



CSO Coastal Hazards Planning & Adaptation Work Group
October 11, 2022 Call Notes

Attendees

Kathleen Angel (WI)	Emily Kirkpatrick (MI)	John Ryan-Henry (CSO)
Joseph Bauer (FL)	Jennifer Kline (GA)	Peter Slovinsky (ME)
Matt Baumgardner (NJ)	Julia Knisel (MA)	Jeremy Smith (CA)
Meg Cavanagh (NJ)	Clinton Little (MN)	Dylan Taillie (MD)
Nicole Carlozo (MD)	Jan MacKinnon (GA)	Mackenzie Todd (MD)
Steve Dickson (ME)	Julie McDonnell (MN)	Annika Tomson (CSO)
Krista Early (NC)	Casey Nolan (MD)	Kate Vogel (MD)
Joe Exl (IN)	Lucy Perkins (NH)	Matt Walderon (PA)
Steve Holland (OH)	Rob Porro (CSO)	

Notes

1. Welcome and Staff Updates

[See attached Staff Updates Handout]

2. Presentation: Annika Tomson, Digital Coast Fellowship Draft Work Plan

- a. Fellowship Background
 - i. Established in 2012 to provide on-the-job education and training opportunities in coastal resource management and policy for postgraduate students and to provide technical assistance to help advance the goals of the Digital Coast and its partner organizations.
 - ii. Annika is placed in a joint-fellowship with CSO and ASFPM
 - iii. Work falls in two buckets: Support host office managed retreat policy work; fellowship project.
- b. Fellowship Project Scope
 - i. Formerly-private coastal property that has become public due to challenges with inundation and/or erosion.
 - ii. All coasts in the United States: East, West, Gulf, Great Lakes, Islands
- c. The Issue
 - i. Sea level rise, higher precipitation, changing lake levels, higher erosion rates threaten properties and infrastructure
 - ii. In some cases, the property transitions from private to public ownership through, for example, buyout programs, rising high tide mark, abandonment.
 - iii. Local governments are often responsible for dealing with the land and the issues and complications it poses.

- iv. As climate change places more homes and properties at risk, more communities will be faced with managing coastal properties and infrastructure.
- v. Response is challenged by local capacity (both financial and staff), technical resources, and controversial nature of managed retreat.
- d. Project Phases and Products
 - i. Workplan Development – Fall 22 to Winter 2022
 - 1. Product – Work Plan
 - ii. Literature Review – Fall 22 to Winter 2023
 - 1. Products – Annotated Bibliography, Best Practices Report
 - iii. Research and Engagement – Winter 2022/23 to Summer 2023
 - 1. Products – Research and Engagement Strategy, Survey and Interview Results
 - iv. Case Studies – Summer 2023 – Fall 23
 - 1. Product – 3+ Case studies
 - v. Technical Guidance Development – Fall 23 to Summer 24
 - 1. Products – Gap Assessment, Technical Guidance Document
 - vi. Rollout and Engagement – Spring 24 to Summer 24
- e. Research Questions
 - i. Question 1: How can communities efficiently, transparently, and equitably manage this land to meet community obligations and achieve community priorities?
 - 1. Community: Local government ~county down
 - a. Diversity considerations: regional geography, coastal geography, economics (of community members and government), population size of municipality, authorities/structures of government, pre-disaster vs post-disaster, island communities, land type (urban, suburban, rural), population density, (more to be added)
 - 2. Efficiently: don't want to reinvent the wheel, or go parcel by parcel when communities don't have to, and generally, timing is a challenge of coordination/funding/capacity
 - 3. Transparently: it's a government project, don't want communities doing it without guidance/direction/input of the community members that they serve
 - 4. Equitably: equity throughout the process of the project (from ideation to implementation), and how the benefits and harms of the new public land are distributed. Not just equally across community members, but in a manner that alleviates past and existing inequities. Do the previous occupants of the property have access to the benefits?
 - 5. Community Obligations and Responsibilities: public safety, public access and use, open space, hazard mitigation, ecosystem services, economic resilience, cultural resilience
 - a. Cultural resilience is a critical part of the management of this newly public land as managed retreat/buyouts can be

traumatic/challenging for communities, and it can feel like they are losing their identity/admitting defeat

- ii. Question 2: What is needed to support that work that is not currently available?
- f. CHPA Member Involvement Moving Forward
 - i. Opportunity for CHPA feedback – fellow to provide presentations on preliminary findings and share draft deliverables.
 - ii. Advisory Committee – volunteers/SME’s that meet quarterly to provide guidance and feedback on preliminary findings and draft deliverables (committed through Summer 2024)
- g. Questions/Comments from Audience
 - i. Peter Slovinsky (ME): Are you going to try to develop a case study from each of the coastal regions, or are you limiting it to 3 case studies total?
 - 1. Annika Tomson: I intend for them to capture as great a diversity of experiences and contexts as possible. 3 is the minimum set out by the project proposal, and depending on the depth to which the case studies are developed, I will stick with 3 or expand to a greater number. It would be great to capture as many communities doing this work as possible, but at some point I wouldn't be able to develop the level of detail needed to make the case studies useful
 - ii. Clinton Little (MN): Will this be limited to private-public transfer? How about public-tribal land exchanges or public land managed retreat?
 - 1. Annika Tomson (CSO): The project is looking at land that has transitioned from private to public, but public-tribal land transfers will be considered among the suite of potential management options for the previously-private land. So, the land transfer could ultimately be private-public-tribal, but the project will not look at direct private-tribal land transfers.
 - 2. Clinton Little (MN): City of Superior has transferred land back to the Fond du Lac band (Chippewa):
<https://www.wsaw.com/2022/08/18/fond-du-lac-band-reclaims-land-wisconsin-point-after-more-than-century/>
 - 3. Clinton Little (MN): Often land is never actually transferred; just sits in state of disrepair. See little interest from local govt to take on land as public because of loss of tax revenue.
- h. Questions for CHPA Work Group
 - i. What other community priorities and obligations should be considered (Public safety, public access/use, open space, hazard mitigation, ecosystem services, economic resilience, cultural resilience)?
 - 1. Meg Cavanagh: Affordability
 - ii. Are there elements and considerations that are missing from the presentation?
 - iii. Do you know any examples of communities that acquired property and are now managing it? Or cases to consider?
 - 1. Jeremy Smith: Pacifica, CA

