

APNEP Living Aquatic Resources Workshop II
Ecological Services Field Office, Raleigh, North Carolina
May 20, 2008

Present: Dean Carpenter (APNEP), Lucy Henry (APNEP), Tom Cuffney (USGS), Bill Crowell (APNEP), Jimmy Johnson (NC-DENR), Wilson Laney (USFWS); on telephone, Jud Kenworthy (NOAA-NOS), Chris Taylor (NOAA-NOS), Kathy Rawls (NC-DMF), Anne Deaton (NC-DMF).

10:20 AM: Dean kicked off the meeting by reviewing the timeline for development of the living aquatic resource (LAR) monitoring strategies. He reviewed the materials that he had distributed to the LAR team for their use and review. He noted that the team had hit a major snag when the NC-DWQ representative indicated that he felt their only obligation was to provide the data sets that APNEP needs, rather than to prepare a draft monitoring strategy for each indicator. APNEP needs to have a substantive product in the July time frame. Wilson agreed that is where the team needs to be.

Wilson asked if the members on the telephone had taken time to read the materials that Dean had sent out, and if they had taken a shot at drafting a strategy. Kathy had not had time to do so. Jud indicated that he had focused on submerged aquatic vegetation, and was prepared to work on that one.

Dean noted that our hope was that existing sampling programs could be used to craft an initial draft, and then build on top for any additional APNEP needs, and then incorporate them into an APNEP monitoring network.

Jud asked for us to define “network.” Dean explained that we would begin with the existing monitoring programs, then add as necessary to establish an APNEP network. He used alligators as an example. Wilson explained to Jud how he had envisioned the process would work. He used the alligator example again. Dean concurred that was the approach that we hoped to take. Dean noted that we expected the agency liaisons to tap whoever’s expertise they needed in each agency.

Kathy asked if anyone had developed a draft yet.

Dean indicated that Sarah McRae has provided several to him. Dean indicated that he could provide those to Kathy and other members.

Jud indicated the New Hampshire monitoring framework looks pretty good, but New Hampshire isn’t nearly as complicated as the AP is. We agreed, but Bill noted it is just the format that we want to follow. Jud noted that he struggled with adopting it. He noted that sorting our priorities is an issue. For example, if you try to take the template and use it for North Carolina. You have to identify priorities first, i.e., do you want to address marine or freshwater species, or address

them all. We have to have a priority.

Dean agreed, noting that we thought that conversation would take place with the SAV experts. Jud indicated that he thought he could tackle the task.

Wilson noted to the group that he and Dean had discussed one approach to developing drafts for all the LAR indicators. Wilson noted that another approach would be to have smaller working groups developing the drafts.

Jud asked that Dean send him the full list of the SAV working group, then he will invite members to join him in preparing the SAV indicator draft. He will also network with others that aren't in the group, but have an interest in SAV monitoring. Jud will prepare a note, then send it to Dean for transmittal to the whole group. Jud noted that he would like to have some idea of how to address priorities and was looking for guidance. He stated that some of the things that he would like to do wouldn't be doable. If we want to get it kicked off right, we need to focus on where the most important place to start attacking the indicators is. Probably some of the benthic and pelagic resources first. Some of the things just aren't doable. Jud stated it goes back to threats. Some can be ongoing and generic, but others should be of more concern and higher priority than others. For example, the threats to water quality may overlap multiple indicators.

Wilson suggested that we try to develop both a Cadillac option and a realistic option, and then share both options to the policy board. For some of them, such as freshwater turtles, we may decide that we can't presently afford them, and just have to drop them for now.

Dean asked that we add a current assessment of the indicator, just in a paragraph or two. Then we can compare that to the assessment that was in the prior CCMP.

Bill noted that we also just want to include those species that we can use as an indicator species, at this point in time.

Chris noted that the New Hampshire document seems straightforward enough, so he felt that we could develop this by the July deadline. Chris felt that we could do this largely via e-mail.

Wilson agreed that we could do so. He indicated that he could be responsible for taking on the fish one.

Dean indicated that he would like to have some idea of the timeline by which we could have something ready. Dean proposed that the team have a synthesis workshop during the week of June 16. Dean and Wilson will send something out by COB on May 29. We want to hear from the lead individuals, whether they are willing to take a shot at the draft.

Jud noted that he would take a shot at the SAV one. The team discussed macroalgae. Jud noted that macroalgae could be combined with the SAV. From a water quality perspective, they are sometimes perceived as negative indicators. Dean noted that some species, sensitive to stress,

could be tracked independently. Others may be important as habitat, or forage. Wilson suggested that we keep macroalgae separate.

Wilson reviewed the remaining fish indicators. Kathy will take the lead for bottlenose dolphin, and work with Chris on the fish stocks. She will work with Kevin Dockendorf on the estuarine invasives, and Wilson will provide information on the snakehead monitoring program in the Potomac River, to be based on conversations with Albert Spells in Virginia, and Steve Minkinen in Maryland.

The team decided that Anne Deaton should be briefed on the process from this point onward. Wilson and Dean did the briefing. The team will have a synthesis meeting the week of June 16, and drafts are due on June 12. Anne agreed to assume responsibility for all the indicators for which she has the lead. Wilson and Dean explained to her for what was desired.

Bill Crowell asked Anne if she would talk to Trish MacPherson about APNEP work. Anne indicated that she would be pleased to do so. She indicated they had met about estuarine benthic indicators, and NC-DWQ staff is saying it isn't possible. The stated reason is that things are just too variable. The species there are very tolerant, so they aren't good indicators. Anne noted that the guy on the team from the Chesapeake, Dan Dower, is doing the work. Anne has his papers and will review them, then reassess the situation.

The team discussed the situation with NC-DWQ staff. Tom noted that his expertise is in freshwater, and he would like to work with NC-DWQ staff on those indicators. Dean briefed Tom on what had transpired with regard to NC-DWQ and their work on APNEP indicator development.

The team decided that they could productively spend the afternoon working on the freshwater indicators, with Dean, Wilson and Tom, and anyone else who wants to work with them.

We discussed doing a separate assessment document, that would look at all the indicators from a prehistoric, historic and present basis.

12:00 PM: The team decided to break for lunch, and reconvened at 1:30 PM.

1:30 PM: Dean, Tom and Wilson worked to develop a draft for the first Living Aquatic Resource indicator.

4:00 PM: The meeting adjourned.