

## Constant Contact Survey Results

<b>Survey Name:</b> Beach Survey	
<b>Response Status:</b> Partial & Completed	
<b>Filter:</b> None	
Oct 12, 2011 3:22:27 PM	
<b>1. Are you aware of the beach erosion problems on Harbor Island? - Comments</b>	<b>Answer</b>
	we live on a barrier island -erosion is a fact of life
	Have observed it as I walk the beach.
	I understand that barrier islands like ours move with some parts gaining and some losing each year.
	I was amazed at how much beach was eaten away by Irene when I saw it this past weekend.
	Have not visited in a year.
	at one end of the beach
	Homes should not have been built where such erosion is occurring. I believe I read an explanation of the beach issues on Hunting and Harbor island in an informative exhibit at Hunting Island. . .scientists explain why erosion occurs in some locations and why sand has been building up on other locations. It should come as no surprise to property owners on Harbor Island.
	The North end is building.
	Comes and goes as barrier islands always do
	We are aware that the tides seemed to have changed the beach on both ends of the island.
	I have been since I bought property 10 years ago.
	Yes but not fully understood the dynamics over a 10 year period. Seems we have lost some years and gained others but do not know the long term loss or gain.
	I would like more info on this subject.
	natures way
	When you build right on the beach at nearly 0 elevation what do you expect? Don't expect everybody else to bail you out of a mess that you created.
	Anyone who walks the beach can see it. Many visitors as well as prospective buyers ask if there is beach at high tide?
	I think the north side of the island is losing sand and the south side is gaining sand
	That's why we didn't buy ocean front.... <input type="checkbox"/>
	we figured we'd be ocean front in a few decades!

	do not know what to say
	However, in the 12 or 13 years I have a house there, there have been several erosion and accretion cycles
	Are you? You dont act like you do.
	I am aware that there is some erosion going on mid island.
	Probably a natural cycle.
	And I'm also aware we a building up on the other end of the island.
	house's built too close to the beach
	beach erosion is a natural process so it should be expected.
	Harbor Island is a barrier island and this is common on all beaches over time
	We have lived here on Harbor for the past 11 years and have seen the beach build and erode in various places during that time. Its what barrier islands do.
	There are no surprises where nature is concerned. □ We have chosen to avail ourselves of the info about erosion on Harbor and would have preferred to have the survey poll each member of the household. This would yield a more rich set of data. Including this here because we ran out of characters in the last data field.
	I would be interested in getting more of the specifics, location and extent of the erosion problems
	erosion is a constant natural occurrence on All beaches
	This has obviously been a gradual process over many years.
	We have owned our property since 1982, and we have seen the beach come and go more than once. When we purchased our place, the dune line was just about like it is now. There was only one primary dune in front of us. We don't get too excited about it.
	This is a natural process at almost all beaches and people need to accept the risk when you buy beach front property.
	There is always some kind of erosiion problem going on.....it's a larger problem if it takes place on your property.
	we see that some areas are gaining and others are losing sandy beachfront
	Through owner association mtgs, bulletins and seeing the changes
	only at the far tip where the homes are located, the other side is where we are accreting sand from Hunting and fripp and have more sand than we need. You can build more duplexes and condos at those places.
	The beach changes constantly...every season, every big storm.
	based on our personal experience during our walks on the beach (we visit every 3-4 months)
	I have not seen the specific homes currently threatened by the erosion. I have observed the drastic changes in the topography of the beach.
	I noticed after the last storm looked like we lost about 8-10 inches. Other than that I really have not seen much of a problem Informally - only what we see when we walk the beach.
	We've watched the sand come and go for years. Some sections of the beach have gained multiple new dunes over the past 15 years, other areas have lost and then regained. That's how Nature works on a barrier island.

	Mother Nature taketh and taketh away. There is an assumed risk one takes when buying "beach" property, even more so when buying on the ocean front. Erosion and renourishment is a natural cycle, Disturbing this cycle upsets the balance of nature. The answer in DON'T build right on the beach, but rather far enough back to enjoy the view, without the risk of erosion....but there's always the "storms."
	I call it Mother Nature doing what she does!
	I have seen it at the end of the beach, I did not purchase a lot in that area because of the erosion
	Natural errosion for a barrier island
	THIS EFFECTS ALL BEACH AREAS
	no longer live on H.I
	very much so.
	We are a barrier island. Absent mans tinkering, a constantly changing shoreline goes with the territory. what would it be like if Hunting never engaged in renourishment or jetties or Fripp never built a seawall? No one really knows.
	I have lived or worked on the island since 1982. Erosion is not a new issue. The sand comes and goes as is typical of a barrier island.
<b>2. Do you feel that beach nourishment is a practical way to approach the erosion problem? - Comments</b>	
	<b>Answer</b>
	I think the more practical and sustainable solouction for the future is to have sufficiently large set backs and limit practices that contribute to erosion. Since nourishment only has temporary benefits and can be environmentally harmful, it seems like a bad idea.
	no, doesn't work anywhere else without jetty's, etc built at same time
	ONLY IF CERTAIN ITEMS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE ISLAND ARE CORRECTED. WE NEED AN EXPERT TO TELL US WHY JUST THIS PART OF THE ISLAND IS LOSING SAND AS OTHER PARTS LIKE THE NORTH PART OF THE ISLAND IS GROWING. MAYBE THE SEA WALL THAT HAS BEEN THERE FOREVER??????
	If properly done it can help at a price.
	Although someone with more technical expertise than I may be able to provide documentation, I've never see it work in practice. It just seems like a good way to throw a lot of money at a problem without resolving it.
	It will eventually be eaten away. Nature doesn't stop for anyone or anything.
	I don't know enough about the process.
	I think it would be an expensive, never ending process

	Can not really change Mother Nature. And based on other East Coast beach erosion issues, it's an never-ending issue and too costly to try and change. Especially for a small, private island.□ Public beaches with state funding have trouble dealing with such issues as it is.
	Not sure, made some erosion worse at the State Park
	This is a never ending expense in a fragile economy.
	I am aware of the problem but do not have enough technical information to make an educated judgement.
	I am not fully educated on the term "beach nurishment."
	It will happen again. Its ongoing. We could be doing it for ever. Ecretion and evulsion. Let the owners build some barriers themselves
	Firm believer in letting nature takes it course.
	Possibly, but not 100% sure.
	Let Nature take it's course
	Unsure what that means "beach nourishment"
	The tide will very well wash it away again..Hunting Island is an example...the amount needed would be very costly. From what I have read over the years ... it is only a temporary fix ... \$ wasted.
	NO. IT NEVER WORKS. JUST A WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY. WE WATCHED BEACH NOURISHMENT ON ISLE OF PALMS.
	Should be done only if the nourishment will last a few years and should be engineered to last as long as possible.
	it has been tried. The state renourished Hunting□ and that "renourishment sand" has washed over to the south end of Harbor causing the north end to erode more . . .□ it just doesn't work and has a tremendous cost associated with it - didn't the state spend \$3 million . . . I believe this might be a temporary fix.
	This is a waste of money as it will happen again and again.
	very short term fix
	I don't know what beach nourishment means.
	The barrier islands are always changing. Trying to change naturally changing channels artificially is both expensive and temporary.
	wehat is beach nourishment?
	Bringing in sand by dumptruck from the outside could possibly postpone the eventual outcome.You are not going to stop erosion but you might slow it down some.
	It is what many other islands do to preserve their beach and property.
	No, just look at Hunting Island and how much they have done to try to save the beach. It's a money pit and against the natural process.
	I'm not sure beach nourishment is the way the problem should be approached.
	I am unaware of any other ways to approach this problem.

