

YEAR THREE ANNUAL WORKPLAN FISCAL YEAR 1999



MOBILE BAY NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM

**440 Fairhope Avenue
Fairhope, AL 36532
(334) 990-3565**

**MBNEP 98-02
JUNE 1998**

MOBILE BAY NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM YEAR THREE ANNUAL WORKPLAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Summary of Accomplishments.....	5
Year Three (FY99) Activities.....	8
Required CCMP Components.....	10
Scientific/Technical Assessments.....	20
Public Outreach and Education.....	40
Program Administration.....	55
Appendix.....	59
Table 1: Mobile Bay National Estuary Program Third Year (FY99) Budget.....	60
Table 2: Funding Table for Year Three (FY99).....	63
Figure 1: MBNEP Management Conference Structure.....	64

MOBILE BAY NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM YEAR THREE ANNUAL WORKPLAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Summary of Accomplishments.....	5
Year Three (FY99) Activities.....	8
Required CCMP Components.....	10
Scientific/Technical Assessments.....	20
Public Outreach and Education.....	40
Program Administration.....	55
Appendix.....	59
Table 1: Mobile Bay National Estuary Program Third Year (FY99) Budget.....	60
Table 2: Funding Table for Year Three (FY99).....	63
Figure 1: MBNEP Management Conference Structure.....	64

PREFACE

This is the third annual Workplan for the Mobile Bay National Estuary Program (NEP). It describes the work items to be carried out for Year Three (Fiscal Year 1999), the final year of the planning and development phase of the Mobile Bay NEP, to develop a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) for the Mobile Bay estuary.

The Workplan is presented to the members of the Management Conference and is available to the Mobile Bay estuary community. The information in this Workplan also serves as an agreement between the Mobile Bay NEP Management Conference and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for continued funding of the Mobile Bay NEP. A more specific Cooperative Agreement with EPA Region 4 will be the instrument for identifying and funding specific activities.

This document contains several sections. The **Introduction** provides a discussion of the establishment of the National Estuary Program, and of the Mobile Bay NEP in particular, under Section 320 of the Clean Water Act. The **Summary of Accomplishments** for Year Two (FY98) follows. The **Year Three (FY99) Activities** include details of each proposed Workplan item in Required CCMP Elements, Scientific/Technical Assessments, Public Participation and Education and Program Administration.

INTRODUCTION

The National Estuary Program (NEP) was established by the Water Quality Act of 1987. The Act authorizes the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans (CCMPs) for estuaries of national significance threatened by pollution, development, or overuse. Section 320 of the Act outlines the estuary designation process and the purposes of a Management Conference.

On September 28, 1995, EPA Administrator Carol M. Browner added Mobile Bay to the National Estuary Program. The Management Conference participants were established and consist of a seventeen member Policy Committee, a Management Committee, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). Subsequently, four TAC/CAC joint issue workgroups were created to further define and refine priority issues and corresponding action plans for the following areas: habitat loss, human uses, living resources, and water quality. A diagram of the management structure is found in the Appendix, Figure 1. The Policy Committee approved the Mobile Bay NEP Management Conference Agreement on July 30, 1996. The Conference Agreement represents the commitments of Management Conference participants to the work to be accomplished over the three-year planning and development phase of the Mobile Bay NEP.

The work outlined in the Conference Agreement includes the tasks necessary to fulfill the seven purposes of a National Estuary Program, as stated in Section 320 of the Water Quality Act of 1987.

Section 320(b) PURPOSES OF CONFERENCE. —The purposes of any management conference convened with respect to an estuary under this subsection shall be to—

1. *Assess trends in water quality, natural resources, and uses of the estuary;*
2. *Collect, characterize, and assess data on toxics, nutrients, and natural resources within the estuarine zone to identify the causes of environmental problems;*
3. *Develop the relationship between the in-place loads and point and nonpoint loadings of pollutants to the estuarine zone and the potential uses of the zone, water quality, and natural resources;*
4. *Develop a comprehensive conservation and management plan that recommends priority corrective actions and compliance schedules addressing point and nonpoint sources of pollution to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the estuary, including restoration and maintenance of water quality, a balanced indigenous population of shellfish, fish and wildlife, and recreational activities in the estuary, and assure that the designated uses of the estuary are protected;*
5. *Develop plans for the coordinated implementation of the plan by the States as well as Federal and local agencies participating in the conference;*
6. *Monitor the effectiveness of actions taken pursuant to the plan; and*
7. *Review all Federal development projects in accordance with the requirements of Executive Order 12372..to determine whether such assistance programs or projects would be consistent with and further the purposes and objectives of the plan prepared under this section.*

On June 20, 1996, the Policy Committee established the following goals for the Mobile Bay National Estuary Program.

- I. To maintain and promote wise stewardship of the water quality characteristics of the Mobile Bay Estuary System.*
- II. To maintain and promote wise stewardship of the living resources base of the Mobile Bay Estuarine System.*

As indicated in the Management Conference Agreement, a strong emphasis is placed on an early action agenda and support of only that research and characterization work necessary for an effective CCMP. Coordination with other ongoing resource management activities to avoid unnecessary duplication and efforts to involve all interested and affected parties will continue as the completion of the CCMP approaches.

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Year Two (FY98) of the Mobile Bay National Estuary Program (MBNEP) was truly productive. Characterization studies provided substantive information necessary to inform the content of preliminary action plans drafted by the Issue Workgroups. The public was given numerous opportunities to learn about the MBNEP through the media, publications, public meetings, and participation at events such as BayFest and Mobile Bay/Earth Day. Some of the accomplishments of Year Two (FY98) are summarized below.

Management and Program Administration

The management structure of the MBNEP went through some minor changes and addressed some communication problems identified among the different committees. A consensus-training workshop was held in January 1998 for members of the Management Conference. On the first day, the workshop focused on Policy/Management Committee relationships and roles. While not resolving all issues, several concrete suggestions made during the session have been implemented. These include joint Policy/Management subcommittees on particular issues, joint meetings (one scheduled for September 1998), and better communication between Policy Committee members and their corresponding members on the Management Committee.

The Management Conference approved a Memorandum of Agreement among the MBNEP, the Alabama Department of Economic and Community Development (Coastal Programs), and the Alabama Department of Environmental Management. The Agreement addresses coordination and cooperation among the NEP and the Alabama Coastal Programs (part of NOAA's state coastal zone management programs) during the planning and development phase of the CCMP.

The Management Committee reviewed its membership to ensure that all groups necessary for the implementation of the CCMP were "at the table." As a result of this review, the Policy Committee approved the Management Committee's recommendation to add representatives from the Real Estate/Developer Community and the University of South Alabama as the Educational Community representative. Other adjustments were made to the membership of the Management Committee and it is now at its full strength of 31.

Matching funds were raised from several different sources. Eight county and municipal governments contributed cash match to the MBNEP. Cash match was also received from industry. In-kind matching funds were received from state and local governments, business and industry, and other nonprofit organizations. Of course, these donations are important for the dollar value. However, the donations as evidence of a commitment to and investment in the NEP process is of even greater importance.

Administratively, the Program Office and the grantee, Faulkner State Community College, made great strides in stream-lining the administrative process, formulating comprehensive and understandable financial reports, and ensuring the fiscal soundness of management decisions. In addition, the Program Office staff moved into larger office space at the Fairhope Campus of Faulkner.

Scientific/Technical

There were numerous scientific/technical highlights during Year Two (FY98). These include cooperative efforts to address shellfish enhancement, initiation of modeling efforts, identification of high priority sites, a wetlands demonstration project and the completion of certain characterization studies.

One major goal of the scientific element of the Program was to effect coordination and cooperation among existing agencies and organizations with common missions or interests. One example of fulfillment of this goal involves a \$150,000 shellfish grant awarded to the Program from the Gulf of Mexico Program at the end of Year One (FY97). These monies are being used to assess and evaluate the following: 1) effects of point and non-point source pollution reduction efforts; 2) survival and growth of oysters at formerly productive sites; and 3) new restoration and culture techniques. The resulting Mobile Bay Shellfish Restoration Program involves fifteen representatives of federal, state, and local agencies, as well as representatives from commercial fishing, educational institutions, and the local National Estuarine Research Reserve.

Another significant accomplishment toward this goal was the formation of a modeling panel that resulted from a recommendation of a two-day modeling workshop held during the latter part of fiscal year 1997. Over fifty workshop participants from federal, state, and local agencies, private and public businesses and industries, educational institutions, environmental organizations, and the general public agreed that formation of this panel was crucial in guiding the modeling effort that was proposed in the Year One (FY97) Workplan. The modeling panel, composed of federal, state, and private entities, has met on several occasions and has conducted a feasibility assessment on numerous existing models. This assessment resulted in the solicitation of two proposals from the corresponding model distributors. These proposals are currently in the review process and the panel plans to choose and contract for modeling work to begin in June, 1998.

Another good example of cooperation is the High Priority Sites Identification and Mapping workshop that was held on February 17, 1998. Twenty-seven individuals representing approximately twenty agencies and organizations that are involved with habitat conservation, restoration, and protection participated in this all-day event. Twenty-five sites were identified and mapped on hard copy maps. A data sheet containing geographic information, ecological and cultural characteristics, current and potential use, management status, site viability, and sources of information was completed for each site. A cooperative agreement with the Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs, Coastal Programs, has been made to include these sites as Gulf Ecological Management Sites (GEMS) and a GEMS website is currently being developed. This website will contain a map of the sites along with the information from the data sheets and will be available to any group for the purpose of assisting them in coordinating activities and exchanging information about these ecologically significant sites. Plans are to continue to update this information on an annual basis.

