



Virginia Coastal Zone

MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Coastal Policy Team Meeting February 15, 2011

Agenda

Tuesday, February 15, 2011

Location: Department of Game & Inland Fisheries
4016 West Broad Street
Richmond, VA

- 10:00 Welcome
- 10:05 Update on NOAA Information Systems grant application and grant to ELI on enforceable policies and endangered species
- 10:15 Update on CELCP Plan & Review of the FY 2012 CELCP Grant Schedule
- Incorporating ecologically valuable estuarine areas into the "PCA" CELCP prioritization map
 - Mar 10 CELCP proposals due to CZM
 - Apr 15 Final CELCP Application due to NOAA
- 10:35 Review of the FY 2011 CZM Grant Schedule
- Mar 15 Continuing CZM proposals due to CZM
 - Apr 1 Section 309 & Focal Area proposals due to CZM
 - Apr 15 Draft CZM Application due to NOAA
 - May 18 Final CZM application due to NOAA
- 10:45 Review of the FY'11 continuing CZM grants
- 11:00 Discussion of the 6 Focal Area Ideas (About 10-15 minutes can be spent on each one to help inform the voting.)
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Continue Focal Area Ideas discussions if needed
- 1:30 Ballots distributed and vote on focal area
- 1:45 Agency Updates
- Virginia CZM Program's 25th anniversary is November 15, 2011
 - DGIF Wildlife Bureau reorganization
- 2:00 Discuss results of voting and set up contingency plans and schedules for writing new focal area scopes of work. The final decision as to which idea becomes the new focal area will have to be approved by the DEQ Director.
- 3:00 Adjourn

Meeting Summary

NOAA Information Systems grant:

VA CZM Program applied for an \$84,000 grant from NOAA to help VIMS address data tracking gaps for wetlands. The money would be available October 1 if Virginia CZM is awarded the grant.

Environmental Law Institute Program Change Grants:

- 1) The first grant focuses on the DGIF laws regarding threatened and endangered species and what authority was in the program when it started, what authority is in the Executive Order, and any recodification. The grant also addresses what the Virginia CZM Program would need to do in order to expand current authority over endangered species. The grant will be completed by May 15.
- 2) The second grant focuses on restating the Virginia CZM Program's enforceable policies as requested by NOAA. A draft report from this grant should be available by September 2011 and a final report no later than May 2012.

CELCP Plan Update and FY 2012 CELCP Grant Schedule:

Background on what CELCP is was provided by CZM staff. In the CELCP plan, as a guide, there is a Priority Conservation Areas (PCA) map that was used to establish a ranking of ecological significance for the possible projects for CELCP funding. VIMS has also created an aquatic priority conservation areas map which contains 17 different data layers. These two maps will be integrated for future use of habitat ranking for CELCP plans and will be included in future CELCP plans. When the two maps are integrated (which will be very soon), a new name will be given to the integrated map. Two possibilities for names are the Virginia Ecological Valuable Areas (VEVA) or the Virginia Ecological Resource Assessment (VERA). Any suggestions for names from the CPT would be welcome. March 10 is the deadline to receive applications for CELCP funding. If CZM gets more than three proposals, the state review board will have to rank them. April 15 is the final deadline for the CELCP Application due to NOAA.

Review of FY 2011 CZM Grant Schedule:

- March 15-deadline for continuing grants
- April 1-deadline for 309 and Focal Area grants

The projected FY 2011 Project List was reviewed. Regarding the Seaside SAMP grant: A resolution passed in the Senate and it was in the House Rules on Feb. 15 regarding a study to better utilize and protect Seaside subaqueous habitats. Policy recommendations will be made and the Marine Resources Commission and other entities will be contacted regarding management options for Baylor grounds. It was noted that there is no longer any funding for the Nonpoint Source Pollution staff. The Department of Conservation and Recreation would like CZM to fund this position at 50%, which would be about \$40-\$50,000/year. The CPT was asked if they thought CZM should start funding this position at 50%. A discussion ensued about whether or not to fund this position and where the money would come from. It was decided to come back to this topic either during or after the Focal Area discussion.

Focal Area Discussions:

The CZM Program Manager went over the background, rules, and process for choosing the next CZM Focal Area. The CPT needs to show Congress the value of the CZM program and the CPT needs to focus on jobs and economic development; preferably green jobs and sustainable development. Keep the difference in mind between 306 and 309 grants. The CPT could choose a focal area to complement 309 grants, which would be helpful. But if it is very different from the 309 grants, the Focal Area could cover more ground. The NOAA Specialist stated that Congress wants a focus on fewer things and measurable results. So he would like for the Focal Area and 309 to complement each other.

Access & Habitat Restoration:

BENEFITS:

- Provides opportunity to use/reevaluate 1997 VDOT Bridge & Recreational Access study
- Provides opportunity for people to utilize/enjoy natural areas and promote local economies
- Provides funding to continue success of Phragmites control projects (invests money now to save money later). Could treat 500 acres of Phragmites or more with other funding sources.
- Could provide funding for bay scallop restoration (potential opportunity for recreational fishery)
- Possibility of revenue stream from public access sites with public/private partnerships
- There is a ready-made market in Hampton Roads for the Native Plant campaign to expand
- This could assist with trails on the Appomattox river, which is a priority for Crater Planning District Commission

CONCERNS:

- May be hard to show the economic value of Phragmites control and educational value of interpretive signage.

Coastal Resiliency:

BENEFITS:

- Helps to push concept of climate change and inform local officials and policies
- Can fund needed updates of natural resource datasets that are useful/essential far beyond the scope of this focal area
- Could promote a suite of state tools to inform planning at the local level
- Not replicated in 309, could be only way to address these issues
- Forgoing could mean time lost in collecting important data and momentum lost in promoting these concepts
- Showing the economic impacts associated with coastal resiliency could influence the buy-in of local governments
- Issue is very relevant to part of the CZM program's focus
- Could add a TMDL element

CONCERNS:

- Potential development of tools that don't get used
- Some areas may not be ready to adopt recommendations or policies developed for coastal resiliency
- Need to show a "hook" for other partners to accept coastal resiliency concept

Marine Spatial Planning:

BENEFITS:

- Could fund much needed data collection of bird/marine mammal migratory paths to inform offshore wind energy projects
- Lease blocks already defined, but could be very timely to inform placement of wind projects within these blocks. Also still need to understand relative value of resources inside and outside the blocks.
- Complements 309 project and very relevant to present, important management issues
- This pot of money would be important because federal money might not be there to use
- This would provide for marine spatial planning in the bay, not just the ocean

CONCERNS:

There were no concerns expressed.

Seaside Habitat & Restoration:

BENEFITS:

- Strong economic components including job creation and lessening erosion and climate change impacts; could provide economic benefit for entire Commonwealth
- Builds on previous, successful work
- This pot of money is important because otherwise it is poorly funded
- Tangible results from on-the-ground work/restoration projects
- Opportunity to evaluate previous work to inform next steps
- SAV restoration if successful has many positive economic impacts
- Some of the restoration components would have the ecological value of providing habitat for other animals
- Provides only funding source of an important analysis of what is the best predator management strategy for shorebirds

CONCERNS:

No concerns were expressed.

Water Quality:

BENEFITS:

- State is going to subdivide TMDL requirements to local level. This would help build much needed capacity at the local government level and provide technical assistance to localities. This proposal augments what the state is doing right now
- Could fund pilot projects through PDCs to gauge effectiveness
- Would leverage (not match) additional fed money
- Could assist PDCs in inventorying their existing practices. There are no other resources available for this type of assistance.
- This could be only source of funding to assist PDCs with implementing federal requirements

CONCERNS:

- Grants beginning in October 2011 may not be timely enough
- TMDL process may not have ability for local governments to collaborate

- Could essentially be using federal (NOAA) money to gather data and refute federal (EPA) requirements
- State TMDL plan not available for 3 weeks, decisions regarding focal area funding need to be made now
- Split between 9 PDC's \$300k would not be able to support additional staff positions
- The pilot projects to the PDCs could be too similar to the 309 projects.

