

Coastal/Infrastructure PAWG - Prioritization Table (10/23/07)				
	Objective: Enhance ability of state and coastal communities and ecosystems to prepare/adapt to impacts of SLR and other CC influences	Priority Rank (3 Top Rank votes and 3 Medium Rank votes per member)	Sequencing: (1 = Impl now; 2 = start now for results later 3 = Impl later)	Comments; linked or precursor items?
I. Priority Recommended Early Action Strategies				
1	Umbrella recommendation: Continue multi-party coordination group on topic; continue to clarify roles of agencies and research entities (UW etc)			
A-1	<p>Promote resiliency of ecological systems and communities, through ensuring that the best available SLR/CC information is incorporated into local government GMA and SMP planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State agencies should compile best available information on SLR to guide local planning. Agencies should provide guidance re: SLR relevance to existing planning processes (ex. CAO Geological Hazard Areas) Critical piece is to make sure that this guidance is clear to local governments. • SMA updates need to include examination of sea level rise issues, including detailed mapping of erosion hazard where appropriate and to extent practical. 			Should not lose the opportunity to get information out to local communities, and should proceed with what is possible now, rather than conduct a study of SEPA and GMA to see which the best tool is. Agencies include ECY (SMA/Coastal); CTED (GMA planning); DNR (Geological Hazard Area guidance?)

A-2	Examine needs to revise State land use planning and regulation statutes to effectively address CC/SLR. This would include GMA, SMA and SEPA.			
A-3	Revamp SMA and HPA to strictly limit new armoring and reduce impact of reconstructed armoring. For example, create an impact fee for armoring under the GMA that would contribute to a habitat restoration fund or require impact assessments for armoring projects.			
A-4	Ensure that erosion hazard is included in setback regulations. Focus protection of processes on most critical types of areas - ex. Feeder bluffs. Concept of funding assistance prerequisite based on risk-based planning (parallel with FEMA hazard funding points system.)			Reducing liability of government for major damage to structures and infrastructure. Avoidance at point of building or rebuilding to reduce liability is vital. Will never be enough money to bail folks out.
A-5	Pursue pilot projects in vulnerable developed shoreline areas to examine alternatives to reconstructing bulkheads.			
A-6	SEPA checklist supplement: Inform individuals/communities on CC impacts and risks of proposed development or non-project action.			Limited by available information. Effectiveness will require effective use of SEPA. It will be critical to create an evaluation process to measure the effectiveness of local communities' actions.

A-7	<p>Utilize FCAAP and EMD Pre-Disaster multi-hazard planning to address SLR/CC related risks. Build flexibility into emergency response mechanisms to ensure that structures destroyed in disasters are not merely replaced but upgraded or relocated.</p>			<p>Will require Fed changes if FEMA is to be included as SLR risk mgt tool. However, State-level programs are adaptable.</p>
A-8	<p>Ensure public is informed regarding SLR risk that could effect coastal property, especially during investment decisions. Clarity on nature of risk and how it will be experienced (episodic high water during storms; changing erosion and deposition processes.) Also clarity on importance of adequate setbacks and limits on armoring to protect vital beach processes. Mechanisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RE Disclosure documents for low-lying areas, both commercial and residential. • Public information regarding potential/emerging insurance industry practices in response to CC. 			<p>Real estate agents must be required to give full disclosure, including potential climate impacts, and someone at a high level needs to discuss this with the insurance industry.</p>
A-9	<p>Create a dedicated fund for compensation to achieve resilience• One potential obstacle is funding, and one option is to build a dedicated federal trust fund.</p>			
<p>B. Consider SLR/CC in construction and maintenance projects in coastal areas</p>				
B-1	<p>Include best available data on SLR in design of coastal facility construction/major repair projects. A. Include SLR in State government coastal infrastructure design. B. Include SLR in State infrastructure funding program eligibility and requirements.</p>			

B-2	Cleanup sites: Consider future SLR in design and prioritization of shoreline cleanup sites.			
B-3	SLR consideration in retrofitting/maint. existing nearshore utility infrastructure: Provide general assessment of vulnerability; encourage SLR inclusion in CFP and project design.			
C. Consider SLR/CC in Habitat Restoration and Acquisition Projects				
C-1	Consider SLR in habitat restoration, large-scale mitigation and acquisition proposals. Add to SRFG, PSNERP and other funding program eligibility and planning req.			Patty Glick
C-2	Consider nearshore areas adjacent to vulnerable coastal habitats for preservation/conservation easement/purchase. Add to criteria for future funding.			
C-3	Consider reclamation/habitat improvement opportunities in long-term management of armored/diked shorelines: Potentially includes agricultural dikes, RR armoring.			
II. Priority Recommendations for Monitoring and Research				
1	Establish sustained monitoring of SLR and its affects in Puget Sound region, modeled after existing State/Federal monitoring program on the WA Pacific Coast			Assign to Hugh et al. Implement a monitoring program in Puget Sound similar to the monitoring program that has been ongoing on the coast of Washington for the past nine or ten years.

2	<p>Improve mapping and characterization of SLR vulnerability: Create general characterization of SLR vulnerability by shoreline type. Add maps to ECY Coastal Atlas; identify home for non-GIS data to ensure accessibility. Use HB 1301 CIG work in 2008 to accomplish this basic characterization.</p>			<p>Avoid over-reliance on SLR mapping; this misses important SLR implications for narrow "strips", ex. bluffs.</p>
3	<p>Improve nearshore elevation data control points to support SLR assessment.</p>			
4	<p>Legal and policy analysis: SLR and ownership/regulation/public access issues, where we are headed under existing law/reggs; recommend changes. CIG/UW ?</p>			
5	<p>Forecast future population and development (urbanization) of SLR vulnerable coastal areas, in order to assess future potential socioeconomic impacts.</p>			
6	<p>Issue SLR benchmarks and risk reduction guidelines for public facility planning. Encourage engineering community to develop guidance/methods. Identify tiers of recommendations based on level of risk over time to various types of facilities.</p>			<p>Disparity in capacity of large ports/cities vs. smaller ports and local governments. . It is important to highlight the need to give a range and not a specific number. Nature of decision being made will affect how risk is assessed in project design/decisions</p>
7	<p>Education: Public, decision makers, others. Disseminate new LG Guidebook</p>			