In addition to these achievements, an action plan demonstration project (APDP) involving the use of constructed wetlands as an adjunct to the existing stormwater management system at Mobile's Hank Aaron Stadium was approved and initiated. The objective is to reduce the amount of nutrients, sediments, and petroleum products from parking lot runoff that is currently being released from existing detention basins. This APDP is a combined effort of the City of Mobile and a private business.

Characterization work continues and will be completed by the end of this fiscal year. To date, we have received draft reports on the base programs and regulatory survey and analysis and the water quality characterization. We also have received the final report for the Data and Information Management System (DIMS) and expect to implement the recommendations in the report for the system soon. Again, we are excited to report a partnership with the Gulf of Mexico Program, in that they have committed to providing the DIMS hardware and software, creating our website, and allowing our site to link to their virtual data warehouse.

Also, a comprehensive monitoring strategy was adopted by the Management Conference and will serve as a framework for the final monitoring plan. As a result of this strategy, combined efforts between the Alabama Departments of Conservation and Natural Resources and Environmental Management to monitor sites in Mobile Bay will begin this summer. Another part of the strategy that has already begun involves coordinated volunteer monitoring efforts and the DIMS, as mentioned above. The next step is to initiate joint efforts between state agencies and industry. This effort also involves cooperation between federal, state, local, and private entities. In fact, all of these efforts have actually gone beyond cooperation into collaboration between involved parties. Work on all of these three projects will continue into fiscal year 1999.

Public Outreach

During Year Two (FY98), public outreach and education activities continued to focus on informing the community about the mission of the MBNEP as well as involving more individuals and groups. Successful efforts included hosting and/or co-sponsoring workshops and public forums and continuing to enhance on-going communication efforts.

Highlighting Year Two (FY98) activities were the numerous partnerships formed to communicate shared messages. An excellent example was the series of watershed management workshops tailored to specific interest groups, (local government officials, planners and engineers, business interests and citizens) held in October. Co-sponsored by a variety of agencies and organizations (the Alabama Department of Environmental Management's Non-Point Source Unit, Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs' Coastal Programs Office, Faulkner State Community College's Center for Business and Industry Training, the Auburn University Marine Extension Research Center Source, the Weeks Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve, the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission, and others) this education effort focused on effectively dealing with non-point source pollution.

Public Forums designed to inform as well as solicit input were held on topics such as "Protecting the Environment as We Build, Are We Doing Enough?" and "Dealing with Septic and Sewer Issues." The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) also hosted a "Report to the Public" as a forum for the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to bring the community up to date on the activities of the joint Issue Workgroups (habitat loss, human uses, living resources and water quality).

Communication efforts were enhanced through continued production of the *Coastal Connection*, a joint newsletter with ADECA and the Alabama Coastal Foundation. Over 2,500 copies are distributed quarterly to scientists, agency representatives, policy makers, volunteers and other citizens who share a joint concern for the Bay and Delta. Another major communication effort

was the production and distribution of "Hard Rain," a 12-page tabloid style publication providing over 120,000 readers throughout Mobile and Baldwin Counties with an overview of the efforts of the MBNEP.

Another focus for the Program Office was working with volunteer citizen water quality monitoring efforts to coordinate activities and address common interests and concerns. A task force of volunteer coordinators was formed as a follow-up to the Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy adopted by the Management Conference, and Year Two activities culminated in a monitoring workshop held during the fourth quarter.

Media relations were enhanced throughout the year with numerous press releases, radio and television interviews, and comments issued for print journalists. Other highlights include a feature about the Mobile Bay NEP on a local weekend news show and a thirty-minute public television show on Mobile Bay and the Delta.

Last but certainly not least, six organizations and individuals were recognized for their efforts to protect the living resources and water quality of Mobile Bay and the Delta. The Citizens Advisory Committee presented the second annual MBNEP Stewardship Awards as the highlight of Mobile Bay Day/Earth Day festivities. U. S. Senator Jeff Sessions presented the awards and was the guest of the MBNEP staff, the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service on a tour of the Tensaw River Delta.

These activities represent only a portion of the Year Two (FY98) Public Outreach and Education efforts and as such mark progress to building community-wide consensus for the CCMP.

YEAR THREE (FY99) ACTIVITIES

Year Three (FY99) will be the last year of the planning and development phase of the Mobile Bay National Estuary Program. The draft Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan is due on September 30, 1998. While a "final" draft will not be ready for publication by that date, preliminary action plans for the four issue areas (water quality, habitat loss, living resources, and human uses) will have been distributed. The draft CCMP will be developed using these preliminary action plans, supplemented by information received from the characterization studies, input from the Management Conference and the public, and other activities proposed in this Workplan. The Year Three (FY99) Workplan will build on the previous two years' efforts and will address the products and activities necessary to produce a CCMP by September 1999.

The EPA allocation to the Mobile Bay NEP for the Year Three (FY99) Workplan is \$561,500. This amount will require a state and local match of \$187,167, for a total of \$748,667. In addition, there will be a carryover of approximately \$100,000.

The MBNEP Year Three (FY99) budget is itemized in Table 1. Table 2 is a summary of Year Three's budget by origin of funds. The budget represents a total of \$848,667 for the Year Three (FY99) Workplan. Figure 1 is a diagram of the MBNEP Management Conference structure.

It is worth repeating the key concepts stated in the Year Two (FY98) Workplan, which provide the overall ideological framework for managing the Mobile Bay estuarine system by consensus.

Key Concepts:

- Actions to increase public awareness of estuarine problems and active seeking of public participation in consensus building.
- Management options based on the estuary as a holistic ecological unit and promotion of basinwide planning to manage our living resource.
- Establishment of working partnerships among federal, state, and local governments and organizations to cut across traditional jurisdictions.
- Projects to transfer scientific and management information, experience, and expertise to program participants.
- Utilization of a phased approach: first, identify and define priority problems; second, establish probable causes of the problems; third, devise alternative strategies to solve the problems; fourth, choose and implement the most effective of the strategies.
- Identification of approaches that balance conflicting human uses of the estuary.
- Utilization of collaborative problem solving, to assemble maximum expertise, to broaden the management perspective, and to secure a wide commitment.
- Reliance on existing, previously underutilized data and information, combined with critical applied research to fill the knowledge gaps.

The allocation of Year Three (FY99) funds will be in four program areas:

1. **Required CCMP Components.** This section contains items necessary to comply with the requirements of a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan as defined by Section 320 of the Clean Water Act. These items do not encompass all required components, but only those not addressed elsewhere in this Workplan or those previously completed.

2. **Scientific/Technical Assessments.** Workplan items focus on information necessary to complete the CCMP, with an emphasis on data gaps identified in the Year Two (FY98) preliminary characterization reports. Additional Action Plan Demonstration Projects will also be initiated.
3. **Public Participation and Education.** Efforts in Year Three will focus on communicating to as broad an audience as possible the proposed action items and their implications through continued implementation of the Public Participation Strategy. A key new element will be the implementation of Local Community Initiatives designed to help communities within the Mobile Bay study area better understand the cumulative impacts of local problems and the benefits of a comprehensive management plan.
4. **Program Administration.** The Program Office staff will continue to guide the MBNEP toward the goals of the Management Conference and the completion of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan. Roles of the Program Office include staff support of committees, program planning, identification of additional funding sources for the development of the CCMP, project contract procurement and coordination, interagency coordination and communication, and administrative coordination with EPA Region 4 and Headquarters.

1.0 Required CCMP Components:

"Comprehensive Conservation & Management Plans: Content and Approval Requirements" (EPA Guidance Document 842-B-92-002) lists the required contents of a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, as follows:

- Management Conference Membership List
- Summary of Characterization Findings
- Statement of Priority Problems
- Environmental Quality Goals and Objectives
- Base Program Analysis
- Action Plans
- Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy
- Monitoring Program Plan
- Federal Consistency Review
- Summary of Public Involvement and Review

The workplan items in this section will address those required elements that have not already been completed or are not addressed elsewhere in this workplan. A summary of workplan items developed and approved by the Management and Policy Committees is provided below.

Year Three Required CCMP Components

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 1.1 | Writing the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan |
| 1.2 | Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy |
| 1.3 | Monitoring Program Plan |
| 1.4 | Federal Consistency Review |
| 1.5 | Design and Printing of Various Mobile Bay NEP Documents |

Specific workplan items are provided in the following section.

1.1 Writing the CCMP

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$25,000 (funding through Draft CCMP only)
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Mary A. Knight
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

During Year Two, the Issue Workgroups developed preliminary action plans in the four priority issue areas: Water Quality, Habitat Loss, Living Resources, and Human Uses. These preliminary action plans will be reviewed and revised during the remainder of Year Two, taking into account the preliminary characterization studies as they become available.

During Year Three, while the scientific, technical and public outreach programs continue, the Management Conference will begin drafting the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). This will involve developing an outline and draft CCMP. This effort will be based on EPA guidance, the scientific/technical studies completed and those underway, the "Stakeholder Report" (Year Two (FY98), Item 2.11; information will become available in the fourth quarter of Year Two), the finance plan and implementation strategy, the monitoring program plan, the Public Participation Strategy and the federal consistency report.

In order to develop a coherent and succinct CCMP, an outline will be developed by the program staff and a contractor. The contractor will then be responsible for drafting the CCMP based on the outline the Principal Investigator helped create. Drafting of the CCMP is an involved process that will require an extensive background in technical and scientific writing, organization skills, and written and graphic presentation/publication skills. The Principal Investigator (author) will be required to produce a draft CCMP with as little overlap and as much detail as possible.

The draft CCMP will serve as the "first impression" many publics (scientific, technical, government, and citizens) will have of the comprehensive work completed to date, and impart credibility to the implementation strategies created by the Management Conference. Therefore, presentation, content and a consistent style must be used to draw the various pieces (technical studies, background, history, action plans, etc.) together, provide consistency throughout the work, and draft the CCMP.

