

MINUTES

POLICY COMMITTEE  
August 29, 1991  
Nags Head, NC

Chairman Ray Cunningham called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Attendees list attached. (ATTACHMENT A)

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

Queen made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 11, 1991 Policy Committee Meeting (PC). Bryan seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Cunningham opened the meeting for public comment. No comments were made.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Citizens Advisory Committees (CACs)

**ACAC - Brewster Brown**

Brown reported that at the last joint meeting of the CACs in Williamston, members heard a brief report on the Striped Bass Study. Brown requested more timely distribution of materials during the CCMP development process to give the CACs adequate time for review and response. Brown initiated a discussion on clarification of the roles of committees and emphasized that at this important time in the study, there is a need for clear definition of committee roles and for good communication to encourage participation. Brown suggested listing workgroup members in the newsletter or a news release to make citizens aware of through whom they can have input.

**Derb Carter - PCAC Report**

Carter noted a drop in PCAC participation and interest and suggested that the public may not be encouraged enough to invest their time into the process. He raised the issue of finding assistance for citizens that are asked to participate extensively in the process.

Carter said that the CAC's collective response to the goals and objectives is that they are too vague and that more defined objectives will guide the process and provide a measure the program's effectiveness. Carter said they are not action oriented enough.

Carter stated that CAC members are anxious to move forward in preparation of the CCMP. They would like the process, the decision-making procedures, and the timelines to be clearly defined.

Carter said the workgroups which will refine the goals and objectives are

1 (230)

heavily weighted toward managers of existing programs within state or federal agencies.

To address any misunderstandings on committee roles and CCMP development processes, Costlow moved that the PC organize a meeting of all committees to be held long before and totally separate from the Summit to clarify any possible misunderstandings and help identify a course of action. Costlow amended the motion to add that the meeting be held October 11, 1991. Mr. Bryan seconded the motion. The motion was never carried.

Discussion drifted to the financial strain on CAC members to attend these meetings, and the question of reimbursement was raised again. It was noted that reimbursement for direct travel is available if necessary. It was acknowledged that loss of salary can not be reimbursed.

Brown suggested that an all-committee meeting might not be necessary and issues concerning communication and CCMP development would be addressed later in the meeting when the CCMP format was discussed. He emphasized the need for a clearly defined CCMP development process.

Bryan made a priority motion to table this discussion until items referred to by Brown could be discussed to give the PC a chance to resolve the problems by that discussion. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Costlow moved that the policy committee instruct the staff to develop a flow diagram, for distribution to all interested parties, which will identify opportunities over the next 12 months for input into the development of the CCMP, identify the role of the standing committees of APES, identify the role of all ad hoc workgroups, and indicate ways in which any other interested citizens or citizen group may have input. The motion was seconded.

In further discussion, it was suggested that the flow chart be put in the next newsletter or a news release. Ashe suggested that a special edition of the newsletter focusing on CCMP development come out as soon as possible. Costlow clarified that the flow chart is not intended to identify or define the CCMP. The motion to instruct the staff to develop a flow diagram was unanimously approved.

#### TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT - Dr. Ernie Carl

Carl said the Secretary has agreed to drop the 7% overhead being paid to the department. Carl said that the TC reviewed and discussed the Puget Sound CCMP. Carl reported to the PC that the TC unanimously agreed that the CCMP should be used to solve a problem and not to create another study.

Carl reported that the TC recommended that the PC drop both Costanza's wetlands valuation project and the Blue Crab disease project because the proposed work would not contribute, within the timeframe, to any kind of management improvement. The TC recommends that the money from Costanza's project (\$37,000) be placed in reserve to cover CCMP completion costs.

**PROGRAM REPORT - Mr. Waite**

Waite reported on the two projects recommended by the TC to be dropped and asked for an official motion by the PC:

**Valuation of Wetlands:** The Technical Review Subcommittee's final consensus was that the project would not be able to provide information directly useful to the CCMP. Bisterfeld added that Costanza indicated that he is funded in part by EPA to do similar work and that expanding this effort would require exceeding the budget and time we have available.

**Dr. Queen moved to drop the Costanza project. Chairman Cobey amended and seconded the motion adding that the \$37,000 would be put in reserve for the development of the CCMP. The motion was approved.**

**Blue Crab Disease:** The Technical Committee decided that the revised project proposal would not provide useful management information. Waite informed the PC that the researchers started the project before receiving funding. He estimated they were about \$2000-\$3000 into the project. The TC and the Technical Review Subcommittee had recommended to drop it with no compensation.

