The NY Times wrestles with whether tax payers should be paying for the protection of coastal Queens, NY. I agree with Mr. Goldstein;

> Eric A. Goldstein, a senior lawyer at the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental advocacy group, said he was sympathetic to Broad Channel and understood why residents have been lobbying hard for aid.
>
> "The problem is, they have picked a spectacularly beautiful but increasingly impractical and dangerous place to live," Mr. Goldstein said.
>
> "If sea levels rise and storm-level projections are accurate, this community may be surviving on borrowed time," he said. He added that the city faced hard questions, one being: "How much sense does it make to keep reinvesting taxpayer dollars in a community that is directly in harm's way?"

As I stated in Climatopolis, communities should use their own $ to defend themselves. Money doesn't grow on trees and cities face balanced budget conditions. Do coastal communities merit a subsidy to take gambles? Read up on moral hazard! To pay for these subsidies will require that somebody else's taxes will have to go up.