National Task Group Review of the Sea Grant Coastal Community Development Program

June 2006

John Woeste, Chair
Geoffrey Anderson
Robert Goodwin
Martin Harris

http://www.seagrant.noaa.gov/leadership/reviewpanel/final_ccd_transmitted_to_panel.pdf

November 1, 2006

Mr. Nat Robinson, Chair
National Sea Grant Review Panel
4426 Hillcrest Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53705-5060

Dear Mr. Robinson:

As chair of the task group appointed August 1, 2005 to review the Sea Grant Coastal Community Development (CCD) Program, I am transmitting the attached report on behalf of the task group. We trust you will find the report effective in addressing the charge to the task group.

The task group had considerable experience in CCD-related matters. Our members represented program partners and collaborators, and included an experienced extension educator. (Please refer to the task group member listing and bibliographic information in the report Appendices).

The task group would like to extend its thanks to Dr. James Murray, Director of the Sea Grant Extension Program, Mr. Ralph Rayburn, Associate Director and Sea Grant Extension Program/Marine Advisory Service Program Leader for Texas Sea Grant, and Ms. Amy Zimmerling, the former National Sea Grant Office Coastal Community Development Coordinator, for effectively assisting the task group with meeting arrangements and contact information, for establishing the meeting agenda, assembling background documents, and, for the formatting and production of this report. The task group is particularly grateful for the assistance of these individuals in assembling State program reports, reviewing state strategic and implementation plans, and compiling documents defining the rationale and activities leading to the establishment of this special initiative.

The task group convened prior to the review in order to gain consensus on its interpretation of the charge, the work plan, and the type and sources of information to be collected.

A two-day session of hearings was held in Washington, D.C. on December 6-8, 2005. (Please see the report Appendices for a detailed agenda.) In summary, the participants involved NOAA's National Sea Grant Office leadership, national program collaborators, Sea Grant

College Program leadership (SGA), extension committee leadership, local program leadership from state programs (Assembly) and both elected officials and Sea Grant staff from local communities. The task group was gratified and impressed with the willingness of local program constituents to share stories of their involvement with the CCD program in addressing issues of critical concern in their communities.

A clear consensus affirmed the wisdom of initiating a targeted educational programming effort addressing the issue of the coastal communities. The constituents praised the initiation of the CCD program while pleading for more assistance as a result of the growing pressures on this Nation's marine and coastal resources.

The task group hopes the report adequately addresses its charge. Should the Panel have questions concerning the report, we will gladly attempt to provide additional clarification.

We encourage the Panel to use the report in telling the Sea Grant Program story. Our interactions revealed an array of interest among elected officials at the local, state and national levels. Likewise, several federal agencies have expertise relevant to the complex issues facing local, state and regional public officials and concerned citizens. The Sea Grant program, with its established local linkages and working relationships with these public resource agencies, is well-positioned to enhance and expand its coastal community services to our citizens.

Lastly, we found the review process both a stimulating and a challenging experience. We are grateful to the many individuals who shared their time and expertise in conducting the review.

Sincerely

John T. Woeste
Panel member and Chair of the
CDC review task Group

CC;
Robert Goodwin
Martin Harris
Geoffrey Anderson
Jim Murray

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2005, the Director of the National Sea Grant College Program asked the National Sea Grant Review Panel to conduct a review of the Coastal Community Development (CCD) program addressing issues such as programming capacity, target audience response and meaningful programmatic impacts.

Panel Chair, Nat Robinson, designated panel member, John Woeste, to chair and organize a review team, or task group. Three additional members were selected, representing a cooperating federal agency, a national constituent group staff member and a retired recognized specialist in community development educational programming. Two NSGO staff members were assigned to support the Task Group.

The Task Group found that the growing complexity and urgency of coastal resource management issues, as suggested in census data and national reports, were affirmed by local elected officials and community leaders. The thirst for expert advice and new insights into resource management strategies was pervasive in the testimony of the many presenters.

The Task Group addressed several issues that have emerged during the CCD program's first few years. Challenges to CCD include building new organizational relationships, developing strong working relationships with target audiences, refining the program focus, and building linkages with expertise relevant to the complex questions faced by stakeholders.

The NOAA/EPA partnership at the national level has injected relevant professional expertise, helpful state and local governmental connections, useful models and perspectives on addressing development issues, and practical educational materials into the early program development and implementation. Increased interaction with NOAA experts and agencies addressing segments of coastal community issues has strengthened the expertise base and provided useful educational materials for local programs. Similar examples of growing partnerships with USDA, Cooperative Extension have assisted local programs in connections with local leaders, and expanded the research information and expertise base for local programs.

The Task Force's national level recommendations addressed program funding, program philosophy, communications and program accountability, and stakeholder linkages. Two themes emerged for primary attention by the existing Coastal Communities Theme Team. While a general consensus on the primary focus of the effort appeared to be emerging, some questions remain about the focus and the desired optimal boundaries for program content and issues.

For the leadership of the state programs, the universities housing the programs, and the program faculty and staff, the Task Force offered eight recommendations. They included attention to further nurturing developing organizational and clientele relationships and linkages, developing subject matter content for faculty and staff development, adjustments to research planning, and shifts in the mix of scientific and technical expertise supporting the extension programming.

In total, nineteen recommendations were made. With their implementation, the task group believes that this highly relevant and productive program will grow in efficiency, effectiveness and value to our coastal communities, our Nation and the world. Decisions by local communities and their elected officials often have profound global impacts on plant and animal species and coastal natural resources.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Sea Grant College Program
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

AUG 1 2005

Dr. Jerry R. Schubel (Chair)
National Sea Grant Review Panel
Aquarium of the Pacific
320 Golden Shore, Suite 100
Long Beach, California 90802

Dear Jerry:

As follow-up to the recent Panel meeting, this is a formal request to the National Panel to convene a Task Group to conduct a review of the coastal community development (CCD) program. Under current FACA regulations, it is incumbent that at least one panel member be a member of the Task Group. In this instance, I might recommend John Woeste, Panel liaison to Extension, as the Panel member perhaps most suited to this job. As former Dean of the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of Florida, Dr. Woeste has had first-hand experience with community-related extension work.

I would envision a small group of three individuals. Possible external members you may wish to consider from the academic side are Bob Goodwin, recently retired from the University of Washington Sea Grant's Extension Program; Reid Ewing, Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Planning at the University of Maryland, and Research Professor for the National Center for Smart Growth Research and Education; or Chris Nelson, Director of graduate studies in Urban Affairs and Planning at the Virginia Tech Washington-Alexandria Center. From the federal side, Geoff Anderson, Acting Chief of Staff for EPA's Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, would be a good candidate. Alternatively, Tim Torma, Senior Policy Analyst for EPA's Smart Growth Program, would also bring to the Task Group the perspective of a national program, as well as expertise in the field of sustainable community development. Note that NOAA recently entered into an MOA with EPA in the area of community development.

The charge is to complete a preliminary review of the CCD program prior to the November meeting of the Panel, with a final report submitted by January 1. The principal issues for the review to address include the following:

1) During its first four years of existence, has the program been effective?
2) Is the CCD program structured in a manner that allows it to perform well as a national program?
3) Are resources adequate to allow the CCD program to make a significant impact? What would a reasonable CCD build-out plan look like?
4) Can effectiveness of the CCD program be improved by establishing new and creative partnerships?
5) Collectively, does the CCD program require a new or sharper focus?
6) Are there opportunities for the CCD program to strengthen its role within NOAA?

Printed on Recycled Paper

7) As NOAA and NSGO move toward a regional approach to ecosystem management, how can the priorities of the CCD program be better aligned with this approach?
8) How might the CCD program be better integrated with Sea Grant's research agenda?
9) What types of performance measures would be appropriate for measuring the effectiveness of the CCD program in the future?
10) Other recommendations to improve the program.

Jim Murray, assisted by Amy Zimmerling, will act as the NSGO liaison to the Committee. When a Chair has been chosen, please ask him/her to call Jim to discuss next steps and determine needs for staff support to the Panel.

With best regards,

Ronald C. Baird
Director

cc: J. Murray

I. Introduction and Background

Introduction: A Review of the Coastal Community Development Program

Growth and development along the Nation's coasts may be the single largest influence on coastal communities, economies, resources, and coastal environments. In recognition of this fact, Sea Grant initiated the Coastal Community Development (CCD) Program in 2001. The program utilizes the talents of university extension specialists who interpret scientific knowledge and ensure that it reaches coastal user groups, including businesses and industries, federal, state and local government decision makers, and agency managers. In turn, these coastal user groups provide critical information to extension staff by identifying pressing problems and issues, thus informing research priorities within the engaged network of universities. The mission of the CCD program is to provide coastal user groups and decision makers with the knowledge and tools needed to make sound, sustainable land use and coastal resource decisions. This report provides an evaluation of the CCD program's activities to date and makes recommendations for the future direction of the program.

Background: The Influence of Development on U.S. Coasts

Thinking about the effectiveness of the CCD program requires an understanding of the scale at which development takes place, and the breadth of its effects. This section provides only a brief sketch. The United States is a fast growing, ever expanding Nation, with a burgeoning population, business sector and infrastructure. This growth is an engine of our economy and our communities. Industry associated with development comprises about 17 percent of the national gross domestic product (GDP). Unfortunately, this growth is also placing a major pressure on our environment—it impacts the health of our air, water and land. In our coastal areas, this pressure is exerting significant impacts on our ecosystems. Essential habitat and coastal species are being lost as development spreads across the coastal landscape.

Development of our Nation's lands is rapidly consuming natural habitat.

- Since 1982, the United States has developed more than 34 million acres of land—nearly 40 percent more land than was ever developed in U.S. history. This rate of development is more than twice the rate of population growth over this 24-year period.
- Over 1.5 million new homes are built each year, with a recent high of 1.9 million new homes in 2004.[1]

Coastal areas are among the most developed in our Nation.

- More than half of this country's population lives in coastal areas in the contiguous United States. Furthermore, employment in near shore communities is growing three times faster than the populations in these areas.

[1] U.S. Census Bureau Construction Statistics, http://www.census.gov/const/starts_cust.xls

- Coastal and marine waters support over 28 million jobs and provide a tourism destination for nearly 90 million Americans a year.

As our population continues to sprawl, our impacts on the environment are growing.

- In 2002, over 7.3 million tons of nitrogen oxide emissions (NOx) resulted from mobile sources (cars and trucks)—this represents one third of all NOx emissions that year.
- In 2003, the population of the United States traveled 2.8 trillion vehicle miles, producing 8.1 million tons of NOx.[2]
- VMT is expected to continue to grow at a national rate of 2.2 percent per year, while population growth is projected at 0.8 percent per year.[3]

The impacts on our water resources are also dramatic.

- Over 40 percent of our lakes, streams, and estuaries are not clean enough for swimming.
- Development causes about 32 percent of the impairment of estuaries and about 18 percent of the impairment of lakes.
- An estimated 56 percent of the impairment of ocean shorelines is caused by development.
- This growth also impacts our receiving waters—for every 10,000 people, our best wastewater treatment releases about one quarter of a ton of particulate organics into receiving waters each day.
- Approximately 2.3 trillion gallons of effluent are discharged into marine waters from sewage treatment facilities annually.[4]

Impacts are particularly pronounced in the coastal United States.

- Coastal counties cover about 20 percent of the land area of the United States but house about 54 percent of the population.
- Within ten years, that population is expected to grow by 12 million people.
- The twenty largest coastal metropolitan areas are projected to increase their land area by 46 percent in the next 20 years.
- Currently, only four states have more than 25 percent of their land area developed, but current trends project that 25 percent of coastal watersheds will be covered by impervious surface by 2025.

