09342

Center

FEB 03 1977

STATE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES 1975-1976

COASTAL ZONE
INFORMATION CENTER

December 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Office of Coastal Zone Management

HT392
.U558
1976

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Coastal Zone
Information
Center

09342

FEB 08 1977

STATE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES 1975-1976

COASTAL ZONE
INFORMATION CENTER

December 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and
Atmospheric Administration

Office of Coastal Zone Management

HT392
.U558
1976

STATE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES 1975-1976

December 1976

US Department of Commerce
NOAA Coastal Services Center Library
2234 South Hobson Avenue
Charleston, SC 29405-2413

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Robert M. White, Administrator

Office of Coastal Zone Management
Robert W. Knecht, Assistant Administrator

HT 392 .U55A 1976
FEB 22 1997

Property of CSC Library

STATE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES - 1975-76

Introduction

This is the third annual progress report prepared by the federal Office of Coastal Zone Management on the activities of the U.S. coastal states and territories that are participating in the federal coastal zone management program. It covers the period 1975 through mid-1976.

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-583) authorized the use of federal resources, both financial and technical, to encourage and assist states and territories in the development and administration of comprehensive management programs for their coastal zones. Responsibility for administration of the act is vested with the Office of Coastal Zone Management within the Dept. of Commerce's National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration.

For the most part, this report describes activities undertaken by the relevant governmental entities during their second year of coastal management program planning. In some instances, a first year's work program and a third year's work program are discussed as well.

Information contained in the report is abstracted from a much larger body of information relating to the activities of individual states and territories that are developing coastal management plans and preparing for coastal management program implementation in accordance with the requirements of the act.

On July 26, 1976, the President signed into law S. 586, the Coastal Zone Management Act Amendments of 1976. That legislation authorizes $1.6-billion for an energy development impact assistance program and for enabling an extension of the scope of the existing coastal zone management program. This report is based on activities that occurred prior to passage of the amendments to P.L. 92-583. Because of the additional requirements of those amendments, and the fact that they allow more than the initial three years for development of a coastal management program plan, certain target dates cited in this report may be expected to change.

In addition, many of the individual state activities that are discussed should be considered proposed actions and/or alternatives to coastal management and, therefore, shouldn't be regarded as standing policy, unless so stated. Some of the program elements discussed may change to accommodate the views of legislative bodies, administrative agencies and governmental jurisdictions, and the public.

The report shows the extent of the financial commitment by the federal Office of Coastal Zone Management and the 33 of the 34 coastal states and territories that are participating. It presents the federal and state matching funds by yearly grant, with the cut-off point being the end of June 1976.

Certain significant occurrences can be cited in the period covered by the report. The State of Indiana became a participant. The State of Washington received approval of its coastal management plan and became eligible for implementation funds under Section 306 of the Act. The State of California and the State of Oregon requested approval of their coastal management programs. The Territory of

Puerto Rico requested federal approval of a management plan for one segment of its coast, the Island of Culebra.

In addition, many states that had suffered setbacks by governmental reorganization or fiscal constraints began to make a comeback to strong coastal program planning efforts.

Federal policy to accelerate development of offshore oil and gas resources in frontier areas added a dimension of urgency to coastal planning efforts and prompted the authorization of federal funds for special studies on the effects of OCS energy development.

In February 1975, the directorship of the coastal zone management program was elevated to the level of Assistant Administrator (and, in the amendments signed in July 1976, that post was upgraded further).

The series of resumes contained in this report provide an overall perspective in that they contain historical data on coastal management efforts by individual state and territory; present priority issues and objectives of coastal planning as conceived by the state or territory; and focus on the current status of the program development by examining performance against the "threshold" elements that form the backbone of the federal coastal zone management program.

Each summary was reviewed by the state coastal management program office prior to publication.

RWKnecht

Robert W. Knecht
Assistant Administrator
for Coastal Zone Management

ALABAMA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Alabama Development Office
Coastal management program contact: Willis Hyde, Alabama Development Office, State Office Bldg., Montgomery AL 36104. (205) 269-1831.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Alabama Coastal Area Board; Dept. of Conservation & Natural Resources; Geological Survey of Alabama; Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium; Marine Environmental Sciences Consortium.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year
	$100,000 (Federal)	$120,000 (F)
	50,000 (State)	60,000 (S)
Subtotal	$150,000	$180,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $330,000

AUTHORITY:

The Coastal Areas Development Act of 1973 established the Coastal Area Board (CAB) and gave it responsibility for developing, coordinating and maintaining a coastal area program. The CAB became operational in late January 1974, with staff and technical functions assigned to the Alabama Development Office (ADO). Following development of a coastal area administration program, the CAB will administer a permit program to regulate coastal activities.

In 1976, the legislature passed Act 536 which repealed the 1973 act and made several significant changes. It realigned the membership of the CAB, gave it responsibility for developing a technical staff, required the coastal management office to be relocated in the coastal area, provided for appointment of a Citizens Advisory Committee and defined the boundary of the coastal zone.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Alabama highlights the following coastal management issues.

*Rapid population growth in coastal counties is intensifying competition among industrial, commercial, agricultural and residential developers for the limited land of the coastal area.
*There are rapidly increasing demands for fresh water resources of Alabama's coastal margin.
*Inadequately treated wastes from municipal and industrial sources, complicated by runoff from agricultural areas, are contributing to the pollution of coastal waters. Disposal of dredged materials also is a water quality issue.
*Growth of Alabama's shrimp fleet is increasing developmental pressure on the coastal estuarine areas essential as a nursery ground.
*Unregulated development in wetlands has destroyed areas that are important as nursery grounds and as factors that stabilize shorelines from wind and water erosion.

*A plan for increased petroleum production in offshore waters poses a demand for coastal shoreland areas required to accommodate refinery distribution and other related resources.
*Coastal development has proceeded without regard for the necessity to avoid areas of higher than normal potential for severe damage during tropical storms and hurricanes and the severe flooding that accompanies them.
*Almost one-third of the Alabama shoreline is subject to erosion, particularly that portion lying along the Gulf Coast.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The objectives of Alabama's coastal program are as follows.
*To allocate available coastal resources for the economic and social benefit of the state's citizens in a manner that will preserve options and values for future generations.
*To recognize and plan for the capabilities and limitations of the natural systems present in the coastal environment.
*To minimize irretrievable commitments of natural resources in developing a management plan.
*To develop and maintain an educational system to disseminate information obtained through marine and coastal research.
*To establish a coordinated system for handling resource use conflicts, embodying the concepts of multiple use, shared use, irretrievable commitments, capability analysis and available alternatives.
*To facilitate coordination of activities of the various agencies in the coastal area.

CURRENT STATUS:

Alabama's coastal management efforts were slowed in their second year by a decrease in staff and by uncertainties associated with legislative review of the CAB and coastal management activities. As a result, little progress has been made in the area of organizational networks, although the management boundary has been determined, categories of permissible land and water uses have been proposed, and an initial cut has been made at defining geographic areas of particular concern.

Boundary identification

Act 534 of the 1976 Legislature defined the inland boundard of the coastal area subject to the management program as being that area lower than 10 feet above mean sea level in Baldwin and Mobile Counties.

Identification of permissible land and water uses

Much of the technical work subcontracted to the Dept. of Conservation & Natural Resources, the Marine Environmental Sciences Consortium and the Geological Survey of Alabama is focusing on the importance of coastal fisheries and wetlands. Various studies were completed during the first year of coastal program development. Those reports include: a bibliography of offshore and estuarine areas; study of geologic and sedimentation changes from an historical review of charts and maps; a report on deep test drilling and test pumping to determine aquifer characteristics and relationships of aquifers to salt water intrusion in southern Mobile County; characterization of

the fish and wildlife in the two counties as to distribution and relative abundance; and a characterization of the designated coastal planning area which, in part, pinpointed major critical areas.

As a result of efforts, the following general categories of permissible land and water uses were proposed: navigation and transportation; industrial development; urban development; energy production; agriculture and forestry; fish and wildlife; recreation; public facilities; mining and minerals; conservation and restoration.

Sub-categories of these permissible uses will be developed during the third year planning program.

Definition of geographic areas of particular concern

A first cut at identifying geographic areas of particular concern was undertaken by 30 governmental agencies and interested citizen groups. Through use of a questionnaire, those groups were asked to recommend areas and provide reasons for their selection.

Those areas of the Alabama coast that have been identified as unique and/or valuable coastal resources and which are considered candidates for designation as GAPCs are: Mobile River delta; Point aux Pins peninsula; Point aux Pins marsh; Grand Bay marsh; Isle aux Herbes; Cat Island; Dauphin Island Airport marsh; Dauphin Island sand dune system; Dauphin Island beaches; Alabama Port bogs; Oyster Bay marshes; Gulf Shores and sand dune system; Gulf Shore beaches.

Work during the third-year planning program will refine the definition of these geographic areas and likely will lead to additions to the list.

Public and governmental involvement

The primary vehicle for intergovernmental coordination is the Coastal Area Board, which is comprised of those state agencies and local governments most directly involved with or affected by coastal zone management, and a representative of the Citizens Advisory Committee. Included as members of the CAB are the Alabama Development Office, the Dept. of Conservation & Natural Resources, the Marine Environmental Science Consortium, Geological Survey of Alabama, Mobile County Commissioner, Baldwin County Commissioner, the Mobile City Commission, the Baldwin County Mayors Association and the Citizens Advisory Committee.

The South Alabama Regional Planning Commission, which covers the two coastal counties, provides inputs on policy issues and coordinates public participation efforts.

Citizen information and involvement efforts have included hosting a number of coastal zone conferences for governmental officials and representatives of particular interest groups and a series of informational workshops for the general public.

In addition, the Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium has prepared a slide show and a brochure and materials for radio and television programs.

Public hearings were held to discuss boundary alternatives.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

The state coastal program office is consulting with federal agencies on a bi-lateral basis. Various agencies have designated

coastal management program contacts and elaborated on specific interests, or requested information on the state program. A paper on agency coordination has been prepared but there has been little formal negotiation on this work element.

Alabama finds consideration of the national interest in facility siting to be a function of defining permissible land and water uses and identifying geographic areas of particular concern. As a result, that task will be addressed during the third year of program development.

Organizational arrangements

Little work has been accomplished on this element. Major efforts will be undertaken during the third-year program to network existing organizations and legislation to provide the necessary organizational framework.

Authorities

Under Act 534 passed in 1976, the Coastal Area Board is charged with coordinating the granting of permits for activities in Alabama's coastal area.

Twenty-seven state laws have been identified as having an impact on the coastal area program. During the third year of program development, those laws will be analyzed and supplemental legislation will be recommended as necessary.

ALASKA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Division of Policy Development & Planning, Office of the Governor
Coastal management program contact: Glenn Akins, Division of Policy Development & Planning, Office of the Governor, Pouch AD, Juneau AK 99822. (907) 465-3512.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Environmental Conservation; Dept. of Natural Resources; Dept. of Fish & Game; Dept. of Community & Regional Affairs.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$600,000 (Federal)	$900,000 (F)	$300,000 (F)
	300,000 (State)	450,000 (S)	150,000 (S)
Subtotal	$900,000	$1,350,000	$450,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $2,700,000

AUTHORITY:

Alaska's coastal management program is based on the major laws that guide state agencies in the protection and development of coastal resources. The responsibility for developing a coastal management program plan is lodged in the Office of the Governor. The Dept. of Environmental Conservation, created in 1971, was responsible for developing the management plan prior to transferrence of that responsiblity in 1974 to the Division of Policy Development & Planning.

On the eve of adjournment, the 1976 legislature passed a resolution acknowledging the rich resource values of the coastline and establishing a legislative-executive branch committee to review and coordinate coastal management activities. It also calls for a compilation of all existing laws and regulations applicable to the coast.

On May 15, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Alaska identifies the following priority issues for coastal management:

*Over-exploitation of fishing stocks by domestic and foreign fleets, and destruction of spawning and rearing areas from improper timber harvesting and mining pollution has caused declining fish populations and economic losses for the Alaskan fishing industry.

*Increasing coastal population pressures are adversely affecting the coastal environment by causing the damming of coastal rivers for hydroelectric power, increased stream and tideland alterations and sewage disposal problems.

*With the start of large scale oil production in the state, oil spills have increased in size and frequency, threatening fish, various waterfowl and other animals dependent on the coastal area.

*Conflicting use demands for the shoreland area are increasing as residential developers, the tourist industry, outdoor recreation interests and commercial and industrial developers compete for prime coastal locations.

*The coastal area traditionally has provided the basis for subsistence for many native Alaskan cultures; increasing population and mining and oil industry developmental pressures pose a threat to the continued existence of those cultures.
*The depletion of natural resources and energy supplies in the other 49 states has placed strong pressure on Alaska to develop its resources, making unpopular any management planning that appears to impede the economic momentum.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Alaska's coastal management program objectives are as follows:
*To achieve coordinated development and utilization of coastal biological, cultural, aesthetic and energy-related resources without emphasizing any single resource at the exense of any others.
*To manage the state's renewable resources in a manner designed to attain maximum sustained yeild.
*To attain optimum time-distribution utilization of non-renewable resources in order to achieve maximum economic and cultural gain.
*To achieve a balance in the human use and natural replenishment of the coastal zone ecosystem at an optimum level.
*To retain the aesthetic, ecological and cultural diversity necessary to maintain economic and ecological resilience to human intervention in the coastal area.

CURRENT STATUS:

The original thrust of the coastal management effort in Alaska was in techinical data collection and information dissemination. As a result of the first year's efforts, a considerable amount of data was assembled and a framework for a continuing catalogue of "Data for Decision-makers" was developed. The final product of this effort was to be a continuously updated compilation of natural and human environmental baseline data and implications of those data for decisions affecting the use of Alaska's coast.

The change of administration in 1974 was greeted by emergence of a key coastal issue -- the accelerated outer continental shelf petroleum leasing schedule proposed by the federal government. In response, the coastal management program took on an immediate purpose in addition to its long-term objectives. It was selected as the tool by which the state could coordinate its internal efforts and ensure that the state would play a significant role in determining the intensity, location and timing of petroleum-related onshore development.

The crucial role of policy in determining management decisions was recognized and the coastal management program development function was moved to the Division of Policy Development & Planning in the governor's office.

In response to the apparent imminence of OCS-related onshore impacts, comprehensive management legislation was drafted and introduced during the 1975 legislative session. While the legislature failed to act on the coastal management bill, the effort produced awareness within the state of the importance of the issue.

Alaska, in its second and third year of coastal program development, is moving beyond data collection and analysis and into the institutional, policy and service aspects of coastal management program development.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Alaska -- a major target area for outer continental shelf development -- is studying the onshore impacts of offshore oil and gas development as an adjunct to its coastal management program development effort. Of the original 17 areas identified for OCS leasing by the federal government's accelerated OCS leasing schedule, nine were off the Alaskan coast.

Alaska will provide direct planning assistance to local communities and regions targeted for OCS development; provide matching grants to localitites for development planning studies; coordinate state plans with local governments to achieve an integrated response to OCS development; and supervise special studies on OCS issues relevant to coastal area planning and management.

Boundary identification

Boundary delineation projects are focused on an ecological identification of the coastal area. The coastal habitat program in the Dept. of Fish & Game has completed studies along much of the coast, providing a basis for future refinement that will carry the delineation process into considerations that are other than ecologically based.

The state's seaward boundary includes all islands, adding substantially to the coastal area of Alaska.

Three types of landward boundary reference points are being examined. Under one alternative, boundaries would be geographically based, primarily by elevations, including demographic factors for areas such as Anchorage and Kenai. This would encompass a coastal area of a one-mile minimum and 100-mile maximum dimension, using a 200-foot elevation contour.

Boundaries drawn along ecological parameters would extend further inland and would include migrators species habitat.

Politically-drawn boundaries would include all coastal boroughs, which would cover only a small area of the coastline. It is envisioned, rather, that the state would be divided into regions which closely correlate with the boundaries of the native regional corporations. The clouded issue of land ownership complicates boundary delineation. The legislature and the governor's office are investigating boundaries of state and federal management programs in the Substate Districting Project.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Inventories of coastal resources have been conducted by several state agencies and a legal analysis has been conducted to determine what areas and activities are controlled by what mechanisms. The state has identified proposed land and water uses that have significant and direct impacts on coastal waters and the following categories of uses will provide a basis for future resource allocation decisions on where various uses should and may be located: urban and industrial development, including energy production and facilities siting; navigation and transportation; agriculture and forestry; recreation; fish and wildlife production and utilization, including subsistence and aquaculture; construction and operation of public facilities; mineral extraction; and restoration of coastal shorelands, habitats and estuarine areas.

The 1976 legislature responded to the need to examine priorities for use of non-renewable coastal resources when it passed the Tank

Vessel Traffic & Regulation Act and the Alaska Oil Discharge Prevention & Pollution Control Act, which establish stringent safety standards and establish a $30-million Coastal Protection Fund.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Alaska's coastal management program has several projects underway aimed at contributing to the identification of geographic areas of particular concern. A map prioritizing critical coastal areas has been prepared by the Dept. of Environmental Conservation. This mapping effort is being applied to statewide studies underway in the Dept. of Natural Resources where there is an effort to integrate needs of coastal planning with statewide land use problems, as well as meeting immediate shoreline management needs. Considerations in identifying GAPCs run the range from coastal flooding hazards through important recreation areas to key mineral resources or fragile ecological units.

Critical areas are addressed by a variety of state and federal programs, since the Dept. of Fish & Game long has been involved in the designation of critical habitats and game refuges. Most recent additions have the Clam Gulch critical habitat and the Mendenhall Flats Refuge, both established by the 1976 legialature.

Public and governmental involvement

Momentum for public and governmental involvement picked up during the second year of coastal program plan development and should carry through into the third year's work. Two films were produced to provide a broad understanding of Alaskan coastal problems and contacts have been made with citizens, special interest groups and government agencies. Several communities approached the state coastal management office with their concerns for changing lifestyles that might be expected to coincide with OCS oil and gas development.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Contacts have been established with federal agencies and there have been bilateral meetings in addition to two organization meetings with federal agencies. Many federal programs exist within the state and there will be an effort to integrate these with coastal planning.

A questionnaire seeking identification of the national interest in facilities siting has been distributed and the results compiled.

Organizational Arrangements

Alaska has identified state agencies that share jurisdiction over facets of coastal resources management and is working to identify state-local relationships and responsibilities, although the network for organizational tie-in hasn't been established.

With overall coordination supplied by the Division of Policy Development & Planning, principal state participants include staff in five line agencies and policy makers in the following seven departments: Community & Regional Affairs; Commerce & Economic Development; Environmental Conservation; Fish & Game; Highways; Natural Resources; and Public Works. Commissioners of these departments, along with the

director of the Division of Policy Development & Planning, comprise the Coastal Management Policy Committee, which guides the prioritization of work and financial resources for coastal program development.

Authorities

Legal studies have been accomplished and the state is believed to have sufficient legal authorities with the possible exception of energy facilities siting. The Coastal Management Policy Committee has been asked to develop the package of existing policies, laws, regulations and institutions that will be the basis of Alaska's coastal management program. The recently-established legislative-executive branch committee will compile existing laws and regulations applicable to coastal management.

CALIFORNIA

GRANT RECIPIENT: California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission
Coastal management program contact: Joe Bodovitz, California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission, 1540 Market St., San Francisco CA 94102. (415) 557-1001.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Delta Advisory Planning Council; Dept. of Navigation & Ocean Development; Dept. of Fish & Game; Dept. of Parks & Recreation; San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	
	$720,000 (Fed)	$900,000 (F)	$896,104 (F)	$303,896 (F)
	371,946 (State)	450,000 (S)	448,075 (S)	151,925 (S)
Subtotal	$1,091,946	$1,350,000	$1,344,179	$455,821

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $4,241,946

AUTHORITY:

Prior to the passage of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Act of 1972 (Proposition 20), and with the exception of the San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission, California's de facto coastal management system consisted of a network of federal, state, and local laws and ordinances and judicial and administrative decisions. State interest and concern for the coastal zone did, however, predate the 1972 election.

A 1931 State Assembly report on seacoast conservation declared a need for proper management of the coastline and called for the creation of a state agency to supervise and control activities affecting the seacoast.

In 1963, California contracted with the Institute of Marine Resources for a study that culminated in 1965 in a report, "California and Use of the Ocean."

In late 1964, a governor's Advisory Commission on Ocean Resources ("GACOR-I") was created. In early 1967, GACOR-II was asked to advise Gov. Ronald Regan on matters relating to ocean resources.

A common conclusion reached by both GACOR-I and GACOR-II was a recommendation for the development of a comprehensive plan for the California coast.

In September 1967, the Marine Resources Conservation & Development Act was passed requiring that the governor develop a California Comprehensive Ocean Area Plan (COAP). The act also established the Californaia Advisory Commission on Marine Coastal Resources (CMC) and the Interagency Council on Ocean Resources (ICOR).

In 1968-69, funds were budgeted for staff to produce the COAP under the direction of ICOR. In 1970, the COAP project was assigned to the Dept. of Navigation & Ocean Development.

In November 1972, Proposition 20 was approved. Coastal management jurisdiction falls under two entities: the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission and six Regional Commissions have jurisdiction over all of the coastal zone except for San Francisco Bay and Delta; and the San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission has jurisdiction over San Francisco Bay and adjoining San Pablo and Suisan Bays.

The San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission (BCDC) is the most advanced, having been established in 1965 as a temporary agency to prepare a plan for San Francisco Bay. Because BCDC already is carrying out a coastal management program based on an adopted plan, no federal assistance for coastal zone planning under Section 305 of the Coastal Zone Management Act was being requested for this agency. However, a request is being made for federal funds under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act to assist in carrying out the BCDC management program.

Proposition 20, the California Coastal Zone Conservation Act of 1972 required one state and six regional coastal zone conservation commissions to prepare, after public hearings and in full consultation with all affected governmental agencies, the California Coastal Zone Conservation Plan for the long-range conservation and use of California's coastal resources. The final responsibility for its implementation rests with the state Legislature, which in July 1976, as this report went to press, approved legislation aimed at accomplishing the major policy recommendations of the coastal plan.

While the Coastal Plan was being prepared, the commissions exercised interim permit controls over virtually every type of activity that constituted a new commitment of or had a significant impact on coastal zone resources. These interim permit controls applied in a geographic area extending from 3 miles at sea to 1,000 yards inland from the mean high tide line.

On April 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state will submit a draft of its application for Section 306 funding late in 1976.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

California identifies the following major problems related to its coastal area: land use; transportation; preservation and management of scenic and natural resources; public access; recreation; public services and facilities; ocean mineral and living resources; population; educational and scientific use of the coastal zone; and government powers and policies that will be necessary to carry out the evolving California Coastal Program after it is adopted by the state Legislature.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM:

California's coastal management objectives are as follows:

*To protect coastal property and wildlife, ocean resources, and the natural evnironment.
*To preserve the ecological balance necessary to prevent further deterioration and destruction of valuable coastal resources.
*To restore, maintain and if possible to enhance the overall quality of the coastal zone environment.
*To ensure the continued existence of optimum populations of all species of living organisms.
*To achieve the orderly and balanced utilization of resource consistent with long-term conservation principles.
*To avoid irreversible or irretrievable commitments of coastal resources.

CURRENT STATUS:

California's coastal management program plan, prepared in response

to Proposition 20 and in accordance with the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, is under review by the federal government.

In a separate application, approval is being requested for funds to be allocated to the San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission to implement the coastal management program for the bay area.

Operating under its third Section 305 coastal program planning grant, California is helping to prepare local implementation programs as well as subregional plans for areas where cumulative impact over time could adversely affect coastal resources and public access.

Meanwhile, at the state level, legislation that would establish authorities to carry out the plan was being considered (and, as this report was published, the legislature approved the California Coastal Conservation Act of 1976). Some of the plan's 162 policy recommendations would be enacted immediately by the legislation; others will receive further study. The following status report doesn't take into account the provisions of the July 1976 law.

OCS oil and gas development study

With funds allocated as part of the basic planning grant, the state is expediting its planning program to deal with potential onshore impacts of oil and gas production off the southern California coast. An OCS task force is analyzing the onshore facilities required to develop, process and distribute California OCS oil and gas; investigating the social, economic and environmental impacts of such development; and formulating strategies to minimize adverse effects of these and related activities.

Boundary identification

California's coastal plan states that "Coastal Zone means the land and water area of the State of California from the border of the State of Oregon to the border of the Republic of Mexico, extending seaward to the outer limit of the State jurisdiction including all islands within the jurisdiction of the State, and extending inland to the highest elevation of the nearest coastal mountain range, except that in Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego Counties, the inland boundary of the coastal zone shall be the highest elevation of the nearest coastal mountain range or five miles from the mean high tide line, whichever is the shorter distance".

Included within the boundaries is a permit area which encompasses "that portion of the coastal zone lying between the seaward limit of the jurisdiction of the state and 1,000 yards landward from the mean high tide line of the sea," excluding certain urban land areas and "the area of jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission, together with all continuous areas 2,900 feet landward thereof, and any river, stream, tributary, creek, or flood control or drainage channel which flows into such area."

Definition of permissible land and water uses

California's coastal management plan proposes restrictive controls over the dredging and filling of coastal wetlands, protection of areas of unusual natural or historic value and regulation of activities that involve substantial environmental risk or the loss of productive agricultural or forest lands.

For purposes of determining the regulatory system covering land and water uses, California prepared basic goals and specific policies for various categorical elements: marine environment (covering resources management and water quality control); coastal land environment (covering coastal streams and watersheds, natural habitat areas, agriculture, forestry, soil and mineral resources and air quality); coastal appearance and design; coastal development (encompassing urban areas, special communities and hazardous areas); energy (including energy conservation, alternative energy sources and energy facility siting and design); transportation (land, air and water); public access; recreation; educational and scientific use; restoration of coastal resources; and public acquisition of coastal land.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

While local implementation plans are prepared to meet the requirements of the coastal plan, specific plans will be prepared for sensitive coastal resource areas where the impact of a development on the resource would be immediate and direct. Such areas include wetlands, highly scenic areas, lands appropriate for public recreation and the immediate shoreline area. Such designations would be made in consultation with the local government. The plan cites numerous areas that are proposed for immediate acquisition by the state.

Public and governmental involvement

Development of California's coastal plan has been one of the most well-publicized and documented processes of planning and coordination with local, state, federal, public and private interests remains a key component of the state's program. The coastal plan recommends that local governments have the major responsibilities for the coast and that they, the city and county government, are the most accessible and accountable to their constitutents.

The state maintains a mailing list of over 10,000 names and there has been a plethora of public meetings of local and state-wide scope as each element of the coastal plan was developed by the regional commissions and as the regional findings were synthesized into a state policy and program.

A subregional planning function just getting underway in seven areas and the pilot local coastal programs will yield insights into the local-regional-state integrated planning process.

The state also is deliberating how best to assure state and regional commission coordination, so as not to inadvertently give participating local governments two different interpretations of coastal plan policies.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Upon approval of its management program, the Coastal Zone Conservation Commission would interact with the federal government, for purposes of consistency and national interest requirements, as follows. The commission will monitor all federal activities that may affect the coastal area and review federal development undertaken in the area. This monitoring will take place through existing procedures -- the A-95

review process, review of the environmental impact statements, and review of Corps of Engineers public notices, supplemented as necessary with special coordination with individual federal agencies. The coastal agency will make every effort to notify federal agencies of potential inconsistencies with the state's coastal management program as early as possible. At the same time, as is implicit in the statement of national interest, it is expected that each federal agency proposing to conduct or support an activity that may directly affect the coastal area, or to undertake any development within the coastal area, will advise the coastal agency of such activities or developments as early as possible in the federal agency's planning process.

In addition, federal agencies will be requested to enter into memoranda of understanding with the coastal agency with regard to any activities or development within the coastal resource management area that would otherwise require a commission permit. These memoranda of understanding will be processed as if they were coastal agency permits, including public hearings where required, and will be based upon the consistency of the proposed project or activity with the management program. If the coastal agency determines that the proposed activity or development isn't consistent with the management program, it will not enter into a memorandum of understanding. In that case, the federal agency will be expected to go forward with the activity, if at all, only after it has advised the coastal agency, in writing, that the project or activity complies with the coastal agency management program to the maximum extent practicable, and has set forth, in detail, the reasons why this is so.

Activities conducted or supported by any federal agency which could directly affect land, water, air, and other coastal resources will be expected to conform to the management program to the maximum extent practicable. The determination as to whether a specific activity could 'directly affect the uses of land, water, air, and other coastal resources' will be made by the coastal agency, which will also determine whether the activity is, or isn't, consistent with the management program.

California identifies specific federal agency licenses and permits for coastal land and water uses that will be subject to certification by the state coastal agency for consistency with its management program.

Organizational arrangements

The state coastal agency would bear the principal responsibility for the administration of California's coastal management program. Its functions would include: administration of local coastal program development grants; review and approval of local coastal programs; coordination of local program development with other state and federal planning and operational programs; facilitation of public involvement; administration of special contracts and interagency agreements; review, coordination, and involvement of federal agencies; assesment of management program effectiveness, and legislative liaison for management program refinement and conflict resolution; development of regulations, procedures, and recommended legislative amendments to effectuate program implementation; and coordination with other coastal states including participation in and administration of interstate coastal organizations.

The state coastal agency would continue to regulate development along the coast through its regional commissions until certified local coastal programs are developed. After local program certification,

issues of statewide significance will be appealable to the state coastal agency as would regional commission decisions in the interim. Local plans would be brought into conformity with the state management program over a two-year period.

It remains to be determined how the San Francisco Bay segment of the California management program will be brought fully under the umbrella of the state management structure or will continue to be administered separately by the Bay Conservation Development Commission.

Authorities

California's plan will be implemented by legislation that was in the final stages of approval by the state legislature at the time of this writing.

CONNECTICUT

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Environmental Protection
Coastal management program contact: Charles D. McKinney, Director, Coastal Area Management Program, Dept. of Environmental Protection, 71 Capitol Ave., Hartford CT 06115. (203) 566-7404.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Commerce.

FUNDING:	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$194,285 (Federal)	$290,000 (F)	$102,000 (F)
	130,379 (State)	145,000 (S)	51,000 (S)
Subtotal	$324,664	$435,000	$153,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $912,644

AUTHORITY:

The Connecticut Dept. of Environmental Protection was mandated by legislation passed between 1969 and 1971 to regulate construction and dredging in tidal, coastal and navigable waters and to develop a permit system to regulate wetlands use.

The Long Island Sound Regional Study managed by the New England River Basin Commission focused attention on coastal resources when it began in 1971.

Comprehensive plans authorized for the purpose of guiding state policies included the Proposed Plan of Conservation & Development, completed in January 1973.

During 1972, the governor appointed a state-level coastal zone management committee. It prepared a report on coastal issues after public hearings, and in 1973 sent to the legislature a bill that would have created a Coastal Resources Management Council. That measure died in the legislative committee.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

The coastal area is densely populated and highly urbanized with the heaviest development in those areas that are most prone to flood and hurricane damage. Only a small percentage of the coastline is accessible to the public, thereby limiting recreational opportunities. The pressures for growth are reflected by management problems of municipal and industrial waste and increasing energy needs.

Leasing for offshore oil and gas off Georges Bank might be expected to impact the Connecticut coastal area.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PLAN:

Goals and objectives of Connecticut's coastal plan are:

*To manage and control industrial, residential and institutional development in a way that maximizes benefits to the citizens of

the state and minimizes adverse effects on coastal resources.
*To preserve and protect areas of unique, scarce, fragile or vulnerable natural habitat, historical or cultural value and scenic importance.
*To improve air and water quality.
*To provide sufficient and diverse recreational opportunities.
*To minimize damage fron natural disasters and erosion.
*To insure effective and environmentally acceptable energy facility siting.
*To maximize productivity and value of fishery and wildlife resources.
*To achieve and maintain a data base upon which to base decision-making and regulation.
*To effect coordinated management of the coastal area.

CURRENT STATUS:

Following delays caused by a reorganization of key units of the Dept. of Environmental Protection in 1975, Connecticut has in place its central program staff and has broadened the membership of the Coastal Area Management Board.

Connecticut, recognizing that it misjudged the magnitude of tasks required and that it underestimated the time required to accomplish many of its objectives, has rescheduled a number of work items. Work tasks that were deferred until the second or third year of program plan development include: recommendation for an inland boundary; delineation of critical regulatory boundaries; examination of tools for the maintenance, protection and management of geographic areas of particular concern; consideration of possible sites for establishment of estuarine sanctuaries; monitoring of major new plans, programs and activities in the coastal area; legislative recommendations; public meetings; and evaluation of public participation methods.

OCS oil and gas development studies

Among 1975's activities were efforts to develop an analytical capability in marine affairs and to focus on outer continental shelf regulations. Connecticut familiarized itself with industrial processes of petroleum development that might occur in response to the federal government's intent to offer oil and gas leases on the North Atlantic OCS.

With state funds and federal funds authorized by the Coastal Zone Management Act, Connecticut is undertaking a resource inventory phase for onshore planning, analyzing facility siting mechanisms and assessing probable economic, social and environmental impacts on the state of OCS exploration and development. Close statewide and regional cooperation is seen as central to the effort.

The state will attempt to estimate the number and types of oil-related facilities that might locate along its coast, assess the ability of the coast to sustain those facilities and describe the long-term effects of offshore development on air and water quality, land use patterns, employment, housing, public services and commerce.

Boundary identification

Connecticut is leaning toward a multiple boundary delineation

based on the following markers. A fixed linear distance of 500 feet inland from mean high water was considered as the management boundary in line with the recommendations of the Long Island Sound Study. Other alternatives include use of a land transportation corridor, flood hazard zone, aesthetic distance, riparian municipality and geographic areas of particular concern. An ecoregional boundary -- based on physiographic, climatic and biotic factors -- would correspond to the 250-foot contour, but precise delineation of this contour makes sole use of this method difficult. Study of boundary options continues.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Development of a strategy for defining land and water uses is being based upon a review of currently permitted uses as set by local zoning and review of priorities as recommended in local, regional and state land use plans and previous studies. An analysis of resource capabilities is underway.

Specifically, each of the six coastal regional planning agencies was contracted to report on zoning districts within 500 feet of the shoreline and analyze land use plans for coastal municipalities. Composite maps of districts and plans were prepared for the municipalities. The state compiled regional plans and refined the map produced by the Plan of Conservation & Development. Regional planning agencies analyzed the recommendations of the Long Island Sound Study.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

"Coastal Areas of Particular Concern: An Approach for Connecticut" outlines a framework for defining geographic areas of particular concern and suggests a two-step approach patterned after that of California.

Initially, the CAM program would select GAPCs and establish management objectives and guidelines for land use. Secondly, municipalities would use federal monies to enable them to adopt and administer standards consistent with state guidelines, and to prepare a detailed plan for the coastal area. The state would review local standards for consistency or take over management in cases where municipalities didn't participate.

In other work, the state made recommendations on delineating GAPCs for fisheries and identified critical shellfish and finfish areas. In a parallel effort, an attempt was made to assess the "significance" of undeveloped land.

Mapping techniques and display are in place and a coastal resource atlas is being prepared. Additional data is being collected, especially in urban redevelopment areas, areas of intense development pressure and in several types of critical natural areas.

While certain areas of particular concern already are regulated and will be included as GAPCs, most other areas will undergo a process of nomination that will occur during the third year of planning.

Public and governmental involvement

The Coastal Area Management Program interacts primarily with the CAM Advisory Board for intrastate coordination and, for interstate coordination, with the New England River Basins Commission and the

Tri-State (New Jersey, New York and Connecticut) Regional Planning Commission. CAM also interacts with the Long Island Sound Study Citizen Advisory Board and various other interests and groups. The CAM Advisory Board, the policy-making body for the program, consists of six state agency heads, the head of the Power Facility Evaluation Council, representatives of six coastal regional planning commissions and six citizen members.

A technical advisory committee and an ah-hoc OCS coordination group, both comprised of representatives of appropriate state agencies, also have input into the CAM program.

To involve the general public, CAM prepared brochures and news releases and a Developer's Handbook, which describes environmental considerations and state regulatory programs.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Contact has been established with most relevant federal agencies. CAM staff participates in NERBC activities, including its OCS task force and on the steering committee of a federally-funded project concerned with OCS siting methodology. While copies of the work program have been sent to various agencies for review and comment, the NERBC may be used in the future as a forum for reviewing management plan proposals with regional offices of federal agencies. CAM is coordinating its efforts with the design of air and water quality plans and the flood insurance program.

In the future, Connecticut plans to hold a series of issue-based symposia covering topics such as dredge disposal and fisheries.

Organizational arrangements

After its first year of study, Connecticut found that the Inland Wetlands Model is the organizational structure that would have the greatest appeal given the tradition of strong local government. The model allows municipalities to develop regulations within standards or criteria established by the state. Connecticut is carrying on its analysis of organizational arrangements. At the local level, regulatory programs to be examined include zoning, subdivision, building and inland wetland regulatory activities.

Authorities to implement the program

Coastal management legislation was introduced in the 1973 session of the legislature, but died in committee as have subsequent legislative attempts. Meanwhile, Connecticut has concluded that existing regulatory controls within the coastal planning region are relatively comprehensive and diverse. After evaluating various management models, the state determined that the Inland Wetlands Model was an appealing basis for allocating regulatory authorities. Its liability is that its operation -- adequate technical, enforcement and administrative capabilities -- would require some duplication of effort since the state agency and each municipality would need expertise in each of the regulatory processes. Implementation of this type of authority would require coordination of technical capabilities and adequate funding to develop them.

DELAWARE

GRANT RECIPIENT: State Planning Office
Coastal Management program contact: David. R. Keifer, Director, Thomas Collins Bldg; Dover DE 19901. (302) 678-4271.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Coastal Zone Management Committee; Dept. of Natural Resources & Environmental Control; University of Delaware, College of Marine Studies.

FUNDING:	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$166,666 (Federal)	$245,000 (F)	$100,000 (F)
	83,334 (State)	172,500 (S)	67,240 (S)
Subtotal	$250,000	$417,500	$167,240

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $834,740

AUTHORITY:

The Delaware Coastal Zone Act became law in June 1971, following several years of study by the Governor's Task Force on Marine & Coastal Affairs. The act, a response to concerns that heavy industrial growth would proliferate in the coastal zone if left unregulated, bans siting of new heavy industry and port or dock facilities within two miles of the coastline. It requires a permit from the State Planning Office for all other manufacturing uses or expansion of existing heavy industries.

In 1973, the Wetlands Act was passed, establishing a permit system for use of wetlands in the state.

The Beach Preservation Act of 1972 made acts of beach destruction punishable as crimes and prescribed means for maintenance and enhancement of beaches.

Other previous coastal management actions include development of the outdoor recreation plan and the comprehensive development plan; study of the potentials for a deepwater port; study of the Delaware Bay relative to oil, ports and marine transportation; and preparation of a preliminary coastal plan in 1973 in accordance with the state law.

The activities of the Delaware Tomorrow Commission are intertwined with coastal management efforts as is the implementation of various environmental quality statutes.

In addition, reorganization of resource agencies into the Dept. of Natural Resources & Environmental Control and strengthening of the responsibilities of the State Planning Office have broadened the basis of coastal management in Delaware.

On June 30, 1974, the first Federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Delaware ranks, by priority, the following issues related to conflicting uses of the coastal area: oil and gas development; marine transportation and conveyance; industrial use of the coastal area;

tourism, resort/second home and vacation development; recreation demand; sport and commercial fishing; conservation of wildlife and marine resources; agriculture; and surface transportation, pipeline and utility uses of the coastal area.

The state also identifies managerial and research problems that hinge on overlapping jurisdictions and authorities and complex procedures for complying with rules and regulations. Delaware sees a need for: basic data on water quality and quantity; research to enable better understanding of fisheries and movements of fish stocks; and better coordination of coastal management functions. It cites the desirability of assuring that Delaware, a strategic part of the Middle Atlantic/Delaware Valley Region, doesn't bear a disporportionate share of the impact associated with attempts to meet national needs.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Delaware identifies three goals and seven objectives of its coastal management program. The goals are:

*To preserve and improve the quality of life and the quality of the marine and coastal environment for recreation, conservation of natural resources, wildlife areas, aesthetics and the health and social well-being of the people.
*To promote the orderly growth of commerce, industry and employment in the coastal zone in a manner compatible with the first goal.
*To increase the opportunities and facilities in Delaware for education, training, science and research in marine and coastal affairs.

The objectives of Delaware's program are:

*To develop criteria for evaluation of uses of the coastal zone within the parameters established by the first goal.
*To determine the compatibility and appropriate mixtures of uses of the zone.
*To protect the inshore and marsh areas from pollution and unwise exploitation.
*To develop and implement a system of criteria, standards and regulations for control of land and water uses within the coastal zone.
*To provide for a focus for coastal management in the executive branch.
*To establish a mechanism for interagency and intergovernmental coordination and reconciliation of coastal affairs.
*To create a coastal research program to furnish scientific and technical information necessary for coastal management decisions.

CURRENT STATUS:

Much of Delaware's first year of management program development was devoted to identifying and filling management data voids and developing approaches to delineating areas of critical concerns, permissable uses and priorities of uses.

Efforts during the second year of work included: completion of much of the basic coastal resources and processes research work; application of the general coastal management methodology to the needs and issues affecting the Lewes-Rehoboth portion of the coast; initial determination of geographic areas of particular concern, including identification of unique and rare natural areas worthy of preservation; initial listing of permissible uses; and additional basic examination of existing legal and organizational arrangements.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds committed under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Delaware is assessing the impact of OCS activities in its coastal area, especially on the City of Lewes and the area known as Big Stone Beach. The state finds that the Lewes-Rehoboth area must be addressed in considerable detail to assess the nature of the area's resources, social values and preferences, magnitude and characteristics of OCS-related and other likely uses and their impact on coastal resources, and the capacity of physical and social infrastructures and institutions to accomodate impacts.

The sale of leases offshore the Atlantic coast and specifically in the Baltimore Canyon Trough will require regional/interstate coordination processes. The state intends to work through the Delaware Geologic Survey for desired collection and interpretation of data on the OCS issue.

Boundary identification

For purposes of both planning and defining a management program, the coastal area has been identified as encompassing the entire state.

A report, "An Examination of Present Boundaries in Delaware's Coastal Zone," assesses present boundaries and considers the possibilities for creation of resources and use-based boundaries.

Near the end of its second year of program planning, Delaware will complete a draft boundaries paper based on a detailed study of its coastal waters using a combination of physical barriers, limits of salt-tolerant/dependent vegetation and salinity records.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Attempts to define permissible land and water uses and to respond to the requirements to determine geographic areas of particular concern center around the Lewes Census County Division Pilot Study, which began during the second year of program planning. The Lewes-Rehoboth area is heavily pressured for potential offshore oil support operations, second home development, recreation and other uses.

The three objectives of the pilot program are: improved understandings of coastal processes and resources; opportunities for public input on issues, uses, priorities; and an examination of a methodology for management of the coastal zone. Various products are available from the pilot program, including papers on existing land use, ground water resources and soils and their implications for development. A draft report dealing with permissible uses of various resource units and the conditions for permissibility has been prepared. Deficiencies in the Lewes zoning code were documented and improvements suggested.

Subsequently, the Lewes study was expanded into an examination of coastal areas based on past trends, likely developmental pressures, proposed and/or adopted plans and ordinances and the expectations of local residents and officials. This effort examines development options and approaches to resource management as well as the implications of various human/social uses of the coastal area.

Once various mixes of use and policy or priority concepts are evaluated, Delaware will identify preferred uses of various portions of the coastal area. These designations will be prepared in plan form and will serve as the basis for regulations and arbitration of conflicts

between units of government, as well as articulating the state's policies and management intent.

Delaware has developed a matrix system for permissible uses to determine and analyze the impacts of use activities on specified resource units. This system lists a number of broad activities (such as spoil disposal and paving), determines what resource units (e.g. fish/shellfish areas and beaches) might be affected, and what the likely primary impacts would be (e.g. groundwater contamination and habitat destruction) and then compares these primary impacts with certain variables (such as magnitude of use and location) to ascertain what human uses or values would be affected by the activity.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

This work task is interrelated with work aimed at boundary identification and the definition of permissible land and water uses. Various other studies have been undertaken, including a state-approved work on critical natural areas and maps of areas of concern; reports on geologic processes and on areas of the coastal zone subject to storm damage and flooding. Wetlands have been classified and mapped and are displayed in a wetlands atlas.

Public and governmental involvement

A variety of methods is being used to provide levels of participation and communication throughout the coastal planning process. During the first year of planning, an explanatory brochure, "Delaware's Coastal Zone Management Program," was published. Briefings are being held with news media and workshops are being convened throughout the project period for the purpose of including federal representatives, legislators, special interest groups, local governmental representatives and state agency staff. During the second year, a series of highly-directed mini-workshops was held to determine tentative geographic areas of particular concern and discuss designation of permissible uses within the coastal area. Coastal Zone Management Program "News" serves as a forum for soliciting public input and for discussion of coastal issues. Summary papers of major coastal program components are being sent to interested parties, the media and relevant governmental bodies. The League of Women Voters is assisting in the mass communications effort, while special advisory committees have been established to participate on a specific level, such as the Lewes study. Delaware also intends to make use of the coordination potentials offered by various lay councils and committees.

A major thrust at intergovernmental coordination is made through the Coastal Zone Management Committee which meets monthly. Its members include representatives of state agencies, the University of Delaware, county planning departments, Delaware River Basin Commission, legislative committees, local governments, federal agencies, Delaware Society of Professional Engineers and the League of Women Voters of Delaware.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

In addition to federal-state coordination achieved by the Coastal Zone Management Committee, coordination is to be achieved through a

seven-step procedure. This begins with initial contact with federal agencies to explain the program and ask the agency to identify its pertinent research, planning activities, and points of view that the state should be aware of. Along the way, the national interest dialogue will be started, and program elements will be submitted to relevant federal agencies for review and comment. Both draft and final program documents and related materials will be submitted to relevant federal agencies. Finally, Delaware will implement post approval coordination procedures with relevant federal agencies.

During the second year of program planning, Delaware began assessing energy facilities in terms of regional and national relationships. The questions of needs for and locations of energy facilities were considered via three elements: an assessment of national and regional needs, tracing Delaware's and others' responses and pronouncements and recommending a state position; and inventory of energy facilities, usage, forecasts of demand, and implications thereof; and guidelines and recommendations for energy facilities siting, including issues of supply of materials, distribution of supply.

Organizational arrangements/Authorities

A number of alternatives are being considered, including implementation of a 306 program with existing state regulatory authorities (the Coastal Zone Act, the Wetlands Act, the Beach Preservation Act, etc.) coupled with "coordination measures" for non-regulated areas. Delaware is attempting to develop a state system of standards and criteria to be implemented at the local level. A regulatory package will be proposed which may include state land development controls, intergovernmental sign-off and coordination requirements, permit processes, penalties for inappropriate damaging acts and other actions necessary for achievement of program goals. The Lewes Study is being used to develop a prototype system with the production of a case study of how to work with local governments to develop zoning ordinances which will insure adherance to the state coastal zone management program.

FLORIDA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept of Natural Resources
Coastal management program contact: Bruce Johnson, Bureau of Coastal Zone Planning, Division of Resource Management, DNR, 202 Blount St., Tallahassee FL 32304. (904) 488-8614

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Administration, Division of State Planning; Dept. of Environmental Regulation.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$450,000 (Federal)	$500,000 (F)	$196,000 (F)
	225,000 (State)	250,000 (S)	98,000 (S)
Subtotal	$675,000	$750,000	$294,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,719,000

AUTHORITY:

The Coastal Coordinating Council (CCC), subsumed by the Dept. of Natural Resources in 1975, began developing a comprehensive coastal zone management plan for Florida in 1970. In 1972, the CCC published the "Florida Coastal Zone Management Atlas," which explains the approach being used to develop Florida's coastal zone management program and applies this approach in general map form to the Florida coastal zone on a county-by-county basis. The CCC approach utilizes three major categories or zones of land and water use: preservation (no further modification); conservation (controlled modification); and development (few if any state level controls). These are designated after consideration of: soil suitability; ecological significance; susceptibility to flooding; historical and archaeological significance; unique features; water quality classifications; present land use; and geological factors. This atlas was updated in 1975 using low-level color infrared remote sensing and more detailed soils data.

The Dept. of Administration, Division of State Planning, in addition to developing components of the state comprehensive plan, has developed regulations under the Environmental Land & Water Management Act of 1972. This act provides for control of areas of critical state concern and requires approval of developments of regional impact.

The Dept. of Environmental Regulation carries the authorities for the primary regulatory programs in Florida: air and water quality, dredge and fill, water resource use, etc.

In 1975, the legislature passed the Florida Aquatic Preserve Act, which provides for the protection and management of state-owned estuarine areas unsuitable for intensive development. This program is managed by the Bureau of State Lands, Dept. of Natural Resources.

The Coastal Construction Setback Line Act, which regulates construction on Gulf and Atlantic sandy beaches, is administered by the Bureau of Beaches & Shores, Division of Resource Management, Dept. of Natural Resources.

The Local Government Comprehensive Planning Act of 1975 requires every county and municipality to prepare and adopt a comprehensive plan by July 1979, and directs coastal cities and counties to include in their plans a shoreline protection element.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Florida identifies the following priority issues:

*Multiplicity of land use demands leading to use conflicts.
*Lack of clear-cut jurisdictional distinctions among the various federal, state, county and municipal agencies with coastal zone management functions.
*Lack of interagency coordination.
*Pollution of coastal waters.
*Destruction of the marine environment through beach erosion and dredge and fill projects.
*Lack of knowledge and data on the cumulative effects of development and the physical and biological parameters of the shore and inshore areas of the coastal zone.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The objectives of Florida's coastal programs are as follows:

*To provide for the coordination of state, federal, regional, county, and municipal efforts to effectively manage and utilize the resources and features of the coastal zone.
*To provide for the most efficient utilization of coastal resources.
*To provide for the protection, management, and beneficial utilization of water resources in the coastal zone.
*To maintain, restore and improve air and water quality in the coastal zone.
*To provide for the preservation, protection, restoration, improvement and enhancement of the upland, submerged land and biological features of the coastal, estuarine and marine environment.
*To establish and maintain in perpetuity coastal and estuarine areas of unique value.
*To provide for recreational opportunities to meet state needs and for the protection and preservation of significant historical and archaeological sites.
*To provide for the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge about the coastal environment and its resources in an attempt to promote public understanding of the concepts, values and issues involved in its management.

CURRENT STATUS:

Florida, entering its third year of coastal management planning, has a technical background established that should provide a good basis for boundary determination, identification of permissible uses and designation of geographic areas of particular concern -- although these work tasks have not been completed. The state must continue to deal with the determination of gaps in authorities, the structure of a permanent management entity, and the relationship between state and regional/local entities and among state agencies.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone

Management Act, Florida is studying impacts likely to occur onshore from offshore energy production and will integrate such planning into the comprehensive coastal management program under development.

Boundary identification

Florida's landward coastal area, for planning purposes, is based on a combination of physical and socio-economic characteristics. Census enumeration districts most closely approximating the selected physical characteristics were factored into boundary delineation. Based on this combination, Florida's coastal area has an inland boundary varying from two to 25 miles from the shoreline for planning purposes. This boundary includes all or part of 38 coastal counties included in 10 coastal regional planning councils. The seaward boundary would extend to the limit of the state's territorial jurisdiction. On the Atlantic coast, this would extend three miles seaward and on the Gulf coast, three nautical leagues. The planning boundaries, with some modifications, are shown in the "Florida Coastal Zone Management Atlas."

While determination of the management boundary hinges on work yet to be done, preliminary analysis indicates that a two-tiered approach would be most advantageous. The first tier would consist of tidal waters and adjacent wetlands and beaches. Within this tier, control would be exercised directly by the state under several existing programs. The second tier would extend inland to the present planning boundary. Within this tier, control would be primarily at the local level except for specified activities and geographic areas which are presently subject to state control. Under provisions of the management program, local plans would be required to recognize legitimate state concerns and existing state resource management programs and achieve consistency with these in local planning/management efforts.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Over the past four years, Florida has done extensive work on developing statewide categorizations of coastal lands and waters. Because of the length, diversity and complexity of Florida's coastal areas, permissible uses including priority uses may well differ from region to region. However, all coastal lands and waters have been classified into three major categories -- preservation, conservation, or development -- each of which carries certain policy implications with regard to development potentials. Presently, coastal regional planning councils are helping to update and refine these categorizations, and final permissible and priority uses will be determined during the third year of program planning. Florida's coastal land and water classifications are defined as follows:

Preservation areas are recommended for protection from further development except in extreme cases of overriding public interest. Subcategories include: Class I and Class II waters; marine grass beds; selected coastal marshes and mangroves; beaches and dunes; estuarine beaches; wilderness areas; selected fresh water swamps; historical and archaeological sites; and other unique environmental features.

Conservation areas include lands and waters unsuited to high density intensive development because of physical limitations of the soil and/or high flooding probability. These areas provide buffer zones for preservation areas and represent a retention of future use options. Subcategories include: Class III waters; aquatic preserves;

aquaculture leases; spoil islands; hurricane flood zones and river flood plains; scenic vistas; forestry and game management areas; wildlife refuges; parks; and marginal lands.

The development category includes lands already developed; undeveloped lands presently vacant or used for other purposes which are intrinsically suitable for intensive development; and undeveloped lands with some physical limitations which can be corrected to allow for development. This category was expanded in the 1975 update of the coastal zone atlas to include a "Prime Agricultural Lands" category.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Florida is turning to existing laws, such as the state law regarding areas of critical state concern, as the basis for identifying geographic areas of particular concern. By so doing, the criteria and process of selection already have been established and often the designation has taken place, as in the case of the Florida Keys. In addition, particular attention is being given to aquatic preserves, state wilderness system areas, areas submitted for state purchase under the environmentally endangered lands program, and those sandy beaches that front the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean.

Public and governmental involvement

Governmental involvement in coastal planning in Florida involves interstate agencies, state agencies, private agencies, regional planning councils, 38 county governments, and approximately 250 municipal governments.

Three state agencies can be expected to be most intimately involved in coastal planning and management. Those agencies are: the Dept. of Natural Resources, into which the Coastal Coordinating Council staff was transferred during the 1975 reorganization; the Dept. of Administration, Division of State Planning, which was discussed previously; and the Dept. of Environmental Regulation, which was formed in 1975 and was given the permitting and other regulatory and enforcement responsibilities that were found in the Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund, the Dept. of Pollution Control, and the Water Resources Division of the Dept. of Natural Resources.

There is a State Interagency Advisory Committee on Coastal Zone Management, which includes representation from all state agencies involved in coastal zone activities. This committee is asked to provide comment and input on work tasks and plan elements from the state-level viewpoint.

The coastal regional planning councils, as subcontractors to the state, are intimately involved in the program development process.

The regional planning councils have handled much of the citizen involvement effort. Each council has organized its own citizen advisory committee. Guidance and coordination is provided by the state coastal program development office. The citizen advisory committees have been developing regional policy elements and have provided comment and input on work tasks and plan elements as they are developed by the state program office.

In its attempt to inform the public and to solicit public input on coastal program development, the Coastal Coordinating Council distributed a monthly newsletter. Following reorganization, DNR's monthly newsletter carries a regular column on coastal-related activities.

Materials are provided to the regional planning councils and to special interest groups for distribution to the public, and presentations to organized groups are provided on a request basis, averaging over 50 per year.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

The initial thrust toward federal interaction has been with the federal regional council and in working directly with federal agencies involved in activities in the state's coastal zone.

Some help in determining the national interest in facility siting should be forthcoming from an ongoing analysis of environmental data for the purpose of locating future industrial facilities in the Jacksonville area and an assessment of the impacts of urban expansion in Dade County.

The OCS impact studies and the ports study being conducted by the Bureau of Coastal Zone Planning also will provide input to this federal requirement.

Organizational arrangements

Discussion of organizational networks is awaiting the analysis of existing legal authorities. Meanwhile, the state is determining what each agency's mission is and tracking down existing regulatory and management processes. At the local level, the state will rely on the comprehensive planning act if necessary amendments can be passed.

In October 1976, the governor appointed a Coastal Zone Management Task Force charged with developing an organizational pattern for the state to qualify for federal approval of its coastal management plan and to provide the most effective, efficient and unified state-local approach to managing the coastal zone. Legislation to this end is to be recommended to the 1977 Florida legislative session.

Authorities

There is discussion over the adequacy of the Local Government Comprehensive Planning Act in that it does not require localities to adhere to state guidelines or criteria as they develop a management plan. Also, there is no mechanism for state approval of local plans, nor is there a state mechanism for resolution of conflicts.

Provision for coastal zone overview needs to be incorporated into a number of existing statutory and regulatory programs.

GEORGIA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Office of Planning & Budget
Coastal management program contact: James Dodd, Acting Director, Planning Div., Office of Planning & Budget, 270 Washington St. SW, Room 611, Atlanta GA 30334. (404) 656-3820.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Law; Dept. of Natural Resources.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$188,000 (Federal)	$349,250 (F)	$67,000 (F)
	115,400 (State)	191,745 (S)	33,500 (S)
Subtotal	$303,400	$540,995	$100,500

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $944,895

Section 312 Estuarine Sanctuary

	$1,500,000 (Federal)
	1,500,000 (State)
Total	$3,000,000

AUTHORITY:

The Coastal Marshlands Protection Act of 1970 regulates dredging, draining, removal or other alterations of coastal marshlands through a permit system administered by the Coastal Marshlands Protection Committee within the Dept. of Natural Resources.

A state interagency task force composed of 12 members of state and local agencies was created by the governor to initiate planning and policy-making for coastal management. The DNR provides technical assistance to the interagency group.

The DNR has conducted a three-year inventory of Georgia's estuarine areas, a coastal fisheries management program and study, a wildlife habitat and resources inventory and an inventory of coastal geology and resources.

Two local planning agencies, the Brunswick-Glynn County Joint Planning Commission (BGCJPC) and the Chatham County-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission (CCSMPC) and one regional planning agency, the Coastal Area Planning & Development Commission have active planning programs. The BGCJPC and CCSMPC carry on programs with regard to sand dune protection, flood plain zoning, marsh conservation and storm drainage and protection.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Georgia identifies the following priority issues:
*Lack of intergovernmental cooperation, public involvement and

coordinated policy to guide decision-making.
*Increasing demand for development without comprehensive regional plans to guide such development.
*Current taxation policies which assess coastal resources on the basis of development potential.
*Inadequate water treatment facilities and decline of water quality, including salt water intrusion in the aquifer.
*Need to protect fragile natural ecosystems from human interference.
*Lack of natural resources data and uncertainty about the legal status of state action in the coastal area.
*Need to protect vital beach and sand dunes along the coast.
*Underutilization of coastal resources for economic development.
*Corporate ownership of large tracts of coastal land.
*Inadequate data base to prepare for the impacts of offshore oil and gas development and lack of legislation to deal with oil spills and related problems.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Georgia's coastal management objectives are as follows:
*To improve decision-making affecting the coastal area by formulating policies, developing comprehensive plans and involving the public.
*To increase intergovernmental cooperation and coordination.
*To protect fragile coastal ecosystems with particular attention to compatibility of uses with the resource base and to the protection of beaches, sand dunes and productive marshes.
*To improve water quality by providing adequate water and sewage treatment facilities and by protecting the aquifer.
*To determine the feasibility of assessing land for taxation purposes on the basis of environmental constraints rather than development potential.
*To increase opportunities for coastal residents to raise their standard of living, with particular attention to raising the per capita income and encouraging economic development of coastal resources within proper environmental constraints.

CURRENT STATUS:

The momentum of Georgia's coastal management plan development was interrupted during a reorganization within the OPB and a re-evaluation of the coastal management effort. With a better focus on its end goal/product, Georgia is proceding with its second year of program planning. It has made substantial progress in determining procedures for citing uses of regional benefit and technical work is of high quality. Good intrastate agency relationships exist in this planning stage. It remains for Georgia to translate this background work into substantive policy and management actions.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, state and local officials will conduct a series of studies to determine and prepare for the social, economic and environmental effects that could impact the Georgia coast as a result of offshore oil and gas production.

The grant funds will be used primarily to prepare an inventory of existing information useful in determining onshore and nearshore

impacts, to design a comprehensive work program for the next several years in directing decisions, analyses and studies related to offshore development and to conduct a series of briefings to explain technical aspects of leasing procedures and production methods. An intensive public information program to appraise local officials and residents of offshore operations is planned.

Boundary identification

For planning purposes, eight counties comprise the landward side of the study area. Those counties are: Bryan, Camden, Charham, Effingham, Glynn, Liberty, Long and McIntosh.

For management purposes, Georgia has defined six alternatives based on resources characteristics (topography, drainageways and wetland vegetation). The following inland boundary designations are being considered:

*Coastal watershed -- area drained by the five major rivers running into the Atlantic Ocean.
*Geologic coastal Georgia -- all lands and waters in the coastal watershed located between the coast and the 100-foot contour.
*Primary geologic division -- all lands and waters in the coastal watershed located between the coast and the 50-foot contour.
*Coastal wetlands within the 50-foot contour -- all waters and wetlands within the boundary of the primary geologic division.
*Tidal wetlands -- all waters and wetlands influenced by tides.
*Tidal marsh -- all waters and marshes.

The eventual boundary may be a combination of those alternatives. Final boundary determination will be made when economic, political and physical studies are completed.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Much of the background work has been accomplished, although there hasn't been designation of permissible land and water uses. Papers have been prepared on the function, value and vulnerability of key coastal resource ecosystems, including: beaches, sand dunes and offshore sand bars; barrier islands; fresh water ecosystems; ground water ecosystems; wildlife; marshlands; and marine and estuarine waters.

Various studies have been published, including: "The Value & Vulnerability of Coastal Resources," "Activities in Georgia's Coastal Waters" and an ecosystem capability study.

Further work is being done to develop a compatibility methodology, permissible use strategies and a methodology to determine the suitability of land and water uses.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

While Georgia hasn't identified geographic areas of particular concern that will be included in the management program, the following areas are being studied for potential designation as GAPCs: valuable natural habitats; unique physical features; important natural areas; developments dependent on coastal waters; conflicts in use due to urbanization; areas of significant hazard if developed; coastal aquifers' watersheds; and sand areas.

Public and governmental involvement

Georgia has identified various state agency relationships to the coastal management program and established a technical committee comprised of representatives of nine state agencies, the Attorney General's office and three regional coastal agencies.

A Governor's Coastal Zone Management Advisory Council is made up of 26 members -- local and state officials and citizens -- who review and recommend coastal management policy, procedures and mechanisms.

Three regional planning agencies are under contract to work on development of general planning and management principles; recommendation of GAPCs; development of future county land use plans consistent with coastal management program goals and objectives; and public participation.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Georgia has made use of its Federal Regional Council and has had bilateral discussions with various federal agencies. Activities in this area haven't proceded to a state where strategies or policies are evident.

Organizational arrangements

It isn't yet clear which agency will be designated to implement the coastal management program, nor which method of controls will be used. The state anticipates, however, a combination of direct state control and state standards to guide local implementation. The OPB and the advisory council will work to determine organizational structures.

Authorities

While a number of pieces of coastal management legislation exist, including the Marshlands Protection Act, a major stumbling block for comprehensive management was in the state's Constitution. This problem was rectified with the passage of a referendum in 1976 that clarified the General Assembly's authority to influence local land use planning and zoning.

Various issue papers will be developed for presentation to the advisory council, which will outline legal approaches that could be used to accomplish objectives of the program and especially to satisfy the previously established rationale for determining use acceptability in the coastal area.

HAWAII

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Planning & Economic Development
Coastal management program contact: Dick Poirier, Dept. of Planning & Economic Development, P.O. Box 2359, Honolulu HI 96804. (808) 548-4609.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Land & Natural Resources; University of Hawaii.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			Section 312 Estuarine Sanctuary
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	
	$250,000 (Fed)	$400,000 (F)	$500,000 (F)	$199,600 (F)
	125,000 (State)	200,000 (S)	250,000 (S)	384,600 (S)
Subtotal	$375,000	$600,000	$750,000	$584,200

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,725,000 (excludes 312 funds)

AUTHORITY:

"Hawaii's Shoreline," a three-part study printed in 1965 by the Dept. of Planning & Economic Development, has remained an important and basic document in planning and managing Hawaii's coastal environment.

Present management efforts also are guided by the 1969 recommendations contained in "Hawaii and the Sea, A Plan for State Action," published by the governor's Task Force on Oceanography. That five-year marine action plan led to the creation of the Hawaii and the Sea 1974 Task Force which, in turn, made more than 70 recommendations for state action toward more effective coastal resources management.

In 1973, the Hawaii legislature passed the Shoreline Protection Act, directing the DPED to prepare a comprehensive coastal management plan. This plan is being developed in conjunction with the overall land use plan that was authorized in 1968. The Land Use Law divided the state into four districts for the purposes of management: conservation (where development is controlled by the Dept. of Land & Natural Resources); urban; rural; and agricultural.

In 1970, the legislature added a 40-foot strip of shoreland around all Hawaiian coasts to the areas designated as Conservation Districts.

A measure passed in 1974 will involve more agencies in erosion and sedimentation control efforts. It charges the Dept. of Health to set guidelines under which each Soil & Water Conservation District would prepare, adopt and implement a control program.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

On June 30, 1976, the state received a federal grant authorized by Section 312 of the Coastal Zone Management Act for the purpose of establishing an estuarine sanctuary.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Hawaii cites the following priority issues in its coastal program:
*Need to integrate prospective coastal planning with ongoing land use

planning and to define coastal management boundaries when there is no point of land in Hawaii more than 29 miles from the sea.

*Need to develop improved municipal and industrial waste and surface runoff pollutant treatment methods to enhance the quality of coastal waters, especially in areas of poor tidal flushing such as Kaneohe Bay.

*Need for improved state-level authority to deal with the conflict between resort and suburban shoreline uses and the lack of public access to Hawaii's shorelines.

*Need to develop and enforce sand mining controls to protect beach sand and areas needed for beach replenishment from being used for the construction of homes, resorts and commercial buildings.

*Need for increased research and state guidelines on the development of Hawaii's underwater manganese deposits and fisheries industry.

*Lack of regulatory authority over unique areas having a particularly delicate ecological balance where uses should be restricted.

*Lack of sufficient information base to provide a decision-making framework for the siting of ocean-based energy complexes and deepwater port facilities which will have significant landside impacts.

*Need to establish criteria for determining environmental carrying capacity and overload characteristics.

*Need to re-examine present institutional arrangements and design an organizational framework to provide coordinated management without fragmentation or overlap.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Objectives of Hawaii's coastal management program are as follows:

*To preserve and improve the quality of the marine and coastal environment for recreation, the conservation of natural resources, aesthetics, and the health and social well-being of the people.

*To promote the orderly and responsible use and development of coastal and marine resources.

*To encourage the effective use of scientific and engineering resources of public and private agencies affecting coastal management activities.

*To promote cooperation and coordination among governmental bodies and public or private organizations.

*To provide an overview of the complicated interrelationships between land use and the marine environment as they apply to a statewide coastal management system.

CURRENT STATUS:

During its second year of coastal management planning, Hawaii developed a management policy proposal that is being used in an effort to draft legislation that would implement the coastal management program.

The proposal considers the entire state as the coastal zone, includes policy statement for coastal resources, hazard areas, shoreline development and proposes a new mechanism for designation and focused management of areas of particular concern.

Estuarine sanctuary

In a parallel activity, Hawaii will establish the Waimanu estuarine sanctuary. Those approximately 5,900 acres in the uninhabited Waimanu Valley will be preserved in its natural state for scientific research, educational study and as a means for measuring human impacts on similar

estuarine areas. The state owns all but 347 acres of land in the river valley area, and state and federal funds authorized under Section 312 of the Coastal Zone Management Act will be used to purchase that land.

Under proposed regulations, prohibited uses include: mining, logging, dredging and filling, site clearing, construction, activities that would lead to water pollution, and the introduction of exotic flora or fauna to the area or the removal of native species.

Controlled uses would include camping, hunting, swimming, horseback riding, and temporary anchoring of vessels in Waimanu Bay to unload game or supplies.

Permitted uses include fishing in saltwater areas, hiking on trails and research which wouldn't alter the environment.

Boundary identification

For planning pubposes, the entire state is considered to be coastal area. After considering the advantages and disadvantages of both a narrowly-defined and a statewide coastal management boundary, Hawaii is considering designating the entire state as a coastal area, with a greater focus for conducting the management program in areas of particular concern.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

The coastal management program would rely on those uses and priorities already established statewide through basic land use district classifications adopted by the state Land Use Commission. They would be additionally determined by counties within the urban districts and within conservation districts. These would be used as a baseline. Additional consideration would be given to changes in land uses that could be expected to occur in the near future. Statewide criteria or policies could be adopted for specific segments of the coastal area in which development pressures are expected to be intense.

