CITY OF BEAUFORT
WATERFRONT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
1911 Boundary Street, Planning Conference Room, Beaufort, SC 29902
November 3, 2025 at 5:00 pm

Meetings will be live-streamed on the City of Beaufort's YouTube Page; City Beaufort SC

STATEMENT OF MEDIA NOTIFICATION

In accordance with South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d), as amended, all local media was duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

Please click the link below to join the Webinar:

Join from PC, Mac, iPad, or Android:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81651023585?pwd=OkXAjvgkinw3KE7zcn4aGABCfg4pkt.1
Passcode:998917 +13052241968 Webinar ID: 816 5102 3585

I. Call to Order
II. Pledge of Allegiance
III. Meeting Agenda Approval
IV. Approval of Minutes from October 6, 2025
V. Old Business
    A. Final approval of public opinion survey on Waterfront Park issues
VI. Committee Comments
VII. Public Comment
VIII. Executive Session
    A. Pursuant to Title 30, Chapter 4, Section 70(a)(2) of the SC Code of Laws, for the purpose of discussions of negotiations incident to proposed contractual arrangements, and receipt of legal advice relating to matters covered by attorney-client privilege.
IX. Adjourn

Waterfront Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes – Planning Conference Room, 1st Floor

October 6, 2025

DRAFT

I. CALL TO ORDER 5:01 PM

Mr. Oliver, Chair.

Members in attendance – David Bartholomew, Scott Marshall, Joseph Oliver, David Russell, Josh Scallate, Josh Schott, Bill Suter, Mike Sutton.

Ben Coppage joined the meeting about 35 minutes after the start time.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Oliver, Chair.

III. MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL

Councilman Scallate made a motion to accept and seconded by Mr. Schott.

All were in favor, motion carried.

IV. MINUTES

A. September 2, 2025.

Motion to approve was made by Councilman Scallate and seconded by Mr. Suter with an addition made by Mr. Oliver. 6th paragraph down under New Business add - Mr. Barna replied that no information on this had been found.

Minutes approved as amended.

Chair, Mr. Oliver, asked Councilman Scallate to address the committee regarding potential funding sources. Councilman Scallate stated before the standing up of this committee he met with a members of Congresswoman Nancy Mace's office and presented them a copy of the survey that was done by the engineers back in June 2024. Recently, he, along with City Manager, Scott Marshall, had the opportunity to go back to Congresswoman Nancy Mace's office to go over the data information collected and to start talking about some of the different alternatives. They discussed what type of grant funding might be obtained, not just for this year, but in years to come. He has also had communications with Senator Tim Scott's office.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Engineering Project Update.

Raul Dominguez, Capital Improvement Projects Director, started off by saying McSweeney Engineers will work on the Day Dock design and permitting, and this is an independent project. JMT/McSweeney are beginning the preliminary design concepts based on the following:

- Do nothing
- Repair
- Rebuild same as existing
- Build Seawall and back fill
- Hybrid approach

O'Quinn Marine is assisting with cost estimates. Davis and Floyd will provide commentary as needed on the impacts of these alternatives as they relate to drainage and utilities.

B. Communications Update.

Scott Marshall, City Manager, stated on September 30, 2025, right before the furlough, he had a conversation with a gentleman from the National Park Service. He had received the information that Congresswoman Nancy Mace's office had sent him. Mr. Marshall explained the situation to him. He will be back in touch with Mr. Marshall at a later date.

C. Future Meeting Dates Confirmation.

The meeting dates of November 3, 2025, and December 1, 2025, were confirmed.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion of Committee's Deliverable to City Council.

Mr. Oliver mentioned there isn't much Council does not already know after having the joint meeting on September 24, 2025. He believes only a presentation on where the committee is now, and how it plans to move forward is warranted.

He asked for opinions as to whether the committee should meet separately with downtown business owners and property owners or whether all interested persons should have an equal opportunity to voice their opinions. After some discussion, Councilman Scallate suggested a public survey could be issued. The committee agreed.

Should the survey and public charette be done before the engineers spend time preparing their design concepts.

A meeting will be scheduled for Tuesday, October 21, 2025, at 5:00 pm to go over the Public Survey process.

Councilman Bartholomew, Councilman Scallate, and Mr. Sutton will collaborate on coming up with some questions for the survey to be discussed.

Ashley Brandon, Public Information Officer, will coordinate the effort to help spread the word about the survey and posting links on our social media pages and website.

There was a discussion on clarifying which scenarios were being presented to Council. They are listed below.

DRAFT

- Rebuilding the relieving platform at the same size and shape
- Replace with seawall and backfill
- Replace with hybrid structure – fixed and floating elements

Should other items that have to do with aesthetics be presented to Council, like moving the swings so they can be accessible.

