

Default Report

Oregon's Coastal Futures

February 1st 2021, 11:53 am MST

Q1 - Below is a list of policies to help mitigate CHRONIC hazards (e.g. flooding, coastal erosion) facing Oregon's coastal communities. Please select FIVE (5) policies you would like see simulated through Envision.

#	Answer	%	Count
1	BPS Construction: Builds new Beach Protective Structures (BPS), (e.g. RipRap, to harden the shoreline against erosion and flooding)	2.63%	1
2	BPS Maintenance: Rebuilds BPS's that are of insufficient height to perform their intended functions	2.63%	1
3	BPS Nourishment: Replenish sand in front of BPS's that has been lost to erosion processes	2.63%	1
4	DRP Construction: Build new Dune Restoration Projects (DRPs), to protect the shoreline from erosion and flooding	2.63%	1
5	DRP Maintenance: Adds sand volume to existing dunes to maintain their function	0.00%	0
6	DRP Nourishment: Replenish sand in from of DRPs that has been lost to erosion processes	2.63%	1
7	Hazard zone development restrictions: Development within safest site or outside of hazard zones	21.05%	8
8	Remove buildings from hazard zone: Removes critical infrastructure from hazard zones	13.16%	5
9	Remove critical infrastructure from hazard zones: Removes buildings from hazard zones	13.16%	5
10	Raise or move structure to a new location in the same tax lot: Raise or move a structure to a new location within the same tax lot	7.89%	3
11	Raise Critical Infrastructure: Raise or move a structure to a new location within the same tax lot	0.00%	0
12	Community based development patterns	13.16%	5
13	Prohibit new hard protection measures (e.g. BPS, dikes, levees, geotextile tubes)	5.26%	2
14	Provide incentives/subsidies for property owners - conservation agreements, transferable development rights, buyback programs	13.16%	5
	Total	100%	38

Q7 - Please list any additional policies to help mitigate CHRONIC hazards (e.g. flooding, coastal erosion) facing Oregon's coastal communities.

Please list any additional policies to help mitigate CHRONIC hazards (e.g. flooding, coastal erosion) facing Oregon's coastal communities.

Q4 - Please list any additional 'resilience metrics' that you think we should be quantifying:

Please list any additional 'resilience metrics' that you think we should be quantifying:

Number of low income residents living/working in a tsunami or coastal flooding zone.

population by race/ethnicity, population by age group, pop/housing density, percent land use by type, number of NFIP claims, total cost NFIP claims, wetland acreage

Number and type of essentials facilities in hazard zone,

These seem like indicators of a hazard impact. Resilience metrics IMO are to measure the ability of the (x) to reduce or mitigate impacts. e.g. buildings NOT flooded after a strategy is employed. Railroad miles not flooded, etc. It may be semantics, but it is important to distinguish Resilience, a virtuous cycle of development; from fixing a list of problems. It isn't a measure of resilience to note 100 miles of road no longer flood in a given event--when 300 miles of new roads were built in new hazard zones during that same period. Resilience metrics are very hard to measure because we actually have to be building resilience over time in order to measure them. That said, this is a good list of subjects to consider.

Q6 - Below is a list of policies to help mitigate ACUTE hazards (e.g. earthquake/tsunami) facing Oregon’s coastal communities. Please select FIVE (5) policies you would like see simulated through Envision.

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Reinforce residential building (e.g. seismic retrofits)	0.00%	0
2	Relocate housing out of tsunami zones	11.43%	4
3	Reinforce critical infrastructure	2.86%	1
4	Relocate critical infrastructure away from tsunami zones	17.14%	6
5	Relocate community assets (e.g. food banks, community centers, resource centers) away from tsunami zones	11.43%	4
6	Reinforce community assets (e.g. food banks, community centers, resource centers)	0.00%	0
7	Reinforce key employment centers	0.00%	0
8	Relocate key employment centers away from tsunami zones	2.86%	1
9	Provide vertical evacuation facilities in coastal communities	8.57%	3
10	Hazard zone development restrictions: Development within safest site or outside of hazard zones	8.57%	3
11	Expand Urban Growth Boundaries to allow for new development away from tsunami zones	8.57%	3
12	Implement more stringent building codes	5.71%	2
13	Reinforce key road networks and bridges	2.86%	1
14	Reroute key transportation routes out of tsunami zones	11.43%	4
15	Provide incentives/subsidies for property owners - buyback programs	0.00%	0
16	Provide incentives/subsidies for construction outside of hazard zones	8.57%	3
	Total	100%	35

Q8 - Please list any additional policies to help mitigate ACUTE hazards (e.g. earthquake/tsunami) facing Oregon’s coastal communities.

Please list any additional policies to help mitigate ACUTE hazards (e.g. earthquake/tsunami) facing Oregon’s coastal communities.

Financial incentives for homeowners and landlords to move out of the tsunami inundation zones

Model the impact of Tsunami Overlay Zones (vs no such zones) to estimate the ability of those exclusion zones to affect physical impact of the tsunami, and the recovery response afterwards for a community with such exclusion zones compared with our current lack of such zoning. Along those lines, it might be interesting to examine how adopting such zones has/has not impacted the development pattern, or economy of Coos County..

Allow for expansion of communities to allow for new development away from tsunami zones. Unincorporated communities continue to be left out of this conversation and they must be included. There are many along the coast including Pacific City, Neskowin, and Barview/Twin Rocks/Watseco. Relocation and transferrable development rights will not be successful if these efforts are only focused on cities. We must not forget coastal communities.

Q10 - Please list any additional 'resilience metrics' that you think we should be quantifying:

Please list any additional 'resilience metrics' that you think we should be quantifying:

Loss of housing for low income individuals and vulnerable populations

Comparison between repair costs to mitigation costs

I consider these the only resilience metrics listed: # buildings removed from zone, # retrofitted buildings. IMO, the definition of resilient pre-excludes vertical evacuation structures. Their existence proves that there are too many people in a very vulnerable place. Accommodating increased human density in hazard zones is not a resilient behavior, it is an enabling behavior.

Q12 - Please list any additional 'distribution metrics' here:

Please list any additional 'distribution metrics' here:

disaster assistance grants, NFIP claims, Recovery plans, post-disaster redevelopment plans, MOUs with other inland jurisdictions, education programs,

Hmmm. I'm struggling with this term. Are we trying to determine if policies affect a broad or narrow part of the community? I'll need more info on this one.

Q13 - Please add any additional comments about policies, 'resilience or distribution metrics' or regarding the Envision project.

Please add any additional comments about policies, 'resilience or distribution metrics' or regarding the Envision project.

I need clarity on the definition of distribution metrics. In general, I would like to see daylight between what is described as resilient, versus what is described as mitigation. We are conflating the two, IMO. A lung transplant is not a resilient strategy for smoking. It is a technological Hail Mary to mitigate the behavior long understood to cause the problem. I think that we can find parallels in our language.