**Dr. Queen moved to drop the project. Brewster Brown seconded the motion. Bud Cross refrained from voting on this motion. The motion was otherwise unanimously approved.**

Bud Cross spoke on Engel's and Noga's behalf saying that the disease occurs in the summer, and so they began working when the disease was occurring rather than sitting 9 months after being funded.

It was noted that the project was tentatively approved by the PC in March pending satisfactory negotiation of the work contract and budget.

Sanzone said that we cannot legally pay for costs incurred before the funding instrument is in place.

**Costlow moved to deny funding or compensation for this program. Don Bryan seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved. Bud Cross abstained from voting. As a consensus of the committee Waite was instructed to provide a clear and complete explanation to the investigators of the deliberations which led to that motion.**

**GOALS AND OBJECTIVES - Mr. Waite (ATTACHMENT B)**

Mr. Waite asked the PC if the goals and objectives were heading in the direction the committee had in mind to get quantifiable objectives. Mr. Waite referred to a new goal suggested by the Human Environment work group to address the cultural integrity of the area. Mr. Waite asked for direction on whether to proceed with this item.

In discussion it was suggested that this goal could become a part of a preamble which should describe what is referred to as the unique combination of cultural heritage which we are attempting to recognize. It was also suggested that the item could remain, but that public trust issues should be added.

Costlow moved to change the wording in the new goal from preserve to recognize and address. The motion was seconded by Chairman Cobey and unanimously approved. It was clarified that the motion was only to change the word preserve and not to adopt the goals and objectives.

It was noted that comments on the goals and objectives are due by the September 10, and the next draft would be sent to all involved parties, and possibly would be ready by the Annual Meeting. Several suggestions were made:

1. Carter pointed out that some objectives state what actions should taken, but most state what information is needed. Steel replied that the next draft will fill in some of the information blanks with more quantifiable objectives.
2. Smith suggested that each goal have background data, such as natural levels and causal factors, and actions that will be taken to achieve it.
3. It was noted that parenthetical notes on the draft should be omitted.
4. Col. Tullock suggested putting timeframes on collecting needed information.

Mr. Waite suggested that the discussion be tabled and said staff would have quantifiable objectives, to the extent possible, at the next regular PC meeting.

#### **PUGET SOUND EXPERIENCE - Waite**

Waite summarized the Puget Sound process, format, positive aspects, and problems. The Puget Sound project alienated industry in developing their implementation process and lacked adequate opportunities for public input. Waite said we have already addressed the public participation issue by planning two sets of public meetings.

Waite outlined the Puget Sound project's use of issue papers in development of their management plan. He suggested that in our program, issue papers would clearly define options for the PC and would be easy to fold into the management plan.

Waite said one of the most important sections in their management plan is the estimated implementation costs.

#### **CCMP FORMAT - WAITE - (ATTACHMENT C)**

Waite circulated for discussion a proposed draft outline which he developed with Bisterfeld. Waite asked that Carter discuss the concepts in his proposal which the PC members had previously received.

Waite discussed the possible approaches for the CCMP:

1. Problem - Focus on the 8 or 9 priority concerns to attack specific problems or concerns and describe to the public, local government, and legislators specific actions to solve the problem. It may belay fears of regulation for the sake of regulation.

2. Watershed - Address problems of each sub basin separately. This approach is likely to have much overlap between sub-basin programs.
3. Program - For example, make nonpoint source program plan and a point source program plan. This approach folds into the existing management structure, but it may limit development of better, alternative approaches.
4. All combined - Try to fold all three approaches together. This approach is difficult to write and may have much overlap.

Waite discussed the structure of the action plans, each based on a priority concern. An action plan would both evaluate programs addressing the priority concern and address any needs for new programs or legislation.

A discussion of how to present cost and benefits followed. Orbach suggested that costs should be compared with a general listing of benefits to avoid the impression of costs with no benefit.

Waite said Todd Miller suggested that the action plans be based on area specifics and followed by a statewide summary. Waite said that he and Bisterfeld think the action plans should be based on priority concerns and followed by Area Specific Assessments which discuss how area specific problems are addressed in the action plans.

Waite reviewed the remaining proposed sections in his outline. The importance of the long-term monitoring plan and the community involvement and public education plan were emphasized. Costlow suggested having a separate section that summarizes any recommended legislation.

