**Table # 1**

**Panel 2, Political, Psychological, Public Health and Ethical Response to SLR**

**Note taker name: Lauren McKee**

**Moderator: Muge Akpinar-Elci**

***Question 1****: Politically, how can the U.S. and the EU move beyond gridlock in addressing sea level rise?*

It’s not necessarily gridlock alone that can mitigate or solve the effects of climate change. Look at the Maldives or the Caribbean. There is no gridlock and those people are still losing their countries.

Learn from other places where the problems is still there but maybe not as bad.

It’s difficult to get people in say, Minnesota to care about sea level rise when it does not affect them.

This means that people who live in places where sea level rise is a real threat should be more inclusive of people who do not live in those areas.

We tend to polarize our language, so in general democrats are more receptive and republicans are less receptive may not be helpful generalizations. Do these labels turn people off to the other side of the argument? This about changing a narrative and rethinking political labels.

We need to take a specific problem-based approach rather than a rhetorical based approach.

You have to be able to apply pressure at the national level from a local problem. Engage the “secondary stake-holders”, for example, people in the transportation or shipping industry which depends on areas where sea level rise matters.

***Answer/Notts:***

***Question 2:*** *In what ways can the discussion move beyond politics* *in order to address environmental, social, spatial, and economic risks?*

***Answer/Notes***

Regulation seems to lead to gridlock, countries won’t sign treaties, etc. There needs to be some sort of movement or ethical appeal. Some problems are rooted in property rights, cultural differences, public vs. private land, etc.

We have to frame this as a tragedy of the commons type situation.

There is also disagreement about what to protect against: Flood or climate change or sea level rise? The conversation is so intertangled. It’s impossible to balance flood protection against spending money on decreasing crime or building a safer road.

In HR, how do we enforce regional planning and cooperation between the different cities? If HR can’t communicate, how can we get states in the US to communicate and cooperate? We have to push from localism into regionalism.

We have to look for the common interest to change the conversation from talking about how we haven’t cooperated in the past to how we can cooperate in the future is key. But it’s hard to ask people in VA Beach to allocate tax funds to build Norfolk a new tunnel.

If you talk about investment, employment, and set a budget, break things down into small pieces and then build on them, it could work.

What works in Europe, or the Netherlands, may not work in the US because politics is so diversified. Even though there are so many parallels. There needs to be a greater understanding of HOW to draw parallels.

Marketing for this global problem has to be persistent and omnipresent.

***Question 3:*** *What role should citizens’ perceptions of risk play in the conversation about sea level rise, its impacts and in adapting to it and how can we broaden their understanding of the issues?*

***Answer/Notes***

We didn’t make it to this question.

***General Question:*** *Given what you've learned during this panel, what types of collaborative research and action might be most useful in affecting adaptive policy?*

***Answer/Notes***

One practical solution is to go spread awareness at community meetings rather than hold your own community meeting. Locate events where lots of people will be, already discussing the events that matter to them.

Capitalize on events like Sandy or Katrina.

Stay away from climate change or sea level rise, but focus more on improving or maintaining quality of life.

*Consensus Points:*

Just because something works in Europe doesn’t mean it will work in the US. The political culture is different, the political climate is different. Still, there are many things that can be learned precisely because there are so many parallels between the situations in both places. There has to be a way to teach and learn between the two places.

We tend to polarize our language, so in general democrats are more receptive and republicans are less receptive may not be helpful generalizations. Do these labels turn people off to the other side of the argument? This about changing a narrative and rethinking political labels.

*Takeaways/Action Items:*

One practical solution is to go spread awareness at community meetings rather than hold your own community meeting. Locate events where lots of people will be, already discussing the events that matter to them.

Capitalize on events like Sandy or Katrina.

Stay away from talking specifically about “climate change” or “sea level rise”, but focus more on making the conversation about improving or maintaining quality of life.

People may not respond to creating a fear narrative or establishing a threat narrative. Maybe it needs to be softer, less about fear and more about information.

*Points of dissent:*

Americans aren’t political, they’re not involved in “politics.” This is debatable—Americans do care and are political, but perhaps in ways that demonstrate a political awareness of the issue that pragmatically affect them on a daily basis. The economy, employment, education, etc. Maybe not so much about theoretical implications of the risk of something that could happen half a country away to people in another state.

*Miscellaneous/Interesting:*