



## Appendix D

### A Northern California Coastal Conservation Needs Assessment

#### Mendocino County Meeting Summary

The following is a summary of meeting notes and questionnaire responses collected at the Mendocino County Linking Land and Sea meeting held at the Fort Bragg Town Hall on March 22, 2006. The meeting was attended by 10 people. Six people completed a *Regional Coastal Conservation Planning and/or Implementation Questionnaire*. The results were summarized by Ruth Blyther, project consultant, and include input from the group discussion and questionnaires.

#### I. Do we need more regional coastal conservation planning?

Written responses (6 total):

**Yes** – 4 total. Three people noted that the need was for marine. Two people noted the need for more terrestrial planning.

**No** – 0 total.

**Maybe** – 2 total.

**Comments** (from group discussion and questionnaire):

#### **A. If we need more regional coastal conservation planning, then what type of planning is needed?**

##### **a) Marine Planning –**

**Comments:**

Need plans that address invasive marine organisms. Do they exist? Answer from Susan Schlosser, Sea Grant, “There are two nation wide invasive species task forces, but there are no plans yet.”

##### **b) Terrestrial Planning -**

**Comments:**

Where needed to prioritize specific resources already known to be significant. Need more planning that leads to implementation.

##### **c) Address Connection between Terrestrial and Marine**

Six of the respondents noted this as a need.

**Comments:**

Address terrestrial impacts on marine resources; and inter-tidal and estuarine ecosystems. Need to understand the interaction between sediment coming from the land and its affect on marine life.

Need to make sure that the data in plans is updated and data resources are updated on a regular basis.

Need on-site inventory of resources and public access to information. The Mineral Management Survey contains a lot of Mendocino coastal data, but is not readily available, Susan Schlosser (SeaGrant) has hard copy.

**d) Specify Regional Priorities**

Four people noted this as a need on the questionnaire.

**Comments:**

Not regional but site specific priorities. Not so much of a need.

**e) Implementation Strategies for existing plans**

Five people noted this as a need on the questionnaire.

**Comments:**

Yes! We know we need to be working in a watershed, but need to prioritize where you'd get the most effective projects. Need more site-specific plans.

**f) Other – We need plans that ....**

Four people identified this as a need and provided input.

**Comments:**

We need plans that:

- Create basic knowledge on terrestrial/marine linkages
- Prioritize across the north coast. SRL's perspective: Where within the range of coast redwood should we focus our efforts?
- Can be implemented and that provide for a human and natural resources future.
- Invasive exotics management/eradication plans
- Contain more detail to be useful for our area (Gualala). Larger plans did not cover this area sufficiently a small property was not identified as having conservation value, so now it is difficult to find funding for its protection. Gualala falls between two larger plans – falls through the cracks.



**B. Who would be the target audience for such a plan? Who would use it?**

Four people responded to this question.

**Government Agencies (3)** – Public agencies, funders, resource agencies

**Implementation organizations (3)** – Non-profit organizations; those facilitating future needs attainment; environmental protection groups

**Private property owners (3)**

**General Public (0)** – Residents of the north coast

**Other (3)** – Resource management professionals

**2. Is there a need to integrate terrestrial and marine plans?**

Four people provided written response to this question, and all of them agreed that this is a need, although there was uncertainty about how it could be accomplished.

**Comments:**

Yes, but this needs to be done specifically through estuary, coastal drift studies, good information on watershed outputs source analysis etc., not broad strategic plans.

**A. How could this be done?**

Look at threats to anadromous fish. Make sure that the three mile out area is included in planning. Research on estuaries; study estuaries, intertidal, stream influence on bays and coastal erosion.

**3. What do you think are the most important gaps in existing coastal conservation plans?**

Five people responded to this question.

**Comments:**

Important gaps include:

- Usal Creek including the lagoon
- Eel River conservation areas including estuary and delta; South Fork Eel to the coast. Note ospreys and the ocean.
- Staff to implement and trained people to volunteer.
- I need more recent data on coho abundance and more site specific data for steelhead.
- The gap between strategic vision and implementable analysis, parcel analysis, resource assessments
- Estuarine habitats, community shoreline park potentials, seawalls, armoring, riprap, sea level rise influence on shoreline, recreation balance with preservation.

4. Do we need more specific (local geographic focus or resource focus) plans within the region?

All six people responded yes to this question.

**A. If so what specific focus would you like to see?**

**Geographic focus**

- Estuaries and places with watershed wide significance to protection of aquatic and marine biodiversity.
- Ten Mile River watershed with an emphasis on the estuary.
- Our land trust, which is essentially between the main areas studied by Sonoma Land Trust and Mendocino Land Trust, needs more study of our immediate area and watersheds (Gualala).
- Gualala geologic study water runoff land sediment slides
- Mattole long-term infrastructure planning
- Cottonveva creek public access

**Resource Focus**

- Trails, stewardship forestry, conservation of marine and inter-tidal resources, fishery and watershed restoration.
- Address exotic invasive plants.
- Priorities for conservation across the range of coast redwood.
- Watershed level planning; potential sites for conservation, public access to seashore, pygmy forest.
- Estuaries
- Id areas that should be conserved as shoreline, parks (bluffs beaches, estuaries)

**Data/Information Focus**

- Follow up on oil spill prevention and response DFG/OSPR. This plan doesn't focus on natural resource damage and effects but has a large amount of information about coastal resources that could be damaged, need to add to this effort and gather more and more detailed/better baseline data
- Seashore armoring and influences on marine life and public access
- Sea level change rise due to climate change and the potential impacts to coastal resources

5. We don't need more planning we need to focus on implementing the plans we already have.

A total of 5 people responded. Strongly Agree, 1; Somewhat Agree, 3; Neutral, 1; Somewhat Disagree, 1; Strongly Disagree, 0

**Comments:**

- We need more planning and we need help in implementing existing plans. My organization (SRL) primarily needs help with implementation (we have sufficient funds for planning).
- Need both more planning and more implementation.
- Implementation prioritizations of specific projects.
- Added need of agency staff to write grants and work with partners. Example, we all talk about streamlining the permitting process, well if there were more DFG, CC staff permit processing would get done faster.
- Project design - the smaller organization/grantee needs better collaboration with other organizations and agencies.
- The agencies should assist with helping to coordinate funding, finding other matches and bringing others to the table. Example: In one acquisition project instead of the agencies working together the initial funding agency required the local organization to find matching funds. This added another step for the local organization, made up of volunteers, to go and find the match funding for acquisition. Since the matches often come from other government agencies they should assist in coordinating the search.
- Need more funds for acquisition and for operations and maintenance.