

APNEP Policy Board Meeting

North Carolina Division of Air Quality, Conference Room
2728 Capital Boulevard, Raleigh, NC
Meeting Notes, May 13, 2010

Members Present: Marjorie Rayburn (CAC), Charles Bass (CAC), Terry Hairston, Tom Allen, Linda Pearsall, Tony Reevy, Steven Blackburn, Bob Howard, Tom Stroud, Todd Miller, Reid Wilson, Eric Walberg, Jack Thigpen, Richard Rogers, Linda Rimer (MAC), Brian Long, Kirk Havens (STAC), Pat Harris, Wilson Laney (Call-in) (STAC).

Staff Present: Bill Crowell, Dean Carpenter, Lori Brinn, Jimmy Johnson, Chad Smith.

Call to Order: Tony Reevy: Tony welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 10:35 AM; introductions followed. Tony recognized that today's meeting is public and asked if there were any comments. There were no members of the public present to offer comments. Tony asked if anyone had any changes or corrections to the meeting notes from the March meeting. Linda Rimer voiced her apologies that she had to leave the room during the discussion of the climate change workshop. She mentioned that she had to step outside for a conference call and was concerned that APNEP may have not been properly recognized at the workshop. Jack added that he thought the conference was well attended by APNEP partners and the event proved to be educational. Tony apologized for any misinterpretation that were typed in the meeting notes and that it was not APNEP who made the statement. The meeting notes were later approved by consensus with no changes.

Recognition of Past Chair: Tony Reevy

- Tony recognized Jack Thigpen for his three years of service on the APNEP Policy Board. He presented Jack with a plaque and posed for a photo.
- Eric stated his resignation from the APNEP Policy Board on account of a new position he will be taking out-of-state. Tony thanked Eric for his service and support of APNEP and its mission.

APNEP Updates: Bill Crowell and Lori Brinn

- Lori talked about Agricultural BMP Day, which is scheduled for late July / early August. This event will take place at the NC Estuarium (Sept. 10th) in Washington, NC. The purpose of this event is to share success stories that deal with agricultural sustainability. Lori also mentioned the spending of \$20,000 for this event was approved by the APNEP Policy Board. The funds will be split between 2 projects. The project is to support efforts for non-till planting education in 5 counties in NE North Carolina.
- Bill mentioned that he hopes to hire a grants and contract manager by next week. He mentioned there were three candidates.
- Bill announced Lori's resignation that will take effect at the end of the month. The APNEP Policy Board recognized Lori's hard work and dedication towards the program.
- Tony mentioned Lori's resignation may challenge the ambitious timeline that APNEP has set for the 2010 CCMP completion.

Program Office Relocation in NCDENR

- David and Bill spent time reviewing the history of the program's location. In 2002, APNEP was within a Unit of the NC Division of Water Quality. From June 2002, APNEP was attached to the Office of Conservation and Community Affairs, which lies within the Office of the Secretary of DENR. In Dec. 2007, APNEP was moved to the Division of Natural Resources Planning and Conservation. The current NC DENR proposal is that APNEP will be moved to the Division of Conservation (former Divisions of Soil and Water, and Natural Resources Planning and Conservation).

- Bob mentioned the 2009 EPA Review and expressed concerns about the program’s visibility and independence after its relocation. He noted the location change that occurred in 2002 and added that APNEP didn’t pass the 2002 program review which was prior to Bill Crowell’s involvement in the program. He was also concerned about the number of management levels and hoped that it doesn’t lead to micromanagement, loss of autonomy, and visibility. He also stated that this year would be big for APNEP with the revision of the CCMP and forming new partnerships. He was wondering how this might be affected by the program relocation.
- A question was asked about EPA funds if a NEP didn’t pass its program review. The response was that funds would go to another NEP.
- Brian Long stated that he felt that Secretary Freeman had put APNEP in a box and threw dirt on top of it by burying it in a larger DENR division. David responded that he didn’t agree and that effectiveness should be the most important component over the program relocation.
- Tony expressed that APNEP has amazing potential. Jack added that relationships between people are more effective than seeing APNEP’s program position on paper.
- Jack mentioned how NEPs are housed by the EPA and questioned to how some of them end up at the agency level, university, etc. Bob mentioned that it depends on the letter from the Governor of the state. He also mentioned that this has changed due to the uniqueness and independence of each NEP. He noted that some NEPs went from weak to strong effectiveness.
- Tony mentioned that Secretary Freeman will respond to APNEP’s 2009 EPA Review and that might confirm our structure.
- Wilson (call-in) mentioned STAC’s involvement with the program relocation and that a letter was written to Secretary Freeman (shared with Policy Board) on the STAC’s behalf. He also mentioned that there was not a thorough discussion on this topic at last week’s STAC meeting since some of the members had to leave early for ECU graduation ceremonies.
- Jack mentioned if there was going to be any physical program location. The response was that eventually all offices in DENR would relocate to the Green Square building in 1-2 years when it is complete.

CCMP – EBM Progress Report: Marjorie Rayburn and Kirk Havens

- Marjorie directed members to look over the proposed timeline for the development of the APNEP CCMP, monitoring plan, ecosystem assessment, and the EBM support activities that was included in the agenda packet.
- For the EBM transition team, there have been monthly meetings since January 2010 to guide the development of the framework for EBM integration into the 2010 CCMP.
- The 1994 CCMP covered five priority issues: Water Quality, Vital Habitats, Fisheries, Stewardship, and Implementation. The new CCMP will cover: Waters, Natural Communities, and Stewardship.
- Marjorie went over the proposed timeline. She acknowledged that the timeline was ambitious but that there were different groups working on different activities of the CCMP. She mentioned that the final draft should appear in December 2010 and that the unveiling of the final CCMP document and Monitoring Plan would take place in June 2011. She also mentioned that the fall of 2011 APNEP may unveil the final CCMP at the “State of the Sounds” conference in New Bern would be viewed as a celebration.
- Marjorie declined to talk about each section of the timeline due to time but she briefly covered the framework of the timeline, which includes the responsible parties for each activity in addition to the resource needs and outputs.
- Marjorie congratulated the APNEP staff for filling in the gaps of the timeline. She mentioned that the earlier draft of the timeline was missing important information.
- Tony, once again, mentioned the ambitious timeline that APNEP has presented and expressed his concerns about there being little room to make-up the time if the timeline flow is somehow disrupted. He also mentioned that Lori’s resignation may present challenges and to possibly seek

assistance from a temporary position or graduate student and use payment from Lori's salary position. Bill commented that it was an ambitious timeline but it was necessary. Bill also mentioned that APNEP was getting an intern for 10 weeks this summer.

- Bob mentioned that the framework for the CCMP is a revision every five years. He mentioned that this can be a bit of an undertaking but warned members that there have been discussions about revisions taking place every four years. He also mentioned that the annual work plan plays a major role in the CCMP and how they are related.

Working Lunch

- Kirk went over the goals and sub-goals of the 2010 CCMP. The first priority issue is "Waters." Goals include the maintenance, enhancement, or restoration of water quality to support natural and human communities. The second goal is to maintain or restore sufficient water quality to support natural and human communities.
- The second priority issue is "Natural Communities." The goals are to: conserve and restore functional natural communities; conserve and restore priority native species; and to limit the establishment and spread of invasive non-native species.
- The third and last priority issue is "Stewardship." The goals are to: actively engage program partners in promoting responsible stewardship; increase environmental literacy among citizens and interested parties; and to promote sustainable land use planning and development practices.
- Jimmy and Pat Harris walked in to the meeting. Jimmy and Pat both introduced themselves. Pat is the director of Soil and Water Conservation and is looking forward to learning more about the APNEP program. She also mentioned that she was around during the APES era.
- Kirk continued by talking about the next steps which is the incorporation of the Partners' Strategic and Action Plans. The staff is extracting goals and objectives from partnering agency plans that supports APNEPs mission and goals, which includes federal, state (NC and VA), and local and non-profit partner agencies. These goals and objectives will advise the creation of objectives and actions for the 2010 CCMP.
- Bob mentioned that NEPs are not interested in receiving credit for their work; they prefer to get things done.
- Richard mentioned that stewardship should be defined clearer
- Kirk mentioned that APNEP was interested in developing a report card on ecosystem health as well.

Proposed FY 2011 Budget and Work Plan: Bill Crowell

- Bill went over the federal funds budget for the FY 2011. Members were advised to look at the proposed budget that was included in the Work Plan. Bill reviewed each line item.
- Bill reviewed the program administration costs and that it is flexible. Richard brought up concerns about having these costs open but Tony reminded him that there are two open positions.
- Bill mentioned that the "Community Involvement and Outreach" line item was used for balancing the budget and printing costs since a majority of the community outreach projects are handled through our partnerships.
- Linda asked about the CMN water quality data. Bill mentioned that it was being housed at the CMN office on ECU campus and that it is available upon request. Chad added that the data is often requested and that recently the NOAA lab in Beaufort was interested in obtaining the CMN data that was collected in the Chowan River for their striped bass research project.
- Bill noted that there were over 100 applicants for the 2010 Teacher's Institute and that the selection process has been difficult for the Environmental Education Office.
- Bill was interested in the Policy Board's opinion regarding the "Restoration Projects" line item. He asked whether or not the allocated funds of \$100,000 be split into two projects at \$50,000 each or if APNEP should look into funding more projects and splitting funds further. Some

members expressed that too many projects may become too burdensome.

- Bill mentioned that the money allocated for the CAC projects would be delegated and split by CAC members at one of their future meetings.
- Bill mentioned that the 2009 Outdoor Classroom Symposium was a success with 160 attendees over two days. APNEP plans to fund the symposium for a second year.
- Bill talked about the “Shad in the Classroom” program. He briefly described the program to the Policy Board and sees the program being a long-term project for APNEP. Tony stated that this project has a lot of potential for marketing APNEP.
- Bill talked about his interest in tracking past projects and Institute attendants and wants the APNEP staff to improve on this. He mentioned to the Policy Board that a past Institute attendant prepared a grant for the establishment of a green space in the Raleigh area. Bob was in favor of Bill’s comments stating that it helps justify the money we spend on these projects and Institutes.
- Kirk mentioned about possibly consolidating some of the budget line items. He used “restoration projects” and the “outdoor classroom symposium” line items as an example.
- Marjorie mentioned that she would like to see more work in Virginia. She feels that North Carolina may be favored more.
- Bill stated the work plan will also include the EPA review letter.
- Bill reminded the Policy Board that the FY 2011 budget has increased by \$200,000. He said that next year we will not see this budget increase and that the annual budget would be around \$500,000 or 600,000. Bill added that the extra money for 2011 was primarily used for EBM support, restoration projects, and the “Shad in the Classroom” program.
- The Policy Board noticed a miscalculation in the total cost of the FY 2011 budget page. The total cost added up to \$782,000. Bill will make adjustment to correct the budget page to correspond with the narrative section of the work plan.
- The Policy Board approved the budget with cost modifications.

New and Old Business: Tony Reevy

- Tony talked about the Clean Estuaries Act (HR 4715). Bob provided some insight concerning the NEPs, competitive funding, and including the Great Lakes in the Clean Estuaries Act.
- Vacancies on the Policy Board were discussed. There are vacant positions open for MAC representation, local and regional planning (Eric’s position), Cooperative Extension, and possibly the Secretary of Natural Resources of the Commonwealth of Virginia.
- There was no discussion of old business.

Notice of Next Meeting and Tentative Meeting Schedule: Tony Reevy

- There will be an Executive Meeting over the phone soon; logistics will be announced to attendants a month in advance.
- Tony asked if members would be okay if the next Policy Board meeting be moved from Wednesday, September 15th to Friday, September 17th. He added that state elected officials are usually in the area on Fridays and that members would have the option to prolong their visit through the weekend. The members agreed and moved the meeting to September 17th. The venue and time of the meeting will be determined at a later date. The Policy Board hopes to include an optional field trip in the meeting agenda so members can visit some of the past and ongoing project sites.
- Tony also mentioned that it is important that the Policy Board meet quarterly with various locations in North Carolina and Virginia.
- Tony thanked Steve and Bob for attending today’s meeting and their valuable input.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.