

Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study  
Policy Committee Meeting  
February 18, 1993  
Greenville, North Carolina

*Minutes*

---

**Call to Order**

Mike McGhee, sitting in for Policy Committee Co-chair Ray Cunningham, called the meeting to order at 9:35 AM. He explained that Secretary Howes had to return to Raleigh and called on Deputy Secretary Steve Levitas for opening remarks.

Mr. Levitas remarked on his delight and excitement at being part of the APES program, and on the interest he had had in APES over the years. He reported that APES was a high priority for the department (Environment, Health, and Natural Resources) and the Hunt administration. He commended the various committee members present for their hard work, and he expressed desire at working with the committee members in the future.

Mr. McGhee then called for self-introduction of those present (See Attachment A). Next, McGhee drew attention to changes in the agenda. These changes consisted of folding in the 10:45 AM item (Economic Analyses) and the 11:00 AM agenda item (New Research Findings) into the 10:15 AM Program Reports (See Attachment B). He asked for other changes and, hearing none, called for approval of the Policy Committee minutes from both the August and December meetings. Dr. John Costlow made a motion to accept the minutes as written, and Mike Gantt seconded; the motion was passed unanimously.

**CAC Report**

McGhee then called upon Brewster Brown, chair of the Albemarle Citizens' Advisory Committee, to bring forth any comments or issues his committee had expressed. Brown did not have any comments, but he requested to open the discussion to any CAC or other member present. Dr. John Costlow responded, stating that he had received copies of a number of letters sent to the program by a variety of people, and that many of these letters, particularly those coming from municipal and county governments, were of a negative nature.

Mr. Brown responded that he felt the letters were, for the most part, from the southern part of the Study area. APES director Randall Waite stated that the northeast area, through the Albemarle Commission (COG), had submitted on behalf of approximately 10 counties their comments on the CCMP. He indicated that the letters in question were the start of the packet of materials distributed for the day's meeting. Mr. Brown felt that, though *continued outreach to the public* - particularly to the county commissions - much of the misunderstanding of the CCMP could be alleviated.

Dr. Costlow asked that a counter offensive be mounted that would enlist the aid of CACs and other members of the program. In response, Brown stated that he felt that, considering the enormity and complexity of the document, APES had done an excellent job in writing the draft CCMP. He added that, of those comments

received on the draft CCMP, all but a few could be traced to a small number of special interest groups. Waite responded that the situation could be improved by increasing the CACs' contact with the local officials of these special interest groups.

In addition, Costlow noted the need for the implementation of a "Legislative Liaison" in order to organize interaction between the CACs, local officials, and their legislators. McGhee agreed with Dr. Costlow, adding that APES should not underestimate the opposition to the Management Plan being received. Levitas added that it would be detrimental to underestimate, not only current, but more importantly potential opposition to the Plan and the effectiveness of that opposition; thus, he felt that the committee's discussion should focus on building support for the Plan.

Mike Orbach noted the importance of Tom Hoban's report, Public Attitudes Toward Water Quality and Management Alternatives in the A/P Estuarine System: Phase II, a survey which demonstrated that people living in the A-P region were generally interested in contributing to the solution. He noted that this report could be crucial in demonstrating to local officials the public's interest in participating in the conservation and management alternatives. In addition, he noted that there were other A-P documents that could improve local officials' perception of the CCMP. Mike Gantt noted the need for a two-leveled effort: a level geared for informing legislators, and one geared towards the needs of the public. Gantt added that she felt that the Policy Committee had repeatedly mentioned the need for a close liaison with the legislators so that the legislators would be better equipped to answer questions from the public, yet she noted that APES had not actually implemented this liaison effort.

Costlow noted that he had received a 12-page copy of a document from the NC Coastal Federation expressing the perception that APES was going to be reorganized and would eliminate some of its major components. After Dr. Thomas Quay stated that the Coastal Federation had from the beginning of APES objected to certain components of the A-P Study, including the first CCMPs and the first Status and Trends Report, Sybil Basnight noted that the document in question was a draft copy. A member of the Board of Directors of the Coastal Federation, Basnight stated that the person who had written the document was new to both the Coastal Federation and APES, and that the comments were in the process of being discussed and revised.

