| | Coastal/Infrastructure PAWG - Prioritization | | | | | Criteria | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Objective: Enhance ability of state and coastal communities and ecosystems to prepare/adapt to impacts of SLR and other CC influences** | Actionability: (1 = Impl now; 2 = start now for results later 3 = Impl later | How important is this relative to other actions on the list? (Low, Medium, High) | Relative effort to implement | Is funding needed? ($100Ks, $1 Ms, $10 Ms) | Legislation/rules/Exec Order needed? (State? Local? Both?) | Does this increase flexibility to prepare/adapt? | Fit with other gov't priorities/programs for "bang for buck" or political support? | Comments |
| | **I. Priority Recommended Early Action Strategies** | | | | | ***Is this a ranking criteria? Move to description of proposal?*** | ***Recommend deleting this criteria as not useful. Answer should be affirmative for every item on the list.*** | | |
| | **Umbrella recommendation: Continue multi-party coordination group** on topic; clear roles in agencies and research entities (UW etc) | 1 | H | | | | | | |
| | **A. Include SLR/CC in land use and hazard plans** | | | | | | | | |
| **A-1** | **Amend planning statutes and State planning funding programs to address CC: R**equire consideration of climate change concerns, including sea-level rise, in SEPA, SMA and GMA land use planning, GMA capital facilities planning and HPA/SMA permitting. Ideas: 1. CC Element for Comp Plans (inc SLR for coastal cities/counties). 2. SMP updates: Encourage in 2009-14 round; require for 2018-21 round? | 1 | H | | Yes | | | | 1. Ability to plan limited by technical information. |
| **A-3** | **Utilize FCAAP multi-hazard planning** to include consideration of SLR/CC related impacts. Ex. Storm risk to low-laying houses on spits. | 3 (Req Fed changes if FEMA to be included) | | | | | | Need to integrate Crit Area protection with EM planning. Also Water Resources and Forestry CC concerns. | |
| **A=2** | **Use SEPA to examine CC issues including SLR.** Useful as long-term, educational mechanism esp. for big projects, shoreline projects | 1 | M-H | | No | A.) ECY guidance could improve attention to issue. B.) Rule amendment needed to ensure consistent use. C.) RCW revision needed to create a new "big project" threshold. | Gets issue "on the radar" | Fits with existing effort to improve use of SEPA | |
| **A-4** | **Avoid non-essential armoring:** Amend SMA permit exemption for bulkheads and emergency actions; amend SMA and/or HPA to provide state "back-stop" to ensure implementation. Recognize need to balance beach material and habitat protection with property rights. Ex. of forage fish dependence on narrow band in upper beach. JARPA, SEPA. | 1 | H | | | 1. Amend SMA and HPA to restrict bulkhead permits (esp. residential exemption). 2. Reducing "Emergency" work: Buyer beware req? GeoTech report issues (ex. "50 yr" assessments) | | Also Cat 2: Habitat resiliency | |
| | **B. Consider SLR/CC in construction and maintenance projects in coastal areas** | | | | | | | | |
| **B-1** | **Include SLR in design of all coastal State facility construction/major repair projects .** Encourage this for local government projects. State and local government coastal infrastructure planning should lead by example. | | H | | | | | | |
| **B-2** | **Improve nearshore elevation data control points to support SLR assessment:** Work with Federal agencies and others to define need and funding. Objective is accurate elevation benchmarks to support mapping and monitoring of sea level in all coastal areas. Link tide gages and contour mapping elevation data. Maintain high-level accuracy over time. . | 2 | H | | | No | | | |
| **B-3** | **Develop state-issued SLR benchmarks and risk reduction guidelines** for public facility planning. Risk-mgt based: Validate projections/models; Identify tiers of recommendations based on level of risk over time to types of facility. Modify over time based on new information. | 3. Precursors:(1) Risk mapping/characterization and (3) Improved elevation controls. | M | H | | Yes. Assignment not clear. | | Would utilize projections from #1 above. Essential for Rec #3 & 4. Parallel mech: 1. Earthquake design w/standard event and risk mapping set by PE's; 2. FEMA FP mapping/elev. | |
| **B-4** | **Require all State infrastructure funding programs to include consideration of CC/SLR in funding & design** | 3 (precursor is #1) | M | Multiple programs | | Executive Order? | | Coordinate with Legislative Infrastructure Study Group | |
| **B-5** | **Cleanup sites: Consider future SLR in design and prioritization of shoreline cleanup sites.** | 1 | M | | | | (TC: Check with TCP) | Already significant investments in cleanup. SLR considerations improve I-t success. | |
| **B-6** | **Saltwater intrusion into existing infrastructure:** Assess vulnerability and design retrofit programs re: stormwater systems, sanitary sewer, coastal groundwater supplies, septic system setbacks. Awareness of utility operators, build improvements (ex. tidegates) into CFPs. QW implications. | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | **C. Consider SLR/CC in Habitat Restoration and Acquisition Projects** | | | | | | | | |
| **C-1** | **Consider SLR in habitat restoration, large scale mitigation and acquisition proposals.** Consider the impacts of future potential sea-level rise, to improve resiliency of habitat. Large-scale mitigation (Ports, wetland banks) should consider SLR in design. | 1 - 3 (some areas need better maps) | | | | Exec Order - State-funded projects, LE and other habitat groups, wetland mitigation banking. Puget So Partnership? CZMA? | | Already funding restoration and acquisition. Add bonus points to existing ranking criteria? | |
| **C-2** | **Consider nearshore areas adjacent to vulnerable coastal habitats for preservation/conservation easement/purchase.** Intent: Preserve diversity of habitats. Add to criteria for future funding. | 1 - 3 (some areas need better maps) | H | | $10 Ms | WDFW Comp WL Conservation Strategy? | Improves ability for system to adapt to change in SLR. | | |
| **C-3** | **Consider reclamation opportunities in long-term management of armored/diked shorelines:** There may be opportunities for reclamation of certain armored shorelines as part of response to SLR. Ideally, SMP Restoration Strategies watershed plans or other pre-planning will guide off-site mitigation to the most important restoration/reclamation projects. Opportunity to achieve NN Loss. | 3 | | | | | | | |
| | **II. Priority Recommendations for Research** | | | | | | | | |
| **1** | **Improve mapping and characterization of SLR vulnerability**: Work through CIG and others to develop science-based sea level rise and erosion potential maps for all coastal areas. Create general characterization of shoreline types and their particular vulnerability to SLR-related impacts. Include habtitat vulnerability in mapping and characterization, through cooperative effort of WDFW, tribes, NWF, etc.Add these products to the existing on-line Ecology Coastal Atlas and other portals. Incorporate new informatio in the future. | 2 | H | | $100ks | No reg or rule action needed | | Will support efforts of State and local agencies and others. Fundamental building block for preparation/adapt. | Avoid over-reliance on SLR mapping; this misses important SLR implications for narrow "strips", ex. bluffs. |
| **2** | **Legal and policy analysis:** SLR and ownership/regulation/public access issues, where we are headed under existing law/regs; rec changes. CIG/UW ? | 2 | H | | | | | | |
| **3** | **Forecast future population and development (urbanization) of SLR vulnerable coastal areas,** in order to assess future potential socioeconomic impacts. | CIG? | M | | | No | | CIG reports will cover this? Links to accommodating growth under GMA | |
| **4** | **Education**: Public, decision makers, others. Disseminate new LG Guidebook | | | | | | | | |