	depends on what nourishment means and what it costs
	no, not at this time. I don't believe beach nourishment alone will reverse erosion.
	Adding sand would be a waste of money.
	We have been on the island for 15 years and have seen the beach come and go but it has never been anything like Hunting as far as erosion...in fact the beach in many places has grown much larger so as a resident I do not see the need for beach nourishment. There are homes on the inland (east or north) side end where the beach has shrunk. However, that end was eroding when many of those homes were built so I do not see that as a problem for the community at large.
	The research has established that these efforts..while extremely expensive..are often very short lived. You can't <input type="checkbox"/> Fight Mother Nature.
	The owners are not geologists or engineers, so how could they possibly make an informed decision without knowing the past dynamics and having scientific reports available to review. What is the alternative, do nothing which has been the approach of the past few boards, even though the association owns 90 plus acres of common area, some of what has been washed away in this some area. Where is that in this document, letting the owners know that this is common area that washed away first.
	without hearing expert opinion, I do not know
	Nourishment is a very expensive attempt to prevent <input type="checkbox"/> what will occur anyway.
	Beach nourishment is only a temporary solution,
	It hasn't worked at other beaches and it won't work at harbor island.
	Bulkheads are preferred.
	We were told years ago when the state did a study on beach erosion that we would have a problem in some areas.With that said, it is the responsibility of the owner of said property.Not the association.
	It serves a few at a cost to the many. I am not prepared to assume that cost.
	It seems that the south end of our Island now has most of the sand from the "nourishing" of Hunting Island!
	It is a waste of money. This is the natural progression of a barrier island.
	according to the articles provided,it is the only way.How practical-one must consider the environmental impact.
	This will be an ongoing issue and only a temporary fix
	again, beach erosion is a natural process. if you add beach back in one area it will affect another area.
	Beach erosion is nature's normal event. In many <input type="checkbox"/> beach nourishment procedures, the efforts have not <input type="checkbox"/> been effective over the long run. Costly and <input type="checkbox"/> non-effective.
	NOT KNOWLEDGEABLE ENOUGH TO COMMENT
	It usually never works over a period of time
	Mother Nature
	Don't know what "beach nourishment" is

	It is a temporary and expensive solution
	Why not ask Hunting Island about how great the beach re-nourishment plan worked for them?
	Would only be temporary and would harm the ecology of the beach.
	Cost outweighs the benefit
	EXPERIENCE WITH THE SAME PROCESS AT HUNTING ISLAND IS EVIDENCE THAT NOURISHMENT ISN'T THE SOLUTION.
	I don't know enough about it. ( I read the survey comments)
	erosion is a constant natural occurrence on ALL beaches
	This is a potentially huge expense for sand that could be washed away with the first big storm.
	I honestly don't know. I have seen it work in some locations, and I have seen it last practically no time.
	Seawall.
	Mother Nature always wins
	Not sure. Would have to study the likely impact and cost relative to benefits.
	Storms continue to erode the beach, especially as Hunting Island erodes.
	Not sure what this is
	But I don't really know
	There is no guarantee that the nourishment will hold up to daily/monthly/yearly wave and current action.
	This is a state responsibility - residents should not have to be assessed for beach erosion.
	Beach Nourishment Basics article indicates results are short term.
	not necessarily...perhaps farther building setbacks for the protection of future of beachfront properties would help
	appears that this is a very temporary solution and must be repeated.
	The homes knew they were on beach front and could have this happen
	It is a huge waste of financial resources to try to contain nature and it is completely futile. Look at Hunting Island and the millions of dollars thrown into that beach.
	IT WOULD BE TEMPORARY AT BEST.
	Not sure what beach nourishment is....
	At best I feel it is temporary, I must admit I have not conducted any research on the impact or duration of beach nourishment efforts.
	I don't know.
	Not sure
	I am in favor of structural reinforcement through the placement of <input type="checkbox"/> groin structures. I am not in favor of nourishment or importing sand. <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Not with importing sand.
	no idea

	actually my answer would be unsure□ but that wasn't an option
	That treats the symptoms not the problem. It would be a temporary fix that would have to be repeated indefinitely.
	Individual owners have renourished portions of the beach in the past year or so and much of that Nature has already taken away. About a year ago, we attended the presentation by experts on beach erosion and they acknowledged that while previous projects they have done on other beaches helped at the time, within 8-10 years, Nature reclaims most of the added sand.
	It really depends on the individual circumstances
	Nature has a way of removing sand and adding sand through the years.....as witnessed by the change we can all see at the south end of Pelican Point.
	But not at the cost of the Home owners assoc.
	See above
	I don't think it's a problem.
	It has never worked on Hunting Island, has it?
	It depends on where the nourishment sand is coming from, and where it is placed. It also depends on the long term impact of the project including effects to surrounding islands and coastlines.
	tHIS DOES NOT WORK
	Other projects don't seem to have been successful in the long term.
	Irene, which was barely tropical storm force when it gave us a glancing blow, ate away significantly. A significant storm or hurricane can undo any beach renourishment in one fell swoop. We have been lucky so far, but are deluded if we think we are immune to such storms.
	All studies prove that nourishment is a temporary fix to an enduring problem. If you built your beach house within 50 meters of the mean high water line, it's on you, buddy.
	I don't have enough information to comment. Specifically, how much will this cost HIOA? What would my share be? Are there grants available? Will this need to be done every few years?
	Not practical but what options are available.
<b>3. Do you feel that beach nourishment is a sound ecological approach to this problem? -</b> <b>Comments</b>	
	<b>Answer</b>
	See answer above.
	The sand has to come from somewhere. Solving a problem at one end may just exacerbate it elsewhere. It would seem to be only a temporary and partial solution at best.
	The removal of sand will negatively impact the removal site.

	I don't know enough about the process.
	In other beach erosion cases (usually after big storms), states on East Coast incur huge costs to sometime replenish large, public beaches. . because they are used by hundreds of thousands of people, not a small number such as on Harbor island. And such beach replenishment projects often get wiped out in the next storm.
	There may be other options, such as groins installed at the erosion site, that may offer a solution.
	(see comment #2)
	Not sure.
	No, let nature be nature.
	Let Nature take it's course
	Same as above
	This is a natural occurrence and not one that we can prohibit...it will very likely wash away again
	SAME AS ABOVE.
	I am not qualified to answer
	I need more info on what it is, what it costs, are there alternatives
	see above
	I don't know if it is or isn't
	If done correctly
	Most of the people living on harbor island had enough sense not to build right on the beach.We are not responsible for people who made such a poor judgement call.
	It is easiest to move sand from one area into the area needing sand, so all we are talking about is shifting sand that once was there ... back.
	No, it is never ending.
	The ocean is going to make its inroad on the beach and at best beach nourishment just delays the situation at an expensive cost.
	In other areas millions of dollars have been spent for beach renourishment to which nature has won and washed the expensive sand back out to sea within a matter of weeks.
	I would hope so but I am not sure exactly what beach nourishment entails and would like other options investigated.
	Really, again are these people trained in this This survey is so biased it is ridiculous. How can anyone in a leadership position think it is a good idea to let homes wash away and most importantly not hold the SC government responsible for all the actions they have done at Hunting Island and in Johnson Creek. For the association to not fight the revision of the 40 yr setback lines when they know they are not accurate or consistent is a breach of their fiduciary duties.
	same as above
	See the above comment
	not sure would like to see more studies on this before I have a strong opinion about anything
	I don't think that it is effective.

	perhaps on a limited basis, the impacted would be relatively low. Only after determining the extent of the fill, could one answer the question.
	It is the best choice of all poor options
	no because it will have an affect, maybe positive or maybe negative, in another area. the groins at hunting island are a perfect example of this.
	Again, don't know what this means
	It introduces non-native life.
	I am not a scientist or an ecologist, but I do not feel that this is a good idea on any level. What we do to any part of our environment does and will have effects on other parts - unforeseen or not. It has been argued that part of the erosion problem on Harbor is due to the measures that have been tried on Hunting Island - maybe true, maybe not - I just don't know. But if it is true and we proceed with this - what will we be altering for the future besides the beach?
	We have seen a lot of factual information documenting that it would be harmful.
	This is a barrier island. These same areas have eroded for years. Yet, over the last few years, more and more houses have been built on that end of the island.
	I had to answer, but I am not sure.
	all sand is continually dislocated by wave action, wind, tides, and storms. Harbor Island's sand will continue to wash away, no matter how much re-nourishment takes place.
	I have no idea.
	I need to see results of local beach projects: cost, how long solution lasted, etc.
	Don't know what this means
	But really don't know.
	It might make sense to scrape some of the sandbars that build up around Harbor but who is going to pay for this?
	need more information
	I again don't know enough to be sure but would support something being done.
	Not sure given lack of understanding of overall process
	you can not mess with Mother Nature
	see above
	I would need to complete some research to answer this fairly.
	I don't know.
	Not sure
	no idea
	again real answer - unsure
	Too disruptive to sea life.
	Avoid it if possible