In addition, Basnight noted that she had been disappointed in the overall leadership of the A/P Citizens' Advisory Committees. She stated that many opportunities had been given for the CACs to prepare written comments on the CCMP, yet she felt that the CACs had failed to provide sufficient comments; in fact, she felt disappointed in the leadership of the CACs overall. In response, Waite stated that, despite the negative comments from parties such as the Coastal Federation, he still valued the public's constructive comments and felt that these comments were crucial to producing the CCMP.

Don Bryan commented on the idea of implementing a "Legislative Liaison" plan. He stated that APES should now be focusing on getting the governor to sign off on the CCMP. He also added that the governor would not sign off on the Plan if he "perceives a great deal of opposition on the part of the local governments, the county commissioners, the town councils, and so forth." Bryan added: "I think the most important thing for us to do is to get to those people."

Levitas expressed agreement with Bryan, stating that, "the focus has got to be on the grassroots opposition and potential support for what we are trying to do both in local government, in the agricultural community where there is growing opposition . . . and anywhere else we can find [opposition]." Waite added that he had already been hearing from a few legislators who had expressed much concern; Waite stated that, in order to avoid promoting a mind set of opposition, it was important to "take care of local government first."

Levitas stated that he felt that the major theme in the day's discussion seemed to be the need for the authorization and direction of the APES staff to "develop a plan for further public outreach and promotion of [the CCMP]." McGhee agreed with Levitas, adding that "not only are we looking for materials that can be used to convince people of our side, but I think that it would almost be worth a strategy list. Let's make up a list of names of every county commissioner, everybody to whom we need to get this information, to gain their support. Then decide who's going to give it to them and how we are going to give it to them." A motion was made to direct the staff to develop a strategy for dealing with present opposition, and that this strategy be "specifically aimed at local government members, who seem to be susceptible to listening to opposition at this point." Levitas added that the strategy should be aimed at, not only APES' opponents, but also its friends. One committee member stated that the strategy should not only be limited to local and county government, but that the plan should also be focused on powerful organizations such as the Farm Bureaus and the Coastal Federation. Mike Gantt added that groups such as the North Carolina Conservation Council and the Nature Conservancy should also be included. She also stated that the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be "more than happy" to be involved in the consensus building activities, such as producing a fact sheet on 'How does the CCMP affect you?'. McGhee stated that, along the same lines, he envisioned APES staff and CAC members holding meetings with individual county commissioners. He stated that this idea "might be more effective than at the commission meetings, when sometimes hysteria takes over."

McGhee asked Sybil Basnight why she perceived that the Coastal Federation's objective was now so "significantly different from what this committee is about." Basnight stated that Todd Miller, director of the Coastal Federation, would be more equipped to answer that question. She also added that, since that APES program was requesting an extension, it was "time to get some fresh blood." She explained that, "when I go to these CAC meetings, you have the same core group of people that, in fact, are not really representative of the whole CAC." She added that new CAC members could provide some new insight and produce new contacts with the public. Waite stated that it may be beneficial to contact non-active CAC members and state, 'Look, we are considering replacing you on the committee. If you are still interested, I need to know now. And we need your active input.' Brewster Brown commented that it was important to come up with a group of citizens who would be involved in and dedicated to the goals of the Study. Later, Sybil Basnight discussed her opinions on the opposition to the draft CCMP that had been expressed by environmental groups such as the Coastal Federation. She suggested that APES redefine the concept of the public and 're-look' some of its views to involve true involvement with the public.

