally supported the coastal federation for their initiative for their oyster storage unit in harkers island. I am conflicted on the Milchuck and peerless oyster proposed lease in Adams creek. I feel they are restricting public and private access to the shore line for fishing and other recreational activities and

those lease locations should be reconsidered. Thank you for your time and allowing public comment.

H, G

North Carolina
3/14/2025 15:26

Lease(s) Referenced:
Not Specified

As a long time Beaufort resident there is nothing like our beautiful waters! The proposed actions will limit and diminish the quality of our water, create challenges for recreational activities, and could make boat docking hazardous or impossible. It is imperative that our nature and land is preserved for generations to come. Additionally, as a town that relies on tourism a decrease in water quality and space would hinder the ability for our town to flourish to its full extent.

Henley, Will

Virginia
2/25/2025 8:55

Lease(s) Referenced:
Not Specified

Hi,

I am an avid recreational fisherman in coastal NC. I encourage the renewal/approval of all shellfish lease applications in Carteret County that meet legal requirements and will occur over non-productive bottom. I believe shellfish farms are very important because they improve water quality, take pressure off wild stocks, provide income for people, and provide communities with fresh seafood.

Thanks!

Hyatt, Josh

North Carolina
2/24/2025 15:57

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-007BL/24-008WC

I would like to voice my Opposition to the proposed oyster lease by Ralph W. Brittingham Jr, North Bay -Carteret County, 4.22 acres

This proposed lease would interfere with our long standing lease and exisiting duck blinds with land owner Mr Peralto.

Senate Bill 410 known as the Marine Aquaculture Development Act on March 28th, 2018 introduced by Senator Bill Cook, Senator Norm Sanderson, and Jerry Tillman. It states in section 113-202.1 (b-3): The leased area must not be within an area traditionally used and available for fishing or hunting activities incompatible with by the activities proposed by the leaseholder.

(b-4) Aquaculture use of the leased area must not significantly interfere with the exercise of riparian rights by the adjacent property owners including access to navigation channels from piers or other means of access.

Thank you.

Joyce, David
North Carolina
2/24/2025 14:40

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-007BL/24-008WC

I am writing to express my opposition to the oyster lease permit filing in North Bay, Cedar Island, Carteret County, NC by Mr. Ralph Brittingham, Jr. My concerns echo those mentioned by Mr. Dallas Goodwin and other hunting club members who have written to voice their opposition. As a fellow hunting club member, my concerns are in regards to safety issues associated with firearms, infringement on fishing/hunting activities, and access of our hunting club's established duck blinds.

Given the range of shotgun fire, the proposed location of Mr. Brittingham's oyster lease poses a significant safety hazard to our already established duck blinds in that vicinity. No one in our hunting club would want to risk the safety of a worker in the Oyster Lease area by hunting in an adjacent

blind. Even if the time(s) the work in the Oyster Lease area did not overlap with time(s) members of our club would be hunting, I think the additional traffic to the area would negatively impact our duck hunting activities in this area as the additional traffic could potentially diminish the likelihood of wildlife remaining in the vicinity area.

The increased risk of boating incidents/accidents that could be caused by the introduction of netting, baskets, or other harvesting processes/equipment is also a concern. Additionally, the water levels in North Bay fluctuate pretty wildly and it can sometimes already be quite difficult to access our duck blinds in that area without the addition of having to navigate around an additional blocked off area where the proposed Oyster Lease would be located. This could also adversely affect local persons who access/use this area for recreational fishing in warmer months as there are already a great number of Oyster Leases in the North Bay area.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Lanier, Peyton

North Carolina
3/13/2025 16:29

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-005BL/24-006WC
24-017BL/24-018WC

Investigation Reports, 24-005BL/24-006WC and 24-017BL/24-018WC are very close to the shore line off of Adams Creek. That's going to impede on many people's ability to recreationally fish those two lengths of shoreline. If the proposed areas were pushed back offshore some it would allow recreational fisherman to continue fishing that shoreline.

Lee, Donnie

North Carolina
3/11/2025 12:42

Please reconsider the Milchuk lease, as this will affect several areas and properties, as well as access to said properties.

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-005BL/24-006WC
24-017BL/24-018WC

McMahon, Corey

North Carolina
3/14/2025 15:47

I strongly oppose shellfish lease application numbers 24-005BL and 254-006WC on the grounds that they do not meet the minimum standards as stated in NC article 16 Cultivation of shellfish.

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-005BL/24-006WC

To paraphrase 113-202 (a) Suitable areas for the production of shellfish shall meet the following minimum standards:

(3) Cultivation of shellfish in the leased area will be compatible with lawful utilization by the public of other marine and estuarine resources. Other public uses which may be considered include, but are not limited to, navigation, fishing and recreation.

(4) Cultivation of shellfish in the leased area will not impinge upon the rights of riparian owners.

As a riparian landowner, this lease will interfere with the exercising of my riparian rights and use of the shoreline.

After the hearing, Mr Milchuck indicated a willingness to move the lease area outside of the riparian zone. I feel that this move would be in the best interest of adjacent riparian landowners and the public.

McMahon, William

North Carolina
3/14/2025 15:26

Lease(s) Referenced:
Not Specified

This lease will severely limit our ability to use the shoreline as landowners. We won't be able to use shore blinds or set decoys for duck hunting. I will also no longer be able to throw the ball into the water for my 2 dogs, who enjoy swimming on the coast very much. This doesn't even begin to mention how increased maritime traffic and fishing will affect the surrounding ecosystem. As someone who grew up in Carteret County I hate to see our beautiful landscape changed and destroyed for personal gain.

Robertson, Harry

North Carolina
3/14/2025 16:54

Lease(s) Referenced:
24-036BL/24-037WC

Mason Allen Proposed Oyster Lease
24-036BL/24-037WC

The proposed oyster lease is located in between the canal and cove access for South River. The residents of Sportsman Village utilize the canal for access into the larger body of water (South River). The canal is narrow and difficult to pass through with one boat not counting two or more. The concern is with the proposed lease the boat traffic and safety is a concern not only for residents but for Allen's staff. There are residents which also used the cove for their docking of boats for recreational and commercial use of this same body of water. Recreational fishing will be impacted also given the proposed location of this lease as well as impacting real estate given its close proximity to residential homes. The compromise being given for the Allens is to relocate the proposed lease across the water away from residential property and boat traffic allowing them the opportunity to continue their business endeavor while leaving water access open to both South River canal and cove residents. The joint decision from the residents is to pay the \$300 fee to have this

proposed lease relocated across the river away from boat traffic and residents that now enjoy recreational fishing, boating and kayaking in this area. Your consideration of this compromise is appreciated and we look forward to your forthcoming decision. Thank you.