



SC Beach Preservation Stakeholder Workgroup Meeting Summary August 25, 2022

OVERVIEW

The SC Department of Health and Environmental Control's (DHEC) Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) convened the SC Beach Preservation Stakeholder Workgroup on Thursday, August 25th at James Island Town Hall in Charleston, SC to further discussion from the previous meeting and discuss Workgroup recommendations identified thus far in the process.

This workgroup brings together representatives of diverse stakeholder groups including residents of coastal communities, state and federal government agency representatives, academic professionals, conservation organizations, consulting engineers and policy experts with a commitment to actively participating in this process. Meetings scheduled in the coming months will present resources and information to promote further dialogue and solution-based discussions. The group was encouraged to maintain the perspective of the full SC coastline and to strive for consensus. DHEC OCRM staff will value all perspectives and take all discussions consideration in determining the agency's recommendations which will be outlined in a final report as the stakeholder process concludes.

There will be opportunities for broader stakeholder and members of the public to provide comment throughout the process and a webpage will be established to provide updates and seek additional feedback. The public participation process and opportunities to comment would extend into any subsequent process of drafting regulations related to the issues discussed by the workgroup.

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

At 9:30 a.m., S.C. DHEC OCRM Chief Elizabeth von Kolnitz welcomed the Workgroup members and noted the importance of this process and the perspectives they bring.

Adam Bode, Coastal Planner for DHEC's OCRM and Kristy Ellenberg, Director of Collaborative Partnerships & Strategic Initiatives in DHEC's Office of Environmental Affairs introduced themselves and noted they would be serving as co-facilitators throughout the meeting.

The following Stakeholder Workgroup members were in attendance:

Jenny Brennan, Southern Environmental Law Center
Blanche Brown, DeBordieu Colony Community Association, Inc.
Alex Butler, SC Office of Resilience
Emily Cedzo, Coastal Conservation League
Nicole Elko, SC Beach Advocates
Justin Hancock, South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism
Jack Smith, Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP—Attorneys and Counselors at Law
Steven Traynum, Coastal Science & Engineering
Don Thomas, Peace Sotheby's International Realty
Amy Armstrong, South Carolina Environmental Law Project
Iris Hill, Town of Edisto Beach
Aaron Pope, City of Folly Beach
Rob Young, Western Carolina University

A full list of stakeholder workgroup members is included as an appendix to this meeting summary. DHEC facilitators and staff will follow-up with those unable to attend to gather perspectives to be shared with the group.

Also in attendance were members of the DHEC's OCRM staff Jessica Boynton, Coastal Services Section Manager; and Matt Slagel, Beachfront Management Section Manager; and Tara Maddock, Program Coordinator.

Following brief introductions, the facilitators provided a short summary highlighting the Stakeholder Workgroup Goals (Appendix B) and Stakeholders (Appendix C), which have been collaboratively identified through the course of the last several meetings.

WHAT IS BEACH PRESERVATION?

The Workgroup continues to work toward a common, foundational definition of what “beach preservation” is as it relates to the topics being discussed. As a starting point, the facilitators highlighted the definition identified and recommended by the 2013 Blue Ribbon Committee on Shoreline Management (see below) as well as the following statements, which were selected from input received by the former Technical Advisory Team (TAC) as well as from current Workgroup members.

2013 Blue Ribbon Committee on Shoreline Management ([link](#))

“preservation” includes the implementation of coastal management techniques such as beach nourishment, the landward movement and/or removal of habitable structures whenever necessary and feasible, the conservation of undeveloped shorelines and sand dune creation and stabilization using sand fencing and native vegetation.

Input from Technical Advisory Committee and Stakeholder Workgroup

- **Maintaining** the current state or status quo
- **Preserving** natural functions
- **Pro-actively** maintaining the functionality of the beach/dune system
- **Protecting** and **enhancing** natural beach processes
- **Balancing** habitat and environmental concerns with current development
- **Protecting** the highly dynamic ecological processes and functions that shape, form and maintain the beach, dunes and nearshore habitat.

Input on the definition was provided by several Workgroup members prior to the meeting (see Appendix). The following provides a high-level summary of the input received during the discussion:

- Is there something missing from the definition?
- Are there terms that could be better highlighted?
- Are there certain components that are challenging or concerning?

