

**Stakeholder Meeting
San Francisco, CA – June 12, 2007**

Meeting Summary

Background

The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972 created a unique partnership between federal and state governments with the goal of balancing the conservation of coastal and Great Lakes environments with the responsible development of economic and cultural resources. Pending reauthorization of the CZMA has prompted discussion within the coastal community on ways to improve coastal management in the US. In response, the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resources Management of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Coastal States Organization (CSO) have undertaken a project to engage coastal managers and stakeholders to envision the future of coastal management. The goal of this process is to gather feedback on priority issues and innovative ideas for improving the CZMA and the National Coast Management Program. The final outcome will be a set of core principles, a suite of options for revising the CZMA, and suggestions for other techniques that NOAA and the states may consider implementing for improved coastal management.

Introduction

The stakeholder meeting in San Francisco, CA was the fifth in a series of five nation-wide meetings being conducted under the initiative titled *Envisioning the Future of Coastal Management*. Donna Wieting and Ralph Cantral of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Jena Carter of the Coastal States Organization (CSO) opened the meeting with a joint presentation about the initiative. The meeting was attended by 105 participants representing a broad range of interests including government, education, conservation, foundations, municipal associations, academia and research. After the opening presentation, participants broke out into small groups to address the following topics: climate change and coastal hazards; land use; energy and ocean uses; habitat; interagency coordination; and water quality. In the afternoon, participants gave input and feedback on coastal management solution ideas generated in previous meetings within the topics of climate change, governance, habitat, land use, public access and waterfront redevelopment.

Breakout Groups: New, Creative, Forward-looking Strategies and Solutions

In each breakout group, participants briefly discussed obstacles. Obstacles identified by the organizers in advance of the meeting as common to coastal management were:

- Geography (coasts extend inland; misalignment of political boundaries and resource boundaries)
- Multiple Governments and Agencies (need for coordination among federal agencies, among levels of government, and within regions)
- Technical Complexity (issues require special knowledge, lack of sufficient data and maps)
- Funding Needs
- Competing Interests (multiple users, achieving balance, and setting priorities)

Participants then spent most of the day generating ideas or responding to previously developed ideas for better managing the coasts and/or improving the CZMA. The summary on the following pages provides highlights from each breakout group, including additional obstacles identified as specific to each breakout topic, management solutions generated during discussions, and reactions to previously developed ideas.

Next Steps

All of the ideas generated by meeting participants, including those not reflected in this summary, will be reviewed and considered by NOAA and CSO as they develop their proposed changes to the Coastal Zone Management Act. CSO and NOAA thank every participant for spending the time and providing thoughtful input.

CLIMATE CHANGE and COASTAL HAZARDS

OBSTACLES

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Technical Complexity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and regional variability are not yet fully understood. • Understanding data can be difficult. |
| Leadership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of national leadership on climate change. |

BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- | | |
|---|--|
| Create Regulations for Land Use Development in High Risk Areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create regulations for new development in areas projected to be impacted by climate change, using regional shoreline management plans as a tool. Plan based on 50+ years of expected sea level rise. • Add climate change mitigation goals into local plans. • Develop clear policy statements and state-level environmental policy and action plans. • Provide data to decision-makers through models showing anticipated impact to particular parcels. First, a decision needs to be made about which coastal inundation models to use. • This could lead to improved public safety and habitat protection. • Potential barriers include takings challenges and other private property rights-related legal concerns. • Purchase/restore shorelines that will be impacted by sea level rise to reduce impacts. • Identify ways to reduce impacts such as planned retreat and building standards. • Examples include the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, which requires that hazards be identified, requires local and state design standards and setbacks, and studies on tsunamis by the National Science and Technology Council in the White House. Bill AB319 authorizes a tsunami mapping program that could serve as a model. • Inform chambers of commerce and industry that developing in hazard areas is unwise over the long term. • Educate the public about potential impacts by using models and maps. Also, educate policymakers by conveying to them the real financial impacts of not addressing the threats posed by coastal hazards. |
| Clearinghouse for Scientific and Public Policy Information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synergistic utilization of resources through integrated monitoring by NOAA of space, weather, earth, and coastal patterns. • One portal for all data is needed, plus a place where data needs can be identified. Use Integrated Ocean Observing System for a network of institutions, researchers, and agencies. • A framework to guide data collection in a coordinated manner is needed. • Challenges include uncoordinated data collection, ineffective communication, the difficulty of finding the right data where it has already been collected, the proprietary nature of much information, and the researcher unwillingness to share data not yet published. • The schools and the general public should be involved. • Decision-makers need to know who is doing similar work, what data exist, and where gaps are. Data needs to be provided at a level of appropriate specificity for decision-making and judicial/court review. • Examples include state-wide projects like Florida's effort to map of all of its state waters. IOOS has two efforts underway in California to coordinate and integrate historical and current data so that it is accessible. |
| Education and Training | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance public understanding that dealing with climate change means addressing avoidance, reduction of emissions, adaptation, mitigation, and compensation. Educate and train people so they know adaptation isn't the only action needed. • CZMA should establish enforceable climate change policies, e.g. on reducing emissions. • Every project NOAA funds should include an outreach program. Expands NERRS Coastal Training Program. • Target education to individuals and businesses (about the impacts of climate change), K-12 students (using a NOAA developed climate education template), faith based groups, mayors and governors' associations. • NOAA should meet with the National Association of Manufacturers and chambers of commerce. • Consider Brazil's national mobilization on the topic of climate change as a possible case study for lessons learned. |

LAND USE

OBSTACLES

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Management and Capacity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local governments are often unable to address cumulative impacts. They often lack the tools and resources to establish goals and policies and implement laws, so federal and state governments need to provide them with additional tools and capacity. • NOAA oversight of states implementing the CZMA often inadequate. Program evaluations are not rigorous enough, so states rarely update or make significant improvements. • States should use federal consistency more often and should strengthen regulations. |
| Connection with Transportation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, planning for land use and transportation (e.g. freight, rails and ports) are not coordinated. The result is that transportation drives land use. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When regulations change, it causes confusion among the public. • Externalities are undervalued in decision-making, especially in sediment, sand, and sea walls. • No enforcement program related to runoff quality and quantity exists. |

BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- | | |
|--|---|
| Ecosystem-based Land Use Management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watershed or ecosystem-based management of land use is needed. Coordinate infrastructure development, close regulatory gaps between states and federal agencies, increase local government agency cooperation. Support local and state governments in taking an ecosystem-based, comprehensive approach to managing land on the coasts. Focus on planning for sustainability, transportation, housing, protecting important habitats and resources, and addressing climate change. • Develop a blueprint for how an ideal coastal zone would be managed from which the state(s) could set standards and guidelines. Allow local governments to develop their own methods to meet the standards. • Provide strong incentives for local governments/individuals to make wise land use decisions. • Conduct a campaign, modeled after the American Planning Association's Growing Smarter Campaign, that encourages communities to seek assistance and information on better coordination of transportation and land use planning, why higher density is good, and other planning-related assistance. Provide a toolbox that allows states to put together programs to help local governments. • Examples include the California Ocean Protection Act which integrates state laws and institutes related to ocean/coastal management, the San Francisco Bay Area Joint Policy Committee of four regional groups collaborating on climate change and transportation planning, the Mattolle Watershed in California, and Natural Community Conservation Plans. |
| Adopt a National Vision for a Livable Earth | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a national vision and goal for a livable environment, a goal for survival on earth, and establish a federal or state coalition to implement the vision. • A broad-based, multi-stakeholder coalition is needed. • Engage minority populations, especially the Hispanic population, which surveys show has a high concern for the ocean environment. • To sell a grand vision, ask communities what we'll look like in 20, 40 and 60 years from now and do visual representation and analysis. • Examples include the Puget Sound Partnership, in which the governor set forth an environmental agenda to be achieved by 2020 and the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. |
| Long Term Funding for Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At a national level, a long term funding source for coastal program implementation needs to be established. Ideas include a tax on coastal tourism, revenues of which are returned to coastal states, or fees for extracting resources. • Remove the <i>de facto</i> \$2M cap on federal CZMA funding for state coastal programs, which is inadequate for states with long coasts. Allocate money to states based on ecological criteria. • Consider a tax on activities that have a negative impact on the coastal environment, such as those that contribute to nonpoint source pollution. • An example to explore is that of the California Energy Commission's authority to assess a small fee through energy bills for addressing energy-related problems. |

