

## **122<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the South Carolina Aquatic Plant Management Council**

### **Attendance:**

**Council Members:** Chris Page, Stan Hutto, Jeannie Eidson, Tammy Lognion, David Wannamaker, Bob Perry, Larry McCord, Bill Marshall, Jeff Thompson (via telephone)

**Guests:** Daniel Hood, Matt Puckhaber, Casey Moorer, John Morrison, Tom Kierspe, Chip Davis, John Grant, Darla Barnette

**Location:** Phillips Market Center, State Farmers Market, West Columbia, SC

**Call to Order:** 10:05am 03/08/16

### **Minutes:**

Chairman Chris Page called to order the 122<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the South Carolina Aquatic Plant Management Council (APMC). Mr. Jeff Thompson, from OCRM, is attending the meeting by phone conference.

The first item on the agenda is approving the minutes from the 121<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the APMC on January 20, 2016. Mr. Page offered to give everyone a few minutes to review the minutes. Mr. Page has copies of the minutes, the agenda and a few of the plan available if anyone needs them. Mr. Page noted that there were not two Stan Huttos present at the last meeting. Mr. Hutto's name was duplicated in error. Mr. Wannamaker asked that his name be corrected from Dave to the more formal David. Mr. Thompson asked for some clarification of the two PDFs of the plan. Mr. Page explained that the first part stays pretty much the same and the second part changes a little from year to year. Mr. Page said Mr. Thompson should have a copy of the minutes, which are being reviewed now. The minutes are very detailed, so if you miss a meeting, you know what happened. Mr. Thompson indicated that he should be attending meetings in person in the future, although they may decide to send someone else. Mr. McCord noted on page 9 in the discussions of grass carp, Phil Quirke's last name should be spelled Kirk.

Ms. Eidson asked how the minutes were being transcribed and said she was okay with having a bullet list of summarized points for the meeting. Mr. Page noted that it's a long standing tradition to have the details in the minutes. Mr. McCord noted that there have been some extended discussions in past meetings and he thinks there needs to be a record of those discussions, including what was decided and why. That information might be missed in the bullet format, but it would depend on how detailed the bullets are. Sometimes the minutes get long and drawn out, but we do need to capture the major issues. Mr. Page said that if we go to a bullet format, we would also need to go to an audio recording format, too, so someone would have access to the detailed information they may need from the meeting. Ms. Eidson asked if that was already being done. Mr. Page said that the recordings are not posted or generally not kept once the information has been transcribed. Mr. Page stated recordings may be kept for two

or three prior meetings before they are deleted. Mr. Thompson commented on the portion of the minutes that discussed the perceived lack of participation from the SC Department of Health and Environmental Control's (DHEC) Office of Coastal Resource Management (OCRM). Mr. Thompson wasn't there to defend himself or his agency, but thinks that some of the comments weren't quite correct. It was Mr. Thompson's intent to attend all the APMC meetings. Supervisory staff insisted that he did not need to be involved, even though he wished to attend. It has not been an issue of being too busy. Mr. Thompson had planned to attend the last two meetings, but was told that he did not need to by his supervisors. The legislation and the proviso requiring OCRM involvement had to be printed out and shown to his supervisors to convince them that the lack of involvement over the last nine years was wrong. Mr. Thompson plans to attend all meetings in the future or send a representative in his place. Ms. Eidson stated that Mr. Thompson's comments kind of negates her argument for bullets, as he would not have seen all the commentary and tell the APMC that he felt it was a misrepresentation of the facts. Ms. Eidson was sorry if it was misrepresented. Mr. McCord said he didn't hear everything that was said. Mr. Page paraphrased that the comments in the minutes misrepresented the fact that it was Mr. Thompson's responsibility to be here. Mr. Thompson was not missing the meetings by his own volition, but was told by his supervisors that he did not need to attend. Mr. McCord asked if the minutes specifically indicated that it was Mr. Thompson's responsibility or OCRM's responsibility. Mr. Page said it was OCRM's responsibility. Mr. Page indicated that Mr. Thompson wanted to ensure that we understood that it was not him, but the structure in place that prevented him from attending the meetings. Ms. Eidson commented that she was not the only one making comments, even though her name is repeated several times. There was a general discussion about the OCRM representation by the APMC. She was not throwing Mr. Thompson under the bus.

