GOVERNORS' SOUTH ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

3RD ANNUAL MEETING

SEPTEMBER 4-6, 2013 • RALEIGH, NC

MEETING SUMMARY

Introduction

The 3rd Annual Meeting of the Governors' South Atlantic Alliance (GSAA) was held in Raleigh, NC at the NC Museum of Natural Sciences, Nature Research Center and Environmental Conference Center. Approximately 100 people attended from the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, as well as representatives from federal agencies, regional organizations, the academic community, non-profit organizations and industry. The list of attendees can be found in the program book.

The 3rd Annual Meeting marks the first time that representatives of stakeholder groups outside of the GSAA's core membership were invited to participate in planning discussions. These new participants brought energy and insight into the discussions and contributed significantly to new partnerships and ideas for 2014 planning for the GSAA's four Issue Area Technical Teams (Clean Coastal and Ocean Waters, Disaster-Resilient Communities, Healthy Ecosystems, and Working Waterfronts).

The purposes of this Annual Meeting were to discuss key issues affecting the region's ocean and coasts and how these issues are being addressed in GSAA activities, Identify specific partnership and resource opportunities to support GSAA collaborative activities, and formulate 2014 Work Plans that continue to drive progress in implementing the GSAA Action Plan.

Opening Remarks

John Skvarla, Secretary, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Secretary Skvarla welcomed participants to North Carolina on behalf of Governor McCrory. As the head of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the Secretary has been charged with two duties by the Governor – to protect the environment and grow the economy. The GSAA presents an opportunity for collaboration and communication that can help accomplish both charges. The Department includes both regulatory and natural resource components, and as a public service organization, the Secretary has emphasized the importance of high quality customer service. The Secretary also encouraged participants to consider the balance between economic needs and the environment. The Department is a community of science and makes determinations based on a comprehensive understanding of all scientific perspectives. The Department also supports coastal tourism, ports, and North Carolina's military installations. Partnerships like the GSAA can help share information and further support these relationships through a regional framework.

Mark Williams, Commissioner, Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Commissioner Williams, Chair of the GSAA's Steering Group, welcomed participants and thanked the generous sponsors of the 3rd Annual Meeting, North Carolina Sea Grant and the Southeast Coastal Ocean Observing Regional Association (SECOORA). The Commissioner highlighted the opportunity for the GSAA to discuss key issues that affect the South Atlantic region and its shared resources. The GSAA is looking forward to new participation to expand partnerships and incorporate new ideas into the foundation that has been established through its long-standing partnerships. The Commissioner reviewed the goals for the meeting and emphasized the opportunity to create a new path forward while building upon the successes of this past year.

Jim Giattina, Director, EPA Region 4 Water Protection Division
Mr. Giattina welcomed participants on behalf of the federal partners of the GSAA. In reflecting on his time spent at both the Great Lakes and Gulf of Mexico National Program Offices, he described the accomplishments derived from collaboration among federal and state partners. Mr. Giattina emphasized the need for states and the federal partners to be moving in the same direction in order to create impact on a regional basis. The need for such collaboration stems from the fact that no one agency has all the resources necessary to accomplish these regional goals. Aligning priorities at every level allows partnerships to leverage resources, including expertise, training, data and support tools. In addition, coordinating state and federal management responsibilities is important to efficient government. Mr. Giattina provided an overview of the key sessions for the day and encouraged participants to share new ideas for partnerships.

State of the South Atlantic

Braxton Davis, Director, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Division of Coastal Management
Mr. Davis moderated the panel session and began with brief comments on the opportunities for working across the region and with federal partners to identify solutions for streamlining regulation and using non-regulatory approaches for ocean and coastal management. Working with colleagues through the GSAA, organizations can bring forward new ideas to promote effectiveness and efficiencies in coastal management.

Please note that the perspectives expressed by invited speakers are their own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the GSAA or its member organizations

Mayor Harry Simmons, President, American Shore and Beach Preservation Association
Mayor Simmons reviewed the events that transpired around Superstorm Sandy and the way in which engineered beaches and natural dune systems reduced the impact of the storm, preserving land and the structures behind the dunes. In areas where dunes were removed for aesthetic purposes, storm surge from Sandy led to large areas of complete destruction. $82 billion was spent after Sandy to restore the coast, and Mayor Simmons emphasized that sustainable funding could have helped prevent the extent of the damage at a fraction of the cost. He recommended that the states should determine how much funding is required to protect their shorelines and then identify the funding sources, and that the GSAA could be a part of the discussion in identifying sources of revenue to fund beach management projects. Mayor Simmons also shared his perspective on the current events surrounding a proposal for critical habitat for Loggerhead Sea Turtles and highlighted a number of other areas where the GSAA could support coastal management efforts, including research and education.

During the Question and Answer session, Mayor Simmons and other participants made the following additional points:

- The cost to "fix" the issue of beach restoration and preservation would be around $500 million per year, although there is recognition that even with the appropriate level of funding, sand resources may not be sufficient to meet the need.
- Permitting should be streamlined to help fortify estuaries.
- The American Shore and Beach Preservation Association is discussing alternatives to beach nourishment for beach preservation, such as funding to support removal of

structures from at-risk areas and incorporating beach planning into local comprehensive plans (similar to hazard mitigation planning).

- BOEM is investing resources in understanding sand resources along the east coast via seismic studies and will continue to engage the states to share information.

Dr. Douglas Rader, Chief Oceans Scientist, Environmental Defense Fund

Dr. Rader's presentation focused on the patterns of living marine resources within and beyond the South Atlantic. Dr. Rader described the impacts of currents on important coastal and marine species and their habitats and emphasized the dependence between physical and biological systems at a number of different scales. The different scales at which living marine resources function need to be considered in their management and planning efforts. Ecosystem-based management requires an understanding of how managed species interact with humans and society, including effective governance, and how species interact with their environment, such as the impact of water quality on habitat. Management decisions tend to be based on the expectations and experiences of the past, but the system in which these species exist is changing, and managers will need to consider that fisheries may be different in 20-30 years. Dr. Rader highlighted some of the good news in fisheries management, including the overall increase in sustainability of fisheries over the last decade, the incorporation of new solutions from experienced commercial fishermen, incentive-based management approaches, and support for community-based fisheries and effective territorial user rights. In addition, he discussed the value of Marine Protected Area networks to promote productivity, the Southeast's progress in protecting habitat, and the close work with industry to reduce pollution. In the future, there is the potential for actively managing a changing mosaic of ocean and coastal uses, and the interaction between fisheries and ocean energy opportunities will be of particular interest. Dr. Rader highlighted a number of opportunities for the region, but the most emphasis was placed on the importance of managing for the future and not the past because resources cannot be returned to past conditions.

During the Question and Answer session, Dr. Rader and other participants made the following additional points:

- The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council has built a strong foundation of work to support the scope of fisheries management beyond its traditional jurisdictions, although there have been challenges posed in implementation of the 2006 Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act.
- Sand is a critical resource and there is an important opportunity to coordinate sand management through the GSAA. Leveraging regional resources to address these and other issues will be the best approach, particularly in the long-term.
- While it is difficult to alter long-established management strategies, managing for the future will involve accountability at a system level, not at an individual species level. Success will be based on how species thrive together, not on how individual species fair.
- While resources are limited, there is "never no money," it's a matter of where the money is being spent. Success in attracting investment is based on building a strong case for support. New opportunities exist in public-private partnerships and philanthropic organizations.

Dr. Michael Orbach, Duke Marine Laboratory, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University

Dr. Orbach's presentation focused on the socio-political context of ocean and coastal policy and management in the South Atlantic region. Dr. Orbach posited that all coastal and marine policy and management decisions have biophysical, social, and economic objectives and impacts, and therefore these decisions require tradeoffs, which is the process of governance. In all management decisions, we can only affect the behavior of people and if management requires changing someone's behavior, then there is always an element of social process. This means that we need as much data and information about human factors as environmental factors in order to understand and judge the necessary tradeoffs. Dr. Orbach then reviewed examples of historic cooperation in coastal environments. He highlighted the good record of cooperation in marine fisheries in the South Atlantic and the Atlantic States, although there are stressors on the system because of increasingly tight federal restrictions. Coastal Zone Management was characterized as having historically strong individual state management, but faced challenges in funding, changing philosophy of government, and public property issues that have led to fewer active inter-state collaborations than in fisheries. Cooperation in ocean policy and planning was described as a new and undeveloped area for the whole country, with little inter-state cooperation except in limited cases of specific drivers, such as ocean energy. In addition, no partnerships have crossed the land-sea boundary, addressing issues from the watersheds to the EEZ, for true Ecosystem-Based Management, and this was highlighted as a potential opportunity for the GSAA. Dr. Orbach described two examples of policy challenges: ocean planning via the Carolina Capes Coastal and Ocean Use Framework and integrated coastal management for climate change and sea-level rise. He suggested that to adequately address these challenges, policy-makers and managers will need to have full biophysical, social, and economic characterization; new, innovative, participatory policy and management regimes; and the cooperation of the South Atlantic states, which is an opportunity for the GSAA.

During the Question and Answer session, Dr. Orbach and other participants made the following additional points:

- Convincing people that sea-level rise is a real challenge will be especially effective at the local level when municipalities develop plans to retreat from shorelines, establish rolling easements, and are unable to guarantee public services in vulnerable areas.
- Additional conflicts are arising regarding the transition of submerged lands from private to public ownership and taxation policies that impact decisions on land use.

GSAA Products and Progress

Debra Hernandez, Executive Director, Southeast Coastal Ocean Observing Regional Association and Principal Investigator for the Regional Information Management System project (RIMS)

Ms. Hernandez discussed the progress made by the RIMS project team, specifically the development of the GSAA Coast and Ocean Portal. Describing how far the project has come since 2012, Ms. Hernandez highlighted the launch in May 2013 of a live, fully functioning GSAA Portal, and the Portal's user-friendly design, providing access to 126 searchable data layers (many of them new), including human uses. The initial build of the Portal focused on data from the shoreline to the ocean, and in its initial focus areas, the portal can be used to investigate beach renourishment effects, port maintenance and expansion, and habitat conservation issues. "Use cases" for each focus area demonstrate how the portal can be used to address current management issues. The RIMS team collaborated closely with the Healthy Ecosystems team to

set priorities, obtain feedback, and identify regional datalayers. With the Working Waterfronts team, the RIMS team is identifying available military datalayers and scoped a project for port infrastructure focused on how to integrate land use information with vessel traffic and how to make better use of brownfields near ports. The RIMS team continues to work closely with the Issue Area Technical Teams to provide technical support and expertise, including on Snap Shot development. Going forward, the RIMS team continues to request user feedback and work on outreach on the GSAA Portal, building on successful training sessions recently held in each of the four states. Other opportunities to demonstrate the Portal are encouraged and requests can be directed to the RIMS program manager, Jennifer Dorton (gsaaportal@gmail.com).

Dr. Clark Alexander, Professor, Skidaway Institute of Oceanography and Principal Investigator for the Hazard Vulnerability Assessment project (HVA)

Dr. Alexander relayed progress towards the development of a coastal Hazard Vulnerability Assessment tool (AMBUR-HVA) that is being built by a regional team of researchers and coastal managers. The focus of the project is on developing tools for the South Atlantic with consistent metrics for vulnerability across region. The GSAA is leading the nation in Hazard Vulnerability studies and with the incorporation of shoreline change rates, and other physical, biological, and the socioeconomic data, the AMBUR-HVA will be robust and support decision making by coastal managers. In Phase 1 of the project, the team identified existing datasets and pilot areas. The pilot areas chosen include a broad range of coastal environments and habitats and occupy about 1,000 km of estuarine shoreline in each state. Shorelines were digitized for three time periods in each pilot area, 1930s/40s, 1970s/80s, and 2000s, and the digitized shorelines are being used to conduct shoreline change analysis. A beta version of AMBUR-HVA has been reviewed by the project team, and with input from the managers on the team, is being revised to provide more information about the source of assessed vulnerability so that users have more insight into why an area is highly vulnerable. The goals for the upcoming year include the dissemination of information across the four states, developing consistent assessment methods, gathering more relevant data, and integrating the data.

Will Salters, Coastal Planner, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, and Team Lead Disaster Resilient Communities (DRC)

Mr. Salters highlighted the progress of the Disaster-Resilient Communities Issue Area Technical Team in completing their actions for 2013. He acknowledged the important resilience resources already available through FEMA's resources for states with the National Disaster Recovery Framework and other resources available at disasterrecoveryresources.net. These planning tools provide guidelines to communities on how to plan for resiliency. The DRC team has been working with NOAA's CRest program to expand eligibility for future resiliency projects in the South Atlantic and participated in the Coastal Services Center assessment of redevelopment planning. The team also worked with partners to sponsor a live broadcast of an American Planning Association session on post-disaster recovery planning that was viewed by over 500 participants.

Kelly Hill, Coastal Resources Specialist, Georgia Department of Natural Resources Coastal Resources Division, and Team Lead Clean Coastal and Ocean Waters (CCOW)

Ms. Hill presented the accomplishments of the Clean Coastal and Ocean Waters Issue Area Technical Team. The Watershed Improvement Working Group was established as a subgroup of the CCOW team and is completing a watershed water quality process catalogue to be used for analyzing the similarities and differences among the four states for water quality improvement.

The team is also preparing a compendium of Best Management Practices and a list of Low Impact Development demonstration sites. Goals for 2014 include extending outreach in the professional community for feedback concerning best management practices that can be utilized in the South Atlantic region.

Marine Planning Session

Brad Gane, Section Chief, Ecological Services Georgia Department of Natural Resources Coastal Resources Division and Executive Planning Team Chair

Mr. Gane reviewed the actions in the Governors' Action Plan related to marine planning in the South Atlantic and highlighted the progress that has already been made in laying a foundation for marine planning through GSAA and state planning efforts. The GSAA has developed the framework for marine planning through the GSAA Coast and Ocean Portal and the data layers to understand multiple ocean and coastal uses. The GSAA's Hazard Vulnerability Assessment project is developing a geospatial tools for understanding the most vulnerable areas of the coast and where those vulnerabilities overlap with critical coastal uses. In addition, each of the states has projects that support the understanding and mapping of coastal and ocean uses in their area of responsibility. These state projects and the projects already in place for the GSAA provide a solid foundation for continued regional efforts for marine planning.

Deerin Babb-Brott, Director, National Ocean Council

Mr. Babb-Brott provided an overview of the National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan and Marine Planning Handbook. Acknowledging the work already being done by the states and the GSAA, Mr. Babb-Brott indicated that the National Ocean Council is working with the Navy to support the development of a Regional Planning Body in the South Atlantic that leverages this ongoing work and brings additional federal support and partnership, as well as involvement of the tribal nations of the region. Reflecting on his work in the Massachusetts Coastal Management Program, he discussed the opportunities provided by marine planning to improve efficiency, and reduce costs and conflict for major infrastructure projects. Establishing a Regional Planning Body is voluntary; the federal agencies will work to coordinate their areas of responsibility, but other partners can choose whether to participate. The scope, scale, and content of the marine plans is decided by the partners in the region and will be based on the capacity of the region to pursue. Resource limitations may require that initial work is at a scale commensurate with those resources, and setting specific and attainable goals will be the most important first step. Marine plans could address mapping and data needs to address current issues and conflicts or stitch together existing work, and the federal agencies will be looking to support these goals. Mr. Babb-Brott emphasized that marine planning is primarily a smart use issue that makes the best use of data and information to streamline regulatory processes and understand cumulative impacts of multiple marine uses. Benefits of establishing a Regional Planning Body include the opportunity to engage with federal agencies in non-traditional ways to address regional goals, and to raise critical regional issues to the National Ocean Council for support and action. The relationship between the Regional Ocean Partnerships, like the GSAA, and Regional Planning Bodies are evolving differently in each region, and the areas of overlap are where additional benefits can be identified. The approach for establishing Regional Planning Bodies is incremental, as needed, and focuses first on the goals and available data and then eases into planning approaches when appropriate.

During the Question and Answer session, Mr. Babb-Brott and other participants made the following additional points:

- Marine planning can provide information and decision-support tools that individual states may not have the resources to prepare.
- It is up to each region to decide how often to revisit marine plans and whether it is an ongoing or finite process.
- The structure of marine planning is dictated by the goal, but the basic requirements of a Regional Planning Body would include some combination of state and tribal boundaries to address the stated goals. The purpose is to think regionally.
- The federal agencies are interested in regional issues because they are part of the region. Their authorities and responsibilities overlap with the interests of states and tribal governments and the Regional Planning Bodies can highlight those overlapping interests.

Marine Planning Discussion

A discussion session on marine planning centered on the following three questions:

1. *Where could the Regional Planning Body (RPB) assist with current ongoing marine planning activities?*
2. *What are the opportunities or regional drivers for marine planning that would be beneficial and not duplicative of current ongoing activities?*
3. *Given the GSAA's progress in marine planning and the guidance from the Marine Planning Handbook, how could the organization of the South Atlantic RPB compliment the GSAA?*

Comments and suggestions made by participants included the following:

- Areas of common process for Regional Planning Bodies include development of a work plan and charter, identification of regional goals, engaging stakeholders and the public to offer opportunities to influence the contents, data and information of marine plans, development of options that lay out alternative ways to achieve objectives, analyses of pros and cons, and decision on a plan.
- Concerns were raised about the capacity available for marine planning and a Regional Planning Body without funding for dedicated staff.
- "De-conflicting" is sometimes highlighted as a benefit of marine planning, and it was described as bringing together partners that start with diverse ideas and perspectives and working to decide on common outcomes to start building a plan.
- The process of bringing the partners together and sharing their diverse perspectives is beneficial in itself because it puts all the issues out on the table and brings visibility to the conflicts, which then challenges partners to find ways to solve the most important issues and understand what data is required.
- While federal resources are limited, endorsement of a Regional Planning Body is going to help bring federal support to the priorities in the region.
- Commercial shipping was described as not being adequately represented. While there is information on where shipping lanes are located, the industry does not feel part of the process.
- Concern was expressed about the lack of information on where commercial and recreational fishing activities are taking place.

- GSAA members do not want to reinvent the organization or create parallel processes to establish a Regional Planning Body, rather it should be a tool for the GSAA to accomplish its goals.
- It was recommended that the Regional Planning Body may best be integrated as a subgroup of the GSAA.
- It has not been decided who would be involved in a Regional Planning Body that is not already involved in the GSAA. New partners would likely include additional federal agencies and tribal representatives.
- The approach of the GSAA to whole watershed and ecosystem-based approaches aligns well with tribal perspective on the upland, estuaries, and ocean as one ecological system. The data included in the GSAA Coast and Ocean Portal provides important information to tribes.
- Decision-making in the Regional Planning Body is based on consensus. If any participant has an objection to a particular issue, the whole group has the opportunity to revisit the issue and consider alternative options.
- The federal co-lead role is to facilitate a Regional Planning Body and Navy has volunteered for this role in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico to be a good steward of the region and find mutual benefit for everyone in the region.

2014 Planning – Issue Area Technical Team Breakouts and Snap Shot Discussions

Clean Coastal and Ocean Waters

The Clean Coastal and Ocean Waters (CCOW) team discussed key opportunities for the upcoming year. In conjunction with the Healthy Ecosystems (HE) team, the CCOW team is interested in developing an interactive map-based assessment tool to support the snapshots for actions CCOW 2A and HE 2A. Coordination with the South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperatives will be important, and a meeting that includes the HE team and other partners will be needed to further discuss the opportunity.

The team discussed working closely with USGS to evaluate regional nutrient models as described in CCOW1B2. The USGS has begun an effort to identify areas where additional monitoring is needed, which could aid in CCOW's future nutrient modeling efforts. The team will also continue to work on streamlining watershed/water quality processes across the four states. As outlined in the Snap Shot for CCOW1A, the team will be looking for support to analyze the catalogue of water quality processes to make recommendations on how to improve efficiency.

Related to their Snap Shot for CCOW3A, the team discussed the possibility of partnering with the National Water Quality Monitoring Council to establish a regional water quality monitoring work group. An inventory is needed as a first step and comparability of water quality data across the region is a key goal. The team will collect background from the Gulf of Mexico Alliance, USGS, and others to determine a path forward.

Disaster-Resilient Communities

The Disaster-Resilient Communities (DRC) Issue Area Technical Team focused their discussions on the resources available for continuing their work on post-disaster recovery planning. The team discussed the challenges of hazard mitigation planning, and a culture that waits to address

disasters until they occur. Local governments are the lead entities when disasters occur, but are often overwhelmed by the numerous federal and state programs that come to help, particularly in small communities. The team discussed what the role for the GSAA might be in helping to support local communities by coordinating state and federal efforts across the region. Resources from FEMA, NOAA Coastal Services Center, student internships, and the ongoing work with the Hazard Vulnerability Assessment project may be able to support the DRC team's efforts to inform planning at the local government level. In addition, the team agreed to coordinate with State Hazard Mitigation Officers in all four states to discuss how resources can be pulled together across the region. Working with the business community on post-disaster continuity issues will also be part of 2014 Work Plans.

DRC also reviewed the Snap Shots they prepared at the May technical teams meeting. Living shorelines or alternative/hybrid shorelines was highlighted as an area with momentum and interest from numerous entities in the region. The team discussed what the GSAA role might be and that any activity in this area would need to be coordinated with partners, particularly the Southeastern Regional Partnership for Planning and Sustainability (SERPPAS) and the Southern Environmental Law Center. Significant work by the states is underway, and some long-standing pilot projects could contribute to the understanding of how living shorelines work and when they are viable. The EPA may have resources available to support living shorelines work, and other federal agencies, such as the Army Corps of Engineers and NOAA, would be critical partners. The shoreline migration Snap Shot would require the support of ongoing work in the Hazard Vulnerability Assessment project, but will need further funding to prepare a regional guidebook that can help local communities make use of shoreline change decision support tools. There are also two Snap Shots that were prepared in coordination with the Working Waterfronts team, and there may be some existing resources to support their implementation; however, with the numerous plans discussed for 2014, the DRC team agreed to focus on the activities they can reasonably move forward over the next year.

Healthy Ecosystems

Panel Presentations provided an overview of the Healthy Ecosystem (HE) Issue Area Technical Team activities and shared examples of efforts underway by partners that correspond with the team's objectives and activities. As the current team lead, Jan Landsberg (Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission) provided a brief background on HE goals and objectives, followed by an overview of team activities for the past year. Rua Mordecai, South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative (SALCC) Science Coordinator, provided the participants with an overview of the organization and then spoke about the ongoing effort to develop a Blueprint for the South Atlantic, including terrestrial, freshwater, estuarine and marine ecosystems. Funded in part through SALCC, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) is currently working on developing regional coastal and marine maps for a variety of habitats and species. Mary Conley provided an overview of the analysis underway for coastal ecosystems and discussed the relationship with the biological, habitat and use spreadsheet developed by the team over the past year. The session wrapped up with a discussion amongst participants of priority activities or actions that the Healthy Ecosystem team should be considering in their upcoming work plan.

Breakout participants reviewed the three Snap Shots developed by the Healthy Ecosystems team. The first Snap Shot discussed the mapping priority habitats and biological resources in estuarine areas with priorities defined by surveys. The goal is to capture the estuarine biological and habitat data identified in the HE spreadsheet. The challenge is how to distill the data in a

consistent way across the region given that each state monitors and maintains the data differently. The team wants to clearly formulate the purpose/value of including biological data into the mapping project to determine effort worth. TNC agreed to work with the states to "test" analysis options on one species. The team recommended blue crab and Pat Geer (GA DNR) agreed to help organize a call with representatives from the four states and TNC.

