

Attachment E

Charge to Stakeholders

SAP 4.1 Stakeholder Review: Charge to the Reviewers

General Questions and Report Structure

1. The outline that the authors have been using to write the report assumed that about 60% of the report would be issue-by-issue (or process-by-process) at the national or mid-Atlantic scale, while 40% of the report would attempt to integrate all the issues on a place-by-place basis. The outline page allocations are shown below. Is this about right? _____
Or would you favor changing the allocation.

	Outline	Suggestion
Ch1 Background section explaining coastal change in general	12.5%	_____
Ch2 Explanation of new studies	6.25%	_____
Ch 3,5,6 Results/Discussion--National and Mid-Atlantic scale	25%	_____
Ch4 Place-by-Place results and discussion	43.5	_____
Ch7 Research Plan	12.5%	_____

Please explain _____

2. The prospectus for this report says that this report is written for two audiences: The coastal practitioner and the general public. Given these two audiences, which of the following views are more likely to be correct regarding the length of this report?

- Most people would prefer to read the entire report from beginning to end. Therefore, it is better to keep the report reasonably short even if doing so prevents complete explanations of particular issues or locations.
- Most people prefer a complete explanation of the issues that interest them. Therefore, it is better to provide complete explanations about particular issues and locations, even if doing so makes the report longer.
- To meet the needs of both audiences, the authors need to concentrate on designing the report so that one can easily find the sections that will interest them and skip the sections that do not.
- To meet the needs of both audiences, the final CCSP report should be short with an invitation to contact the authors directly if one needs further information.
- Other _____

3. Which of the following scales are useful for tables of results (e.g. area of low land, population in the vulnerable area)?

- _____ nationwide
- _____ Mid-Atlantic wide
- _____ statewide
- _____ county (or city) wide
- _____ estuary wide

Please explain _____

4. The various chapters include maps and figures. If the final version has the same length as the current version, what is your opinion of the mix of graphics and text: (a) about right, (b) chapter needs more words and fewer graphics; (c) chapter needs fewer words and more graphics

Chapter 2 _____

Chapter 3 _____

Chapter 4 _____

5. Physical and social factors both determine vulnerability to sea level rise. In your view, what is a good mix (in terms of page allocation) for those factors? _____

Why? _____

6. The report outline assumes that the report will have a detailed background chapter 1 explaining all the coastal processes (physical, biological, and social) that need to be understood to answer the prospectus questions. In the rough draft, some of the answers included most or all of the background necessary to understand the particular question. Should the report:

- a. have a detailed background chapter and omit background material (and simply refer to the background chapter) when answering the questions, referring the
- b. drop the detailed background chapter and include the background material as needed in the answers to each question.
- c. provide a detailed background chapter so that the reader can see how all of the factors inter-relate, but then include enough background material in the answer to each question so that the average reader would understand the answer without having to turn back to the background chapter.

Please explain _____

Does your answer depend on our next question _____

7. Should Chapter 2 (explanation of what the agencies did to answer the questions, including study method) remain in its current location before the answers to the questions (chapter 3)? Or should these explanations each be inserted into the section answering each of the questions? _____

Taking Chapters 1 and 2 together, would it be best to

- a. Keep the current structure: (Background, approach, answers to the questions)
- b. Keep the approach chapter but fold background into the answers
- c. Keep the background chapter but fold methods into the answers
- d. Start with the answers, and put the background and methods in an appendix

Please explain _____

Feedback on Specific Questions and Chapters

Question 1: The maps provide 6 elevation bands for dry land, two elevation bands for nontidal wetlands (purple), plus tidal wetlands and open water. The authors assumed that the maps would have been too confusing if they had included 6 different colors for nontidal wetland—but that it is useful to distinguish nontidal wetlands from dry land.