#### **CARTER'S PROPOSAL - Derb Carter (ATTACHMENT D)**

Carter said that his approach differs in that the action plans have a programmatic focus. He mentioned that the CACs suggested and support a watershed approach, and said that programmatic action plans (such as a nonpoint source pollution plan, a point source discharge plan, a critical areas plan, etc.) will allow easier folding in of the watershed management approach than the problem approach. Carter said his proposal puts the implementation plan as the first action plan because it drives the other plans and is a key component of the CCMP. Carter referred to a chart in which he identified which priority concerns would be addressed by which programmatic action plan. Carter said he thinks there is a fundamental difference between the problem and the program approaches, and he believes the approach, or "the packaging", is very important. Carter said that his approach fits into an existing structure and can lead more directly to implementation.

Chairman Cobey said the environmental concerns emerged through public input in many discussions, and he thinks the public would rather have a plan that addresses the environmental problem about which they are concerned than a plan that addresses management.

Waite asked Carter several questions on his proposal:

1. Will the Municipal and Industrial Discharges Plan alienate industry? Carter agreed and said that industry must be involved early as one of many players.
2. How does this get us beyond what the state is currently doing? Carter replied that we have decided to approach resources management and environmental problems through the coordination of state and federal management programs, and the APES CCMP is not going to fundamentally alter that structure.
3. How will the nonpoint source plan and the point source plan be related as in a basin wide strategy like DEM is developing? Carter replied that his proposed plans could change later as necessary.

Chairman Cobey moved to endorse the general direction that the staff is taking in pursuing the outline of the CCMP and for staff to try to take the comments made, accommodate them, incorporate them, to the best of their ability without totally changing the state of the outline. The motion was seconded. Mr. Carter opposed the motion and asked for endorsement of the other approach that he proposed.

Col. Tulloch suggested endorsing the staff's proposal with an additional section that addresses programmatic recommendations developed in the action plans.

Ashe opposed the motion on the floor saying he preferred Carter's proposed outline.

Costlow and Cross suggested the action plans be lumped under Water Quality, Critical Areas, Fisheries, and Human Environment. Dr. Queen moved to stifle debate. Chairman Cunningham clarified that the motion was to close debate. The motion was seconded by Brewster Brown. Hand vote: for closure of debate 5, opposed to closing debate 6.

Chairman Cunningham clarified that the previous motion was to focus on the priority concerns and consider how to implement Carter's proposal.

Brown made a substitute motion to accept the draft outline from Randy with the exception of changing the section on action plans to from the 9 priority concerns to the ones that Carter's plan set forth.

Saunders voiced his support for Chairman Cobey's motion with the provision that the PC meet in a very short time, after the staff has given it consideration. Cunningham suggested October 11th or 12th as a date to meet again.

Don Bryan moved an amendment to the motion that states that the staff prepare this amalgamation of the two approaches and present it to the PC which is to reconvene on the 11th or 12th of October. The amendment to the motion was seconded by Bud Cross and unanimously approved. The motion was amended. The motion was unanimously adopted as amended.

Three topics to discuss at October meeting were agreed upon: (1) Revised outline and final decision on the outline, (2) Summit for the Sounds, (3) Review of the flow chart.

Carter proposed that the PC request the CACs to provide them with a recommendation on whether and how to go forward with the Summit by the October meeting.

The PC charged Waite and Giordano to plan the October meeting.

**STRIPED BASS UPDATE - Wilson Laney**

Laney said the report was under review and a version for public consumption would be available by September 13th. Public meetings in Weldon and Edenton on September 25 and 26.

Cunningham entertained a motion to adjourn. Don Bryan seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 1:45.

---

ATTENDEES LIST  
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING - AUGUST 29, 1991  
ATTACHMENT A

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>
Bo Crum	EPA - Atlanta
Ted Bisterfeld	EPA - Atlanta
Bud Cross	National Marine Fisheries Service/NOAA
Jennifer Steel	A/P Staff
Don Bryan	P/C (Town of Nags Head)
Margaret Scully	APES - Staff
Beth Burns	PCAC/DMF
Kristin Rowles	APES - Staff
Jim Benton	USFWS - Morehead City
Wilson Laney	USFWS - Fisheries Assistance
Stephanie Sanzone	EPA, Washington,DC
Dan Ashe	US Congress
John D. Costlow	Duke University - Policy Committee
Joan Giordano	APES - Staff
Mike Wicker	USFWS
Mike Gantt	USFWS - Policy Committee
John Carlock	Hampton Roads P.D.C.
Derb Carter	PCAC
Brewster Brown	ACAC
Bill Queen	ECU
Bill Cobey	NC DEHNR - Policy Committee
Scott Tulloch	Corps of Engineers
Larry Saunders	Corps of Engineers
Neil Armingeon	NC Coastal Federation
Tom Stroud	PTRF
Marybruce Dowd	Friends of Roanoke Island
Ernie Carl	NC DEHNR - Technical Committee
Sybil Basnight	Friends of Roanoke Island
John Green	PCAC
Joe Demeke	Mayor Pro Temps - Kill Devil Hills
Mike Orbach	NC Marine Science Council/ECU

