



Second Round of Public Input Meetings

Five meetings were held during the period of March 3 through March 12, 2009 to outline the ongoing development of the North Carolina Beach and Inlet Management Plan (BIMP). These provided opportunities for members of the public and communities to be informed of the progress to date and to provide valuable input and comments.

While the initial set of meeting in December focused on the overall plan, data collection, and the development of management regions, the second set of meetings focused on strategies, costs, valuation, funding approaches, and preliminary draft plan recommendations. The meetings consisted of two main parts. The first part was a presentation on the current status of the BIMP and the second involved interactive breakout sessions or open discussion where maps and flip charts were available to document comments, questions, and concerns during the session. The presentations are available for viewing on the project website www.ncbimp.net. The comments from the meeting break out sessions are summarized in this document. Additional opportunities for comment are the questionnaires provided at the meetings and email feedback at DENR.NCBIMP@lists.ncmail.net . Public input and participation in the process is greatly appreciated.

Summary of Public Comments at Each Meeting

Region 1 Meeting – Held March 3, 2009 from 6-8:00 pm at Brunswick Electric Membership Corporation, Supply NC

Discussion in the break-out sessions ranged from sand sources to funding strategies. The following list summarizes the comments made:

General

- A seawall protects Fort Caswell

Sand Sources

- Frying Pan and Jay Bird Shoals represent a large possible source of sand (close proximity to Bald Head Island)
- Holden Beach has used and is currently truck hauling sand to nourish the beach at costs of \$8-\$9 per cubic yard.
- Wilmington Harbor Project put 1.3 Mcy of sand onto the beach in 2008.
- For the management plan there needs to be clarification of quality of beach compatible sand.
- Wilmington Harbor reaches have some areas of sand that are too fine for beach nourishment

Economics

- The commercial fishing landings near Lockwoods Folly Inlet appears quite low. There are several commercial docks along the Intracoastal Waterway between Holden Beach and Lockwoods Folly Inlet and also fish docks in Varnamtown. (perhaps Shallotte is too high and is capturing some that are associated with Lockwoods Folly)
- Should include things that have value but are not quantified. (e.g. Shallotte and Lockwoods Folly Inlets both need to be open for water quality circulation)
- Inlets will not close but may shoal and current uses are not possible if not maintained.
- Bald Head Island has some economic data to provide.

Environment

- Region 1 maybe too large for programmatic EIS (do it by federal project or over distance from inlet to inlet)
- Beach nourishment has not only environmental impacts but also value/benefits (e.g. Holden Beach nourishment increased saebeach amaranth population and growth. Can also benefit birds and turtles with improved nesting areas.)

Strategies/Priorities

- New system of prioritization should be developed.
- Corps priority system for inlet maintenance is out of date.
- Need for regional dredging plan for AIWW, side channels, and river channels
- Buyout analysis should clearly list assumptions, realistic possibility of scenario, sensitivity analysis.
- Vulnerability should use 2004 erosion rates not the older ones.
- Proposed inlet hazard areas are not realistic – too large to be considered accurate and people do not buy into the proposed delineation.

Funding Approaches

- Current funding is very variable.
- Need for dedicated funding for Beach and Inlet projects.
- Possible funding sources / current taxes
 - Sales tax – 0.25% statewide, 0.5% in coastal counties
 - Prepared food and beverage tax – 1%
 - Room occupancy tax – 2%
 - No transfer tax.

Regions 2a and 2b Meeting – Held March 4, 2008 from 5-7:00 pm at New Hanover County Northeast Regional Library, Wilmington NC

The attendees gathered around several tables with maps and flip charts discussing topics presented ranging from BIMP strategies to vulnerability and funding. The following list groups and summarizes the comments made:

Sand Sources

- Sediment budgets should be developed – coarse estimates statewide as a first step.
- Dredging for port expansion project at Southport may be a sand source in the future.
- Sand sources should consider broad range of possibilities – islands, shoals, sounds, and land based, etc.
- Recycled glass? (Florida study)

Economics/Environment

- Value of ecosystem function of inlets should be accounted for.

Strategies/Priorities

- In the past 300,000 cy has been considered a large scale project which potentially results in property take issues by fixing the vegetation line so the 1 Mcy assumed project size in developing cost estimates might be an issue (new static vegetation rules and long term projects may address this issue).
- Include as a factor for prioritization - how the local government is managing and protecting the beach and educating citizens (e.g. sea oats and dune protection)
- Regional management to eliminate piecemeal measures is a good idea.
- Tax incentives for relocation from vulnerable properties.

Vulnerability

- Future work should examine improvements to vulnerability assessment combining long-term and short-term erosion rates and storm impacts.

Funding

- Equitable and statewide.
- Trust fund – not political (e.g. let DENR decide funding)
- Needs to be a source for renourishment after storms, especially “no name storms”
- FEMA money potential should be outlined.

Regions 2c and 3a Meeting – Held March 5, 2009 from 6-8:00 pm at North Carolina Aquarium, Pine Knoll Shores, NC

Discussion occurred throughout the presentation and in a single open discussion at the conclusion of the presentation given the smaller animated group in attendance at this meeting. The following list summarizes the comments made:

Strategies/Priorities

- Since 1984 there have been 3 large nourishment events – data should make this clear by breaking down project sizes (e.g. show which ones are less than 100,000 cy)
- Should provide scale of dredging and beach projects – some are large, some are small

- Should highlight which stretches of shoreline have received most of the placed sand against total number of miles of shoreline that have been actively nourished.
- Some sand was placed on Core Banks once.
- How is the deep draft dredging accounted for – keep this data separate.
- Some sensitivity analysis should be conducted with respect to sealevel rise.
- How much of ODMDS could be used for beach placement? Important source.

Economics/Environment

- Beach recreation values seem too high – are dissimilar from NC Tourism data.
- Cultural/Heritage value needs to be accounted for in economics (e.g. lighthouses, national seashore)
- The Cape Lookout National Seashore has some trip numbers to add to economic valuation data (Region 3a)
- Natural resource values

Vulnerability

- Should have inlet hazard areas (IHA) delineated in undeveloped areas also (why not define IHA at lighthouse)
- Static vegetation line from 2004 should not be used – what is on the ground should be

Funding

- Sales tax from beach rentals is a good possibility.

Regions 3b and 4 Meeting – Held March 9, 2009 from 6-8:00 pm at North Carolina Aquarium, Manteo NC

Discussion in the break-out sessions ranged from vulnerability to funding. The following list summarizes the comments made:

Strategies/Priorities

- There are potential issues using Oregon inlet dredge sand.
- Question of sand ownership – e.g. Does Oregon inlet sand belong to park service?
- Florida’s system for prioritization is a good example.
- Relocation vs. buyout are two different approaches.
- Moving a house has a large potential cost of power line moving, which needs to be accounted for.
- More tools in the toolbox (consider new options)
- A main comment made last meeting was that BIMP was considering strategies “only within State policy” which seems to only leave sand placement or relocation as main options – why not suggest changes to State policy
- Relocation should consider longer stretches of shoreline
- Soundside should also be considered in future updates to the plan.
- Better sand exists offshore of Nags Head than in inlet.

Economics/Environment

- Clarify economic split of Hatteras Village and Buxton/Frisco
- Positive tax value to properties behind nourishment (gain value)
- Environmental concerns – are they all valid?
- The level of sea level rise discussed has just not been seen in my lifetime – is it actually measured?

Vulnerability

- 2004 shoreline does not reflect recent storms/ vulnerability of shorelines in Region 4 (see county aerials – 2007 GIS data) – structures are closer to shoreline than indicated based on 2004 data
- Some houses in the region are currently endangered so their values are greatly reduced (no longer \$1M homes)

Funding

- If buyout of houses is to be considered, need to give fair value – FEMA, Insurance, homeowner, county and state all have interests – potential for a common pooled resolution with all interests contributing
- Beach and inlet fund like the clean water management fund
- Fund should be used to help with buyouts/relocation
- Can FEMA relook at how to help with buyouts?
- Beach access is important
- Funding – local taxes, sales taxes – more
- Earmark funds - should not go to general fund because of potential lost control
- Don't underestimate coastal counties contribution to state revenues, especially compared per capita
- Education of economic value should be made to entire State

All Regions – Held March 12, 2009 from 6-8:00 pm at NCSU McKimmon Center, Raleigh NC

Open group discussion occurred at the conclusion of the presentation involving all attendees. Discussion focused mainly on funding questions. The following list summarizes the comments made:

Funding

- FEMA storm repair funding of engineered beaches
- If fund is based on beach rental sales tax it will fluctuate with the economy – need a diversified portfolio approach
- What does DWR Water Resources Development Grant Program currently rely on to fund projects? (capital funds from previous year surplus, averages \$15M of which typically \$5M is for beach projects)
- Why are southern beaches federal projects? – what about other regions?
- Make sure federal government stays involved.