	I lived on a barrier beach island in the northeast and now what beach erosion is. I live on Plum Island and have witnessed nature change that beach from year to year. I do not feel beach nourishment is a practical or cost effective approach to what mother nature has in store for our beach in the long term.
	Yes, but not at the cost of the Home Owners Assoc.
	See above
	I don't see this as a problem.
	Again, it just depends on the details of the nourishment project and if the benefits outweigh any negative impacts or outrageous costs incurred with the project.
	I don't know enough about the science involved.
	Scientists disagree. There are too many possible unknown consequences and way too few guarantees.
	No evidence exists that this fixes the problem. Recommend all you folks read, "A Beach For All Seasons" which defines the problem and approaches to work with nature. Nourishment is not the answer.
	Not sure.
	undecided
<b>4. Is there a permanent solution to the problem? - Comments</b>	
	<b>Answer</b>
	See answer above.
	unless you build groins, sea walls, etc no permanent solution and OCRM will not allow that
	Not absolutely sure. Obviously groins, etc. would be an option, but I'm sure an expensive one. I was just at Edisto Beach and their's seem to have worked.
	Barrier islands "roll over" ever so many years. It is not natural to "renourish" a beach - often leading damage to occur somewhere else. Have laws that prevent building so close to the dunes and the water!!!! And ENFORCE them.
	As ocean levels rise in response to global Warming, the problem can only get worse.
	I don't know enough about the process.
	See above comment.
	Nature will take its toll
	There is not enough money to throw on this environmental evolution.
	There may be other actions that have been taken on neighboring islands that may have contributed to the issue at Harbor.
	I do not believe that there is any "permanent" solution to a naturally-occurring phenomena.
	Build a sea wall and spoil the beach. Everyone knows that we run the risk of losing beach when buying on a barrier island but people think it will never happen to them
	Probably not.
	We can't predict what nature brings us. we are only here for a while. she is here forever.

	Unsure, it is Mother Nature
	It is a risk involved with beach front property. Also, everything changed when the sand from Hunting Island came our way...there is concern that now with the change their project caused in the tides and the flow of the river, it cannot be corrected. It just does not seem that this current tide flow can be redirected..should we try to change the natural way?
	Let nature work ... this is an island and the beaches move around over time ... look at previous maps, pictures, etc.
	NATURE IS GOING TO ERODE AND ECREDE THE SHORELINE WITHOUT REGARD TO NOURISHMENT.
	Probably not unless there are causes we can control or causes are a result of other's actions.
	the sea barrier islands are constantly changing . . . when I purchased my CRV in 1982, my hope was that the island would not wash away in my life time. At that time high tide lapped□ at the foundation of the "D" building. The Pelican Point duplexes built those "burms" with hopes of keeping the high tides from their homes.□ The first SC drawn "demarcation line"□ was behind the Pelican Point homes, down the middle of the street behind them; so if they □ washed away they could not rebuild them.
	I don't know this answer. I believe the true answer is no. Erosion is an on going problem, and might only be slowed. Do jetties placed at strategical points work?
	The ocean will do what it wants. We just have to live with that fact.
	This question should be answered by experts.
	I really don't think that we can regulate nature.
	Let nature take its course
	Mother Nature
	I don't know. Some ongoing problems seems likely.
	Only if you can stop global warming.
	It depends how you define permanent. There should be a plan for 10-20 years on how to address the problem.
	Building on a barrier island is always a risk. Islands accrete and erode as a natual process and no amount of money spent on engineering will alter that process. (Look at Hunting, Tybee, Jekyll, and other barrier islands.)
	There is not really a permanent solution, at best we can only delay the final outcome.
	Nothing is permanent, but nourishing our beach may forestall what may or may not be inevitable, i.e., complete destruction of our beach and subsequent destruction of the entire remaining island.
	Again, I would hope so but if not we would have to keep working on it
	I do not know
	not really, other factors would have to change
	Whose ridiculous question was this? Obviously the movement of barrier islands, through man made changes to inlets, shoals and wave action, along with the intense impact of hurricanes contribute to the changes in the natural environment.

	same
	See the first comment
	Nature will win. Look at Hunting Island as an example.
	Beach nourishment
	Individuals affected by beach erosion assume cost of replenishment or let homes fall into the sea as done on Hunting Island.
	We can't control shifting sands, tides, storms....
	Relocate Bruce Hoffman
	it does not appear that there is. Women go to the hairdresser to get a permanent wave-need I say more.
	Build a seawall and sacrifice the ability to access that beach area at high tide
	no, beach erosion & build back is a natural process.
	Let nature take it's course.
	Let time and natural shifting of the sands coming on shore at both ends of the Island spread sand as nature will.
	Mother Nature
	Don't know
	It is a barrier island.
	Barrier islands are transient in nature - the idea of anything permanent in terms of sand staying in one place is folly. ONLY NATURE WILL HAVE ITS COURSE.
	Mother Nature has been at work for thousands of years. All sea islands are suseptible to beach erosions. Beach property owners in lot's of places have spent MANY thousands and thousands of dollars to no avail permanently. The more "artificail" means are applied the worse the erosion becomes in most instances. Putting thousands of dollars into trying to circumvent Mother Nature is like trying to stop a moving freight train by jumping in front of it.
	there is no solution as evidenced by the State of South Carolina's monumental and woeful attempts to halt Hunting Island's continual erosion.
	We all have homes on these barrier islands. The islands will always change shape due to the forces of nature.
	Coastal change has always occurred and will continue.
	Probably not.
	That is the problem - the only way to achieve a permanent solution is to NOT build on the beach.
	Seawall.
	Changes in the beach are natural, just check out old Harbor Island & Hunting Beach photos
	Beach erosion is a problem that repeats as severe storms batter our beach. Beach nourishment is a matter of throwing good money after bad.
	No,, the beach naturally erodes
	No comment
	don't think so
	I don't know enough to answer this question

	it appears there is but it effects the look and usability of the main beach where erosion is
	Nature has to take its course. Beach renourishment programs as close a Charleston have falied, according to press reports as recently as last week
	see above
	not sure
	Barrier Islands move, this is the natural way of things on the planet. Therefore, any solution implemented, would not be permanent.
	Not sure
	Permanent is a strong word. We are not educated enough to recommend a "permanent" solution. Is there one? The majority of the solutions we have seen are very costly and seem to have a life span. Additionally, a solution for one problem area seems to create another erosion problem area.
	i dont know
	Allow nature to take its course.
	Erect barriers to mitigate the erosion.
	This is a 20 year cycle.
	Leave the beach to the natural world. We can not control the ocean. This is not a problem!
	Never a permanant solution due to the nature of erosion and the continual wind, currents and tides of the ocean.
	Unknown
	unless we use the fripp approach which will destroy whatever natural beach we have
	Not really.□ Building houses on barrier islands should not have been allowed by the state. Now that it's too late to prevent interference of the natural "roll over" of barrier islands, all we can do is sit and watch and hope for the best.
	Nothing is permanent! but it would help delay the erosion.
	Let nature take its course. Just because a neighboring island, state, or community has opted for beach renourishment does not prove viability. Indeed, the history of Hunting Island makes a case against viability.
	Anything we do will NOT be permanent. Re- nourishment will need to be done over and over every few years and will get worse if global warming is true.
<b>5. The erosion affects several beachfront properties. Do you feel that this negatively impacts everyone's property values? -</b> <b>Comments</b>	<b>Answer</b>
	But that is the risk of owning beach property. the consturction and cost invovled in renoursihment also harm everyone's property values.

