

MINUTES

ALBEMARLE-PAMLICO ESTUARINE PROJECT

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

JULY 31, 1986

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF ATTENDEES	1 - 2
SUMMARY OF POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES	3 - 6
DETAILED MINUTES	7 - 17

ATTACHMENTS

1. Cooperative Agreement Between the Environmental Protection Agency and the State of North Carolina
2. Recommendation for the Policy Committee
3. Proposed Operating Procedures for the Policy Committee
4. N.C. Recommendations for the Management (Technical) Committee Albemarle/Pamlico Estuarine Study
5. Recommendations for the Management (Technical) Committee Albemarle/Pamlico Study [EPA List]
6. Technical Committee - Albemarle/Pamlico Estuarine Study

MINUTES
ALBEMARLE-PAMLICO POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

July 31, 1986
Raleigh, North Carolina

The Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Project Policy Committee held its first meeting at 11:00 AM on July 31, 1986, in the Archdale Building, Raleigh, North Carolina. The seven-member committee was joined by six observers from state and federal environmental offices.

List of Attendees

Policy Committee

Secretary, S. Thomas Rhodes
(Co-Chairman)
Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, NC 27611-7687
(919) 733-4984

Mr. Jack E. Ravan
(Co-Chairman)
Regional Admin., EPA Reg. IV
345 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30365
(404) 347-4727

Dr. John D. Costlow, Director
Duke University Marine Laboratory
Beaufort, NC 28516-9721
(919) 728-2111

Dr. Ford A. Cross
Acting Laboratory Director
National Oceanic & Atmospheric
Administration (NOAA)
Southeast Fisheries Center
Beaufort Laboratory
Beaufort, NC 28516-9722
(919) 728-3595

Observers

Dr. Ernest A. Carl, Deputy
Secretary Department of Natural
Resources and Community Development
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, NC 27611-7687
(919) 733-4984

Mr. Lynn Muchmore
Assistant Secretary
Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, NC 27611-7687
(919) 733-4984

Mr. Don Follmer, Director
Public Affairs
Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
P. O. Box 27687
Raleigh, NC 27611-7687
(919) 733-4984

Ms. Sally Turner, Project Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency, Region IV
345 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30365
(404) 347-3409

List of Attendees
(Continued)

Policy Committee

Dr. Dirk Frankenberg, Chairman
UNC Marine Science Curriculum
12-5 Venable Hall
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
(919) 962-1252

Ms. L. K. (Mike) Gantt
Field Office Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P. O. Box 25039
Raleigh, NC 27611-5039
(919) 856-4520

Mr. Dan Ashe
Merchant Marine and Fisheries
Committee
H2-575
Washington, D.C. 20515
(202) 226-2460

Observers

Dr. Howard Marshall, Project
Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency, Region IV
345 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30365
(404) 347-4467

Mr. C. G. Vanderpool
Advanced Technology, Inc.
4 Concourse Parkway, Suite 215
Atlanta, Georgia 30328-5346
(404) 396-7822

Summary

Thomas Rhodes -
Co-Chairman)

Mr. Rhodes called the meeting to order.
He welcomed and introduced the attendees.

Jack Ravan -
(Co-Chairman)

Mr. Ravan presented a brief history of
the National Estuary Program and explained
explained the funding for 1986 and the
expected funding for the five-year
project.

Lynn Muchmore -
Sally Turner

Mr. Muchmore and Ms. Turner introduced
the Cooperative Agreement between the
Environmental Protection Agency and the
State of North Carolina (copies were
provided) and described the major points
regarding the six tasks associated with
the agreement: development of a five-year
work plan; establishment of a state
project office; formulation of a manage-
ment structure to implement the study;
development of a consensus on APS
environmental issues; establishment of a
mechanism for and initiation of a public
participation program; and development
of a centralized data management system
for the APS.

Discussion -

The Committee discussed the role of the
State Project Manager and agreed that
the final three candidates for the
position should be reviewed and commented
on by the Policy Committee before the

state hires a Project Manager. The State representative agreed to distribute copies of the advertisement for the position to the Policy Committee the week of 11 August 1986.

The Committee also agreed on the importance of a successful data integration and management system using existing hardware and having the data base for the project available to other projects and agencies.

Thomas Rhodes -

Mr. Rhodes called the Committee's attention to the Policy Committee Recommendations handout (copy attached) for discussion.

Discussion -

The Committee discussed item two on the list of Policy Committee duties: determination of the geographic extent of the study. Several suggestions were made concerning the method of determining boundaries. Dr. Howard Marshall recommended a specific boundary based on hydrological and biological data. The Committee agreed that the Policy Committee should oversee the options proposed by the Management Committee, giving them guidance for preparing options.

Thomas Rhodes -

Mr. Rhodes called for discussion on the next section of the handout, the proposed operating procedures for the Policy Committee.

Discussion -

The Committee discussed and agreed upon a rewording of the statement concerning the location of the Policy Committee meetings to read: "Meetings will be held at various locations, including those in the Albemarle-Pamlico Sound area." The meetings are to be open to the public.

The Committee agreed to each of the proposed operating procedures.

Thomas Rhodes -

Mr. Rhodes introduced the next agenda item, discussion and approval of the Management Committee structure.

Discussion -

The Committee discussed the need for industry representatives on the Management Committee. It was agreed that it would be difficult to fairly choose and limit the representatives from industry and that they should instead be included on the Citizens Participation Committee.

The Committee also agreed to ask Dr. Michael Orbach to chair the Citizens Participation Committee, as well as serve on the Management Committee.

The Committee discussed whether the name "Management Committee" was appropriate and agreed to change the name to "Technical Committee" to better represent the function of the group.

Thomas Rhodes -

Mr. Rhodes addressed the final agenda item: the August Committee meetings.

Discussion -

The Committee discussed the plans for meeting on the 14th and 15th of August in Washington, NC. Several Committee members felt it would be helpful if the Policy Committee could meet once more before meeting with the Technical Committee. It was agreed that the Policy Committee should meet on the 14th of August to formulate directives for the Technical Committee, and meet with the Technical Committee on the 15th of August.

It was also agreed that the Policy Committee members should provide to the other members information or suggestions for policy that should be considered before the next meeting. This information will be sent to Lynn Muchmore for distribution to each Policy Committee member.

Detailed Minutes

Co-Chairman Thomas Rhodes opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing the attendees. After brief opening remarks, he turned the floor over to Co-Chairman Jack Ravan.

Mr. Ravan outlined the history of the National Estuary Program, emphasizing its importance in giving necessary attention to critical resources. He explained that the Albemarle-Pamlico Sound (APS) Project was one of two new efforts for 86/87, the other being San Francisco Bay. These two were preceded in 85/86 by five estuarine projects: Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, Long Island Sound, Buzzards Bay, and Narragansett Bay.

Recognizing the State of North Carolina for their own efforts already underway, Mr. Ravan expressed the EPA's commitment to the APS Project. He stressed that the plans and suggestions on paper for operation of the Policy Committee were simply a starting point. The desires of the Policy Committee should take precedence over the guidelines they had received.

Regarding the funding for the APS Project, Mr. Ravan assured the committee that the EPA had no intention of dictating the application of the federal dollars; rather, it is up to the Committee how the funding is ultimately used within the Project. He explained the general breakdown of the \$350,000 FY86 funding as agreed upon by the State: \$300,000 for establishment of a State Project Office and initial development of the five-year work plan, and \$50,000 for contractor support based on the lack of prepositioned personnel assigned to the State Project Office.

In closing, Mr. Ravan assured the Committee that he, as Regional Administrator for the EPA and as Co-Chairman of the Policy Committee, intended to be active on the Committee and

hoped the other members would participate and could find the time to dedicate to the Project because of the tremendous contribution the efforts of the Project could make to the State of North Carolina and the estuarine environment.

Mr. Rhodes then addressed the next agenda item, the cooperative agreement between the EPA and the State of North Carolina (copy attached), and asked Lynn Muchmore and Sally Turner to explain the cooperative agreement handout distributed to the Committee.

Mr. Muchmore, speaking from the State's perspective, addressed the key points in the agreement. He pointed out that because of the significant amount of money involved and the complexity of estuarine issues in North Carolina, a preeminent concern is that an adequate amount of time be spent on the plan and design for the project. He explained that between now and the first of February, the State and the EPA collectively must draft a long-term agenda for the five-year project.

Speaking about the management structure to implement the Project, Mr. Muchmore said that the State and EPA agreed that the Management Committee should function as an agent of the Policy Committee, which must be the driving force of the Project. The Policy Committee should delegate duties and responsibilities to the Management Committee.

Regarding the development of a consensus on environmental issues for the Albemarle-Pamlico Sound, Mr. Muchmore explained the EPA and State agreement to ensure that all issues and problems are both researchable and actionable. This stipulation is meant to preclude esoteric or non-applicable research efforts that have no direct relevance to the policy issues that the State must face in its management of the estuarine system.

Mr. Muchmore also stressed the importance and complexity of public participation in the project, which the State and the EPA felt deserves a thorough evaluation regarding what role the citizens should play and at what junctures their influences should be brought to bear on the Project. Therefore, a public participation program was made part of the planning process.

Sally Turner than spoke from the EPA's perspective of the cooperative agreement. She explained how, in developing the agreement, they had tried to build on the strengths and profit from the weak points of the other estuary programs. One problem area of the other programs was the data management systems. Therefore, they felt it was important to decide at the beginning how to manage the data for this project. She said that the idea was not to purchase another computer system, but to work with what they have, find out what is available in the State, and decide how best to handle the data before beginning to collect it. She then asked for comments or questions from the Committee.

Jack Ravan commented that, in addition to the APS Project, a need exists within EPA Region IV to be able to communicate both verbally and through data. Various individuals have information and knowledge, but other don't know they have it. He proposed that the Management Committee take on the task of creating the ability to combine data services for availability to other users rather than just collecting and storing information. He stressed that data management is important and that he would like to see the Policy Committee direct some kind of effort in that area.

Bud Cross added that NOAA is interested in supporting that concept and in working to integrate their resources in such a data integration system.

John Costlow recommended consideration be given to contacting Robert J. Monroe (North Carolina State University,

retired) to head up either an ad hoc or standing group that will not only develop the concept of a data management and integration system, but will oversee it throughout the five-year project.

Michelle Hiller commented that a weakness in the Chesapeake Bay Project was the failure to create a data management system that could be readily handed over to the participants at implementation. EPA is still maintaining that system. She stated that an objective of this Project is to create a system that five or ten years from now will be in place to track long-term effects of the inputs and to identify new problems previously unanticipated.

Lynn Muchmore added that the Department of Natural Resources and Community Development has management and policy responsibilities not only for the estuary, but for the entire State. He said they are interested in having the estuarine data available for integration into the State-wide data base for areas outside the estuarine uses, for example, forestry. Compatibility with the State system already in place is important.

Jack Ravan recommended that one of the committees contact experts from the North Carolina data information system to demonstrate its principal functions and capabilities.

Thomas Rhodes referred to the schedule summary on page ten of the cooperative agreement, commenting that it is an aggressive schedule; the time table is very tight.

Sally Turner explained that the schedule dates were arrived at based on the anticipated availability of FY87 money around March 1, 1987. Therefore, working with EPA headquarters, they felt the work plan should be ready to go when the money is available. The interim dates are driven by the deadline for completion of the work plan when money is available to fund it.

Jack Ravan explained that it is important that the Policy Committee ensure that the work plan is ready when the funds are available to help ensure proper allocation. He said that though the schedule for development of the long range work plan is tight, it should be a dynamic document that can change as the Project progresses.

Dirk Frankenberg asked how the schedule dovetailed with the State's (NRCD) legislative schedule.

Thomas Rhodes responded that the schedule would fit as it relates to the State Legislature meetings. However, the timing is tight and should not slip if possible. He then voiced appreciation for the efforts that went into the schedule development and the cooperative agreement.

Moving to the next agenda item, Mr. Rhodes called the Committee's attention to the Policy Committee Recommendations handout (copy attached).

Jack Ravan introduced the handout by stating that it was designed as a starting point to assist the Committee in feeling comfortable about "who we are". The thoughts on the paper were based on experience and were not intended to limit the Policy Committee.

Thomas Rhodes pointed out Item Two on the list of Policy Committee duties: Determination of the Geographic Extent of the Study, and asked whether the boundaries should be laid out by the Management Committee and approved by the Policy Committee.

Jack Ravan answered that he thought the Policy Committee should evaluate whatever the Management Committee decides on as geographic boundaries.

Dirk Frankenberg commented that the scientific community in general seems to think that the watershed context should determine the boundaries. He agreed that the Policy Committee should take the role of overseeing the options on determining the geographic area.

Michelle Hiller stated that these are watershed projects historically and that the problem definition phase would narrow the actual areas addressed.

Dan Ashe agreed with Ms. Hiller that the problem definition phase is significant in determining geographic boundaries. He said the emphasis should be on identifying the problems and the problems would determine what areas should or should not be included.

Howard Marshall recommended a boundary for consideration based on hydrological and biological unions. He suggested the boundaries extend from Morehead City and Beaufort to the Virginia State line, including the watersheds upstream of those points.

Dirk Frankenberg suggested that to efficiently oversee the direction of the Management Committee, the Policy Committee should spend some time establishing goals and objectives within which the Management Committee could function. Otherwise, the Policy Committee would have to meet each time the Management Committee needed a decision on an issue.

Thomas Rhodes replied that there had been some objectives suggested for the Management Committee that could be discussed after lunch.

The Committee then adjourned for lunch.

Thomas Rhodes reconvened the meeting and directed the Committee's attention to the Proposed Operating Procedures of the Policy Committee handout (copy attached).

After some discussion on the statement concerning the location of the Policy Committee meetings, it was agreed that the wording of the statement be amended to read as follows:
"Meetings will be held at various locations, including those in the Albemarle-Pamlico Sound area."

Thomas Rhodes stated that the subsequent Committee meetings are to be open to the public.

The Committee agreed to each of the proposed operating procedures as Mr. Rhodes stated them from the list.

Lynn Muchmore announced that the advertising for the position of State Project Manager would be ready within a week. In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Muchmore outlined the criteria for the position, which included a Masters degree or Ph.D., a background in public policy with an adjunct in natural science, and preferably someone who had experience in interacting with state and federal government and managing large research projects. He agreed to send copies of the advertisement to the Policy Committee members for their information.

John Costlow asked what role the Policy Committee would have in deciding on the State Project Manager.

It was agreed that the Policy Committee should look at the three finalists for the position to provide comments only.

Jack Ravan recommended that the State consider hiring the Project Manager as other than a merit system employee. Other

arrangements might offer more status and money, thereby attracting a more qualified individual. It was suggested that an I.P.A. position should be considered.

Thomas Rhodes agreed that the State would take these points into consideration.

Lynn Muchmore explained that the project manager would have access to the resources of the NRCD department for support.

Thomas Rhodes added that the project manager would most likely be located in Raleigh where the resources are.

John Costlow suggested there may need to be two offices, one in Raleigh and one in Morehead City.

Thomas Rhodes said they would take a close look at location as they continue to look for the person for the job.

Moving to the next agenda item, Mr. Rhodes opened discussion on the Management Committee structure. He pointed out the two recommendations for the Committee structure, one which was proposed by the State and the other by the EPA (copies attached).

The Committee discussed the similar lists. The State's list proposed Division Directors. The EPA list proposed Commission Chairman with Division Director Alternates.

Jack Ravan commented that the EPA had no position on Commission Charman versus Division Directors on the Committee.

The Committee adopted the list of Directors with some modifications.

Jack Ravan raised the question of whether the Management Committee should include industry representatives, since it would be very difficult to choose or limit those representatives fairly.

After some discussion, John Costlow suggested the industry representatives be made part of the public participation group instead. The Committee agreed to remove industry representatives from the Management Committee structure.

Dirk Frankenburg submitted names of two other groups for inclusion on the Management Committee: the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the Water Resources Research Institute (WRRI).

The Committee agreed to replace the industry positions on the Committee list with representatives from USGS and WRRI.

Mike Gantt recommended that a member of the Management Committee attend Policy Committee meetings, and likewise, a Policy Committee member should attend the Management Committee meetings to ensure accurate representation of what takes place at the meetings.

It was suggested that the Co-Chairman of the Management Committee could fulfill that need for the Management Committee and that someone from the Policy Committee would attend Management Committee meetings. This is in addition to the Program Manager, who will attend all meetings.

Regarding the recommendation that Dr. Michael Orbach chair the Citizen's Participation Committee as well as serve on the Management Committee, Mr. Rhodes suggested that this be contingent on his ability to invest the time on both committees in addition to his many other responsibilities. The Committee agreed that he should be contacted to ascertain his availability.

Dan Ashe suggested that the term "Management Committee" might be misunderstood by some to mean a regulatory group. The Policy Committee discussed several names for the Management Committee and agreed that a more appropriate name would be Technical Committee.

Likewise, it was agreed that the term "Study" should be replaced with the name "Project", so that the function of the project would not be misunderstood as academic.

Ernie Carl suggested that any members of the Technical Committee who would likely not be able to attend the meetings should delegate someone to take their place on the Committee. The Policy Committee agreed that there should not be any alternate members on the Technical Committee because it encouraged absenteeism. In the event that members can not attend, they will not be able to have a substitute attend for them.

The Policy Committee approved the list for the Technical Committee (copy attached), accepting the recommendation that Dr. Alvin Morris represent EPA Region III on the Committee and that Colonel Paul Woodbury of the Corps of Engineers and Mr. James Graham, Commissioner of North Carolina Department of Agriculture, be asked if they would like to appoint replacements for themselves.

Thomas Rhodes addressed the final agenda item, the August committee meeting, and asked what plans had been made.

Lynn Muchmore recommended that the Technical Committee meeting be postponed until the end of August to allow the Policy Committee time to meet and arrive at some definite positions on several issues that were not covered thoroughly at this meeting.

Thomas Rhodes suggested that the Policy Committee meet on the 14th of August as scheduled and that the Technical Committee meet on the 15th of August with the Policy Committee, at which time the two committees could get acquainted and the Policy Committee could give the Technical Committee specific direction. The Technical Committee could then meet at the end of August as their first meeting.

It was agreed to schedule the Policy Committee meeting for the 14th of August and the Policy and Management Committees meeting on the 15th, followed by the public ceremony.

Dirk Frankenberg suggested that the Policy Committee members provide each other with information or suggestions on the types of policies they think should be considered at the next meeting. That information should be sent to a central point for distribution to the other members before the meeting on the 14th of August.

Lynn Muchmore said all information could be sent to Thomas Rhodes and they would duplicate and distribute it to the other members.

Dan Ashe suggested that statements be written on the issues discussed, to get them on paper before the 14th and that those should be distributed also.

Thomas Rhodes agreed and recommended that all information be directed to Lynn Muchmore, rather than to him, and it would be distributed.

Having completed the agenda, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES
ALBEMARLE-PAMLICO ESTUARINE PROJECT
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

JULY 31, 1986

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY AND THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

PURPOSE:

To provide Technical Assistance and Support to the State of North Carolina to Develop and Implement the Albemarle/Pamlico Sound (APS) Study

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE:

The period of performance shall be September 1, 1986 to September 30, 1988

PROJECT OFFICER:

Sally Turner
Marine Protection Section
EPA Region IV

BACKGROUND:

The Albemarle-Pamlico estuarine system is the second largest estuary in the United States ranking third in commercial fisheries yield. The surrounding land areas are experiencing major recreational, residential, agricultural and industrial development contributing to serious water quality degradation in portions of APS. In May 1986, EPA and the State of North Carolina jointly announced that a major cooperative multi-year study would be conducted to characterize the conditions in the estuary and to develop a management structure and strategy to effectively restore and manage both water quality and living resources in the APS. This cooperative agreement outlines the areas of responsibility in

development and implementation of this effort. Resources for this study will primarily be used to:

- develop a 5 year workplan for implementation of the study;
- establish an effective state project office and coordinator;
- formulate a management structure to implement the study;
- develop a consensus on environmental issues for the APS;
- establish a mechanism for and initiate an active public participation effort; and
- develop a centralized data management system for the APS.

STATEMENT OF WORK:

1. Development of a 5-Year Work Plan

The State of North Carolina (in cooperation with EPA and the Management Committee) agrees to develop a detailed workplan for the study and submit it to EPA Region IV by February 1, 1987. The workplan will outline the major issues in the APS and will be developed through the mechanism of the Management Committee. The workplan should specify activities for the next 5 years including the priority study areas, goals, objectives, listings of specific projects for each priority area, schedules for completion plus milestones, and general resource requirements. In some

cases, it is expected that the workplan will identify resources from other Federal Agencies such as FWS, USDA, USGS, NOAA, and COE or other state sources to cover project costs. Specific projects may include, but are not limited to:

- the review of historical data bases on nutrients, toxics and living resources; media areas can include water column, sediment, and living resources.
- the identification and review of ongoing projects in the APS.
- the conduct of scientific investigations to increase our understanding of the problems in the APS and provide information which will support policy and program decisions to achieve the overall goals of the APS study.
- the conduct of monitoring and field surveys to enhance the historical data bases.
- the establishment of trends in living resources, land use, and water quality.
- the establishment of water quality and habitat criteria necessary to support and enhance living resources of concern in the estuary.
- identification of solutions for specific priority areas.

To the extent possible, the workplan should anticipate specific research topics; demonstrate why the projects are necessary and appropriate; explain the interrelationship among the projects; clarify

the reasons why research outcomes will affect policy choices or program design; and identify parties to conduct the research. The workplan should subdivide the study into tasks and establish the schedule to complete those tasks. Additionally, the workplan should demonstrate how special areas of concern are to be resolved. These include public participation, since it is a goal of the study to sustain an information, education, and consultation program that will both advise the public about the course of the study and its purposes and solicit periodic input that may refine the development of specific projects. Special consideration should also be given to data management, since a well organized and coordinated approach to data generation and manipulation with adequate quality control is essential to the study. To that end, the workplan will indicate a framework within which data acquisition and storage is to occur, with particular attention to the compatibility of machine-readable records. Further, the workplan will assign responsibility for data management to a single agency and establish the general rules under which that responsibility is to be executed. The workplan shall set forth the procedures under which other state and federal agencies may cooperate with the study, contribute to its purposes, or align their own research programs to reinforce study objectives.

2. Establish a State Project Office

The State of North Carolina agrees to appoint a Program Manager, and to establish and staff a State Project Office by October 1, 1986. To successfully develop and implement a

a program of this nature, it will be necessary to coordinate APS activities among the various state and federal research and regulatory groups, local and institutional constituencies.

The project manager must have sufficient experience with large-scale studies and knowledge of estuarine systems to assume leadership in the day-to-day administration of the study.

Administration will involve extensive liaison with state and federal agencies, public relations, fiscal management, liaison with the Policy Committee and the Management Committee, and the monitoring of individual research projects.

3. Establish a Study Management Structure

The study will proceed under the general guidance and direction of a Policy Committee, which shall have final responsibility for operational and fiscal conduct of the study. The Policy Committee shall approve the workplan and shall consider amendments from time to time. The Policy Committee shall set forth procedures establishing the process by which the study shall be conducted.

The detailed management of the study shall be overseen by the Management Committee, whose membership shall be selected by the Policy Committee. The Management Committee shall possess such authority as may be delegated to it by the Policy Committee, and may at its discretion establish subcommittees, working groups, task forces, or ad hoc advisory bodies to facilitate its deliberations.

Meetings of these committees will be held periodically throughout the project duration. Workgroups supporting these committees

will be formed and supported as appropriate.

Minutes of the meetings of the Policy and Management Committees will be distributed by the State Program Office. Records of all Management & Policy Committees' decisions will be maintained by the State Program Manager.

Disbursement of funds from the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study Grant shall be made by the Co-Chairpersons of the Policy Committee in accordance with the laws, regulations and procedures of the State of North Carolina and applicable federal regulations.

4. Identify and Characterize Significant Issues

The State of North Carolina agrees to identify the priority problems in APS by January 1, 1987 and provide support to the Management Committee (or its designated workgroups) to complete problem definition which will provide the basis for the 5-year workplan.

The State will furnish an annotated outline that identifies the major issues or problems that are to form the central agenda for study. Issues and problems should be (1) researchable - that is, display a reasonable expectation that aggressive application of scientific methodologies and resources will yield greater understanding of underlying natural or social phenomena; and (2) actionable - that is, sufficiently related to current

or anticipated institutional capacities that improvements in knowledge or understanding can be expected to translate into more effective policy and program administration at the local, state, or federal level. The outline should include such documentation from secondary sources as will enable the uninformed reader to grasp the essential nature and scope of the issues and to discern the reasons why they are appropriate for study. Problem areas shall be agreed upon by both the Policy and Management Committees.

Candidate problem areas that may require definition should include, but are not limited to:

- o point and nonpoint source pollution
- o effects of impoundments, freshwater withdrawals, channelization, drainage projects, changes in land use, and wetlands loss;
- o fishery production, management, contamination, diseases, and habitat alteration;
- o industrial development, agriculture, recreational and commercial fishing, waste disposal, and tourism;
- o regulatory and permit programs.

The following criteria should be considered in ranking the problems:

- Does the problem have system-wide impact?;
- Does the problem impact users of the system?;
- Are there significant major or local impacts that dominate the estuary?
- Can the cause of the problem be identified?; and
- Does the problem have a range of solutions with high probability of success at various levels of effort?

Characterization builds on the scientific work done in the estuary in the past. The process of characterizing the trends in the estuary may take several years. This effort will require scientific support from academic and research institutions, State and Federal agencies, and some national expertise. The process in characterizing a priority problem will involve:

- data identification, gathering and screening;
- data synthesis and analysis;
- developing conclusions on status and trends and how the system has changed over time;
- identification of linkages between pollutant source and resource impacts; and production of program findings reports;
- development of a Quality Assurance Program for all data collection.

5. Agreement on a Data Management System

The State (in cooperation with EPA and the Management Committee) will identify a data management system and specify its location for

the APS Study.

In identifying the data system, the following criteria should be considered:

- Data entered or maintained for problem definition and characterization must be available to, or on, the EPA NCC mainframe and be compatible with Storet;
- availability to the local scientific community, EPA, and State program participants;
- Capability for update;
- Cost, user-friendliness, compatibility with existing systems;
- Data manipulation and assessment capabilities;
- The data management system used must be flexible, anticipating that the responsibility for support will go to a program participant under the 5-year Study Plan.

6. The State of North Carolina (in cooperation with EPA and the Management Committee) agrees to promote an effective public participation program and will establish an advisory structure for this effort. The public participation program will incorporate results from past or contemporary public participation exercises conducted by the state government.

Schedule Summary:

October 1, 1986	State Project Office established
January 1, 1987	Draft Summary Report identifying priority problems
February 1, 1987	Draft 5-Year Work Plan
March 1, 1987	Final Summary Report identifying priority problems
March 30, 1987	Final 5-Year Work Plan

Recommendation for the Policy Committee

The Policy Committee will set the overall policy of the APS project and ensure that a coordinated federal-state effort is made to address resource management decisions in APS.

The duties of the Policy Committee will include but are not limited to:

1. Approval of the management structure for the Albemarle/Pamlico Study. The Policy Committee will approve all memberships on the Management and Citizens' Advisory Committees. The committee will provide guidance and direction to these committees on a continuing basis.
2. Determination of the geographic extent of the study.
3. Final approval of the 5-year work plan.
4. Ultimate responsibility for all financial expenditures.
5. Integration of all agency and individual efforts under the management structure of the Albemarle/Pamlico study.
6. Actively working to obtain additional funding to support the research and public information efforts.
7. To the extent practical, encouragement of all other agencies to support the Albemarle/Pamlico study.
8. Ensure that the public is fully and continuously advised of the study and has an opportunity to be represented on the Citizens' Advisory Committee.
9. Ensure that all efforts and program elements support the objectives of the study.
10. Final approval of the list of priority problems to be addressed by the study.

42

Proposed Operating Procedures for the Policy Committee

I. Meetings of Committee

- Meetings will be held at least twice a year or as necessary to effectively carry out responsibilities
- Meetings will be called by the co-chairmen of the committee
- Meetings will be held at locations throughout the Albemarle/Pamlico area.

II. Chairperson

- EPA Region IV Administrator and Secretary of North Carolina Dept. of Natural Resources and Community Development shall co-chair committee meetings
- The co-chairmen shall appoint designees to serve in their absence.

III. Voting

- Each committee member shall have one vote
- The majority vote shall rule
- Individual voter and abstentions will be noted in minutes of meeting.

IV. Committee Secretary

- The APS State Project Manager or designee shall attend all meetings as Committee Secretary and shall:
 - Prepare and distribute agendas for the committee meetings
 - Record and retain minutes of the meetings
 - Disseminate minutes of meetings to all committee members and to members of Management Committee
 - Draft and provide copies of committee directives to the Management Committee.

(93)

N. C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ALBEMARLE/PAMLICO ESTUARINE STUDY

- Co-Chairman: 1. Dr. Ernie Carl, Deputy Secretary
Natural Resources & Community Development
- Co-Chairman: 2. Mr. Bruce Barrett, EPA
Water Division Director
- Members: 3. Ms. Michelle Hiller, Chief
Technical Guidance Branch, EPA-DC
4. Mr. W. Paul Wilms, Director
Division of Environmental Management
5. Mr. David Owens, Director
Division of Coastal Management
6. Mr. Charles Fullwood, Executive Director
Wildlife Resources Commission
7. Dr. B. J. Copeland, Director
North Carolina Sea Grant Program
8. Commissioner James A. Graham
N. C. Department of Agriculture
9. Dr. William Hogarth, Director
Division of Marine Fisheries
10. Mr. Harry Layman, Director
Division of Forest Resources
11. Mr. William Austin, Director
Division of Soil and Water Conservation
12. Dr. Michael K. Orbach, Chairman
North Carolina Marine Science Council
13. Col. Paul W. Woodbury
District Engineer
Wilmington Corps of Engineers
14. Representative from the State of Virginia
15. Representative from EPA Region III
16. Mr. Doug Mercer
TexasGulf
17. Fishing Industry Representative
18. Coastal Forest Industry Representative

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ALBEMARLE/PAMLICO STUDY

- Co-Chairman: 1. Mr. Bruce Barrett, EPA
Water Division Director
- Co-Chairman: 2. Dr. Ernie Carl, Deputy Director
Natural Resources & Community Development
3. Ms. Michelle Hiller, Chief
Technical Guidance Branch, EPA-DC
4. Mr. Charles Baker, Chairman
Environmental Management Commission
Alternate: Mr. Paul Wilms, Director of
Environmental Management
5. Mr. Dan Besse, Chairman
Coastal Resources Commission
Alternate: Mr. Dave Owens, Director
Division of Coastal Management
6. Mr. David W. Sides, Chairman
Soil & Water Conservation Commission
Alternate: Mr. William E. Alston, Director
Division of Soil and Water Conservation
7. Mr. Jerry W. Wright, Chairman
Wildlife Resources Commission
Alternate: Mr. Charles R. Fulword, Jr., Executive Director
Wildlife Resources Commission
8. Dr. William T. Hogarth, Director
Division of Marine Fisheries
9. Dr. B.J. Copeland, Director
North Carolina Sea Grant Program
10. Mr. James A. Graham, Commissioner
North Carolina Department of Agriculture
Alternate: Mr. Tom Ellis, Environmental Planner
North Carolina Department of Agriculture
11. Ms. Sharon K. Shutler, Estuarine
Programs Coordinator
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration

12. Dr. Michael K. Orbach, Chairman*
North Carolina Marine Science Council
13. Colonel Paul W. Woodbury, District Engineer
Wilmington Corps of Engineers
14. Representative from the State of Virginia
15. Alvin R. Morris, Director
Water Management Division
EPA Region III

*Also serves as chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

ALBEMARLE-PAMLICO ESTUARINE STUDY

CO-CHAIRMEN

Dr. Ernest A. Carl, Deputy Secretary
N. C. Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
Post Office Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687
(919) 733-4984

Mr. Bruce Barrett, Director
Water Division
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
345 Courtland Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30365
(404) 347-4450

MEMBERS

Mr. William Austin, Director
Division of Soil and Water Conservation
N. C. Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
Post Office Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687
(919) 733-2302

Dr. B. J. Copeland, Director
North Carolina Sea Grant Program
North Carolina State University
Post Office Box 8605
Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-8605
(919) 737-2454

Mr. Charles R. Fullwood, Jr., Executive Director
N. C. Wildlife Resources Commission
512 N. Salisbury Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
(919) 733-3391

Commissioner James A. Graham
North Carolina Department of Agriculture
Post Office Box 27647
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7647
(919) 733-7125

MEMBERS (continued)

Ms. Michelle Hiller, Chief
Technical Guidance Branch (W8-556M)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
401-M Street
Washington, D. C. 20460
(202) 426-4793

Dr. William Hogarth, Director
Division of Marine Fisheries
N. C. Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
3411 Arendell Street
Morehead City, North Carolina 28511
(919) 726-7021

Mr. Harry Layman, Director
Division of Forest Resources
N. C. Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
Post Office Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687
(919) 733-2162

Dr. Alvin R. Morris, Director
Water Management Division
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
841 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
(215) 597-9410

Dr. Michael K. Orbach, Chairman
North Carolina Marine Science Council
210 Longmeadow Road
Greenville, North Carolina 27834
(919) 757-6883

Mr. David Owens, Director
Division of Coastal Management
N. C. Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
Post Office Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687
(919) 733-2293

MEMBERS (continued)

Ms. Sharon Shutler
Estuarine Programs Office
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
University Building, Room 622
Washington, D. C. 20235
(202) 673-5243
FTS

Dr. James M. Stewart, Associate Director
Water Resources Research Institute
North Carolina State University
Campus Box 7912
Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7912
(919) 737-2815

Mr. James F. Turner, Jr., District Chief
U. S. Geological Survey
Post Office Box 2857
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-2857
(919) 856-4510

Mr. W. Paul Wilms, Director
Division of Environmental Management
N. C. Department of Natural Resources
and Community Development
Post Office Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687
(919) 733-7015

Colonel Paul W. Woodbury, District Engineer
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
Wilmington District
Post Office Box 1890
Wilmington, North Carolina 28402-1890
(919) 343-4501