In its third year of program development, Hawaii will complete selected problem analyses, prepare a coastal policies plan, obtain the views of the public and their advisory groups on these policies, study the organizational relationships necessary for implementing the Coastal Zone Management program and draft necessary legislantion.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Criteria for the identification of areas of particular concern were formulated on the basis of nine management purposes. They are based upon the availability and distribution of specific resources, measures of uniqueness or fragility, the immediacy of threats to resources in specific geographic areas, potentially irreversible land and water uses that threaten specific resources and other social and economic considerations.

It is expected that the implementation of the APC concept will be the primary regulatory method or management tool used to coordinate governmental activities to conserve particular coastal resources or ameliorate specific problems of statewide interest.

These areas probably would be designated by the Governor. While none have been designated, studies have identified potential sites.

The interim boundary probably would be designated first with the other spots around the island being designated, as appropriate. APCs would be put anywhere in the state for as long or short a time as needed. Area designations could be suggested by anyone to a new coastal council or the State Plan Policy Council.

Work will continue on the further development and evaluation by citizen groups and others of the criteria for the identification, selection, designation, and undesignation of APCs. Finally, the designation and/or treatment of both APCs and environmentally sensitive areas will be integrated with the legal framework.

Public and governmental involvement

Development of various mechanisms to ascertain state, county, and citizen concerns and priorities, work undertaken during the first year, was closely coordinated with all work elements.

Sixty alternative means of obtaining citizen input were developed and described in a technical paper. Based on these alternatives, various input-generating mechanisms were used in the site selection processes of prototype areas and estuarine sanctuary candidate sites. In addition, a Hawaii Coastal Management Policy Coordinating Committee (which is composed of state and county governmental officials), a Federal Contacts committee, Statewide Citizens Forum, and seven County Coastal Management citizens advisory committees were formed. Each committee generated and ranked problem areas and concerns as viewed from their respective perspectives and this served as the basis of the "problem analysis" completed as part of the second year work program. The Statewide Citizens Forum and some of the county citizens advisory committees further supported the problem analysis efforts by producing case studies demonstrating the deficiencies of Hawaii's existing land or resource management systems.

The citizens advisory committees sponsored a series of public information meetings using a slide show. Newsletters also describe facets of the program to the general community. More emphasis will be placed on the use of various communications media to publicize the intent and contents of the Hawaii Program as a prelude to the public hearings which will have to be held on the program.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Hawaii has inventoried and located federal lands. In addition, all relevant agencies have been invited to serve on the federal advisory committee and there has been bilateral discussions with federal agencies. Most of the national interest questions arise with respect to defense proposals or ocean mining, which in turn may create greater energy needs. This issue will be addressed by the State General Plan as well as by the coastal management program planning effort.

Organizational arrangements

The proposed concept of management through use of areas of particular concern would require little reorganization. The Dept. of Planning & Economic Development would be the lead agency and major coordinator of the program.

Additional attention will be given to linkages between the state coastal management program and the State General Plan.

Authorities

A thorough analysis of existing authorities has revealed that the state is not lacking in this area. However, the legislature will be asked to authorize the program. Hawaii has considered alternatives that range from consolidation of existing functions to establishment of a separate cabinet-level agency.

ILLINOIS

GRANT RECIPIENT: Illinois Dept. of Conservation
Coastal management program contact: Peter Wise, 300 N. State St., Room 1010, Chicago IL 60610, (312) 793-3126.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Transportation, Div. of Waterways; Geological Survey; Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year
	$206,000 (Federal)	$384,000 (F)
	118,000 (State)	192,000 (S)
Subtotal	$324,000	$576,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $900,000

AUTHORITY:

The Illinois Dept. of Transportation reviews and issues permits for filling, dredging or construction of bulkheads, placement of outfall structures or other alteration of natural shorelines of public waters, including Lake Michigan.

A lakefront management plan and protection ordinance guides development in the City of Chicago, which covers nearly the entire area of Cook County, one of Illinois' two coastal counties. The protection ordinance makes it unlawful for landfill, excavation or construction to take place within the protected district without the approval of the Chicago Plan Commission.

Various studies have influenced the planning for coastal management. The Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission has undertaken a series of planning studies concerning Illinois' coastal area. Recent products include: a Regional Open Space Plan; a Regional Wastewater Plan; a Regional Water Supply Report; and a technical report, "The Water Resource in Northeastern Illinois, Planning its Use."

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Illinois finds that because coastal land use decisions are made entirely at the local level, state and regional needs often are ignored. The rights and needs of public, as opposed to private, interests frequently conflict as competition increases for available land throughout the coastal area. To help ameliorate that problem there is a need for adequate state funds for land acquisition, recreational development and erosion protection structures. Heavy urbanization increases Illinois' problems in defining coastal boundaries.

Other issues identified by the Illinois program include property damage due to shoreline erosion and bluff recession, loss and degradation of natural resources, balance of economic development needs and environmental protection, decline in shipping trade and inadequate consideration of aesthetic values in the design of shoreland structures.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Illinois defines the following objectives of coastal management:

*To preserve, protect, develop and where possible to restore and enhance the resources of the shorelands of Lake Michigan.
*To encourage and assist local and regional governmental and private bodies to recognize and effectively exercise their responsibilities to develop and implement local land use management programs.
*To ensure that full consideration is given to ecological, cultural, and private groups engaged in activities affecting Illinois' shore lands to cooperate and participate in conducting the management program.
*To encourage the public to become aware of the need for wise management of the shoreland resources and to maintain the educational processes required to effect strong public involvement in the program development process.

CURRENT STATUS:

A tentative boundary has been established and Illinois has selected five geographic areas of particular concern from among sites nominated. Legislation to establish state authority for managing coastal resources is being drafted. A statewide policy advisory committee will review the legislation and the draft management program.

Boundary identification

Illinois coastal waters are Lake Michigan extending outward from the shoreline to the Lake boundary of Illinois with either Wisconsin, Indiana or Michigan. The inland boundary is being determined through a process involving a biophysical determination of impacts, a jurisdictional examination of methods of control and an analysis of citizen and local government desires. Natural, man-made and jurisdictional features are being considered as bases for boundary lines.

The state has conducted studies of physical and natural features of the shoreline in order to make the biophysical determinations. The Illinois Geological Survey has mapped nearshore characteristics in 10 selected areas; conducted open Lake research; examined the ground water characteristics of shore bluffs; mapped the hydrographic characteristics of the shoreline. The Illinois Natural History Survey conducted an inventory of sensitive areas, including natural systems and historical, archaeological and architectural sites.

The Northern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) is inventorying land ownership of the coastal area and existing land use policies of the political subdivisions within the coastal area. These will aid the state in its determination of control mechanisms.

A preliminary boundary determination based on areas of particular concern, uses, problems, issues and resource capacities has been made. Municipalities are nominating alternative boundaries. These nominations, the results of workshop and a public meeting, and the recommendations of the state Inter-agency and Lake Michigan Shoreland Advisory Committee, will be taken into consideration when finalizing the boundary.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

The state will be responsible for uses subject to the management program occurring in coastal waters and flood and erosion prone areas.

Working in accordance with state guidelines, the local governments will be responsible for inland uses subject to the management program. Management policies will be derived from federal and state laws and local zoning ordinances.

NIPC is conducting technical work necessary to set priorities on uses. NIPC has analyzed natural and man-made resources capacity to support existing and projected demands. It also has inventoried existing land uses; analyzed existing residential, commercial, industrial, transportation and recreational demands, and forecast needs.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Illinois solicited nominations for geographic areas of particular concern from legal and planning consultants, units of government and private citizens. Seventy-five nominations were received. That number was screened to 36 areas employing environmental vulnerability, problem complexity, and ecologic and economic value criteria. From that list, five GAPCs tentatively have been established.

A multi-level governmental group will assess the individual problems and solutions of managing GAPCs as the management plan is developed. The plan must include a method of determining permitted resource uses and priorities for these uses as well as a determination of the role of each unit of government. The Illinois coastal management program will provide funds to units of government managing GAPCs.

Public and governmental involvement

Illinois has employed the Lake Michigan Shoreland Advisory Committee as a forum for local government input into the coastal management program. The committee is composed of representatives from each shoreline municipality and Lake county. Ex officio members are representatives from special districts, military bases, and the Illinois Dept. of Conservation. The Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission serves as secretariat. The committee has helped develop grant applications and work programs, reviewed and commented upon coastal management products and responded to shoreline-related A-95 notification.

A policy advisory committee comprised of members of the Lake Michigan Shoreland Advisory Committee and representatives from statewide interest groups will review the draft management program and accompanying legislation.

The members of the public and various interest groups are urged to participate in public meetings held by the League of Women Voters and in five citizen task forces formed through the Lake Michigan Federation. Slide shows and monographs have been prepared. A quarterly newspaper tabloid, "The Lake Michigan Current," and a booklet, "The Coastal Resources Game, It's Your Turn...," are being distributed. Each municipality was given funds to survey its littoral owners on various issues.

Examples of direct citizen input to program development are the public and municipality nominations of GAPCs, the municipal nominations of boundaries and public meetings devoted to obtaining input on policy questions such as means of management.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

A principal contact has been established with each relevant

federal agency. Letters were sent to federal agencies requesting them to identify their interest in the coastal zone and the type of information and documentation that they want to receive from the states. A report on the responses is being prepared and potential work areas are being identified.

Illinois participates in the activities of the Great Lakes Basin Commission and its Standing Committee on Coastal Zone Management.

Organizational arrangements

Coordination of relevant state agencies has occurred through the state Inter-agency Advisory Committee. Members of the committee are the directors of the Departments of Transportation, Conservation, Agriculture, Local Government Affairs, Registration & Education, Business & Economic Development, Environmental Protection and Budget. A working relationship at the staff level has been established. Working letters of agreement and other means of coordination are taking place.

The state/local government relationship exists through the Lake Michigan Shoreline Advisory Committee and the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. All 14 shoreline municipalities belong to the Advisory Committee.

Authorities

In Illinois, the state has absolute authority over the Lake and the land it covers through the public trust doctrine. The Dept. of Transportation, the designated trustee, administers the coastal management planning effort and will continue to be the lead agency when the program is completed.

Local governments have the authority to zone uses to meet certain goals designed to improve the quality of life in the community. Municipalities and counties also are empowered to regulate subdivisions under the Planning Acts.

The state has water and air pollution control, flood plain zoning and other legal authorities that it will draw upon for program implementation. The state plans to submit legislation to strengthen its control over erosion-prone areas and to enable it to set standards with which local zoning ordinances will have to apply.

INDIANA

GRANT RECIPIENT: State Planning Services Agency
Coastal management program contact: Theodore Pantazis, Executive Director, State Planning Services Agency, Harrison Bldg., 143 W. Market St., Indianapolis IN 46204. (317) 633-4346.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Natural Resources; Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission; Michigan Area Council of Governments.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

1st year	
$220,000	(Federal)
110,000	(State)
$366,300	

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $330,000

AUTHORITIES:

Indiana has relied upon use of various single-purpose state laws to manage resources along its Great Lakes shoreline. Those laws include the Flood Control Act; Flood Plain Management Act; and Flood Control Districts Act. Those laws, along with the Small Watershed Planning Program, are administered by the Dept. of Natural Resources.

State water quality authorities include the Stream Pollution Control Board; Lake Preservation Suits Act; and aspects of the Environmental Policy Act. Ports and navigation on Lake Michigan are regulated by the Indiana Ports Commission, port authorities operated by local governments, the Interstate Port District of Illinois and Indiana and the Indiana Board of Public Harbors & Terminals.

Water rights are established by the Lake Mighigan Lands - Rights of Riparian Owners and the Surface Water Rights laws.

On June 20, 1975, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Indiana's shoreline contains one of the heaviest industrial and population centers found anywhere in the country, and has mounting numbers of difficult problems.

Approximately one-half of Indiana's shoreline already is commited to commercial-industrial uses; the other one-half, to residential uses. The industrial-commercial uses vie for the same land and water resources that recreational, housing and other uses require. Private development is in conflict with demands for public access to the shore.

Erosion is another major problem confronting the state's shoreline, as are flooding and sedimentation problems.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Indiana's coastal management objective is to develop a comprehensive program for allocating the shoreline among competing users in a sound and rational manner. Stated goals of the program are:

*To maintain active coordination among the coastal management program and the general public and local, state and federal government agencies.

*To supplement and update an information base that can be used by state and local agencies in decision-making regarding the use of the coastal resources.

*To develop a management program for Indiana's coastal resources which establishes the format for identifying alternative courses of action regarding coastal issues and is inclusive of federal requirements.

CURRENT STATUS:

Indiana is undertaking its program development in two phases: program identification and program planning. The purpose of program identification is to inventory and analyze physical, social and economic, and administrative and legal information relating to the coastal area. A major effort is being made to solicit public opinion and interest.

Later, during the program planning phase, Indiana will develop a program for determining an overall state program objective and for meeting the specific threshold requirements of the coastal zone management program. Indiana is in the data collection phase now.

Boundary identification

During its first year of program planning, Indiana is looking at the waters of Lake Michigan and the lake bed over which the state has jurisdiction. It has identified the inland boundary for planning purposes as the southern jurisdictional line of Lake, Porter and LaPorte Counties, within which the Lake Michigan/Indiana watershed is contained. The shoreline is 45 miles long. Some 22 miles are industrial and commercial and approximately 17 miles are recreational. Approximately 18 miles of the shoreline are in public ownership and 27 miles are privately owned.

Indiana's territorial limits of Lake Michigan extend to the boundaries of the adjacent states of Illinois and Michigan. The upland limit of its coastal zone along rivers and streams hasn't been determined. The Dept. of Natural Resources is reviewing data on the surface and ground water resources of the planning areas to help the state determine the upland river and stream limit of the coastal waters.

Because the Indiana shoreline is largely urban and/or altered, it will be difficult to relate uses to the water body through natural systems relationships. Indiana is looking into other factors to make a reasonable boundary determination in its extensively modified areas. The dependency of certain uses on water sites and visual relationships between the land and the water are two examples of the kinds of factors that may help determine a boundary in modified areas.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Indiana is approaching this task in a number of ways. The Dept. of Natural Resources is inventorying the physical character of the coastal zone which includes: surface and ground water resources; mineral resources; forests; wetlands; fish and wildlife habitats; soils; natural areas; historic, archaeological and cultural resources; geological resources; flora and fauna; structural projects; and data on natural processes including flooding, erosion and littoral drift.

The state intends to work with the regional planning commissions to collect socio-economic data including needs for electricity, gas, communications systems, water supply, waste water treatment, and solid waste and hazardous material disposal. Existing land use and land ownership will be inventoried and mapped by the regional agencies. Air and water quality programming will be coordinated with the coastal zone management program by the regional agencies in the coastal areas.

A technical advisory committee and a citizens committee will work with the state during the data collection phase. Also, the state will obtain a legal consultant to research the existing administrative and legal authorities controlling land and water uses in the coastal area.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Indiana will be utilizing the inventory data being compiled by the Dept. of Natural Resources and the regional planning agencies to gain a general knowledge of what portions of their planning area might be candidates for special designation. The actual identification and determination of management strategies for such areas won't take place until the second year of program development. The citizen, technical and elected officials advisory committees that the state has developed will have a role in nominating and deciding management actions for such areas.

Public and governmental involvement

Indiana has developed a Citizens Advisory Committee representing commerce, industry, residential associations, the news media, recreational concerns, financial institutions, labor, utilities, environmental organizations and the academic community. Secondly, a Technical Advisory Committee guides the technical and procedural aspects of the program. This committee consists of federal and state government agencies, local and regional planning agencies, environmental organizations, educational institutions, industry and financial institutions. In addition to providing technical expertise, this committee also will serve as a means of coordinating public and private sector activities affecting the coastal planning area. A third mechanism used to insure the coordination and involvement of affected parties is the Elected Officials Committee. Composed of state legislators, mayors, town board presidents and county commission presidents from Lake, Porter and LaPorte Counties, this committee will be asked to provide guidance on the problems, issues and implementation techniques of the program.

The state is contracting with the regional planning agencies to develop public participation programs for their particular areas. Planning agencies are identifying existing plans and programs that affect coastal zone management. Three public meetings have been held on the program and the film, "It's Your Coast," is being shown to groups along the shoreline. Public information materials have been developed and distributed. The state's newsletter, "Shorelines," and a summary document of the program, "Coastal Zone Management Program, A Review," are available, as are copies of the state's quarterly performance reports.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Indiana is participating in the Great Lakes Basin Commission's Coastal Zone Management Standing Committee, which has representation from federal agencies. Also, federal agency representation is provided through the state's Technical Advisory Committee. During the first year, the state determined federal agency contacts and kept them advised of program activities by mail. Federal agency representatives are invited to attend meetings, as appropriate.

Organizational arrangements

Indiana hasn't addressed this task. It will be relying upon the advice of state, regional and local agencies when developing the organizational structure.

Authorities

Indiana is reviewing federal and state law, zoning regulations, local government authorities and relevant case and tax law to develop information on the adequacy of existing state authority to implement a coastal management program.

LOUISIANA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Louisiana State Planning Office
Coastal management program contact: Paul Templet, State Planning Office, 4528 Bennington Ave., Baton Rouge LA 70804. (504) 389-7041.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Louisiana Wildlife & Fisheries Commission; Louisiana Coastal Commission; Louisiana State University Sea Grant Program; regional planning agencies; parish governments.

FUNDING:	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$260,000 (Federal)	$342,000 (F)	$143,000 (F)
	134,090 (State)	171,000 (S)	71,500 (S)
Subtotal	$394,000	$513,000	$214,500

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,121,590

AUTHORITY:

Pending a governmental reorganization that is to be completed in 1977 in line with a Constitutional amendment, six major state agencies are involved in Louisiana's coastal planning and management activities.

The Wildlife & Fisheries Commission reviews water quality impacts on fish and wildlife in the coastal area. The Dept. of Public Works is responsible for water resource development, drainage and flood control. The Land Office protects land interests, as does the Mineral Board. The Board of Health is responsible for sewerage disposal. Oil and gas activities are regulated by the Dept. of Conservation. There also are numerous state boards, commissions and special districts regulating other activities in the coastal areas. The Dept. of Natural Resources ordered by Constitutional amendment has been formed.

The Louisiana Advisory Commission on Coastal & Marine Resources completed "Louisiana Government & the Coastal Zone" in 1972 and "Louisiana Wetlands Prospectus" in 1973. Both contain recommendations on coastal management organization at the state level.

On June 30, 1974, the first Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Louisiana cites the following coastal management concerns.

*Nonrenewable resources have been developed in a manner which has reduced the renewable resource base, particularly the marsh and estuarine resources.

*Marsh areas supporting fisheries and recreation have been significantly decreased by unrestrained urban expansion, flood control projects, expansion of the transportation system, agricultural activity, salt water intrusion and pollution.

*A deep draft terminal planned for offshore Louisiana, airport construction and major recreational development will cause substantial landside environmental and social impacts.

*The rate of salt water intrusion into previously freshwater strata is increasing.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The objectives of Louisiana's coastal program are as follows.
*To review the impact of wetland uses on water flow, circulation, quantity and quality prior to authorization of such uses.
*To assess the impact of uses on coastal marshes and estuaries in terms of cumulative impact upon the system.
*To assess land and water uses in terms of intrinsic suitability and the limiting factors of the particular land area.
*To encourage urban and industrial growth in most suitable corridors and to discourage such growth in substantially undisturbed wetlands.
*To assure that provision of long-term energy needs won't destroy the integrity of the coastal environment.

CURRENT STATUS:

A major thrust in Louisiana's third year of coastal program planning is redrafting of a coastal resources program statute for consideration by the 1977 Legislature. The state also will pass through funds to parishes to establish a planning capacity at that governmental level. At the same time, efforts are being made to explain the process of coastal resources management to the public and solicit comments and suggestions.

In 1976, the legislature approved the State & Coastal Resources Management Act which designated the Louisiana Coastal Commission as an autonomous policy and decision-making body within the office of the governor. The 21-member LCC, headed by the director of the Wildlife & Fisheries Commission, was directed to recommend to the Legislature prior to March 1977 an act establishing the framework of a comprehensive state and local coastal management program for the state. The LCC is to disband in August 1978, unless legislatively extended.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Louisiana is undertaking studies that will identify trends or development patterns that occur from oil and gas production on the outer continental shelf. The state will study existing procedures for controlling onshore impacts -- particularly in the Barataria/Lafourche area, develop parameters for assessing consequences of offshore development on individual parishes and define the size and scope of Louisiana's oil activity and its effect upon the environment and economy. The findings of these studies will be integrated into development of the state's coastal management program.

Boundary identification

For planning purposes, Louisiana's coastal area is comprised of the first and second tier coastal parishes. This area encompasses nearly 10-million acres of land of which nearly 8-million acres are wetlands. That represents more than 25% of the nation's wetlands.

Based upon ecological and legal considerations, Louisiana has

suggested a management boundary that approximates the five-foot contour except for the Atchafalya Basin where the boundary extends inland to the headwaters of the basin. For purposes of administrative ease, the boundary would be delineated in terms of those cultural features (range, township, parish or railroad lines) that most closely approximate the five-foot contour.

New Orleans and Morgan City would fall within the management boundaries which are described in a report, "A Rationale for Determining Louisiana's Coastal Zone."

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Louisiana is moving toward a three-class system for defining permissible uses and the level of government that would serve as the primary management unit. Class 1 uses would involve major uses of wetlands or national or multi-parish interests. Management would be a state responsibility with some local input.

Class 2 uses would involve wetlands uses affecting a single parish or dryland uses affecting coastal waters. Local governments would be encouraged to prepare a management program under state guidelines and to develop a permitting process for those uses.

Class 3 uses would involve uses of local concern traditionally handled by local governments. An atlas has been prepared to guide decision-making there.

Environmental characterization and use categories have been identified for the Barataria Basin as the result of a pilot study on oil and gas production there.

During the third year of coastal program planning, environmental and use characterization will be completed for the remaining parts of the state, permissible uses will be reevaluated as to priority and area and management techniques will be formulated.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Those areas not capable of being managed under the general management program process would be designated geographic areas of particular concern. Existing GAPCs are the 35 state-mandated wild and scenic rivers. Potential GAPCs would include the Atchafalya Basin and development corridors, although it is probable that the latter could be handled under the general management program.

A process for designation of areas of particular concern has been stated in the proposed coastal management bill. Under that proposal, an inventory of possible CAPCs would be followed by a listing of areas by priority. The LCC would approve the areas and they would be regulated in line with LCC-approved guidelines.

Similarly, standards and criteria for preservation and restora- areas will be established. Priority ranking for areas of preservation will be suggested, although recommendations can't be considered until the state inventory and use characterization is near completion.

Public and governmental involvement

In its mass communications effort, Louisiana has used brochures, television interviews, press announcements, slide shows, public meetings and workshops. The public participation effort that revolves around the proposed coastal management bill assumes passage of the

bill and attempts to explain how the legislation would affect local governments. User groups are being contacted to discuss guidelines that are being formulated.

The organizational network visualized by the draft bill is being explained to governmental bodies at different levels, as well as the public, planning agencies and port authorities. There will be an effort to transfer technology to the local level in order to assure development of a satisfactory local plan. Those parishes that already have plans will be advised as to the process for complying with state management guidelines.

In the third year of program planning, attempts will be made to broaden public participation by greater use of mass media and use of the school system. An effort will be made to involve regional planning commissions in a coordination effort with those parishes under their jurisdiction. Materials will be prepared for legislative committees and hearings.

A paper, "Coastal Zone Management & State-Local Relations under the Louisiana Constitution of 1974," addresses constitutional authority to implement coastal management and the authority of home rule charter governments and non-home rule charter governments and special districts.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Several federal agencies have substantial investments in the Louisiana coastal area -- primarily in wildlife refuges and flood control properties. The state has used the Southwest Federal Regional Council in its initial attempts to communicate with federal agencies.

Under a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Geolgical Survey, the State Planning Office generated a set of land ownership map overlays that include a listing of federal and state-owned lands in the 22-parish coastal study area. Expressions of the national interest can be made through use of the FRC as well as through an ad-hoc interagency committee on coastal management. The state is soliciting nominations from federal agencies for areas of particular concern and an analysis of allowable and non-allowable uses on federal lands is being made. A paper, "Achieving Federal-State Coordination in Coastal Resources Management," has been completed.

Organizational arrangements

The draft coastal management bill sets up a system of cooperation and coordination with state and local level agencies as well as allowing input from user groups. The Coastal Resources Management Program established in the bill is assigned to the Office of Coastal Resources Management in the Dept. of Wildlife & Fisheries. Ten state agencies, four planning commissions, three special commissions and affected port authorities are suggested as members of an Interagency Advisory Committee.

Local government involvement is outlined and provisions made for local control of local uses if the governing body has a state-approved coastal management plan. A policy and appeals commission is composed of one-half local representatives and one-half representatives of user groups.

Authorities

The Sea Grant Legal Program at Louisiana State University has the responsibility for assuring that the state program complies with federal requirements. It was instrumental in drafting the proposed state coastal legislation and, if that is approved, the LSU group would be involved in drawing up implementing regulations and any necessary governmental agreements.

As part of the effort aimed at defending the proposed legislation, papers have been prepared on various legal aspects of coastal management including property rights, public ownership and state-local relationships.

The bill will designate the management agency, establish the mechanisms for interagency linkages and set the framework for the state in comprehensive coastal management.

MAINE

GRANT RECIPIENT: State Planning Office, Coastal Planning Group
Coastal management program contact: Allen C. Pease, State Planning Director, 184 State St., Augusta ME 04333. (207) 289-3261.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Conservation; University of Maine; Dept. of Marine Resources; Dept. of Inland Fisheries & Game; eight regional planning commissions; Office of Energy Resources, Commission on Maine's Future.

FUNDING:	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$230,000 (Federal)	$328,870 (F)	$146,000 (F)
	115,000 (State)	164,435 (S)	73,000 (S)
Subtotal	$345,000	$493,305	$219,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,057,305

AUTHORITY:

Maine's coastal management effort began in 1969 with adoption of the Maine Coastal Development Plan - Work Program. Since then, it has progressed through various executive, legislative and research phases.

Four state laws form the foundation of the program. They are: Site Location of Development Act; Mandatory Shoreland Zoning Act; Wetlands Protection Act; Registry of Critical Areas Act.

The Mandatory Shoreline Zoning Law authorized the Maine Environmental Improvement Commission and Land Use Regulation Commission to set standards for land use control in a 250-foot-wide strip of coastal shoreland. The act mandates enforcement by local governments.

Several major studies have shaped Maine's coastal management efforts. The 1971 Maine Coastal Resources Renewal study was used by the Governor's Task Force on Energy, Heavy Industry and the Maine Coast which, in 1972, recommended that heavy industry should locate in two designated areas of the coast.

The Penobscot Bay Resources Plan depicted problems and developmental opportunities present in that area and was the stimulus for similar inventories in lower Penobscot Bay, Hancock County and the western portion of the mid-coast of Maine.

As a result of data gathered from land, water and socio-economic studies and a statewide poll -- Maine: An Appraisal by the People -- the SPO advises on resources suitability for selected uses coastwide and specific uses on particular sites.

Various commissions have been charged with coordinating state land use policy, including the Land and Water Resources Council.

On March 25, 1975, the governor created an Advisory Committee on Coastal Development & Conservation to make policy recommendations on outer continental shelf oil and gas development and to advise on overall coastal program plan development.

On March 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Competing use demands continue to intensify, placing pressure on the unique natural systems of the Maine coast.

Recreation and tourism, second home development, power plant siting, deep water port development, refinery siting and offshore oil production, commercial fishing and fish processing and mineral extraction, along with environmental quality, are areas of primary interest in this economically-disadvantaged area.

Within an overburdned and underfinanced state and local regulatory and enforcement network, an attempt is being made to bolster the role of local governments and the public in coastal management program development.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The overall goal of coastal planning activities in Maine is to encourage compatible and multiple uses of the coastal area, optimizing those intrinsic and real values that assure the greatest long-term social and economic benefits for state residents.

CURRENT STATUS:

Maine is expending efforts most strenusosly in two areas: responding to the desire of coastal towns and communities for additional participation and control of coastal management; and attempting to plan for the anticipated exploration for and production of outer continental shelf oil and gas.

In 1975, Maine submitted and subsequently withdrew a proposed management program for its mid-coast area, extending from Casco Bay to Frenchman's Bay. The proposal was recalled in order to effect a greater level of participation by town governments. Coastal towns are receiving assistance from the regional planning commissions so they may better assist in coastal area planning and program implementation.

OCS oil and gas development study

Assuming the presence of commercially-recoverable quantities of oil and/or gas in the North Atlantic offshore area, production of the resource almost certainly will generate problems and opportunities for Maine.

With federal funds awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act and state funding, Maine is conducting an outer continental shelf oil and gas development study. This series of integrated research tasks is designed to insure that the state receives the maximum benefit and least risk from OCS oil and gas development. Tasks will be undertaken as an adjunct to the Maine coastal planning program. They include a fast-cycle issue analysis; evaluation of potential onshore development; OCS and energy facilities siting methodologies; management strategies; public and community assistance; coastal protection studies; and overall program coordination. The governor's Advisory Committee on Coastal Development & Conservation will make policy recommendations on OCS oil and gas development.

Boundary identification

For planning purposes, Maine's coastal zone includes the land

area in 11 coastal planning areas and the water seaward to the state's territorial limit. Planning areas are: Upper Penobscot Bay; Western Penobscot Bay; Eastern Penobscot Bay; Eastern Hancock County; Lincoln County; Bath-Brunswick, Western Mid-Coast; Western Washington County; Central Washington County; Eastern Washington County; Cumberland, Greater Portland Area; and Southern Maine, York County.

For management purposes, the boundary of Maine's program stems from a combination of local political and physical features, although the boundaries issue is under review. Uses of immediate shoreland are subject to local control according to state guidelines and criteria under the Mandatory Shoreland Zoning Act. High-intensity uses within and beyond the immediate shoreline (250-feet) and within the first tier of towns on tidewater (extending inland approximately 10 miles) are directly regulated by the state in accordance with the Site Location of Development Act.

Thus defined, Maine's coastal zone is a strip about 10 miles wide (13 miles including the territorial sea) along the coastal and tidewater areas, and includes 140 town or minor civil divisions.

Under the Wetland Control & Protection Act, proposed alterations in the area to the reach of tidal influence are subject to state approval and review supplemented by local comment.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Maine's methodology for identifying permissible land and water uses is based upon its resource inventory and capability and suitability analysis.

Three activities of major concern have been identified and maps will match the level of suitability of these activities with land and water areas. The selected activities of major concern are: (1) construction of large buildings; (2) large residential developments or subdivisions with septic sewage disposal; (3) large residential developments or subdivisions with sewage collection systems. Considerations in determining suitability are: soil conditions, surficial and bedrock geologic conditions; presence or absence of hazards; and presence or absence of potential conflicts between development activity and significant public values.

Under the Mandatory Shoreland Zoning Act, uses of the immediate shoreland are subject to local control, according to state guidelines. High-intensity uses within the immediate shoreline and the first tier of towns on tidewater are directly regulated by the state under the Site Location of Development Act. It might be anticipated that, as envisioned by the mid-coast management proposal, particular uses wouldn't be excluded from the coastal area as a whole, but would be guided to suitable areas.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Data from resource inventory and mapping have been synthesized into maps intended to become guides for land use decisions. The maps show areas of particular concern and suitability of areas for activities of major concern.

In analytical work to date, the areas of particular concern have been judged against nine major aspects. Those elements are: hazard areas, including floodplains; areas of scientific, historic and prehistoric significance; areas of scenic or visual significance; areas where development affects the public and which are under

intense development; areas with economically valuable or potentially valuable natural resources; ecologically sensitive areas; areas which offer significant recreational opportunities; routes of public access; and important habitats. Modification to these areas could occur as a result of ongoing examination.

Public and governmental involvement

Participation in plan development by Maine's coastal towns will be achieved at the policy level through membership on the Governor's Advisory Committee on Coastal Development & Conservation and through contact with town officials and residents. The committee has balanced representation from among state agencies, local officials and the public.

At the working level, the state is making data, maps and other planning products directly available to towns to facilitate their input. Coastal towns are being asked to determine what types of activities they would wish to undertake as part of the Section 306 program implementation phase.

It is planned that coastal towns will receive funds passed through the state so they may better assist in program implementation.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

In addition to local government inputs and work that occurs through the regional planning commissions, Maine is coordinating with other New England states and with the federal agencies through the New England River Basin Commission.

Rapport with federal agencies is being accomplished by furnishing them with copies of newsletters and by meeting on a bilateral basis when necessary. As new aspects of the program are developed, federal agencies will be asked to respond.

Further guidance regarding federal participation will come from the Governor's Committee on Coastal Development & Conservation.

Organizational arrangements

As indicated above, Maine's anticipated coastal management system is based on an intergovernmental structure tied together by laws, executive orders, coordinating committees, regional planning commissions and town governments. Guidance is provided via the the statuatory responsibilities of the State Planning Office, which has the budgetary control over the participants in the implementation of the coastal management program. SPO also is responsible for keeping the State Register of Critical Areas.

Two other state agencies have responsibilities that must be closely tied with SPO's coastal management efforts. The Dept. of Environmental Protection is the key state agency for setting and enforcing environmental regulations. The Dept. of Conservation must "preserve, protect and enhance the land resources of the state."

Authorities

Maine anticipates that existing laws will provide authority needed to meet federal criteria for management program approval. At the sub-state level, management responsibilities are expected to reside with town governments.

MARYLAND

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Natural Resources
Coastal management program contact: Ken Perkins, Energy & Coastal Resources Administration, Towes State Office Bldg., Annapolis MD 21401. (301) 269-3382.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of State Planning; Chesapeake Bay & Coastal Zone Advisory Commission.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year/Supplement		
	$280,000 (Federal)	$400,000	$25,000 (F)	$135,000 (F)
	140,000 (State)	208,600	12,500 (S)	58,900 (S)
Subtotal	$420,000	$608,600	$37,500	$193,900

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,260,000

AUTHORITY:

The Dept. of Natural Resources created in 1969 has the responsibility to plan for development, conservation and management of the Chesapeake Bay ocean shorelines and other tidal waters, including their shorelines and bottom lands, are resources associated with the Bay. Until a reorganization in 1976, the Water Resources Administration was designated to procede with coastal management planning. With the creation of the Energy & Coastal Zone Administration within the DNR, the coastal management program was elevated to a position of parallel status with other administrations in the state government.

Various pieces of legislation guide coastal developments. Those laws include the Power Plant Siting Act, Coastal Area Facilities Review Act and the Wetlands Act. In addition, planning authority has led to studies of the Chesapeake Bay, an inventory of undeveloped shoreline areas, a study of public landings, a recreational boating needs and carrying capacity study and a water resources study of the Eastern Shore.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

The following problems and issues are evident in Maryland's coastal area:

*Loss of wetland areas from agricultural draining, solid waste disposal, construction of residences and boat marinas, dredging and disposal of dredge materials, and the diking and bulkheading of shoreland areas.

*Need to identify and protect critical areas of ecological importance and to insure that developments are located and constructed to cause a minimum amount of adverse environmental and aesthetic impact.

*Insufficient knowledge of the causes and effects and ways to minimize

shore erosion, particularly in hurricane-prone areas.
*Potential for oil production in Baltimore Canyon with associated onshore supports.
*Increasing port activity requiring expanded support facilities and improvement and maintenance of shipping canals.
*Large-scale modification of the flow of fresh water into Chesapeake Bay. Need for information concerning the requirements of the Chesapeake Bay's fish and wildlife resources, their tolerance to human activities and the long-range effects of their management.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The overall goal of Maryland's coastal management program is to provide for rational allocation and utilization of the state's coastal resources while protecting, enhancing and, where desirable and feasible, restoring the biological, recreational, aesthetic, scientific, historical and cultural resources in coastal areas.

CURRENT STATUS:

Maryland's initial efforts in coastal management planning were research intensive, with certain specific targets set during its second year of program development. The state has focused on completing the resources inventory necessary to determine geographic areas of particular concern; initiated a study of onshore development associated with OCS activities; established a public participation framework within which program elements may be reviewed and appropriately modified; completed the draft comprehensive dredge spoil disposal plan; completed inventory and analysis of institutions and authorities for managing coastal areas to determine the remedial action necessary; and worked with relevant state and federal agencies and local governments in an effort to insure consistency as permissible uses of the coast are identified.

Following governmental reorganization that placed primary responsibility for coastal planning under the Energy & Coastal Zone Administration, a clearer course of action toward coastal program approval is emerging. Major objectives of the state's third year of coastal planning are: a creater effort toward soliciting public and local government participation; work on the Baltimore Metropolitan Coastal Area Study; initiation of a coastal use capability study in an effort to develop a management mechanism whereby resources information may be used; work with the Dept. of State Planning to recommend mechanisms necessary to meet the requirements for authorities and organizational networking; additional emphasis on state-federal coordination; and preparation of the management program document.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Maryland is attempting to identify the onshore impacts of offshore activities in Baltimore Canyon. This study has been integrated as part of the attempt to identify geographic areas of particular concern. In defining GAPCs, Maryland will identify developmental critical areas -- those areas within its coastal area that are suitable, feasible and capable of accepting various types of major facilities; and areas where those facilities exist. The

intent of this exercise is to resolve conflicts concerning location of major facilities in the coastal area; to reduce developmental pressures on high-value coastal resources; and to provide for the protection of areas where those activities are most suitable with environmental and economic policies of the state.

Boundary identification

For initial planning purposes, all counties in the state that border on the Potomac River, the Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean were included in the Maryland coastal area, which extends seaward three miles. During the first year of program development, a planning focus boundary was determined for all of the coastal area except Baltimore City and Baltimore County. Six natural features were mapped, which approximate a natural biophysical boundary in coastal processes: coastal soils; tidal wetlands; tidal extent of rivers; tidal drainage basins; areas of potential tidal inundation; and beaches and associated dunes. A system of state and county roads then was chosen which bounds the area covered by the above factors.

Boundaries are being determined along different criteria for the heavily urbanized areas of Baltimore City, Baltimore County and northern Anne Arundel County. The inland coastal boundary won't be finalized until the third year of program development, after the other elements of the management program have been developed. It is likely that Maryland will develop a multiple coastal boundary with management focus on the Chesapeake Bay area.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Maryland generally defines permissible uses as those uses that reasonably and safely can be supported by a resource, are compatible with surrounding resource utilization and will have no more than a tolerable impact upon the coastal environment.

In its attempt to identify permissible uses, much of Maryland's effort during the first two program development years was directed toward inventorying natural and manmade features. A variety of mapping had been done in the state's development of its land use plan and tidal wetlands were delineated as part of the Wetlands Act of 1972. The coastal management program initiated the following projects: tidal wetland vegetation mapping; upland natural areas study; archeological resources management study; Bay bottom survey; environmental mapping program for Chesapeake Bay; shore erosion mapping study; shore erosion control structures; and developmental critical areas study. In addition, a recreational boating study and an analysis of the impacts of ocean dumping contributed to the understanding of the capability of resources to sustain particular uses.

Uses that the state will manage under its coastal program will include those uses that have been determined to be of state concern because they are addressed by existing regulatory programs and uses that are determined to be of concern by the direct and significant impact tests. Determination of uses subject to the management program is a summary task and its completion will take place during the third year of program development.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Under the state Land Use Act of 1974, critical areas designation

is being applied to shose areas within and significant to the state's coastal zone. Areas are considered under three categories: resource protection areas; hazard prone areas; and developmental critical areas. Within the latter category are areas identified as incorporated waterfront cities; intensely developed urban areas; existing and proposed major facility, industrial or port sites; potential major facility, industrial or port sites; and scarce and recoverable mineral resource areas.

A determination of appropriate uses in GAPCs identifies the relationship of this program element to the permissible uses element. With regard to GAPCs, the identification of permissible uses is area-based, whereas in the remainder of the coastal management area it is activity-based.

Various inventory and baseline-type studies aimed at aiding the state in identifying GAPCs are generally winding down and emphasis in the third year of program development will be placed on analysis and evaluation of their results.

Public and governmental involvement

Attempts to communicate with the public are being refined during the third program year and will grow out of the efforts that have been made to introduce the concept and structure of coastal management through slide shows, panel discussions, speaking engagements at citizens' group meetings, conferences and workshops and distribution of literature.

Particular attention is being given to cooperation with local jurisdictions to identify interested and affected groups and individuals in Maryland's 12 rural and five urban coastal jurisdictions. A commitment to public participation by all involved units of government, as described in the communication and participation document produced by the Baltimore Metropolitan Coastal Area Study governments, is encouraged in other coastal areas. Formal advisory bodies will grow in number and in importance to enable a substantive public agency dialogue on program development. Advisory bodies will consist of a statewide advisory commission with balanced membership from local and state government, academia, industry and special interest groups; regional advisory groups with a citizen ombudsman orientation; and coastal county advisory bodies endorsed by elected officials.

The second half of the third year will empahsize mass production, distribution and review of the coastal management program document. Four regional/local coordinators will be named and it is anticipated that three consultants will serve as extensions of the planning staff in the public participation effort.

The Baltimore Metropolitan Coastal Area Study is a model effort whereby state and local units are utilizing demonstration grant monies to develop and support mutual working arrangements. This process facilitates development of a coastal management program in a state/local/regional context.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

During the first two program years, liaison by the state with federal governments has been on an ad-hoc basis for a variety of technical purposes including: program coordination on OCS development,

re-routing of the Delmarva Intracoastal Waterway, dredge spoil disposal and port development at Crisfield; technical studies such as the Soil Conservation Service's Delmarva River Basin Study and the urban coastal area study for Baltimore Harbor, supported by the Dept. of Housing & Urban Development; and efforts to assure that inventories and studies met perceived needs at various governmental levels.

In the third year of program development, policies and mechanisms will be devised to coordinate interstate and with the federal government. Still ahead for Maryland is its response to the responsibility to determine adequate consideration of the national interste in facility siting and the incorporation of national air and water pollution program requirements into the design of the coastal program.

On an interstate level, Maryland meets quarterly with neighboring states to discuss commonalities and problems of coastal management. It performs the staff function for the Middle Atlantic Governors Coastal Resources Council, which is attempting to develop a regional response to pressing offshore resource management questions. During the third program year, Maryland will seek assurances that its proposed coastal boundary is compatible with Delaware's and Virginia's boundary determination efforts.

Organizational arrangements

The Energy & Coastal Zone Administration under the Dept. of Natural Resources is considered a trial-run for a prototype coastal management agency, since it combines the responsibilities of the coastal zone management, power plant siting and coastal area facilities review program and the Bureau of Mines. Coastal program officials will work with the Dept. of State Planning to develop legislation to more clearly define the role of the two departments, other state agencies and county governments in the coastal management program.

Authorities

Preliminary analysis of existing legislation indicates that "coverage" is close to being adequate, with the recent passage of the flood plain management bill greatly increasing the state's authority to control riverine and tidal inundation in hazard areas.

While sufficient authority to control land and water uses in coastal areas probably exists, two problems in authority remain. First, lines of authority aren't clear-cut and myriad agencies are carrying out largely uncoordinated programs. Second, the evaluation criteria used in regulatory decisions don't include the impact of the proposal on the long-range management of coastal resources.

Aside from authorities already delegated to various levels of government in existing legislation, the state will offer financial and technical assistance to county governments so that they may help in identifying GAPCs and develop local site review programs for managing permissible uses in their jurisdiction that aren't of regional impact or benefit. Continued receipt of management funds by the county would be contingent on consistency with the state program.

Maryland won't rely on legislation to codify coordination of existing authority and organization, but will attempt to establish formal agreements among each of the appropriate departments on the extent of their responsibilities in the coastal area.

In addition to the DNR, the following departments have pertinent planning, regulatory and/or advisory roles: State Planning; Health & Mental Hygiene; Economic & Community Development; Transportation; and Agriculture.

MASSACHUSETTS

GRANT RECIPIENT: Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
Coastal management program contact: S. Russell Sylva, Assistant Secretary of Environmental Affairs, 100 Cambridge St., Boston MA 02108. (617) 727-2808.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Office of State Planning.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	
	$210,000 (Fed)	$382,000 (F)	$465,000 (F)	$110,331 (F)
	105,000 (State)	204,812 (S)	232,500 (S)	55,165 (S)
Subtotal	$315,000	$586,812	$697,500	$165,496

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,764,809

AUTHORITY:

A wide range of existing laws has enabled Massachusetts to regulate various uses of its coastal resources. The Coastal Wetlands Protection Act of 1965 authorizes the state to issue orders regulating, restricting or prohibiting dredging, filling, removing or otherwise altering or polluting coastal wetlands.

Other major legislation that has guided the commonwealth's interest in coastal management includes the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, the Off-Shore Minerals Act, the Coastal Wetlands Restriction Act, the Ocean Sanctuaries Act, the Scenic Rivers Act and the Energy Facilities Siting Act.

In January 1974, the Task Force on Coastal Resources was created to assist the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs in development of a coastal plan.

On May 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state is preparing a draft Section 306 management program for submission to the federal office in the spring, 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Massachusetts has identified the following coastal management issues.

*Need to develop a coastal zone management program that builds upon the commonwealth's strong tradition of local government, but which also allows the commonwealth to make decisions on matters with far-reaching impacts on the coastal zone or on the state as a whole.

*Lack of sufficient information base and management mechanism for decision-making with respect to siting of major power and oil-related facilities, control of possible air and water pollution and associated urban blight problems.

*Lack of adequate recreation facilities in and public access to shoreland areas, accentuated by the rising demands for and conflicts among shoreland uses.

*Need to identify, protect and restore estuarine, wetland and fishing ground areas from the effects of unchecked development, natural catastrophy and the impacts of erosion and sewage and waste disposal.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Massachusetts identifies its coastal management objectives as follows:

*To develop coastal management implementation measures that build upon the tradition of local decision-making but which also provide for state overview of local decisions on matters with far-reaching impacts.

*To encourage commercial, industrial, port and energy facility developments of the type required to meet the commonwealth's social and economic needs, and to guide such developments to those areas which are best suited for such activities.

*To improve public access to coastal areas of significance for recreation and leisure use and to provide better opportunities for those suffering from an inequity in the distribution of recreation resources.

*To protect coastal land, water and living resources of major significance from degradation and over- and to preserve from development areas of natural productivity and flood and hurricane damage prone areas.

CURRENT STATUS:

The Massachusetts coastal zone program is in its third year of management program development. The Governor's Task Force on Coastal Resources targeted mid-December 1976 for presentation to the governor of the "Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Preview." This preliminary program for public review is the first step in preparation of a draft Section 306 management program that will be submitted to the federal Office of Coastal Zone Management.

OCS oil and gas development study

Massachusetts has entered the second year of planning for outer continental shelf oil and gas development with state and federal funds provided under the Coastal Zone Management Act. During the first year, the commonwealth collected information about exploration and production facilities, identified suitable areas for development, provided technical assistance to potentially impacted municipalities and provided the public with information about OCS-related development.

In the second year program, the commonwealth intends to organize a method for estimating impacts of OCS development and determine effective means of implementing policies for siting OCS facilities consistent with the emerging coastal management program. The project is being coordinated as a joint effort with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, the coastal zone management program and the Office of State Planning.

Boundary identification

Regional citizen advisory committees are reviewing the boundary configurations presented in "Alternative Management Boundaries," which will be the basis for final determination of boundaries. Citizen assistance in selecting a final management boundary is expected to emerge in tandem with public input on permissible uses.

"Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Preview" proposes a boundary that extends from the three-mile territorial sea boundary to the first major road running parallel to the shore.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Massachusetts has completed drafts of papers on "Survey of Uses." The papers present the coastal management program's findings on whether a specific use discussed has a "direct and significant impact on coastal waters," meets a statewide or national need, and is acceptable and/or of high or low priority for differing areas of the coastal zone. The "Survey of Uses" covers commercial fisheries, maritime shipping and terminals, housing, tourism, marine recreation, electric power, sewer services, institutional uses, military uses, land and air transportation, shoreline engineering works, agriculture, aquaculture and general commerce and industry. The "Survey of Uses" has been incorporated into the policies presented in the "Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Preview," along with extensive public review and comment.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Regional citizen advisory groups are assisting Massachusetts in delineating the following three levels of critical areas. Significant Resource Areas (SRA) are lands or waters that play a vital role in the functioning of the coast and have been identified by citizens, coastal zone management or state laws as meriting special consideration.

Areas for Preservation and Restoration are special sites or groups of SRA's whose conservation, recreational, ecological or aesthetic values merit preservation or restoration.

Special Assistance Areas are sites which warrent special planning and funding, primarily because of their development capabilities and value as loci of coastally-dependent activities. A primer on coastal ecosystems has been prepared in an effort to heighten citizens' awareness of the coast's natural environments.

Public and governmental involvement

The 87 coastal cities and towns within the commonwealth have been broken down into 10 units for public participation purposes, with meetings held in each sub-region that consists of a small grouping of coastal communities. Citizen advisory committees for each subunit have met monthly to insure that coastal management policies meet the needs of each sub-area.

In addition, the Governor's Task Force on Coastal Resources, with 41 representatives from the legislature, various levels of government and major user groups in the coastal zone serves as a board of advisors to the commonwealth's coastal program. The coastal management program has conducted a public opinion survey of 1,000 randomly-selected coastal residents to further ascertain the needs and desires of coastal citizens.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Informal contact, briefings and formal working relationships with federal agencies characterize this work task for Massachusetts, which is situated close to regional headquarters of most federal agencies.

Prior to initiating policy formulation within the program, state coastal managers contacted 35 agencies to solicit their views and

concerns with respect to the coastal zone. The "Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Preview" will be circulated for comment to those agencies. In addition, coastal managers are working to institutionalize policies and to achieve consistency between state and federal assistance and coastal management objectives. Memoranda of understanding will be established with state agencies including the Energy Facilities Siting Council and the Dept. of Public Works.

Organizational Arrangements/Authorities

After analysis of the existing state and local authorities pertinent to coastal management and an inventory and description of the zoning ordinances and bylaws in effect in coastal towns, Massachusetts anticipates that existing state-level authorities will be relied upon either as the major or basic building block, or as the sole basis, for program implementation.

MICHIGAN

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Natural Resources
Coastal management program contact: Mark Raber, Div. of Land Use Programs, Dept. of Natural Resources, Stevens T. Mason Bldg., Lansing MI 48926. (517) 373-1950.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: 10 Regional Planning Agencies

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year
	$330,486 (Federal)	$400,000 (F)	$436,308 (F)
	165,243 (State)	200,000 (S)	218,154 (S)
Subtotal	$495,729	$600,000	$654,462

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,750,191

AUTHORITY:

Shorelands Protection & Management Act of 1970 directed the Dept. of Natural Resources' Waters Resources Commission to develop a comprehensive plan for control of the use and development of Great Lakes shorelands. The plan was completed in August 1973.

The plan sets forth three basic principles: limit development to those areas which specifically require a shoreline location; require permissible developments to be planned and constructed to harmonize with the capacity of the shoreline ecosystem; and foster and facilitate public acquisition of significant environmental areas.

In December 1973, the Water Development Services Division of the DNR published "Flooding Problems Associated with Current High Levels of the Great Lakes." The report presents an overview of the Great Lakes' flooding problems: causes, effects, solutions, and possible future alternatives.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Michigan identifies the following coastal management issues:

*Lack of a coordinated management program to effectively deal with potential of further serious damage to shoreland properties from flooding and erosion.
*Minimal local planning, zoning, health and sanitation programs for much of the shoreland area subject to increasing recreational and residential demands.
*Need to rehabilitate and redevelop blighted urban waterfronts.
*Need to protect shoreland wildlife and fishery resources from ecologically degrading activities.
*Need to integrate and ensure cooperation among coastal management programs currently fragmented among numerous units of government.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Michigan's objectives are as follows:

*To protect the environmental integrity of Michigan's Great Lakes shorelands.
*To facilitate the orderly use and development of shoreland resources including transportation, recreation, energy production, industry, agriculture and commerce.
*To preserve the shoreland ecosystem and its diverse array of flora and fauna.
*To perpetuate unique cultural, ecological, scenic, aesthetic, historic, and scientific shoreland resources.
*To minimize damages to shore properties from erosion and flooding.
*To assist in the conservation and protection of the Great Lakes through enlightened use and development of shoreland areas.

CURRENT STATUS:

Michigan has completed its second year of program development. The Michigan Shorelands Act has helped designate the coastal zone boundary in unincorporated areas. Most recently, the landward boundary has been tentatively established in the heavily urbanized area of southeastern Michigan. A set of criteria has been established for identifying uses subject to the management program.

Michigan characterizes its coastal zone according to 10 basic shore types to assist in determining land capability and, therefore, permissible uses. Over 600 nominations have been received for areas of particular concern and a final set of areas remains to be selected.

The Shorelands Management & Protection Act of 1970 will be the core of the Michigan program. A public meeting will be held in each shore zone county to explain the program in the next several months.

Consideration must yet be given to determining the lake boundary between Michigan and Ohio, and policy of state relationship to privately owned lands within Indian reservation boundaries.

Boundary identification

Michigan's coastal waters are Lakes Superior, Huron, Michigan and Erie, extending outward from the Michigan shoreline to the lake boundary with either Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio or Canada. Also included are limited portions of rivers extending to a Corps of Engineers'-maintained navigation channel or to the 100-year flood mark, whichever is farthest inland.

Michigan's inland boundary includes a biophysically-determined intensive zone and a jurisdictionally-determined extensive zone. The intensive zone includes the coastal waters, wetlands, and coastal lakes with a 1,000-foot "buffer" strip around them. It bulges when necessary to include sand dunes, flood prone areas, areas supporting threatened or endangered species, beach ridges and swales, and designated recreation or game areas. In heavily urbanized southeastern Michigan, the landward boundaries for the management zone are determined by the first principal arterial road. The extensive zone includes any shoreline municipality or township whose jurisdictional area includes any part of the intensive zone. An exception to this occurs in the Upper Peninsula where congressional township boundaries are used to delineate the planning area.

Various possible boundary determination policies have been outlined and modified in line with comments received from the Shoreline Advisory Committee, regional planning agencies, and various local governments. Copies of that document have been distributed to affected federal agencies. County meetings and regional hearings were held to solicit citizen and local government input on the boundaries for the program.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Direct state control will be affected through existing regulatory authority and will be based primarily upon performance standards for air and water quality, dredge and fill activities, mineral extraction, erosion and sedimentation control, subdivision control and other standards.

The 10 regional planning commissions are working with local governments and citizens to develop use priorities for particular areas. These priorities will be based upon existing land and water uses, local and state needs, program goals and objectives, physical capabilities of the land and water in the regional planning area and areas of particular concern identified in the planning area. Local governments will be responsible for controlling uses in accordance with the regional plans and state guidance.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Michigan is asking regional planning agencies, other state agencies, federal agencies, and citizens to nominate areas of particular concern which fit into 14 classifications. The types of GAPCs are: high risk erosion; flood hazard, ecologically significant; natural; recreation; historic and archaeological; sand dune; island; coastal lake; rivers and bays; urban mineral resource; agricultural; navigational; and industrial development-suited areas.

The 10 regional planning agencies will have the major responsibility of screening the nominations, assigning priorities of action within each category and recommending courses of action and management policies. Thus far over 600 nominations have been received.

A draft document on "Areas of Particular Concern in Michigan's Coastal Zone" is available for review.

Public and governmental involvement

Michigan has attempted to provide information to the public in various ways. A monthly newsletter, "Shorelands Watch," and a descriptive pamphlet are available. An audio-visual slide show is used to explain methods of participation and regional planning agencies and the state distributes newsletters and questionnaires on the program. A Sunday advertising supplement to the Detroit "Free Press" asked the public to suggest issues which should be addressed by the coastal program and to propose solutions to the problem areas.

Michigan has solicited input from citizens through the Shorelands Advisory Committee, regional advisory committees, meetings and hearings on the Shorelands Management Act, workshops and a Great Lakes Shorelands Conference held under the sponsorship of the state legislature. The state of the program will be discussed at a public meeting in every county and a public hearing in each region.

The major effort at intergovernmental involvement has occurred with the regional planning agencies from pass-through funding from the state

coastal zone program. This has resulted in a continuous two-way flow of information. The regional agencies along with other state and local agencies also have been given the chance to review and comment on the statement of goals and objectives of the program.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

State-federal interactions have occurred primarily through telephone and mail communication. Federal agencies have been providing comments on program products. Coordination with various federal programs, such as water quality planning, is a normal function of the regional planning agencies' collaboration with the state in coastal management program development.

During the fall of 1975, Michigan explained its program to federal representatives who were advised of ways to become involved in program development. Suggested routes to involvement included such things as providing information on federal land ownership and plans for land acquisition, existing shoreline problems, federal agency policies which should be reflected in the program, and designation of contacts within each agency during program development and review.

Organizational arrangements

Coordination of relevant state agencies, both within and outside of the DNR, has occurred through the Dept. of Natural Resources Standing Committee on Shorelands & Water Coordination. Most of the consolidation of relevant authority will occur within the DNR. Letters of agreement will be signed between the DNR and other agencies as needed. The DNR will set up a separate section to coordinate all state permitting in the coastal zone and is expected to be the lead agency when the program is implemented.

Authorities

"State Authorities with Application to Coastal Zone Management," a draft document, describes existing state legislative authority applicable to shoreland management in Michigan. It has been reviewed by the administering agencies.

The Shorelands Management & Protection Act of 1970, as amended, is the basic legislation around which the CZM program is being built. This legislation calls for the control of environmental, flood hazard and high risk erosion areas situated 1,000 feet landward from the ordinary high water mark. Flood hazard areas are included in the coastal zone. The control of these areas extends beyond the 1,000-foot line to account for areas affected by flood levels of the Great Lakes. Under this act, the state is required to develop a plan for the use and management of the shoreland.

Draft descriptions of most pertinent state programs and the authorities behind them has been prepared for review.

MINNESOTA

GRANT RECIPIENT: State Planning Agency
Coastal management program contact: Roger Williams, State Planning Agency, 801 Capitol Square Bldg., St. Paul MN 55155. (612) 296-2884.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Natural Resources, Bureau of Planning; Dept. of Economic Development; Arrowhead Regional Development Commission.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year	2nd year supplement
	$99,500 (Federal)	$150,000 (F)	$190,000 (F)
	49,750 (State)	75,000 (S)	95,000 (S)
Subtotal	$149,250	$225,000	$285,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $659,250

AUTHORITY:

The Shoreland Management Act of 1969 requires the Commissioner of the Dept. of Natural Resources to set zoning standards for county governments to enact and enforce. It covers lands within 1,000 feet of the normal high water mark of a lake or pond, or within 300 feet of a river or stream in both incorporated and unincorporated areas. The Shorelands Management Unit of the DNR is developing a comprehensive plan for the maintenance of the shorelines and control of dredging, filling and spoil removal, based on the classification and regulation schemes developed by county units.

The Dept. of Highways has completed several studies related to highway planning and construction in the coastal area. The North Shore study, conducted with the DNR, includes an inventory of physical land characteristics and existing land use by means of computer mapping.

At the regional level, the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission is responsible for development of a water quality management plan for the Minnesota portion of the Lake Superior Basin. The commission has developed and approved a sewer and water plan for communities of less than 5,500 and a six-county solid waste management system plan.

On June 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Minnesota's coastal management program recognizes these issues:

*Lack of proper land use controls causing strip configurations in shoreland areas, eliminating open space and public access.
*Lack of a bi-state comprehensive plan or organizational structure capable of effective coordination or control over metropolitan and harbor development of the Duluth/Superior area.
*Need for increased public land holdings, parks, recreational areas and public access corridors to the shoreline.
*Need for large commitments of land, rail and harbor facilities to

accomodate expansion of taconite and copper-nickel mining operations.
*Need for public sewer service in many shoreland areas.
*Need to control industrial waste disposal, accelerated erosion, sedimentation and storm runoff and mining effluents to protect water quality and a declining fishing industry.
*Need to develop a mechanism to integrate and coordinate the overlapping and duplicative activities of various state and local entities.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Minnesota's objectives are as follows:
*To establish procedures for information exchange, consultation and coordination among government agencies, public and private groups and citizens interested and active in the coastal zone.
*To minimize conflicts and eliminate inconsistencies in the goals, objectives and policies governing all planning, management and regulatory activities carried on in the coastal area.
*To identify gaps, duplication, or overlaps in legal authorities and cite possible legislative changes necessary to ensure the establishment of effective controls over coastal area resource uses.

CURRENT STATUS:

Minnesota has received a six-month supplemental grant to enhance its second year's work program. It will be completing special studies on shore erosion and coastal areas soils and geology, mapping alternative coastal boundaries and developing management policies for geographic areas of particular concern. The state is also focusing efforts on the Duluth/Superior Harbor through a demonstration project grant. The objective of the study is to develop a comprehensive plan for the harbor, allocating land resources for current and long-range development needs. Inventory work has been progressing, but few policy determinations have been made.

Boundary identification

Minnesota's coastal waters include Lake Superior extending outward from the shoreline to the Lake boundary with either Wisconsin or Canada. Also included as coastal waters are limited portions of the rivers flowing into Lake Superior.

For planning purposes, Minnesota's inland boundary has been defined as the entire Lake Superior watershed with the exception of the upper reach of the St. Louis River, along with the City of Duluth and its neighboring townships. It contains lands of St. Louis, Cook and Lake Counties, stretching 200 miles along the shore.

Minnesota has studied alternative approaches of boundary determination, including the biophysical and biophysical/administrative approach. The possibility of tiered management areas also has been analyzed.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Minnesota has been inventorying its coastal zone in order to be able to perform capability analysis of the shore to determine which uses can be supported by the land and water resources. Products include various maps, a study of "Demographic & Economic Characteristics of the North Shore" and a report, "A Guide to Economic Information & Activity for the Minnesota Coastal Zone Land Use Management Plan."

Minnesota has computerized much of the land capability data from its inventories to tie in with the state's land management information system. The state will be able to determine permissible/priority uses based upon needs projections and the computerized land capability analysis. In drawing up goals and objectives for land and water use, Minnesota is soliciting public, local government and regional planning commission input.

In addition, the Pollution Control Agency has prepared a status report on water quality monitoring; assessed water and air quality and solid waste management in the coastal area; and outlined environmental strategies for sanitary and sewage systems and noise pollution abatement.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Minnesota will be using its inventory work as it sets up criteria to screen the coastal zone and sort out areas to designate as potential geographic areas of particular concern. Many of the areas will be designated for preservation and possible restoration. These include Indian and early settlement remains and areas with unique fauna or grand vistas. A form has been prepared to solicit nominations from the public.

A general process for the management of each designated site has been proposed. In most cases, primary responsibility for the development of a site will lie with the local unit of government in which the site is located.

Public and governmental involvement

Most of Minnesota's public participation program is being run through the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission and the State Planning Agency. A slide presentation has been prepared to generate interest in the program and acquaint the viewer with some issues of coastal management. The State Planning Agency has prepared a brochure on the North Shore and is surverying residents there to determine the sophistication of their perceptions of coastal issues.

Public meetings have and will continue to play a major role throughout the planning program. These meetings are directed to both special interest groups and broad-base citizen involvement. A public hearing and workshops will be held at the mid-point of the program development and at the completion of the draft of the plan, towards the end of the third year's work. Press materials have been provided to area newspapers, electronic media. Mailings are made to interested persons, notifying them of meetings and availability of reports. Contact has been made with the County and Municipal Planning Commissions throughout the North Shore. Based upon the joint determination of the planning needs, the coastal workgroup is assessing the viability of assisting these planning commissions in their respective areas.

Increased citizen and governmental participation has been achieved through recent establishment of the Policy Advisory Committee. This group includes six local and six state representatives.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

A memorandum was sent to forty-five federal agencies explaining the requirement that the national interest be considered in developing

the Minnesota program. In addition, the importance of federal agency review and comment on all Minnesota coastal zone management materials was stressed. A questionnaire was also distributed to these agencies in an effort to determine their goals and objectives and how those objectives might relate to the Minnesota program.

Organizational arrangements

The governor designated the State Planning Agency to receive federal grants and develop a coastal management program. A coastal management working group consisting of representatives from state agencies, the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission and St. Louis, Cook and Lake County Planning Commissions is integrally involved in policy formulation and interagency coordination.

The State Planning Agency also has been dealing with the local governments through the activities of the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission and public meetings. There are a myriad of special districts, five municipalities, 12 townships and three counties in the planning area. The coastal management program will deal with these local government units more extensively as it begins to formulate its management policies.

Authorities

Minnesota has critical areas legislation and power plant siting regulations administered by the Environmental Quality Council. The Dept. of Natural Resources established statewide standards for local zoning in the following programs: flood plain management; shoreland management; wild and scenic rivers; and water surface zoning. The DNR also manages certain types of state lands and administers conservation restrictions. It grants permits relating to water resources and mining and reclamation. The Pollution Control Agency administers laws regarding water pollution, air pollution, waste disposal and solid waste management. The Dept. of Economic Development promotes and encourages business, industry and commerce on a statewide, regional and local level.

Local governments, municipalities, townships and counties have various authorities enabling them to zone and develop local master plans. In addition, the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission develops regional plans.

MISSISSIPPI

GRANT RECIPIENT: Mississippi Marine Resources Council
Coastal management program contact: Jay Thomas, Mississippi Marine Resources Council, P.O. Box 497, Long Beach MS 39560. (601) 864-4602.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium; Southern Mississippi Planning & Development District; Gulf Regional Planning Commission.

FUNDING:	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$101,564 (Federal)	$127,038 (F)	$80,000 (F)
	50,782 (State)	68,589 (S)	40,000 (S)
Subtotal	$152,346	$195,627	$120,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $467,973

AUTHORITY:

The Coastal Wetlands Protection Act in 1973 established the Mississippi Marine Resources Council (MMRC) as the regulatory agency for activities conducted on state-owned coastal wetlands. The MMRC was directed to include an overall plan for use of coastal and private wetlands in the state's comprehensive coastal zone management plan.

The MMRC works closely with the Mississippi Sea Grant Consortium, and the director of the MMRC serves as a member of the Sea Grant Management Committee. The University of Mississippi, the University of Southern Mississippi, Mississippi State University, and the Gulf Coast Research Laboratory also belong to the consortium.

On May 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Mississippi cites the following coastal management issues:

*Increasing population pressures and the decreasing availability of coastal lands aggravate competition among industrial, commercial and residential developers. This diminishes areas available for recreational and public use and places demands on ground water supplies and waste treatment facilities.

*Inadequate municipal and industrial waste treatment facilities pollute estuarine and tidal areas to the detriment of wildlife, sport, and commercial fisheries and the tourist-recreation industry.

*Highly productive coastal marshes and wetlands have been developed and destroyed.

*Increasing petroleum extraction and facility construction has increased transportation and waste treatment needs, as well as the risk of oil spills.

*Inadequate planning has been done to locate coastal development in areas least prone to hurricane damage.

*Alternative modes of land based transportation in the coastal areas need

to be addressed.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Mississippi's coastal management objectives are as follows:

*To develop available coastal resources in a manner which will preserve resource values and provide options for future generations by minimizing irreversible commitments.
*To initiate and maintain a continuing inventory of natural resources and their requirements and capabilities while recognizing and allowing for their limitations.
*To coordinate coastal management activities, focusing on immediate problems but remaining cognizant of long-term trends.
*To develop and maintain an educational system to disseminate information obtained through coastal research.
*To establish a system for handling resource conflicts which embodies the concepts of multiple and shared use, irretrievable commitments, and available alternatives.
*To provide protective mechanisms and regulations for the conservation of natural ecosystems and prime resources essential to the coastal area.

CURRENT STATUS:

Mississippi, which will complete an extention to its second year grant on November 30, has been making progress in defining boundaries, permissible land and water uses and geographic areas of particular concern. Among the work tasks that require stronger focus are development of program goals, legal authorities, and intergovernmental coordination. The state continues to analyze its current legal framework to determine its adequacy and potential for achieving comprehensive coastal management.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Mississippi will attempt to determine the effects of offshore oil and gas production on its coastal environment and on economic and social structures.

The grant is being used primarily to determine what types of energy facilities are suitable for the Mississippi coast, where they might be located, how they could affect critical environmental areas and what additional infrastructure would be needed in the state if offshore oil and gas drilling would occur. The results of the studies will be integrated into the total coastal planning effort.

Boundary identification

Mississippi's coastal planning area consists of the first two tiers of coastal counties. Those counties directly adjacent to the Gulf coast are Hancock, Harrison and Jackson. The second tier counties, included for planning purposes, are Pearl River, George and Stone counties.

After considering environmental and socio-political aspects, the state identified four possible boundaries for management purposes: a six-county alternate; three-county alternate; three-plus county alternate; and critical areas alternate. Applying various selection criteria, the three-county area of Harrison, Hancock and Jackson

counties was found to best satisfy requirements and reflect environmental and socio-political considerations.

Finalization of the boundary awaits identification of geographic areas of particular concern by local and state agencies and the results of public hearings.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

A major factor in determining permissible uses will be the water quality criteria established for coastal waters under the federal water pollution control law.

The following preliminary definition of "direct and significant" impact is being used pending legal review: "Any activity initiated by man causing a discernible and/or predictable modification of the coastal ecosystems, economy and/or social conditions." An evaluation of priorities of permissible uses will be obtained by use of a two-dimensional matrix-type questionnaire containing 55 functional uses and six geomorphological areas. The questionnaire is being distributed to concerned state, local and federal agencies. State and federal agencies will be asked to indicate if permitting is required under present local statutes and to identify categories where permitting would be desirous.

The Mississippi coastal program will be based on regulatory controls that list permitted and prohibited uses, performance standards and design standards.

The council will consider items not limited to those listed below in reaching decisions on uses having direct and significant impact:

*Direct requirement for a coastal dependent site.
*Capacity of the site to support such development in terms of social and economic impact.
*Economic development needs such as quantity and quality of environmental impact.
*Capacity of the area to support development in terms of environmental impact.
*Compatibility with nearby uses and activities.
*Consistency with public and private plans and studies, particularly with local comprehensive community plans.
*Consideration of cumulative, long-term effects as well as localized, short-term effects.
*Contribution to public use of, enjoyment of, and access to the the coastal region.
*Consistency with the Mississippi coastal plan.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

A categorical designation of geographic areas of particular concern and selection criteria has been completed by the Gulf Regional Planning Commission. The areas are listed under three broad categories: physiographic elements; biologic elements; and socio-economic elements. Each of these categories is further broken down into 32 specific areas. Fifty-five functional uses have been characterized under six broad headings: domestic uses; food and fiber production uses; mining and energy production uses; manufacturing uses; transportation uses; and recreation uses. These functional uses along with the areas of particular concern have been arranged in an evaluation

matrix in order to indicate which of the uses were either permissible, undesirable or insignificant in relation to an area.

This matrix has been distributed to all affected federal and state agencies with a request to them to indicate their evaluation of each area and use. Meanwhile, the Mississippi Marine Resources Council has been mapping tentative areas of particular concern.

Final decision on the designation of GAPCs will be made by the council after relevant input has been compiled. Once this designation has been completed it will become the basis of memoranda of agreement with local and county governments to abide by this designation in their zoning activities.

Public and governmental involvement

In Mississippi, there are more than 200 state agencies, departments, boards, commissions, etc., making interagency coordination a particularly important aspect of program development.

On the regional and local levels, involved groups consist of the Gulf Regional Planning Commission (GRPC), which covers three coastal counties, and the Southern Mississippi Planning & Development District (SMPDD), which covers 15 counties including the six counties in the planning area. GRPC is providing socio-economic and land use data for the three coastal counties. SMPDD is providing the same information for the second-tier counties. GRPC also is preparing criteria for local governments to use in determining permissible and priority uses.

In its second year work program, Mississippi began to deal directly and extensively with coastal county and city governments. As subcontractors, cities and counties would perform two major tasks: develop initial cuts at permissible and priority uses and host a series of public meetings and workships for public participation.

In addition to the initial series of public meetings noted, the MRC held hearings during the summer of 1976 to get public input on management recommendations. Additional public awareness efforts include a slide show; talks to civic groups; development of a mailing list; and use of a newspaper supplement. Consideration is being given to launching a newsletter during the third year of program development.

A public opinion survey has been undertaken by the Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Mississippi has prepared a list of areas of national interest that can be found in its coastal areas. During its third year of program development, Mississippi will give considerable attention to two of those types: flood prone areas and wildlife management areas.

Four types of federal land in relation to jurisdictional status is recognized: exclusive, concurrent and partial legislative jurisdiction and proprietorial interest. Those lands within the classification of exclusive legislative jurisdiction will be excluded from the state management program. Alternative mechanisms are being considered for managing the remaining three types of areas. These encompass inclusion and exclusion of all federal lands and a mid-ground whereby managers of the federal lands within the state coastal area would agree in memoranda to comply with the substance and merits of

the state program.

Organizational arrangements

On the assumption that the lead agency will be the Mississippi Marine Resources Council and that other management efforts will be undertaken by other state agencies to deal with land and water uses of more than local significance, an assessment is being made to determine the existing organization and legal abilities needed to carry out the management plan. Earlier legal efforts and preliminary assessments have been completed on these agencies but that hasn't been done in enough detail to formulate an organizational structure.

Five key state agencies have been assessed to determine the necessary formulation of an organization structure. The agencies include: Air & Water Pollution Control Commission; Board of Water Commissioners; Archives & History Dept.; Mineral Lease Board; and Oil & Gas Board.

After an identification of the responsibilities of local units of governments, two avenues will be taken with them. The first will be to develop or add to the existing local ordinances to eliminate the weaknesses that control land and water uses in the limits of their jurisdiction. The second will define, by either letters of agreement or memoranda of understanding between local units of governments, the management functions expected from the local units of governments and the council.

Authorities

It is felt that the Wetlands Act in conjunction with other existing legal authorities in other state agencies will meet some of the legal requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act. Legislation for any specific additional authorities will be drafted and presented to the 1978 Legislature.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

GRANT RECIPIENT: Office of Comprehensive Planning
Coastal management program contact: Jerrold Moore, Director, Div. of Regional Planning, State House, Concord NH 03301. (603) 271-2155.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Strafford-Rockingham Regional Council.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year
	$ 78,000 (Federal)	$120,000 (F)	$148,000 (F)
	39,000 (State)	60,000 (S)	74,000 (S)
Subtotal	$117,000	$180,000	$222,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $519,000

AUTHORITY:

Various pieces of single-purpose legislation dealing with coastal resources management are being implemented under authority granted to 12 state agencies and two commissions. The Office of Comprehensive Planning coordinates planning. Its director chairs an 11-member Council of Resources & Management, a mechanism used to coordinate state agency involvement in coastal resources management.

The state works closely with the Strafford-Rockingham Regional Council, which includes 37 of the 44 municipalities within the preliminary coastal area boundary. All of the state's 17 coastal municipalities have planning boards and zoning ordinances.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

In developing its coastal management program, New Hampshire recognizes the following priority issues: population growth; residential, industrial and commercial development; recreation and tourism; water supply, fisheries and agricultural land availability and limitations; and air and water pollution.

Leasing for offshore oil and gas off Georges Bank might be expected to impact the New Hampshire coastal area.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PLAN:

Four general goals are established by New Hampshire. They are:

*To preserve, protect, develop and, where possible, to restore or enhance the resources of the coastal area.
*To achieve the wisest and best balanced use of land and water resources of the coastal area, giving full consideration to ecological, cultural, historic and aesthetic values, and needs for social and economic development.
*To integrate public policy into a coordinated and managed program.

*To conduct, sponsor or assist research in coastal matters to improve the data base on which coastal land and water use decisions are made.

CURRENT STATUS:

As New Hampshire looks toward the January 1977 legislative session, it is concentrating its work program in three major areas: drafting legislation, which encompasses a public participation effort, hearings and federal coordination; additional technical work necessary to aid in the promulgation of policies and regulations; and completing the management program package.

OCS oil and gas development study

A three-part study beginning in fiscal year 1977 is designed to describe the effects that offshore oil and gas development in Georges Bank will be expected to have on the state. Initially, there will be a cataloguing of industries and activities that could come to the state as a result of OCS development and a description of the socio-economic and environmental demands that these facilities and activities would have.

The second part of the project, funded by state and federal funds under the Coastal Zone Management Act, is to inventory each municipality in the coastal area to determine its capacity to accommodate demands from OCS-related facilities and to identify those municipalities that are capable of accommodating OCS activities. The results of the first two phases will be used to develop a framework for impact analysis. Scenarios will be developed to test the methodology.

Boundary identification

New Hampshire has completed the basic work on identifying its coastal zone boundary. A three-tiered boundary has been delineated and mapped, with program emphasis to be placed initially on the zone immediately adjacent to coastal waters. The boundaries encompass coastal waters out to the state's jurisdiction. Transitional and intertidal areas and inland areas are controlled to the extent that their uses would have a direct and significant impact on coastal waters.

In designating a coastal boundary that follows the general configuration of the coastal drainage basin, New Hampshire's controls will encompass a land area of 921 square miles, or about 10% of the state land area. The coastal zone includes 44 communities with an estimated population of 181,794, or 22% of the state's population. A legal definition of the recommended coastal zone is being prepared for draft legislation. Alternative methods for precisely delineating the primary zone are being determined.

As currently delineated, the first tier or primary zone extends from the mean high water mark seaward to the three-mile limit and to lands laying 1,000 feet landward of the mean high water mark or of the land limit of salt marshes; or to the 20-foot elevation contour -- whichever is the fartherest inland.

The secondary zone includes remaining lands within those municipalities bordering in any part on tidal waters. The tertiary zone includes the remaining 27 municipalities in the coastal boundary as it is preliminarily defined.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

During the first two planning years, criteria were developed and used to define land and water use capabilities. They were mapped and summarized into four general classes indicating gradations of land and water use capability. Capability classifications then were put into a matrix with resources uses, from which constraints or performance standards could be established and permitted uses assigned. An operational definition for "direct and significant impacts" was developed and use constraints defined to prevent impacts by particular activities. As a minimum, use priorities will be assigned to areas of particular concern. A tentative method to prevent arbitrary exclusions of activities that are of regional benefit has been established.

Papers on land and water performance standards and use constraints are being circulated for state agency review and comment. Land and water uses considered include residential, transportation, agricultural, commercial, waste disposal, recreation, commercial fishing, sport fishing, shipping, research and education, aquaculture, deepwater ports, industrial, mineral extraction, public water supply, utiliites transmission and offshore energy facility siting.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

The state has established 13 types of areas of particular concern using nine criteria that will be designated through legislation. In addition, specific areas for preservation and restoration have been identified, and estimates made of easement costs and acquisition costs. Ongoing technical work is contributing to a more precise delineation of areas of particular concern. A coastal activities monitoring system will be established to review and record public and private plans or activities in the coastal area.

Public and governmental involvement

Contacts are identified in public and private groups and agencies that might be affected by the coastal resources management program, and a mechanism for continuing coordination is being developed. Staff papers have been circulated to concerned state agencies for comment. The New England River Basins Commission provides help in interstate coordination and continuing input is being solicited. A public information and participation process will lead to a minimum of three public hearings and subsequent legislative action will insure public visibility of the program in the third year of program development.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

A survey directed to federal agencies is being conducted in an effort to determine the national interest in facility siting. Responses are being followed up through formal contacts and presentations on substantive elements of the program are to be conducted. Coordination with and participation by all relevant local, regional, state, interstate and federal agencies is being developed and will

be an important part of the third year work program. All federal air and water pollution standards will be incorporated into the program. The role of the state management agency with regard to federal consistency and consultation will be described in terms of operating procedures and mechanisms. The state's primary effort in this work element has been through combined use of the New England River Basin Commission and bilateral discussions with federal agencies.

Organizational arrangements

The Office of Comprehensive Planning has analyzed alternative organizational structures and circulated that report through the Council of Resources & Management for review and comment. Alternatives suggested include a state Coastal Resources Management (CRM) Agency with limited functions, a CRM with broad functions and an independent sub-state CRM agency with broad functions. Functions are analyzed in terms of policy, regulatory authority, planning, coordination and communications, operations and programming. OCP, with the assistance of the Attorney General's office and a legal consultant, is reviewing and analyzing existing state and local authorities and the need for new authorities. Conclusions will be used as the basis for drafting legislation.

Authorities

The additional authority needed to control land and water uses, acquire property and resolve conflicts will be established by legislation, the heart of which will set the organizational structure of the coastal management program.

Legislation will be drafted for review during the third planning year. It will define the tentative organizational structure, the designated state agency and the additional authority needed to control land and water uses. The draft legislation will be presented to the public and appropriate legislative committees for review and comment. There will be coordination with federal agencies to insure that the legislation responds to the requirement to consider the national interest in facilities siting. It is intended that legislation will be refined and submitted to the General Court in the session that begins in January 1977. The state identified public participation as the most important element in the process that leads up to legislative action on the program.

NEW JERSEY

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Environmental Protection
Coastal management program contact: David Kinsey, Coastal Area Planning Coordinator, P.O. Box 1889, Trenton NJ 08625. (609) 292-2938.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: None

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$275,000 (Federal)	$470,750 (F)	$337,000 (F)
	137,500 (State)	235,375 (S)	168,500 (S)
Subtotal	$412,500	$706,125	$505,500

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,624,125

AUTHORITY:

The Dept. of Environmental Protection, created in 1970, is responsible for regulating coastal land and water uses under the Coastal Area Facility Review Act (CAFRA), the Wetlands Act of 1970 and riparian statutes, under which the state owns lands at or below the mean high tide line. DEP has discretion to convey riparian lands by lease, license or sale.

DEP's Office of Coastal Zone Management, created in December 1975, is charged with uniting coastal planning and regulatory efforts under CAFRA.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will submit a draft Section 306 management program in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

New Jersey identifies the following priority issues in coastal areas.

*Large-scale residential and commercial development.
*Need to retain physical and biological value of wetlands.
*Maintenance of the supply of high-quality, readily-accessible recreation areas.
*Amelioration of adverse effects of power plants and waste disposal methods on coastal resources and ecosystems.
*Impacts of offshore oil development and oil discharges and spills.
*Recreational and economic impacts of declining shellfisheries.
*Beach erosion and shoreline stability.
*Maintenance of commercial and recreational navigation channels.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The general goal of the coastal management program is to control coastal land and water uses so as to enhance the environment and to prevent further degradation, while achieving maximum utilization of the resources. The state is attempting to address each of the identified problem/issue areas and to maintain a balance of acceptable air and water quality while meeting social and economic needs.

CURRENT STATUS:

Much of the work accomplished during the past two years has been that mandated under the auspices of the Coastal Area Facilities Review Act (CAFRA). In its third year of program development, the state intends to broaden its efforts to meet the specific requirements of the federal coastal management program.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds committed under the Coastal Zone Management Act, New Jersey is conducting a number of studies dealing with OCS energy exploration and development. The state will estimate and analyze the likely physical, social, economic, political and environmental effects of OCS leasing, exploration, development and shut-down processes on the coastal area.

Industry siting requirements will be studied and the state will attempt to establish contingency planning and legal tools for use in the event of malfunctioning of energy production systems. An analysis is being made of the capability of local governments to cope with problems and respond to opportunities of OCS resources and energy facility development.

The information gathered under this OCS study effort will be incorporated into the on-going development of a coastal management plan.

Boundary identification

Planning boundaries encompass all counties with shorelines and river banks subject to tidal influence, with emphasis being given to areas covered by CAFRA and the Wetlands Act.

Coastal program officials are evaluating the development of the CAFRA boundary in light of the federal program requirements.

Meanwhile, coastal managers are considering a multi-tiered approach to delineating the coastal boundary. Under the consideration of alternatives, the state finds that at a minimum the coastal boundary could consist of the water boundaries with adjacent states and the legislatively and judicially-defined boundaries in the riparian, wetlands and CAFRA statutes. Outside the CAFRA area, the riparian line would constitute the upland boundary along the Hudson, Hackensack, Passaic, Raritan and Delaware Rivers, as well as along Newark Bay and the Arthur Kill. In non-CAFRA areas where tidal wetlands have been delineated, the upland coastal boundary would be the line delineating areas regulated under the Wetlands Act, particularly in Gloucester, Camden, Burlington, Mercer and Union counties.

A more-inclusive boundary alternative would be to define the area by a system of roads and rights-of-way, ranging inland from the riparian and wetlands line and including coastal areas according to criteria used by DEP when it proposed the initial CAFRA boundary. The inland boundary could range from several thousand feet to a small number of miles from key coastal rivers under this approach.

The state's third alternative would be to consider the entire geologic coastal plain -- approximately that portion of the state south of U.S. 1 -- as its coastal zone.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

"Interim Land Use & Density Guidelines for the Coastal Area,"

completed in June 1976, provides interim policy guidance for uses defined by CAFRA. Precedents established in administering the three major laws are regarded as additional sources of policy guidance for identifying permissible and priority uses of the coastal area.

Steps toward defining statewide coastal land and water uses are being made through issue and policy alternative papers and by use of the environmental inventory mandated by CAFRA and the "Atlas of Coastal Area Land Development." Short-term identification is being pursued through "interim management strategies." Policy guidelines for various types of uses are being drawn in the third year of program development.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

The state made its initial presentation to the public on geographic areas of particular concern in May 1975. It is completing policy papers that designate critical and sensitive coastal areas and will institute a public GAPC nomination process in its third year of program development.

In attempting to designate GAPCs, several bases have been used. The interim land use and density guidelines classify approximately 25 land and water features of the CAFRA area into preservation, conservation and development areas. Various issue and policy alternative papers also identify as particularly important certain geographic areas such as aquifer recharge areas, historic districts, dunes and depressed urban areas. DEP's coastal managers review all proposed Green Acres state and local open space acquisition and park development grant applications in the coastal area.

In looking at potential GAPCs, the state is concerned with both environmental and socio-economic factors. It has suggested that some areas such as depressed urban areas would be candidates for designation -- an action that would imply strong encouragement for development. It also suggests that one GAPC may be the area around nuclear power plants, where low-density development might be advisable.

Public and governmental involvement

Various methods of encouraging public and governmental involvement with the ultimate decision-makers are being practiced -- largely associated with the implementation of CAFRA.

In addition to wide circulation of the proposed CAFRA procedural rules in May 1975 and March 1976, the state held two public meetings in 1975 to introduce the coastal management program. Since then, smaller meetings have been held with builders, county planning directors, environmental leaders and state agencies to seek input on preparation of the land use and density guidelines. Public hearings are held on each CAFRA permit application.

In December 1975, New Jersey issued a "Call for Information" on energy facility siting.

It worked with the American Arbitration Association on a data validation experiment and in June 1976, conducted a fact-finding beach walk along the 127-mile, five-community Atlantic coastline.

Slide shows, brochures and other mass communications methods are in use or slated for use.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Informal briefings and meetings have taken place with selected federal agencies, which also are given opportunities to comment upon drafts of proposed CAFRA regulations. Contact has been established with various federal agencies including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Depts. of the Navy and Air Force to determine their interests in coastal areas. Various federal agencies are included in public agency advisory conferences. Notice of coastal permit applications are sent to affected and interested federal agencies.

Perhaps the broadest effort to solicit interaction was the "Call for Information" to private and public concerns, soliciting mission and/or interest statements with regard to existing or potential OCS-related involvement in the CAFRA area.

During its third year of program development, the state will continue to define how the federal consistency clause will work. A state-federal coastal coordinator staff function may be established to nurture continuing interaction and provide a structure for conflict resolution.

Organizational arrangements

It is anticipated that DEP's coastal management office as presently constituted may remain the core organization responsible for the coastal program, although there may be some changes in its role and in that of the Division of Marine Resources. A coastal planning group, including a coastal information system as a service agency, may remain to keep the strategy/program current and responsive.

The state is considering the alternative roles of local government in coastal decision-making, including organizational requirements of alternative levels of decision-making, with some delegation of state authority to local agencies.

Authorities

New Jersey indicates that the state's existing CAFRA, wetlands and riparian statutes, coupled with DEP's general authority (including the ability to acquire land) may well constitute sufficient state authority to implement the management strategy and program.

In its third year of program development, the state intends to analyze and demonstrate the sufficiency of state authority to manage designated land and water uses in the coastal area by preparing case studies. Those studies will test authorities regarding waterfront redevelopment on the Hudson, liquefied natural gas facilities on the Delaware, dredge spoil disposal, major housing construction and a chemicals port and tank farm in Jersey City.

The state will draft, propose and pursue adoption of other rules and regulations, as necessary.

NEW YORK

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of State
Coastal management program contact: Henry G. Williams Jr., Director, Division of State Planning, Dept. of State, 162 Washington Ave., Albany NY 12231. (518) 474-7210, 8834.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Environmental Conservation; Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board; St. Lawrence-Eastern Ontario Commission; various local and regional bodies.

FUNDING:	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$550,000 (Federal)	$779,666 (F)	$373,000 (F)
	275,000 (State)	389,834 (S)	187,000 (S)
Subtotal	$825,000	$1,169,500	$560,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $2,554,500

AUTHORITY:

A reorganization of certain functions of state government in 1975 resulted in the statutory designation of the Dept. of State as the agency responsible for administering the state's coastal zone management program. The Division of State Planning in the Dept of State has the responsibility of carrying out the program.

In addition, the Dept. of Environmental Conservation administers several programs relating to the state's coastal resources including identification and regulation of tidal and freshwater wetlands, shellfish protection, fish and wildlife management, beach erosion control and regulation of certain dredge and fill activities. These activities are being conducted in cooperation with the state's coastal program development effort. The DEC staff also is performing other program development tasks under contract with the Dept. of State.

The Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board has been engaged in coastal resources planning for many years and has substantial planning and review authority. Long Island Sound was the subject of a federally-funded study which produced certain useful information.

The St. Lawrence-Eastern Ontario Commission is a state agency that has the statutory responsibility to prepare a comprehensive development plan and review projects within its service area, which includes 25 shoreline municipalities in the counties of St. Lawrence, Jefferson, Oswego and Cayuga. This plan must be submitted to the governor and the legislature by March 31, 1977. The St. Lawrence-Eastern Ontario Commission's activities are being conducted in a manner that is complementary and consistent with the state's coastal zone program development strategy, and the commission has a contractual relationship with the Dept. of State to perform designated tasks.

The state maintains a computerized land and water related information system and many agencies have functions relating to the coastal zone. These activities are being coordinated through a state Interagency Planning Advisory Committee. The state also works closely with and provides financial support to such bodies as the New England River Basins Commission and the Great Lakes Basin Commission.

On November 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase early in 1978 with a segmented approach beginning with Long Island's Nassau and Suffolk counties. That effort will be followed closely by submission of a coastal management plan for the St. Lawrence-Eastern Ontario coastal segment. The remainder of the state's coastal area will be included in the third and final segmented portion of its comprehensive coastal management plan.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

The following priority needs are identified by New York.

*To delimit the statewide coastal zone.
*To establish an effective line of communication with federal agencies for the purpose of ensuring state/federal coordination on coastal matters.
*To set up a statewide citizens committee that represents a cross section of coastal zone interest groups and that participates in the development of the New York coastal zone management program.
*To obtain the active participation of substate agencies throughout the state coastal zone.
*To identify, evaluate and describe geographical areas of particular concern.
*To describe and evaluate existing land and water uses.
*To determine permissible and conflicting uses of land and water in the coastal zone.
*To design a methodology for equitably administering permissible uses in the coastal zone.
*To increase the staff of the New York coastal management program.
*To identify and evaluate the various local, state and federal laws and regulations governing the coastal areas.
*To refine the various regulations and legislation in the coastal zone to eliminate overlapping authorities, to include the necessary legislation and to simplify both the citizens' use of and the administration of the coastal zone.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

New York intends to carry out the above-mentioned priority tasks and to satisfy other coastal management program development requirements by working with local governments, regional, state and federal agencies and public parties having interests in the coastal zone.

CURRENT STATUS:

Having regained the momentum lost during a reorganization of state government that necessitated an extension of the first year's grant, the New York coastal management program is accelerating its efforts to formulate a statewide management structure and to fulfill program requirements so it can apply for management program approval on a segmented basis.

During the first year, the state completed its inventory and analysis of tidal wetlands; initiated mapping of freshwater wetlands; developed procedures to identify areas of particular concern; formulated goals and objectives; specified factors that will be used in the delineation of coastal boundaries; and began to organize public participation and intergovernmental coordination procedures.

The state's coastal management program development strategy is

based upon the belief that the management program must be the product of a high degree of intergovernmental and citizen involvement. A significant portion of program development grants are being sub-allocated to local governments to aid and encourage their participation, and a statewide citizens' involvement procedure is being set up.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds committed under the Coastal Zone Management Act, New York is planning for the physical, social and economic onshore changes that could occur as a result of oil and gas leasing implementation and production on the outer continental shelf.

Focus will be on the areas most susceptible to offshore operations: New York City and the counties of Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester and Rockland. The state will identify probable benefits of offshore production on the economy; analyze need for support services; determine nature of and best place to locate onshore support facilities; evaluate effects of offshore production on state and local revenues; survey activities originating outside the state that could affect areas within it; identify critical natural resources that are vulnerable to spilled oil; and assess factors contributing to oil spills.

Existing laws will be evaluated and legislation recommended where necessary. A portion of the funds may be allocated to interstate agencies to develop a work program for each of the proposed OCS leasing areas -- Georges Bank and the Baltimore Canyon. The findings of the studies will be integrated into the development of the state's coastal zone management program.

Boundary identification

For planning purposes, the state has identified 28 coastal counties. Along the Great Lakes, the planning area extends from Chautauqua County on Lake Erie to Franklin County on the St. Lawrence River. The marine coastal area includes Long Island and the coastal counties along the Hudson River up to and including Albany and Rensselaer counties.

Initial input on delineation of management boundaries is with local governments acting through counties or regional planning agencies according to broad state guidelines. Alternative boundaries have been suggested on maps by several sub-state agencies and boundaries may be modified based on ongoing inventory and public participation.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Identification of potential development areas and possible conflicts between ecologic and economic considerations is based upon field surveys, mapping, interviews and questionnaires. The City of Rochester's Port & Estuary Plan, the Basin Water Quality Plans for the 11 water quality planning areas in New York's coastal area and studies of water supply needs and problems for regional segments of the coastal area are being used. This ongoing effort is managed by the DEC, although increased emphasis is being placed on participation of regional and local agencies under supervision of the Dept. of State.

During the second year, pilot demonstration studies will be undertaken by selected local governments. This work will include

analyses of existing development and waterfront usage; categorization of segments of the shoreline as to priority of uses; analysis of land and resource capacities and potentials; and related activities such as the development of alternative strategies.

Analysis of requirements for regional facilities within the state also will be conducted.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

This effort has involved extensive mapping, including mapping of a number of sample critical areas, review of existing materials and studies and preparation of draft guidelines by the state.

Mapping of Long Island, Hudson River and New York City tidal wetlands is completed. Inventory mapping of significant fish and wildlife habitats for that area also is completed. Mapping of freshwater wetlands in coastal counties is continuing. A flood plain management report delineated flooding and erosion problems, with particular emphasis on the New York City-Long Island area. Ongoing efforts aimed at enabling designation of geographic areas of particular concern include development of preliminary management techniques for erosion damage reduction for the north shore of Long Island and the Great Lakes coastal area. Field studies will be expanded to cover scenic and aesthetic areas and shoreland deposits. Finally, areas will be designated and categorized in order of relative priority for preservation or restoration.

Public and governmental involvement

An "outreach and feedback" program will enable the state to meet with citizens, governmental advisory committees and others having interests in the coastal zone. Regional planning commissions have established citizen and technical advisory groups that work in combination or coordination with groups concerned with areawide water quality management programs or other federal planning programs. Formal public hearings will begin in the third year of program development. Various methods of public communications will be used.

A statewide intergovernmental coordination and public involvement process has been set up to advise the Secretary of State on the the conduct of the program. This includes the following: state coastal zone management citizens advisory committee; state interagency planning advisory committee; local elected officials panel; federal agencies coastal zone management panel. In addition, a coastal zone management energy advisory panel is being organized.

A substate coordination structure also has been worked out and provides for a citizens advisory body, substate technical advisory group and local elected officials involvement in each county or regional agency. The state has encouraged individual discussions among public officials, workshop sessions with governmental groups at all levels and intergovernmental review and comment upon completion of all major tasks within the work program.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Meetings have been held with federal agencies that have interests in the coastal zone and an effort is being made to encourage federal

review of the state's work programs relating to the coastal management program. A procedure to insure proper consideration of matters of the national interest in the coastal zone is being developed. New York intends to prepare a report on federal lands within its coastal area, update and expand listings of federal and interstate programs and regulations prepared under the first year program and examine alternatives for establishing a continuing federal/state coastal zone management review process.

Organizational arrangements

The Dept. of State is expected to maintain the lead role in coastal zone management, and it probably will continue to assign administrative responsibilities to its Division of State Planning. The Dept. of Environmental Conservation will continue to have regulatory responsibilities, as will other state agencies. In line with New York's strong allegiance to home rule powers, local governments are expected to have major roles in any coastal management program. These considerations suggest that the state is likely to use a networking approach that endeavors to link applicable authorities in the overall coastal management program.

Authorities

An inventory and analysis of state and federal laws and programs affecting the coastal area has been initiated. This will form the basis for an assessment of the need for additional legislation and regulations required to implement a coastal zone management program. It is anticipated that special legislation will be needed to enable the state to satisfy requirements of the federal coastal zone management program.

NORTH CAROLINA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Natural & Economic Resources
Coastal management program contact: Dave Adams, Assistant Secretary, Dept. of Natural & Economic Resources, Box 27687, Raleigh NC 27611. (919) 829-4984.

OTHER MAJOR PARITICPATING AGENCIES: Coastal Resources Commission; Coastal Resources Advisory Council; Office of Marine Affairs, Dept. of Administration.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	2nd year supplement	
	$300,000 (Fed)	$503,000 (F)	$124,544 (F)	$12,202 (F)
	230,188 (State	251,500 (S)	62,273 (S)	15,000 (S)
Subtotal	$530,188	$754,500	$186,817	$27,202

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,498,707

2. AUTHORITY:

The Coastal Area Management Act of 1974 confers the primary authorities and duties for development of North Carolina's coastal management program on the 15-member, state-level Coastal Resources Commissions (CRC). The commission draws principal staff support from the Dept. of Natural & Economic Resources (DNER).

The act provides for a cooperative state-local program. The state establishes areas of particular environmental concern and drafts guidelines and reviews programs prepared by local governments. The local governments may and probably will assume responsibility for administering minor permits in the areas of particular concern, while the CRC is responsible for major permits.

~~On June 30~~ In, 1974, the first ~~federal~~ Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state ~~anticipates that it will~~ enters the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

North Carolina identifies the following coastal management needs.

*Provision of economic development and transportation facilities while still preserving and enhancing wildlife and fisheries habitats, cultural, historic, scenic and scientific resources.
*Protection and improvement of water quality, including management of solid waste disposal.
*Provision of a variety of shoreline recreation opportunities and protection of public rights of access to shoreline land and waters.
*Minimization of the impact of large-scale agricultural activities on coastal resources.

1. OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

North Carolina's coastal management objectives are as follows.

*To preserve and manage the natural ecological conditions of the estuarine system so as to protect, perpetuate and enhance its

natural productivity and its biological, economic and aesthetic values.

*To insure that development and preservation of the land and water resources of the coastal area proceed in a manner consistent with the capability of the land and water for development, use or preservation based on ecological considerations.

*To establish clear-cut objectives, policies, guidelines and standards for public and private uses of coastal lands and waters, and to develop effective institutional arrangements to accomplish these objectives.

CURRENT STATUS:

The North Carolina program, being drawn under the mandate of the state Coastal Area Management Act, is entering its third year of development. The Coastal Resources Commission has established interim areas of environmental concern and will establish final AECs in mid-1977. With the exception of one county and one municipality, local governments have worked with CRC guidelines and adopted land use plans acceptable to the CRC.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, North Carolina will study and plan for the potential for onshore impact of offshore oil and gas production. North Carolina will determine the potential for developing energy off its coast and attempt to assess the value of its marine resources. Additionally, it will evaluate the effects of offshore energy production in terms of people, jobs and coastal facilities; identify existing laws and regulations related to development of the outer continental shelf; and determine if new legislation is needed.

Boundary identification

Boundaries for planning and for management are coterminous and are defined by the Coastal Area Management Act. In accordance with the law, the governor has identified the following coastal counties: Currituck, Camden, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Chowan, Gates, Hertford, Bertie, Washington, Tyrell, Dare, Beaufort, Hyde, Craven, Pamlico, Carteret, Onslow, Pender, New Hanover and Brunswick. The act defines coastal areas as "the counties that (in whole or part) are adjacent to, adjoining, intersected by or bounded by the Atlantic Ocean...or any coastal sound," extending offshore to the limits of state jurisdiction. The act directs that "the inland limits of a sound on a tributary river shall be defined as the limits of salt water encroachment under normal conditions....The limits of seawater encroachment shall be considered to be the confluence of a sound's tributary river with the river or creek entering it nearest to the fartherest inland movement of oceanic salt water under normal conditions."

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Permissible uses outside areas of environmental concern have been identified as part of the plan development process undertaken by local governments. Local governments acted in accordance with standards established in the "State Guidelines for Local Planning

in the Coastal Area. CRC has approved all but two of the local plans submitted by 20 counties and 33 cities.

Each local land use plan contains five basic elements: statement of objectives, policies and standards; summary of data collection and analysis; existing land use map; land classification map; and text indicating appropriate uses for interim areas of environmental concern and maps of those areas.

The land classification map divides county or city lands into classes based on density and other state-drawn standards. The five land classes are: developed, transition, community, rural and conservation. The developed and transition areas are expected to contain and/or accommodate projected growth over a 10-year period. The community classification encompasses low-density, small-scale developments. The majority of the areas of environmental concern will be found in the rural and conservation classifications.

The CRC conducted a consistency analysis of the plans to ascertain potential conflicts and cumulative impacts. Focusing on a special concern, the CRC initiated a study of existing carrying capacity information and legal authorities for dealing with septic tank pollution problems.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

The Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA) authorizes the CRC to designate critical areas of the coastal zone as areas of environmental concern (AECs), and to develop a permit system that will assure their preservation and protection. CRC solicited local government input by asking governments to nominate AECs. Based on this input and state criteria and guidelines, CRC designated the following interim AECs in May 1976:

*Coastal wetlands -- low tidal marshland; other coastal marshlands.
*Estuarine waters.
*Resource areas - watersheds or aquifers -- small surface water supplies; special aquifer areas - outer banks and barrier islands.
*Fragile, historic or natural resource areas -- existing national or state parks; complex natural areas; areas that sustain remnant species; areas containing unique geologic formations; historic places; registered natural landmarks.
*Areas subject to public rights - certain public trust water areas.
*Natural hazard areas -- sand dunes along the Outer Banks; coastal flood plain; execssive erosion areas, including coastal inlet lands; ocean erodible areas and estuarine, sound and river erodible areas.

For each AEC and subset, guidelines provide a scientific and/or legal description, a discussion of the natural resource significance of the particular AEC, a policy objective and an indication of appropriate land uses. The state will refine permissible use determinations and develop a permit system to regulate uses within AECs and designate final AECs in 1977.

Public and governmental involvement

The public has been involved through the ability to provide input to local land use plans, serve on the Coastal Resources Advisory Countil and attend CRC meetings. The public may receive summaries of local land use plans.

State and federal government agencies have reviewed draft and final local land use plans, attend CRC meetings and review existing

state permits for work in the coastal area.

North Carolina's intergovernmental coordination, encouraged by the CAMA, centers on the performance of tasks by the Dept. of Administration's state planning and marine affairs offices; the Coastal Resources Commission; the Coastal Resources Advisory Council; and local governments. The 47-member advisory council, which meets quarterly, has been a useful conduit for transmission of information from state level to local governments. Individual council members have been involved in explaining the coastal management program to citizens' groups.

In other public involvement efforts, state officials and the CRC members have met with local government officials, planning board members, citizens' advisory groups and planners. More than 10,000 copies of the "Handbook on Public Participation in Development of Land Use Plans in Coastal Areas" have been distributed.

The state also has placed a four-part series on its coastal law in local newspapers; used radio and television spots; prepared a brochure on the law; utilized a slide-tape presentation; established a bi-monthly newsletter and a speakers bureau; distributed a bibliography on the coastal law to schools and public libraries; and developed a course on coastal issues for use by the school systems. In 1977, the state intends to distribute a synopsis of the local government's approved land use plan to each household within that government's jurisdiction.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

North Carolina has provided relevant federal agencies the opportunity to participate in the development of the state program by enabling them to review and comment on local land use plans; holding bilateral discussions; and making presentations to the Federal Regional Council.

In addition, the state is placing special emphasis on the development of a unified permit system for the coastal area which would include a greater degree of coordination between federal and state permitting requirements than exists. North Carolina's primary objectives would include development of a master permit application form that would incorporate information needs of federal and state agencies. Local permit application offices would be established to facilitate permit application processing.

Organizational arrangements

Although the organizational networks haven't been finalized, the basic roles of state agencies, commissions and local governments in comprehensive coastal management are evident. The Dept. of Natural & Economic Resources will have administrative responsibilities relevant to the federal implementation grant. The Coastal Resources Commission will be responsible for regulation of land and water uses within the areas of the coastal zone that are designated as final AECs. Its permit responsibilities will be as identified by the Coastal Area Management Act and will mesh with local governments as directed by CAMA. It will act as the focal point for administration of state permit and regulatory activity within the coastal area. Other lesser authorities are identified for the following state entities: the Attorney General's office and the Departments of Human Resources;

agriculture; Commerce (Utility Commission); Administration; Transportation; and Cultural Resources.

Authorities

Although the Coastal Area Management Act provides the state with the basic authorities required to implement its coastal management program, more than 20 statutes provide supplemental authorities.

OHIO

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Natural Resources
Coastal management program contact: Wayne Nichols, Dept. of Natural Resources, 1930 Belcher Drive, Columbus OH 43224. (614) 466-4768.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency; Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments; Eastgate Development & Transportation Agency.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year
	$200,000 (Federal)	$419,000 (F)
	166,300 (State)	220,000 (S)
Subtotal	$366,300	$639,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,005,300

AUTHORITY:

The Dept. of Natural Resources has conducted almost all of Ohio's coastal zone activites which prior to 1973 centered on engineering and geologic studies of Lake Erie and its shorelands. Since 1951, various studies have dealt with shore erosion and mineral extractions. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway led to harbor project planning. Water resources studies and planning have been conducted by the DNR's Division of Water, and fish management programs have been conducted by DNR's Division of Wildlife. DNR's Flood Plain Management Section is working to bring vulernable communities into federal flood insurance programs.

DNR organized an Ohio Shore Zone Management Workshop in 1973 to coordinate the policies and positions of the appropriate state agencies in the development of Ohio's coastal management program.

On May 15, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Ohio identifies these factors as issues to be addressed in coastal management:

*The destruction or deterioration of the resources of the Lake Erie shore zone is a major problem.
*Intensive development along the Lake shore has given rise to a complex system of competing land and water uses.
*Record high water levels in the Lake Erie Basin have greatly increased the incidence of flooding, the rate of shore erosion and resulting damage to public and private property.
*Jurisdictional overlap, duplication of efforts and fragmented approaches to a complex series of problems are obstacles to be sorted out and overcome before an effective coastal management program can be put together.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Ohio's management objectives are as follows:

*To develop a comprehensive overview of the shore resource base and a summary of the problems associated with the use of these resources.
*To inventory legal and administrative arrangements underlying state, regional and local planning and management programs in the shore area, and to recommend changes necessary to implement the management program.
*To coordinate the activities of federal agencies, the Great Lakes states, and Ohio regional and local agencies in the program development process.

CURRENT STATUS:

The momentum of Ohio's coastal planning efforts has picked up following a statewide lay-off caused by revenue constraints that occurred in September 1975. As Ohio enters its second year of coastal planning, various issues prevail. These include the need to define policies for urban coastlines, coordinate public participation in state planning within the tradition of strong home rule and examine the organizational structure it would employ in implementing a coastal management program.

Boundary identification

A natural resource inventory of Ohio's shore establishes the natural resources baseline information for the coastal management program. The inventory identified key areas that contain economically significant mineral, biologic, or hydrologic resources; hazard areas where conditions pose a threat to life or property; unique areas which are significant in that they are undisturbed and scarce; and vital areas which are necessary for maintaining biological, hydrological and physiographic coastal systems. These areas are comprised of 27 resource units that have been mapped in a nine-county series. In addition to being categorized according to their intrinsic nature, these resource units have been classified as renewable or non-renewable within a 50-year period. Federal lands also were identified in this inventory.

Supplementary to the inventory effort, background reports were prepared on critical areas and the legal and administrative arrangements affecting the Lake Erie shore area.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Ohio is identifying areas that are sensitive to use by categorizing some 27 resource units into four groupings: key areas, hazard areas, unique areas and vital areas. Working through the Ohio Capability Analysis Program (OCAP) the state is assisting local governments in determining the physical capability of the land to carry certain uses. An Impact Assessment Model for the shoreline may be used to facilitate site-specific cost/benefit analyses.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Ohio has made substantial progress in citing types of areas that may be of statewide concern in its identification of key economic areas, hazard areas, unique areas and areas which are vital to the long-term

productivity of the shoreline waters. In addition, it has researched alternative means of screening areas for inclusion into a statewide critical areas program, and considered the information and management requirements for such a program.

Public and governmental involvement

During the first year of management planning, Ohio solicited the opinions of residents, public officials and interest groups on their perceptions of problems, the quality of the shoreline, ideas for solving problems and whether public and/or private action was desirable in attempting to implement a solution.

The state staff also contracted with three regional planning commissions along Lake Erie to conduct workshops on the shore zone program. A newsletter was published quarterly reaching about 3000 subscribers. Coordination at the state level was approached by reviewing and commenting on permits, leases, A-95's and environmental impact statements affecting the shore area. An information clearinghouse was set up. Interaction with government agencies included technical assistance on data organization methods to local and regional units; participation in committees considering actions of statewide interest such as the selection of dredge disposal sites; and participation in the Great Lakes Commission and the Great Lakes Basin Commission.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Initial and on-going contact with federal agencies occurs through meeting with the Great Lakes Basin Commission Standing Committee on Coastal Management.

Organizational arrangements

Ohio hasn't determined what kind of an organizational structure it will use. The legal report prepared during the first year's work recommended that the legislature create a Commission to oversee uses within the coastal zone. The Commission would be composed of the directors of the Dept. of Natural Resources, the Dept. of Economic & Community Development, the Dept. of Environmental Protection and four citizens residing in the shore area.

Authorities

It has been recommended that Ohio establish two general types of management areas in the shoreline zone: areas of minimum management and areas of optimal management. Areas of minimum management would provide for direct local regulation consistent with state criteria. In areas of optimal management, where intensive regulation is deemed desirable because of unique value, direct state regulation would be exercised. Thus direct state regulations would occur in areas of particular concern singled out during the development of the program by the public and government officials responsible for decision-making. Local implementation, in accordance with statewide policy and guidelines for the use of the shore area, would occur in all other areas within the coastal boundary.

OREGON

GRANT RECIPIENT: Oregon Land Conservation & Development Commission
Coastal management program contact: Jim Ross,
1175 Court St., Salem OR 97310. (503) 378-4928.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Transportation; Ports Development Commission; Dept. of Economic Development; Dept. of Energy; Dept. of Forestry; city and county governments.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			Section 312 Estuarine Sanctuary
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	
	$250,132 (Federal)	$298,811 (F)	$897,135 (F)	$1,748,965 (F)
	141,214 (State)	154,406 (S)	448,586 (S)	1,748,965 (S)
Subtotal	$391,346	$453,217	$1,345,703	$3,497,930

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $2,190,266
(excludes 312 funds)

AUTHORITY:

Oregon's concern with protecting its coastal resources took a major step in 1969 with passage of the Beach Access Bill, giving citizens the right to unrestricted use of the state's beaches up to the vegetation line.

In 1971, the legislature created the Coastal Conservation & Development Commission (OCCDC). The OCCDC was directed to develop a natural resource management plan and to submit the plan to the 1975 session of the legislature. The same year, a coastal construction moratorium was imposed on state agencies until a shoreland management plan could be implemented.

Oregon's efforts were carried into 1973 by passage of Senate Bill 100, establishing the Land Conservation & Development Commission (LCDC). Four of the commission's primary duties are: to prepare statewide planning guidelines; to review regional, county and city comprehensive plans for conformance with statewide planning goals; to issue permits for activities of statewide significance; and to recommend the designation of areas of critical state concern.

When the OCCDC completed its charge in April 1975, LCDC initiated a process through which coastal policies would be reviewed, refined and adopted as additional state planning goals and guidelines specific to the coast.

On March 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state submitted its draft management program for federal review and approval of implementation in 1975. Pending approval, Oregon continues to refine elements of its program plan with funds allocated under Section 305 of the federal act.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Oregon has identified the following coastal management issues:
*Fragmentation of decision-making by special purpose units of government.
*Lack of a coordinated coastal zone planning system.
*Lack of public awareness of environmental problems.
*Inadequate information base for management of coastal resources.
*Conflicting economic and environmental interests.

*Environmental problems related to intense summer use and winter depopulation.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM:

Oregon's coastal management objectives are as follows:
*To favor preservation of natural over man-made processes to the extent necessary to insure maintenance or improvement of environmental quality.
*To insure coordination with local, state and federal agencies.
*To develop sound resource inventory and economic information as a basis for resource management decisions.
*To create public awareness of the need for resource management and insure citizen involvement in the planning process.

CURRENT STATUS:

Oregon is operating under a third year program development grant while awaiting federal review of the draft management program that it submitted in February 1976.

Oregon will conduct an environmental assessment of its proposed management program; develop and adopt coastal goals; assist local governments in preparing comprehensive land use plans and provide planning assistance grants; and coordinate goals of the program with federal and state agencies.

Additionally, Oregon will attempt to assure that state and national interests are reflected in the management program and will initiate a third phase of a study to utilize and conserve natural resources in the Lower Columbia River Estuary.

Oregon's draft program is undergoing federal environmental impact reviews.

Estuarine sanctuary

With state and federal funds authorized under Section 312 of the Coastal Zone Management Act, Oregon is attempting to establish the South Slough Estuarine Sanctuary, Coos Bay.

Three levels of management of the sanctuary include the inner tier of land immediately adjacent to the Slough, a buffer zone and the remainder of the South Slough watershed. The inner tier and possibly the buffer involve land acquisition, affecting 34 landowners. Land transfer would take place in two or three major closings.

The research program that will be conducted in the area is being designed by a team being assembled by the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology in cooperation with Oregon State University, Portland State University, the University of Oregon and the South Western Oregon Community College.

Boundary identification

Oregon's coastal area extends from the Washington border in the north to California in the south, seaward to the extent of state jurisdiction and inland to the crest of the coastal mountain range. There are three exceptions to the eastern boundary: the Umpqua River Basin, where the boundary extends to Scottsburg; the Rogue River Basin, where the boundary extends to Agness; and the Columbia River, where the boundary extends to the downstream end of Puget Island.

The coastal area ranges in width, excluding the territorial sea, from eight to forty-five miles, and includes approximately 7,811 square miles of land area.

There are several federally-owned land areas in Oregon's coastal region. The U.S. National Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management together own more than one-third of the coastal lands.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

As a result of inventories and input from resource specialists, a list of uses having direct and significant impact on coastal waters was developed. These uses constitute the permissible uses for the program and represent uses that will be controlled, guided, restricted or encouraged, as appropriate. The identified uses are: navigation and transportation; urban/idustrial, including energy production; agriculture and forestry; recreation; fish and wildlife production and utilization; public facilities; mining and minerals; and restoration. For each use, Oregon has designated the controlling authority.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Geographic areas of particular state concern are addressed through a combination of the existing state goals, draft coastal goals and existing special-purpose statutes. These areas were identified by the public and governments of all levels. Estuaries, wetlands, beaches and dunes, coastal agricultural lands, the ocean shores, offshore kelp beds and energy facility sites all have been designated as GAPCs. Existing or proposed goals establish the state concern for the first four areas. The last three are addressed by special state statutes: the Ocean Shores Act; the Kelp Fields regulations; and legislation establishing the Dept. of Energy and the Energy Facility Siting Council.

A process for identifying areas for preservation and restoration also has been established. Areas will be considered for preservation if they offer exceptional environmental, aesthetic, economic or cultural benefits and if those benefits are threatened by other uses or activities.

Areas for restoration will be identified and will include areas where the natural or cultural benefits deriving from a resource have been diminished because of degradation of the resource.

Two basic tools are available for preservation of special areas: designation as an area of critical state concern or state acquisition. Both require legislation. Before disbanding, OCCDC identified several coastal areas as potential areas of critical state concern. One of those areas, South Slough, Coos Bay, is being established as an estuarine sanctuary.

Public and governmental involvement

Major opportunities for public involvement in developing the general goals for the state included two series of 28 workshops; 17 public hearings; 17 technical advisory committees; a citizens involvement advisory committee; local officials advisory committee; state agency advisory committee; and federal agency advisory committee.

Opportunities for public involvement during the OCCDC policy development process included 21 public workshops; development and review of resource inventories; and extensive public and agency review of the draft and revised policies.

The public also is involved in development of the coastal management program through continuing review of successive drafts by the state and federal agency task forces, other advisory committees and individual cities, counties and areawide agencies and private organizations.

The responsibilities of local governments are spelled out by the state office and the legislature. Local governments are charged to develop coordinated, comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances. County government bodies coordinate and provide initial review of the plans and policies of local governments and special districts and serve as a focus for coordination and input from state and federal agencies.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

In establishing priorities of uses, the national interest has been considered in an exchange with federal agencies that have an interest in the coastal area. This exchange began in the early stages of program development by OCCDC and continued through the time of program submission.

Continued participation by these federal agencies will be necessary for the adequate development and administration of specific local coordinated plans.

Oregon has taken the eight areas in where there has been asserted a national interest in facilities siting and listed the associated facilities and cognizant federal agencies. It then shows where each of those areas was considered as it prepared its comprehensive planning goals. The eight areas are: energy production and transmission; recreation (of an interstate nature); interstate transportation; production of food and fiber; preservation of life and property; national defense and aerospace; historic, cultural, aesthetic and conservation values; and mineral resources.

Organizational arrangements and Authorities

LCDC has the ultimate responsibility for the administration and implementation of the Oregon coastal management program. This will be facilitated through the adopted statewide goals, the coastal goals which may become adopted, and the local comprehensive plans which must incorporate the goals and guidelines in their substance. The existing body of state statutes supplement and strengthen this organizational base and the administration of the program. Local, state and federal agencies and the general public will be asked to review and comment on the development, adoption, and admisistration of the local comprehensive plans.

PENNSYLVANIA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Environmental Resources
Coastal management program contact: George Fogg, Chief, Div. of Outdoor Recreation, 3rd & Reilly St., Harrisburg PA 17120. (717) 787-6674.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Erie Metropolitan Planning Dept.; Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			OCS Impact Plan
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	
	$150,000 (Fed)	$225,000 (F)	$225,000 (F)	$67,000 (F)
	75,000 (State)	112,500 (S)	112,500 (S)	33,500 (S)
Subtotal	$225,000	$337,500	$337,500	$100,500

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,000,500

AUTHORITY:

Most land use controls in Pennsylvania are in the hands of local government. Uses of the Delaware River are controlled by state and federal governments, with the commonwealth setting shipping and boating regulations and wastewater controls. Pennsylvania regulates fishing and boating on Lake Erie as well as construction within the Lake.

Land controls consist primarily of permit regulation of earthwork activity to control erosion and sedimentation. Flood control and flood damage abatement programs have existed for many years and flood plain management programs recently have been initiated.

The commonwealth's environmental master plan and its investment plan will be coordinated with the coastal management program.

One June 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The commonwealth anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Problems common to both of Pennsylvania's coastal areas -- the Lower Delaware River and Lake Erie -- revolve around duplicated authorities, fragmented responsibilities and overlapping jurisdictions and the need to resolve potentially conflicting public rights and needs and private rights.

Examining the Lower Delaware River, Pennsylvania cites the following issues and needs for coastal management.

*In this heavily urbanized and industrialized area, wastes must be adequately treated and controlled to improve water quality without causing detrimental effects on regional economy.
*The relatively small water surface area generates conflict between the volume of commercial shipping and recreational boating traffic.
*Disposal of polluted dredge spoil from the ship channels is a problem.
*The deterioration of the waterfront requires renewal techniques.
*The Tinicum Marsh is surrounded by commercial and industrial pressures.
*The area faces pressure of new deep water ports, either shore-based or on artificial islands in the estuary.

*Demands for sand and gravel production from the stream channel and along its shores call for extraction regulations.
*During periods of low flow, the oxygen block caused by concentration of pollutants frequently makes it impossible for anadromous fish to migrate upstream to spawn.

Lake Erie's problems and issues are defined as follows:

*Restoration of water quality in Presque Isle Bay is important.
*The high lake level is accelerating shoreline erosion.
*A proper balance between urban and environment-related needs is required. Recreational demands are heavy and recreational opportunities must be increased. Because the shoreline is privately owned for more than three-fourths of its length, ample access to coastal waters for fishing and boating is a severe problem.
*Should exploration for natural gas occur in Lake Erie, adequate management controls should be available.
*Sand and gravel extraction should be controlled.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Pennsylvania cites the following coastal management objectives:

*To control erosion and sedimentation.
*To move unwanted materials to locations where their presence will minimize effects upon human activities and upon the natural systems on which activities depend.
*To maximize public recreation opportunities.
*To minimize the combined economic, social and environmental cost of moving materials and people.
*To optimize the beneficial effects of wetlands on coastal uses.
*To maximize public aesthetic opportunities.
*To provide ample, low-cost fresh water of a quality acceptable for current and anticipated uses.
*To maximize the economic advantages to commerce and industry.
*To maximize the sustained dollar value of the commercial fish catch.

CURRENT STATUS:

Just into its third year of coastal management plan development, Pennsylvania has identified geographic areas of particular concern and tentatively established coastal boundaries. Through the work of impact analysis networks and a breakdown of the coastal areas into resource types, activities with direct and significant impact are being determined. From this work permissible and priority of uses will be established. The state still must concentrate on various aspects, including adoption of a coastal management policy framework and development of a method and organizational structure to implement its management program.

OCS oil and gas development

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Pennsylvania will determine physical, social and economic effects of outer continental shelf oil and gas leasing and energy production and provide policy guidance and advice for decision-making in the Delaware Estuary coastal area.

Boundary identification

The coastal waters of the Lake Erie region extend outward from

the Pennsylvania shoreline to the Lake boundary with either Ohio, New York or Canada. The coastal waters of the Delaware River region extend outward to the border in the middle of the river with New Jersey from that portion of the Pennsylvania shoreline running northeast from the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Delaware border to the limit of tidal influence in the river (the rapids near Morrisville).

Natural, man-made and jurisdictional features are being considered as bases for inland boundary determination.

The planning boundary in the Erie region is the inland border of the townships that abut the Lake. The planning boundary in the Delaware region includes those census tracts which are near either the river or tidal waters flowing into the Delaware. This extends inland three or four census tracts to a maximum of approximately three miles in the more sparsely populated areas and a minimum of one-half mile in Philadelphia.

An overall base map showing the planning boundary has been prepared for each coastal area. Overlay maps show the results of the physical resources inventory. Social and economic resources also were tabulated.

A tentative final boundary has been established in the Erie area. It runs along Route 5 west of Erie to Lake City and then along the Penn Central Railroad to the Ohio border. East of Erie, the primary boundary follows Route 5 to the New York boundary, while a secondary boundary runs along the Ashtabula Escarpment. A secondary boundary also runs along the Penn Central railroad by the Penn Electric Company site to Avonia road west of Erie.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Each region is developing its own criteria to determine those uses or use impacts that are direct and significant on coastal waters. In Erie, a use's impact will be considered direct when a change in the ambiant characteristics of the coastal waters is the immediate or primary result of a particular action, activity or use. It will be considered significant to the extent that such changes are irreversible or reversible only by use of extraordinary means; create a lasting or prolonged effect; or are of a highly controversial nature. Similar determinations are being made in the Delaware region.

In determining the acceptability and priority of these uses, studies have been conducted to determine the effects of uses on certain resource types. In the Erie region, the ability of the various resources to support development and the desirability of having certain uses occur near others is being studied. In the more developed region of Delaware, the full range of impacts of various activities in specific areas is being determined by considering the causal relationship of these uses to the resource base. These determinations, along with the inventories of existing state and local ordinances will help finalize use acceptability criteria.

Based upon its inventory of existing land uses, projected demands and analyses and information concerning the resource base, the coastal management program will set priorities on land and water uses.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

In identifying geographic areas of particular concern, Pennsylvania solicited nominations from its citizen advisory committees, steering committees, commonwealth coastal management subcommittee and regional planning commissions. Management policies and programs will be determined for each area ranging from technical assistance to acquisition.

In the Erie region, the entire shoreline is designated a GAPC based on its erosion tendencies. The area involved extends back to a distance of 50 times the 30-year average annual recession rate. Pennsylvania also has designated as GAPCs the vineyard areas, a proposed power plant site and land that a steel company has targeted for development. Other designated GAPCs in the Erie region include Erie Harbor, Presque Isle and Twenty Mile Creek. The commonwealth would like to purchase the Elk, Six Mile and Twenty Mile Creek areas.

In the Delaware region, the Tinicum Marsh, Van Sciver Lake and various creek inlets, and Little Tinicum Island are examples of GAPCs. Development-oriented GAPCs include a steel plant, the airport and Port Richmond.

Public and governmental involvement

In the Delaware region, there are quarterly meetings of each of the three county citizen advisory committees, which are composed of environmental, citizen and business groups. There also is a central steering committee whose six voting representatives include one from each of the three counties, one from the City of Philadelphia, and two representing the local general purpose governments of Bucks and Delaware counties. Non-voting membership consists of observers from various business, environmental and citizen groups, federal agencies, the Port Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission and representatives from the three citizen advisory committees.

"Tidings," a newsleter, is put out quarterly. Newspaper coverage and radio spots are employed. A library repository system was set up at key locations.

In the Erie region, a series of bi-monthly joint steering and citizen advisory committee meetings were held for each of the three planning areas. Each community on the shore has voting members on these committees.

Newspapers, radio and television are used to help publicize the coastal management program and brochures and slide shows are available. Library receptacles have been set up. "Erie County CZM Public Participation" documents Pennsylvania's efforts in that area. A public hearing has been held and a questionnaire on local concerns was distributed and the results analyzed and published.

The regional planning commissions do much of the program's technical work and are integrally involved in the program development process. They also attend meetings of the State Agency Coordinating Council Subcommittee on Coastal Zone Management. Draft documents and work programs are reviewed and critiqued by the citizen and steering committees, which help guide the direction of the program.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Pennsylvania has been coordinating its program with federal agencies through periodic mailings of completed work reports for review and comment. Several meetings of the Federal Regional Council have focused on intergovernmental aspects of coastal management and methods to address the region-wide implications of various states' coastal management plans.

A procedure is being devised by which the state will identify and assess the influence of federal interest in facility siting. Facilities of regional benefit and facilities of national interest will be defined

and a general listing of those facilities will be prepared. The procedure will attempt to assure that unreasonable or arbitrary restrictions and exclusions relative to facilities siting don't occur.

Organizational arrangements

Existing statutes, administrative regulations, judicial decisions, executive orders and inter-agency agreements are being analyzed and put into a legal framework and organizational structure to implement policies developed for coastal management. This exercise will identify the legal constraints or prohibitions of state or local powers concerning uses of the coastal area.

It is most likely that the Dept. of Environmental Resources, which administers the coastal planning funds, will be the lead agency for program implementation.

Authorities

In the Erie area, the commonwealth has absolute authority over the Lake and the lands it covers. The DER must approve any mining, dredging or protrusion into the Lake. Pennsylvania will request that local governments adopt erosion hazard setbacks in their zoning ordinances as well as adopt the general policies of its program.

In the Delaware region, the commonwealth owns the river bed from the low water mark on the Pennsylvania side to the low water mark on the New Jersey side. Philadelphia County has some jurisdiction over uses of the river bed also. The DER has authority over dredge and fill, mining, etc., while the DOT has jurisdiction over water obstructions. The commonwealth is undecided as to which method of control it will use in the Delaware region. In both areas, various authorities over air and water pollution, solid waste management, state lands, etc., will be incorporated into the program.

Having devised a policy framework after a series of meetings with state and local officials, Pennsylvania will be prepared to assign responsibilities for policy implementation in an effort to accomplish its coastal management objectives.

RHODE ISLAND

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Administration
Coastal management program contact: Daniel W. Varin, Chief, Statewide Planning Program, 265 Melrose St., Providence RI 02907. (401) 277-2656.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Coastal Resources Management Council; Dept. of Natural Resources; University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$154,415 (Federal)	$304,440 (F)	$118,400 (F)
	81,855 (State)	152,227 (S)	59,200 (S)
Subtotal	$236,270	$456,667	$177,600

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $870,537

AUTHORITY:

The Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Program is an outgrowth of state legislation that in 1971 established the 17-member Coastal Resources Management Council. The CRMC is closely related to the Div. of Coastal Resources within the Dept. of Natural Resources, which serves as its staff arm, and to the Coastal Resources Center of the University of Rhode Island, which provides technical assistance. The Legislature acted in response to a 1956 study made in the aftermath of hurricane damage to the shoreline and after a gubernatorially-appointed committee in 1970 recommended that a coastal management mechanism be created to prepare a comprehensive coastal management plan.

The council has authority to approve, modify, set conditions for or reject development proposals for coastal waters, with the burden of proof falling on the developer. In coastal land areas, the council has the power to "approve, modify, set conditions for or reject the design, location, construction, alteration and operation of specified activities or land uses when these are related to a water area under the agency's jurisdiction...."

On March 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Rhode Island's coastal management efforts grew out of state concern over the following problems and issues.

*Preemption of the shoreline for the benefit of a few individuals.
*Permanent preemption of public waters without planning and without cost to the beneficiaries through construction of docks, breakwaters, marinas and private residential developments.
*Lack of "best use" guidelines and controls for the location of power plants, industrial enterprises requiring waterfront locations, recreational service businesses such as marinas and residential developments.

*Lack of adequate plans for handling dredge materials, toxic wastes, solid wastes and other potential pollutants.
*Inability of the state and private groups to acquire substantial wildlife, recreational and open space holdings for the public.
*Inadequate administrative tools for developmental control through the exercise of police powers, zoning, easements and other devices.
*Inadequate information about public needs and preferences.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The overriding goal of the Rhode Island effort is the development and implementation of a coastal resources management program for the optimum protection and use of the coastal region's resources.

CURRENT STATUS:

After approximately five years of experience in coastal resources management and two years of management planning with federal coastal program assistance, a draft coastal resources management plan has been submitted to the federal government for preliminary review. There have been previous opportunities for public and private review of the draft program and the URI Coastal Resources Center has prepared documents describing the program. Hearings on the draft environmental impact statement on the program plan were held in 1976 and final approval of the program is anticipated in 1977.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds commited under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Rhode Island is conducting a series of studies to determine the social, economic and environmental effects of offshore energy production on its 419-mile coastline. Particular attention will focus on the area surrounding the former naval air station at Quonset Point and the adjoining Davisville Construction Battalion Center for use as a service base.

The state will attempt to determine what types of energy facilities might be located along the coast, the most suitable areas for placing them, their possible effects upon critical natural areas and what auxiliary facilities might be needed onshore in the event of offshore operations. The information gathered in the OCS impact study will be incorporated into the ongoing development of the coastal management program. The grant is being administered by the Statewide Planning Program.

Boundary identification

The state has adopted a two-tiered approach to its inland boundary definition. The first tier includes the shoreline, intertidal and transitional areas and other land areas subject to CRMC jurisdiction. The second tier, less amenable to mapping, is keyed to uses demonstrating a potential for direct and significant impacts on coastal waters regardless of their location. Cooperative institutional agreements between the CRMC and other state agencies with authorities over air and water pollution control and freshwater wetlands management have been made to insure implementation of those responsibilities in a manner supportive of and integral to the coastal management program.

The legislation creating the CMRC granted it jurisdiction over certain land uses and activities regardless of their location where there is reasonable probability of conflict with a resources management plan or of damage to the coastal environment. Those uses are: power generation and desalination plants; chemical and petroleum processing, transfer or storage; minerals extraction; sewage treatment and disposal and solid waste disposal facilities.

Federal-state differences regarding the seaward boundary are under discussion.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

The CRMC has determined that the best approach to permissibility is through a combination of generally-applicable criteria and policies and the application of specific regulations over specific activities and uses and/or areas in the coastal region. The policies and criteria established reflect an assessment of the impact-generating potential of specific uses and activities and the ability of proposed sites to absorb those impacts.

Policies and criteria adopted by the CRMC are as follows.

*Direct orientation to the coastal region and need of a site there.
*Capacity of the site to support such development in terms of water supply, sewage disposal, solid waste disposal, transportation access and facilities, other supporting services and facilities, soil suitability, susceptibility to flooding, storm damange and other factors.
*Capacity of the area to support development that may result from the granting of a council permit.
*Effects on the cultural environment.
*Economic development needs such as quantity and quality of employment.
*Compatibility with nearby uses and activities.
*Consistency with public and private plans and studies, particularly with local comprehensive community plans.
*Consistency with the State Guide Plan.
*Consideration of cumulative, long-term effects as well as localized, short-term effects.
*Contribution to public use of, enjoyment of and access to the coast.

CRMC also recognizes the following management considerations.

*Impact on national security and military contingency requirements.
*Compatability with applicable federal laws, standards and regulations.
*Compatability with public views, opinions and priorities.
*Impacts on geographic areas of particular concern, as defined.

Those land and water uses in areas outside the direct jurisdiction of the CRMC that may exercise significant impacts on coastal waters are regulated by freshwater wetlands regulations and air and water pollution controls.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Prior to identifying geographic areas of particular concern, CRMC identified land and water uses that affect or produce statewide or regional benefits. While these uses, as well as those that show a clear national interest, are identified, Rhode Island has determined that it is most effective to manage all uses and areas of greater than local concern under uniformly-applied procedures and criteria.

In turning to identify geographic areas of particular concern, Rhode Island has designated 17 types of GAPCs, 12 of those which are further designated for preservation and restoration. Those in the latter category are: coastal natural areas; areas of highest water quality; historic coastal areas; intertidal salt marshes; barrier wetlands; prime fishing grounds; existing recreation, conservation and open space areas; proposed recreation, conservation and open space areas; public rights-of-way to the shore; beaches and dunes; barrier beaches; and marine sand and gravel deposits.

The five additional GAPCs are: ports and navigation areas; existing coastal dependent commercial and industrial sites; potential coastal-dependent commercial and industrial sites; military installations and military operating areas; and urban waterfronts.

Each area has been inventoried and mapped and general priorities for its use have been determined.

Public and governmental involvement

Rhode Island has identified broad interest groups and key groups within each category that have interest in or are likely to be affected by the state coastal management program. It can point to a history of public involvement in coastal program development, citing activities that grew out of the 1969-1971 efforts of the Governor's Committee on the Coastal Zone and the policies established by the CRMC after its creation. As the coastal program has developed, affected and/or interested citizens groups and individuals have been encouraged to participate in the process.

Citizens advisory committees have been established. Two coastal field days were held to acquaint Rhode Islanders with barrier beaches. Mass communications efforts have employed use of brochures, exhibits, workshops and radio and television programming.

To coordinate with governmental groups, a CRMC speakers bureau has been established, key agencies receive copies of coastal program documents for review and comment and forums and workshops have been held. On a regional front, Rhode Island works within the New England River Basin Commission. Public hearings are a continuing practice.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Twenty-nine plans prepared by eight state agencies have been identified as being relevant to the coastal resources management program.

Direct contact has been made with the majority of relevant state agencies and formal cooperative arrangements have been set with some. There are various advisory committees that facilitate input from state and federal agencies.

The consideration of the national interest, in the absence of other criteria, is based upon awareness of the mandated responsibilities, programs and policies of federal agencies. The state has compiled position papers and policy statements pertaining to federal agency interest in or functions relevant to coastal management.

It buttresses this documentation with the recognition that resource uses and facilities that provide services, amenities or other benefits to the nation are of national interest.

The state hasn't found it useful to apply separate management criteria to siting national interest facilities. The state finds that federal activities in which there is an indisputable, overriding national interest are protected by Constitutional guarantees and federal laws that are binding on lesser jurisdictions.

To elicit continued federal review and feedback, Rhode Island has invited all interested federal agencies to participate as members of the Federal Policy Advisory Committee, which meets quarterly with special sessions as necessary.

The state will continue to utilize the New England River Basin Commission and the New England Regional Commission as focal points and forums for addressing regional issues and coordinating management.

Organizational arrangements

Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Management Program consists of the CRMC as the legislatively designated principal mechanism for management of coastal resources, and three other agencies that cooperate in program implementation under statuatory obligations and formal interagency agreements. Those additional three agencies are the Statewide Planning Program, the Dept. of Natural Resources and the Dept. of Health.

Authorities

The governor's legal officer has certified that the state has the required authorities and is prepared to implement other necessary actions required to implement the objectives, policies and individual components of the CRMP. In citing the Coastal Resources Management Council as the lead agency to implement authorities and administer program implementation grants, the state counsel has found that other coordinated state agencies have the requisite authority to administer land and water regulations, control development and resolve conflicts in accordance with the proposed coastal resources management program.