	<p>I only checked "no" because I had to enter a response. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>To this point I am not certain. Can someone show evidence of this, pre and post nourishment, in other communities?</p>
	<p>To a point, but there is a point of diminishing return -- there needs to be a long term view on the success rate versus the expenditure.</p>
	<p>The East Coast has been eroding for decades. Personally, I think they should not have been allowed to build so close to the water. Requiring everybody on the island to pay so a few properties are saved will negatively impact my property value because new owners won't want the financial responsibility.</p>
	<p>As a Cedar Reef condo owner, it's pretty obvious the beach has grown in depth. Perhaps with the installation of some rip-rap groins at the affected property sites, some of the accretion may shift to their benefit.</p>
	<p>That is the danger of buying beachfront on a barrier island. We all enjoy the beach so if we can't of course property values are affected</p>
	<p>We are on the oceanfront and do not feel like it impacts our property value. If our house was sitting in the ocean we would feel differently, but that is the risk we took when we bought our property.</p>
	<p>I think it impacts their value but that is the consequences of buying on the beach.</p>
	<p>It depends on the extent of the problem. Both ends of the island have dramatically changed.</p>
	<p>I see no impact on my property value.</p>
	<p>The entire beach should be maintained, otherwise it could become too narrow to walk from one end to another.</p>
	<p>it is part of the beach environment. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Some built their home with the tide lapping at the <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>foundation at they built them. It is like building by an airport and complaining about the planes . . . the ocean was there first and it changes the island twice a day as the tides come in and go out . . . it is a positive and a negative thing. It is why we want to be on the island . . . but acceptance of the ever changing character of it needs to be condered before purchasing, not after.</p>
	<p>I'm sure that erosion on North Harbor will impact values on Pelican Point.</p>
	<p>It is unfortunate but, we have no control of nature. People understand the beach comes and goes and it is a risk when you build directly on the beach.</p>
	<p>People purchase property on a beach in South Carolina can expect two things beach erosion and storms</p>
	<p>Every few years you would have to renourish the beach because a very small number of people made a very expensive mistake.It was obvious this could happen and it did.Don't expect the rest of us to bail you out.We,re sorry but it was not our mistake.</p>
	<p>It absolutely impacts all property values. It will be hard to sell homes if the beachfront properties get taken out by erosion...</p>
	<p>We all use the beach. We are a beachfront community and that is why Harbor Island was developed and why people buy here. Try selling a beachfront property with out a beach. Buyers see erosion in one spot and they become skeptical of the whole coast .</p>

	In fact, it might even make non-beachfront look even better.
	Everyone has the choice to purchase the property of their choice. My husband and I chose to buy a property not on the beach front knowing what the risks were. In turn, the people who have chosen to purchase this property have chosen to take the risk of beach erosion and in turn pay much more home insurance than I do. I strongly disagree with me having to "bailout" others who made their own choices nor would I expect others to pay for my gambling.
	Again the erosion affects acres of common area land that association owns that is now under water. I see you neglected to note that! How could it not? When an oceanfront home that sold for almost \$1 mil goes now for just over \$500K and an oceanfront lot goes for \$250K are you joking? Anyone that answers this questions other than in the affirmative is a complete idiot.
	While there is erosion...there is also accretion. We are aware <input type="checkbox"/> as property owner's that the ocean may reclaim our house or property at any time. We buy insurance to cover that. We do <input type="checkbox"/> not expect others to pay for our beach home ever.
	Not equally, at least. However, I am not sure. Isn't this a research issue, and not a "feeling" issue? How have property values been negatively impacted by erosion? How are other similar properties impacted by erosion? Serious proposals will obviously have to do do some research.
	This part of nature.Go to Hunting Island or Fripp we know this will happen.
	No more than any other natural changes that occur on any barrier island. I feel that the marsh developing on the south end of the island is affecting my property's value.
	There is plenty of beach for everyone to enjoy.
	they knew the risks when they built on the beach.
	to varing degrees.consider having no beach at all, it would definitely effect values.Many are there for and because of the beach.
	But not in a material way at this point
	when you build on the beach front beach erosion has to be something to be always in the back of your mind and a consideration when you build!
	While unfortunate, the Island is ever-changing and this too may change in the future.
	However, Buyers at Harbor Island knew investment risk when they purchased properties in proximity to the ocean. OCRM has been a viable source of information for all before a purchase.
	During the days of a strong economy, there was still erosion on the island and that did not stop growth. What has impacted property values is the economy- not the erosion. Having grown up in this area, erosion is a fact of life and we can not pour money into temporary solutions trying to defeat mother nature.
	This is a maybe. We bought 20 or so years ago and there was erosion then, but we ignored it.
	Harbor's is an active beach - new beach is being added to both the North end and the South end - the fact that it is eroding in places mid-island is and unfortunate fact of nature. There will - for the foreseeable future - always be a beach here, but there might not always be the same beach front homes that are here now.

	There are many other issues affecting property values. Harbor Island looks shabby in general not just beach front houses.
	I believe that it will affect the homes with eroded beach greatly - less to the remainder.
	Anyone who owns or even thinks of owning beach front property KNOWS going in that it is a very high risk property venture. If there are people who are not aware of that fact then they either do not read, watch T.T. or they are choosing to stick their heads in the sand.
	I'm afraid so. We would be willing to go along with whatever is decided.
	I view it as a localized issue.
	I hate to see this happen to those houses built on the beach. The owners chose to build in a high risk area. I think they need to talk with the appropriate governmental agencies managing all of the state's beaches about their options. Implementing an option should be at the choice and expense of the home owners.
	No comment
	not necessarily
	I am concerned with respect to the perception. How far will it erode, all the way to Harbor Dr, then what? <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	I don't think letting homes fall into the ocean with no action from the HIOA will attract future owners to the island. <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	If something negative happens to those homes real estate value will fall further.
	Depends on how bad the erosion is and what it does over time
	that is the risk you take, hence why we pay insurance when we may have a hurricane
	In fact many of the houses in the worst shape were built when that end of the island was washing away, and they should not have been built.
	It is probably the reverse. Other properties would relatively increase in value.
	Unfortunately, it affects those particular properties that are exposed at the present time but that is the risk on takes for purchasing beach front property.
	If ground accumulates, owners gain property. If reliction occurs, they loose property. Typical for all coastal properties.
	It only affects the values of those who are threatened by the erosion. We have much more usable recreational shoreline on the south end of the island than we have ever had. Most of the erosion that is endangering a few beach front homes may likely have been caused by the installation of a seawall. <input type="checkbox"/>
	Once we establish the precedent that all hioa members may be accessed for renourishment all values will fall because buyers will have to live with the uncertainty of future accessments.
	There should be a third choice: "Possibly". But erosion is part of the risk we take living in a vulnerable location. Erosion almost certainly has some negative impact (short term/long term, no one can predict with certainty when the beach may begin accreting again), but the flip side is that for an island that prides itself on being "natural" the consequences of beach renourishment--a decidedly UNnatural process---should also be considered. And for reasons other than financial.

	All properties on Harbor Island have exceptional value because of the beautiful beaches that are so accessible to all property owners, not just the beachfront ones.
	All beach communities are struggling with this problem. Incurring expenses for a large re- nourishment project WILL DEFINITELY impact property values. This expense will be need to be incurred every few years. I am NOT willing to pay for this every few years. Additionally, some of these homes are not well cared for and are in need of rehab. This also negatively impacts our property values.
<b>6. Given the transient nature of barrier islands, what do you think we should do? - Comments</b>	
	<b>Answer</b>
	Monitoring can help determine what development practices need to be modified and can provide notice of future erosion and loss.
	I'm saying minor, but we need to do what ever is necessary to save our island property and it's value.
	I do not have enough information to reach a decision on this question. I would have to see priced proposals as a minimum.
	I have no idea how much a minor nourishment costs.
	Unfortunately, we can't beat nature, only delay what ultimately will happen. That is what Hunting Island has done with its cabins.
	I think that the reason Harbor Island is much more special than interior sea islands is the beach. Everyone is affected and in our short and long term interest to have a vital beach.
	See above...
	I understand that the board has not allowed the homeowners in question to try and take care of the problems themselves. Why not. It could be done with Board supervision.
	We cannot answer this question without more specific and detailed information from "experts" on each of these choices....what is a "minor nourishment project" ...our concern is that with tremendous impact to us following the Hunting Island Project it would be impossible to fix back.
	Use the best engineering advice to provide the best results.
	inform buyers that this is a transient barrier island . . . in case they are not aware of it
	I need more facts to understand the problem and what the solutions include? E.G.: --Who will pay for a nourishment project? <input type="checkbox"/> --If the home owners pay, how much will a major or minor cost? <input type="checkbox"/> --What is a major as opposed to a minor?
	I need more info. I might be in favor of nourishment, but dont know what this entails.

