

HJR

64

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

POUCH Y - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
907-465-3800

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY

May, 1988

Copies of minutes listed below were originally included in this file. The minutes are available on the STAIRS database CMPR. In order to save space copies of minutes have not been left in the files.

Mary Van Nimwegen

House Labor & Commerce:

March 15, 1988

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(7)

Date referred: 2/15/88

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Resources

DATE: 3/15/88

The Labor & Commerce Committee has considered HJR 64

Relating to Alaska's participation in the bottomfish fisheries and other benefits from the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States off the coast of Alaska.

RECOMMENDS:

- replace with _____ the same title
- attached amendment(s) a new title
- do pass
- do not pass
- no recommendation
- individual recommendations
- additional referral to the _____ Committee

ADOPTS: _____ letter of intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

- fiscal impact same as previous fiscal note published _____
- zero fiscal note same as previous zero fiscal note published _____
- zero with analysis

SIGNING DO PASS:

David Donley

W. Ellist

Scott Bennett

John L. Brack

Alto E. Koppman

SIGNING OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

[Signature]

David Donley

Chairman's signature



Official Business

COMMITTEE:

HOUSE LABOR & COMMERCE

DATE: March 15, 1988

SIGN-IN

Subject of meeting:

A presentation on the Alliance Bank and the proposed Hallwood Stabilization Trust.
 HJR 64 "Relating to Alaska's participation in the bottomfish fisheries in the exclusive economic zone."
 SB 15 "An Act relating to trade secrets."
 HB 482 "Appropriation loan to the Alaska Power Authority."
 HB 483 "An Act relating to loans from the Railbelt energy fund; and providing for an effective date."
 SB 322 "An Act relating to workers' compensation and providing for an effective date."

PLEASE PRINT
NAME & TITLE

REPRESENTING

ADDRESS & ZIP

PHONE

**DO YOU WANT
 TO TESTIFY?
 YES / NO**

**SUBJECT:
 BILL #**

<i>City Manager Nancy Gross</i>	<i>City of Unalaska</i>	<i>PO Box 89 Unalaska 99685</i>	H W 581-1251	<i>HJR64</i>	
			H W		
<i>TONY GUMBINER</i>	<i>CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD THE HALLWOOD GROUP</i>	<i>767 Third Avenue NY NY 10017</i>	H W		
<i>JIM CAIRNS</i>	<i>CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD ALLIANCE BANK</i>	<i>MINNESOTA / BENSON BLVD ANC AK</i>	H W		
<i>GARY DAILY</i>	<i>CITY OF UNALASKA</i>	<i>Box 89 Unalaska AK 99685</i>	H 581-1682 W 581-1250	<i>HJR64</i>	<i>HJR64</i>
<i>Barbara Sheinberg</i>	<i>State Div. of Governmental Coordin.</i>	<i>PO Box AW 99811</i>	H W		
<i>C.S. Christensen</i>	<i>Sen Fails</i>	<i>Capitol Bldg Rm 107</i>	H W 3753	<i>IF NEEDED</i>	<i>SB 15</i>
			H W		
			H W		
			H W		

STATE OF ALASKA
1988 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL VERSION: HJR 64
PUBLISH DATE: _____

FISCAL NOTE

REQUEST:

Revision Date: 3/15/88 Agency Affected: _____
Title: Ak fishing in exclusive economic zone. BRU: _____
Sponsor: Herrmann Components: _____
Requestor: _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAPITAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
REVENUE	0	0	0	0	0	0

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS : (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Prepared by: _____ Phone: 465-3892
Division: H.L&C Chairman - Rep. Dave Donley Date: 3/15/88

Approved by Commissioner: _____ Date: _____
Agency: _____

- Distribution (by preparer):
- Legislative Finance
 - Legislative Sponsor
 - Requestor
 - Office of Management and Budget
 - Impacted Agency(ies)

BRIEFING PAPER ON ALASKAN
INVOLVEMENT IN EEZ ISSUES

Provided by the Alaska Division of Governmental Coordination

- ° The State of Alaska is actively working to obtain a more equitable federal-state partnership in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). On the national level Governor Cowper is working with both the Coastal States Organization and the National Governor's Association to achieve recognition of this goal.
- ° Approximately 7 bills or resolutions have been introduced in the Alaska Legislature this session that address the EEZ. This indicates a growing recognition of EEZ issues in the state. Many of these bills are in development and the Governor does not have a position on each bill. The bills fall into two groups: first, a bill calling for a resource inventory and establishing an EEZ management program (SB 334) and second, resolutions calling for the federal government and private sector to recognize that Alaskans are entitled to a larger share of the resources and revenues generated in the EEZ off Alaska's coast (HJR 45, HJR 63, HJR 64, SJR 51, SJR 57, SJR 67).
- ° Alaska has recently met with the Minerals Management Service to initiate a state-federal taskforce effort on offshore mining in the EEZ. The taskforce will initially focus on developing an Environmental Impact Statement for an offshore mining lease sale in outer continental shelf waters immediately adjacent to state waters off Nome.

This lease sale is anticipated to occur in late 1988 or early 1989. It would be authorized under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) Section 8K. While the state believes that the OCSLA is not the appropriate enabling legislation for offshore mining in the long term, we are willing to work within the existing regime so as not to delay the development of research and the expansion of the existing offshore mining industry in the state. The state believes the project and lease sale off Nome would essentially be a continuation of a successful offshore mining venture in state territorial waters. This is an unique circumstance for the offshore mining industry in that there is a great deal of information known about the exact nature of the deposit, mining methods and environmental impacts.

The State of Alaska has a lease sale for offshore mining in state waters approximately every 18 months. The state has an established regulatory scheme and procedures for such lease sales. The Department of Natural Resources administers the state program and must find proposed offshore mining projects to be in the state's best interest and to be consistent with the Alaska Coastal Management Program.



*Coastal States
and
The U.S. Exclusive
Economic Zone*

COASTAL STATES
AND
THE U.S. EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE

Coastal States Organization
Washington, D.C.

APRIL 1987

This project was funded in part by a grant from the
William H. Donner Foundation



The Coastal States Organization, a nonprofit, nonpartisan association, represents the collective views and interests of 35 coastal State and Territorial governors in U.S. ocean and coastal affairs. Established in 1970, CSO encourages cooperation among its member States in the resolution of national ocean and coastal issues which affect the Gulf, oceans and Great Lakes of the U.S. and also serves as a forum for debate, review and assessment of ocean and coastal management practices, problems and progress.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Coastal States Organization is indebted to Robert W. Knecht, consultant to CSO for this study, whose experience and vision contributed greatly toward our understanding of the complexity and components of this vast ocean area. Special thanks is extended to Admiral Bruce A. Harlow, USN (Ret.), for sharing his expertise in the evolving legal relationships of U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone resources. Special thanks also to the symposium participants whose constructive commentary contributed significantly to the study's purpose and findings. Finally, this report would not have been possible without the continued guidance of the CSO EEZ Steering Committee or the contributions made by the delegates of the CSO's member States, Commonwealths, and Territories.

Copyright © 1987 by the Coastal States Organization, Washington, D.C.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without written permission from the Coastal States Organization, except for brief quotation used in articles or reviews.

PREFACE

Over the last several decades, events have recast the status of ocean resources within 200 miles of the world's coastline. International law now clearly acknowledges the authority of coastal nations to manage ocean resources, living and nonliving, within two hundred nautical miles of their shorelines. These 200-mile exclusive economic zones encompass roughly 50% of the world's fisheries resources, most of the offshore hydrocarbon deposits, and many potentially valuable hard mineral resources.

On March 10, 1983, President Reagan established by proclamation an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) for the United States and thereby joined 58 other coastal nations declaring jurisdiction over the ocean resources adjacent to their land masses. The coastal States have a strong interest in the protection, conservation and development of the coastal and ocean resources bordering their shorelines since they are closest to both the problems and the opportunities inherent in their use. Hence, in January 1985 the Coastal States Organization (CSO), a non-profit representative organization of the 35 coastal States, Territories and Possessions of the United States, undertook a study of the implications of the new U.S. EEZ and the role that the States should play in its development.

The U.S. EEZ is the largest, and probably most valuable, in the world. The protection, conservation and development of the resources of this new zone are of great importance to both the Nation and the coastal States. Coastal States are already actively involved in managing the 90,000-mile U.S. shoreline and coastal zone which together constitute an essential part of the ocean resources development equation. Without efficient access to and interconnections with ports and harbors, shoreside logistical support, land-based processing and storage facilities, markets, and the countless other needs that accompany offshore development, the exploitation of ocean resources would be impossible.

The rational management of ocean resources is a difficult matter for two fundamental reasons: our present complex system of ocean governmental jurisdictions, and the nature of the ocean itself. The challenge, therefore, is to design and implement an equitable and efficient ocean resource management system in the face of the nation's jurisdictional complexities and the ocean's complex nature.

This report, made possible through a grant from the William H. Donner Foundation, presents the Coastal States Organization's findings and conclusions regarding the role of the coastal States in partnership with the federal government in managing the resources of America's Exclusive Economic Zone. CSO has embodied its conclusion in a proclamation and policy statement, developed during the course of the study and based on the considerations and findings discussed in this report. The proclamation is a clear assertion of the rights and responsibilities that the coastal States have in the protection, conservation and development of the U.S. EEZ resources. The policy statement is intended to guide CSO and its individual member governments in formulating an equitable and efficient management system for America's Exclusive Economic Zone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iii	PREFACE
1	PROCLAMATION
2-3	POLICY STATEMENT OF THE COASTAL STATES
4	Section I—Introduction
5-7	Section II—Importance of the EEZ
10-12	Section III—Federal and State Interests in the U.S. EEZ
13-15	Section IV—Recent Developments in International Law Affecting the Role of States in EEZ Resource Management
16-18	Section V—The Ocean Governance Challenge
19-21	Section VI—Forging the Partnership
22-23	Section VII—Conclusion
8	Figure 1—Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States
9	Figure 2—Sources of Strategic Metals for the United States
10	Table 1—Governmental Roles in the Exclusive Economic Zone
11	Table 2—Possible Effects of Offshore (EEZ) Development
24-25	Footnotes
26	Appendix A—History of the CSO EEZ Project Appendix B—CSO EEZ Steering Committee

PROCLAMATION OF THE COASTAL STATES

AN ASSERTION OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES PERTAINING TO THE PROTECTION, CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE

WHEREAS the Presidential Proclamation of March 10, 1983 established sovereign rights over living and nonliving resources within a 200-mile U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone; and

WHEREAS these marine resources, both known and yet to be discovered, are of vital importance to the United States; and

WHEREAS full realization of the benefits of the Exclusive Economic Zone for present and future generations of Americans depends upon an enhanced capability to protect, conserve and develop these marine resources; and

WHEREAS the impacts of the development of the Exclusive Economic Zone fall disproportionately on the coastal States, affecting the general welfare of their citizens; and

WHEREAS the marine, coastal and terrestrial environments are an interdependent system that must be managed in a manner that transcends existing Federal-State boundaries; and

WHEREAS recognized principles of international law distinguish this Nation's defense and foreign policy interests from its domestic resource management regime within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone; and

WHEREAS the Coastal States have substantial expertise and experience in protecting, conserving and developing ocean and coastal resources;

THEREFORE, THE COASTAL STATES do hereby assert and proclaim, on behalf of their citizens, direct and inherent rights and responsibilities pertaining to the protection, conservation and development of the living and nonliving resources now under domestic jurisdiction within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone. In recognition of these rights and responsibilities, the coastal States do hereby resolve that they must be full partners in the management of U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone resources and share in an equitable division of benefits derived from their development.

“As general purpose governments with existing resource management competence, the coastal States are directly responsible for acting on behalf of the ocean interests of their citizens, and the citizens of the country as a whole.”

POLICY STATEMENT OF THE COASTAL STATES

The U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone was established in 1983. With this action the United States acquired internationally recognized “sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring, exploiting, conserving and managing natural resources, both living and nonliving, of the seabed and subsoil and the superjacent waters.” The Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) extends 200 nautical miles seaward of the Nation's coasts, bringing an area more than one and a half times larger than the land mass of the United States under exclusive U.S. resource management authority.

Vast reserves of known resources, and the promise of tremendous reserves yet to be discovered, exist within the EEZ. All Americans stand to benefit from the proper management of these marine resources. Early national attention should be given to the creation of an appropriate management regime for this important new ocean area. There are existing regulatory regimes that manage oil, gas, and fishery resources. However, full economic and social benefits of other EEZ resources will be realized only if an orderly and stable regulatory framework is in place — one in which all affected parties are effectively represented in the decision-making process.

International law recognizes a 200-mile zone (the EEZ) within which coastal nations have sovereign and exclusive rights over living and nonliving resources. Exploration and exploitation of these resources are thus separate and distinct from other ocean uses, such as navigation and overflight, within international jurisdiction. Resource management in the U.S. EEZ is now a domestic issue. As such, it is the joint concern of the coastal State and federal governments. Therefore, the legitimate roles of the federal and State governments in the management of these resources must now be re-examined.

Given their proximity to, and reliance on, the sea, and the extent that development of these marine resources will affect their economy and environment, the coastal States have direct and inherent

interests pertaining to the protection, conservation and development of the living and nonliving resources of the EEZ. It is neither feasible nor desirable for the national government to attempt to represent all of the public interests in ocean activities beyond the territorial sea. As general purpose governments with existing resource management competence, the coastal States are directly responsible for acting on behalf of the ocean interests of their citizens, and the citizens of the country as a whole. The present statutorily created dividing line between State and federal jurisdiction in the ocean — the seaward limit of the territorial sea — measures only the current division in the management authority over the ocean resources. The coastal States' interests, rights and responsibilities extend well beyond this statutorily created, yet arbitrary, limit.

Because the marine, coastal and terrestrial environments are one interdependent ecological system, the EEZ resource management regime must be an integrated one. Ocean management is a logical extension of coastal management, forming a unified whole. The management regime must have the capacity to account for the use and development of various resources. The single-purpose approach to ocean management now in use has generated conflicts rather than resolving them, and will become increasingly ineffective in handling multiple uses in the EEZ.

The diversity of the resources of the EEZ and their vital importance to present and future generations of Americans requires that careful attention be paid to maintaining a proper balance between protection, conservation and development in the EEZ. A primary goal of EEZ resource management should be to maintain the health and viability of the ocean ecosystems in order to ensure sustained long-term benefits to the people of the Nation.

The extension of sovereign rights over the resources of the EEZ carries with it a public trust duty to conserve and ensure the availability of these resources for present and future generations. Since the citizens of the coastal States will be directly affected by the discharge of this duty (or a failure to do so), coastal State governments have a special responsibility to ensure that this duty is fully incorporated into EEZ management decisions.

Because of this responsibility, there must be shared decision-making with the federal government on all ocean activities affecting the interests of citizens of coastal States. Long-term commitments of fixed ocean and shoreside space and potential long-term impacts to coastal and ocean resources often require the mutual consent of the federal government and the affected coastal State governments.

Coastal States also have a responsibility to assure that State and local participants in any ocean activity receive an equitable share of responsibility, better advance information on value and distribution of ocean resources must be in the State government's hands before decisions are made. This will ensure that the public receives a fair return for the use or sale of their resources.

The establishment of the U.S. EEZ brings great new opportunities and challenges to the coastal States. The coastal States have a legitimate right in the management of the resources of the EEZ in concert with the federal government. Certain fundamental principles have guided the coastal States in arriving at their Proclamation of rights and responsibilities pertaining to the management of the resources within the EEZ. These principles include: shared decision-making on all ocean activities affecting the interests of the citizens of the coastal States; an equitable division of the costs and benefits of the development of these ocean resources; full recognition of the duty to future generations to protect their interests; and an appreciation that effective ocean management must be based upon solid research and environmental protection.

The coastal States are committed to shaping national policy for the protection, conservation and development of U.S. EEZ resources in accordance with this Proclamation and Policy Statement.

“The single-purpose approach to ocean management now in use has generated conflicts rather than resolving them, and will become increasingly ineffective in handling multiple uses in the EEZ.”

“The adversarial relationship that has developed between the federal government and coastal States in certain ocean matters is seen as unfortunate, unnecessary, and not in the public interest.”

SECTION I INTRODUCTION

The coastal States have a great interest in the ocean resources lying beyond State waters, an interest that started long before the President's 1983 proclamation establishing a U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). Since the late 1960s several States have been involved with the development of offshore oil and gas. For the past ten years the coastal States have acted with the federal government and the private sector in managing the fisheries resources of the 200-mile fishery conservation zone created by the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Several federal ocean resource laws permit coastal States to participate to varying, but often limited, degrees in certain types of ocean decision-making beyond the territorial sea.¹

Although limited opportunities exist for State participation in ocean resource management, certain recent developments have strained Federal-State relations. Department of the Interior plans to lease large areas of the outer continental shelf (OCS) for oil and gas exploration beginning in 1981 was of significant interest to a number of States. Failure of the Department of Commerce (NOAA) to promulgate federal consistency regulations clearly defining coastal State interests in federal decisions beyond State waters also concerned coastal States. Aggressive moves by the Federal government to begin leasing the potentially rich ocean mineral deposits off California, Oregon, and Hawaii also called attention to the weak role of the coastal States.

When the President issued the EEZ proclamation in March, 1983, and called for increased development of EEZ resources, the coastal States were quick to initiate a reexamination of the roles of the federal and State governments in ocean resource management.² From the onset of this study, the orientation of the coastal States has been positive and forward-looking. The adversarial relationship that has developed between the federal government and coastal States in certain ocean matters is seen as unfortunate, unnecessary, and not in the public interest. In embarking on this study, the coastal States sought new and more effective ways of preserving, conserving and developing America's newest and largest resource zone — the EEZ.

SECTION II

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE U.S. EEZ

America's Exclusive Economic Zone covers a vast area of ocean.

Generally speaking, it extends 200 nautical miles from the coastline, having a breadth of 197 nautical miles beyond the three-mile U.S. territorial sea (see Figure 1). The U.S. EEZ is nearly 4 billion acres, or about 1.7 times the land area of the United States. Except for highly migratory species of tuna, the United States now possesses exclusive authority over all resources, living and nonliving, within this very large area.³

America's EEZ is the largest, and probably most valuable, in the world. The fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico, off New England, the West Coast and Alaska are among the richest in the world. Oil and gas deposits of considerable magnitude exist in the Gulf of Mexico, off California and northern Alaska. New discoveries are likely elsewhere along the U.S. coastline. Promising areas for ocean minerals are present offshore North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, California, Oregon, Alaska and Hawaii, and in the vicinity of some of our Pacific Island territories. Economically important marine sand and gravel deposits exist off much of the Eastern seaboard, and the Gulf and Alaska. Recently, cobalt-rich crusts have been discovered near the Hawaiian archipelago and in the vicinity of Johnston Island in the Pacific. These resources, and others, are of great national interest. A closer look shows why.

• **FISHERIES** — The United States leads all other nations both in abundance and diversity of fish and shellfish off its coasts. It is estimated that 15 to 20% of the world's living resources are within the U.S. EEZ. Nonetheless, the United States ranks only fourth (after Japan, the U.S.S.R., and China) among the fishing nations of the world. In fact, less than half the potential yield from U.S. fisheries is harvested and processed in this country. The remainder is either caught by U.S. fishermen but sold to foreign processors, or caught by fishing

fleets of more than a dozen other countries, or left unused.⁴

Clearly, the potential exists for further growth of our domestic fishing industry. To the extent that the United States moves toward the goal of self sufficiency in fishery products, an important component in the present trade imbalance will be reduced or eliminated.

Fish and shellfish are an important source of nutrition and recreation, contributing to the economy and health of the coastal States and the Nation. In gross terms, U.S. fishermen produce 10 billion pounds of food annually, or nearly 50 pounds for each person in the United States. Another 750 million pounds are caught each year by recreational fishermen. Counting all subsidiary effects, U.S. coastal fisheries contribute over \$23 billion to the economy each year, providing employment for over a million people.⁵

• OFFSHORE OIL & GAS

RESOURCES — Petroleum products are the single most economically significant resource in the U.S. EEZ, and most likely will continue to be for the foreseeable future. The product value alone of oil and gas from both State and federal waters is nearly \$26 billion annually. In addition, the federal government receives over \$7 billion per year in revenue from federal leases on the outer continental shelf (OCS).⁶ In 1984, offshore wells produced 12% of the Nation's total oil and 25% of the total natural gas. The United States Geological Survey estimates that up to 41% of the oil and 30% of the natural gas yet to be discovered in the United States lies in the EEZ.⁷ These offshore supplies of oil and gas will be of vital national importance as the present onshore sources become depleted.



At present, two issues — at-sea incineration of toxic wastes and ocean disposal of radioactive wastes — seem to be increasingly prominent. The safe disposal of highly toxic liquid wastes such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and high and low level nuclear wastes are vexing national problems. Satisfactory solutions must be found since significant quantities of these dangerous materials continue to accumulate. Without doubt, emergency contingency plans, storage and transshipment within coastal areas, and the possible use of the EEZ (and perhaps the more remote deep seabed ¹¹) for waste disposal will be studied and debated in the coming years.¹²

• **QUALITY OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT** — The rich life and relatively pristine marine environment within the EEZ is perhaps its most valuable resource. The affects of pollution in the near-shore waters due to runoff from land are less pronounced in the EEZ, although ocean disposal of municipal sewage and industrial wastes places added strains on marine environmental quality. Only by maintaining and improving the environmental quality of the EEZ is it possible to maximize the value of its other resources, such as fisheries, marine wildlife, oxygen production, pharmaceuticals, recreation, and the basic security of a healthy, rich community of marine life.

The U.S. EEZ is home to a rich variety of marine life, inhabiting a range of arctic to tropical marine ecosystems. Abundant fisheries, marine mammals, reptiles, sea birds, coral reefs, chemosynthetic communities of hydrothermal vents and cold water seeps, kelp forests, and other plant and animal life are among the great diversity of life within the U.S. EEZ. There is an obvious strong coastal State interest in maintaining this resource.

• **ADDITIONAL USES OF THE EEZ** — The U.S. EEZ has many other uses beyond the major ones listed above. Sport fishing, diving, and boating make the offshore areas attractive to growing numbers of recreationists. Ocean-borne commerce is a regular use of the U.S. EEZ, including the specialized traffic lanes that extend into the EEZ that increasingly guide passage to and from U.S. coastal ports. Finally, military “exclusion zones” represent yet another use of ocean space that is of national importance and which sometimes competes with resource-related activities.




Figure 1.— Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the United States, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and United States overseas territories and possessions (outlines of map are approximate). Acreage now deemed within the U.S. EEZ includes: United States proper, 2.787 billion acres; Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, 0.299 billion acres; territories and possessions, 0.839 billion acres.

Source: Rowland, R.W., M.R. Goud and B.A. McGregor, *The U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone - A Summary of its Geology, Exploration and Resource Potential* (U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey Circular 912, 1983).

Table 2-6.—Sources of U.S. Chromium Imports

Country	1979-82 (percent)	1982 (percent)
Chromite:^a		
South Africa	48	59
Soviet Union	17	6
Philippines	13	11
Turkey	7	6
Albania	6	1
Finland	4	7
Madagascar	4	9
Ferrochromium:		
South Africa	61	35
Zimbabwe	12	25
Yugoslavia	12	12
Brazil	4	11
Sweden	4	4
Turkey	2	4
West Germany	2	3
Japan	1	—
China	1	4
Other	1	2

^aChromite = chromium ores

NOTE Major world producers of chromite and their contribution to world supplies in 1982 were: Soviet Union (34 percent); South Africa (22 percent); Albania (12 percent); Brazil (10 percent); Zimbabwe, Philippines, Turkey, and Finland (4 percent each); India (3 percent). See table 5-4 of ch. 5 for more detail, and for information on reserves.

SOURCE U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, *Minerals Yearbook*, 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983.

Table 2-8.—Sources of U.S. Cobalt Imports

Country	1979-82 (percent)	1982 (percent)
Zaire	37	39
Zambia	13	9
Canada	8	12
Belgium-Luxembourg ^a	8	5
Finland	7	6
Japan ^a	7	8
Norway ^a	7	7
Botswana	3	3
France ^a	3	3
Other	7	8

^aProcesses cobalt ore originating from other countries.

NOTE Major world producers of primary cobalt and their contribution to world supplies in 1982 were: Zaire (45 percent), Zambia (13 percent), Australia (9 percent), Soviet Union (9 percent), and Canada (6 percent). See table 5-16 of ch. 5 for more detail, and for information on reserves.

SOURCE U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, *Minerals Yearbook*, 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983.

Table 2-10.—Sources of U.S. Manganese Imports

Country	1979-82 (percent)	1982 (percent)
Manganese ore:		
South Africa	30	52
Gabon	27	21
Australia	22	17
Brazil	13	3
Mexico	4	1
Morocco	4	4
Other	—	2
Ferromanganese:		
South Africa	43	49
France ^a	26	21
Mexico	6	7
Brazil	3	6
Australia	2	1
Other ^a	20	16

^aProcesses manganese ore originating from other countries.

NOTE Major world producers of primary manganese ores and their contribution to world supplies in 1982 were: Soviet Union (41 percent), South Africa (23 percent), Gabon (7 percent), China (7 percent), Brazil (6 percent), Australia (5 percent), Mexico (2 percent). See table 5-22 of ch. 5 for further details, and for information on reserves.

SOURCE U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, *Minerals Yearbook*, 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983.

Table 2-12.—Sources of U.S. Platinum Group Metal Imports

Country	1979-82 (percent)	1982 (percent)
South Africa	56	48
U.S.S.R.	16	16
United Kingdom	11 ^a	13
Other	17	23

^aPGM production from the United Kingdom is from ores originating in South Africa and Canada and from secondary materials.

NOTE Major world producers of PGM and their contribution to world supplies in 1982 were: Soviet Union (54 percent), South Africa (40 percent), and Canada (4 percent). See table 5-33 of ch. 5 for further details, and for information on reserves.

SOURCE U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, *Minerals Commodity Summaries*, 1983 and 1984.

Figure 2.— Sources of Strategic Metals for the United States

Source: *Strategic Materials: Technologies to Reduce U.S. Import Vulnerability* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, OTA-ITE-248, May 1985).

“Because major segments of their coastal populations can be affected, coastal State governments have strong interests in how these governmental roles are performed in the EEZ.”

SECTION III FEDERAL & STATE INTERESTS IN THE EEZ

Federal and coastal State interests in the EEZ rest in part on the legitimate and necessary functions of government in the offshore area. The manner of administration of these functions affects national and coastal State interests. Table 1 lists six broad purposes which government serves in the ocean. The top two are clearly “national” in nature and must be carried out by the federal government. However, to assure citizens that the duties and responsibilities of State governments are carried out, the remaining roles require coastal State involvement.

Important sectors of coastal State economies depend directly on the EEZ and its resources. In Louisiana, for example, the oil and gas, and commercial fishing, industries depend heavily on the EEZ. Coastal States and their local governments — the planners and managers of the Nation’s coastal zones — oversee the ports, harbors, and shore space that are essential to ocean development. Physical linkage inextricably couples the shoreland to the sea.

Through the bonds of common air basins, the actions of waves and currents on the shoreline, and the effects of rivers and run-off on ocean water quality, the land and the sea are joined together in an inseparable relationship. Thus, an equitable governance scheme for the EEZ must acknowledge the quality of interests — national and State — that exist in the U.S. EEZ.

Because major segments of their coastal populations can be affected, coastal State governments have strong interests in how these governmental roles are performed in the EEZ. Coastal States are “home” to most users of the EEZ. Their citizens have major economic interests in the conservation and rational development of the EEZ. Coastal States have important public trust responsibilities within their jurisdictions. They are concerned with “spillovers” and other adverse environmental effects emanating from poorly regulated uses in the adjacent EEZ that could damage State resources. New EEZ-related activities compete with other ocean ac-

TABLE 1
GOVERNMENTAL ROLES
IN THE EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE

Role	Function
1. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	—Insure consistency with foreign policy goals
2. NATIONAL SECURITY	—Maintain the national defense
3. INTERSTATE & FOREIGN COMMERCE	—Regulate commerce between the States and other countries
4. PROPRIETARY	—Secure maximum earnings for the public
5. PUBLIC TRUST	—Conserve resources for present and future generations
6. REGULATORY	—Protect the public welfare, prevent and solve conflicts

tivities of economic interest to the coastal States. For example, access to valuable and limited coastal space for necessary shoreside facilities (ports, processing plants, etc.), is often at the expense of the traditional users. Coastal States are proprietors of the ocean resources in their State waters, and are concerned with possible reductions in the value of State resources, such as the drainage of State oil and gas fields or overfishing in the EEZ of fish stocks that also exist in State waters.

Given these interests, the coastal States are naturally concerned with the actions of federal agencies taken in connection with the governmental purposes set out in Table 1. The degree of coastal State interest depends upon the nature of the demands placed upon State and local resources as well as on EEZ resources. Some of the possible effects (positive and negative) of the development of EEZ resources are listed in Table 2 below.

“Without effective local participation in the decision-making process, no amount of ‘national interest’ justification is likely to overcome local opposition.”

TABLE 2
POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF OFFSHORE (EEZ) DEVELOPMENT

National Benefits

- improved domestic supply of strategic and critical resources
- reduced trade deficit
- improved food supply
- increased national security
- enhanced economic growth
- increased federal revenues

Regional/Local Benefits

- (some public, some private)
- increased jobs
 - increased investment earnings
 - increased tax revenue

Offshore Environmental Impacts

- deterioration of marine water quality
- deterioration of air quality
- addition of toxins to the environment, and possibly the food chain
- visual disturbance
- potential accidents

Onshore Environmental Impacts

- increased risk of accidents
- degradation of coastal esthetics
- reduction in quality of coastal recreation experience
- reduction in tourism

Offshore Displacement Impacts

- prevention or disruption of usual fishing patterns
- interference with commercial and recreational navigation

Onshore Displacement Impacts

- competition for limited commercial and recreational port and harbor space
- competition for sites for processing, storage and transportation facilities
- competition for limited recreational beach space

Onshore Socio-economic Impacts


- increased population
- public facilities and infrastructure
- public services
- housing, water supplies
- additional requirements on local government planning processes

For any particular activity in the EEZ, one would have to evaluate each of the possible effects listed in Table 2 to obtain the cumulative impact. Generally, the impact will be greater from EEZ activities closer to the coastal zone, when activities of greater importance to the State are displaced, and when significant, yet uncompensated, demands are placed on local public infrastructure due to increases in population. Perhaps, in the long run, the economic benefits associated with a new EEZ activity could partially or even totally offset these social, i.e. non-economic, costs. But this fails to address the importance of the non-economic aspects of local decision-making, i.e., the need for "self-determination."

A community, or State, will be the recipient of the costs and benefits, both economic and non-economic, of development in the EEZ off of its shores. Without effective local participation in the decision-making process, no amount of "national interest" justification is likely to overcome local opposition. Nor would the best interest of the community, State or nation be served by the resulting delay in the orderly development of these resources due to the

foreseeable political obstacles or, worse, protracted litigation. Thus, a true Federal/State partnership in the decision-making process is clearly necessary for the management of the living and nonliving resources in America's EEZ.

The establishment of a true Federal/State partnership, founded on cooperation and mutual benefit, requires an equitable sharing of both the benefits and costs derived from the development of EEZ resources. The sharing of benefits, including revenues, from EEZ resource development is a natural extension of shared decision-making. It is both realistic and just to recognize the interests of the federal government and the States in the EEZ while bearing in mind the possible effects of EEZ development.



SECTION IV

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW AFFECTING THE ROLE OF STATES IN EEZ RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Prior to World War II:

International ocean law has undergone significant change in the past four decades. Prior to World War II the ocean waters beyond a nation's territorial sea were nearly universally regarded as "high seas." Within these waters any nation was free to do whatever it chose, including navigate, fish, conduct research, drill for oil, perform military maneuvers or any of the other high seas freedoms, unless it agreed otherwise by international agreement or treaty. But in waters that were once pure high seas that are now EEZs, there has been a fundamental change.

1945-1983:

In 1945 President Truman proclaimed U.S. jurisdiction and control over the resources of the continental shelf adjoining the United States.¹³ Other nations quickly followed suit, asserting various forms of national control over ocean resources off their coasts. Mexico, also in 1945, asserted similar jurisdiction over its continental shelf. Argentina in 1946, and Peru and Chile in 1947 asserted jurisdiction over not only the sea bottom of the continental shelf, but also the water above it. Honduras, in 1951, established a 200-mile "resource protection zone," the first such zone that would later be referred to as an exclusive economic zone. In the next 30 years over 50 nations claimed varying degrees of jurisdictional authority over ocean resources out to 200 miles from their shores. As a result, the international recognition of the "high-seas" character in these 200-mile zones became less and less pronounced.

Overlapping the last decade of this period the nations of the world negotiated the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention (LOS Convention), culminating in 130 nations signing the treaty in 1982. The LOS Convention is the sole internationally recognized text defining the legal parameters of exclusive economic zones. Although the United States announced that it would not sign the LOS Convention, the President's EEZ Proclamation conforms closely to the LOS articles on exclusive economic zones.¹⁴ In addition, the President announced that the United States would act in accordance with the provisions of the LOS Convention relating to "traditional uses of the oceans — such as navigation and overflight."¹⁵

After the 1983 U.S. EEZ Proclamation:

The EEZ Proclamation fundamentally altered the legal character of the 200 mile zone around the United States. Prior to the Proclamation, the body of U.S. law pertaining to this zone, while asserting U.S. jurisdiction in piecemeal fashion over select resources, nonetheless continued to apply in the internationally recognized regime of "high seas." . . .

"Prior to World War II the ocean waters beyond a nation's territorial sea were nearly universally regarded as 'high seas.' But in waters that are now EEZs, there has been a fundamental change."

"The EEZ Proclamation fundamentally altered the legal character of the 200 mile zone around the United States."

“Unless another country’s recognized rights are impinged upon, no other nation can question the management decisions of the United States concerning its EEZ resources.”

“For decades the U.S. Supreme Court has consistently ruled that only the federal government possessed full and paramount authority to manage the natural resources outside the territorial sea. However, the legal basis upon which these cases rest no longer applies.”

Although the pure concept of the “high seas” was eroding within 200 miles of this country and others, the status of ocean resources in this zone did not unequivocally change from high seas resources to U.S. domestic resources until the U.S. EEZ Proclamation. At the same time, in accordance with international law, the high seas rights of non-resource related activities, such as navigation and overflight, among others, are expressly recognized and preserved in the President’s Proclamation.

The United States now has sovereign rights over the living and nonliving resources within its EEZ. How to exercise these rights is an internationally recognized sovereign, i.e. domestic, question. That is, unless another country’s recognized rights are impinged upon, no other nation can question the management decisions of the United States concerning its EEZ resources. In terms of U.S. federal law, this is a fundamental change with potentially profound domestic consequences.

Supreme Court Rulings, International Law and EEZ Resource Management

For decades the U.S. Supreme Court has consistently ruled that only the federal government possessed full and paramount authority to manage the natural resources outside the territorial sea. In fact, until Congress passed the Submerged Lands Act in 1953, the Court ruled that even within the three mile “marginal sea” the federal government had full and paramount natural resource management authority. However, the legal basis upon which these cases rest no longer applies.

In the landmark case *United States v. California*¹⁶, the court ruled against California’s assertion of “dominion” over the submerged lands within its three nautical mile zone of State ocean waters. The court based its decision on the rationale that:

“But whatever any nation does in the open sea, which detracts from its common usefulness to the nations, or which another nation may charge detracts from it, is a question for consideration among nations as such, and not their separate governmental units.”¹⁷

As a result, the Court ruled that because marine resource management could affect international relations, the “Federal Government rather than the state has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area.”¹⁸

This rationale is the basis for a series of Supreme Court rulings that followed. In 1950, in *United States v. Louisiana*,¹⁹ the Court rejected Louisiana’s claim of rights over the resources in, and beyond, the three mile zone, holding that “The ocean seaward of the [three mile zone] is perhaps even more directly related to the national defense, the conduct of foreign affairs, and world commerce than is the marginal sea. Certainly it is not less so.”²⁰ The same year, in *United States v. Texas*,²¹ the Court also rejected Texas’ claim to the resources in its three mile zone of ocean waters. Texas argued that because it was an independent Republic prior to admission to the Union it thus held full authority over these resources. The Court, however, ruled that upon entering the Union Texas was placed on an “equal footing” with all other States.

and that "The United States then took her place as respects foreign commerce, the waging of war, the making of treaties, defense of the shores, and the like. In external affairs the United States became the sole and exclusive spokesman for the Nation."²²

Congress reacted to these Supreme Court cases by passing the Submerged Lands Act of 1953,²³ signed into law by President Eisenhower, that vested in the States title to the seabed of their ocean waters. Later the same year Congress passed a companion act, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA).²⁴ The OCSLA provided that the waters above the continental shelf are recognized as high seas²⁵, while establishing exclusive federal jurisdiction over the continental shelf seaward of the territorial limit of the States.

Nonetheless, in 1969, in *United States v. Maine*,²⁶ 13 Atlantic States challenged the federal government's paramount rights over the submerged lands beyond State waters, claiming that as successors to the Crown of England (or Holland in the case of New York) they possessed full authority over the seabed beyond the three mile State waters. The Supreme Court, rejecting this argument, reaffirmed the rulings *California, Louisiana and Texas*, and ruled that the international character of these waters required the federal government to retain full dominion over the seabed of the continental shelf beyond the three mile line.

These rulings, both before and after the Submerged Lands Act or the OCSLA were implemented, were based on the Supreme Court's determination that the ocean area beyond State territory was international in character, and thus the management of these resources could affect relations with foreign nations. Because the U.S. Constitution expressly grants to the federal government all powers to conduct foreign affairs, the States had no role to play in marine resource management beyond their ocean waters.²⁷ This has changed.

A Sea Change with the EEZ Proclamation

With the EEZ Proclamation, resource management within the EEZ is no longer international in character,²⁸ but rather is a purely domestic matter. The basis upon which the above Supreme Court cases rest no longer applies. The EEZ is no longer an "open sea." No other nation can charge that a resource management decision by the United States detracts from the "common usefulness" of this zone. The resources of the U.S. EEZ are not to be managed for their international "common usefulness," but rather for the usefulness of the United States. Thus, domestic management of U.S. EEZ resources has become a question for consideration by the "separate governmental units," i.e. the federal government and the coastal States. This does not mean that the coastal States automatically acquired resource management authority in the EEZ with the issuance of the presidential EEZ Proclamation. It simply means that no constitutional barrier now exists to deny States their proper role in sharing the responsibilities and benefits of resource-management authority with the federal government.

Thus, to the extent that management of the resources of the U.S. EEZ does not directly affect the rights of other nations, this management is now purely a domestic question, a question that can be answered only with full participation by both the coastal States and the federal government.

"With the EEZ Proclamation, the EEZ is no longer an 'open sea.' The resources of the U.S. EEZ are not to be managed for their international 'common usefulness,' but rather for the usefulness of the United States. Thus, domestic management of U.S. EEZ resources has become a question for consideration by the 'separate governmental units,' i.e. the federal government and the coastal States."

“The orderly development of EEZ resources would be impossible without efficient access to, and interconnections with, ports, harbors, shoreside support, processing and storage facilities, markets, transportation routes and the countless other needs that accompany offshore development.”

SECTION V THE OCEAN GOVERNANCE CHALLENGE

JURISDICTIONAL COMPLEXITIES

The human side of the equation governing America's ocean resources can be stated in five parts: local authorities, State governments, the federal government, the private (commercial) sector, and the general public. Local authorities control the location and operations of facilities, such as ports and harbors. State governments control environmental aspects, such as air and water quality, as well as protection, conservation and development of resources in State ocean waters. The federal government has authority over the international aspects of the EEZ, such as law enforcement and national security, as well as, currently, dominant authority in the management of the living and nonliving resources. The private sector is often the prime mover in offshore development. What does, or does not, happen offshore, and at what pace, usually depends on market conditions and the judgment of corporate officials. And finally, the general public has an important role in the decision-making process. Public hearing are a legal requirement in many resource-use decisions, at both the federal and State levels.

Because the orderly development of EEZ resources would be impossible without efficient access to, and interconnections with, ports, harbors, shoreside support, processing and storage facilities, markets, transportation routes and the countless other needs that accompany offshore development, it is clear that all five parts of the ocean governance equation must participate in the decision-making process.

The jurisdictional division between levels of government — Three separate bands of jurisdiction divide the coastal and ocean area — local and State governments generally control shoreline use; in most cases State government has jurisdiction in the belt of ocean from the tidemark out to the three-mile limit; and the federal government has general jurisdiction from three out to two hundred miles.²⁸ The problems thus created for the planning and management of these activities are:

- most important ocean activities involve all three jurisdictions, a major complexity; and
- the benefits and costs of ocean resource exploitation frequently fall on different, or multiple, jurisdictions.

The jurisdictional division in the management of different ocean resources/uses — Within the two offshore jurisdictions (federal and State), each resource/use is typically under the jurisdiction of a different agency operating under a different legislative framework. For example, a specific federal agency manages offshore oil development, while another agency handles water quality and related matters. The problems created by this single purpose approach include:

- difficulty in advance planning for heavily used ocean areas;
- lack of early identification and resolution of conflicts among users;
- few opportunities for accommodating alternative or competing uses; and
- difficulty for general purpose local governments to relate to single purpose offshore agencies.

Ocean Complexity

In addition to these human factors, the nature of the ocean itself must be considered. The ocean's fluid and dynamic properties mean that effects from activities at one offshore location can spread quickly to other locations, including the shoreline. Further, the complex relationship of ocean and coastal ecosystems — between interdependent organisms and their habitats and the larger dynamic environment upon which they depend — together with our incomplete knowledge of these systems, virtually guarantees that any ocean development activity will produce unexpected effects well removed from the project itself. As a result, predicting the impacts of an ocean use is exceptionally difficult. The management problems that arise include:

- unintended, unforeseeable consequences of ocean exploitation;
- uncertainty over the fate and effects of discharges; and
- uncertainty about the geographic extent and duration of impacts.

Congress has wrestled with the jurisdictional and natural complexities of ocean and coastal resource governance. In October of 1972, recognizing the fundamental importance of the coastal zone of the United States, the Congress enacted the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA). This legislation authorized the coastal States to develop and implement coastal zone management programs for the shorelines of the United States, including the State ocean waters. Building on significant coastal management efforts already underway in California, Oregon, Delaware, Washington, Rhode Island, North Carolina, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, most coastal

States took the federal legislative challenge seriously, completing and obtaining federal government approval of their coastal zone management programs. At present, 29 States and territories have federally approved programs, covering more than 90% of the U.S. shoreline.

A major objective of these State coastal zone management programs is to provide a coordinated decision-making mechanism to reconcile conflicting uses of the coastal zone. Congress intended that through this mechanism, coastal areas and resources requiring protection would receive that protection while water-dependent activities that must exist in the coastal zone would receive priority consideration. At the same time, the mechanism fosters public participation and streamlines the decision process.

Central to the entire process is the requirement of "consistency" with a federally approved State coastal zone management program. Generally, any federal agency, or any person operating under a federal permit or license, that conducts an activity that affects a State's coastal zone must do so in a manner


"The ocean's fluid and dynamic properties mean that effects from activities at one offshore location can spread quickly to other locations, including the shoreline."

consistent with a State's approved management plan. While the CZMA has only been in effect for 15 years, it is generally accepted that State coastal zone management programs are performing rather well and program improvements are occurring on a regular basis.²⁹

The coastal zone management process has been very effective in reconciling the multiple interests associated with most coastal uses. Yet from the coastal State perspective, even beyond recent efforts to reduce or terminate federal coastal zone management funding assistance, there are some serious shortcomings with the present system, especially when viewed against the new challenges posed by America's new Exclusive Economic Zone.

Up to 1982, tensions between the coastal States and the federal government had largely focused on offshore oil. The

prospect of ocean incineration of toxic wastes, seabed disposal of decommissioned nuclear submarines, and plans for ocean mining have also provoked additional coastal State concern. In each of these instances, the concern is fueled by two factors: 1) uncertainty as to the effects of the proposed activity on the marine and coastal environments, and 2) the feeling of coastal States and communities that they lacked the legal authority needed to participate in the formal decision-making processes. In light of increasing pressure to develop and use the resources of the EEZ, the coastal States view these concerns as harbingers of potential conflict unless some important changes are made in present ocean governance arrangements.



SECTION VI FORGING THE PARTNERSHIP

The geographic range of State and national interests in the oceans bears relatively little resemblance to the extent of formal State and federal jurisdiction. Strong national interests (e.g., security and interstate commerce) exist throughout the entire ocean area.

Similarly, as discussed in the previous section, strong State-local interests exist well beyond the limit of State waters. In State ocean waters, the State government has jurisdiction and ownership of resources; hence State agencies have been delegated management authority over those resources. This authority, however, must be carried out in manner that acknowledges and protects co-existing national interests in these same waters. Similarly, federal agencies that are delegated authority to manage resources in the EEZ, must, we believe, take account of State and local interests that, in many cases, co-exist with national interests beyond the three-mile limit. There is nothing in the concept of legal jurisdiction over resources in a given area that leads to the non-recognition of valid "outside" interests that also exist in the management of those resources.

It is implicit, therefore, that a set of duties and responsibilities accompanies the benefits of ownership and exploitation of publicly held ocean resources. One important element of the governmental presence in the oceans, therefore, is made up of both the management of the benefits that flow from sovereign rights and the discharge of the duties and responsibilities associated with the exercise of those rights.

In the Exclusive Economic Zone, three different duties fall to federal resource managers:

Duties to the Nation: includes maximizing the financial benefits that flow from control of the resources, while minimizing the impacts from such exploitation to other ocean users, resources and the environment.

Duties to the international community: maintaining navigational and other high seas freedoms for the world community in compliance with international law. Also, a duty exists to prevent pollution in the U.S. EEZ from spilling over to the high seas or into the EEZs of adjacent nations.

Duties to adjacent coastal States: to prevent, reduce or compensate for pollution and other effects shown in Table 2 that affect resources under State ownership or control.

A similar set of duties falls on the coastal State ocean resource manager, including:

Duties on behalf of the State's citizens: to maximize earnings while minimizing environmental impacts.

Duties to the Nation: Prevention of pollution entering the EEZ; protection of endangered species and marine mammals; facilitation of interstate commerce and safe navigation, acting consistent with national security interests.

"There is nothing in the concept of legal jurisdiction over resources in a given area that leads to the non-recognition of valid 'outside' interests that also exist in the management of those resources."

“In the past, the interests of the States and local communities have usually been projected from the shoreland seaward. A more appropriate approach is to start from the location of the activities in the EEZ and project the effects and impacts shoreward.”

Duties to the coastal local governments: Prevention of air and water pollution that would affect them, assistance in dealing with planning and socio-economic impacts.

Of course, federal and State resource management agencies operate under the terms of ocean resources management law. However, two additional norms generally guide public decision-makers: agency policy and public duties. But, only a portion of these are ever formally written into law.

The law: a framework of procedures and processes duly adopted by a legislative body guiding decision-making in a given area, not necessarily predetermining every outcome, usually not exhaustive, usually not eliminating all discretion in decision-making.

Agency policy: the objectives that a particular governmental agency wishes to achieve during its tenure, working within the broad limits established by the law. Usually not so comprehensive or all inclusive as to eliminate discretion in dealing with matters not directly in conflict with agency objectives.

Public duties: an inherent part of the execution of public tasks, related to norms of fairness and justice, that flow from considerations of equity. On a par with the law, sometimes spelled out in the law, sometimes not.

Much of the difficulty associated with the operation of the present OCS oil and gas leasing program, for example, centers around the different weights that various interests tend to give to these three norms.

In the past, the interests of the States and local communities have usually been projected from the shoreland seaward, and terminated arbitrarily at the boundary of State ocean waters. A more appropriate approach, however, is to start from the location of the activities in the EEZ and project the effects and impacts shoreward to the State coastal zone and shorelands. This lends a more accurate view of the range and extent of the State interests that need to be protected in State-Federal arrangements governing the EEZ.


Furthermore, the concept of “shore-linked” impacts of ocean development is useful in gauging the roles of the State and federal governments in ocean development. Long-term commitments for the exclusive use of ocean space, and the resultant long-term commitment of the shoreside support facilities, require the concurrent approval of both the federal government and the involved coastal States. The Deepwater Ports Act and the Ocean Thermal Energy Act set a precedent for shared decision-making in the case of ocean developments of this type.

An efficient EEZ management process will also have to address the uncertainty due to the complexity of ocean processes. Given our incomplete understanding of ocean dynamics, accurate predictions of effects of a given ocean activity are usually not possible. Nonetheless, new ocean developments will not be held back until all of the necessary knowledge about ocean processes is known. Improved ways are clearly needed to deal with these uncertainties.

To minimize uncertainty, operationally-linked monitoring programs should be used. Prior to the start-up of a new ocean activity, baseline studies should be performed. Then, agreement should be reached among the potentially affected interests, on levels (thresholds) of key parameters that, if reached, would trigger pre-agreed changes in the

operation of the activity (or full shut-down, in the worst case situation). Too often there is no mandated connection between monitoring and the operation of the program. Operational rules and procedures are established at the onset of a new ocean program, based on the best information available at that time. The tendency is for these procedures to remain fixed throughout the operation despite the fact that a properly designed monitoring effort could be providing highly relevant and useful information to the ongoing program.

In some ocean situations, we know too little to design an operationally-linked monitoring program. If the gaps in our understanding are of that magnitude, an even more conservative approach should be adopted (e.g., a scaled-down project) until the needed basic research has been completed and a proper monitoring program can be designed. Too little effort has been put into this aspect of the ocean management problem. The result has been unprofitable debates over the likely consequences of a proposed ocean development activity and final decisions that are often largely political rather than technical in nature. Even our current understanding of ocean science should permit us to do better than that.



SECTION VII

CONCLUSION

"Whether the words are 'consultation,' 'joint participation,' or 'concurrent authority,' the message is the same — the process of managing America's EEZ resources must involve all who are affected."

"Our goal is to establish an effective, joint participatory process with the federal government that recognizes the legitimate interests of the coastal States and their citizens, and best serves the interests of the Nation."

Whether the words are "consultation," "joint participation," or "concurrent authority," the message is the same — the process of managing America's EEZ resources must involve all who are affected.

The coastal zone will continue to be "home" for land-based facilities — ports, piers, warehouses, docks, and processing plants — so integral to EEZ activities. As these activities expand and intensify in the future, the need for coastal support facilities will also increase and with it, the growth of associated and necessary local "infrastructure"— roads and related municipal and county services. The construction and operation of these facilities and urban infrastructure will place financial, social and environmental demands on coastal governments and their citizens. Likewise, the environmental impacts offshore from ocean resource development are of direct interest and concern to the citizens of the coastal States. These citizens therefore must be part of the EEZ resource management process.

There is some statutory precedence for involving coastal States in ocean resource management. For example, consultation authority is available to coastal State governors and local governments under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. A joint participation mechanism is available under the Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, where the federal government, coastal States, commercial and recreational fishing interests are all involved. Coastal State concurrent authority is available under the Deepwater Ports Act. But all too often the degree of involvement of coastal State governments in the EEZ resource decision-making process does not match the impacts of the EEZ resource activity on the coastal States.

Our proclamation, asserting the rights and responsibilities pertaining to the protection, conservation and development of resources of the United States Exclusive Economic Zone, and the accompanying policy statement speak to this process and partnership. The coastal States' Proclamation does not, however, call for an extension of State boundaries, or more water or submerged land "ownership." An extension of the State waters boundary to 12 miles, while it may have specific benefits, would not address the larger issue of effectively managing this vast interdependent ecological system.

Rather, our goal is to establish an effective, joint participatory process with the federal government that recognizes the legitimate interests of the coastal States and their citizens, and best serves the interests of the Nation. The elements of this joint participatory process include: an equitable division of EEZ resource development costs and benefits, full recognition of the duty to future generations, the need for ocean research

and environmental protection, and shared decision-making for all ocean activities affecting the interests of the citizens of coastal States. These elements will be our guide as we actively seek to improve the existing piecemeal, and all too often confrontational, approach to EEZ resource management. An effective intergovernmental process must, and can be achieved if this nation is to reap the full benefit of its EEZ resources.

The coastal States have already been active in pursuing this EEZ partnership with the federal government through pro-

posed EEZ hard mineral mining legislation and national oil spill liability and compensation legislation. Other proposals being considered include: completion of comprehensive State Coastal Zone Management programs for the territorial sea, coordination of State ocean management agencies and policies, greater ocean awareness through Coastweeks and other public education programs, examination of an equitable EEZ revenue sharing formula, development of legal agreements between the coastal States and the federal government regarding the exchange of ocean research data and information, strengthening of State concurrence authority over federal ocean activities having direct effects on coastal States, and enactment of legislation establishing a national ocean policy commission.

The coastal States are committed to taking their rightful place as full partners with the federal government in managing the resources of the U.S. EEZ. Together, our nation will move forward to meet the challenges and develop the potential of its ocean heritage.

“An effective intergovernmental process must, and can be achieved if this nation is to reap the full benefit of its EEZ resources.”

Footnotes

1. For example, the Coastal Zone Management Act grants States the authority to require federal activities that are in a State's coastal zone, and activities that are federally licensed or permitted that directly affect a State's coastal zone, to be "consistent" to "the maximum extent practicable" with that State's coastal management program. 16 U.S.C. §1456 (c).

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act provides for limited input by a State Governor regarding the size, timing or location of a proposed lease sale. A Governor "may submit recommendations to the Secretary" of the Interior Department, and the Secretary must "communicate to the Governor, in writing, the reasons for his determination to accept or reject" the Governor's recommendations. 43 U.S.C. §1345.

The Deepwater Ports Act requires the approval of a Governor of an "adjacent coastal State" before the Secretary of Transportation can issue a license for a Deepwater Port. Further, the Secretary is required to condition a Deepwater Port license, upon such notification by the Governor, "so as to make [the license] consistent with" State programs "relating to environmental protection, land and water use, and coastal zone management." 33 U.S.C. §1508.
2. On behalf of the coastal States, Michael Fischer, then Executive Director of the California Coastal Commission, drafted a proposal outlining the parameters of such a study and approached the William H. Donner Foundation of New York City regarding funding. After a period of negotiation, the Donner Foundation provided a grant to the CSO to undertake the EEZ study.
3. The Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act provides that the exclusive management authority of the U.S. "shall not include, nor shall it be construed to extend to" species of tuna. 16 U.S.C. §1813. The Proclamation likewise expressly provides that "highly migratory species of tuna ... are not subject to United States jurisdiction and require international agreements for effective management."
4. Gordon, W.G., and R.E. Gutting, Jr., Winter 1984/85. "The Coastal Fishing Industry and the EEZ," *Oceanus*, Vol. 27, No. 4.
5. *Id.*
6. Watkins, Joel S., 1984. "Petroleum Exploration and Production in the EEZ," Chapter 4 of *Symposium Proceedings, A National Program for the Assessment and Development of the Mineral Resources of the United States Exclusive Economic Zone*. Sponsored by the Department of the Interior.
7. Curlin, J.W., 1984. "Technology and Oil and Gas Development in the Exclusive Economic Zone," in *Exclusive Economic Zone Papers*, reprinted from *Proceedings of Oceans '84*, Washington, D.C., Sept. 1984.
8. 50 U.S.C. Sec. §98-98h.
9. See Ballard, R.D., and J.S. Bischoff, 1984, "Assessment and Scientific Understanding of Hard Mineral Resources in the EEZ," in *Symposium Proceedings, A National Program for the Assessment and Development of the Mineral Resources of the United States Exclusive Economic Zone*. Sponsored by the Department of the Interior.
10. Champ, M.S., and N.A. Ostenson, Winter 1984/85. "Future Uses and Research Needs in the EEZ," *Oceanus*, Vol. 27, No. 4.
11. See Sandia National Laboratories, 1984. The Subseabed Disposal Program: 1983 Status Report. Report No. SAND 83-1387, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
12. See Booz-Allen, 1980. "Hazardous Waste Generation and Commercial Hazardous Waste Management Capacity: An Assessment." U.S. GPO No. SW894.
13. Presidential Proclamation 2667 of September 8, 1945.
14. Compare Part V, United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, with the March 10, 1983 U.S. EEZ Proclamation.
15. Statement by the President on the Executive Economic Zone of the United States (March 10, 1983).
16. 332 U.S. 19 (1947).
17. *Id.* at 35.
18. *Id.* at 38-39.
19. 339 U.S. 699.
20. *Id.* at 705.
21. 339 U.S. 707.
22. *Id.* at 718.
23. 43 U.S.C. §1301 *et seq.*
24. 43 U.S.C. §1331 *et seq.*
25. 43 U.S.C. §1332 (2)
26. 420 U.S. 515.

FOOTNOTES, continued

27. Note that Florida and Texas have federally recognized boundaries in their Gulf of Mexico waters out to 3 marine leagues, or roughly 10 miles.
28. *Id.*
29. "A review conducted by NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) of Federal consistency actions during 1982 indicated that the states reviewed approximately 300 direct Federal activities under Section 307(c) (1) with non-concurrences in about 3 percent of the cases. Approximately 7500 Federally licensed and permitted activities were reviewed under Section 307(c)(3)(A) and the states objected in about 2 percent of the cases. Approximately 500 Federally licensed activities described in detail in OCS plans under Section 307(c)(3)(B) were reviewed by the states with nonconcurrences in about 0.5 percent of the cases. Finally, the states reviewed approximately 600 Federal assistance proposals to state and local governments under Section 307(d) and objected in about 0.5 percent of the cases. These numbers are approximate since precise data was unavailable in a few cases; but they also reflect a tremendous level of success under existing mechanisms.

"the litigation history of the consistency provisions provides further evidence that the Federal consistency system works. NOAA's research indicates that in the twelve years since the passage of the CZMA 23 lawsuits have been brought against Federal agencies on consistency grounds. Of these, 9 of the cases involved OCS leasing, 2 involved fishery management plans, 5 involved activities on Federal enclaves within the coastal zone, and 7 involved activities, including permits located within the coastal zone." CZM Federal Consistency, H.R. Rep. No. 98-52, 98th Cong. 2d Sess., 59, March 27 and June 26, 1984.

APPENDIX A

History of the Coastal States Organization's Exclusive Economic Zone Project

The two year course of the work, commencing in January 1985, can be divided into six segments:

1. **January to May 1985 — Preparation of a draft report for use at the EEZ Symposium**
The 300-page report included a description of current and projected EEZ activities, a discussion of national and State interests in the EEZ, an analysis of the fundamental problems of ocean resources management, and an assessment of the presently available legal tools for protecting coastal State interests.
2. **June 24 to 26, 1985 — The CSO-Sponsored EEZ Symposium, Orcas Island, Washington.**
The Symposium involved about 60 participants representing a range of ocean users, levels of government, and academic specialties. The meeting focused on the significance of the EEZ proclamation, resources and uses of the EEZ, current and emerging problems in the management of ocean resources, present tensions between State and federal levels of government, and options for improved management.
3. **July to August 1985 — Formulation of a Set of EEZ Policy Options for the Coastal States**
Five sets of options were formulated: strengthening the fundamentals of the existing CZM system; strengthening the financial base of State coastal programs; improving the effectiveness of Federal-State working relations; changing the basic ground rules through legislative amendment; and developing an enhanced ocean education, awareness, and planning effort. These were compiled in a report prepared for a CSO meeting in Bar Harbor, Maine, in August 1985.
4. **September to December 1985 — Consideration of a Tentative CSO Plan of Action Based on the Policy Options Discussed at the Bar Harbor Meeting.**
The tentative plan included general recommendations in four areas: strengthening of the existing CZM program; developing an ocean awareness program; legislative action to better define the coastal State role in major EEZ development activities; and seeking support for a legislatively-created national ocean policy commission.
5. **March to August 1986 — Development of a Modified Approach: Emphasis to be on a Proclamation of States' Rights and Responsibilities in the EEZ and an Accompanying Policy Statement.**
Based on discussions at CSO meetings in Corpus Cristi, Texas (December 1985), Washington, D.C. (January 1986), and Seattle, Washington, (March 1986), a coastal State proclamation and a supporting policy statement were prepared as the more appropriate way of expressing the present policy positions of the coastal States with regard to the EEZ.
6. **September to December 1986 — Completion of a Final Report, Including Final Versions of the Proposed Coastal State Proclamation and the Accompanying EEZ Policy Statement.**
Preparation of the present report and submission to the annual meeting of the CSO membership in Florida in December 1986.
Much of the work of the study was accomplished in a series of meetings between the Consultant, the EEZ Steering Committee, and the Executive Committee of CSO. These meetings were held every two to three months during the course of 1985 and 1986.
The Consultant's final report was submitted to CSO in late October 1986. After consideration by the Steering and Executive Committees, the report was presented to the CSO Governing Board during its annual meeting in December.
7. **December 1986 — April 1987 — Adoption of Final Report.**
The Proclamation and Policy Statement, as revised, were adopted by the CSO Governing Board at the 16th Annual CSO meeting, with the understanding that the Executive Committee give final approval on the balance of the report at its March 1987 meeting. The CSO Executive Committee approved the full final report, giving direction for its publication by early April 1987.

APPENDIX B

CSO EEZ STEERING COMMITTEE

Arthur J. Rocque, Jr.
Chairman
Connecticut

Richard F. Delaney
Massachusetts

Robert Grogan
Alaska

John Hunter
California

Rod Mack
Washington

Jim Ross
Oregon

Murray Towill
Hawaii

EEZ Steering Committee Staff

R. Gary Magnuson
Director

David C. Slade
Counsel

Catherine B. Nash
Assistant to the Director