

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN NORTH CAROLINA'S COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

CIRCULATING COPY

Sea Grant Depository

APR 15 1974
SEA GRANT DEPOSITORY
84

By
STEVE TILLEY

REPORT NO. 74-4
JUNE, 1974



CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN NORTH CAROLINA'S
COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

by

Steve Tilley
June 28, 1974

This report was prepared while the author was a Research Assistant with the Center for Marine and Coastal Studies, North Carolina State University with financial assistance from the North Carolina Sea Grant Program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people helped me to conceive and prepare this report. Naomi Pēna, Bill Lott and Delilah Blanks helped me in becoming aware of the need for citizens to be involved and in organizing my thoughts for this study. I would like to thank all the people of New Hanover County who gave freely of their time and extended their hospitality to me while I conducted the study. Dr. Jay Langfelder has given me a great deal of assistance and the freedom to do what I thought was best. For this I am very grateful. Secretaries, Paula Howell and Faye Brooks, have always been cheerful to work with. Again, I would like to thank Christine Parke for her encouragement and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. The Need for Communication	2
III. Present Local and State Participation Efforts	4
IV. Defining Meaningful Participation	14
V. Encouraging Public Interest in Coastal Management Issues	17
VI. Conclusions	22
Footnotes	
Appendix A: By-Laws, Cartaret County Environmental Resources Commission.	A1-A4
Appendix B: Implementation (or, steps in establishing a Local Community Council)	B-1
Appendix C: Citizen Involvement	C1-C3
Appendix D: Land Use and Environmental Issues in Coastal Areas	D-1
Appendix E: Chesapeake Bay Foundation Pollution Report	E1-E3
Appendix F: Pollution Report	F-1

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN NORTH CAROLINA'S COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

I. Introduction

How to increase mutual respect, cooperation and understanding between the government and people of coastal North Carolina is an urgent problem. Government officials are often besieged by conflicting demands from the public. The informal meetings and public hearings which are held often do not help to resolve these differences and officials and planners are left to work out solutions by themselves. Often the developed plans do not fully meet the needs of the people and may not be adopted in the end.

This lack of opportunity for people to become involved in a continuing process creates frustration and apathy among the public. It causes people to feel that they are the recipients of plans and programs, only being allowed to say something about the plans after they are well developed. The coastal environment also suffers from this lack of communication. Given the chance, those who work, live and play there would plan a safer, more comfortable and more productive environment than that which is present now. Governments must work more closely with their constituents if the steps necessary to solve the economic and ecologic problems of growth are to be taken.

Over the past few months, I studied what citizens and local governments in one coastal county were doing to communicate, in order to understand why this process is so difficult and how citizens and governments could work together more productively. I tried to answer three general questions which seemed to be basic to the problem. These questions are:

- a. What kinds of involvement are both meaningful for people and for the planning process?
- b. How can people be moved to become more involved in local and state coastal planning?

c. What kinds of involvement are most acceptable to local government officials?

The purpose of this paper is to present what I found in regard to the above questions, and what I think should be done. The necessity of communicating with the public in planning is demonstrated in the next section. In section III, I describe ways citizens are active outside the government in influencing decisions in New Hanover County (the county studied) and ways that governments are working with people. The provisions for citizen involvement in administration of the North Carolina Coastal Area Management Act of 1974 are reviewed and compared with other states' programs.

Section IV defines what is necessary in citizen-government involvement in planning in order for it to be meaningful. I discuss, in section V, the need for understanding the local cultures of coastal people in working with them to increase their involvement. Finally, section VI presents my recommendations for government activities which will improve citizen-government communication and interaction.

II. The Need for Communication

Past planning in the coastal area of North Carolina has often resulted in plans which were not adopted or implemented by local governing bodies. These shelved plans were sometimes done by outside consultants who had no personal feeling for the study area; they consisted of standard planning models such as zoning and subdivision ordinances.

The results of this poor planning are easy to see. Many people are dissatisfied with planning. Time and money have been wasted. A misunderstanding of planning concepts and the use of consultants and a general mistrust of government controls are common in people who have been planned for, not with. As a result, people become apathetic and pessimistic about being involved. Basic to these problems is the lack of communication, the distance between government and citizens.

In the past, citizen involvement in planning has been confined mostly to public hearings or meetings. The government officials would present the plan; the people would comment on it. These hearings were

and are recognized by developers, citizens and government officials to be of little value. Developers feel that only the opposition shows up. Clark Davis, in a recent study of public hearings for stream reclassification, found that very few of the people living in the affected area knew of the hearings and that those who spoke mostly represented vested interests.¹ Citizens are often intimidated and confused by the presentations. In studying the Corps of Engineers' process for planning for coastal inlets, I found that the hearings served little purpose other than to irritate people. Government officials I talked to from several different agencies have dismissed hearings as a waste of time. Officials are also frustrated by the lack of constructive activity resulting from the meetings. The following comparison of advantages and disadvantages of public hearings defines the problem:

Advantages of Public Hearings

1. By virtue of long tradition, they have a high degree of legitimacy. Persons can "have their say."
2. Persons can say virtually anything they wish on the matter, subject to constraints of relevancy imposed by the chairman.
3. Transcript and statements are open to the public.
4. Low cost.

Disadvantages of Public Hearings

1. No guarantee of representativeness. Thus, potential high degree of bias.
2. Open ended statements are sometimes hard to interpret and use in planning.
3. Advertising of hearing may not reach the relevant public.
4. Meeting place may inhibit some from attending.
5. Meeting time may inhibit some from attending.
6. Chairman, being from the agency, may strongly bias hearing.
7. Status ordering in presentations inhibits expression.
8. Persons testifying often do not understand the issues or the plan on which they are speaking. (Especially if the plan is first explained at the hearing.)
9. Length of time often inadequate.²

Large meetings by nature discourage real discussion or consensus-

building since the purpose of the meetings is usually not to solve a problem but to gather information from the public. Officials who have worked hard on developing plans become defensive when criticism arises but a public which is not involved can not make constructive remarks. In this way, hearings are no more constructive than after-the-fact environmental impact statements in helping a community analyze the problem and become part of the solution. A revised planning process in which citizens and governments listen to each other and work together should help to solve some of the problems poor planning has created.

Basic assumptions of this paper are that a more aware and involved public will benefit the land use planning process and themselves in the following ways:

- a. it will keep plans more in touch with reality and special local conditions;
- b. it will help to define public values and priorities;
- c. it will keep people in touch with the planning effort so they are a part of the solution;
- d. it will increase feelings of community and local pride;
- e. it will help promote equity in the decision process;
- f. it will help insure that the plan will be implemented, and
- g. it will add workers and new ideas to the problems.³

Recognizing that public involvement has positive values and that public hearings are not an adequate method of gaining public involvement in planning, let us see what is being done now in a few selected places to stimulate more effective public involvement.

III. Present Local and State Participation Efforts

New Hanover County is a good place to study citizen involvement because it resembles other coastal counties in its generally conservative political atmosphere and governmental attitudes toward citizen participation. It also faces the same kind of development problems that other coastal counties have. The large population includes a diverse group of people who have had experience as citizens involved in government planning.

During my field work in New Hanover County, I talked to people who represented many different interests. I chose them for their interest

or involvement in environmental and land use problems. These people included members of local government-appointed advisory groups, local government officials, members of special interest groups and members of lower income and minority groups.

I had several purposes in talking to private citizens. I wanted to know what kinds of problems or issues they were most concerned about or involved in, what kinds of action they had taken, how effective the action was, what the government reaction was and what problems they encountered.

While talking to government officials, I asked what they thought the role of government was, what part citizens should have in decision making and planning, what community problems were most important and whether there was a need for local government to have more public exposure. I asked this last question because many of the citizens I talked with felt very distant from their government officials. The following section outlines the public involvement I found in New Hanover County, in two other counties and in several state programs.

Citizen Suits

There are several ways that citizens have been active without the help of the government in New Hanover County. One of the most direct and difficult of these is through suits against governmental agencies. One citizen is now suing a municipality in New Hanover County to force it to live up to State and Federal water quality regulations.⁴ This type of action is difficult because it is personally expensive and documentation of irregularities is time-consuming for private citizens. It is even sometimes hard to find out which government agency has responsibilities in the problem area.

