

**RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM THE APRIL 8, 2004
STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT
&
MEETING SUMMARY
for the
ALBEMARLE-PAMLICO NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM**

- May 2004 -



NCSU - DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS

Prepared by:

NATURAL RESOURCES LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

- Mary Lou Addor
- Laura Bush
- Kathy Kay



www.ces.ncsu.edu/NRLI

WATERSHED EDUCATION FOR COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

- Patrick Beggs
- Christy Perrin



www.ces.ncsu.edu/WECO

For a copy of this report, please contact:

Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program
1601 Mail Service Center - Raleigh, NC 27699-1601 - (919) 715-1327 - www.apnep.org

Recommendations of Cooperative Extension Staff
Based on Strategic Assessment and Retreat Meeting3

Retreat Summary

- Grading CCMP Action Items Assignment6
- Welcome and Overview.....6
- APNEP Program Implementation.....7
- Working Lunch7
- Discussion on APNEP Mission8
- Discussion on CCMP Goals.....9
- Discussion on Coordinating Council Roles and Responsibilities.....10
- Discussion on Regional Council Roles and Responsibilities10
- Discussion on Communication and Outreach.....11
- Next Steps12

Appendix A: APNEP Reports Cards13

Appendix B: Working Lunch Task #2.....17

Appendix C: APNEP Executive Order19



Recommendations of Cooperative Extension Staff Based on Strategic Assessment and Retreat

Following are recommendations from the NC State Cooperative Extension staff. The staff has been working on this project since June 2003 and has had the opportunity to communicate with many different people involved with the Albemarle Pamlico National Estuary Program (APNEP). These recommendations are based on the information gained from participants of the Retreat and the Strategic Assessment.

Communication:

Many concerns voiced by participants at the Strategic Assessment Retreat and respondents of the Strategic Assessment survey indicated a lack of communication overall, and many of the other concerns voiced may stem from a lack of effective communication. One of the most telling comments from a respondent was, "APNEP is NC's best kept secret." APNEP should strive to consider communication at every juncture and every decision. Communication includes not only internal communication among staff, councils, and DENR, but outreach and marketing of APNEP to the public and to participating organizations.

- All communication should be designed to keep the most people informed.
- Develop an internal communication plan that includes clear action steps for implementation. This includes determining who needs what information when, how this information will be communicated, and who is responsible for implementing the actions steps.
- Develop an outreach and marketing plan that includes clear actions steps for implementation. This includes determining who needs what information when, how this information will be communicated, and who is responsible for implementing the action steps. A media marketing strategy (assessment of media opportunities and working with the media plan) should be included in the external marketing plan.
- Communication should include active communication, such as of email, list serves, mailings, press releases, etc., as well as passive communication such as the website.
- A database of APNEP participants could be developed with differing levels, such as council members, cooperating agencies, interested participants, associated or interested organizations, and the media. This will aid in implementing communication and outreach.
- APNEP should take advantage of the resources of the NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) Office of Public Affairs.
- Vibrant communication is required for the success of most recommendations in this report.
- Provide guidance materials to all members in a handbook

Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan Implementation Tracking

The Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) is one avenue to help APNEP reach its Mission. It consists of goals, objectives, and action items. These must be viewed as a whole to understand their effectiveness: accomplishment of action items helps achieve objectives; and accomplishment of objectives helps achieve goals. This chain of accomplishment has not been effectively communicated. Much of this may be due to a factor of involvement over time, where the CCMP structure is forgotten and not recomunicated to those people not intimately involved.

- A CCMP tracking mechanism should be put in place to determine the success of the CCMP implementation. This will allow APNEP to decide what has been accomplished before making future decisions.

- A CCMP tracking mechanism should include information on who is responsible for implementing the action items and where appropriate, should emphasize partnerships.
- Credit those agencies which have helped or will help implement the CCMP. Strong partnerships can help attract additional funding.
- A CCMP tracking mechanism will help determine if the objective and goals have been met and/or need to be evaluated.
- After determining status of the current CCMP implementation, APNEP should evaluate its goals to determine if they need to be updated to reflect priorities of stakeholders, new information, and/or changes in the estuary. A collaborative and inclusive process should be used.
- Clearly and specifically communicate how the CCMP is being tracked

Program Evaluation

Program evaluation includes assessing the overall performance of APNEP in meeting its mission. The current APNEP Executive Order requires the submission of annual reports evaluating the progress made in implementing CCMP recommendations and the success of implementation strategies. If these reports are submitted, they are one tool that can be used for regular program evaluation.

- Regular program evaluation should be conducted to determine if the program structure and processes are allowing APNEP to meet its mission. Include both quantitative and qualitative data in regular program evaluation. Quantitative data could include that which is collected in annual reports from participating organizations and councils. Qualitative data could be collected through tools such as informal interviews with participants, or focus groups.
- Develop a reporting format for all councils and cooperating agencies. A format will allow for objective comparison of reports and aid organizations in submitting reports.
- Encourage a program review of APNEP every two years via a steering committee represented of the various interests. The ad-hoc steering committee could elaborate on program successes, recommend strategies to deal with limitations or program inefficiencies, and provide deliberation on areas of concern. The focus of this evaluation is ongoing organizational development.

APNEP Representation

APNEP representation, dictated by the current Executive Order, is too prescriptive. Interested stakeholders are being denied representation and potential stakeholders may be missed.

- Revise the current Executive Order or develop a new authorization mechanism (such as a Memorandum of Agreement, or a Proclamation)
- Safeguard flexibility in representation. If a new Executive Order includes representation guidelines, they need to be flexible enough to allow all stakeholders to have a voice.
- Determine who the APNEP stakeholders are and how to reach them.
- Provide many, frequent opportunities for current and potential participants to communicate on any restructuring of APNEP representation.
- Research different forms of engagement to accomplish decision making.
- Clearly communicate how feedback will be used.
- Pursue increased representation and participation from Virginia stakeholders.

Public Participation

- Public participation differs from outreach. Public participation involves the public in problem solving and decision-making to strengthen overall decision-making. It also provides an opportunity for citizens to be heard and understood. Public participation can improve problem definition; provide a wider range of alternatives; establish a basis for the level of decision-making needed; fosters respect for diverse perspectives; and provides a stronger foundation for implementation. Recognize the various forms of engagement to accomplish public participation and respective goals.
- Determine when it is appropriate to use a particular form of public participation and how to communicate this use to the public.

APNEP as Facilitator

APNEP should strive to play a strong role as convener and facilitator between cooperating partners, potential partners, and the public.

- Guide and integrate efforts of cooperating partners to meet APNEP's mission.
- Make every effort to involve the public in APNEP's mission and create allies.
- Develop an APNEP dictionary that provides definitions and uses of common terminology. For instance, the words "work-plans and annual reports" are used interchangeably. Are both of these terms understood the same way by those involved with the use of these documents? As APNEP continues to grow as an organization, so will the amount of terms used to describe its purpose and support its growth. Broad understanding, consistency, and shared meaning of terms will assist with overall communication efforts.
- Provide a graphical version of APNEP historical timeline on the website. This will allow newcomers to understand the significance of historical events to APNEP as well as recognize its numerous accomplishments of its long-term partners. Consider other ways to recognize the efforts that have developed and sustained this partnership.
- Provide guidance materials to all members in a handbook
- Keep abreast of national NEP issues and keep all members informed of these issues.

APNEP Strategic Planning Retreat Summary
Pitt County Agricultural Extension Building
April 8, 2004
10:00am-5:00pm

The Albemarle Pamlico National Estuary Program (APNEP) held a strategic planning retreat on April 8, 2004. This was a culmination of a phase of stakeholder participation which began in June 2003. APNEP hired the Natural Resource Leadership Institute (NRLI) and Watershed Education for Communities and Local Officials (WECO), two Cooperative Extension programs within the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics at NCSU to initiate strategic planning. A Strategic Assessment was completed in March 2004 and was a result of broad stakeholder surveys. Recommendations from Cooperative Extension staff included holding a retreat of all interested stakeholders to discuss the findings. The Strategic Assessment can be obtained by contacting APNEP at www.apnep.org. The following is a summary of the Strategic Planning Retreat.

Retreat Objectives:

1. Update on APNEP program activities.
2. Share and verify the results of APNEP Strategic Assessment.
3. Gather feedback on the Assessment
4. Develop potential strategies to address the issues raised in assessment.
5. Provide possible steps for APNEP staff to take in order to move forward with Strategic Planning.

Grading CCMP Action Items Assignment

Upon arriving participants were given a blank Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) report card and asked to grade the implementation of the 49 action items in the CCMP as being accomplished fully, substantially, moderately, some, or minimally. They were also given the option of N/A (non-applicable) if they felt unable to grade a certain item. The official report card, completed in 2001 was handed out later in the meeting for participants to compare those grades to the grades they gave. Both the official Report Card and the report card with averaged grades from the retreat can be found in Appendix A. This exercise helped to frame the issue of CCMP implementation for the retreat participants. It also demonstrated inconsistency of knowledge of CCMP implementation status among members. It is unclear how CCMP implementation was measured by participants during the exercise. Participants noted that some of them graded based on what other organizations accomplished, while some only graded based on what APNEP alone had accomplished. Participants would like to know what has been accomplished before changes are made to the CCMP.

Welcome and Overview

Following introductions and orientation, a brief overview of the Strategic Assessment methodology and results was presented. The Assessment was mailed to everyone who participated. Numerous attempts were made to contact everyone. If people decided not to participate in the Assessment, a copy was not mailed to them, but they were notified of its existence and that a copy would be available on the APNEP website.

Comments and questions from participants included:

- Was everyone contacted?

- Should the Assessment be sent out to everyone?
- Some people do not know they are still on an APNEP Council.
- Don't waste resources on people who are not participating.

APNEP Program Implementation

Bill Crowell, APNEP Director, presented background on APNEP, the National Estuary Program (NEP) and other NEP's around the country. Included in this was a review of strategic planning, changes to the APNEP program that recently occurred at the direction of EPA, funding strategies, APNEP 2004 work plan, the APNEP program area, authority of APNEP, and an overview of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). This presentation is available by contacting APNEP at www.apnep.org.

Some highlights of the presentation include:

- Currently the only matching funds from sources other than APNEP are in-kind services
- APNEP has the largest program area of all NEP's, which includes 80,000 square miles of watershed, 30,000 square miles of program area, 36 counties and 3 million people, but still receives the same federal funding as other NEP's.
- Some states have developed round tables or teams similar to regional councils that involve local stakeholders.
- One of the NEP examples given has involvement based on different types of councils from APNEP, such as: science and technical, outreach, local government, citizen input. The population of these councils may not be exclusive of one another.

Bill Crowell stated that APNEP staff is aware of the concerns others have regarding its geographic size and allocation of resources. The Chesapeake Bay Program receives \$3.8 million annually in federal money, APNEP and each of the other NEPs receive \$500,000 annually. The APNEP staff plans to address this issue in time but for now is looking at how to best manage the current situation. One important point to take home from this retreat is the recognition that the restructuring of APNEP would allow a place for everyone involved now and others who want to remain involved. In addition, Bill wants to reach out to others that are currently not involved.

Participant's comments included:

- The ability to implement plans and projects is compromised by the lack of effective communication.
- Invasive species should be considered as part of APNEP plan.
- What ways can coastal habitat protection be tied into APENP?
- The program is too big in geographic area and also very diverse.
- Many of the challenges are a result of the APNEP population being spread far away from one another.

Working Lunch: APNEP Timeline and General Feedback

During lunch, participants completed two tasks.

1. The first was a visual time line in order to illustrate the long and rich history of APNEP from the perspective of the participants. A time line was set up which included a few specific dates and events in APNEP history. Participants were asked to fill in any events they could in an effort to flesh out the history of APNEP.

2. The second task was to answer two questions, using brief phrases written on note cards. These cards were collected and the responses are reported in Appendix B. The two questions were:
What do you think is a good aspect of APNEP? What do you think can be improved upon?

Discussion on APNEP Mission Statement

Following lunch, the NC Cooperative Extension staff presented the strategic assessment findings to the retreat participants. The initial activity was a brief presentation on the APNEP mission statement to determine the level of understanding about the mission. During the strategic assessment interviews, it was apparent that those interviewed did not understand the APNEP mission in the same way. Those interviewed emphasized different elements of the mission, perhaps based on their own personal or organizational mission. For instance, some emphasized protection of water quality in the sounds while others focused on protection of water quality in the counties. Others were unclear how the APNEP process worked with economic interests though "sustainable development," which encompasses ecological, economic, and social interests, is mentioned as a purpose on the APNEP website but not explicitly in the mission.

APNEP Mission Statement Presented:

To identify, restore, and protect the significant resources of the Albemarle-Pamlico estuarine system.

Participants' reactions included:

- APNEP does not have legislative authority to implement the "restore and protect" aspects of the mission statement, instead it is charged with encouraging and facilitating these activities. We need to make sure APNEP has the ability and/or authority to encourage and promote sustainable development, a concept that was not defined when the APNEP Executive Order, CCMP, and Mission were written.
- APNEP looks at an entire ecosystem, not just water quality. Need to consider sustainable development.
- Different people view the APNEP mission differently thus, participation level varies. That said, clear communication about the mission is required regardless of various levels of interests.
- The mission may need to be reevaluated. (Staff commented that CCMP also needs be reevaluated but not today).
- CCMP is not a rule, but a recommendation to restore and maintain the ecosystem. The APNEP staff facilitates the CCMP. The EPA provides resources for APNEP to be able to do this.
- Defining purpose for involving people is a great challenge and a necessity to getting people involved and keeping them engaged. The Cultural diversity is so large in the APNEP region; it cannot be treated the same as smaller NEP's. Stakeholders bring in their own perspectives, and in a system this large, that can be very tough to accommodate.
- People tend to join when they oppose certain things common to each of them. It is often harder to get people to join together for something they want, as compared to something they do not want to happen. Find out what people are opposing. When that issue is over, they may be a great source of participation since they may be looking for something to stay involved with. APNEP could be the positive factor.

Discussion on Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP)

Cooperative Extension staff presented the five goal statements of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan outlined to meet the APNEP mission. The CCMP is composed of objectives and management actions designed to accomplish the five goals. Participants were split into four groups, each of which reported to the entire room after a specified time. Participants were asked: *How do we make sure that the CCMP goals help us achieve the mission of APNEP?*

APNEP Goals:

1. Restore, maintain or enhance water quality in the Albemarle Pamlico region so that it is fit for fish, wildlife, and recreation.
2. Conserve and protect vital fish and wildlife habitats, and maintain the natural heritage of the Albemarle-Pamlico region.
3. Restore or maintain fisheries and provide for their long-term, sustainable use, both commercial and recreational.
4. Promote a responsible stewardship of the natural resources of the Albemarle-Pamlico region.
5. Implement the CCMP in a way that protects environmental quality while using the most cost-effective and equitable strategies.

Participants' responses included:

- The goals are broad and general, and can be refined. The NEPs promote environmental issues, and these may need to be revisited (to include other issues). May need specific goals, for instance for the regional councils.
- Demonstrations projects show how restoration can occur locally in meeting the goals.
- Mission is intended to be subjective. The difference is in the goals on which the CCMP was based. Success will come in when people address the problems indicated within the CCMP. To do this, a good status and trends system is required to measure success. APNEP staff can facilitate utilization of the measurement and trend system. Process is to undertake and analyze each CCMP item by item to see if they were really implemented and how well. If that is done it will be successful. Put APNEP in a leadership role. Assessment of all that is going on in the sound. "What is the status of the environment?" (Several comments were made about requiring a measurement system to determine when goals are implemented and achieved).
- Mission statement supports the goals. Need to educate stakeholders about the CCMP and how to work in other needs into the goals.
- Mission and goals not a limiting factor - need to determine what has been done and what is needed to be done.
- An additional goal may be "use of public trust waters."
- APNEP's job is to look at different groups and find ways to bond them together. APNEP could be providing solutions to get the needed work done. Cultural differences are great, and need to be considered in this effort.
- The CCMP is a living document. CCMP needs to be revisited, may need to be revised. Some goals may be outdated. Need to look at new things. Need to tie into them. In addition, structure and political positioning is important to carry out the goals within. If you do not have ANREP

properly positioned in the agency then you are not going to be successful or if you do not have the infrastructure in meeting the goals.

- Comments occurred about the difficulty in getting people whose jobs are unrelated to APNEP to attend meetings, for example, some counties have never sent a representative to meetings, and how this prevents assessing the goals or meeting additional needs.

Discussion on Coordinating Council Roles and Responsibilities

Cooperative Extension staff presented the Coordinating Council duties and observations from the Strategic Assessment. Coordinating Council duties can be found in the Executive Order, Appendix C.

Observations from Strategic Assessment:

Different people define the roles of the Coordinating Council differently. Some see the council as a receptor and reviewer for Regional Council information. Others see the Coordinating Council's role as carrying out the CCMP. Respondents did not emphasize the role of the Coordinating Council in submitting annual reports, or its role in evaluating and supporting processes to ensure cooperation among agencies. Both of these are stated roles of the Coordinating Council.

Comments from participants included:

- Duties sound good, but are they being performed?
- Some of the duties are misunderstood or there is confusion over who is expected to do what.
- Strategizing sessions have occurred with the Coordinating Council regarding work plans (also known as annual reports).
- Does this mean we should pay more attention to the work plans?
- Consider a reassessment of who should generate reports and who knows they need to generate a report. The Executive Order may require an amendments if it is too prescriptive of a reporting system that does not need to occur. There are already many different types of reporting mechanisms that need to be considered in the restructuring of APNEP.
- Can APNEP staff use reports to convey to the council about accomplishments? Councils would like to be part of the process.
- The Coordinating Council has made decision in the past, but never carried them out, for example, lobbying Washington for more money, and spending \$100,000 on education. There appears to be a lack of continuity on the Council. Decisions are made but not implemented (or it is not known that the decision was implemented).

Discussion on Regional Council Roles and Responsibilities

Cooperative Extension staff presented the Regional Council duties and observations from the Strategic Assessment. Regional Council duties can be found in the Executive Order, Appendix C.

Observations from Strategic Assessment:

Respondents said the purpose of the Regional Councils was to identify water quality issues in the region, to be a vehicle for demonstration projects, and to lobby the Coordinating Council for local projects. Issues revealed during the assessment include: and underutilization of the councils, a lack of enthusiasm, a strictly prescribed representation guideline, various understandings of roles and responsibilities, and some process issues such as a lack of identified alternatives and too few meetings.

Comments from participants included:

- Workings of the program seem to be independent of the Councils, because the Councils are not the decision makers. People get involved in the minutia, and they get discouraged.

- Need to have some type of orientation to new members to increase motivations.
- Experiences with the Regional Councils have been positive. Few people show up, but those that do have specific issues to address. Strategies that they have come up with are viable. The Regional Councils are functioning well but representation is not adequate at the river basin level.
- There have been missed recruiting opportunities for the councils. APNEP staff needs to listen to the concerns of public participants, to the concerns of the Regional Council members.
- What about the effectiveness of a yearly meeting, a broad public workshop?
- Need to be sure all stakeholders have an opportunity to be represented. If they do not fit the cookie cutter Executive Order, they should not be excluded.
- Need to decide what the purpose of public participation is in APNEP, before redefining participation and representation.
- Create subcommittee's like the Upper, Middle, and Lower Neuse River Basin groups. The basins are too large to have single representation, and to get municipalities to participate across the entire basin.
- Consider simply having an Albemarle group and a Pamlico Group to coordinate more effectively. Consider having a meeting for any interested citizen through radio etc. Have them survey five topics that they are concerned about and then have at it. The people who attend are the best for dispersion of information. Capture people that have a passion for a certain topic.
- Could have a public meetings for anyone, survey some topics they are concerned about and discuss how to solve. Of the people present, what types of dispersion of information is available among the people present – take advantage of that. Capture the opportunity of people with a passion for a certain topic.
- Use “ad hoc sunset” committee's. These would deal with a certain topic for a given amount of time, then move on to something else. Determine if there are other groups who could continue with the topic into the implementation stage and allow APNEP to champion the issue, while letting these other groups do it.
- The purpose of the Regional councils is to provide a forum for local businesspersons and citizens. APNEP needs to provide the forum so people with an issue have somewhere to go with their issues. The critical thing is that there is a forum in which a local stakeholder can have a voice.

Discussion on Communication and Outreach

Cooperative Extension staff presented the findings from the Strategic Assessment concerning communication.

Observations from Strategic Assessment:

- Communication and information sharing, although perceived as good, is apparently lacking, with participants at varying levels of understanding concerning program issues.
- Members are unaware of Regional Council reports.
- Communication has improved some, particularly between NC and VA.
- In-state communication has improved with new leadership and program visibility.
- Lack of coordination between many state agencies, councils, and EPA
- Lack of outreach to citizens. (“APNEP is NC's best kept secret.”)
- Demonstration projects go unnoticed.
- Communication between membership and administration could use improvement.

Comments from retreat participants included:

- Coordination between programs would help with communication.
- Giving people more ownership will give them something they can relate to locally.
- No matter how much marketing you do, it is never enough. The Beacon newsletter is good, the website is good, and so are some other things APNEP has put out. Look at the good things other NEP's do to get ideas.
- People need to understand the estuary health so they can have ownership. People need to be provided facts before becoming members.
- We need to communicate and market between regions in the program itself and also state line.
- Advertise public meetings on the radio.
- Need some formal structure for communication between the councils – maybe a liaison from one council to another.
- Package the successes better.
- It should be a requirement to provide outreach for every demonstration project. It should be written into the grant application process.
- There should be an addition to the APNEP structure whose focus is getting info out to marketers, media folks, etc.
- Develop connections with the local media.
- Scholarship programs for high school seniors – could become high profile.
- Need to work with the tourism sector, perhaps partnering with tourism folks or economic development folks.

Next Steps

Bill Crowell presented some information about the restructuring of APNEP councils and what that could entail. He emphasized what he stated earlier, that there would be a place for everyone present, and for anyone who wants to be involved. Bill Crowell will present a proposal on the restructuring of the councils to the Coordinating Council.

The following points were brought up during this wrap up session:

- APNEP is working on a database to track accomplishments of the program and fulfillment of the CCMP.
- APNEP will first look at its own structure before tackling the CCMP.
- Question: How will the Regional Councils be involved? Answer: The people and the issues of the Regional Councils will be involved, but we don't yet know how.
- Look at the people who show up and restructure with them in mind.
- Do more with VA.
- Get interstate governor's agreement.
- EPA would like to see just a bit of money from each county. It may just be a good will gesture, but that is important.
- We should have tipping fees for biosludge dumping in NC.
- Develop indicators to monitor the program.

- Look for county funds also.
- Consider a non-profit APNEP group that could raise money and awareness, and also lobby for the same issues.

Meeting Adjourned

Appendix A: APNEP Reports Cards

DRAFT 2001 APNEP CCMP Report Card			Full	Substantial	Moderate	Some	Minimal
<p>This report card provides a summary evaluation of the level of progress that has been made regarding implementation of each of the 49 management actions listed in the APNEP CCMP. For a detailed listing of CCMP implementation activities, please refer to the 1999 APNEP CCMP Implementation Update Document.</p>							
WATER QUALITY ACTION PLAN							
Objective A	1	Develop and begin implementing basinwide plans	•				
	2	Establish total maximum daily loads (TMDLs)			•		
	3	Renew all discharge permits in a river basin simultaneously	•				
	4	Consider long-term growth when determining assimilative capacity			•		
	5	Improve scientific models for understanding the estuarine system		•			
	6	Continue long-term, comprehensive monitoring of water quality		•			
Objective B	1	Develop and implement basinwide plans to control NPS pollution			•		
	2	Expand funding to implement nonpoint source pollution controls	•				
	3	Continue to develop alternative septic systems and new BMPs	•				
	4	Strengthen enforcement of water quality violations due to NPS			•		
	5	Strengthen implementation of forestry BMPs	•				
	6	Enhance stormwater runoff controls			•		
	7	Implement an inter-agency state marina policy			•		
Objective C	1	Promote pollution prevention and alternatives to discharge	•				
	2	Expand and strengthen enforcement of NPDES permits		•			
Objective D	1	Increase monitoring of contaminated resources & identify causes		•			
	2	Continue to issue fish advisories to protect public health	•				
	3	Remediate toxic contamination where necessary and feasible					•
Objective E	1	Continue to track and evaluate indicators of environmental stress	•				
	2	Improve techniques for evaluating env. health of estuaries			•		
	3	Develop and adopt better indicators of shellfish contamination					•
VITAL HABITATS ACTION PLAN							
Objective A	1	Develop ecosystem protection & restoration plans		•			
	2	Develop and maintain accurate maps & records of natural areas		•			
	3	Expand programs to identify wetlands and to evaluate their function		•			
Objective B	1	Bring highest priority habitats into public ownership/management			•		
	2	Provide incentives to protect privately owned vital habitats		•			
Objective C	1	Enhance agency enforcement of existing wetlands regulations		•			
	2	Strengthen regulatory programs to protect vital fisheries habitats		•			
	3	Enhance efforts to restore degraded wetlands & fisheries habitats		•			
	4	Establish a consistent and effective wetlands mitigation program		•			
FISHERIES ACTION PLAN							
Objective A	1	Develop and implement fishery management plans	•				
	2	Modify the existing marine fisheries license structure	•				
Objective B	1	Continue and expand the development of by catch reduction gear	•				
	2	Institute a cost-share program for best fishing practices	•				

DRAFT 2001 APNEP CCMP Report Card			Full	Substantial	Moderate	Some	Minimal
This report card provides a summary evaluation of the level of progress that has been made regarding implementation of each of the 49 management actions listed in the APNEP CCMP. For a detailed listing of CCMP implementation activities, please refer to the 1999 APNEP CCMP Implementation Update Document.							
STEWARDSHIP ACTION PLAN							
Objective A	1	Provide incentives to integrate env. & economic planning				•	
	2	Provide affordable & accessible GIS data to local governments			•		
	3	Implement a comprehensive approach to managing public trust waters			•		
	4	Support orgs. that promote nature-based tourism & education	•				
Objective B	1	Expand and coordinate education projects about the estuary	•				
	2	Increase opportunities for citizens to communicate with agencies	•				
	3	Enhance public involvement in issues affecting the estuary			•		
	4	Expand involvement in the Citizens W.Q. Monitoring Program					
	5	Create a citizen ombudsman position within DENR			•		
Objective C	1	Develop a comprehensive environmental science & education	•				
	2	Provide renewal credits to teachers for involvement in environmental	•				
IMPLEMENTATION ACTION PLAN							
Objective A	1	Create a Coordinating Council and five Regional Councils	•				
	2	Coordinate implementation of the CCMP	•				
Objective B	1	Develop an annual "progress review" of CCMP implementation		•			
	2	Assess the health of the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuary		•			
TOTAL			20	14	12	1	2

Rankings Key:

- **Full:** Implementation complete or nearing completion (75-100%)
- **Substantial:** Major progress has been made (50-75%)
- **Moderate:** Fair level of progress made (25-50%)
- **Some:** Less than 25% complete
- **Minimal:** No progress has been made (0-25%)

Summary: Of the 49 Management Actions contained in the APNEP CCMP, 20 (40.8%) have been fully implemented as of December 31, 2001. Of the 29 remaining management actions, 14 (28.6%) have been substantially implemented and 12 (24.5%) have been implemented to a moderate degree. The remaining three management actions (6.1%) have received little attention. These figures are still under review and subject to revision.

APNEP CCMP Report Card - Graded by retreat participants			Full	Substantial	Moderate	Some	Minimal	N/A
Retreat participants were asked to grade the implementation of the 49 action items of the CCMP. Grading options were accomplished fully, substantially, moderately, some, or minimally . The option of N/A (non-applicable) was available if they felt unable to grade a certain item. This exercise helped to frame the issue of CCMP implementation for the retreat participants. Participants noted that some of them graded on what other organizations accomplished, while others graded only on what APNEP had accomplished. The answers represent participant perceptions at the time. Grade indicates highest scoring category. More than one grade indicates a tie.								
WATER QUALITY ACTION PLAN								
Objective A	1	Develop and begin implementing basinwide plans	•					
	2	Establish total maximum daily loads (TMDLs)					•	
	3	Renew all discharge permits in a river basin simultaneously	•					
	4	Consider long-term growth when determining assimilative capacity					•	
	5	Improve scientific models for understanding the estuarine system			•			
	6	Continue long-term, comprehensive monitoring of water quality			•			
Objective B	1	Develop and implement basinwide plans to control NPS pollution	•					
	2	Expand funding to implement nonpoint source pollution controls					•	
	3	Continue to develop alternative septic systems and new BMPs				•		
	4	Strengthen enforcement of water quality violations due to NPS					•	
	5	Strengthen implementation of forestry BMPs			•			
	6	Enhance stormwater runoff controls			•			
	7	Implement an inter-agency state marina policy				•		•
Objective C	1	Promote pollution prevention and alternatives to discharge				•		
	2	Expand and strengthen enforcement of NPDES permits					•	
Objective D	1	Increase monitoring of contaminated resources & identify causes			•			
	2	Continue to issue fish advisories to protect public health		•				
	3	Remediate toxic contamination where necessary and feasible					•	
Objective E	1	Continue to track and evaluate indicators of environmental stress			•	•		
	2	Improve techniques for evaluating env. health of estuaries				•		
	3	Develop and adopt better indicators of shellfish contamination	•					•
VITAL HABITATS ACTION PLAN								
Objective A	1	Develop ecosystem protection & restoration plans			•			
	2	Develop and maintain accurate maps & records of natural areas			•			
	3	Expand programs to identify wetlands and to evaluate their function	•	•	•	•		
Objective B	1	Bring highest priority habitats into public ownership/management				•	•	
	2	Provide incentives to protect privately owned vital habitats				•		
Objective C	1	Enhance agency enforcement of existing wetlands regulations				•		
	2	Strengthen regulatory programs to protect vital fisheries habitats		•				•
	3	Enhance efforts to restore degraded wetlands & fisheries habitats				•		
	4	Establish a consistent and effective wetlands mitigation program					•	
FISHERIES ACTION PLAN								
Objective A	1	Develop and implement fishery management plans		•				
	2	Modify the existing marine fisheries license structure						•
Objective B	1	Continue and expand the development of bycatch reduction gear		•				•
	2	Institute a cost-share program for best fishing practices						•

APNEP CCMP Report Card - Graded by retreat participants

Retreat participants were asked to grade the implementation of the 49 action items of the CCMP. Grading options were accomplished **fully, substantially, moderately, some, or minimally**. The option of N/A (non-applicable) was available if they felt unable to grade a certain item. This exercise helped to frame the issue of CCMP implementation for the retreat participants. Participants noted that some of them graded on what other organizations accomplished, while others graded only on what APNEP had accomplished.

Grade indicates highest scoring category. More than one grade indicates a tie.

			Full	Substantial	Moderate	Some	Minimal	N/A
STEWARDSHIP ACTION PLAN								
Objective A	1	Provide incentives to integrate env. & economic planning					•	
	2	Provide affordable & accessible GIS data to local governments		•				
	3	Implement a comprehensive approach to managing public trust					•	
	4	Support orgs. that promote nature-based tourism & education		•	•			
Objective B	1	Expand and coordinate education projects about the estuary		•				
	2	Increase opportunities for citizens to communicate with agencies		•				
	3	Enhance public involvement in issues affecting the estuary			•			
	4	Expand involvement in the Citizens W.Q. Monitoring Program		•				
	5	Create a citizen ombudsman position within DENR					•	
Objective C	1	Develop a comprehensive environmental science & education			•		•	
	2	Provide renewal credits to teachers for involvement in environmental						•
IMPLEMENTATION ACTION PLAN								
Objective A	1	Create a Coordinating Council and five Regional Councils	•					
	2	Coordinate implementation of the CCMP	•					
Objective B	1	Develop an annual "progress review" of CCMP implementation		•				
	2	Assess the health of the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuary		•				

Appendix B: Working Lunch Task #2

During lunch, participants were asked to answer two questions, using brief phrases written on note cards. These cards were collected and the responses are reported here for the first time:

What do you think is a good aspect of APNEP?

- Inclusiveness
- The Mission
- Program Re-evaluation/ Strategic Assessment
- Partnership with VA
- Since addition of staff, much more effective
- Organized structure to get stakeholder involvement
- Opportunity for networking
- Demo projects are great outreach tool
- Personnel, Purpose, Technical Skills
- Tries to reach all stakeholders
- Can be a platform for change and advocacy
- Good, committed staff
- Public outreach products, brochures
- Energized staff, great promoters of stewardship
- Good job at educating locals on land use and water quality connections
- Partnership building and collaboration
- Sounding board for concerns
- Opportunity for public involvement
- Credit to RC and CC members and staff that have supported program
- Energetic and dedicated staff

What do you think can be improved upon?

- Need for greater public support
- Needs Identity
- Relevance? Need to find niche
- Doesn't relate to the daily lives of the public
- Public recognition of program
- Lack of value to other programs
- Not integrated with other programs
- Please explore partnering with non-profits to raise funds
- Insufficient resources
- Insufficient funding
- Lack of support from local, state and fed government
- Under funded for its mission
- Program structure
- Study is too large to effectively manage
- Wasted time while waiting for a structure
- Need more staff
- Needs to serve as a leadership role
- Not focused
- Improve communication
- Size of area
- Poor attendance at RCs
- Council participation low
- Bureaucratic
- Waste of money, duplicates many other efforts
- Need more solutions to problems
- Need greater emphasis on education

Appendix C APNEP Executive Order

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 75
CREATION OF REGIONAL COUNCILS
AND A COORDINATING COUNCIL TO
SUPPORT SOUND ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT IN THE ALBEMARLE-
PAMLICO ESTUARINE STUDY REGION

WHEREAS, the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study (APES) was a cooperative effort by the State of North Carolina and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to preserve water quality, habitats, and fisheries in eastern North Carolina; and

WHEREAS, APES was the first of 21 National Estuary Programs to be started under the Clean Water Act; and

WHEREAS, APES has provided extensive information and scientific research about the environmental issues facing the Albemarle-Pamlico estuary since 1987; and

WHEREAS, that scientific information was combined with extraordinary involvement by citizens to develop a Comprehensive Conservation and Management plan (CCMP) entitled "A Guide to Environmental and Economic Stewardship in the Albemarle-Pamlico Region"; and

WHEREAS, the CCMP also recognizes that, from an ecological and an economic standpoint, the best way to ensure the general environmental health of the Albemarle-Pamlico watershed is to manage and protect the five river basins of the watershed; and

WHEREAS, the CCMP also recognizes the importance of involving the public in making decisions regarding environmental management; and

WHEREAS, the CCMP recommends the establishment of Regional Councils to foster public input from each of the five river basins in the Albemarle-Pamlico region, and a Coordinating Council to support the implementation process of the CCMP;

NOW, THEREFORE, by the authority vested in me as Governor by the laws and Constitution of the State of North Carolina, IT IS ORDERED:

Section 1. Establishment.

Five Regional Councils of citizens ("Councils"), one for each river basin in the Albemarle-Pamlico watershed, are hereby established to advise agencies responsible for environmental management on concerns and issues relative to that basin.

A Coordinating Council consisting of representatives from each Regional Council, citizen commissions, federal resource agencies, and state government is hereby established to evaluate and support implementation of the CCMP.

Section 2. Regional Councils.

A. Composition.

1. Basins to be represented by the Councils. Five separate Regional Councils shall represent each of the following river basins, with the area of the river basin being defined by the hydrologic boundaries ascribed to it by the N.C. Division of Environmental Management (DEM):
 - a. Neuse (including areas of the White Oak River basin that drain to Core and Bogue Sounds)
 - b. Tar-Pamlico (including areas draining directly into the northern Pamlico Sound)
 - c. Roanoke (the portion of the basin below Lake Gaston dam)
 - d. Chowan
 - e. Pasquotank/Alligator (including smaller rivers and areas that drain directly into the Albemarle, Currituck, Croatan, and Roanoke Sounds).
2. Membership of the Regional Councils.

- a. Each county in the basin shall have at least three representatives on the Council for that basin. In instances where a county lies in more than one basin, that county shall have at least three representatives on each Council that serves a basin of which the county is a part.
- b. Membership from each county shall include:
 - (1) one elected or appointed county official selected by the board of county commissioners;
 - (2) one elected or appointed municipal official selected by the board of county commissioners in consultation with municipalities in the county (counties without municipalities shall appoint a second county official); and
 - (3) one person appointed by the Secretary of the N.C. Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources (DEHNR). In making his appointments to each Council, the Secretary shall, to the greatest extent possible, seek to ensure demographic and social balance, as well as balance among the following interests:
 - (a) agriculture
 - (b) silviculture
 - (c) conservation
 - (d) environmental science
 - (e) commercial fishing
 - (f) business/industry
 - (g) recreational fishing
 - (h) tourism
 - (i) Soil and Water Conservation Districts
 - (j) at large
- c. Each Regional Council may expand its membership as it deems necessary.
- d. Members shall serve for a five-year term to coincide with the five-year cycle of discharge permit renewals in the river basins. Vacancies shall be filled by the appointing authority.

B. Duties.

1. The Regional Councils shall advise and consult with local, state, and federal governments, as well as the general public and different interest groups within the basin, on the implementation of environmental management programs in the river basins. Because different basins are likely to face different concerns and problems, the Council for a particular basin shall work to prioritize the problems to be addressed in that basin and to design and build consensus support for the most cost-effective strategies for dealing with those problems. The councils shall also advise the public and local governments of actions and information relevant to environmental management in the basin. The Councils will have no authority other than as advisory bodies.
2. Federal and state agencies with environmental management responsibilities in the basin shall be invited to participate in meetings of the Regional Councils.
3. Each council shall be responsible for determining its own rules of order, chairmanship, attendance regulations, quorums, and other matters of protocol.
4. DEHNR shall assist the councils and serve as a conduit for information between the councils, state and federal agencies, local government, and the public.
5. Each council shall work with DEHNR in preparing an annual public report on the progress of environmental protection and related concerns in the five river basins.

C. Meetings.

Each Regional Council shall meet within three months of its formation by the Secretary of DEHNR and local governments. Each Council shall meet at least two times each year, or more frequently if deemed appropriate.

Section 3. Coordinating Council.

A. Membership.

Membership of the Coordinating Council shall include:

1. Fifteen representatives of the five Regional Councils.

(Each Regional Council will select two of the elected and/or appointed government officials and one other representative from any background.)

2. Seven representatives of citizen commissions and councils. The Chair of each of the following groups shall select a representative:
 - a. Marine Fisheries Commission
 - b. Soil and Water Conservation Commission
 - c. Environmental Management Commission
 - d. Coastal Resources Commission
 - e. Wildlife Resources Commission
 - f. Forestry Advisory Council
 - g. Sedimentation Control Commission
 3. Four representatives of federal resource agencies, to be selected by the appropriate federal administrators, are invited to participate:
 - a. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 - b. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 - c. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - d. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 4. Three representatives of state government:
 - a. Secretary of DEHNR, or his designee (Chair of the Coordinating Council)
 - b. Secretary of the N.C. Department of Commerce, or his designee
 - c. Commissioner of the N.C. Department of Agriculture, or his designee, is invited to participate.
- B. Duties.
1. The role of the Coordinating Council shall be to evaluate and support the implementation process to ensure the highest level of cooperation and coordination among agencies, local governments, and public and private interest groups.
 2. The Coordinating Council shall consult the Regional Councils for guidance on coordinating implementation strategies at a local level.
 3. The Coordinating Council shall set annual priorities for implementing sections of the CCMP and make recommendations based on progress and success, and shall identify and prioritize information needs as described in the CCMP.
 4. The Coordinating Council shall pursue a Memorandum of Agreement between North Carolina and Virginia to ensure continued cooperation and coordination in implementing the CCMP.
 5. Each participating agency, institution, and organization of the Coordinating Council shall submit annual reports evaluating the progress made in implementing CCMP recommendations and the success of implementation strategies.

Section 4. Compensation, Per Diems and Expenses.

Members of the Regional Councils and the Coordinating Council shall serve voluntarily and without compensation, per diems or expenses.

Section 5. Effect of Other Executive Orders.

All other Executive Orders or portions of Executive Orders inconsistent herewith are hereby rescinded.

This Order shall become effective immediately.

Done in the Capital City of Raleigh, North Carolina, this the 30th day of March, 1995.