Snap Shot two focuses on expected effects from increasing development and climate change on estuarine habitats and biological resources in the South Atlantic coastal ecosystem. The snap shot was described as being too broad and the team will need to focus in on one issue in order to complete an analysis. Distilling the current literature on the climate change impacts (e.g. storm changes, ocean acidification, sea level rise, salt water intrusion) to natural resources in the South Atlantic was discussed as an initial step; however, the team did not want to be redundant with other efforts. Having a bigger picture policy or management issue to direct the effort around would help to define the direction of this Snap Shot.

Snap Shot three focuses on identifying key coastal uses and their locations that should be managed to benefit regionally important resources. Both the marine and estuarine data spreadsheets developed by the HE team have noted some coastal uses; however, the team has not prioritized these for regional mapping. This represents a good opportunity to work with the other Technical Teams. By identifying a broad regional action, (e.g. sediment management), the GSAA leadership could help to refine what data is pulled together. Overall, participants felt that this year some effort could be put towards steps one and two under the snap shot approach: (1) review coastal use priorities and identify gaps in managed resources from a regional perspective and (2) complete surveys of coastal use priorities identified by other Technical Teams, HE team and coastal managers. However, work towards completing the maps of priorities uses would not be a team priority this year.

Working Waterfronts

The Working Waterfronts (WW) Issue Area Technical Team panel included presentations from April Turner, the new WW Team Lead, and three partner organizations. April discussed the work of the team over the past year, including work on a proposal for brownfield mapping and analysis for port expansion and development. In 2014, the Working Waterfronts team will focus on identifying and compiling existing data layers for a regional mapping effort with the help of the Sea Grant programs of the southeast. This mapping effort will focus on compiling and developing an inventory of working waterfront sites, public access infrastructure, and associated support facilities, and help the team determine what data is missing (gap analysis). In order to provide the data to the GSAA Portal, each state will be responsible for hosting, maintaining, and updating their own data. The team discussed the capacity needed to complete the work, and may have to complete the tasks in stages or on a state-by-state basis.

Brad Pickel, Executive Director of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Association (AIWA), discussed the work of his organization and the opportunities for partnership with the WW team. Working toward completion of Snap Shot WW1A, the Working Waterfronts team will attend the AIWA annual meeting in November. The team members will convene a panel session at the conference where participants will learn more about the GSAA and what WW implementation steps are currently underway. Attending this session will enable the WW team members to build relationships with the AIWA members, engaging critical partners. The AIWA will take on the bulk of the tasks outlined in this snapshot, including compiling pertinent data related to chronic

navigational problems/hinderances for the GSAA portal and producing a white paper highlighting areas of concern for both commercial and recreational users. This would be a relatively low cost opportunity to accomplish action plan objectives, while aligning well with the needs and objectives of the AIWA.

Bob Swett, Florida Sea Grant, presented on his involvement with the National Working Waterfronts Network (NWWN) and the development of their online toolkit, which provides an opportunity for the Working Waterfronts team to engage with a national partnership. The toolkit is a compilation of activities and resources for waterfront communities including law and policy, tools, economics, financing, historic trends, and community interactions. There are multiple points of intersection with the GSAA WW team and the NWWN that can be fostered through direct connections between the two groups. For example, Dr. Swett and April Turner currently serve on the NWWN Outreach & Education Committee and can serve as conduits of information and shared ideas that can be mutually beneficial.

Finally, Paul Friday from US Marine Corps Installations East, based at Camp Lejeune, presented on the preparation of GIS maps of the region's military resources footprint to make available on the GSAA Portal. He shared the current status of the effort, and the opportunities and challenges this information raises. In addition to spatial information for location of installations, data layers will be available for special air space, ranges, training routes, turf routes, noise safety, and radar clearance. The information is being provided to support compatibility of military activities in the region with environmental management efforts. The data collection and formatting efforts are nearing completion for 3 of the 4 states, and will continue with Florida to complete the regional footprint.