

APNEP Citizens Advisory Committee

Chowan County Courthouse, Edenton, North Carolina
Spring Meeting Notes, May 20, 2011

APNEP Staff Present: Jim Hawhee, Dean Carpenter, Scott Gentry, Chad Smith.

CAC Members Present: Harrel Johnson, Marjorie Rayburn, Kay Winn, Lisa Kirby, Christine Mele, Dianne Hardison, Brian Roth

Call to Order: Kay Winn, CAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:15 AM and welcomed the APNEP staff and committee members. There were no members of the public present to make any comments. Kay asked members to approve notes from the winter meeting. Harrel added that he was in attendance through conference call for half the winter meeting. Members approved the winter meeting notes pending the change requested by Harrel.

APNEP Updates

- Dean mentioned that Bill Crowell couldn't be in attendance as he was out-of-state for a graduation ceremony.
- Scott presented members with a PowerPoint presentation detailing past CAC-funded projects in addition to the ones approved at the winter meeting. He passed around completed project reports that offered further details and pictures; he also passed around a booklet titled, *Living in your Watershed*, which was supported by APNEP.
- He also highlighted some of the ongoing APNEP projects, which include: Shad in the Schools, Environmental Education (EE) Teacher Training Institute, *Living in your Watershed* Booklet, and the North Carolina Outdoor Classroom Symposium.
- Kay recommended that getting an individual to speak about grant-writing would be beneficial for the EE Teacher Training Institute. She added that teachers are sometimes unsure on how to either write or handle grants thus a lot of them don't apply.
- Marjorie added that bringing in a teacher who recently completed the Teacher's Institute to speak to active participants about their experiences and how it has helped them.
- Dean asked that members mark their calendars for November 17th of this year, which is the State of the Sounds Conference. It is a one-day event that will take place in New Bern, NC. The completed Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (CCMP) and State of the Sounds Assessment will be unveiled at this event.
- Scott mentioned that Secretary Freeman was visiting Manteo High School today to give an address about the importance of public education. He delivered the speech at the school's outdoor classroom, which was funded by an APNEP grant.

CAC Membership Discussion

- Jim asked if anyone would be interested in renewing their term. He also listed four vacancies: Commercial Fishing/Seafood Industry, Virginia Municipal League, Recognized Tribal for both North Carolina and Virginia.
- Christine said she had a potential nominee for the Commercial Fishing/Seafood Industry

vacancy. She will be in contact with Jim about arranging for this nominee to either attend or speak at the next meeting. Harrel said he may have contacts with the Recognized Tribal vacancies for both states and that he would follow up on this at a later date.

- There was some discussion among members concerning K-12 representatives to the CAC. Members who are active educators may not be able to attend the quarterly meetings due to their commitment to teaching in the classroom and the difficulty in acquiring time off and associated expenses (i.e. using personal money for finding a substitute, personal vehicle). The discussion steered towards whether the committee wanted to seek an educator who has retired or has a flexible schedule. Jim added that he would like to have an educator who is actively engaged in the community but it is the committee's decision.
- Jim passed around a printed spreadsheet that listed vacancies and held positions.
- He also added that he would like for members whose terms might end soon to think about staying through 2012 so they could see the benefits of the newly updated CCMP.
- Kay brought up a question about those who may be ending their second term and whether they are able to renew for a third term? Dean mentioned the 2-term limitation rule but said that STAC had this limitation removed from the bylaws and advised that this committee look into this action as well.
- Kay briefed members on the nominating committee process. After making suggestions, she asked if Jim could come up with nominations. During their recent phone conference, Jim emailed the committee with attached CVs of the three nominated individuals.
- Members looked over the CVs and there was an approved motion to accept the three nominations. Prior to the motion, Dianne asked if she should leave the room due to conflict of interest. Members felt she didn't have to leave the room for the motion.

State of the Sounds Assessment and CCMP Progress Report

- Dean gave members a PowerPoint presentation that combines these separate agenda items. He reviewed the following items: process objectives of the CCMP; the ecosystem-based management (EBM) transition team and how they are working to integrate this management approach to the new CCMP and monitoring plan; and proposed changes of the new CCMP.
- He presented the four questions that describe the foundation of the CCMP.
 - What is a healthy Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine System?
 - What is the status of the system?
 - What are the biggest threats to the system?
 - What actions are needed?
- He mentioned that this document was written for all stakeholders. Kay commended the staff for this design and that it is nice to have a document that isn't full of jargon. Both Dean and Jim said this was an important consideration during its design; they also added that member feedback at this time would be highly beneficial to staff.
- Dean went over the goals and outcomes of the CCMP framework. Jim asked for members to refer to their handouts if they need a closer look for comments.
- Dean added that Goals 1-3 focus on the first question, "What is a healthy Albemarle-Pamlico system?"

- Kay commented that “*surface hydrological regimes*” may be too technical and recommended that staff simplify or better define the term (Goal 1, Term C). There was continued discussion about the use of jargon and how it should be avoided in documents that are intended for a wide audience.
- Dean added that the listed proposed strategies address the fourth question, “What actions are needed?”
- Lisa asked about overlap between data collection and analyses and if there was something in place that could limit duplicated efforts (and save taxpayer money)?
- Marjorie commented that acronyms be spelled out and also the inclusion of a glossary that defines terms that some stakeholders may be unfamiliar with.

Members took a 15-minute break at 12:05PM.

- After returning from break, Dean briefed members about the 2011 Ecosystem Assessment. This is related to the State of the Sounds Assessment, which will give us an idea on how things have changed over the past two decades.
- Topics included in the assessment: climate change, air quality, unusual mortalities/disease, economic productivity, species diversity, land cover, population, water quality, extent of living habitat, fish population, riverine inputs.
- There was discussion about what are the biggest threats and that APNEP is considered a “climate ready estuary.”
- Dean and Jim asked that members refer back to the handout for input/comments regarding the five proposed strategies: Identify, Protect, Restore, Engage, and Monitor. Within each strategy are listed objectives and actions.
- Dean also added that the CCMP will be continually revised in response to improved knowledge and changing conditions.
- Kay asked what the standard was for the term “restoration.” Dean added that it is usually based on societal data (culture of the area) as opposed to complete scientific data.
- A2: Kay suggested a change in the objective to read, “*Assess vulnerability of the original ecosystem to stressors, including but not limited to climate change and sea-level rise.*”
- A2.6: Brian asked if uranium mining was considered and that it might carry more importance in coming years.
- B1.4: Christine suggested that “*low-impact development*” be clearly defined.
- B1.5: Kay suggested that “*no-till*” be changed to “*conservation-till.*” She added that no-till typically means that more chemicals will be used thus creating a trade-off.
- B2.3: Members thought this sounded regulatory, which steered further discussion on how citizens respond to regulations and the pressures that ascend from it. Harrel was curious to how this action would be implemented. There was a suggestion to change the phrasing of the action item to read, “*Assist others in the development of incentives for protection and management of targeted natural communities and habitats on non-public lands.*”
- C1.6: There were several suggestions for this action item. Members thought this may be hard to control and also suggested that the word “*facility*” be replaced with “*system.*” There was a question to whether or not overflow was the only form of discharge. Brian added that there is a big need to repair the pipes so water loss can be reversed.
- C1.7: There were concerns that retrofitting existing areas of development might be costly

and questioned where the funds may come from. Chad mentioned that the CAC has funded retrofitting projects in the past using their given funds for demonstration projects.

- C2.2: There was concern that this action item was too broad and that it should include stream banks.
- C3.1: The word “*eradication*” might be a bit ambitious, perhaps use the word “*control*.”
- D1.2: There was a suggestion to change the phrasing of this action item to read, “*Facilitate an increase in efforts to increase cooperation between public and private lands to protect and restore ecosystem processes.*”
- Harrel commented that this was an ambitious document and whether APNEP would be able to come near to implementing all the action items. Dean added that APNEP would be working from this document for the next ten years, and that APNEP will work with its partners to implement the plan’s actions.
- Again, Kay commended APNEP staff for being able to put together a well-formed document for a complex watershed and for their ability to make this document reach a wide audience by keeping the jargon at minimum.

APNEP Media Options.

- Jim gave an overview of media options that APNEP is offering. Some of the outlets discussed were the APNEP website, Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. Jim encouraged that members visit APNEP’s Facebook page. He mentioned that you don’t need an account to view our page and that it is a great way to network, read current news articles, and view pictures from recent APNEP events and demonstration projects.
- He also encouraged members to contact him if they have any suggestions or additions to the APNEP website. He added that current related-news articles would be featured on the website homepage on a regular basis. There is also a calendar on the website that details some of the upcoming APNEP events. He also added that there was a RSS feed, which enables visitors to subscribe so updates can be sent to their email, cell phones, etc.

Round Table Discussion.

- Members had the opportunity to discuss the CCMP and the State of the Sounds Assessment during the presentation given by Dean.

New and Old Business.

- There was no discussion of old business.
- Christine requested a diagram that shows the network of agencies within NCDENR. Jim said something like that already exists and that he would forward it to her.
- The date and time for the summer meeting was not set at this time.

Networking Session.

- A few members remained after the meeting to continue various discussions.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15PM.