

Evaluation Process

Coastal Zone Management Act Evaluations

Coastal Zone Management Programs
National Estuarine Research Reserves

June 2021



National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Office for Coastal Management

Table of Contents

Overview	2
Purpose of the Guide	2
Authorities	2
Priority Outcomes	2
Evaluation Process	2
Process Overview	2
Selection and Notification of Programs	3
Information Gathering	3
Target Areas	4
Public Meeting	5
Evaluation Team	5
Agenda Development	6
Site Visit.....	7
Findings Report	7
Reporting on Recommendations	7
Appendixes.....	9
A. Evaluation Overview Fiscal Year 2022	9
B. Letter to Department Head	12
C. Example Information Request for Coastal Program Liaison.....	13
D. Example Information Request for Reserve Liaison	14
E. Information Request for Coastal Management Program	15
F. Information Request for National Estuarine Research Reserve	20
G. Coastal Program Stakeholder Survey	25
H. Reserve Stakeholder Survey	28
I. Reporting Template	32

Overview

Purpose of the Guide

This guide is for coastal program and national estuarine research reserve managers, as well as NOAA Office for Coastal Management site liaisons, to help lead them through the evaluation process. The guide is a living document and will be updated periodically to reflect changes to the process.

Evaluation documents that are not expected to change significantly over time are included in the appendix. For documents that change more often, or are impacted by changes from in-person to virtual site visits due to COVID-19, the guide notes where a program manager or site liaison can request the most up-to-date information from the evaluator.

Authorities

Periodic evaluations are required under the Coastal Zone Management Act. Section 312 of the Coastal Zone Management Act and implementing regulations at 15 CFR 923, Subpart L, require that a state **coastal program** be periodically evaluated concerning the extent to which the state has 1) implemented and enforced the program approved by the secretary; 2) addressed the coastal management needs identified in Section 303(2)(A)-(K) of the act; and 3) adhered to the terms of any grant, loan, or cooperative agreement funded under the act.

For **research reserves**, Section 315 of the Coastal Zone Management Act and implementing regulations at 15 CFR 921, Subpart E, require that a research reserve be periodically evaluated with regard to 1) its operation and management, including education and interpretive activities; 2) the research being conducted within the research reserve; and 3) adherence to the requirements of Section 315(b)(2) of the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Priority Outcomes

When conducting evaluations under the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Office for Coastal Management is most interested in the following outcomes:

1. Improving programs and policies in a systematic manner
2. Monitoring of program performance for accountability
3. Providing the opportunity for NOAA, state programs, and partners to discuss problems and solutions
4. Identifying program impacts

Evaluation Process

Process Overview

The [Evaluation Overview](#) for Fiscal Year 2022 in Appendix A highlights the major tasks and provides a timeline for the process.

Selection and Notification of Programs

The Office for Coastal Management chooses programs to be evaluated primarily based on the time since they were last evaluated. Other considerations may also be taken into account, such as staff resources; the desire to evaluate a state's coastal program and reserve at the same time, or in the same year; or specific issues a program is having. Currently, most programs are on a five- to seven-year evaluation cycle.

The office will notify coastal programs and reserves that they have been selected in early spring, the year before the site visit, so that they can incorporate an evaluation task into their cooperative agreement award. For state programs with two-year awards, the office will strive to inform a program in time to include it in its first-year application.

The evaluation team will contact programs undergoing an evaluation in the fall to solicit their preferred timing for the site visit the next year. Programs will then be assigned to an evaluator and programs will be notified. The evaluator will be the program's primary contact throughout the evaluation process. Most evaluations are anticipated to occur April to November (expanded from previous guidance) but evaluations can also be scheduled outside of that time frame.

The Office for Coastal Management will send a letter to the head of the state agency in January (approximate) of the site visit year announcing NOAA's intent to evaluate. An [example letter](#) can be found in Appendix B.

Information Gathering

Evaluators will gather information from a wide range of sources prior to the evaluation site visit. Key items are highlighted here.

Site Liaison Information Submittal for Reserves and Coastal Programs

Site liaisons are to complete a short information submittal, which will be due at the end of December, the year before the site visit.

- [Site liaison information submittal for coastal programs](#) in Appendix C
- [Site liaison information submittal for reserves](#) in Appendix D

Coastal Program and Reserve Information Submittals

Coastal program and reserve programs must also complete a standard information submittal, which will be due at the end of December, the year before the site visit. If a program is struggling to meet the deadline, it should contact the evaluator to discuss an extension. The information submittal should cover the time period from the month after the previous evaluation site visit (the start of the evaluation period) to the end of September the year prior to the site visit. It is optional to include information beyond September.

Please keep in mind that the evaluation team is looking for information on a few major successes and challenges per area. These should be described in a paragraph or two that covers the issue, activities, and impact.