- iv. General feedback?
 - 1. Emily Kirkpatrick: Buyouts with rentbacks
- i. For questions or more feedback, contact Annika Tomson at atomson@coastalstates.org.

3. Group Discussion: *Hazard Mitigation Planning*

- a. The group discussion focused on coastal program involvement in statewide hazard mitigation planning activities. Participants provided responses to discussion questions in Mural Board (online white board), found [here](#).
- b. **Fall Member Meeting Hazard Breakout Recap:**
 - i. Today's discussion is a follow-up to a hazard mitigation planning breakout discussion we had during the Member Meeting in NH last week.
 - ii. That 45-minute discussion included about 20 folks and centered on the following questions:
 - 1. Investments in HM alignment with CZM
 - 2. Barriers to coordination
 - 3. CSO can support
 - iii. Overall, it seemed that there were a few examples of successful alignment between CZM programs and HM planning efforts (Silver Jackets, having a resilience officer in CZM, Climate Action Planning), but overall there still seems to be a disconnect between the investments made in and some planning efforts related to hazard mitigation and CZM priorities, and still lots of room to improve that coordination.
 - iv. We touched on some of the barriers to that coordination between CZM and EM/HM (culture, capacity, no requirement to coordinate, etc.) and also some of the things CSO might be able to support with. These are included on the Mural Board.
- c. Discussion Question 1: **How does your program engage with Statewide mitigation planning efforts?** *Participants verified whether or not their coastal program engages in the following mitigation planning activities (responses by state can be found [here](#):*
 - 1. Provide data or information
 - 2. Review / provide feedback
 - 3. Lead development on coastal section
 - 4. Review HMA grant applications
 - 5. Provide support or technical assistance to applicants
- d. Discussion Question 2: **What are the top barriers to coastal program engagement in hazard mitigation activities?** *Participants verified barriers identified in Fall Mtg Breakout and added additional barriers. Responses found [here](#), and listed below:*
 - i. Agency cultural patterns of behavior (from Fall Mtg Breakout)
 - ii. Coordination breaks down at the local level (from Fall Mtg Breakout, emphasized on Mural Board)
 - iii. Lack of understanding of CZM capabilities/responsibilities (from Fall Mtg Breakout)

- iv. Agency/staff capacity to coordinate (both in EM and CZM agencies) (from Fall Mtg Breakout)
 - v. No requirement for EM coordination with CZM (from Fall Mtg Breakout)
 - vi. Benefit cost data needed not available sometimes
 - vii. Takes too long to get awards
 - viii. Staff turnover of Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO)
 - ix. Document is very technical, likely difficult for the public to understand and access
 - x. Hard to find our HMP, so haven't seen updated one
 - xi. Our state HMPs can be hard to find, and too scientific and not useful for the general public
 - xii. Program capacity
- e. Discussion Question 3: **What are suggested CSO activities to help foster more CZM-EM coordination?** *Participants verified suggested CSO identified in Fall Mtg Breakout and added additional suggestions. Responses found [here](#) and listed below:*
- i. Build new agency partnerships (Federal Highways Administration, HUD) (From Fall Mtg Breakout)
 - ii. Develop national fact sheets of CZM capabilities/expertise/topics (From Fall Mtg Breakout)
 - iii. Facilitate interagency discussion/workshop to help break down barriers (From Fall Mtg Breakout)
 - iv. Pilot project – highlighting lessons learned from interagency work (From Fall Mtg Breakout)
 - v. Need CZM fact sheets for multiple Fed Agencies, not just FEMA or State EMA
- f. Discussion Question 4: **What are possible solutions or best practices for better CZM-EM coordination? Examples?** *Participants added examples or suggested solutions on the mural board. Responses found [here](#) and listed below:*
- i. Coordination through other programs (e.g. Silver Jackets)
 - ii. GA CZM sits on State Haz Mit Plan Update and in return they sat for an interview on our 312 evaluation. It is a constant working relationship.
 - iii. MA has had long-standing collaboration between MEMA and CZM. We signed a joint hazard mitigation and climate adaptation plan in 2018 and are currently working on the plan update.
 - iv. Communities of practice and work groups addressing coastal hazards
 - v. Developed swift water rescue training videos
 - vi. Developed a hazard vulnerability protocol for public access sites
 - vii. Review committee so everyone is in the loop
 - viii. Coastal Plan Alignment: <https://resilientca.org/topics/plan-alignment/compass/>
 - ix. Routine Coordination
 - x. Regular meetings organized by EM agency and related state level agencies/local EM personnel
 - xi. Coordination across funding options

- xii. MD Resiliency Partnership tries to make connections between projects/across agencies
- xiii. NH is piloting Flood Smart Seacoast Partnership across agencies focused on helping communities access HMA funding, among other things