	The owners built knowing their homes were right on the beach before they started construction.They should be allowed to pay for their own sand-possibly brought in from the outside.The ocean will eventually win but it could be delayed.
	I think we should get an expert to devise a plan over the next 10 years on what we should do and then implement it.
	I believe the first step would have to be a study which we can certainly afford.
	Sacrificing the houses is less costly than trying to save them.
	I think the more you do, the potentially greater return you are likely to see.
	We all pay a high premium for our home insurance. That is because the chance of natural disasters is so much greater where we have them. No one wants to lose their home, but if a natural force takes it, our insurance will help us rebuild or rebuild in a safer area.
	You again failed to list the fact that oceanfront homes could pay for a much larger portion to regain their land and then the rest split up by the entire association. Also "given the transient nature of barrier islands" Harbor has been accreting for the last 100 years, but seriously eroding since the groins project that you did nothing about, you fail to mention that. You also fail to mention what the options are or the cost or that the State has possibly had anything to do with it.
	Given the economy do we really think anyone has money for <input type="checkbox"/> projects of any kind?
	I have owned property on Harbor Island for 17 years and have seen many changes. Sometimes they reverse themselves, sometimes not. We all knew that when we decided to purchase a lot or dwelling on an ever changing island. As I watched some of the houses being built I wondered how they were able to get a building permit, construction loan and insurance.
	Absolutely nothing.
	a definition of major or minor at this point is required, and what impact each would have.Cost and options available should be considered.
	if you nourish a beach in one area it can/will have an affect to another area at some point. Hunting Island is a prime example of this.
	Yea!
	Since my property is not threatened by erosion, it is hard to say to those whose property is being attacked that we should do nothing. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient funds to embark on a program that would last long enough to be worth the money.
	Nature will take her course, whether we like it or not.
	We all knew this is a barrier island when we bought here. Many of the properties are far too close to the ocean. The new set-back lines are a positive thing.
	WE COULD SPEND THOUSANDS AND THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS AND I CAN ASSURE YOU - MOTHER NATURE WILL, I REPEAT, WILL MOST DEFINITELY STILL TAKE WHATEVER COURSE SHE DECIDES TO TAKE!!!!!!!

	Get some advice from the experts!
	transient is the word, no amount of money or re-nourishment will stop erosion.
	We all have homes on these barrier islands. The islands will always change shape due to the forces of nature.
	Let nature take her course, because nature is going to win in the long run anyway. If you start messing with it, it will be a continual process and you will be impacting somebody else's beach property. This is why building on the beach is high risk.
	Monitor and build seawall at owners expense,
	And, work with federal, state agencies to see how flexible they would be to minor fixes, such as permitting impacted homeowners to alter their access (change the direction of stairs) without having to engage in a massive project. Project fees will negatively impact housing values, particularly in the short run. Residents don't need higher fees now.
	Whoever purchased beach front needs to pay for this
	No comment
	Grants should be written asking the state for help. If it is denied then only the property owners affected by the erosion are responsible.
	its the risk we all take
	WE can spend \$100 or \$1million dollars - it will not stop the erosion it will only make a few feel better about thier lots. It is a barrier island - barrier island s move! Look at Hunting all that money spent and the errosion is still taking cabins and trees. You can't stop mother nature
	I hate homeowners are in jeopardy of losing their homes, but I would hate for the beach on Harbor Island to look like Hunting with the jetties added.
	What is the long term prognosis with erosion for Harbor Island? Is there imminent danger to the island? We are not up to date on the problem to make a recommendation.
	Evaluate creating various types of barriers.
	Also, try use of sand fences to trap and hold sand.
	Let the home owners effected determine the extent of the project at their cost.
	I am not knowledgeable as to the best options for our given situation; I do not, therefore, feel qualified to offer a strong opinion.
	Each takes their own risk.
	It is easy for us to sit back and monitor the course because our property is not beachfront nor affected by the current erosion issue. I would like to know how the homeowners who are dirctly affected view the solution.
	I fear that a partial nourishment project may alter the natural flow of sand to other beach front lots making the problem worse. oftentimes mans well intentioned solutions do more harm than good
	NOTHING with a capital N.
	We will only enhance and speed the problem if we do anything. This is a SC problem. Nourishment on Fripp Island is hurting Harbor.
	The nature of barrier islands is the accumulation of sand and erosion of beach areas.

<p>7. Estimates have run from \$570,000 to \$5million or more depending on the scope of the project. As a property owner how much would you be willing to pay per lot to finance a project? -</p> <p>Comments</p>	
	<b>Answer</b>
	I would be viorously opposed to pay for any portion of a temporary and potentially environmentally harmful nousihment project.
	Those who built on that section of the beach knew the risk they were taking when building there.
	If we could spread it over a period of time, and if our regine fees do not increase during that period of time. The bottom line is that we are all feeling the effects of this economy.
	Even a thousand dollars is a lot of money for what is only a temporary solution.
	No more that \$1000 -- actually, \$500 is a better number, but someone needs to be actually reviewing the success rate of the proposed plan on other beaches.
	I was wise enough to buy property that was removed from the beach.
	already can not afford the \$3550 annual property insurance on our tiny condo--a cost that skyrocketed after 2005's Katrinia, and probably will spike again in aftermath of Irene, etc in 2011.
	Many properties that rent pay a state accomodations tax. Have we thought about getting funding from SC Dept of Tourism, which oversees these funds, to help with the funding.
	When we built 10 years ago, we were advised not to buy or build in the erosion zone
	Assessments have to be stated on sales contracts. Considering how many properties are for sale on Harbor, no one would receive a contract with thousands of unknown dollar fees on the horizon. □ It would cripple any possible sales.
	Federal and State funds could be requested.
	We would be willing to contribute something. I don't know how much but the burden for most of it should fall on the beach front owners. Maybe graduated assessments. More for those who live closer to the bech
	No more than \$ 250-\$ 500 per lot should be assessed.
	Strongly believe that Harbor Island should leave the beaches alone .... we have a lot of projects that need to be done that Mother Nature won't affect.
	We just do not believe that the majority of property owners can or will be willing to pay for this.
	Maybe more if spread over a period of time like bridges. Maybe ask permission of all owners for a annual surcharge to build a permanent fund.

	see above
	Under further evaluation and plan the amount would change.
	I cannot answer this question but was required to answer....I need more information. I would be willing to help if we have some reason to know that the project will be successful. I'm not sure how I would define successful....but more than five years relief would be necessary...
	I chose to purchase my home in a safer area. purely my choice.
	Why should I be willing to pay from \$5000 upward in order to protect or increase the property values of a few property owners along a segment of N. Harbor Dr. They purchased the property knowing full well the hazards of owning such property.
	I would be willing to pay at least \$1000 or more/property if there is data of effectiveness. However, I do think those with properties on the beach should pay proportionately a little more, since their properties are worth more and they benefit more from success or are hurt more by continued erosion. Of course over time many properties further back could be affectd.
	Don,t ask us to spend this kind of money because a few people gambled and lost!
	The beach is every bit as important to us as the bridges for which there was a special assessment .
	Beachfront owners assume the risk. Let them work it out with their insurance companies.
	We are having hard time, and I do not think we can pay more than \$500.00 only.
	unless convinced it would be a permanent solution to beach erosion. I'm not there yet.
	See next answer. Depends on total cost, number of lots, number of first row ocean lots.
	Kana said %250,000 starting....where is that? Likewise Tim Mason said \$250,000. You are lying about the estimates that have been made. Why don't you just say we really don't want to do anything, but are going to send out a survey to try to cover our asses so we won't get sued individually and collectively for doing nothing to protect property values.
	I can see property sales plummeting if someone ready to purchase finds out they are having to pay for an island nourishment project demanded by someone whose property sits unfortunately close to the shore.
	The errosion only affects a very few properties on the beach. It was obvious in most cases when the houses were built that they were subject to errosion. I have been an owner for over 20 years and could see this before most of the properties were there. If they owners want to protect their investments - they should move the houses back, as others have done.
	We have a one-bedroom condo and have little invested. Condo owners pay for the heavy equipment that negatively impact infrastructure (e.g., bridges with weight limits) and that are primarily employed to build and maintain larger properties.
	There has to be a commitment that states if done for one lot then needs to be done for all lots in the future as needed.
	This is a shovel job for obama.Call him !!!!
	I will never pay anything for beach renourishment!
	Cosider the benifit-csider the cost. No one wants to spend more than what is necessary.