SOUTH CAROLINA

GRANT RECIPIENT: South Carolina Coastal Zone Planning & Management Council
Coastal management program contact: Andy Laurent, Wildlife & Marine Resources Dept., 1116 Bankers Trust Tower, Columbia SC 29201. (803) 758-8442.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Wildlife & Marine Resources Dept.; Dept. of Health & Environmental Control; Water Resources Commission; State Ports Authority; State Development Board; Land Resources Conservation Commission.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	
	$198,485 (Fed)	$221,000 (F)	$417,257 (F)	$60,665 (F)
	100,015 (State)	114,793 (S)	208,853 (S)	28,116 (S)
Subtotal	$298,500	$335,793	$626,110	$88,781

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,349,184

AUTHORITY:

State agency activities in South Carolina's coastal area traditionally were characterized by fragmented authorities and overlapping jurisdictions. Twelve state agencies administered 33 programs involving the coastal area.

In 1973, the governor created the South Carolina Coastal Zone Planning & Management Council. It was instructed to develop and recommend to the General Assembly within three years a planning and management program together with the necessary legislation to implement such a program.

Late in 1976, the governor, by executive order, created a new 23-member council which is comprised of representatives of the coastal counties, the large municipalities and environmental interests. Core staff is supplied by the Wildlife and Marine Resources Dept.

In addition, a Coastal Zone Management Advisory Committee has been established. It is comprised of university members, four representatives of private interests and representatives from each of the three coastal regional councils of government. Of the 33 state programs identified as affecting the coastal area, 29 are administered directly by members of the council or its advisory committee.

On May 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

South Carolina identifies the following coastal management issues.

*The state lacks mechanisms to identify priority industries, to identify and protect important industrial sites and to guide construction in a way that minimizes environmental impacts.

*Increased coastal development is creating pressure on existing resource uses, primarily recreation and commercial fishing.

*Domestic and industrial wastewater, air emissions, spoil deposition and the generally unregulated spread of economic development are degrading environmental quality.
*Although the development of tidal wetlands has been brought under some control, the destruction of less publicized natural and cultural areas continues.
*Much resort and urban growth has occurred without consideration of such hazards as flooding, hurricanes, unsuitable soils and erosion.
*The authority to regulate land and water use, provide required support services and undertake planning is fragmented, particularly at the local level.
*Major controversies have developed around the administration of federal and state permit systems.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

South Carolina's coastal program objectives are as follows.
*To insure the quality of the coastal environment while recognizing and accounting for the economic and social needs of coastal residents and the people of the state.
*To prepare a comprehensive, coordinated and enforceable program for the orderly growth and development of coastal resources.
*To minimize conflicts among coastal activities and users by determining the public's desires, determining the capacity of coastal resources to support these desires, establishing priorities where capacities and uses can't be matched and informing the public of the expected benefits and costs of particular decisions.
*To identify and reconcile the local, state and national interest.
*To develop and implement a viable public involvement program.

CURRENT STATUS:

South Carolina, in its third year of coastal program planning, is hoping for passage of coastal management legislation. A bill will be submitted to the Legislature in January 1977.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, South Carolina will help local governments, especially in the areas of Jasper and Georgetown Counties, develop the technical capability of planning for and dealing with onshore developmental pressures that may result from activities associated with outer continental shelf oil and gas development. Three areas in the state that are most likely to be impacted by OCS development are the Savannah River Corridor, Charleston Harbor and Winyah Bay. The state will identify corridors appropriate for pipelines as part of its OCS work.

Boundary identification

For planning purposes, South Carolina's coastal area consists of eight coastal counties: Horry, Georgetown, Berkeley, Charleston, Dorchester, Colleton, Beaufort and Jasper.

In attempting to delineate management boundaries, South Carolina has considered state legislation that would define the coastal area as

consisting of "all coastal waters and submerged land seaward to the state's jurisdictional limits and all lands and waters (in the counties listed above) which are critical areas and are uplands adjacent to critical areas...."

Coastal waters are defined in the proposed legislation as "those navigable waters adjacent to shorelines and which contain a measurable quantity or percentage of sea water...."

"Uplands adjacent" refers to those areas which "might potentially...be proposed as sites for future residential, commercial, recreational or industrial development that is generated due to the proximity of critical areas or shorelines; or...are likely to generate, or are now subject to, uses which may directly impact critical areas through water pollution, siltation, erosion or direct encroachment...."

Natural resource inventories and analyses, soil capacity studies and a study of the salt/fresh water interface are being pursued in an effort to further define and geographically locate the boundaries articulated in the proposed legislation.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

South Carolina, acknowledging that it suffers from a critical lack of data concerning its coastal processes, has been attempting to allocate funds to fill critical portions of this information void. The state interprets proposed legislation to include council permitting authority over activities directly and significantly affecting the legislatively-defined critical areas. But, a method for identifying those activities hasn't been developed.

South Carolina anticipates, however, that criteria governing development on and/or general uses of critical areas will be promulgated in the firm of rules and regulations. Those standards will be the primary land use mechanism used to implement the management plan.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Under proposed legislation, four major categories of critical areas are specified: tidelands; beaches; coastal waters; and primary ocean front sand dunes. All are defined with reference to ecological characteristics. Broadly defined priority of uses are designated for tidelands and ocean front sand dunes. Efforts relative to delineation of these critical areas include maps and inventories of watercourses and wetlands; beaches; beach erosion areas; fish and shellfish habitats; and water quality.

Public and governmental involvement

While South Carolina has identified state agencies that have some interest in the coastal area and has contracted with a number of them for technical work, there has been scant concentration as yet on policy interaction. Three regional Councils of Governments, Waccamay, Charleston and Low Country, are contracted to map coastal uses and develop projections for land demands and patterns.

A primary focus of South Carolina's public information program has been associated with pending state legislation. In addition to meetings with elected officials in coastal communities and statewide public hearings on proposed state legislation, public information efforts have included programs on the educational television network,

TV and radio spots, presentation of a slide show to general purpose organizations, distribution of two pamphlets and establishment of a telephone hotline on coastal issues. The state also is working with the League of Women Voters to establish a statewide network for reaching primary and secondary opinion-makers.

The state is working through the Coastal Plains Regional Commission and other regional bodies to insure coordination with the plans of adjacent states.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

South Carolina has contacted federal agencies, notifying them of the coastal management program development process and soliciting their responses as to their jurisdictions and interests in state coastal resources. Those responses are being compiled.

Organizational arrangements

The major thrust of South Carolina's effort to network its various coastal management authorities will be to construct an interface among the authorities provided the coastal council in pending legislation, police power authorities presently being exercised or available to local governments and management authorities inherent in the areawide water planning effort. The interface will consist of administrative review by the council of local police power ordinances and memos of agreement between the council and the three areawide water planning agencies on the South Carolina coast.

Authorities

The state is looking toward the eventuality of legislation that recognizes the need for state and local cooperation in a number of ways. A bill considered but not passed by the 1976 Legislature required the state to make available to local governments technical assistance and grants to aid in the formulation of zoning ordinances prior to acceptance of them as part of the management plan. New legislation will be filed during the 1977 Legislative session.

Standards governing development and uses of critical areas will be the primary land use mechanism used to implement the management plan. In non-critical areas, the state will look for additional mechanisms to manage uses, such as management arrangements with individual sub-state agencies and administrative review of local police power ordinances.

TEXAS

GRANT RECIPIENT: Texas General Land Office
Coastal management program contact: Ron Jones, Texas Coastal Management Program, 1705 Guadalupe, Austin TX 78701. (512) 475-6902.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Texas Coastal & Marine Council; Highway Dept.; Industrial Commission; Parks & Wildlife Dept.; Water Quality Board; Water Development Board; Texas Historical Commission; Air Control Board; Water Rights Commission; Dept. of Health Resources; Railroad Commission; Bureau of Economic Geology.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development			OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	
	$360,000 (Fed)	$620,000 (F)	$900,000 (F)	$300,000 (F)
	189,003 (State)	448,401 (S)	538,713 (S)	49,054 (S)
Subtotal	$549,003	$1,068,401	$1,438,713	$349,054

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $3,405,171

AUTHORITY:

The Open Beaches Act of 1959 recognized the historic right of public access to Texas beaches and directed the Attorney General to defend the right. In 1961, a four-year study of the state's bays and beaches culminated in the enactment of legislation mandating protection of the public interest in the bays, islands, beaches and submerged lands of the coast. In order to obtain more information about the coastal area and its processes, the Coastal Resources Management Program (CRMP) was launched through the governor's office, with financial support from the state Legislature. In 1973, CRMP studies and recommendations were made to the legislature. These included a report on legal and institutional arrangements, and studies of bay and estuarine management, transportation, economic development, power plant siting and waste management.

Legislation enacted in response to the recommendations touched on many areas: research and teaching programs, park development, fish and wildlife management, curtailment of subsidence, sand dune protection, beach management, port and harbor development and public land management. The Coastal Public Lands Management Act of 1973 directs the state to take the lead in enlightened management of coastal resources.

On June 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Texas has identified the following coastal management problems.

*State policy planning and coordination is inadequate to insure effective and economical government.

*The state's data management and research coordination practices don't adequately serve management needs.

*Present state decision-making processes aren't sufficiently responsive to the complex interactions among the natural and economic systems of the coast.
*Further data and information programs are needed in response to coastal hazards.
*New policies and programs are needed to assure balanced management of the state's bay and estuarine systems.

Texas identified the following specific issues of coastal management during its second year of program development: the need for sustained economic development; increased recreational pressures arising from urban population growth, industrialization and other causes; the need for freshwater inflows to the bays and estuaries; the need to enhance the capability of local governments to identify and resolve coastal problems; residential, resort and other developments requiring the dredging or filling of wetlands; the consequences of accelerated energy resource development -- particularly outer continental shelf oil and gas development -- upon the nearshore and upland coastal areas; the prevention and mitigation of coastal hazards; and the improvement of existing permitting processes and coordinating mechanisms pertinent to coastal resources.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Texas' goal is to recommend means to improve present multiple and disjunct management processes so that a reasoned balance of environmental, economic and social considerations can be reached and implemented effectively and economically.

The goal of the program development stage of the Texas coastal management program is to devise a management process by which the above-stated goal would be reached. While this goal is procedural, it doesn't preclude the making of new policy with respect to important coastal issues. Recognizing that the responsibility for policymaking lies with the legislature and the state's various agencies, the Texas coastal management program seeks to:
*Identify and confirm the significance of the issues for which improved management processes are needed.
*Establish improved means by which to anticipate and evaluate policy alternatives so that all affected decision-makers may be better advised of their options.
*Propose means to improve intergovernmental coordination.
*Develop more effective means of public information and participation.

CURRENT STATUS:

Into its third year of coastal program planning, Texas in June 1976 stated its directions in the "Draft Texas Coastal Management Program." In the report, the General Land Office recommended that four basic changes be made in order that the state may improve management of its coastal area. Those recommendations are: the Interagency Council on Natural Resources & the Environment should be restructured to serve as a policy-level council for reviewing, proposing and coordinating coastal management policies and activities; an organized information system, housed in the governor's office, should be established; the "Activity Assessment Routine" should be established for assessing, in advance, the probable economic, environ-

mental and social effects of specific activities planned for particular coastal locations; and the boundary should include coastal waters and only those shorelands closely related to those waters.

Public hearings set for August will lead to final recommendations for consideration by the governor and the state legislature.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Texas will continue studies directed at determining the impact of outer continental shelf oil and gas development. Texas will seek to determine the increased need for marine facilities and improved navigation; the location of pipeline corridors; the expansion of storage and refining facilities; the secondary impacts of additional jobs and people working in those jobs; the sudden demand for more social services; and the techniques for mitigating adverse effects. The state also will provide policy advice on OCS matters to the governor and the state legislature. The results of the studies will be incorporated into the ongoing development of the comprehensive coastal management program.

As a result of previous studies, Texas has produced an annotated bibliography on the onshore impacts of OCS development and designed five coastal region input/output models for use in predicting effects of OCS production.

Boundary identification

For initial planning purposes, Texas' coastal area covered 28 coastal counties. Included within those areas are such major urban centers as Houston-Galveston, Beaumont-Port Arthur, Victoria, Corpus Christi and Brownsville. The area within the proposed management boundary is smaller.

The seaward boundary of the Texas coastal zone coincides with the seaward limit of the state's jurisdiction as determined by the Supreme Court. The northern lateral boundary of the state's coastal zone is defined by the adjudicated boundary between Texas and Louisiana. The southern lateral boundary is determined by treaty between the Republic of Mexico and the United States. Documentation and mapping of these boundaries has been largely concluded.

The landward boundary of the Texas coastal zone hasn't been determined finally, although a set of alternative boundaries has been proposed. The proposed alternatives were arrived at by consideration of the following factors: the landward extent of jurisdiction necessary to control those uses of lands and waters which have been determined to have direct and significant impacts upon coastal waters; ease of administration; and considerations of certainty, notice and cultural factors.

The identification of federally-owned lands within the state's coastal waters or within the first tier of counties along the coast has been substantially concluded. However, final determination hasn't been made as to which, if any, of those lands will be "excluded lands" within the meaning of the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

The state has conducted an inventory of natural and man-made

resources in its coastal area and is developing a method for relating various specific land and water uses to impacts upon coastal waters. An operational meaning for "direct and significant impact" is being developed, and a method to analyze the capability of coastal resources to support various uses is ingredient in the operational definition of "direct and significant impact." A method for analyzing the environmental impact of reasonable resource utilization also will result from that procedure.

Texas' inventory procedure has identified 18 "composite resource area" categories. Each of those areas has been described in terms of its distinguishing features and identified on maps of the coastal zone.

To implement the performance standard approach for determining permissible uses, state agencies with permit authority within the coastal area would be directed to adopt the Activity-Assessment Routing (AAR) developed by the GLO. The AAR, when used in conjunction with the proposed data system to be located in the governor's office, would provide permit agencies with data concerning the probable economic, environmental and social impacts that a specific use would have on a particular coastal resource.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Preliminary identification of general areas of particular concern has been sought from state and federal agencies. Among the GAPCs suggested are: critical habitats; state and national parks, preserves and refuges; state management areas, hatcheries and laboratories; urban and rural natural areas; trails and waterways; marine grass flats, marshes and tidal creeks; oyster reefs; active floodplains, areas of hurricane tidal flooding, washover channels; active faults, areas of land subsidence; fore island dunes, active dunes and blowouts; air quality maintenance areas; agricultural lands used for citrus, rice, sugar cane or range land; commercial stands of trees; emergency evacuation corridors; deepwater port facilities, mineral resource areas and industrial sites; impoundments, water resource districts, and points of water diversion; and coastal waters.

Those preliminary designations were evaluated by the public and local government officials at workshops held between November 1975 and April 1976, and by the technical subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee. Following hearings scheduled for August 1976, the GLO will propose recommendations for legislative consideration and/or designation.

The emerging concept is that designation of GAPCs will serve as notice to public/private interests that there are state interests (often supported by regulations or stringent permit requirements) in particular areas, with the implication being that required permits will be harder to get in those areas than in non-GAPCs. The state already has programs of regulation, study, enhancement, development, preservation, etc., directed to those areas.

Public and governmental involvement

Fifteen state agencies have been involved in the inventorying efforts and in preliminary identification of GAPCs. In addition, the

Interagency Council on Natural Resources & the Environment, comprised of state agencies with related resource interests, serves as a review body.

The most important state agencies for implementation purposes appear to be the water-related agencies (Water Development Board, Water Quality Board and the Water Rights Commission), the Parks & Wildlife Dept., Air Control Board, Coastal & Marine Council, the Antiquities Commission, the General Land Office, the Railroad Commission and the Bureau of Economic Geology.

The councils of governments have set up public information meetings, and provide data for and review and comment on technical efforts. At the local government level, briefings are being provided for county judges and mayors.

In its public involvement efforts, Texas utilizes a 41-member advisory committee and has held several series of public hearings in various coastal locations and in Austin to solicit input on components of the coastal management plan. Public hearings on management recommendations are scheduled prior to submission of a program package for legislative consideration.

Additionally, Texas' public information/education efforts have included distribution of a film, "Faces of the Coast," to civic groups and businesses; publication of a newsletter; distribution of technical reports; and distribution of brochures.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Texas has made use of the Federal Regional Council and held bilateral discussions with directly affected federal agencies in order to provide relevant federal agencies with the opportunity to participate in the development of the Texas coastal management program. As a result of this consultation, Texas has identified federal lands and areas of national interest located within the coastal area and catalogued the national interests of relevant federal agencies. Federal agencies through the FRC have been asked to help identify GAPCs.

Organizational arrangements

Texas will use existing direct state control to regulate land and water uses within its coastal area. It is proposing to rationalize delivery of coastal programs by existing state agencies, with the restructured Interagency Council on Natural Resources & the Environment (ICNRE) playing a key role in coordinating management efforts. Accordingly, the GLO has recommended that the ICNRE be reconstructed to serve as the policy-level council for reviewing, proposing, and coordinating the state's coastal policies and activities; and that the governor's office serve as the designated state agency to administer management program implementation.

Authorities

Although Texas expects to use existing statutes to implement the majority of its proposed coastal management program, the GLO will, following public hearings in August 1976, develop a program package for the 1977 Legislature. At a minimun, this package is expected to include delineation of additional state policies and wetlands legislation.

VIRGINIA

GRANT RECIPIENT: Division of State Planning & Community Affairs
Coastal management program contact: Don Budlong, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce & Resources for Planning, Richmond VA 23219. (804) 786-7652.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences; Virginia Marine Resources Commission.

FUNDING:	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$251,044 (Federal)	$367,810 (F)	$35,710 (F)
	125,522 (State)	181,147 (S)	20,613 (S)
Subtotal	$376,566	$548,957	$56,323

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $981,846

AUTHORITY:

The Office of Commerce& Resources for Planning is the responsible agency for the administration of the coastal management program. Since various coastal related programs were initiated in response to perceived needs, planning responsibilities are shared with the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences (VIMS) and the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC). Coordination is facilitated through the Coastal Resources Management Advisory Committee, comprised of the directors of eight agencies with coastal interests.

In addition, the Virginia General Assembly in February 1975 established a Coastal Study Commission to study the "offshore, interface and onshore effects of possible exploration and development of the outer continental shelf adjacent to Virginia's coast." The commission is to report to the governor and the General Assembly on December 1, 1976.

Regional Advisory Committees to the Office of Commerce & Resources for Planning were established in some of the coastal planning districts in an attempt to provide forums for describing the intent of the program and developing issue analysis and assessment.

The Virginia Wetlands Law of 1972 provides a major coastal management tool. It makes illegal the modification of tidal wetlands without a permit. It defines wetlands as that area of the coastal zone within 1.5 times the tidal range, measured from mean low water, when certain grasses are present. Counties choosing to establish wetlands boards may issue permits. In the absence of county boards, permits are issued and reviewed by VMRC and VIMS.

On August 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

In general, Virginia's primary concern is that demands for shoreline development of all types are increasing, as are the impacts associated with some of those activities. Methods of controlling

such pressures often are inadequate, with degraded water quality an all-too-often typical result of the increasing pressures of population and growth.

Only 50 miles of Virginia's 3,000-mile shoreline are open to the public, much of it in the Virginia Beach area.

Virginia identifies its rural Eastern Shore as an area likely to experience impacts of offshore harbor and petroleum developments of the future.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Virginia cites the following objectives of its coastal program.

*To foster cooperation among all levels of the public and private sectors to preserve the aesthetic and natural resources of the coastal area.
*To relate activities, public and private, to the utilization of existing natural resources.
*To establish a process that enables decisions to be made so that natural resources are managed to achieve optimum levels of economic and social vitality.
*To progressively improve and maintain the water quality of estuarine rivers, bays and seas.
*To identify and protect groundwater sources and suppliers.
*To preserve, to the maximum extent practicable, the coastal wetlands.
*To improve and maintain commercial and sport marine life.
*To utilize marine resources at or below a level of maximum sustainable yield.
*To identify and manage vital wildlife areas.
*To minimize the irreversible use of non-renewable natural resources.
*To identify and protect the significant aspects of the social heritage of the commonwealth.
*To enhance public and private recreational opportunities.
*To locate new development in an orderly pattern allowing for efficient utilization of land and water resources.
*To provide efficient mobility within and through the coastal zone.
*To maintain channels for viable marine transport while providing positive solutions to the removal and disposal of dredged spoil.
*To develop an efficient use and environmentally safe means for cargo transfer within major ports.
*To encourage economic growth while safeguarding and maintaining use options to the maximum extent possible.

CURRENT STATUS:

Just into its second year of program planning, Virginia has been primarily involved with data collection and public discussions of coastal management. Responsibility for administering the program has changed hands, passing to the Office of Commerce & Resources for Planning with dissolution of the Division of State Planning & Community Affairs.

In the second year's work, the commonwealth intends to define its coastal boundary; draft its procedure for determining permissible and priority uses for land and water areas; formulate management program alternatives for areas of particular concern; define procedures for federal involvement in implementation and administration of the coastal plan; continue to involve the general public and various levels

of government in program formulation; prepare a plan outlining integration of agencies required for a comprehensive program; and prepare legislative proposals where needed.

In its third year of study, Virginia will define its management strategy, procedure and organization requirements and develop mechanisms whereby the public will be able to review and comment prior to final coastal management program recommendations. The Office of Commerce & Resources for Planning is developing a draft plan scheduled for completion in early 1977.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds commited under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Virginia is attempting to formulate a strategy to deal with OCS issues.

The legislatively-created Coastal Study Commission will report to the General Assembly on OCS and coastal management issues.

Boundary identification

The coastal planning area, comprised of nine planning districts, served as a basis for developing a procedure for arriving at a smaller, precisely defined management boundary. Virginia is attempting to define a multi-tiered zonal system composed of seaward, shoreline and landward zones.

The seaward zone would consist of the water area between the three-mile territorial limit and the mean low water line. Where wetlands are present, the landward boundary of wetlands is established at a point 1.5 times the mean tidal range.

A shoreline zone may be defined as that area within which almost all activities have a direct and significant effect on coastal resources.

The inland boundary will be defined along the boundary lines of those local jurisdicitons within which wetlands and intertidal areas are located.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Progress has been made on various studies including a key facilities siting study; shoreline and tidal marsh inventories undertaken by VIMS; a methodology for identifying geographic areas of particular concern; a statement of issues and impact of OCS development; permissible uses; and the matters of national interest and federal consistency in Virginia's coastal area. The significant portion of tasks within this program element remains to be accomplished.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Prior to designation of areas of particular concern in its third year of program planning, Virginia will establish guidelines for identifying, designating, planning for and managing geographic areas of particular concern. The commonwealth will rely on localities, coastal planning district commissions and other agencies to accomplish this work.

Public and governmental involvement

Much of the first-year energy, under the mantle of the Division of State Planning & Community Affairs, was used to interact with area planning district commissions. Regional advisory committees in seven of nine planning districts conducted assessments of coastal management issues. At the end of the first year of planning, a regional assessment report was prepared for each participating APDC. The regional reports are being consolidated into a state assessment.

Following the transfer of the coastal program to the office where it now resides, the Coastal Resources Management Advisory Committee, consisting of state agency and planning district commission representatives, and the General Assembly's Coastal Study Commission have been reconvened. Both groups will assist the staff in establishing the state assessment of coastal issues, problems and needs. The work of these bodies to date has been to review and comment on staff work.

While the state hasn't acquired assessments of issues, needs and problems from each state and regional interests, a statement of issues based upon existing state and regional assessments was prepared as part of the draft coastal resources management plan. The state intends to work more closely with planning district commissions and local governments to make a complete assessment of coastal concerns.

Through mid-summer 1976, the principle efforts at public information were staff work with advisory committees in planning district commissions 17, 18 and 20 and miscellaneous speaking engagements. A public participation program is being designed along the following lines. Workshops on coastal resources management are being scheduled in five planning district commissions, a plan for public information and participation has been prepared for the third year, five brochures on various aspects of the coastal program have been drafted, arrangements are being made for television and radio spots and preparations are underway for publication of a program newsletter.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

The Office of Commerce & Resources for Planning has established communication with federal agencies and intends to follow up with bilateral discussions where appropriate. The Virginia Marine Resources Commission is taking a large role in directing coordination activities.

The Coastal Resources Management Advisory Committee was broadened to include relevant agencies in the commonwealth as well as representatives from each planning district commission.

The conclusions of the key facilities study will be used to address the national interest requirements. That study defines a key facility as "a development vital to the furtherance of the national interest or interest of the state; or, a development required to service or support a facility vital to the national or state interest; and/or, a public facility which represents a major investment of public funds, whose effectiveness may be affected seriously by locational considerations."

During the second year's work, the state solicited points-of-view from federal contacts and disseminated a key facilities siting study. It is mapping excluded federal lands, studying the possible

impact of federal uses upon generally permissible uses of state waters, attempting to define other federal interests in state priority of uses and integrating federal programs with state management alternatives.

Organizational arrangements

The definition of the state role in coastal resources management will start with existing executive and legislative precedents for environmental planning and management. The requirements for program implementation, such as grant administration, determination of consistency, research, water use planning and land use management, will be spelled out. Once the existing state organizational responsibilities for each of those requirements is identified, new organizational structures will be proposed, as needed. Responsibilities for individual program elements will be assigned among existing institutions or to proposed organizational structures set up to implement the coastal resource management program. The third year program also will define the relationships among existing state decision-making procedures as they relate to coastal resources management. Management recommendations will be presented as alternatives and then refined into a management program.

Authorities

State and local level authorities will be analyzed for applicability in managing land and water uses. Enabling legislation allowing local land and water use planning and management activities will be considered for application to coastal resources management.

During the third year of program planning, legislation required to implement the management proposals will be drafted and draft executive orders will be prepared.

Pls
xerox
11 copies of
the attached
(Washington
program)

WASHINGTON

GRANT RECIPIENT: Washington Dept. of Ecology
Coastal management program contact: Rod Mack, Dept. of Ecology, Olympia WA 98504. (206) 753-6879.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Shorelines Hearing Board; Dept. of Natural Resources; Dept. of Game; Dept. of Fish; Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council; Parks & Recreation Commission.

FUNDING:

	Section 305 Program Development		OCS Impact Planning
	1st year	2nd year	
	$388,820 (Federal)	$625,000 (F)	$150,000 (F)
	194,410 (State)	312,500 (S)	75,000 (S)
Subtotal	$583,230	$937,500	$225,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,745,730

Section 306 Program Implementation

$2,000,000 (F)
1,000,000 (S)
$3,000,000

AUTHORITY:

Washington's Shoreline Management Act of 1971 is the primary vehicle by which the Dept. of Ecology coordinates the state's coastal zone management efforts.

The act establishes a cooperative program between the Dept. of Ecology and local governments, which have the primary responsibility for administering the regulatory program.

On May 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

On June 1, 1976, Washington became the first state to receive federal approval of its coastal management plan. The state was awarded a grant to implement its program, as provided under Section 306 of the Coastal Zone Management Act.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Following is a list of problems the Washington coastal management program is attempting to alleviate:

*The coastal shorelines are unique and fragile resources which, if not carefully managed, could be subject to destructive changes which will have undesired environmental economic and functional consequences.

*There are a variety of demands on the coastal resource, each competing for certain segments of the resource. Certain resources can withstand and support the demands; some cannot.

*There are many classes of interest or activity which use and involve coastal resources. Balancing each need, knowing how much of the resource to allocate to each interest, and knowing what the proper responsibilities for each level of government for each interest is difficult.

*The needs of various competing interests are not always clearly and comprehensively known, thus creating conflicts and preventing the best

prioritization for use of the coastal resources.
*Various areas are pre-empted by uses which do not need, are not related to, or are destructive of the coastal environment.
*Significant portions of the state's economy and ecology depend on special areas that have high biologic production and importance, but low tolerance to the impact of many human activities.
*Much of the coastal and adjacent areas are in private ownership, and unguided, unrestricted construction in both privately and publicly owned areas is not in the best interest of the public.
*Knowledge of the nature, extent, tolerance, capability, value, and importance of the coastal resources is incomplete, out-of-date and fragmented.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM:

Washington identifies the following coastal management objectives:
*To actively identify and coordinate the diverse interests in the coastal area in order to provide resources necessary to meet various demands.
*To promote and encourage the continued productivity and desired expansions of biological resources.
*To consult and coordinate with other states, federal agencies and nations which use or are related to the state's coastal area.
*To manage the total resource such that each need is met to the maximum extent feasible, and such that the resource is maintained, prospers and continues to meet needs.
*To protect and encourage the natural processes of the coastal area.

CURRENT STATUS:

Just undertaking the transition from planning to program implementation, Washington will be concentrating on enhancing the role of local governments in the areas of program administration and enforcement; revising and refining local master programs; conducting studies of particular concern to local communities; establishing closer federal agency coordination and designing a conflict resolution mechanism; standardizing coastal resource data; and developing model ordinances and guidelines for marine water areas, the outer continental shelf and the second tier of the coastal boundary.

OCS oil and gas development study

With state and federal funds authorized under the Coastal Zone Management Act, Washington will study the onshore impacts of offshore oil and gas development and incorporate the data into its coastal management program. The state will study the extent to which oil development in Alaska has affected Washington's coast; compare the past five years with respect to the level of Alaska's oil activities, looking at production volume, employment and transportation ramifications; decide whether existing facilities along the Washington coast are sufficient to meet the oil needs of Alaska and Washington; and analyze the ability of potentially affected areas to support expansion or introduction of oil related activities.

Boundary identification

Washington's coastal management area embodies a two tier concept.

The primary tier, the "resource boundary," is that area legislatively defined by the Shoreline Management Act of 1971. It encompasses the state's marine waters and their associated wetlands, including at a minimum the upland area 200 feet landward from the ordinary high water mark. The second tier, the "planning and administrative boundary," is composed of the area within the 15 coastal counties which front on salt water.

The basis for the inclusion of Wahkiakum County on the Columbia River estuary within the second tier boundary is the presence of measurable quantities of salt water up the Columbia River to Pillar Rock. The second tier is intended to be the maximum extent of the coastal zone and as such is the context within which coordinated coastal policy planning will be accomplished.

The state will enter into memoranda of understanding with federal agency land managers as to the applicability of the state program to parcels of federal land or private holdings within federal lands in the state's coastal area.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

Prior to the passage of the federal law, Washington had established through the Shorelands Management Act a process, policies, and guidelines which enable it to meet the intentions of the requirement to define permissible land and water uses.

The legislation provided that all "reasonable and appropriate uses" would be permitted under specified conditions which would protect against "adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life." This laid the groundwork for a performance-standards approach to land and water use decision making. Two notable exceptions were made by the legislature: within the resource zone, only selective commercial timber cutting would be allowed; and surface drilling for oil and gas within a specified geographic area of Puget Sound wouldn't be permitted.

Seven use elements covering different shoreline uses are included in master programs as appropriate: economic, public access, recreation, circulation uses, conservation, historic/cultural/scientific and education.

Local governments must inventory their coastline and designate environments (natural, conservancy, rural, and urban) based upon the existing development pattern, the biophysical capabilities and limitations, and the goals and aspirations of the citizenry.

Based upon studies and analyses, the guidelines established 21 shoreline use activities which were to be included within the local master programs subject to a permit process.

To assist in an overview of uses of highest and lowest priority, 15 county shoreline matrices were assembled along with maps to provide a summary of the types of uses considered to be permissible in the various shoreline environments.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Criteria used by the state to identify areas of particular concern include: the area contains a resource feature of environmental value considered to be of greater than local concern or significance; the area is given recognition as of particular concern by state or federal legislation, administrative and regulatory programs, or land ownership; and the area has the potential for more than one major land or water use or has a resource being sought by ostensibly incompatible users.

With these criteria the state identified ten major areas of particular concern: the Nisqually Estuary; Hood Canal; the Snohomish River Estuary; Skagit and Padilla Bays; the Northern Strait and Puget Sound Petroleum Transfer and Processing Area; the Dungeness Estuary and Spit Complex; Grays Harbor; the Willapa Bay Estuary; the Pacific Coastal Dune Area; and the Continental Shelf.

Most of these areas were identified as "shorelines of statewide significance" in the Shoreline Management Act. In addition, the 200 foot resource boundary is designated into special environment categories - urban, suburban, rural, conservancy, natural and aquatic. Twenty-one shoreline uses are regulated as defined in the Local Master Programs for each of these environments. For instance, most uses are not permitted in the natural environment but they are in the others or are conditional uses, thus affording special management to these areas.

Public and governmental involvement

The state's shoreline management program is probably a national model for maximizing involvement at all stages of development.

The Act originated from the involvement of concerned citizens. As a result of the Washington Environmental Council's Initiative 43, the legislature passed the Shoreline Management Act of 1971, and enacted it as an emergency law. On November 7, 1972, voters affirmed the present law. Prior to the election and in order to inform the electorate of the issues involved in the management proposals, an informational program was established throughout the state.

With the passage of the Shoreline Management Act, the Ecology Dept. had 90 days to draft guidelines for local governments and citizen advisory committees to utilize in the formulation of their shoreline programs.

Public meetings were held and federal and state agency participation in guideline preparation was considerable.

Citizen involvement is stressed as a required part of local shoreline master programs. In fact, the final guidelines stipulate that failure of local governments to encourage and utilize citizen involvement without proper justification will be considered as a failure to comply with the Act.

Local governments were required to appoint broadly based citizen advisory committees, representing both commercial interests and environmentalists, to define goals and to draft policy statements for the master programs. Each local committee was to conduct a series of public meetings and encourage the participation of governmental agencies and private groups. Local committees were encouraged to issue newsletters to describe the results of the meetings and to give information about policy statements and program development.

The response by local government to the challenge presented by the public participation requirements of the act has been impressive. Of 224 cities and counties (statewide) directly affected by the act, only four declined to take on the task of preparing a master program. Program development has often extended over an 18-month period and required anywhere from five to 40 citizen advisory committee public meetings. In the lengthy process over 2,000 citizens have been directly involved in developing the shoreline program in Washington.

The regulatory portion of the program involves a permit system which cities and counties have the responsibility for administering. Local governments must publish notices in a local newspaper within the county of the proposed development.

Local governments may establish a mandatory or optional public hearing procedure to precede the issuance or denial of permits in order

to allow citizens the opportunity to present their views.

As applications for permits increased, the state, local governments, and local committees recognized a need for professional expertise in the area of technical assistance in reviewing permits and in developing master programs. This resulted in the formation of the Interdisciplinary Advisory Committee.

