

**Stakeholder Meeting  
Waltham, MA – May 8, 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 Waltham, MA meeting was the first 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 NOAA and Kacky Andrews of CSO opened the meeting with a joint presentation on the initiative. The meeting was attended by 71 participants representing a broad range of stakeholders including government, marine trades, energy, research, insurance and conservation. After the opening presentation, participants broke out into small groups to address the following topics: energy; habitat; coastal hazards/climate change; land use; water quality; intergovernmental/interagency coordination; waterfront revitalization; and public access.

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

In each breakout group, participants briefly discussed obstacles. The obstacles to effective coastal management noted by participants that spanned all the topics were:

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

The participants then spent most of the day generating creative solutions for managing the coasts and/or improving the CZMA. The meeting summary on the following pages highlights each breakout discussion, including interesting ideas and other obstacles specific to each topic.

**Next Steps**

All the ideas generated by meeting participants 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 all the participants for their thoughtful input and time.

# ENERGY

## OBSTACLES

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>Governmental</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lack of a federal energy policy means that when new uses are proposed they don't have a public policy framework or priorities, and competing proposed energy projects must contend with an unclear process for evaluation and planning.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Other</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a relatively new industry, there is a lack of experience within government and the industry to guide appropriate uses, siting, impacts, etc.</li> </ul>   |

## BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- |                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Provide Training</b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government energy agencies and coastal programs need to educate one another.</li> <li>Establish partnerships with university planning departments, with support from federal grants, using extension schools, museums, aquaria, and training trainers.</li> <li>Require that training be a part of every grant application of Sea Grant, National Estuarine Research Reserves, etc.</li> <li>Require coastal zone managers to get Continuing Education Credits.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Regional Collaboration</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NOAA should have a lead role in planning off-shore energy at the regional level.</li> <li>Provide mechanisms to reduce the state burden of off-shore/coastal energy development.</li> <li>Create a regional energy planning group like the Gulf of Maine Council.</li> <li>States within a region should work together in advance to determine best sites for energy. Challenges to doing this include the territoriality of agencies, industry competition and jurisdictional questions.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Management and Planning</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create state-federal task forces on energy development and siting.</li> <li>Form state-level citizen coastal advisory groups to advocate for CZM programs.</li> <li>Shift the burden of the environmental management systems (EMS) to the developer, then have the state and federal government review the industry-developed EMS.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Financial Mechanisms</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link project funding to impact. If there are negative impacts from energy development in the region (i.e. displacement of land use, transmission lines) then the company would pay based upon impacts. Provide incentives such as tax breaks or additional public funding for projects with fewer negative impacts.</li> <li>When submitting energy development permits to the state, have developer pay the state a permit fee to fund state capacity to review the permit. This may also result in expedited permitting decisions.</li> <li>Use lease fees and mitigation money for mapping, assessments, monitoring, etc</li> <li>Establish a partnership between federal government and industry to fund research and test new renewable ocean/coastal energy technologies.</li> <li>Establish a Clean Energy Fund to pay for environmental monitoring.</li> </ul>       |
| <b>Research and Development</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to understand all the impacts of energy development (environmental, economic, technological, and social).</li> <li>Promote federal demonstration programs on a regional basis.</li> <li>Research and development should include a public education component.</li> <li>Create regional centers for energy technology testing.</li> <li>Need mechanisms that allow industry to share their expertise and demonstrate technologies with government. Challenges to this include industry reluctance, funding, and concern about sharing proprietary technology information. Working in partnership with government could diversify supply and lead to incentives for expedited project approval. Examples of such partnerships are the Cooperative Institute for Coastal and Estuarine Environmental Technology and the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Regulatory</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify the lead federal agency for energy issues.</li> </ul>  |

# HABITAT

## OBSTACLES

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Governmental</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision-making procedures for habitat are not articulated and supported.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Technical Complexity Geographic</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to express the value of habitat.</li> <li>• It is hard for the public to understand an ecosystem they cannot see (underwater).</li> </ul> |
| <b>Other</b>                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need common terminology to define effective coastal management.</li> <li>• To address habitat, the CZMA should be framed around ecosystems.</li> </ul>    |

## BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Mapping</b>                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to create in-depth, comprehensive GIS and watershed maps that are useful to all. Maps are a powerful tool for good management.</li> <li>• Federal government should develop a standardized protocol and unified effort with funding to create a baseline level of data currently missing (especially sub-aqueous data). States would then follow those guidelines when seeking data. Would want to include stakeholders, integrate many kinds of data, have agencies (the Environmental Protection Agency, NOAA, the US Department of Agriculture) share information and equipment.</li> <li>• Challenges of effective mapping include getting data from multiple sources that can be integrated, mapping far enough off-shore, ensuring consistency at border edges so maps don't stop at boundaries, and creating data that is useful for managers.</li> <li>• One example of effective mapping is Maine's Beginning With Habitat project, which provides maps, data, and technical information to community members digitally and in hard copy. Another is the Census on Marine Life.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Framework for Ecosystem Management</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CZMA should provide the governing framework for ecosystem-based management. It should be a federal mandate carried out at the state level. It could be done at a regional (multi-state) level and should support pioneering initiatives and innovation.</li> <li>• This would mean revisiting management structures and boundaries among NOAA, the US Minerals Management Service, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, etc.</li> <li>• The CZMA should work as a model for implementing habitat protection. It should use pilot programs, test different scales of planning, use incentives, provide technical oversight on a broad scale, and cross jurisdictional lines.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Valuation of Natural Resources</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NOAA should work on valuation of natural resources and habitat, including third party verification. An interdisciplinary, multi-state group could do cost benefit analysis for the ecological systems we have today and those we would like to have in the future. One example of this is the Rhode Island Economic Policy Council study that uses baselines and indexes, which will serve as both a monitoring tool to assess economic and ecological value, and as a tool for managers.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Regulatory</b>                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require states to update their critical areas yearly (using maps, for planning purposes).</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Support and Share Best Practices</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NOAA should proactively identify, support, and build on best practices and best decision-making, identifying what works and sharing costs, benefits and examples with coastal managers.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Living Shorelines</b>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a federal program initiate living shorelines rather than hard walls.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Example Habitat Programs</b>           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North America Water Fowl Management Plan</li> <li>• National Fish Habitat Action Plan, which drives policy and action. It suggests a model of ecosystem management and collaboration. It starts with authorization and appropriation at the federal level then narrows to habitat level.</li> <li>• Atlantic Coast Joint Venture, a bird project from Maine to Puerto Rico. This involves hundreds of partners, little administrative burden, and focuses on birds but effects fish.</li> </ul>  |

## HAZARDS and CLIMATE CHANGE

### OBSTACLES

<b>Governmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outdated policies about rebuilding after disaster, including incentives to redevelop in coastal areas (shoreline hardening).</li> <li>• There is rarely political will to take action in the face of uncertainty.</li> <li>• Multiple agencies can contribute (the Army Corps of Engineers with modeling, NOAA with research, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency with funding).</li> </ul>
<b>Technical Complexity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wealthy developers beat local community lawyers (not a level playing field).</li> <li>• National Flood Insurance Program map needs to be updated – based on 20-year old data.</li> <li>• There are a lack of data and no organized efforts to monitor regional change of fisheries and temperature change.</li> </ul>
<b>Geography</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to develop corridors, address multiple land-owners.</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current disincentives don't work (people build without insurance).</li> <li>• Prospective land buyers aren't told clearly about real levels of risks.</li> </ul>

### BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

<b>Land Bank for Development of Adaptation Corridors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a land bank for development of adaptation corridors. Could be federal legislation, or could occur more quickly at a town level.</li> <li>• Allow federal and state agencies to collaborate to buy land together.</li> <li>• Mitigation fees for land acquisition after events, or required development fees for development that impairs the ability of natural systems to adapt to rising sea level.</li> <li>• Create funding source dedicated to floodplain land acquisition.</li> <li>• Land banks are a market-based solution.</li> <li>• Develop ecological baseline of system condition.</li> <li>• Land bank concept could be created in federal legislation under CZMA.</li> <li>• Land bank success could be measured in terms of ecologically significant corridors allowing dunes and marshes to migrate, with intact compliment of species.</li> <li>• This could be seen as an overly targeted tax on the wealthy.</li> <li>• It is necessary to know the ecological communities to determine appropriate mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Shoreline Development Policies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Adverse Impact (NAI) toolkit and workshop aimed toward town solicitors and attorney generals including model bylaws for municipalities.</li> <li>• More publicity about the NAI toolkit to build local legal capacity through NAI to handle “takings” issue.</li> <li>• Benefits of the NAI include fully-accredited legal training course, state bar credits, benefits to local town and communities because it maintains community rights but is not anti-development.</li> <li>• The success of the NAI concept can be measured by determining what damage was avoided due to NAI projects.</li> </ul>
<b>Rebuilding Disincentives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There need to be disincentives or prohibitions for rebuilding, or agencies need to work together to buy landowners out after storms. Current outdated policies are harmful.</li> </ul>
<b>Mapping</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New low-tech state run mapping efforts.</li> <li>• Make climate change data available to decision-makers.</li> <li>• One example of good mapping is Maine's Erosion Hazard Area (EHA).</li> </ul>