APES TARGET ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVESI. Declines in fisheries productivityA. Restore or maintain fisheries resources at levels for optimum sustainable yields (OSYs)

1. use the Magnuson (federal--Cole), ASMFC, and state (Hawkins) management plans to identify OSYs for:

American eel  
American shad and river herring  
Atlantic croaker, spot, and weakfish  
Atlantic menhaden  
Atlantic sturgeon  
bay scallops  
black drum  
blue crabs  
bluefish  
butterfish and harvestfish  
catfish (freshwater)  
hard clams  
kingfishes  
oysters  
pigfish  
pinfish  
red drum  
sharks  
sheepshead  
shrimp  
southern flounder  
spade fish  
spotted sea trout  
striped bass  
striped mullet  
summer flounder  
tautog  
white perch  
yellow perch

B. Restore Roanoke River striped bass stocks to levels of reproductive success as measured by juvenile abundance recorded during 1960 through 1974 time period with corresponding adult stock levels.

1. juvenile abundance index should equal or exceed 6 for 3 out of 5 consecutive years (call Hawkins to define JAI)

2. (wait for SBMB report to Congress for specific timeframes)

## II. Health of Aquatic Resources

### A. Reduce prevalence and incidence of diseases, such as ulcerative mycosis in finfish and shell deterioration in blue crabs, by reducing or controlling causal factors

1. estimate "natural levels" of disease (call Engel and Noga)
2. compile known information on causal and contributing factors (stressors) resulting in UM and shell disease
3. further identify causal and contributing factors (stressors) resulting in UM and shell disease
4. initiate management strategies to reduce identified stressors to levels associated with estimated natural levels of disease

### B. Eliminate the availability to aquatic life of toxic concentrations of pollutants in the water and sediments

1. ensure that all sediment or water within the A/P Study area will not be toxic (as measured by standardized toxicity test methods for sediment and water, e.g., Ceriodaphnia dubia survival and reproduction, fathead minnow survival and growth, mysid shrimp acute or chronic, sea urchin fertilization, and Champia parvula chronic tests) Note: toxicity is defined as any test result statistically different from the control
2. maintain/develop a "pollutants of concern" list (pollutants which are found at or near toxic concentrations in the environment or pollutants which have the potential for such, based on release data). Locate all sources of such pollutants
3. determine background levels of these pollutants. (call Riggs for metals)
4. incorporate/adopt EPA's sediment criteria as triggers for management actions. Develop additional triggers for pollutants on the list of

"pollutants of concern" not covered by EPA  
sediment criteria

5. develop list of appropriate species or community structures to serve as bio-indicators for sporadic and chronic toxicity events in brackish and marine waters, and in large rivers (call EPA for status of their estuarine assessment procedures)
6. remediate any identified toxicity problems, if feasible and environmentally sound options for remediation exist
7. continue or expand programs to limit inputs of toxic chemicals to levels which will not cause or contribute to toxicity problems

C. Maintain water quality and quantity to protect existing aquatic living resources and community structure (biological integrity) in all areas. Improve degraded waters up to the standards necessary to restore historically documented aquatic living resources

1. develop methods to measure biological integrity of individual ecological systems within Study area
2. waters not meeting current water quality standards are: (develop list using 305(b) report)
3. ensure water quality and quantity necessary for protection of rare and endangered species. (Consult WRC for list of R&E species and AQUIRE toxicity database for appropriate levels of protection-by species or chemical)

D. Adhere to antidegradation requirements of the Clean Water Act within all tributary drainage basins (goal moved from "III. Eutrophication") (review current N.C. regulations and policies to determine if this goal is already being met)

1. ensure that state regulations sufficiently address federal requirements
2. ensure that state implementation strategies sufficiently address federal requirements
3. allow no point or nonpoint source waste discharge to reduce benthic macrofaunal diversity or species richness from established seasonal norms

### III. Eutrophication

- A. Achieve nutrient reduction goals prescribed in management strategies for tributary drainage basins designated as Nutrient Sensitive Waters (NSW)
1. NSWs are: (develop list using 305(b) report)
  2. continue to review for new designations so that all appropriate waters are designated
  3. establish water quality standards for nutrient concentrations
  4. determine the airborne nutrients (and their ambient concentrations) found to contribute unacceptable fallout to the sounds. Set appropriate reduction goals for contributions from anthropogenic sources (consult Paerl, Bachmann, and Chesapeake Bay Study)
  5. revise and refine nutrient reduction goals and strategies, through the integration of all current management strategies (to be included: basin-wide planning strategies, BMP programs, etc)
  6. develop or expand programs to achieve nutrient reduction goals

### IV. Impairment of nursery area function

- A. Maintain or improve water quality and quantity conditions to protect areas functioning as estuarine nursery and spawning areas for fish and shellfish within the A/P Study area
1. the necessary water quality requirements for primary nursery areas, spawning habitats, and juvenile fish and shellfish nursery areas (i.e., dissolved oxygen, temperature, salinity, turbidity, total suspended solids, flow, etc.) are: (contact DMF, NMFS, WRC, and USFWS and utilize AQUIRE toxicity database)
  2. identify and map additional areas not included in present database (inland and estuarine)
  3. develop or expand programs to protect water quality and quantity in nursery and spawning areas

- B. Maintain or restore the structural integrity of estuarine nursery and spawning areas for fish and shellfish within the A/P Study area
1. compile definitions of the unique characteristics (structural integrity) of each area as defined above (DMF, NMFS, WRC, and USFWS)
  2. determine the need for buffers around the areas defined above
  3. develop or expand programs to protect structural integrity of nursery and spawning areas
- C. Ensure adequate quantity of primary and secondary nursery areas and anadromous fish spawning areas to support optimal fish stocks (see I.A)
1. assess the need for additional nursery and spawning areas to be established through efforts of restoration or creation (see fisheries management plans, Hawkins)

V. Anoxia-related fish kills

- A. Improve water quality in all areas experiencing high incidence of fish kills to established water quality standards or better if necessary
1. Target high incidence areas including: Pamlico River, Pungo River, Chowan River, Neuse River, and Roanoke River (check with DMF for concurrence on areas)
  2. review current water quality standards for adequacy of protection, including the possibility of DO flux and SOD criteria (consult Thorpe and EPA Gold Book)
  3. determine background dissolved oxygen levels for each system (consult Stanley and Bales)
  4. if necessary, improve or expand appropriate water quality programs

B. Achieve measurable reductions in the incidence of fish kills

1. document incidence of fish kills in all areas of concern
2. determine the level of incidence that is natural and the reductions which are achievable
3. implement programs to achieve reductions

VI. Habitat loss

A. Halt losses of fisheries habitat areas (primary and secondary nursery areas, spawning areas, anadromous fish pathways, and shellfish areas) necessary for reproduction and rearing

1. remediate impasses to anadromous fish pathways wherever feasible
2. implement Goals IV and VIII to protect water quality, water quantity, and structural integrity of these critical areas
3. restore habitat necessary to repopulate documented, lost shellfish areas, if feasible

B. Limit habitat losses of game and non-game wildlife species

1. generate a list of "species of special concern" that would include endangered, threatened, and other important species of plants and animals and define the critical habitat of each (consult WRC and USFWS)
2. identify the habitats where loss must be halted in order to protect the species (consult WRC and USFWS)
3. identify the habitats that have not yet been reduced to critical levels, but must be managed to ensure the continued survival of the species of concern (consult WRC and USFWS)
4. implement or expand programs to protect and manage these critical habitats

C. Maximize protection of unique and sensitive barrier island wetlands and terrestrial habitats

1. identify all unique and sensitive barrier island wetlands and terrestrial habitats (consult DCM and Natural Heritage)
2. determine which unique ecosystems are threatened due to areal loss or degradation and halt losses of these areas
3. determine the necessity of buffer strips for the protection of these ecosystems. Define the necessary buffer strip requirements and incorporate in management programs
4. develop and implement programs to provide additional protection to unique ecosystems which have not yet been reduced to critical levels
5. identify and preserve all critical water supply recharge areas -- eg. maritime forests (consult with RTI researchers)

D. Achieve no-net-loss of wetlands productivity and function and pursue opportunities to increase wetland productivity

1. Achieve consensus on definitions of "no-net-loss" and "wetlands" (review state and federal concepts)
2. determine functions and productivity levels of isolated and headwater wetlands.
3. identify, classify, and map all wetlands within the Study area (include headwater, isolated, bottomland, fringing, brackish, and saltwater wetlands) (NWI/CGIA, DSW, USFWS, DEM, DCM, USACE)
4. determine the relative quality (ability to function) of each wetland area (DSW, DEM, USFWS, DCM, USACE)
5. when feasible, restore or improve the functioning of degraded wetlands
6. implement programs to achieve "no-net-loss" and protect the function and productivity of existing wetlands (determine the need for buffers)

7. Closure of shellfish waters (WQ)

A. Maintain viable shellfishing areas and restore degraded areas

1. identify and map all "viable shellfish areas" (areas that support "harvestable stocks" of shellfish) and all "historically viable shellfish areas" (areas that are documented as having supported the harvest of shellfish since November 28, 1977)
2. ensure that all such areas are classified as SA
3. restore water quality necessary to open any SA waters closed to the harvest of shellfish
4. adopt or incorporate new EPA human pathogen indicators as developed
5. define "harvestable stocks" independent of the definition of "commercially viable" shellfish areas found in shellfish leases

VIII Changes in distribution patterns of bottom-dwelling organisms

A. Maintain water quality necessary to maintain to support the growth and propagation of shellfish in all SA waters

1. define water quality requirements necessary for the success of shellfish populations (turbidity, sedimentation, salinity, dissolved oxygen, etc.) and incorporate in Water Quality Standards (consult NMFS, DMF, and EPA's Gold Book)
2. expand or implement programs to maintain or improve WQ as necessary to bring all viable and historically viable shellfish areas into compliance with SA water quality standards

B. Maintain or improve water quality necessary for survival and growth of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV)

1. define water quality necessary for the success of SAV (e.g., photosynthetically active radiation

(PAR), salinity, water circulation, sediment type, etc.) (consult NMFS' Guidelines for Management and Restoration of SAV and the Chesapeake Bay Program)

2. review list of "pollutants of concern" potentially SAV-damaging toxicants (search AQUIRE toxicity database)
3. restore water quality that is not meeting the minimum SAV requirements in historic SAV areas (consult NMFS' Guidelines for Management and Restoration of SAV)

C. Limit losses of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) due to physical destruction or disturbance

1. halt all losses in areas of endemic SAV (measured on a broad scale, allowing for natural shifts in distribution)
2. wherever feasible, restore historic populations of endemic SAV (e.g., Rose Bay, Swanquarter Bay, Pamlico River, South Creek,) (contact Ferguson to verify areas and consult NMFS' Guidelines for Management and Restoration of SAV)
3. determine buffer area necessary to protect water quality in SAV areas from turbidity causing activities

IX. Impact of human population growth and development on the estuarine system and cultural integrity of the area (problems associated with unplanned human population growth)

A. Ensure that land use changes have minimal adverse ecosystem impacts

1. ensure that all land uses are classified in a regional or local comprehensive conservation plan which considers environmental impacts of growth
2. develop methods of identifying and monitoring cumulative and secondary environmental impacts of land use changes
3. ensure that all land use classification changes are consistent with the comprehensive plan
4. ensure that all land use classification changes

are implemented such that there is no net addition of pollutants to surface waters

5. ensure that no land use classification changes encroach upon or destroy critical areas (as defined in other goals)

**B. Preserve the combination of physical, biological, historical, and cultural characteristics (cultural integrity) that is unique to eastern North Carolina and southeastern Virginia (this new goal and corresponding objectives were brought up as a concept and is presented here in very raw form)**

1. promote a cooperative understanding of the human role in the interaction of the components of the system
2. promote environmental education and environmental stewardship
3. promote widespread economic progress in harmony with environmental protection
4. promote historic preservation

FOOTNOTES

- I. - IX. = Priority Concerns  
 A. - D. = Goals  
 1. - 7. = Objectives

**Bold Type = Revised draft language for goals**

CCMP DRAFT OUTLINE  
August 27, 1991

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Summarize findings and action plans in a format suitable for the general public

INTRODUCTION

- Describe Management Conference purpose and review the Study goal and timeline from the Five Year Work Plan and the Designation Agreement
- List participants (PC, TC, and CACs)
- Describe purpose of the CCMP document
- Discuss Clean Water Act Section 320 and seven purposes of a management conference
- Describe approach to characterization work and summarize types of information obtained

STATUS AND TRENDS SUMMARY

- Include full Executive Summary from the Status and Trends Report

TARGET ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- Define and describe approach to Target Environmental Goals
- Include full listing of Goals and Objectives

ACTION PLANS (based on 9 PRIORITY CONCERNS)

- Include each priority concern as a separate action plan
- Note criteria for setting action priorities
- Include the following sections under each action plan:

