

NC COASTAL RESOURCES COMMISSION (CRC)

**August 29-30, 2012
Sea Trail Convention Center
Sunset Beach, NC**

Present CRC Members

Bob Emory, Chair
Joan Weld, Vice Chair

Lee Wynns
Pat Joyce
David Webster
Jerry Old
Bill Peele

Melvin Shepard
Ed Mitchell
Jamin Simmons
Joseph Hester

Present CRAC Members

Randell Woodruff
Bob Shupe
Tim Tabak
Ray Sturza
Dave Weaver
Steve Myers
Missy Baskervill
Bill Morrison
Wayne Howell
J. Michael Moore
Debbie Smith

Bert Banks
Judy Hills
Tracy Skrabal
Spencer Rogers
Vernon Cox
Mark Zeigler (for Lee Padrick)
Anne Deaton
Boyd Devane
Phil Harris
Harry Simmons

Present Attorney General's Office Members

Mary Lucasse
Christine Goebel

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Bob Emory called the meeting to order reminding the Commissioners of the need to state any conflicts due to Executive Order Number One and also the State Government Ethics Act. The State Government Ethics Act mandates that at the beginning of each meeting the Chair remind all members of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest and inquire as to whether any member knows of any conflict of interest or potential conflict with respect to matters to come before the Commission. If any member knows of a conflict of interest or a potential conflict of interest, please state so when the roll is called.

Angela Willis called the roll. No conflicts were reported. Renee Cahoon, Charles Elam, and Veronica Carter were absent. Based upon this roll call, Chairman Emory declared a quorum.

Joseph Hester read his Evaluation of Statement of Economic Interest from the State Ethics Commission which indicated they did not find an actual conflict, but did find the potential for a conflict of interest. The potential conflict identified does not prohibit service.

MINUTES

Melvin Shepard made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 20-21, 2012 Coastal Resources Commission meeting and the June 21, 2012 closed session minutes. David Webster seconded the motion. The motion passed with nine votes in favor (Weld, Wynns, Joyce, Webster, Old, Peele, Shepard, Mitchell, Simmons) and one abstention (Hester).

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT

DCM Director Braxton Davis gave the following report.

It is good to see you all again and to welcome Commissioner Hester. I look forward to meeting with you soon to discuss our program. In your information packets you will find a DCM Update Memo. As you will recall, we have begun providing this as a standard part of your packets to provide a little more detail on ongoing activities at DCM in terms of permitting, enforcement, rule development, planning and Coastal Reserve activities. Some notable items include our prioritization of funding for beach and shoreline public access projects totaling \$1.3 million in 13 of North Carolina's coastal communities; and a recent CAMA workshop for coastal surveyors conducted by the Reserve Program's Coastal Training Program that we think was very well received. I hope everyone here is also on our email list for our CAMAgram newsletter, which has a new format and will go out quarterly with program updates. If you are not please let me or Michele Walker know.

For today's agenda, we worked with the Executive Committee to address several important program areas. We will hear from Ray Sturza on the progress being made by the CRAC on understanding and improving public shoreline access in North Carolina. I will run through H819, SL 2012-202, which became law in August and how we are beginning to think about implementation of the various studies that are required by the bill. I'll also hand off to Robin Smith, Assistant Secretary of DENR, to discuss a few other recent bills and executive orders that are relevant to the CRC. You will hear from Commissioner Wynns on the outcomes of the Ocean Hazards Committee meeting yesterday afternoon, with a focus on sandbag enforcement priorities and moving forward with rule changes the CRC approved for public hearing last year. As you will recall from the last meeting, the Estuarine and Ocean Systems Committee met to discuss the draft SLR policy before reconsidering its release for public hearings. We heard a report from Commissioner Peele, who chairs that Committee, on the results of their discussions and today you'll have the draft policy before you for potential release to public hearings as an action item. But first, you'll hear from Tancred Miller from our staff about the kinds of activities DCM envisions undertaking, leading, or partnering on in response to the policy if it is eventually adopted. John Thayer will describe final recommendations from the 7B Land Use Planning Guidelines Review Committee and next steps that DCM would like to take in reviewing our LUP planning program over the coming year. Mike Lopazanski will provide an update on our Department-level initiative to advance "living shorelines," including marsh sills, which I described briefly at your last meeting. There are several action items before you related to temporary rules and consideration of the SLR policy and related fiscal analysis; approval of the 2012 Coastal Habitat Protection Plan's Annual Report, which will be presented by Jimmy Johnson; and several LUP certifications and amendments.