VII. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Councilman Bartholomew asked if the permitting process could be sped up and inquired about replacing the chain link fencing to 4 x 4's with rope to make it look more appealing. He also questioned if the day dock could be extended.

Mr. Sutton mentioned the dinghy dock and getting it repaired also as an access point.

Linda Roper, Downtown Operations Director, stated they are working with McSweeney Engineers about possibly widening the day dock by two feet on each side. The permitting process has been started.

Mr. Suter inquired about making the functionality of the park better as a whole. Adding water and electrical lines, renovated restrooms, updating the fuel storage facilities.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Savannah White, Field Representative for Congresswoman Nancy Mace.

Howell Beach, Alternate Member of the Committee.

IX. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Pursuant to Title 30, Chapter 4, Section (70) (a) (2) of the South Carolina Code of Law: For the purpose of discussions of negotiations incident to proposed contractual arrangements, and receipt of legal advice relating to matters covered by attorney-client privilege.

Councilman Scallate made a motion to go into Executive Session and seconded by Councilman Bartholomew.

All were in favor, motion carried.

Councilman Scallate made a motion to come out of Executive Session and seconded by Mr. Sutton.

All were in favor, motion carried.

No actions from Executive Session.

X. ADJOURN 7:46 PM

Motion to adjourn was made by Councilman Bartholomew and seconded by Mr. Sutton.

All were in favor, motion carried.

DRAFT

Henry C. Chambers Waterfront Park Community Survey

Purpose:
The City of Beaufort and the Waterfront Advisory Committee are seeking community input on potential improvements to the Henry C. Chambers Waterfront Park. Your feedback will help shape the design priorities for future enhancements to this important public space.

---

1. Connection to Beaufort and the Waterfront Park

Which of the following best describes your connection to Beaufort and the Waterfront Park?
(Check all that apply)
☐ Resident within the City of Beaufort
☐ Live outside the City but visit Beaufort regularly
☐ Property owner in the downtown or impacted area
☐ Business owner in the downtown core area
☐ Visitor or tourist
☐ Other (please specify) _____

---

2. Frequency of Use

How often do you visit or use the Henry C. Chambers Waterfront Park?
☐ Daily
☐ Weekly
☐ Monthly
☐ A few times a year
☐ Rarely or never

---

3. Age Group

Please select your age group:
☐ Under 25
☐ 25–44
☐ 45–64
☐ 65 or older

---

4. Primary Reasons for Visiting

Please **rank the following reasons for visiting the park** from **1 (most important)** to **7 (least important):**

- ☐ Dining and shopping
- ☐ Relaxation and waterfront views
- ☐ Walking or exercise
- ☐ Events or festivals
- ☐ Children's play areas
- ☐ Boating or marina access
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

---

5. Park Use and Satisfaction

On a scale of 1–5 (1 = Very dissatisfied, 5 = Very satisfied), how satisfied are you with the following?

- Overall layout and design
- Seating and shaded areas
- Green spaces and landscaping
- Waterfront access and views
- Event space and infrastructure
- Accessibility (wheelchairs, strollers, etc.)
- Cleanliness and maintenance
- Lighting
- Bathroom facilities

---

6. What do you like most about the current park?

---

7. What aspects of the current park could be improved?

---

8. Do you see any safety issues with the current park design?

If yes, please describe:

---

9. Day Dock Use

How often do you **moor your vessel to the Day Dock** (tie off your boat, not just visit or board from it)?

☐ Once a week
☐ Once a month
☐ Once a year
☐ Never

---

10. Water Access

Should **additional access for smaller watercraft** (such as kayaks, paddleboards, or small personal boats) be a design priority in the future?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Unsure

---

11. Vessel Accommodation

Should the park's design accommodate docking or tie-up for any of the following vessel types? *(Check all that you would support)*

☐ Recreational small boats
☐ Kayaks and paddleboards
☐ Shrimp boats
☐ Tour boats
☐ Government vessels
☐ Cruise ships
☐ Other (please specify) _____

---

12. Downtown Business Owners / Property Owners Only

a. How does the park currently impact your business or property?
b. What improvements could best support local commerce?

---

13. Renovation Priorities

Please **rank the importance** of the following possible improvements to the Waterfront Park (1 = Lowest priority, 5 = Highest priority):

- Enhanced waterfront access
- Additional green space or gardens
- Improved playground or family-friendly areas
- More seating and shaded areas
- Upgraded event/entertainment infrastructure (stage, lighting, etc.)
- Art installations or cultural elements
- Eco-friendly/sustainable features
- Fitness or recreational facilities
- Accessibility improvements
- Parking enhancements

---

14. Design and Character

How important is it to you that the current park design remain largely the same?
☐ Very important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Neutral
☐ Not important

---

15. Additional Feedback

Please share any other comments or suggestions regarding the Waterfront Park renovation: