

ALBEMARLE-PAMLICO NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM

Science & Technical Advisory Committee

Quarterly Meeting Summary

Inaugural Meeting - July 28, 2004

Pitt County Agricultural Building, Greenville, NC

Dean Carpenter, APNEP Science Coordinator, called the inaugural meeting of the APNEP Science & Technical Committee (STAC) to order at 10:00am. He welcomed and thanked those present while conveying the regrets of the few who were unable to attend. He then reviewed the meeting agenda, asked for any additions, and hearing none, began his presentation with an overview of the STAC.

Dr. Carpenter's presentation addressed the STAC's mission, staffing, history, goals and objectives, by-laws, and members' roles, as well as an organizational strategic planning model.

Upon introduction of discussion pertaining to the by-laws, Dr. Carpenter disclosed that they were modeled, in part, by the STAC of the Chesapeake Bay Program. He thanked them in absentia for their help.

While further defining the role of STAC members, Dr. Carpenter mentioned foreseeing a need for STAC members to liaison to the other newly restructured APNEP committees (e.g., Citizens' Advisory Committee, Local Government Committee, Outreach and Education Committee) when they are formed.

Just prior to the discussion of the by-laws, and for the benefit of all those in attendance, Dr. Carpenter asked that self-introductions, as well as brief descriptions of individual expertise, be made around the table. A guest, Dr. David O'Brien from VIMS, was acknowledged and welcomed.

Following this assessment, he mentioned that there was need for a social scientist to be added to their ranks, and asked the members if they felt the addition of other expertise were warranted.

Discussion ensued with the recommendation that social/anthropological planning expertise be considered, as well as that of coastal law and shoreline stabilization. Having NC/VA State agency division presence was also mentioned and debated.

Dr. Carpenter and Bill Crowell, APNEP Director, addressed the comments of state agency representation on the STAC by saying their hope for future STAC discussions, decisions, and recommendations was that such would be free of political consideration, and that all STAC activities should be conducted in an environment of objectivity and good science. More discussion ensued with the assurance being made that as STAC activities progressed and the need for state agency expertise was required, such representatives of state government as were needed to reach the best and most informed decisions, would be invited to participate on an ad hoc basis.

More discussion pertaining to the by-laws yielded changes in the wording under: II. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, Section A, numbers 1 and 2:

1. **Executive Board:** The words "**members and STAC**" were rearranged and the addition of the words "**of the**" were added. The change should read: "The Executive Board of the STAC consists of the two co-Chairs, and no more than five additional **members of the STAC** who are nominated by the co-Chairs, and approved by the full membership for two-year terms."

2. **Chairpersons:** The phrase "**for inland and coastal issues respectively**" is removed. The change should read: "The STAC will have two Chairpersons and both Chairpersons will sit as voting members on the Management Council. Chairs are elected by a majority vote of the STAC members with a quorum present. Each co-Chair serves a two-year term, renewable once."

In final discussion of the by-laws, members' attendance policies, attendance by a member's designee, and term limits, were discussed. It was mentioned that meeting attendance records would be strictly kept with the roll being called at each meeting, and that attendance by a designee would **NOT** be counted as attendance by the member.

At this point a short break occurred allowing the group to pick-up their lunch and prepare for the luncheon speaker, Barry Burgan from the USEPA.

Mr. Burgan gave a brief presentation on the transition of the APNEP: its program history from being selected by Congress as an "estuary of national significance" in 1986, the acceptance of the CCMP in 1994, the 2002 Implementation Review, the relocation of the program into the DENR Secretary's Office, and the need for, and role of, establishing a Science and Technical Advisory Committee.

He closed with his vision of the next steps for the APNEP, including the recommendations for: completion of an APNEP monitoring strategy, development of qualitative and quantifiable NEP indicators of success, and the establishment of implementation priorities.

During discussion following Mr. Burgan's presentation, questions and comments arose pertaining to the probability for EPA's future funding of the National Estuary Program, how other NEPs were structured and funded, NC's remiss development of a monitoring strategy and the reasons for it, the uniqueness of NC's estuarine/sounds system and climate, how other NEPs are dealing with monitoring in their states, and the development of TMDLs in other areas.

In response to the questions about the APNEP's structure, involvement and impact, Director Crowell commented that the APNEP is the largest program among the 28 NEPs encompassing two states (36 counties in NC and 19 counties and incorporated cities in VA), 5 major river basins, ~30,000 square miles of watershed, and a unique lagoonal sound system.

He continued noting that all the NEPs received the same amount of EPA funding (despite the programmatic and geographic diminutiveness of most other programs) and that perhaps future funding for the APNEP might be included in the Governor's budget or through the Smithfield Foods settlement with NC. He added that the Management Committee will be the body that will set priorities in the future, and its development would be completed soon.

Closing this portion of the agenda, Mr. Burgan asked the STAC not to become a "rubber stamp" in the APNEP decision-making process, but to be innovative and forward thinking.

Regarding the issue of monitoring, Dr. Carpenter directed the members' attention to the paper included in their packet entitled: *Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program Monitoring Plan Workshop, December 12-13, 2000*.

The election of co-Chairs followed with Dr. Nancy White from the UNC Coastal Studies Institute and Mike Wicker from the US Fish & Wildlife Service being nominated by Dr. Hans Paerl and Dr. Michael Mallin respectively, before the nominations were closed. Dr. White and Mr. Wicker were elected by acclamation and will serve a two-year term.

Dr. Sam Pearsall, from The Nature Conservancy, suggested that further steps to define the organization be suspended thus allowing for latitude in committee structure and function.

Dr. Jay Tomlinson, from NC State University, recommended that the co-Chairs be able to nominate Executive Committee members not on the STAC, when the need arose.

Barbara Doll, from NC Sea Grant, returned to the question of having DENR (and VA) agency representation on the STAC in an ex-officio capacity, or at the very least having them invited to the STAC meetings.

Mike Wicker stressed the need for including people in STAC meetings who have the responsibility for implementing STAC recommendations and decisions.

Dr. Hans Paerl inquired whether the APNEP Management Committee membership had been defined, selected, or approached to which Bill Crowell reiterated his previous comments about the restructuring of the APNEP. He added that it was envisioned that state agency representation would be included on the Management Committee.

Dr. Doug Rader, from Environmental Defense and the first of APNEP's Directors, moved to accept the by-laws with the aforementioned changes. The motion carried by acclamation.

Dr. Carpenter then reviewed the four sections of the APNEP Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP): water quality, habitat, fisheries, and stewardship.

He added that an objective of the STAC would be to revisit the goals, objectives and recommendations contained in the CCMP that was accepted on behalf of the

citizens of NC by the Governor, and by the EPA Administrator on behalf of the people of the United States, in November 1994.

He felt some post-CCMP considerations should include the following topics: invasive species, endocrine disruption, aquaculture, water supply, climate changes and sea-level rise.

Dr. Carpenter mentioned that indicators in other NEPs could be found in the report entitled *Mid-Atlantic Integrated Assessment of Estuaries 1997-1998* published by EPA in 2002. He also referenced the suite of indicators that are provided in the *National Coastal Condition Reports* of 2002, 2004, and 2006.

Dr. Pearsall suggested that the STAC look at the amount of funding the program had before determining how many indicators should be defined.

Mr. Burgan added that indicators span two arenas: public and managerial. Mr. Wicker stated that the STAC could determine indicators that are indicative of the STAC cognitive process. Dr. Carpenter said he would distribute a paper on how indicators are determined.

Dr. White commented that she and Mr. Wicker should meet with their Executive Committee to determine how indicators will be determined, and also to develop a timeline for implementation.

Dr. Rader suggested that an Indicator Development Work Group be formed to look at the question of indicators while Bill Crowell mentioned that EPA had contractor assistance available for doing such.

Barbara Doll, Dr. Rader, and Dr. Paerl agreed to serve on the work group. It was suggested that Jimmy Overton (NCDWQ), Mike Street (NCDMF) and Cindy Camacho (NCDCM) be included. It was agreed that the Executive Committee would meet with the ad hoc group in September.

Dr. George Hess, from NC State University, and Dr. White remarked that global indicators should also be considered.

Dr. Carpenter stated that the STAC is intended to meet quarterly with the next meeting planned for November. He agreed to survey the membership to determine the date most convenient to all. He further mentioned that experience and

research showed holding meetings in the same place each quarter would prove to be the most successful in assuring attendance, although he hoped from time-to-time that members would host meetings in their locations and sponsor presentations by their agency, organization, etc.

Director Crowell mentioned the APNEP State of the Sound Forum planned for November 17, 2004 at the New Bern Convention Center and urged those present to consider attending.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm.