

Policy Board Meeting Notes
Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program
10:00 am – 4:00 pm
June 8, 2011
Martin Community College
Room 14
1161 Kehukee Park Road, Williamston, NC

Members Present: Tom Allen, Timmy Baynes, Terry Hairston, David Jones (for Bill Swartly), Todd Miller, Willy Phillips, Marjorie Rayburn, Tony Reeve, Linda Rimer, Tom Stroud, Jack Thigpen.

APNEP Staff Present: Dean Carpenter, Bill Crowell, Scott Gentry, Jim Hawhee, and Jimmy Johnson.

Guests: Billy Barber, Charlotte Griffin, Carl Hershner, Tom Mercer, Sam Pardo, Linda Pearsall, Ana Zivanovic-Nenadovic, Gabriell Vires, Brandon Morrison.

10:08 Welcome Tony Reeve, Chair

Tony convened the meeting. He noted that there were a number of students visiting as Stanback fellows from Duke University. Tony asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Tony welcomed Willy Phillips to his first Policy Board meeting. He introduced Willy to the Policy Board, noting that his spouse is Feather is the Executive Director of Pocosin Arts and that Willy previously served with the NC Marine Fisheries Commission.

Tony reviewed the agenda and read the conflict of interest guidance to the Board. There was no statement of conflict of interest.

Tony congratulated Bill Crowell on the completion of his doctorate degree. His dissertation studied how NC's environmental educators relate environmental concepts. The work was conducted in partnership with the Department of Environmental Education.

Welcome from Martin Community College, Billy Barber, and Charlotte Griffin (Chair of the Board of Trustees, and Mayor of Bear Grass).

Billy welcomed us to Martin Community College. The college was established in 1987, and is one of the only two-year equity schools on the east coast. MCC was just announced as one of the recipients of a Bill and Melinda Gates Completion by Design grant. Billy noted that he had looked at the web site last night, and was impressed. He noted that our estuary is the second largest on the east coast and a significant estuary to the nation. As a citizen of eastern NC, born and raised here, he applauds our efforts and wants this resource to be here for his children and grandchildren.

Tony thanked Mr. Barber for hosting us. Tony asked Mrs. Griffin if she wanted to address us. She indicated that Billy had said all that needed saying, but she did note that Billy is very familiar with the area and with the sounds.

Public Comments Tony Reeve, Chair

Tony invited public comments. No public comments were made. Tony noted that public comment would be welcome throughout the meeting.

Tony noted that Bill Holman had provided a summary of recommendations for the Policy Board from the Climate Ready Estuaries report recently completed for APNEP by the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions.

Approval of February Meeting Notes

Wilson Laney moved and Linda Rimer seconded approval of the minutes. The motion was approved.

Director's Report Dr. Bill Crowell

Bill thanked Tony for his kind words earlier. Bill noted that his report will be short this time, in that a lot of what he would cover will be covered in the STAC and other reports. Bill noted that Linda Pearsall will review for us some of the budget issues that may impact APNEP, although APNEP is not directly affected since it is federally funded. Bill noted that APNEP has obtained matching funds for the coming year.

Linda Pearsall noted that the State Legislature has passed a budget, and we are waiting to see what the Governor's response will be. NCDENR is slated to lose a few hundred positions. The NC Office of Conservation, Planning, and Community Affairs is losing one position which focused on working lands and was important for establishing a partnership between the NCDACS and the NCDENR. Three other positions are being fund-shifted, being taken off appropriations and being moved to support from the Natural Heritage Trust Fund. They are doing that through legislation. Heritage Trust is also being asked to support the Plant Conservation Program in the NCDACS. The Natural Heritage Trust now supports most of the Office of Conservation, Planning, and Community Affairs. The Legislature wants to take 8 million dollars from that fund, as a one-time reversion to the General Fund. Linda noted that with the reversion and other changes, there probably will be no funds for land acquisition this year. However, if the housing economy begins moving again, we may have some funds. Another proposal is to move the Partnership for the Sounds to the Department of Commerce. Linda noted that the Clean Water Management Trust Fund is being cut substantially. The proposal to move non-regulatory agencies out of NCDENR was defeated. The Division of Forest Resources and the Division of Soil and Water Conservation are moving to NCDACS. Linda noted that several other functions are being moved, or lost.

Jack Thigpen asked which agencies were being moved to NCDACS. Linda responded. Wilson asked if the NC Aquariums and NC Museum of Natural Sciences were staying in NCDENR. Yes, they are. Tony asked about the other trust funds? Linda noted that they are also being cut to the extent that there will be little land acquisition this year. The farmland preservation trust fund is left largely intact.

Jack asked about moving DMF to NCWRC? Linda noted that the Division of Marine Fisheries is losing some positions, but will not be moving. She noted that merger had been discussed for a number of years.

Bill stated again that while there is little direct impact on APNEP, our partnerships will be affected. Bill noted that Rhonda Evans, our Regional EPA representative, was unable to attend today due to lack of travel funds.

Bill noted that the Office of Environmental Education, which was to run APNEP's summer teacher institute, will no longer have the necessary employees, so they are hoping to hire someone else to work on that program.

Todd Miller noted that there are some pretty big regulatory changes occurring which will affect our programs going forward.

• **APNEP Media Jim Hawhee**

Jim Hawhee noted that he wants to see the broader APNEP community be able to communicate freely. He noted that he is trying to provide some avenues for such community. Jim gave a brief test of current events related to the program.

APNEP Media Options were listed by Jim: website; mailing list; calendar; news feed; Facebook, Twitter and Linked In. Jim reviewed each of these in turn and demonstrated how they may be used. Users can sign up for the mailing list, on the web site. APNEP maintains a calendar of events occurring through the region, including local volunteer opportunities, conferences, and events of interest to the APNEP community. The calendar link is also on the web site.

Jim reviewed how he clips and provides news stories related to APNEP's mission. Jim noted that he had just learned on the way down about an editorial written by one of our PB members, Reid Wilson, and posted it to the site. Jim took us to the article on the site. Some of the stories highlight the work of our partner organizations, while other follow pertinent policy or political issues in our region. It includes timely links to scientific papers and other resources.

Jim reviewed the social media options available for use by Policy Board members and others interested in APNEP, including Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn

Tony asked for questions? There were none from the group.

Bill asked Jim to explain how he is using LinkedIn to facilitate communication with the Virginia Healthy Waters Initiative. Jim did so and briefly described the initiative, which aims to identify and preserve healthy waters before they become unhealthy.

Tom Allen asked what the relative usership is for the different media options. Jim noted that there are about 25 APNEP folks in the LinkedIn group, but he is still introducing these services to APNEP committee members. Twitter is less used. Jim sees the most potential for LinkedIn. Jim noted that you can have an e-mail digest once a day, or once a week.

Jack noted that LinkedIn just went public not too long ago. Jack noted they have something valuable, which is the information about their users. Jack asked about the security dimension, how much information one must provide to participate. Jim noted the information you must provide is limited, and you can control what you put on the site. It is a good way to get a more detailed picture of the people you work with on a daily basis.

CAC Report: Marjorie Rayburn:

Marjorie noted the CAC met on May 20 in Edenton. One issue which came up is representation from the

citizenry. They have never had representation from the Native American community. There are also other areas where there is no representation. Some of them may wear different hat. A big part of their meeting was discussing the CCMP. With many of them not in the higher levels of academia, some of them have a different perspective on the structure and language of the CCMP. Marjorie noted that the staff had taken a lot of their comments, in terms of wording and a lot of specific areas, and did a good job of revising the document to make it more user-friendly and acceptable. The public will be turned off if there are a lot of scientific terms they don't understand, and public engagement is critical. The Policy Board will be looking at the goals and objectives, and the action summary. Marjorie feels the document is good and concise and will go a long way toward fulfilling the mission.

Marjorie asked for questions? Timmy asked if it had to be a federally recognized tribe. Tony indicated that it doesn't have to be. Marjorie noted that we don't seem to have good links to those tribes, and if anyone has any good ideas, she asked that they be shared. Jim Hawhee noted that the staff does want to spend some time on that issue.

STAC Report Dr. Wilson Laney, Dr. Dean Carpenter

Wilson discussed the previous STAC meeting, and noted a presentation from Connie Brower of DWQ regarding the adoption of new water quality standards for NC. The STAC has expressed interest in supporting DWQ's efforts through scientific outreach and an examination of the implications of these proposed standards.

With regard to the letter from the STAC addressing water quality changes, there was some discussion of how the Policy Board and STAC might proceed. Tony indicated that he didn't feel that he knew enough about the issue to sign off on a letter. Todd felt that it was inappropriate for the STAC to send an independent letter, since the perception would be that it came from the program. Wilson indicated then that perhaps the best way to proceed was for the STAC to draft a letter for the Policy Board's consideration. Linda Rimer asked to whom the letter would be sent? Wilson advised it was to go to the Director of DWQ, Secretary of NCDENR, with a copy to the Governor. Linda Rimer and Jack Thigpen supported the concept of sending a letter. Wilson explained that we had not polled the STAC. The meeting that took place was held with STAC leadership, and the plan was to draft a letter for consideration by the STAC.

Willy Phillips noted that there hasn't been any contact with the fisheries community from DWQ regarding the proposed standards. He voiced his support for high water quality standards, noting that the fisheries industry bears the brunt of water quality impairment in many instances.

Todd stated that we have 3c as a goal in the draft CCMP. To him this is a perfect case study of how we can help use our limited resources. The letter is a good first step. Bill noted that we have discussed having the DWQ folks address the CAC on this issue as well.

• Integrative Ecosystem Assessment Update

Wilson turned to the 2011 Assessment. He briefed the Policy Board on how the process is going. He noted that he and Dean are working on an example chapter for the assessment dealing with fish populations.

APNEP's EBM Process Overview Dr. Carl Hershner, VIMS

Carl noted that the last time he addressed the Policy Board, he talked about how to approach ecosystem-based management (EBM). Carl noted that he felt a lot of progress has been made, and Bill will present some of the products. Carl noted that he wanted to underscore for the Policy Board how this approach would affect them in the coming years. The benefit is the way it brings information to the Policy Board, but it also depends on their engagement in the process.

Carl reviewed the program framework: articulate program goals; describe factors influencing goal attainment; assess current management efforts (and gaps); develop management strategy, develop monitoring program; assess performance; and manage adaptively. Carl reviewed each of these steps and noted the progress made in APNEP's CCMP efforts. Carl noted that both the natural and human (social, economic and political) elements of the system must be considered when undertaking EBM.

Carl gave us some examples of logic models which have been used to develop EBM approaches. He noted that APNEP took a simpler and more intuitive approach. There are biological, chemical, physical and human factors which the EBM team considered. Carl noted that the EBM team developed a long list of factors, and then ranked them with regard to their importance and manageability. The staff then looked at plans for all the state and federal partners, and for some of the NGOs, to identify actions which are already being undertaken. Once program goals are set and a survey of management actions has taken place, gaps must be identified. This group needs to have the ability to motivate stakeholders to undertake filling the gaps. In the CCMP, we need to note what all the partners are doing, highlight the gaps, then find ways to reach out and encourage them getting done.

Carl noted that Wilson had addressed the monitoring program, and noted that it makes no sense to develop such a program before you decide what you want to do. That is the step we are in at present. Once we have developed the monitoring program, then we can come back to the PB and discuss how we want to assess our performance. Carl noted that it is important to establish performance expectations for the APNEP system. We should know up front whether conditions are going to improve, decline, or change with a lag time, and we should be able to put some boundaries around them. Carl noted that we should be able to determine whether we are within the envelope of uncertainty around the parameters we are measuring. If we are outside of that, then either the program is not being effective, or our understanding is incomplete. In either case, you should be able to make some decisions about restructuring things.

Carl turned to the actions which the team felt were needed. They are grouped into identify, protect, restore, engage and monitor categories in the draft CCMP. Every one of the actions tracks back to the goals and outcomes. He noted that the Policy Board should never find any action that doesn't link back to one of the goals or outcomes.

Carl noted that we are getting close to the "Develop Monitoring Program" step. We looked at useful indicators for the desired outcome. One could be swimming closure days in designated waters (those identified for contact). For the necessary management effort, there are a number of actions identified. Carl had those listed on the screen. He noted that there are condition indicators, and management or action indicators. Carl gave some performance expectations, which he noted were presented just for discussion purposes and haven't been agreed upon at all. Carl explained that we are looking for practical measures which can be assessed. Carl noted that you can look at your monitoring data to determine whether success is being achieved. If it is not, one can go and talk to stakeholders and determine the reasons why performance isn't being achieved. This sort of evaluation allows problems to be addressed

with both the public and politicians. Carl noted that what we will have, when this is all developed, is a clear pathway, with expectations. When we don't see performance, then we have a rationale which can be presented. This provides us with not only a system-wide approach to APNEP, but also a way to be accountable and transparent to the public.

Carl explained where APNEP is in the process. The Policy Board has articulated the program goals. The EBM workgroup has described the factors influencing goal attainment. The staff has assessed current management efforts and gaps. The stakeholders will develop the management strategy. The STAC is to develop the monitoring program. The Policy Board will have to assess performance and manage adaptively. Carl noted that the Policy Board has to review the work plan, assess it, and then act adaptively to effect change.

Carl concluded his presentation. Tony asked for questions. Carl was asked if we plan to construct a logic model. Carl said that we did intend to do such an exercise. He noted that across the country, a cadre of scientists usually has been involved in the monitoring program development, and in many cases, wind up measuring things that do not necessarily relate to what your goals and outcomes are. It is one of many forms of adaptive management. This approach requires setting performance expectations.

Linda Pearsall noted that some folks expect a hypothesis to be developed, and then proven or disproved. She asked if that has been done here. Carl stated that it has. He noted that experimenting with public dollars is usually frowned upon. What this approach does is identify what we believe the system response will be. What we are then doing with our strategy is testing our model. The assessment we are currently doing will provide us with two points in time but the program had no real expectations with regard to how it was going to influence things. There was no basis for making any adaptive changes. Now we are doing that by formulating performance expectations.

Todd asked how the process was going to accommodate natural variation which was beyond expectations. Carl stated that the scientists we consult would have to be forced to put some lines on the board. The discussion regarding acceptable bounds will have to include variability in the system. Monitoring should be able to identify whether actions were insufficient, or whether other factors are involved. Carl noted that the death of the ferry monitoring program is very unfortunate in that regard, since it was a long-time program. Bill noted that the staff were discussing on the way down that SAV can vary dramatically in a given year, due to a hurricane for example. Bill noted that water quality in the sounds improved dramatically during droughts since there was no runoff. Todd noted that shrimp are down this year.

Willy noted it seemed like a nice academic exercise, but APES has been around a while. We have dead water now in the sound, and everything in the middle is dead. The DO is the culprit, and we know that because of the fishermen who "monitor" things daily, and find their catch dead.

Carl stated that EBM is an effort to move things out of the ivory tower. The problem is as Willy has described it. There is no process for taking the information which Willy described and then transferring it to action. Once we know what has to be done, the trick is to take the observations and get them back into the decision-making process. Carl gave an example of no fish being on the dock due to hog farm wastes.

Tony asked for any last questions? There were no more.

Tony indicated that we would break now to get our lunches, and then come back for a working lunch to discuss the ccmp, at 12:25 PM.

Working Lunch: Review of Draft CCMP Actions Bill Crowell

Bill provided a handout and reviewed it with the Policy Board. Bill noted that we had inserted the word “invasive” in the Goal 2 outcomes for Native Species. Bill noted that clarity and understanding are attributes which the staff and EBM team are striving for in writing these documents. Bill walked the Policy Board through each of the four questions, spending the most time on the fourth one, reviewing each of the objectives and actions.

Todd asked, relative to Goal 1, whether there shouldn’t be some outcome related to economic viability, so that Willy could make a living for example. Bill noted that in one of the prior drafts, we had something along that line, but in further discussions, it was decided that the program was not responsible for economic activity and/or viability. There are too many other factors controlling that activity, which are not the responsibility of the program. The feeling is that the program is responsible for the environmental aspects of the system.

Marjorie noted that she had been a strong advocate of including some economic factor, but now understands why the program needs to focus on the environmental aspects.

Todd expressed again that for generating public support, we need to have some measure of the economic benefits in the document.

Wilson noted that he understood Todd’s point, but urged caution in getting too far into trying to measure the economic benefits. Wilson noted that not everyone would have the same definition of what constitutes a “vibrant” or “viable” economy.

Todd asked if “monitoring” was the correct word, or whether “evaluation” should be the correct word for the “E” step? Bill noted they weren’t steps. Willy noted they weren’t in any particular order.

Bill concurred. He noted that not all of the actions link back to a specific goal, but may be necessary for some of the other parts of the process.

Bill moved to the objectives and actions, and used the yellow handout provided to facilitate our review.

Bill used A2.4 as an example of one action for which we presently don’t have any funding or capacity to undertake. Bill noted that EPA would likely have to take the lead for this one. Willy stated that we need to at least identify where the testing is, that would be helpful. Tom Stroud asked if any of the university institutes are focused in that direction. Tony noted that UNC is doing some work on the issue.

Wilson noted that the same messenger which took the issue to the MFC also brought it to the ASMFC Habitat Committee, so we did have a session on it with Dr. Barbara Grimes as our invited speaker. Wilson noted that part of the problem is just the sheer number of compounds being put in the water, and how you prioritize them for some action.

Bill moved on to Objective A3. He noted that the activities for this one may be greatly influenced by the current actions of the General Assembly, and we will have to reassess what we can do, once the session has ended.

Bill moved to the Protect category. He noted that the selection of actions was based on the ones where we felt that we could make a difference.

Bill moved to B2. Bill noted that there needs to be a freshwater counterpart to the CHPP. There needs to be some integrated management of those resources, just as there is on the coast through the CHPP.

Willy asked about the SAV strategy. He noted that there is quite a bit of protection already. He noted that they worked with Roger Rulifson, on a grant for SAV, and noted that because of the variability, they decided that it was almost impossible to develop a strategy. He asked what Bill had in mind? Bill indicated that the intent is to determine what the resource is, what the core area is that needs protection, and then define what is needed to protect the resource.

Bill noted that each year, an annual work plan will establish the steps to implement these actions. In future years, the Policy Board and STAC will be more active in determining what the priority actions will be in a given year.

Bill moved to B3. Bill noted that this one didn't arise in the initial ecosystem modeling, but rather arose from our stakeholders and others. It lends itself to working with multiple partners. Bill asked if everyone knew what a living shoreline was. Everyone did. Todd asked if it was a conscious decision to limit the LID practices to working with local governments. Bill noted it was. Todd noted that if there are opportunities to get state government involved in that one, he would think that would be beneficial. Marjorie noted that some CAC members were concerned about this one being regulatory, and suggested that non-regulatory approaches might be more constructive.

Jack asked if a specific technique called a "sill" was included? Bill noted that there are a number of approaches to creating living shorelines. The key feature is a combination of water and land. Jack concluded it was too detailed to get into at this point.

Tom Allen asked if there were a lot of living shorelines being implemented in NC. Bill noted that there aren't a lot of them in NC. Bill indicated that we are going to be able to identify where all the hardened shorelines are in NC, as a metric.

Bill moved to Objective C1. Bill noted that this one gives us a good opportunity to point out how some of these, interact with other actions in the plan, such as the living shorelines one. The C14 action relates to the one about pathogens being reduced.

Bill moved to Objective C2. Bill noted that C2.1's language has been refined quite a bit. The intent here is to have large-scale restoration projects, not just small ones. We want to have the duck, fish and water quality people all there. He noted that makes sense, but we don't often do it. Restoration often occurs based on a narrow functional loss.

Linda Rimer noted that we would be using John Dorman's SLR results, and risk assessment, and there is a lot of information on this. She noted that John gave a presentation to the Federal Interagency Committee, and someone asked if the real estate people had seen his presentation. Linda stated that the evidence for living shorelines, is there in John's presentation, and she asked if we are tapping into his study. Bill stated that it was clear that this is not being done for ocean-front property. Bill noted that there is a lot of work to be done on these. We should be able to develop a whole suite of incentives for landowners. Linda noted that a picture is worth a thousand words, so we should use illustrations.

Marjorie stated that we need to keep our living shorelines unprescriptive, and maintain flexibility. Bill noted that our shorelines are very diverse, and location makes a huge difference in potential shoreline stabilization techniques.

Bill moved to Objective C3. He noted that we need to do all of these actions in a coordinated fashion. Bill noted that we need a coordinated strategy for wetlands restoration.

Bill moved to Objective C4. He noted that anadromous fish are a good symbol of our estuarine ecosystem. This is something else that emerged from our citizens, in addition to the ecosystem model. Bill noted that oyster habitat restoration (C5) is another action which arose from the citizens and stakeholders.

Todd suggested that for C5, we eliminate the word “maintain” and instead use “encourage.” Bill stated that he was trying to avoid the use of the word “encourage” in the CCMP.

Bill moved to the Engagement approach. He noted that working with decision-makers is one priority which arose from our dialog. He noted that some of the environmental protection issues here in NC are the subject of ongoing dialogs.

Todd noted that Bill had stressed earlier that nutrients were not going to be a focus. He asked if bacteria shouldn't be a focus here, for consistency, rather than nutrients. Bill noted that he couldn't recall why we left this one in place. Todd noted that for consistency, he didn't understand why it was here. Bill stated that part of the rationale may be that nutrients' role in the system causes some undesirable outcomes which we want to avoid.

Bill moved to D2 and D3. There were no questions on these. Tony asked if any of the Regional Local Governments were looking into climate change right now. Bill noted that some of them are starting to talk about it. Most of them are talking about flooding issues and storm hazards. Tony asked how the information will be disseminated. Bill indicated it will be put on the web site. Bill noted that there is a “climate-ready utilities” initiative now, and the staff is in discussion with some of them. Jim Hawhee noted that a lot of the materials are going to be distributed by others, to the local communities. Bill noted that NOAA is taking a similar approach. Linda Rimer stated that we are all going to be able to go online and see how climate change will affect our homes. Bill explained one of the tools which will be available.

Tony stated that we should provide links on the web site when we can. Bill noted that a large portion of the APNEP region is not wired and won't be for a long time. Tony noted that part of the population which may be the most threatened population, may not be reachable via the Internet. Willy noted that there is a community down the road from him who is moving out now because of water issues. He noted that they are very well connected with the Internet, perhaps surprisingly so. He noted they can access the web via libraries and other resources. Jack noted that just because people have access to the information via the Internet, doesn't mean that they have the capability to change. Bill agreed that direct communication will be important.

Marjorie noted that the fourth item, D3.4, doesn't appear to support the “provide tools and training” objective very well. She speculated it might not fit very well anywhere else. Bill concurred that is why it was put there. Tom Stroud noted it fit because it encouraged environmental stewardship. Jack agreed.

Bill moved to Objectives under Strategy E. He explained the two actions there.

Bill noted that the next step is to go and meet with the MAC members, and discuss the specific actions will fall under their purview. Bill noted that he would meet first with the Natural Heritage Program, as a run-through. Linda Rimer had asked to sit in on some of these, but Bill noted that he wanted to keep these meetings small. Bill noted that he hoped that all of these measures flow well. The next step will be most challenging for us. Bill noted that the activities we propose should not be in conflict with any partner missions or action plans out there. We may need to refine some of the wording, but we want them to be involved in the CCMP implementation.

Tony noted that he wanted to complement the staff on the plan draft itself. Tony noted that Rhonda had sent an e-mail yesterday stating that she also was very impressed with the document. He hoped that everyone else was feeling the same way.

Willy asked if there was a comparison from the first document, so that the differences could be explained. Willy noted as a second point, he had been around other groups who have done what Bill is getting ready to do, and they have found that they were unable to move the ball. He asked Bill what his estimation is about how successful he may be.

Bill stated that the comparison between the old, and new CCMP, has been done, by Tom Stroud, who worked for APES in the past. With regard to the second question, Bill noted that this next step is critical. We need to set up things as a body, and move these things forward. We need to make sure that we have real commitments to implement these measures. If we are not meeting a performance expectation, then we have to sit down and determine why we failed. Either we didn't have enough resources, or we weren't doing it right.

Willy noted that the engagement part is the key. Willy noted that there was a lot of excitement and support for APES, initially. Later they became disinterested. Willy stated that engagement with the public is the key to getting this moving. There are a lot of restraints. Willy stated if you can get the people fired up, you can get things moving, especially if you use videos, perhaps provocative ones.

Bill noted that this approach is fundamentally different from APES. Also, we have a long time to implement, some ten years. The challenge is to get the entire watershed engaged. Bill stated that getting the public to understand that the economy is related to the ecosystem.

Willy stated fundamentally, you can't regulate it. People have to understand it. Willy noted the ongoing effort to video all the National Wildlife Refuges, and how amazing it all is. Bill agreed that it goes beyond raising awareness; you have to create the understanding.

Todd noted that EPA will have the expectation that this will be adopted, and asked about the reporting period? Bill noted that we will report on the outcomes, and have to do so in three years. The effort will be to make progress on all of these, but his understanding it that EPA wants positive environmental change.

Todd asked if over the course of the ten years, we will have some assessment. Yes, there is.

Jack noted to Bill that he and we can't do anything all at once, and asked if there was any prioritization?

Bill said that there isn't. Jack asked how do you know where to start? Bill indicated that he would be coming back to the Policy Board and others to seek priorities.

Tony asked for clarification on the process. Bill stated they would go through the managers next. If there is change, another electronic version will be sent out. If there is no major change, the documents will go to the public in August. Bill noted that he will go to the managers once the budget has passed. He noted that several of the state agencies are facing substantial cuts in natural resource management or monitoring. He will have a schedule of public meetings, and wants at least one Policy Board to attend each of the public sessions. Tony encouraged Policy Board members to attend.

Bill agreed and noted that it is important for Policy Board members to hear what the public has to say, but also that would like to see Policy Board members engaged in making the presentations. Bill indicated they will solicit Policy Board members to participate. Bill stated they hope to combine APNEP briefings, with other scheduled meetings, such as CRC, or DMF meetings. If they can find a forum that is related to APNEP, they likely will get more participation.

Tony stated the plan is for the next meeting of the Policy Board to focus on approval of the CCMP, and the assessment. Tony noted that we can't say now, when the next meeting of the Policy Board will be. Tony noted that he would like as much advance notice as possible. Bill noted that the document will be held under 100 pages. Tony reiterated that we hope in later September to focus on approval of the documents. That next all-hands meeting will be in New Bern. The next Policy Board meeting will occur before that meeting. Tony asked that everyone mark November 17th on their calendar. Todd asked that Bill send a reminder out this week or next.

APNEP 2012 Workplan & Budget Dr. Bill Crowell

1:51 PM: Tony noted that Bill will address this issue. Tony noted that the EPA budget was cut 15.5 percent, but the NEP budget wasn't affected, but that was for only this year. The coming year is yet to be resolved. Tony noted that some of us will be called upon to comment. Tony noted that there are some budgetary challenges to come.

Bill noted that this year we dropped back to 600 K. The NEPs overall fared quite well. The program is supported by Congress since it is non-regulatory and community-based.

Bill and Tony noted that he would discuss the budget for the next year, beginning October 1. Bill noted that there will be some structural changes in the budget from EPA. He reviewed the proposed FY 2012 budget. He noted that the proposed work plan is a transitional one. Bill reviewed the general budget. Todd Herbert is the Virginia Field Coordinator. Bill noted that we want to work with Virginia more as a partner, than as a contractee. Next year, that position will be picked up more by Virginia, or the budget item will disappear and be picked up completely by Virginia.

Bill moved to the Citizens' Monitoring Network Transition. He noted that he met with ECU last week. We want to redevelop the Citizens' Monitoring Network, but he doesn't know what form that will take yet. Bill noted a few years ago, we had 75 groups, now we have only 20-25. It has been mostly citizens engagement, instead of monitoring, but we want to transition to the latter. Next year, we will likely have an RFP, to frame out what we want the program to be. This year, they plan to provide funds for chemical supplies. ECU will continue to fund Chad Smith to maintain the existing groups. We will not be recruiting new groups. ECU will fund Chad, and then APNEP will have the RFP next year.

The next four items all fall under the CCMP. Bill noted that he would be coming back to the Policy Board for more guidance on these. Bill noted that they may hire a temporary staff person to assist with the engagement activities. Bill explained the Community Involvement and Outreach item. Bill noted that there is additional clarification attached. He indicated he would answer any questions.

Willy asked what our role is. Bill noted the role is to approve the budget and categories. Bill explained that the Executive Committee will usually make any further decisions. Todd noted that it would be good to have some further discussions, later in the year, regarding specifics. Bill stated that staff will provide recommendations back to the Policy Board once the CCMP is completed. They will want advice from the Policy Board, regarding those recommendations. Todd suggested that it would be productive to have some further discussion regarding citizen monitoring and other aspects. Willy noted that further discussion of engagement would be useful. Bill noted that we need to have some further discussion of Shad in the Classroom, for example, regarding moving shad between basins and so forth.

Bill suggested that we have an ad-hoc committee to look at some of the issues related to the Citizen's Monitoring Network. Tony concurred that it would be good to look at the old program and the proposed new structuring. Tony would like to have at least a couple of folks from the Policy Board, and someone who has expertise in monitoring.

Linda Rimer noted the Meg Lowman of the new Nature Research Center would be a possibility. She would like to see her invited to the meeting. Tony wanted to see some folks from the area, who might be interested in participated. Bill noted that he would like to have at least one of the people doing the monitoring. Todd suggested that we need to talk through why we are doing this. How are the data going to be used, etc?

Bill stated that we need to decide what it is that we need to do, if we decide that we are going to have one. Bill stated that we can issue contracts on a yearly basis, but we do need to decide all the specifics as well, i.e., where the data go, and how they are used.

Tom Allen noted the "protect" category is not in the budget. He asked if that is something we will see in the future? Bill said yes. He was responsible for putting "restoration" in the budget this year. He noted that we will have something on the web site about the Healthy Waters Initiative.

Linda noted the Policy Board needs to be comfortable with this right now, so Bill can propose this to EPA, but she noted that we aren't locked in, that more information will be gathered, and changes can be made later. But Bill is under a time constraint and has to get this to EPA. Tony noted that we need to include some language regarding flexibility, in the motion to approve the budget.

Bill concurred. He noted that the indirect cost will be negotiated between EPA and NCDENR. Bill noted that the bottom line figure is solid, but the indirect costs are subject to change.

Bill noted that this year the Policy Board will be consulted regarding how the funding for the CCMP will be spent.

Linda Rimer stated that this was very exciting. She felt it makes sense. Bill stated the budget outline will appear similar next year, but will have more specifics.

Willy asked if the EPA required these identified categories. Bill noted they correspond to the proposed CCMP. Willy asked if there was any way to consolidate any of these to provide for more flexibility. Bill stated that we have ten percent flexibility, but more significant changes can be made after notifying EPA.

Bill noted that APNEP has enjoyed a low indirect charge. He noted that given all the changes in DENR, they anticipate the indirect will go up.

Timmy moved that we approve the budget, subject to giving the director flexibility. Linda Rimer seconded the motion. Tony asked for discussion. There was none. The motion passed unanimously.

Tony asked Bill to send the final version out to everyone. He asked Bill to review the approval process. Bill did so. The Secretary signs off on it and then it will go to EPA. We should get an award notice around October 1, but it could be as late as May of the following year.

Todd asked if they were getting their funding on time.

Bill noted that the NEPs are actually a year in advance. Local NEPs are one year behind the federal budget, which is advantageous.

Tony asked if the bylaws allow the Chair to appoint an ad-hoc committee. Yes, they do. Tony noted that he would consult with the staff about appointments.

Bill noted that we do have a trip planned to a demonstration site, after this meeting. He noted that a demonstration project was funded to demonstrate a number of BMPs, so this is a good site to visit. Bill showed us some photographs of the site and some of the features.

New & Old Business Tony Reevy

Tony noted that he was not aware of any old business.

Tony noted the first issue was the boundary issue. Tony noted that the STAC had been asked to address the boundary issue. Wilson made the presentation on behalf of the STAC.