Continuing on the motion made earlier (developing a strategy for building consensus), Levitas suggested that the motion include developing a financial plan for this strategy, a plan which could involve hiring someone on a contractual basis to oversee the spending of funds. In addition, committee members discussed whom to target in the implementation of consensus building. Costlow moved "that the staff organize and implement, with assistance from all facets of the Albemarle-Pamlico, a strategy to inform and encourage citizen groups to support the concepts of the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study." He added that the concept of citizen

groups should extend from President Clinton downwards. Gantt added that the plan should incorporate tools like the Hoban study to develop consensus. John Costlow stated that the APES organizational structure, including the CACs, Technical Committee, and staff, be involved in the process. Mike McGhee suggested that, instead of holding another meeting to get the strategy implemented, the Policy Committee direct the staff to move forward with soliciting input from all of the Policy Committee members on this strategy. McGhee moved to vote on the motion in question; the **motion was approved and passed unanimously.**

### Technical Committee Report

Mike McGhee turned the meeting over to Bo Crum for the Technical Committee report. He announced that the Technical Committee had met the previous day, and he commended the Technical Committee and their new co-chair, Steve Levitas, for their efforts. Crum stated that the committee had discussed the program reports and had had presentations by Steve Smutko concerning the economic analysis of the draft CCMP. Dr. Pat Cunningham of the Research Triangle Institute had also given a presentation on her toxics study. In addition, Crum stated that there had been a number of motions made and carried to recommend to the Policy Committee certain changes concerning the schedule and wording of the draft CCMP. The first motion made and carried had been to extend the present CCMP schedule by three months (until September, 1993). Crum and McGhee agreed that a motion needed to be made to direct a request for extension specifically in EPA headquarters. Waite suggested that this motion be delayed until the CCMP discussion portion of the meeting.

Crum continued discussion of the motions made during the Technical Committee meeting. He stated that another part of the first motion had been to give the Administrator of the EPA authority to "massage the numbers, the dates in the schedule, to allow an additional review by the three major committees of the Conference of the CCMP before it goes out for public review." Furthermore, a motion had been made and carried to use the Coastal Resources Commission's definition of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV). The Technical Committee had also discussed obtaining the approval of the NC Dept. of Environmental Management (DEM), the NC Division of Marine Fisheries, and also the EHNR Division of Shellfish Sanitation, along with APES staff, to agree upon the definition of shellfish waters for the draft CCMP; a motion had not been made concerning this issue. In addition, a motion was made and carried to "include, as a recommendation, a minimum 20-foot buffer strip rather than, as stated before, a recommended 20-foot buffer strip." The Technical Committee had also agreed to continue to investigate the possibility of recommending an APES Foundation, a post-CCMP nonprofit organization which would serve as both a forum for advocacy and a structure for CCMP implementation; this concept would be discussed in the next draft of the CCMP. Finally, the committee had discussed the wetlands stewardship program. This discussion had called for a clarification of the definition of wetlands; the committee had agreed to remove the definition of wetlands included in the stewardship program portion of the draft CCMP.

### Public Comments

During the public comment portion of the meeting, Philip McMullan, a CAC member and regional economist, discussed his involvement with county commissioners. He stated that, having been in touch quite often with county commissioners and county managers, he would like to be involved in APES' consensus building efforts. He suggested, as proposed earlier, that APES develop some short and concise documents (e. g.,

fact sheets) which would summarize APES' main concerns and goals. McMullan also suggested that these documents be written by someone "quite apart from the staff . . . with a more PR attitude." Waite expressed appreciation for these ideas and recommended that he and Levitas, along with some consultants, discuss the feasibility of these actions. Crum stated that the Technical Committee had expressed similar concerns. He stated that, in fact, one of the reasons for the three-month extension of APES had been to produce a "new, more easily understood streamlined version of [the CCMP]." Waite added that he felt it was a feasible idea to "have an outsider, in essence, write the three page summary."

### Program Report - Bisterfeld

Ted Bisterfeld proceeded with the program report. He stated that his report items were essentially as he had presented to the Technical Committee on the previous day. The first item was that EPA headquarters had been advised of the extension of the APES program yet had not acted upon APES' previous request for an extension. Secondly, Bisterfeld stated that much work needed to be done with regard to accounting for the money that had been incorporated into the Study, and the products that had come out of it. He remarked that one problem APES was encountering was dealing with environmental data that had been collected. He stated that he and Waite were working with the Center for Geographic Information and Analysis (CGIA) in order to be able to identify and account for all of the data that needed to be put on APES' data management system. In addition, Bisterfeld stated that, since this data management system was being funded by tax dollars, APES needed to ensure that the data being put on the system was of good quality and could be used by state and local governments for many years.