STATEMENT OF PRIORITY CONCERN

- Describe each priority concern

VALUE OF RESOURCE

- describe how the natural resource is important to the environment or to humans

STATUS and TRENDS

- summarize the information in the Status and Trends Report pertaining to each priority concern, including the sources of the problem

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- list and explain the goals and objectives pertaining to each priority concern

CURRENT PROGRAMS AND STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENTS

- describe and evaluate current management programs (state, federal, and local) that affect each priority concern area, including:

Responsible agency or office  
Scope of authority  
Available resources to do the job  
Gaps in authority  
Effectiveness

- recommend improvements to current programs based on evaluations in previous section
- recommend improvements for coordination
- recommend improvements for enforcement
- set timeframes

#### NEW PROGRAMS

- recommend any new programs which may be necessary to improve the protection or management of the resource
- discuss range of options considered
- discuss agency/group responsible

#### NEW LEGISLATION

- describe any new legislation that may be necessary to implement the improved and new programs

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDS

- list unfinished research and information requirements

#### ESTIMATED COSTS

- estimate the costs of implementing this action plan

#### AREA SPECIFIC ASSESSMENTS

- Summarize information from Action Plans that relates specifically to the areas listed below. Include area specific Priority Concerns and management strategies.

MARINE LAGOONAL AREAS PLAN (WHITE OAK RIVER/CORE  
SOUND/BOGUE SOUND)  
PAMLICO SOUND/TRIBUTARIES AREA PLAN  
ALBEMARLE SOUND/TRIBUTARIES AREA PLAN  
CURRITUCK SOUND/BACK BAY AREA PLAN

#### LONG TERM ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING PLAN

- Describe objectives and basis
  - Track environmental responses
  - Redirect corrective actions
  - Support management and research
- Describe monitoring elements addressing each priority problem
  - Describe the responsible organization
  - Discuss reporting
  - Estimate Costs
- Describe citizens' monitoring program

#### CITIZENS INVOLVEMENT AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

- Summarize program elements during the 5-year study
- Describe long term plan
  - Describe techniques to be used
  - List targeted groups

List responsible parties and their elements  
Estimate funding requirements

FUTURE INFORMATION NEEDS

- Summarize research and information needs from Action Plans

FINANCIAL PLAN

- Describe purpose and requirement
- Describe Financial Planning Committee and support services
- Assess existing sources, alternative revenue sources, and funding strategy for each action category

IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

- Review administrative commitments pursuant to the CCMP
- Discuss coordination between responsible parties

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL PROGRAM CONSISTENCY REPORT

- Describe purpose and requirement
- Make inventory of Federal development and financial assistance programs
- List target programs
  - Discuss areas of potential inconsistency
- Describe recommended plan to ensure consistency of future actions

DETERMINE CCMP CONSISTENCY WITH THE NC CZM PLAN



Southern  
Environmental  
Law Center

ATTACHMENT D

137 E. Franklin Street,  
Suite 404  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-3628  
919-967-1450  
FAX 919-929-9421

*Regional Office*  
201 West Main St., Suite 14  
Charlottesville, VA  
22901-5064  
804-977-4090

MEMORANDUM

To: Policy Committee

Fr: Derb S. Carter, Jr. *(DC)pd*

Re: CCMP Proposal

Dt: August 26, 1991

In less than six months, we are to have prepared and available for review the draft Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan for the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study. At our joint Citizens Advisory Committee meeting in Williamston on August 6, it was apparent to me and many of the CAC members that, while progress is being made, much remains to be done. I believe it essential that the Policy Committee become engaged in moving this process forward. I will propose at the Policy Committee meeting in Kill Devil Hills on August 29 that the Committee consider certain actions which I believe will move us toward completion of the draft CCMP. These proposals are summarized below.

The only CCMP approved by EPA is the Puget Sound Management Plan. It is my understanding that all members of the Policy Committee have been furnished a copy of this Plan. It provides a useful model for our consideration, recognizing of course that our Plan must be directed to our particular problems and concerns. The Puget Sound CCMP is, in essence, a collection of individual action plans. These action plans follow a standardized approach of (1) problem definition, (2) program goal, (3) strategy, (4) program elements, (5) major public actions, (6) legislation required, and (7) estimated costs.

I have enclosed a copy of the Shellfish Protection Program of the Puget Sound CCMP. I have also enclosed parts of the Albemarle-Pamlico Status and Trends Executive Summary and draft Goals and Objectives which are relevant to shellfish protection. As you can see, our Statement of Status, Trends and Causes and draft Environmental Goals and Objectives are parallel to the Puget Sound action plan sections on problem definition and program goal. We have yet to adopt in concept an outline or approach to developing action plans or identify appropriate action plans to achieve the goals of the program.

*(250)*

Proposal 1.

I propose that the Policy Committee consider on August 29, directing relevant committees and staff to begin drafting the CCMP within the following framework: The CCMP will be a collection of action plans to address identified priority environmental concerns and environmental goals and objectives. Each action plan would be organized along the following outline:

Action Plan Outline

Problem (Status/Trends/Causes)  
Goal and Objectives  
Action Plan (Strategies)  
Legislation Required  
Estimated Cost

Proposal 2.

I also propose that the draft CCMP include the following action plans:

Proposed CCMP Action Plans

Implementation Plan  
[overall CCMP implementation]  
Nonpoint Source Pollution Plan  
[by river basin/watershed]  
Municipal and Industrial Discharges Plan  
[by river basin/watershed]  
Critical Areas Protection Plan  
[by river basin/watershed]  
Shellfish Protection Plan  
Fisheries Management Plan  
Wetlands Protection Plan  
Education and Public Involvement Plan  
Monitoring Plan  
Research Plan  
Financial Plan  
[to finance CCMP implementation]

The attached chart indicates how each proposed CCMP action plan responds to identified priority environmental concerns and draft environmental goals and objectives.

Proposal 3.

I propose that the Policy Committee endorse an approach that CCMP Action Plans for Nonpoint Source Pollution, Municipal and Industrial Discharges, and Critical Areas Protection be developed on an appropriate river basin or watershed basis. Watersheds could include each of the identified large river basins in the study area

(Pasquotank, Chowan, Roanoke, Tar Pamlico, Neuse, and White Oak) or appropriate combinations of watersheds (e.g. Albemarle and Pamlico). This approach could also utilize special area management plans for particular watershed (e.g. Currituck/Back Bay or Core/Bogue Sounds).

Proposal 4.

The Policy Committee is scheduled to meet next December. In order ensure that we maintain a schedule which will result in completion of the draft CCMP by January 1992, I further propose that we convene a work session of the Policy Committee in early November to review progress and, if necessary, provide direction to the staff or appropriate committees.

You all received a copy of the enclosed letter from Congressman Jones which suggests that the program convene a "Summit for the Sounds of North Carolina" in the fall of 1992. The proposed Summit would review the CCMP and produce a "Save Our Sounds Agreement" which would be presented to the Policy Committee for review and approval as the final management plan. I personally endorse this concept. It will require, however, that we and the other program committees concentrate and accelerate our efforts on development of the CCMP. I hope we can make some major decisions at our Policy Committee meeting on August 29 towards this end.

Enclosures

<u>Proposed CCMP Action Plans<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Priority Environmental Concerns<sup>2</sup> Addressed by Action Plan</u>	<u>Draft Environmental Goals/Objectives Addressed by Action Plan</u>
Implementation Plan	All	All
Nonpoint Source Pollution Plan	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9	IIB, IIC, IID, IIIA, IVA, VA, VIA, VIIA, VIIIA, VIIIB, IXA
Municipal and Industrial Discharges Plan	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9	IIB, IIC, IID, IIIA, IVA, VA, VIA, VIIA, VIIIA, VIIIB, IXA
Critical Areas Protection Plan	1, 4, 5, 7	IA, IB, IIA, IIB, IIC, IVA, IVB, IVC, VIA, VIB, VIC, VID, VIIB, VIIC
Shellfish Protection Plan	4, 7, 8, 9	VIIA, VIIIA
Fisheries Management Plan	1	IA, IB, IVC, VIIC, IXB
Wetlands Protection Plan	1, 3, 5, 7	VIC, VID
Education and Public Involvement Plan	All	All
Monitoring Plan	All	All
Research Plan	All	All
Financial Plan	All	All

253

*addition to the  
2-1-01  
in cooperation with  
the other plan  
sections*

- <sup>1</sup> Action Plan Outline
- Problem (Status/Trends/Causes)
  - Goal and Objectives
  - Action Plan (Strategies)
  - Legislation Required
  - Estimated Cost

- <sup>2</sup> Priority Environmental Concerns
1. Declines in Fisheries Productivity
  2. Ulcerative Sore Diseases
  3. Anoxia-Related Fish Kills
  4. Changes in Distribution Patterns of Aquatic Sessile Organisms
  5. Impairment of Nursery Area Function
  6. Entrophication
  7. Habitat Loss
  8. Shellfish Closures
  9. Toxicant Effects