Tony noted that the STAC had gone beyond the scope of where he thought they would go (proposing expansion 3 miles offshore and into the upper Roanoke Basin). He asked if the to proposed expansions could be separated? Wilson stated that the Policy Board could certainly elect to split the question so to speak. Tony felt that the two areas were separate and not linked. Wilson noted that many of the residents from the upper Roanoke no doubt spend their vacations on the coastal portion of the system.

Tony asked Bill what the implications were and what the process would be. Bill explained how he felt the process would proceed. Conversations need to be held with the Virginia delegation.

Tony asked that a motion be made to ask the Policy Board to “receive” the report and consider the need for further action.

Marjorie expressed the concern that the boundary was already too big, and asked that consideration be given to the issues we may create.

Tony noted that it had always bothered him that the upper part of the basin wasn't considered part of the system.

Bill noted that acceptance of the agreement of the STAC's recommendation will take a lot more discussion.

Wilson noted the STAC wanted to include the entire watershed to make sure that we had the proper scale.

The motion to receive the issue paper passed. Tony asked Wilson and staff to inform the STAC. Tony noted that the issue will be further discussed. Tony noted that we might perhaps want to wait until the CCMP was finalized, before taking further action on the boundary issue.

Uranium Mining Issue: Jim Hawhee

Jim presented an overview of Virginia's uranium mining controversy and how it relates to the APNEP region. He noted that Virginia presently has a moratorium on uranium mining. The issue is the potential for mine tailings to contaminate the watershed. Jim prepared a written brief that is being reviewed by staff, but it will be provided in coming days. Jim noted that the site is in Chatham County, VA. Jim noted the economics impacts are important, with an estimated 10+ billion dollars worth of uranium ore present. The NAS is doing a study right now, due out in December, which will look at the impact of mining. Virginia Beach has done a separate study which has already been released. Their water supply would be potentially affected. Jim noted that staff is following the issue. He will put together a list of resources, so that both sides of the issue can be followed. The issue is likely continue for years, but a vote to remove the moratorium is likely next year. If the moratorium is lifted, there will be another whole set of discussions, and it will be a significant issue. Call Jim if you have questions. Jim indicated that he would take questions.

Tony noted that he had a resolution from the Roanoke Rapids Sanitary District, and he read part of that to the Policy Board. They (Roanoke Rapids Sanitary District) found the mining untenable. Jim noted that the bi-state commission also is considering a resolution. Timmy noted that he has a list of all of those who have passed resolutions against lifting the ban. Timmy noted that their concern is the clean water issue. The health impact is potentially tremendous.

Tony asked if there was a legislative research commission on this issue in NC. No one was aware. Tony suggested that if such a commission develops, STAC members with relevant expertise might participate.

Linda Rimer noted another controversy regarding "fracking" (hydraulic fracturing for natural gas) and asked if that may affect our area? Jim and Tony stated it was in the upper Cape Fear Basin. Jim noted that any regulations will be statewide. Tony stated that there is a bill in the Legislature which would address the issue. Tony noted that UNC will be doing some work on fracking. Timmy stated a great study has been done about the Marcellus Shale, in PA, and he can provide the reference.

Tony asked if any Policy Board member wanted to pursue the issue further. Linda asked for more information. Jim will provide a package to the Policy Board. Tony stated that we should keep on tracking this issue.

Tony recognized Linda Rimer to address a couple of issues.

- **FEMA/ EPA MOA Dr. Linda Rimer**

Linda provided us with a copy of the subject MOA. She noted that when it became obvious that we weren't going to see anything happen with carbon credits, she began to look for sources of funding. FEMA had some funding, and EPA was able to convince FEMA that NC was a good place to demonstrate this MOA. June 27-28 will be the days for the NC Emergency Management Division to host a meeting. Many folks here will be invited to this meeting to discuss opportunities to do this in NC. The plan is to identify one coastal, and one riverine, community, subject to flooding, to participate. Linda noted that it would not be surprising to have at least one of these communities in the APNEP.

- **SENRLG Climate Actions**

Tony asked Linda to define the abbreviation. Linda noted it stands for SE Natural Resources Leadership Group. Linda noted the principals involved are high-level management. A while back, SENRLG wanted to determine what they could do on climate change, if they pooled their resources. Linda stated a work team has been composed, and they took back to the principals a recommendation for leveraging their resources. They identified 15 areas, but the APNEP region came up as the number one priority. The SENRLG asked the work group to meet and provide further recommendations, at the July meeting. The presumption is that they will recommend something that will bring the combined portfolios of some 14 agencies to bear. Linda noted that the EPA Ecosystem Services Program is working on that area. She doesn't yet know what all this means, but she wanted to bring it to us.

Tony asked for any other new business. There was none.

Notice of Next Meeting

3:00 PM: Adjourned. Tony thanked everyone for attending and asked those interested in the field visit to stick around.

Optional Site Visit to Williamston HS Demonstration Project