13982

COASTAL ZONE
INFORMATION CENTER

COASTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

CZIC COLLECTION

WHAT THE PUBLIC THINKS

University of. Sea Grant Program

GC
57.2
.N45
no.160

UNH-SG no. 160

By DAVID MOORE

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

13982

CZIC COLLECTION

COASTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT:

WHAT THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC THINKS

by

David W. Moore

UNH-SG-160

This publication is a result of research sponsored by NOAA Office of Sea Grant, Department of Commerce, under Grant No. 04-6-158-44056. The U.S. Government is authorized to produce and distribute reprints for governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation that may appear hereon.

COASTAL ZONE
INFORMATION CENTER

Department of Political Science
University of New Hampshire
September, 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NOAA
COASTAL SERVICES CENTER
2234 SOUTH HOBSON AVENUE
CHARLESTON, SC 29405-2413

New Hampshire University of Sea Grant Program
GC57.2.N45 no.160

Published by the University of New Hampshire Marine Advisory Program, a part of the UNH/U-Maine Cooperative University Institutional Sea Grant Program. Available for $1.50 from the UNH Marine Advisory Program, Marine Program Building, Durham, N.H. 03824, 603-862-1889.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Purpose and Data Sources ii

Summary of the Results iii

I. Desirability of a Coastal Resource Management Plan iii

II. Organization and Responsibilities of a Coastal Resource Management Agency iii

III. Possible Funding of a Coastal Resource Management Plan iv

IV. Development in the Seacoast iv

Section I: Desirability of a Coastal Resource Management Plan 1

Section II: Organization and Responsibilities of a Coastal Resource Management Agency 5

Section III: Possible Funding for a Coastal Resource Management Program . 19

Section IV: Development in the Seacoast 25

TABLES

Table 1 Knowledge About CRM Plan 2

Table 2 Support for a CRM Plan 3

Table 3 New or Existing Agency for CRM Program 6

Table 4 Special CRM Board Within Existing Agency 7

Table 5 Power of Special Board 8

Table 6 Composition of Special Board 9

Table 7 Size of Special Board 10

Table 8 Breadth of CRM Program 12

Table 9 Advisory or Mandatory Standards for a CRM Program 13

Table 10 Advisory or Mandatory Standards: Use of Salt Marshes 14

Table 11 Advisory or Mandatory Standards: Soil Erosion and Sedimentation. 15

Table 12 Advisory or Mandatory Standards: Supply of Ground Water 16

Table 13 Advisory or Mandatory Standards: Establishing Natural Preserves. 17

Table 14 Funding for CRM Program: Political Leaders' Responses 20

Table 15 Property Tax Increase 21

Table 16 Diversion of Local Funds 22

Table 17 State Income Tax 23

Table 18 State Sales Tax 24

Table 19 Industrial vs. Recreational Development 26

Table 20 Desirability of the Nuclear Power Plant 27

Table 21 Desirability of an Oil Refinery 29

INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE AND DATA SOURCES

In the summer of 1974, the state of New Hampshire began a four-year effort to develop a comprehensive plan for the management of marine and land resources in the seacoast area. That planning effort came in response to the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-583, 86 Stat. 1280), which was enacted to encourage all states bordered by salt water or the Great Lakes to develop their own plans for use of their coastal resources.

As part of New Hampshire's effort to develop a coastal resource management plan, two Sea Grant-funded surveys were conducted. The purpose of the surveys was to determine the attitudes of selected groups at the local (seacoast) and state levels toward various issues related to coastal resource management. Results of the first survey, conducted in the spring and summer of 1975, were presented to the state Office of Comprehensive Planning, the designated lead agency for development of the New Hampshire plan. These results provided one of many sources of information used by the Office of Comprehensive Planning in designing a coastal resource management plan for New Hampshire. Results of the survey were published (June, 1976, # UNH-SG-155) and distributed by the University of New Hampshire Sea Grant Program.

A second survey was conducted in the summer of 1976. While the first survey dealt with general questions about the desirability and organization of a coastal resource management agency, the second examined these and other issues in greater detail. Again, results were provided to the Office of Comprehensive Planning for use as one source of information in developing a final version of the plan.

In the spring of 1977, the state legislature passed a coastal resource management bill by a substantial margin in both the House and Senate. The governor, however, vetoed the bill, not because of its substance, but because of the procedural mechanisms included in the bill for establishing the program. Among other provisions, the approved bill called for a referendum on the plan in the directly affected cities and towns. The bill stipulated that the plan could be adopted only if a majority of voters in a majority of the towns and cities approved it, <u>and</u> if the total of all votes for the bill represented a majority of all seacoast voters. The purpose of this provision for concurrent majority of the cities and towns and of the voters overall was to ensure that both the people and the political units favored the plan.

In vetoing the bill, the governor called for majority approval in each city or town--not just a majority of voters in a majority of cities and towns. Such a result would also, of course, ensure a majority approval of voters overall, though it also would mean a minority of the towns and cities, or just one, could block the program. The governor's veto was sustained, and a new bill will be presented to the state legislature when it reconvenes in 1979.

The purpose in publishing this report at this time is to provide information about public attitudes toward coastal resource management issues. It should be noted that the most recent data are two years old, and some caution must be used in applying these results to the current situation. Nevertheless, given the relative stability of public opinion on many of these issues, this report should be a useful source of information for consideration of the merits of the new bill.

Those contacted in the second survey included a random sample of the seacoast general public, political leaders in the seacoast area (all selectmen, city council members, mayors and town and city managers) and all members of the New Hampshire General Court (both the House and Senate). The study was funded through the University of New Hampshire Sea Grant Program, which is supported by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

This report covers the results of the 1976 survey of public and political leader attitudes in four general areas related to coastal resource management. The major conclusions are listed below under each of these areas:

I. Desirability of a Coastal Resource Management Plan

Support for a coastal resource management plan was very strong among all groups surveyed.

Support increased from the spring of 1975 to the summer of 1976, as did the amount of information people had acquired about the issue.

II. Organization and Responsibilities of a Coastal Resource Management Agency

Consensus exists among political leaders at all levels for the CRM plan to be administered by an existing, rather than a new, agency.

Consensus exists among political leaders that a special board with seacoast representatives should be created to advise the CRM agency.

Consensus exists among political leaders that the special board should be large enough to include at least one representative from each town or city in the coastal zone.

There are differing opinions among political leaders at various levels over the proportion of non-seacoast representatives that should be on the board.

There are also differing opinions among political leaders at various levels on the nature of the board's authority, whether advisory or final, on seacoast matters.

With respect to the scope of a CRM plan, local political leaders prefer the minimum required by law, while state political leaders favor a broader program.

As a general rule, local political leaders prefer that environmental guidelines established by a CRM plan be advisory, although mandatory guidelines are acceptable in some areas.

State political leaders prefer mandatory over advisory environmental guidelines.

III. Possible Funding for a CRM Plan

Differences of opinion exist among the groups surveyed as to the proportion of funds, if any, that should be supplied by seacoast communities to finance a CRM plan.

If the seacoast area is required to provide a part of the cost for a CRM plan, political leaders at the state and local levels are generally opposed to increasing property taxes, while the seacoast general public supports the increase.

Generally strong opposition exists among the groups surveyed to the establishment of a state sales or income tax.

IV. Development in the Seacoast

A plurality of each group surveyed prefers that additional development in the seacoast area about equally emphasize recreational and industrial development.

Support for the nuclear power plant at Seabrook is strong among the general public, local political leaders, and non-seacoast members of the House.

More opposition than support for the nuclear power plant is found among members of the Senate and seacoast members of the House.

The possible construction of an oil refinery remains a divisive issue among the general public, local political leaders and non-seacoast members of the House.

The Senate and seacoast members of the House show firm opposition to an oil refinery in the seacoast area.

Survey questions were designed to focus on four areas of concern in coastal resource management. The first area involves the amount of information that respondents had about New Hampshire's efforts to develop a CRM plan, and whether people supported the general concept. The second area involves the several ways in which a CRM agency might be organized to administer the program and possible responsibilities that the agency should have. In the third area are examined respondents' attitudes toward different funding sources for a CRM program. (The federal government provides 80 percent of the funds, through the CZM Act, and states need only furnish the remaining 20 percent.)

The fourth area covers three general issues that are relevant to coastal resource planning, although these questions do not pertain directly to the desirability of adopting a resource management plan. The three issues are: the type of development respondents believed should be encouraged in the seacoast; the level of support for the nuclear power plant at Seabrook; and the level of support for construction of an oil refinery in the seacoast area.

DESIRABILITY OF A COASTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

SECTION I

In the year between the first and second surveys, knowledge about the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Act of 1972 and about New Hampshire's efforts to develop a Coastal Resource Management plan increased among people at all levels of government. Compared to the first survey, the second survey showed more than twice as many people among the seacoast general public had heard "some" or "a great deal" about coastal resource planning. Among the seacoast political leaders and members of the state legislature, knowledge had also increased, but not at the same rate. Still, as Table 1 shows, about two-thirds of the general public had not heard much about coastal management issues, compared to about one-third of the seacoast and state political leaders.

Not only did people know more about the issue in the second year than the first, they also gave greater support for establishing a state CRM plan. As shown in Table 2, more than two-thirds of the seacoast political leaders supported the adoption of a Coastal Resource Management Program. Just over half supported the issue the previous year. Eighty-eight percent of the House gave support (62 percent the previous year) and all of the Senate gave support (92 percent the previous year). The general public showed virtually identical support both years (72 vs. 71 percent), although opposition dropped somewhat (from 11 percent to 4 percent).

In summary, it appears that as information about the issue was disseminated, the overall acceptability of establishing a CRM plan increased.

TABLE 1

KNOWLEDGE ABOUT CRM PLAN

Question: In 1972, the Federal Government passed a coastal zone management act to encourage states to develop their own coastal resource management programs. In the past two years, N.H. state government has made some preliminary efforts to develop such a program. Have you by chance heard a great deal of information about this matter, some information, or not much?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
Great Deal	5	21	17	39	12	15
Some	26	46	49	51	48	69
Not much	68	33	34	10	39	15
DK/NA	1	0	1	0	1	0
TOTAL	100	100	101*	100	100	99*
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 2

SUPPORT FOR CRM PLAN

Question: For a moment, let us assume that a resource management program is adopted for the seacoast area. If so, it would help coordinate plans among the seacoast towns and cities to deal with population and industrial growth. In general, would you favor or oppose the adoption of such a program?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Favor	72	67	88	90	88	100
Divided	8	0	0	0	0	0
Oppose	7	24	7	8	8	0
DK/NA	12	9	5	3	4	0
TOTAL	99*	100	100	101*	100	100
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF A COASTAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SECTION II

Organization

The consensus among political leaders in the state was that a CRM program should be incorporated into an existing state or regional agency, rather than forming a new agency altogether. As Table 3 shows, however, House Representatives from the seacoast marginally favored that idea (46 percent) with a substantial minority (41 percent) indicating a preference for a new agency. The local leaders in the seacoast preferred an existing agency by a narrow majority (52 percent), compared to almost two-thirds majorities of the Senate and of the non-seacoast members of the House. The general public was evenly divided.

If the CRM program is incorporated into an existing agency, there is strong consensus that a special board with seacoast representatives be established to advise the agency in dealing with coastal problems. Table 4 shows that more than three-fourths of local political leaders, two-thirds of the House, and slightly more than half of the Senate favored the idea of a special board.

There is not as widespread a consensus about the role of the board as there is about its desirability. As shown in Table 5, a majority of local political leaders want the board to have final, rather than advisory, authority on coastal matters, while seacoast House members are about evenly divided on this issue. The Senate and non-seacoast House members strongly prefer the board to be advisory.

Differences between seacoast political leaders and state political leaders are also found on the question of board membership. Table 6 shows that local political leaders and seacoast House members want a board dominated by people from the seacoast, while the Senate and non-seacoast House members prefer a board of which at least half of the members are non-seacoast people.

Finally, there is consensus among political leaders in the seacoast and the rest of the state that a special advisory board be large enough to allow for at least one representative from every town or city affected (Table 7).

Responsibilities

Federal law requires a state coastal resource management plan to provide standards for land and water use only when there is "potential for direct and

TABLE 3

NEW OR EXISTING AGENCY
FOR CRM PROGRAM

Question: If a program were adopted would you prefer that the responsibility for implementing the program be exercised within the state or regional agencies that already exist, or would you prefer that a new agency be created to implement the program, or doesn't it matter?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
Prefer New Agency	28	31	24	41	21	23
Doesn't Matter	27	13	8	8	8	8
Prefer Existing Agency	28	52	65	46	69	69
DK/NA	18	4	3	5	2	0
TOTAL	101*	100	100	100	100	100
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 4

SPECIAL CRM BOARD WITHIN EXISTING AGENCY

Question: Some people have suggested that if an existing agency is to be used, a special board with seacoast leaders on it should be created to help that agency in dealing with coastal resource problems. Do you think that such a board should be created or do you think that the state agency should handle the coastal resource problems internally (as it does with other problems now) or doesn't it matter which arrangement is used?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives			Senate
		Overall	Seacoast	Other	
Prefer Special Board	76	66	77	64	54
Doesn't Matter	7	11	10	12	0
Oppose Special Board	11	17	8	19	39
DK/NA	6	5	5	6	8
TOTAL	100	99*	100	101*	101*
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 5

POWER OF SPECIAL BOARD

Question: What about the power of such a board? Should the board have final authority on any action taken by the state agency dealing with coastal matters, or should the board be advisory only, or doesn't it matter one way or the other?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Final Board	51	32	44	29	15
Doesn't Matter	7	5	3	5	0
Advisory Board	31	57	46	59	69
DK/NA	10	7	8	7	15
TOTAL	99*	101*	101*	100	99*
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 6

COMPOSITION OF SPECIAL BOARD

Question: If a special board were created to help a state agency with coastal resource problems, about what proportion of the board members should be from the seacoast compared to the rest of the state?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
All from Seacoast	40.0	17.2	23.1	15.9	23.1
75% from Seacoast	40.0	34.4	43.6	32.4	23.1
50% from Seacoast	12.9	24.9	17.9	26.4	23.1
25% from Seacoast	2.9	11.3	5.1	12.6	30.8
Less than 25%	1.4	3.2	0	3.8	0
Doesn't Matter	0	4.1	2.6	4.4	0
DK/NA	2.9	5.0	7.7	4.4	0
TOTAL	100.1*	100.1*	100	99.9*	100.1*
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 7

SIZE OF SPECIAL BOARD

Question: If a special board were created, should each city and town in the seacoast have a representative on it, or should there be a smaller board on which members represent several towns, or doesn't it matter very much which of these two arrangements is adopted?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Representative for each town	76	57	59	56	62
Doesn't Matter	1	11	10	11	0
Smaller Board	17	28	23	29	31
DK/NA	6	5	8	4	8
TOTAL	100	101*	100	100	101*
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

significant adverse effects upon coastal waters." Some people have proposed a CRM plan that would be more intensive. Table 8 shows that a broader CRM program is supported much more strongly by non-seacoast political leaders than by seacoast political leaders. In fact, more than half of the local political leaders want only the minimum standards required by federal law, and 31 percent want a broader program. House members from the seacoast are about evenly divided, but the Senate and non-seacoast House members strongly prefer the broader program (69 percent and 59 percent, respectively), with a minority supporting the minimum standards (15 percent and 29 percent).

Similar to the question of the breadth of a CRM program is the question about the general flexibility of standards that would be outlined in the program. As Table 9 shows, local political leaders want guidelines to be advisory only, while the House strongly supports mandatory guidelines. The Senate is evenly split on the issue.

The next four questions deal with this same issue (advisory versus mandatory standards) as applied to specific responsibilities. There is consensus among political leaders at all levels that mandatory standards are desirable for the use of salt marshes (Table 10) and for the control of soil erosion and sedimentation in coastal waters (Table 11). For regulation of ground water supplies (Table 12) and establishment of natural preserves in the seacoast area (Table 13), local political leaders were slightly more likely to prefer advisory to mandatory standards, while the House (including seacoast members) strongly preferred mandatory standards. The Senate was more divided.

In summary, local political leaders expressed less support than other political leaders for a broad CRM program and for mandatory standards. Despite this general orientation, local political leaders are willing to see mandatory standards applied in some specific areas of resource management.

TABLE 8

BREADTH OF CRM PROGRAM

Question: First of all, federal law requires any such state program to provide management standards for land and water use when there is "potential for direct and significant adverse effects upon coastal waters." Some people would like to see a broader management plan that deals more generally with regional planning goals. What about you? Would you prefer a program that sets standards only when there is potential for direct and significant adverse effects on coastal waters, or would you like to see a broader program, or doesn't it matter very much which kind of program is adopted?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives			Senate
		Overall	Seacoast	Other	
Minimum Standards Only	51	32	44	29	15
Doesn't Matter	7	5	3	5	0
Broader Program	31	57	46	59	69
DK/NA	10	7	8	7	15
TOTAL	99*	101*	101*	100	99*
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 9

ADVISORY OR MANDATORY STANDARDS
FOR A CRM PROGRAM

Question: As a general rule do you feel that a coastal resource management program should establish minimum environmental guidelines that towns and cities must meet, or do you feel that a coastal resource program should only advise the towns and cities about environmental standards?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Mandatory Standards	37	55	64	53	46
No feelings at this time	3	9	5	9	0
Advisory Only	56	33	28	33	54
DK/NA	4	4	3	4	0
TOTAL	100	101*	100	99*	100
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 10

ADVISORY OR MANDATORY STANDARDS:
USE OF SALT MARSHES

Question: Where there is potential for direct and significant effects on coastal waters, should a coastal resource management program include responsibilities for the use of salt marshes?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Mandatory Standards	46	49	59	47	54
Advise Only	33	24	18	25	23
Not sure at this time	10	20	18	21	23
Exclude from CRMP	7	2	3	2	0
DK/NA	4	4	3	4	0
TOTAL	100	99*	101*	99*	100
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 11

ADVISORY OR MANDATORY STANDARDS:
SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION

Question: Where there is potential for direct and significant effects on coastal waters, should a coastal resource management program include responsibility for controlling soil erosion and sedimentation in coastal waters?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Mandatory Standards	54	48	56	46	69
Advise Only	31	26	18	28	31
Not sure at this time	6	20	18	20	0
Exclude from CRMP	4	3	5	3	0
DK/NA	4	4	3	4	0
TOTAL	99*	101*	100	101*	100
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 12

ADVISORY OR MANDATORY STANDARDS:
SUPPLY OF GROUND WATER

Question: Where there is potential for direct and significant effects on coastal waters, should a coastal resource management program include responsibility for regulating the supply of ground water?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Mandatory Standards	33	40	46	39	39
Advise Only	40	26	21	28	31
Unsure at this time	16	24	26	23	15
Exclude from CRMP	6	5	5	6	15
DK/NA	6	5	3	6	0
TOTAL	101*	100	100	102*	100
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 13

ADVISORY OR MANDATORY STANDARDS:
ESTABLISHING NATURAL PRESERVES

Question: Where there is potential for direct and significant effects on coastal waters, should a coastal resource management program include responsibility for establishing natural preserves in the seacoast area?