Project Objectives:

1. With the Program Director, coordinate with contractors (primarily Stakeholder Report, Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy, Monitoring Program Plan, and Federal Consistency Report), Program Staff, Workgroup Chairs to create a draft CCMP based on timely and accurate data.
2. Write the preliminary (for the Management Conference) and draft (for the public) Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan in "camera-ready" format.
3. Ensure program data and information is incorporated in the Data and Information Management System of the Mobile Bay NEP.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Factor in "Stakeholder Report" Information.....	Sept./Oct. 98
Preliminary Draft CCMP.....	Dec. 98
Draft CCMP.....	Feb. 99
Preliminary Final CCMP.....	Sept. 30, 1999
Final CCMP.....	Dec. 31, 1999

1.2 Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$37,500 (\$22,500 from Year 2 Items 3.1 and 3.2)
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Mary A. Knight
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

EPA guidance states that the finance plan and implementation strategy requirements can be met in one of two ways: individual action plans, which include information on costs, financing mechanisms and commitments; or, a separate plan which specifies how funds will be raised to implement a group of actions. Finance plans should match action plan costs and cash flow needs to a suitable funding source and managing entity. The plan may identify existing or potential new sources of funding, in which case new state or local legislation may be required.

The goal of the implementation strategy is to "institutionalize" the recommendations made in the CCMP. Implementation factors for specific action items in the CCMP will address issues and questions such as:

- Results of the base program analysis—who has the authority, the resources, and the expertise?
- Which of the recommendations should be enforceable, and how can they be made enforceable?
- Which recommendations will require new legal authority?
- What mechanisms will be used to obtain agency commitments?
- Who will oversee implementation?
- What role will the public play in implementation?

This work element includes investigating possible scenarios for housing the MBNEP CCMP, investigating possible funding mechanisms for various action items within the MBNEP CCMP, and developing recommendations for the Management Conference.

Whichever method is appropriate, this workplan item will provide the information necessary to complete this CCMP requirement.

Project Objectives:

1. Using preliminary and draft action plans, identify a) potential and willing entities to be responsible for implementing each action item; b) suitable and available funding sources; and, c) which recommendations are enforceable and how they can be made enforceable. Determine if new funding sources are required, and if new legislation will be required.
2. Work with the Management Conference to determine what mechanisms will be used to establish and document agency commitments and ensure MBNEP commitment to use those funds for the purpose for which they were contributed. Contact each implementing entity and determine willingness to commit to implementation.

3. Work with the Management Conference to determine what management strategy will be used by the Mobile Bay NEP Management Conference (carried over from Year Two (FY98) Workplan Item 3.2) to *lead* CCMP implementation, including potential program office funding and staff needs, and continuing or revised make-up of the Management Conference. Determine if new budgeting or legislation is needed to create this management strategy.
4. Provide input into individual items of the CCMP or provide a separate report on the Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy, depending on which option is chosen.
5. Deliver this information to the Data and Information Management System of the MBNEP.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Preliminary Report on Post-CCMP Structure and Funding.....	90 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	320 days
Final Report.....	365 days

1.3 Monitoring Program Plan

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$30,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

The MBNEP has adopted a previously developed Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy as a starting point for the MBNEP Monitoring Program Plan. This effort has involved the following approaches: interagency cooperation, agency/industry cooperation, volunteer monitoring, and a data management system. To date, the interagency approach has been developed and initiated and a volunteer monitoring coordinators' group has been formed. The data management system is to be incorporated into the MBNEP Data and Information Management System.

A detailed environmental monitoring plan must accompany the CCMP. The two major goals of the plan are:

- 1.) To measure the effectiveness of the management actions and programs implemented under the CCMP; and,
- 2.) To provide essential information that can be used to redirect and refocus the CCMP during implementation.

In addition, the plan will provide accountability to elected officials and the public relating to the progress towards estuary protection. The plan will include the following:

- Program objectives and performance criteria;
- Testable hypotheses;
- Monitoring variables, sampling locations, field sampling procedures, analytical procedures, and quality and assurance procedures;
- A data management system and statistical tests to analyze the monitoring data;
- The expected performance levels of the initial sampling design; and,
- A timetable for analyzing data and assessing program performance.

The CCMP itself must also include a summary of the monitoring program plan. The summary will give the general public an overview of how the CCMP defines effective and successful action plans, what is being monitored and why, and how data will be managed and communicated.

Specific objectives to be accomplished as part of the monitoring plan in Year Three include:

1. Develop a monitoring plan for fecal coliform in public swimming areas.
2. Develop a monitoring plan specifically dealing with harmful algal blooms (HABs).
3. Refine and continue to develop the monitoring strategy to include details such as testable hypotheses, an environmental indicator system, cause and effect analyses, and a timetable for analyzing data and assessing program performance.
4. Develop a communications strategy to make information readily available and understandable to public officials and the general citizenry. This strategy should include an interface with and access through the MBNEP DIMS. (See Section 3: Public Participation Workplan Item 3.1.2)
5. Develop a monitoring plan summary to be included in the CCMP, including a requirement for annual reporting on progress.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	120 days
Final Report.....	180 days

1.4 Federal Consistency Review

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$10,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Mary A. Knight
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

Estuaries and their adjacent shores and drainage basins have long been choice sites for recreational, commercial, agricultural and industrial activities, the majority of which affect the quality of the coastal marine environment in one way or another. Federal and state governments support many of these activities, directly or indirectly. Because government-sponsored activities have a wide variety of objectives, some of these activities may be inconsistent with coastal resource protection. One way of addressing potential inconsistencies among such activities is through the consistency review authority given to the National Estuary Program Management Conferences under Section 320(b)(7) of the Clean Water Act.

All Management Conferences must prepare: (1) an inventory of federal programs that may affect the estuary (base program analysis), and (2) a federal consistency report that accomplishes two objectives. First, in a one-time assessment, the consistency report must identify inconsistencies between federal programs and projects and CCMP objectives, and describe how these inconsistencies will be resolved. Second, the report must define a consistency review strategy that includes a process for continuing consistency review and seeking resolution for activities under federal programs and development projects proposed in the future. Any documentation of this review and resolution strategy (e.g., written interagency agreements to resolve inconsistencies, written commitments to coordinate program objectives) would be included as appendices to the consistency report. The report and the inventory must be either incorporated into or referenced in the CCMP, and must be available to the public on request.

Project Objectives:

1. Prepare a report, consistent with EPA guidelines, that identifies inconsistencies between federal programs and projects and CCMP objectives. Describe how these inconsistencies will be resolved.
2. Outline a consistency review strategy that includes a process for continuing consistency review.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	Dec. 1998
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	120 days
Final Report.....	180 days

1.5 Design and Printing of Mobile Bay NEP Documents

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$50,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Mary A. Knight
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

It will be necessary to provide sufficient copies of MBNEP documents to the Management Conference and to the public. These documents include, but are not limited to:

Draft Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan
Technical Reports (from the Preliminary Characterization Studies)
Federal Consistency Review

Number of copies for each publication will vary, depending on the document in question and the overall priority within the publication budget. The highest priority will be given to the draft CCMP.

Project Objectives:

1. Layout, design, printing of various MBNEP documents.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

TBD

2.0 Scientific/Technical Assessments:

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members will continue to participate in the further development of priority action plans for human uses, habitat loss, living resources, and water quality issues as members of Local Community Initiative committees to be set up as determined by the Public Participation Strategy (i.e., Workplan Item 3.1.1). In addition, as results from the ongoing preliminary characterization studies are received, revisions to developed action plans that were based on previous assumptions will be made as needed. New workplan items and/or APDPs may also be developed by the TAC for approval from the Management and Policy Committees.

A summary of workplan items developed and approved by the joint TAC/CAC issues workgroups is provided below. These workplan items involve one (1) or more of the priority issues identified by citizens in a series of public workshops held in June 1996.

Year Three (FY99) Scientific/Technical Workplan Items

2.1	Wetlands and Submerged Aquatic (SAV) Survey
2.2	Assessment and Modeling of Priority Water Quality Parameters for the MBNEP Study Area
2.3	Land Use Planning Effort
2.4	GIS Layering Effort
2.5	Living Resources Data Synthesis/Analysis
2.6	Sediment Contamination Analysis
2.7	Profile of User Groups in the Theodore Ship Channel/Industrial Park
2.8	Examination of Species at Risk Conservation Practices
2.9	Bycatch Assessment
2.10	Survey of Bird Nesting Areas
2.11	Introduced or Nuisance Species Impacts
2.12	Action Plan Demonstration Projects (APDPs)--Technical Tasks.

Specific workplan items developed by each of the Issue Workgroups, to date, are provided in the following section. In addition, we will initiate several new technical early action projects for Year Three (FY99). These potential projects are briefly described under the workplan item 2.12, entitled "Action Plan Demonstration Projects (APDPs)--Technical Tasks."

2.1 Wetlands and Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) Survey

Performing Organization:	Dauphin Island Sea Lab (for SAV; Wetlands—TBD)
Principal Investigator:	Judy Stout (for SAV; Wetlands—TBD)
Total Funding:	\$258,514 (Year 2 dollars—\$108,000; Year 3 dollars—\$60,000; Needed Outside Funding— \$90,302)
Priority Problem:	Habitat Loss
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

Habitat loss or degradation is important to the overall health of an estuarine ecosystem. Two important ecosystems are emergent wetlands (including marshes and forested wetlands) and submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV). An estimated 90% of commercial fish and shellfish landed in Alabama rely on wetlands for critical habitat during their life cycles. Submerged aquatic vegetation play a pivotal role in determining the productivity and water quality of estuarine environments. Both ecosystems serve as primary producers in estuarine and nearshore environments, provide habitat for many invertebrate and fish species, serve as sinks for nutrients, and stabilize sediments. The amount of emergent wetlands lost to conversion, alteration, or degradation and the current amount and type of SAV habitat within the MBNEP study area is unknown.

