

Revised Draft
Subobjective Implementation Plan for
Strategic Plan Subobjective 2.2.2 - Improving Coastal and Ocean Waters

I. **Subobjective 2.2.2**

- A. **The subobjective: Improve Coastal and Oceans Waters.** By 2008, prevent water pollution and protect coastal and ocean systems in order to improve the overall health of coastal aquatic ecosystems nationally and regionally by at least 0.2 points on the “good/fair/poor” scale of the National Coastal Condition Report (NCCR).
- B. **Scope of implementation plan:** In the Strategic Plan, ocean and coastal water quality is shared between Goal 2, Clean and Safe Water, and Goal 4, Healthy Communities and Ecosystems. However, for purposes of implementation plan development, all the coastal and ocean waters strategic targets and program activity measures (PAMs) will be addressed in this subobjective implementation plan.
- C. **Implementation strategy:** A key factor affecting our ability to achieve our outcome measures is that the threats to ocean and coastal ecosystems are not limited to activities and actions in coastal areas. Major threats include: habitat loss; urban/rural runoff; managing sediments; air deposition; invasive species; point source discharges, including vessel discharges; and population growth and density. As a result, achieving Subobjective 2.2.2 and the associated five strategic targets depends not only on implementing the ocean/coastal PAMs and other Oceans and Coastal Protection Division (OCPD) program activities, but also many of the PAMs under other OW and EPA subobjectives. In addition, we will need to work closely with numerous partners outside of EPA in order to achieve our outcome measures.
1. **Relationship to Other OW Programs.** Based on the threats identified above, meeting the environmental outcome measures of this subobjective depends in part on the successful implementation of various other OW programs, including other OWOW programs. Some of the key programs are: (1) CZARA and CWA Section 319, which are key to controlling nonpoint source pollution; (2) stormwater and other NPDES permitting; (3) TMDL establishment and implementation; (4) wetlands protection and restoration; (5) Gulf of Mexico program; and (6) monitoring and assessment.
 2. **Coordination within OWOW.** Except for NPDES permitting, OWOW is the lead EPA headquarters office for these programs and is playing a key

role in three Strategic Plan subobjectives tied to these programs. This creates particular opportunities at both the Headquarters and Regional levels for coordinating Strategic Plan subobjective implementation to achieve common environmental goals. For example, addressing ecosystem health along the Gulf of Mexico coastline is a component of achieving the environmental outcome measures of this subobjective, and is also addressed in the Gulf of Mexico subobjective under Goal 4 (4.3.5). In addition, wetlands protection and restoration, which is addressed under a different Goal 4 subobjective (4.3.2), is a key component of the overall habitat outcome measures under Subobjective 2.2.2. Moreover, estuaries are counted as part of the way that success is being measured under the Goal 2 watershed subobjective (2.2.1).

3. Relationship to Partners Outside of EPA. EPA is only one of a number of Federal agencies that have a role in improving ocean and coastal water quality. A number of the ocean/coastal PAMs need to be implemented jointly by EPA and one or more other Federal agencies. To successfully implement Subobjective 2.2.2, EPA will also need to work in partnership with other levels of government and private sector partners. For example, in carrying out the PAMs addressing vessel discharges, our partners include the US Coast Guard, Navy, and International Council of Cruise Lines. In the area of invasive species, EPA needs to work with the US Coast Guard, the National Estuary Programs (NEPs), and the States.
- D. The 2002 baseline: National rating of “fair/poor” or 2.4, where the rating is based on a 5-point system in which 1 is poor and 5 is good, and is expressed as an aerially-weighted mean of regional scores using the NCCR indicators addressing water clarity, dissolved oxygen, coastal wetlands loss, eutrophic conditions, sediment contamination, benthic health, and fish tissue contamination.
- E. The FY 05 target: National rating improves to equivalent of 2.5 in second NCCR (to be released late 2004).
- F. Determining success: Progress in meeting the subobjective, as well as several of the strategic targets, will be tracked through the NCCR, created in 2002 as a cooperative project of EPA (OW and ORD), NOAA, USDA, and DOI. The report describes the ecological and environmental condition of US coastal waters according to a number of key parameters. EPA and other federal agencies will review changing conditions and periodically issue updated assessments of the health of coastal waters.
- G. Funding status for future NCCRs: As reflected in the subobjective and in the strategic targets, development of NCCRs in 2004, 2006, and 2008, as well as

NCCRs focused on the NEP in 2006 and 2008, are a critical component in EPA’s ability to determine success in achieving these environmental outcomes. ORD and OW have budgeted and planned for the 2004 NCCR, which is based on data collected from 1997 - 2000, and for the 2006 NCCR, which will be based on data collected from 2001 - 2004, and will also include a trends analysis based on 1990 - 2004 data. However, funding is not yet in place for the 2008 NCCR or the 2008 NEP NCCR. It appears that additional Agency funding will be needed in order to collect the data for these NCCRs.

II. Strategic Targets

- A. Strategic Target P: By 2008, maintain water clarity and dissolved oxygen in coastal waters at the national levels reported in the 2002 NCCR . (T)
1. 2002 Baseline: 4.3 for water clarity; 4.5 for dissolved oxygen
 2. FY05 Target: 4.3 for water clarity; 4.5 for dissolved oxygen
 3. Determining success in meeting FY05 Target: We will use the 2004 NCCR, which is based on data collected through 2000, to determine attainment of this interim target. The objective is to determine whether coastal water quality is at least being maintained nationwide. It is not expected that these factors would show any significant changes in the short period of time to 2005.
- B. Strategic Target Q: By 2008, improve ratings reported on the national “good/fair/poor” scale of the NCCR for: coastal wetlands loss by at least 0.2 points; contamination of sediments in coastal waters by at least 0.2 points; benthic quality by at least 0.2 points; and eutrophic condition by at least 0.2 points. (T)
1. 2002 Baseline: 1.4 for coastal wetlands loss; 1.3 for contamination of sediments in coastal waters; 1.4 for benthic quality; and 1.7 for eutrophic condition
 2. FY05 Target: 1.5 for coastal wetlands loss; 1.4 for contamination of sediments in coastal waters; 1.5 for benthic quality; and 1.8 for eutrophic condition
 3. Determining Success in Meeting FY05 Target: We will use the 2004 NCCR to determine whether we have achieved this target. This will indicate whether we are moving in the direction of meeting this subobjective.
- C. Strategic Target R: By 2013, in cooperation with other Nations, other Federal agencies, and state and local governments, reduce the rate of increase in the number of invasions by non-native invertebrate and algae species of marine and estuarine waters. (T)
1. 2000 Baseline: rate of increase approximately one percent per year

2. FY05 Target: Measure Development Plan (MDP). The MDP further defines the baseline for this strategic target. By 2007, a baseline will be established against which measures will be made to determine the annual rate of unintentional introductions of Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf of Mexico coasts. Establishing a baseline will enable EPA to assess the effectiveness of actions taken to reduce the risk of unintentional ANS introductions. This measure would derive from several sources: 1) baseline data collected and analyzed by Federal agencies, who will begin baseline development in FY05; 2) baseline data compiled by the NEPs; 3) Coast Guard monitoring of ballast water contents pre- and post- implementation of the mandatory ballast water management rule; and 4) ongoing scientific studies of unintentional introductions of ANS. It is anticipated that baseline data will be reported in FY 2007 and that data will be collected and first compared against that baseline in 2009 and every two years thereafter.
 3. Determining Success in Meeting FY05 Target: Working with NISC to initiate Federal agency baseline development.
- D. Strategic Target IV-C: By 2008, improve the overall aquatic system health of the 28 estuaries that are part of the NEP, as measured using the NCCR and NEP specific indicators.
1. 2002 Baseline: By 2006, develop a baseline report on the condition of the NEP estuaries, using the same indicators as the NCCR and aggregable NEP specific indicators.
 2. FY05 Target: MDP. The MDP further explains how the baseline will be established. Using the same indicators as the NCCR, this NEP report will establish a uniform set of quantifiable indicators, as well as quantifiable estuary-specific NEP indicators, that can be aggregated on a regional and national scale. The baseline itself will be established in FY06, when the report is completed and released. Each NEP will report upon individual estuary specific indicators. These indicators range from health and abundance of a particular species of fish or shellfish to the percentage change in impervious surface to the change in the number and abundance of an invasive species. By the end of FY 04, each NEP is required to develop and report upon the appropriate indicators to measure the effectiveness of actions taken in response to their Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). The 2006 baseline NEP NCCR report will be based upon quantifiable indicators that can be aggregated to regional and national scales along with core NCCR indicators reported upon at NEP, regional, and national scales. Starting in 2008, and every two years thereafter, conditions in the NEPs will be reported upon and trends or changes over time will be provided when

adequate basis has been determined.

- E. Strategic Target IV-D: By 2008, working with NEP partners, protect or restore an additional 250,000 acres of habitat within the study areas for the 28 estuaries that are part of the NEP. (FY04 APM 207)
1. 2002 Baseline: 137,731 cumulative acres of habitat restored or protected as of 2002 [NOTE: We believe this baseline is cumulative and not limited to 2002 activity.]
 2. FY05 Target: 25,000 acres (incremental)
 3. FY05 Regional Targets: Regions will be asked to commit to an interim target. The Regions can use existing guidance to assist them in determining an FY05 Regional target. That guidance explains that “programs should report those acres protected or restored during the reporting period, whether the project has been completed or is on-going (therefore acreage related to previous years should not be reported). The term ‘restored [or] protected’ is being interpreted broadly, including created areas, protected areas resulting from acquisition, conservation easement or deed restriction, submerged aquatic vegetation coverage increases, permanent shellfish bed openings, anadromous fish habitat increases, etc.
 4. Determining Success in Meeting FY05 Target: Total the acreage reported by the Regions, conduct appropriate QA/QC, make any needed revisions and then determine whether the FY05 targeted acreage was achieved.

III. Program Activity Measures

As reflected in the following PAMs, key programs focused on and critical to improving coastal waters are: assessing coastal conditions; reducing vessel discharges; controlling coastal nonpoint pollution (see Subobjective 2.2.1); managing dredged material; managing nonindigenous invasive species; and supporting international marine pollution control. In addition, the health of the Nation’s estuarine ecosystems also depends on the maintenance of high-quality habitat. Diminished and degraded habitats are less able to support healthy populations of wildlife and marine organisms and perform the economic, environmental, and aesthetic functions on which coastal populations depend for their livelihood. Also, as noted in the overall subobjective section (see I.C. above), partnerships between OCPD and others within and outside of government will play a critical role in our ability to improve ocean and coastal water quality.

- A. #73: Publish a revised national NCCR describing the quality of the Nation’s ocean and coastal waters in 2004 and 2006. (T)

As explained above, completion of these reports is critical to our ability to determine whether we are making progress towards meeting Strategic Targets P and Q. Work on the 2004 NCCR is progressing on schedule – the draft report is scheduled for release in March 2004; the public comment period and internal peer and policy review will conclude in June; and the final report will be issued in September. In the 2004 report, the number of indicators has been reduced from seven to five; however, this change will not affect our ability to track progress back to the original seven indicators and consistent with Strategic Targets P and Q. Publication of the 2004 NCCR is also an action under the draft EPA 500-day plan. For the 2006 NCCR, in FY05 we will begin analyzing the data collected from 2001 - 2004, and begin writing the draft report.

- B. #74: Number of dredged material management plans that are in place for major ports and harbors developed by COE-led stakeholder process and the percentage of dredged material from coastal waters that is managed in a beneficial manner.
(I)

Effective dredged material planning and sediment management, including the beneficial re-use of dredged materials, requires open and early communication among federal and state dredged material regulators, watershed planners, and other interested parties. EPA Headquarters will work with the Corps of Engineers to track the number of dredged material management plans developed for major ports and harbors, and the percentage of dredged material that is managed in a beneficial manner. Such tracking is essential to evaluating our progress in managing sediments and using this valuable resource.

Excessive sediment erosion, transport, and deposition are estimated to cause damages of approximately \$16 billion annually in North America. The US spends about \$800 million annually on dredging. Sediment overloading from land and stream erosion causes significant environmental and economic challenges – excessive sediment in rivers, reservoirs, and estuaries may contribute to low water clarity, increased oxygen demand, eutrophic conditions, sediment contamination, loss of flood-carrying capacity, and sediment deposition in navigable waterways.

Much of the several hundred million cubic meters of sediment dredged each year from these navigable waterways could be used in an environmentally beneficial manner, such as for habitat restoration and creation, beach nourishment, aquaculture, forestry, agriculture, mine reclamation, and industrial and commercial development. Unfortunately, most of this dredged material is instead disposed in open water, confined disposal facilities, and upland disposal facilities.

We need to ensure open and early communication among Federal and State dredged material regulators, watershed planners, and other interested parties so that: (1) sources of sediment (and sources of contamination carried by the sediments) can be addressed; (2) the broadest range of beneficial use and disposal alternatives for dredged material can be evaluated; and (3) adequate funding for dredged material use or disposal can be secured. Local Planning/Project Groups can be an excellent vehicle to facilitate this communication and to foster the development of effective dredged material management plans to address these issues and to identify and implement beneficial use projects for dredged material.

C. #75: Number of ocean disposal sites with approved site management and monitoring plans that are monitored in the reporting year, including those monitored by EPA’s Ocean Survey Vessel, Peter W. Anderson. (I)

The monitoring of ocean dredged material disposal sites for proper and accurate dredged material disposal operations will assure the maintenance of high-quality estuarine and marine habitats, the continued health of coastal and oceanic fish and invertebrate populations, and compliance with the requirements of the law. For each ocean dumping site that is monitored in the reporting year (FY05), the Regions will report (1) the name of the site, (2) the name and date of the Site Management and Monitoring Plan (SMMP), and (3) the following information on the monitoring:

<u>Type of Monitoring (check appropriate box(es) below)</u>	<u>Who paid for it?</u>	<u>If EPA paid, how much did it cost?</u>	<u>Was an EPA vessel used?</u>
<u>Bathymetry</u>			
<u>Other Physical Monitoring (e.g., grain size, current speed)</u>			
<u>Chemical Monitoring</u>			
<u>Biological Monitoring</u>			

Establishing appropriate SMMPs for these sites, and meeting the goals and requirements of these SMMPs, will contribute to improvements in water clarity

and benthic health. In addition, testing requirements for the disposed dredged material will ensure that there are no negative impacts to dissolved oxygen concentrations, sediment condition, and fish tissue contaminant levels. Analysis of these monitoring efforts will substantially improve EPA's ability to assess coastal and marine conditions, leading to more accurate national reporting results.

- D. #76: By 2005, and each year thereafter, the National Marine Debris Monitoring Network will be 100 percent operational. (T)

EPA supports a national marine debris monitoring program through a grant to The Ocean Conservancy. This assessment and monitoring program collects information on the sources of marine debris on 174 beaches along US shorelines in order to better address this environmental and human health hazard. By 2005, The Ocean Conservancy's network will be fully operational, with the data on marine debris sources posted on the Conservancy's National Marine Debris Monitoring Program website. In January 2005, EPA will publish a five-year report on the program. This will contain the first statistically valid conclusions as to the sources of marine debris in specific regions of the country. That data will allow us to address those sources in those areas. Marine debris can: be detrimental to the benthic health of the marine environment; kill aquatic life (e.g., when debris is swallowed, or the animal becomes entangled); harm humans (e.g., used hypodermic needles on the beach); and damage property.

- E. # #77: By 2004, mandatory nationwide requirements to exchange ballast water will be developed to reduce the discharges of invasive species in U.S. coastal waters. (T)

Studies indicate that ballast water discharges are a major contributor to the introduction of aquatic nuisance species into US waters. Mid-ocean exchange of ballast water prior to entry into port, while less than 100% effective as a control measure, can at least help address this problem by reducing the number of potentially invasive organisms contained in a vessel's ballast water tanks.

Ballast water exchange requirements are developed under the authority of the National Invasive Species Act (NISA). Under § 1101 of NISA, the responsible Agency is the USCG. USCG has promulgated mandatory ballast water exchange requirements applicable to vessels equipped with ballast tanks that enter the Great Lakes or upper Hudson River after operating beyond the US Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). 33 C.F.R Part 151, Subpart C. In addition, USCG has promulgated voluntary ballast water exchange guidelines for the remainder of the country. 33 C.F.R Part 151, Subpart D.

A USCG proposed rule to make such ballast water exchange mandatory on a nationwide basis was published in 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 44691 (July 30, 2003)), and USCG intends to promulgate a final rule in Calendar Year 2004. EPA is providing technical support and assistance to USCG for this rulemaking, primarily in development of the Programmatic Environmental Assessment. EPA will continue to provide such assistance to USCG in 2004 so as to support their finalization of the rulemaking.

F. #78: By 2008, develop standards for the discharge of ballast water, including control of organisms. (T)

Studies indicate that ballast water discharges are a major contributor to the introduction of aquatic nuisance species into US waters. Mid-ocean exchange of ballast water prior to entry into port is less than 100% effective as a control measure; as a result, there is considerable interest in developing ballast water discharge standards (most likely in the form of concentration-based discharge standards) for organisms in ballast water.

Under § 1101 of NISA, USCG has issued regulations addressing ballast water exchange requirements (see PAM # 77 for further details). NISA provides that, as an alternative to ballast water exchange, ships may use other environmentally sound methods for ballast management that are approved by USCG, if such methods are at least as effective as ballast water exchange. NISA §§ 1003(6), 1101(b)(2)(B)(iii) and (c)(2)(D)(iii).

Under NISA, USCG is in the initial stages of developing ballast water standards and has announced its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in furtherance of that rulemaking (68 Fed. Reg. 5559 (September 26, 2003)). Although USCG is the agency responsible for development of ballast water standards under NISA, EPA will be a cooperating agency on the EIS and has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with USCG to provide technical support and drafting assistance for EIS development. USCG work on that EIS is being initiated in Calendar Year 2004 with EPA support and assistance, and will continue in upcoming years to support the USCG rulemaking.

G. #79: In 2004, participate on the U.S. delegation working with other Nations to secure an international agreement on a global treaty that establishes rigorous performance standards designed to prevent future introductions of non-native aquatic species to U.S. waters from the discharge of ships' ballast water. (T)

Studies indicate that ballast water discharges are a major contributor to the introduction of aquatic nuisance species into US waters and coastal areas around

the world. An international treaty to address ballast water discharges from commercial vessels is being negotiated, under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization, in order to help control such discharges. OW participates along with OIA and OGC on the multi-agency US delegation to those treaty negotiations, which are expected to conclude in Calendar Year 2004. Any resulting treaty would be subject to US ratification, including Senate advice and consent. The US delegation is agreed that it will sign the treaty only if it is environmentally protective and likely to reduce invasions of aquatic nuisance species. OW will continue in upcoming years to participate as appropriate on the US delegation for follow-up activities to that treaty, such as development of technical guidelines, and for domestic implementation should the treaty be signed/ratified by the US.

H. #80: By 2006, propose standards for black water and gray water for cruise ships operating in Alaskan waters. (T)

In 2000, Congress passed a law regulating the discharge of sewage and gray water (wastewater from sinks, showers, laundries, and baths) from large cruise ships operating in the waters in and near Alaska. The law set requirements for these discharges and authorized EPA to develop discharge standards to replace those in the law. EPA is currently in the process of developing these standards, and expects to propose regulations in 2006. These discharge standards will address potential impacts from pathogens, nutrients, increased biological oxygen demand, and other contaminants on water quality and clarity and human and ecosystem health.

I. #81: Number of coastal States in which State air and water officials that have received training in assessment and management of air/water interface issues (cumulative). (I)

The pollution of water from air deposition has become a significant concern in both fresh water and estuaries. A variety of pollutants, including nitrogen, metals such as mercury, and other natural and man-made compounds, including pesticides, can be transported from mobile and stationary sources and deposited on the land and be washed into water or fall directly into water. These compounds can travel various distances affecting both local waters, as well as long-range transport across states and internationally, to contribute to water pollution and food contamination concerns. While various activities are directed at reducing emissions from sources (see Subobjective 1.1, Healthier Outdoor Air), water quality managers need to be aware of both the possible contribution of these sources to water quality issues and the opportunities to reduce these impacts.

To that end, OW, in cooperation with the Regional NEP and TMDL coordinators, is undertaking a series of workshops to provide information and hands-on training for state and local officials with responsibility for TMDLs and NEPs with air deposition concerns. As of early FY2004, state air and water officials in 21 of the 31 coastal states had received training in the assessment of air/water interface issues.

J. #82: Number of coastal States in which there is at least one mercury deposition monitoring station (cumulative). (I)

Mercury is one of various pollutants that can be transported from mobile and stationary air sources ultimately to coastal and other waterbodies. Mercury is an airborne toxic of particular concern because it persists in the environment and tends to bioaccumulate in the food web. While often present in minute amounts, mercury can be concentrated as it moves up the food chain from microorganisms to larger and longer living organisms. Of particular concern are human health effects, including developmental retardation in children, as well as cancer and other concerns for adults.

This measure reports on the number of coastal states that have at least one mercury deposition monitoring station. Such stations provide useful data on the scope and extent of the mercury deposition problem. As of early FY2004, 23 of the 31 coastal states had at least one such station. In addition to this measure, other parts of the EPA Strategic Plan relate to the issue of airborne mercury and its adverse effect on coastal and other waters. In particular, subobjective 1.1.2 addresses reducing air toxic emissions, including mercury emissions from electric generating units.

K. #IV-NEP-1: Number of NEP priority actions in CCMPs that have been initiated and the number that have been completed. (I)

Each National Estuary Program uses a consensus-based, inclusive process to identify the major concerns in the estuary watershed and potential solutions to those problems. The resulting plan (Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, or CCMP) contains a variety of actions designed to protect and restore the estuary, tailored to the problems and solutions identified through that process. For a well-designed plan, implementation will result in environmental progress. It also shows respect for the process, and thereby earns continued support. Implementation also allows for mid-course corrections when it is determined that additional or different actions are needed to address a particular issue.

This measure reports on the number of CCMP priority action items that have been initiated and/or completed by the NEPs. Regular increases in implementation of priority actions will indicate continued progress in protecting and restoring our nation's estuaries and their watersheds.

[PLACEHOLDER FOR 2002 BASELINE]

- L. #IV-NEP-2: By 2006, publish an NEP CCR describing the quality of the coastal waters in the 28 estuaries in the NEP using the NCCR report indicators as well as NEP specific indicators that can be aggregated to a regional and national level.

(T)

This measure addresses the baseline report on the condition of the NEP estuaries, and will be the tool used to measure success with Strategic Target IV-C, described in detail above. We are in the process of drafting the 2006 NEP baseline report, starting with a draft for the Gulf of Mexico NEPs comparing the National Coastal Assessment-collected data with data collected by each NEP and its partners. This draft will be reviewed by the NCCR workgroup, revised as needed, and work will proceed in the other coastal regions. A complete draft of the NEP baseline report is scheduled for early-mid FY 2005.

- M. #IV-NEP-3: Overall combined ratio of leveraged resources (cash or in-kind services) to Section 320 funds for all NEPs (for LIS, Sections 119 and 320). (I)

Under Section 320 of the Clean Water Act (as well as Section 119 for the Long Island Sound NEP), the NEPs receive federal funds to implement, in cooperation with stakeholders and partners, the actions in their Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans (CCMPs) to restore and protect their estuaries. The NEPs have been successful in leveraging these Section 320 (and Section 119) funds to generate significant additional resources through federal, state, local, and private partnerships. The 2002 baseline ratio of leveraged resources to Section 320 funds was an impressive 11:1. These leveraged funds are used for such efforts as restoring and protecting habitat and reducing point and nonpoint sources of pollution threatening estuaries.

Under this measure, each Region will provide, for each NEP within the Region, the overall combined ratio of leveraged resources to 320 funds. Regions should use the most current guidance on “NEP Leveraged Resources Criteria” to determine which monies or in-kind services are considered leveraged resources and which Section 320 funds to include as part of the ratio.

- N. #IV-NEP-4: By 2005, each NEP will have indicators in place to track key environmental and other trends in their estuary based on CCMP priorities and

emerging issues, including invasive species where appropriate, and to enable each NEP to periodically report on status and trends. (I)

An indicator summarizes complex information into a simplified and useful manner to facilitate the measurement of status and trends. When tracked over time, an indicator can provide information on trends in the condition of a system. By FY2005, each NEP will have individual, estuary-specific indicators in place. These indicators will range from health and abundance of a particular species of fish or shellfish to the percentage change in impervious surface to the change in the number and abundance of an invasive species.

Code	Type	Outcomes / Activity Measures	Data Source	Who Reports	2002 Baseline	National 05 Draft Target	National 08 Target	Unit	Managing Office
72	T	Number of States using integrated planning and priority systems to make CWSRF funding decisions.	Internal Tracking System	Region & State	19	29	28	States	OWM
Subobjective									
2.2.2	T	Improve Coastal and Ocean Waters. Score for overall aquatic system health of coastal waters nationally, and in each coastal region, on the "good/fair/poor" scale of the National Coastal Condition Report (a 5 point scale.)	NCCR	HQ (ORD)	2.4	2.5	2.6	Scale	OWOW / ORD
Strategic Targets									
P	T	Score for water clarity and dissolved oxygen in coastal waters at the national levels reported in the 2002 National Coastal Condition Report. (a 5 point scale)	NCCR	HQ (ORD)	4.3 4.5	4.3 4.5	4.3 4.5	Water Clarity Dissolved Oxygen	OWOW/ ORD
Q	T	Score for coastal wetlands loss; contamination of sediments in coastal waters; benthic quality; & eutrophic condition reported in the National Coastal Condition Report. (5 point scale)	NCCR	HQ (ORD)	1.4 1.3 1.4 1.7	1.5 1.4 1.5 1.8	1.6 1.5 1.6 1.9	Wetland Loss Contamin Sed Benthic Quality Eutrophic Condition	OWOW / ORD
R	T	Rate of increase in the number of invasions by non-native invertebrate and algae species of marine and estuarine waters.	N / A	HQ	1%	n / a	Reduce rate of increase by year 2013	Invasions	OWOW
IV-C	T	Score for overall aquatic system health of the 28 estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Program (NEP), as measured using the National Coastal Condition Report and NEP specific indicators starting in 2006.	NCCR / NEP Reports	HQ (ORD)	TBD 05	n / a	Improve compared to 2006	Scale	OWOW
IV-D	T	Number of additional acres of habitat within the 28 estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Program (NEP) that are protected or restored. (cumulative)	NEP Reports	Regions and NEPs	0	25,000	250,000	Acres	OWOW

Code	Type	Outcomes / Activity Measures	Data Source	Who Reports	2002 Baseline	National 05 Draft Target	National 08 Target	Unit	Managing Office
Program Activities									
73	T	Publish a revised national Coastal Condition Report describing the quality of the Nation's ocean and coastal waters.	n / a	HQ	n / a	1 (in 2004)	1 (in 2006)	Report	ORD / OWOW
74	I	Number of dredged material management plans that are in place for major ports and harbors developed by COE-Led stakeholder process and the percentage of dredged material from coastal waters that is managed in a beneficial manner.	Internal Tracking System	Corps of Engineers	To be determined based on completion of COE assessment database.	n / a	n / a	- Mgmt Plans - Managed Material	OWOW
75	I	Number of ocean disposal sites with approved site management and monitoring plans that are monitored in the reporting year, including those monitored by EPA's Ocean Survey Vessel, Peter W. Anderson	Internal Tracking System	HQ/Regions	81 42	n / a	n / a	- Sites w/ Mgmt Plans - Sites Monitored	OWOW
76	T	Each year, the National Marine Debris Monitoring Network will be 100% operational.	Ocean Conservancy	HQ (Ocean Conservancy Database)	70%	100%	100%	Network Operational	OWOW
77	T	Mandatory requirements to exchange ballast water will be developed to reduce the discharges of invasive species in U.S. coastal waters.	n / a	HQ	n / a	Completed 2004	n / a	Requirement	OWOW / Coast Guard
78	T	Develop standards for the discharge of ballast water, including control of organisms.	n / a	HQ	n / a	n / a	Completed 2008	Standards	OWOW
79	T	Work with other Nations to secure an international agreement on a global treaty that establishes rigorous performance standards designed to prevent future introductions of non-native aquatic species to U.S. waters from the discharge of ships' ballast water.	n / a	HQ	n / a	n / a	Completed 2006	Agreement	OIA
80	T	Propose standards for black water and gray water for cruise ships operating in Alaskan waters.	n / a	HQ	n / a	n / a	Completed 2005	Proposed Strds	OWOW

Code	Type	Outcomes / Activity Measures	Data Source	Who Reports	2002 Baseline	National 05 Draft Target	National 08 Target	Unit	Managing Office
81	I	Number of coastal States in which State air and water officials have received training in assessment and management of air/water interface issues (cumulative). (There are 31 Coastal States)	Internal Tracking System	HQ	17	n / a	n / a	States	OWOW
82	I	Number of coastal States in which there is at least one mercury deposition monitoring station (cumulative). (There are 31 Coastal States)	Internal Tracking System	HQ	23	n / a	n / a	States	OWOW
IV-NEP-1	I	Number of NEP priority actions in CCMPs that have been initiated and the number that have been completed.	NEP Reports	Region & NEPs	Baseline determined by Dec 2003	n / a	n / a	# Action Initiated # Completed	OWOW
IV-NEP-2	T	Publish an NEP Coastal Condition Report describing the quality of the coastal waters in the 28 estuaries in the NEP using the National Coastal Conditions report indicators as well as NEP specific indicators that can be aggregated to a regional and national level.	NCCR/Other Assessments	HQ	n / a	HQ Target / TBD	By 2006	Report	OWOW
IV-NEP-3	I	Overall combined ratio of leveraged resources (cash or in-kind services) to Section 320 funds for all NEPs (for LIS, Sections 119 & 320). (Baseline determined by Dec 2003)	Internal Tracking System	Region & NEPs	11 : 1	n / a	n / a	Ratio	OWOW
IV-NEP-4	I	NEPs have indicators in place to track key environmental and other trends in their estuary based on CCMP priorities and emerging issues, including invasive species where appropriate, and to enable each NEP to periodically report on status and trends. {Base: 28 NEPs)	Internal Tracking System	Regions and NEPs	TBD by December 2003	n / a	n / a	Indicators in place	OWOW