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Bob Emory said he has been asked by several Commissioners about the status of reappointments. There is no news from the Governor's Office on reappointments. After the last meeting there was a flurry of sea-level rise related activity. Braxton and I have met with a couple of interested parties.

CRAC REPORT

Ray Sturza, CRAC Chair, stated the CRAC has been focusing on public access issues over the last few months primarily in an attempt to gather some data about what the conditions are in terms of access. We have gathered a lot of information and found that we have a vibrant and successful coastal resource access program. The summary of all of these meetings has served to open some people's eyes about it. The CRAC heard from Ken Richardson who discussed the information that is available on the DCM website for various coastal access locations. We think it is a medium that will serve as a great source of information. We also summarized the related access issues that have come up as a result of looking at estuarine, ocean and marine related access locations and identified that there are conflict issues that arise with the principal of making public access available. In some locations we have found that there are conflicts when there is no fee or remuneration and there is an adjacent private entity that has access facilities available and then we are competing with those who operate for profit. That is an issue we will try to get into to find a way to resolve this unanticipated conflict. The CRAC came to agreement that we will use the 20 local government and 7 coastal cities representatives on the CRAC to poll the local governments in the coastal area and see who would be interested in some regional workshops to be conducted by our staff. The goal of the workshops will be to identify where the access is and try and resolve the conflict that we uncovered. The bigger goal is to aggregate what we think is available data in communities that have been working to establish local shoreline restoration or beach nourishment and put a value on our access facilities in order to defend, if not advocate, the access program. We feel it has great benefits, not just to the 20 coastal counties, but also to the other 80 counties in NC and in other states that use the facilities. We were also reminded by one of our members that there are legislative efforts adrift to try to revise the composition and organization of the Coastal Resources Advisory Council and the Coastal Resources Commission.

PRESENTATIONS

Legislative Update – H819 Coastal Management Policies

Braxton Davis

Braxton Davis stated H819 is composed of five sections. The first section defines the coastal area. This is the first time that the 20 coastal counties that define the North Carolina coastal zone have been codified. They were previously laid out through an Executive Order. The second section talks about sea-level rise policy. The Act says that the CRC and DCM shall be the only state agency authorized to define rates of sea-level change for regulatory purposes. The CRC cannot proceed to define a rate of sea-level rise for regulatory purposes until after July 1, 2016. The Act directs the Commission to direct the Science Panel to deliver a five year updated assessment report no later than March 31, 2015. This updated assessment report was already planned. The Act requires that the report include a comprehensive literature review. It asks the Science Panel to clearly define its assumptions and uncertainties and to make its report available for public comment. The CRC is asked to further evaluate the use of predictive models in assessing sea-level change and to look at regional rates of change. The Act also asks the Commission to look at the economic and environmental costs and benefits of any sea-level rise regulations. Using the timelines that are laid out in the Act, the Science Panel Assessment Report would be due March 31, 2015. DCM will ask the Science Panel to work with us to come up with a draft by late summer 2014. This will allow some time for technical review and amendments the Science Panel may want to make based on comments received. The CRC could then seek written comments upon receipt of the report for a ninety day period and could hold a public hearing during its May/June 2015 meeting. The Commission is required to submit a report including the Science Panel's Assessment for public

comment by December 31, 2015. All of the reports, policies, and comments must be delivered to the General Assembly's Environmental Review Commission by March 2016.

Section three of the Act looks at ocean setbacks. It creates a grandfathering provision. It says that the Commission shall not deny permits for replacement of single-family residential or duplex structures greater than 5,000 square feet based on the failure to meet the ocean setback if it was constructed prior to August 11, 2009, does not exceed the original square footage or footprint, and meets the minimum setback under 7H .0306(a)(2)(A). If it cannot meet the current setback the replacement shall be rebuilt as far landward on the lot as possible. The Act requires the Commission to adopt temporary rules until permanent rules become effective. We could have the permanent rule finalized by spring 2013.

Section four of the Act requests the Commission study the feasibility of creating a new AEC for lands adjacent to the mouth of the Cape Fear River. The Act asks the Commission to consider the unique coastal morphologies and hydrographic conditions in that region and to collaborate with the Town of Caswell Beach and the Village of Bald Head Island as well as land owners in the area in making this determination. If the CRC deems an action is necessary then it asks the CRC to eliminate overlapping AECs in that region and to incorporate the appropriate development standards in a single, unique AEC for this subregion. A report on this is due to the Secretary of the Department, the Governor and the General Assembly by December 31, 2013. There is already a formal AEC designation process that is laid out in CAMA as well as the related CRC rules 7H .0503. Staff and the Chair will meet with local officials in the region before the next Commission meeting to discuss the process for developing this report and assessment. We will lay out the timeline for meetings over the next year, develop a process for public engagement, and discuss roles and responsibilities and considerations for the final report.

