

**Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study  
Technical Committee Meeting  
December 7, 1992  
Ground Floor Hearing Room  
Archdale Building, Raleigh**

**Call to Order**

Co-chair Ernie Carl called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 AM. He moved to approve the April 16 minutes, and to postpone approval of the October 9 minutes until the committee members had had the opportunity to review them during lunch. The motions were seconded and passed unanimously. Next, Carl welcomed changes to the agenda; hearing none, he turned over the meeting to Randall Waite, APES Program Director.

**Program Report**

Waite noted that, in January, Dr. Carl would be leaving his position of EHNR Deputy Secretary. As an expression of appreciation, Waite presented Carl with a t-shirt bearing the APES logo. Carl stated that he would follow the progress of APES very carefully, and he thanked Waite and his staff for their work in the study.

Waite mentioned that lately APES had been the topic of many newspaper articles. He noted that an Economic Council member from Craven County had been encouraging local government officials to resolve that they would not support an implementation management plan. In addition, Waite stated that APES had received letters from several county commissioners stating that their main concern was lack of an economic impact assessment. Waite stated that Resource Analytics would be preparing an economic characterization of the A/P estuarine study area for the next public draft of the Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (CCMP). Vernon Cox of Resource Analytics explained that the characterization would examine the economic costs and benefits to the private sector, government, and the public. Waite stated that a final summary report on the analysis would be prepared, but that information would be incorporated into the CCMP as the information became available. Furthermore, Melany Earnhardt had been hired to conduct legal analyses of the draft CCMP recommendations.

Waite discussed public perception of the draft CCMP. He stated that the primary criticism APES was receiving from the public was the perception that the CCMP would ruin the economy of eastern North Carolina. In reaction, APES would encourage local officials to provide APES with more constructive comments that could be used to make changes in the document. APES would also improve its liaison activities by visiting with county commissioners and municipalities and providing them with briefings on the study.

Waite noted that several reports were in review or being revised. Committee members expressed concern that APES would not receive the data from these outstanding reports in time to incorporate the data into the draft CCMP. One committee member suggested that APES staff either hold meetings with the principal investigators of the outstanding reports and discuss the specifics of these reports, or request a preliminary report or draft from which to collect information.

Waite discussed the budget for the following year. He mentioned that APES was considering funding for the following projects: consensus workshops to be held in January, the development of land use planning guidelines, a BMP mapping demonstration, research into BMP effects on groundwater, and septic systems studies.

## CAC Report/Public Comment

Waite stated that, since the Citizens' Advisory Committees would be meeting on the following night, there would be no CAC report for this TC meeting. During the public comment portion, Dr. Quay commended APES staff on their continued progress in the study.

### *Potential Budget Cuts*

Waite discussed a memorandum entitled "Action Alert", which detailed EPA's consideration of cutting the National Estuary Program budget by 30% the following year. He stated that he did not know how this potential budget cut would affect APES, yet he noted that budgets for estuary programs having a completed CCMP would be the first to be cut. However, he said that there was draft legislation in Washington that would provide approximately \$50 million for implementation of NEPs.

### CCMP Revisions

Waite summarized changes which had been included in the second internal draft of the CCMP. Among the changes were as follows:

- \* expanded discussions and clarifications of benefits research needs, time frames, and implementation costs for each management action
- \* addition of clarifying language where needed
- \* pro-active focus shift in certain sections (e.g., buffers, septic systems, marinas)
- \* development of agency summaries

### CCMP Discussion

#### *Human Environment*

APES environmental analyst Margaret Scully led discussion on the Human Environment Action Plan of the draft CCMP. She noted the following changes which had been made or were under consideration for the next public draft:

- \* transfer of discussion of the various land and water uses of the systems to the Introduction chapter
- \* contents of management action focusing on a regional approach to local planning moved to other management actions.
- \* management action discussing a public access master plan extended to represent riparian and other water areas
- \* options for implementing land and water plan management action (consideration of extending Coastal Area Management Act requirements into non-CAMA counties in the A/P region was one option discussed

A discussion among committee members regarding the last consideration ensued. Carl stated that committee members should consider that, if the expansion of CAMA regulations should fail, this failure could put the current CAMA structure at risk. He stated that a wiser approach would be to state that A/P counties need land use plans of some sort and to depend on local officials to shape the planning process.

#### *Vital Areas*

Scully discussed the major considerations under the Vital Terrestrial Areas and Wetlands Action Plan. The considerations were as follows:

- \* change "wetlands protection program" to "wetlands stewardship program" to emphasize a proactive approach
- \* under the wetlands stewardship program, recommend that DEM continue to investigate development of a joint permit review program between DEM and the Corps of Engineer's permit review
- \* move discussion on educating the Div. of Marine Fisheries and other staff in wetlands protection to the education action plan
- \* move discussion on monitoring permits to the Monitoring Action Plan

Scully noted that John Chazal of Resource Analytics was currently working on an economic characterization of the Vital Terrestrial Areas and Wetlands Action Plan. He was paying specific attention to Management Action B, which discusses acquisitions and management of important natural areas. APES hoped that Chazal's economic characterization would provide better cost analyses for the public.

Scully stated that during the next Technical Committee meeting, committee members would discuss and vote on the revised Critical Areas chapter of the Status and Trends Report that was written by the APES wetlands subcommittee and task force.

#### *Water Quality*

Randall Waite, in the place of Guy Stefanski, discussed the Water Quality Action plan. He noted the following items that were under consideration for the next CCMP draft:

#### Mgmt. Action      Consideration

- \*B      more clearly define EPA's implementation procedures and DEM's role in antidegradation
- \*E      recommend that the new non-agricultural NPS urban cost share projects be placed in the NC Div. Soil and Water
- \*F      change recommendation for septic tanks regulations to a more pro-active approach
- \*G      addition of the term "or functional equivalent" for buffer strip recommendation; addition of a Grandfather Clause for present land uses
- \*I      shift approach to training and education
- \*J      shift approach to development of a specific siting policy for marinas
- \*P      delete this management action

Committee member Tom Ellis made a motion to strike the grandfather clause, bringing present urban areas under the same regulations as rural areas; the motion failed. A motion was also made to delete the term "or functional equivalent", since committee members felt that this term may weaken buffer strip enforcement. The motion was seconded and approved.

#### *Fisheries Action Plan*

Kristin Rowles noted several changes which had been implemented into the Fisheries Action Plan. First of all, she noted that freshwater species, in addition to additional background information about submerged aquatic vegetation and shellfish diseases, had been added to the plan. Rowles also stated that Goal A, Objective B, which had formerly read "by 1996", now read "by 1994", and she noted that the discussion of the benefits and time lines under each management action were made clarified and expanded. Rowles also noted these specific changes:

Mgmt. Action    Consideration

- \*A    new discussion regarding effort control schemes for limited entry systems
- \*B    more details on cost, on protection measures which already exist, and an expanded discussion of potential water quality benefits of doing so
- \*G    wording changed to emphasize the collection of information for fish kills and diseases; research plan for this recommendation no longer recommended
- \*H    more specific information on staff and funding for a coordinated education program within DMF
- \*J    additional legal and economic information regarding cost share program for best fishing practices

*Public Education and Involvement*

APES Public Involvement Coordinator Joan Giordano noted that the options under this plan had been reorganized for more consistency with other plans. In addition, Management Actions A and B had been consolidated into Management Action A to discuss DPI's new curriculum for teaching science education.

*Other Sections*

Committee members discussed the structure of the Implementation Council recommended in the draft CCMP. Some of the public had expressed the desire to see representation of more different types of user groups in the council. No motion in regards to this discussion was made.

**Vote on CCMP Recommendation**

A motion was made to recommend the draft CCMP to the Policy Committee, as amended by the Technical Committee, and with a draft Executive Summary sent out separately for review, to be released for public review.

**Public Comments/Adjourn**

As there were no public comments, the meeting was adjourned.