The expansion of development along the coast threatens our habitat, air quality and receiving waters.

---

[2] 2005, EPA National Emissions Inventory Air Pollutant Emissions Trends Data http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/trends/index.html#tables

[3] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, *Highway Statistics 2003* (Washington, DC: 2004), table VM-1.

[4] NOAA, Perspectives On Marine Environmental Quality Today, page E-7, 1998. http://www.yoto98.noaa.gov/yoto/meeting/mar_env_316.html

- The narrow coastal fringe that makes up 17 percent of the nation's contiguous land area is home to more than half of its population.
- In 2003, approximately 153 million people (53 percent of the nation's population) lived in the 673 U.S. coastal counties, an increase of 33 million people since 1980.[5]
- More than 20,000 acres of coastal habitat disappear each year in the U.S.
- More than 60 percent of coastal rivers and bays are considered degraded by nutrient runoff.[6]
- An amount of oil equivalent to the Exxon Valdez spill flows into coastal waters every eight months through the runoff.
- Only about 5 percent of oil pollution in oceans is due to major tanker accidents. Runoff from land and municipal and industrial wastes is by far the largest source of oil in the oceans.[7]

The challenges presented by coastal development were highlighted in the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy's September 2004 report. According to the report: *"The pressures of continuing growth are acutely felt in coastal areas. While largely attributable to activities taking place at the coast, some pressures originate hundreds of miles away in inland watersheds."*

Threats to Traditional Waterfront Usage

Many traditional users of the waterfront resources (many of whom are long-standing constituents of the Sea Grant program), are, or will be affected by coastal population growth. These traditional users include: a) ports, harbors, and marinas; b) recreational boating and marine trades; and, c) the marine tourism industry. Each group is facing issues of displacement as a result of congestion of waterways, pressure on the supply of boat launches and marinas, loss of common access to waterways through condominium conversion of marinas, and impaired freight mobility in metro areas.

Conversely, these constituents stand to benefit from growth-induced opportunities including: increased sale of boats, motors and fishing gear, and market growth for waterfront services (restaurants, museums, aquaria, harbor tours, etc.) leading to revitalization of deteriorated urban waterfronts, and increased throughput of freight at our Nation's ports.

II. Sea Grant CCD Program

[5] 2005, NOAA *Population Trends Along the Coastal United States: 1980-2008*
[6] 2003, Pew Oceans Commission. To download or read the full report online and to review referenced sources, see: http://www.pewtrusts.org/ideas/ideas_item.cfm?content_item_id=1635&content_type_id=8&issue_name=Protecting ocean life&issue=16&page=8&name=Grantee Reports
[7] National Research Council, 1985. Oil in the sea. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.)

At the beginning of the new millennium, the National Sea Grant Office outlined a new program element for the 2001 budget cycle focused on the critical importance of community planning and growth management in coastal areas. The Coastal Communities and Economies (CCE) theme team was tasked to develop broad guidelines for the proposed Sea Grant Coastal Community Development Program and to provide strategic oversight of the program nationally. The CCE theme team was also charged with considering the idea of a national coordination center for the new program to facilitate regional planning, product development, communications, promotion, talent sharing, and to act as a national headquarters.

As a result of theme team discussions and ongoing dialog within the Sea Grant network, a consensus emerged on the vision for a CCD initiative, and guidance was provided to the NSGO for development of the program. The Sea Grant CCD Program represents an opportunity for Sea Grant as an organization to provide national leadership while enabling flexible implementation at the local level. The CCD framework was developed at the national level, while the content and programming are managed by each state Sea Grant program, thus taking into account each university's core capabilities and unique constituent needs. The initiative is intended to capitalize on Sea Grant's demonstrated capacity to provide educational programming to community decision makers who address CCD issues.

Vision and Goal

Sea Grant's Coastal Community Development program is dedicated to assisting coastal communities in their efforts to protect their environmental amenities, strengthen their economies, and improve their quality of life. There is no "cookbook" approach to community planning. Rather, each community must make its decisions in ways that integrate their unique environmental, social, and economic issues with their state's policies for coastal land use decision-making. Thus, the challenge to Sea Grant is to provide science-based information and innovative tools to encourage successful community-based environmental protection and sustainable community development.

A modest investment was envisioned to help Sea Grant extension programs build additional capacity and establish new partnerships with other public and private organizations and agencies concerned with "smart growth" and "sustainable development." Some state legislatures have enacted comprehensive land use planning statutes; others have established growth management programs; and, sometimes, these are combined and integrated into state-wide coastal management programs. Regardless of its particular form, state-mandated community land-use planning places primary responsibility for implementation on local government—in some cases, without providing commensurate funding or technical assistance. Likewise, few resources are committed to education and to empowering the public to participate in policy making and planning exercises.

The vision for the proposed Sea Grant Coastal Community Development Program is that regional, state and local constituencies will improve land- and resource-use decisions and

community development practices to achieve effective sustainable development solutions. Sea Grant can build on its extensive science-based outreach experience to increase assistance to community officials and the coastal public, many of whom may have limited professional training or educational experience with growth management practices. The goal of the CCD program investment is to realize a significant step-up in Sea Grant's engagement at the coastal community decision-making level (e.g., municipalities, counties, state agencies, watershed management districts) by providing the enhanced science-based support needed to balance environmental, social and economic considerations.

Resources

In 2001**,** a total of $1.5M ($50,000 per year) was allocated to create increased capacity for CCD efforts in each Sea Grant program. Funds were distributed equally to the "core" budgets of each participating Sea Grant program. The funds were to be a recurring annual allocation and considered an addition to the outreach capabilities of each program. These resources enabled Sea Grant Directors to identify one person as the program specialist in their state and to represent the interests of their Sea Grant program regionally and nationally.

Since 2001, each Sea Grant program has received $50,000 per year which is leveraged at the state level. Additional investment by the state Sea Grant programs has enabled CCD efforts expand over the past five years. Collectively, more than 90 Sea Grant extension agents (of the network's 377 extension personnel) are addressing critical coastal community development issues.

III. Findings

Since 2001, the CCD initiative made significant advances. During this time, the Sea Grant network's understanding of community development decisions and their impacts on coastal communities grew, and CCD specialists were able to build working relationships with key local and community decision makers. Overall, the program has been successful in its first years in expanding awareness and discourse related to the human impacts on coastal communities. Numerous individual program successes indicate the program has both the scientific/technical capacity and the established connections with decision makers and other key stakeholders necessary to have a long term, positive impact on the health and vitality of coastal communities.

Specific attention was given to the question of appropriate performance measures for the program. Given the vision and purpose outlined at the inception of the program, changes in program capacity, new working relationships among agencies, and the leveraging of resources addressing CCD issues, were the predominate measures suggested in the program reports and hearings. Substantial evidence was presented against those measures. Testimony during the hearings by cooperating agency personnel and local leaders affirmed new and valuable working relationships among the governmental agency staff.

Data on local program outputs and impacts are more difficult to aggregate into national performance measures. While many programs provided data on metrics such as educational events, instructional materials, completed surveys, situational reports, and individual consultations, macro measures appropriate for national reporting of programmatic outcomes have not been identified. Functional national measures could be useful for program accountability as well as a focal point for increased agency collaboration. As a result, development of macro measures was recommended.

Several major adjustments to the program need to be made in order to make further progress on a broader scale. Lessons derived from existing successful state models need to be disseminated nationally. The Task Group observed that the capacity for creating new working relationships and building the program was, at times, reliant on the leadership abilities of the individual Sea Grant CCD specialist. These leadership abilities are important in order for programs to acquire the expertise and resources to successfully build and expand new state program initiatives. In short, the innovativeness of the local university faculty was a greater contributor to success than the formal organizational structure.

Universities would be well advised to expand their research to more human-centric science in support of the CCD program. CCD personnel and their partners within universities would benefit from an increased understanding of, and engagement in, local government decision making processes. Further engagement by participation/attendance at planning/zoning meetings, or sharing their knowledge at public or community meetings would likely help CCD personnel and their partners to more intimately understand the constraints and interests that affect local decision makers, and, in turn, would also help decision makers understand the impacts of their choices.

CCD needs to better market its services and expertise. Increased interaction and connection with public officials was offered as the vehicle for building program awareness and increased public understanding of CCD's purpose and impacts.

CCD is not a stand-alone Sea Grant program. To be effective, CCD must be integrated into the network of extension specialties and academic research that informs understanding of growth and its impacts on marine and coastal resources and environments. Watershed and estuarine studies; marine near-shore functions; cumulative impact models; hazards vulnerability assessment, and so forth, are necessary components of this understanding that can inform growth management decisions. This intersection of CCD, coastal environmental management and coastal hazards mitigation, is fertile ground for future SG programming.

In the early stages of a new initiative, particularly one with limited financial support, these challenges are to be expected. Given these constraints, the CCD program appears to be making a substantial impact. Now entering its fifth year, a series of accomplishments, coupled with positive clientele feedback, indicate that a more significant investment would be a sound expenditure of federal dollars. There are

suggestions for the possible allocation ratios for these funds in the Recommendations on page 22. However, it is clear that even a relatively modest increase in core funding for each CCD program would have a significant impact in an area of growing public concern.

While reports on the new initiative were highly favorable, there were notes of caution from staff. There was unanimous consensus that the current funding allocation was far short of the level needed to satisfactorily address the needs within each state—needs that are growing in complexity and urgency. Staff expressed concerns that publicity and the initial efforts will create expectations far beyond the capacity of the program. This could result in damage to existing working relationships with clientele and cooperating agencies, as well as harm to the public image of the Sea Grant program. In short, CCD staff urged caution, recommending measured commitments made to public officials, cooperating agencies and the general public.

A. Strengths

1. Organizational Linkages

CCD, through linkages with other NOAA offices and a cooperative agreement with EPA, has been able to leverage its assets and expand its capabilities. Still, other opportunities to enhance program capacity exist.

The program charter for NOAA's "Ecosystem Research Program," (Cammen, et.al,) projects a relevant and essential biological and natural research program. New findings from the proposed research could strengthen the scientific base for the creation of more relevant and robust models and new "best management" practices. Enhancement of those research products will enable more effective science-based decisions by government officials and citizens addressing coastal community development issues.

CCD has built a strong national partnership with EPA—a key federal agency with significant experience and a strong reputation for its work in the areas of growth and development. The national partnership with EPA has added needed expertise, lent credibility, and broadened the issue areas to address more human-centric growth and development concerns.

Specifically, the Sea Grant Extension Program's capacity to address coastal community development issues was materially enhanced through the "EPA's Smart Growth Boot Camp." In 2003, forty three Sea Grant agents and specialists from 29 programs attended a week-long intensive program on Smart Growth concepts and program development processes to address coastal development issues. Further, the training sessions offered a fruitful opportunity for information sharing among the state programs. Strategies for enhancing new program initiatives were widely discussed among extension leaders and directors.

In addition, national interagency coordination efforts have increased the information base for the program and resulted in enhanced and more coordinated communications between federal agencies and local implementers. Multi-agency-sponsored projects enable CCD participants to test different approaches to assisting communities who wish to incorporate smart growth techniques into their development and/or redevelopment projects.

CCD has developed strong cooperative relationships with other NOAA programs and non-government organizations (NGOs), particularly Nonpoint Education for Municipal Officials (NEMO). NEMO was created in the early 1990's to provide information, education and assistance to local land use boards and commissions on how they can accommodate growth while protecting their natural resources and community character. The program is built upon the basic belief that the future of our communities and environment depend on land use, and, since land use is decided primarily at the local level, education of local land use officials is the most effective, and most cost-effective, way to bring about positive change. In many instances, the CCD program seems to have utilized NEMO personnel and activities as a foundation for initiating local program efforts.

In 2004, the National Sea Grant Office hired a Coastal Community Development Coordinator to help develop national guidance and focus for the Sea Grant CCD program. The coordinator developed a bi-weekly CCD bulletin focusing on issues of concern to the CCD programming network and organized an ongoing NOAA "Smart Growth Speakers Series," in order to inform CCD, Agency staff and others of coastal community development philosophies, practices and projects. In addition, a workshop was held for CCD Sea Grant extension personnel through NOAA's Coastal Services Center. In summary, federal agency expertise was engaged to strengthen the ability of local Sea Grant program CCD agents to serve public officials, and local, regional and state leaders.

2. State and Local Programming Level

The CCD initiative can help many longstanding constituents of the Sea Grant College program in several ways including: a) organizing themselves to participate in local land and water use planning and development project reviews; b) conducting sector economic and demographic studies to assess the changing demand for water access (moorage, boat launch lanes, put-in/take-out sites, water trails, etc.); c) undertaking regional scale studies of physical and social carrying capacities of waterways under different scenarios; and, d) assisting ports and cities participate in effective dialog over transportation infrastructure investments to insure continued freight mobility. Thus, the CCD initiative builds Sea Grant value for those constituents facing changes in the coastal environment and economy.

Sea Grant Extension's proven roles as impartial broker of information and neutral convener of diverse interests have been utilized and applied to the CCD Program, and have been applied to local coastal community planning activities in many ways.

For example, CCD personnel are engaged in: watershed planning in Connecticut and Washington; community redevelopment in Hawaii; coastal community growth management in Delaware and Texas; planning for coastal hazards mitigation in Washington, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Delaware; addressing impacts of urban coastal growth, redevelopment plans and projects on "Working Waterfronts" in Florida, Maine, and Massachusetts. The above represent a range of issues addressed by local programs that were driven by the needs and interests of local officials and citizens.

Local programs have established new, productive partnerships with a variety of agencies, NGO's and professional organizations. These partnerships have taken different forms, from informal dialogues to required participation in planning boards/commissions, and have contributed both procedurally and substantively to local coastal community planning.

In some instances, partnerships with USDA's Cooperative Extension Service programs at county and state levels were particularly productive and may present opportunities for building a national USDA/NSGO partnership, similar to that with EPA, in the future. Examples include:

a) Formal Cooperative Extension Service (CES)/SG partnerships for improving coastal water quality in the Puget Sound.
b) Enhanced SG/CES relations in Michigan. Over 2,300 local decision makers and planning commissioners have been trained by the "Citizen Planner" program. This program clearly elevated coastal issues into the planning and decision making process and demonstrates the value of the CCD program.
c) Maine Sea Grant's seamless integration of CES and SG Extension staff into a Marine Extension Team (MET) that has tackled a variety of local community development issues from southern Maine's rapidly growing counties to the eastern region's traditional fishing communities. (The recent Maine Sea Grant Program Assessment Team (PAT) recommended that the MET be designated a Best Management Practice.)

CCD personnel have also engaged participants from non-traditional departments, schools and colleges in extension-driven research and education program efforts. Examples include the following: Hawaii - the University of Hawaii School of Architecture; Maryland - Environmental Finance Center; Connecticut - Center for Land Use; and, Florida – University of Florida Law School. New partnerships were reported under development in Texas and Louisiana. Further, a new multi-disciplinary institution was created in Hawaii, the "Center for Smart Building and Community Design," to address the CCD agenda.

B. Weaknesses

Included in the original guidelines for the CCD program are references to human health, yet this expertise was notably absent. There also appears to be a void in the science necessary to inform decisions on the social and economic dimensions of sustainable

coastal development. For the public and local decision makers, health and social science research information is essential to evaluating proposed policies, best management practices (BMPs) and technology-based models.

Impacts having to do with quality of life and economic consequences often dominate local development and redevelopment decisions in coastal communities. Achieving the vision for a more holistic, research-based coastal community development program requires a more "human centric" perspective incorporating increased health and social sciences. Although notable progress has been made, CCD program personnel have not established the breadth of connections and relationships with local elected leaders and development stakeholders necessary to achieve desired results. The strong natural science and research backgrounds of many CCD personnel do not fully address the more human-centric focus and objectives of the CCD program. There is a need for increased inclusion of health and social sciences' expertise and research information into local Sea Grant programming.

Given the dual agency involvement and multiple organizational levels of the CCD program, the team had questions concerning the core focus of the program. With its four-year history, an in-depth look at this issue is warranted as an element of ongoing program improvement. This will be addressed in the recommendations.

Coordination with other federal agencies

The collaboration with EPA on smart growth and community development has received nearly universal support from federal and state participants, and has demonstrated its effectiveness. While the CCD program has done well by establishing a major partnership with the EPA to incorporate smart growth principles into coastal communities' programming, more work needs to be done to build effective partnerships at the local level to assure continued program growth.

The development and growth decisions that impact coastal communities are primarily the province of local governments. Therefore, it is vital that the CCD program establish strong relationships with local decision makers and that CCD specialists actively participate in community development processes. The most effective way to begin to do this may be through the establishment of partnerships between local CCD experts and representatives from national NGOs, perhaps using the EPA/NOAA/Sea Grant collaboration as a model. There are several national organizations well-equipped to assist CCD in gaining access to local decision makers. These organizations host national conferences as well as state and regional gatherings that provide the opportunity to bridge this gap. In addition, these groups provide a range of mediums through which to promote the CCD program and raise awareness of its services. Foremost among these groups are the National Association of Counties (NACO), the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), the National League of Cities (NLC), and perhaps the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

A system responsive to local needs demands a ground up, client-centered philosophy of management. A well-informed public is essential to the implementation of public policy and management decisions. Likewise, an informed citizenry provides the foundation for sustaining policy decisions and incorporating innovation.

The federal role has been important in setting the overall objectives of the CCD program and in providing resources vital to the program's success and expansion. However, while its role is important, it should also be limited to providing expertise, resources and coordination that enable individual CCD programs to respond to specific coastal development challenges within their regions. Repeated testimony of clientele and local staff concurred that it is crucial for programs to retain the flexibility to reach out to local and state partners and to engage non-traditional stakeholders and experts in sustainable development, smart growth, redevelopment, transportation and other topics of relevance, necessary to improve the health and vitality of their coastal communities.

IV. Resources (national to local)

The reports presented to the panel and the interviews with cooperating agency leadership, local governmental officials, and interested citizens revealed a steady growth in coastal community development programming since initiation of the program. Beyond the federal investment and required local match, local programs redirected existing program funds and secured substantial public and private funds to build programming capacity and increase assistance to local communities. Clearly in the panel's view, the growth in system capacity, and evidence of valued impact within local communities confirmed the merit of the pilot program investment. This investment has built a functional foundation for an expanded research and education program to assist local communities in addressing ever more critical development and redevelopment issues.

Expanded research on the impacts of development on coastal communities from a more human-centric perspective, and increased CCD specialists' knowledge of, and participation in, community growth and development processes were identified as "human resource" issues. Building partners at the federal, regional, and local levels (in areas related to smart growth, planning and community development) who can assist SG/CCD personnel in strengthening their efforts to address current or emerging coastal community needs offers increased expertise, sharing of resources and wider endorsement of programming efforts. Lastly, additional funding for CCD programs is needed. The pilot programs have proven very successful in wisely utilizing and significantly leveraging NOAA Sea Grant's original investment. It seems highly likely that increased funding would prove to be a wise investment.

V. Conclusions/Discussion

Long Term Vision: NOAA's Approach to Coastal Development

The pressures of coastal growth profoundly affect NOAA's ability to reach national goals for the sustainable management of coastal resources and the protection of human health and the environment. Sea Grant's CCD program is one of many NOAA activities that address this challenge. To properly evaluate the CCD program and make coherent recommendations for its future activity, it is useful to understand CCD's role within the context of NOAA's broader strategy for addressing the impacts of development

NOAA's strategic plan, "NOAA's Priorities for the 21st Century," reflects the Agency's work to meet the challenges and opportunities that coastal communities are facing. This plan lays out four mission goals, including one objective to "increase number of coastal communities incorporating ecosystem and sustainable development principles into planning and management." Individual NOAA programs reflect their commitment to this objective.

For example, NOAA's Coastal Services Center (CSC) joined the Smart Growth Network in 1999. CSC remains a leader in helping communities address challenges and opportunities that growth and development bring. The NOAA office has contributed to the CCD initiative by creating tools to help measure the environmental impacts of different development patterns and by providing training to extension agents and coastal community leaders to help them better understand the environmental implications of how and where their communities grow.

In addition, NOAA's Office of Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) is responsible for implementing the Coastal Zone Management Act, which has specific land use considerations embedded in its statutory language. Coastal resource managers are charged with identifying and addressing land uses that may degrade coastal resources. OCRM's focus on local management and regulatory issues and ability to support coastal land use and development decisions makes it an ideal CCD partner.

The CCD program was created by NOAA's Sea Grant Extension Program to provide leadership in helping coastal communities address issues related to land development and coastal resources. This program builds on the program delivery, research and expertise base, program successes and existing Sea Grant infrastructure, and focuses specifically on coastal development.

The NOAA Sea Grant CCD initiative creates an additional link between NOAA resources and coastal communities. The linkage capitalizes on both the Sea Grant Program's connectedness with coastal communities (i.e. Sea Grant's capacity to educate local decision makers), and the relevant expertise and research capacity contained in the Sea Grant colleges—adding material capacity for serving coastal communities.

By working together, these NOAA programs have enhanced the overall CCD effort and formed a productive intra-agency partnership. Another outgrowth of their collaboration is the Agency's emergent interest in coastal community resilience—an issue that

incorporates sustainable land use, coastal hazards planning and mitigation—thus, going several steps beyond traditional smart growth and development issues.

Coastal Community Development

To be effective, the Sea Grant CCD program must operate within certain parameters. At a minimum, the CCD program must be responsive to: 1) the scale, diversity and diffuseness of the development sector; 2) Sea Grant's role within NOAA and within communities; 3) the loci of decision-making for development decisions (developers, local government, states, infrastructure providers, etc.); 4) Sea Grant's strengths and competitive niche; 5) the impacts of Sea Grant's traditional programming; and, 6) NOAA's capacity for a direct role on growth issues and decisions. It is within this context that we evaluate the Sea Grant CCD program and make recommendations for its future direction.

The task group believes that Sea Grant CCD can provide leadership in the following crucial areas:

1. **Identifying issues at the local level and using this knowledge nationally—Because Sea Grant is located in communities, CCD specialists are ideally positioned to identify the barriers to, and opportunities for, improved development patterns and practices. This knowledge should be used to create research that is applicable to community problem solving. In addition, locally derived information on barriers and opportunities must filter up to the national level when more systemic changes are possible or desirable.**

2. **Occupying a niche as an objective third party source of research, information and technologies—Because Sea Grant is not the decision maker on growth issues, and because of the program's role in extension, the CCD should base information on sound science, advocating for informed decision-making, and helping communities meet their objectives rather than advocating for individual projects.**

3. **Recognizing the scale of the issues and the positioning required to serve clientele in concert with other agencies and organizations—The CCD program must work on issues and initiatives that have the largest impact on development and create the most leverage for widespread or systemic change.**

4. **Applying the extension model to growth issues—The need to bring national knowledge, best practices and problem solving to thousands of communities across the country is similar to the agricultural challenges which gave rise to the cooperative extension program. Sea Grant's history and place-based setting ideally positions the program to play a central role in public**

education, technical assistance and providing university expertise and research to public officials and interested citizens.

5. **Assessing and documenting project strategies and impacts—Inform national efforts about realities on the ground and rely on national efforts to wholesale best practices and innovations.**

6. **Defining critical expertise sets for local CCD programming—Retool staff skills to better address growth issues and reach out to other experts within the university system and cooperating agencies to provide assistance directly to localities.**

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on a review of background information and documents provided to the task group and information received from the hearings, a set of recommendations were formulated. The recommendations are offered with the intention of guiding the program toward greater visibility and a higher profile as it serves the public need for assistance with the complex issues of community and coastal development.

A. <u>Action items for national program consideration:</u>

NOAA and NSGO

1) Increase the social science research portfolio in NOAA, which, in concert with the Agency's natural and biological sciences capacity, will add a more useful and relevant knowledge base for CCD programming.
2) The Sea Grant Coastal Communities theme team, in cooperation with the NSGO, should review and expand guidance on program performance measures.
3) NSGO should fund a .5 FTE (housed at the NSGO) for national program leadership, inter-agency coordination, national program accountability, and sharing across the network of "Best Management" practices in areas such as local program collaboration, program impact assessments and utilization of program information resources.
4) NOAA should continue to champion and demonstrate its commitment to a "service" mentality by supporting local personnel, and serving public officials and the public. Expanding the availability of federal agency expertise and information services to local programs will increase public use of the resources and enhance both the Agency's visibility and reputation with the local, state and regional clientele.
5) NSGO should sustain the "bottom up," client-centered programming philosophy embedded in the CCD program model. Responsiveness to the expressed needs of elected officials, interest groups and the public will further CCD program public support as well as a public view that their concerns and needs are the central focus of the program.
6) Increase the CCD funding allocation by 100,000 dollars per program over the next one to three years to be allocated one third for Extension and two thirds for

social science research. Increase the allocation to 150,000 per program within the next 3 to 5 years using the same use distribution.

7) The NSGO, working with the CCD theme team and Sea Grant Association, should review and further define Sea Grant's role among the array of federal agencies and offices within those agencies addressing both the terrestrial and the wet side of coastal issues.
8) The NSGO and NOAA should pursue a formal federal partnership with USDA in order to address the nation's coastal community development issues.
9) Implement a concerted, coordinated effort to engage additional key stakeholders on development issues affecting coastal communities at the national and local levels. Potential stakeholders include organizations of county, city and township officials, planners, and builders/developers.
10) Develop a systematic feedback mechanism for field CCD staff to provide guidance and input to the NSGO. Much of what the panel found most useful in reviewing and providing recommendations on the program came from interactive dialogue directly with CCD program leaders. While this is necessary for the review, having a similar mechanism for providing input on a consistent (perhaps yearly) basis from the individual CCD programs would likely prove useful. This should be in addition to the normal written reports and updates. In addition to providing feedback on program needs/direction at the national level, bringing individual CCD leaders together will also likely spur new strategies and approaches through their sharing of best practices.

Coastal Communities Theme Team

1) The Coastal Communities theme team, in concert with the NSGO, should review the current program definition in order to more clearly define the scope of the program and to gain a broader consensus within Sea Grant program leadership on the programmatic focus.
2) The Sea Grant Coastal Communities theme team, in cooperation with the NSGO, should review and expand guidance on program performance measures. Working together, they should develop a set of national program performance measures that will be useful for assessing program effectiveness and fulfilling the program's accountability responsibilities.

B) <u>Action items for local program consideration:</u>

1) Consult regularly and directly with local decision makers to discuss growth and development trends within the state and region to better inform research and education program planning. A review of local program advisory committee membership is suggested to insure representation of target audiences for the CCD program.
2) Increase the marketing of NOAA/Sea Grant's CCD capacity and commitment to providing a vast array of scientific information and expertise to local, state and regional public officials and citizens.

3) Further develop working relationships with state and regional membership organizations for public officials and relevant planning and development associations for professionals in these fields.
4) Formulate and advance efforts to increase university leadership and faculty members' understanding of coastal issues and the relevance of their expertise to pressing coastal development issues.
5) Expand local Sea Grant research planning, review and implementation to include more social scientists and design professionals to better address the human dimensions of CCD programming issues. Specific areas for consideration include: modifying the research review process to create a level playing field for social science and environmental design proposals (vis-à-vis those from natural sciences and engineering); including social scientist in internal Sea Grant proposal review panels; and, including coastal community development themes in calls for research proposals.
6) Increase the capacity of extension staff through training and instructional resource materials to engage in public policy education, conflict resolution strategies and institutional building programs.
7) Refine the processes of identifying and prioritizing regional research needs. Further coordination among agency and University research programs within regions offers the potential for both engaging a broader base of research expertise and capitalizing on recognized authorities to support local programming.
8) Develop proposals in conjunction with local government, metropolitan planning organizations, community development organizations and private stakeholders to secure outside funding in order to leverage NOAA/Sea Grant monies.
   Local and state elected officials play a central role in the future of our man-made environment, protection of natural resources and long term quality of life. Given a vital interest in those concerns, they have a stake in guiding the direction of the program. Engaging them through their state and national associations will serve to increase understanding of available national and university resources, build a sense of program ownership and engage program funding support. The success record of the expanded program coupled with the growing coastline population clearly calls for new and greater efforts to enhance informed coastal community planning and development.

Appendix A – Coastal Community Development Program Topical Assessment Team

John Woeste (Chair)
Professor Emeritus
University of Florida
Phone: (352) 377-0190
FAX: (352) 271-7256
jandmwoeste@juno.com

Robert Goodwin
(Retired) Affiliate Associate Professor
School of Marine Affairs, University of Washington
Phone: (509) 422–1733
goodrf@ix.netcom.com

Martin Harris
Director, Joint Center for Sustainable Communities
National Association of Counties
Phone: (202) 661-8805
Fax: (202) 737-0480
mharris@naco.org

Geoffrey Anderson
Director, Development, Community and Environment Division
Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: (202) 566-2832
Fax: (202) 566-2868
anderson.geoffrey@epa.gov

National Sea Grant Office Staff:

Jim Murray
Director, Sea Grant Extension Program
NOAA Sea Grant
Phone: (301) 713-2431 x152
Fax: (301) 713-0799
Jim.D.Murray@noaa.gov

Amy Zimmerling
Coastal Community Development Coordinator
NOAA Sea Grant
Phone: (301) 713-2431 x187
Fax: (301) 713-0799
Amy.Zimmerling@noaa.gov

Appendix B - Meeting Agenda

CCD Program Review
Committee Meeting Agenda
December 5-7, 2005
1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring

Monday 12/5
Conference Room #10836

8:30 – Charge to Panel, CCD Program overview
Ron Baird, Director, National Sea Grant Office
Fritz Schuler, Executive Director and co-chair of the Coastal Communities and Economies theme team

10:15 – Summary of Sea Grant Extension papers
Jim Murray, Program Leader for Extension

10:45 – Break

11:00 – Committee meeting
-Review materials
-Review/refine evaluation protocol

12:30 – Lunch

1:30 – Coastal Communities and Economies theme team views
Gordon Grau, Hawaii Sea Grant Director and Theme Team Co-Chair
Fritz Schuler, Executive Director, National Sea Grant Office and Theme Team Co-Chair
Mary Donohue, Associate Director, Hawaii Sea Grant
Steve Meder, Director, Center for Smart Building and Community Design, Hawaii Sea Grant
John Carey, Sustainability Coordinator, Hawaii Sea Grant

3:00 – Sea Grant Association views
Jon Kramer, President

4:00 – Committee meeting, continued

5:00 – Adjourn, Social/Dinner

Tuesday 12/6
Conference Room #10836

8:30 – Committee meeting, continued

9:30 – Assembly of Sea Grant Extension Program Leader views
Ralph Rayburn, Chair of Assembly, Texas Sea Grant
Tom Murray (for Bill DuPaul), Virginia Sea Grant
Doug Lipton, Maryland Sea Grant

10:30 – Break

10:45 – Stakeholder Views: conference call/panel
Donald McCann, Planner, Lancaster County, VA *(in person)*
John Mateyko, Greater Lewes Foundation, Lewes, DE
Christine Gault, Director, Waquoit Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve, MA
Valerie McCallum, Lake Township Clerk, Huron County, MI

11:45 – Jeff Taebel, Director of Environmental and Community Planning, Houston-Galveston Area Council
Jim Bolger, Assistant Planning Director, Kitsap County, WA
Ron Flick, Oceanographer, California Department of Boating & Waterways

12: 30 – Lunch

1:30 – CCD Agents and Specialists panel
John Jacob (TX)
Mike Klepinger (MI)
Peter Rappa (HI)
Mike Liffmann (LA)
Tom Murray (VA)

3:00 – The NOAA mission and Sea Grant role
Jan Kucklick, CCD Lead, Coastal Services Center
John Kuriawa, NOAA/EPA CCD Partnership Coordinator

4:00 – Working Waterfront Preservation Act – research, extension, public education needs
Avery Day, U.S. Senator Susan Collins' (ME) office
Andrew Minkiewicz, U.S. Senator Olympia Snowe's (ME) office

5:00 – Adjourn

Wednesday 12/7

Conference Room #6836

8:30 – Committee meeting: further information needs, tentative conclusions, next steps, writing assignments

12:00 – Adjourn

Appendix C - List of presenters and organizations represented by presenters

Ron Baird, Director, National Sea Grant Office
Fritz Schuler, Executive Director, National Sea Grant Office
Gordon Grau, Director, Hawaii Sea Grant College Program
Mary Donohue, Associate Director, Hawaii Sea Grant College Program
Steve Meder, Director, Center for Smart Building and Community Design, Hawaii Sea Grant College Program
John Carey, Sustainability Coordinator, Hawaii Sea Grant College Program
Jonathan Kramer, Director, Maryland Sea Grant College Program
Ralph Rayburn, Sea Grant Extension Program Leader, Texas Sea Grant College Program
Tom Murray, Coastal Community Development Specialist, Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences
Doug Lipton, Sea Grant Extension Program Leader, Maryland Sea Grant College Program
Donald McCann, Planner, Lancaster County, VA
John Mateyko, Greater Lewes Foundation, Lewes, DL
Christine Gault, Director, Waquoit Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve, MA
Valerie McCallum, Lake Township Clerk, Huron County, MI
Jeff Taebel, Director of Environmental and Community Planning, Houston-Galverston Area Council

Appendix D – Sea Grant Extension Response to Coastal Community Development Survey and Survey Instrument

ASSEMBLY OF SEA GRANT EXTENSION PROGRAM LEADERS RESPONSE TO COASTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SURVEY CONDUCTED IN SUPPORT OF THE COASTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PANEL DELIBERATIONS

PREPARED AND DELIVERED BY

RALPH RAYBURN
ASSEMBLY CHAIR

on

DECEMBER 6, 2005

INTRODUCTION

The Assembly of Sea Grant Extension Program Leaders is an unincorporated independent organization. The organization operates under a set of bylaws established by its membership consisting of extension program leaders from each of the state Sea Grant programs.

In order to support the National Sea Grant Review Panel and National Sea Grant Office in the review of the Coastal Communities Development initiative, the Executive Committee of the Assembly tasked the Assembly chair to prepare an instrument and survey the Assembly's membership on elements of this initiative.

Following review of the survey instrument by the Assembly executive committee, staff of the National Sea Grant Office and the National Sea Grant Review Panel's liaison to the Assembly, the survey was distributed to the Assembly membership through electronic mail.

By the preparation of this report, 27 of 32 programs responded to the survey with one respondent indicating no engagement in the CCD program due to the small size of the program and then the Assembly chair (from Texas) abstaining from the survey; however, the Texas Sea Grant Community Development specialist will be addressing the review committee through a conference call at some point it is deliberations.

The body of this report consists of a simple compilation of the survey responses to include averaging the numerical scores given to questions requesting a rating and composing actual narrative comments with only minor edits for readability.

The Appendices to this report include the survey instrument and the listing of programs that responded.

SUMMARY OF
ASSEMBLY OF SEA GRANT EXTENSION
PROGRAM LEADERS RESPONSE TO
COASTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

1) **During its first four years of existence, has the program been effective?**

Rating 0 (not effective) to 5 (very effective) score = **4.29**

Comments:

- CCD has enabled us to network on matters relating to our communities. It has also highlighted the diversity found in our coastal communities and the multiple issues and challenges they confront. Thus, I find us to be quite diffuse and involved in a multitude of subjects. And that might be ok for now, but we need to find some common denominators and the Gordon Grau's [theme team] group should give us some direction.
- CCD complements all our other program areas and address a most critical issue for the coast – dealing with accelerating growth and its impacts on natural resources, communities, economies.
- In [state deleted] this effort has certainly caused us to look closely at this program area in our coastal region and have used the effort to initiate CCD programming in the state. There is a lot of potential for the effort if funding is continued and strengthened from the federal level.
- Locally it has had some great successes, but it has suffered from a lack of focus. A lot of programming now loosely falls under the rubric of "CCD", but its origins were built on a NEMO/land use focus.
- Not sure what level of effectiveness you are asking about (State, regional or national). We would not have been able to achieve our CCD state successes with the funding support we have received.
- CCD is a pivotal program with a high demand from coastal and inland constituents. Unfortunately, it is under funded. Given the resources, I would rate the program at a 5, but given what it could be, I rate it a 4.
- We are able to spread the $50,000 to a number of uses.
- Yes! The funding support provided by the CCD program has enabled [program deleted] Sea Grant to undertake a number of new community based initiatives, foremost among these, the establishment of our new Center for Smart Building and Community Design.
- The program has been an excellent opportunity to improve and expand the priorities to impact more government agencies at all levels within smart growth, in our case.
- Initial efforts have been quite productive in terms of building [program deleted] SGMAP capacity in this area, spreading knowledge of this new capability among stakeholders and forming successful short and long term programmatic and financial partnerships.

- There is a compelling need for this programming in every coastal county. Funding to support one full FTE would be highly desirable.
- The program is great but expectations were also very high!!!
- [The initiative] provided the resources to become more involved CCD issues outside of our traditional areas.
- The coastal communities and economies theme has been one of the most active on a national level and has probably generated more good ideas and interaction among specialists.
- [With the other state program] and we have not been able to jointly hire a CCD specialist so we've used the funds for our ongoing CCD work. It could have had a bigger impact if we'd been able to pool our funds and hire a full-time person.

2) Is the CCD program structured in a manner that allows it to perform well as a national program?

Rating: 0 (strongly **disagree)** to 5 (strongly **agree**) score = **3.52**

Comments:

- We still lack focus and direction as a national program, although attempts at steering the effort are underway.
- Smart growth training and Amy Z are two things that are helping, but so far, there has been little significant national-scale initiatives. I think it takes time to develop.
- Need to ensure that we have local flexibility while being able to rely on NSGO to compile the activities and mine from the nationally gathered information to make the case for impact locally, regionally and nationally.
- Our program's CCD element is fully integrated within our program. I do have a concern that at the national level, we are too closely associated with the EPA's agenda. I also have a concern that the CCD theme team has taken an advocacy approach to smart growth. In our program we see ourselves in supporting the decision making process by adding science based information and presenting alternatives. We do not advocate any alternative, even the ones we present.
- Funding is minimal and not assured from year to year to allow us to have confidence resources will be available in succeeding years.
- The CCD program suffered from an initial lack of leadership and focus, and time has allowed its "fuzziness" to become institutionalized. New leadership is helpful, but may not be able to overcome the hodge-podge of programs that have resulted.
- I sense we are still struggling to work as a national program.
- Don't think that a program like this with strong local impact can be a strong national one as well

- The initial CCD support for the 'smart growth' training program with EPA was a real solid contribution and helped to re-energize the Coastal Communities and Economies Theme Team. The new CCD Bulletin provides a start in terms of establishing some form of national sharing of information among programs, but more could be done in terms of building a permanent structure within the national Sea Grant office for this program.
- It helps greatly to have a coordinator in Washington. Amy Zimmerling facilitates discussion and exchange with state programs.
- It is needed to integrate more research and subsidize it, on the different topics and priorities of the CCD. Also additional funds will need to be identified, and more capacity building is needed.
- Need some national objectives we are trying to achieve as each state decides what they are going to do to justify their 50K. Some states have formed a coordinated program by joining into the NEMO network – others are more disparate and not part of a coordinated effort.
- Local programming pre-dated national effort so consolidated approaches need more time in order to provide a resource to respond to local needs. The key is for the national program to reflect local and regional priorities, not vice-versa.
- Yes but would benefit from increased funding
- Needs a little more leadership at the regional and national level.
- Allocating $50,000 annually for each program and allowing the flexibility to program the resources to meet state and local priorities has been a good model. The EPA partnership has been helpful and Jim Murray and Amy Zimmerling have guided the program well.
- CCD program would be most efficient if there were specialists working exclusively on CCD issues. With limited funds, I suspect that most programs are having someone do the work on a part-time basis.

3) Are resources adequate to allow the CCD program to make a significant impact?

Rating 0 (strongly **agree**) to 5 (strongly **disagree**) score = **3.56**

Comments:

- We need millions of dollars not just a few hundred thousand if we are to make an impact in this arena. We need to obtain expertise in a variety of non-traditional Sea Grant fields and this will cost us some serious bucks.
- Oftentimes broad expertise is needed, and funding levels limit the amount of expertise available.
- It would be better to have $75-80K so that we could purchase a full FTE.

- I believe our program has done a very good job in using the resources we have. We could of course use additional resources, were they are available.
- No - resources are inadequate, especially for a state, such as [state deleted], which has a vast coastal region. NSGO resources don't even fund 50% of a position.
- Every year, the value of the $50K erodes. Like all other SG programs, it requires strong partnering and additional funds to be effective and have significant impacts. However, the $50K is still a good amount of funding with which to forge new partnerships, but if the program continues (and I think it should), the amount invested in it should be increased by Sea Grant to keep our investment in the program meaningful.
- Still need funds to support CCD research.
- The program needs more funding, either as additional operating funds or personnel funds. The coastal and inland demand for the service far exceeds our ability to supply it.
- We are making an impact with the $50,000. Couldn't do it with much less.
- Additional resources are always needed! In the case of the CCD program most of the funding goes to support extension specialist salary. The CCD funded specialists have made a significant contribution within their states and nationally with their support of the work of Coastal Communities and Economies Theme Team. To make a significant impact what is needed; however, is an augmentation of program funds that could be leveraged to initiate/support CCD community-based project activities.
- There are lots of resources, many of them we have identified during the development of our program.
- Need enough to support 1 FTE in each program – a minimum of $110,000 per program.
- Currently with successful financial leveraging, the CCD funds are an adequate base.
- Emphasize local "fit" to complement/ strengthen existing community and regional planning, land use and environmental management capabilities. Avoid chasing national programmatic priorities set by other agencies such as EPA and other parts of NOAA that do not share the same ultimate goal as Sea Grant in fostering coastal economies and communities.
- Impacts are significant, but not without supplemental program support
- To be really significant funds should be at a level to employ a specialist ($100K with overhead and travel)
- The current level of funding has produced a significant impact, but more funding targeted strategically could produce more of an impact. An additional amount dedicated to a planning oriented research project for each state that could be paired with the outreach would be worth exploring, as would regular competitive RFPs.
- Resources are spread too thin for this program especially when the folks doing the work are probably not primarily urbanists. So, when folks from

other disciplines take the work on as a collateral duty, they're probably spending a lot of time educating themselves. The reasonable program would have at least one full-time CCD specialist per state and more than one in large states with long coastlines.

What would a reasonable CCD build-out plan look like?

- We need to expand the core staff involved in this field and we can't do so through occasional small grants. We need to obtain expertise in coastal engineering, land use planning, urban systems, hazards mitigation, etc.
- $100K per program would allow a full FTE plus program development expenses to help bring partners to the table.
- I would say a minimum of 100K/year in funding is necessary and committed over at least a 5-year period.
- Not sure
- Continued funding of at least one CCD agent in each state. Available salary funds need to be increased to attract and keep qualified agents in a very competitive field. Adequate operating funds need to be added to the project.
- It would be great to get enough money for a full-time professional.
- Resources are needed to expand Sea Grant's research and outreach capabilities and to extend a newly created knowledge-base to states and communities struggling with growth issues. A three-pronged approach is proposed to expand the community knowledge base, extend that knowledge base to coastal decision-makers at the local, state and regional levels, and build local capacity utilizing new tools and the application of new knowledge to promote environmentally sustainable coastal community growth.

  Specifically, resources are needed to expand Sea Grant's research and outreach capabilities and to extend a newly created knowledge-base to states and communities struggling with growth issues. A three-pronged approach is proposed that expands the community knowledge base, extends that knowledge base to coastal decision-makers at the local, state and regional levels and builds local capacity through the utilization of new tools and application of new knowledge to promote and enable environmentally sustainable coastal community growth.

  Providing the knowledge base – Building and cultivating healthy coastal communities require integrated knowledge from a variety of scientific, social science and architectural/engineering disciplines. As a science agency, NOAA is greatly undercapitalized in the social sciences and in design and engineering or the type most needed to address Coastal Community Development (CCD) issues. Sea Grant is NOAA's link to universities that have that breadth of knowledge and the coastal

communities they serve. What is needed is collaborative research involving comprehensive new approaches in which research in the physical and social sciences are linked with architecture and engineering studies to increase our understanding of the way in which the built environment interacts with and impacts the ocean and earth systems of which they are a part. This research can also be tied to training a new generation of professionals, scientists and engineers who will build both strong communities and sustain healthy coasts.

Resources needed = $20 M per year awarded on a competitive basis

Reaching out to communities – A recent review of Sea Grant's extension program (Byrne, et. al., 2000) concluded that the number of Sea Grant extension agents needed to be substantially increased in order for NOAA to successfully engage the coastal public. What is clear from the early assessments of the National CCD program is that it is greatly oversubscribed in terms of the demand being generated by coastal decision-makers for information -- greatly exceeding Sea Grant's ability to accommodate it. What is needed is a substantial additional investment to extend the existing university-based outreach infrastructure of extension agents and specialists in all coastal states. This investment will be highly leveraged, because of the requirement for a local match and also because Sea Grant has an impressive track record in leveraging funds through partnerships with other agencies, private foundations and NGOs.

Resources needed = $ 11.5 M per year

Building new national capacity – In recent years, NOAA and EPA have jointly initiated a Federal partnership to apply their collective resources to address coastal community issues through local capacity building. The partnership is being formalized by an inter-agency MOU, which includes staff exchanges, training programs and co-funding of projects. To meet its potential to serve state and local governments the partnership envisions a strong Sea Grant role in delivering products, services, and research results to local community decision makers. To deliver these services a network of National Sea Grant Coastal Community Development Centers is proposed. These Centers would be administered by individual Sea Grant programs and selected on a competitive basis. The Centers would form the focal point for assisting local community development planning and priority setting processes, addressing issues related to the built environment and development, and their potential impact on the coastal environment and assisting communities by helping to organize and bring to bear expertise from both inside and outside of government to directly assist local officials. Experts in the areas of sustainable architectural design and construction, urban and regional planning, development

economics, traffic planning, among others would represent the new expertise made available through the Centers.