Section five of the Act asks the CRC to determine the feasibility of eliminating the inlet hazard AEC and incorporating appropriate development standards adjacent to the State's developed inlets. The Act asks the CRC to consider eliminating the inlet hazard boxes that have been under consideration and developing tailored shoreline management strategies including erosion rates, setback factors and development standards. The CRC should take into account historical and ongoing dredging, beach fill and engineered structures. The CRC should also collaborate with local governments and landowners to identify regulatory concerns and develop strategies to address the concerns. This report is due to the Secretary of the Department, Governor and General Assembly by January 31, 2015. A Science Panel meeting will be scheduled on the inlet hazard area discussions. The Science Panel will be asked to evaluate various models for determining long-term erosion rates for inlets, evaluate implications of historical and ongoing engineering, and to propose the most scientifically defensible method for determining erosion hazards. We anticipate a technical review and public engagement by January 2014. Regional workshops will also be held with stakeholders to discuss regulatory issues and concerns in the Act that we need to address. The final report would outline proposed changes by July 2014 and then go out for public comment.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Robin Smith, DENR Assistant Secretary, stated most of the legislative changes to coastal issues are included in H819. There are other studies and reporting requirements that applied to all of DENR's permitting and enforcement programs. Coastal Management will be participating in some other studies and reports on permit processing times, inspections and how we provide notice of inspections. We will be sending an overview of environmental legislative actions that will be provided to CRC/CRAC through the Director.

A reduction of almost two percent was taken out of the Department's budget. During the 2011-2012 biennium, DENR will have taken a total budget cut of about 14.5% over the two year period. If you look back to January 1, 2009, we are edging up toward a 40% reduction that includes special funds. This has had a significant impact on our programs. Our goal is to be sure that as we implement these budget cuts we protect the core programs in the Department. We have largely been able to do that. The one area this year where we took a significant cut beyond the 2% that affected a core environmental protection program was a targeted staff reduction in the sedimentation program. This cut resulted in a reduction of 10% of staff. We will look at rebuilding this program as things start to turn around.

Governor Perdue issued Executive Order 124 that addresses protecting military installations by ensuring the compatibility of State action with military needs. For a number of years now, our Department has been looking at ways that we can use our non-regulatory capacity to help the military bases maintain their functionality. One of their big concerns is encroachment on their activities by non-military incompatible land uses (i.e. noise from low flying aircraft and residential neighborhoods). We could use our land conservation program and land acquisition program to help protect a natural area as well as buffer military activities. This led to the recent release of a Land Compatibility Analysis. The Governor's Executive Order is picking up on that report to remind the state agencies to be aware of what the military's needs are and to keep the information flowing back and forth between the state agencies and the military.

OCEAN HAZARDS COMMITTEE REPORT

Lee Wynns stated the Ocean Hazards Subcommittee received an overview of the sandbag enforcement activities that are taking place from Ted Tyndall. Mr. Tyndall advised the subcommittee that sandbags are a moving target since there are nourishment and realignment projects happening that change our evaluation of the existing sandbags. Mike Lopazanski reviewed proposed amendments that have been before us for awhile, but were put on hold. The proposed rule amendments include the length of time that sandbags can remain as well as eliminating the limitation requiring sandbags only be used one-time per property. A motion was made to ask the CRC to reaffirm the approval to take the amendments to public hearing.

Melvin Shepard made a motion to re-affirm sending 7H .0308 and 7H .1705 to public hearing. Bill Peele seconded the motion. The motion passed with seven votes in favor (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Mitchell), two opposed (Weld, Webster) and one abstention (Hester).

PRESENTATIONS

Land Use Planning Process

7B Guidelines Review Committee Recommendations (CRC 12-23)

John Thayer

John Thayer stated that in 2010 the CRC established a subcommittee group to review the 7B rules based on a section in CAMA that requires review of the guidelines every five years. We have not reviewed the 2002 guidelines since they were updated. The committee met several times and came

up with recommendations and comments. These recommendations have not yet been discussed with local governments or other interest groups.

The first recommendation is to take the recommendations out for review by local governments before the CRC considers formal rulemaking. The second recommendation is that the primary goal should be clarification of existing rules and plans. It was also recognized that the technical manual should be updated to ensure that the local governments have examples of how to meet any new rules. The committee felt that it was important that local governments update their land use plans periodically. Possible requirements relative to the frequency were discussed; however there was no resolution within the committee. The current rules require that everyone had to update local land use plans to meet the new rules within six years. The rules are silent on updating the plans after that. It is recommended that the Division develop guidance for local governments as to how to update portions of their land use plans without having to overhaul the entire document. The final recommendation is there is a need to develop an assessment related to using local policies for federal consistency. One of our meetings included a conference call with OCRM officials about this issue. The conclusion of that was that ideally we could include within the plan requirements that the local government look at the issue of when their local policy is suitable for use for federal consistency determinations. OCRM has a very narrow focus about what policy is suitable for acceptance and it has to be an enforceable statement. DCM will be talking to local governments to discuss their planning needs in the spring of 2013. The focus will be how we can help local governments more broadly. We will then come back to the CRC to discuss the best way to move forward.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

15A NCAC 07H .0304 AECs Within Ocean Hazard Areas – Erosion Rates

15A NCAC 07H .0304 Fiscal Note

No public comments were received.

PUBLIC INPUT AND COMMENT

No comments were received.

PRESENTATIONS

Discussion of Potential DCM Sea-Level Rise Activities

Tancred Miller

Tancred Miller reviewed the handout describing the types of things we may pursue under the draft sea-level rise policy. There are two broad categories. The first type of activity is to support the communication and dissemination of research efforts, which includes some items set forth in H819. The next broad category is fulfilling a supportive role and getting the information out to local governments to let them know the status of the science, to share what we learn about sea-level rise, and educate them about what resources are available. Since H819 has passed and is now Session Law we have examined it and do not find any conflicts with the intent of that Bill and with pursuing the policy and moving forward with these types of activities.

Estuarine Shoreline Stabilization – DENR Action Plan (CRC 12-24)

Mike Lopazanski

Mike Lopazanski stated this will provide you with an update on the progress we have made in promoting alternatives to vertical stabilization. We assembled all of the agencies to talk about marsh sills and where they stood in terms of the General Permit and the issues and concerns that revolved around the permitting of marsh sills. We have updated the CRC in past meetings on progress we have made in meeting those concerns. At the last meeting you heard about an initiative that the Directors of Marine Fisheries and Coastal Management put together to promote the use of marsh sills and living shorelines in general. A part of the strategy centered on DCM's General Permit. The effort was to streamline some of the conditions on the permit to make it a more useable permit. We also talked about ways we have been using outreach and awareness efforts to reach property owners and marine contactors. The strategy also looked at ways to incorporate financial incentives to bring these stabilization measures within reach of property owners. It was also acknowledged that there were additional concerns with the use of these structures. Some additional research is needed. Now that we know how much shoreline we have, through our mapping efforts, we also know where stabilization measures are being used. DCM and DMF worked together to put this strategy at the Department level and put together an inter-agency workgroup to look at what more we can do to implement this strategy.

When the GP was first put together it required coordination by Marine Fisheries, Water Quality, State Property Office, and the Army Corps of Engineers. We have been able to eliminate some of the specific conditions that required their review of individual projects. Marine Fisheries no longer needs to be involved in the review of a project issued under this GP. Under the new General Water Quality Certification, DWQ no longer needs to be involved in projects that are completed in accordance with the GP. There are still issues with the Army Corps of Engineers. They are reluctant to go along with our GP for marsh sills. We have arranged some meetings with the Corps to look at what their concerns are relative to the GP and see if some commonalities can be found between what we would like to accomplish and what they will allow. The Corps has been working with us through their programmatic general permit that is issued in conjunction with our Major Permit.

For the education and outreach part of the strategy we have continued to use materials we already use in public awareness efforts. We have conducted living shoreline workshops with marine contractors as well as property owners. Through our interagency workgroup we have looked for ways to conduct more outreach. Financial incentives will take a little bit more work. A year or two ago we made some progress in working with the Community Conservation Assistance Program. Marsh sills have been added to their program as a BMP that is eligible for cost sharing. It is not available in all counties depending on whether the county participates in the Community Conservation Assistance Program. We are looking at why some counties aren't participating and if there is a way to promote it through our advocacy. We also want to look at a way of addressing the costs of marsh sills. They are an expensive proposal for individual property owners. We will continue to do our mapping, monitoring and research efforts related to marsh sills. We want to look at the efficacy of these structures and how they perform in storms. We have some ongoing research projects that are wrapping up and we will provide the results at a future meeting. We have completed the estuarine shoreline mapping and now we are going to do some detailed analysis. We will be engaging other agencies within the Department to get their ideas on further implementing the broader goals associated with the strategy for living shorelines. We want to develop some longer term needs, particularly additional research that might be necessary for us to know the

impacts and effects of utilizing marsh sills and what are some of the impacts of vertical stabilization methods. We will try to develop a DENR strategy that is approved by the Department with some specific near-term activities and actions and bring that back to the CRC to show a commitment to promoting this idea.