	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Mandatory Standards	36	47	56	45	39
Advise Only	40	29	18	31	46
Not sure at this time	10	17	21	17	15
Exclude from CRMP	9	4	3	4	0
DK/NA	6	4	3	4	0
TOTAL	101*	101*	101*	101*	100
(Number of Respondents)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

POSSIBLE FUNDING FOR A CRM PROGRAM

SECTION III

According to federal law, up to 80 percent of the costs of a CRM program will be provided by the federal government. The remaining 20 percent must be provided by the state. At the time this survey was administered it was not clear what funding arrangements might be appropriate, so several survey questions explored possible, acceptable funding sources.

Table 14 shows that the general public feels the seacoast should provide some of the funds, while local political leaders are split and seacoast House members are only marginally opposed. Other state leaders in the House and Senate also expressed the view that the seacoast should provide some funds for the program.

The next two tables show a surprising willingness of the seacoast general public to provide financial support for a CRM program. Table 15 shows that half of the public would agree to a 1 percent increase in property taxes to fund the program (29 percent oppose the increase), while Table 16 shows more than two-thirds of the public willing to divert 1 percent of local funds for the program (13 percent oppose diverting funds). Political leaders at all levels, except the Senate, show more opposition to a property tax increase, although they are somewhat less opposed to diverting local funds.

The general public support of a property tax increase to help fund a CRM program is particularly interesting in light of its overwhelming opposition to both a state income tax (Table 17) and a state sales tax (Table 18). These figures suggest that the public is not necessarily opposed to new programs that will cost additional money, but is opposed to the general sales and income taxes as mechanisms for raising funds.

TABLE 14

FUNDING FOR CRM PROGRAM:
POLITICAL LEADERS' RESPONSES

Statement: What about the funding of a coastal resource management program? Currently the Federal Government will provide 80% of the costs. Do you feel that the remaining costs should be provided by the state government alone, or that the seacoast area should provide some part of those funds?

	General Leaders	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
State Provide All	28	46	33	49	29	0
No Opinion	16	7	13	13	13	8
Seacoast Provide Some	56	44	51	36	54	92
DK/NA	0	3	4	3	4	0
TOTAL	100	100	101*	101*	100	100
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 15

PROPERTY TAX INCREASE

Statement: Would you be willing to have an increase in your (seacoast) property tax of one percent to help pay for such a resource management program?

	General Public	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Yes	50	26	27	31	26	39
Divided (unsure)	6	19	27	21	28	31
No	29	51	40	46	39	31
DK/NA	16	4	7	3	8	0
TOTAL	101*	100	101*	101*	101*	101*
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 16

DIVERSION OF LOCAL FUNDS

Statement: Would you be willing to have your local government divert one percent of its funds from current programs to support a coastal resource management program?

	General Public	Local Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	Seacoast	Other	Senate
Yes	67	30	30	23	29	39
Divided (unsure)	6	23	29	26	30	39
No	13	43	34	39	33	23
DK/NA	15	4	7	3	8	0
TOTAL	101*	100	100	101*	100	101*
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 17

STATE INCOME TAX

Statement: Do you believe the state government should institute a state income tax?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
Yes	22	37	36	49	33	39
Divided	4	0	1	0	1	0
No	67	60	44	41	57	62
DK/NA	7	3	9	10	9	0
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

TABLE 18

STATE SALES TAX

Statement: Do you believe the state should institute a general sales tax?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
Yes	21	27	16	18	15	8
Divided	2	17	16	18	16	23
No	64	54	58	54	59	69
DK/NA	3	1	10	10	9	0
TOTAL	100	99*	100	100	99*	100
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

