

APR 10 1991

Albemarle/Pamlico Citizens' Advisory Committees
American Legion Building
Edenton, N.C.
13 February 1991
3:30 p.m.

Minutes

Attendance - See Attachment A

The Albemarle and Pamlico Citizens' Advisory Committees met jointly in the American Legion Building in Edenton on 13 February 1991, with Brewster Brown and Dr. Ernie Larkin presiding.

Program Review Subcommittee Report - Dr. Larkin introduced Frank Sommerkamp, Chairman of the Program Review Subcommittee for the PCAC. Explaining the subcommittee's goal as "looking over where we're going," Sommerkamp stated that the PCAC and probably the ACAC has questioned "whether we're focusing on the objective, are we studying for the sake of studying, and are we getting the background needed to come forward with a plan?" He noted that 9 November 1991 is the target date for completion of the Status and Trends document and November 1992 is the final date for production of the CCMP. Sommerkamp reminded the group that if all the studies are not meshed together in a comprehensive plan by the end of the five year project, then APES will turn out to be just another study.

Fact Sheets - Neil Armingeon of the Coastal Federation was introduced and called on to speak about the fact sheets. He stated that the document, A Blueprint for Action, is completed. It remains for Derb Carter to sign it, Armingeon said, noting that seventy people had reviewed the document. "I'm officially turning it over to Randy." Armingeon noted that even though the document was completed before the Status and Trends was released, it is still current as it has been updated in terms of the recently released Status and Trends.

Armingeon told the CAC members that the Coastal Federation, Frank Tursi and he were producing ten fact sheets to be distributed to the general public. He requested input and feedback from the CACs on the ten subjects selected for the fact sheets. See Attachment B The fact sheet subjects and the newspaper articles that Tom Stroud (PTRF) is doing complement each other nicely, Armingeon said. Fact sheets will be printed front and back with a logo and the subject matter will be tied in with the research undertaken by the AP Study. Some of the resource people will be contacted for ideas and input, for example, Dr. Bill Hogarth, for the fisheries fact sheet. Armingeon stressed that although the fact sheets will contain generalized information for public consumption, there will be other sources of information listed for further study. He then asked for comments.

Joan Giordano called attention to item number ten, public participation, suggesting that the Hampton Rhodes Planning District Commission should be added as it conducts outreach for the AP Study in Virginia.

One CAC member suggested that estuarine shorelines might be handled as a separate subject.

On the subject of best management practices, Armingeon stated that David Sides and Jim Cummings had agreed to help furnish data, and a suggestion was made to include information from someone outside of the Division of Soil and Water. Paul Lilley of the Albemarle CAC was mentioned as a possibility. Members also suggested including urban BMPs.

Armingeon stated that his organization wanted to work with the CACs in the development of the fact sheets, noting that comments and suggestions will still be accepted in the near future.

In responding to a question, Armingeon explained the format of the fact sheets, using subject #1, aquatic diseases, as an example. There will be a single sheet printed front and back, beginning with a brief background on what is meant by aquatic disease. Then we will tie in shell disease and ulcerative mycosis. The main purpose of the fact sheet is to get people's attention so that if they want to read more about a particular subject, the AP Study has a larger document for review. In answer to a question about the fact sheet on public participation, Armingeon stated it will include the citizen's water quality monitoring program.

Discussion followed concerning a fact sheet on the development of the CCMP process. It was recommended to include information on the CCMP in the fact sheet focusing on the status and trends report; maybe as a last paragraph outlining where do we go from here? A motion was made, seconded and passed to accept the subject matter for the ten fact sheets as presented.

Recommendations on Technical Proposals - Next the CACs heard the subcommittee's recommendations on the technical proposals. They were presented in four categories: Critical Areas, Fisheries, Water Quality, and Human Environment. Each proposal was ranked from 1 to 4, then averaged to come up with one figure, with 4 being the highest and 1 the lowest. Beginning with critical areas, the highest was project 510, the delineation of SAVs in Currituck, Albemarle and Western Pamlico Sounds, which received a 3.5. The second project, receiving a 2.3, was 526, an inventory protection plan for critical natural areas, exemplary wetlands and endangered species in Virginia. The third proposal, 501, wasn't highly ranked.

After consideration of fisheries proposals, the highest ranked one was 552, Rulifson's continuation of the striped bass study in the Roanoke River which received the only 4.0 ranking. Proposal 527, Dr. Ed Noga's study of shell disease in blue crabs, received a 3.5. A suggestion was made to modify it to include both conclusions and management recommendations. Fisheries proposal 541, a study of the relationship between shoreline land uses and shellfish reproduction, received a 3.1 ranking. Proposal 505 got a 2.6 ranking and studies the effect of trawling on benthic community in lower Pamlico River.

Under human environment, four studies stood out and were rated highly, beginning with proposal 550, which got a 3.5 ranking. 550 was a study to develop management strategies for the study of area sub-basins with applications to key planning issues which were fairly specifically spelled out in the RFP. This has a direct relationship to the CCMP. The second study, number 533, received a 3.2. It is a continuation evaluation of state and other programs protecting the resource, looking at additional programs and evaluating their effectiveness, and also making management recommendations for changes in the way the state agencies work. This might be helpful for the CCMP also. The next proposal was 543 which

got a 3.0 ranking and is the environmental management program for the southeastern Virginia portion of the watershed. The last one, 548, received a 2.54. This proposal is a study of land use and land cover change which is still a baseline establishment thing, using satellites and similar technology to see how land uses have changed.

