

Burgos, Alexander N

From: BCM General Manager <gm@bradleycreekmarina.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2024 2:19 PM
To: rrc.comments
Cc: Burgos, Alexander N; Wiggs, Travis C; Ruhlman, Carrie A
Subject: [External] RRC Objection Letter Submission for May 29th Meeting
Attachments: RRC Letters.pdf; RRC Speech.docx

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Good afternoon,

Please find attached, 73 letters of objection to **15ANCAC10F.0314 (New Hanover County, Bradley Creek, Wilmington, NC - No Wake Zone Extension)**. I will be hand-delivering copies of these at the May 29th meeting of the RRC. I plan on speaking at the meeting too. I may add speakers prior to this email as well, and I will notify you as such when I have that information. Please let me know if I need to submit anything further.

THANK YOU,

JONATHAN CREWS 
CMO

GENERAL MANAGER

BRADLEY CREEK YACHT CLUB
6338 OLEANDER DR
WILMINGTON, NC 28403
BUSINESS OFFICE (910) 350-0029
DOCK OFFICE (910) 392-2584
CELL (910) 470-4389



As the general manager and representative of Bradley Creek Boatominum, Inc. doing business as Bradley Creek Yacht Club, I would like to express concern from the members of Bradley Creek Yacht Club over the current no-wake zone extension.

Bradley Creek Marina was built in 1964, and the navigable channel that exists now was dredged at that time. Bradley Creek Yacht Club is the sole permit holder for the channel and its maintenance. Creekside Yacht Club was built in the mid-1980s and shares a property line with our facility. Combined, we store close to 1,000 vessels. This number has not changed significantly in the last 30 years. That means boat traffic in Bradley Creek has not significantly increased, and the fact that the commission could only state two boating incidents in that period shows that safety has not been a major issue in the creek. Even at the time of the incidents, no changes were sought. It was only several years later at the request of homeowners, not enforcement personnel, that the issue of safety was brought up as a way to get the changes the homeowners wanted.

Last year, the NWRC extended the NWZ roughly 3,300 feet towards the East, extending to within several hundred feet of the Intercoastal Waterway. Extending the zone another couple hundred feet will do nothing to increase safety, but on the contrary, will likely INCREASE the danger to boaters navigating in and around the entrance to Bradley Creek. It is clear that this no-wake-zone extension has been the product of a private property owner on the creek who seeks to protect their dock, not a governmental body as required by statute. A high-level Wildlife officer stated that on the 4th of July 2023, they witnessed no traffic backup in the area. But that was on a Tuesday when the weather was overcast with scattered showers, not exactly favorable for a boat day, and far from a benchmark for changes to a no-wake zone. We understand that the commission has the authority to make these changes, but they do not seem warranted from a safety standpoint.

We believe that moving the NWZ to within roughly 300 feet of the Intracoastal Waterway will **create** a significant safety hazard on high-traffic days. Boats already have issues trying to enter the creek due to the high boat traffic in the ICW. This slowdown and backup while entering the creek are likely to cause collisions in the ICW. At the very least, the State would benefit more if a study such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has to perform when they institute a no-wake zone is undertaken before these types of changes are codified.

The slowing of vessel traffic will impact Bradley Creek Yacht Club financially. The slowing of vessels will allow suspended sediments to fall out more quickly causing shoaling in the navigation channel, which will increase the danger to vessels. The action of these homeowners trying to protect their private docks will lead to the inability to access those docks without BCYC spending millions of dollars to dredge the channel. These homeowners have no financial stake in the maintenance of Bradley Creek, yet they benefit from it in many ways.

We appreciate your consideration of our members when making discretionary changes that will affect so many people. Our members feel strongly that an extension of the No Wake Zone would only benefit a couple of homeowners yet would negatively impact nearly a thousand people.

Burgos, Alexander N

From: Bill O'Bryan <billyboyq87@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2024 10:08 AM
To: rrc.comments
Subject: [External] Bradley Creek

You don't often get email from billyboyq87@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Dear Sirs and Madams,

As a boat slip owner at Bradley Creek Marina, I want to reach out regarding the proposal to extend the NO WAKE zone at Bradley Creek. I firmly believe this extension is unnecessary and counterproductive.

My main argument is that boats traveling on plane naturally contribute to dredging the channel. This action is beneficial as it helps maintain the necessary depth for navigation by churning the sandy bottom of the creek. Dredging the channel by a commercial dredging company is expensive. A NO WAKE zone inhibits this natural dredging. Extending the NO WAKE zone beyond the last dock would only add additional costs for marina boat residents, with no clear benefits.

I understand the importance of safety and respect for other boaters, but there is no need to expand the NO WAKE zone so far from the last boat dock.

Thanks for considering my input. I'm open to discussing this matter further if needed.

Best regards,

Bill O'Bryan

919-812-5094