

**Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study  
Policy Committee Meeting  
April 21, 1992  
Nashville, North Carolina**

*Minutes*

**Call to Order**

Co-chair Bill Cobey called the meeting to order at 10:25 AM. He noted that committee members Dan Ashe, Keith Buttleman, Walter Tulloch, and Don Bryan were not present for the meeting. He also mentioned that Don Hoss was sitting in for Bud Cross, and that Bowman Crum was sitting in for Ray Cunningham.

**CCMP Update**

Program Director Randall Waite discussed the status of the draft Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (CCMP). He stated that, during this meeting, he would like to determine how far the process of creating the document had progressed and the direction in which the process should be moving. He stated that he would like the committee members to discuss each of the Action Plans individually, and that he would solicit the members' opinions about those plans.

Waite discussed the latest developments in the draft CCMP process. He noted that APES had held a Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting during the previous week, which he was unable to attend. At this meeting, APES staff members had "walked through" the work plan and action plans with the CAC members, and had received feedback on those plans. There had also been a Technical Committee meeting during the same week, in which committee members discussed each of the Action Plans; Waite noted that the general conclusion drawn from Technical Committee members had been that there were still many technical "holes" which needed to be filled in before releasing a public draft of the CCMP; members also felt that the document needed additional chapters, such as an Introduction and an Implementation Strategies Action Plan.

Waite noted that APES had held a Monitoring Subcommittee meeting in order to review the monitoring budget for the present year, as well as the Monitoring Action Plan as part of the CCMP. He also noted that there had also been a Technical Review Subcommittee meeting in order to discuss potential projects under the \$200,000 line item in the budget. He stated that, in order to submit a complete work plan to the EPA, he had decided to postpone submitting the following year's budget to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) until after the day's meeting.

Waite reiterated that the primary thought expressed at the Technical Committee meeting had been that there still remained much work to be done on the draft CCMP. Furthermore, committee members felt that, in order to avoid creating a negative first impression of the document, it was important to release a good first product to the public. Thus, the Technical Committee had decided to delay releasing a first draft to the public until the committee was comfortable with a version of the Plan. Waite stated that the Study expected a minimum of about three months to fifteen weeks for completion of the first draft.

**Scope of Work Plan**

Waite reiterated that the Study had a \$200,000 budget item for completion of the CCMP. This money would be use for workshops, as well as for small projects that would fill in "holes" in the document and would produce a more implementable CCMP.

### ***Upcoming Projects***

Waite stated that the Study had discussed doing an economic analysis of the Management Plan, in which a contract analyst or an economist would conduct a base-line analysis addressing the positive and negative economic impacts of the recommendations of the CCMP. He estimated that such an analysis would cost about \$50,000.

Waite stated that he would like to have the BMP (Best Management Practice) program extended. The first part of this program would involve BMP mapping, and using the data for the Study's Geographic Information System (GIS) and runoff modeling analyses; he expected that such research would cost about \$15,000. The second part would involve having research done on groundwater and the effects of nutrient retention on the Study area's streams. In addition, he would set up a work group on septic tanks, an area for which the study lacked much needed information for the completion of its Management Plan. He also mentioned contracting a legal analyst to research the legal implications of the recommendations outlined in the draft CCMP, and he estimated that such an analysis would cost approximately \$25,000.

Waite noted that, in APES' Monitoring Subcommittee, the subcommittee had concluded that the Study would need a three-phase approach to monitoring. The first phase would be to retain a skeleton monitoring system for the collection of long-term data. The second phase would be to concentrate the smaller portions of data into larger areas for heavy analyses, such as the Division of Environmental Management's (DEM) basin assessment. The third phase would be to have some resources research and identify specific environmental problems in specific areas, for example bacteria in the South River. Waite also stated that he would like to set aside approximately \$15,000 for an analysis of the Study's fisheries monitoring site; such an analysis would determine what type of fisheries assessments the Division of Marine Fisheries would need for the CCMP's Fisheries Management Plan. In addition APES would incorporate \$35,000 into Randall Dodd's research. The Study would also hold workshops similar to the ones conducted the previous February in order to build support and consensus from industry and other outside organizations. Waite estimated that about \$25,000 would be needed to set up those workshops and to bring together facilitators for the workshops.

### ***Potential Funding and Upcoming Projects***

Waite noted that, in addition to the \$200,000 line item, other monies would potentially be available. The first potential funding was \$250,000 from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers that had been reserved for the past three years to aid in the striped bass management study. He noted that presently the Corps' idea would be to spend about \$200,000 of that money on wetlands and soils mapping for GIS; this data would be used in GIS's permitting procedures; the rest of the money (\$50,000) would go directly to GIS. Another alternative would be to use the money for a type of water quality modeling to match with the hydrodynamic modeling that APES had done. In addition, Waite noted that APES had potential monies from EPA in the Near Coastal Waters Program; This funding, if received, would be used for developing model ordinances or guidelines for land and water use planning.

Other projects discussed at this meeting were Pete Peterson's project on scallop recruitment in the Pamlico Sound, Bill Hogarth's project on by-catch reduction gear, and Preston Howard's project on bacteria. Waite noted that the Technical Committee would be responsible for determining which of those projects would be appropriate for Near Coastal Waters funding.

### **Work Groups**

Waite discussed the individual work groups he would set up to review and research specific parts of the action plans in the CCMP. The purpose of these work groups would be to fill in technical "holes" which existed in the draft Management Plan. Information obtained by these work groups would also serve to provide justification for the recommendations in the Action Plans (e. g., why -or do - septic tanks need to be pumped out every five years), as well as quantify goals and set specific guidelines for the recommendations. The work groups include the following: buffer strips, agricultural Best Management Practices, forestry practices, land use and water use plans, runoff modeling, NPDES enforcement, wetlands, septic tanks, water use problems water management districts, fisheries, economic impacts, and the development of an Implementation Strategies Action Plan.

Derb Carter expressed concerns that the development of these work groups would delay the process of producing a final CCMP. Other committee members expressed concern about the time frame for CCMP development, but seemed to agree upon the need for these work groups as a necessary tool for developing an implementable and justifiable CCMP.

### **Discussion of CCMP**

APES staff discussed specific portions of the Action Plans. These staff members were Kristin Rowles, who discussed the Fisheries Action Plan; Jennifer Steel, who discussed the Water Quality Action Plan; and Margaret Scully, who discussed the Wetlands and Critical Natural Areas Action Plan.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.