ACTION ITEMS

Temporary Rules 15A NCAC 07H .0306

Replacement of Single Family or Duplex Residential Dwellings (CRC 12-25)

Mike Lopazanski

Mike Lopazanski stated during the last Legislative session H819 directed the CRC to take certain actions and among them was a modification to setback provisions that the CRC adopted in 2009 that pertained to single-family and duplex residential structures greater than 5,000 square feet. The legislation that was passed into law allows the replacement of such structures that cannot comply with the current setback factors for structures of that size.

The old setback factors had provisions that made a distinction between large and small structures. Small structures are less than 5,000 square feet. That determined what setback factors were used in combination with the erosion rates to determine how far from the first line of stable, natural vegetation the development needed to be sited. If a structure was considered a residential dwelling then it didn't matter how big it was and the small structure setback applied. In 2008, the CRC altered the rule to require that oceanfront setbacks be based only on structure size and not on use. In adopting this policy, the CRC also adopted the graduated setback factors that we use today.

This legislation creates an exception for single-family or duplex residential structures greater than 5,000 square feet. The replacement of these structures is now allowed if the structure was constructed prior to August 11, 2009; the structure does not exceed the original footprint or square footage; it can meet the minimum setback, it can't meet the current setback provisions, and if it is rebuilt as far landward on the lot as feasible. The legislation also directs the Commission not to deny any permits for the replacement of these structures. The law directs the CRC to adopt temporary rules that are consistent with the Session Law. If the CRC approves the temporary rules for public hearing today then we will hold a public hearing at the Morehead City office in October. The CRC could then adopt the temporary rule at the November meeting and the rule will be in effect in December. We will then begin the permanent rulemaking process and the permanent rule will be ready for the CRC to send to public hearing in November.

David Webster made a motion to send 15A NCAC 07H .0306 temporary rule to public hearing. Jerry Old seconded the motion. The motion passed with eight votes in favor (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Hester) and one abstention (Webster) (Mitchell absent for vote).

Draft 15A NCAC 07M .1300 Sea-Level Rise Policy and Fiscal Analysis (CRC 12-26)

Tancred Miller

Tancred Miller stated we reviewed the draft policy in June and the subcommittee had a couple of minor edits that are included. Following that meeting there were discussions with the Chairman and Staff about a couple of other items. The first was in the Declaration of Policy section to make the

language read more fluidly. The second change was in the Definitions section to the definition of "planned adaptation".

DCM's view on the fiscal analysis is that the fundamental premise of a non-regulatory policy is that there is no fiscal impact to the public, agencies, or local governments. This is meant to be an advisory, educational and research statement. There is no fiscal impact to anyone that would be affected by this policy.

Melvin Shepard made a motion to send 15A NCAC 07M .1300 and fiscal analysis to public hearing. David Webster seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Webster, Hester) (Mitchell absent for vote).

Approval of 2012 CHPP Annual Report (CRC 12-28)

Jimmy Johnson

Jimmy Johnson stated every year the Department is required by Statute to present an annual report on the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan. You have the report for this year. Each of the four Commissions involved in the Steering Committee have been asked to endorse the report. The format of the report has not changed over the years. This year DCM has put a lot of their focus on education and utilizing the Reserve program. There is one change. A sentence was added at the request of one of our partners on page 5 under Goal Number 2. We have added a second sentence that says, "the Strategic Habitat Area designations were completed in partnership with NC Sea Grant and DMF shared Marine Fisheries Management Fellow". We added this at the request of Sea Grant who is our partner in this effort. This report gets to the General Assembly through the Department. I am seeking an endorsement of the annual report and a recommendation that we forward the annual report to the General Assembly.

Joan Weld made a motion to approve the CHPP 2011-2012 Annual Report. Jerry Old seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Webster, Hester) (Mitchell absent for vote).

Land Use Plan Certifications and Amendments

John Thayer stated there are two Land Use Plans for certification and five for amendment.

Southern Shores LUP: The Southern Shores LUP was adopted on July 18 and this is the first full land use plan that the town of Southern Shores has had. The previous certified document was a sketch plan under the 1995 rules. Staff has no issues with the request and recommends that the CRC certify the plan. There are no substantive issues with the rules or conflicts with state or federal policy.

Town of Southern Shores LUP Certification (CRC 12-29)

Jerry Old made a motion to certify the Southern Shores Land Use Plan. Pat Joyce seconded the motion. The motion passed with eight votes in favor (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Webster) and one abstention (Hester) (Mitchell absent for vote).

Pender County LUP: The Pender County plan was certified in 2006 and it is a comprehensive update of the plan. Staff advised the Commission that Pender County received the Coastal Federation's Pelican Award recently in recognition of the County's efforts. There have been no comments on the County's adoption of the plan and staff recommends certification with the determination that it has met the substantive requirements of the 7B guidelines and that there are no conflicts with state or federal rules.

Pender County LUP Update Certification (CRC 12-30)

Jerry Old made a motion to certify the Pender County Land Use Plan. Joan Weld seconded the motion. The motion passed with eight votes in favor (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Webster) and one abstention (Hester) (Mitchell absent for vote).

Second Amendment to Town of Swansboro's LUP: The Town of Swansboro's plan was originally certified in November 2009. This is the second amendment to the plan. This amendment was adopted by the Town on June 19 and changes the future land use map. Staff recommends certification and has determined that it meets the substantive requirements of the 7B guidelines and that there are no conflicts with state or federal rules.

Town of Swansboro LUP Amendment Certification (CRC 12-31)

Bill Peele made a motion to certify the Town of Swansboro Land Use Plan amendment. Pat Joyce seconded the motion. The motion passed with eight votes in favor (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Webster) and one abstention (Hester) (Mitchell absent for vote).

First Amendment to City of Jacksonville's LUP: The City of Jacksonville's plan was certified in August 2011. This is the first amendment to that plan. This amendment recognizes annexations that have occurred since that time and some changing development trends. There are also changes to the future land use plan map. Staff recommends certification with the finding that it has met the substantive requirements of the 7B guidelines and that there are no conflicts with state or federal law.

City of Jacksonville LUP Amendment Certification (CRC 12-32)

Jamin Simmons made a motion to certify the City of Jacksonville's Land Use Plan amendment. Melvin Shepard seconded the motion. The motion passed with eight votes in favor (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Webster) and one abstention (Hester) (Mitchell absent for vote).

First Amendment to Camden County LUP: The Camden County Land Use Plan was certified in June 2005. The amendments are principally to the future land use plan map. Staff has reviewed the proposal and recommends certification based on the finding that it has met the substantive requirements of the 7B guidelines and there are no apparent conflicts with state or federal rules.

Camden County LUP Amendment Certification (CRC 12-33)

Jerry Old made a motion to certify the Camden County Land Use Plan amendment. Jamin Simmons seconded the motion. The motion passed with eight votes (Joyce, Old, Shepard, Weld, Peele, Wynns, Simmons, Webster) and one abstention (Hester) (Mitchell absent for vote).

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Nominations Committee – CRC Appointed Advisory Council Representatives

Bob Emory

Mike Lopazanski stated the CRC appoints the coastal cities, marine science/technology, and local health director representatives to the CRAC. There are slots for representatives from eight coastal cities, three representatives with marine science/technology background and one slot reserved for a local health director. These representatives are appointed for two-year terms or for four-year terms with good attendance. It is time to do the reappointments. A nominations committee needs to be formed to solicit nominations from local governments to fill these slots. The nominations committee will then make a recommendation to the CRC for consideration. Chairman Emory selected Anne Deaton, Tim Tabak, Ed Mitchell, and Renee Cahoon to serve on the CRAC nominations committee.

Joan Weld requested an update of the status of applications for terminal groins. Braxton Davis stated we have already commented on Figure Eight Island's draft EIS and the Corps is currently compiling comments. Bald Head Island has a project review team that will be holding their second meeting. Ocean Isle Beach has hired a third party consultant and will hold its first project review team meeting with the next few weeks. Holden Beach has a project review team and is just getting into the process.


Braxton Davis stated that discussions are underway with Commissioners Simmons and Peele to plan the next CRC meeting, including a field trip.

With no further business, the CRC adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Braxton Davis, Executive Secretary



Angela Willis, Recording Secretary