

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2003

MIN CLERK

Natural Resource Advisory Board
Minutes
September 30, 2003 (Approved 10/27/03 Unanimously)
Town Hall Hearing Room

Present: Doug Franklin, Chair, Lezli Rowell, committee secretary, and John Riehl.
Absent: Glenn Shields.

Attending: Ben Gitlow, Cynthia Hope, Mary von Kaesborg, Jim Quigley, Alan Platt, Bill Knittle, Tim Hughes; Amy Dougherty and Nancy Finley of CCNS - Natural Resources, Abby Franklin of WBWS Audubon.

The meeting convened with a quorum at 7 PM. Agenda began with operational issues: minutes of July 29, 2003 were moved as presented by John Riehl, seconded by Lezli Rowell. There was no discussion. Minutes were accepted by 3 - 0 vote. Minutes of August 26, 2003 were moved as presented by John and seconded by Lezli. There was no discussion. Minutes accepted by vote of 3 - 0. Chair Franklin noted receipt of a memo from Fin / Com Chair, Berta Bruinooge, asking that advisory board minutes be forwarded when approved, via the mailbox at Town Hall. Lezli preferred to share minutes with the Fin / Com as soon as available, with the understanding that draft minutes may be subject to some amendment, noting the lag of at least one month sometimes two before approved minutes become available. She preferred that interested boards, committees, etc. receive timely information regarding meeting contents should they be interested to comment. John expressed preference to share approved minutes only. Lezli noted that the Board of Selectmen routinely make draft minutes available to the public, that anyone can request copies of filed draft minutes and that the regulatory boards may begin sharing their draft minutes for the same purpose of timely exchange of information; she moved that the NRAB forward draft minutes, when available, to the Fin / Com, per request, and until such time as there is a stated preference for approved minutes only. The motion was seconded by John. There was no further discussion. The motion was accepted by unanimous vote (3 - 0).

Doug noted nearly losing this meeting venue (use of the THHR) despite posting for the date early when a scheduling conflict occurred with a joint Fin / Com - BOS meeting for the Hearing Room, taking "precedence" over the NRAB. The announcements, press releases and posters for NRAB agendas had already gone out, so the Board of Selectmen and Fin / Com kindly agreed to relocate their meeting. As back-up against any other scheduling snafus, Doug announced that he had penciled in all scheduled NRAB meeting dates at the Library, should any need to relocate the board's business occur. Preference for the Town Hall Hearing Room as venue for the Harbor Management Plan update was agreed upon.

From the audience, Abby Franklin offered update on the November 8, 2003 Wellfleet Harbor Conference: venue has been chosen as the new COA / Senior Center, speakers will include Brenda Bolyn, moderator, Nate Johnson, Dale Donovan for the BOS, Jim O'Connell of WHOI, Charlie Roman on tidal restrictions, Helen Purcell on history, Henry Lind, Natural Resource Officer of Eastham, Graham Geise, Bob Prescott of Audubon, perhaps Rich Delaney of Urban Harbors, to promote using state-certified harbor planning process. Confirmation from County Health Agent, George Heufelder, and Brian Howes is still awaited.

Glenn Shields arrived at 7:18 PM.

From the audience it was questioned whether the NRAB minutes are posted on the Town's website. Doug asked who was in charge of web-postings. Lezli noted that approved minutes should be accessible on the website as the Assistant TA, Rix Peterson, is charged with maintaining the site and postings. She urged anyone having difficulty finding the NRAB's minutes or the posting of the 1995 Harbor Management Plan to contact Mr. Peterson. (In BOS meeting earlier in

the year, Rex declined to post meeting minutes provided to him in hardcopy. Selectmen Wood noted the ease with which scanning should make any board or committees minutes available on-line. Arlene Kirsch of the Fin / Com personally assisted committee clerk Lezli Rowell by scanning several sets of hard copy minutes into her computer then e-mailing to the Assistant TA's office, to make website posting possible. Mr. Peterson then asked Ms. Kirsch to also scan the 1995 HMP, to satisfy the BOS request for copies made available. She declined as this was a time-consuming request for staff to make of a volunteer. Mr. Peterson then approached Chair Franklin seeking the NRAB's unexpended funds as the fiscal year ran out, suggesting the purchase of a scanner for his office, to support the working needs of the NRAB to post agendas, minutes, announcements and the Harbor Plan).

Doug noted that a 1996 letter from Eugene Cavanaugh regarding the Marina / Dredging area of content from the 1995 HMP had been sent out to members in a mailing. Lezli noted the scope of commentary, that it did not address the Harbor Management Plan as a whole.

Doug announced that there will be free walks provided by WBWS Audubon for Wellfleet and Eastham residents in conjunction with the Oyster Festival and Harbor Conference, to promote ACEC Resource Management Plan process.

Doug announced an art exhibit at 4C's relating to horseshoe crabs. Also received was notice from the Cons / Com announcing Public Hearing to consider amendment to the local bylaw, Oct. 15, 2003 at 5 PM at the Senior Center. Lezli asked of the substance of proposal; it was noted that the announcement gave no specific information.

John asked how TA Tim Smith received the NRAB's announcement letter regarding update of Harbor Management Plan, to which Doug responded that it had been carbon copied to at least 20 Town boards and committees of interest, coordinated by Town Hall. Doug noted receiving the memo returned, marked "done" and signed by Smith, dated September 9, 2003. Doug noted using e-mail lists to avoid postage, due to lack of budget, categorized as NGO's such as the Cape Cod Commission and CCNS, Politicians such as Shirley Gomes, the press, non-profits such as the Community Forum, Chamber of Commerce and Historical Society and individuals interested to be on the e-mailing list. John asked what is currently posted on the Town website for the board, expressing that he would prefer to see information posted that way then sent out by e-mail, which is then just viewed by those we have thought to include. From the audience, Jim Quigley asked what will be received by one who signs up to be on the NRAB e-mail list? Doug responded that agendas for meetings, notes, any changes to calendar such as meeting dates or venues, etc. John thought it would be preferable to use e-mails as promptings to get parties to check the website, and use the website to inform anyone interested of minutes, updates, meeting schedules, etc.

Doug concurred but reported the exchange he has had with Rix Peterson. Mr. Peterson has been claiming difficulty with scanning the 1995 HMP hard copy text, for which purpose he used the advisory board funds to purchase the high-volume scanner; he says the software is not "interpreting" the text very well. Peterson says it is time consuming to make corrections and will only offer to make hardcopies of each chapter available for requests - posting availability of each chapter, in turn, on the website. Peterson will provide typing service for the NRAB as updated chapters are produced, and will post any notices for the board requested. From the audience, Ben Gitlow questioned whether Peterson's difficulty scanning may be using 'Optical Character Recognition' feature on the scanner. He noted there is no trouble scanning old texts with his equipment unless using the OCR, which does make a mess. He expressed being puzzled by the Ass't. TA's claims. Ben further advised that the hard copies may be useful to distribute but do not serve the NRAB for editing. John affirmed that the board will need a format that can be edited and manipulated; he prefers text to be posted on the website. Lezli saw value to both formats. She appreciated that some hardcopies will be available at Town Hall for anyone who requests them but also felt that the majority of people will wish to access the information on-line. Both Doug and

John wished to further explore conversations with Rex Peterson. John noted that website postings offers a permanent, cohesive record. Doug noted that in the exchanges, Rex offered to be helpful.

Doug asked if a member might take posters advertising dates, agendas and Harbor Plan update process to post in public sites, to which Lezli agreed. (One was given to Ms. von Kaesborg for the Non-Resident newsletter, postings were made at both Post Offices, Town Hall, South Wellfleet General Store, Farrell's Market, the package store on Main Street, and the Box Lunch).

Doug welcomed two former NRAB members to the table - Cynthia Hope and John Portnoy. He noted that it was under Cynthia's chairmanship that the 1995 HMP was completed. She responded that her task had been to push through the final gathering of information, final revisions and the presentation to the BOS. She stressed there had been "reams of work" stretching back ten years behind her. Cynthia addressed the board with several questions. "What do you want to accomplish with an update" - will the board rewrite the goals and objectives of each chapter, or the HMP as a whole? If the latter, in what way does the Town of Wellfleet no longer fit the vision in the Executive Summary? Does this group wish to do something entirely new? Is this just an opportunity to introduce new data and review the 1995 recommendations in light of new information? Doug responded that we might each respond to the questions differently, and Lezli spoke to the process as an 'audit' of the 1995 Plan, a chance to review whether recommendations had ever been implemented, if they worked or should be stricken, and in some cases made more firmly in light of new information. She did not see the update as a new direction or vision distinct from the NRAB's Town Meeting charge. Glenn responded that the major effort is in maintaining resources we have in Wellfleet in the presence of a greater population and serving new use demands; he saw the water quality concerns as "overarching" to keep the natural systems healthy. Cynthia questioned whether the NRAB would keep to the same format established in the HMP? Doug responded that we would not throw out anything created. Cynthia noted that each chapter took a long time and involved setting specific goals. She advised that some recommendations take longer to implement while others are achieved more short-term - to bear this in mind while auditing 1995 recommendations. She advised using member assignments to keep work on track, such as checking in with the boards, committees, etc. when a recommendation is made, to receive comments or feedback supportive of implementing. Cynthia made example of the recommendation to designate the Central District as an Historic Seaport District - which should have been forwarded to the Planning Board to receive the review of whether the zoning district change was warranted, or to follow through with Public Hearings on the proposal. She concluded with the advice to "be more assertive" in communicating with other boards and committees. She noted that former NRAB Pat Woodbury was unable to attend tonight but forwarded the advice to "keep it simple" : limit agenda items to a specified time, send a list of immediate concerns to the BOS.

John Portnoy spoke to serving the NRAB, agreeing with the points sent by Pat. He suggested assembling a list of technical people, agencies for help (such as attending the Harbor Conference) and to expect to be overwhelmed by the number of topics and aspects. Trying to get at it all will achieve an end result of touching lightly on many complicated topics - to which he cited the Natural Resource chapter of this agenda. John emphasized critically evaluating which issues need to be updated more in-depth than the 1995 Plan and which are in good shape. He expressed bias toward the format used by CCNS, consisting of 4 - 5 elements:

- Describe, include citations, present the most important management problems and issues.
- Present the alternatives to problem resolution, ranging from no action through types of action.
- Assess the likely impacts and effects of each alternative.
- Recommend an alternative.

John noted that assessment does not always culminate in endorsing an alternative.

John Riehl asked Portnoy whether the information available since 1995 is of a degree of sophistication which a volunteer board can not deal with, whether it is better turned over to technical resources. Portnoy answered that "you guys know what the issues are" for Wellfleet,

there is the value of citizen boards, and that the NRAB can always seek out technical people to help. From the audience, Jim Quigley added that the process is political from beginning to end, with the cooperation and assent of the voters this group (the NRAB) has been assigned the work in the Town's interest; it is one thing to subscribe to technical assistance as background to the plan but not the charge of the board to hand it away. Lezli agreed with Mr. Quigley's point that any plan generated needs to come from the citizen / volunteer board to be credible to Town Meeting. Portnoy noted that the process should be open to the public and noted that Truman Henson of CZM would not approve a Harbor Management Plan for State-certification without a shown plan for public participation and involvement. Cynthia commented that Town support needs to be behind an inclusive plan should we apply for any grants to fund implementing recommendations.

The Chair thanked former NRAB members Cynthia Hope and John Portnoy for coming to speak to the process from their experience. John remained at the table to speak to the agenda topic of the Natural Resources chapter, and Chief Officer of Natural Resources for the CCNS, Nancy Finley was introduced.

Doug commenced by noting that the NRAB serves an advisory role to Town Meeting and the BOS; the board does not adopt bylaws or regulations. The HMP is a "roadmap" to serve the Town and if it fails to include the people they may not like the recommendations contained within it, therefore they may ignore it. Doug advanced that healthy, inclusive process will contain public policy disagreements, but the goal is recognizing what we all have in common: appreciation and enjoyment of a way of life in Wellfleet. Jim Quigley concurred that the advisory board does not make policy but may act as advocates when necessary. Ben Gitlow noted that the 1987 Town Meeting charge to prepare a HMP led to TM adoption of the 1995 Plan, and with it certain action items to be implemented by the regulatory boards; he questioned whether the process made it mandatory for those boards to meet goals and objectives, or just to consider them? Ben noted the end product was a Plan requiring ongoing action by the appropriate regulatory boards, and the need for follow through and advocacy by the NRAB. Doug responded that the advisory board has no jurisdiction over other boards - it is assumed that TM "blessed" the management plan but like the Local Comprehensive Plan it is out there for other boards and committees to take action on. Cynthia Hope noted that after 1995 Plan acceptance, the BOS talked about setting up another committee to implement the recommendations but this never occurred.

From the audience, Mary von Kaesborg asked whether there would be a State-certified HMP? Doug responded that the NRAB is working within its 1987 Town Meeting mission to update the local Harbor Plan, and that is not to say that the plan, or some portion of it, will not at some time be considered for State-certification. Ben spoke to fully considering the State regulations for certified Plan process before entering into that process, which he stated from his reading of the citations takes a lot of local control out of "our hands". Doug noted his personal intent is to see the board execute a local Harbor Management Plan, and Cynthia commented that there is no real advantage to going for State-certification.

Back to the Natural Resource chapter as agenda, Doug noted the Bob Prescott of Audubon had also been invited but could not attend due to injury. Nancy Finley introduced Amy Dougherty in the audience, a fellow working with the Seashore specializing in sedimentation effects on shellfish beds with interest in Wellfleet Harbor. Doug asked John Portnoy and Nancy to comment to the chapter as written, and any trends, changes or threats since 1995. John responded that the Natural Resources chapter is "sketchy" - that so much more information and references could be included. John Riehl asked how we could focus on key issues which require management - how to identify what to act on? Portnoy responded to start with a list of issues, take them one at a time, and tap local and regional technical assistance. Nancy added that the Seashore tackles it by listing the resource impacts and trying to pick them off one at a time. She suggested the 'silly beaurocratic' method of "choosing by advantages" - an exercise in prioritizing issues by having a divers group assign priority level points to the laundry list of concerns; taking on the few that score highest first

to get some success on focused issues before moving down the list. Doug asked how many issues would the Park tackle expecting success within 7 - 8 years, to which Portnoy responded three. Nancy added that there is no harm in going 'back to the well' if you get through your issues early. She spoke to the ramifications on water quality if the Town considers sewerage or expanded groundwater withdrawal.

John Portnoy responded to a comment about sustainability from Glenn that first you need to decide to sustain what? A simple approach is to come up with a list. John spoke to nutrient loading impact on surface waters, shellfish resources and recreational values. He further noted that Wellfleet Harbor is the receptor for all development - that people use it for recreational and economic resource, and that it is habitat of finfish and shellfish resources. Nancy distinguished between starting with the Causal effect or the Receptor site - you could start at either end in describing what the board wishes to sustain. John noted an exercise recorded in November 2002 by the Park in its own effort to monitor programs which might be helpful for the board to review; it led to realizing that the Park was overextended and limited by manpower and helped to scope Park management policies into 5 Year strategic and 15 Year horizon categories.

Glenn said that knowing the water quality is the key, would we take all components that use it and plug into what it does to the water, to see how "water explains itself"? Portnoy responded that he did not understand the question. Nancy noted that no topic stands alone, there will always be "fingers" into other content. John Riehl asked Nancy if a list of critical issues will result in some rising to the top of concern while other settle out, or become left out of the effort due to lack of data or having no way to defend. Nancy responded that any part of the project not achievable within an expressed timeframe can be cast aside knowing that it is still an issue, or nick away at some achievable facet.

Doug asked whether the LCP had ever been completed? Cynthia noted that the 1995 HMP had been incorporated into it and Ben noted that he belonged to the LCP coordinating committee which never had a quorum. He recalled the difference of opinion between the Planning Board and the BOS as to who would execute the LCP, resulting in a separate committee with one Plan. Board representative assigned to do the LCP, leaving no follow up after its completion. He noted that he has attended Regional Policy Plan hearings and workshops. Doug asked Ben if he was aware of the LCP update process? Ben responded that the Planning Board will go through the items that relate to them specifically, and then work on the recommendations which had Planning Board - joint responsibilities with another board.

Doug asked the board its pleasure as to how to proceed - did we wish to generate a shopping list of technical support needs and questions? John Riehl asked Nancy whether the Park measures process on issues against its charter or a mission statement, whether a standard to gauge the importance of efforts was advisable? Nancy responded that in a Park rating system, they will use categories such as "relevance to mission" and "consistent with policy" in assessing points or value in scoping process. She noted that getting input at Public Hearings may weed out some issues and is very important as a process, so you don't have "people screaming that they didn't have their chance to be heard". Responding to inquiry from Doug and John Riehl, Lezli noted that the NRAB has initiated Public Hearing process receiving comments and concerns: the NRAB binder contains sign-in sheets for hearings held on August 16, 2000, February 8, 2001 and August 29, 2001. Portnoy asked whether record of comments were kept; Lezli responded that summary of comments for each hearing had been distributed following the date at NRAB meeting and most recently summary of comments and concerns for the three hearings had been distributed to NRAB and the Harbor Planning Group, when it was thought they would need such information for a 'Notice to Proceed' filing. In response to John Riehl's interest, Lezli offered to again copy the summarized comments from the binder and mail them out to members before the next meeting.

Glenn commented about communications, the meeting process, using the website and articles in the press and other means to put issues out before the people, so everybody can take part to the benefit of the Town. Nancy affirmed that 'transparency of process' leads to broader understanding of issues, that it becomes intuitive what the document should say by the time it is published. Glenn continued that in coming to an issue that is paramount to resources compared to capital, he wondered how the Park decides which? He gave an example about forest fires vs. tourism. John Portnoy said he did not understand what Glenn was asking, but to be assured forest fires would be fought regardless of capital or tourism. Nancy noted that resources are linked to capital, in that degrading resource quality causes more investment in remediation, and can result in decreased revenues as visitation declines. She thought Glenn might have been referring to controlled burns as a tool to restore landscapes which is not always a culturally appreciated method (many people ask us why we don't just mow?)

John Portnoy suggested separating out from the Natural Resources chapter the archaeology section as more cultural, that there should be a separate consideration of any Historic District or zoning changes. Glenn stated that a resource left alone will still stand, where a building left alone will fall. Portnoy emphasized the suggestion was to ease assessment of Natural Resource issues for the chapter.

Doug asked both Nancy and John Portnoy to comment as to what they saw as the most pressing, 5 Year strategy item, to which they both answered water quality. Portnoy spoke of land use - color coded maps, past and present, which show the impact of upland development, making the Park boundary crisp on the present images. He noted development impacts many species on the Natural Resource inventory. Doug asked if that trend concentrates species into the Park; Lezli responded that some critters just move into the cul-de-sacs. John Portnoy stressed that the board should not work from the assumption that natural resources left alone will stand, to realize that development pressures amplify throughout the ecosystem. He noted that the Park has been wrestling with heathland management and restoring areas as interpreted as prior to European settlement or technologically-manipulated. Lezli asked how natural succession of ecosystem is halted to interpret and actively maintain a particular era, such as the heathscape. She asked rhetorically if the intent is to hold nature into a landscape prior to any technologically manipulating human influences, why cut that point in time as European settlement, why not interpret the landscape back to a post-glacial till pile with a few lichens and mosses? Nancy acknowledged the issues are hard to delineated, that the Park struggles to do what is best for the resources with these management determinations. She noted that 50% of the State's vesper sparrows are in the CCNS and their habitat is being lost to natural succession. Doug asked if that leads to recommending a wildlife refuge to manage certain species? Portnoy answered that while an ideal habitat supports certain species, we cannot manage for a single species; management needs to be of ecosystems, and retaining them as close to native as possible. Nancy expounded that the Park interprets that mandate as managing resources as they would progress naturally without the presence / impact of man.

Doug asked whether John and Nancy would recommend purchases of open land around the Harbor to preserve habitats? Portnoy responded affirmatively, as rising sea level will cause landward migration of marshes. Doug asked about supporting the opening of diked marshes? Portnoy responded that dikes act like a bulkhead, blocking marsh accretion.

Ben spoke to the difficulty of maintaining stasis, avoiding change in nature. He noted that pressures of growth cause certain changes, and the enormous effect will be felt in the Harbor. He spoke to the issue of the Town heading into a large water supply system for the Central District, and the development which may follow after residential hook-ups. He spoke to the increasing intensity of use that may become possible leading to wastewater issues, possibly sewerage. Ben noted that potential wastewater treatment sites identified by the 201 study have been reduced as the one near the CCNS is now under Wellhead Protection - there is only the transfer station area

available. He questioned why the Town isn't looking at the impact of large volume well withdrawal on resources, whether the CCNS would look at those impacts were it may be near or in their bounds, and how large-scale use of the Checquesset lens would effect the kettle ponds, vernal pools and the Herring River? He concluded with the current limitation on use of the Cole's Neck public water supply well permitted to 20,000 gpd was allowed under an Environmental Impact Report for that withdrawal; how would use of the same source for 100,000 - 200,000 gpd be permitted under those same standards of review?

Lezli noted that the regulatory boards are already seeing the push to develop a larger well and expanded uses in the Central District. She relayed hearing that it has already been argued before the Zoning Board of Appeals that an applicant being denied an expansion request can "join in on the class action lawsuit" being served against the town to gain "hook-up" into the municipal service run of the Cole's Neck water supply. She noted that the Board of Health has already seen unprecedented DEP denials of septic upgrades that instruct property owners to seek hook-up into the Cole's Neck well. She recalled asking of the Environmental Partners consultant when an Environmental Impact Report would be prepared considering the effects of drawdown on the ponds and Herring River - that the response given was that towns served public water supply have experienced surface water resource impacts without complaining. Lezli noted the difference is that Brewster and Harwich may have experienced the impacts for 30 -40 years and not remember prior to an environmental impact but Wellfleet would not tolerate a new impact to surface waters being created. Nancy commented that Truro and Provincetown will be looking toward the Checquesset Lens to solve their water needs, and the Federal statutes will protect resources adjacent to Park lands from environmental impacts if there are not "demonstrated controls" in place to address demand. She concluded that while Provincetown and Truro have hit "critical" with water issues, Wellfleet and Eastham may not ever become critical. John Portnoy emphasized intelligent management of water demands and extractions.

From the audience. Jim Quigley commented that a water supply for the downtown is not necessary. He noted that an opinion from Town Counsel has allowed 37 service futures to be installed along the Main Street main pipe run, and abutters to the municipal service have been advised to apply pressure on the Town. He noted that more hook-ups in Town will result in throwing more fresh water into the Harbor. Jim referred to advancements made since the time Town Meeting considered sewerage the Central District under the consultant Pio Lombardo, who has now recently written a 'letter to the editor' in a local newspaper citing availability of on-site advanced nitrogen treatment. Lezli agreed with Mr. Quigley's points and further saw problem with preparing for service connections for public water from a system not authorized by Town Meeting to hook up anything but Town buildings.

Doug spoke to water / wastewater impacts in Chesapeake Bay, that resource productivity is acknowledged as "seriously dead" as oyster and crab populations have crashed. He asked how Wellfleet avoid the same fate? John noted agricultural fertilizer runoff as a source of nutrient impact to the Chesapeake, as well as siltation. Nancy spoke of loss to eelgrass habitat as an element comparable in Wellfleet Harbor. John Riehl asked if there had been eelgrass on the inside? Nancy suggested seeking data from CZM which does 5 year interval evaluations using eelgrass as the indicator species - she recommended John Castello and John Costa for the data. Nancy discussed the impact of nutrient loading promoting an algal growth causing a wasting disease to the eelgrass, as well as mechanical damage caused by draggers. Glenn said that for many years he saw the scallop draggers come in with eelgrass all over their gear. John Portnoy suggested looking into original distribution. From the audience, Tim Hughes spoke of beds of eelgrass running along the west side of the Harbor, south to Great Island, and John Riehl mentioned good beds remaining outside the Harbor, in Cape Cod Bay. Doug suggested it could be a recommendation of this chapter to protect eelgrass beds as nursery habitat. Doug asked whether the content might cover management of predators? Nancy noted the problem of the exotic green

crabs to shellfish resources. Glenn commented that nature 'keeps it in check' as the ice of last winter seems to have reduced the crabs.

To comments from the audience about observed fluctuations in horseshoe populations and razor clams, John Portnoy noted we don't know much about 'natural variability' to determine whether populations rises and declines are predictably cyclic.

John wished to add to the November 10, 2003 agenda discussion of process for citizen feedback, and discussion of the chapter's goals. He noted that he had distributed notes for the chapter emphasizing protection or enhancement of biodiversity while the notes prepared and distributed by Lezli for the same chapter of Natural Resources suggests emphasis on compatibility of resource types and systems with typical, traditional human uses. Doug anticipated it would take 'hard discussions' to find a consensus. Nancy recommended breaking out the cultural issues of use, viewing them separately, compared to Natural Resource issues.

Doug noted the October 27, 2003 meeting will kick off review of the Shoreline Land Use chapter, while continuing to look at Natural Resources. He hoped to schedule former NRAB member Pat Woodbury on the agenda, as well as Bob Prescott, and asked the board what other invitations to extend. Lezli recalled the board's interest to hear from 'lay people' of their observations, such as Myron Taylor, Jake Bruinooge, Irving Puffer and Rick Merrill - to get representation from those making a livelihood with Harbor resources. It was noted that some of the same people may be interested to comment on the work of the Shellfish Advisory Committee in drafting a "Shellfish Management Plan" to submit to the NRAB - but of all the content covered by the HMP, this chapter might most specifically draw from the 'same audience'. Doug concluded by tasking members to review the Natural Resource chapter and come to the next meeting with any 'laundry list' of needed outside, technical assistance or questions which arise. From the audience, Mary von Kaesborg wished to facilitate input from Non-Residents and offered to share information through that organization's newsletter.

John Riehl concluded with the question of whether the board has a ready definition of Natural Resources? Lezli responded that the question is interesting as to some, it just refers to marketable resources, while she interprets it to include cultural, traditional and aesthetic values. Doug commented that the board can review any definition adopted in the 1995 HMP.

At 9 PM, Lezli moved for adjournment; seconded by John. Motion carried 4 - 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Lezli Rowell