### Budget Items

Next, Bisterfeld discussed the budget for the following year. He announced that neither APES nor the other 20 NEP programs had received allocation for the 1993 fiscal year. He clarified that this fact was not yet particularly a problem for APES, yet APES was concerned about the structure of the first post-CCMP budget for the program office. Bisterfeld also recalled that the previous December there had been a move for a 30% reduction in the NEP budget. He stated that, since Congress had decided that the NEP budget was 'uncuttable', Congress had elected to throw out the budget cut. Thus, according to Bisterfeld, "approximately \$300,000 would be available to the state of North Carolina for the first year of the implementation phase of the CCMP." Bisterfeld further stated that the first task at hand was to get the CCMP into the best format possible. The next aspect of the budget would be the long term planning element of EPA post-CCMP funding, which had been projected to last for approximately four years. He noted that EPA's first priority had been the funding of younger studies that were formulating their management conferences; its second priority had been the funding of National Estuary Programs that had already completed their CCMPs and were ready for the implementation phase.

Bisterfeld asked Randall Waite to discuss the role of Congress in NEP funding. Waite noted that APES had received a memorandum from the American Oceans Campaign discussing Congressional support for the DeLauro-Lowey Water Pollution Control and Estuary Restoration Financing Act. According to the memo, the campaign wanted to amend the NEP section of the Clean Water Act to provide specific implementation funding. Waite stated that apparently the two representatives DeLauro (D-CT) and Lowey (D-NY) were reintroducing bills that would provide that implementation funding. These bills would also provide additional

funding for the state revolving local funds for the construction of wastewater treatment plants and would be reworked to cover nonpoint source controls. Bisterfeld added that, under the Clinton-Gore transition team, North Carolina was expecting to receive a large increase in state funding for the construction of wastewater treatment plants. He noted that about 20% of that money had always been available, at the Governor's discretion, to spend on nonpoint source projects. Waite stated that he would provide copies of the draft bill for any interested committee members.

### GIS Developments

Philip McMullan commented on the success of the Geographic Information System (GIS) at Elizabeth City State University. He stated that APES had extended an invitation to the Center for Geographic Information and Analysis (CGIA) to go to ECSU to give a demonstration of the capabilities of the GIS system to the counties within the APES region. McMullan stated that the demonstration was well received, and that ECSU now had a contract with the National Park Service to train people in GIS. In addition, he mentioned that he was working on a major government-sponsored economic development conference, tentatively scheduled for March 26; McMullan requested that the APES look at these specific projects and "make sure that they fit within the concept of APES and EPA . . . while providing opportunities for jobs to people in our region." One of the major projects would involve a GIS presentation in Hyde County, in which presenters would be able to identify potential environmental pitfalls and land opportunities for development." McMullan stated that he felt that the GIS demonstrations would give local government planning levels a forum for educating the public on environmental issues and would help combat ignorance.

### Environmental Symposium

Waite asked Sybil Basnight to discuss a symposium being held on April 22 in Kill Devil Hills. Basnight announced that the meeting was a free, all day symposium being held at the Ramada Inn, and was being funded by Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation. Basnight noted that the symposium, featuring speakers Rodney Swink, Ben Bouhser, Robert Becker, and Joan Davis, was receiving much positive response from the public. She also mentioned that Michael Silverstein, author of The Environmental Factor (1989), would also be speaking at the meeting. Silverstein's credentials include being president of Environmental Economics, a Philadelphia consulting/research firm and publishing company, and professor of Environmental Economics at the Management Institute of New York University.

### NEP Developments

Bisterfeld stated that EPA Region IV would request that Waite, along with the three NEP directors in Florida, participate the first week in May in a Program Directors' Meeting; APES Public Involvement Coordinator Joan Giordano would also be participating in this session in order to exchange ideas on public involvement and education. John Costlow suggested that APES invite someone from an NEP such as the Delaware Estuary Program to hold a meeting in order to specifically discuss the 'sins of omission' which had occurred while writing their CCMP. A committee member stated that he felt that part of this idea had already been accomplished during a recent NEP Directors' Meeting in Washington, DC, in which Waite and other NEP directors exchanged many valuable ideas.

Gantt asked that either Bo Crum or Ted Bisterfeld comment on some recent developments at EPA. Crum stated that, on the Near Coastal Waters Program budget for Fiscal Year '93, APES would be receiving the same amount of money received the previous year. Crum stated that, during a National Program Meeting, there had been much discussion regarding NEP funding; attendees had expressed a need for an "umbrella program" for all EPA's coastal efforts. Attendees had also expressed the desire for geographical targeting to efficiently and effectively manage the program's limited resources. Crum stated that Congress recognized the watershed protection approach in dealing with the Water Quality Section of the Clean Waters Act, basically pioneered by the NEP program; this approach was being viewed as the "wave of the future". EPA was also considering renaming the Near Coastal Waters Program. Crum also stated that EPA was holding a national video conference "as we speak" among the various Near Coastal Waters Program coordinators in order to discuss those issues. These issues would also be discussed in March, when the Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watershed headquarters would be holding its annual meeting. Crum felt that these developments would produce a stronger, more recognized, and more visible Near Coastal Waters Program.

#### Public Involvement and Education Report

Joan Giordano discussed developments occurring in the study's public involvement and education arena. She mentioned that APES had "organized and publicized the January public meetings that were held in Manteo, Morehead [City], and Raleigh." Giordano stated that these meetings were well attended, and provided APES the opportunity to engage in dialogue with and receive good comments from the public. Giordano stated that APES staff had already responded in writing to many of the people who had written to APES with comments on the CCMP. Also, staff had redrafted a set of fact sheets that the Coastal Federation had prepared for the study; three of ten were in the process of being printed. In fact, those fact sheets and the fact sheets that APES was expecting from the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission were "about the only two outstanding projects for the public involvement portion [of the program]."

Giordano next discussed the APES newsletter. She announced that APES was continuing to revise and expand its 16,000 person newsletter mailing list. In addition, APES was responding to program inquiries and requests for research and educational materials advertised in the newsletters.

#### Media Coverage

Giordano also mentioned that the study was experiencing "increased and heightened presence by the media." In fact, it had been arranged for Waite and Tom Thompson (Craven County Economic Development Commission) to appear on Newsletter Sunday, a television program aired on WCTI, the ABC affiliate in New Bern. This program would be aired on Sunday, February 28 at 2:30 PM. Furthermore, APES staff was working with the Charlotte Observer in order to prepare a two-page, full color spread on the program. Present at the meeting, Jack Horan of the Observer stated that this article would appear the 21st or the 28th of March.

Waite remarked on the Study's educational efforts. He stated that he had been asked to serve as chair of the Environmental Impacts committee of the 4-H Center in Tyrell County. Waite stated that he would like to focus, not only on potential site impacts, but also on the coordination of other agencies such as the Fish and Wildlife Service that had similar educational focus. The goal would be to establish an educational center close enough for the Clinton-Gore early funding initiative. It would also be a high priority to build the center "in a very environmentally conscious fashion" (e. g., utilizing buffers, special building materials, energy conserving devices). Similarly, Dave McNaught was experiencing progress with an educational center being constructed in Washington, NC.; he mentioned that Tyrell County was also considering the construction of another educational center near the 4-H Center.

### Program Report - Waite

Waite discussed a number of new reports APES had recently received. He mentioned that he had already sent out abstracts or executive summaries from many of those reports to the committee members. Waite reiterated that Dr. Pat Cunningham had given an excellent presentation the previous day on her toxics report. In addition, the economic characterization report being done by Resource Analytics, Inc. (RAI), which focused on the individual/administrative impacts of the CCMP recommendations, was also progressing very well. In addition, the amount of RAI's contract had been increased to provide for a financing plan. The financing plan would focus on federal programs and other state programs which could provide implementation funding, and the likelihood of securing funding from each of these sources. The items from this research would cross-match those from each of the CCMP's management strategies, so that each strategy could discuss the potential sources and most likely options for funding each management strategy. Waite stated that obtaining this information would increase the likelihood of political support for the CCMP.

Waite discussed the study's legal analyses, being prepared by Melany Earnhardt. Earnhardt's work was already beginning to provide staff with important insights on aspects such as whether or not water quality standards were enforceable. (At present, staff had concluded that these standards were not enforceable and could only really be enforced through permit programs. Staff wanted to research suggestions for legislation that would make these standards enforceable.) In addition, Earnhardt had done a review of the "takings" issue for APES; she had researched what constituted a "taking", and applied this information to buffer strips. The analysis would be circulated for review by the Publications Review Subcommittee, as well as the Attorney General's Office; assuming favorable review, the document would be made available as part of the APES program. Waite felt that that type of information would be very helpful in expressing some of the public's concerns.

Waite mentioned several developments from JoAnn Burkholder's (NCSU) research. For instance, Burkholder had found a correlation between increased phosphate levels and the presence of a toxic dinoflagellate. In addition, her eel grass project had shown that increased levels of nitrate, especially in the spring, could cause toxicity to sea grass beds. Waite stated that, while this study was still in its early stages, it could give the study some early implications that could be used to write new standards for phosphate and nitrate levels.



Waite reiterated that Research Triangle Institute (RTI) had also been writing some reports for APES. In Dr. Pat Cunningham's toxics report, Dr. Cunningham had reviewed all of the information APES had on fish tissue, sediment, water quality, and water column, as well as Fish & Wildlife data and wildlife samples; Cunningham had screened this data against state and national criteria, and had come up with potential 'hot spots' in the APES area to be considered. One such item was mercury contamination in many of the fish tissue samples; Waite stated that this information flagged for APES some areas of concern that needed to be addressed immediately. In addition, Randall Dodd (RTI) had done some reports for APES using the GIS system to study critical habitat areas, degraded areas, and water quality problems by subbasin. Waite stated that staff believed they had enough information to derive river basin summaries from the Water Quality Action Plan; DEM would also help in writing these summaries.

### CCMP Extension

Waite stated that staff had recommended to the Technical Committee the previous day delaying the plan, and that this delay had been discussed and voted on at the meeting. Waite named several reasons for the delay, including the need to incorporate new research, to give the document a more priority-oriented focus, and lastly to give the document a "face lift". Waite stated that, by the comments staff had been receiving, the document was very comprehensive, but not easily "digestible"; thus staff was streamlining the Action Plans and providing supporting information in the form of appendices. In addition, the delay would give APES time to gain support and participation from the Hunt administration. The Technical Committee had decided upon a three month delay in order to write and send out a third draft of the CCMP. The main reason for this delay would be to meet the public participation requirements, which require that APES give 45 days advance notice of public meetings on the Management Plan, and to have the draft CCMP "on the street" a full 30 days before the meeting. A further advantage to the delay would be that staff could begin working with the legislature during the revision process. Waite asked that the chair entertain a motion to approve the extended schedule so that the study could officially apply to EPA for an extension to the program. The motion was approved unanimously.

### CCMP Discussion

Waite led discussion on the CCMP, noting that the main purpose of the discussion was to make sure the CCMP revision stage was heading in the right direction. He stated that he did, however, want the committee to formally consider the concept of SAV habitat protection. Staff had listed in the draft CCMP to protect "native" submerged aquatic vegetation but had received comment that the Coastal Resources Commission (CRC) had reviewed this issue in full, and had decided not to use the word "native". In order to be consistent with CRC terminology, the Technical Committee had voted to use the CRC's definition and not restrict the definition to protection of "native" species.