This work element is a continuation of Year Two (FY98) Workplan Item 1.3. It is designed to determine the extent of emergent wetland conversion, emergent wetland alteration or degradation, and current SAV areal coverage and composition (within the MBNEP study area) for development of CCMP action plans related to habitat. This study is a priority effort of the habitat loss workgroup, builds upon the results of the Year One (FY97) preliminary characterization study of habitat loss, and should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS). Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Quantify the extent of emergent wetland conversion within the MBNEP study area by type, watershed, and cause (i.e., agriculture, oil and gas production, urban uses, pine monoculture, etc.).
2. Identify existing (including altered or degraded) emergent wetland sites within the MBNEP study area by type, status, and location.
3. Determine the distribution, areal coverage, species composition and provide change analyses of SAV habitats in the MBNEP study area where data is lacking or needed (Year Two item).
4. Deliver this information in GIS and a standardized database format into the MBNEP DIMS.
5. Identify four potential restoration sites and assess the feasibility of restoring these sites by type, cost, and time and difficulty of implementation.

6. Recommend methods for restoration of these sites.

7. Rank and recommend restoration projects, based on feasibility criteria, for demonstration of restoration method.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	300 days
Final Report.....	365 days

2.2 Assessment and Modeling of Priority Water Quality Parameters for the MBNEP Study Area

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding	\$200,000 (Year 2 dollars—\$115,000; Year 3 dollars—\$85,000)
Priority Problem:	Water Quality, Habitat Loss
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

The development of a conceptual model(s) for understanding the Mobile Bay estuarine system is crucial to a comprehensive watershed approach to water quality management. Modeling allows regulators and managers to focus on the most critical issues impacting the MBNEP study area, thereby reducing the cost of regulation, monitoring, management, and enforcement. The establishment of total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) and the watershed's assimilative capacity is important in determining the impacts of long-term growth. This work element is a continuation of Year Two (FY98) Workplan Item 1.8. All of the objectives listed below will be conducted within the boundaries of the MBNEP study area. It is required that each of these objectives be accomplished within the framework of the MBNEP Data and Information Management System (DIMS).

This project is a priority effort of the water quality workgroup and will be useful in developing the management plans of the CCMP. Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Develop a preliminary loadings budget using existing data including:
 - A. Total suspended solids.
 - B. Nutrients (including organics).
 - C. Toxins (at minimum).
2. Quantify contributions from point source discharges.
3. Quantify contributions from upstream river flow.
4. Quantify contributions from non-point source discharges (including septic systems).
5. Quantify contributions from bay sediments.
6. Develop a mathematical model capable of predicting water quality parameters and sediment deposition and movement based on modification in point and non-point source loadings.
7. Refine the budget and models using water quality assessment data.

Project Deliverables and Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Reports.....	300 days
Final Reports.....	365 days

2.3 Land Use Planning Effort

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$8,000
Priority Problem:	All
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

A major contributor to water quality degradation, erosion, and habitat loss in the MBNEP area is land use practices causing nonpoint source contributions and hydromodifications. These practices result from unplanned, poorly located and poorly designed urban and/or suburban growth. The problem can be defined as increasing impervious surfaces, contaminant contributions, habitat fragmentation (i.e., loss of corridors and riparian buffers), removal or reduction of buffering functions, and the lack of enforcement power for existing regulations and/or ordinances. This problem relates not only to loss of habitat but also to water quality and living resources issues (including erosion and sedimentation associated with Best Management Practices and endangered species habitat).

Building on the Base Program Analysis, an examination of existing local regulations, legislative limitations and/or provisions, other states' plans, and relevant scientific information will be undertaken to develop recommendations to aid Mobile and Baldwin counties with their respective land use management plans and local development ordinances. Key to this effort is participation by the appropriate individuals from the counties, cities, and state who deal with land use planning. In addition, a well-planned public education component is vital to eventual implementation of this plan (see Public Participation Workplan Item 3.1.1). MBNEP will attempt to aid in facilitation and coordination of this effort.

This study is a priority effort of the water quality, habitat loss, living resources and human uses workgroups for development of management plans for the CCMP and should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS) and utilize land use information from other MBNEP projects. Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Form a planning task force of appropriate county, city, state, and federal officials.
2. Examine existing legislation, ordinances, regulations, other pertinent information and land use plans (local and otherwise) to determine effectiveness in controlling nonpoint source pollution, erosion, sedimentation and critical habitat loss.
3. Identify areas for "greenbelt" or "greenway" planning strategies.
4. Make specific recommendations for the design and implementation of consistent, enforceable, countywide development ordinances and land use management planning (including a widespread, diverse public outreach component).

5. Where appropriate, deliver this information into the Data and Information Management System of the MBNEP.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	120 days
Final Report.....	180 days

2.4 GIS Layers

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$20,000
Priority Problem:	All
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

Information that is easily understood and user-friendly is vital to the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS). Geographic information systems (GIS) can provide a means to access data that are in a visual format and can meet these criteria. Not only does this informational tool prove useful to scientists but also to the general public for conceptual understanding. Much of the data needed to build informative GIS layers is currently and/or readily available.

The purpose of this work item is to add existing layers or easily accessible existing data into the MBNEP DIMS and to develop scopes of work for those layers that require additional data or effort. This project is a priority effort of the habitat loss, water quality, living resources and human resources workgroups and will be useful in developing the management plans of the CCMP. Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

Develop GIS layers or scopes of work for development of layers to include, but not limited to, the following:

- Erodability index
- Dirt roads (private and public)
- Bulkheads
- Borrow pits
- Impervious surfaces
- Channelization ("improved" drainage systems) (salt water intrusion analysis)
- Pump out stations
- Shellfish areas
- Municipal sewage stations and problem locations (trends analysis)
- Point sources
- Self-contained sewage systems
- Septic system areas
- 10' contour line
- Zoning areas
- Endangered and threatened species habitat
- Land use (trends analysis)

Project Deliverables and Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Reports.....	120 days
Final Reports.....	180 days

2.5 Living Resources Data Synthesis/Analysis

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	TBD
Priority Problem:	Living Resources
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

This work element will be developed based upon the recommendations from the Year One (FY97) characterization study of living resources. An example of a possible recommendation is to perform fish population status and trends analyses on existing data sets. The results from this work element may be useful in the refinement of the monitoring plan and will provide the groundwork for any future priority action of the CCMP for maintenance and wise stewardship of the living resource base of the Mobile Bay estuarine system. This study is a priority effort of the living resource workgroup and should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS). Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. TBD
2. If warranted, deliver results into the MBNEP DIMS.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	TBD
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	TBD
Final Report.....	TBD

2.6 Sediment Characterization Analysis

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$48,667 (FY98 "earmarked" federal dollars - \$36,500; State/Local required match - \$12,167)
Priority Issues:	Water Quality
MBNEP Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

The MBNEP preliminary characterization of water quality has identified a lack of sediment data analysis and understanding for the MBNEP study area. In addition, EPA, through its National Sediment Quality Survey, designated the Mobile Bay hydrologic unit as an "Area of Probable Concern" with respect to sediments. The Alabama Department of Environmental Management, in its ALAMAP-C report for 1993-94, characterized certain locations as having moderate to poor sediment quality. The EPA National Sediment Quality Survey data set appears dated and limited in comparison to information sources identified in the water quality characterization study. Therefore, uncertainty remains in our understanding of the condition of sediments in Mobile Bay.

Sediment quality has been identified by citizens and scientists as issues of concern for the MBNEP. If certain areas are identified as having poor sediment quality, then steps to identify probable causes and possible health risks associated with these sediments should be undertaken. This work element is considered a high priority item of the Water Quality workgroup and will be useful in the development of management actions for the CCMP. It is designed to increase our understanding of existing information as well as determine the need for additional data collection. All work should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data and Information Management Systems (DIMS) and a MBNEP Peer Review Technical Subcommittee will guide this process. Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

The National Estuary Program received a \$1 million earmark from Congress in the U.S. EPA's Fiscal Year 1998 budget. EPA would like to target this money to further the goals of the Clean Water Action Plan, announced by the Clinton Administration on February 19, 1998. Each eligible NEP will receive \$36,500 (which must be matched), in addition to their base grant, to take steps to ensure that public health is not compromised by poor environmental conditions resulting from population growth in those coastal watersheds. The Mobile Bay NEP has decided to expend those earmarked funds on this workplan item.

Project Objectives:

1. Expand the EPA National Sediment Inventory database to include all available relevant data.
2. Assess the data quality of the aforementioned data, including the EPA National Sediment Inventory database.
3. Attempt trends analysis on existing data, if feasible.

4. Determine the need for additional data to perform an overall evaluation of the status of Mobile Bay sediment quality.
5. If necessary and feasible, develop a program to determine probable causes of contamination and possible health risks associated with poor sediment quality.
6. Prepare a status report for EPA that describes the project, presents information on cost and effectiveness, suggests improvements to the approach based on lessons learned, the start and end date of the project, the recipient or entity conducting the work, and identifies a point of contact for further information.
7. Deliver this information into the MBNEP DIMS.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Reports.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	120 Days
Final Report.....	180 Days
Report to EPA.....	Sept. 30, 1999

2.7 Methods in Assessment and Resolution--Profile of User Groups in the Theodore Ship Channel/Industrial Park

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$15,000
Priority Issues:	Human Uses
MBNEP Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

Developing and implementing a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) will require consensus based approaches to identifying, presenting and resolving multi-party interests and potential conflicts throughout the MBNEP study area. These interests and potential conflicts particularly arise in localized watershed regions, which may be widely different from each other, with dissimilar demographic and economic situations, and similar or differing ecological characteristics. Application of collaborative planning processes, to include identification of stakeholders or user groups, user interests, collaborative resource planning and conflict resolution, will be required to achieve the MBNEP's goal for successful implementation of a CCMP. This study will be a test case for these methods.

As a result of increasing opportunities for participation in international trade, the Theodore Industrial Park is experiencing conflicting user demands. The MBNEP has selected the East Fowl River and the Deer River Watershed (HV03160205-030), encompassing the Theodore Industrial Park, as a test case in conflict resolution and comprehensive planning for the area to ensure that future development is accomplished in an environmentally sustainable manner.

The MBNEP will enter into a collaborative effort with the Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs (ADECA), Coastal Programs to examine user group conflicts and possible resolutions for the Theodore Industrial area. The MBNEP effort involves profiling user groups of the area, identifying user group conflicts and interests, and assessing the possibility of negotiation (consensus) among these groups. An examination of this type could provide insight for the development of a successful, implementable CCMP.

A MBNEP/ADECA subcommittee will guide this process and, if warranted, work should be conducted within the framework of the MBNEP Data and Information Management System (DIMS). This study is considered a priority effort of the human uses workgroup for development of an implementation plan for the CCMP. This workplan item will be coordinated with the Land Use Planning Effort (Workplan Item 2.3). Efforts will also be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Profile user groups in the Theodore Ship Channel/Industrial Park.
2. Identify user groups' conflicts and interests.
3. Provide recommendations on the feasibility of conflict resolution.

4. If necessary, use these results to aid ADECA in defining the specific areas of conflict.
5. If warranted, deliver this information into the MBNEP DIMS.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	120 days
Final Report.....	180 days

2.8 Examination of Species at Risk Conservation Practices

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$10,000
Priority Problem:	Living Resources
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

The adequacy of federal and state practices regarding the protection of species at risk are not known. In addition, the monitoring and updating of listed species is believed to be insufficient. Based on the results of the Base Programs Analysis, this workplan item calls for an examination of those state regulations and recommendations on the necessity of expansion of regulations, better enforcement of regulations, and updating of protected species lists. The recommendations from this work element will be useful in the refinement of the monitoring plan and will provide the groundwork for any future priority action of the CCMP for maintenance and wise stewardship of the living resource base of the Mobile Bay estuarine system.

This study is a priority effort of the living resource workgroup for development of management plans for the CCMP and should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS) and the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Game and Fish Division. Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Examine existing federal, state, and local practices regarding protection of species at risk, including enforcement and updating of lists.
2. Assess plans from other areas that specifically deal with protection of species at risk.
3. Make specific recommendations based upon the above information for improvement, if needed, of existing species at risk regulations, enforcement, monitoring, and listing of protected species.
4. If warranted, deliver results into the MBNEP DIMS.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	120 days
Final Report.....	180 days

2.9 Bycatch Assessment

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	No NEP funds
Priority Problem:	Living Resources
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

The impact of bycatch on extant populations of fish in the MBNEP area is unknown. If the federal authorities implement Bycatch Reduction Device (BRD) requirements for federal waters, it is important to determine the extent of this impact, if any, for informed decision-making in state waters. This workplan item calls for promotion of an assessment of bycatch impacts on fish populations within the MBNEP area (similar to Louisiana efforts) and recommendations for action based upon those results. Results from this type of assessment will be useful in developing priority action plans in the CCMP for maintenance and wise stewardship of the living resource base of the Mobile Bay estuarine system.

This study is a priority effort of the living resource workgroup for development of management actions for the CCMP and should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS). Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated. Special efforts will be made to ensure cooperation with appropriate responsible agencies (e.g., AL Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Marine Resources Division).

Project Objectives:

1. Facilitate implementation of a bycatch assessment study that will determine the impact of bycatch on extant fish populations in the MBNEP area.
2. Make specific recommendations based upon the above information for dealing with bycatch reduction issues.
3. If warranted, deliver results into the MBNEP DIMS.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	300 days
Final Report.....	365 days

2.10 Survey of Bird Nesting Areas

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$15,000
Priority Problem:	Habitat Loss, Living Resources
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

Establishing a baseline for colonial nesting birds (including shorebirds, seabirds, and wading birds) sites in the MBNEP area is important for developing action items for the CCMP. The quality and quantity of bird nesting sites may be an important indicator of ecosystem health and extent of human impacts. A complete inventory of all colonial nesting bird sites in the MBNEP area has not been completed in recent history. Partial surveys for bird-nesting sites were conducted as part of the Mobile Bay symposiums. Documentation of existing colonial nesting bird sites is essential to developing a conservation plan that may include protection of existing sites and management or enhancement of others. This study is a priority effort of the Habitat Loss and Living Resources workgroups for the development of management plans for the CCMP and should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS) and the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Mobile Bay Audubon Society, and the Game and Fish Division. Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Use databases collected in the habitat and living resources characterizations to determine whether colonial bird nesting sites are still active and document new sites.
 2. Develop a map of existing nesting sites in GIS format.
 3. Based on the previous objectives, develop CCMP action plans for the following:
 - Identify options for dealing with any increases or decreases in bird nesting sites, taking into account a qualitative assessment of threats to existing nesting sites.
 - Identify species needing additional management of nesting sites and recommend specific management measures necessary to improve their abundance including public outreach, habitat manipulations, protection options, etc.
1. If warranted, deliver results into the MBNEP DIMS.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	120 days
Final Report.....	180 days

2.11 Introduced or Nuisance Species Impacts

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	No NEP funds (Needed Outside Funding—\$20,000)
Priority Problem:	All
MBNEP Project Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
Designated Reviewer:	TAC

The extent of habitat impacts in the MBNEP area due to introduced or nuisance species' impacts is unknown. Before appropriate action plans can be developed a determination of the present and potential impacts of introduced or nuisance species is needed. An examination of existing local regulations, legislative limitations and/or provisions, other states' plans, and relevant scientific information should prove useful in developing adequate regulations along these lines, if warranted. In addition, a public education element is important in preventing or alleviating any associated problems (see Public Participation Workplan Item 3.8). The species to be addressed by this workplan item will be determined by a living resources workgroup prioritization that is to be based upon the Living Resource Characterization Study.

This study is a priority effort of the water quality, habitat loss, living resources and human uses workgroups for development of management plans for the CCMP and should be closely coordinated with the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS). Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Catalogue and provide background biology, ecology, relative abundance, and controls for species that are considered nuisance species or have been introduced into the MBNEP area (Species to be addressed will be determined by the living resources issues' workgroup and the Living Resources Characterization Study).
2. Determine the extent of habitat, living resource, water quality, and human use impacts of introduced or nuisance species in the MBNEP area.
3. Examine existing Alabama legal authority to regulate and enforce the transportation, introduction and/or sale of introduced or nuisance species.
3. Research introduced or nuisance species regulatory and enforcement programs in other states.
4. Make recommendations and develop appropriate legislation for the control of exotic/nuisance species, including the costs and process of implementing the control methods versus the benefits derived.
5. If appropriate, deliver this information into the MBNEP DIMS.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	30 days
Progress Report.....	Midterm
Draft Report.....	300 days
Final Report.....	365 days

2.12 Action Plan Demonstration Projects (APDPs) -- Technical Tasks

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$75,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Lisa R. Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Management Conference

Several known priority problems are occurring within the MBNEP study area that are readily apparent even before characterization. Early action projects that can demonstrate or assess the effectiveness of small-scale remedial strategies, while providing information that can be applied basinwide, are known as Action Plan Demonstration Projects (APDPs). Several of these APDPs are integral to some of the Year Three technical workplan items described above or to previously proposed strategies from other similar, ongoing efforts. Where feasible, small disadvantaged communities will be targeted for these projects. Specific project deliverables, schedules, and budgets are to be determined.

Action Plan Demonstration Projects will be considered for all projects that have a potential impact on the priority issues of the Mobile Bay National Estuary Program.

Potential Project Objectives:

1. Restoration of emergent wetlands in high priority areas.
2. Implementation, on a small-scale, of the previously recommended monitoring plan for (a) key species (i.e., Year Two (FY98) Workplan Item 1.6, "Identification of Key Living Resources") to assess the suitability of the chosen species as a bioindicator of the Bay's health and of the plan itself.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Project Workplan.....	TBD
Progress Report.....	TBD
Draft Report.....	TBD
Final Report.....	TBD

3.0 Public Participation and Education Activities

Successful implementation of a CCMP that is truly consensus-based is dependent upon three factors:

- Development of action plans that effectively address the priority problems facing Mobile Bay and the Delta while also addressing local concerns and problems,
- Communication efforts designed to incorporate local input while effectively placing local concerns in the larger context of a comprehensive, area-wide plan, and
- Belief throughout the community that recommendations are unbiased and based on the best available information.

Year Three efforts will focus on carrying the message from the issue workgroups regarding proposed action items to as broad an audience as possible through continued implementation of the Public Participation Strategy. A key new element will be implementation of Local Community Initiatives designed to help communities better understand the cumulative impacts of local problems and the benefits of a comprehensive management plan. Additional efforts such as the Report to the Stakeholders, the Communication Strategy for the Monitoring Plan, MBNEP sponsored workshops and other outreach activities will incorporate scientific and technical results as the basis for proposed actions to be included in the CCMP.

All scientific and technical elements of the public participation and education program will be coordinated with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). A summary of Public Participation and Education workplan items for Year Three (FY99) is provided below.

Year Three (FY99) Public Participation and Education Workplan Items

3.1	MBNEP Public Participation Strategy – Action Plan for Year Three (FY99)
3.1.1	MBNEP Public Participation Strategy - Local Community Initiative
3.1.2	MBNEP PPS - Communication Strategy for the Monitoring Program Plan
3.2	MBNEP Communication Plan for Report to Stakeholders
3.3	MBNEP Newsletter
3.4	MBNEP Fact Sheets
3.5	MBNEP Speakers Bureau
3.6	MBNEP Workshops
3.7	MBNEP Action Plan Demonstration Projects (APDPs) – Public Education
3.8	MBNEP Education Plan for Introduced or Nuisance Species Impacts
3.9	MBNEP Participation in Mobile Bay Day / Earth Day Events

3.1 MBNEP Public Participation Strategy—Action Plan for Year Three (FY99)

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	No NEP funds
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	MBNEP Citizens Advisory Committee

Action plans for the Year Three (FY99) Public Participation Strategy (PPS) focus on building momentum toward implementation of the CCMP. PPS activities, begun in the second half of Year Two, are continued with additional emphasis on communicating potential action items to target audiences.

A critique of public participation efforts to date will be provided at the beginning of the program year, including plans to better inform the Management Conference of the progress of public participation efforts. Emphasis will be placed on tracking activities, reporting results and seeking input and guidance from committee chairs and others. Changes will also be made, if necessary, to reflect any revisions of MBNEP timelines.

The Program Office will emphasize developing partnership opportunities for public involvement projects and will also continue to seek to incorporate lessons learned from other NEP's.

Project Objectives:

1. Work with the Management Conference, especially the CAC, to continue implementation of the PPS.
2. Provide quarterly status reports, highlighting results and modifications to proposed plans.
3. Solicit and evaluate feedback from the Management Conference.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Critique of efforts to date including recommendations	Oct. 1, 1998
Activity reports.....	Quarterly
Revisions based on lessons learned.....	As needed

3.1.1 MBNEP Public Participation Strategy – Local Community Initiatives

Performing Organization:	TBA
Principal Investigator:	TBA
Total Funding:	\$15,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti/ Lisa Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee Technical Advisory Committee

To more clearly associate the goals of the MBNEP, as well as action items which may be included in the draft CCMP, to the problems and concerns of local communities, the Program Office will set up "Local Community Initiatives." These initiatives will be instrumental in building local support for the CCMP by incorporating into the CCMP local actions addressing local concerns. Vital information concerning specific action items individual communities may commit to will be generated to support Workplan Item 1.2, "Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy."

Working with the Data and Information Management System, six or more regions within the MBNEP study area will be identified as "Local Communities." Each area will be characterized demographically with problems specific to that region highlighted. Included will be a data base of key local stakeholders (elected officials, citizen groups, business and industry representatives, community leaders, etc.), those with and without MBNEP experience. A local community "white paper," detailing identified problems along with possible action items developed by the issue work groups, will be prepared and distributed.

The Citizens Advisory Committee and the Program Office will host local public forums and invite input on items each community feels may best address local problems and concerns. The result will be the identification of problems that can be addressed within the boundaries of the "local community" while highlighting those problems that must be addressed as part of a larger, more comprehensive effort.

It is important to note that these initiatives represent much more than simply hosting regional CAC meetings. Funding required for this workplan item will create a minimum of six regional data bases, cover six regional mailouts, produce six "white papers," print six meeting summaries, and other support activities. Some activities will be contracted out and some handled by the Program Office and CAC members.

The result will be to ensure local community problems and concerns are included in the CCMP and to ensure that no group is excluded. Following the local public forums, Workplan Item 1.2 will seek to "close the loop" by soliciting commitments from each local community on implementation of specific action items and by securing support for broader strategies designed to address larger issues.

Project Objectives:

1. To inform local leaders about potential action items and involve community stakeholder groups in the process of developing a CCMP.

2. Identify for each "local community" CCMP action items they can implement to address local problems.
3. Identify for each "local community" CCMP action items beyond the scope of their control, thereby highlighting the need for cooperation and collaboration.
4. Get buy-in from local communities with the ultimate goal to obtain commitments for funding and implementation of specific action items. Provide information to support Workplan Item 1.2, "Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy."

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Identify "local communities" and build data base for each.....	1 st Quarter
Develop "white paper" on each area and produce.....	1 st Quarter
Distribute "white papers" and host community forums.....	2 nd Quarter
Identify "local community" action items and solicit commitments.....	See FY99 Item 1.2

3.1.2 MBNEP PPS – Communication Strategy for the Monitoring Program Plan

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	\$2,500
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee

The significance of the Monitoring Program Plan (see Workplan Item 1.3) for an NEP is in tracking progress toward goals of the CCMP and identifying any need for course corrections. For the community, the significance is its focus on addressing questions raised by concerned citizens and scientists. Therefore, its true success lies in an effective communication strategy to inform the public about the status of water quality and living resources throughout the coastal waters of Alabama.

The focus of this strategy is to create awareness about the effort itself, highlighting aspects such as interagency cooperation, the role of business and industry monitoring and the opportunity for citizens to take an active part through voluntary monitoring efforts. This focus also includes the importance of effectively communicating results from the monitoring efforts.

An important communication tool will be the Data and Information Management System. The DIMS will allow water quality and living resources data to be compiled and accessible to individuals representing a wide range of interests and meeting many different needs. Users will range from policy makers and agency representatives to citizens and students. Users will also include groups outside of the defined NEP boundaries who are interested in benefiting from lessons learned from the MBNEP effort.

Project Objectives:

1. Develop a DIMS User's Guide introducing non-technical individuals to the DIMS. This guide will provide an overview of the information available about living resources and water quality and explain how to get answers to individual questions.
2. Work with local environmental educators to develop a Teacher's Guide to support their environmental education curricula.
3. Develop a DIMS Media Guide outlining the variety of information available, the schedule for when the information is updated and a Media Page that could be downloaded by the Media as needed. Selected information (water quality at the Fairhope Pier, for example) can also be formatted as "camera ready copy" to be run in local newspapers and newsletters. Work to encourage additional efforts like the Alabama Coastal Foundations' "ads" reporting water quality data.
4. Communicate to target audiences and the public in general the wide range of living resource and water quality data available through the World Wide Web.

5. Develop additional support materials such as slide presentations added to the Speakers Bureau inventory, maps highlighting particular areas, video presentations, etc. to be used in communicating how and why a monitoring strategy is important and for strengthening community support and participation.

Project Deliverables:

Develop Media Guide and materials	1 st Quarter
Develop Teacher's Guide.....	1 st Quarter
Draft User Guide for DIMS, focusing on water quality, habitat, and living resources data.....	2 nd Quarter
Identify and Develop additional support materials including Speakers Bureau presentation.....	2 nd Quarter

3.2 MBNEP Communication Strategy for Report to the Stakeholders and Draft CCMP

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	\$7,500
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee

The release to the public of the Report to the Stakeholders is a significant milestone toward implementation of the CCMP. As such it represents an integral part of the Program Office's overall communication efforts. In addition to broad distribution to a range of stakeholders, it is imperative that key audiences are specifically reached.

Funded in Year Two (FY98), the Report to the Stakeholders will be delivered in the second quarter of Year Three (FY99), in order to include summaries from the preliminary characterization studies. It will lay the groundwork for the release of the draft CCMP later in Year Three. As part of the scope of work the contractor will deliver appropriate communication pieces including a Speakers Bureau presentation and executive summary. This workplan item is designed to complement the work of Speakers Bureau members and the general distribution plan.

Funds will be used to produce a short video appropriate for both the Report to the Stakeholders and the Draft CCMP. Additional efforts will include advertising in selected media, advance notice teasers, targeted direct mail and other communication measures. These efforts will be in addition to on-going contacts included as part of the media strategy in the Public Participation Strategy.

Project Objectives:

1. Build anticipation with selected stakeholders for the release of the Report to Stakeholders.
2. Position the Report to receive positive coverage reflecting progress toward the CCMP.
3. Create a demand for Speakers Bureau presentations and other opportunities to get out a positive message about the MBNEP.
4. Generate the opportunity for feedback from the community providing the Program Office with valuable information for consideration prior to the release of the draft CCMP.
5. Modify presentation materials to support the draft CCMP.
6. Repeat the most effective communication efforts in advance of the release of the draft CCMP.
7. Provide opportunity for public comment as required.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Develop Timeline (in conjunction with the contractor), i.e. establish target release date, date for mailing teaser cards, date for executive summary and date for a limited number of advance copies.....1st Quarter
Identify targets and design products accordingly.....1st Quarter
Implement strategy including feedback from stakeholders.....2nd Quarter
Develop timeline for communication efforts prior to the release of the CCMP.....TBD

3.3 MBNEP Newsletter

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	\$6,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee

During Year Three (FY99), the MBNEP will continue joint efforts with the Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs and the Alabama Coastal Foundation to publish four (4) newsletters during the program year.

Each issue will highlight Year Three (FY99) MBNEP activities leading toward the development of the CCMP, as well as additional information about the unique features and characteristics of the study area. Production runs will continue to be monitored (currently 2,500 up from 2,000 copies per newsletter) and may be expanded as opportunities arise to reach new audiences. Regular features, written in an easy to understand style and targeted to the general community, will be continued. Efforts will be made to target specific audiences by further expanding the mailing list and by providing articles to be included in other newsletters. The continued effectiveness of the joint newsletter will be evaluated during Year Three (FY99) with recommendations issued for changes as necessary.

Year Three (FY99) funding represents a \$2,000 increase over Year Two (FY 98) funding to allow for a special edition issued to announce the draft CCMP.

Project Objectives:

1. Continue to expand and maintain joint mailing list.
2. Identify existing newsletters and work to include MBNEP articles.
3. Solicit suggestions for future topics from the Management Conference and other sources.
4. Print and distribute four (4) quarterly newsletters during Year Three (FY99).
5. Determine the need for a "special edition," develop timeline and implement as warranted.

Project Deliverables and Schedule:

Produce and distribute four newsletters (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer)	Quarterly
Special Edition	As Warranted

3.4 MBNEP Fact Sheets

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	\$5,000 (FY96 dollars)
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti/Lisa Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee Technical Advisory Committee

Additional "white paper" fact sheets will be developed during Year Three (FY99) in order to provide a more detailed explanation of issues concerning the Mobile Bay estuarine system and the goals of the MBNEP. The fact sheets will serve to enhance the public's understanding and awareness of certain priority issues. They will be used in a variety of ways in support of the public outreach and education effort. It is expected that four (4) to six (6) summaries will be written and distributed during Year Three. The focus may highlight an area of concern, report on positive results from APDP efforts or communicate information about overall program activities.

The fact sheets will include a map of the study area, emphasizing the area featured, as well as a synopsis of the MBNEP activities for readers who may not have seen other MBNEP materials. The combined expertise of both the TAC and CAC will help ensure an effective message while the Program Office will oversee actual development.

Project Objectives:

1. Develop a standard format for fact sheets.
2. Identify potential target audiences and topics.
3. Draft copy and submit to TAC and CAC for review.
4. Produce and distribute as required to support ongoing activities of the Program Office.

Project Deliverables and Schedule:

Copies of Completed Fact Sheets.....As Available

3.5 MBNEP Speakers Bureau

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	No NEP Funds
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee

The Speakers Bureau, implemented during the second half of Year Two (FY98), will continue to serve a vital role in reaching a variety of grassroots organizations throughout the study area. Volunteers will be provided with the proper knowledge and experience to accurately communicate MBNEP goals to diverse and sometimes antagonist audiences. CAC Speakers Bureau members will be able to attend speaker training sessions, in order to ensure a consistent, professional delivery reflecting the goals and mission of the MBNEP. Additional Speakers Bureau members will be recruited from the Management Conference to speak on specific technical/scientific issues.

Speakers Bureau members will utilize presentation materials developed during Year Two (FY98), including fact sheets, portable information displays, and other information pieces. Additional presentations will be developed to support the Stakeholders Report, Monitoring Plan and Local Community Initiatives workplan items.

Feedback cards will be provided to each audience to allow the Program Office to evaluate the effectiveness of the presentations as well as to identify additional information requested by the group.

Project Objectives:

1. Continue to contact target groups and solicit speaking engagements.
2. Develop a list of speakers for the Speakers Bureau and the topics they are comfortable addressing.
3. Identify underrepresented areas and recruit additional speakers.
4. Evaluate the need for advanced training and develop accordingly.
5. Incorporate new presentations as they become available.
6. Report to Management Conference on effectiveness of Speakers Bureau.

Project Deliverables and Schedule:

Track speeches, Q & A, and evaluations and report to Management Conference.....	Quarterly
Recognize speakers in the newsletter and through other opportunities.....	On-going

3.6 MBNEP Workshops

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	\$5000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti/Lisa Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee/ Technical Advisory Committee

During Year Three (FY99), workshop/forums will again be implemented in response to specific issues raised or as a continuation of efforts from previous years. The Program Office will seek to coordinate with other organizations or agencies to host or co-sponsor these workshops.

The workshops/forums will also be designed to effectively seek input from the community and incorporate the results in continued efforts of the Management Conference. Workshops will be designed to cover a variety of topics and target audiences throughout the study area. Some potential topics and locations are outlined below.

Potential Workshop/Forums:

1. Soil Conservation and Erosion Control (repeat) to address the impacts of sedimentation throughout the study area, the importance of good soil conservation and erosion control methods and the role of individual citizens, business and industry in addressing this issue.
2. A Wetlands Workshop designed to inform the public about the types and importance of wetlands throughout the study area.
3. Alabama Yards and Neighborhoods will promote the concept of sustainable landscaping to target groups such as individual home owners and property managers, landscape professionals, and public and private organizations involved in land management and real estate.
4. A Citizen Monitoring workshop will focus on regulatory monitoring and developing monitoring actions to coordinate with existing agencies and regulations.

Project Deliverables and Schedule:

Quarterly Calendar of Events	Quarterly
Progress Reports.....	Quarterly

3.7 MBNEP Action Plan Demonstration Projects (APDPs) - Public Education Tasks

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$25,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti/Lisa Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee/ Technical Advisory Committee

Efforts will continue in Year Three (FY99) to solicit and identify additional CCMP-related activities with wide public exposure. Requests will be issued seeking community groups or individuals to initiate projects designed to heighten the public's awareness of the estuary and translate public concerns into meaningful actions. In order to maximize the \$25,000 appropriated for educational APDPs, efforts will be made to develop partnerships and share resources.

A CAC subcommittee will coordinate public education-related APDPs with support from the MBNEP Program Office. All technical components will include a review by the TAC. Previously established selection criteria will remain in place during Year Three (FY99).

Project Objectives:

1. Monitor pending actions on APDPs and report to the Management Conference.
2. Work with members of the Management Conference, especially the CAC and TAC to identify potential APDPs and develop.
3. Select and initiate additional projects, recommending funding levels and parameters.
4. Report results to Management Conference.

Project Deliverables/Schedule:

Identify Potential APDPs	1 st Quarter
Project Workplans.....	Bimonthly
Bimonthly Reports Beginning.....	Dec. 1, 1998
Final Report to Management Conference.....	Sept. 30, 1999

3.8 MBNEP Education Plan for Introduced or Nuisance Species Impacts

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	No NEP Funds
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee

An important element in preventing or alleviating problems associated with introduced or nuisance species will be educating the public. This effort will focus on creating partnerships designed to incorporate messages about the potential harm and environmental costs from introduced or nuisance species. Implementation of this workplan item will be dependent on securing funding for Workplan Item 2.11.

Target groups such as nurseries, recreational boaters, shipping interests, horticultural clubs, exotic pet stores, etc. will be identified and appropriate messages crafted for each audience. Efforts will also include reaching out to appropriate agencies and other organizations to seek partnerships and funding.

This workplan item will also be tied in to the MBNEP Data Information and Management System (DIMS). Efforts will be made to coordinate the project with other similar, ongoing programs and projects to build upon and ensure that efforts are not duplicated.

Project Objectives:

1. Draft a communication effort, including target audiences and messages working with the contractor.
2. Implement plan based on timeline developed in conjunction with the contractor.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Submit communication plan including target audiences.....	3 rd Quarter
Implement education plan.....	4 th Quarter

3.9 MBNEP Participation in Mobile Bay Day/Earth Day Events

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	\$2,500
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Danny Calametti
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	Citizens Advisory Committee

Earth Day festivities take on particular significance for the Mobile Bay NEP when they are focused on celebrating Mobile Bay Day/Earth Day. This workplan item will support the efforts to implement the CCMP by communicating, in an environmental setting, how the measures proposed help reach the program goals. Participation will build on continued efforts to foster positive relationships with key environmental citizen organizations.

Additional Earth Week opportunities will be explored including possible participation in school functions, other environmental or agency public forums, workshops, etc. A CAC subcommittee will be formed to coordinate Mobile Bay Day/Earth Day activities and make recommendations for participation in other events. This subcommittee will also work closely with the Program Office to conduct the 1999 Stewardship Awards program.

Funds will be used to promote the Stewardships Awards and to support Earth Week activities such as possible tent rental, special signs and science fair awards, etc.

Project Objectives:

1. A CAC subcommittee will be formed to work with participating organizations to facilitate participation in the annual event as well as other Earth Week events as appropriate.
2. The committee will also review the MBNEP Stewardship Awards program and make any recommendations for changes to the CAC and Program Office.
3. The goal of both of these efforts is to increase awareness of the CCMP while recognizing those individuals and groups who are demonstrated good stewards.

Project Deliverables and Schedules:

Recruit interested CAC members to serve on subcommittee.....	1 st Quarter
Review the Stewardships Award program and make recommendations	1 st Quarter
Present proposals for participation in Bay Day/Earth Day and/or other events.....	Jan., 1999
Implement plans for the 1999 Stewardship Awards and Earth Week activities.....	2 nd Quarter

4.0 Program Administration

A new item in the Program Administration element has been added as a result of the Report on the Data and Information Management System for the Mobile Bay NEP. The Final Report recommended that the Mobile Bay NEP "hire a part time person or contract for the services of a part time person" to maintain the DIMS and coordinate data activities with other entities. The implementation of this effort is scheduled to begin in Year Two (FY98).

4.1 Maintenance of the Data and Information Management System

Performing Organization:	TBD
Principal Investigator:	TBD
Total Funding:	\$17,000
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Mary A. Knight/Lisa Mills
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	N/A

The Final Report and Recommendations on Data and Information Management System (DIMS) for the MBNEP recommended that the Mobile Bay NEP should either hire a part time person or contract for the services of a part time person. This employee/contractor, the Report stated, is needed to assist the Program Office with coordinating the data related activities of the various contractors as well as coordinating data activities with other Federal, state, and local organizations. It is essential to ensure that all new data collected is compliant with the overall data base design and that the required MetaData be compiled into the overall MetaData Database. The person could also coordinate activities with the Gulf of Mexico Program staff to ensure some form of data consistency, be responsible for maintenance and updating of the MBNEP Website (homepage), and assist users with data access and information retrieval.

The Report recommended that requirements for the position include a working knowledge of ArcView GIS Software, Access Database Management Software, a basic understanding of Web-related technologies, and also a working knowledge of basic scientific database management, design and manipulation. The Management Committee, after discussion of the Draft Year Three (FY99) Workplan, recommended that a contractor be hired.

Project Objectives:

1. Hire contractor to coordinate data requirements for the DIMS with other federal, state and local entities.
2. Coordinate with Gulf of Mexico Program Staff to ensure data consistency.

4.2 Administrative Support for the Management Conference

Performing Organization:	MBNEP Program Office
Principal Investigator:	N/A
Total Funding:	\$196,500*
Priority Issues:	All
MBNEP Coordinator:	Mary A. Knight
MBNEP Designated Reviewer:	N/A

The MBNEP Program Office works closely with all of the MBNEP Management Conference committees and answers directly to the Policy Committee (Figure 1). Task 4.2 will provide resources for the Program Office to continue program planning, implementation, evaluation, and reporting. Staff will provide organizational and logistical support for all of the Management Conference committee meetings and coordinate/communicate as necessary with appropriate groups, including user groups, state, local and Federal agencies, and professional groups relevant to CCMP development and implementation.

Staff will:

- Prepare following year workplans and budgets;
- Prepare annual EPA Cooperative Agreement grant applications;
- Administer grants/contracts;
- Amend the Cooperative Agreement workplan as necessary;
- Monitor projects including coordination of workplans, progress reports, and draft/final reports with principal investigators;
- Coordinate project workplans and activities with other local, state and Federal agencies; and,
- Provide for overall Program coordination.

Program staff will participate in regional, state, and national conferences and meetings relevant to estuarine management. EPA has earmarked \$10,000 of program funds for travel related to outreach and technology and information transfer. Attendance at Association of National Estuary Programs workshops and EPA workshops/meetings will be stressed. The remaining portion of the funds will be utilized as earmarked. The additional \$5,000 in travel funds will be used for travel associated with routine program administration, coordination with EPA Region 4, the Gulf of Mexico Program, and other Federal, state, and local agencies.

In addition to the above, each of the four Program staff will be assigned particular duties and responsibilities, including (but not limited to) the following:

Program Director: Responsible for ensuring completion of the commitments set forth in the MBNEP Management Conference Agreement. Provides staff support for each committee and subcommittee of the Management Conference and coordinates activities to ensure successful and timely completion of scheduled deliverables identified in the annual workplan. Responsible for the financial planning of the Program. Serves as point of contact for media and other external inquiries, and provides liaison between the MBNEP Management Conference and other National Estuary Programs for exchange of information relevant to the development of an effective CCMP.

Scientific Program Coordinator: Coordinates and supervises the development of MBNEP scientific and technical programs. Performs key tasks related to the development of action items required for CCMP development and building consensus among the Mobile Bay community. Works closely with the Program Director to coordinate and support Management Conference committee meetings and any other business. Initiates contact with area professionals and professional organizations involved in estuarine management.

Public Outreach and Education Coordinator: Coordinates and supervises the development of MBNEP outreach and education programs. Performs key tasks related to educating the public and building consensus among the Mobile Bay community. Translates information pertaining to the MBNEP into lay terminology and prepares printed and electronic media educational materials to be used in public outreach efforts. Works closely with the Program Director to coordinate and support Management Conference committee meetings and any other business. Initiates contact and educates interest groups on the MBNEP.

Professional Secretary: Works closely with the Program Director and Staff. Conducts general secretarial and receptionist duties. Responsible for general office management. Provides staff and logistical support to Management Conference committees and subcommittees and is responsible for the accurate preparation of meeting minutes and other reporting requirements as a result of such meetings. Assists in the development and quality control of work standards.

Project Deliverables and Schedule:

Program Quarterly Reports.....	Quarterly
Year-end Report.....	Sept. 30, 1999
Management Conference Meeting Minutes.....	Monthly
Updates to Management Conference Directory.....	As Needed

*Salaries for the Scientific Program Coordinator and Public Outreach and Education Coordinator are not included in the Program Administration total. See Table XX, "Mobile Bay National Estuary Program Third Year Budget," sections 2.0 and 3.0 for these salaries.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1
MOBILE BAY NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM THIRD YEAR (FY99) BUDGET

WORK ELEMENT		(748,667 Total)
1.0	REQUIRED CCMP COMPONENTS	
1.1	Writing CCMP	25,000
1.2	Finance Plan and Implementation Strategy	15,000 (+ 22,500-Yr. 2)
1.3	Monitoring Program Plan	30,000
1.4	Federal Consistency Review	10,000
1.5	Printing	50,000
	SUBTOTAL	130,000 (+22,500-Yr. 2)
2.0	SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL COMPONENTS	
2.1	Wetlands/SAV Survey	60,000 ¹
2.2	Modeling/Water Quality Priorities	85,000 ²
2.3	Land Use Planning Effort	8,000
2.4	GIS Layering Effort	20,000
2.5	Living Resources Data Synthesis/Analysis	TBD
2.6	Sediment Contamination Analysis	48,667* ³
2.7	Profile of User Groups/Theodore Ship Channel	15,000
2.8	Examination of Species at Risk Conservation Practices	10,000
2.9	Bycatch Assessment	No NEP funds ⁴
2.10	Survey of Bird Nesting Sites	15,000
2.11	Introduced/Nuisance Species Impacts	No NEP funds ⁵
2.12	APDPs	75,000* ⁶
	Scientific Program Coordinator	54,000 ⁷
	SUBTOTAL	290,667 (+100,000-Year 2)
3.0	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND EDUCATION	
3.1	Public Participation Strategy	No NEP funds
3.1.1	Local Community Initiative	15,000
3.1.2	Communication Strategy/Monitoring Plan	2,500
3.2	Stakeholders/Draft CCMP Comm. Plan	7,500
3.3	Newsletter	6,000
3.4	Fact Sheets	5,000
3.5	Speakers Bureau	No NEP funds
3.6	Workshops	5,000
3.7	APDPs	25,000*
3.8	Education Plan/Introduced Species Impacts	No NEP funds
3.9	Participation in Mobile Bay Day/Earth Events	2,500
	Public Outreach Coordinator	44,400 ¹
	SUBTOTAL	114,500

4.0 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

4.1 DIMS Maintenance	17,000 ¹
4.2 Administrative Support	
4.2.1 Director	73,800 ²
4.2.2 Secretary	24,800 ³
4.3 Travel—Training (601)	5,000
4.3.1 Travel—Outreach & Technology Transfer	10,000*
4.4 Telephone/Internet (604)	7,000 ⁴
4.5 Postage (605)	11,177
4.6 Maintenance and Repairs (606)	2,000
4.7 Service Contracts on Equipment (607)	3,000 ⁵
4.8 Rental Equipment (613)	3,000 ⁶
4.9 Rental Facilities (Office [8640], Meetings [1500])(614)	10,140 ⁷
4.10 Subscription Dues (617)	500
4.11 Membership (618)	1,000 ⁸
4.12 Other Contractual Service (639)	1,000
4.13 Office Supplies (641)	10,000
4.14 Advertising (667)	2,000 ⁹
Administrative Cost (678)	<u>33,683¹⁰</u>
SUBTOTAL	\$213,500
TOTAL	\$748,667

*EPA budget guidance, cannot be changed.

Notes for Scientific/Technical Components:

¹This is a Year 2 Workplan Item approved for 2 years: 90,000 in Year 2 (increased to 108,000) and 60,000 in Year 3. NOTE: Current estimates are that this entire effort will cost 258,514 and thus would require an additional 90,302 (outside this budget) to complete.

²This is a Year 2 Workplan Item approved for 2 years: 115,000 in Year 2 and 85,000 in Year 3.

³ This Workplan Item was chosen to use EPA earmarked funds, which must be spent pursuant to EPA guidelines with report due on results 9/30/99. Earmark is 36,500 with 12,167 required state/local match for total of 48,667.

⁴This Workplan Item is not funded; program staff will facilitate search for outside resources to accomplish.

⁵This Workplan Item is not funded; 20,000 from outside resources must be found to fund the item.

⁶3/4 of total APDP budget of 100,000. Rest is in Public Education/Outreach.

⁷Includes provision for up to 6% base salary increase over FY98.

Notes for Public Participation and Education:

¹Includes provision for up to 6% base salary increase over FY98.

Notes for Program Administration:

¹Per DIMS final recommendation; contractual or salaried employee half-time.

²Includes provision for up to 6% base salary increase over FY98.

³Includes provision for up to 6% base salary increase over FY98.

⁴Monthly charges:

BellSouth (system and local)	325
BellSouth (Internet line)	52
Gulf Telephone (long dist.)	100
Zebranet (internet access)	38
WilTel (maint. contract)	<u>40</u>
	555/month

⁵Monthly contracts of \$48/copier and \$25/fax plus copies over and above contract amount (16¢/copy). FY98 amount was 2,000. Assumes increased copying for draft action plans and CCMP.

⁶Copier: 12 months @ 242.00.

⁷Total rent is 11,520. Includes in-kind match of 25% from Faulkner State Community College.

⁸Association of National Estuary Programs annual dues.

⁹Public meetings for the CCMP; announcement of public availability and comment period for CCMP.

¹⁰Total would be 44,910 assuming all cash match (6% of 748,500); amount here includes in-kind match of 25% from Faulkner State Community College.

TABLE 2
FUNDING TABLE FOR YEAR THREE (FY99)

<u>Source of Funds</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Total</u>
EPA Federal Funds:		
Base Funding	\$400,000	
Travel	10,000	
APDP	75,000	
Tier V Supplement	40,000	
FY98 NEP Earmark	36,500	
<u>Subtotal</u>		\$561,500
State/Local Funds for Year Three (FY99):		<u>187,167</u>
<u>Total FY98 Funds for Year Three (FY99)</u>		\$748,667
Federal FY97 Funds from Year Two (FY98)		91,875
State/Local FY97 Funds from Year Two (FY98)		<u>30,625</u>
<u>Total FY97 Funds from Year Two (FY98)</u>		\$122,500
TOTAL FUNDS FOR YEAR THREE		\$871,167

<u>Match Information</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Total Year Three (FY99) Federal Funds	\$653,375	75
Total Year Three (FY99) Non-Federal Match	<u>\$217,792</u>	<u>25</u>
TOTAL	\$848,667	100

FIGURE 1

MOBILE BAY NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

