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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>IPCC AR5 Median (inches)</th>
<th>USACE High (inches)</th>
<th>NOAA High (inches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where is Your Community/Organization in the Adaptation Planning Process?

Go to www.Menti.com and use the code: 88 91 99
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Climate Change from the Legal and Policy Front
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The Law: Where Does Climate Change Show Up?

1117 Cases as of 11/2019 - Columbia Law School Tracking Database

Federal Claims
- Federal Statutes
  - NEPA, ESA, CAA, CWA, FOIA
- NEPA, ESA, CAA, CWA, FOIA & 14th Amendments
- Records, Env Regulation

State Claims
- State Statutes
  - Impact Assessments, Records, Env Regulation
- Constitutions, Commerce, 1st, 5th & 14th Amendments
  - Federal or Both?
  - State or Both?

Adaptation
- Seeking Adaptation
- Opposing Adaptation

Insurance
- Damages/$$$
- Flooding-Related
- Defending climate activity

Climate Advocacy and Science
- Speech/Defamation
- Conduct Scientific Research

Speech/Defamation

Conduct Scientific Research

1117 Cases as of 11/2019 - Columbia Law School Tracking Database
### Other Evolving Federal Legal Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFIP Reform</th>
<th>CRS</th>
<th>Corps of Engineers</th>
<th>NEPA</th>
<th>FFRMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• NFIP Authorization extended to 12/20/19 through Continuing Resolution</td>
<td>• Sea Level Rise Credits ~ 500 pts.</td>
<td>• Corps “(Engineer Technical Letter 1100-2-1) covering &quot;Procedures to Evaluate Sea Level Change: Impacts, Responses and Adaptation” (July 2014)</td>
<td>• Guidance from previous administration on application of NEPA with regarding to climate AND GHG analysis</td>
<td>• In place since 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk Rating 2.0 will incorporate a broader range of flood frequencies (2021)</td>
<td>• Mapping</td>
<td>• Previous Guidance 2009, 2011 and current 2013- “Incorporating Sea-Level Change Considerations in Civil Works Programs”- use of 3 scenarios</td>
<td>• Withdrawn 2017</td>
<td>• 2015 EO - construction in floodplains: methods from climate science, 2’ above the 100-year flood elevation, or the 500-year flood elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better reflect a property’s unique flood risks</td>
<td>• Improvement of rating score</td>
<td>• 2019 Engineering Technical Letter on Procedures to Evaluate Sea level change: Impacts, Responses and Adaptation</td>
<td>• New DRAFT Guidance summer 2019</td>
<td>• Federal investments (federal funds used for new construction, substantial improvement, or to address substantial damage to structures and facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Example- County x receives a CRS score of 5, but to improve to a 4, these points are pivotal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Biggest change: OMITTED- NEPA reviews should address impacts of climate change on the project; for example, sea level rise affecting a coastal project site</td>
<td>• Revoked 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Watershed Management Plan is key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CDBG MIT Grantees (8/30/19)- Resi BFE + 2’, “critical actions” 500 yr or 100-year + 3’(hospitals, nursing homes, police, fire &amp; utility)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legal Actions & Climate

SEEKING DAMAGES, COMPELLING RESPONSE & GOVERNMENT EXPOSURE:
TORTS, NUISANCE, TAKINGS & INACTION
Duty, breach, **causation** and injury

Tort claims brought on grounds such as public and private **nuisance, negligence**, failure to warn, trespass and unjust enrichment

**Early Examples:**

- **Kivalina** - Nuisance claim for $ from the energy industry for flooding damage caused by climate change. Dismissed on political question and specific emissions causation.

- **Comer v. Murphy Oil** - Mississippi Fed Court- property owners alleged oil company defendants released by-products that led to global warming, which produced the conditions that formed Hurricane Katrina, which damaged their property. Dismissed because injury not traceable to defendant’s conduct.

**"Takings Clause" of the 5th Amendment = "[N]or shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."**

**Inverse condemnation** = a landowner may recover just compensation under the 5th Amendment for a physical taking of his property when condemnation proceedings have not been instituted.

Are there exceptions takings? Yes, “public necessity” can be a defense to a takings claim when 1) there is an imminent danger and 2) an actual emergency giving rise to the actual necessity. Example: emergency adaptation measures.

**Early and Current Examples:**

- Flooding from infrastructure operations
- Government implements an adaptation project that impacts property values
- Government operates existing infrastructure and there are impacts

**Why is this all important?** 1) Some state and local governments are tying the impacts of climate change to industry actions; 2) As we plan and adapt, not everyone is not going to be happy with our decisions on infrastructure delivery.
More on Takings v. Torts at the Federal Level

Traditionally at the Federal Level:

- **Takings liability** can arise from an “authorized activity” (affirmative act). Takings liability does not turn on the level of care. Government must take a private property interest for public use by some specific action.
  - Did the specific action cause the injury?
  - Must show the damage that would have occurred without government action.

- Example scenario #1: POs sue government for taking of property for failure to maintain FEDERAL roads or drainage structures inundated by tidal flooding. Not likely successful under a takings theory because there was no specific governmental act.

- **Tort liability** can arise from “failure to act”. Tort liability can turn on the government not adhering to a level of care or the lawfulness of a government action or inaction.
  - The challenge in a tort claim is whether or not there is sovereign immunity attaching because an action or inaction is discretionary (planning) v. operational.
  - The other challenge is showing that action or inaction caused the injury.

- Example scenario #2: POs sue government under negligence claim for failing to elevate a FEDERAL road or install drainage structures impacted by tidal inundation. Not likely successful under a tort theory because the decision to elevate and install structures is likely a planning decision not subject to tort liability under sovereign immunity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation/Duty/Action</th>
<th>Local Government Response/Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is Sovereign Immunity for local government infrastructure? Gov’t liability</td>
<td>Section 768.28, F.S., <strong>waives governmental immunity</strong> from tort liability for injuries caused by the negligent actions of the state committed within the course and scope of carrying out official government acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waived (or not) for infrastructure decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is a local government required to upgrade infrastructure? No.</td>
<td>A governmental entity’s decision to <strong>upgrade or improve or not</strong> to upgrade or improve is a <strong>planning level function</strong> for which there can be <strong>no tort liability</strong>. Trianon Park Condo. Ass’n v. City of Hialeah, 468 So. 2d 912, 920 (Fla. 1985); see also Dep’t of Transp. v. Konney, 587 So. 2d 1292, 1295 (Fla. 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the local government decide the level of maintenance? Traditionally yes.</td>
<td>[A] county is <strong>not obligated</strong>, nor can it be compelled, to perform or provide for any <strong>particular construction or maintenance</strong>, except such as it <strong>voluntarily</strong> assumes to do. Ecological Development, Inc. v. Walton County, 558 So. 2d 1069 (Fla. 1st DCA 1990) The <strong>County</strong>, and not the courts, <strong>dictates the level of maintenance and accessibility necessary</strong>, Id. &amp; State ex. rel. White v. MacGibbon, 84 So. 91 (Fla. 1920).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traditional State and Local Government Tort Actions/Liability for Capital Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation/Duty/Action</th>
<th>Local Government Response/Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> What are planning versus operational decisions?</td>
<td><strong>Examples of planning</strong>: constructing road medians, initial infrastructure planning decisions, road alignment, traffic control device installation, or the improvement of roads and intersections. <strong>Examples of operational</strong>: failure to warn of known dangerous conditions at an intersection (i.e., vegetation obscuring signs), failure to place signs at railroad crossings, failure to warn of improperly constructed manhole cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Why is planning versus operation important?</td>
<td><strong>Planning-level</strong> decisions are immune from a tort suit, but <strong>operational-level</strong> decisions are not. Commercial Carrier Corp. v. Indian River Cnty., 371 So. 2d 1010, 1021 (Fla. 1979).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Are planning level decisions reviewable by courts?</td>
<td>The decision to <strong>build or change a road</strong> and all determinations inherent in such a decision are of the judgmental <strong>planning</strong> level type. To hold otherwise would supplant the wisdom of the judicial branch for that of the governmental entities whose job it is to determine, fund and supervise necessary road construction and improvements, thereby <strong>violating the separation of powers doctrine</strong>. Dep’t of Transp. v. Neilson, 419 So. 2d 1071 (Fla. 1982).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obligation/Duty/Action**

- Planning level functions are those requiring basic policy decisions, while operational level functions implement policy.
- Planning-level decisions are immune from a tort suit, but operational-level decisions are not.
- Generally no. The decision to build or change a road and all determinations inherent in such a decision are of the judgmental planning level type. To hold otherwise would supplant the wisdom of the judicial branch for that of the governmental entities whose job it is to determine, fund and supervise necessary road construction and improvements, thereby violating the separation of powers doctrine.
More on Takings v. Torts at the State Level

- Traditionally at the **State and Local Levels**:
  - **Takings liability** can arise from an "authorized activity" (affirmative act). Takings liability does not turn on the level of care. Government must take a private property interest for public use by some specific action. *Jordan says “Governmental inaction – in the face of an affirmative duty to act – can support a claim for inverse condemnation”*
    - Did the specific action cause the injury?
    - Must show the damage that would have occurred without government action.
  - Example scenario #1: POs sue government for taking of property for failure to maintain LOCAL roads or drainage structures inundated by tidal flooding. *Jordan says consider facts on “cause and degree of diminished access, reasonableness of County’s maintenance and whether or not it equates to abandonment.”*
  - **Tort liability** can arise from “failure to act”. Tort liability can turn on the government not adhering to a level of care or the lawfulness of a government action or inaction.
    - The challenge in a tort claim is whether or not there is sovereign immunity attaching because an action or inaction is discretionary (planning) v. operational.
    - The other challenge is showing that action or inaction caused the injury.
  - Example scenario #2: POs sue government under negligence claim for failing to elevate a LOCAL road or install drainage structures impacted by tidal inundation. Prior to the *Jordan* decision it was clear that the decision to elevate and install structures was likely a planning decision not subject to tort liability. *Jordan says that discretion is not absolute, but whether or not the County performed a reasonable level of maintenance that affords ‘meaningful access’ was left to the trier of fact and remains unclear.*
5-POINT PLAN TO MANAGE INFRASTRUCTURE LIABILITY

1. **Make planning v. operational decisions for infrastructure:** Planning analysis and policy decisions about maintenance and upgrades are a good thing and inherently do not incur liability. Operationally, once you build it, you have to maintain it at a “reasonable level”. And that’s an ongoing obligation and cost.

2. **Be clear about the levels at which you will maintain your infrastructure:** Jordan- “We hold that the County has a duty to reasonably maintain Old A1A as long as it is a public road dedicated to the public use. We do not hold that the County has the duty to maintain the road in a particular manner or at a particular level of accessibility”.

3. **Maintain your infrastructure:** Maintaining is a good idea.

4. **Don’t terminate maintenance without a formal procedure:** Although the Jordan ruling is an anomaly and traditionally an affirmative government action has been required for a taking to occur, it is currently a relevant DCA decision. It’s also likely “inaction” has to be “intentional” like a de facto abandonment.

5. **Filling in the legal gaps:** Develop local policy solutions that help manage expectations and fill in the gaps like, “reasonableness” of maintenance and levels of service.
## Transparent Level of Service/Design Criteria

- **St. Johns County Ordinance 2012-35** uses Florida Greenbook design exceptions to establish criteria:
  - Allows for designation of “environmentally challenging locations”
  - Defines “meaningful access” as a “commercially available land vehicle on a road or portion of a road owned/maintained by County for access to private property”.
  - Adds a cost prohibitive component
- **Monroe County Interim Design Resolution 028-17** adopts annual flooding return period of not to exceed 7 days + sea level rise projection for the useful life of the road project (25 years)

## Public Interest Evaluation

- WMDs evaluate factors to consider in regulatory processes that are “balanced”.
- **Examples of ERP factors**: PI Test: whether activity will adversely affect public health, safety, welfare or property of others, fish and wildlife, temporary or permanent in nature. **Examples of CUP factors**: Reasonable/beneficial use: economic and efficient use of water, not cause harm to existing off-site land uses, not harm water resources and not cause water quality violations.
- **Factors to consider in development**: Apply similar public interest / reasonable beneficial analysis to permitting of local government projects and infrastructure that may include:
  - Future maintenance needs and costs
  - Number of residents or visitors served by project
  - If the project affects adjacent property owners
  - If the project is related to critical infrastructure or services

## Policy Development and Notifications

- Use of Comprehensive Plan policies such as Peril of Flood and AAAs & Code to enhance flood disclosure notifications.
- **Flood Disclosure Laws (FL)**: “…where the seller ...knows the facts materially affecting the value of the property which are not readily observable and are not known to the buyer, the seller is under a duty to disclose them to the buyer” . - Johnson v. Davis, 480 So.2d 625, 629 (Fla.1985).
- **Leon County Code of Laws, Section 12-8(b)**: ...unlawful for a seller or landlord of residential property, with knowledge that such property has experienced flooding or is otherwise floodprone, to fail to disclose such facts in writing ... when such flood conditions are not readily observable and are not known ...the failure ... to provide such disclosure in advance of entering into either a purchase and sale ... or written lease agreement ... shall create a rebuttable presumption that the seller or landlord has failed to disclose facts that materially affect the value of such property ... and can recover from the seller...”
Planning

- Energy and Climate Element of Comp Plan (2013)
- Finalized GreenKeys Plan in 2016
- 165 Recommendations organized in 5-year Plan

Recommendations included:

- Data development (LiDAR)
- Pilot Road Elevation projects
- Coordination on CRS
- Enhanced modeling (for roads and stormwater)
- Sustainability initiatives

Key Implementation Steps:

- Countywide Mobile LiDAR
- Pilot Roads Planning in design
- Integration of CRS, Resiliency and Comprehensive Plan
- Countywide Roads and Stormwater Planning process
IMPLEMENTATION EXAMPLES:
1ST STEP: MORE ACCURATE DATA AND TOOLS

1. Implementation has resulted in 4 successful grants to date
   - Site specific resiliency/vulnerability planning projects on facilities (ALF/Park)
   - NOAA Grant included:
     - Collaboration with FEMA and development of CRS Class 4 compliant Watershed Management Plan analyzing SLR
     - Real time assessment of stormwater structures countywide

2. Linkages with CRS in pursuit of Class 4
   1. Repetitive Loss Analysis
   2. Stormwater Maintenance & Capital Plan
   3. Flood insurance outreach
   4. Watershed Management Plan
DEPs Resiliency Planning Grant (RPG) program has awarded 3 cycles of grant funding designed to:

- Help local governments plan vulnerabilities
- Update Comprehensive Plans

DEP awarded RPG R-1915 from 7/29/19-6/1/20

Scope of Monroe’s RPG is to develop draft Comprehensive Plan language to comply with new “Peril of Flood” requirements in Section 163.3178(2)(f), F.S. (Conservation and Coastal Management Element)

- Note: this is very preliminary language that will be incorporated into the overall Comprehensive Plan update (EAR 5/1/21-5/1/22) process
  - This will not be the last opportunity to discuss

Make recommendations for other Comprehensive Plan Elements to address climate and sea level rise issues

Internal Coordination / External Engagement
IMPLEMENTATION EXAMPLES:

1ST STEP MORE ACCURATE DATA & PILOTS

1. Pilot Projects in Big Pine (the Avenues) and Key Largo (Twin Lakes)

2. Meet 25 year projection of sea level rise + not exceed 7 days of flooding

1. Interim Design Resolution

2. Adopted 2017

3. Stormwater features include pumps: challenge is siting them (Comp Plan and right of way constraints)

4. 90% Design stage
IMPLEMENTATION EXAMPLES:
1ST STEP MORE ACCURATE FLOOD DATA & LIDAR

1. Create database for localized tide/flood events- residents send photos of tidal flooding
2. Obtain digital building footprints and ground elevations for all structures
3. Obtain Mobile LiDAR elevations for roads and first floods- more accurate elevation readings for future analysis
As part of the County's proactive sustainability approach, this project is to merge climate change science and modeling, with transportation engineering and planning, to develop a long-term roads adaptation plan based on design criteria, Sea Level Rise projections, adaptation methodology, policy/financing evaluation, and public/stakeholder outreach.

### Task 1: Data Collection

### Task 2: Engineering Analysis

### Task 3: Concept Development

### Task 4: Policy Review & Regulations

### Task 5: Stakeholder & Public Outreach

### Task 6: Implementation Plan

---

**Average Length of County Roadway Segment**

- 1,381.0 Feet
- 0.26 Miles

**Total Length of County Maintained Roads**

- 1,658,221.0 Feet
- 314.06 Miles

---

**Country Roads Spread Throughout 21 Different Keys, non-linear**

**Total of 1202 Roadway Segments Throughout Project Limits**

---

*82 Days Underwater: The Tide Is High, but They’re Holding On*

A brutal “king tides” season made worse by climate change has flooded the streets of a Florida Keys community for nearly three months.
# Keys Countywide Roads and Stormwater Plan

## Project Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Engineering Analysis</th>
<th>Concept Development</th>
<th>Policy Review and Regulations</th>
<th>Stakeholder and Public Outreach</th>
<th>Implementation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tidal Data</td>
<td>King Tide Predictions</td>
<td>Maintenance of Traffic</td>
<td>Roads Liability</td>
<td>Receive Input</td>
<td>Funding Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Data</td>
<td>Storm Surge, Wind Waves, and Extreme Event Analysis</td>
<td>Signing and Pavement Marking</td>
<td>Levels of Service</td>
<td>Establish Consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Outfall Structures</td>
<td>Vulnerability Assessment and Inundation Mapping</td>
<td>Drainage Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Regulatory Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Assessment and Condition Survey</td>
<td>Prioritization of Roadway Segments</td>
<td>Environmental and Permitting</td>
<td>Implementation Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveying and Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geotechnical Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Estimates and Benefit-Cost Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/13/20
Where the Rubber Meets the Road