Mr. Page said there are currently a couple changes on the front page and on page 9. Mr. Page asked if there were any other changes that need to be made. Mr. McCord noted that there were some discussions while the recorder was off and asked for confirmation that those discussions were not detailed here. Mr. Hood confirmed that the recorder was turned off during Executive Session and a little afterward. Mr. Page did not think much got missed and remembered that Ms. Eidson repeated a good bit of it after the recorder was turned back on. Ms. Eidson made a motion to accept the minutes with the minor changes to the names. Ms. Lognion seconded the motion. Mr. Page asked for discussion. No discussion was brought before the board. Mr. Page called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Page thanked the Department of Agriculture for letting the APMC use this beautiful building. It is very easy to get in and out of and is a good place to meet. The parking is good without having to deal with all the issues downtown. Mr. Page asked Mr. Wannamaker to thank the staff, as they had the room ready for the meeting when we arrived this morning. Mr.

Wannamaker said the APMC was lucky to get it on short notice and suggested that we request it earlier if possible in the future. Mr. Page indicated that it's difficult to do so sometimes.

Mr. Page indicated the next thing on the agenda is public comments, of which there were none. Information was sent to Mr. Buford Mabry, with Pentel Partners, who represented more than one group, and he had no comments. Everything was posted, as usual, on the SC Department of Natural Resources' (DNR) website and sent out as a news release. The meeting date and time was publicized the same way, as required by state law. Mr. McCord noted the lack of public comments is very unusual and probably unprecedented. He said that concerns him some, as we usually get both positive and negative comments each year. He does not know if there is anything that can be done differently, but he can't imagine why people did not find an opportunity to comment unless the decisions being made are not affecting the constituent groups. He did not think this was necessarily a bad thing. Mr. Page stated there have been other instances where there has been little to no response to the plan. Mr. Page noted that in one instance it was sent out again and there were still no comments. Mr. Page said that it has been posted on the DNR's main page for the last month and the news releases are sent to the major outlets, but it is up to the individual papers or groups to post it. The news releases are more likely to be picked up and published in years when there is more controversial issues or when a bigger story, like the flood, is not on most people's mind.

Mr. McCord would agree with that, but several of the usual people who comment are in the process of setting up meetings specifically to discuss aquatic plant issues on the Santee Cooper (SC) lakes. He thinks it is odd that they have chosen to keep their discussions outside the APMC, but have had discussions with DNR, USFWS, and SC about having meetings regarding habitat enhancement, which is directly related to aquatic plant management. Mr. Page thinks the perception from those few people is that we are not responsive to their needs at all. The scheduled meeting is supposed to cover stuff that we have addressed with them in years past, including starting habitat enhancement programs by planting *Valcénaria* and other species and doing selective management of areas is not new. The APMC, DNR, and SC have proposed these programs in the past. Mr. Page thinks it has come full circle and maybe we are in that process again, although previous attempts did not get much participation from outside groups during the planting activities. Mr. McCord repeated that the lack of comment wasn't necessarily bad, just rather odd.

Mr. Page noted there over the past few years, there have not been any comments on water bodies other than SC. The last comments on Lake Murray were in 2002 or 2003. The other areas just don't pick up on it. There have been very few comments on other water bodies in the state. A few comments have been made on Goose Creek Reservoir and Black River because they are highly affected. Most of those have been after severe years of infestation. The SC plan is a work in progress. We do what we normally do, but hold off on the big ticket items until we

have a scientific explanation of what we need to do. We are going to let the science drive us. We may end up having to fly by the seat of our pants because there may not be any science. We may have to rely on the institutional knowledge to guide us.

In regard to the science, Mr. Page noted that Scott Lamprecht was trying to figure out a way to do some grass carp counts and asked Mr. McCord if he had heard anything about that. Mr. McCord was on the lake with Mr. Lamprecht yesterday looking at some other issues, but they didn't discuss grass carp collection. Mr. McCord said John Morrison on the SC staff has been in contact with Mr. Lamprecht's group about some fish collection, but not grass carp collection. The flood, mentioned earlier, had and continues to have a tremendous impact on the SC lakes.

Mr. Page noted that the plan posting was handled the same way it has been handled for the last twenty-five years to his knowledge. Mr. Page asked if there were any comments from the members of the APMC regarding the public comments.

Mr. Page moved on to the final plan recommendations and has a couple copies available for anyone who didn't bring theirs to the meeting. He asked if anyone had an area they wanted to start in. Mr. Page started by saying he does not feel the maintenance stocking planned for Lake Murray and Lake Greenwood in the numbers of a 1:10 ratio are sufficient. That said, it would be appropriate to stock at those rates as previously plan, monitor the situation, and restock at a later date if needed. The APMC could reconvene to modify the stocking rates. The plan is a plan, but sometimes that plan, within reason, gets changed on the fly when you don't have time to convene the council. That does not mean we are doing anything majorly different. It may mean we are changing herbicides to account for a different plant. The general stuff is in there. Any of the big ticket items, such as stocking, will not change without council approval. Mr. Page said we have to estimate how many acres are going to grow during a season and what is going to control it. Sometimes that is difficult. He is unsure what those final numbers may have to be at the end of the year on some of those waterways.

Mr. Page noted the Lake Murray system is very similar to the SC lakes in the sense that it had major water moving through it, with the flood gates open. We have no idea the specific number of carp that are left in the system. SC probably has a similar situation. We do not have a clue if the carp numbers are what are supposed to be there by the model, somewhere close to it, or fifty. It is kind of hard to make decisions on stocking if you do not have those numbers. Mr. Thompson asked if there was a methodology on electroshocking to determine those numbers. Mr. Page said it is difficult to electroshock carp, but it can be done. Mr. Page noted that Mr. Lamprecht, the fisheries biologist for the SC system, is working with Mr. McCord to determine a way to do some sampling, which has been done in the past with bow fishing. Once caught, the carp have been sized and aged, and their condition assessed to estimate numbers. Mr. Thompson

said it would seem to be an important thing to know to determine stocking rates. Since carp tend to swim into the current, he wouldn't expect too many of them to be swept out of the lake. Mr. Page said the carp are attracted to flowing water and have been known to move very large distances downstream. Mr. Page believes that with the type of flows seen during the water release, it is unlikely that even the large carp would be able to withstand the pressure of the flow. Mr. Page stated one of the fisheries biologists went to the Saluda Shoals Park and there were hundreds of grass carp, along with other fish, in the parking lot after the emergency water release.

Mr. McCord said there is a model that we have been following since 1989, when the first stocking was done. It has been adjusted periodically based on new information. The vast majority of fish collection that is loosely connected with that model has been done with bow fishing techniques, because electrofishing is generally not effective on Chinese Grass Carp, as shown in literature from across the country. We are going to continue to follow that model as best we can. There are certainly times when we have to make some adjustments during catastrophic situations, but our base numbers for recommendations are going to follow that model. Mr. McCord noted we currently have issues with determining how many carp are present and how much vegetation is present in the system because of continued high turbidity in the SC water system specifically. That may also be the case in Lake Murray and some other water bodies. This is information we have been discussing in depth for a long period of time. We have to keep going in the direction we have been going because it is the best science available.

Mr. Thompson asked if there had been any efforts to collect fish since the flood to determine the population status. Mr. McCord said he is unaware of any such efforts, but it is something that will be looked at down the road. Mr. Thompson stated that while the primary purpose of the lakes is energy production, we also need to show concern for the recreational use of the lakes. More information is needed to determine whether or not we need to account for the lost carp due to the flood. The older technologies used to determine the stocking rates is generally a reasonable method under normal circumstances, but he would not want to jump too far and estimate the loss of 50,000 carp or something along those lines without something to support that.

Mr. McCord respectfully stated that would never happen, on behalf of SC, DNR, and the rest of the agencies, as we all cooperate. These issues have been discussed in front of the council for a lot of years now and we are all up to speed on what has been done in the past and what is expected in the future. There are lots of different issues to consider, not just hydroelectric issues. All of those issues have been discussed numerous times before this council and we have reached the agreements necessary to move forward from this point. Mr. Thompson said his only concern was an earlier statement that all the grass carp had washed out of the system and we needed to replace all the grass carp. He doesn't disagree with the numbers determined using the current

methodology, but wants to ensure that anything above that has some scientific reasoning behind it. Mr. Page noted that Mr. Lamprecht and SC have been tasked with trying to determine those population numbers, so we will know if we had a significant loss. Those numbers are unknown right now, but we are trying to get them. Mr. Page said we will keep that in mind when making the decision on stocking numbers and not just jump in and say we need 50,000 extra grass carp. Grass carp surveying and fishing is a difficult task and is not as easy as seining fish and electroshock surveying. It's very hard to get population densities using the data received from those methods. We have looked at literature, too, from all available sources. Mr. Page noted that the section of the plan for SC, which we will get to in a minute, we don't have any stocking recommendations.

Ms. Eidson explained to Mr. Thompson that what drives this is vegetation. The mortalities and the model are used as an indication of what to stock, but the majority of our discussion is about what vegetation is out there and how it changed from year to year. Before a decision on restocking is made, the focus is on what's out there, often validating it on a field trip. Although mortality is one tool we use, but the primary thing is the native and non-native vegetation in the system, as seen in aerials and in the field.

Mr. Page asked if there were any other comments on any sections of the plan, things that need to be looked at or changed, items that need to be wordsmithed or do anything with. Mr. Page told Mr. McCord this might be a good time to discuss the SC section. Mr. McCord noted that SC was not able to do the normal or other effective survey work during the fall of 2015 due to the flood itself. The rainfalls and high inflows into the lake system, that caused a 4-5 foot rise in lake levels, came at the time when SC was beginning their plant surveys. As reported at the last meeting, SC was not able to collect any useful information. SC is continuing to investigate the system since that point, but they are still seeing very high turbidity and the lakes continue to be within one foot of full pool since the flood. That is exceptionally unusually.

Mr. McCord said the rule curve for water level management generally sees a lowering of the lakes in the winter, beginning in mid-November until mid-January. That did not take place this year, so the lakes have had continuous high and cloudy water. Both of those impact light transmission to the bottom, which is what initiates growth of submersed aquatic vegetation. This is especially important to native vegetation, which requires much more light than the invasives, particularly hydrilla. The water levels being seen now may be affecting the hydrilla growth, which is good for management. There probably is not enough light penetration to the bottom of the lake at this point for hydrilla to take advantage and actively spread, but that is unconfirmed. That will be determined as soon as the lake situation gets to a point where it can be seen visibly or with sophisticated aerial photography. At the moment, nothing can be seen with either of those. Sonar surveys are possible, but they are not economically feasible for trying to identify all the vegetation around the SC system. Sonar is being used for the initial survey work now just to

try to see what's on the bottom and confirming it by throwing rakes and pulling up samples of vegetation, but it is too early to be seeing much of any results from that. Until the lake levels and turbidity drop, not much change is expected.

Mr. Page asked if there is a new timeline for when estimates might be available. Mr. McCord said it would be a couple months down the road just based on normal growing season, but with these water conditions, it is anybody's guess as to what will be seen and when it will be seen. It will probably be mid-summer before there is a good indication of what is out there in terms of vegetation. SC has been discussing it with the company that does the aerial photography. That company is tied in and can do something as soon as needed, but unless someone wants pictures of the mud plume moving through the SC system, there's not much point to do it. It's pretty expensive just to see what is already known. That is all sitting on go as far as the extensive surveys and there have been conversations about cooperative surveys with DNR. That's all well and good, but it doesn't matter how many people are available, there's no way to see what is out there. We will have to be patient, collect information as soon as possible, and hope that it's not too late to keep the hydrilla under control.

Mr. McCord's best guess is that there is not going to be a tremendous expansion of hydrilla because of the situation with light penetration. He has lots of data concerning water depth, Secchi depth readings (another physical measurement of the clarity of the water), and turbidity measurements from SC water quality data. If anyone is interested in it, Mr. McCord will provide the data by hard copy or send it electronically. That data has been requested by members of the public who didn't comment. They are looking for a lot of information. If anyone doesn't believe what Mr. McCord is saying, the data will back it up, or the SC system can be viewed by putting a boat in at any of the public landings. If anyone finds something that hasn't been seen by SC, please report it so it can be included in the overall lake survey.

Mr. Perry asked if there has been a short term trend in decreasing inflows yet. Mr. McCord said the inflows have fluctuated, because there has been fairly continuous rainfall in the watershed since October. Even in Columbia, there have been very few weeks when there has not been some pretty intense rainfall. The inflow has gone up and down, but it has not settled. On average, the inflow has been above normal. It is unknown what it will do from this point on. Mr. Marshall stated that the precipitation will drive it. At other meetings, Dr. Hope Mizzell has stated the outlook may be for a drier summer as the conditions in the Pacific change. Mr. Perry said a strong Bermuda high is developing, which typically means it is a little drier for South Carolina.

Mr. McCord noted that the constituent groups, such as duck hunters and fishermen, should be reminded that what drives our native, submerged aquatic vegetation is water clarity and water depth which relates to light penetration to the bottom. If the light does not penetrate to

the bottom, there will not be expansive native submersed vegetation. Historically speaking, every time there is an expansion of native submersed vegetation, such as *Vallisneria* (Eel grass), is when there is clear water and/or shallower water in areas where the vegetation tends to grow. In situations of poor water quality, that is not conducive to the growth of those plants. These plant levels have cycled up and down over the last few decades. It is just the last two decades in terms of eel grass, which was not present before. That is going to be the constant situation and there is very little control over that, no matter how many agencies are involved. The level and clarity of the water cannot be controlled, so those cycles will continue and have to be dealt with it. Once the plant numbers and species are determined, plans can be made for control.

Mr. McCord said some duck hunting and fishing groups have discussed transplanting eel grass out in the lake. Currently, there is no point in doing that, as there are no areas where it would survive if transplanted. Large areas of thick growth are needed to transplant eel grass, which are not present right now because of the water situation. Right before the lake levels came up, a lot of juvenile eel grass was coming up from seed and root crowns under the soil. There was a pretty expansive spread of eel grass, because of very low water levels due to the drought. What has happened with all that vegetation is unknown. Hopefully, that vegetation can hang on long enough for the lake levels to drop. Once the levels drop, assessments can be made on native submersed vegetation and invasive plants, like hydrilla, and floating leaf invasives, like crested floating heart. The one thing we do know that water hyacinth is that it has moved it effectively from the upper lake area to many areas in the lower portion of Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie. What we had not already controlled with herbicides has spread tremendously around the system, which will make for some interesting control efforts once things start to warm up.

Mr. Thompson asked if the aerial imagery used to determine the extent of the vegetation is one pass that is able to identify all of the different types of vegetation. Mr. McCord stated that hyperspectral imagery is done over the entire system. It is most effective at identifying floating leaf and emergent vegetation. It will identify submersed vegetation that is fairly close to the surface, but that is dependent on water clarity. If the clarity is good, submersed vegetation can be identified about three feet down. If the clarity is poor, submersed vegetation may only be identified if it is within six inches of the surface. The aerial photography is generally done on an annual basis, dependent on budget and weather, but most years that is part of SC's overall survey along with helicopter flyovers, airboat surveys, and any other information available.

Mr. Thompson asked if rooted species like crested floating heart are underwater when the lake levels are high. Mr. McCord stated those species are still mostly dormant. Crested floating heart does have some completely submersed leaves on the root crowns, which may be affected by high water and turbidity. Isolated areas of the lake have been impacted by the high inflows and the populations of this species has been reduced in those areas. Whether the current situation will reduce the numbers more is unknown. It is certainly not beneficial to the growth of



that plant. Very few of those plants have any floating leaves at this time of the year. It loses all of them by early to mid-winter and it grows new ones from the base.

Mr. Page noted there was a meeting with Lake Wateree home owners, WaterWatch, and USC researchers. Lake Wateree has a high phosphorous load in it, which has been problematic in some of the small coves where *Lyngbya* is starting to grow. Several USC researchers are trying to determine where the phosphorous load is coming from or if it is just one of those things. The main body of the lake is not seeing much *Lyngbya* growth. It is mostly isolated to the small coves where property owners are. The meeting was to determine what could be done. USC has been pulling data from water samples. The Lake Wateree part of the plan does include some filamentous algae work, which hasn't been done out there in a long time. That's one of the reasons we keep that in there, as it will rear its ugly head eventually. That's on the radar. Just know that part of the plan is already set to deal with the filamentous algae component.

Mr. McCord asked if the USC researchers were reviewing other efforts on *Lyngbya* control by other universities to keep from reinventing the wheel. Mr. Page said the researchers are not looking at *Lyngbya* control, but relying on the committee for that. They are looking more at the water quality and the why, when and where the phosphorous is coming from, and what might be done as a community or region to eliminate some of that load. Mr. McCord asked if DHEC is involved in any of that in terms of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) studies to identify sources. Mr. Page said there wasn't a DHEC employee at the meeting, but thinks the WaterWatch group reports to or thru DHEC. Ms. Eidson said the only place a TMDL would be done is if there is a monitoring station that shows an impairment. If the monitoring station shows impairment, a TMDL has to be done. Mr. Page said he thinks there are DHEC monitoring stations on Lake Wateree, but he didn't go into detail about it with the researchers as they are focused on research, not solving the problem. Ms. Eidson asked for the site location. Mr. Page has a map of the areas where the *Lyngbya* growth had occurred, which were very shallow coves. Mr. McCord said DHEC may not have any monitoring stations close to those coves. If that is the case, the data may not be adequate to spur a TMDL. Ms. Eidson noted that the Watershed Atlas is live, and could be viewed through a wi-fi connection. A search could be done for the nearest station to the coves to see if they were impaired and if a TMDL had been done. There are also TMDL areas and sites on the Atlas. Mr. Page said he didn't pay attention to that when he was looking over the data. Mr. McCord said that is for potential source reduction, but there is probably going to be a control situation at some point anyway, if the algae is in the coves. Mr. Page said it appears to be more of a nonpoint source than a point source issue, because the USC researchers haven't been able to identify a point source area. Mr. Page just wanted to bring this up briefly. This has been in the plan for years and nothing has been done, but work may be done this year. That is why a lot of things that stay in the plan every year may not get done each year, but there have been problems in the past and there may be problems in the future and we try to

include it so that it is covered by the plan. Mr. McCord said that SC may be able to provide some treatment options for *Lyngbya* control.

Mr. Page asked if there are any other changes or additions to the plan. Mr. McCord said there is one item attached to the plan that he would like to discuss. That is the agreement between SC and DNR that is still included in the plan. Mr. McCord is not comfortable with that agreement continuing to be included until there has been an opportunity to revise and continue it as it technically expired six years ago. It hasn't not been revised or revamped. Mr. McCord would have no concerns other than it has been mentioned many times in the public comments received on last year's plan and it was discussed many times during the council meetings. The agreement was basically misquoted on a number of occasions where it was discussed that the agreement called for or required ten percent coverage of submersed aquatic vegetation. That statement was made many times in public comments and was made in comments during council discussion. That is erroneous. The agreement does not state that ten percent coverage of submersed aquatic vegetation is the goal. It is an overall goal that includes just about every aquatic plant known on the system. Mr. Page stated that it stated that the agreement says ten percent coverage of beneficial vegetation.

Mr. McCord agreed that is what the agreements says, but it is referred to erroneously quite often. He feels that until we revise that agreement, it shouldn't be an addendum to the plan. Mr. Page thinks a paragraph could be added that describes all the types of plants it covers and there would still be someone misconstruing what it says. The reason it was included, this being a memorandum of agreement (MOA), is that a lot of times when you have something that you want to revamp every so many years, the current one kind of stays in effect until you get to what you want to change on it. Mr. Page is not aware of anywhere on the MOA that it is not valid after five years, but believes it says we want to change it every five years, if possible to do it. Mr. McCord said the MOA says there will be discussions annually and after five years it would be reviewed, but it doesn't say it is a living document that continues until it is re-signed. If the MOA is re-signed or a new agreement is put in place, it will be reworded because of the misunderstandings and misquotations that have taken place. Mr. Page noted the MOA doesn't have an expiration date, just a specific time period where it is active and that we will do certain things every five years. A review needs to be done and Mr. Page thinks we are working on that.

Ms. Eidson said her understanding of an MOA is that it is automatically renewed unless it is changed. Mr. McCord said this MOA has wording in it that is different from that. Mr. Page said he gets Mr. McCord's point and agrees that the MOA needs to be revised, but disagrees with the need to take it out of the plan, because it doesn't say what has been insinuated. It says something completely opposite. Mr. Perry said the MOA does not have a sunset provision. Mr. Page said we need to get it revised and re-signed. Mr. McCord said it needs to be modified and it hasn't been reviewed.

Mr. Perry said there have been internal discussion on this, but we haven't reached an internal agreement. He feels that until we schedule a meeting and people are facing a deadline, there will not be any motivation to do it. He suggested that Mr. McCord go ahead and schedule a meeting between DNR and SC for the purpose of addressing any modification of this agreement, and a plan for moving forward with the execution of a new agreement. Once we get that date, some internal meetings could occur on both sides before we get together. Mr. McCord was agreeable to that. Ms. Eidson feels the ten percent terms and types must be specified in detail. Mr. McCord asked for clarification of what she meant. There was a discussion amongst several members regarding the inclusion of other agencies in the agreement between SC and SCDNR. Mr. McCord stated the agreement was established outside of the APMC and the ten percent coverage had been discussed by the APMC, but not established within the council. The ten percent figure is based on benefits for all constituent groups and is a goal, not a mandate. SC cannot fully control the coverage, especially the submersed vegetation.

Mr. Page called for a five minute recess.

The meeting was reconvened at 11:35. Mr. Perry asked if there were any more comments. There were none. Mr. Perry moved that the draft plan be approved. Ms. Eidson seconded the motion. Mr. Page asked for discussion. No discussion was brought before the board. Mr. Page called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Page asked if there was any new business to bring before the committee. He said the SC numbers are needed for the appendix. Mr. McCord said they would be provided. Mr. Perry recommended that SC and SCDNR meet on Earth Day (April 2<sup>nd</sup>) to approve agreement. He invited any and all APMC members to attend and become signatories.

Mr. Page asked if there were any other items. The date of the next meeting is dependent on the availability of data. The meeting will likely be in June or July and be a field trip. Mr. McCord agreed.

Mr. Page asked how many employees will be present in five years. All agencies need to plan for a change in staff. Mr. McCord that succession planning was a good idea and introduced Darla Barnette.

Mr. McCord moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wannamaker seconded the motion. Mr. Page called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:47 am.