

## Craven County Public Hearing for Proposed Shellfish Leases Comments

July 29, 2024

Name	State	Created	Submission ID	Comments
William Ipock	North Carolina	7/1/2024 10:43	16910	There's limited stretches of undeveloped shoreline in Adams Creek, and that particular stretch is among the best for traditional uses like hunting... bluebills love it... these leases would exclude those traditional uses along a really big chunk of that key stretch, so these leases disallow anyone but the lease owners use of this area. Somehow that seems unfair to me, how about you.
Jonathan Lucas	North Carolina	7/22/2024 6:05	17286	I support the expansion of shellfish aquaculture in this state. However, in this specific situation I have used the western bank of Adams Creek for duck hunting for years. Placement of a water column lease here would eliminate duck hunting from yet another area in Carteret County. There are three competing interests for undeveloped shoreline in eastern North Carolina: hunting/fishing, aquaculture, and waterfront property development. These continually come into conflict for access and space, and one of them has to give. The state of North Carolina has a constitutional amendment to protect the right of the people to hunt and fish. The state government has a vested interest in promoting shellfish aquaculture. Therefore, waterfront property development is what needs to give. Put these new leases immediately offshore from developed shoreline in Adams Creek. There is no such thing as a constitutional right to a "nice view" from a waterfront house. But don't block off hunters from utilizing their state constitutional rights in public-trust water.
Christopher Yeomans	North Carolina	7/24/2024 11:29	17368	I have been living on the Carteret County side of Adams Creek since 1997. I have consistently used the areas that are in question for duck hunting since that time. It's one of the few remaining places in the creek that has not been developed along the shoreline. I am concerned that these areas will not be accessible for hunting purposes in the future if they are leased. Thanks for your consideration in this matter!
F. Joel Fodrie	North Carolina	7/24/2024 16:33	17381	I am a resident of Beaufort, NC, and live along Core Creek (immediately south of, and connected to, Adams Creek). Both for work and pleasure, I am often in Adams Creek. While I greatly appreciate the motivations for, and potential benefits of, shellfish mariculture, I am very concerned about the placement of the proposed leases by Allen/Chadwick (23-036BL/23-037WC) and Vetrano/Penchansky (23-048BL/23-049WC). Separately, and certainly combined, these leases would occupy the major remaining undeveloped marsh shorelines in Adams Creek. These are THE key shorelines in Adams Creek for duck hunting (primarily - but not only - blackhead ducks), and also valuable recreational fishing hotspots. Given (a) proximity to shore; and (b) water-column designation (i.e., floating gears), it is difficult to imagine how these leases will not greatly obstruct this traditional use, thereby violating the standard that leases "not unreasonably interfere" with other important uses. As an avid duck hunter in this area, I know this would impact the activities of many NC residents. There are no practical accessibility factors that necessitate the proposed leases being located so close to the marsh shoreline - rather, they could be >150 m from shore and yet still well away from the marked navigation channel (i.e., intercoastal waterway), and in reasonably shallow water. Looking forward, the extreme proximity of these proposed water column leases to shore may also impact accessibility for adjacent landowners that may someday wish to construct docks (which would also be sad for duck hunters, but these would be the rights of the property owners). I hope there is a path to work with these potential leaseholders to find better sites for their plans. I do understand the extended timelines/paths involved for prospective growers to secure leases, so I do not make this objection lightly - in this instance, they really have just picked a "bad" spot for managing competing uses.