

# Beach SAMP / STORMTOOLS Changes to the Landscape of Municipal Liability





## Liability exposure for:

- Public information
  - Accuracy and reliance (negligence)
- Planning and Policymaking
  - Failure to plan (negligence)
- Infrastructure maintenance
  - Failure to adapt (temp. takings, negligence, nuisance)
  - Abandonment (takings, statutory injunction)
- Permitting
  - Wrongful permitting (negligence)





# Wrongful permitting:

- Duty
  - Public Duty Doctrine
- Negligence
  - How does the permit address unique site hazards?
- Cause in Fact / Proximate Cause
  - More specific information means more foreseeability
- Damages
  - State Tort Claims Act damage cap: \$100,000





- State Tort Claims Act:
  - Sovereign Immunity waived
  - Non-proprietary functions damages capped at \$100,000
- Public Duty Doctrine protects non-proprietary functions
  - Exceptions: Special Duty and Egregious Conduct
- "A municipality should not be the general insurer of every construction project within its limits."
  - Quality Court Condo. Ass'n v. Quality Hill Dev. Corp., 641 A.2d 746 (R.I. 1994)





## **Special Duty**

- Plaintiffs "specifically come within the knowledge of the [town] so that the injury to that particularly identified plaintiff can be or should have been foreseen."
  - Knudsen v. Hall, 490 A.2d 976, 978 (R.I.1985)





## In a storm-damaged house:

- Special Duty
  - Did the permitting process involve continued contact beyond the norm?
  - "[T]he building inspector ... had specific knowledge of certain irregularities and violations of the condominiums, had attended meetings with the architect, had received written notice of specific building-code violations, and had returned to the condominiums on a number of occasions to view the repair work"
    - » Quality Court Condo. Ass'n v. Quality Hill Dev. Corp., 641 A.2d 746 (R.I. 1994)





## **Egregious Conduct**

- "The [town] has knowledge that it has created a circumstance that forces an individual into a position of peril and subsequently chooses not to remedy the situation."
  - Verity v. Danti 585 A.2d 65, 67 (R.I. 1991)
- 1) Created a situation of "extreme peril"
- 2) Actual/constructive knowledge of peril
- 3) Inaction within reasonable time



## In a storm-damaged house:

- Egregious Conduct
  - Hazard creation A matter of degree?
  - Actual or constructive knowledge
    - Haworth: "nothing in the record indicates that the town was aware that the houses were subject to flooding when it issued the certificate of occupancy or that the flooding posed a position of extreme peril."
      - Haworth v. Lannon, 813 A.2d 62, 65 (R.I. 2003)
  - Inaction How do permit conditions deal with the hazard?





## In a storm-damaged house:

- Causation: Foreseeability
  - Foreseeability increases with better science
  - Pickle v. Bd. of Cnty. Comm'rs of Cnty. of Platte, 764 P.2d 262 (Wyo. 1988)
    - Subdivision review re: septic systems
    - Reasonable care in gathering information extends to analyzing flood risk.
  - Illinois Farmers Insurance Company et al. v. County of Lake, et al., 2014 WL 2488893 (III.Cir.Ct.)
    - Filings claim that regulatory findings of fact about climate change created a duty to maintain stormwater systems





# Wrongful permitting:

- Duty
  - Public Duty Doctrine
- Negligence
  - How does the permit address unique site hazards?
- Cause in Fact / Proximate Cause
  - More specific information means more foreseeability
- Damages
  - State Tort Claims Act damage cap: \$100,000





#### Proactive steps:

- Rigorous permit/variance grants
  - Explicitly discusses flooding risks; conditional on adaptations
  - Conforms to an explicit zoning/planning climate change policy/standard
  - Ensure disclaimers cover storm and flooding damage

#### Policies

- Ensure binding portions of comprehensive plans address climate change
- Add to permit/variance review process, e.g. checkbox in application forms
- Incentives: e.g. define municipal zoning height limit from base flood
- Public education
- Specific notice to property owners