- a. Do you agree that it is useful to distinguish the nontidal wetlands from the dry land?
 - b. If so, do you agree with using just two shades to show elevations of nontidal wetlands. If not, how many elevation bands would you favor and what colors should be used?
-
-

Question 1. The maps provide 6 elevation bands for dry land. Where the data is better, the contour interval is 50 cm. But where the elevation data is poorer, the contour interval is 100 cm. The legend states the contour interval. Do you find it confusing to see maps with two different contour intervals based on data quality? Would it be better to simply show three elevation bands up to 3 meters in areas with the poorer data, or it is better to show 6 elevation bands?

Questions 1, 3, 4: Interrelationship. The net change in tidal wetland area depends on topography (question 1), wetland accretion (question 3), and shore protection (question 4). Which approach makes the most sense for discussing net wetland loss?

- a. Discuss net wetland loss in the discussion of question 3.
 - b. Discuss net wetland loss at the end of the discussion of question 4.
 - c. Make the issue a separate question that integrates the results from questions 1, 3, and 4.
 - d. Discuss net wetland loss at the end of each of the separate sections on questions 1, 3, and 4.
-

Question 2. Should the answer to question 2 address shores of Chesapeake, Delaware, and other large bays? If so, can you help us find a contributor who could write the necessary text to do so?

Question 3. In many cases, the summary map indicates that wetlands would be "marginal" for a given rate of sea level rise. In that context, marginal means that the wetlands may or may not be able to keep pace with rising sea level, depending on how they are managed. Can you provide additional details on how human activities may be—or could—help or hinder wetland accretion?

Question 4. The end of this section has a table on "conservation goals" which represent the portion of wetlands that must keep pace with rising sea level to achieve no net loss, as a function of shore protection and the rate of sea level rise.

- a. Is this a useful indicator? _____
- b. The table makes two alternative assumptions (a) potential conversion of nontidal wetlands to tidal wetlands should count as tidal wetland creation and (b) conversion of nontidal wetlands should not count. The report does not analyze whether dry land will convert to nontidal wetlands from any backwater effect of the higher sea level. Should the tables include both (a) and (b), or simply one or the other?

Question 5. Does section 3.5 (floodplains) have too much, too little, or the correct mix of background material on FEMA and floodplain management, given the amount of text on the impact of sea level rise on FEMA and floodplain management?

Questions 8 (environmental impacts)

EPA sponsored a series of 16 miniature literatures on the environmental implications of sea level rise for specific areas (e.g. Hampton Roads, Western Shore of Chesapeake Bay, Atlantic Coastal Bays) generally corresponding to the subregions discussed in Chapter 4. EPA planned to extract the most important impacts (1-2 pages) from each of these reviews, and insert them into the corresponding section of Chapter 4--hopefully in a fashion that would keep the discussion fresh by making different points for each region (while referring the reader to other sections whenever the impact has already been explained.)

So far, the authors only made such extractions for three subregions: Hampton Roads (Section 4.2.2.4), Middle Peninsula/Northern Neck (Section 4.2.3.3) and Delaware Bay (Section 4.4.1.3). Should the authors extract the key environmental information from these other miniature literature reviews? If so, how many (single spaced) pages should be included for the environmental implications of

- Potomac River
- Western Shore of Chesapeake Bay
- Eastern Shore of Chesapeake Bay
- The Atlantic coastal bays of Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware
- The New Jersey Atlantic Coast
- Raritan Bay/NY Harbor
- South Shore of Long Island
- Long Island Sound

Question 8. Do you agree with the Easton-meeting stakeholders that section 3.8 needs to start with a 5-10 page overview discussion on wetland structure and function, and on how sea level rise alters the structure and functions, before directly answering the question about the species that are affected by habitat loss due to sea level rise?

Questions 9-10. Do you make decisions whose outcomes depend on how much the sea rises? Do you know someone who makes decisions whose outcomes depend on how much the sea rises? In either case, please explain how that decision depends on sea level rise, and any barriers to properly addressing sea level rise. Is this a decision that the CCSP report should discuss (either specifically or in general).

Questions 9-10. Do you agree with the Easton stakeholders' comment that the report should include a set of practical recommendations that state and local government can do now to prepare for rising sea level, e.g. a "top 10" list?