



# An Overview of State Standards and Policies Incorporating Sea Level Rise Projections

New Jersey Coastal Resilience Summit  
October 9, 2018

*Dr. Marjorie Kaplan, Associate Director, Rutgers Climate Institute*  
*Jeanne Herb, Executive Director, Rutgers Bloustein School Environmental Analysis & Communications Group*

# Project Scope

- Summarize other states' Sea-Level Rise (SLR) standards and official guidance & provide insights on how they might inform development of a SLR standard in NJ.
- Examine efforts in other states that have 1) adopted sea-level rise projections, and/or 2) have statutes, regulations, or policies that require consideration of sea-level rise into planning, design, or decision-making on the part of state and local agencies and governing bodies.
- Information to be collected about other states' SLR standards will include:
  - what standards or official guidance have been established in other states participating in the federal CZM program;
  - Enabling authority;
  - Science basis and background to support the establishment of SLR standards;
  - Nature of how standards or official guidance are structured and implemented;
  - Any documented or reported outcomes and evaluation of impact, including public opinions, etc.

# What the project is and is not

- A summary analysis of state level SLR standards and policies, along with illustrative examples of those policies in other states.
  - Authoritative direction at the state level
  - May include guidance if it is tied to authoritative direction
  - Partnership effort with NJCMP in the DEP Office of Coastal and Land Use Planning (funding support + collaboration)
  
- Does not include:
  - Exhaustive inventory of all states' resilience activities
  - Guidance without authoritative direction
  - Resilience or SLR policies at other jurisdictional levels
  - Other resilience policy considerations (e.g., financing, local government mandates, other hazards, etc.)

# Targeted States

California	Connecticut	Delaware
Florida	Hawaii	Louisiana
Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts
New York	Oregon	Rhode Island
Texas	Virginia	Washington

# Information Collection

1. What is the technical nature of each state's SLR projections?
2. What was the process by which SLR projections were developed?
3. How are any SLR standards or guidance communicated to end-users?
4. Did any data on cost-benefit or avoided costs go into development of the projections?
5. Is there guidance/framework/tools for agencies to use when applying the SLR standards in programs?
6. What is the nature of the underlying authority to enable the SLR projections?

# Information Collection

7. What programmatic areas are the SLR standards applied to? Is the SLR underlying authority supported by other programmatic authority?
8. Is application of the SLR projections enforceable? Is there any surveillance of compliance or monitoring reporting requirements?
9. How is implementation of the SLR projections managed within government? Are there any incentives for agencies to comply?
10. How long have policies been in place? What feedback has been given with respect to ease of implementation, utility, costs or benefits?
11. Are there any data or studies done on program benefits vs. costs?
12. How does the program integrate with Federal programs related to flood risk reduction in coastal areas?
13. Are SLR standards conveyed to non-state agencies such as local governments, MPOs, etc.?
14. What have been the biggest programmatic challenges?



## States are generally...

1. Creating deliberative processes to establish SLR adaptation standards;
2. Building partnerships with the science community to ensure that SLR adaptation standards are science-informed;
3. Committing themselves to revise their SLR standard as science is updated;
4. Developing guidance for applying SLR standards (regardless of whether the end user is state agencies, local governments, private sector, other public authorities);
5. Undertaking outreach and education to the general public regarding their SLR standards and policies.



## States sometimes are....

1. Applying different authorities to implement a science-informed SLR standard;
2. Developing their science-informed standards acknowledging global science (IPCC) but moving towards more localized science;
3. Considering impacts to vulnerable populations;
4. Directing state agencies to **consider** SLR as part of planning, regulatory and capital infrastructure spending and assessment of state facilities/assets;
5. Encouraging or directing local governments to **consider** SLR in planning (but not setting a mandatory standard).

## States do not seem to be consistently....

- Integrating cost benefit analyses in development and/or implementation of their SLR standards;
- Directing adoption of a SLR standard as a mandatory provision (regardless of whether the target is state agencies, local jurisdictions, private sector) with notable exceptions;
- Considering cumulative impacts.

# Existing Building Blocks in New Jersey

- Demonstrated Need
- Supportive constituency
- Ready made science
- Guidance and decision support tools – under enhancement
- SoVI analyses - under enhancement
- Professional continuing education
- Innovative authority
- Ongoing dialogue @ MLUL reform



[climatechange.rutgers.edu](http://climatechange.rutgers.edu)  
[njadapt.rutgers.edu](http://njadapt.rutgers.edu)  
[www.njadapt.org](http://www.njadapt.org)

Jeanne Herb  
[jherb@ejb.rutgers.edu](mailto:jherb@ejb.rutgers.edu)

Dr. Marjorie Kaplan  
[kaplan@envsci.rutgers.edu](mailto:kaplan@envsci.rutgers.edu)