- Beach preservation can be broken down into 'beach' and 'preservation'. By the definition of beach, this indicates preserving the beach and beach dune system. From a policy standpoint, there may be other things to protect but suggest the workgroup not try to add too much into these two words. If there are other goals and if we are looking to preserve something else (ie, coastal infrastructure), this should be a separate effort that requires additional language in statute and regulation.
- Need to understand that the values and functions of the beach differ along the coast and aren't all the same. Natural beaches and wildlife refuge beaches vs. developed beaches. Can be more specific and flexible but need to recognize that not all beaches are the same and each may have different outcomes. There need to be different policies for natural beaches vs developed locations and ensure there is flexibility in approaches.
- Preserve can mean to hold in place and prevent damage. Need to discuss whether the Legislature defines preservation as protecting or preserving the beach and beach dune system itself or to "hold the line" and protect development as well.
- Need to ensure that this discussion remains centered on beach preservation, not about policy about all of the various aspects we want to protect.
- Concern about the statement of "maintaining current status quo." The beach is such a dynamic system that it is not only difficult to identify the "status quo," but it would be difficult to maintain this current state. Instead of thinking about maintaining the status quo, should consider and think about resiliency. We may not be able to maintain the status quo but we can be resilient with these dynamic systems.
- Need to determine what specifically we are looking to protect, the beach or the structures adjacent to the beach. Over the last several meetings, we are moving in the direction of and have been discussing approaches to protect the beach.

- Although beach nourishment can slow or delay the process of moving back from the beach, it can't stop the progression.
- The priority of the State is the beach. That doesn't mean that you ignore everything behind it or landward, but the beach should be the focus.
- Section 48-39-260 is pretty straightforward and states the current Policy:
 - In recognition of its stewardship responsibilities, the policy of South Carolina is to:
 - (1) protect, preserve, restore, and enhance the beach/dune system, the highest and best uses of which are declared to provide:
 - (a) protection of life and property by acting as a buffer from high tides, storm surge, hurricanes, and normal erosion;
 - (b) a source for the preservation of dry sand beaches which provide recreation and a major source of state and local business revenue;
 - (c) an environment which harbors natural beauty and enhances the well-being of the citizens of this State and its visitors;
 - (d) natural habitat for indigenous flora and fauna including endangered species.
- In places where infrastructure is to be protected, what are the guidelines for doing so? These guidelines aren't specifically outlined or defined in the Beachfront Management Act. Existing language is to protect the beach dune system because of the various benefits (including storm protection) that the beach dune system provides
- The beach is the beach dune system. The approach to preservation will look different based on location. If there is nothing behind the beach/beach dune system, there can be natural retreat. If there is something behind it, you try to preserve using renourishment.
- We use nourishment because we don't want to see seawalls up and down the coast but at some point, we will reach a point where we need to consider the cost/benefit of the cost of nourishment vs the value of what we are looking to preserve and protect.
- Important to consider how to address the issue within private communities where there they have used structures on the beach for protection because they can't nourish and don't want the public to access the beach. How do we address this issue going forward?
- We may want to consider setting up an "if this, then that" system in order to detail out various scenarios to include approaches (nourishment, retreat) and funding mechanism. We could consider a decision tree for these scenarios. Could also consider whether the beach could be divided into zones.
- Everyone needs to have some skin in the game to make this work (local, state, private).
- Local management plans may be the opportunity to provide local-scale flexibility in approach. Overarching series of laws, statutes, and regulations that apply statewide and then have local management plans that are more specific. Part of what we are

discussing is decision-making. There are overarching policies at the state-level. Local level policies and ordinances can be more specific.

- There needs to be a distinction between developed shorelines and undeveloped shorelines. If we only seek to preserve the beach dune system, the Beachfront Management Act may be sufficient. The tension is where people want to protect the beach dune system as well as beachfront development and infrastructure.
- Need to be clear that some of these approaches are more management actions rather than policy. The statute is already clear with what it describes and defines. We may consider adding a section on developed shorelines where we are protecting infrastructure as well as protecting the beach.
- Consider making minor modifications to be definition and add examples to include different situations.
- The definition from the Blue Ribbon Committee was voted on by legislators and should serve as a starting point.
- Protect, preserve, restore, and enhance should be included. Seawalls don't protect the beach.

GROUP DISCUSSION: WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the discussion to gather input on the definition of beach preservation, the facilitators summarized the input received from Workgroup members (See Appendix for Summary) on the following Workgroup Recommendations.

Does the Work Group reaffirm the State's current Beach Nourishment Policy as a component of beach preservation?