This new direction will be delivered as education and demonstration to the development communities, educational outreach to the professional community, and provide curriculum changes to the associated colleges and universities thereby bringing new knowledge and skills to today's designers as well as tomorrow's leaders. Example programs would include; 1) teams of experts to be assembled to address specific problems beyond the expertise level of the state or local government. These teams would be assembled and funded under the auspices of the Centers and the request of state or local governments, or 2) state or local governments could develop applications for federal or university resources to be applied to specific state and local coastal community issues.

Resources needed = $ 8.5 M (National Center = $ 0.5 M, + 8 regional centers @ $ 1 M per year)

- Need money for a full FTE not partial FTE. Increase to 100K per program. In addition, it would be great to expand resources beyond the FTE with competitive grants for program implementation and TA (like smart growth).
- Fully fund at least one FTE in each program for CCD work.
- Funding needs to be about three times as much. $150K per program would support a high-level full time person with a budget to travel and even fund some activities.
- A plan that had objectives that showed what the 33 FTE's of Sea Grant CCD personnel would collectively accomplish. It would probably be in 2-3 subprogram areas such as: land use planning – economic development, etc.
- In [state deleted], a reasonable commitment in the next 2 years would be 1.5 FTES. An increase of approximately .75 FTES.
- Double funding levels to allow each program to support one FTE addressing coastal community development issues
- The issues in this area are critical and will have long term impacts. The program in my state could be three times the size.
- Strong comprehensive plans with citizen engagement in all coastal communities.

4) Can effectiveness of the CCD program be improved by establishing new and creative partnerships?

YES **23** NO **2**

Partnership suggestions:

- This is a must, but it also needs to be accompanied with our internal capabilities to engage in meaningful partnerships. For instance, if we are to engage NACO [National Association of County Officials] or ICMA [International City/County Management Association] we ought to have the capabilities to work with these groups. We don't at this time.
- ICMA (already started)
- Local agencies and municipalities.
- For individual programs, partnerships arise based-on local needs and opportunities. A potential national partner might be the American Planning Association (APA), which has local chapters in every/most states.
- I think a good job has been done at establishing the existing relationships with EPA etc. but I'm certain if the program received more focus more could be done. I would like to see EPA have resources available for this effort at the state level.
- This is essential and has been from the beginning. However, I believe this needs to occur at the local level, rather than imposing partnerships like Smart Growth on every program.
- Some more network interaction would be most helpful.
- Any state, regional, or national partners that have a similar/complementary mission that SG has.
- Additional training for the Cooperative Extension Service at the county level
- Partnering with state development and training agencies, in [state deleted] DCA.
- A structured integrated CCD program with the US EPA
- Local planning authorities
- Individual communities
- Academic architecture and planning departments
- Already doing this at the local level.
- Partnerships within NOAA are critical … particularly those with OCRM and the Coastal Services Center. Beyond that, the partnerships with EPA's Smart Growth Office, the National Smart Growth Network, and community organizations (e.g., Conference of Mayors, National Association of County Officers) are critical. The National Sea Grant Office has been doing an exemplary job in nurturing these partnerships … they; however, require constant attention and direct involvement. Strong national CCD support is necessary to continue to build these partnerships and maintain existing partnerships.
- IBHS [Institute for Business and Home Safety], APA, Council of Mayors, AIA [American Institute of Architects], Reinsurance, ULI [Urban Land Institute].
- USEPA, state smart growth initiatives, local NGO's involved with smart growth etc. EcoCity [city deleted]

- The main missing partner is Cooperative Extension, we need to utilize that county-based network that is more extensive than just the Sea Grant network
- APA, Smart Growth Network, ICMA
- Don't limit partnerships to just EPA smart growth. – must focus on how NOAA research and ocean observing systems can be used to inform coastal community development decisions – we could focus on identifying sustainable development limits and forecasting of impacts from various coastal development scenarios.
- Continue building upon core of local community and regional economic development and marine resource dependent community stakeholders. Continue networking with other Sea Grant CCD programs to learn and share successful initiatives and keep an eye toward potential regional programs.
- Partner with EPA, CZM and state regional planning organizations.
- EPA, state and local organizations in planning and development
- NERRS
- National Association of Realtors, National Builders Assoc., Centers for Disease Control, AARP
- American Planning Association (connections to state chapters)
- Midwest Spatial Decision Support System Partnership.
- If coastal communities have some unique characteristics, then we, as Sea Grant, should develop our own cadre of experts in this area. If we partner (for instance with HUD), they're more likely to try either to co-opt our efforts for use elsewhere or they just don't have the marine and coastal interest and skills that we do. We need to develop our own expertise in this area to succeed.

5) Collectively, does the CCD program require a new or sharper focus?

Rating 0 (strongly **disagree**) to 5 (strongly **agree**) score = **2.52**

Comments:

- Flexibility is critical. There is no way that Silver Spring (or any centralized body) can know what the local communities need.
- No. Every program will probably approach CCD differently based-on local needs and circumstances. I do not think the local programs require national leadership to provide focus. Rather, the national level should facilitate communication and inter-program coordination.
- I really believe the focus is there that we can build from at the state and regional level.
- There is still a wide variety of topics and issues that are covered by the CCD program. Do they all fit?

- CCD provides the basic framework, but local conditions should and will determine how the program functions on the ground.
- Needs flexibility for each state to tailor to local needs and local partners.
- The CCD program could benefit from a sharper focus and direction. Efforts to blend a 'meta-theme' for Sea Grant composed of elements from the Coastal Communities and Economies, Urban Coasts, Hazards, and Ecosystems Theme Teams could provide such a focus and direction. The elements of such a 'meta-theme;' could provide the strategic direction for the specific program elements of the national CCD program.
- Sharpening the focus needs to occur at the local level, not dictated from above.
- Perhaps a sharper focus at the national level, but this should not be prescribed in a way that hamstrings the local program. Currently, it seems the national CCD effort has appropriately focused upon assisting the local CCD programs in coordination, networking, information sharing and the like. This is entirely appropriate and helpful to local programs. Caution should be exercised in making the CCD program solely (or primarily) a land use/smart growth initiative that, while perhaps more in line with the goals of EPA and selected NOAA programs, is not where Sea Grant community educational efforts must focus.
- I think the direction is good; however, we need more resources to support the program.
- Focus should be sharpened at the local level based on their priorities
- States should define their future direction.
- Currently CCD means many things to many people. This provides flexibility among programs but a narrowing of the focus might improve results.
- The program is well managed.
- If we're serious about this, we should hire folks from the urban focused professions (planners, urban economists, development economists) and teach them how to be effective extension professionals. It might even evolve into a branch of the Extension Academy.

6) Are there opportunities for the CCD program to strengthen its role within NOAA?

Rating 0 (strongly **disagree**) to 5 (strongly **agree**) score = **3.92**

Comments:

- I think so, but we have some serious "competitors" in this "race" for NOAA's attention. The CSC and OCRM come to mind, particularly the former, when we consider its ability to maneuver much more effectively than we do.

- I assume there must be, but it is not clear that these activities even show up in the NOAA work plan. It would be nice if SG could encourage this, but NOAA gets so “NOAA-centric” that I am not sure they really care about local coastal community needs.
- Undoubtedly; however, I can’t be specific. Certainly a program with an interest in coastal access for commercial fishermen or other traditional users, could work with NMFS, for example, on socio-economic impacts of coastal growth in a fisheries context.
- I think the opportunities are there and it would probably take an IPA or some other relationship, to bring someone into NOAA from a state Sea Grant program.
- I think there are tools and information available through other parts of NOAA that would be beneficial to utilize in local programs, and would strengthen local impacts and increase effectiveness. They should be explored and the CCD community made aware of them (sharing among the network). However, the roots of the program lie in local communities and local needs, and should remain there.
- NOAA doesn’t seem that interested in this type of effort. It’s perhaps not "sciency" enough.
- I agree there should be ways to strengthen our role within NOAA, but not sure whether there are opportunities, or not.
- More strongly pull NOAA technical expertise into the program.
- I don’t know.
- Yes. The CCD program needs to become a more recognized NOAA program … not just an internal Sea Grant program! Efforts need to be made to ‘market’ the program to OCRM and the NOAA Coastal Services Center as a mechanism for NOAA to reach coastal communities through the CCD extension agents.
- Only with more money (storm surge info delivery)
- We always have opportunities to strengthen our role within NOAA but for some reason our efforts to get increased funding fall flat. All the reports say we do great things, we have an involved evaluation system that keeps us at a high level of efficiency and the national reports say Sea Grant should be better funded yet we end up getting the shaft. Why? Who is dropping the ball?
- Stronger ties with the Coastal Zone program would make the most sense.
- Due to the past hurricanes in the Gulf Coast and our experience with the same natural events in our island CCD has the opportunity to bring all the expertise to the redevelopment of these areas.
- Tie to NOAA research and be outreach arm for that related to CCD.
- Sea Grant CCD should be the primary conduit for NOAA educational and outreach efforts with coastal communities. Recently emerging NOAA and NOAA funded efforts (such as the Chesapeake Bay Program’s “NEMO”) present some what of a risk to our growing CCD programs by confusing local stakeholders and impeding the continued success and growth of the increasingly important Sea Grant CCE programs.

- This program affects many aspects of our coastal environment.
- A committed CCD FTE could act as a liaison to other NOAA programs
- It appears that some parts of NOAA are very interested in CCD issues and would welcome our 'grass roots' efforts
- More collaboration with the NOAA Coastal Services Center.
- CCD can strengthen its role in NOAA but first NOAA has to understand that there is a unique problem to which the CCD program can make an effective response. I'm not sure that NOAA understands that and, if push came to shove, they'd probably like to see it handed off to HUD. If we want CCD to thrive, we need to make a better case for it within NOAA—that there is something unique about coastal communities and that we're the folks who truly understand the issues.

General Discussion Questions –

7) **What are the affects of the CCD national program on program priorities within the state**?

- Helpful in that we have been able to add capabilities in GIS that we'll put to good use in rebuilding efforts.
- As usual, we try to address local priorities that fit within the national program priorities -- doesn't seem to be a problem from our perspective.
- Little or none this should be locally driven with the activities and information going to national for synthesis and value adding.
- None. Our programs are based on our state's needs. We should ask the reverse, what are the affects of the state CCD programs on the national CCD program?
- I think the CCD program is really starting to be recognized by some state agencies in [state deleted].
- Working in local communities on land use decisions has long been a part of our program's effort, with the initiation of the NEMO program in the early 1990s, and will continue to be. The CCD funds have not changed our overall priorities in this regard, but have enabled us to focus more of our efforts specifically on coastal communities and developing tools that will benefit these municipalities in their decision-making**.**
- This program matched almost exactly what we were doing. So it has been a big help in allowing us to expand coastal community programming in concert with our partners.
- We have made CCD a high priority with our state, even have a new CCD initiative beginning with 2 other colleges at the university and we are included in the university president's budget request to the state for additional support.
- CCD allowed us to enter a totally new area that effectively integrated many of our other program efforts including water quality, land use, coastal resource management and the shared use of coastal resources.

- Just keep it flexible for us as it is now.
- As a direct result of CCD program funding [state deleted] Sea Grant was able to build the basis for its Center for Smart Building and Community Design and undertake efforts state-wide with the City and County of [areas deleted] Counties to assist with coastal community planning and development efforts.
- Huge. Brings credibility to SG to have a national network and program focus to our state. Lets us tap into other programs and leverage additional donor funds.
- They are very compatible with [program deleted] Sea Grant priorities.
- This has always been a priority in the state, the CCD program allowed us to have some resources that we could apply to it.
- In our case CCD Program gives an excellent opportunity to collaborate with other government agencies such as transportation, among others, and being advisors in planning, development and economic issues in the coastal zone.
- This supports ½ of one of our key programs
- Aside from the benefits outlined above(#5) and the consistent funding support, there are not significant effects on the state program, rather the national program has been motivated and steered by ongoing state programs. This should continue to be the direction of program development. If CCD national programming begins to follow areas that are not justifiable for local programs to follow then the national program would have a significantly adverse impact on local programs by distracting from what local stakeholders need from Sea Grant.
- Good ideas for future control of growth but very slight impact at this point in time.
- Dedicated CCD person to provide liaison w/ ecosystem management initiatives w/in NOAA
- Fits in perfectly!!!
- Working with EPA and Smart Growth program has been a positive relationship for our program
- The CCD national program aligns with current state priorities.
- Projects related to coastal planning and smart growth were already underway in [state deleted] when the national CCD program was initiated. The national program has sustained these efforts and CCD outreach efforts in [state deleted] have benefited from interaction with other Sea Grant specialists regionally and nationally.
- Not much effect in {state deleted but is probably obvious] since we have a state population of 38 million and only a part-time effort in one county (that has a population of 11 million people). Since the issues affect much of the 1,100 miles of our coast, we have loads of opportunities for rendering assistance. With a full-time person, we could probably mount a focused program.

8) What are the affects on system capacity in terms of new expertise and development of relevant expertise among current faculty/staff?

- Not sure exactly what is meant by this question, but we would not have a coastal communities extension educator without the funding commitment for CCD.
- In our case our extension program has been engaging and learning the issues regarding coastal tourism resulting in many new partners for Sea Grant.
- The CCD program in my state has a direct impact on all program areas, including hazards, fisheries, and water quality.
- Actually here at [university deleted] there is a lot of expertise available in this program area. If it became a research priority for the state, there would be an excellent research response.
- The CCD funds enable us to maintain our ties with the NEMO program by supporting part of an FTE. In turn, the CCD program benefits greatly from all of the staff expertise and resources available through the NEMO program and the University's Center for Land Use Education and Research, a big bang for our bucks. We could use more staff time to increase the amount of impact we can have, by providing more opportunities for local training and outreach.
- Many more new staff in this area has boosted national capacity significantly,
- Unclear what you are asking here.
- The CCD program has fostered partnering with campus researchers and other outreach units, allowing Sea Grant to expand its CCD footprint at a time when the expertise is greatly needed along the coast.
- No affects
- We have to be creative with the $50,000 – can't afford an FTE with it.
- The [state deleted] Center for Smart Building and Community Design now has three dedicated extension agents and related staff directed at helping communities work through planning and development efforts that are sustainable. All of the [state deleted] Sea Grant extension agents have been fully informed of the new CCD program directions and their individual development plans address what efforts they are undertaking that support broad CCD and community development related issues.
- Provides an opportunity to bring expertise to the team and exchange with current SG staff. The theme/tools can then be used in a broader set of programs by the whole team.
- We have two well trained nicely positioned individuals working on CCD type efforts. CCD funding helps us keep an active program in CCD. Without it we would not be able to maintain such a high level of effort.
- CCD has allowed us to add expertise in an area we were not strong in. Training will be necessary for other faculty.
- The program initiative gives us the opportunity to hire a new agent, which have been capacity itself and transferring the acquired knowledge to our

clientele.

- We were able to leverage a new position with these funds
- The affect here will only be positive. As pointed out above, building upon existing local expertise in many fields is what the CCD program should be restricting itself to
- We have good expertise but staff is overwhelmed by the immensity of the possibilities for involvement.
- We are trying to expand capacity throughout the entire staff.
- Not sure I understand the question, but I feel that the CCD program has made specialists in other disciplines more aware that they have an impact on communities with the programs (fisheries, water quality, etc.)
- Due to opportunities presented by the CCD program, capacity among current staff has been increased.
- From the outreach perspective, [state deleted] Sea Grant has a GIS Specialist that has a Masters degree in urban and regional planning and experience working as a planner in both the public and private sector. The water quality and coastal habitats specialist has worked extensively to communicate the land use/water quality connection in the Fox/Wolf River watershed. [state deleted] Sea Grant has funded a researcher to develop GIS tools to support comprehensive planning in coastal communities.
- This campus has a sophisticated School of Policy, Planning and Development (programs in planning, public policy, public administration and real estate development) with a large faculty, but with no links to extension. So, a full-time extension specialist here working on CCD issues could leverage the research talent already on deck.

9) What changes in program constituents have been realized through the CCD program implementation?

- Greater connections with local governments (city, township, county)
- We have added local planners, local elected officials, regional planning councils, etc. to our constituency and addressed existing constituencies about new issues related to coastal growth as it impacts them.
- Our program efforts are being used by coastal communities on [area deleted] who are required to implement Phase II storm water requirements
- Sea Grant and NEMO were already present in many local coastal communities. However, CCD allows us to offer more training opportunities and tools/resources to these communities, and address more closely coastal-related components of land use decisions.
- Too many to list here but mostly have empowered communities to better protect their natural resources.
- We are beginning to formalize partnerships with land-use and planning groups at various levels in the state.
- Our constituent base has been expanded to include local and state officials, developers, and planners that we failed to support before the program.

CCD and water quality efforts are the growth areas of our program and they work to compliment each other.

- No affects
- As a result of the CCD program, [state deleted] Sea Grant is now working with new community and stakeholder groups across the state and also importantly engaging non-traditional university partners (e.g., urban planning, architecture, travel and tourism, business) in support of the work of the Center for Smart Building and Community Design.
- Policy makers and others are better able to see the benefit to integrate social-eco and env. issues. SG has helped outreach smart growth techniques though extension and training and has become a player at the local/state level.
- For over a decade [program deleted] Sea Grant has had interest in and involvement with CCD work. The CCD directed funding has helped us to deliver needed programs in a state with a heavy dependence on manufacturing. Because of our dependence on manufacturing, we are one of the first states to go into the dumpster when the USA economy goes south and we are one of the last to recover from a turn down in the economy. Therefore, CCD work is very important to us in [state deleted].
- We are working with local governments and community organizations that we haven't worked with before. This is in addition to our work with local water-based industries such as fisheries and marine trades.
- Now we are able to help NGO's, Government agencies, stakeholders and general community in Smart Growth issues, economic opportunities and development options in our coastal area.
- Now serve local land use decision makers.
- Here we have made more in-roads with regional planning groups, county and local government, and community colleges.
- We are just starting to make a difference; this is something that takes time to change attitudes as to how things are done as compared to the old models of controlling growth.
- Varies with the particular activity, impossible to quantify for something as broad as CCD. Obviously, water quality parameters such as reduced sediment delivery, reductions in pollutant loads, etc. can be quantified. Similar project specific measures can be identified for other activities.
- I provided a report on this to the National office.
- Closer ties to state, regional and local land use planners
- The new emphasis on CCD has resulted in adding clients (e.g. real estate leaders) and deeper penetration into existing constituents (eg. Local planners)
- [state deleted] Sea Grant works closely with local government planners and land information officers in the 15 Great Lakes coastal counties. The GIS specialist is now affiliated as adjunct faculty with the [university deleted] Department of Urban and Regional Planning and teaches an applied GIS workshop once a year starting in January 2005.

- Even with our modest efforts, we've been involved with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to help educate municipal officials on policies that would increase groundwater retention in the county. That's an ongoing theme and we've co-sponsored educational efforts with the RWQCB to spread the word about "hydromodification" with considerable success.

10) What are the benefits/costs of more regional CCD organization?

- I like the idea as long as there is an overarching national goal(s). Too, I'd like guidance, but ample latitude to adjust to the situation(s) in my state.
- Benefits: broader range of expertise available; Cost: can loose touch with individual communities
- Adding value through regional collaboration and communication is obvious. When there are shared needs and capacities, then there are efficiencies with program development, delivery and evaluation tools as well as products.
- Inter-program collaboration and coordination should arise out of program need. They should be nurtured and facilitated. Having said that, and under those circumstances, regional organization can add value and be a real benefit. As a mandate, they do not, in my opinion, work.
- Regional efforts do make sense and could be encouraged with some regional funding available.
- I believe that a regional/national network is important for sharing ideas, successes, tools, resources, etc. However, I see this program locally implemented and do not think regional CCD organization would benefit the program, and might actually detract in terms of local impacts. Regional workshops make sense.
- I don't see the need to regionalize in a formal way as we in the NE area work regionally now in many cases.
- If states are focusing on land-use planning and smart growth issues in their state CCD programs, these lend themselves to local issues and not regional.
- Regional organization can help bring focused training to both agents and clients and address common problems. However, we must guard against too many regional meetings just to have meetings. CCD resources are too limited to waste on unfocused efforts.
- No changes
- Don't want one.
- See discussion/proposal above under question #3
- Opportunities to have study tours for program partners, potentially regional training events for staff and partners. Less travel cost!
- Benefits are improved CCD program delivery.

- Benefits are that there are a lot of similar issues across a region so that shared experiences and talent can be used to deliver programs in a more cost-effective manner. Not sure what the added costs are.
- At short term the costs of more organization will be expensive, in terms of what is needed in time effort, staff and other things, but it will be compensated with the achievement of the goals, objectives, and impacts in the coastal communities of the program.
- Benefits are that greater collective impacts could be realized with more focused programs that are supported by NOAA research.
- Hard to define but will know it when we see it! Leveraging resources and working on cross-cutting issues helps all involved. Sea Grant (and most recently Sea Grant CCD) has created regional programs quite successful and on a clearly regional need basis. However, regional programming should probably remain the **exception** to local CCD program activities rather than some sort of paradigm. It must be acknowledged that this seems desirable at the NSGO/NOAA level, but strikes us as more or less the "fashion of the day". The benefits relate to conducting programs that individual states cannot complete themselves. The costs relate to allocating resources away from strictly local programming toward regional efforts.
- Regions tend to have similar problems, more opportunity for collaboration.
- Benefits = a stronger network of professionals to share information and resources.
- More regional CCD organization allows for the fostering of local partnerships and ongoing projects.
- The CCD specialists in the Great Lakes Sea Grant Network met for three days in December to share their work and explore opportunities to collaborate. There will be a reunion in early December 2005. This was a very productive venue and several partnerships have been started, including the discussions about a Great Lakes Circle Tour coastal access guide.
- A regional CCD effort would primarily facilitate the kinds of information sharing that takes place among the fisheries folks or the aquaculture folks. It should really be national in scope rather than regional, however.

11) How might the CCD program be better integrated with Sea Grant's research agenda?

- This ought to be a center-piece of the Gordon Grau Group. Ample research is needed, but we'll have to reach out to faculty at other universities and in other disciplines. Not sure if all directors are so disposed.

- Need time to develop relationships with new researchers; individual programs could use short-term help on identifying CCD research priorities to draw in new researchers
- Locally the programs should open the door to social and economic research that meets some of the needs. This also brings a new community from the research world to the Sea Grant table.
- It already is in my program. All SGE staff contribute research priorities to the RFP development process, review proposals, work with PIs to focus research on management and other issues, and assist in conducting research. Not all these things on every project, but on every project where the SGE help makes sense and is needed.
- This will come in time if there proves to be a continuous funding stream for the CCD program effort.
- It is in our program, but response by PIs has been underwhelming to date as most see the problems as too "social science like" or not solvable.
- Need a NSI focused on Coastal Community Development; however in this budget climate, not likely to happen.
- On a state level CCD research projects should compete on equal footing with all other proposals. At the national level, specific research needs can be fostered through national Sea Grant initiatives.
- Not sure.
- We'll do the integrating at state program level.
- See discussion/proposal above under question #3
- Opportunities to have study tours for program partners, potentially regional training event for staff and partners. Less travel cost!
- Develop a NSI for coastal economic research. Our research budget is typically so small we are only able to fund one economic project at each RFP. We are not taking advantage of the applied economic research capacity we have at the Land Grant colleges. The Land Grant colleges have the land use, natural resource, tourism, and environmental economists that can help us develop CCD information to assist coastal communities to maximize their competitive advantages to develop a sustainable coastal community.
- That's a local call. In our program it is completely integrated and will be reflected in our forthcoming RFP.
- Sea Grant could subsidy research projects that measure impacts in the area of economics and social sciences.
- Respond to local CCD programs stakeholder needs and program needs assessments and utilize the priorities developed to set local, regional and national Sea Grant research objectives and priorities. Setting a responsive and applied Sea Grant research agenda first at the State, then regional and perhaps national level is the best approach to building a sustainable and effective CCD program.
- Put more emphasis on non-point research and economic aspects of smart growth.

- I think this is a great area to bring some national experts together and review.
- Target CCD in research grants.
- Sea Grant directors will need to encourage more proposals that will provide results for CCD extension programs. Given the limited research $$ this means other, traditional areas may be cut.
- Planners are not a traditional Sea Grant partner. Extra effort is needed to encourage CCD research proposals.
- Integrating it with the research agenda is fundamentally a matter of having subject-area specialists on campus who are familiar with faculty and can promote work in this area. Since Sea Grant has not done much work in this field, it's a matter of convincing research faculty that Sea Grant is a logical funding source.

12) What types of performance measures would be appropriate for measuring the effectiveness of the CCD program in the future?

- Partnerships with local government units
- This depends on the nature of the programs being developed. Number of municipal governments that access SG materials and change behaviors/policies.
- That's a good question that I can't answer here. However, I do not think developing program measures will be much of a problem. Possibly it could be a role of the theme team or a volunteer group to develop model performance measures that individual program could adopt or adapt to their individualized uses.
- Tools developed, P&Z regulations or policies revised or implemented, number of individuals trained and the outcome of that training…
- As with all Sea Grant Extension programs you need to measure change in your audience…social, economic, policy and environmental.
- Improved ordinances adopted by coastal communities
- Participation in CCD training programs by officials, planners, and developers
- Planning for and completion of model developments
- Change in public and attitudes about coastal development
- Add the funds to the pool available for competition.
- Testimonies of participants and local partnerships and impacted stakeholders.
- Responses from state and community officials and leaders as to the value and usefulness of Sea Grant's participation in their planning efforts.
- Measures of improvement in the environmental quality of the coastal environment as a result of efforts to reduce the footprint of the built environment and reduce the amount of non-point source pollution reaching coastal waters.

- Needs to be based on behavior change of stakeholders. We used Canada SDRC "outcome mapping." Also, identify quality of life indicators.
- Same as with any extension program. What are people doing as a result of the CCD effort? Use the logic model etc.
- By necessity these will mostly be process measures (e.g., due to CCD, county X adopted smart growth principles in comprehensive planning). It will be difficult to quantify counterfactuals (i.e., how growth would have occurred without CCD involvement.
- Measures of customer satisfaction and cost-effectiveness would be useful to measure the impacts and best allocation of resources of the CCD.
- Number of communities changing policies and land use decisions to protect coastal resources while developing coastal communities
- Number of dollars added to coastal communities through CCD programming.
- Ecosystem responses to CCD programs – Acres of coastal habitat, populations of fish or wildlife saved or protected, water quality improvements, etc.
- Diversity of stakeholder support will be one indicator, but tracking the numbers and significance of new CCD partners and financial leverage seem like bonafide assessment methods. Also building in success measures to Sea Grant research projects would be a logical approach to better quantifying effectiveness.
- Tough call. Miles of open space saved, attitude changes in planning organizations, number of new developers using CCD programs, number of ordinance changes for the better.
- There are many measures of sustainability that would lend themselves to a universal way to quantify impacts and effectiveness. Although it was created in 1998, the sustainability indicators developed in Seattle and a good example of the types of measures that can be used. (See attached pdf file) {not included in summary}
- Changes in building and zoning regulations. Implementation of BMPs by builders. Economic well-being of coastal communities. Citizen satisfaction with how their community is progressing.
- CCD projects should use the LOGIC model (or other effective program effectiveness techniques) in project design. Minnesota Sea Grant recently arranged with the NOAA Coastal Services Center to conduct a project design and evaluation workshop. Many [program deleted] Sea Grant staff attended the workshop and found it very useful.

13) Other recommendations to improve the program.

- Increased funding. Need to keep pace with inflation, salary increases, promotions, etc.
- Engage the full theme team so that the program does not become focused by the vision of a single (or sub-set) of programs but becomes a suite of

activities under the CCD umbrella. Creativity at NSGO should provide the ability to synthesize the national impact story from the diversity of activities throughout the network.

- I doubt there are any. There are way too many players in the community development arena for Sea Grant to demonstrate a clear impact.
- While the CCD funding formula assumes a uniform need for boosted effort in this area, network-wide, the fact is that needs vary widely from region to region and state to state. Some states enjoy an active CZM office, state planning offices, regional and local smart growth offices, and numerous NGOs working in the area of coastal community development. As such, I hope that future funding initiatives for increased outreach would not be so targeted, thereby allowing us to better respond to a wide array of higher-priority local needs.
- I have three recommendations:
  - More funding
  - More funding
  - More funding
- CCD program represents a new opportunity to improve the quality of life and the natural environments of our coastal areas. Due to the natural disasters we experience during this year it is highly needed to recognize the importance of the Program.
- Emphasize local "fit" to complement/strengthen existing community and regional planning, land use and environmental management capabilities. Avoid chasing national programmatic priorities set by other agencies such as EPA and other parts of NOAA that do not share the same ultimate goal as Sea Grant in fostering coastal economies and communities.
- I like the direction of the program if more resources and support can be leveraged. This is a program that will take a long time to see significant changes and progress.
- Well, I think that we are on the right track. It goes without saying that we could use more resources.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

ASSEMBLY OF SEA GRANT EXTENSION PROGRAM LEADERS RESPONSE TO COASTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

1. During its first four years of existence, has the program been effective?

   Rating 0 (not effective) to 5 (very effective) score = _____

   Comments:

2. Is the CCD program structured in a manner that allows it to perform well as a national program?

   Rating: 0 (strongly **disagree)** to 5 (strongly **agree**) score = _____

   Comments:

3. Are resources adequate to allow the CCD program to make a significant impact?

   Rating 0 (strongly **agree**) to 5 (strongly **disagree**) score = _____

   Comments:

   What would a reasonable CCD build-out plan look like?

4. Can effectiveness of the CCD program be improved by establishing new and creative partnerships?

   YES _____ NO _____

   Partnership suggestions:

5. Collectively, does the CCD program require a new or sharper focus?

   Rating 0 (strongly **disagree**) to 5 (strongly **agree**) score = _____

   Comments:

6. Are there opportunities for the CCD program to strengthen its role within NOAA?

Rating 0 (strongly **disagree**) to 5 (strongly **agree**) score = _____

Comments:

General Discussion Questions –

7. What are the affects of the CCD national program on program priorities within the state?

8. What are the affects on system capacity in terms of new expertise and development of relevant expertise among current faculty/staff?

9. What changes in program constituents have been realized through the CCD program implementation?

10. What are the benefits/costs of more regional CCD organization?

11. How might the CCD program be better integrated with Sea Grant's research agenda?

12. What types of performance measures would be appropriate for measuring the effectiveness of the CCD program in the future?

13. Other recommendations to improve the program.

_____ _____

Sea Grant Extension Program Respondent

Please complete and return to ralph-rayburn@tamu.edu by Nov. 15.

SEA GRANT EXTENSION PROGRAMS
RESPONDING TO SURVEY

STATE	CCD-Survey
AK	
AL	X
CA	X
CT	X
DE	X
FL	
GA	X
HI	X
IL/IN	X
LA	X
MD	X
ME	X
MI	X
MN	X
MIT	X
MS	
NC	X
NH	X
NJ	
NY	X
OH	X
OR	
PA	X
PR	X
RI	X
SC	X
TX	*
USC	X
VA	X
WA	X
WHOI	NA
WI	X

*** = compiled survey so abstained**
NA = Program Leader indicated program too small to contribute

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS
REQUESTED FOR THE CCD REVIEW PANEL
(Note: comments are individual and not reflective of Assembly)

1. State of the state program. (i.e. -How you see the program.)

In Texas the program is becoming better recognized within the principal operating area of the CCD specialist – namely the Houston-Galveston complex. Extension of area influence also comes about as the CCD specialist is called on to help train volunteers under the Master Naturalist Program in other areas of the coast.

In addition, the Texas Sea Grant Program is a member of the Coastal Coordination Council, which is the state agency coordinating the coastal management program.

The Texas program is fortunate in that it has a strong CCD specialist who has the talents, knowledge and skills that have placed him in a leadership role on CCD strategies development.

The Texas program is also fortunate in that working with its partner, Texas Cooperative Extension, the CCD specialist has been repositioned into the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Science that also supports the Rural Communities Development initiative within Texas Cooperative Extension.

Finally, the CCD specialist and leadership of the Texas Sea Grant Program have established a good relationship with the Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning in order to engage the research resources of that department in CCD issues.

Bottom line is, I think the program is gaining momentum and the ability to make a difference in the development of communities along the coast.

2. Vision where things ought to be.

Just as Sea Grant has long had a close affiliation with NOAA Fisheries Service through the years primarily due to the program's focus on fisheries, the CCD program should serve to have Sea Grant establish a strong relationship with the Office of Coastal Resources Management within NOAA Ocean Services. The affinity between Sea Grant and the coastal zone management programs should be enhanced because while funded primarily through federal funds, the organization and activities are state based.

One of the challenges in developing such a relation is potential conflict with internal organizations within NOAA Ocean Services that parallel the services and opportunities that Sea Grant could offer. Still the opportunity to engage the university community in research on coastal issues and the network of outreach personnel to transfer the research findings to potential users and decision makers are key elements unique to Sea Grant.

Finally, if Sea Grant could become more engaged and intertwined with the coastal management programs then it could attempt to build a stronger affiliation with the Coastal States Organization and through that the various governors and local leaders organizations.

3. **From the Survey**
    a. **Potential areas requiring training**
        i. General—In that each person is at a different level of knowledge in the CCD area, it would be a challenge to prescribe meaningful training for a large number of CCD practitioners within Sea Grant; however, here are some training potentials.
        ii. Potential partnership – To identify and consider various government and non-government organizations that could be potential partners in CCD initiatives.
        iii. Developing CCD goals within Community – Consider the various processes that can be used to develop community goals. These could include the process of charrettes, public forums or leadership training.
        iv. Political or regulatory processes for establishing development standards/criteria within local communities – what are the driving forces within local communities in the area of development and how best to provide information to this process.
        v. Tools for decision-making – what type of tools are available for local decision making on development issues and how best to support incorporation of these tools in the process.

    b. **What should be the initial focus for training?**
        i. Tools for decision making – what type of tools are available for local decision making on development issues and how best to support incorporation of these tools in the process.