Differences Across the Keys
- Differing elevations and impacts across neighborhoods
- There may be areas where we cannot maintain a certain level of service
- We are likely looking at a "range" of conditions for levels of service based on what may or may not be possible
- This will impact where people continue to live and how
- Private property owners may need to contribute
- What does that mean for funding?
  - Ongoing capital improvements
  - Special assessments for the differences
  - Disaster recovery funds
  - Bonding

Transparency in Science and Policy
- Where is our future growth and demand for infrastructure and services?
- Use updated vulnerability analysis to determine existing and future conditions impacted by sea level rise
- Determine the technical opportunities and constraints with drainage to avoid impacting adjacent properties
- We will need internal and external input

The New Vision of the Keys
- We may need to start looking at other methods of construction ("living with water")
- Other modes of transportation (based on water)

Photo: Monroe County

Photo: Monroe County TDC
## Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Climate Element</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating now to incorporate all climate planning initiatives</td>
<td>2013 Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be finalized in Evaluation and Appraisal Report based Comp Plan amendments</td>
<td>In process (RPG) 2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peril of Flood Amendments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be finalized in Evaluation and Appraisal Report based Comp Plan amendments</td>
<td>In process (RPG) 2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Integration of Sea Level Rise into other Comp Plan Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be finalized in Evaluation and Appraisal Report based Comp Plan amendments</td>
<td>In process (RPG) 2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Policy Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1001.1.3 &amp; 1001.1.6: Updating stormwater management regulations &amp; inventory and analysis of existing public drainage facilities</td>
<td>In process (DEO Grant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDENTIFYING THE ISSUES FOR FUTURE PLANNING

- Integration of Countywide Roads into capital improvements planning process
- Updating other vulnerability work beyond roads/stormwater to form the basis for establishing adaptation action areas
- Shoreline assessment and policies
- Disaster recovery and rebuilding more resiliently
- Remaining growth in the Keys (2023)
- ROGO and transfer of development rights (evaluation of sea level rise vulnerability)
- Framing infrastructure commitments (deficiencies and growth/expansion)
- Land acquisition and evaluation of sea level rise
- Recreation and open space opportunities
## Funding Strategies and the Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes</strong></td>
<td>Direct taxes (i.e., property taxes) and indirect taxes (i.e., sales taxes and use taxes) levied for lawful public purpose. Local discretionary sales surtaxes (infrastructure + resiliency)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments/Special Districts</strong></td>
<td>Charge against property receiving 1) special benefit and 2) fairly apportioned. Authorized by specific statutes or home rule authority. “Resiliency assessment district”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonding</strong></td>
<td>General Obligation (full faith and credit of an issuer with taxing power) and Revenue (payable with specific sources of revenue (utilities)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Fees or TIF</strong></td>
<td>Fees for the impact of new development (link between additional facilities and growth). “Tax increment”: the difference between the assessed value of the property before and after the redevelopment project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User Fees</strong></td>
<td>Payments for voluntarily purchased services which benefit the specific individual to the exclusion of non-feepayers such as stormwater utility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td>New trends include: disaster recovery funds for resiliency and infrastructure; traditional uses to address stormwater, septic and water quality; moving from planning to implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Group Discussion

Are you having these conversations on preparing for sea level rise?

If so, what’s the first step?
If not, what has held you back?
What is the best approach?
What is your perspective on the local government’s duty to provide road and safe infrastructure access?
What is your process for determining/updating SLR scenarios to lead into decision-making (i.e., who, how, how often, etc.)?

Submitted by: James Pahl, Louisiana CPRA
How can inland cities prepare for an influx of climate migrants retreating from the coasts and ensure vulnerable low-income/marginalized groups aren’t last to be helped and have their community preserved?

Modified from questions submitted by: Julie Donna, Louisville Metro Government and Christian Kamrath, Miami Dade County
Experts Answer Your Questions

Jayantha Obeysekera, Director and Research Professor in the Sea Level Solutions Center, FIU

Kha LeHuu, Principal, LeHuu Partners, Architects and Urbanists
Group Discussion

What’s your adaptation success story?
What Are You Doing During the Quarantine?

Go to www.Menti.com and use the code: 88 91 99
Thanks for joining us today!

- Put your project on the map
- Attend another GAMEOn! Event

Visit www.GlobalAdaptationMonth.org