Public hearings were held for the Shoreline Management Act as well as for all the regulations and local master programs.

Washington's chief interstate involvement has been with Oregon, which shares the Columbia River estuary.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

The state has provided several means for federal agency involvement in the development of its coastal management program. Prior to the passage of the Coastal Zone Management Act, interested federal agencies were invited to review and comment on the guidelines for shoreline management. Early participation of agencies was also solicited through the creation of a state/federal task force to review local master programs.

An early effort was made to identify federal agencies that would be principally affected by the state's program. The original two dozen identified agencies have since grown to over 40, although the principally affected agencies are approximately one-half that number.

Contacts were selected by the agencies and correspondence was directed to the contacts. A questionnaire was sent out in February 1975, and several of the agencies responded with details about their coastal management concerns, activities, programs, problems and expectations. These have been considered in the refinement of the Washington program.

The preliminary Washington program document was made widely available in late March 1975.

A major tool to achieve mutual understanding, develop consistency of activities and resolve differences is the coordinative packet system adopted by the Dept. of Ecology. The packet system has been designed to assure that a single documented basis for considering individual agency views and concerns is established and maintained in the future.

Washington considers the siting of facilities or uses of regional benefit met primarily through the planning process establishing the shoreline program, the appeals process available through the Shorelines Hearings Board (one basis of appeal being failure to consider greater-than-local interests), recognition of the statewide over local interests with respect to shorelines of statewide significance, and the checks, balances, and procedures associated with other state laws and related programs.

Organizational arrangements

The Dept. of Ecology through its Shorelines Division administers and manages the comprehensive coastal program. The management network consists of a variety of formal and informal complex interrelationships among agencies, DOE offices and individuals.

The management network system consists of the following elements: studies and information base; policy development; plan review/approval consistency; project review; permit processes. Washington establishes the specific agency responsible for the lead function in those elements.

While the focal point for the coastal zone management program is the Shorelands Division, the major integrative mechanisms for facilitating the coordination of intra-departmental concerns are contained within the Office of Comprehensive Programs. The Office of Comprehensive Programs will analyze the issue in terms of how it fits with other programs, what impacts other programs will have on a decision and what impacts that decision will have on other programs and processes with the department. Recommendations go to an executive committee which is comprised of the top departmental management. If concurrance isn't obtained, the matter goes to the Director or the Deputy Director for decision.

In terms of very large-scale proposals such as deep water ports, energy facility siting, and monobuoy systems, the issue also would go through the Natural Resources Cabinet and the Governor's Office.

Authorities

The Dept. of Ecology is designated to implement the coastal management program. It is responsible for regulating the shoreline uses and has authority to acquire shorelines and related wetlands, although it lacks powers of condemnation.

Under the provisions of the Shoreline Management Act, local governments formulate master programs -- development plans to guide proposed activities along shorelines within their jurisdiction. Development of goals and shoreline inventories are followed by development by citizens and officials of specific shoreline environment designations and use regulations. State review and approval of local master programs is the final step in implementation of the program.

The regulatory system is administered locally, subject to state review. Appeals go before the Shorelines Hearing Board, which is comprised of three members of the Pollution Control Hearings Board, the Commissioner of Public Lands, a representative of the Assn. of Washington Cities and a representative of the Washington State Assn. of Counties.

The Dept. of Ecology is the lead agency for implementing state requirements of federal clean air and water programs and is responsible for integrating those standards, regulations and guidelines with those of the coastal management program.

WISCONSIN

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Administration
Coastal management program contact: Al Miller, State Planning Office, B-130, One West Wilson St., Madison WI 53702. (608) 266-3687.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Natural Resources; University of Wisconsin; Northwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning & Development Commission; Bay Lake Regional Planning Commission; Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year	2nd year supplement
	$208,000 (Federal)	$340,600 (F)	$219,800 (F)
	145,215 (State)	171,700 (S)	112,000 (S)
Subtotal	$353,215	$512,300	$331,800

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,197,315

AUTHORITY:

Wisconsin conducts a variety of land and water planning and management programs in the coastal zone. The Dept. of Administration's State Planning Office is administering the State Development Policy Program, the Critical Resource Information Program and the Land Resource Analysis Program and is developing a land use information system.

The Dept. of Natural Resources has responsibility for water resources planning including the preparation of the state water plan pursuant to the State Water Resources Act of 1965. The DNR also is conducting activities in the areas of flood plain management, shoreland zoning, the regulation of navigable water and surface water classification. Related programs administered by DNR are outdoor recreation planning, scientific areas preservation, fish management, air pollution control, solid waste management and environmental impact assessment.

State activities affecting the coastal zone include the regulating of power generating facilities by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission; highway, waterport and urban transportation system planning by the Dept. of Transportation; and coastal zone related research and education programs carried on by the University of Wisconsin System.

On June 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Wisconsin has outlined the following priority issues to be addressed by the coastal management program:

*The highly erodible nature of the Wisconsin shoreline.
*Inadequate public access to the Lakes.
*Tourism and recreational needs increasing the demand for land and for support services.
*The need for economic development to be balanced against irretrievable commitments of natural resources.

*Residential and other development encroaching upon ecologically sensitive areas.
*Obsolete structures, inadequate transportation patterns, and natural hazards causing a deteriorated waterfront in some areas.
*Certain shorelands subject to periodic flooding and damage.
*Inability of the catch to support the commercial fishing industry as in earlier years.
*Loss of competitive position of Great Lakes ports.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

In managing the coastal zone, Wisconsin will seek to revitalize the natural features of the area; to systematically guide, through multi-governmental cooperation, shoreline uses to those that are resource dependent and compatible with natural shoreline processes; and to provide a better balance among ecological, aesthetic and economic concerns.

CURRENT STATUS:

At the end of its second year of coastal plan development, Wisconsin was making substantive progress toward boundaries determination, taking novel approaches toward the issues of regional benefit and conducting a strong public participation program. The state proposed to define uses of regional benefit as any use subject to control of the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act. As Wisconsin undertakes its third year's program, the issue of organization -- what mechanism will be used to implement the management program -- will become important.

Boundary identification

Wisconsin's coastal waters are Lakes Michigan and Superior extending outward from the Wisconsin shoreline to the lake boundary of Wisconsin and either Minnesota, Illinois, Michigan or Canada. Also included are limited portions of rivers flowing into the Lakes. The determination of the inland boundaries continues.

In macro-perspective, Wisconsin uses three nested zones. The management zone is the water area of the Great Lakes and a narrow, highly sensitive land/water interface which warrants the most intensive management effort. A planning zone in which land and water activities have a less than direct interaction is the second zone, while the third zone is the zone of influence, perhaps the Lake drainage basin, in which land activities affect the Great Lakes in a more remote manner.

Data for a baseline inventory, including aerial photography of the shoreline, is being collected using the following tentative boundary definitions. The management zone includes at most the civil township bordering the Great Lakes; the planning zone is the counties adjacent to the Great Lakes; and the zone of influence is the respective Lake drainage basins. Data collected in these areas will be used in more specifically delineating the narrow management zone, but will also be of use to the local units of government, residents, state agencies and planning bodies.

During parts of the first and second years of program planning, a 12-member university faculty seminar considered various means to define the coastal management boundary and to assess appropriate shore uses. Two test sites, one urban and one rural, were used to validate the boundary definition process.

The results of the faculty seminar were presented to the Coastal Zone Management Coordinating & Advisory Council, which presented it to the regional technical and citizen advisory committees. Based upon a series of public hearings throughout the state on the boundary determination process, the council will choose a boundary determination methodology. During the third year, the Regional Planning Agencies will apply the methodology to determine the coastal zone boundary.

Preliminary implications are that the state will employ a 1,000-foot uniform setback from the coastal waters with buffers for certain areas such as those identified as natural hazard areas and areas where water-dependent uses occur.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

In Wisconsin, the regional planning commissions are inventorying land ownership, land use and local zoning controls. The Dept. of Natural Resources has conducted inventories on the fish and wildlife and the other natural resources in the shoreline planning area as well.

A university faculty group is making recommendations on how to define uses that should be subject to the control of the coastal zone management program. The regional planning commissions are soliciting local input on this issue. In addition, the state is preparing policy papers to handle special issues affecting the Wisconsin coasts. The papers cover ports, public access, recreation opportunity, power plant siting impacts, lake levels and erosion.

The Wisconsin Coastal Zone Management Coordinating & Advisory Council will consider the recommendations and options presented in the policy papers. The council's decisions on uses will be made concurrently with the boundary determination due to the close relationship between the two activities.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

One means of designating GAPCs in Wisconsin is through the heritage areas program. Citizens, local interest groups and county governmental bodies work with state coastal managers to identify potentially critical areas. Proposed legislation would allow the counties to then designate such areas. In the Heritage Areas Program, critical resource areas are areas which are important to human health and safety, or which contain one or more resources of economic, recreational, aesthetic, research, educational, psychological or philosophical value.

The coastal office is independently devising criteria to designate GAPCs. These criteria will be reviewed by the council and then by the public at the same time as boundaries and permissible uses. GAPCs will then be designated by the state.

Public and governmental involvement

The Governor designated the Coastal Zone Coordinating & Advisory Council to make all policy recommendations to him based upon interaction with the State Planning Office. The members of this council represents state agencies, regional planning commissions, local governments, universities, and public interest groups. The Citizens Advisory Committee, composed of citizens and public interest groups, advises the council of public viewpoints on issues. Each regional planning commission also has a Technical and a Citizen Advisory Committee.

These groups review documents to ensure that the policy options are adequately presented. Upon completion of these reviews, the council will approve the policy option papers. Three sets of public hearings are being held on the boundary, permissible uses, and areas of particular concern determination methodologies, the six policy studies, and the state organization and authorities. Based upon the inputs it receives, the council will choose the option it prefers on behalf of the citizens of the state.

The Heritage Areas Program also solicits public input. Members of the state Citizens Advisory Committee talk to other citizen bodies about coastal zone management in Wisconsin. The state has also distributed brochures on coastal management. The Coastal Zone Gazette is distributed prior to every council meeting.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Wisconsin has developed a list of contacts within the appropriate federal agencies in addition to a list of required contacts provided by the federal coastal program office. These sets of contacts in conjunction with the Great Lakes Basin Commission provide the vehicles for communicatiion, coordination, and substantive input between the Wisconsin program and appropriate federal agencies.

The state has sent out letters to federal agencies that own lands in the coastal area, asking the agencies to identify the type of jurisdiction they hold, and the management plans for those lands.

Organizational arrangements

The Governor designated the State Planning Office within the Dept. of Administration as the agency to administer coastal management. At the same time he formed a Coastal Zone Coordinating & Advisory Council to make policy recommendations to him. Six state agencies have representatives on this council while four have done contract work for the program. The Wisconsin Environmental Protection Agency should help tie together the diverse authorities that the State Planning Office is drawing upon.

State administrators from other similar programs will formulate policy options regarding state organization and authorities. The council will then hold hearings on the legal authorities and organization options and will eventually determine the option it prefers based upon local and citizen input.

State-local interactions in Wisconsin have occured on the council and the Regional Planning Commissions. An inventory of local land use and zoning has been completed too. The final state program will be a combination of local, regional and state implementation within a state policy framework.

Authorities

During the first year, the State Planning Office identified all statutory provisions that relate to governmental authority over land and water uses. In the second year, the Institute of Government Affairs of the University of Wisconsin investigated the capability of local governments in non-urban areas to use existing land controls. County land use ordinances were collected and analyzed to determine how well they were enforced and to identify the factors that were involved in sucessful local land use programs. The state is studying non-regulatory means for guiding land use, examining the effectiveness and feasibility

of the use of public investments, acquisitions, taxation, development moratoria, and transfer of development rights.

GUAM

GRANT RECIPIENT: Bureau of Planning
Coastal management program contact: David Bonvouloir, Bureau of Planning, Government of Guam, P.O. Box 2950, Agana, Guam 96910. (via operator) 477-9502.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: None

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year
	$143,000 (Federal)
	71,500 (State)
Total	$214,500

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $214,500

AUTHORITY:

A turning point in the development of the Island of Guam occurred in November 1962 when Typhoon Karen destroyed a major portion of the Island. As a result of that, the U.S. Congress passed the Rehabilitation Act, authorizing funds to lay out Guam's infrastructure. A plan was developed for an integrated wastewater system and since then, numerous sewer outfalls have been constructed. In May 1976, Typhoon Pamela again destroyed a large portion of the island. Development funds as a result of this storm will far exceed those received after Karen.

A proposed master plan for the Commerical Port of Guam, a joint facility shared by the U.S. Navy and the Government of Guam, is being studied. It embodies estimates of harbor needs and loading facilities through 1990 and proposes a phased development program.

Various single-purpose legislation exists that relates to coastal resources management. Those laws include: Seashore Reserve Act; Seashore Protection Act; Parks and Recreation enabling legislation; Zoning Law; Subdivision Law; and the Historical Preservation Act.

Although April 1, 1975 marked the first federal Section 305 program development grant under the Coastal Zone Management Act program, Guam anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in late 1978 or early 1979. Start-up was delayed until October 1, 1976 due to severe financial constraints relating to matching funds.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Guam cites the following priority issues in coastal management:

*Present zoning and land use control doesn't protect the quality of coastal waters or reflect the combined management of terrestrial and submerged lands, leading to haphazard strip development adjacent to the shore.

*The presence of untreated raw sewerage discharges in waterways, drainage and coastal areas poses a significant threat in terms of epidemic diseases, and polluted recreation areas.

*Development of flood-prone lands without precautionary measures threatens the individual's health, safety and/or economic well being and diminishes the value of the land as scenic and open space.

*The increase in construction activity has intensified the need for sand; the removal of sand for this purpose has caused deterioration of the aesthetic quality of beaches; the crushing of coral to manufacture sand, undertaken to minimize the problem of sand mining, leads to increased siltation.
*Increased traffic that proposed supertankers would bring to Guam's coastal waters would increase the frequency of probable oil spills as well as port expansion posing a definite threat to several fragile ecosystems within the harbor area.
*Erosion of topsoil and subsequent siltation of lowland water areas is becoming a major problem with the rapid increase in construction on the island.
*Prime agricultural lands are a natural and presently endangered resource.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM:

Objectives of Guam's coastal management program are as follows:
*To improve the quality of life by improving the quality of the coastal and marine environment.
*To promote the orderly growth of commercial and industrial facilities as well as residential, recreation and scenic areas in the coastal area such that it is compatible with the goal stated above.
*To promote the oderly and responsible development of coastal resources to fully maximize benefits accrued from these resources, thereby creating employment opportunities and increasing local revenues.
*To encourage the use of the coastal waters to promote scientific knowledge.
*To provide a mechanism to coordinate various governmental agencies' interests in and programs concerning the coastal area.
*To provide a mechanism to coordinate and control land use adjacent to the coastal waters, thereby guarding the fragile relationship that exists between the two.

CURRENT STATUS:

In its second year of coastal program planning, Guam is progressing within the various work elements and wil attempt to facilitate island-wide participation by establishing networks (e.g., questionnaires) to receive reaction to various program activities. Harsh climatological conditions -- typhoons -- continue to plague the island.

Boundary identification

For planning purposes, the entire island of Guam is considered to be coastal area. The seaward boundary extends to the three-mile territorial limit. In its second and third years of coastal program planning, Guam will identify conceptual management program (CMP) boundaries. It will take into consideration federally-owned or controlled lands excluded from the coastal program and the limit of the seaward boundary. Legislation will be analyzed relative to the jurisdiction within that boundary and a narrative, with accompanying maps, will be prepared.

Determination of permissible land and water uses

A "Comprehensive Land & Water Use Bibliography" has been completed

and is being printed. Field work is ongoing in an inventory of land and water resources. Guam is reviewing and analyzing area-specific problems and issues as they relate to use of land and water resources. It will consider, among other uses, major infrastructure facilities; wastewater/solid waste facilities; commercial port development; beach access; resort development; mineral extraction; marine development; agriculture adjacent to the shoreline; aquaculture/mariculture; multiple use/urban pressures on the shorefront; high impact uses affecting surface, ground and marine water resources; and surface water impoundments.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

Guam is mapping critical areas and geographic areas of particular concern and has identified the following GAPCs: areas of significant topographic or geologic resources for agriculture, commercial or industrial development; areas of hazard if developed; and areas of high natural productivity.

A working definition is being prepared for "pristine ecological communities" and they will be delineated. Guam will designate areas of highly competitive use and land and water courses and areas suitable for aquaculture.

Later, Guam will develop performance standards for identified critical areas and evaluate restoration and preservation options to GAPCs including acquisition, operations and maintenance costs and methods of control other than fee simple acquisition.

Guam will develop policies and guidelines governing the relative priority of uses through an exercise that includes inventory and identification of constraints affecting the formation of priorities for the future. Those constraints include: prior commitments; impacts on surrounding areas; scarcity and uniqueness; diversity; dependency; and public preference.

Public and governmental involvement

Guam has compiled lists of village leaders and "opinion setters" for use in establishing feedback mechanisms for coastal planning activities. Direction is away from formalized, established committees toward setting up a network for receiving community reaction to program activities. A goals survey was developed through village meetings and a monthly newsletter is being published. Slide shows are to be presented weekly to interested groups and public reaction will be solicited on land use legislation being drafted by the Bureau of Planning for the legislature.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

A report is being prepared on military lands, federally-controlled land and submerged lands and non-military lands. Contact to be made with federal agencies and they are asked to review program components. An advisory committee has been established and the territory will define how the coastal management program will relate to and/or be integrated with other federal programs.

Organizational arrangements

Much work remains to be accomplished before Guam defines its

organizational arrangement. In preparation for that, Guam will review the territory's political structure for possible contribution to the coastal management program through such groups as the Council of Commissioners and legislative committees. Alternative management programs and organizational structures will be considered. Guam will analyze the institutional options, regulatory mechanisms and costs of carrying out the management program and develop methods for reviewing and adopting the program.

Authorities

Guam is analyzing land use legislation, permitting procedures and related seashore laws to provide a framework for design of management program and a process for streamlining land use controls, as well as procedures for the legal analysis that will be undertaken later in the program planning.

Initial analysis will include: statutes establishing jurisdictional limits for land use control; statutes specifying power authorities; and statutes dealing with environmental controls over land use.

Draft land use legislation is being reviewed and commented upon. The revision would establish a mechanism for critical areas' performance standards.

PUERTO RICO

GRANT RECIPIENT: Dept. of Natural Resources
Coastal management program contact: Arsenio Rodriguez, Dept. of Natural Resources, P.O. Box 5887, Puerto de Tierra PR 00906. (809) 724-8774.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Puerto Rico Planning Board; Environmental Quality Board.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year
	$250,000 (Federal)	$350,000 (F)	$424,190 (F)
	125,000 (State)	175,000 (S)	212,095 (S)
Subtotal	$375,000	$525,000	$636,285

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $1,536,285

AUTHORITY:

The Dept. of Natural Resources is responsible for Puerto Rico's natural resources and is active in fisheries management, forestry programs, physical and biological oceanography studies, water resources planning, beach stabilization and control, and mangrove preservation programs. It issues permits for sand extraction and exercises control over dredge and fill projects in navigable waters. The Planning Board has completed an island-wide master plan that recommends areas for heavy industry, industrial ports, airports and major highway and rapid transit facilities. Agricultural zones are being identified so that their conversion to urban or industrial use will be restricted. The Planning Board issues construction permits for building activities within urban areas and administers zoning and subdivision controls.

The Environmental Quality Board is inventorying, analyzing and planning for water quality management in the 17 management regions into which the island has been divided.

The Dept. of Natural Resources and the Planning Board have established a joint Coastal Zone Task Force as the vehicle for program development and interagency coordination.

On June 30, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The state anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1976 with a segmented approach beginning with the Culebra segment. That effort will be followed by submission of a coastal management plan for the rest of the commonwealth in late 1977 or early 1978.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

Puerto Rico cites the following priority issues in its management effort:

*Identify and protect unique natural areas and associated wildlife habitats along the coast.
*Control extraction of beach sand for construction purposes.
*Control coastal land uses, specifically industrial and harbor development, power plant construction and operations, tourism indistries, residential housing and waste treatment facilities.

*Increase public access to coastal areas.
*Control expanded recreational use of coastal waters, including: protection of reefs and other features, sport fishing, boating, swimming and skin diving.
*Control offshore structures and operations, superport construction, supertanker berthing and transfer operations, ocean shipping and navigation, offshore mineral extraction.
*Curb water pollution from human and industrial wastes and from siltation.
*Support the declining commercial fisheries.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

Puerto Rico identifies the following coastal program objectives.
*To designate estuarine areas for public acquisition.
*To establish protected wildlife habitats and natural areas.
*To specify high-priority critical areas within which uses and activities inimical to marine biological processes shall be expressly prohibited.
*To designate suitable offshore sites for the extraction of sand.
*To acquire potentially prime recreational areas, sanctuaries, wildlife habitats and other critical natural areas in the coastal zone which now are used for defense-related purposes, according to a systematic plan jointly agreed to by the relevant federal agencies.
*To develop a program for increasing the commercial finfish and shellfish catch to the optimum sustainable yeild.
*To undertake a program of mangrove rehabilitation, concentrating on those areas adversely affected by poor drainage practices.
*To protect barrier beaches from adverse development and to plant dune grasses, sea grapes and other protective vegetation.
*To relocate "squatters," including houseboats, from the water's edge when they exist in critical natural areas such as the shorelines of La Parguera and Ensenada Honda.

CURRENT STATUS:

Puerto Rico, into its third year of coastal program planning, is requesting federal approval for a management plan for the Culebra Segment. That area consists of the island of Culebra, several surrounding islands (of which Culebrita, Luis Penya and North Cay are the most important) and the surrounding coastal waters. That area is located 17 miles east of the island of Puerto Rico. In addition, the commonwealth continues to refine work being done to enable it to gain federal approval of its entire plan for comprehensive coastal management.

Boundary identification

Based on an inventory of natural and man-made features, and analysis of socio-economic data and existing political jurisdictions, Puerto Rico has identified a three-tiered landside boundary for planning purposes as well as for management consideration.

The first tier (or primary zone) extends inland fron the shoreline one kilometer. This area is being considered for the management zone. (For purposes of administration, the area may extend to the limits of the coastal barrios rather than one kilometer, although in many instances these two lines are nearly coterminous. The barrio is

a unit of government somewhat akin to minor civil divisions in terms of size but without any governmental responsibilities.

The second tier would extend inland as far as the circumferential highway. Initially the commonwealth is entertaining the idea this would represent a review area with regard to permissible uses.

The third tier extends inland seven kilometers (the approximate equivalent of municipio boundaries) and represents the overall planning area.

In addition, the coastal zone will include, for planning and management purposes, the offshore islands of Vieques, Culebra, Mona and Desecheo and offshore reefs, sand bars and rock outcroppings.

The seaward boundary will extend to the limit of Puerto Rico's territorial waters.

For the proposed Culebra segment, the management boundaries would include the entire island, the surrounding islands, the offshore reefs and the surrounding waters (to the three-mile limit on the north and east, to the mid-point between Vieques and Culebra on the south and to the mid-point between Culebra and the main island on the east).

Definition of permissible land and water uses

The following methodology has been employed to determine permissible uses: existing standards for reviewing and permitting projects has been complied and reviewed to determine adequacy, overlap and consistency. In addition, environmental assessment criteria regarding use impacts have been established. The results of these efforts will be combined with results to be derived from economic criteria assessments (to be developed during the coming year) to provide the basis for categorizing and defining permissible uses.

The Culebra segment provides for the management (including regulation) of all uses of land on Culebra as well as all uses of coastal waters.

Four permissible use categories have been established for the Culebra segment: wildlife or biological refuge; recreation; conservation (open space and agriculture); and development.

Broad policies have been established governing relative priorities for each of the above categories. Uses of lowest priority are heavy industry and urban development, which is permitted only in the development category.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

While selection of geographic areas of particular concern will not be made until the final year of program development, staff effort to date has focused on four primary resource areas: mangroves, beaches and dunes, coral reefs and sand resources (including marine sand deposits). Work on these has included inventorying of the resources, evaluation of the conflicts/problems associated with these resources and development of preliminary management recommendations.

The designation of GAPCs on Culebra has been based on a review of inventories and studies and the application of the following criteria: areas of unique, scarce, fragile or vulnerable habitat, physical features; areas of high natural productivity or essential habitat for living resources; areas of substantial recreational value; and areas needed to protect, maintain or replenish coastal

lands or resources, including coral and other reefs, beaches and mangrove stands. Application of these criteria has resulted in the designation of all significant reef systems, all significant mangroves and all beaches.

The commonwealth has also designated the following specific areas as Areas for Preservation: the end of Flamenco Peninsula; Flamenco Lagoon; mangroves and uplands around Bahia del Manglar; mangroves in Ensenada Harbor; Cayo Louis Pena; and Monte Resaca (above an elevation of 150 meters).

In addition, two geographic areas have been designated as Areas for Restoration: squatters areas, principally along the shore of Ensenada Harbor, and former Navy target areas (lands and surrounding waters that contain unexploded ordinance).

Public and governmental involvement

An interagency agreement relative to coastal zone interaction is in effect between the Planning Board and the Dept. of Natural Resources.

As there are no local planning and zoning authorities in Puerto Rico, the Planning Board is responsible for preparing local comprehensive master plans and for preparing and administering zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations.

While lesser than state units exist -- municipios and barrios -- they don't have regulatory powers. However, the commonwealth agencies work with municipio officials, particularly in development of master plans.

In Culebra, the Conservation & Development Authority (CCDA) is charged with formulating and administering plans and programs for the public lands and waters of Culebra, a function performed by the Dept. of Natural Resources in the remainder of Puerto Rico.

In the area of public involvement, first year efforts have focused on public education and consciousness raising. A series of reports has been produced for general public distribution covering a coastal overview, coastal uses, mangroves, reefs, natural systems (particularly lagoons and bird habitats) and beaches and dunes. It is anticipated that the coastal overview booklet will be adopted for use in the secondary school system.

Upcoming efforts will include establishment of a Citizens Advisory Group, hosting a series of public information seminars and publication of newsletters and further non-technical reports.

Most of the public involvement in the development of the Culebra segment has occured through the public hearing process. A public hearing was held on the Culebra plan in June 1976.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Puerto Rico has made use of the Federal Regional Council review process and bilateral discussions with directly affected federal agencies in order to provide relevant federal agencies with the opportunity to participate in the development of the management plan for Culebra.

The primary mechanism for determining consistency will be the A-95 review process administered by the Puerto Rico Planning Board.

Organizational arrangements

Puerto Rico is using direct state land and water use regulation in implementing the Culebra segment plan. The Planning Board and the Dept. of Natural Resources are the key regulatory agencies.

The implementation of the Culebra management program contains two broad categories of functions: the management of public lands and waters and the regulation of development on both private and public property. As the anticipated transfer of public lands from federal to commonwealth ownership will vastly increase commonwealth land holdings on Culebra, considerable emphasis has been placed on the development of management programs for public lands and waters. Although the Dept. of Natural Resources performs this function throughout the remainder of Puerto Rico, the CCDA will be responsible for the management of public areas on Culebra.

Five agencies are responsible for regulating the development of both public and private property. While critical interrelationships exist among all of those agencies with respect to policies, regulations and permit and project review, the unifying element is the requirement that all development must be consistent with the policies established in the comprehensive land use plan for Culebra and the law for the conservation and development of Culebra.

Authorities

The Puerto Rico Planning Board Organic Act provides the statutory basis for controlling land and water uses and the resolution of conflicts. The powers of the Planning Board are judged to be sufficient to control developments and resolve conflicts. Planning Board plans and regulations pertaining to Culebra include the comprehensive land use plan for Culebra, a zoning regulation and a subdivision regulation.

In addition to Planning Board regulations, the following laws provide controls of uses in Culebra: The Environmental Policy Act; The Organic Law; and The Law for the Conservation & Development of Culebra.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

GRANT RECIPIENT: Virgin Islands Planning Office
Coastal management program contact: Thomas R. Blake, Director of Planning, Office of the Governor, P.O. Box 2606, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands 00801. (809) 774-1730.

OTHER MAJOR PARTICIPATING AGENCIES: Dept. of Conservation & Cultural Affairs.

FUNDING: Section 305 Program Development

	1st year	2nd year
	$90,000 (Federal)	$120,000 (F)
	45,000 (State)	60,000 (S)
Subtotal	$135,000	$180,000

Total Plan Development Allocation (through June 1976): $315,000

AUTHORITY:

The Organic Act of the Virgin Islands passed in 1936 gave the territorial government the power to control the use of public and private properties within the Virgin Islands. Federal laws were made applicable to the navigable waters. Zoning laws became effective in 1963, but they didn't provide for special treatment of coastal areas, nor was a comprehensive or general development plan or policy adopted.

In June 1970, the Virgin Islands Planning Office was created. Its principal function is to prepare a long-range, comprehensive plan for the coastal zone of the Virgin Islands.

In June 1971, the legislature passed the Open Shorelines Act, creating an Open Beach Committee that was to prepare a comprehensive plan for the conservation and development of the shoreline. The act also established a permit system within the Dept. of Conservation & Cultural Affairs to control land use activities along the shorelines. Subsequent legislation gave the CCA power to regulate filling and development in coastal waters. The permit system has been established, but the regulatory system continues to deal with development proposals on an ad hoc basis, in the absence of a comprehensive plan.

On December 1, 1974, the first federal Section 305 program development grant was awarded under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The Virgin Islands anticipates that it will enter the Section 306 implementation phase in 1977.

PRIORITY ISSUES:

The Virgin Islands identifies the following management concerns.

*Most of the shoreline areas suitable for recreation are privately owned, with exclusive right of the owners to use the beaches.
*Rapid population and economic growth have placed unprecedented pressures on coastal resources.
*A number of legal issues must be clarified. These concern and affect title to and use of submerged lands; dredge and fill regulations; and overlapping jurisdiction among territorial agencies as well as between the federal government and the Virgin Islands.

OBJECTIVES OF COASTAL PROGRAM:

The following coastal program objectives have been identified.

*To prepare a coastal management program to insure that preservation and development of the land and water resources is consistent with their capabilities.
*To integrate land use planning of inland areas with that of the coastal area, and to allow greater consideration of the physical relationship and effect of land use activities beyond coastal boundaries.
*To involve private citizens in the decision-making as it pertains to formulation of policies for the utilization of coastal resources.
*To recognize the interdependence of the islands and assess the regional impact of major facility development.

CURRENT STATUS:

Now into its second year of coastal program planning, the Virgin Islands has made substantive progress in its data gathering and analysis. Boundary determinations are well advanced and procedures for designating geographic areas of particular concern have been identified. It remains for the Virgin Islands to concentrate on coordination of territorial agencies and work more specifically with the interests within the federal government. The Dept. of Conservation & Cultural Affairs has been identified as the implementation agency, but interrelationships between it and other agencies haven't been worked out.

Boundary identification

For planning purposes, landward boundaries have been established following a series of coastal roads, property lines, U.S. Geological Survey contour lines and ridgelines including offshore islands and cays, except those in federal ownership. The National Park portion of St. John also is excluded.

Basically, the Virgin Islands proposes to extend the legal jurisdiction of CCA inland to the management boundary, which is defined in terms of roads, contours and geographic areas of particular concern. It will amend existing zoning classifications prepared by the planning office to conform to the permissible use designations.

Definition of permissible land and water uses

The designation of permissible uses has been based on an inventory of natural resources, capability studies, socio-economic analysis and goals and objectives of the territory's definition of what constitutes a direct and significant impact on coastal waters. Following the designation of permissible uses for each "coastal environment," the planning office will prepare both a comprehensive land and water use plan and amendments to the existing zoning ordinance reflecting the permissible use determinations.

It has been determined that all water dependent uses will have first priority, followed by water oriented uses and then by non-water dependent or oriented uses.

Identification of geographic areas of particular concern

By means of a descriptive pamphlet, the planning office has asked other territorial agencies, federal agencies and the public to nominate geographic areas of particular concern. In the interim period, the planning office has identified the following areas as potential GAPCs: mangrove stands; beaches; reefs; historic sites; salt ponds; lagoons; bird and wildlife sanctuaries; and potential industrial/port sites.

The adoption of strict and specific zoning regulations will be the primary method of regulating land and water uses within GAPCs.

Public and governmental involvement

Since governmental activities are all handled at the territorial level, the Virgin Islands doesn't have the need to interact with local governments. Of the territorial departments, the most significant for planning and management purposes are the Dept. of Conservation & Cultural Affairs, Dept. of Public Works and Dept. of Commerce. In addition, the Port Authority and the Water & Power Authority have interests in the coastal area.

Interagency coordination is facilitated through monthly interagency conferences involving the director and assistant director of each agency with interests in the coastal area.

On the public involvement front, mass communications efforts have been made through use of radio and television spot announcements, brochures, newspaper articles and slide presentations to interested groups.

Public input into coastal program development has been solicited by use of informal meetings with the League of Women Voters, property owners and representatives of special interest groups; use of questionnaires, surveys and GAPC nomination forms; and input from policy and technical advisory committees.

State-federal interaction and consideration of the national interest in facility siting

Efforts to provide federal agency input into the coastal program development process have involved contacts with relevant federal agencies and numerous bilateral discussions with those federal agencies believed to have the most interest in the territory's coastal area. The Virgin Islands continues to develop more sophisticated mechanisms to respond to the need to consider the national interest in facility siting and to assure federal consistency with its program.

Organizational arrangements

Direct control by the territorial government of regulation of land and water uses within the coastal area will be employed by the Virgin Islands. The Dept. of Conservation & Cultural Affairs will be the management agency. The planning office will continue to be involved for purposes of program update and refinement of zoning and subdivision regulations.

Authorities

Substantial pieces of legislation relevant to coastal management already exist. Among these are the Submerged Lands Act; Earth Change Law; Open Shorelines Act; Oil Spill Pollution Control Law; and Historic Preservation Act. In addition, there are regulations that deal with building, cutting of trees, management of keys, management of parks and open space, subdivision controls and island-wide zoning.

Some additional legislative authority for the CCA may be desirable. There could be amendments to the existing master plan and zoning ordinance in order that they conform with the permissible use and GAPC designations, and the transfer of the administration of zoning regulations and building permits for work within the coastal area to CCA from the Dept. of Public Works. The planning office is developing a legislative package that will be taken to the legislature in 1977.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1977-240-848/1126

COASTAL ZONE
INFORMATION CENTER

NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CENTER LIBRARY
3 6668 00000 8781