ENERGY and OCEAN USES

OBSTACLES

- | | |
|--|--|
| Multiple Governments and Agencies | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conflicting and changing regulations regarding offshore areas are becoming increasingly difficult for users to meet.• Changing administrations and a shifting political climate lead to a lack of regulatory predictability for offshore users. |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing data about offshore areas is poorly disseminated and hard to access.• The temporal cycles and spatial boundaries that drive the functions of governments and ecosystems are misaligned, |

BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- | | |
|---|---|
| Direct Coastal Programs to do Regional, Ecosystem-based Management | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Direct coastal management programs to do place-based, ecosystem-based management. Right now we have sectoral management (we manage one thing in many places, e.g. shipping). Instead, we should manage many things by place.• In each region, establish councils modeled after fishery management councils, but for multiple issues. Create regional councils that include federal, state, and tribal representatives in addition to stakeholders.• Redefine political boundaries in terms of ecosystems.• Agencies should have a specific mandate to coordinate.• Begin by identifying ecosystem boundaries, then manage each according to its unique characteristics.• Encourage stakeholder involvement.• Outcomes would include that regions would better address multi-use issues, management would be more coordinated, competing interests would be reconciled, and applicants would save time/money.• Offer incentives for better coordination, e.g. increased funding or loosened regulations if agencies collaborate.• Increase funding for research that is conducted on ecosystem-scales.• Examples can be found in the UK, Germany, Belgium, the Gulf of Mexico, and starting in Massachusetts, Florida, and Maine. |
| Improved Data on Ocean Uses and Energy | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Define “minimize harm” as the standard for approval of all activities. Use the precautionary approach and only allow uses after they have been evaluated.• Develop a mechanism for quickly analyzing the potential effects of emerging issues.• Establish an ocean trust fund or another federal-level funding process that is independent of Congressional appropriations and is continuously funded.• Incompatible data sets among agencies inhibit good decision making. Agencies should address this by setting joint standards or formats for future data collection that will facilitate sharing.• Develop a GIS database of human uses of the ocean. Integrate this with habitat maps, and study what activities are compatible with each other.• Examples include California’s Department of Fish and Game’s Marine Region, and the Northwest Hawaiian Islands by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. |
| Increase Funding for Education | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase funding for education programs for the public and policy makers with on the purpose of enhancing ocean stewardship. Provide continual funding for public education. The general public appears not to understand the magnitude of the problem, so we need to significantly raise awareness.• Target messages based on what people (not resource managers) care about.• Create forums where decision-makers can hear a broad range of views.• Create a compelling slogan like Smokey the Bear’s “Give a Hoot, Don’t Pollute.”• Develop programs that target discrete ages, users, and private-sector audiences.• The National Marine Sanctuary Program and COMPASS are currently offering good programs. |

HABITAT

OBSTACLES

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Technical Complexity | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a lack of biological knowledge and information about the impacts of many activities.• There is a lack of baseline knowledge and identification of critical habitat.• Habitat is multi-dimensional. |
| Multiple Jurisdictions | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Many agencies are involved with habitat management and it is difficult for them to coordinate. |

BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- | | |
|---|---|
| Collect Baseline Information | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Collect and fund collection of baseline information on habitat. Include substrate maps and physical, chemical, and biological baseline data. Coordinate academics, government at all levels, and local/community knowledge.• NOAA could partner with the Ocean Protection Council on this effort.• Statewide wetland mapping efforts by the Nature Conservancy and the Environmental Protection Agency in California are good examples of baseline information collection. Florida is working to synthesize existing data on best management practices for shorelines.• Institute a national coordination effort between NOAA, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey and others. NOAA could take the lead.• This should be an integrated system with repositories of metadata, not a czar of coastal data or more bureaucracy.• A benefit would be that it would assist state and national efforts to prioritize investments. |
| Regional Protection Partnerships | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create regional joint-ventures including the public, business, and government to focus on protection of habitat in specific areas. This would be a proactive regional stakeholder approach to protecting important habitats. Start by identifying what needs to be protected (a species? ecosystem? roadway?), then engage partners who are necessary for making protection happen.• Many organizations and agencies are doing habitat protection without joint prioritization.• Scale of partnerships should vary based on the overall objectives.• Involve the private sector, which owns much of the habitat that should be preserved – what incentives would make them want to preserve land and reduce their risk? Model after farm bill or forest legacy program (fisheries or wetlands legacy?).• Protect habitat in water as well. Need regional priorities, accountability and stakeholder involvement to protect public resources. |

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

OBSTACLES

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Government Mandates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies have no mandates or incentives to work with other agencies or to address issues outside the narrow focus of their missions. |
| Staffing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff turnover makes coordination difficult over the long term. |
| Incentives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no reward structure in place for staff who pursue issues outside of their prescribed mission. |

BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- | | |
|--|--|
| Fund Collaboration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund coordination efforts. Local area managers often form committees that include local, state, and federal agencies and organizations. These coordination efforts take time and resources. • A non-regulatory agency should have authority to disperse funding for coordination of multi-agency efforts. Coastal programs should be authorized to fund coordination efforts. • Provide funding specifically for coordination, rather than for the actual project. • Leverage disparate programs for greater benefits. • This funding stream could be included in reauthorization of the CZMA, perhaps through an earmark. • NOAA's Ocean Prediction Center Marine Protected Areas is an example of funding coordination. |
| Clarify Mandates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpreting and communicating the interpretations of different mandates and legislation can be confusing as program staff work to implement goals. There should be policy guidance that sets out a clear path for implementation of legislative goals and mandates. • NOAA should develop guidelines, guidance and funding for local agency to implementation. • It should be made clear where resource managers go to find general interpretations of mandates and legislation, and the guidelines for local implementation. • A coordinating task force should be established to look at how to delivery general interpretations should be pulled together and delivered. • Examples to explore include the San Francisco Bay Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) for Sediment Management and a project in Laguna Beach that includes a marine protection ordinance and publicity through a website with links to all program managers in the area. |
| Educate Legislators and Decision makers About CZMA, science, and management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate legislators about state and local concerns about what aspects of current CZMA implementation are working and not working. • The current lack of education among decision makers about geography, watersheds, and coastal sciences is a major issue. Leaders who don't understand the basic functions of watersheds cannot effectively draft legislation for watershed protection. Politicians need to understand how a region functions ecologically before they can pass legislation that governs management of that region. • Lawmakers should be given feedback on current expenditures on coastal management and their effectiveness. • Educate inland agencies about the impact their activities have on coastal regions. Expand the Coastal Training Program, as part of CZMA reauthorization, to educate agencies/staff by region. Create an information exchange between agencies on their programs and projects. • Current examples include the Coastal Training Program, the Santa Cruz Blue Circle (an interagency social event), and the US Army Corps of Engineers cross-training in dredging laws, activities and guidance (which they teach around the nation). |

WATER QUALITY

OBSTACLES

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Funding | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Because NOAA does not have an organic act, the agency must fight for funding each year.• Municipalities have to fund court enforcement at the local level. |
| Management and Enforcement | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exemptions and waivers are granted at the staff level and there are inconsistent and selective interpretations of policies by staff in various government offices.• Government is mistakenly operating like a business in which the applicant, not the public, is their client. |

BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- | | |
|---|--|
| Make Data Accessible to the Public | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create a one-stop shop for maps and data that are easily accessible via the internet, user-friendly, and link to different watersheds. Develop better and more accessible data designed to increase awareness about public health, groundwater effects on watersheds, etc. Clarify how data should or should not be used. Quality control could be difficult.• Make federal coastal funds available to state water quality agencies.• Link NOAA coastal programs and EPA water quality programs.• To ensure data quality, rate data and train citizen monitoring groups.• Perhaps there is limited monitoring at a local level because of a fear of what they might discover. There need to be incentives for local governments to do necessary monitoring without being penalized for discovering poor water quality.• Begin the development of this data clearinghouse by coordinating data that are already available. Require agencies and institutions that collect data to create a framework with best practices for data collection and sharing. Look for best practices for adaptive monitoring.• Use the data to identify economic benefits of water quality protection.• This is being done in San Joaquin, in the Chesapeake Bay for point and nonpoint, by state water boards that collect from county environmental health agencies, and in the California Integrated Water Quality System.• Consistent funding for monitoring, chemical analysis, and data production is needed. |
| Coastal Watershed Approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use a watershed approach to managing the coasts. Think creatively about financial incentives for use of permeable surfaces or other technology that leads quickly to measurable improvements in water quality.• Decision-makers want to see results, which makes working further up watersheds difficult.• This would improve the quality of water in the ocean and groundwater.• Increase citizen awareness of their local watershed in order to increase political support for investments in watershed management.• National Estuary Programs should focus on local watershed-level work.• Watershed councils in Oregon are an example. There, salmon recovery funding led to watershed assessments according to state-developed protocol, selected restoration efforts for funding, and directed mitigation efforts to priority watersheds.• It is a staffing and resource challenge for local governments to work regionally.• Best practices, like low impact development, often require exemptions from federal, state, or local standards. There is also frequently a disconnect between fire districts (which, for example, want trees removed) and water quality (for which trees should be in place).• Support creation of regional water quality boards.• Conduct training, education, and outreach on best practices to improve water quality. Conduct a simple, effective public media campaign with compelling images (e.g. trash in ocean).• Examples include the Critical Coastal Areas Program in Sonoma Creek, Regional Water Quality Boards, and the San Gabriel River Watershed Monitoring Program.• Conflicts of interest and the complexity of multiple jurisdictions needs to be addressed. |

CLIMATE CHANGE and HAZARDS

RESPONSES TO PREVIOUSLY BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

<p>Conduct Statewide Assessments To Determine Near- and Long-Term Impacts of Climate Change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would work with statewide satellite or aerial mapping, climate modeling projects, and assimilation of existing data. The goal should be to develop models that describe the impacts of climate change on the coastal zone. • Obstacles include political and economic resistance to climate change research, lack of public education and therefore support, the small size of state boundaries (consider multi-state regions), local decision-makers' tendency to become overwhelmed by large-scale data, and the desire for more locally tailored maps and models to take action. • Consider starting with a global model and then focusing on the state/local level for management purposes. • Funding from USGS or NASA will be needed. • Agreement on assessment methodology will need to be reached. • A federal mandate would spur action, but state agencies should spearhead the efforts. • Current examples include the USGS study on rates of sea level change, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission Sea Level Rise maps, the University of California at Santa Cruz studies on snowpack, the California Climate Action Plan, and Oregon's littoral cell management planning.
<p>Develop an Index for Measuring the Resilience of a Community to Natural and Manmade Hazards and Climate Change Impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An index for measuring the resilience of a community to natural and manmade hazards and climate change impacts would be a very useful decision-making tool for determining how to apply management actions. • It would also assist in the prioritization of federal disaster-related expenditures. • It would need to identify factors and quantifiable metrics that affect human life and biological communities (e.g. human demographics and population, elevations, and exposure of communities to the ocean and meteorological events.) • It also would need to measure linkages such as evacuations inland and habitat migration. • It would need to consider resilience of communities to both rapid and long term changes. • The index could be used to develop legislation about land use, encourage larger scale planning through legislation, and prevent building in risky coastal areas. • It would help in the revision of coastal construction standards. • Resistance to this idea could come from coastal homeowners with homeowners' insurance, developers, and the insurance industry. • Funding opportunities for development of the index would need to be developed. • Examples include the California state emergency response plan, to which a climate change component could be added, and management decisions in Holland to sacrifice some communities while prioritizing the preservation of others. • There needs to be a long term planning horizon, equitable application and a clear purpose for the index.
<p>Ensure reliability of water supplies and other sources of drinking water (e.g. desalination)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptation and resource conservation measures, and new technological innovations and planning needs to be developed. • Obstacles include a large carbon footprint if using reverse osmosis, entrenched interests, an unwillingness to change current practices, saltwater intrusion in the Delta, entrainment of plankton or other organisms in collecting sea water for desalination. • Need to diversify water supplies, increase storage capacity, and engage in water conservation. • Need international cooperation on water supply issues, especially for arid countries. • Need to maximize Low Impact Development to increase groundwater recharge.

