



**Leadership Council Meeting  
Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Partnership  
February 12, 2019**

Halifax County Visitors Center  
260 Premier Blvd, Roanoke Rapids, NC 27870

**Attending:** Kirk Havens (VIMS), Holly White (Town of Nags Head), Bill Crowell (APNEP), Wilson Laney (USFWS), Tony Able (EPA), Dean Carpenter (APNEP), Trish Murphey (APNEP), Stacey Feken (APNEP), Heather Jennings (APNEP), Kelsey Ellis (APNEP), Tim Ellis (APNEP), Carl Hershner (VIMS), Susan White (NC Sea Grant), Paul Cough (at large), Todd Miller (NC Coastal Federation)

**Action Items**

APNEP Staff:

- Drop “vested” from page 3 of bylaws and adopt bylaws
- Bill Crowell will be organizing meetings with Leadership Council members to discuss APNEP priorities, direction.
- Stacey Feken, Carl Hershner, Holly White, and Kirk Havens will discuss how to move NC/VA MOU forward.
- APNEP will draft response letter to EPA program evaluation, Leadership Council will discuss at May meeting.
- Bill Crowell will be talking with DNCR Deputy Secretary Reid Wilson about potential move to DNCR.
- Bill Crowell will send out survey to Leadership Council to prep for facilitated discussion about APNEP future directions.
- Leadership Council recommends staff focus on picking 1-2 outcomes to work on, deciding what APNEP should prioritize.
- APNEP staff should put together draft letter regarding rolling back of WOTUS rules, send to Leadership Council to finalize before April deadline.

Leadership Council:

- Any feedback on APNEP Engagement Strategy is welcomed.
- Carl Hershner will figure out how to talk to Steve Hummel’s supervisor about job responsibilities and ability to work on APNEP issues.
- Susan White will send Bill Crowell information about creating a Friends group.

**Call to Order / Welcome and Introductions / Agenda Review and Meeting Objectives**

Kirk Havens welcomes everyone, explains that at the end of this calendar year, Holly White will become Leadership Council Chair and the Council will be needing someone to step up to be Vice-Chair.

Wilson Laney states that he would like to add flow issues on the Roanoke River, the potential for APNEP to submit comments on WOTUS proposed regulations, and a discussion about the STAC's recent meeting about NC mariculture.

Council discussion adoption of previous meeting minutes and corrections to bylaws. Paul Cough presents change to bylaws for discussion – at-large members with “vested” interest on page 3. Committee decides to drop “vested” from bylaws text and adopt bylaws. All agree.

### **Chair's Comments**

Kirk Havens states that part of this meeting will be a discussion of APNEP's future direction and prioritization of activities.

### **Director's Briefing**

Bill Crowell welcomes Tony Able, states that he may be organizing one-on-one meetings with Leadership Council members over the coming months. Bill Crowell gives an update on APNEP activities, including:

- National NEP meeting next month
- Mike Piehler, longtime STAC member, is now Director of UNC-IE
- Conditions aren't favorable for APNEP moving to UNC or NC State, mostly because of issues related to indirect costs. Finding space is another issue.
- Majority of Action Teams are up and running, most have met in past calendar year. Staff also running Monitoring and Assessment Teams.
- Staff are trying to focus efforts to better implement the CCMP. Feedback from staff survey was that there are a lot of Teams, a lot of actions, and we need to find a better way to focus.
- APNEP's EPA program evaluation was last year, APNEP passed.
- APNEP is still working to further Virginia MOU, Kirk Havens will provide details. Have dropped efforts to work on Governor's Agreement for the time being due to the present political climate in Virginia.
- APNEP staff have developed an Engagement Strategy, it is available on our website. Feedback, comments, etc from Leadership Council are welcomed.
- Welcome to Heather Jennings, new staff member.
- APNEP helped with the North Landing Symposium in Virginia, NC DEQ Tidewater screening event.

- At spring Leadership Council meeting this year, Council approved APNEP working on Lake Phelps study. Now called Scuppernong Study and has been broadened a bit, APNEP is working on getting funding.
- Tim Ellis has been working on NC Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan. Coordinated effort between regulatory agencies working on aquatic invasives in NC. Want an approved plan because it will allow the state to apply for federal funds. Tim Ellis also working on VA ALOSA Task Force.
- Next SAV map will be out soon. Will be doing flights this summer. Looking into SAV Economic Valuation Study, potentially with NC Collaboratory. Might be quicker but may not be best route. Collaboratory may be able to provide more money, to be determined.

#### Engagement and Stewardship Action Team Recommendations

Kelsey Ellis presents Engagement and Stewardship Team recommendations for continued funding for the Teacher Institute and Shad in the Classroom programs. At April 2018 Leadership Council meeting, Council asked APNEP to create evaluation process/metrics for line item funded projects – particularly Teacher Institute.

At October 2018 Engagement Team meeting, project leaders for Shad in the Classroom and Teacher Institute presented about their initiatives and how they are being evaluated. Team discussed and provided anonymous recommendations for whether APNEP should continue to fund these initiatives through 2021. Afterwards, reevaluation based on clear and communicated metrics/evaluation process.

Kelsey Ellis presented selected data and results from both programs, discussed Team's recommendations. 100% recommendation for continued funding, with feedback for how both programs could be expanded/strengthened.

Based on this feedback, APNEP will put both programs into next workplan and Leadership Council will approve or not approve at the May meeting. APNEP staff have also been working to develop criteria that can be used to evaluate engagement projects, currently being used for ongoing requests less than \$2500. This will help making APNEP funding process more transparent and will be used as basis for how larger projects are evaluated as well. If Shad/Teacher Institute are approved for further funding, APNEP staff will work with Team to decide how best to evaluate project funding in 2021. If funding is not approved, TBD – depends on overall allocation of APNEP funds, needs in the region, etc.

Wilson Laney expresses that Shad in the Classroom faces spatial constraints because Shad must be released into the Neuse. American Eel have been suggested as another species that could be used. Expresses that he fully supports program continuing, offers to help talk about how to incorporate Team member suggestions for how program could be strengthened.

Susan White says that this is great progress in terms of showing accountability, asks if APNEP has thought about how all of this will funnel back to the next EPA program evaluation. Kelsey

Ellis responds that APNEP has not yet developed a systematized way to report this back to the EPA, it's a topic that's worth further thought and discussion.

Carl Hershner asks where APNEP is currently with developing guidance for these programs. Kelsey says that funding criteria has been finalized for ongoing requests less than \$2500. Bill Crowell says that CCMP outcomes have a gap in terms of measuring/tracking the human aspect of the system, that's something that needs to be addressed.

Susan White suggests looking at the Kenan Fellows Program as a potential partner or way to leverage funds for APNEP, they also provide professional development and funding opportunities for teachers.

Carl Hershner says that he is happy with what APNEP has done in response to the questions the Leadership Council asked at their last meeting. Suggests thinking about how these programs will be evaluated in the future and how the data gained from these programs can be used to provide larger information about the state of the system. Thinking about if there are measurable impacts beyond the population being directly trained, reached, etc. Agrees that it is good to have human dimensions outcomes.

Susan White responds that it is important, but not an easy ask. Thinking on decadal, intergenerational time scale. Idea of qualitative vs. quantitative study, looking at where past program participants are now. Carl Hershner says that an example is looking at if the lesson plans they're using are models that other teachers use.

Kelsey Ellis responds that APNEP staff will let program leaders know what the funding process will be, whether it is similar to now or through an open RFP.

Kirk Havens suggests looking at how well curriculum is being disseminated among population, would think that would make teachers an advocate. Bill Crowell adds that expenditure for both programs together is about \$50K, and they leverage a tremendous amount. Question of how to balance this with other potential things APNEP could be spending money on.

Todd Miller states that in the future, having a process that is known to all parties and where the money goes back into a pool for all applicants is important. It is normal for organizations being funded to have to make their case every year, this gives the funder the opportunity to say that they have a great track record and to look continually for other ways to support the program.

Carl Hershner states that he thinks where we're going to end up is that metrics will show that these programs are consistently effective within the small group that they work with, but will never have enough resources as is to have the needed level of impact. This tells you that these programs are very effective and need to grow. Task isn't for APNEP to fund these programs as long as possible, but to find other groups to step up and fund, help run, etc. Bill Crowell reminds the Council that APNEP is 23,000 square miles in 2 states, operating with 600K budget. Kirk Havens says that this goes back to what is APNEP the program responsible for versus the

larger partnership, in this case he would suggest APNEP find partners to help expand existing programs. Can discuss further later.

Kelsey Ellis thanks Council for their feedback, states that big issue is that APNEP can't take this all-in approach for everything in CCMP – don't have the staff time/resources to do so. Knowing where to focus energy would be helpful.

### **NC/VA MOU Update**

Kirk Havens states that Steve Hummel is APNEP's new VA Liaison, hopefully Leadership Council will be able to meet him at some point. Stacey Feken says that having a representative from the cultural resources side of the VA house talk to Steve Hummel's supervisor would be helpful in order to increase his ability to work on APNEP-related issues. Carl Hershner tells Stacey to let him know what she needs and he'll work to get approval for Steve to work on APNEP-related things.

Kirk Havens says that there has been a lot of work on the MOU, particularly on the NC side, including:

- Development of Wetland Criteria(?)
- Two Executive Orders dealing with climate change from NC and VA. Carl Hershner is involved in climate resilience on VA side, not sure how to tie in with NC but can be discussed. Holly White says that her and Stacey Feken have some ideas, there are some regional meetings where it would be helpful to have VA people involved. Would like VA folks to give managers a watered-down presentation. Kirk Havens and Stacey Feken will talk about opportunities for further collaboration.
- Kirk Havens says that NC/VA Governor's Agreement may not be out of reach, may need to refocus. Governor has emphasis on underserved communities, could leverage that in southern watersheds.

Stacey Feken states that in discussion with people on VA side, there is consensus that focusing on some kind of project is needed to move forward. Past year has been spent rebuilding relationships, finding something to work on together would be good. Could flesh out Governor's Agreement ideas more for example.

Kirk Havens says that he, Carl Hershner, Stacey Feken, and Holly White should talk more about how to move things forward. Carl Hershner will figure out how to talk to Steve Hummel's supervisor about job responsibilities.

### **EPA Program Evaluation Findings**

Kirk Havens says that major things called for in the recent program evaluation were a vision statement and a prioritization of activities. Bill Crowell states that feedback was positive overall. APNEP usually puts together a response letter within 6 months of receiving feedback to talk about what we're doing to address challenges.

Bill Crowell states that APNEP needs to develop a vision statement, will work with Leadership Council and partners to take mission statement and develop vision statement. They are also asking APNEP to prioritize resources given the large area covered. Doesn't see this as major challenge.

Bill Crowell says that financial management was another challenge – exploring additional opportunities for funding. EPA wants all NEPs to be self-sustaining as a long-term goal. Getting more money will be a challenge as long as APNEP is in DEQ, right now doesn't see a way to address this directly. Carl Hershner responds that a "Friends of APNEP" group has been a solution for other similar programs.

Bill Crowell says that developing a monitoring strategy has been another challenge. APNEP has been working on this, following creation of strategy APNEP will also develop a more robust plan. The monitoring strategy is not just what APNEP can monitor, it includes what partners are already monitoring.

Bill Crowell states that another challenge was better communicating accomplishments and results. APNEP needs to wave our own flag more. New website is part of that, it will be available in mid-March. Our workplan also isn't set up in a way that is easy for the EPA to understand, APNEP will be taking workplan and tagging projects to go in EPA-approved categories.

Bill Crowell states that we want new CCMP to be finished before 2022. It will not be a 4-year process like the last CCMP. Idea is to go back through current CCMP and evaluate how things have changed, what we've made headway on. Things that have been accomplished and no longer need to be done.

Tony Able says that this EPA administration is pushing lean management, setting targets and tracking. May be helpful to set measurable targets that are related to timelines. Showing targets, steps, and timelines are important.

Carl Hershner asks what are APNEP's next steps going forward. Bill Crowell says that APNEP will draft a response letter, will be done by June. Bill Crowell will draft a letter and the Council will discuss at the next meeting in May.

### **Future Directions Discussion**

Kirk Havens says that he wants the group to discuss how APNEP can prioritize its activities, and what the organization should look like in the future.

Bill Crowell says that the program's location has been an issue. Have tried to separate from DEQ but hasn't solved perceptions. DEQ and DNCR secretaries are supportive of APNEP moving to DNCR, which is non-regulatory and would give APNEP greater ability to acquire funds and have

a “Friends of APNEP” group. His recommendation is to pursue moving to DNCR. Susan White will send Bill Crowell information about creating a Friends group. Can also sign onto someone else’s 501c3 as a small piece as another solution.

Bill Crowell will be talking with DNCR Deputy Secretary Reid Wilson about the move, has already talked with John Nicholson.

Bill Crowell states that he would like the Council to discuss what kind of organization APNEP is, knowing that there are many different potential answers. What kind of program could APNEP be? Feedback from staff and partners is that APNEP is science-based, trusted partner, and neutral.

Kirk Havens states that he thinks of APNEP as a trusted science-based watershed stakeholder facilitator, because budget is so limited. Carl Hershner agrees, says that he always felt APNEP was like a good hearted NGO, doing what was possible and trying to make a difference. Everyone believes in the goals, way to get there is to facilitate/connect people, focus on the partnership. Todd Miller adds that leveraging other resources and being strategic is important.

Bill Crowell adds that if APNEP is a watershed organization, we have to take into account the huge area that needs to be covered. Susan White says that one positioning opportunity might be thinking about the rural-urban connection. Decision makers are in urban areas, where is the power? COGs in these more rural areas? Would argue that there are spaces you should cover and spaces you shouldn’t cover.

Bill Crowell asks if the program area should be split – could become the Albemarle and Pamlico program. Could become an EPA program and remove from state control. Or APNEP could focus programmatically.

Todd Miller says that given the resources and size, and that it is an estuary partnership, that APNEP should focus on the estuary. Some issues are more holistic and others are more local. If APNEP focused more on the estuary, that would narrow the scope of issues tackled. Holly White adds that it’s important to realize impact of urban-rural impact mentioned. Carl Hershner says that the concept of working from the watershed is appealing from a science and ecosystem basis. If you want to manage the ecosystem, need to do that. May not be able to do everything, have to set priorities.

Wilson Laney says APNEP is one of the few entities that has actually come up with a plan for implementing EBM and is working hard to try and do that. Support that even though it is hugely challenging. Coming from a watershed approach, agree. Also helps with restoration of species with unique life cycles. Advantage to looking at things from a large landscape scale.

Kirk Havens states that the Leadership Council will continue this discussion at a future meeting.

The Leadership Council discusses potential downsides of move to DNCR. Todd Miller states that the move wouldn't solve issue of an administration that isn't supportive of APNEP. Fundraising is a huge amount of work. Without staff to focus on that, won't be extremely successful with it. Bill Crowell states that if we move toward a model where we're trying to generate funds, we're going to have to allocate resources to that. Holly White asks that, knowing that you have to do a vision discussion, could you use some of the discussion to work towards priorities? Bill Crowell says that is possible, and he thinks that someone else (external) will likely facilitate that discussion.

### **CCMP Actions and Outcomes Discussion**

Bill Crowell introduces the topic – there is a gap in the CCMP. APNEP has been focusing too much on actions, not enough on outcomes. There is a gap in human-focused outcomes and we think we need to incorporate some kind of human dimensions outcomes into CCMP implementation efforts. Bill Crowell shows the Leadership Council the outcomes spreadsheet developed by staff.

Carl Hershner says that it makes sense to focus on goals/outcomes instead of actions. Why are we doing this and is it moving it towards us the ultimate outcome we want to have? Should guide monitoring/assessment. With that in mind, look at outcomes and recognize that some aren't going to happen in the next decade. How do you go about figuring out which ones to focus on? Trying to link actions with direct impact on outcomes is one way to look at it, another way is to take a step back and look at outcomes and say which seems the most tractable at this time? Then you would be able to demonstrate some effectiveness, demonstrate what program resources need to be doing. Necessary to pick a few things to make some progress, question is how to get there.

Carl Hershner says that our recommendation to Bill was that he ask APNEP staff what to focus on. Know the partners, know what is feasible in the region. Then Leadership Council could start by giving some advice about what makes sense. Think about goals and then what is keeping you from reaching those goals. To reinvigorate that logic, thought it would be best to focus on list of outcomes and think about where you can make the most progress. Tony Able adds that then reputation would be getting successes on the ground. Would show that the program can deliver.

Dean Carpenter says that APNEP went through the exercise and got the factors, translated that exercise (logic model) and said that if we want the biggest bang for our buck, these are the factors that are most important. Then we created 13-14 of these Teams, each takes a handful of actions to try to implement. When we create the Teams, we try to think about the partners that are most interested. If we got each of these Teams in a room, got them together for a day, where should we focus our resources to address that factor. Out of that, we would have 12 plans that we could bring forward.



Carl Hershner replies that the problem remains that each action team looks at multiple outcomes. Understanding what you're trying to measure as progress, other than just saying that we're doing what we said we were going to do, there's not a lot of connection. Goal is to get to outcomes. Focus on particular outcome will allow you to build logic and ensure efficiency of the operation.

Dean Carpenter says that each outcome depends on a lot of different activities. Water quality for example, need to go after a lot of different factors to address it. Hard to say how individual factors are improving the water.

Carl Hershner says that in order for APNEP to demonstrate effectiveness, in order for Leadership Council to be able to pass judgement on success, every action should be able to be judged based on how much it goes towards achieving that outcome. If there are multiple outcomes, how to make that connection? When progress is spread across all these different outcomes, it's difficult to prioritize and make progress. Not that they aren't important, but need to have clear, communicable focus.

Dean Carpenter says that the Action Team charge is a conceptual/qualitative model of how what they are doing impacts the outcomes. STAC members are on Team to help develop those models.

Carl Hershner responds that the recommendation was that you can't do all the outcomes, so need to focus on one in particular. Dean Carpenter responds that if we're just facilitating discussion among our partners, we aren't the experts. We are bringing knowledgeable folks into the room. You are saying pick one outcome, that's fine to focus on one but if there are different partners working on different things than I don't know why they can't work on different pieces.

Carl Hershner responds that it's a matter of simplifying to demonstrate success. Dean Carpenter asks, won't that take a long time? Carl Hershner says yes, but point is to clearly articulate and demonstrate what APNEP is doing so you can focus and show success and then move on to other things. Don't want to keep coming to meetings without anything to show for it.

Dean Carpenter says that he wants to give each group one shot which should be the piece to tackle. Carl Hershner says that he thinks it should be this group (APNEP staff)

Tony Able asks if a criteria used in this spreadsheet was which Team could get things done?

Bill Crowell says that no, they haven't done that yet. Looking at Contaminant Management Action Team. Looking at Actions assigned to that Team. First two actions have no direct link, last two have direct link. Have come to realization in the last year, thinking about rewriting CCMP, regardless of host there has to be partners that can implement the actions we want. Whether its monitoring, etc., has to be a partner that can implement that action. We can't rely

on partners to fill gaps, they don't have budget or authority. Need to think about which actions are implementable, who will implement it, is it us? In addition, if we step away from ecosystem outcomes, there are assessment, planning, monitoring needs that aren't represented there and that needs to be done too.

Carl Hershner says that we don't disagree, just a matter of prioritizing. Pick one outcome, pick two outcomes. Bill Crowell says that he's thinking that instead of picking one outcome, we pick certain actions within each Team. Carl Hershner responds we've recommended is that you pick one or two outcomes that you feel like you can make some progress on. Focus on building strategy, monitoring plan, and adaptive management process within those. Bill Crowell says that we can have outputs for each, outcomes are less attainable. Tony Able adds that some of it depends on scale. Start small, will spread out to others.

Bill Crowell asks, do you all care about the outcome, is moving the puck towards the outcome more important than reaching the outcome itself? Carl Hershner responds that the outcome is why you're there, making progress is what's important. Need everyone working towards one single goal to do that.

Paul Cough says that you need to focus, choose one outcome, then pick the actions that can best help you reach that outcome. Would hope that we would use strategic decision-making framework a little more clearly at upcoming meetings. Need to create Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 actions and push some back. Todd Miller says that it would be good to think about what's worked in the past. Need a nucleus of people that are willing to dedicate time and resources. Can't stretch resources too far.

Bill Crowell says that he mentioned earlier that he surveyed staff, he would like to send out a survey to Council to fill out as well. Strategic planning in the future, facilitated discussion. Bill Crowell will interview Council members, discuss things talked about in the survey. Staff are going to still go through and start focusing, going to find ways to move forward.

Kirk Havens says that action items for staff are focusing on the outcomes as we discussed here, Leadership Council does survey and then we combine that into something more focused. Susan White says that this is a very difficult conversation, figuring out what to do first versus second or third. There are things that are going to have to go, and helps you communicate your story. Everybody wants to be everything for everyone, but you can't. Good job moving forward on that.

Kirk Havens says that he wants to reiterate Carl Hershner's point about staff needing to think about what they want.

Dean Carpenter brings up the example of the Contaminant Team, Nutrient Criteria Development Plan, now having to reboot entire Team and are asking those folks how we can make advances on those questions. Carl Hershner says that his response would be, instead of focusing on action teams, if you focused on outcome, then everyone is focused on that. You

end up with lots of different kinds of people, doing things to get you to that ultimate goal. As opposed to each group doing things separately. Want to show real, demonstrable, obvious progress.