The use of citizen suits as a means of forcing action is made even more difficult because in order to sue, a person or group must have standing in court. This means the person must be directly affected by the problem as a man who lives on a polluted waterway would be. The North Carolina Coastal Management Act also requires that a person be directly affected in order to appeal a minor permit granted by local government. A bill to allow citizens standing in court even when they are not directly affected was introduced in the 1973 session of the North Carolina Legislature but was reported unfavorably out of committee.

The lack of procedure for people to become constructively involved in local resource planning forces those who have grievances into the courts. These cases are likely to be drawn out for a long time in court and certainly slow down the traditional planning process. However, in many cases where citizens have sued, the courts held in favor of the citizens, finding that the agency responsible was not carrying out its duties properly.

Homeowners' Associations

A homeowners' organization was formed in the town of Wrightsville Beach in order to give townspeople more of a voice in their town government's decisions.⁵ The first newsletter of the organization says:

The object of this Association shall be to preserve and develop the aesthetic values of Wrightsville Beach as a high quality, low density residential area, to help protect the interests of the residents and real property owners, and to assist in making it a pleasant place to live. Specifically the purposes of the Association, as approved on 10 January, are:

- a. Improve the Community of Wrightsville Beach.
- b. Preserve the quality of life at Wrightsville Beach.
- c. Maintain the best features of the resort-residential community of Wrightsville Beach.
- d. Protect the personal and property rights of the members.
- e. Prevent overcrowding, high-density buildings, choked traffic, abuse of the natural environment and excessive commercialization at Wrightsville Beach.
- f. Foster efficient and economical government services, obedience to the law and responsible leadership and participation in public affairs.
- g. Assure attendance and Association representation at meetings of boards, agencies and departments of the Town of Wrightsville Beach.⁶

The Association was founded in the belief that pressure to develop on the beach would increase and that well organized development interests might sway local government decisions in directions which the residents did not want. There was no government procedure for citizens to make constructive contributions to planning the town's development so the citizens organized into a pressure group. The organization now has about 1,000 members and has been effective in influencing town policy

with regard to the consideration of more high density development.

Homeowners' organizations can serve other purposes as well. A property owners' association in Holdens Beach tries to keep out-of-town property owners informed about what is happening. This helps all the property owners feel more responsible toward the town, and more a part of the community.⁷

Public interest organizations

I talked to leaders of four different organizations interested in land use and the environment in New Hanover County. These were the Cape Fear Chapter of the Sierra Club, the Wilmington Chapter of the League of Women Voters, Project Environment and the New Hanover Fishing Club.

The Cape Fear Chapter of the Sierra Club is a fairly new organization in New Hanover County. The membership is mostly white, middle class and the issues it works on are those which appeal to the membership. These include stream channelization and lobbying for the coastal management bill. Membership is growing slowly as no great effort is made to recruit new members. A few people do most of the organizational work. Since the organization is new, it has not worked with local government very much. One of the members of the New Hanover County Environmental Impact Ordinance Committee is a member of the Sierra Club and is recognized as a conservation interest on the Committee.

The Wilmington Chapter of the League of Women Voters is also a new organization. A few years ago some women tried to start a Chapter but failed. This failure may have been due to the more conservative feeling of the middle class community then. Recent immigration of middle class liberals who manage the new industrial plants has changed the situation considerably. While it still has no strength of numbers, the Chapter does have a member on the New Hanover County Environmental Impact Ordinance Committee and a member who monitors all County Commissioners' meetings. She is often the only member of the public who attends. This gives the Chapter more visibility than its numbers would indicate. All members are white, middle class, as are many of the issues they work on and black women may be wary of joining for

this reason.⁹

Project Environment was active for a few years but is now dissolving. At one time the group had about 80 members attending monthly meetings and the group worked on local environmental issues such as recycling. A few members did most of the work on recycling and the effort collapsed when they withdrew. Although the Wilmington public works officials expressed interest, no continuing arrangements were made. One of the leaders of Project Environment commented that those who worked the hardest in the organization became "burned out" after a time and the lack of continuing manpower was the reason the organization fell apart.¹⁰

The New Hanover County Fishing Club has over 1,000 members and its success is probably due to the role of the Club in organizing fishing contests. The Club does get involved in conservation efforts directly connected with sports fishing and has been successful in some of these efforts. Conservation has not always been an issue for the Club. It only tackles those issues which are relatively noncontroversial and which do not require a lot of work on the part of the members, since the Club is not a lobbying group.¹¹

Local Government and Citizen Participation

New Hanover County now has a significant example of citizen-government cooperation for planning in the New Hanover Environmental Impact Ordinance Committee. I will discuss this and then outline important features of the programs of the Currituck County Environmental Resources Commission, the Guilford Community Councils Program and the Virginia Wetlands Boards. These last three programs go beyond New Hanover County's in the responsibility and initiative they give to citizens.

The New Hanover Environmental Impact Ordinance Committee has about fifteen members who are appointed by the County Commission. There are presently no contributing members of farm or lower income interests but the developer-environmentalist mix seems about even.

The Committee members are private citizens and represent the public but most feel they would not like to conduct business with the public

present. They feel that since the Committee is only making recommendations which are subject to review by the Commission, the public does not need to be present.

The Committee was created to evaluate environmental impact ordinances for New Hanover County but was soon given the job of preparing a sedimentation control ordinance. The ordinance has now been adopted by the County Commission and the Committee will probably remain as a general citizens' environmental advisory body to the County Commission.

The county government seems to be satisfied with the work of the Committee. County commissioners think the Committee adds public support to the measures they work on. The Committee, having local membership, is able to tailor its recommendations to local needs.

Local officials do see some problems with the Committee. Members have no legal responsibility or constituency and must be held to a strict work schedule just as the government is. Some commissioners want the committee to stick to the specific tasks assigned to it and fear it might become a general purpose citizens' committee which would detract from the duties and powers of the county government. Generally, the commissioners felt that since they were the elected officials, there was no need for citizen participation other than to gain technical advice and to acquire public support for their program.¹²

The Cartaret County Environmental Resources Commission is one of the oldest and best organized of the local environmental advisory committees. The Commission presently has fifteen members who are subject to reappointment every year. It acts as an advisory body to the local planning board and county commission, stressing resource problems in the coastal area. (See Appendix A for the bylaws of the Commission.) The Commission has worked on such issues as regional water and sewer planning, local development evaluation, sewage sludge disposal, soil mapping recommendations and mobile home regulation violations; it has established a Shoreline Protection Board to work with the Shoreline Protection Officer. A Consultant Advisory Council has been set up of technical experts to work with the Commission.¹³

The bylaws specify that members must be from technical and professional occupations with not less than three members from the general

public. It is no surprise then that the Commission membership does not now represent a cross-section of the community. The membership is overbalanced in the marine science field and, while well divided between environmental and development interests, no farm or low income interests are represented.

Guilford County is not a coastal county but the Community Councils Program being set up there has some features which are important to us. This program seeks to set up a number of local citizen councils, one in each community of the county. Anyone can participate in a community council and representation is sought from established local organizations as well as from those people who are not members of any organization.¹⁴ The program is being run in cooperation with the Guilford County Planning Department, Mental Health Center and Agricultural Extension Service. One important contribution the Extension Service makes is in publishing a monthly newsletter for the councils to keep people aware of meetings and activities.

The purpose of the Community Councils Program is to generate requests for action and recommendations on decisions for the county government on issues of local importance. The Program met with early success in its recommendation of a summer recreation program for the county which was adopted and funded by the county commissioners. The county commissioners have strongly supported the Community Councils Program and funding of the recreation program is evidence of this. The Guilford Planning Department has offered staff assistance in the organization of the councils and in drawing up proposals for them, but planning staff members are not usually present at meetings. The councils have been free to explore any issues they feel are important to the community.

The Community Councils Program is unique in its stress on citizen initiative, responsibility and openness to participation by all citizens. (See Appendix B for an outline of the organization process used.) The planning staff has also stressed the need for involving people who are not members of organized groups in the community. That it is important to do so is proven by a study just done of organization membership among people in the region. According to the study, about

50% of the people in the region are not members of any organization.¹⁵

A final example of citizen participation in local government are the Wetlands Boards set up by localities in Virginia under the Virginia Wetlands Act of 1972. This Act allows about 50 counties, towns and cities to set up wetlands boards which rule on applications for permits to alter tidal wetlands.¹⁶

The board members are local residents appointed by the local governing body. The only guidelines for appointment are that members may not hold other public office except for membership on the town zoning or planning board. Since there is no requirement for representation by usually unrepresented groups of the community, many of the board members are likely to be middle-class professionals. I found this to be true at one meeting I attended.¹⁷ The lack of funds to pay members for their time enforces this trend. Another problem is that even the professionals on the boards feel that technical services, legal council, staff and enforcement officers were needed to do the job properly as any agency of this type would.

These boards have more responsibility than any local citizen boards I have seen. They seem to have been well accepted as the permit agency in most communities, especially since the alternative to local boards is for the state to issue the permits.

Citizen Participation in Coastal Management at the State Level

In this section, I will outline the provisions Maine, Washington and North Carolina have made for citizen involvement in their coastal management programs. Some of this information is sketchy since it is only available in grant proposals and enabling legislation.

The programs differ in the amount of responsibility they give to citizens and in the amount of energy devoted to gathering citizens' contributions. Hopefully, knowing what other states are doing should help North Carolina to design a sound program for citizen involvement. The primary considerations in Maine's public participation program will be:

- a. how to get a reliable reading of public attitudes,
- b. how to get the maximum participation without overburdening those asked to participate, and
- c. how to insure participation by a broad cross section of the people.¹⁸

The first phase of the program will be a public opinion poll which will determine knowledge and attitudes on coastal problems and needs. Inferences about what situations concern people and what future they want will be made and then tested with subsequent polls.

Citizen committees will then be established on environmental quality, socio-economic impact, governmental relations and general policy alternatives in each region. "These committees are to be the primary vehicle for public involvement and membership in the committees will be open to anyone who volunteers." 19

The program as outlined in the Maine Coastal Plan does not mention any continuing role for citizens in program operation or evaluation. Citizens will contribute by developing a static plan. The citizen committees which will be set up seem to be mainly reactive in nature, commenting on and evaluating proposals staff members have worked up between meetings. There does not appear to be an effort for the committee members to work actively in generating problems, solutions or building consensus. The program description also does not discuss the need for a broad base of representation on the committees. A good feature of this program is the citizen committee devoted to analysis of socio-economic impacts of growth and controls. Many state programs ignore the social effects of coastal management.

Washington State has a more developed set of guidelines for their citizen participation program. They are reproduced in Appendix C. Citizen advisory committees are to be formed which will use citizen input in developing master programs. Tasks are spelled out and local governments must provide some measure of the level of local concurrence reached on the master programs submitted to the State. This program is unusual in its stress on the resolution of local interest conflicts and in the use of citizen committees to do this. No role for citizens is specified in the final program operation or evaluation. As in Maine, a static plan is envisioned; once drawn up, it will be administered according to the rules.

Over 2,000 citizens have participated on the advisory committees and they represented a wide range of interests. Members were selected by

public invitation, by letters to organizations and individuals and by government officials. Newsletters are published by the committees to keep the communities informed of their activities and to help citizens feel they are a part of the planning process.²⁰ With the need for local consensus in the plans, citizens seem to have more importance in this State program than in any other.

The major role for citizens under North Carolina's Coastal Area Management Act is to participate in public hearings, "at which public and private parties will have the opportunity to present comments and recommendations."²¹ At the hearings, citizens will comment on land use plans which have been developed by the counties and later on permit applications.

The public will be involved in designation of areas of environmental concern at first in a "...one day public hearing, at which public and private parties shall have the opportunity to present views and comment concerning proposed interim areas..."²² and later at "...a public hearing in each county in which lands to be affected are located, at which public and private parties shall have the opportunity to present comments and views."²³

Notice of public hearings will be in the typical manner, a notice in a newspaper of general circulation. When a permit is applied for, the Secretary of the Department of Natural and Economic Resources will: a) notify those who filed a request to be notified, b) post a copy of the application at the proposed development; and c) publish a notice in the newspaper seven days before a hearing on local permit action.

If a permit is granted, only those people directly affected by the action can request a hearing before the commission. This effectively eliminates public interest group action in appealing permit grants.

The structure of the law gives citizens only a role in commenting on policies, programs and plans already formulated at the local and state level and no role in goal formulation or administration of programs. The State government will develop guidelines for the county land use plans and it would be possible at the same time to include requirements for the process of plan development. This could contain provisions for public participation and consensus-building among different public

interests. The law does not specify the membership of the local permit letting agencies and it would be possible for the agencies to include citizens as in Virginia.

It might be argued that citizens do participate in administration of the law through the citizen members of the Coastal Resources Commission. While these people are private citizens, they will all undoubtedly be white middle-and upper-class professionals or businessmen who represent particular vested interests. There is no insurance under the law that the Commission will be representative of all the economic or cultural groups present in the coastal area.

An opportunity for broader citizen representation exists in the three Governor-appointed positions on the Coastal Resources Commission. While the other positions will be filled by those with specific vested interests, the Governor could, if he wishes, fill his three positions with people who would represent homeowners, shore dwellers, tourists, blacks, lower income groups, migrant workers, fishermen or other unrepresented people.

IV. Defining Meaningful Participation

A discussion here of the essentials of a meaningful participation effort will help us in thinking about how to improve citizen-government communication. Generally, the public and governments can participate in effective planning when: 1) citizens and government officials both want to know and understand the needs and problems of the other side from the others' viewpoint; 2) citizens and officials respect each others' views; and 3) both parties work to resolve conflicts and problems as fairly as possible for all concerned. These requirements for participation are valid no matter what planning process is used and they stress the importance of mutual respect, understanding and cooperation in achieving an equitable solution to any problem.

Citizens and officials must want to understand the views of the other. Government officials especially must seek out different citizen views and needs which relate to the problem. Too often, officials listen only to peer friends and organized citizen voices in making decisions. Citizens and officials need help in articulating their needs in lang-

uage the other can understand and in understanding the technical information available on the problem. Every person must be allowed to participate in a physical setting in which he or she feels comfortable.

The needs and attitudes of each person must be accepted as important. No one should be dismissed as ignorant, bigoted, liberal or conservative. Each view must be weighed and evaluated equally.

Finally, citizens and officials must be willing to work together to solve the problems. The goal must be fairness to all concerned. Citizens must be active in analyzing problems, suggesting alternatives and choosing solutions.

The value of particular involvement processes lies in the extent to which they incorporate or represent the basic philosophy outlined above. A process which insures that government and citizens carry out their part of the bargain is better than one which leaves room for one party to dominate or ignore the other. Many people feel that citizens must have some decision-making responsibility to insure their views are fully considered. As Sherry Arnstein said, "...participation without redistribution of power is an empty and frustrating process for the powerless..."²⁴ "The squeaky wheel gets the grease," in other words. Citizens intuitively recognize this. Unless they feel they have some responsibility and will be listened to, they will not bother to sit through the endless meetings. The measure of responsibility given to citizens involved with government is a measure of the amount of respect officials have for the views and abilities of citizens and is an indication of the weight that citizen views will be given.

Another indication of the philosophy behind a participation program is the amount of effort devoted to contacting different citizen interests within the community. The following list of community interests developed by the Regional Plan Association demonstrates the variety of interests present in the public and the difficulty of contacting them all:

1. Civic Leaders (Volunteers)
2. Non-Volunteers among the Middle-Class
3. The Poor
4. Representatives of Major Institutions
5. Experts in Planning -- Related Fields²⁵

A description of the characteristics of people within these groups is given in Appendix D.

Another way to categorize citizen interests is indicated in the following list the Corps of Engineers uses to identify public groups for Corps projects:

- a. Individual Citizens. This includes the general public and key individuals who do not express their preferences through or participate in any of the groups or organizations listed below.
- b. Sportsmen's Groups.
- c. Conservation/Environmental Groups.
- d. Farm Organizations.
- e. Property Owners and Users.
- f. Business-Industrial.
- g. Professional Groups and Organizations.
- h. Educational Institutions.
- i. Service Clubs and Civic Organizations.
- j. Labor Unions.
- k. State-Local Agencies.
- l. State and Local Elected Officials.
- m. Federal Agencies.
- n. Other Groups and Organizations-Consider Urban League, Urban Coalition, Consumer Groups, economic opportunity groups, political clubs and associations, ACLU, minority groups, religious groups and organizations, other social action groups, etc.
- o. Media.²⁶

There are many different interests in any community which influence or are influenced by a particular issue. A citizen involvement effort must have as one of its goals, to contact all of these interests in order to live up to the participation philosophy I have outlined.

When lists of groups like those above are used, it is important that people who fairly represent the interests of each group be contacted. "Uncle Toms" and "wild eyed radicals" will not give a true picture of the needs of the people. At a recent conference, a man told me he was angry because a middle class black man was discussing the problems of the poor. Since the speaker was not poor, he did not legitimately represent poor people, this man argued. The issue of representativeness

is important and must be resolved in any government-citizen interaction.

Our philosophy of participation says that we not only want to find all those who might have an interest in a problem but we must make sure that people can tell us clearly what their interests are. Citizens often have difficulty in defining their needs in our technical jargon. Therefore, an effort is required to help them organize their thoughts and learn about the government system. One author, Cary, believes that helping marginal and unorganized groups to organize should be a major part of the participation effort,²⁷ and I agree. Fishermen, for example, are one of the least organized groups of people in the coastal area and their needs should be included in any decision.

Each cooperative planning effort between citizens and government must include safeguards like the ones discussed above to insure that the philosophies outlined are incorporated. We have seen differing amounts of citizen responsibility, initiative and representation in the participation programs surveyed. These safeguards are important to a planning process but they will be different in every situation. This is why I define participation in terms of a philosophy rather than as a planning model.

IV. Encouraging Public Interest in Coastal Management Issues

One of my purposes in this study was to find out how to encourage interest in coastal land use and environmental problems. Local governments and public interest groups alike have difficulty getting the public interested and involved in working on local problems even when citizens have a clear opportunity to do so.

At first, I thought if I could put together a list of issues that interest people, then those issues could be used to stimulate public interest. I did make such a list and it is included in Appendix E. As I spent more time in New Hanover County, however, I realized that there are many different kinds of problems and that while some problems affect large numbers of people at certain times, no problem interests everyone at any given time. More importantly, the amount of interest people have in an issue which is presented to them depends on two factors: the extent to which the message speaks to people's cultural values about the problem; and the manner in which the message is presented.

The need for understanding the culture of people being communicated with is part of elementary communications theory; we need to understand the people we want to get our message to. Most people, assume that being a part of the community is knowledge enough of local culture. Therefore, all they need to do is find out what rivers are being polluted to understand the problem. I found during this study that there were many groups of people in the New Hanover community; neighborhoods, minorities, occupations and religions, which the people I interviewed did not know anything about. They didn't know what values were held or what the concerns in environmental problems were. The existence of unique cultural groups in the coastal area is illustrated in the following description:

The coastal towns of Eastern North Carolina are unique in many respects. Many of them date their origins back prior to the Revolutionary War. In-migration has been relatively static between the Civil War and the end of World War II. Since the late 1940's, in-migration, out-migration, and population growth have averaged less than the state average. Population density is low, with most towns being well under 5,000 people. This is an area of isolated pockets of people whose families have lived in the same communities for more than a hundred years, who have developed language patterns and dialects of their own, whose sons and daughters tend to marry within the community, or if they marry out, to bring their spouses back to live at "home". It is an area where kin relations are strong and three-generation families still abound, where contact with the outside world has been limited and change has been slow to come. It is an area of limited cash income where subsistence hunting, farming, and fishing supplement the food supply and where a person can count on kin, friends, and neighbors to share through the hard times.²⁸

There are also new forces stressing coastal society which must be understood if we are to communicate with coastal people. Great social changes such as outmigration of young people and the in-migration of retired people, vacationers and middle class professionals are altering the political and social character of the coastal area. Old stable communities are giving way to new subdivisions and exclusive vacation retreats. Many of these vacationers want no part of the coastal society or its problems. Vacation homeowners on Figure 8 Island, an expensive resort community, want to escape from the world's problems and have no contact with people across the guarded bridge. Retired people often take more interest in their community affairs but their expecta-

tions, conditioned by suburban living, are frustrated by conservative governments who see planning as a necessary evil at best.

A particular land use problem which illustrates the need to understand the cultural values of the people is the prevalence of "heirs property" among black people, not only on the coast of North Carolina but all over the South. Land ownership has been an important part of black culture in the South. It was important for a man to leave land to his children and land was often handed down with no written title. Thus it became "heirs property". All the children knew the land was partly theirs but the titles were never recorded and after several generations the ownership situation became confused. This would not be so important now if taxes did not have to be paid every year and if developers did not want some of this property. There have been many cases in recent years of heirs property being lost through tax foreclosures, legal manipulation and outright theft. The recent history of land ownership changes around Hilton Head, South Carolina, seem to bear this out and I encountered instances of the same sorts of problems in New Hanover County. Tax foreclosures listed in the daily Wilmington paper are mostly against black owned land. Lower income people with no experience in land dealing or land law are likely to sell out early and cheap while the speculators make the real profit. (This also happened around Kerr Reservoir).

Penn Community Services in Frogmore, South Carolina has published a booklet, Got Land Problems, to help people understand their land problems. An advisory group, Black Land Services, was established by Penn to help people with their land problems. Mr. Gadson, Director of Penn pointed out to me the need for person to person contact and a strong sense of people's cultural attachment to land in advising them on their land problems.²⁹ For this reason, information leaflets are not enough. The problem is made worse by the lack of lawyers trained in land law and by the even greater lack of legal advisors people feel they can trust with their problems.

Another illustration of the need to understand the people and their cultural relationship with problems is evident in the problems which interest different economic and social groups in the coastal area. These

interests often reflect the moral-philosophical concern for the environment held by many middle-class people and the more practical view of the environment held by lower-class groups and by those who work and deal with land.

The middle-class public interest groups are more likely to be interested in issues such as power plant siting, recycling, stream channelization (prevention), noise and water pollution on the inland waterway and beach erosion control. Lower economic classes tended to be more interested in such problems as beach access, shellfishing restrictions and public housing conflicts with environmental controls - issues which are closer to home and just as important.

There are times when lower-,middle-and upper-income people have direct interests in the same problem. The recent closure to shellfishing of Hewletts Creek in New Hanover County provided a good example of this. Signs announcing the pollution were posted everywhere and easily in view of the expensive homes on the creek. The oyster fishermen who had made money from the Creek lost income and the homeowners were upset over the signs and polluted water.³⁰

Flooding of roads and yards is another problem that affects everyone. Lower income people seem to have the worst problem since they often live on unpaved roads which get the least maintenance. Lower and middle income people both get fooled into buying subdivision houses where no provision is made for maintenance of drainage facilities or where periodic flooding could only be prevented by expensive new works. These people are manipulated another way in that the subdivisions which have these problems seem to be designed to inhibit any neighborly feeling among the residents. Grid pattern streets and lack of community facilities prevents people from feeling like they are part of a viable community in which they should take an interest and responsibility. Inlet stabilization is another issue which many different groups are concerned with. Commercial and sports fishermen, boaters, beach residents and others become very involved in debate over which inlets to stabilize.

The second factor in determining people's interest in an issue, other than its relation to their cultural values, is in the way the issue is presented. This includes the types of media and people who are used

and the manner in which meetings are conducted. I found during my study for instance, that the local newspaper was helpful in telling me who the important people were as well as what social events were popular. Ministers of local churches were happy to talk to me and direct me to members of their congregations who would be helpful. Community baseball games, barber shops and general stores were good places to meet people. They felt at home and were comfortable talking about their grievances. I found a lot of skepticism at first but after I had been there for a while, people started taking me seriously.

It is important in understanding people's values not to force them into seeing their problems in our own terms. We need to keep an open mind, to see the person and his problems from his own perspective. I found that if I made comments about situations or problems in terms of my own value system, the person I was talking to would lose interest. If I picked out the issues that person was concerned with which coincided with the values I thought were important, then he would be more interested.

The task of organizing, of creating community interest about particular issues and forming groups to work on them builds on the information we have gathered. We need to use the understanding of the various people and their interest in our problems to design ways to communicate and work with them. If people feel most comfortable in a board room, at home, in a general store or on a fishing pier, then that is where we should meet. If we set up a meeting, it would best be done through local leaders, rather than by posting notices in the post office or printing them on the back pages of the newspaper.

After people understand the problem within their cultural values, they need help in focusing their action to work on solving problems. I found that at times, interest about certain issues is very high in particular areas: a body of water is closed to shellfishing; foreign investors buy large tracts of local property; a proposed shopping center promises to flood a subdivision. Usually though, interest dies down after a short while and people become apathetic. It is difficult to organize, to get technical information, to find who the responsible government agencies are or to have any constructive influence with responsible agencies.

Thus there are several factors in getting people interested and involved in working on a problem. People need to have the problem presented to them in an environment they are comfortable with and through a medium they are used to. The message must speak to the cultural values which people relate to the problem. Finally, there must be an organization to help focus people's energy as they work toward a solution to the problem.

V. Conclusions

North Carolina's State and local governments face difficult problems in dealing with growth in the coastal area. Public involvement in planning for this growth could be valuable for the planning process and for the people themselves. It is evident, however, that the public is not involved with government planning to the extent that it could and should be. Some of the difficulties which lie in the way of greater public involvement are due to governmental attitudes or purposeful actions and some are due to lack of knowledge or skill on the part of the public. I found the following problems to be most important in inhibiting citizen participation in the coastal area of North Carolina:

- a. skepticism on the part of government officials as to the value or legitimacy of citizen participation - they feel they are elected and should make the decisions;
- b. lack of organizational skills on the part of citizens who seek to take action - a few people become active and then "burn out", leaving the organization leaderless;
- c. confusion created by government agencies about the role of the public or about agency roles in planning;
- d. lack of education and shyness on the part of the public in the face of a well organized government agency;
- e. social and economic differences which prevent people with common interests from communicating and working together;
- f. lack of organizational focus for problem solving when problems do arise; and
- g. inability of the public to see the effects of plans and problems in personal terms - terms which reflect their cultural values.

These problems can be solved, however. If a basic philosophy of meaningful participation is followed, local and state governments can design participation programs which will involve people more productively. The philosophy of meaningful participation I described in this paper

requires three things of government and public participants:

1. a desire to understand the culture and values of those people who are affected or involved;
2. a recognition of the importance of each person's values; and
3. a desire to work with everyone involved or affected to resolve conflicts and find the best solution.

Adherence to these three points can be insured in a participation program by designing for a particular political and social climate. Definition of public responsibility in the decision process and of concerned members and groups of the public in the participation process are two measures which can help insure that the basic philosophy is followed in the programs.

I will not try to present a model for participation in local or state government here because I believe that the design of each program depends on the circumstances present. I will make some recommendations for activities on the part of local and state governments which should increase public trust and ability to participate and help governments find the best way to organize their programs.

Recommendations for Local Government Action

1. Define the types of problems the public should be involved in working on. This can even be done with a citizen committee.
2. Define the extent of responsibility which the public should have in problem solving and how they will be expected to interact with officials. The mechanism for public involvement is not as important as this definition of the responsibility given to the citizens.
3. Define the members of the public who should be involved in the program and check to see if these groups or people actually represent all social, cultural and occupational groups who will be affected by the problem or the solution.
4. Become acquainted with the different subcultures in the area. This includes knowing the means of communication used by members of the group, the kinds of social and organizational activities they engage in, their occupations, the problems they feel they have within your interest area and the cultural relationship they feel with your problems.
5. Communicate with the public in ways appropriate to each subculture in terms they can understand. Find out if they are interested in the problem and if they are willing to work on solving it.
6. Meet with people and begin to organize into work or **study** groups.

7. Use the organization to acquire and disseminate information about the problem and solutions.
8. Seek to generate citizen interest in local government by increasing its public exposure. The times and meeting places of commissioners' meetings could be changed around to reach a greater portion of the public. Meetings could be held at night and important parts of meetings could be televised. Meetings should be better publicized, through a variety of media including local leaders.
9. Seek to increase credibility of local government by:
 - a. requiring that all important meetings be open to the public,
 - b. allow citizens to appeal regulatory decisions made under the Coastal Area Management Act,
 - c. record all meeting proceedings,
 - d. use layman's language for meeting notices and send notices out to interest groups,
 - e. establish waiting periods during which denied permits may not be resubmitted,
 - f. periodically identify aspects of local procedures that may give rise to citizen mistrust, and
 - g. respond to citizens' procedural concerns in every practical way.³¹

Recommendations for State Government Programs

A State Coastal Management effort can greatly increase the amount of citizen involvement in planning. The following list sketches the different types of activities which should be undertaken.

1. Information Service
 - a. Gather and publicize information on land use, environmental problems, social and cultural characteristics of the population, responsibilities of various government agencies and new techniques for public participation. Use of "pollution reports" such as the one shown in Appendix F can help publicize environmental problems.
 - b. Information should be available to anyone who requests it.
 - c. Information should be available in a form which will appeal to the various economic and cultural groups who may find it useful.
2. Advisory Service
 - a. Offer information and special skills to the public and local government.
 - b. Coordinate participation efforts in the coastal area and publish a newsletter to keep people informed of other's participation activities.

- c. Offer speakers to provide technical information (could model after or use the Environmental Information Network at N.C.S.U.).
 - d. Offer people skilled in community organization and public participation to local interest groups and to local governments to help in organizing people to work with governments on specific issues and on ongoing participation programs.
 - e. Set up coastal research centers as headquarters for advisory services and organizers.
 - f. Make a special effort to acquaint local governments with the benefits public involvement will bring to them and show them non-threatening methods of obtaining public involvement.
3. Guidelines for county land use plans should include requirements for public involvement.
- a. Guidelines should require counties to define responsibility citizens will have in plan development and implementation.
 - b. Guidelines should require counties to define what social and economic groups of the public will be involved and how they will be contacted.
 - c. Guidelines should require a statement of the differences in attitudes of various cultural groups in the local area towards land use and environmental problems.
 - d. Guidelines should require a statement as to the amount of local consensus reached about the plan and possibly a referendum to give the state and locality an idea of the plan's chances for implementation and its relevance to local needs and problems.
 - e. Guidelines should require a description of how the local participation program is organized.
 - f. Guidelines should make it clear that not only the county plans, but the manner in which the plans are developed will be examined carefully before they are approved. It should be made clear that public hearings by themselves do not adequately involve the public.
4. Public involvement in administration of the state program. A broad range of citizen interests should be included on the Coastal Resources Commission. Future appointments should be made with the intent of including as many citizen interests as possible. This would acknowledge the fact that coastal management will affect many interests other than those specifically mentioned in the law.
5. State legislation to promote public participation.
- a. A law should be enacted giving citizens standing to sue government agencies or private firms even when the citizen is not directly affected by the problem.
6. Enabling legislation is needed for local citizen advisory boards like House Bill 1990 to point out the possibility of such boards to local government. (Provision should be made for broad citizen representation on these boards).

I hope this study will be useful to members of the public and to government officials in design and evaluation of public participation programs. I have not emphasized particular participation methods here, not because they are unimportant but because they are discussed in many other studies. I feel the attitude with which one enters a participation effort and the understanding and belief one has in others are what finally determine its success. If these thoughts are kept in mind, programs can be designed which will be meaningful for everyone involved.

FOOTNOTES

1. Davis, Clark, Public Participation in Water Pollution Control Policy and Decision Making, U.N.C. Water Resources Research Institute, Report No. 88, p. VIII.
2. Institute for Water Resources, Public Participation in Water Resources Planning: A Multi-Media Course, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Professional Development Paper 72-1, April, 1972, 8.0 H-A, p. 1.
3. Summarized from:
Cahn, E. S. and Cahn, J. C., "Maximum Feasible Participation" In: Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change, Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Pussett, eds., Prager Publishers, N.Y., 1971, p. 16.
and
Warner, K. P., Public Participation in Water Resources Planning, Environmental Simulation Laboratory, U. of Michigan, N.T.I.S. Report No. PB 204 245, July, 1971, p. 106.
4. Personal Communication with William S. Funderberg, March 19, 1974.
5. Ibid.
6. Hines, J. D., Letter "To Residents and Real Property Taxpayers of Wrightsville Beach", Wrightsville Beach Association, January 26, 1973.
7. This was a comment from the floor at the Conference on Coastal Management in Beaufort, North Carolina, June 16-17, 1974.
8. Personal communication with Barry Grimm, March 6, 1974.
9. Personal communication with Mrs. Karen Gottovi, March, 1974.
10. Personal communication with Janet Godwin and Paul Harrington, March 1974.
11. Personal communication with Larry Ely, March, 1974.
12. This information is based on my conversations with several members of the Committee and with county commissioners.
13. Personal communication with Mrs. Barbara Carpenter.
14. Personal communication with Rex Todd.
15. Personal communication with Michael Milakovich.
16. The Virginia Wetlands Act of 1972, Chapter 2.1, Title 62.1 Code of Virginia.
17. Conference on "Land Use Controls in Wetlands Areas", Hampton, Virginia, October 16-18, 1973.

18. Coastal Planning Group, State Planning Office, Maine Coastal Plan, Application for Financial Assistance from Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, January 15, 1974, p. 35.
19. Ibid, p. 36.
20. Personal communication with Glen. A. Crandal, Community Affairs Consultant, Washington State Shoreline Management Program, April 29, 1974.
21. North Carolina General Statutes, Chapter 113A-110(c).
22. Ibid, Chapter 113A-114(b).
23. Ibid, Chapter 113A-115(a).
24. In: "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", A.I.P. Journal, July, 1969, p. 216.
25. Warner, K. P., Public Participation in Water Resources Planning, Environmental Simulation Laboratory, U. of Michigan, N.T.I.S. Report No. PB 204 245, July, 1971, pp. 204-205.
26. Institute for Water Resources, Public Participation in Water Resources Planning: A Multi-Media Course, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Professional Development Paper 72-1, April, 1972, Appendix B.
27. Cary, Lee J. "The Role of the Citizen", Chapter 6, In: Cary, L. J., ed., Community Development as a Process, U. of Missouri Press, Columbia, 1970.
28. Peck, Gregory, "Selected Social and Economic Aspects of Waterbased Recreation as Related to the Human Ecology of Coastal North Carolina", Sea Grant Project Summary, University of North Carolina Sea Grant Program Proposal for Institutional Support, Volume II, p.D-13-14.
29. Personal communication with John W. Gadson, Sr., Executive Director, Penn Community Services, Inc., Frogmore, South Carolina 29920.
30. Personal Communication with Adrian Hurst.
31. Some of these recommendations are given in, The Use of Land: A Citizens' Policy Guide to Urban Growth, William K. Reilly, ed., Thos. Y. Crowell Co., N.Y., 1973, pp. 214-217.

APPENDIX A

BY - LAWS

Carteret County Environmental Resources Commission

Article I - Name, Purpose

- Sec. 1 The Carteret County Board of Commissioners has established a commission, to be made up of citizens of the county, and to be known as the CARTERET COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES COMMISSION.
- Sec. 2 The purpose of the designated Commission is to inventory and review, on a continuing basis, the condition of and threats to, the environmental resources of the county; and to report all needs for improvement and corrective actions to the Board of Commissioners.

Article II - Membership

- Sec. 1 The Commission shall be made up of not less than ten, nor more than eighteen, members.
- Sec. 2 The Board of Commissioners shall designate members from professional and technical occupations, and from the general public. Insofar as possible, membership shall include a representative of both the legal and medical professions, as well as not less than three members from the general public.
- Sec. 3 Each member shall serve for the balance of the calendar year in which he is appointed, and in the subsequent calendar year until replaced; except he be dropped as set forth in the next section.
- Sec. 4 A member may be dropped from membership by the Board of Commissioners at the request of the Chairman (see Officers, following) after missing three or more monthly meetings without acceptable reason, or because of other demonstrated lack of interest and participation. Before making request for dropping, the Chairman shall, if possible, discuss the matter with the involved member and request his agreement. In every instance, the making of the request will be reported to the full Commission and made a part of the minutes. Resignation of a member shall be reported to the County Board of Commissioners, to this Commission, and recorded in the minutes.
- Sec. 5 Altho they will not vote as members, attendance of regular meetings of the Commission by students, civic groups and their members, local officials and businessmen, is to be encouraged.

cont.

Article III - Officers

- Sec. 1 The Commission will name from among its members, a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman, and a Secretary.
- Sec. 2 The officers of the Commission will be elected by ballot of the members present at the first meeting of each calendar year.
- Sec. 3 The officers elected will take office immediately, and will serve until the election of the following year unless dropped from membership.
- Sec. 4 In the case of any vacancy among the officers, an election will be held at the next monthly meeting to select an incumbent for the balance of the calendar year.

Article IV - Duties of Chairman

- Sec. 1 The Chairman will preside at business meetings of the Commission, appoint Committees, and perform such duties as custom and parliamentary procedures may require. He will represent the commission, or will arrange for such representation, in presentations to the Board of Commissioners, and at public hearings or in other meetings concerned with environmental matters. He will report vacancies on the Commission to the Board of Commissioners and request appointment of replacements or of additional members. The Chairman will notify, or have notified, all members in advance of each regular meeting.

Article V. - Duties of Vice-Chairman

- Sec. 1 The Vice-Chairman will assume the duties of the Chairman whenever the latter is absent from a meeting, or unable to attend to any other official requirement. In the case of a vacancy as Chairman, the Vice-Chairman will act in that capacity until a new Chairman is elected. (See Article III, Sec. 4).

Article VI - Duties of Secretary

- Sec. 1 The Secretary shall keep the records and minutes of the Commission and shall keep the members informed of business transacted. At the direction of the Chairman, he will notify members of dates and places of meetings of the Commission, and of other groups; as well as of scheduled events of pertinent interest.
- Sec. 2 The Secretary will conduct correspondence as may be appropriate to his office.
- Sec. 3 The Secretary will maintain an up-to-date record of members, together with their addresses and telephone numbers.

cont.

Article VII - Committees

- Sec. 1 A Committee will be designated, with members of the Commission assigned thereto, for each of the separate resources and pollution areas of Land, Water, and Air; with an additional Committee for handling of Publicity, Liasion, and Education.
- Sec. 2 The Chairman of the Commission will name members to the four Committees. There shall be no restriction against any member serving on more than one Committee.
- Sec. 3 Each Committee, by vote of its designated members will elect a Chairman to serve during the calendar year. The Chairman will be responsible for calling and conducting meetings of the Committee, for furthering the work of the Commission within the designated field of the Committee, for coordination with the Commission and the other Committees, and for making sufficient record, minutes, and reports to the Commission.
- Sec. 3a No Commission member may at any time be Chairman of more than one of the Committees; however, the Vice-Chairman of the Commission may serve as Chairman of a Committee.
- Sec. 4 All members of the Commission shall be encouraged to keep abreast of the work of the Committees other than that to which they are assigned, and to attend committee meetings whenever there is a matter under consideration in which they have an interest or to which they may contribute. The interest of, and attendance by, non-members shall be similarly encouraged. (See Article II, Sec. 5)

Article VIII - Meetings

- Sec. 1 The Commission as a whole will meet at least once each month to review reports, discuss current or proposed conditions and projects, prepare recommendations to the County Board of Commissioners, and to plan other actions within the scope of its responsibilities. These monthly meetings are to be open to the public.
- Sec. 2 Insofar as is possible, the monthly meetings will be scheduled for the same day of the week (i.e., first Thursday), and at the same meeting place and hour.
- Sec. 3 Other meetings, as required by needs or events, will be called by the Chairman, who will, at the same time, arrange for the members to be notified sufficiently in advance to permit attendance.
- Sec. 4 Minutes shall be kept and made a part of the Commission records for each such regular or called meeting of the Commission.

cont.

Article IX - Expenses

- Sec. 1 All Commission members, including the Officers, serve without pay.
- Sec. 2 The Secretary, and others with approval of the Chairman, will be reimbursed for postage, stationery, and telephone costs incurred for authorized business of the Commission. Reimbursement will be made from County funds under procedures established by the County Board of Commissioners.

Article X - Guidelines

- Sec. 1 The Commission will have no legislative or enforcement authority; nor will its members commit the County to expenditures or contractual agreements.
- Sec. 2 The Commission will encourage and promote interest in environmental matters among all citizens, especially students and civic organizations.
- Sec. 3 Commission members, through normal communication means, news media, and personal appearances, will keep the Board of Commissioners, State and Federal agencies, and the public, advised as appropriate of pertinent conditions, needs, general violations, and available or possible corrective measures and actions.
- Sec. 4 The Commission will recommend to the Board of Commissioners actions requiring funds or contracts, or need for coordination with, or assistance by, other governmental groups.
- Sec. 5 The Commission will request the Board of Commissioners to ask local, State or Federal authorities to take enforcement action against violators.
- Sec. 6 The Commission will, by letter, notify the Sheriff's office, county and town Boards, firms and institutions, of the statutes and ordinances applicable to possible or known threats against, or pollution of, the environmental resources of the County.
- Sec. 7 To the greatest extent possible, the Commission will publicize and give credit for each instance of local improvement in environmental conditions, and as to noteworthy compliance with legal requirements for pollution control.

APPENDIX B

C. IMPLEMENTATION (or, steps in establishing a Local Community Council).

1. Notify leaders in a particular community. Ask them to identify other people who would be influential in helping form the LCC. Existing strongholds of organization, such as a particularly energetic club in a community, may serve as this initial contact point within that community.

2. Specify a meeting date in which leaders in local organizations (not necessarily the elected officers within such groups) and other interested citizens who do not belong to such clubs can meet. At this meeting, the concept of the Community Councils Program will be explained in full by the staff of the Guilford County Planning Department (phone 373-3673) or by the staff of the Agricultural Extension Service (phone 375-5876) upon request by the community.

3. Next, those present at this initial meeting (hereafter called the "steering committee") will decide upon a date for a "mass community meeting" at which the entire community can receive the same explanation of the Community Councils Program.

4. Next, all organizations and citizens "at large" will, within their own separate meetings, select their representative to sit on the Local Community Council.

5. Then, through coordination with the steering committee, a date and place for the first meeting of the LCC will be set. At this meeting and subsequently, the following questions should be asked and assessed.

a. Have all organizations in the community been identified, and do they have their representatives on the LCC?

b. Are the "citizens at large" (those outside local organizations) organized and represented equitably on the LCC?

c. Are all geographic areas of the community represented equitably?

d. Do members of the LCC really represent all categories of income, age, sex, education, race, political affiliation, religious conviction, and special interests which make up this particular community?

If the answer to either of the above is "no", then steps to rectify the deficiency must be taken immediately. Everyone who lives in this community has to deal with the same community problems daily, and therefore, deserves to be represented and have input into decisions made at the LCC as much as anyone else or any other special interest.

(Source: "How to Set Up a Local Community Council In Your Community", Guilford County Planning Department).

APPENDIX C

Citizen Involvement (WAC 173-16-040(1))

While public involvement and notification is required of the master program at the time of adoption by the act, the general public must be involved in the initial planning stage during formulation of the master plan.

The act requires that prior to approval or adoption of a master program, or a portion thereof, by the department, at least one public hearing shall be held in each county affected by the program for the purpose of obtaining the views and comments of the public.

The act charges the state and local government with not only the responsibility of making reasonable efforts to inform the people of the state about the shoreline management program, but also actively encourages participation by all persons, private groups, and entities, which have an interest in shoreline management.

To meet these responsibilities, the local government agencies responsible for the development of the master program should establish a method for obtaining and utilizing citizen involvement. The extent of citizen involvement in the formulation of the master program will be considered by the department in the review of the program. A failure by the local government to encourage and utilize citizen involvement, or to justify not having done so, may be noted as a failure to comply with the act.

Though the department recognized various forms of citizen involvement as viable approaches for involving the public in the master program, the local government will be encouraged to utilize the method as suggested in these guidelines. If a local government does not follow these guidelines, it should provide an explanation of the method used. The department will be available to explain and help organize the suggested approach to citizen involvement upon request.

The suggested approach to citizen involvement to be utilized by the local government agency responsible for the development of the master program includes the following:

(a) Appoint a citizen advisory committee whose function will be to guide the formulation of the master program through a series of public evening meetings and at least one public hearing. The committee members should represent both commercial interests as well as environmentalists. However, the advisory committee itself is not to be a substitute for general citizen involvement and input. The aim of the committee will be to utilize citizen input in:

- (i) Studying existing public policies related to shorelines.
- (ii) Defining the needs to satisfy local demands for shorelines.
- (iii) Studying the type and condition of local shorelines relative to needs.

- (iv) Developing goals and policies for the master program with the local government fulfilling the specifications of the master program, including designation of the environments.
 - (v) Identifying use conflicts.
 - (vi) Proposing alternatives for the use of shorelines.
 - (vii) Examining the effects of the master program on the environment.
- (b) The citizen advisory committee should hold at least three public meetings during development of the master program and designation of the environments according to the following guidelines:
- (i) Public notice (as stated in subsection 1 below) must be provided seven days prior to the evening meeting.
 - (ii) All meetings must be open to the public for free discussion.
 - (iii) Meetings should be held in the evening at a location accessible to the general public.
 - (iv) Record of all meetings should be filed with the local government and made available to the public.
 - (v) Local government should provide resource persons to assist in the preparation, organization and diffusion of information.
 - (vi) The final evening meeting should be held at least seven days prior to the public hearing.
- (c) A newsletter should be published by the advisory committee in cooperation with the local government.
- (i) The information sheet should be available to the public at posted locations.
 - (ii) It should be available after the first evening public meeting and prior to the second.
 - (iii) The date, time, and location of future meetings and hearings should be stated.
 - (iv) A phone number should be provided to obtain further information.
 - (v) Public notice should be made of the availability of the newsletter as stated in subsection (d)
- (d) Publicity of the master program should utilize:
- (i) Public notice postings as per subsection (i) below.
 - (ii) Newsletter.
 - (iii) Radio, T. V. and local news media.
 - (iv) A local paper of general circulation.
 - (v) Announcements to community groups.
- (e) At least one public hearing should be held by the local government after the three public meetings have been held to discuss the proposed master plan.
- (i) Public notice (as stated in subsection (i) below) must be made a minimum of once in each of three weeks immediately preceding the hearing in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the area in which the hearing is to be held.

(ii) The master program should be available for public inspection at the local government office and available upon request at least seven days prior to the public hearing.

(f) Prior to adoption of the master program, all reasonable attempts should have been made to obtain a general concurrence of the public and the advisory committee. The method of obtaining or measuring concurrence must be established by the local government and must provide a clear indication of how citizen input is utilized.

(g) If the level of concurrence on the master program is not considered adequate by the advisory committee at the conclusion of the public hearing, the local government should hold subsequent public meetings and public hearings until such time as adequate concurrence as per subsection (f) above is reached.

(h) Attached to the master program upon its submission to the department of ecology shall be a record of public meetings and citizen involvement. A discussion of the use of citizen involvement and measurement on concurrence should be included.

(i) Public notice shall include:

- (i) Reference to the authority under which the rule is proposed.
- (ii) A statement of either the terms or substance of the proposed rule or a description of the subjects and issues involved.
- (iii) The time, place and manner in which interested persons may present their views thereon (as stated in RCW 30.04.025).

(Source: Final Guidelines, Shoreline Management Act of 1971, State of Washington, Department of Ecology).

APPENDIX D

1. Civic Leaders (Volunteers) -- these are people who are actively interested in the future development of their communities and who volunteer regularly to participate in various types of civic projects as a result. For example, James O. Wilson and Edward Banfield found in their study of housing programs in Chicago that "citizens who rank high in income, education or both have an enlarged view of the community as a whole and tend to have a high sense of personal efficacy, a long time perspective, a general familiarity with and confidence in city-wide institutions and a cosmopolitan orientation toward life."⁷ Because of their generally higher interest, information and motivation levels, the participation of this group was much more easily obtained and the study groups included a disproportionate number of them.
2. Non-Volunteers among the Middle Class -- these people constitute probably the majority of the region's population and are both less concerned and less sensitive to planning issues than the civic leaders. The RPA has hypothesized that in order to assure consideration of their interests and values, it would be best to involve them through organizations such as churches and labor unions, whose primary purpose is not civic affairs.
3. The Poor -- the RPA has noted that these people, of necessity, must be more concerned about immediate, basic survival problems than longer range regional policy implications which are more difficult to relate to their daily concerns. "Showing how the issues are relevant, simplifying them for those with little education, and testing whether the unrepresented differ in their opinions even from the poor people who might be recruited will be especially difficult. We may have to use depth interviews of those who serve as listening posts, e.g. barbers and bartenders -- rather than going to large numbers of low income people."⁸
4. Representatives of Major Institutions -- the spokesmen of various organizations and groups concerned with regional development issues were also considered an important source of viewpoints. Among the types of institutions mentioned were large corporations and their professional advisers, labor unions, educational organizations, the information media, foundations, churches, conservation groups, women's organizations, design and construction firms, etc.
5. Experts in Planning -- Related Fields -- these include professional planners employed by various local and state jurisdictions, as well as professionals in various specialized fields with major implications for future regional growth such as health, education, retailing, etc. "In many cases, these professions are not planning for the future of the services they provide; in such cases regional planners can stimulate them to look ahead and can provide economic and demographic projections on which planning for this segment of regional affairs can be based. In any case, the special conditions governing each of these areas of activity must be known to the regional planner for his own work."

(Source: Warner, K. P., Public Participation in - Water Resources Planning Environmental Simulation Laboratory, U. of Mich., N.T.I.S. Report No. PB 204 245, July, 1971, p. 204-205.

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES IN COASTAL AREAS

1. Transportation
 - A. policies, guidelines and standards for transportation and circulation patterns within and to the coastal area - land and water
 - B. development of port facilities
 - C. navigation improvements - inlet stabilization, channel maintenance, etc.
2. Public Health and Welfare
 - A. information on storm hazards, shore erosion, etc. for future residents
 - B. suitability of various soils for septic tank use
 - C. solid waste disposal
 - D. waste and litter
 - E. flooding of low areas
3. Recreation
 - A. provision of adequate public shore recreation facilities and access to beach areas
 - B. preservation of scenic areas
 - C. designation of potential park sites
 - D. depletion of sport fisheries due to water pollution, commercial fishing policies, etc.
 - E. policies, standards and guidelines for recreation and tourist facilities and park lands
4. Environmental Quality
 - A. policies, standards and guidelines for preservation and conservation of natural resources
 - B. Surface water quality
 - a. boat pollution
 - b. thermal pollution
 - c. provision of sewage treatment systems
 - d. shellfishing areas condemnation

- e. stream channelization and bog drainage near estuarine areas
 - f. algal blooms, millfoil growth and odors from polluted water
 - g. maintenance of circulation and flushing action through inlets
 - h. pesticide or fertilizer runoff from residential, commercial or agricultural areas
 - i. feed lot waste disposal
 - j. dredging and filling
- C. Ground water quality
 - a. salt water intrusion
 - b. maintenance of aquifer recharge areas
 - c. designation of capacity use areas in areas of excessive draw down
 - d. septic tank waste seeping into ground water
 - e. drainage of extensive areas of wetlands
 - D. Marsh and swamp alteration within the coastal area
 - a. drainage for mosquito control
 - b. filling, dredging, draining etc.
 - c. alteration of water circulation through marshes
 - E. Alteration of sand dunes
 - F. Depletion of sport or commercial fisheries
 - G. Establishment of policies, guidelines and standards for preservation and enhancement of historic, cultural and scientific aspects of the coastal area
 - H. Preservation of prime agricultural and forestry lands
 - I. Evaluation of environmental effects of new industry and choice of best locations
 - J. Policies, guidelines and standards for fragile or historic areas such as present or potential park sites, natural and scenic river, wildlife refuges, complex natural areas, areas sustaining remnant species or landscapes, areas suitable for two or more organic uses, areas with unique geologic formations, historic places, etc.
 - K. Erosion and sediment control
- 5. Identification of areas of environmental concern where permits for development will be needed and where authority and provisions of the Coastal Area Management Act will operate.
 - 6. Management of transitional or intensively developed areas especially suited or unsuited for intensive use or development
 - A. Provision of information to developers on economics of various development configurations, on planned unit developments and on types of development acceptable to state and local governments.

- B. Provision of information to local land owners on how to benefit from increased land prices and development potential
- C. Provision of information to local government on economics of development - effects of various types of development on the tax base, life styles, etc.
- D. Provision of information to local people on likely effects of development on local culture and quality of life and the differences between various types of development
- E. Development in natural hazard areas or those areas where extreme or unusual environmental conditions exist such as sand dunes, beach areas, marshes etc.
- F. Planning for areas which will be impacted by key facilities
- G. Land drainage and diking in residential and commercial areas
- H. Definition of priority uses and permissible uses in coastal areas
- I. Compensation for landowners whose use of property has been restricted

APPENDIX F



CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION, INC.

17 State Circle, Box 1709
send to.... Annapolis, Maryland 21404

268-8816

POLLUTION REPORT

Witness: _____
Name

Date: _____

Address

Time: _____

Location: _____
specific site location, body of water, address (sketch site on back or attach map)

Alleged Violator: _____
name, address, boat registration number

Type of Pollution: _____
sedimentation, industrial, sewage, trash dumping, dredging, filling, other

Type of Evidence: _____
enclose photos (preferably color) - if samples, attach analysis report

Description: (concise detailed statement)

Signature of Witness: _____

Telephone #: _____

CBF ACTION

Case No. _____

Date Notified: _____

Agency Contacted: _____

Agent: _____

Date: _____

Agency Action:

PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED
By
THE CENTER FOR MARINE AND COASTAL STUDIES

Wave-Current Force Spectra, C. C. Tung and N. E. Huang, Report No. 72-2,
December, 1972.

A Survey of North Carolina Beach Erosion by Air Photo Methods, H. E. Wahls,
Report No. 73-1, May, 1973.

Sediment Movement in Tubbs Inlet, North Carolina, Robert P. Masterson, Jr.,
Jerry L. Machemehl and Victor V. Cavaroc, Jr., Report No. 73-2,
June, 1973.

Influence of Current On Some Statistical Properties of Waves, C. C. Tung
and N. E. Huang, Report No. 73-3, December, 1973.

CTD Sensors, Specific Conductance and the Determination of Salinity,
C. E. Knowles, Report No. 73-3, August, 1973.

Planning for North Carolina's Coastal Inlets - An Analysis of the Present
Process and Recommendations for the Future, William S. Tilley,
Report No. 73-4, September, 1973.

A Preliminary Study of Storm-Induced Beach Erosion for North Carolina,
C. E. Knowles and Jay Langfelder and Richard McDonald, Report
No. 73-5, October, 1973.

A Historical Review of Some of North Carolina's Coastal Inlets, Jay
Langfelder, Tom French, Richard McDonald and Richard Ledbetter,
Report No. 74-1, January, 1974.

Statistical Properties of Kinematics and Dynamics of a Random Gravity
Wave Field, C. C. Tung, Report No. 74-2, June, 1974.

A New Technique of Beach Erosion Control, Tom French, Jerry L. Machemehl
and N. E. Huang, Report No. 74-3, June, 1974.

Citizen Participation in North Carolina's Coastal Area Management Program,
Steve Tilley, Report No. 74-4, June, 1974.

An Experimental Study of Scour Around Marine Foundations Due to
Oscillatory Waves and Unidirectional Currents, Greg N. Abad and
Jerry L. Machemehl, Report No. 74-5, September, 1974.

Proceedings of A Conference on Coastal Management, Report No. 74-6,
September, 1974.

Statistical Properties of Fluid Motion and Fluid Force in A Random
Wave Field, Keikhosrow Pajouhi and C. C. Tung, Report No. 75-1,
May, 1975

"A Numerical Method for Solutions of Systems of Non-Linear Algebraic Equations", John M. Klinck and Leonard J. Pietrafesa, Report No. 75-2, July, 1975.

"Wave-Current Interactions in Water of Variable Depths", A. M. Radwan, C. C. Tung and N. E. Huang, Report No. 75-3, August, 1975.