Secondly, Waite stated that staff had been receiving many comments on buffer strips. These comments ran the gamut of not having a buffer strip requirement, to making the buffer strip requirement much wider. In addition, staff was receiving objection to what activities the CCMP stated would or would not be allowed in the buffer strip (e. g., that grazing would not be allowed). The Technical Committee had voted on stating, in the CCMP, the benefits of having a buffer strip; this level of specificity would require that a forum be held at which experts would be brought in to decide on buffer strip requirements. Furthermore, the Technical

Committee had recommended a minimum 20 foot buffer instead of 20 feet exactly and had recommended relegating some of the decision making to another rule-making body. Waite stated that one option for implementation would be to enforce the requirement throughout the watershed. A second option could be enforcement through the Environmental Management Commission's or the Coastal Resources Commission's authorities to protect water quality; Waite stated that a study commission would have more time and more resources to address such issues in detail.

Levitas stated that the study would be reviewing the buffer strip issue extensively over the next few months. In addition, he intended to "talk to agricultural interests and see how they propose to deal with the problem of nonpoint source pollution - from agriculture to silvaculture." **Don Bryan made a motion to adopt the recommendation of the Technical Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.**

Waite stated that there would be another meeting to seriously look at how the CCMP draft had been revised, based on the new direction. In addition, Management Conference members would further address issues such as buffer strips, the APES Foundation, and options for setting up an entity to oversee public involvement and education activities. It had been decided that Mike Orbach would be in charge of soliciting input on the specific goals and structure of the APES Foundation and would be the point of contact for all questions from committee members on the subject.

Next, committee members discussed Section 6217 guidelines, NOAA and EPA's joint program for coastal zone management. Waite stated that, during the next few months, staff would be reviewing the new guidelines to make sure the CCMP recommendations were consistent with these guidelines. Waite discussed ways in which the new guidelines might impact the Management Plan, which included allowing the Plan to cover more activities (e. g., highway construction) and to be more stringent in some areas.

Waite noted that another important issue was avoiding a dual definition (in the Wetlands Section) on recommendations for a stewardship program. Waite stated that the Technical Committee had discussed a way to protect wetlands for water quality value and then separated those areas in order to protect for important habitat values, while recognizing that some of the areas to be protected as habitat may not be wetlands. Gantt suggested that APES utilize the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) definition of wetlands. The Policy Committee expressed support for the NWI definition, along with the acquisition of NWI mapping.

Mike Orbach stated that he felt that the wetlands issue should be treated similarly to the buffer strip issue - that is, that financial aspects should be considered along with the wetlands program. Colonel Tulloch also agreed that there should be some mention in the management plans of the socio-economic impacts of the wetlands recommendations. Waite agreed, acknowledging that attention to the socio-economic impacts would add credibility to the study. He added that some summary material for the economic analysis would be added into the Plan. Ted Bisterfeld suggested that fact sheets (e. g., "What the CCMP Means to You) be used to address those in opposition to the Plan.

At the request of one attendee, Waite discussed the BMP mapping project, which essentially involved obtaining the Soil Conservation Service and Div. of Soil and Water Conservation data on where BMPs had been installed, and making a data set out of this information. Waite also stated that the study had about \$200,000 left for other projects, such as mapping analyses; the Technical Committee had recommended

putting this money towards CCMP development activities, such as consulting services, outreach services, and additional mapping evaluations - especially in the river basin.

### CCMP Completion

Waite stated that he would be sending out a new CCMP schedule some time after the meeting (See Attachment C). The new schedule would highlight the three month extension, during which the CCMP would be sent to the Technical Committee, Policy Committee, and Citizens' Advisory Committees; after a series of public hearings, the CCMP would go back to the Policy Committee for recommendation. Finally, the CCMP would be sent to the Governor to be signed.

### New Business

Steve Levitas introduced Debbie Crane, Director of the NC Dept. of EHNR Division of Public Affairs, who would serve on the APES Publications Review Subcommittee. Committee members said goodbye to APES environmental analyst Margaret (Meg) Scully, who had served as the staff's wetlands and critical areas expert; Scully would be moving to Germany on the 1st of March.

### Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

APES  
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

GREENVILLE, NC  
02/18/93

NAME

AFFILIATION

Jan Jordan	APES
Margaret Scully	APES
Melany Earnhardt	APES
Mike Smith	FWS PC
Dor Hess (for Cross)	NOAA/NMFS
John W. Costlow	DO (rel.)
Don BREAD	PC
SCOTT TULLOCH	CORPS OF ENGINEERS
Brawley W. Brown	ACAC
Bo CRUM	EPA, Region IV, Atlanta
Mike McGhee	EPA " "
Susan Levitts	DEHNR
Bill Queen	APES/PC
Guy Steforski	APES
RANDALL G. WHITE	APES
Kristin Rowles	APES
Bill Coker	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Larry Vannoy	Corps of Engineers
Harley Coad	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Phil Barnhart	Apes CAC - Friends of Pamlico Delta
Geo H. Houlakis	N.C. Marine Fisheries

NAME

AFFILIATION

MIKE ORBOM	ELM/OCEAN AFFAIRS COUNCIL
Dodd Galbreath	ECV/ICM/Citizens Water Qual. Program
Phil McMullan	ICSU/Albemarle CAC
JACK HORAN	CHARLOTTE OBSERVER
JOHN M. CARLOCK	HAMPTON ROADS PDC
Tom Dwyer	PCHC
Jed Binstock	EPA Atlanta

Attachment B

DRAFT POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA

FEBRUARY 18, 1993  
9:30 AM - RAMADA INN  
GREENVILLE, N. C.

9:30	WELCOME	ROBERT F. MCGHEE
9:35	CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT	BREWSTER BROWN DERB CARTER
9:45	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT	BO CRUM
10:00	PUBLIC COMMENT	
10:15	PROGRAM REPORTS PROJECT OFFICER DIRECTOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COORDINATOR	TED BISTERFELD RANDALL WAITE JOAN GIORDANO
10:45	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS SUMMARY	
11:00	NEW RESEARCH FINDINGS	
11:15	CCMP DISCUSSION PROBABLE TOPICS - BUFFER STRIPS - SHELLFISH WATERS - FISHING LICENSES - APES FOUNDATION - OTHERS	STAFF
12:15	LUNCH	
1:15	CCMP DISCUSSION CONTINUED	
2:45	NEW BUSINESS	ROBERT F. MCGHEE
3:00	ADJOURN	ROBERT F. MCGHEE

**CCMP SCHEDULE***Revised 4/15/93*

<u>WEEK</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
3/1	Revise Management Plan
3/8	Revise Management Plan
3/15	Revise Management Plan
3/22	Revise Management Plan
3/29	Revise Management Plan
4/5	Revise Management Plan
4/12	Revise Management Plan
4/19	Revise Management Plan
4/26	Revise Management Plan
5/3	Revise Management Plan
5/10	Revise Management Plan
5/17	Print third internal draft
5/24	Mail third internal draft to committees
5/31	Management Conference review
6/7	Management Conference review
6/14	Management Conference meetings (6/16 & 17)
6/21	Revise Management Plan
6/28	Print third public draft
7/5	Print third public draft
7/12	Mail third public draft to public and committees
7/19	Public review of the third public draft
7/26	Public review of the third public draft
8/2	Public review of the third public draft
8/9	Public review of the third public draft
8/16	Formal public meetings on third public draft (8/16-19 & 8/23)
8/23	Management Conference meetings (8/25 & 26)
8/30	Revise Management Plan
9/6	Revise Management Plan
9/13	Revise Management Plan
9/20	Print final draft plan
9/27	Mail final draft plan to committees
10/4	Management Conference review
10/11	Management Conference review
10/18	Management Conference meetings for final CCMP approval (10/20 & 21)
10/25	Revise Management Plan
11/1	Revise Management Plan
11/8	Print final plan
11/15	Submit final plan to Governor Hunt and EPA Administrator Browner
11/22-	
1/31	EPA Review, Governors' concurrence, and signing ceremony

357