



New York-New Jersey Harbor Estuary Program Management Committee Meeting Minutes of 12/15/98

(Draft Feb 11, 1999)

1. Kevin Bricke convened the meeting at 10:05 a.m. The agenda was reviewed and a number of additions were made.
2. The Management Committee approved the minutes from the September 17, 1998 meeting.
3. The September 24, 1998 Policy Committee meeting minutes were approved to pass along to the Policy Committee with the addition of language on page 1 stating that Mary Gastrich was representing Commissioner Shinn and on page 2, that she described the New Jersey Toxics work plan.
4. Bob Nyman discussed the new charges to the Toxics, Pathogen, and Nutrient work groups that were distributed with the MC package. He stated that the Toxics Work Group (TWG) had expressed an interest in expanding its role beyond the initial charge of just reevaluating the list of toxics of concern. The management committee agreed that that was a good thing to do. Gene Flatow said she thought that CSO updates were needed. Kevin Bricke said that would be covered in the Pathogens WG. Dennis Suszkowski said it would be a good idea to develop time lines for TMDLs and WG items, as well as budgets and work plans for all work groups. He continued by saying that the trackdown effort needs to be picked up and should also be addressing the right endpoints within CARP.

Gene Flatow was concerned that Connecticut may direct efforts of a combined HEP-LISS Nutrients WG towards LISS and away from the Harbor. Kevin Bricke said that the programs were being joined to form a system-wide approach.

Dennis S. mentioned that a researcher from Cornell University suggested that Phosphorous is the limiting nutrient in the Hudson. There was also a suggestion that an endpoint for nitrogen control could be water quality that allows bringing back submerged aquatic vegetation.

Marc Matsil added that one strategy for nitrogen control is mass planting of vegetation to prevent erosion. This could be tied to the ranking system for the Bond Act.

The MC agreed that all the HEP work groups should be overseeing their respective CCMP chapters.

5. Bob Nyman described the TWG meeting and agreed to distribute the minutes of that meeting to the MC.

6. Ad Hoc Modeling committee minutes from November 25, 1998 will be distributed to the MC.

7. Kevin Bricke summarized the status of the HEP office commitments. Phil D. was concerned about how much funding was to be available for New York's involvement in all NEP programs. He indicated that proposed changes in the 106 formula may impact NY and NJ over time. While we can make up the HEP funding that will support the program office this year, we need to look at the aggregate of all Federal funding of State activities. Federal funding of programs, other than 319, is not increasing, and may decrease.

Jennifer DiLorenzo said that \$45,000 from the Section 320 budget that NJ expected to get was OK to spend on the office this year. Mary G. said that HEP needs to develop the functions, work plan, and scope of work for the office.

Mr. Bricke said that SEPs were a possible source of funds in the future, but that the Ocean Dumping Ban Act settlement was not a possibility for the HEP office.

Mike Weinstein said that a Sea Grant Associate Director was to be hired and that the program would have significant funds for research.

Gene Flatow said that the CAC was willing to do fund-raising for an independent office and that their priority would be for education and outreach. She requested part-time help for mailings. The tip strips and fact sheets were also being updated by the CAC. Discussion then continued and centered on whether Member Items were an appropriate way of funding HEP.

Anne Galli said that all that is needed to set up the non-profit account in NJ is a letter and money for the account. Dennis S. said that HRF was also willing to set up a fund.

The MC then charged Bob Nyman with scoping out the non-profit account for the next MC meeting. Mike Weinstein, Gene Flatow, Anne Galli, Marc Matsil, Jennifer DiLorenzo and Dick Draper agreed to assist.

Hal Stanford said that perhaps the program should focus on outreach and advocacy. Gene Flatow added that research should also be a priority. Andrew Voros said that a list of deliverables would be useful.

8. Marc Matsil said that several new sites were being proposed for addition to the HEP habitat list for NY and NJ. Kevin Bricke requested that the information be distributed for discussion at the next MC and PC. Gene Flatow said that the MC must be briefed ahead of time. The Port

Authority said that they were interested in a regional restoration map for mitigation purposes. Others suggested that a comprehensive plan for habitat was needed. Mr. Matsil was asked to develop a needs list for the budget. Phil suggested that funds be set aside for printing copies of the habitat maps.

The CAC was concerned about the potential limiting of participants at the upcoming May 10-11 Estuary Implementation Conference.

Nancy Steinberg said that Battelle and Yankee Consulting were in contract negotiations for developing the HEP website.

Gene Flatow said that she was interested in conducting a post-Manhattan College conference. She said that Columbia had offered space. Ms. Flatow will prepare information for discussion prior to the next MC meeting.

The PC reps list will be distributed to the MC.

The overheads from the August 1998 Atmospheric Deposition PC meeting were made available at the meeting. It was noted that Steve Eisenreich from Rutgers was to set up a network of 4 air monitoring stations. It was noted that mercury should be a focus and that holes in the data collection needed to be identified. Bob Nyman said that he would distribute information from the October 1998 Annapolis meeting on atmospheric deposition.

9. The next MC meeting was set for February 25th.

10. The meeting broke for lunch and then continued in the afternoon with a presentation by NYSDEC on the Bond Act projects that were selected. They distributed an updated application book.

Marc Matsil was concerned about the rankings that some of the projects received. In particular, he was concerned that projects should not be selected for funding if there is a consent order in place forcing the city or state to carry out a project in the first place.

There was also concern expressed by some members that they were not being given a realistic voice in the review of projects for funding. NYSDEC said that the best way to influence the process was to coordinate proposals before submission. Examples of this coordination were between the state and the city and within agency departments.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm