

South Shore Estuary Reserve Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

June 4, 2019 11:00am- 1:00pm

Town of Islip

Long Island Maritime Museum

86 West Avenue, West Sayville, NY 11796

In attendance:

South Shore Estuary Reserve Office:

Jeremy Campbell

Christie Pfoertner

Rachel Neville

Sally Kellogg

Carolyn Fraioli, DOS OPDCI

TAC Members:

Lane Smith, TAC Chair, New York Sea Grant

Kristin Kraseski, NYSDEC

Rich Groh, Town of Babylon

Alexa Marinos, Town of Babylon

Chris Schubert, USGS

Nicole Maher, The Nature Conservancy

Terry Blitman, Long Island Maritime Museum

Maureen Dolan-Murphy, Citizens Campaign for the Environment

Tom Wilson, Stony Brook University SOMAS

Michael Bilecki, National Parks Service

Christa Farmer, Hofstra University

Maureen Dunn, Seatuck Environmental Association

Jim Browne, Town of Hempstead

Kyle Rabin, LINAP

Meeting called to order at 11:02 am. Introductions of those in attendance.

Review/Approve February Meeting Minutes

Mention of addition to original Draft minutes.

MOTION: pass April meeting minutes. Seconded. Approved.

Minutes are on Google drive as well as agendas and can be accessed at any time.

Update on the Climate Vulnerability Assessment Letter

J. Campbell: Provided an update on the CVA letter. There was interest in the CVA at the Council meeting. The recommendation was to bring it back to the TAC to discuss it more to refine the request. With looking for a potential RFP, the letter needs a more detailed scope and cost assessment which it did not have and needs more refinement to be the most helpful to the Reserve. C. Fraioli is here to present on the process so we can have a solid recommendation to the Council. Can also use the tools Peconic Estuary Program is using to develop theirs. J. Campbell recaps that the letter was not presented to the Council because it needs more budget information and refinement.

Confusion on the purpose of the letter, some thought the letter was a request to develop the RFP.

J. Campbell: We spoke about this at the Council meeting and we need more detail to put into an RFP, how it would go together, and what it would include.

L. Smith: The sub-committee thought that is was a letter asking if it is okay to do a CVA and if so, we will put an RFP together.

J. Campbell: We need to focus on the scope of the project and how much it would cost. The presentation by C. Fraioli will provide tools that can help with this.

R. Groh mentioned we want to shy away from manmade resources and look at natural resources. Don't want to focus on hospitals, etc.

N. Maher mentioned that a vulnerability assessment is not the vulnerability of our resources, it is supposed to focus on the goals of the estuary program and looking at the climate vulnerability of the group's objectives. The focus document from the EPA, sent out with the meeting agenda, has a table that is useful for this.

L. Smith: We can look at habitat and if it is vulnerable, but we should look at the goals of the CMP to see if we can even complete those goals with new changes in climate.

M. Bilecki: What does the Council want from the TAC? A letter with more detail to show we want to develop an RFP?

J. Campbell: Frame it as a rough cost estimate and what the components are to achieve that.

M. Bilecki: Had thought we wanted to ask about the cost after having an idea of if we could move forward. TAC expertise does not have experience with how much this kind of project would cost.

T. Wilson mentioned that TAC members are the people who could do the technical work, but we want to ensure we avoid a conflict on interest. The group can come up with what is and is not valuable and give that to the Council, then another party should write the RFP to avoid any potential conflict.

N. Maher discussed how is value in developing an RFP to hire an outside source to assemble the background literature, keep the TAC group on track, facilitate meetings, and write the document.

Suggestion to ask Peconic Estuary Program what their costs were for their project.

**Presentation by Carolyn Fraioli, Coastal Resources Specialist, NYS DOS, OPDCI:
“Resilience and Vulnerability Assessment Resources”**

The letter drafted by the sub-committee had been shared with C. Fraioli to see where improvements could be made. A goal is to identify resilience strategies. Resilience was defined, background on the updated CMP and addition of Resilience chapter.

Discussion on how chapters of the CMP relate to resilience and which parts of these chapters could be priorities when thinking of how climate change could impact resources.

Discussion of assessment tools including the SLAMM tool (which generates tables and maps to show how sea level rise affects marshes), The Nature Conservancy’s Future Habitats Coastal Resilience Mapper (N. Maher added that this tool is informed by SLAMM), InVEST model Habitat Risk Assessment tool, Natural Resource Navigator, and NFWF CREST. The CMP covers not just natural features but also economic aspects. Economic vulnerability is important too and needs to be considered.

M. Bilecki asked if these tools need new data input. C. Fraioli responded that the habitat risk assessment tool does need data input.

R. Groh: It seems like a goal or parameter should be the impact of water rising.

C. Schubert: Absorbing stormwater will be a big issue and a tool that can import groundwater hazards is important.

R. Groh mentioned that Fire Island National Seashore (FINS) did a vulnerability assessment and looked at groundwater.

C. Schubert: The FINS assessment, when public, would be a good tool because of its strong focus on (SLR-driven) groundwater flooding. FINS has detailed modeling results for this hazard, whereas the PEP and its assessment currently have more limited information available.

C. Fraioli: When will this assessment be public?

M. Bilecki: In the next month. Completing peer review now, will incorporate comments and hopefully release it at the end of July.

L. Smith: Maybe a product could be a GIS model or layers to project changes over 50 years related to marshes and SAV, under current conditions, low, and high. Can be used for decision-making.

M. Bilecki: Let’s focus on what we need to bring to the Council to move forward with this, as the letter was not sufficient.

Discussion on the creation of models and an ultimate matrix showing vulnerability vs. risk.

M. Dunn: When writing the letter, we had to choose what areas of the CMP to focus on. Which goals do we want to tackle?

N. Maher: Having goals of the CMP in a matrix will help prioritize.

Discussion on Council's role in moving forward with a CVA.

J. Campbell: The role of the TAC s to come up with ideas to advance the CMP. If the TAC has identified this as a priority, then it is. We make a recommendation, present it to the Council for approval and funding. The Council does not identify priorities for the TAC.

M. Bilecki: For the FINS assessment, workgroups focused on separate priority areas, then came together as a large group.

R. Groh: We need an outline with areas that we want to look at, a timeline, and circulate that to the Council.

M. Dunn: We should go through the draft CMP, pick sections to focus on, and see how climate change may impact them. The matrix could be the end product.

C. Schubert: The TAC could benefit from some control and command from SSER staff and some insight on what would be the best way to get the goals across to the Council. PEP and Long Island Sound Study staff play a major role in their TACs.

L. Smith encouraged continued discussion in between meetings.

M. Dunn mentioned it may be helpful to have the subcommittee who wrote the letter, present it to the Council to explain the reasoning behind it.

ACTION ITEM: L. Smith: The subcommittee will look at the CMP and determine priorities.

M. Bilecki mentioned SSER staff should be on the subcommittee, R. Neville was suggested.

Other Business & Group Discussion

J. Campbell: Discussed Nassau County Back Bays study and the request for TAC to come up with comments to submit to the Council. Comments are due by June 21st. Public meetings are coming up in Freeport and Long Beach.

ACTION ITEM: L. Smith will send the email with the information.
SSER staff will compile the comments sent to the SSER email.

M. Bilecki: Discussed the tide gauges that need funding, in Moriches Bay, Ponquogue Coast Guard Station, and Watch Hill. National Parks is looking for funding. Maybe the TAC could support this and see if funding from DOS exists. Gauges were originally funded by Sandy Mitigation funds through Suffolk County Emergency Services. They cost \$12,000 annually each, one costs \$16,000 annually due to the addition of a weather station. Total \$30,000-\$40,000 a year total. J. Campbell recommends the TAC write a letter to the Council.

ACTION ITEM: M. Bilecki will write a letter, send it to L. Smith, and it will go on the Google account for comment.

R. Groh: Motion for support to request funding from the Council? All in favor.

M. Bilecki: USACE is doing a dredge material sediment review at \$250,000, studying what to do with sediment that is dredged from federal channels.

M. Dunn: Spartina planting at Seatuck National Wildlife Refuge on 6/8/19.

K. Rabin: LINAP is looking to expand newsletter subscriptions.

R. Groh: Thanked SSER for attending Babylon Earth Day.

Meeting adjourned at 1:17pm.