

Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study
Joint CAC "CALL" MEETING
DEHNR - Washington Regional Office
Washington, N. C.
9/23/91

Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Carter at 7:20 p.m. He explained that it was a special "call" meeting to obtain CAC input for CCMP development (outline, work groups and flow chart) as listed on the agenda. He asked for open discussion of the points prior to the special Policy Committee meeting to be held on October 11, in Manteo. He then continued with a paragraph of background on the agenda items.

The CCMP outline is the framework around which the CCMP will be developed. At the last Policy Committee (PC) meeting the most lively debates to date were concerning which direction we should take with the CCMP. A proposal was submitted to the Policy Committee that Chairman Carter took a part in developing. It contained two objectives. It consisted of ideas and concepts that would provide a framework for discussion of the management plan, and secondly it urged expediency because of the November '92 deadline. With those two objectives in mind a CCMP outline was submitted to the Policy Committee members and staff. Also at the Policy Committee meeting an alternative CCMP outline was submitted by Randy Waite prepared by program staff. There was no resolution by the Policy Committee as to which direction we should go, but recognition of the need to move forward was acknowledged. This is one instance where CAC input to the Policy Committee is important, Chairman Carter stressed.

The difference in the two approaches is that one would propose a programmatic type plan that would be directed towards resolving the problems --the other approach would start with the problems and try to work back into the programs. Problem → program vs. program → problem.

Mr. Waite informed the group that we're moving forward with development of issues and the outline. The outline of August 27 came together through conversations with Ted Bisterfeld and Randy Waite. Their discussions included where we should be; what kinds of things should be included in the CCMP; and what EPA requirements are in terms of our program grant. There are federal requirements to be included in the final document. The difference between the two versions boiled down to the section on action plans. There are four different ways the outline can go. First, a geographical approach - sub-basins - my backyard. Second, a problematic approach - the whole study has gone along based on identifying specific problems--fish kills, shellfish closures, etc. So it follows we should have a management plan that addresses problems and action plans that specifically say how we're going to solve them. Third, break down into a programmatic approach. We've got a non point source management program, a point source management program and others already in place. Let's target those programs and determine what improvements are needed to those existing programs. Fourth, figure out a way to mix all those because all of those in their own right are very important and would have to be addressed somehow in the management plan.

Ted and Randy settled on the problem based approach--the reason being that stuff is hearing from Legislative members that they don't want to hear more on how to expand current programs. "We wanted to take them (Legislature) an answer to our problems. Here's a problem the people see and feel and here is an answer," said Mr. Waite.

"The irony of this is that the action plans will contain exactly the same items overall. The same actions will be done in the end. It's all in how you package it. We felt we needed to package it right so we could get it sold. From our discussions we think that taking a new approach, beyond what we're doing now in terms of programs, is the most receptive way for them," Waite added.

Geographic approach -- good except that what you end up doing is talking about the same action plans over and over again. So what we put into our plan were problem oriented action plans and then provided summary chapters on what all these action plans mean in your geographic area.

The problem oriented approach will look at program areas anyway and will have program evaluation. The Policy Committee directed staff to take another look at the program vs problem approaches.

Chairman Carter proceeded to outline the differences between the two approaches:

Program - still a collection of action plans but instead of action plans flowing from problems, it would recognize we had a structure of programs already in place intended to address specific problems. It is the approach used in Puget Sound. Three reasons to go this way are:

- 1) It allows more directly the integration of a basin approach to planning.
- 2) Plan's implementation--It lays out what needs to be done in existing program areas to address problems--It's more likely to provide for comparison of what's being done and what needs to be done to provide for and assure that this program is implemented. Its action oriented in that its directed already at a framework that exists.
- 3) Action plans in Derb's outline are broader than even program areas. There's an overall action plan recommended for implementation of the whole CCMP. In other words, CCMP implementation would be an action plan.

Randy Waite then followed up with comments: "In the August 27 draft I would take implementation plan and move it up in priority so its spelled out in terms of implementation strategy. The other key difference - in general, in things like monitoring and in Public Involvement we saw more as summary chapters because all those would have been items in the action plans themselves.

In defining Summary Chapters Mr. Waite said "We've already got one called Area Specific Assessments, in other words that's what's going to happen in your backyard. I'd suggest two other summary chapters, one being the summary Affected Agencies - those responsible for implementing the plans. This would point out how these are going to be implemented. The other we're looking at is the possibility of having a separate section which pulls together everything in the action plan for affected agencies, and programs so you'll have what these action plans mean to the NPDES program, to the agricultural non-point source program, etc.

