

Draft

NC Coastal Resources Advisory Council Sheraton Hotel & Marina New Bern, NC January 16-17, 2007 Meeting Summary

Attendance

Dara Royal, Chair	Y	Wayne Mobley	Y
Penny Tysinger, Vice Chair	Y	J. Michael Moore	Y
Deborah Anderson	Y	William Morrison	Y
Eugene Ballance		Elwood Padrick	Y
Bert Banks (Adrian Cox)		W. Burch Perry	
Joe Beck	Y	Spencer Rogers	Y
Ernie Bowden		Frank Rush	Y
Randy Cahoon	Y	Robert Shupe	Y
Carlton Davenport	Y	Harry Simmons	Y
Eddy Davis	Y	Lester Simpson	Y
Anne Deaton	Y	Steve Sizemore (Andrea Frazier)	Y
Christine Mele	Y	Paul Spruill	
Webb Fuller	Y	Ray Sturza	
William Gardner, Jr.		Tim Tabak	Y
Renee Gledhill-Earley (Nathan Henry)	Y	Reid Thomas	
Gary Greene	Y	Joy Wayman	Y
Judy Hills	Y	Beans Weatherly	
Al Hodge	Y	David Weaver	Y
Maximilian Merrill	Y	William Wescott	Y
Joe Lassiter	Y	Traci White	Y
Travis Marshall	Y	Rhett White	
Gary Mercer		Don Yousey (David Stanley)	

Wednesday 16th

Call to Order

Dara Royal called the meeting to order at 3 pm and the Council approved the November 2007 minutes.

CRAC Effectiveness Discussion

Royal stated that the CRAC is the communications link between their appointing bodies and the CRC. The CRAC has made a lot of progress in this role in the past few years and Royal would like to see that link further strengthened. Royal asked Council members to share their experiences in communicating with their appointing bodies.

Judy Hills said that her appointing body issues a weekly bulletin, and that the other coastal Councils of Government do something similar. Hills said that the bulletins are one-way communications, and

Draft

that she rarely gets much feedback. Penny Tysinger added that unless the CRC is discussing an issue that has the potential to significantly affect a local government, they don't usually allocate resources to respond or comment. Webb Fuller said that most coastal cities expect their appointees to the CRAC to represent their interests in front of the CRC. Fuller said that he often gets calls for information from developers and individuals.

Christine Mele said that she usually gives a summary to her commission at their monthly meetings. Tim Tabak said that he communicates directly with his county manager, and relies on that individual to decide what needs to be relayed to his appointing body. Phil Harris said that DOT appointees take rulemaking actions back to their supervisors, and will occasionally call meetings to discuss them. Dave Weaver said that he used to send out an email summary after each CRAC meeting, but now sends out copies of CAMAgram instead. Weaver said that he does targeted emails on specific issues, as needed. Michele Walker offered to add emails to her CAMAgram and Interested Parties distribution lists. Bob Shupe said that he tried writing letters after every CRAC meeting, but got little response. Shupe said that he has also hand delivered some information to the Brunswick County Clerk.

Royal asked what else Council members need to do to fulfill their responsibility, and whether members thought that appointing bodies appreciate the impact they can have on the CRC. Judy Hills said that the perception is that the rulemaking process is so cumbersome that appointing bodies don't know how to participate efficiently. Joe Lassiter said that there is a feeling of impotence among many lay people, including individuals and contractors. Lassiter said that the Council needs to help them understand and participate in the process.

Bob Shupe asked whether the CRC and CRAC are looked upon favorably, particularly on the islands. Dara Royal said that she thinks that they looked upon favorably by the appointing bodies, but that it tends to be issue specific. Royal said she doesn't think that the general public has any knowledge about the CRAC or the coastal management process, and so their voices might not be heard—at least until public hearings, which are towards the end of the process. Penny Tysinger said that retirees may have more time to follow the issues, but tend to follow only those issues of personal interest to them.

Webb Fuller asked whether there was a proposal to extend the CRAC's communications role to the general public; Fuller said that this was not a part of the CRAC's responsibilities. Joe Lassiter said that the program needs public support otherwise we would constantly be swimming upstream. Fuller said that this would be a good time to revisit the CRAC Guidebook—there is a perception that the CRAC is communicating with the general public, but that is incorrect, the CRAC needs to communicate only with its appointing bodies.

Mike Lopazanski asked about information flowing in the other direction, from appointing bodies to the CRC. Fuller said that local governments are reactive, they will usually wait until the CRC is about to act and then they will work directly with the CRC, not through the CRAC. Steve Sizemore said that it would be easier if the CRC had an annual strategic planning meeting (not in January) so that the CRAC could plan and schedule opportunities to get input from their appointing bodies. Fuller senses that most citizens that are interested in an issue will go to the CRAC as a last resort—they will approach their local elected officials first, then the CRC, then the CRAC. Harry Simmons observed that we tend to hear from the public on the negatives, but not on the positives.

Penny Tysinger said that the Council should check in with appointing bodies, especially local governments, after newly-elected officials take office. January is not a good time. Steve Sizemore suggested a PowerPoint presentation targeted to appointing bodies as an introduction/refresher on the CRC and CRAC. Harry Simmons pointed out the communications challenge faced by coastal

Draft

cities representatives, there being only eight of them to cover all coastal municipalities. Royal asked whether the Council wanted to ask staff to prepare the PowerPoint presentation as Sizemore suggested. The Council did not make the request of staff, but decided to begin a revision of their Guidebook.

On the subject of the joint CRC-CRAC agenda for the remainder of the meeting, Bob Emory said that CRC members feel it is time to discuss long-term strategy and how meetings should run in the future, especially with respect to standing committees. Emory said that while the majority of the facilitated discussion will be just among the Commission, CRAC input is critical and there will be opportunities to participate.

CRAC Priorities

Max Merrill pointed out that water quality protection is not listed as one of the CRAC's current priorities, particularly as that includes naturally vegetated buffers. Doug Langford said that the EMC's proposed stormwater rules include a minimum 50-foot buffer for all coastal waters. After discussion, the Council voted to present the following list to the CRC. These issues will be incorporated into the CRC's strategic planning discussion.

Top Priorities, in order of importance:

1. Public (water) access associated with DOT projects, State Parks & other state owned properties. (Will be a CRAC agenda item in July). Review CRC rules and legal issues to find ways to increase access.
2. Emphasize management topics that are "hot topic" issues in CAMA land use plan guidelines, e.g. sewage and stormwater management, and water supplies (quantity & quality). Possible tools for growth management. Offer incentives as well as requirements. Establish penalties for nonperformance? Seek state funding for implementation of LUP policies.
3. Reiterate need for better compliance and enforcement of existing rules.
4. Estuarine shoreline stabilization. Should permitting & resource agencies regulate which methods can be used in different areas? Incorporate recommendations of Biological Workgroup.

Secondary issues, in no particular order:

5. Wind farms/alternative energy.
6. Annual erosion rates. Are long-term rates misleading? Is a shorter-term rate more appropriate? If the data are available, give the range of erosion over the reporting period.
7. Involvement in CRC/DCM education plan.
8. How are local governments dealing with relative sea level rise? How should local governments deal with it, especially in the estuarine system? 30-year setback in the face of increased erosion from RSLR. Study the effectiveness of nourishment in dealing with relative sea level rise. What should the state level responses be to RSLR? Buyouts, protection, etc.
9. More detailed consideration of how other agencies' proposed rules will affect coastal communities, before taking a position to support. Concern that science and fiscal impact estimates are inadequate.

Draft

10. Improve general permit for riprap sills. Address numerous conditions that inhibit its use. Involve the CHPP Steering Committee.
11. Marine pumpouts.
12. Buffers. Development of strategy dependent upon management goal.

New Business/Old Business

With no further business the Council adjourned.

Thursday 17th

Advisory Council met in session with CRC.

##