- [Coastal program information submittal](#) in Appendix E
- [Reserve information submittal](#) in Appendix F

Stakeholder Surveys

The evaluation team will send stakeholders a brief survey to gather information before selecting target areas. The program manager will be asked to send stakeholders a brief email introducing the survey before the evaluator sends the survey. Example text will be provided to program managers by the evaluator.

- [Coastal program stakeholder survey](#) in Appendix G
- [Reserve stakeholder survey](#) in Appendix H

Note: The coastal program survey includes questions for programs that conduct permitting. For programs that do not have a permit program these questions will not be included.

The survey is approved by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act. Changes to the survey questions are therefore not allowed.

Additional Information Collection

The evaluator will review previous cooperative agreements and performance reports, evaluation metric data, previous evaluation findings, and responses to previous evaluation findings. For **coastal programs**, evaluators will also review 309 Assessment and Strategies and program changes relevant to the evaluation period. For **reserves**, evaluators will also review relevant management plans and site profiles. In addition, evaluators will interview reserve sector leads and may interview other office staff as well regarding the program's performance during the evaluation period.

If there are other reports, newsletters, articles, or other easily accessible documents that would be of interest and value to the evaluator and evaluation team, these can be sent to the evaluator by the site liaison or program.

Target Areas

An evaluation will focus on one to three target areas. Virtual evaluations will most likely focus on one to two target areas. Target areas are:

- Recurring or major issues
- Innovative or high-impact projects or activities

After the survey is complete, the evaluator will provide a list of potential target areas of interest and set up a meeting with the state program to discuss and finalize the target areas. A short summary of the survey results will also be provided at this time. The initial list of potential target areas will be determined by the evaluator in consultation with the site liaison, a review of available information,

particularly the information submittals and survey results, and potentially other office staff. For the selection of most target areas, the Office for Coastal Management welcomes feedback on what would be most helpful for the program. There will be cases where NOAA has determined that a specific target area must be part of the evaluation. At the end of the target area meeting, it is anticipated that the target areas will be finalized. In addition, there may be discussion of potential state participants and potential site visit agenda.

Public Meeting

A public meeting will need to be scheduled 10 weeks before the site visit to ensure that NOAA can meet the requirement to publish a public notice 45 days beforehand in the *Federal Register*. If the meeting is to be in person, an evening meeting is usually best to facilitate attendance. If the meeting is virtual, a lunchtime meeting, or another time during the work day, may better facilitate attendance.

Programs are required to place an ad in the major newspaper in the local area where the meeting is occurring. The ad only needs to run for one day. The ad should be placed 45 days (or earlier) before the public meeting. The evaluator will provide the state program with the required text for the newspaper notice.

Programs are also expected to use other available means to get the word out, such as email list servers, state public notices, news releases, websites, and social media outlets. These types of advertisement do not need to follow the newspaper template, but notices should include the opportunity to provide written comments.

Public meeting information will be posted on the Office for Coastal Management website on the [evaluation page](#).

See also the [Site Visit](#) section.

Evaluation Team

The evaluator and site liaison are part of the evaluation team. The evaluator will also invite a state or reserve program participant or other expert to participate on the evaluation team. In addition, there may be a regional Office for Coastal Management representative, or one or two others, that are part of the team. The state program participant will be chosen in consultation with the site liaison, program manager, and others, such as Office for Coastal Management managers. The Office for Coastal Management has occasionally had funding to support the travel of state program participants, but state participants may need to fund their participation depending on the year.

Every member of the evaluation team is responsible for reading the state's information submittal and survey results. In addition, for **reserve** evaluations the team is provided with the most recent management plan and for **coastal programs** the applicable 5-year 309 Assessments and Strategies. Team members will participate in all meetings.

Every team member is responsible for providing the evaluator with feedback on specific questions for one target area of the evaluation. These questions may vary depending on the evaluation, but example questions are:

- How does the program address the target area?
- What are the issues?
- What are the program's great successes/accomplishments in this area?
- What can the program improve upon? Ideas going forward?
- Linkages to others dealing with the same issue(s)?
- Potential recommendations for findings?
- Other thoughts or connections?

In addition, the team members will review and provide comments on the draft findings.

Agenda Development

The evaluator will provide the program with example agendas from recent evaluations. In addition, the evaluator can provide examples for how meetings with stakeholders can be structured and information on how to help participants prepare.

The coastal program or reserve is responsible for preparing the draft agenda, which should include the proposed meeting times and topics and the names and affiliations of potential stakeholders. A draft agenda should be provided to the evaluator for feedback prior to inviting the stakeholders. Once the program and evaluator agree on the draft agenda and invitee list, the program will be responsible for setting up the stakeholder meetings. The draft agenda may need to be modified to address stakeholder schedules. The program should communicate with the evaluator regarding any major proposed changes to the agenda.

For an in-person or virtual visit it is anticipated that most agendas will provide time for

- 1 to 3 meetings with program staff for an overview of program and target areas
- 2 to 6 meetings with partners and stakeholders, 1-2 meetings per target area
- Public meeting
- The evaluation team and program staff to discuss accomplishments, issues, and solutions and address any follow-up questions. For virtual site visits this has often been an afternoon "coffee hour" to cap the day's stakeholder meetings.
- Exit meeting with program manager and staff to discuss initial findings
- Exit meeting with department head to discuss initial findings

The meetings with stakeholders will be conducted with program staff present for about 75 percent of the meeting and will allow time at the end for the evaluation team to meet just with stakeholders. For example, it is common to schedule in-person meetings for 1.25 hours. For the first hour, staff are part of the meeting and for the last 15 minutes the evaluation team meets with stakeholders.

Site Visit

The program manager is anticipated to participate actively in the evaluation site visit. In addition, most programs involve key staff in relevant meetings.

The public meeting will be led by the evaluator. If the state program manager wishes to briefly welcome everyone to the event they should consult with the evaluator regarding this possibility. The formality of the meeting will vary based on the number of attendees and their concerns. The evaluator will bring fact sheets and sign-up sheets to in-person public meetings.

Findings Report

Each findings report will include:

- **Summary of Findings** that includes the accomplishments, necessary actions, and recommendations
- **Program Review Procedures**
- **Evaluation Findings** for each target area
- **Evaluation Metrics** data and discussion
- **Conclusion**
- Written comments and NOAA's **Response to Written Comments**

The major findings will take the form of accomplishments, necessary actions, and recommendations.

Accomplishments describe a program's impacts, success in addressing coastal management issues, or areas where a program is performing at an exceptionally high level.

Necessary Actions address programmatic requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act or its implementing regulations. These must be carried out by the dates specified. Failure to address necessary actions may result in a future finding of non-adherence and the invoking of interim sanctions, as specified in the Coastal Zone Management Act §312(c).

Recommendations are actions that the office believes would improve the program but which are not mandatory. The state is expected to have considered the recommendations by the time of the next evaluation or dates specified.

Reporting on Recommendations

Programs are required to report annually in their cooperative agreement progress reports on both necessary actions and recommendations until closed. A template specific to a program's recommendations will be provided along with the final findings. A generic template is in the appendix.

If a program will not be able to meet a necessary action by the deadline, the Office for Coastal Management strongly encourages the program to discuss any issues with the site liaison and to submit a request for extension. The site liaison can help ensure that the email request goes to the right person, particularly if office staffing is in flux. The program should email the Planning and

Performance Measurement Program manager and copy the evaluation team record keeper, and site liaison. The email should briefly describe the reasons for the extension request and the new proposed completion date. The Planning and Performance Measurement Program manager will then review and send an email either approving or not approving the request, or asking for additional information. It is also possible that the site liaison may discuss the request with the program, and submit a request on behalf of the program, ensuring the program is copied on the request.

Appendixes

A. Evaluation Overview for Fiscal Year 2022

Note: Blue rows highlight tasks where state program has lead or major role.

Initial Scheduling and Notifications

Task	Time Frame
Program identifies several weeks that will work for site visit.	August-September 2021
NOAA matches evaluators to programs based on coastal management programs' (CMPs') and research reserves' preferred scheduling.	Fall 2021
Evaluator holds call with program to provide overview of evaluation process, answer questions, and discuss site visit dates.	October-December 2021
Evaluator sends "notification of evaluation" letter to state department head	January 2022

Information Gathering

Task	Time Frame
Program completes information submittal.	December 2021
Program emails notice to stakeholders regarding survey.	February-March 2022
Evaluator sends out survey.	February-March 2022
Survey closes and evaluator analyzes initial results and creates summary.	February-April 2022

Public Notice

Task	Time Frame
Program works with evaluator to schedule the public meeting and arranges facility.	3 months prior to site visit (varies February-July 2022)
NOAA publishes a <i>Federal Register</i> notice advertising the public meeting.	45 days prior to the site visit

Task	Time Frame
Program publishes a notice in a newspaper(s) of wide circulation in the area AND takes other methods of advertisement, which may include publishing on website, newsletters, a state register of notices, press release, or use of email list serves.	45 days prior for publication of newspaper notice. Other methods of advertisement can vary.

Site Visit

Task	Time Frame
Evaluator sends initial summary survey results to program and holds call to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Choose target areas ● Discuss site visit structure and potential participants ● Have program identify preferred expertise in 'expert' evaluation team member 	2-3 months prior to site visit meetings. Varies (March – July 2022)
Evaluator identifies an 'expert' evaluation team member that is able to participate in the site visit.	In 2-3 weeks after target areas determined
Program sends draft stakeholder invitee list for evaluator team comment.	2 weeks after target area call
Program schedules and arranges site visit to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1-3 meetings with staff on targets areas ● 2-6 meetings with stakeholders on target areas ● Exit meeting with program manager and staff ● Exit meeting with agency leadership 	Begins 2-3 months before site visit
Evaluator emails stakeholders with information on NOAA evaluations and initial evaluation questions.	2-7 days before site visit
At end of site visit, evaluation team meets with program manager and staff to discuss initial findings. A second meeting is held with agency leadership to discuss initial findings.	Last day of site visit

Drafting & Review of Evaluation Findings

Task	Timeframe
Draft findings completed and reviewed by NOAA	60-130 days after site visit

Task	Timeframe
Evaluation team meets with program manager to discuss key findings in report	130-140 days after site visit
Full draft findings sent to program manager and lead of state agency	By 140 days after site visit
Agency and program reviews draft evaluation findings	During 4 weeks after receipt by program manager
Final Findings released by NOAA	180 days after public meeting

B. Letter to Department Head

The example letter below is for a reserve; the template for a coastal program letter is similar.

Dear Secretary Name:

I would like to inform you that the NOAA Office for Coastal Management will be conducting an evaluation of the Name National Estuarine Research Reserve as required by the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). The evaluation will cover the period of Month 202X to Month 202x, the time since the previous evaluation.

The evaluation will examine how the Name Department is implementing the federally approved Name National Estuarine Research Reserve Management Plan, adhering to federal regulations governing the implementation of the reserve system as found at 15 CFR, Part 921, and meeting all federal requirements for managing financial assistance awards under the CZMA. As part of the evaluation process, we will be soliciting the input of the reserve's partners and stakeholders, and the public will be able to provide input through written comments and a public meeting as required by the CZMA. We will be working closely with your staff throughout the evaluation process and will provide you with an opportunity to comment on the draft evaluation findings. The completed findings will be sent to you and the other participants.

We recognize that the evaluation process requires a substantial investment of staff time and effort. In addition to meeting statutory requirements, the evaluation findings will provide information on program accomplishments and areas needing greater attention, which we believe will be useful both for the NOAA Office for Coastal Management and the Name Department to help guide the direction of future reserve activities.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation with the evaluation. We look forward to working with you and your staff. Should you or your staff have any questions about the evaluation, please contact me at (240) 533-07XX, or via email at *first.last@noaa.gov*.

Sincerely,

Name, Division Chief
Policy, Planning, and Communications
NOAA Office for Coastal Management

C. Example Information Request for Coastal Program Liaison

Due: December

For This Evaluation Period

1. Provide copies of relevant evaluation findings from evaluations (other than Section 312) conducted of the program or parts of the program that have been shared with the Office for Coastal Management.
2. Provide the cooperative agreement award numbers for any awards that are NOT the annual or biennial cooperative agreements.
3. Provide copies of other relevant reports, project summaries (e.g., regional ocean partnership projects), and articles from newspapers, Coastal Management News, etc. (especially those that address top impacts and accomplishments or issues and challenges).
4. Describe the top two to four impacts or accomplishments of the program from your perspective.
5. Describe the top two to four issues or challenges that the program faced from your perspective.
6. Describe any major issues with program administration, including issues with cooperative agreement and grant administration, operations, or management.
7. Provide up to 20 names of, or types of, program partners and stakeholders who should be surveyed or interviewed by the evaluation team or you may work with the coastal management program as it develops a similar list.

D. Example Information Request for Reserve Liaison

Due: December

For This Evaluation Period

1. Provide copies of relevant evaluation findings from evaluations (other than Section 312) conducted of the program or parts of the program that have been shared with the Office for Coastal Management.
2. Provide the cooperative agreement award numbers for any awards that are NOT the annual or biennial cooperative agreements.
3. Link to relevant science collaborative projects during the award period on the National Estuarine Research Reserve System's Science Collaborative project database at <http://nerrsciencecollaborative.org/projects> and/or provide other information on these projects.
4. Provide copies of other relevant reports, project summaries (e.g., regional ocean partnership projects), and articles from newspapers, (especially those that address top impacts and accomplishments or issues and challenges).
5. If the management plan is overdue, please provide a brief overview of the status and plan to complete.
6. Provide copies of any needs assessment or special plans developed by the reserve (for example, KEEP, vertical control, bio-monitoring).
7. If the reserve is not meeting System-Wide Monitoring Program requirements, provide the reserve's plan to become compliant.
8. Describe the top two to four impacts or accomplishments of the reserve from your perspective.
9. Describe the top two to four issues or challenges that the reserve faced from your perspective.
10. Describe any major issues with program administration, including issues with cooperative agreement and grant administration, operations, or management.
11. Describe the reserve's level of engagement in national workgroups and initiatives.
12. Provide up to 20 names of, or types of, reserve partners and stakeholders who should be surveyed or interviewed by the evaluation team or you may work with the reserve as it develops a similar list. Especially for new site liaisons, you can also work with your evaluator to review the program's list and determine if there are gaps.

E. Information Request for Coastal Management Program

Due: Friday, December 31, 202X

For the Evaluation Period (Month/Year to Month/Year)

Administration, Operation, and Management

1. Provide an organizational chart for
 - a) the coastal management program's (CMP's) lead agency, and
 - b) the CMP.
2. Provide a staffing list for the CMP, including
 - a) names and titles of each staff member,
 - b) full- or part-time status of each staff member,
 - c) source of position funding for each staff member,
 - d) subject/topic area(s) of work and responsibility(-ies) of each staff member,
 - e) loss or gain of positions during the evaluation period, and
 - f) number of vacant positions with length of each vacancy as of the time of the response to this request.
3. Identify any non-Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) federal or state match program funding (i.e., other federal, state, and private funding) in the amount of \$100,000 or more for each year of the evaluation period by source, amount, and how those funds were used. *Please note:* This does not include CZMA cooperative agreement funds and associated match.
4. Identify the composition of any advisory committee or board, frequency of meetings, and the committee's or board's role.
5. If the CMP has a strategic plan, provide a copy and identify how the CMP developed its goals and priorities, including whether it was a public-driven, internal, or hybrid process.
6. The evaluator will contact stakeholders and partners for input into the Section 312 evaluation. Provide the name, organization, position, and email address, for 20-30 stakeholders and partners with whom the CMP coordinated or collaborated on projects and activities. Include at least one contact from each of the following categories, if applicable: other parts of the coastal management program's lead state agency; other state agencies; federal agencies; gubernatorial offices and staff; legislative representatives and staff; local government elected officials and staff; regional planning organizations; nongovernmental organizations (e.g., chambers of commerce, trade associations); nonprofit organizations (e.g., environmental groups); local businesses and industry; the permit-regulated community; and academia. Please ensure that at least two of the stakeholders and partners can speak to each of the major six areas of the CZMA: public access, coastal hazards, coastal habitat, community development, coordination and public involvement, and water quality.

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Position	Email Address

In a total of two pages or less:

7. Summarize any major changes to program administration, structure, operation, or management that occurred and any associated impacts or accomplishments.
8. Summarize any issues or challenges the CMP faced in regard to program administration, operation, or management, including grants management. Include influences and factors that have hindered program administration, operation, or management.

In a total of two pages or less:

9. Summarize the CMP's partnership or activities with any reserve(s) in the state, including any major initiatives or projects and their impacts.
10. Summarize the nature of major local, regional, statewide, and/or national partnerships and projects and the role that the CMP has played or is playing in them to achieve and/or complement CMP goals.

Protection of Natural Resources/Coastal Habitat

In a total of five pages or less:

11. Summarize how the CMP addressed protection of coastal habitat and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
12. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal habitat.
13. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal habitat.
(If the information requested is in a Section 309 Assessment and Strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to the Office for Coastal Management, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)

Coastal Hazards and Adverse Effects of Land Subsidence and Sea Level Rise

In a total of five pages or less:

14. Summarize how the CMP addressed coastal hazards and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
15. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal hazards.
16. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal hazards.
(If the information requested is in a Section 309 Assessment and Strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to the Office for Coastal Management, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)

Coastal Water Quality

In a total of five pages or less:

17. Summarize how the CMP addressed coastal water quality and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
18. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal water quality.
19. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal water quality.
(If the information requested is in a Section 309 Assessment and Strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to the Office for Coastal Management, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)

Coastal Dependent Uses, Siting of Major Facilities, and Community Development; Assistance to Support Planning, Conservation, and Management for Living Marine Resources, including Aquaculture Facilities; and Redevelopment of Deteriorating Urban Waterfronts and Ports

In a total of five pages or less:

20. If the CMP started, continued, or completed any special area management plans (SAMPs) or ocean/Great Lakes plans, please describe the effectiveness to date of the SAMP or ocean/Great Lakes plan in meeting its designed purpose and goals.
21. Summarize how the CMP addressed coastal-dependent uses and community development and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
22. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to coastal dependent uses and community development.
23. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing coastal dependent uses and community development.
(If the information requested is in a Section 309 Assessment and Strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to the Office for Coastal Management, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)

Public Access

In a total of five pages or less:

24. Summarize how the CMP addressed public access and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
25. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to public access.
26. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing public access.
(It is not necessary to include information that is in the Section 309 Assessment and Strategy documents in effect during the evaluation period or that is part of any program changes already submitted to the Office for Coastal Management. The evaluator has access to those documents.)

Coordination and Simplification for Expedited Governmental Decision Making; Consultation and Coordination with Federal Agencies; and Public and Local Government Participation in Coastal Management Decision Making

In a total of five pages or less:

27. Summarize how the CMP addressed government coordination and decision making and any changes to relevant state legislation and/or regulations.
28. Summarize the 2-4 major impacts or accomplishments of the CMP with regard to government coordination and decision making.
29. Summarize the 2-4 major challenges the CMP faced in addressing government coordination and decision making.
(If the information requested is in a Section 309 Assessment and strategy document in effect during the evaluation period or is part of any program changes already submitted to the Office for Coastal Management, you may refer to those documents instead of including the information in your information submittal.)
30. In one page or less, summarize any changes in the roles of state and local governments in managing the coastal zone since the last evaluation that are not addressed in other topic areas.
31. In two pages or less, for the issuance of permits that are part of the state's approved coastal management program, summarize:
 - a) how the CMP collaborated and coordinated with other state and federal permitting agencies;
 - b) how and whether the process of collaboration and coordination worked well;
 - c) any ways to improve collaboration and coordination; and
 - d) any improvements to length of time for permit issuance and to permit processing efficiency.
32. Provide the list of the CMP's enforceable policies and enforceable policy information that the CMP provides to federal agencies and others who request it, and describe how interested parties obtain access to the enforceable policies list.

In a total of four pages or less:

33. Summarize any concerns or issues the CMP had in regard to effective implementation of federal consistency.
34. Summarize the process for incorporating public comments into federal consistency and other decision making.

Education and Outreach

35. In two pages or less, summarize any outreach and education efforts to communicate the value of the state and national coastal management program and coastal resources to the public.

Overarching

36. In two pages or less, and from the CMP manager's perspective, identify the two to four most

significant impacts or accomplishments and the two to four most significant challenges (excluding program administration, operations, or management challenges discussed in item 9) the CMP had or faced during this evaluation period. If any of these are not already discussed in 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, or 30, please summarize them. Include influences and factors that have advanced or hindered the achievement of any CMP goals, objectives, or outcomes.

OMB Control # 0648-0661, May 31, 2023. The Office for Coastal Management requires this information in order to adequately evaluate the ongoing approval and financial eligibility of CZMA coastal management programs. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 71 hours per response. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA/NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. This reporting is required under and is authorized under 16 U.S.C. 1458(a). Information submitted will be treated as public records. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

F. Information Request for National Estuarine Research Reserve

Due Friday, December 31, 2021

For the Evaluation Period (Month/Year to Month/Year):

Administration, Operations, Management, and Facilities

1. Provide an organization chart for
 - a) the reserve's lead agency, and
 - b) the reserve.
2. Provide a staffing list for the reserve, including
 - a) name and title of each staff member,
 - b) full- or part-time status of each staff member,
 - c) source of position funding for each staff member,
 - d) subject/topic area(s) of work and responsibility(-ies) of each staff member,
 - e) loss or gain of positions during the evaluation period, and
 - f) number of vacant positions with length of each vacancy at the time of the response to this request.
3. Identify any non-CZMA federal or state match program funding (i.e., other federal, state, and private funding) in the amount of \$100,000.00 or more for each year of the evaluation period by source, amount, and how those funds were used. *Please note:* This does not include CZMA cooperative agreement funds and associated match.
4. Identify the composition of advisory committee(s) or board(s), frequency of meetings, and the committee's or board's role.
5. If the reserve management plan is not up-to-date, please describe a plan and timeline for how this is being or will be addressed.
6. In one page or less, summarize how the reserve funds and maintains facilities and note any major changes to reserve facilities and infrastructure.
7. In one page or less, summarize the results and impacts of any geographic information system (GIS) products developed by the reserve and used by partners and reserve staff.
8. In one page or less, summarize how the reserve's research and monitoring, education, coastal training, and stewardship programs and activities are integrated with one another.
9. The evaluator will contact stakeholders and partners for input into the Section 312 evaluation. Provide the name, organization, position, and email address, for 20-30 stakeholders and partners with whom the reserve coordinated or collaborated on projects and activities. Include at least one contact from each of the following categories, if applicable: other parts of the reserve's lead state agency or organization; other state agencies; federal agencies; gubernatorial offices and staff; legislative representatives and staff; local government elected officials and staff; regional planning organizations; nongovernmental organizations (e.g., chambers of commerce, trade associations); nonprofit organizations (e.g., environmental groups); land management partners; local businesses and industry; and academia. The stakeholders and

partners should also include, if applicable: Coastal Training Program participants, Coastal Training Program partner providers, educators and/or school district staff whose students have participated in reserve education events, stewardship partners, and researchers who have conducted research projects at the reserve.

10.

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Position	Email Address

In a total of two pages or less:

11. Summarize any major changes to program administration, structure, operation, or management and any associated impacts or accomplishments.
12. Summarize any issues or challenges the reserve faced in regard to program administration, operation, or management, including grants management. Include influences and factors that have hindered program administration, operation, or management.

In a total of two pages or less:

13. Summarize the reserve’s partnership or activities with the state coastal management program, including any major initiatives or projects and their impacts.
14. Summarize the nature of major local, regional, statewide, and/or national partnerships and projects and the role that the reserve has played or is playing in them to achieve and/or complement reserve goals and to ensure protection of reserve resources.

Public Access

In a total of four pages or less:

15. Summarize existing public access and public use, and any changes of uses at the reserve.
16. Summarize the results of any studies related to public access at the reserve and any activities undertaken as a result of the studies.
17. Summarize major public access projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
18. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its public access goals and objectives.

Acquisition

In a total of four pages or less:

19. Summarize the values of any land acquisition projects completed or in process.

20. Summarize major acquisition projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
21. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its acquisition goals and objectives.

Research and Monitoring

In a total of one page or less:

22. Summarize any efforts to fill data gaps identified in the site profile.
23. Summarize how the reserve and others (if known) use the site profile.

In one page or less:

24. Summarize how fellows were integrated into reserve activities and discuss how their research addressed coastal management issues, as well as the value of their work on a local, regional, and/or national scale, as appropriate.

In a total of two pages or less:

25. Summarize the reserve's ongoing efforts to develop and maintain the System-Wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) and to implement any new SWMP protocols (e.g., vegetation monitoring, sentinel sites).
26. Summarize any additional non-SWMP monitoring activities the reserve conducted or in which it participated or collaborated.
27. Summarize how SWMP and other reserve monitoring data is shared with and used by other researchers, partners, and stakeholders.

In a total of two pages or less:

28. Summarize the process for identifying, prioritizing, and monitoring the reserve's research and monitoring needs to address coastal management issues and how, and the extent to which, collaborations occurred between research scientists at the reserve and coastal managers and coastal planners.
29. Summarize activities the research and monitoring programs undertook to promote the reserve as a research platform and the value and impact of reserve research and monitoring to external partners and reserve staff.

In a total of four pages or less:

30. Summarize major research and monitoring projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to

resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.

31. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its research and monitoring goals and objectives.

Education

In a total of three pages or less:

32. Summarize the process for identifying, prioritizing, and monitoring/evaluating educational activities and audiences.
33. Describe how KEEP (K-12 Estuarine Education Program) is integrated or incorporated into the initiatives and activities of the reserve.
34. Describe how the reserve's classroom curricula aligned with state standards. If not aligned, please summarize why and any plans the reserve may have to do so.
35. Summarize any professional development opportunities for teachers provided by the reserve alone or in collaboration or coordination with reserve partners.

In a total of four pages or less:

36. Summarize major education projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
37. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its education goals and objectives.

Coastal Training Program (CTP)

In a total of one page or less:

38. Summarize any collaboration efforts the reserve's CTP organized or in which it participated at the local, regional, and/or watershed scale.
39. Summarize how CTP projects and training have integrated NOAA's and other external partners' research and stewardship information or programs.

In a total of four pages or less:

40. Summarize the reserve's progress in implementing the CTP strategy, including major CTP projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
41. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its CTP goals and objectives.

Stewardship/Resource Protection, Manipulation, Restoration

In a total of five pages or less:

42. Summarize the process for identifying, prioritizing, and monitoring/evaluating stewardship or resource management activities at the reserve.
43. Summarize existing capacities and abilities, as well as changes, regarding the reserve's land management and/or enforcement responsibilities.
44. Summarize major stewardship/resource protection, manipulation, and restoration projects or initiatives developed or implemented and their results or accomplishments, including how a project or initiative responded to emerging national, state, or local issues, and highlight successes in helping to resolve an on-the-ground coastal management issue, if applicable.
45. Summarize the challenges the reserve faced in achieving its stewardship/resource protection, manipulation, and restoration goals and objectives.

Overarching

46. In two pages or less, and from the reserve manager's perspective, identify the two to four most significant impacts or accomplishments and the two to four most significant challenges (excluding program administration, operations, or management challenges discussed in item 11) the reserve had or faced during this evaluation period. If any of these are not already discussed in 16, 17, 19, 20, 29, 30, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, or 44, please summarize them. Include influences and factors that have advanced or hindered the achievement of any reserve goals, objectives, or outcomes.

OMB Control # 0648-0661, May 31, 2023. The Office for Coastal Management requires this information in order to adequately evaluate the ongoing approval and financial eligibility of CZMA national estuarine research reserves. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 71 hours per response. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA/NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. This reporting is required under and is authorized under 16 U.S.C. 1458(a). Information submitted will be treated as public records. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

G. Coastal Program Stakeholder Survey

2019 Coastal Program Template

The NOAA Office for Coastal Management conducts periodic evaluations of state coastal management programs as required by the Coastal Zone Management Act.

As part of the evaluation of the [] Coastal Management Program, the Office for Coastal Management would like to obtain your perspective and opinion on the program's implementation and activities. The evaluation will cover the time period of [] to [] 2019. Please note that the word "you" in the following questions refers to an organization or a person, as appropriate.