The second was suggested at the P.C. MTG.
--Also at the Policy Committee meeting the question of the ability of an affected party to know how he was being impacted or how his local government was being impacted arose. Those Policy Committee comments suggested the writing of a summary section on affected parties. Farmers, fishermen, municipalities etc. will all know how they will be impacted directly. The reason these are pulled out as summaries is to maintain the idea of addressing problems.

Page 3
CAC "Call" meeting
9/23/91

In terms of the action plans themselves we took the suggestion of the Policy Committee and suggestion from Bud Cross to break the action plans down into four categories: W.Q., C.A., Fish & H. E. -- W.Q. is the only point where the two outlines differ.

SIGNIFICANTLY

Discussion ensued with Mr. Waite finally stressing that the packaging of the CCMP was more important than anything. ~~If we take an approach that drives at the programs that are on-going now, it will be the failure of the plan.~~ We have to show that this is different than current business. It will stand a better chance at being implemented. The question of what type of implementation, Legislative or changes in the department's Executive branch arose. Mr. Waite answered that both are involved. Legislative because that is where we will get our authority to do things and Departmental wise because they have to go back to the Legislature to ask for money to do a better job and they can only do that if they can sell the Legislature on what they're doing. *EXTREMELY*

A-CAC member Paul Lilly emphasized that the goals and objectives are what are important. If the goals and objectives are agreed upon, the approach is immaterial. The goals and objectives define the scope of the program.

Chairman Carter then called for a straw poll. He said he had a sense that there was going to be an attempt to merge the two versions to get the best result ~~said he had~~ with the best aspects of each approach.

A straw poll was held to determine which approach would be adopted and recommended to the Policy Committee if a merging of the two versions failed and the consensus of the group was to go with the program outline approach.

Summit for the Sounds - Chairman Carter turned the group's attention to the proposed "Summit for the Sounds" as communicated in a letter from Congressman Jones to Secretary Bill Cobey. The committees' sense was that the matter of the "Summit" had pretty much been settled at the Roundtable Meeting in Kill Devil Hills. That is, they felt the proposal was unacceptable because it detailed involvement by persons not otherwise involved with APES to come in at the "eleventh hour" and possibly set aside, or at the very least modify, what it took the CACs, staff, and other committee members 5 years to accomplish.

Paul Lilly added he felt a final big kick-off for the CCMP to publicize it, announce its completion, etc. was a good idea, but that it should not be limited to just a few people. He stressed it should be wide open with exhibits, presentations, etc. and resemble the Valentine's Day 1987 meeting held at Beaufort Community College in Washington. He added he thought we were asking for big, big trouble if we opened it for criticism at that point. The committee agreed.

Randy Waite stated that we've already funded Coastal Federation to ~~do just that.~~ *PLAN AN IMPLEMENTATION KICK-OFF*

Chairman Carter then called on Neil Armingeon to describe the contract the Coastal Federation had for the 5th cycle and what they planned to do. Mr. Armingeon reported that 7 scoping/public meetings would be specifically designed to get the public involved with the management plan and to provide direct input to the staff and work committees. He added that NCCF was beginning discussion of the format of those meetings. They may be regional meetings, or may bring targeted groups in to hear what the CCMP is about and what it would mean to their area. Randy wants meetings directed at specific user groups or affected parties (ex. farmers, fishermen).

Ernie Larkin at that point asked if there was a grand finale planned for the program.

Mr. Waite and Mrs. Giordano responded that there was and that next year's annual meeting was meant to be a grand finale. The last part of NCCF's contract is for that purpose.

Discussion turned to the grand finale again.

Chairman Carter at that point summed up the committees' feelings by stating that "the sense of the CACs is that as proposed, at least, the Summit for the Sounds empowering this separate group to come in late after the CCMP is done, consider it and make recommendations on it to the Policy Committee is not endorsed. But that the concept of a presentation event at the end of the process, once it's done, with the intent to develop the momentum for implementation is something the CACs strongly endorse."

Discussion turned to the flow charts and work groups.

Flow charts - The Policy Committee wants the flow chart more spelled out in terms of time line, places for citizen input, committee roles and responsibilities. It will be discussed at the October 11 Policy Committee meeting. Jennifer Steel is working on it with John Costlow.

Work groups - We have to dig into the problems first regardless of which approach we choose for the management plan, because that's the way we're heading. We will expand that and find out what programs are effecting that problem, and what's being worked on to control that problem, then we will combine it all. We'll be developing workgroups to attack those problems and to start putting together issue papers which are going to lay out the options. Mr. Waite will be assigning members to the workgroups based on what appears to be their best potential for input into a specific area. He added he is going to lay it out so everyone has an opportunity to be involved in one of the workgroups.

Lastly, Chairman Carter referred to the Goals and Objectives letter from Ernie Larkin and John Stallings. He urged all to respond to the goals and objectives document expressing deep concern for having the committees' comments.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.