DEVELOPMENT IN THE SEACOAST

SECTION IV

Three development questions asked in the first survey were again asked in the second survey. As shown in Table 19, about 45 to 50 percent of each respondent group believes that any additional development in the seacoast area should place equal emphasis on industrial and recreational uses. Of those respondents who preferred that one use be emphasized, there is a tendency for those at the local level (general public, local leaders, seacoast House members) to be more supportive of industrial development than respondents who do not live in the seacoast. Non-seacoast House members, for example, preferred recreational over industrial development 34 to 8 percent; the Senate 39 to 15 percent. The general public preferred industrial to recreational by 29 to 18 percent; seacoast political leaders, by 33 to 20 percent. Seacoast House members are almost evenly divided (21 percent industrial to 26 percent recreational).

This same pattern was found the previous year, with the Senate and non-seacoast House members putting greater emphasis on recreational use than any of the seacoast residents. The major shift from the first to the second year is found in the greater percentage of respondents in virtually all groups who want to see equal emphasis.

Table 20 shows the pattern of response to the question about the desirability of building the nuclear power plant at Seabrook. It should be re-emphasized that the data presented here were collected in 1976, and changes may have occurred since then. Nevertheless, the stability in responses of the general public from 1975 to 1976 is noteworthy. The general public favored the power plant by a margin of more than two-to-one in both surveys. The second survey did show a shift in opinion among local political leaders of about 8 percent, but those in favor still outnumbered those opposed by 60 to 36 percent. A shift of about 8 percent against the nuclear power plant also occurred among seacoast members of the House, with about a 20 percent shift against the plant among Senate members. (In the latter case the numbers involved are quite small; a 20 percent shift means a change of only three Senators, and that "shift" may in fact be no shift at all, but rather different individuals responding.)

As of 1976, support for the Seabrook power plant was very strong among the general public in the seacoast area, local political leaders, and House members outside of the seacoast area. The desirability of the plant was more controversial among seacoast House members and the Senate, with opposition somewhat greater

TABLE 19

INDUSTRIAL VS. RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Statement: If additional development is going to occur in the seacoast area, do you think industrial or recreational development should receive greater emphasis, or that both should receive about equal emphasis?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
Industrial	29	33	10	21	8	15
Equal	49	46	48	44	50	46
Recreational	18	20	33	26	34	39
DK/NA	4	1	9	10	8	0
TOTAL	100	100	100	101*	100	100
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

TABLE 20

DESIRABILITY OF THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

Statement: Recently, there has been much controversy over the construction of the nuclear power plant at Seabrook. Are you generally in favor or opposed to the construction of the power plant?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
Favor	56	60	59	38	64	39
Divided	16	0	0	0	0	8
Opposed	25	36	34	46	31	46
DK/NA	3	4	7	15	6	48
TOTAL	99*	100	100	99*	101*	101*
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

than support.

The pattern of responses to the question of building an oil refinery in the seacoast area is stable across all groups of respondents. The general public and non-seacoast members of the House were about evenly divided on the issue, as in the previous year. The Senate, local political leaders, and seacoast House members were still firmly opposed the second year as in the first. The only noteworthy change among all the groups from one year to the next was a moderate increase in the percentage of those who were unsure about the desirability of an oil refinery.

Firm opposition to an oil refinery in the seacoast can still be found among political leaders who reside in the seacoast and among Senate members. The general public and non-seacoast State House members are still divided on the oil refinery issue.

TABLE 21

DESIRABILITY OF AN OIL REFINERY

Statement: Do you think that an oil refinery should be built in the seacoast area?

	General Public	Seacoast Political Leaders	House of Representatives Overall	House of Representatives Seacoast	House of Representatives Other	Senate
Yes	43	30	36	31	39	23
Divided	9	23	17	18	17	8
No	42	44	42	56	40	61
DK/NA	6	3	5	5	5	8
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	101*	100
(Number of Respondents)	(525)	(70)	(221)	(39)	(182)	(13)

*Figures do not always total 100% because of rounding error.

NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CENTER LIBRARY
3 6668 14107 2555