Wilson Laney states that another challenge is, with respect to outcomes and measuring outcomes, those factors that influence the outcome that are totally beyond your control, and how you factor those into the equation. Carl Hershner says that's when benefit/return on your effort becomes a critical part of the equation. If you only have control over 30% of that, then you need to pick another goal.

### **NC/VA Climate Change Executive Orders**

Stacey Feken provides brief overview of both executive orders. NC's is more focused on climate/mitigation, VA is talking about SLR/resilience. NC EO establishes goals/directives, meetings. Very tight deadlines for this, what NC is proposing to do in 1-2 years is what other states have taken 3-4 years to do. Each cabinet agency directed to evaluate climate change impacts on operations and integrate mitigation/adaptation strategies. Support communities and sectors vulnerable to climate change impacts – more relevant to APNEP. Opportunity for public and stakeholder input is key. Going to republish/update APNEP climate change webpages.

DEQ relying on partners for resilience/adaptation initiatives. Climate Risk Assessment and Resiliency Plan development – opportunity for APNEP to get involved? DEQ Natural and Working Lands Stakeholder Group – only group that has not met yet. Idea of coastal resiliency workshops and summit to share info. Opportunity for public to have input. External working groups – ultimately 6 working groups, opportunities for stakeholders to get involved. A lot of potential to synergize with APNEP CCMP actions, support what those groups are doing. Also, opportunities to work with STAC.

CCMP has 3 actions that directly address climate change and SLR. APNEP has done things in the past related to climate change. Most recently ~2013. Staff are waiting to see where we are focusing but have been having conversations. Where can APNEP fill gaps and be of assistance?

Todd Miller says that the AP region is really ground zero in country for being impacted by SLR. Issues are very different from VA Beach area. Would be hard to find an area that is more vulnerable to SLR – lots of potential there, getting funding. Next 30 years, things are going to change dramatically.

### **Other business/issues –**

Kirk Havens updates the Council - the US Supreme Court now hearing uranium mining case. VA banned uranium mining in Roanoke River, did they have authority to do that?

Wilson Laney says that 3 years ago after 216b process, court decided process wasn't needed and implemented flow regime on the Roanoke. Agreed to implement what had been proposed in the beginning for Kerr Reservoir. Implementation of regime has resulted in more extreme and prolonged flooding. Ongoing discussion, wanted to bring it to attention of Council. APNEP could do letter of support.

Wilson Laney brings up proposed WOTUS rule, would greatly impact isolated and headwater wetland regulations. Possibility of if Leadership Council thought it was a good idea, staff could put together comments and send those in. Deadline sometime in April. Possible discussion. Bill Crowell says that if Council requests that a letter is sent, we'll send a letter. Todd Miller says that it would be helpful to provide draft. Bill Crowell says that if Council by consensus or other means directs staff to draft a letter, would draft a letter. Tony Able asks what would the statement be? Analysis of acres of wetlands, linear feet of stream this would impact in APNEP region? Wilson Laney says that he's not sure, the American Fisheries Society did extensive analysis. We could use that as basis for comments to be sent in. Or if something better exists, that could be used as well. Tim Ellis says that the supplement for the nationwide assessment could include data sources for NC. Bill Crowell says that comments should be focused on impacts to estuarine system and function. Paul Cough suggests that something more qualitative could work well? Todd Miller states that you could compare what effect would be to what was in place in 1970's, large scale land clearing. Tony Able says that you can't do exhaustive quantitative analysis during comment period, but could do qualitative analysis. Nutrient levels up, sedimentation up. Kirk Havens agrees, likes the qualitative idea. Almost, we concur with the governor. Kirk Havens says as a caution, if we do move forward I would recommend that federal partners abstain. Kirk Havens asks if it is the consensus of group to put forward qualitative statement on rolling back of WOTUS rules? All agree, Todd Miller says it's not just about what's being affected but also affects restoration.

Wilson Laney asks for an update on STAC Action. What's going on? Bill Crowell says that STAC leadership is contacting Wilson Laney to draft mariculture questions and get back to Council at next meeting. State is planning on moving forward on mariculture legislation, using report delivered this year as basis for some of those actions. Will be opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in review of that.