GOVERNANCE

RESPONSES TO PREVIOUSLY BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

Expand the CZMA to coastal watersheds

- NOAA should start by mapping coastal watersheds.
- Congress should amend the CZMA to stress the importance of watersheds. Then map watersheds and delegate responsibility to the states for modifying their coastal zones with incentives. States should be given the opportunity to limit the inland extent by both geography or subject matter with the states justifying geographical amendment.
- Scale regulations as you go up the watershed so that the further you are from the shore there are fewer direct regulations or oversight. Expansion of boundary would likely affect water quality more than habitat protection or land use planning.
- States need to ensure that local governments are enforcing laws, and states need to provide enforcement for state laws rather than requiring that it be carried out by local governments.
- NOAA and coastal states should develop partnerships with inland states to address critical coastal impacts where possible, using carrots such as technical assistance and expertise.
- Consider ways to include tribes and local governments in watershed management.
- Other federal agencies (beyond NOAA) should be required to be part of coastal management programs.
- Consider requiring all cities and counties within a state's coastal zone to have comprehensive zoning plans.

Create a new enforcement program whereby states receive funding to ensure their decisions are being enforced (i.e. an inspector for setback regulations or public access, etc)

- States could develop grant programs to support local government enforcement of state laws.
- Attorney general should fund district attorneys to investigate the environmental affects on public health and safety to help support and drive stricter environmental laws.
- Additional funding is needed, primarily for staff, to implement current enforcement mechanisms.
- Consider ways the federal government can help address state and local enforcement issues. For example, California state enforcement officers have poor state benefits and are subject to union laws, so there are currently dozens of open positions.
- States should develop multi-agency approaches to enforcement, so that one officer covers all relevant coastal laws rather than single-mandate enforcement officers potentially working at cross-purposes.
- Amend the CZMA to allow funding for enforcement programs and local compliance.
- Need support for increased enforcement of stormwater permits, public access and coastal program regulations.

Other general discussion of governance

- NOAA does not have authority to ensure that coastal programs carry out federal law, only to review whether state programs are being implemented as they were approved. NOAA should develop federal standards and sanctions for non-compliance.
- NOAA should conduct more meaningful Section 312 evaluations and withhold grant funds from programs that are non-compliant.
- The CZMA needs to include a clear mandate linking it to other federal programs and mission to management coastal and ocean resources.
- The CZMA should be written to reconnect coastal, estuarine reserve, and marine sanctuary programs.
- CZMA should mandate that local governments report back to NOAA and the states on local CZMA implementation.
- Work should be done with inland states and farmers, especially in critical drainage areas which contribute water quality impacts that are causing hypoxia.
- Collaboration between NOAA, the US Environmental Protection Agency and the US Department of Agriculture should be strengthened.

