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**Envisioning a Resilient Oregon Coast: Co-developing alternative futures for adaptation planning and decision-making**

**January 2021 Virtual Advisory Council Meeting (virtual conference info below)**

15 January 2021 (10:00 am – 12:00 pm)

**Meeting Objectives:**

1. Update the Advisory Council on project progress.
2. Discuss and work toward developing the project’s final list of **policies, scenarios, and metrics** to be explored and quantified in Envision.
3. Harness the expertise of Advisory Council to develop actionable knowledge to inform statewide policies and localized decision-making.

**Attendees:**

* Sarah Absher (Tillamook Community Development Director), Jay Raskin, Jarod Norton (USACE), Gwen Shaughnessy (NOAA), Meg Reed (DLCD), Shelby Walker (Oregon Sea Grant), Jack Barth (Marine Studies Initiative), Mike Harryman (State Resilience Officer), Charlie Plybon (Surfrider), Hailey Bond (DLCD), Althea Rizzo (OEM), Kira Glover-Cutter (ODOT, sitting in for Michael Bufalino), Phillip Mote (OSU), Michael Howard (UO Institute for Policy Research and Engagement)

**Welcome, Introductions (lightning round all), Meeting Overview (Peter)**

* Meeting overview: See meeting objectives on agenda and powerpoint presentation
* This meeting’s focus on is largely on: policies, scenarios, and metrics

**Brief alternative futuring exercise (Pat)**

* What would you like the future coast to look like (what’s your desired future condition)? How would we get there? How would success look like?
* Pat: Wants the coast to look like a place where hazard zones are taken seriously. Get there by incentivizing density/movement outside of the worst hazard areas. Success would be number of survivors. Or get there by requiring disclosure of properties in the inundation zone. Success could be measured by a survey of coastal property owners
* Jarod: Wants to coast to have increased commerce with reduced footprint or costs. Get there by promoting a more nature-based approach.
* Althea: Desired condition: No development in the tsunami inundation zone. How to get there: Public policies and public pressure to move populations outside of the hazard zone. How to measure: No one dies in the tsunami.
* Peter: Snowy plovers taken off the endangered species list. Get there via beach nourishment and dune restoration projects. Success measured by snowy plover population measures.
* Jay: Resilient communities. Get there by adaptation and mitigation policies. Get there via measures in the Oregon Resilience Plan.
* Tiffany: Is concerned about no development in the tsunami inundation zone – in Clatsop county this isn’t feasible. We need other land use policies to deal with the reality of development and real estate.
* Charlie: Desired condition: Little has changed to how we value, enjoy the coast and beaches. How to get there: Pay and plan for the adaptation strategies and relocation (where possible) rather than pay and plan for the re-build and mitigation post-catastrophe. Slow relocate. How to measure: chronic hazards and the # of problems/permits those are triggering can be a slow, over time measure of how we’re addressing acute hazards. Headline: Oregonians retreat to adaptive living post tsunami. Beach recreation resumes.

**Centering the conversation on policies, scenarios, and metrics (John)**

* See powerpoint for policies, scenarios, metrics overview as well as survey results preview

**Discussion**

* Sarah: Wants to echo what Tiffany said. Likes the Protect policy because it could actually be used in coastal communities where it may not be feasible to move buildings outside of the inundation zone
* Meg: How does the model, or can the model, differentiate the difference between private property in need of protection from erosion vs. public infrastructure? I.e. Highway 101?
  + John: We have data on which houses are eligible to armor, on critical infrastructure, on roads, etc. We can identify these different types of infrastructure.
* Charlie: Can we be clear what we are protecting? Is beach recreation a human activity that would be protected?
  + Peter: Qualtrics survey has a list of the policies we’ve considered so far. In it everyone can add policies and metrics they want to see
* Pat: Can Envision balance incentives with costs?
  + Peter: Who pays for it is difficult to specify in Envision. However, this also gets at the style of implementation, and starts getting at equitable resilience. Which we will talk about shortly.
* Pat: Does not prioritize worst case climate scenario. Those who also agree:
  + Michael, Meg, Sarah
* Jack: Explore the worst case, since it’s plausible if ice sheets collapse. Those who also agree:
  + Charlie
* Philip: Even if 2m sea level rise does not happen by 2100, it is fairly likely by 2200. Any appetite for thinking that far out? Esp with the overlay of rising likelihood of M9 earthquake and tsunami
* Meg: Flood ordinance scenario - apply FEMA flood standards to areas affected by SLR. This would affect a larger area than what is required now to be regulated under FEMA flood regulations.
  + Pat, Philip, Charlie think this is a great idea
* Philip: I’ve always loved the 12-square tile diagram. Now I have a thought based on this discussion and Meg’s comment… and that’s the potential path dependence. That is, a policy scenario that is now exceedingly unlikely might become more palatable if the climate scenario unfolds higher than expected. That is, rather than just modeling each of the 12 tiles as a fixed evolution, what if you start out at one extreme but 20 years later the climate /CSZ scenario goes a different way and the policy changes?
  + Peter: Adaptation pathways
  + Steve: Thanks for this comment Phil - path dependence is definitely something I am interested in and understanding what those "new" options would be is an important discussion
  + Philip: I think what I was driving at is the paths look different once you have sunk costs
  + Pat: Would like to see pathways with sunk costs vs those not beholden to sunk costs. If there’s anywhere in the country we can look at this, the Oregon Coast would be it.
  + Peter: Maybe have a hybrid adaptation pathway?
  + Pat: How would development look like after the earthquake? Can we model development after the earthquake?
  + Peter: Maybe an acute baseline scenario could have development after the earthquake?

**Interactive breakout discussions on scenarios and styles of implementation (Jenna)**

* See Styles of Implementation breakout group document on Box

**Discussion/report back**

* Jenna’s group:
  + Had a great conversation about targeted implementation approach. General consensus that having targeted vs untargeted was a good idea.
  + Do chronic and acute hazards match up with measures of socioeconomic vulnerability? Maybe not. So, how to target exposure risk but also socioeconomic vulnerability.
  + Are targeted policies – e.g., targeting black businesses – feasible/implementable in reality? May have legal issues down the road. But there may be pathways to do this, especially after Covid.
  + Charlie: Workforce centers is really good to think through from a socio-demographic standpoint, we really exposed a lot of that importance on the coast with COVID for sure
  + Clarifying language. “Resources” here means largely financial mechanisms in Envision.
* Steve’s group:
  + The most politically viable would be distributing the resources to a combination of socioeconomic and exposure risk. Targeting them separately would be less feasible.
* Both groups didn’t get to the distribution metrics. Can see them again and make comments in the Qualtrics survey.

**Wrap up/next steps/project timeline/informal discussion of statewide and regional resilience efforts (Peter)**

* Meg: DLCD is submitting a proposal today about looking at vulnerable populations on the Oregon Coast, using adaptation pathways. She can share the whole proposal once it’s finished.
  + Gwen, Michael and us would love to see this proposal.
  + Brief discussion about adaptation pathways
* Discussed plans for next couple of months (our 3rd and final year of the project), next AC meeting.
* Jay: Coastal Caucus’ fears of losing ability to develop the coast have really impacted DOGAMI. This is a concerning situation. Appreciates that we are looking at the problem, our work is very relevant right now.
  + Charlie: It was driven by money mismanagement really, but agree a terrible loss. Recommends reaching out to your legislators.
  + Sarah: Charlie, Tillamook County already sent a letter of support
* Charlie: Asked if someone from our team would be interested in presenting for Surfrider folks or the general public?
  + Peter: We can come up with a group that would be more than happy to present. Maybe in early spring?