

SUMMARY OF COASTAL RESOURCES ADVISORY COUNCIL ACTIONS
August 24, 2004
Sheraton Capitol Center
Raleigh, NC

The Advisory Council welcomed Angie Manning as the new member for Onslow County. Ms. Manning is Onslow County's Interim Director for Planning/Community Development, and replaces William Price on the Council.

Consideration and Vote on CRAC/CRC Meeting Schedule

Mr. Shupe informed members that a joint CRC/CRAC subcommittee had requested the Council's preference for the meeting schedule. The Council voted 7-4 in favor of retaining the current Tuesday/Wednesday/Thursday schedule, with 11 abstentions.

Model Communities Pier Litter Project

Judy Bolin of NC Big Sweep spoke with us about the NC Pier Litter Project. The project focuses on reducing litter from visitors to the state's fishing piers through public education brochures, signs, and recycling bins for trash and fishing line. Ms. Bolin explained that wildlife entanglement in monofilament fishing line is a growing problem in North Carolina. Fishing line was responsible for 25% of known wildlife entanglements in 2003, up from 10% in 2002. NC Big Sweep decided to target fishing piers in an attempt to reduce the amount of improperly discarded fishing line. 17 of the state's oceanfront piers are participating in the Pier Litter Project. NC Big Sweep believes that the project is already having a positive effect, and hopes to increase the number of piers that participate.

CRAC Involvement with CAMA Land Use Planning

John Thayer, following up from the June meeting, gave the Advisory Council further information about the CAMA land use planning process and how the CRAC could get involved. Mr. Thayer explained that the land use plans go through a two-year, two-phase process. In year one/phase one communities begin the process with tasks that include assembling teams, setting goals, and scheduling. Year two/phase two tasks include producing draft plans, seeking public input, and plan review, adoption and approval. Mr. Thayer presented the following examples of how the CRAC could be involved:

- Assign CRAC members to communities at the beginning of the local land-use planning process so that each community has a representative from the Advisory Council
- Allow CRAC members to participate voluntarily, though some communities get no volunteers
- Either of the above but shift the CRAC participation focus onto primarily strategic tasks and critical meetings (e.g. initial issues public meeting, state review of the Draft Land Use Plan, and public hearings)
- Any of the above but further narrow the CRAC member's participation just to the state review of the Draft Land Use Plan

Overview of CHPP Public Comments

Mike Lopazanski stated that the public meetings in 2003 focused on introducing the CHPP to the public and getting feedback on what the public felt the Plan should focus on. The meetings this year were intended to collect feedback on how well the public felt the draft plan addressed the needs that had been identified. DENR hosted ten public meetings and five additional meetings

that sought feedback from targeted stakeholders who seemed to have been under-represented (e.g. Realtors, builders, foresters, and fishers). Over 500 people attended meetings in 2004, and over 700 written comments were submitted. Mr. Lopazanski reported some of the public sentiment about the CHPP, including skepticism that anything will change, dissatisfaction with the level of detail in the Plan, and a desire to see stronger enforcement of existing rules. Mr. Lopazanski said that some meeting attendees took issues with aspects of the CHPP, saying that it focuses too heavily on new development rather than on retrofitting existing development, that it focuses too much on the negative aspects of beach nourishment and not on the benefits, that it proposes overly harsh reductions in impervious surface limits, and that there is insufficient economic analysis. Mr. Lopazanski stated that forestry experts contended that the negative impacts to water quality were overstated in the CHPP. Finding the experts' claim to be true, the CHPP review committee revised the recommendations. Mr. Lopazanski said that as a result of the public feedback, several other changes had been made to the draft recommendations, and that those changes would be covered in greater detail in the full CRC session.

Discussion of CHPP—Issues, Comments, Concerns

The Advisory Council then had a lengthy discussion about the CHPP. Harry Simmons proposed a resolution that while the CRAC does not agree unanimously with all aspects of the Plan, the Council accepts the Plan as it is intended and wishes to move forward to implementation. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Old/New Business

In new business, Dave Weaver asked whether staff could stop including hardcopy press articles in members' meeting packets. Mr. Weaver stated that excluding the articles would save on paper and postage costs. Michele Walker explained that there are options for receiving the articles electronically if that is the Council's preference. No motion was made and the Council did not vote on the question.