Regarding privacy, your responses will not be linked to your name. A summary report that includes combined survey responses will be made available to the program and will be made available to the public upon a Freedom of Information Act request.

If there are questions that do not apply to you, or questions you do not wish to answer, please skip them. Thank you for your participation in this survey.

1. How would you characterize the coastal management program's management of the state's coastal zone?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

2. What are the coastal management program's top one to three accomplishments?

1.

2.

3.

3. What are the coastal management program's top one to three challenges? (external obstacles and/or issues)

1.

2.

3.

4. What are the coastal program's top one to three strengths in implementing the state coastal management program?

1.

2.

3.

5. What are the coastal management program's top one to three weaknesses in implementing the state coastal management program? (internal obstacles and/or issues)

1.

2.

3.

6. How effective is the permit process in balancing development and environmental protection?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

7. If you have applied for a permit, how would you rate the permit assistance provided by the program?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

8. How well does the federal consistency process work?

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Discuss your rating of the federal consistency process in terms of what is working well and what is not working well.

10. What are the coastal management program's top one to three opportunities to make a bigger impact in the future? (Locally, regionally, and/or nationally)

1.

2.

3.

11. Is there anything else you would like to share?

12. Choose the category that best describes who you represent.

- Local Government
- State Government
- Federal Government
- Business/Industry
- Nonprofit/Nongovernmental Organization
- Academia
- Other

OMB Control Number 0648-0661. Expires: 8/31/2019. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per completed survey. Send comments regarding this burden estimate, including any suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. A summary report of the survey results will be provided to the coastal management program and will be available to the public upon request. Your survey responses will not be linked to your name. Responses to this survey are voluntary. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

H. Reserve Stakeholder Survey

2019 NERR Template

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office for Coastal Management conducts periodic evaluations of national estuarine research reserves as required by the Coastal Zone Management Act.

As part of the evaluation of Old Woman Creek Reserve, the Office for Coastal Management would like to obtain your perspective and opinion on the reserve's implementation of its programs and activities. The evaluation will cover the time period of October 2009 - August 2018. Please note that the word "you" in the following questions refers to an organization or a person, as appropriate.

A summary report that includes combined survey responses will be provided to the program and will be made available to the public upon a Freedom of Information Act request. Your responses will not be linked to your name.

If there are questions that do not apply to you, or questions you do not wish to answer, please skip them. Thank you for your participation in this survey.

1. How well do you think the reserve is doing in addressing the following four National Estuarine Research Reserve System priorities?

a. Providing opportunities for research and monitoring.

Excellent Good Adequate Poor Very Poor No Opinion

Comments

b. Enhancing public awareness and understanding of estuarine areas through public education and interpretation opportunities.

Excellent Good Adequate Poor Very Poor No Opinion

Comments

c. Providing coastal decision makers with knowledge and tools to address critical resource management issues through the Coastal Training Program.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion

Comments

d. Protecting and restoring the reserve's resources.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion

Comments

2. What are the reserve's top one to three accomplishments?

1.

2.

3.

3. What are the top one to three coastal management challenges/issues in the region?

1.

2.

3.

4. What are the reserve's top one to three strengths in implementing its programs?

1.

2.

3.

5. What are the reserve's top one to three weaknesses in implementing its programs? (Internal obstacles and/or issues)

1.

2.

3.

6. What are the reserve's top one to three opportunities to make a bigger impact in the future? (Locally, regionally, state-wide, or nationally)

1.

2.

3.

7. Is there anything else you would like to share?

8. Choose the category that best describes who you represent.

- Local Government State Government Federal Government Business or Industry
 Nonprofit or Nongovernmental Organization Academia
 Other (please specify)

OMB Control Number 0648-0661. Expires: 8/31/2019. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per completed survey. Send comments regarding this burden estimate, including any suggestions for reducing this burden, to Carrie Hall, NOAA NOS/OCM/PPC, 1305 East-West Hwy., N/OCM1, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910. A summary report of the survey results will be provided to the reserve and will be available to the public upon request. Your survey responses will not be linked to your name. Responses to this survey are voluntary. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

I. Reporting Template

Include Full Text of Necessary Action or Recommendation

Short Summary: Include a **Description of key activities and results** that address the recommendation during the reporting period. Most descriptions should be a couple of sentences. If the status of the recommendations is either “not started” or “not on schedule” include a short explanation and describe any future plans to address the recommendation.

Status: Choose from

- Completed + completion date
- In-progress
- Not on Schedule
- Not Started

Additional Instructions: If you have completed a recommendation during a reporting period, include a brief summary of how the recommendation was addressed over multiple reporting periods. After a recommendation is reported as complete and NOAA concurs, no future reporting is necessary. A recommendation that is not a necessary action may also be marked as complete if a program explores pursuing the recommendation but determines it is not in the best interest of the program and NOAA concurs. A brief paragraph summary describing how the conclusion was reached should be included.

Complete for all necessary actions and recommendations.