

Coastal Erosion Hazard Mapping Task Force Meeting Notes

MN DNR Conference Room- January 22nd, 2020 – 10:00 a.m.

Meeting Attendees: Neva Maxwell-Lake County, Clint Little-MN DNR Coastal Program, Jenn Moses-City of Duluth (phone) Ilena Hansel-Cook County SWCD (Phone), Sonja Smerud-Lake County SWCD, Ross Hoffman-Lake County GIS, Ryan Dagger-AMI

1. Welcome/Introductions

- a. All were welcomed and introduced themselves.
- b. Otsea provided a brief overview for new attendees on the scope of the project and where the current status is.

2. Vision Statement Draft Review

- a. Otsea referenced the meeting packet which contained 3 different draft versions of vision statements. He asked meeting attendees to provide feedback on elements of each that they would like to see utilized in a final version of a vision statement for the project. Feedback and discussion followed. Topics included: including lake superior's north shore, that the layer will be vetted and updated, inform local ordinances and/or decision making, hesitancy towards the term 'legally defensible', looking at other state examples, among other items discussed.
- b. After the discussion, Otsea said he'd utilize the feedback to craft a new single draft of the vision statement and seek consensus at the February meeting.

3. Action Plan Discussion

- a. Otsea referenced the meeting packet which included an updated version of the action plan discussed at previous meetings. He noted that the methodology defining benchmarks had been moved up due to input from team members. Discussion followed:
 - i. Concern on moving methodology finalization up even further to allow as much time for analysis of remote sites as possible.
 - ii. Discussion on upcoming 3-inch imagery from Lake County expected to be available in March.
 - iii. Concerns over initial LIDAR flights and corrections that may be needed.
 - iv. Adding a line to the action plan identifying pilot target areas sooner in advance of the total target areas to test run the methodology in advance of a bigger analysis.
 - v. Otsea was asked to engage John Swenson to attend the next meeting if possible as geology would likely play a role in target site development and analysis. **
- b. Otsea stated he'd make the edits to the action plan and provide a final draft version for 'adoption' at the February meeting.

4. Methodology discussion

- a. Discussion followed on defining the methodology. The focus of the discussion was to begin answering questions that will inform the final methodology. It is expected that Melanie will have a more robust presentation prepared for the next meeting but was unable to attend today due to a conflict with a Wisconsin Community of Practice meeting happening around coastal erosion. Agenda items have been utilized below in attempt to help frame the discussion which followed:

Coastal Erosion Hazard Mapping Task Force Meeting Notes

MN DNR Conference Room- January 22nd, 2020 – 10:00 a.m.

- b. USGS /DSAS Update
 - i. Tool had not been used much yet but would be discussed at the next meeting.
 - ii. Charlie will research the tool in advance of next meeting as well.
- c. Coastal Work and Previous analysis
 - i. How do we come to Consensus?
 - Look at the analysis Melanie did, and see if DSAS can replicate.
 - At a meeting, run a few different methodologies through a computer and see what each it is. Look at various data sets and try to demonstrate what works and how well.
 - A report with 3 different methodologies (like existing report)
 - **Check recommendations from Melanie methodology report
 - ii. What are Parameters to determining the method?
 - See above.
 - iii. Who is documenting and doing methodology?
 - Charlie/Melanie/Brandon/John possibly?
 - iv. Is there a single pilot location we can start with?
 - South of the first tunnel
 - Encampment forest association – has lost 50 ft of shoreline.
 - Split rock could be a spot?
 - Park point
 - Picking 3 or 4 pilot areas to test methodology prior to larger analysis is expected to be valuable.
 - Geologist can help inform target sites, maybe there's a possibility of identifying different areas that could have different geology to help inform future sites and improve analysis.
 - Pilot areas should be determined by data availability or data poor areas also incorporated.
 - v. Other
 - SWCD's would like to know what data they should be collecting for the summer. Defining a 'one page' or other items would be helpful. Identify what the data needs are so SWCD's and staff can collect it immediately, as they are already getting calls to schedule site visits.
 - Survey 1,2,3 could be a valuable tool for to input data.
 - Could be a need for technical group to meet outside of monthly meetings, specifically when developing methodology.
 - Follow up with Maren to mention that a possible pilot area would be the MnDOT property by Silver Creek tunnel.

5. Data Update

- a. Ross- Imagery for Lake County is becoming available, 3 Inch resolutions – imagery will be available free through WMS soon, just not sure when/where. Expects it within the next few weeks just waiting for money to host that data. Determining the cost per month in the ESRI Cloud (using Sanborn company to host massive 6 Terabyte data set) is underway.

6. Other Partner updates

- a. Sonja-1W1P was approved in December and the grant agreement should be through soon and is expected to include an additional 30k of staff time for SWCD's to continue to be a part of the project.
- b. Clint-Groups that could help with QAQC or analysis review, Clint is on two different boards that could provide follow up: governors committee on 3d geospatial data & the DNR geospatial water resource team

7. Future Meeting Location

- a. Next meeting is set for February 26.
- b. Sonja - will check on the Lake County Highway Conference room and follow up with Justin to confirm.

8. Next Steps

- Finalize Vision Statement
- Finalize Action Plan
- Methodology Focused Discussion to near finalize and identify future needs.