HABITAT

RESPONSES TO PREVIOUSLY BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

<p>Work together as a region to target certain critical habitats for acquisition, restoration, protection and management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a clear regional purpose in order to get many players to work together. • Regional approaches to address non-coastal and ocean issues should be explored for lessons learned (e.g. approaches to address biodiversity regionally). • Look at lessons learned from approaches from joint ventures. • The term “critical habitat” needs to be defined. • Programs should use a regional strategy to identify objectives and goals. • Regional strategy examples include the South California Wetlands Regional Project in which agencies are less competitive than they would otherwise be because they are working together, the California Ocean Law, and the Santa Monica Bay restoration. • Evaluation criteria are needed, such as an integrated regional assessment, to ensure that money is spent wisely. • Stakeholder processes should be used in setting up regional projects. Sanitation agencies have valuable information and should be included.
<p>Include provisions for protecting tidal and submerged aquatic habitats in state land acquisition plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize state management over federal. • Develop criteria to protect or acquire submerged aquatic habitats, as well as to conserve a network of habitats and corridors. • A national priority needs to be articulated to be able to develop a framework for protecting and acquiring critical habitat. • Develop a set of best management practices and tools for habitat conservation. • Consider a special focus on habitats along and around interior waterways that have high human use impacts. • Habitat inventories of key habitat type, ownership, stressors, and uses are need to establish habitat priorities. • Adequate funding to manage, maintain, monitor and restore acquired lands is needed. Agencies without adequate management resources should not acquire more land. • Prioritize habitats that are most threatened. • Balance acquisition of sub-tidal habitats with other habitat types. • Inventory private lands to determine what is currently leased and by which organizations, and explore what could be acquired. • Look for existing options for enhancing, restoring and protecting land rather than creating a whole new program. • Focus on public trust lands and public benefits – remove incompatible uses currently allowed by some submerged land leases in California. • A good study to review is one by the Nature Conservancy about long-term leases.
<p>Move the Estuary Restoration Act from the US Army Corps of Engineers to NOAA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Marine Fishery Service has a community-based restoration center. NOAA coastal management office should collaborate and coordinate better with this program. • This Estuary Restoration Act fits more with NOAA’s environmental ethic than with the ethic of the Army Corps of Engineers. • The program should be implemented based on performance, e.g. dollars per mile of wetland restored.

LAND USE

RESPONSES TO PREVIOUSLY BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

Develop a coastal impact fee for homeowners in coastal counties

- The development and use of a coastal impact fee would not slow development on the coast. Possible unintended consequences could be: turning the coasts into enclaves for the rich (who aren't deterred by additional fees), local governments encouraging development to collect fees, subjective implementation, fees used to subsidize risky development, and/or an increase in development pressure on inland communities,
- If an impact fee did work as intended, to get people to design and site development better, it could reduce the amount of impervious surface and provide resources to local funding departments. Perhaps it could be applied only to second homes. In that case, the federal government would have to define second homes through the Internal Revenue Service.
- Rename this idea as a "coastal incentive fee," and switch it to an incentive program where, for example, you keep your impervious surface to a particular percentage and you don't get taxed. Or, reward people for doing the right thing rather than punishing those who are out of compliance with protective ordinances.
- Implementing such a fee would be complex. Fee revenue would need to be targeted for specific purposes.
- The impact fee idea would have to be sold to the business community to be successful.
- Instead of a coastal development impact fee consider the following ideas: greening the existing fee scale by raising fees on undesirable activities and lowering them on desirable activities, basing development fees on a range of factors (such as a detailed equation based on all types of natural resource protection, better economic interests, community needs, etc.), groundwater impact fees or watershed impact fees for on the coasts and inland, and linking the fee to the need for affordable housing.

