

**Notes from 8/30/07 SLR briefing with Jay Manning
(Including comments from other managers and policy staff at meeting)**

Characterizing the threats:

SLR projections from IPCC are based on multiple models.

- High level of variability and uncertainty, but relied upon by all. State does not have capacity to produce an alternative projection.
- IPCC projections are relatively conservative, for example not accounting for potential rapid ice melt scenarios (ex. Gore projections are higher than any of IPCC-utilized projections).
- Most common for our region is 6" – 2 ½' range. Specific number is less important for many purposes; an exception is shoreline facility design.
- May have improved projections in 12 – 18 months.

Other examples of risk consideration in facilities are important to consider:

- Flood hazard: Maps that are mostly quite crude are accepted because of apparent risk.
- Seismic: ASCE provides design guidance to engineers.
- Landslide hazard: Very general maps are available. Individual builder secures experts to evaluate their specific site. Not based on probabilistic projections (% chance in x years).

PAWG should group impacts into understandable "clumps", such as impacts to habitat and to infrastructure. Must be readily understood by legislators, interest groups, interested public.

PAWG recommendations: Most useful will be *range* of alternative actions, ranging from state-mandated actions to individual responsibility.

Key topics include:

- Land use planning processes such as GMA and SMA.
- Coastal facility readiness/adaptation planning re: SLR
- State facility planning: Higher level of direction re: preparation/adaptation for State investments

Anticipate limited new proposals in 2008 session. Big push re: CC investment is anticipated for 2009.

Data and analysis: While there are many pieces, we have a limited amount of well-connected technical information. Additional data collection and analysis should be oriented to produce useful detailed guidance.

For Puget Sound, much of the data needs will be met through overall "sustainable Sound" effort.

- Coordinate with existing monitoring efforts and Federal interest re: investment in data. Governor is less interested in studies than direct actions.

- Identify what is occurring and missing/inadequate elements.
- Current SLR mapping and reports over-emphasize large low-lying estuary/coastal areas.
- Significant impacts may occur in “thin strip” areas such as bluffs. Should pursue case studies of vulnerability in these narrow but significant areas.

Armoring: This is a major coastal management issue already re: property protection vs. sustaining natural long-term changes in shoreline.

- Both technically and politically challenging.
- SLR will add to concerns on both sides.

Existing programs related to SLR preparation:

- Shoreline Act: Staff needs to prepare guidance/fact sheet linking SMP updates with opportunity for SLR preparation. Cannot continue to be silent on this issue.
- FCAAP: This program may be more suitable for infrastructure-oriented SLR preparedness planning.
- In many cases, SLR issues will match up with issues and work already underway. Should leverage this work to ensure that SLR is considered.

Notes prepared by Tom Clingman

tcli461@ecy.wa.gov

407-7448