Beach Nourishment Policy (SC Code 48-39-260(5))

to "promote carefully planned nourishment as a means of beach preservation and restoration where economically feasible"

Workgroup Discussion

- Economic studies exist with regards to the cost/benefit analysis of renourishment. Enable and provide more funding mechanisms for local governments (i.e., accommodations taxes). These are important for raising funds for beachfront management to ensure management remains at the local level. Could provide more avenues to tap into tourism dollars. Hilton Head Island is an example where this has been successfully done.
- Consider adding 'where ecologically and economically feasible.' Need to consider what economically feasible means. Keep in mind that even if the economics (cost of project vs benefit) don't perfectly align, most will still want to do the project in order to protect their property. Feasible often just means 'doable.' If someone has the money, they will do it.

- It is often difficult to capture and accurately convey all the economic benefits at public beaches (e.g., day tourists who don't pay for parking or for services but still enjoy the resource). Some local governments are stewards of public beaches.
- If we're not 'promoting' other methods, the State shouldn't be 'promoting' this method. Promote is more active so we should consider 'allow' or 'permit' over promote.
- Need to ensure that a change in the language doesn't mean that it is more restrictive.

Does the Work Group recommend the establishment of a Beach Preservation Fund?

Workgroup Discussion

- If private communities are contributing to the fund, they should have access to the fund.
- The workgroup previously identified the need for a tiered level of support based on location relative to the beach.
- Still need to discuss what constitutes full and complete access. It is already defined in S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 30-21 but would like to see a definition that applies to SCDOT and others.
- Need to acknowledge that there is a cost to have people come to a public beach regardless of whether they pay for parking or have free access.
- Should consider access (i.e., can someone access the beach via a road) and be less concerned with parking and/or fees. USACE has access requirements for federal funding. The State could start by looking at those requirements, which include public access points as well as parking.
- Suggest we research how other states and communities have gathered funding and create a suite or menu of options on how to fund the Beach Preservation Fund. There are examples where Federal, State, Local, taxes, property owners, and visitors have funded such efforts.
- Should acknowledge that a lot of communities are already very tight on budgets so having the dedicated state funding will allow them to better preserve the beach.
- The beachfront owners should have some skin in the game. Presently, there are scenarios where these property owners are not contributing to the cost of these projects. These owners directly benefit financially from the nourishments by reducing the risk and increasing the beach so they should have more skin in the game than others.
 - A tiered level of funding would help to alleviate this issue.

If a Beach Preservation Fund was established, does the Work Group recommend additional coordination and planning (Comprehensive Plans, LCBMPs, Resilience, etc) between state, county, and local entities?

Workgroup Discussion

- For the beachfront property owners who are paying more taxes and higher insurance premiums, could they be incentivized in some way to encourage them to pay for nourishments? Example, should the resulting renourishments reduce their taxes or premiums?
 - Insurance companies don't take in account renourishment when setting insurance premiums or assessing risk.
- The FEMA Community Rating System (CRS) is in place to lower insurance through the local government actively pursuing the rating.
- The State should consider requiring every community to have a LCBMP regardless of state funding.
- General agreement that additional coordination and planning would be good.
- This would require additional funding and/or capacity at the State level to assist with additional planning mandates.
 - New York example – the State provided additional resources for additional mandates.
- Since the concept of a beach preservation fund is to support more than beach nourishment, planning assistance could be included in Fund to help communities build capacity for additional planning efforts.

GROUP DISCUSSION: RECOMMENDATIONS ANALYSIS

Over the course of the last several meetings, several policy recommendations, actions and suggested next steps have been identified. Workgroup members were asked to categorize recommendations and topics that have been previously identified (below) and provide input on additional items that should be considered using the following categories:

Categories

- ❖ DHEC Policy (Statute, Regulation, or Both)
- ❖ Other Federal, State, Local Government, or Partner Led Efforts
- ❖ Non-regulatory Recommendations – Best Management Practice, Standard Operation Procedure, Project-level, and Education/Outreach

Topics for Categorizing

- General Permit for Sand Fencing
- Flexibility with Permit Modifications
- Sediment Quality
- Nourishment Project QA/QC
- Establish Beach Preservation Fund
- LCBMP Requirement for Comprehensive Plan
- Timing Windows based on Species / Gear Type

- Real estate Disclosure
- Accommodations Tax Changes
- Definition of Beach Preservation
- Definition of Beach Nourishment
- Tiered level of Funding Responsibility