# LAND USE

## OBSTACLES

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>Governmental</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local land use planning is a challenge where home rule is strong and state government has not taken a strong lead.</li> <li>• There are no standards for who sits on planning commissions.</li> <li>• Municipal decisions don't include environmental factors and real costs.</li> <li>• Regulatory and legal authorities are insufficient for local regulators to implement the policies they want.</li> <li>• There is a disconnect in the Federal Emergency Management Agency over mitigation and public assistance.</li> <li>• Local decision-makers don't have the capacity to focus on the ecological world.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Geography</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal physical and management boundaries are often obsolete.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Funding</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The funding structure of the grant program could be better leveraged.</li> <li>• Allocation of funding under the CZMA is disjointed. One of the original goals of the CZMA was to coordinate coastal funding that goes to states, and isn't currently happening.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Other</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication and stewardship ethics are needed in land use planning.</li> </ul>  |

## BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- |                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Planning</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create coastal watershed plans that, once approved, would guide federal money across agencies (the US Environmental Protection Agency, NOAA, the US Department of Agriculture, the US Department of Transportation).</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Governance</b>           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a Bureau of Federal Water Management (like the Bureau of Land Management).</li> <li>• Create coastal overlay districts that supercede all other permitting and zoning regulations, like the Cape Cod Commission has done.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Technical Assistance</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a staff whose primary task is to provide technical assistance to local communities to assist them in environmental decision-making, planning and action (i.e. coastal circuit riders for low impact development).</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Consistency</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reverse consistency so that local governments must be consistent with the states.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Standards</b>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create binding nationwide standards for coastal development and coastal management objectives, like flood insurance standards, that account for regional differences. Establish performance-based indicators to track progress toward goals. Binding State – Regional – Local planning requirements (zoning consistent with plan), local CZMA requirement with state oversight. Make CZMA more like the Clean Water Act or Clean Air Act regarding enforcement, so if locals don't address local problems, those higher up can. Make state standards binding on locals. Standards have to be high and there is no ceiling for a lower body to exceed the standard, except scientific evidence of necessity.</li> <li>• Appoint a commission to look at models of such standards and develop standards for coastal zones. Provide funding to reward compliance.</li> <li>• Every rule should address cumulative and secondary impacts of development such as climate change, economic, social, and environmental impact. Want triple bottom line. The Council on Environmental Quality has guidelines on cumulative impacts.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Funding</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need rapid funding mechanisms to allow states to be as adaptive as possible to climate change. One example is the Moore Foundation's mapping work in Massachusetts.</li> <li>• Money from non-profits should count as part of the municipal match.</li> <li>• Value land not just for highest and best use but also for its ecosystem services with a way to pay the difference, maybe appointing a commission of scientists and appraisers.</li> <li>• If a community doesn't address growth management, it shouldn't get transportation funding.</li> <li>• Don't give Federal Emergency Management Agency funding to communities that don't protect coastal resources. One example is the Maine Sensible Transportation Policy Act.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Examples</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rhode Island School of Design is considering a design-centered approach to building sustainably on urban rivers (the One River Project by Charlie Cannon). It is less</li> </ul>   |

prescriptive, more goal and objective oriented, and allows for design and creativity to address program objectives.

- Low Impact Development (private sector): example of adopting existing Smart Growth techniques under coastal programs. Its success comes from fact that state brought in private sector and showed them the benefits. Private sector then helped to change the local laws.

