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Many esteemed environmental law scholars have delighted in exploring the public trust doctrine over the past few decades. This pastime was initiated in large part from what most view as a seminal article by Professor Sax in 1970 in which he declared “of all the concepts known to American law, only the public trust doctrine seems to have the breadth and substantive content which might make it useful as a tool of general application for citizens seeking to develop a comprehensive legal approach to resource
management.” Since then, this doctrine has fascinated sufficient numbers of scholars to spawn books, blogs, and academic conferences, in addition to myriad law review articles. And it seems there is always more to say.

The public trust doctrine reflects the deceptively simple concept that certain resources (usually coastal, including both land and waters) are held by the government in trust for the people. Such a trust preserves the

---

3 Id. at 474.
5 See, e.g., OntheCommons.org, public trust doctrine, http://onthecommons.org/taxonomy/term/14/all/page/blog (last visited Apr. 10, 2007) (“Since Roman times, courts have held that certain resources are inherently common property that cannot be privately owned or given away by government. This is one reason why the public has access to coastal beaches. Now that markets are colonizing oceans, the human genome, space and other commons, it is time to extend the principles of the public trust doctrine.”).
7 See supra note 1 and infra note 8.
9 See, e.g., Alexandra B. Klass, Modern Public Trust Principles: Recognizing Rights and Integrating Standards, 82 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 699 (2006), available at http://ssrn.com/abstract=934819 (last visited Apr. 10, 2007) (“At its core, the public trust doctrine is the idea that there are some resources, notably tidal and navigable waters and the lands under them that are forever subject to state ownership and protection in trust for the use and benefit of the public. To some, the doctrine is a vehicle for public access to water, beaches, or fishing in a world otherwise dominated by private ownership. To others it is a check on government attempts to give away or sell such resources for short-term economic gain. To yet others, it is a back-door mechanism for judicial taking of private property.
resources, making them available to the public for certain public uses. Early case law restricted the protection to limited resources and certain uses (e.g. navigation, commerce, and fishing), but later cases expanded protected resources as well as protected uses to include recreation and public access in many states.

Recent debates regarding application of public trust principles in South Carolina provided a real-life perspective from which to initiate renewed scholarly discussion of this doctrine. Thus in September 2006, the University of South Carolina School of Law and the Southeastern Environmental Law Journal convened a symposium dedicated to exploring the modern public trust doctrine and related topics. The context for this discussion was provided by recent changes to South Carolina state regulations associated with bridges to marsh islands, and the role of the public trust doctrine in the debate resulting in (and subsequent to) these new regulations.

The symposium began with an evening keynote address by Professor Barton H. (“Buzz”) Thompson of Stanford University School of Law. Thompson’s resultant article, entitled The Public Trust Doctrine: A Conservative Reconstruction & Defense, explores the issue of whether the public trust doctrine can escape its perception by conservatives as an anti-
majoritarian, anchorless doctrine providing an easy way to evade critically important property protections. After providing an overview of the history and current application of the public trust doctrine in American jurisprudence, Thompson argues that, in fact, underlying many major United States public trust decisions are four core principles – avoiding excess, the importance of common property, preserving democratic decision-making, and the special significance of oceans and navigable waterways – that are quite conservative in character. To that end, Thompson sets forth a new vision of public trust that he asserts can fulfill the doctrine’s primary purposes while avoiding (at least some of) the concerns that have earned the doctrine conservative distrust.

The first full day of the symposium opened with a panel made up of dynamic presentations by various stakeholders from South Carolina (including representatives of conservation interests, private property owners, and offices of the state government). These presentations discussed the high-profile and contentious issues of access to privately-owned islands in the coastal marshes of South Carolina. They conveyed to those attending the symposium how South Carolina’s courts, state agencies and legislature

---

18 Id. at 49.
19 Id. at 50-54.
20 Id. at 58-68.
21 Id. at 68-70.
22 See Bridging the Divide 2007 Symposium Website, supra note 15. The first panel was moderated by Dr. Dwayne E. Porter, University of South Carolina Department of Environmental Health Sciences and the Baruch Institute for Marine and Coastal Sciences. See http://www.sph.sc.edu/facultystaff/pages/facstaffdetails.php?ID=413 (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
24 See Op. S.C. Att’y Gen., 2003 S.C. AG LEXIS 231 (Dec. 5, 2003) [hereinafter 2003 SC Attorney General Opinion] (answering the question “is it legal for OCRM to consider and grant permits for bridges to islands, whose title is presumed to be in the state, for private development and use where the permit is tantamount to a de facto conveyance of these state lands (or the use of these state lands) and the ouster of the public, without requiring that the applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrate, by means such as an attorney’s opinion and accompanying title abstract, a grant from the State or predecessor sovereign, e.g. a King’s grant or Lords Proprietor’s grant, in the applicants chain of title sufficient to overcome the state’s presumption of ownership of the island?” in the negative. Id. at 15-16). This Opinion is reprinted in this volume, see Henry McMaster, Opinion of the Attorney General State of South Carolina, December 5, 2003 (Reprint), 15 SOUTHEASTERN ENVTL. L.J. 39 (2006).
have struggled with the question of how the state should balance competing public and private interests in deciding whether or not to permit marsh island bridge construction.\textsuperscript{26} Nancy Vinson of the Coastal Conservation League\textsuperscript{27} discussed the origins and history of the “bridges to marsh islands” debate.\textsuperscript{28} South Carolina Attorney General Henry McMaster\textsuperscript{29} told the assembled participants of the events leading up to issuance of his 2003 Opinion asserting that public trust applies to all of South Carolina’s marsh islands absent a King’s grant,\textsuperscript{30} and subsequent related activities in the Attorney General’s office.\textsuperscript{31} Ellison D. Smith of Smith, Bundy, Bybee, and Barnett\textsuperscript{32} spoke from the point of view of the regulated community and private property owners, and asserted that the public trust arguments on behalf of the marsh islands may have been taken too far.\textsuperscript{33} Carolyn Boltin of the South Carolina Department of Heath and Environmental Control\textsuperscript{34} explained the 2006 bridges to marsh islands regulations\textsuperscript{35} and provided insight into OCRM’s

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{26} See Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., South Carolina Marsh Islands Project Data Set, http://www.csc.noaa.gov/id/sc_marsh_islands_metadata.htm (last visited Apr. 10, 2007). See also Saving the Marsh Islands, HERALD (Rock Hill), Nov. 23, 2004, at 5A.
\textsuperscript{27} The Coastal Conservation League website can be found at http://coastalconservationleague.org/ (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
\textsuperscript{28} Nancy Vinson, Evolution of Regulations for Bridges to Marsh Islands in South Carolina, 15 SOUTHEASTERN ENVTL. L.J. 19 (2006). See also infra notes 38-45 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{29} The South Carolina Attorney General’s website can be found at http://www.scattorneygeneral.org/ (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
\textsuperscript{30} 2003 SC Attorney General Opinion, supra note 24, at 15.
\textsuperscript{32} The Smith, Bundy, Bybee and Barnett, PC website can be found at http://www.s3blaw.com/ (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
\textsuperscript{33} See Bridging the Divide 2007 Symposium Website, supra note 15.
\textsuperscript{34} The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC)’s main website is at http://www.scdhec.net/ (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
\textsuperscript{35} DHEC’s Office of Ocean & Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) website is at http://www.scdhec.net/environment/ocrm/ (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
plans with respect to implementation and other actions to provide protection to South Carolina’s public trust lands.\(^3\)

Coastal Conservation League Water Quality Program Director Nancy Vinson’s\(^3\) article, entitled *Evolution of Regulations for Bridges to Marsh Islands in South Carolina*,\(^3\) sets the factual stage for this symposium edition to explore the intersection between current events and scholarly consideration. Vinson opens her piece by noting that the approximately 350,000 acres of salt marsh on South Carolina’s coast represent more public trust tidelands than most other East Coast states.\(^4\) She then catalogs the many years of conservationists’ endeavors to defeat threats to those lands by private persons seeking to encourage development by constructing bridges to small marsh islands,\(^4\) documenting the back-and-forth history of efforts to avoid damage to what many viewed (and still view) as very productive and sensitive ecosystems.\(^4\) She provides helpful background on how the fights ranged throughout the branches of government, including a precedent-setting case from the South Carolina Supreme Court,\(^4\) an opinion by the South Carolina Attorney General,\(^4\) and new regulation.\(^4\)

The symposium continued with a series of two additional panels.\(^4\) The first was entitled *Public Trust: Where Has it Been and Where is it Going?* Professor Marc R. Poirier of Seton Hall Law School opened that panel, followed by Faith Rivers of Vermont Law School. Richard Roos-Collins of the National Heritage Institute closed that panel.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) See Sammy Fretwell, *Fees mulled for salt-marsh docks*, *The State* (Columbia), Sept. 9, 2006, at B5.

\(^3\) Nancy Vinson serves as Water Quality Program Director for the Coastal Conservation League. See http://coastalconservationleague.org/NETCOMMUNITY/Page.aspx?&pid=368&srcid=201 (last visited Apr. 10, 2007). Ms. Vinson can be reached at nancyvin@sccl.org.

\(^3\) Vinson, *supra* note 28.

\(^4\) Id. at 19.

\(^4\) Id. at 25-37.

\(^4\) Id. at 23-25.


\(^4\) See Bridging the Divide 2007 Symposium Website, *supra* note 15, for streaming video of all presentations from these panels.

\(^4\) The second panel was moderated by F. Patrick Hubbard of the University of South Carolina School of Law. See http://www.law.sc.edu/faculty/hubbard/ (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
The final panel of the day was entitled *Bridging Marsh Islands, Public Trust and other Contemporary Matters*. Erin Ryan of William and Mary Marshall-Wythe School of Law opened that panel, followed by Sam Kalen of Van Ness, Feldman, P.C. James Salzman of Duke Law School and the Nicholas School of Environmental and Earth Sciences closed the final panel. The subsequently-submitted papers from each of these speakers are summarized below.

Professor Marc R. Poirier’s article, entitled *Modified Private Property: New Jersey’s Public Trust Doctrine, Private Development and Exclusion, and Shared Public Uses of Natural Resources*, defends the modern public trust doctrine as useful. Poirier uses New Jersey jurisprudence in the public trust arena, which limits or conditions private development of the shore in ways somewhat different than other states, to explore broader themes and justifications in the protection of water and related resources. He begins by addressing use of the public trust doctrine in New Jersey and other states to manage water and land at the water’s edge, resources which have multiple and conflicting uses. He continues with an in-depth analysis of some political realities and academic considerations of the modern public trust doctrine. Poirier concludes that cases which logically fit the rubric of public trust doctrine (such as South Carolina’s marsh islands debate) deserve consideration under this doctrine in terms of background principles, even where regulatory and political realities make its application difficult.

Professor Erin Ryan’s article, entitled *Palazzolo, The Public Trust, and The Property Owner’s Reasonable Expectations: Takings and the South
Carolina Marsh Island Bridge Debate,\textsuperscript{58} provides an interesting analysis of public trust doctrine jurisprudence in the takings context.\textsuperscript{59} Ryan opens with a discussion of South Carolina’s recently promulgated marsh island regulations,\textsuperscript{60} noting that these islands are subject to what she labels South Carolina’s “formidable” public trust doctrine.\textsuperscript{61} Her piece then evaluates the relationship between the public trust doctrine and the takings subtext with respect to the debate over South Carolina’s new regulations, with particular attention to a recent Supreme Court takings decision, \textit{Palazzolo v. Rhode Island},\textsuperscript{62} in which the public trust doctrine made a late-breaking appearance on remand.\textsuperscript{63} Looking to a related analysis in \textit{McQueen v. South Carolina Coastal Council},\textsuperscript{64} Ryan suggests that regulatory takings claims brought by disappointed bridge permit seekers are unlikely to succeed. Noting that property owner’s “reasonable expectations” about development prospects are central to any legal analysis of an alleged regulatory taking, Ryan asserts that the public trust doctrine should serve to limit successful claims.\textsuperscript{65}

Professor Faith R. Rivers’\textsuperscript{66} article, entitled \textit{The Public Trust Debate: Implications for Heirs’ Property Along the Gullah Coast},\textsuperscript{67} sets forth a unique perspective on potential unintended consequences of the public trust doctrine on long-time minority residents on South Carolina’s coast.\textsuperscript{68} Rivers examines the efficacy of using the public trust doctrine and various tax incentive mechanisms as tools to conserve heirs’ property,\textsuperscript{69} which is real property purchased by African Americans and held within families for generations without clear title.\textsuperscript{70} She asserts that selective use of the public trust doctrine can result in limits to development on large areas of ecologically important, yet previously developed, coastal islands,\textsuperscript{71} which

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{59} \textit{Id.}
\bibitem{60} \textit{Id.} at 123-32.
\bibitem{61} \textit{Id.} at 122.
\bibitem{63} Ryan, \textit{supra} note 58, at 122, 132-40.
\bibitem{64} \textit{McQueen v. S.C. Coastal Council}, 580 S.E.2d 116 (S.C. 1995).
\bibitem{65} Ryan, \textit{supra} note 58, at 145-46.
\bibitem{66} Faith R. Rivers serves as an Associate Professor of Law at Vermont Law School. See http://www.vermontlaw.edu/faculty/emp_media_expertise_template.cfm?doc_id=1161 (last visited Apr. 10, 2007). Professor Rivers can be reached at frivers@vermontlaw.edu.
\bibitem{67} 15 \textit{SOUTHEASTERN ENVTL. L.J.} 147 (2006).
\bibitem{68} \textit{Id.} at 155-60.
\bibitem{69} \textit{Id.} at 160-68.
\bibitem{70} \textit{Id.} at 148.
\bibitem{71} 30-6 S.C. Reg. 167 at 30-12(N)(2)(f)(i)(b) (listing islands considered “upland”).
\end{thebibliography}
may expose application of the doctrine to charges of arbitrariness by those holding heirs property resources.\textsuperscript{72} To deal with this issue, Rivers proposes the development of a Gullah Culture Preservation Exemption as a conservation tool that preserves Gullah (a people most prevalent in the South Carolina Lowcountry)\textsuperscript{73} both ownership and traditional use of coastal lands without hindering the property rights of heirs’ property owners.\textsuperscript{74}

The article by Richard Roos-Collins\textsuperscript{75} of the Natural Heritage Institute,\textsuperscript{76} entitled \textit{Lessons From The Mono Lake Cases For Effective Management of Public Trust Resources},\textsuperscript{77} begins by discussing the new “bridges to marsh islands” regulations. Explaining how the public trust doctrine provides for state ownership of these marshlands,\textsuperscript{78} Roos-Collins explores whether the new regulatory program can achieve its intended purpose over the course of the next generation.\textsuperscript{79} Highlighting the significance of the resource, he discusses the substantial discretion granted to the state in deciding whether to balance public and private interests in considering individual permit applications.\textsuperscript{80} Roos-Collins then draws on the lessons provided by the Mono Lake Cases in California to demonstrate that effective protection of public trust resources can accommodate reasonable development.\textsuperscript{81} He highlights four strategic lessons that can be applied: (1) An Ounce of Prevention is Worth a Pound of Cure;\textsuperscript{82} (2) Manage the Commons, Not Just the Individual Shepherds;\textsuperscript{83} (3) Results Matter Most;\textsuperscript{84} and (4) Public Trust Management is a Joint Venture.\textsuperscript{85}
The article by Sam Kalen,66 entitled The Coastal Zone Management Act of Today: Does Sustainability Have a Chance87 begins with an acknowledgment of the historical context for the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA).88 Kalen notes that the occurrence of the Southeastern Environmental Law Journal’s symposium rings familiar alarm bells to those that led to the CZMA.89 He asserts that the issue of coastal protection is being examined too narrowly, based on problematic assumptions that have failed the nation’s coastal areas over the past few decades.90 Kalen states such assumptions will create a situation even less ready to address the increasing pressures on (and resultant building on) coastal resources.91 Other problems, such as pollution,92 historic wetland losses,93 overtaxed marine resources,94 and hurricane activity,95 threaten coastal areas and provide even more reason for reassessment and increased coastal zone management. Exploring alternatives or amendments to the CZMA must be part of that analysis according to Kalen, who believes that expansion of the public trust doctrine in future decision-making can properly embody the notion of coastal sustainability.96

Professors J.B. Ruhl97 and James Salzman’s98 article, entitled Ecosystem Services and the Public Trust Doctrine: Working Change From Within,99

86 Sam Kalen is a Member of the law firm of Van Ness Feldman, PC. See http://www.vnf.com/content/aboutus/bios/smk.htm (last visited Apr. 10, 2007). He can be reached at smk@vnf.com. Mr. Kalen will be serving as a visiting professor at The Florida State University School of Law in the 2007-2008 academic year.
89 See Kalen, supra note 87, at 192.
90 Id. at 208-09.
91 Id. at 192-96.
92 Id.
93 Id.
94 Id.
95 Kalen, supra note 87, at 192-96.
96 Id. at 221.
97 Professor J.B. Ruhl serves as the Matthews & Hawkins Professor of Property at Florida State University College of Law. See http://www.law.fsu.edu/faculty/jruhl.html (last visited Apr. 10, 2007). Professor Ruhl can be reached at jruhl@law.fsu.edu. Although unable to attend the symposium for temporary health-related reasons, Professor Ruhl generously agreed to keep his commitment to provide an article for this symposium issue.
98 James Salzman serves as a Professor of Law at Duke University School of Law and a Professor at Duke University Nicholas School of Environment and Earth Sciences. See http://www.law.duke.edu/fac/salzman/ (last visited Apr. 10, 2007). Professor Salzman can be reached at salzman@law.duke.edu.
begins with the question “[w]hat to do with the public trust doctrine?” Exploring the evolution of the doctrine following Professor Joseph Sax’s 1970 article, the article attempts to ascertain why Sax’s vision is not yet fulfilled. Ruhl and Salzman propose that natural capital and ecosystem services can be integrated into the public trust doctrine. They note that traditional public trust resources often supply economically valuable ecosystem services to the public, and thus natural capital and ecosystem service values should be recognized as protected trust uses. To that end, they assert, the proper approach is not to reshape the public trust doctrine to fit ecological goals, but rather to reshape the way ecological goals are framed to fit the public trust doctrine.

After the formal presentations, a round-table scholarly discussion about the modern public trust doctrine in the context of South Carolina’s marsh island bridge debate ensued. As reflected below in a brief synopsis, the discussion was meandering, many-faceted, and thoroughly fascinating.

The assembled scholars and other participants began by discussing whether on-the-ground application of the public trust doctrine was by necessity a balancing act. Assuming the answer to such an inquiry is yes, participants considered the questions of who does (and should do) the

---

100 Id.
101 Sax, supra note 2.
102 Ruhl & Salzman, supra note 99, at 224.
103 Id. at 224-30.
104 Id.
105 Id. at 238.
106 This discussion was moderated by Professor Josh Eagle of the University of South Carolina School of Law. Southeastern Environmental Law Journal, University of South Carolina School of Law, Conference Schedule, http://www.law.sc.edu/elj/2006symposium/agenda.shtml (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
107 Of course, most modern efforts to engage in either environmental protection or use of property in a way that may impact environmental resources involves balance of some sort. See, e.g., 20th Century Global Conflicts - Issue #6: The Environment: Balancing Act, http://www.room324.com/BalancingAct.htm (“Humans use resources every day to grow, develop, maintain life processes, and reproduce; in doing so, we use both renewable and nonrenewable resources. Governments, conservationists, economists, and others might ask the following questions in their search for a balance of resource use and conservation: * How do we use resources while ensuring that the same resources will be available to future generations? * How do the federal and state governments work with communities and conservationists to ensure that resources are used wisely and economically? * How do national and state park lands coexist with traffic and tourism while protecting natural beauty? * How do industries maintain sustainable ecosystems while running economically viable operations? * What role does the government play in mediating between industry, tourism, and conservation?”).
balancing, and what is (and should be) balanced. Discourse continued, exploring both how one would know if application of the public trust is off-balance, and what to do about it if one determined it was.

The application of the public trust doctrine as it pertains to environmental justice concerns was also the topic of round-table discussion. The idealistic goal of having public trust analyses include a process for assessment of implications with respect to minority and low-

---

108 Governmental entities are usually viewed in the role of trustee in the public trust doctrine context. See, e.g., M. Casey Jarman, The Use of the Public Trust Doctrine for Resource-Based Area-Wide Management: What Lessons Can We Learn From the Navigable Waters Trust?, 4 ALB. L.J. SCI. & TECH. 7 (1994) (“The government has dual ownership responsibilities as public trustee. As owner of the ‘jus privatum,’ the state has the ability, albeit a quite restrictive one in many instances, to alienate trust lands or resources to private parties. As owner of the ‘jus publicum,’ the state has trust responsibilities that it is powerless to abrogate. In the United States, this trust originally applied to tidal waters, lands, and resources, but has been expanded by the courts to large inland navigable rivers and lakes and, under certain circumstances, non-navigable waters. The Property Clause of the U.S. Constitution and some state constitutions establish public trust obligations. Legislative bodies have imposed public trust duties as well.” Id. at 11-12 (footnotes omitted)). Thus, a governmental entity (legislative, judicial, or administrative) of some sort is the likely answer, though other models may be argued.

109 Because the public trust doctrine is viewed by most as a creature of state law, see Erin Ryan, Comment, Public Trust and Distrust: The Theoretical Implications of the Public Trust Doctrine for Natural Resource Management, 31 ENVTL. L. 477, 478 n.5 (2001), the answer to this question may vary depending on location.

110 Participants discussed that while one group of stakeholders make seek reparations through takings suits under the Fifth Amendment, U.S. CONST. amend. V, non-profit or other stakeholder groups may seek to file citizen suits. See Jim May, Now More Than Ever: Environmental Citizen Suit Trends, 33 ENVTL. L. REP. 10704 (2003). Likewise, Attorneys General or relevant state agencies can become involved through appropriate avenues of recourse, including judicial actions. See Allan Kanner, The Public Trust Doctrine, Parents Patriae, and the Attorney General as the Guardian of the State’s Natural Resources, 16 DUKE ENVTL. L. & POL’Y F. 57 (2005) (“Under the public trust doctrine, state AGs can sue, as trustee, for damages to natural resources that are held in the public trust. To recover damages, the AG must demonstrate that the public trust has been violated by an ‘unreasonable interference with the use and enjoyment of trust rights.’ Some states allow for the recovery of natural resource damages (‘NRD’) to any natural resource, while others only allow for the recovery of damages to natural resources that the state government actually owns. States vary as to what is encompassed by the public trust.” Id. at 59 (footnotes omitted)). Other avenues are likely also available.

income interests may not, participants concluded, be workable. Getting “real folks” involved in the nuances of a public trust debate with respect to a particular resource would, at best, be difficult. However, ideas for cooperative efforts between various coastal environmental groups and low-income and/or minority community representatives in developing area-specific protections were deemed promising. Furthermore, as a tangent to the environmental justice discussion, the issue of housing affordability in coastal areas was debated.

Round-table participants also discussed the future of the public trust doctrine. Hopes for its use have not borne as much fruit as some might have expected, though it has been more influential than others would have wanted. But as a way to mitigate for further losses, incorporate other
doctrines, and fully integrate a conceptual framework for moving forward, the public trust doctrine remains murky.

South Carolina’s public trust jurisprudence, and in particular the recent experience with the bridges to marsh islands controversy, was viewed by some participants as a reason why the public trust doctrine as a tool can become dysfunctional. The legislative debate over the new bridges to marsh islands regulations, and the ensuing final regulations (which arguably are not in keeping with the relevant public trust doctrine as earlier articulated by the Attorney General and the courts) reflect the political realities that sometimes stymie rigorous application of a legal doctrine. Can compromise, when it leads to legally imperfect (but politically stable) results be justified? If yes, how does one plausibly defend such a compromise from future “reworking” from either side? In other words, does the end justify the means?

Innovative ideas for future work in South Carolina and other states were bandied about. One idea was an interdisciplinary project in which graduate students in South Carolina (and other states) could cooperate with counties to do a public trust inventory. Another was a public education campaign to help the citizenry understand their interests in public trust land, and grasp the concept of the state as a trustee.

resources is revoked or modified without payment of just compensation.” Id. at 1336 (footnotes omitted).

117 See Kenneth R. Moss, *The Public Trust Doctrine in South Carolina*, 7 S.C. ENVTL. L.J. 31 (1998). See also McQueen, 580 S.E.2d at 119 (“As a coastal state, South Carolina has a long line of cases regarding the public trust doctrine in the context of land bordering navigable waters.” Id. at 119.).

118 See Vinson, supra note 28.

119 Id. at 32-37.


122 McQueen, 580 S.E.2d 116.

123 Many symposium participants acknowledged the viability (though had differing opinions on the likelihood of success) of litigation attacking the 2006 regulations as violative of the pure public trust doctrine under South Carolina law.

124 Such an “inventory” could reflect either maps or descriptions of areas subject to public trust protections.

125 Of course, as one participant observes, an educated citizenry will lead some to say “build a wall” to protect private property and others to say “protect our public lands above all else.” For resources directed at public involvement in environmental issues, see U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Concerned Citizens Resources*, http://www.epa.gov/epahome/Citizen.html (last visited Apr. 10, 2007).
Participants discussed the issues of sea-level rise \(^{126}\) and global warming \(^{127}\) in the context of the future of public trust. By their very nature, public trust lands are generally not stable systems. The differing definitions of mean high tide line and their implications were discussed. \(^{128}\)

A discussion ensued as to whether South Carolina should join other states in seeking an environmental constitutional amendment, \(^{129}\) perhaps even an “environmental bill of rights.” \(^{130}\) Some asserted that such an effort would be a change from recent environmental legislative efforts in South Carolina, where the conservation community has been in “reactive” rather than “proactive” mode. \(^{131}\) Others cautioned that in the current political climate, such legislation would likely involve compromise that had the potential to be a net loss for the environment.

A related dialogue about efforts in South Carolina to enact regulatory takings legislation \(^{132}\) similar to Measure 37 \(^{133}\) in Oregon followed. The


\(^{133}\) See Measure 37, http://www.sos.state.or.us/elections/nov22004/guide/meas/
discussion involved the role of public trust in growth plans, potential takings claims, and political realities in the South Carolina legislature and local governments. The lack of a voter initiative process in South Carolina was deemed important in terms of whether such legislation could become reality in South Carolina.135

The role of local governments and private initiatives received some attention from symposium participants. Inclusion issues, such as assurances for affordable housing,136 were part of that discussion, as were differences in municipal management across South Carolina’s coast.137

The round-table discussion closed with a conversation about citizen enforcement options. The issue of individual standing was discussed,138


See NOAA Coastal Servs. Center, supra note 114.
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comparing California’s standards with that of other states. Discourse about the effectiveness of citizen suits in terms of actual enforcement ensued.

This symposium issue of the SOUTHEASTERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW JOURNAL also contains three excellent student notes by University of South Carolina School of Law Juris Doctor candidates. These notes were competitively selected from among a considerable number of drafts submitted by Journal student members on topics related to the symposium. Bonnie E. Allen’s note, entitled The Viability of Leasing Public Trust Lands for Conservation in South Carolina, explores the innovative idea of importing into South Carolina a public trust lands leasing program for conservation purposes. Jaclynn Bower’s note, entitled Providing Landowners With a Fair and Fighting Chance to Have Their Day in Court: How The Government Is (Not) Effectively Arguing the Statute of Limitations, examines the issue of erosion and other “gradual takings” in the coastal context by exploring case law and other recent developments and pointing to a perceived increasing recognition of private property rights. Finally, Matthew E. Pecoy’s note, entitled Sitting on the Dock of the Bay: South Carolina’s Need for a General Submerged Land Lease Program, argues that a submerged land lease program would provide desirable increased protections for public trust lands in South Carolina.

Through the Bridging the Divide: Examining the Role of the Public Trust in Protecting Coastal and Wetland Resources symposium, the University of South Carolina School of Law and its students indeed were successful in bridging academic discourse with dialogue about practical problems faced by South Carolina’s citizenry. But at the end of the day, the Bridging the Divide Symposium raised more questions than it could answer, introduced more ideas than it could possibly resolve, and left participants and observers alike with a renewed commitment to continued consideration

139 Joan Leary Matthews, Unlocking The Courthouse Doors: Removal of the “Special Harm” Standing Requirement Under SEQRA, 65 ALBANY L. REV. 421, 450 (2001). (“A number of these states are exceedingly liberal in their standing requirements for challenges to their state’s NEPA provisions. For example, California has liberal standing rules for challenges brought under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).” (citing CAL. PUB. RES. CODE §§ 21000-21165 (West 1996 & Supp. 2001)).
of many issues presented by the gathering. In other words, it was a successful symposium!\textsuperscript{144}