§ 921.12 Post site selection.

(a) At the time of the coastal state’s request for NOAA approval of a proposed site, the state may submit a request for funds to develop the draft management plan and for preparation of the EIS. At this time, the state may also submit a request for the remainder of the predesignation funds to perform a limited basic characterization of the physical, chemical and biological characteristics of the site approved by NOAA necessary for providing EIS information to NOAA. The state’s request for these post-site selection funds must be accompanied by the information specified in subpart I and, for draft management plan development and EIS information collection, the following programmatic information:

(1) A draft management plan outline (see §921.13(a) below); and
(2) An outline of a draft memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the state and NOAA detailing the Federal-state role in Reserve management during the initial period of Federal funding and expressing the

(b) The state must seek the views of affected landowners, local governments, other state and Federal agencies and other parties who are interested in the area(s) being considered for selection as a potential National Estuarine Research Reserve Reserve. After the local government(s) and affected landowner(s) have been contacted, at least one public meeting shall be held in the vicinity of the proposed site. Notice of such a meeting, including the time, place, and relevant subject matter, shall be announced by the state through the area’s principal newspaper at least 15 days prior to the date of the meeting and by NOAA in the Federal Register.

(c) A state request for NOAA approval of a proposed site (or sites in the case of a multi-site Reserve) must contain a description of the proposed site(s) in relationship to each of the site selection principals (§921.11(c)) and the following information:

(1) An analysis of the proposed site(s) based on the biogeographical scheme/typology discussed in §921.3 and set forth in appendices I and II;
(2) A description of the proposed site(s) and its (their) major resources, including location, proposed boundaries, and adjacent land uses. Maps are required;
(3) A description of the public participation process used by the state to solicit the views of interested parties, a summary of comments, and, if interstate issues are involved, documentation that the Governor(s) of the other affected state(s) has been contacted. Copies of all correspondence, including contact letters to all affected landowners must be appended;
(4) A list of all sites considered and a brief statement of the reasons why a site was not preferred; and
(5) A nomination of the proposed site(s) for designation as a National Estuarine Research Reserve by the Governor of the coastal state in which the state is located.

(d) Early in the site selection process, the state must seek the views of affected landowners, local governments, other state and Federal agencies and other parties who are interested in the area(s) being considered for selection as a potential National Estuarine Research Reserve. After the local government(s) and affected landowner(s) have been contacted, at least one public meeting shall be held in the vicinity of the proposed site. Notice of such a meeting, including the time, place, and relevant subject matter, shall be announced by the state through the area’s principal newspaper at least 15 days prior to the date of the meeting and by NOAA in the Federal Register.

(e) A state request for NOAA approval of a proposed site (or sites in the case of a multi-site Reserve) must contain a description of the proposed site(s) in relationship to each of the site selection principals (§921.11(c)) and the following information:

(1) An analysis of the proposed site(s) based on the biogeographical scheme/typology discussed in §921.3 and set forth in appendices I and II;
(2) A description of the proposed site(s) and its (their) major resources, including location, proposed boundaries, and adjacent land uses. Maps are required;
(3) A description of the public participation process used by the state to solicit the views of interested parties, a summary of comments, and, if interstate issues are involved, documentation that the Governor(s) of the other affected state(s) has been contacted. Copies of all correspondence, including contact letters to all affected landowners must be appended;
(4) A list of all sites considered and a brief statement of the reasons why a site was not preferred; and
(5) A nomination of the proposed site(s) for designation as a National Estuarine Research Reserve by the Governor of the coastal state in which the state is located.

(f) A state proposing to reactivate an inactive site, previously approved by NOAA for development as an Estuarine Sanctuary or Reserve, may apply for those funds remaining, if any, provided for site selection and feasibility (§921.11a)) to determine the feasibility of reactivation. This feasibility study must comply with the requirements set forth in §921.11 (c) through (e).
§ 921.13 Management plan and environmental impact statement development.

(a) After NOAA approves the state’s proposed site and application for funds submitted pursuant to §921.12, the state may begin draft management plan development and the collection of information necessary for the preparation by NOAA of an EIS. The state shall develop a draft management plan, including an MOU. The plan shall set out in detail:

1. Reserve goals and objectives, management issues, and strategies or actions for meeting the goals and objectives;
2. An administrative plan including staff roles in administration, research, education/interpretation, and surveillance and enforcement;
3. A research plan, including a monitoring design;
4. An education/interpretive plan;
5. A plan for public access to the Reserve;
6. A construction plan, including a proposed construction schedule, general descriptions of proposed developments and general cost estimates. Information should be provided for proposed minor construction projects in sufficient detail to allow these projects to begin in the initial phase of acquisition and development. A categorical exclusion, environmental assessment, or EIS may be required prior to construction;

7(i) An acquisition plan identifying the ecologically key land and water areas of the Reserve, ranking these areas according to their relative importance, and including a strategy for establishing adequate long-term state control over these areas sufficient to provide protection for Reserve resources to ensure a stable environment for research. This plan must include an identification of ownership within the proposed Reserve boundaries, including land already in the public domain; the method(s) of acquisition which the state proposes to use—acquisition (including less-than-fee simple options) to establish adequate long-term state control; an estimate of the fair market value of any property interest—which is proposed for acquisition; a schedule estimating the time required to complete the process of establishing adequate state control of the proposed research reserve; and a discussion of any anticipated problems. In selecting a preferred method(s) for establishing adequate state control over areas within the proposed boundaries of the Reserve, the state shall perform the following steps for each parcel determined to be part of the key land and water areas (control over which is necessary to protect the integrity of the Reserve for research purposes), and for those parcels required for research and interpretive support facilities or buffer purposes:

(A) Determine, with appropriate justification, the minimum level of control(s) required [e.g., management agreement, regulation, less-than-fee simple property interest (e.g., conservation easement), fee simple property acquisition, or a combination of these approaches]. This does not preclude the future necessity of increasing the level of state control;

(B) Identify the level of existing state control(s);

(C) Identify the level of additional state control(s), if any, necessary to meet the minimum requirements identified in paragraph (a)(7)(i)(A) of this section;

(D) Examine all reasonable alternatives for attaining the level of control identified in paragraph (a)(7)(i)(C) of this section, and perform a cost analysis of each; and

(E) Rank, in order of cost, the methods (including acquisition) identified in paragraph (a)(7)(i)(D) of this section.

(ii) An assessment of the relative cost-effectiveness of control alternatives shall include a reasonable estimate of both short-term costs (e.g., acquisition of property interests, regulatory program development including associated enforcement costs, negotiation, adjudication, etc.) and long-term costs (e.g., monitoring, enforcement,