DHEC Policy

- Statutes
 - Definition of Beach Preservation
 - Real Estate Disclosure
 - Establish Beach Preservation Fund
 - DHEC, DNR, PRT (dependent on funding mechanism)
 - Accommodations Tax Changes
 - Jurisdictional Lines
 - Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plan Requirement for Comprehensive Plan
 - Tiered Level of Funding Responsibility
 - Exemption for Local Permit for Sand Fencing
 - Allowable so long as consistent with LCBMP
 - 10yr permit
- Regulations
 - Definition of Beach Nourishment
 - Flexibility with Permit Modifications
 - Need public notice and opportunity to challenge
 - General Permit for Sand Fencing
 - Remove requirement for newspaper posting and 15 public notice period
 - Linkage with LCBMP
 - Timing Windows for Beach Nourishment Based on Species/Gear Type
 - OCRM Needs Regulations to Support its Jurisdiction in “beaches” critical area (already in Statute)
 - SOP for Nourishment Project QA/QC
 - Sediment Quality
 - Include enforcement monitoring when dredge pulls up incompatible sand
 - Define beach compatible
- Both
 - Definition of Beach Preservation
 - Definition of Beach Nourishment

Other Federal, State, Local Government, or Partner Led Efforts

- Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plan Requirement for Comprehensive Plan

- SC Office of Resilience
 - BMPs and Guidance for Resilience Component in Comprehensive Plans
 - Information
 - Estimate of buyouts
 - No state/federal funding
 - Primary residents
 - Priority needs
 - Buyouts
- State-scale beachfront resilience plan (SLR adaptation)
 - DHEC OCRM, SCOR, SC DOT
- Flexibility with Accommodations Tax Changes
 - Other taxes/fees that could be used for funding
- Tiered Level of Funding Responsibility
- Establish Beach Preservation Fund
 - PRT, DNR, SCOR (based on funding mechanism)

Non-regulatory Recommendations – Best Management Practice, Standard Operation Procedure, Project-level, and Education/Outreach

- Define what constitutes a legitimate university or academic study.
- Define what constitutes a “new” or experimental “technology.”
- Timing Windows for Beach Nourishment Based on Species/Gear Type
- Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plan Requirement for Comprehensive Plan
 - State-scale beachfront resilience plan (SLR adaptation)
- Nourishment Project QA/QC & Sediment Quality
 - Include specific technical criteria and guidance into the permit process via published BMP or SOP
- Flexibility with Minor Permit Modifications
 - Add small uncertainty zones within the larger project to allow flexibility in planning and implementation

Appendix A – SC Beach Preservation Stakeholder Workgroup Member List

Ross Appel
Attorney & Charleston City Council Member

Amy Armstrong
South Carolina Environmental Law Project

Keith Bowers
Biohabitats, Inc.

Jenny Brennan
Southern Environmental Law Center

Blanche Brown
DeBordieu Colony Community Association, Inc.

Alex Butler
SC Office of Resilience

Emily Cedzo
Coastal Conservation League

Melissa Chaplin
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Nicole Elko
SC Beach Advocates

Paul Gayes
Coastal Carolina University

Justin Hancock
South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation & Tourism

Iris Hill
Town of Edisto Beach

Lindsey Jackson
SC Realtor's Association

Michelle Pate
SC Department of Natural Resources

Aaron Pope
City of Folly Beach

Queen Quet (or designee)

Gullah/Geechee Nation

Jack Smith
Attorney

Don Thomas
Peace Sotheby's International Realty

Steven Traynum
Coastal Science & Engineering

Rod Tyler
Industry - New technology/Living shoreline products/Property Owner on Marsh in Murrels Inlet

Robert Young
Western Carolina University

Appendix B – Stakeholder Workgroup Goals

Group Goals of this Process

Discussions reflected in policies and regulations	Have the outcomes of these meetings and discussions reflected in updated policies or regulations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure state flexibility in processes and enforceability• Policy recommendations and changes as straight forward as possible• Help DHEC OCRM do their jobs in a more effective way to help better define and place boundaries on the existing regulations
Balancing needs	Balance the needs of the beachfront communities, economic benefit from tourism, value of beachfront infrastructure and the natural systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure not only threatened and endangered species but also the beach dependent shorebird and species are represented.• Public trust resources• Look at how beach preservation differs locally
Proactive planning and management	Thinking proactively about short- and long-term threats and impacts to the SC Coast. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rather than planning and managing on the emergency scale and timeframe, begin long-term planning in an orderly matter.
Learning and sharing information	Provide clarity on specific beach preservation topics and issues so that everybody is operating from a clear set of standards for permitting and planning. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Identify forum(s) and innovative methods for knowledge transfer and information (best practices, for example) sharing</i>
Tools for beach preservation	Increase the number of tools in the toolbox for beach preservation for the state and all involved <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify management tools for both short- and long-term needs
Funding and implementation	Discuss how these policy changes may impact the assistance provided to the state. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider funding for any potential changes

Appendix C – Stakeholders

Conservationists & Natural Resources (habitat, species)	Property Owners (oceanfront, non-oceanfront)	Regulatory & Resource Agencies (State & Federal)
Business Owners / Commercial	Industry / Coastal Engineering	Future Generations
Academics	Tourists	Realtors
Developers	Local Governments	Public Beach User
Elected Officials	General Public	Non-human Species
Utilities / Infrastructure	State of South Carolina	

Appendix D – Beach Preservation Definition Input



**South Carolina
Beach Advocates**

Tim Goodwin, Chair
Mayor, Folly Beach
Marilyn Hatley, Vice-Chair
Mayor, North Myrtle Beach
Blanche Brown, Secretary
GM, DeBordieu Colony Comm. Assn.
Will Connor, Treasurer
MR&R, Kiawah Island Comm. Assn.

Pat O'Neil
Mayor, Town of Sullivan's Island
Sel Hemmingway
Administrator, Georgetown County
Iris Hill
Administrator, Edisto Beach
John Pedersen
Administrator, Myrtle Beach
Linda Lovvorn Tucker
Administrator, Isle of Palms
Bill Otis
Pawley's Island
Ex-Officio

Nicole Elko, Ph.D., Exec. Director
President, Elko Coastal Consulting
Vice-President, American Shore and
Beach Preservation Assoc.

South Carolina Beach Advocates
P.O. Box 1451
Folly Beach, SC 29439
(843) 371-7082
exdir@scbeaches.org

South Carolina Beach Advocates

POSITION STATEMENT

A State Policy of Beach Preservation

October 19, 2018

Issue

On May 3, 2018, the Governor signed Act No. 137, the Beachfront Management Reform Act, which among other things, changed the state's long-time 40 year policy of retreat to one of beach preservation. This was the first recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Shoreline Management in 2013 and stated, "Replace language regarding the policy of retreat with the following: *The policy of the state of South Carolina is the preservation of its coastal beachfront and beach/dune system.*"

Position

Our Board of Directors is made up of the Mayors and Administrators of South Carolina beach communities.

Definition of beach preservation

The South Carolina Beach Advocates recognize the importance of protecting the beach and sand dune system for natural habitat, storm buffer, recreation, and tourism. The term "preservation" includes the implementation of coastal management techniques such as beach nourishment, the landward movement and/or removal of habitable structures whenever necessary and feasible, the conservation of undeveloped shorelines, groin construction and repair, and sand dune creation and stabilization using sand fencing and native vegetation.

The 40-year policy of retreat which began in 1988 has resulted in the implementation of numerous state coastal management policies, which are recommended to continue under the revised policy of preservation:

- Coastal management planning at the state and municipal levels (e.g., Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plans)
- Beachfront jurisdictional lines
- Limited private coastal armoring
- Rebuilding restrictions (if seawalls damaged >50%, cannot be rebuilt)
- Property information disclosure to potential buyers

Need for a dedicated source of annually recurring state funding for beach preservation

This was a recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Shoreline Management in 2013, which stated, "Establish a dedicated funding source to adequately and reliably fund the Beach Restoration and Improvement Trust Fund and expand the purpose, appropriations, and designation of funds to include additional beach management options."

State permitting modifications to accommodate long-range planning and regionalization to optimize costs for efficient beach preservation

City of Folly Beach

The policy of the state of South Carolina is to preserve the storm damage reduction, habitat, recreational, and economic functions of the coastal beachfront and beach/dune system through management techniques such as beach nourishment, the landward movement and/or removal of habitable structures whenever necessary and feasible, the conservation of undeveloped shorelines, groin construction and repair, and sand dune creation and stabilization using sand fencing and native vegetation.

Appendix E – Stakeholder Workgroup Recommendations Summary

SC Beach Preservation Stakeholder Workgroup Recommendations Summary

Does the Work Group reaffirm the State's current Beach Nourishment Policy as a component of beach preservation?

Beach Nourishment Policy (SC Code 48-39-260(5))

to "promote carefully planned nourishment as a means of beach preservation and restoration where economically feasible"

Yes (with considerations) = 7

Yes = 1

- Cost/benefit analysis would allow for better decision making and a better understanding of what "economically feasible" means. Compare cost of nourishment over a specified period of time (20-40 years) vs the cost of relocation.
- Beachfront areas that do not provide open 'public access' but provide vacation rental opportunities, which contribute to state/local coffers, should be considered. These funds could serve as part of the funding sources that all stakeholders can benefit from.
- Sand source environmental impacts and consistency with local climate resilience plans are important to consider.
- "Carefully planned nourishment" means creating a comprehensive schedule of nourishment projects and ensuring adequate funding resources at the local and state (and federal, where applicable) levels. (short-term strategy)
- Longer-term strategy will also include beach nourishment projects but these will be combined with other strategies to ensure long-term beach health (e.g., property buy-outs to re-establish dune fields in over-developed or vulnerable areas).
- Propose "allow" or "permit" rather than "promote". Promote implies advocacy and active encouragement of this option rather than simply making it a valid method.
- Beach nourishment project standards need to be updated. For example, QA/QC for sediment quality as this continues to be a problem up and down the coast with renourishment projects.

- Consider implementing similar standards to groin projects to include better ongoing monitoring and a bond requirement in the event a project has unintended consequences.
- Beach renourishment is a temporary and expensive solution to a long-term problem. What does resiliency look like beyond beach renourishment?

Does the Work Group recommend the establishment of a Beach Preservation Fund?

Yes (with considerations) = 6

Yes = 2

- Beach Preservation and what the fund could be used for need to be clearly defined. Must include flexibility to use funds for relocation (as appropriate) where the long-term costs of nourishment warrant relocation, the location has experienced repeated erosion and/or is highly vulnerable, and other factors that should be defined.
- Criteria, eligibility, and local government responsibilities for the fund must be clearly defined and updated (where needed). Applications should be managed in a way that prevents the monopolization of awards (either by a cap on the amount or through an objective scoring system). See recent RIA infrastructure grant money as example.
- Access to the Fund should include criteria designed to incentive long-term planning, and specifically requirements for shoreline management, risk assessments, resiliency elements, etc.
- A fund of this type, created with a recurring revenue source, is essential to being able to navigate short term and long term 'fixes' and should include all stakeholders in the process and funding. (State, Local, Federal, private property owners, etc.) This would allow the State to be pro-active, rather than reactive, when it comes to beach nourishment projects.
- Only beaches with full public access should be able to receive funding. We should also only pursue this fund if we are also pursuing a part of it or a separate fund in conjunction that would be used to support a managed retreat strategy. Given the need for retreat may first effect private gated communities due to lack of financial resources, we need to plan for them separately. Lastly, none of this funding should be used for new hard structures on beaches. Any new hard structures (e.g. groins) should be funded entirely at the local level. See previous legislation as example.
- Should not be a bailout fund. Beach renourishment does not address the long-term problem of SLR impacts to developed beach communities locked in place so creating a funding source continues to keep the focus in the near term.

If a Beach Preservation Fund was established, does the Work Group recommend additional coordination and planning (Comprehensive Plans, LCBMPs, Resilience, etc) between state, county, and local entities?

Yes (with considerations) = 2

Yes = 6

- Coordination of planning efforts is needed before funds are spent.
- Planning and coordination with all entities is essential to a successful result and is necessary before funds are spent.
- It's important for all involved to realize that all stakeholders may need to compromise for the benefit of all concerned.
- DHEC OCRM could consider policy to require Special Area Management Plans (SAMPs), which would be consistent with climate resiliency plans. Ecosystem preservation in concert with the nourishment.
- Planning
 - Resilience plans should be incorporated into Local Comprehensive Beach Management Plans (LCBMPs). These plans could serve for both short- and long-term beach needs.
 - Keep in mind that planning for local governments with their own LCBMPs looks very different from planning for HOAs and other entities that locally manage beaches. Connecting municipal and county Comprehensive planning with LCBMPs would be great but may be difficult geographic areas where there is less coordination, capacity, or resources. The SC Office of Resilience may also be able to play a role in some of this as barrier island communities are not only needing to manage the beach, but also the marsh and flooding concerns.
- Funding should only be available to communities with a LCBMP that includes sea turtle and shorebird monitoring/management approved by SCDNR and USFWS.