	Based on current state it does not warrant an assessment
	I believe it is the property owners responsibility to handle any beach nourishment that may be needed. the property owner so chose to build on the beachfront and needs to deal with the issues it can present.
	With Owner fees much higher, taxes higher and upkeep and utilities higher, it would hurt to add still more fees.
	If this was a project that was undertaken once and the problem was permanently fixed, that would be one thing. But my understanding is that this is a continuing process and if we spend \$5 million□ today, we will almost certainly have to do it again in 5 years or less.
	If people want to spend their money on their own property, then let them do so if it is approved by the proper authorities. However, I WILL NOT SPEND ONE THIN DIME OF MY MONEY ON ANY SUCH PROJECT.
	I can't answer that with a range that wide.I would pay my share.
	as retirees we have an extremely limited income. any assessed beach re-nourishment monies would force us out of our home
	Bridge repair, the pool benefit the entire community. I would support a one time fee to pay for the research necessary to make an informed decision. I am opposed to locking in permanently higher fees. It will devastate the property values on the island.
	really unsure
	No comment
	I do not own a beach front property.
	Don't think the benefits are worth the cost
	We think this issue would need to be voted on by a majority of the homeowners before any decision is made.
	nothing at this point
	see above
	We would not commit to any per lot price at this time since there isn't a specific plan/proposal before the residents for consideration. Our feeling is that any renourishment project would be on going. There isn't a permanent solution, and whatever money we might spend now would only be a temporary fix. We've all seen what happened on Hunting Island when the berms/jetties were built increasing erosion in other parts of the island and appearing to adversely effect Harbor.
	In fact, I am horrified you even ask. I not only do not want to do anything, but would look into legal action against the homeowners association if they attemptd to force me to do so.
	This would be a challenge for our budget at this time.
	It is premature for us to identify how much we are willing to pay until we understand the problem, the impact on the island, and the recommended solutions.
	i am way, way, way upside down on my lot and can not afford to pay any more at all.
	no idea
	See #1
	Not really sure of amount--cannot speak on behalf of our timeshare owners, but we do not have available funds for renourishment at this time.

	EACH owner takes their own risk.
	No more than \$1000, but again it depends on the effectiveness and benefits of the proposed nourishment
	Hunting Island spent \$11 million it did not work Harbor Property owners do not have enough money to solve this problem
	many of the property owners who bought less threatened properties on purpose are struggling to hold on in this economy. They should not be required to bail out those who also should have known the risks associated with owning coastal properties
	Beach renourishment projects do not work as far as I can judge from what has been going on the past 20 years. The only possibility I can see is to do what Fripp Island did and surround the island with rip-rap. It may bring postponement of execution, so to speak.
	100% opposed to beach renourishment, groins, jetties, etc. We have seen the marsh move closer and closer to our home, and at spring tide water is 5 feet from our foundation. We knew the risks of coastal living when we purchased here many years ago.
	Let the houses placed within the mean high tide limit slid back into the ocean. Those lots belong to the ocean.
	Certainly NOT \$4000 or 8000. Homeowners who purchased beachfront properties ACCEPTED the risks and rewards prior to purchasing. Where is personal responsibility for one's decisions?
<b>8. If a project is undertaken, who should pay for it? - Comments</b>	
	<b>Answer</b>
	as above, you build on the beach you assume the risk
	We all use the beach. The homes add color and also helps to protect the rest of the island.
	But I think the owners of affected properties should bear a higher % of the cost than others.
	We were advised not to buy or build in the erosion zone, the owners involved should pay
	Their problem is not my problem. I would imagine someone would take legal exception to having to pay alot of money for someone elses misfortune.
	Again, given the fact that I know very few of the specifics, I would suggest further study, and consultation with knowledgeable coastal management experts.
	Owners on beach front reap the benefits in property value and should therefore incur the lion share of the cost. However, perhaps a small contribution from each owner (noted above) would help defray at least a portion of those costs.
	If the owners of the property do not want to pay then let the beach do what it will. there are very FEW houses impacted at this time. If they don't want to pay then let it go.
	Again, this is a potential risk associated with beach front property anywhere.
	See suggestion above. Key would be to keep assessment low and very transparent as to were we need it and why.

	no one really - see above
	Another question I cannot answer with current information....HIOA assessment if it is applied unequally. There certainly would be more benefit to those in immediate harms way.
	Is there a chance to get Federal money? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	If the owner assessment option is selected, houses on the beach should be assessed more.
	Why should I pay for someones mistake!
	See above comments.
	Perhaps those with problems now or on beach front should pay proportionally a little more, since they will directly benefit more.
	If everybody is asked to bail out a handful of people who made a very obvious mistake,you are going to have everybody bitching every time you need more sand.Is it worth it-I don,t think so.
	It affects the entire island, but assessments should be broken down into categories by proximity to beach, charging the oceanfront lots more than the houses off the beach.
	We all use the beach and the beauty of the beach or the lack there of significantly impact all real estate prices at Harbor Island . If our beaches continue to deteriorate all property values will continue to decline. We are a "Beach Community" . Without the beach the major draw of the island is gone. When buyers see even a portion of the beach eroding they become skeptical of the whole island .
	Definitely the owners of the properties involved.
	All properties are involved, directly or indirectly. All property values are affected. I personally feel that those who use the beach the most, the permanent residents, should pay a fair share. As one of owners most directly affected by the erosion, I can understand that I may be asked to pay more than some.
	only with majority vote
	If we do the beach then someone along the causeway will want the same thing done for them.
	Its a community problem
	The cost burden should be shared by all owners but not equally. The first row ocean front property owners should bear a larger share of the cost.
	Should be a combination of both!!! Where are the options????
	Do not undertake the project - If the owners of these properties want to undertake and personally finance the process - let them do it, but without any involvement of the HIOA.
	Nobody takes care of my property. Choice of lot was the owners'. They should be prepared to take care of their property by themselves.
	Harbor Island should really have never been built on. It is difficult to pay for something that for all my growing up years people said it was marsh lands and should not be built on. We bought into the property aware that there were risk. I am not sure how to handle the problem but spending millions on the island seems crazy.
	Not us as an association.

	When we discovered Harbor Island we looked at several houses, lots and condos that were for sale. Our final decision was definitely influenced by each one's proximity to water and how that would possibly impact the property in the future. We didn't even bother to go inside one house when we saw the high tide lapping at the pilings for the deck.
	Apparently, I cannot unclick the above. This question is moot since I have already indicated that I don't believe anything should be done.
	This project should not be undertaken no matter who is going to pay for it.
	Though we should have a capital fund to help offset individual homeowner outlay
	i believe it is the responsibility of the owners involed only. It is their lot and they are responsible!
	Properties at risk should be responsible for any project undertaken on a volunteer basis. An assessment for all oceanfront property owners should not be mandatory. We should not prohibit oceanfront homeowners from protecting their property within legal limits.
	N/A
	I said it should not be undertaken.
	Even if the owners of the properties involved pay for the project, I believe it to be a bad idea. But given the choice above - it is the lesser of the two evils. Under no circumstances do I believe that this should be undertaken.
	Specifically, the owners who have beachfront properties should pay. However, do not feel the renourishment projects really work for long periods of time; after all, mother nature is mother nature -- we do not have the control!
	Neither of the above. We don't believe anything should be done.
	I don't feel that the pain should be spread over all property owner's. I'd be willing to contribute to help keep Harbor Island sound.
	I think everyone should pay some with the owners of the subject lots paying more. I know this is a tough decision for you....There is not an easy answer.
	I do not believe renourishmwnt to be a viable option based on current scientific research.
	Limited problem: limited response.
	Those who built on the beach should have known that Harbor Island is a barrier island and that barrier islands change as a result of storms and environmental (i.e., nature) changes. Property owners involved should be responsible for the cost they choose to protect their property.
	If the non-beachfront owners do not want to pay for the project, then they should not use the beach.
	Neither of the choices will bring about a positive reaction from HIOA property owners. I don't like being forced to select one of the two options in order for this survey to be accepted.
	Each beach front property owner is responsible for their property. Ideally the group of beach front property owners,1st and 2nd view, should organize and start their own yearly assessment just as Nautical Watch, Harbor Key, and other communities practice. This way the beach front property owners can have a financial reserve when beach erosion occurs.
	the beach erosion is a problem that affects all of us who use the beach

