

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Leadership Council Meeting
Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Partnership
10:00am – 3:00pm
April 30, 2018

Wildlife Resources Commission
NC State Centennial Campus
1751 Varsity Dr., Raleigh NC 27606

In attendance: Kirk Havens (VIMS/STAC representative), Bill Crowell (APNEP), Susan White (NC Sea Grant), Paul Cough (EPA – retired), Todd Miller (NC Coastal Federation), Mac Gibbs (Cooperative Extension – retired), Stacey Feken (APNEP), Kelsey Ellis (APNEP), Jimmy Johnson (APNEP), Trish Murphy (APNEP), Tim Ellis (APNEP), Dean Carpenter (APNEP), Rachel Hart (EPA Region 4), John Nicholson (NC DEQ), Carl Hershner (VIMS), Wilson Laney (USFWS/STAC representative), Chris Thomas (EPA Region 4), Reid Wilson (NC DNCR)

Attending remotely: Holly White (Town of Nags Head)

Action Items

LC Members:

- All LC members: email comments about bylaws to Bill Crowell
- All LC members: send Bill Crowell any ideas for tangible, accomplishable, low-cost actions that could be the topic of a Governor’s Agreement
- Holly White: gather list of planners/managers through NC Planners Association for dissemination of first economic evaluation
- Wilson Laney: take question of STAC paper about mariculture impacts on AP system to STAC at next meeting. STAC will develop questions the paper would answer and then talk to stakeholders to see if it is something they would incorporate into their policies.

APNEP Staff:

- Incorporate Susan White’s editorial comments on LC bylaws and post updated draft to website
- Schedule next LC meeting, likely circa October
- Create evaluation process/metrics for projects (particularly Teacher Institute). Potentially through applying for outside funding. Report back to LC at next meeting
- Find opportunities to get funding outside the NEP to develop/implement model evaluation so LC can see evidence - this is the benefit, change over time, etc. Assessment could then become a model out of this program for other programs. Write a proposal to obtain these funds.
 - **This is something the LC wants reported on at next meeting. BC states that this will be through the Engagement and Stewardship Team/Human Dimensions Team.
- Internal staff discussion about Carl Hershner/John Nicholson suggestion to incorporate AP region criteria in DWI projects, then talk to Kim Colson.
- Next stage economic study/evaluation.
 - See if NEP headquarters has any resources APNEP can use
 - Make target group of planners/managers aware of first study. Work with Holly White - she will gather list of people together through NC Planners Association.
 - Chat with Jane Harrison at NCSG
- Be ready to discuss progress on developing evaluation methods at next LC meeting - LC doesn’t want APNEP to wait until that meeting to start developing
- Carl Hershner can provide lessons learned, ways to organize/prioritize/increase efficiency of efforts related to Team organization/implementation
- Follow up about opportunities for APNEP to be a part of the Governor’s Hometown Strong Initiative
- Move forward with Lake Phelps project

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

- Pursue elevating MOU to Governor’s Agreement - focusing on 1-4 (more towards 1) task that states can focus on so that local governments can see benefits and we can carry this on past this administration

Summary of Leadership Council Suggestions/Directions:

- Workplan
 - Want to be able to keep track of progress and see that projects are moving forward.
 - Develop/report metrics for Teacher Institute to evaluate program effectiveness. See if it’s worth continuing to fund.
 - Work on developing an implementable, useful evaluation process for projects that is aimed at helping the Leadership Council better understand what APNEP is doing.
 - Each Action Team will come up with measures for their CCMP Actions and find a way to report back to LC
 - Finding opportunities for outside funding in general - tied up in issue of host entity.
 - Next stage economic evaluation - look at elements/sectors where there is greatest opportunity for growth regionally to help focus CCMP.
 - Work with local governments to ask them what is needed to include in this stage 2 study
 - Create template for local governments that they can adopt with slight changes. Water quality and education goals that are actionable by state governments
 - Think about county scale vs watershed/sound scale
 - Will ultimately be RFP
- Project Applications
 - Always ask what you expect the outcome to be
 - Revisit project application/SOW(?) - Carl Hershner and Kirk Havens can take a look
 - Can provide Chesapeake Bay program logic framework - apply to these projects
 - Susan White - look at implementation action teams, all the different workgroups you have going on, the time your time invests in those resources, is a needed piece
- Action Teams/MATs
 - If Action Teams decide to do an action, need to think about what they anticipate the result to be/what is the trend of the action
 - If Team is shooting for a particular outcome, what are the factors affecting their ability to do so? How do climate change scenarios affect outcome? If there are factors to mitigate, want to move forward with that too.
 - Concern about lack of timelines for assessment/inventory phase - you can assess gaps forever
 - Climate change/SLR should be incorporated into project assessment

10:00 Call to Order, Welcome & Introductions, Agenda Review – Dr. Bill Crowell, Director

Introductions. Tom Allen not in attendance; Kirk Havens will vote for him by proxy if need be.

Bill Crowell – Anyone have objections to agenda? No objections. Bill Crowell thanks everyone for being here.

10:15 Review of Executive Order #26

Bill Crowell – New Executive Order was signed in November. Limited terms for some Leadership Council (LC) members was determined by random number generator. Can elect to re-up when your term is up.

Bill Crowell – Big changes to new Executive Order (EO) – Policy Board to Leadership Council, adding official LC position for Sea Grant, adding NC DNCR to LC, adding one more at-large position. Any questions? No questions.

Bill Crowell – To remind everyone, previous EO had lapsed, current governor’s administration and NC DEQ was very supportive of us moving forward with this.

10:20 Review and Adoption of Bylaws (*Action Item*)

Bill Crowell – Next item is bylaws. There are some typos, NC DENR wasn’t changed to DEQ. Questions?

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Susan White – You have an APNEP management conference? Bill Crowell – Should have been implementation advisory committee. Kirk Havens – Susan White has gone through and made a number of editorial comments in association with the bylaws. **Nothing major but would suggest you go through and incorporate those, then we vote on that at next meeting.**

Todd Miller – “Vested interest” is the right word for qualified members? Bill Crowell – Can strike it if you want, used to be just interest. Kirk Havens – Tend to agree with that, could get into conflict of interest issues – change to just “interest.” Bill Crowell – We will change that – “reside or have interest in the...” on page 3.

Bill Crowell – Any other comments or suggestions? **As we’re not going to adopt them at this meeting, we’ll try to do that at the next meeting. If you have any other comments, feel free to email them in.** As long as we have them before the next meeting.

Paul Cough – How often are the bylaws updated? Bill Crowell – As often as we need to. Paul Cough – So if the Leadership Council discusses it and decides they need to be updated...? Bill Crowell – Yes, last updated 2 years ago, they’re changed when issues come up. Board members can contact the chair if they would like to have that discussion.

10:45 Election of Chair and Vice Chair (*Action Item*)

Bill Crowell – Nomination for Chair, Kirk Havens, nomination for Vice Chair, Holly White. Happy to accept other nominations. No other nominations. All in favor of Kirk as Chair? He’s agreed for one more year which was second half of his original Policy Board term. Any objections or abstentions? None. For Vice Chair, it’s Holly White – all in favor? Ayes. No objections.

Kirk Havens – Working with this group has been very rewarding, will find as we move forward with this that it’s a really good group to work with. Enjoyed it, can really see progress moving forward.

11:00 Director’s Report

Bill Crowell – Been a busy year since last meeting, February 2017. Since then program was awarded EPA grant divided into two parts, got the first part early in the year and the second later. EPA released news releases for partial grants, had partners calling us and thinking that it was a new grant. Nice to see that people were paying attention, helped us build relations and reach out to people we haven’t talked to in a while.

Bill Crowell – Hired Dr. Tim Ellis in March 2017. Had another season of Shad in the Classroom. Hired Kelsey Ellis in May, at May meeting had full staff for the first time in years. Meant we started getting Monitoring and Assessment Teams (MATs) and Action Teams (ATs) up and running. Some moving slower than others but are making headway.

Bill Crowell – Summer 2017 Teacher Institute was held, 20 teachers from around the state. Worked with ECU to test SAV monitoring protocol. Developed with the help of MATs a draft set of indicators which was reviewed by STAC in February 2018. Discussions of removing fish ladder and dam on the Tar River.

Bill Crowell – Held Symposium in November 2017. About 200 attendees, number of you attended that and thanks for coming. At symposium signed MOU with NC DEQ and NC DNCR and Secretary of Natural Resources in VA. Submitted our initial package for EPA program review. Will be conducting a site visit May 15-17. They would like to meet with a number of you to talk about the program. Got a new liaison in headquarters, Vince Bachalan also new liaison in EPA Region 4 and Region 4. Every other week at staff meetings, EPA calls in. Has been beneficial to have open communication about the region. Added Region 3 in part because the MOU was signed. New person, Megan Mackey, has been very engaged.

Bill Crowell – Got a new staff member in late 2017, thanks to DEQ, will be providing in kind match to the program. Located in Beaufort NERR offices. Creates ties to the NERR which we want and will be sharing our boat with them for their work, make sure it gets some use. She’ll be helping Jimmy with the CHPP and implementation teams as well.

Bill Crowell – We moved back to Green Square in March 2018, on 3rd floor. Bill Crowell now reports to John Nicholson. Open lines of communication between APNEP and Secretary’s Office. Was initially worried when APNEP moved to DWR, but they were very supportive. Unfortunately, Dr. Coley Cordeiro has left APNEP, stayed at DWR. Her position was posted and closed last week, have a number of applications to review. VA liaison position has been posted and hope to have someone in that soon too. Position was unfilled for a while. Susan White – Will be with VA DEQ? Bill Crowell – Yes, located in VA Beach Office. Roger Everton is in charge of

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

that position, also expressed interest in finding a few other people in the basin who can tie into the program as well. Think our relationship to VA is improving, thanks in part to MOU.

Bill Crowell – We just helped put together a Symposium with the Town of VA Beach. Stacey Feken spent a lot of time on that, recruited speakers. Secretary of DEQ, VA's First Lady spoke at lunch. Also had an opportunity to talk to VA's Deputy Secretary Ann Jennings about ways NC and VA can work together.

Bill Crowell – EPA Program Evaluation visit is May 15-17, staff will be out of the office that week. We have a facilitator workshop with NOAA scheduled for next week, hopefully will help partners and APNEP staff with meeting management skills. Have invited folks from various action teams to participate in that workshop. No cost to APNEP except for travel costs associated with meeting.

Bill Crowell – National scale, we were cut from the President's budget twice now, Congress has been supportive. Current budget is up now, ANEP is working to advocate for us. Continuing resolution had us at current funding level. Looking forward, would like to get together this fall for a strategic planning meeting. Afternoon, overnight, next morning. Audubon has offered Pine Island facility. Want to talk about future of program, program direction, CCMP update, etc. Want to get input from you all. May bring in a facilitator to help move things along. **Will try to get that scheduled ASAP, likely in October – early November time frame.** Any questions? No questions.

Wilson Laney – Those of you who have not made it out to a shad fry release, I encourage you to do so. Program was initiated by USFWS and handed off to APNEP/Museum of Natural Sciences. Kids get really excited about it – not just about the shad, a lot of these kids don't even know what a watershed is, helps them to learn that.

Bill Crowell – One more thing – in our budget last year, were planning on SAV flights, committee that works on that has decided to postpone those flights, funds will carry over.

11:15 Chair's Comments – Chair

Kirk Havens – Thanks for your confidence and support for one more year. I want us to think about how this group would be best empowered to evaluate the progress made by the workplan and CCMP. How can we evaluate the progress so at end of the year, we can get together and have comments/suggestions - so we're not just stakeholders listening, we're actively managing.

Susan White – Is it May 15-17 is program evaluation site visit? Is there a role for this group? Bill Crowell – Yes, not for the Leadership Council as a whole but individuals will be asked to meet with the team. Will be back on Thursday.

Paul Cough – Is there a relationship between EPA program evaluation and progress/evaluation from Leadership Council? Kirk Havens – My view is more how to we look at things to better manage? PE is more 10,000 foot level. Bill Crowell – More administrative. **Kirk Havens – As we go through the workplan, how do we keep track of progress and move projects forward? At end of year, want to be able to see the progress rather than just having this group listening.**

11:30 Review of Draft 2018-19 Workplan and Budget – Dr. Bill Crowell, Director Discussion of Draft Workplan and Budget (*Action Item*) – Dr. Kirk Havens

Bill Crowell – Workplan was sent out, used to go through items line by line. Previous board decided that wasn't best use of time. Focus on sections, primarily in proposed activities and in budget. Other part is, are there questions related to ongoing projects?

Bill Crowell – Document tells EPA what we plan on using funds for. Start with reviewing any of the items you would like to discuss in project updates? Pages 8-32. Or we can go into proposed projects.

Carl Hershner – Question that focuses on Kirk's suggestion to make it easier to tell what is happening with the program. **Teacher Institute comes up every year and we hear about the successes. Interested in the metric for the effectiveness for that program? Is it teachers reached? Etc.? Want to find a way to evaluate it, see if it's worth continuing to fund amid the large and growing list of projects that APNEP could fund.**

Kirk Havens – Teacher Institute as example, if we can come up with that evaluation metric and we see it's a big success, would maybe want to think about expanding it. For all of these, if it's something that's working we'd want to think about further funding.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Mac Gibbs – We had to do that with all our extension programs. Want to think about knowledge gained – evaluation at the end of each session. True impacts, becomes going down the road and asking how you implemented the knowledge you gained. Takes a lot of work, that's what we struggled with. Knowledge gained is easy to measure, looking at behavior change is much harder. Want to know, how are these teachers using the knowledge they've gained? Becomes difficult, need a person to go do that.

Wilson Laney – Had this conversation in the vehicle with Stacey Feken last week. How do we evaluate if we're having a beneficial impact? Thought it would be really neat if we could follow a cohort through time – 2 years after, 5 years after, etc. Asking them what they learned from the program and if it made a difference in their life?

Todd Miller – Over the years, seems like the amount of discretionary money to fund programs is going down. Bill Crowell – Will come back to that, to answer Carl Hershner's question. Want to track all our projects, anything we fund has to fit our CCMP. Projects need to fit CCMP implementation. Teacher Institute and Shad in the Classroom are line items, have been working with the Teacher Institute to survey teachers to find out how they've used what they learned at the Institute. The real impact in any education effort, does the person down the road exhibit a behavior change. Much more difficult to answer. We haven't really talked about students, can be a tricky issue, not opposed to those kinds of projects. If we plant 3000 trees, easy to say that we've planted trees. These educational projects can be more difficult to measure.

Carl Hershner – Can't come up with protocols right now, you are not anxious to carve out a large block of staff time to do this kind of thing. **Is there a way to move in the direction of an implementable, useful, evaluation process that is aimed at helping Leadership Council to better understand what is going on?** Bill Crowell – **Yes, Action Teams are in charge of certain CCMP Actions and each team will come up with measures and find a way to report back to the Leadership Council.** Chris Thomas – Why don't you find a way to incorporate feedback loop into teacher training? If teachers are teaching what they've been taught?

Stacey Feken – As contracts have been renewed, conversation that Coley was having. For both Shad in the Classroom and Teacher Institute, something that has been incorporated. Communication is typically directly with the teachers. Shad in the Classroom also does follow up surveys. Can get copies of surveys and give them to you if that is helpful, question is, is this helpful for Leadership Council? Carl Hershner – Probably not. To the extent that what you're doing in these programs is similar to what programs across the country are doing, **there's bound to be an opportunity to get funding outside the NEP to develop and implement this kind of model evaluation, so this group can see evidence – this is the benefit, change over time, etc. Assessment could then become a model out of this program for other programs. Seems like we ought to be able to write a proposal.**

Paul Cough – There are many NEPs across the country that have had to tackle similar issues. Chesapeake Bay example. In NC, every sector has to have metrics. Thinking about which other metric system APNEP could nest in to some degree.

Dean Carpenter – It seems to me Carl there are two levels of justification. Justification that you are making a difference and evaluating how you can make a bigger difference. Organic process through Engagement and Stewardship Action Team, what is biggest impact for students in the region, would come up with a different question.

Carl Hershner – How can you use APNEP's limited resources to produce the biggest movement towards your ultimate goals? Had discussion a few years ago, ended up saying it was difficult and twiddling our thumbs and not doing anything. Jimmy Johnson – Was about the CHPP.

Carl Hershner – Can we make this a work task to see at next meeting if we've made a difference? Bill Crowell – **Yes, through Engagement and Stewardship Team and Human Dimensions Team.** Stacey Feken – Yes, have had those opening discussions among team. Something we've talked about as a team, something to work on collaboratively, developing evaluation criteria for projects. Having team come up with criteria and input about what metrics can be. Looking at bigger picture, benefit to program as a whole. We will add that to agenda moving forward.

Bill Crowell – One comment about teachers being easy to follow, ones that participate in Teacher Institute often don't stay in the same school. Very ambitious, then we find out they're not at the school and they've moved somewhere else.

Todd Miller – My impression is that amount of discretionary funding is less and less, having these recurring costs limits ability for Action Teams to respond to emerging issues. **Need to have this conversation about these programs so we can evaluate whether this is the best way to spend money. Gives less ability to respond to emerging issues, GenX example.**

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Bill Crowell – Takes us to budget page. Over time, administrative costs of program has gone up. Goal is for administrative costs of program to be less than half of total costs. Means that we have greater ability to go look for outside funds though, we all have to earn our keep at little bit. Organization needs to be looking for funds outside of 320 funds. We are approximately 4 years behind in implementing CCMP. Difficulties at one point, I was half time and Dean was the only full time APNEP employee. Policy Board was supportive of us not adding any new Action Teams, etc, until we got new staff. Took a while to get positions filled, but this past spring we were able to fill those positions. This year we were supposed to be formally reevaluating CCMP progress, we're about 4 years behind that. Need to get teams up and running, some are going a little slower than I would wish, need staff to do that. Indirect costs have varied a lot over time, varies year to year.

Chris Thomas – Leveraging becomes how you get to scale. 600K is what gets you going. There was discussion about the difficulty of partnering and leveraging because state is host entity, I don't know where the right place to have that discussion is. Public private partnerships, etc, there are a lot of companies out there to whom that is not a lot of money. The leverage piece really becomes how you get to scale. Bill Crowell – I think we're doing a decent job leveraging monetarily. We're looking at changing our host, they're being really nice to us, the university system discussions haven't gone quite the way we would like. NC State College of Natural Resources is supportive of us coming there but finding a place for us and dealing with indirect costs is a huge issue. Might be able to join nonregulatory state agency – DNCR for example. Having that ability to bring in those other monies...have had private partners in the past, but being in a regulatory agency, we don't want to put our host agency in the position of taking funds from regulated bodies.

John Nicholson – Lot of my questions come out of ignorance of the program. On this piece, are you working with DEQ Environmental Education folks to make sure we're complementing each other? Bill Crowell – Yes, we're working with Lisa Tolley and that group. John Nicholson – Wanted to talk about our partnership with Reid and what we can do with that, will leave that until he gets here.

Susan White – Quick comment, our partners specifically related to teacher training is UNC-IE. With new director, there could be some nice changes that could benefit APNEP. Bill Crowell – Mike Piehler is a STAC member and now will be head of UNC-IE. Bill Crowell – These are important discussions, we're not in a rush.

Bill Crowell – For every dollar that came into APNEP, \$23 was generated in in-kind support, direct match, etc. Am always worried with leveraged numbers or habitat numbers that it will be reported that APNEP specifically did something and create misunderstandings. We don't want to undercut our partners; our partners are what make things happen. Don't require match.

Kirk Havens – To follow up on original discussion, you said we can plant 3000 trees and know we've done that. What I want us to think is, we're planting those trees for some reason – did those trees improve water quality? That's the way we need to be thinking moving forward.

Bill Crowell – Hans Paerl put out a study this year, looking at changes to sounds following hurricanes. 35 events over past few decades. Some storms dramatically alter nutrient input, creates question of how do we measure change? SAV example, changing dramatically from year to year from outside sources. Staff are committed to figuring out what good indicators are.

John Nicholson – What are you all doing with Kim Colson's group in Division of Water Infrastructure? How do you compete or stack up? Bill Crowell – We are not in that, DWI is our match for our grant. Part of that is provided by in kind through staff and part of that is funding for these projects. Used to be clean water management trust fund. Now Division of Water Infrastructure. When communities in our area are awarded funds by DWI for wastewater treatment, etc, that is used as match. John Nicholson – When you see projects in your area of responsibility, how can we tie that in with Kim and his crew, help them to score better? Is it an additional scoring item that we could ask them to look at? Bill Crowell – CWMTF from inception to 2004 had a criterion if they were in APNEP region they got an extra point. Estuary of National Significance. Now criteria are more equitable across the state. Fully supportive of APNEP regions getting a leg up, question of is that disadvantaging other parts of the state?

Carl Hershner – That's a great idea, the CCMP has all these different sorts of actions that can be taken to advance towards selected goals. Would there be an opportunity to prioritize projects that are more advantageous to moving APNEP forward? Helping to tie your objectives to what they're doing. John Nicholson – Worth having internal sidebar with your team and then pulling Kim in.

Bill Crowell – We had talked years ago about using Water Resource Development Grants, mechanism wasn't there, now that Coley is there that might be better.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Paul Cough – Looking at economic dimension of this, EBM idea – is there a place to see the economic dimension more clearly? These are the projects, this is the effect on jobs? Bill Crowell – I suppose, we're doing a lot of smaller projects right now, thinking about how we would approach things. Thinking about how that contributes to new jobs...not opposed to it but not really sure how to do that.

Carl Hershner – You have basis from RTI study. Looking at value of APNEP region, provides for you at least a framework for looking at sustainability, etc. Bill Crowell – On that scale yes, but not on a project scale. Staff and I have been talking about doing a stage 2 of that study, you may be hearing more about that in the coming months. Teams are supposed to generate project ideas, will go to implementation team, they will make decisions about projects over \$5000. Right now, Leadership Council and STAC reps are playing this role, will be implementation advisory committee when it is active.

Dean Carpenter – Notion for this study, we suggested there is definitely more investment needed in our area. Much more than 600K needed to adequately manage the region. Talked to other NEPs about merits of this kind of economic study, showing the benefits of what this ecosystem is providing. **Carl Hershner – To Paul Cough's comment, if the next iteration is to look at those elements/sectors where there is greatest opportunity for growth regionally, helps you focus within your CCMP to see what kinds of projects you want to make a priority.**

Chris Thomas – Moving forward, these economic evaluations are going to be really important. Resources are going to be scarcer, need to show that we're doing the best job we can with the resources we have. Need to break things into parts, help prioritize. Show the importance of this resource and what it is for the state of NC. Oysters, etc.

Bill Crowell – ANEP has also put together a proposal for headquarters to see what we need; economic evaluation is one of those things. **Susan White – Suggestion is to see if national headquarters has any information or resources you could use.**

Holly White – As local government person, I have used that study multiple times. **I think it would be good to share a target group of planners and managers in the region and to make them aware that you have this information.** Want to think elected officials buy into things because they understand the importance of natural resources but putting the number behind the resource is helpful. Contacting planners and managers to make sure they know it is available.

Kirk Havens – Great suggestion. **Holly White – Would be happy to help gather the list together, through NC Planners Association. Could get their email list for eastern regions, includes Raleigh area as well.** Cover our bases. Holly White – Was also wondering, about next stage of economic study, for our local government I looked at CCMP and included some of the water quality items in our strategic plan. Ultimately works to accomplish overall CCMP action. **Wondering if we could work with local governments to ask them what is needed to include in this stage 2 studies. They can become a mechanism for implementation on their own.** Ultimately get action into local govt. into their hands, they begin to implement at local level, help whole region succeed. Whole region works together towards template.

Kirk Havens – template for local governments. Can adopt with slight changes. Water quality goals actionable by local government. education goals actionable by local government. more generalized language. Data helpful for region.

Todd Miller - 2nd RTI study. GA has appropriated a fair amount of money, does this go into leverage? Not sure about federal grants.

Paul Cough – Look more closely at the economic dimension. Does it get to county scale or still thinking of watersheds and sounds? Value of resources.

Paul Cough - When you zoom in, do you look at economic dimension? Bill Crowell – getting down to counties would be an interesting way to go. **Susan White – Having chat with Jane Harrison at NCSG, economist and might have good ideas for team to consider as well. Bill Crowell – Seems like second level study would be helpful. Susan White – Zooming down to the right level.**

Holly White – [inaudible] something about tourism factor, reaching out to other groups as relevant.

Kirk Havens – Implementation projects category, going to ultimately come through as RFP. Bill Crowell – In the past, small projects staff will evaluate. Large projects are supposed to come through action teams. Funding can mean funding with our money or figuring out appropriate mechanisms to fund, or combination. Maybe project would be really good candidate for 5 Star Grant, etc. Not

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

always that APNEP is the sole funder, partial funder, or even applicant for funds. Kirk Havens – Is there a process that is a basic component of those applications that would help us evaluate that request. Basic information that APNEP needs to be a part of that. I think we did that in the past as part of the RFP progress. Bill Crowell – We change our application from project to project. We ask if projects incorporate climate change/SLR, ask for if there is improvement in water quality, those kinds of things. Kirk Havens – Always a good question is, what do you expect the outcome to be? Kirk Havens – Might be worth revisiting that a bit, Carl Hershner and I can take a look. Susan White – Parallel conversation, also need to look at implementation action teams. All the different workgroups you have going on, the time your team invests in those resources, is a needed piece. Kirk Havens – Trying to take Chesapeake Bay program logic framework and applying it to these projects. Easy framework, we can provide that.

Kirk Havens – Other questions regarding workplan and budget? Kirk Havens – Motion to approve workplan and budget? Carl Hershner – Motion Wilson Laney – Second Carl Hershner – That approval comes with the understanding that we're going to make progress on developing evaluation methods. Bill Crowell – Sounds like a good topic for the fall. Kirk Havens – Hopefully will have something to discuss at that point. Don't want to wait until then to develop. Set to move forward with that caveat. All in agreement.

11:45 Action Teams and Monitoring and Assessment Teams Update – Ms. Kelsey Ellis, Program Associate

[on Stacey Feken computer] – incorporating addressing climate change impacts into future contracts/projects; Kirk/Carl can give background/guidance/materials to help with structure, success stories, etc.

Kelsey Ellis - ATs and MATs do slightly different things. AT work more with implementation of CCMP, MATs focused on developing monitoring strategies, indicators and metrics for ecosystem. 7 active ATs. Topic based. 4 pending team has not yet met. A lot have informal things going on. 2 externally facilitated. Through outside groups.

Kelsey Ellis - Handout when teams have met in the past year blue longer meeting/ orange phone calls/webex/remote meeting. More consistent engagement vs. meet once or twice a year. 7 MATs; in March STAC met to review initial list of indicators.

Kelsey Ellis - Action Team highlights.

Contaminant Management. APNEP no longer leading nutrient criteria development; back into DEQ. Decision Support Tools.

Ecological flows. Study with Mike O'Driscoll at ECU.

Many are in assessment phase. What is already out there. Ecological flows. EST. mapping/ survey prioritization. FWHP. Exploring dam removal opportunity Participation in regional teams by staff. Invasive species Team hasn't met formally, hosted a workshop.

Policy & Economics: EPA funding opportunity / local the ground projects build on the ground resiliency. Organize fall workshop with local planners. Restoration Strategies - Lake Phelps Water budget project. Public Access - Potentially no formal team needed, more information gathering exercise. Living Shorelines/ Oyster Habitat / externally facilitated.

Kelsey Ellis – Challenges are maintaining high level of partner engagement, Team lead recruitment has proven difficult; meeting facilitation help take that role on. New strategy addressed potential solutions / communicate value of APNEP / role/ what is value to partner organizations.

Kelsey Ellis – Another challenge is representing diverse communities and stakeholders in the AP region. Identify key stakeholders and community leaders to participate on teams. Not agency folks, people who live and work in the region, landowner, own business, use resources recreationally, etc. Idea is to incorporate into action teams, hasn't happened as of yet.

Kelsey Ellis – Challenge is staff capacity to manage all teams. 13 AT/MATs, 4 pending/ 2 external. Need to think about how we can be most efficient and effective in how we spend our time. Meet with teams consistently, following up.

Kelsey Ellis - Next steps. Adaptive process. Team makeup, purpose, and number will change to reflect a shift away from inventory and towards CCMP implementation.

Kelsey Ellis - MATs settle on a meeting schedule for 2018. Teams prioritize list and begin assessment of indicators. ATs continue to meet goal have all formally active by end of the year. Continue assessments. Guidance documents for each team.

Carl Hershner - Parallel other programs. Lessons learned. Organize, prioritize, increase efficiency of efforts. Have discussion offline.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Chris Thomas - A lot of teams. How bridge between Raleigh and coast? People live in and next to the resource. Want them represented. People in the middle may not relate to either. Huge challenge. Geographic challenge impacts a lot of what we do.

Kelsey Ellis - Try to hold in central location, Rocky Mount, Greenville, other areas. Also have Trish and Jimmy located regionally. Facilitate interaction. Have more teleconference meetings. Engagement strategy.

Bill Crowell - WQ issues may be similar, but causes, effects, responses may be different. Ex Chowan vs. Pamlico.

Susan White - Questions? status of MATs/ target implementation and measure against targets?

Bill Crowell - Each team asked to develop priority actions, most saying they don't have enough information so are doing assessments to develop status, see what needs to be done next.

Susan White - Is that the implementation plan that was referred to? If do something, need to track it. All based on CCMP that ends in 2022.

Kirk Havens – If Action Teams decide to do an action, what do they anticipate is the result. What is trend of that action.

Kelsey Ellis – We're coming back to the idea of developing metrics and looking at trends.

Kirk Havens - Lesson learned not just do because we've always done it this way. Question is, did it happen like we thought it would?

Bill Crowell - Teacher Institute: one action provide training to educators in the region. Another action is D2.3. some of the course material provides information for that. Is this enough to measure, what others are doing. List of other programs, is it still filling gap, do we need other Teacher Initiatives, are we done?

Susan White – Are there timelines set where monitoring and assessment will end? Concern is that you can assess gaps forever. Where do we collectively pull trigger with knowledge we do have?

Tim Ellis - Clarify two different things – Monitoring and Assessment Teams vs. what Action Teams are doing. Monitoring plan going. Action items vague, opportunities to meet, teams still trying to see what other partners are doing. Where our team can best / finite resources money/time. Cover something different than what partners are doing. Teams large, hard to come to consensus. Bill Crowell no timeframes set yet, most just report back by the next meeting.

Paul Cough - Want to learn more. Where go to learn more?

Kelsey - Website. List of members/notes from last meeting. Different staff members in charge of different teams. Go to them for more in depth information.

Chris Thomas – Should we anticipate teams having a workplan? Yes.

Tim Ellis – It's not as clear as it should be what we need from the team and that's what we hope to address via the guidance documents. Why they are involved in the program. Then teams will use that to develop their workplan.

Dean Carpenter – Example is Natural Resource Policy and Economics Action Team. Not booting up yet. Which partner is technical lead for the group? Workplan is next step. The Team's actions were designed vaguely on purpose to ensure flexibility, we want to get the experts in the room and see what they think are the initial steps to move the ball.

Todd Miller – There are already groups of people motivated around certain subjects, it has worked out that way with oysters.

Bill Crowell – Hoped more would go that way.

Todd Miller – Maybe that speaks volumes to whether or not it's a priority for people.

Bill Crowell – Numerous folks want to help. We need to better articulate our needs from partners and what their role is.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Todd Miller – I notice that sea level rise and climate change are missing from the CCMP, but this region is ground zero for those impacts. Are we doing something to fill that void?

Bill Crowell – There was a fair amount of pressure to make this a climate change document when developing the CCMP. Resisted, we see climate change as a stressor, magnifies amount of stressor. Intended to be a dynamic document, move away from actions being too prescriptive. Left up to citizens and committees rather than having everything prescribed. Big area, sometimes wish it was smaller.

Todd Miller – Rather than having a stand-alone action, it should be infused throughout entire group. Dramatic impacts on everything. Opportunity moving forward.

Kirk Havens – This is vitally important. We should be asking, what is the anticipated impact of climate change on investments and if it can't be incorporated into planning, why invest?

Paul Cough – If approach is to infuse CC/SLR into teams, what would be the mechanism to infuse?

Kirk Havens - Brainstorm: if have particular outcome shooting for. What are factors affecting ability to do so. How do climate change scenarios affect outcome? If there are factors to mitigate, want to move forward with that too. Look at our ability to impact, that's where comes into play.

12:30 Working Lunch: NC Coastal Habitat Protection Plan Review and Update – Mr. Jimmy Johnson, Coastal Habitats Coordinator

Jimmy Johnson – Wanted to update you about where we've come from and where we are. Background on CHPP origin and purpose, what it is.

John Nicholson – Personal opinion about going down to a CHPPlet? Jimmy Johnson – I really like this doc, hard pill to swallow after spending 2 years trying to rewrite the 2010 document. People that look at the needs for science, they know where to go to find the science and recommendations. Like the idea of being able to reach out to a more general population, broader group of folks.

Wilson Laney – Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act – similar idea, requires a report to Congress. Went to shorter/more colorful presentation. As long as scientists can get to the information and find what they need, that's fine.

Jimmy Johnson – the url for the science resource document is in there a couple of times.

Carl Hershner – Is there a companion document that reports on progress on all these things? Jimmy Johnson – We have a database that has all the actions that have been met since 2004, but we have not printed it. Bill Crowell – There was an implementation report to the general assembly. Jimmy Johnson – Until this year, was required to send reports to General Assembly. Now GA said don't send anything unless you make major changes. Have reports from 10-11 years if anyone wants to see those.

Susan White – Any web statistics? Jimmy Johnson – Folks at DMF can track that because it's housed on their website. Not anything I've looked at because of access issues.

Paul Cough – How far offshore do you go? Statewide? Jimmy Johnson – 3 miles, we incorporate some hard bottom. Don't talk a lot about oil and gas in this doc because it's further out. And when we wrote it we were under the auspices of the previous administration, they didn't want SLR/climate change – we tried to include it subtly but it's in there to a minimal extent.

Chris Thomas – What happens as a result of the recommendations? Jimmy Johnson – We work with the steering committee, made up of members of the commissions, and a team of agency staff. They look at the goals and recommendations and they come up with their actions to meet those recommendations and those goals. In implementation plan, you can see agencies and priority areas.

Bill Crowell – When we put together the CCMP, staff looked at over 50 partner plans to make sure we were supportive but not duplicative.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

13:10 Review of APNEP Engagement Strategy – Ms. Stacey Feken, Policy & Engagement Manager

Stacey Feken – Engagement Strategy is a new doc for APNEP, formerly had a communications plan. Through updates to communications plan and feedback from Policy Board at last meeting, created this engagement strategy. Expanded core communications plan to recognize all aspects of engagement – partner engagement, outreach, and communications.

Stacey Feken – We're not really proposing anything new or different. Core of engagement is through interaction with management conference, advisory bodies, teams.

Stacey Feken – Needs assessment shows that network of partners is primary form of assistance APNEP provides. Information and research, second.

Stacey Feken – Previous conversations from Policy Board about who our partners are. Over 100 partners listed on website, but we've broken things down into categories. Not any one of these partners is necessarily fully engaged at any moment in time, part of the conversation – how do we engage moving forward, how do we assess moving forward.

Stacey Feken – Other ways we engage with partners – project partnerships. Projects sponsoring, funding, providing in-kind resources for. Summaries of projects are in workplans. APNEP participation in external working groups. Targeted engagement with existing and potential partners. Focus on engaging local governments/needs of local governments. Trying to track and follow up on these things.

Stacey Feken – As we're going through this, trying to assess strengths and areas for improvement. Strengths – network of partners, sharing/disseminating information, recognition of APNEP as neutral, science-based information. Challenges – quality vs quantity in terms of engagement, capacity to follow up and manage relationships, touting our own accomplishments. Next steps: explore ways for APNEP to better communicate its role and value to partners and regional stakeholders, prioritize partner engagement based on regional needs/gaps.

Stacey Feken – Outreach, education, and engagement. Symposium last fall, one thing we focused on was the panel with representatives from local government and organizations that work with local governments. Try to sponsor and promote partner initiatives, attending events and networking with new partners. Strengths – CCMP presents a lot of opportunities for outreach. Areas for improvement – assessing involvement and how it relates to CCMP implementation. Being more strategic in terms of what we participate in and aligning things back to CCMP. Tracking reach/success.

Stacey Feken – Try to align our communications and outreach with things happening at the federal level. Efforts to align with partners, create synergy.

Stacey Feken – Communications efforts. Strong presence on social media, tracking metrics associated with that. Special features – Sound Reflections series, Coastwatch article, participation in national campaigns, publishing in external publications. Promoting partner initiatives, sharing things with one another. Moving forward, will be featuring more about management conference member initiatives.

Stacey Feken – Evaluating communications tools that we've been using versus audience. Strengths, weaknesses, next steps. Hoping to identify targeted opportunities for outreach/communications in relation to team actions. Looking at outputs of CCMP, tying into outreach opportunities. Available on the web.

Susan White – This is wonderful, good use of time and resources. Gets at what is impactful. What is Mano el Hermano? Stacey Feken – Initiative led by NCCF in partnership with Mano el Hermano. Provided support for the program for 2 years. Organization that services the Hispanic community in Dare County, literacy is one aspect and that's what we've been involved in. Incorporating estuarine education into this. There is a video about it created by one of our former interns, we can share.

Paul Cough – Under resourced/underserved communities? Stacey Feken – Area we've been assessing, haven't yet stepped back and taken a look at the region as a whole but it's a part of what we are doing. **Kelsey Ellis – We are seeking to incorporate that into our engagement strategy, it is one audience, but it is an important one. Incorporating language throughout engagement strategy. Bill Crowell – Just met with EPA about Environmental Justice, will be looking for opportunities to better incorporate that in the future.** Stacey Feken – Always looking to synergize with partners.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Chris Thomas – One thing I've seen done is to highlight the good work of partners in an end of year celebration, positive strokes on the things that have been done – other people see it and want to be a part of that. Think about how to highlight the good work of partners that are supporting the estuary partnership? Reid Wilson – I don't know how many of your familiar with Gov. Cooper's hometown strong initiative? Effort to get government agencies together to help rural counties. Announcing this cross-government approach two months ago, announced counties – 3 are in APNEP region. Governor will be going to each county over the next month and a half. Talked to local people about what they need, some of the things highlighted are existing partnerships – these three counties could be a good opportunity to highlight things going on. Ways things that APNEP is doing can be highlighted, partners are doing, can all be wrapped up into the hometown strong thing. Ways to leverage resources from different departments, talk to one another. There will be more counties after these first 6.

Stacey Feken – We work closely with OEE, referring to it at governor's rural initiative. Tying into Engagement and Stewardship Team, making sure we were aware and considering that moving forward. John Nicholson – That's where if you stick close to Lisa, find out what DEQ/DNCR is doing in those areas. Thinking about what they want to push forward to the governor. Opportunity for APNEP to be inserted into those teams.

Paul Cough – Is this an opportunity to zoom in to the county scale, integrate across a range of things that highlight current partnerships plus the ability? Time to do that is in advance? John Nicholson – Pasquotank example, water infrastructure in Elizabeth City. Recycler to highlight, wind farms up there. If APNEP has something they're working on in Pasquotank, easy walk to come give it to me. Looking to see everything we're touching in those counties. Reid Wilson – Example Lenoir county, they're interested in creating a science museum with a focus on the Neuse but they don't have everything they need to do that, so we're trying to help them out. Local plans to expand greenway, etc. Synergy. We don't know every day on the calendar yet but if you have a pressing thing that would be a good fit, let us know asap and we'll try to make it fit. Stacey Feken – One example of integration is Shad in the Classroom program. Pasquotank County MS was one of the releases on Friday. We'll definitely try to make your office aware.

Bill Crowell – Finger counties up there in the NE, one area where we've struggled to get people to participate. Summer childcare an issue for teacher institute. Everything more complicated than the surface would have you believe.

13:50 2012-2017 EPA Program Evaluation – Dr. Bill Crowell, Director

Bill Crowell – If you see your name on here don't worry about it, I'm going to talk to you. More than welcome to join in for everything, anything. Good way to talk to your review team is to sequester them in a van for 3 hours on the way to the coast. Starting in Raleigh, going to Morehead City area, then going up to Englehard, Edenton.

14:00 Lake Phelps Water Management Issues – Mr. Brian Strong, Chief of Planning and Natural Resources, NC Parks and Recreation

Brian Strong – Going to talk about some of the challenges and issues we've been having at Lake Phelps. The objective of this talk is to discuss background of Pettigrew State Park and 1980 management study, how it's become a little dated. Some of the park initiatives we're working on right now to work on water management challenges.

Brian Strong – Pettigrew State Park was established in 1936, Lake Phelps was approximately 16,600 acres – second largest natural lake in the state. Lake is big and the property managed around the lake is not extensive – manage very little of the area around the lake. Vast majority is not under the state's control. Another unique thing is Lake Phelps is one of the highest points in the county – water flows out/down from there.

Brian Strong – 1980 Lake Management Study. Trying to balance the needs of all the different users of the lake, meeting all these unique interests. Challenging. Study called for waters to remain between 10.41 and 12.1 feet. Lake fluctuation is divided into 4 hydroperiods. Recent rainfall events have caused issues, concern that 80's study is no longer relevant.

Brian Strong – Flow managed through gates, canals that drain out of lake. Gates are old, damaged. Project has been initiated to replace these, still going to use same hydrological periods and water levels. This is just an initiation of where we want to be.

Brian Strong – Potential for partnering. Lake Phelps is a small portion of the overall watershed. Focal point because of park staff presence. Need for overall coordination in the region, managing relationships. Allow for credibility in the region – someone viewed as neutral party. Ability to bring partners to the table.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

Brian Strong – Folks at Creswell have had a lot of flooding issues. Need for a detailed study and better hydrologic modeling in the region.

Brian Strong – Challenges – distrust of governmental organizations in the region. Cost of funding a new water management study (\$350,000), stakeholders have widely differing views of what should be done and how the system should be managed. Questions?

Susan White – Just learned about Lake Phelps through NC LOW, dark sky preserve. Any contact with them? Brian Strong – Not about this program, local folks at the park might know them through programming.

Carl Hershner – Request is for collaboration? Bill Crowell – Parks approached us, fits with one of our CCMP actions, regional restoration strategy. We saw that a number of wildlife refuges, state parks, etc., were in the area and maybe there should be a coordinated regional strategy instead of individual ones. First through was get USGS to do study, but out there is significant mistrust of US federal government at the moment, particularly USFWS and through that, USGS. We talked with USFWS and State Parks, there needs to be someone to bring in and organize a community engagement project. Straightforward scientifically but figuring out who the affected parties are, what they're interested in, and finding appropriate body to do research. Once research is done, finding a way to communicate results in a way that is understandable. One idea is to use projector/sandbox tool to show where rain would go. Allows them to see for themselves. Going back and forth on numbers, figuring out sources of money including GA and foundation money. Wanted to make sure you heard this and thought it was a good thing for APNEP to be involved in.

Jimmy Johnson – We had a meeting a few weeks ago in Washington, John Blanchard and parks folks were there. It's a complicated mess and it's a matter of picking and choosing who is going to flood – south or north end of lake. You talk to one farmer and get one story, another and get another story. Going to take a lot of work to sit down with folks and come up with some semblance of consensus. USFWS has to maintain certain flows certain times of the years... Brian Strong – Yes, because of fish passage. How do we release that water? Is sediment being released as well, is it causing issues, should we be using a different technique? One of those periphery issues that comes up and they're all tied together. Jimmy Johnson – a lot of issues going on in that small issues that need to be addressed.

Brian Strong – We own a very small amount of property – vast majority of canals are on private property.

Chris Thomas – What's the distance the canals go between the lake and river? Brian Strong – Dependent on canal, some are far, and some are closer. 5-10 miles at the most. Brian Strong – Also some tidal influence, wind influence on water level. Pretty complicated system.

Todd Miller – Similar efforts around Lake Mattamuskeet. Source of funding could be Farm Bill. Brian Strong – Over time, as you farm, your elevation is dropping, and the forest is higher than the farm. Todd Miller – Mattamuskeet drainage association... Mac Gibbs – Interesting study, hydrology of the Albemarle-Pamlico region from USGS. Used this in Mattamuskeet to determine original hydrology. Good if you want to understand the drainage of the whole area. Lake Phelps was one of the first areas to be drained to sell the land to farmers. Money was used for NC schools. Report shows all canals, when they were dug. Phelps was drained long before, late 1700's. Long history of drainage. Way to get information about what original flow was, how to get original flow back.

Brian Strong – Talking with USFWS about Lake Mattamuskeet – different system, groups of people, etc. This might not be a fun thing but would be very beneficial. Todd Miller – And then there's the issue of SLR. Susan White – This is more than a 3-year effort. Where would other things have to not happen in order to take this on, or is there the capacity? Brian Strong – Will have to figure out a bit as we move along, need to set up a steering committee. Need to line up funding before we can do any engagement, don't want to go to communities and then not have funding to follow through. Susan White – Is Cooperative Extension involved? Brian Strong – Yes, were talking about how they've been going to the ditches, measuring sediment. Not sure about their presence throughout the district. Brian Strong – USGS is already involved.

Brian Strong – Success is that we all have an understanding of the problem and the impacts of how to manage the lake. All individuals will have to give and take. Best science, how to manage it, and how to communicate that with folks. Stakeholders are involved from beginning and have an understanding of the process. Kirk Havens – Transparency is important, so no one is surprised. Brian Strong – We do that, report is public, and superintendents work with farmers, etc, as much as possible.

Kirk Havens – So what you need from us is the go ahead to move forward? Agreement? Leadership Council agrees.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

14:20 NC/VA MOU Update – Dr. Kirk Havens

Kirk Havens – MOU has progressed further in both VA and NC, interest in moving forward on both sides. Some projects we can move forward quickly. **At Symposium there was interest in elevating MOU to governor's agreement.** Bill Crowell – Talked to Ann Jennings about governor's agreement about a few targeted actions the two states could work on, showing that they could make progress during these two administrations. Also, since APNEP crosses EPA regions 3 and 4, having those regions involved as well. Way for states to show they are serious about water quality and other issues. Have talked with Ann and John Nicholson, going to think about how to move this forward in the coming months. Could be administrator level signature. Chris Thomas – Just signed MOU on watershed that flows between VA/Tennessee, could share that with you. Good place to start. Basically, an agreement to work together. **Kirk Havens – In this one we're envisioning, as MOU did too, having an annual evaluation at Secretary level. This one focusing on 1-4, maybe more towards 1 task, that states can focus on so that local governments can see the benefits and we can carry this on past this administration.**

Bill Crowell – APNEP also covers two USFWS districts, Army Corps districts, etc, could be for everyone but we don't necessary want to do that unless it is relevant to the action that is being focused on. Bill Crowell – if you have any ideas about tangible, accomplishable, low-cost actions, please let myself and Kirk Havens know. Kirk Havens – Will be opportunities for additional funding as well.

14:30 Other Business/Issues

Wilson Laney – We touched on oysters a little during previous part of the meetings, something that came up at STAC meeting was if someone is taking a look at potential impacts of oyster culture and more broadly mariculture on the AP ecosystem. ASMFC Group that Wilson Laney and Jimmy Johnson are a part of has a draft guidance document about this issue. Question is, is there any sentiment from the board about charging the STAC to take a look at that and produce a white paper on it? STAC has done this in the past. There are public trust issues involved, one thing I know happened recently is Pea Island NWR which includes an area of presidential proclamation waters, received a request from NCDMF to lease within those waters. In this case, issue is waterfowl management. Oyster sanctuary could be alternative to lease. For Leadership Council – do we want to charge the STAC with that?

Susan White – What else is the STAC spending their time on? Bill Crowell – Indicators. Carl Hershner – Are there people on the STAC who would be interested, besides Wilson Laney? Wilson Laney – I would say yes, Mike Piehler and others would be very qualified. We also have guidance documents and federal policy documents to look at.

Todd Miller – I think what Wilson Laney is suggesting has potential for collaboration with VA, ties into water quality benefits. Talk by TNC recently, couldn't find anything measurable in terms of water quality and you assume certain positives. Look at water quality, NOAA is gearing up for a big spatial planning study in Bogue Sound. Study is mandate from GA to generate strategic plan related to shellfish mariculture.

Carl Hershner – Lesson from VA, hard to end up with a winner. **For STAC paper, want to think very carefully about what questions you want answered. Ask them if there is a group that could craft a set of guiding questions. Then could go look for sponsors, groups outside of the STAC that could work on it.** Wilson Laney – I know state of Washington was indicating their intent to ban salmon netpens...part of the overall picture. Certainly, shellfish is different and has tremendous water quality benefit. I agree with Carl Hershner, formulating specific charge to the STAC would be desired. **Kirk Havens – Carl Hershner is suggesting that the STAC designs those questions. Bill Crowell – Sounds good to me that the STAC designs those questions. Generating questions is the easy part, get back to you all – these are the questions that need to be answered. But question is, is this a product that would be beneficial to the program? Carl Hershner – My thought was, having questions developed would give you the chance to turn around and talk to your stakeholders – would this be something you could incorporate in your policies?** Todd Miller – VA is giving oyster farmers cash payment as TMDL credit. People already looking at this in NC.

Kirk Havens – Would Wilson Laney be willing to take this question to the STAC? Wilson Laney – Yes.

14:50 Public Comments

Kirk Havens – Period for comment from the public. No public comments – we can adjourn early. Bill Crowell – I will coordinate fall meeting, list of topics of discuss, form agenda together and figure out a good time.

DRAFT – Pending Leadership Council Approval

15:00 Adjourn