**Solve Boundary Differences**

- Solve the difference between geographic and political boundaries through block grants for self-organized, cross-jurisdictional entities.
- Federal agencies focused on the coast should pool money into blocks that would be used by collaboratives for ecosystem-wide actions. Or have an annual collaborative summit to coordinate how agencies allocate funding. This will address stove-piping and overlap. The block grant activities would need to be consistent with the CZM program for that state.
- Use a block grant, like community development block grants, which are not considered federal money to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. In order to implement this idea, build the authorities to make it possible. Federal government should require it and have flexibility to work across regions and entities. Block grants would force collaboration, so these are not really a “block,” they are more like what the Environmental Protection Agency tried to do with performance partnerships.

**Coastal Brownfields**

- Develop a strategy for coastal brownfields, with the Department of Commerce. Include goals of redevelopment for both high-end development and water-dependent uses. Create a title in CZMA reauthorization to support this.

**Cap and Trade Impervious Surface**

- Create the requirement of an impervious surface plan in CZMA. Establish a cap and trade in which you would set the cap at the limit at which you start seeing adverse impacts. The state political entity that controls the watershed would set the limit. Every town would have a quota and towns could trade. Require that if you go into an impaired area, you have to conserve elsewhere.
- Could give towns a total maximum daily load (TMDL) for water and tell them they have to reduce their nutrient input by a certain percentage any way that works for them. One challenge to this is addressing existing development that already exceeds limits. An example of this is the Coastal Zone Plan and Wildlife Action Plan.

**Community Development Block Grants**

- Tie Community Development Block Grants and wastewater together.

# WATER QUALITY

## OBSTACLES

- |                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Governmental</b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inflexible regulatory systems such as storm-water ordinances that prescribe treatment systems that don't work.</li> <li>• Unclear goals – the problem is too big to undertake under CZMA. Effectiveness is largely dependent on states passing enforceable policies, and the federal government cannot make state legislatures pass policies.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Geography</b>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upstream watersheds create problems in coastal water bodies – need upstream cooperation.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Technical Complexity</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of data quality with complex models.</li> <li>• There is scientific uncertainty about how water quality fits into ecosystems and about the causes of decreased water quality.</li> </ul>  |

## BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- |                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Task Force</b>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a technical advisory group or task force that would help set water quality priorities. The group should have a limited objective so they can do their work and be done. Funding should go towards identified priorities. Task forces can't be too broad, or objectives will become unobtainable.</li> <li>• The task force should include all stakeholders by issue and geography.</li> <li>• To be successful, the task force should have leadership, accountability, empowerment, clear purpose, and a fixed timeline with an end date.</li> <li>• Provide guidance on how to measure, practical costs, prioritization and how to optimize people and funds.</li> <li>• Needs to have a stick and have measurable results.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Non-point Source Programs</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve non-point source programs to more effectively address runoff throughout watersheds. Create a national enforceable policy.</li> <li>• Develop priorities and standards for the 6217 program (more funding, narrower focus).</li> <li>• Create regulations for towns to meet, and then provide them financial rewards.</li> <li>• Eliminate 6217 program and create non-point source pollution prevention partnerships.</li> <li>• Develop incentive grants with priorities, standards and criteria.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>National Estuary Program</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funds from the US Department of Transportation and the US Fish and Wildlife Service should be tied to a National Estuary Program plan (consistency to drive partnerships).</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Small Business Administration</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The US Department of Transportation and community development block grants have money and are making landscape-scale changes.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>National Policy</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A national, enforceable policy on land use would help.</li> <li>• EPA's Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) addresses water quality but not land uses.</li> <li>• Certify communities, like the National Flood Insurance Program, where certain levels of regulations could result in additional funding, better insurance rates, etc.</li> </ul>   |



# INTERGOVERNMENTAL and INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

## OBSTACLES

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>Governmental</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inland parts of the country do not understand the value of the ocean, which makes it hard to get adequate federal funding for good coastal management.</li> <li>• Measures of success – overemphasis on accountability on the wrong things is causing problems. End up over-focused on short-term measures rather than long-term goals.</li> <li>• Overwhelming number of local, state and federal programs.</li> <li>• Shifting funding between agencies is difficult.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Other</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate of change is so fast it is hard to keep up with priorities.</li> <li>• Communities need a sense of stewardship, not just information if they are to act differently.</li> <li>• Hard to measure effectiveness in coastal management.</li> </ul>   |

## BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Regional Management Councils</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create regional management councils.</li> <li>• Need a uniform way to define regional areas (right now agencies define these differently – define ecological boundaries).</li> <li>• Need data integration among agencies.</li> <li>• Should agree whether the geographical region defines which issues are addressed or whether the issues define which area is considered to be in the region.</li> <li>• Identify shared interests (resources, social), focus on issues and what groups can do together around an issue, clarifying the joint vision and benefits.</li> <li>• If regional management councils are federally required, there should be federal funding.</li> <li>• To some, regional planning sounds like big government. Should focus on the opportunity for regional planning to save time and resources.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Management Planning</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to have a management plan, where you can overlay different objectives for solving a variety of problems.</li> <li>• These should meet federal objectives and be driven by state needs.</li> <li>• Mandates should be used as drivers, and should lead to inter-governmental collaboration. Federal agencies should provide states with integrated data and objectives and the states should come back to the agencies with how they and their region are going to address the problems around ocean management.</li> <li>• Plans that are well thought out and regional should be prioritized for funding.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Funding</b>                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen the CZMA to allow regional funding.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Example</b>                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of agencies coordinating: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) coastal barriers study is an example of how NMFS and the US Department of Transportation collaborated to develop joint data for the purposes of siting road culverts.</li> <li>• Of connecting with communities: the Beginning with Habitat Program and Gateway 1, a multi-town collaboration on transportation planning, both in Maine.</li> <li>• Of using social outcomes: the Gulf of Maine Council meetings.</li> <li>• Of good watershed-based ecosystem management: Massachusetts.</li> <li>• Of helping local governments meet funding incentives and working with non-profits: the Charles River Watershed Association in Massachusetts.</li> </ul>  |



# WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION

## OBSTACLES

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Governmental</b>  | • There is no national policy for waterfront revitalization. |
| <b>Definitions</b>   | • There is no clear definition of what revitalization means. |
| <b>Balance</b>       | • Balancing multiple uses is a challenge.                    |
| <b>Participation</b> | • User groups do not always participate in decision-making.  |

## BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Training</b>               | • Promote local capacity with training and education.   |
| <b>Non-profit Involvement</b> | • Involve the non-profits in a variety of ways.<br>• Use councils that include state, local, non-profits and private organizations.   |
| <b>Regulatory</b>             | • Require enforceable state policies on waterfront use (“smart waterfronts”), with money to promote public access. Fund state mechanisms to promote waterfront uses, public ports.<br>• Create a national policy statement with state implementation plans.<br>• Enhancing the role of waterfront use in the CZMA could promote rediscovery of urban waterfronts, reduce pressures to turn public resources into private economic uses, and promote partnerships. Federal involvement in local issues and removing resources from other uses could both be challenges to this.<br>• Develop new opt-in program within CZMA that states could receive additional funds if have policies that balance uses, consider waterfront revitalization, and meet certain standards.<br>• Examples of regulatory ways to address waterfront revitalization include work done in New Bedford, Massachusetts and on the Massachusetts Seaport Council. |
| <b>Enforcement</b>            | • Enforce policies that are already in place.   |
| <b>Incentives</b>             | • Create incentives for infrastructure, planning, money for buying real estate and subsidies, resources to promote public uses.   |

## PUBLIC ACCESS

### OBSTACLES

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>Geography</b>     | • The proximity and opposition of abutting property owners is often a barrier to public access. |
| <b>Legal</b>         | • Definition of public rights is too narrow.  |
| <b>Multiple Uses</b> | • The need to managing multiple uses can lead to restrictions of certain uses.                  |
| <b>Education</b>     | • Lack of awareness of public trust and private property rights.                                |
| <b>Funding</b>       | • The price of coastal land is a significant challenge to ensuring public access.               |
| <b>Planning</b>      | • Poor city planning leads to lack of access opportunities.                                     |

### BRAINSTORMED SOLUTIONS

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Public Access Goal</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Require each state to develop a public access goal and explain how they will achieve it.</li><li>• Expand consideration of public access at urban waterfronts.</li><li>• Inventory historic access rights and lost rights of way.</li><li>• Apply habitat objectives to new and existing developments.</li><li>• Example: Massachusetts' new state legislation.</li><li>• To the greatest extent possible, make this voluntary and use incentives.</li></ul> |
| <b>Matching Funds</b>     | • Provide federal matching funds for land acquisitions when states create public access funds.   |
| <b>Prioritize Access</b>  | • Raise the profile of access within the CZMA, and provide funding as incentive.   |