	<p>Perhaps a higher percentage of the assessment should go to the most impacted homeowners. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Otherwise, if they pay it all others will benefit on the island thus we have an economic free rider concept. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Some type of proportional split or waterfall scheme should be considered.</p>
	<p>if they want to, you cannot fight Mother Nature</p>
	<p>The costs are astronomical and prohibitive and not the responsibility of other owners not involved. It is a struggle in this economy for some owners to maintain the costs of owning property on Harbor. It would be a hardship to assess all the owners on Harbor. The owners involved are wealthy enough to take the financial loss.</p>
	<p>At this point, the properties involved need to take whatever financial steps they deem necessary to protect their own property.</p>
	<p>I emphatically do not intend to pay money to sift sand where tides and currents have moved it. The affected houses should leave the beach alone too. They need to move their homes back further from the water as others have done.</p>
	<p>not sure</p>
	<p>Individuals know the risk of owning beach front property. We all run the same risks. On the north end of the island owners choose to build close to the water and should have understood the risks.</p>
	<p>Is not the property beyond the critical line owned by the State? <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>It is difficult for us to answer this one until we are educated on the severity of the problem and the recommended solutions.</p> <p>again, unsure Marked no because of the answer to property values above</p>
	<p>They chose to buy lots near the water. Erosion is not something new on Harbor Island.</p>
	<p>A combination of both. The owners of properties involved should carry a heavier burden.</p>
	<p>I will not support individual risks. I am not asking anyone to support my risks.</p>
	<p>both with possibly more fiscal proportion allotted to the properties involved</p>
	<p>After expert advice.</p>
	<p>It becomes a lot owner problem</p>
	<p>unfortunately that is the risk of buying a home within 50 feet of the high tide line mother nature can quickly encroach on your lot</p>
	<p>As the building on Harbor Island is something that shouldn't have happened - but did - it is really the result of the State of SC not having their ducks in a row as far as the coast is concerned. The state should pay.</p>
	<p>I am completely opposed to beach renourishment -- here or anywhere.</p>
	<p>All properties on Harbor Island have exceptional value because of the beautiful beaches that are so accessible to all property owners, not just the beachfront ones.</p>
	<p>I live in Ocean Marsh. Deliberate choice after my first visit here. The owners on the "front row" knew the risk. They have property on "unbuildable" ground. Move.</p>

	let the buyer beware. they bought right on the ocean. most of us did not just because mother nature will have her way. let them choose another lot to move their homes to. but no way should other property owners financially subsidize the ocean front property owners.
	A beachfront homeowner gets to enjoy all the benefits of that beautiful location but expects others to share in the risk of that location? I receive no benefits from someone's beachfront home. Why should I bear a cost burden? I'd love to have a beachfront location but do not due to the increased risks. I understand and am willing to incur risk on MY property's location and proximity to the beach. I DO NOT expect HIOA or anyone else to bail me out if something goes wrong.
<b>9. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THIS ISSUE - Responses</b>	
	<b>Answer</b>
	I hope I have conveyed my serious opposition to this short-sighted and costly proposed project.
	While I certainly feel for those affected, unless they can show me a parallel case, where proximal properties were devalued, throwing sand (and money) at this is no fix. Nourishment (and renourishment) by definition will fail over time...what exactly is to be gained by this ephemeral exercise???
	The HIOA is responsible for taking care of the HIOA common properties, not the beach front that belongs to the state of South Carolina or an individual's private property.
	NOT REALLY SURE THERE IS AN ANSWER TO THE ISLAND PROBLEM.
	We probably need to do what we expect our government to do. Cut in some areas to help out in others. I do not believe that continuing to raise regime fees is the answer. That does not appear to help our situation each year.
	I think we should learn by studying the nature of barrier islands, and by observing what has happened to other beaches/islands that have used "renourishing" methods. For the most part, renourishment is costly, not permanent, and injurious to next door islands and beach sites.
	I think we should have an input into decisions on adjacent islands as well. I can remember the Army Corps of Engineers removing large quantities of sand from the channel at the North end of our Island in the early nineties. This may well have something to do with our current problems.
	It doesn't seem there is a definitive answer, or a guaranteed successful outcome, therefore I would like to see some effort made, without creating an undue burden on the community.□ It should also be made clear that just because we try this once, we are not bound to try it again, depending on the success.
	Your timing could not have been worse. How many people in this economic situation are willing or able to do this?
	Our property values, rental values, and livability of the island are all affected. We need to come together to address this issue.
	We have too many assessments now, The majority of the people do not have a problem, don't penalize us .
	I don't believe a homeowners association has carte blanc to encumber property owners at their whim.

	I think maybe we should try it on a small portion of the beach.
	no
	The beach is essential to the property value for every homeowner on the island. However, as stated above, those homes closest to the beach reap direct benefits from being beach front properties.
	no
	It's not fair to ask others that are not impacted to pay for this expense. Living/Buying on waters edge is unpredictable. It's not our problem.
	When you purchase ocean front property the risk you take is beach erosion. The owners affected should bare the cost.
	I feel that homes that were built on the beach should have been <input type="checkbox"/> under some other guidances as to what could possibly lie ahead <input type="checkbox"/> for them. We are seeing more coastal areas impacted by hurricanes and other tropical storms....what is to say that the beach could be rebuilt and withstand further storm damage? <input type="checkbox"/> NOTHING, it is unpredictable.
	Did we have this problem prior to the renourishment at Hunting Island...it seems that we had the problems only after that took place and changed the flow of the river...one end got more sand, another got increased erosion from the tides. Does the state have any responsibility for that?
	Hunting Island has tried this over and over. The sand washes away building up Fripp Island and the Upper part of Harbor Island. The lesson should be from Hunting Island. Nature will reverse itself in a few years.
	you have got to be kidding- do you really think the owners of property not currently affected by this problem would want pay a portion of the 570,000 to 5000000 on this project.
	There is risks and rewards in most actions ... folks that built "very close" to the beach have enjoyed the rewards of beachfront value and activities ... they should also have to deal directly with the risks.
	Involve everyone who owns property in decision, make a good case for why is is for everyone's good not just the few who are currently affected. Don't try to say this is a one time project when we know it will always be an on going maintenance issue.
	only a puzzled why does man think he can control nature - do the hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes, blizzards from just this last year not teach that .. . ???????
	I would like evaluation of such projects results.
	Am interested in survey results. Appreciate the information.
	no
	Why should I vote to replenish an area of a beach where I have only limited access? And we are concerned in this country about government entitlements. Why should I provide entitlements for a limited number of property owners who would be the only beneficiaries of a renourishment project.
	This is not the HOA problem. We have no control past the high water mark and that mark seems to change. It is an unfortunate problem for a few homeowners but also what you get when you choose to own property on a barrier island.

	This survey is extremely frustrating because it does not allow me to answer "I don't know". Poor survey design.
	Please do not undertake any beach nourishment projects on Harbor Island.
	I think I've said enough.You cannot fight nature and win.I bet 99% of us on harbor island agree with me. <input type="checkbox"/> !
	Renourishment of the beach as a group is an equatable undertaking and can be done. No one property owner or a handful of owners could not, nor should they, bear the costs alone as the beach belongs to and is used by all.
	We are vehemently opposed to paying for this.
	I think that definite consideration should be given to refurbishing the beach, while we have a beach to enjoy. I feel that the entire ownership should be involved to an extent. I further feel that any decisions made should be made by the ownership at large, after an open fully informative forum where all opinions can be voiced.
	I do feel badly for these homeowners. The definition of "barrier island" explains the natural progression and regression of the land. Leave nature alone.
	costs are way more than I thought. My only thought was that the sand dunes needed to be maintained or something as inexpensive as that.
	There is a big financial difference between Beach Front home owners and one bedroom condo owners! <input type="checkbox"/> They (anyone with half a brain) knew beaches erode and the first to go is oceanfront... Duh! <input type="checkbox"/> I will foreclose first! That's why we didn't buy <input type="checkbox"/> oceanfront. Should we secure a lawyer soon?
	Harbor Island is a barrier island. All barrier island are constantly remodeled due to their interaction with the sea. Any effort by man to alter this natural, ongoing process is futile.
	It would be cheaper to buy the houses then to renourish the beach.
	I am dead set against an island wide plan to pay for beach work as listed above. I purchased a home not on the beach because I did not want to endure erosion so I will not willingly pay for others that chose to make a different decision.
	Links were not provided to some listed documents.
	The environmental committee is only concerned about the natural environment, but inexplicably not the beach, even though when the beach is gone there will be no more natural environment to care about. The Board has an obligation to represent all owners, including those that do own on the beach.
	The project should definitely not be undertaken. <input type="checkbox"/> Why should we pay for someone else's mistake?
	You can't change the inevitable. As the owner of an uneffected property,I feel that it is up to those effected to bear the brunt of a "temporary" fix. If you assess all the property owners for a major renourishment effort, be prepared for a drop in property values as purchasers will assume another assessment will be forthcoming.
	The last time I walk to the beach from my property my neighbors property did not go to the ocean.That property is own by the state.You might want to call them and tell them they have a problem.
	Please, no more HIOA assessments!

	None of us know how our properties may be affected by nature in the future...where would we draw the line on when it is our neighbor's responsibility to repair their own property and when is it their responsibility to repair ours?
	The beach on a barrier island is constantly shifting. If you try to build up the beach in one area you will no doubt screw up another. LEAVE IT ALONE!
	We all knew (or should have known) the risks of building and living on a barrier island. Beach replenishment is a temporary fix that could be washed away by the next severe storm. Changing the beach in one area could have a negative effect on another.
	in medicine the term iatrogenic translate to:whatever you do-do no harm.Would nourishment benefit the island-most definitely.However,according to the articles provided,the project would be ongoing and the impact somewhat negative[but to what degree].What would be the impact for our situation?
	We all knew buying homes here involved risk, and expenses related to protecting individual property needs to be funded primarily by those impacted with assistance from the community.
	I really don't understand why anyone would believe that all property owners on the island would be responsible to share in the costs to individual lot beach nourishment.
	HOA fees an assessments are already high. I would object to Additional fees for properties not affected by erosion.
	A beachfront owner assumes the risk of erosion at the purchase of his/her property. Someone far away from the beach shouldn't have to pay for creating a new beach or painting the beachfront house or stocking the bar in said beachfront house with top shelf whiskey.
	In Harms Way! <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Why are we discussing again?
	With my property value well below what I paid for it, and with increasing HIOA fees (bridges, roofs, etc.), I will have to foreclose before spending any more on condo fees.
	There is little agreement on exactly what we could expect from a beach nourishment program. If it would work, for how long, how much it would cost. I think this is a bad idea that is being pushed upon all island residents by the few <input type="checkbox"/> that are directly effected by the current erosion. I understand where they are coming from - but still disagree.
	We understand the concern of vulnerable property owners, this is a risk we all took when buying property here. Beach erosion is a natural occurrence and historically speaking, re nourishment is a waste of money and devastating to many species. We wish this survey had been sent to all individuals instead of property owners.
	I have watched this portion of the beach over the last ten years and it has built up and then receded. My bet is that it will eventually build up again. I'm sympathetic toward those homeowners with homes on the oceanfront but I also was aware of potential erosion and maintenance costs for those type of lots. That's why I didn't buy oceanfront.
	This is a barrier island and as such, should be allowed to run it's natural course. However, the re-nourishment and shoring up of Hunting Island should be a consideration. It is affecting Harbor and our own erosion.

	Just need more information.
	I WILL NOT VOTE IN FAVOR OF ANY SUCH PROJECT, NOR WILL I PAY ANY MONEY ON ANY SUCH PROJECT. MOST HEARTILY AND SINCERELY.....Sandy
	Thank You guys for showing your concern. There are no EASY answers! any and all beach re-nourishment will never stop erosion on Harbor Island.
	As a beach front community the risks to personal property from multiple natural threats is an obvious and inherent reality.
	Far too many of the HIOA assessments have been either to remedy the actions of a few of the owners, such as bringing in heavy loads that damaged the bridges, or to benefit a few of the owners, as with this renourishment.
	My masters thesis was on coastal processes and beach erosion. Building directly on the beach is high risk and you need to accept the risks.
	The owners of these properties knew the risk of building that close to the water in the first place . Now they expect the rest of the island to pay for there mistake.We should allow them to build a sea wall if necessary but at their own expense.
	This is a serious and expensive problem that I doubt is ever completely resolved. It is not the responsibility of HIOA to pay for projects that benefit only a few home owners. The assessment to replace the bridges affected everyone on the island. I'm sorry this happens to some but I'm not willing to pay for their projects.
	I hate that this is happening.. But u have too much invested already...
	The nourishment project should be split equally amongst all property owners. When you purchase a beachfront home, you do not own the stretch of beach in front of your house; therefore, the beach front belongs to Harbor Island in general.
	Beach erosion happens on all coastal property, not just barrier islands. All we can do is build smart and not build beyond the lines dictated by the county.
	Beach front property owners reap great benefits from their properties when they sell and none of those benefits are channeled to other owners. These homes are rented frequently and are a lucrative source of income for these owners. Please do not let them put their hands in my pockets.
	Harbor Island is a barrier island. It changes every day.
	I am new to the island but do feel something should be done most likely in a waterfall scheme where those areas and homes most impacted pay more and thus scaled down for those less impacted. <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/> This would be a lot of work to bring everyone together on this concept as well as determining percentages but is in my opinion the most optimal solution.
	I do not intend to be forced to pay for something that cannot be changed. We all knew the risks with barrier Islands and ocean front property
	Dont do it! it is like taking cash and throwing it into the ocean and hoping on magic

	If you repair the erosion, it will happen again and the monies will have been wasted. Look at other projects on the coast that have wasted their monies. We will not pay for this. If you choose to live on an island, you choose to take chances from Mother Nature.
	I am alarmed to have this question brought up. I willingly admit I will head a homeowners group to oppose funding of such a futile project that really benefits a few homes built at locations which were poor choices to begin with.
	NO
	We definitely would need more info before expressing an opinion...
	Purchasing ocean front property on our fragile barrier islands, is a risk. Harbor is a precious jewel and as a member of the association I feel a level of responsibility in protecting the beaches. Mother Nature is relentless, and I feel re-nourishment is at best a temporary solution.
	We believe that this problem will be larger in scope and too costly for the HIOA to resolve. We feel that steps should be taken now to address the erosion with OCRM and DEHEC to find out what avenues and resolutions are available and then act accordingly.
	We need to quit bailing out people who build and buy properties in hazardous locations.
	It's unfortunate this is happening, but after all, Harbor is a barrier island. Nature has the control here and why waste money in these difficult economic times on something that has only temporary value for only certain property owners.
	People should know what they are getting into buying beachfront properties built basically on sandbars.
	If I have an issue of nature that effect my home, ie termites, unstable soil, flooding from creeks, etc will Home Owers Assoc cover that as well?
	In this economic climate, it is impractical to undertake a major, very expensive project without fully explaining exactly what the significance of the problem is along with alternatives property owners have to mitigate the problem.
	You need to resubmit the survey, but this time include "I don't know" as an answer option.
	I think if you live on the beach it is up to you to pay for the erosion problem
	Each owner must assume their own risk. Some buildings have poor building materials. Are all owners on the island going to help carry this cost to fix. I will refuse to pay anything towards other owner risk and will assume litigation if the island tries to force this expense.
	no
	absolutely will not pay an assesment....will go to court to fight it.
	Does the state of S.C.have people to give advice?Or the Army core of engineers.
	When you own property on a Barrier Island you know the risks. It is not my responsibility for someone else's risk taking. When you buy on the beach you should know nature has no controls and the owner is responsible for the outcome.
	This beautiful island is forever changing - naturally. I prefer we do not mess with Mother Nature.

	<p>I certainly have a great deal of sympathy for the effected property owners. However we have seen through the years that some areas of the island have eroded while other area have had accretion. Anything we do would be temporary. I am unwilling to spend my dollars unless it is a one time reasonably priced permanent fix. Unfortunately none exist</p>
	<p>While we cannot change what neighboring Hunting or Fripp Islands have done in attempts to thwart nature, joining their ranks--for what is almost certainly ephermal gain--is foolhardy. That Hunting's projects may have negatively impacted our beach is unfortunate, but insufficient reason to follow in their footsteps.</p>
	<p>I refuse to pay and will seek legal action if I have to pay for Mother Nature, Acts of God, and the selfish tier on Harbor Island that want all this mess paid for on the backs of the rest. Once we begin nourishment, we will be handcuffed to dumping sand for decades with no clear results.</p>
	<p>Sometimes I think I am foolish to have a home on a barrier island. However, I have made a deliberate choice to risk the amount of my investment due to the beauty of the area and the enjoyment I receive from owning a home there. So too the owners of beachfront property....life is a gamble.</p>
	<p>Has HIOA approached the appropriate SC agency that approved the renourishment of sand on Hunting Island? It seems like that action has had a negative impact on Harbor's beaches. We should explore retribution from that agency instead of wasting all this time &amp; energy on pumping sand at Harbor.</p>