Develop a multi-million dollar land use technical assistance program aimed at local governments. The funds would be tied to actions and demonstrated results

- Technical assistance targeted at land use and local governments could be a very powerful tool, if it were specific to ensure that it serves the right purpose (maybe enactment of watershed networks, easements, land conservation?).
- Such a land use technical assistance program would need an overall vision/goal, such as "coordinated, sustainable land use strategy that protects coastal resources and results in livable communities" or "preserving coastal values." If tied to the goal of reducing impacts of climate change, it could connect with a larger effort and justify federal involvement.
- Clarify the purposes of the technical assistance, desired actions and results first.
- It should be as locally focused as possible. Could help local governments do assessments.
- Political will and funding will be necessary for the technical assistance program's success.
- Local governments might object if the federal government sets the goals unless it is a voluntary grant program. Want to give incentives to communities to act environmentally.
- There should be a grant program for local governments to purchase land.
- Develop a methodology for using public funds to acquire private lands for coastal access.
- NOAA and the states should partner with other organizations to purchase more coastal land. Develop and use public-private partnerships with matching grants to initiate activity, thereby turning it into an entrepreneurial effort.
- Create a critical coastal areas program that brings stakeholders together to address water quality problems. The technical assistance could be to collect stakeholder data and help bring stakeholders together.
- Provide federal funding for technical assistance through the states to the local governments.

Incentive program for low impact development (LID), work with developers

- NOAA should develop an incentive for low impact development that would encourage real protection in watersheds and more creative redevelopment and infill. It should be a program that drives us away from business as usual, e.g. buying and converting cheap agricultural land.
- Methods for working with developers should be created. They want certainty when they go for financing.
- Develop strong incentives for developers to integrate low impact development into their proposals, with strong performance standards and affordable housing.
- Santa Monica, California is using low impact development approaches and stormwater best management practices for retrofits and redevelopment.
- Low impact development principles should apply to all land use decisions, not just development in the coastal zone.

PUBLIC ACCESS and WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT

RESPONSES TO PREVIOUSLY BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

Create special area management plans to revitalize working waterfronts, and require states to develop waterfront revitalization elements in state coastal management plans

- Define working waterfront revitalization as “to support marine-dependent uses.” Identify working waterfronts as a need and raise public awareness of their disappearance.
- The CZMA should clarify that the country has an interest in making sure there are well planned industrial/port areas.
- State programs should help determine which ports and harbors are most at risk from a range of impacts.
- Revitalization efforts should be focused on non-commercial and industrial ports, which are underutilized.
- Government should encourage development of diverse, economically viable ports.
- Preferential leases should be used for working waterfront businesses.
- Regional port planning and prioritization (of dredging, transportation improvements, etc. should be conducted.
- Working waterfronts and waterfront revitalization is not always compatible. There should be a mandate that only water-oriented uses may occur on the water’s edge.
- Smaller harbors are at disadvantage which should be considered in any waterfronts program.
- A toolbox of innovative design standards for working waterfronts and waterfront condominiums, which are otherwise a substantial threat to non-industrialized ports, should be developed.
- Some waterfront management projects and approaches include:the California Marine and Intermodal Transportation System Advisory Council which is developing plans for large commercial/industrial ports; the San Francisco Water Trail which is bringing access to the waterfront; and Humboldt and Morro Bay which combine commercial uses with recreational uses. California laws which prevent residential uses on public tide lands but allow hotels and timeshares.
- Look with all partners at long term economical sustainability of waterfronts.
- Promote larger waterfront spaces for the public, and promote localization.

Ensure beach/public access

- In many places public access to the beach is precluded because of residences, private uses, or shoreline protection.
- Ensure public access by providing local assistance and funding to develop access ways to the coast, requiring public access easements, tying highway transportation funds to public access, using outer continental shelf exploration to fund shoreline access, and by requiring large developments to provide access.
- Require that public access routes be set back far enough to resist erosion and sea level rise.
- Public access is perhaps a state issue rather than a national or NOAA issue.
- Federal tax dollars should be used to provide public access because states are not providing it.
- NOAA should provide grant funding for public access, with targeted or preferential funds to state-developed public access programs.
- NOAA could work to identify undeveloped access easements to partner with other organizations to get the easements dedicated and developed for public access.
- The CZMA should develop a Coastal Estuarine Land Conservation Program (CELCP)-like program for public access, in which states develop a plan for access and acquisition which is funded by NOAA.
- NOAA and the states should enforce the provision for public access.
- Public access should be focused and developed in low income areas.