Corrigendum

Page 109:

Page 115:
Replaced “Local preferences are strongly for dike reinforcement. One citizen said, “I feel the best option is to fix the dike [sic] ... We have to keep our community intact as much as possible and protect our way of life so people can continue to live in Advocate and know that it’s going to be a safe place.”” With “Local preferences are strongly for dike reinforcement, as one citizen argued, “... they have to be very careful that the future of the community is not placed under a shadow by doubt about what’s going to happen here. You may have property and assets in Advocate that you may want to sell, develop or do a number of things with. ... It’s going to be a long time before the government would actually move anybody if that’s what has to happen.””

Page 120:
The following text was added: “Proposed changes to dykelands must also be cleared with Mi’kmaq First Nations and the Nova Scotia Department of Communities.”

Page 126:
Replaced “It is also estimated that within three years post-breach” with “It is also estimated that within 8-10 years post-breach”.

Page 127:
The following text was removed: “as well as (unusually) allowing those credits to be “banked” beyond a year.”

Page 137:
The following text was added: “Technical support to the Council’s and community were provided by Aramanu Ropiha, Infometrics, Maven Consulting Ltd, Mitchell Daysh Ltd and Tonkin & Taylor Ltd. Details of these assessments can be found at https://hbcoast.co.nz/resources/ . Living at the Edge, a research collaboration funded by the NZ National Science Challenge acted as a “critical friend” to the process and provided independent advice and assistance.”