A decision was made to use \$40K-\$50K in Section 306 dollars to fund 50% of a Nonpoint Source Pollution position at DCR. The matching funds would be a non-federal source for non-point work within Virginia's coastal zone.

Working Waterfronts:

BENEFITS:

- Very complicated but very timely issue
- Creates jobs and positive short term economic impacts
- Addresses land use and regulation issues
- One focus is on preservation of existing structures
- Could be further supported by potential 2012 fed funding
- Coordinating opportunity for PDCs and local communities

CONCERNS:

- The tasks currently assigned to this area do not create a lot of new jobs during the three years; background resources, but not jobs.

Ballots were handed out to all CPT appointees or alternates and each member voted for their top two areas. The votes were tallied and displayed for the CPT. [Subsequently votes were sorted by state agency and PDC which yields the detailed results in parenthesis below :

Coastal Resiliency had 13 votes (9/4 – state agency votes/PDC votes)

Seaside Restoration had 12 votes (12/0)

Water Quality had 11 votes (4/7)

Working Waterfronts had 10 votes (8/3)

Access & Habitat Restoration had 9 votes (8/2)

Marine Spatial Planning had 1 vote (1/0)

After much discussion about the results, it was considered whether or not to vote again. It was decided not to. It was suggested that CZM could fund Habitat Restoration and Tactical Technical Assistance on a competitive basis for projects that speak to: Resiliency, Water Quality, Public Access & Habitat Restoration and Working Waterfronts.

In regards to PDC TA grants, it was asked if there were any training opportunities that PDCs should include in their proposals. It was suggested that they could provide training on the PCA maps, Coastal GEMS, Community Stewardship, and Climate Change.

Agency Updates:

CZM-November is the 25th anniversary of the Coastal Zone Management program. DGIF-Reorganization was done to create operational efficiency. There is one Bureau-the Bureau of Wildlife Resources with four regions and four science teams. Each region has a Terrestrial Operations Manager, an Aquatic Operations Manager, and a Regional Lands & Facilities Manager.

Meeting Adjourned.

Attendees:

Bahen, April – DEQ/CZM	Mason, Pam – VIMS
Baxter, Sharon – DEQ/P2	McFarlane, Ben – HRPDC
Berman, Marcia – VIMS	McKay, Laura – DEQ/CZM
Bittner, Mark – CPDC	McKenzie, Stuart – NNPDC
Bulluck, Jason – DCR/NH	Meade, Nick – DEQ/CZM
Byrnes, Kevin – GWRC	Moon, Shep – DEQ/CZM
Croonenberghs, Bob – DOH	Murray, Tom – VIMS/VA Sea Grant
Davis, Dave – DEQ/Water	Neikirk, Chip – MRC
Fernald, Ray – DGIF	Polak, Beth – DEQ/CZM
Grape, Laura – NVRC	Poole, Dannette – DCR/P&R
Gwynn, Becky – DGIF	Reay, Willy – VIMS/CBNERRVA
Hardaway, Scott – VIMS	Ruble, David – DEQ/EE
Harmon, Tracey – VDOT	Salkovitz, Dan – DEQ/Air
Hartley, Troy – VIMS/VA Sea Grant	Salvati, Joan – DCR/CBLA
Hill, Rick – DCR	Smith, Tom – DCR/NH
Irons, Ellie – DEQ/EIR	Stewart, Jackie – RRPDC
Jenkins, Ron – DOF	Stewart, Sarah – RRPDC
Johnson, Cindy – DEQ/Water	Varnell, Lyle – VIMS
Jurman, Ken – DMME	Watkinson, Tony – MRC
Kuriawa, John – NOAA	Wesson, Jim – MRC
Lawrence, Lewie – MPPDC	Witmer, Virginia – DEQ/CZM