In the water quality area, there were seven proposals ranked close together. The first was 538 which received a 3.6 ranking and is a study of flows and flow patterns in the Pamlico and Neuse Rivers by USGS. The next proposal was 539 which is a similar study for the Roanoke and Albemarle Sounds, with a 3.5 ranking. The third proposal, 520, the biological impact of heavy metals in the upper Neuse, received a 3.1. Next was 509 which got a 3.1 also and is the baseline water quality monitoring program from DEM. 506 was given a 2.9 ranking and is also a study assessing the biological effects of heavy metals and other contaminants in the sediments in the Pamlico. The recommendation is to fund at least one of these proposals. The next proposal, 536, was given a 2.7 ranking. This study identifies groundwater recharge areas and the susceptibility of pollution, whether groundwater is actually getting into the estuarine system and causing some degradation. The last of the group, 540, had a 2.6 ranking. It is a USGS study monitoring water quality and is a continuation of monitoring efforts systemwide. The study had a \$150,000 match, as well. This concludes the group.

A question from one of the CAC members revealed that the ranked proposals totaled in excess of \$300,000, which exceeded available funding, according to Randy Waite. It was pointed out that all of the recommended proposals could not be funded.

Following a question about determining the final cut of proposals to be funded, a subcommittee member noted that the group considered the rating numbers to be "our best estimate of the absolute value of the study."

After discussion, a motion was made and seconded to accept the studies in the four categories as prioritized by the subcommittee. The motion carried.

Public participation rankings were discussed, the first being 514, a continuation of the citizens' monitoring program, which was ranked at the top. These scores were derived by ranking projects from 1 to 5 and taking an average. The second proposal examined was 524 which is Community Outreach by PTRF. The recommendation also included funding for PTRF to assume production of the APES newsletter for the remainder of this year and next. The third ranked proposal, the public education program in the Albemarle area, received a 4.27 ranking. Number 508, the Coastal Federation's proposal to involve the public in developing the A/P Estuarine Study CCMP, also included hosting two annual meetings. The fifth ranked proposal, 542, from the Hampton Rhodes Planning District Commission, was modified to set the dollar amount at \$10,000. It was left up to the program to negotiate what could be produced for that amount of money. Proposal 502, Phase II of the Estuarine/Environmental Health Education Curriculum, was ranked sixth. Equally ranked was a proposal entitled "Clean Water Charlie", a pamphlet targeted at a very young age group.

If all of the above recommended proposals are funded, members were told, the public participation total would be about 19%, with the benchmark percentage being 10-20%.

A question was raised about the rating of two proposals which dealt with alternatives for long term citizen involvement. Mike Orbach explained that, although the issue itself was considered important, the proposals presented to accomplish the objective were ranked very low. However, the objective itself is still highly ranked and the subcommittee felt it appropriate for the program to perform that task and provide funds for it, if necessary. Orbach said his subcommittee in conjunction with the Technical Committee would develop some alternatives toward accomplishing that task for the consideration of the Policy Committee.

Following Orbach's explanation, a motion was made by Vince Bellis to accept the proposals as ranked and was seconded by Dick Leach. The motion passed, with one abstention.

A second motion was offered to have PTRF produce the A/P Study newsletter for the remainder of this year, and it was seconded and approved.

As two different systems of ranking were used for the technical acquisition and public participation projects, a member suggested that all scores be "normalized" be multiplying them by .8, and it was agreed to do this.

Discussion followed about having the CACs continue to meet jointly or go back to individual meeting schedules as in the past.

It was announced that Derb Carter and Brewster Brown have considered putting together a legislative subcommittee of the CACs. Such a subcommittee has been formed in the Policy Committee. The two chairs of the CACs would like to have broader input from the CACs and from interested members about that liaison. Discussion followed concerning the validity of forming a subcommittee to communicate with the legislature when the CACs already serve much of the public function. Brewster Brown suggested looking at the Blueprint for Action and determining what in the document requires the legislature to take some action.

Al Howard made a motion stating that the chairmen of the CACs come up with a proposal for this legislative committee and take input from both the Albemarle and Pamlico Committees at the next meeting. Then the committees can meet and make the taskings to the individual members appointed to the new subcommittee. Ann Carter added a modification to the Howard motion, stating that the two chairmen draw up an outline of the new subcommittee and mail this to the CACs for written comment and approval. If approval was forthcoming, then the process of assigning members to the new subcommittee could begin. If not, provision was made to call a special meeting. The original motion and its modification was seconded and approved.

Members were reminded that any APES proposals that require funding or extensions from the General Assembly need to be included within the current two year budget.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

Attendance

2/13/97

Attachment A

John Leonard	A/P Steady
Bruce Wilson	A/CAC
Ernie Farlin	P
J. A. W. CAT	A-CAC
Clide Hughes	A-CAC
Ann Carter	P-CAC
JOHN T. SPAGNOLO	P-CAC
Carlyn Hess	A-CAC
Vince Bellis	P
RANDY G. WAITE	A/P STAFF
Phil Hunter	A-CAC
Bill Filand	A-CAC
Tenny Pratt	A-CAC
Yates Barber	A-CAC
Al Howard	A-CAC
Dick Leach	P-CAC
John Van Duyn	P-CAC
Todd Miller	P-CAC
JERRY SCHILL	P-CAC
L. P. Williams	A
Dan Widdle	P-CAC
Frank Sommerkamp	P-CAC
Ben Bunn	P-CAC
Roger Lyons	P-CAC

TENTATIVE SUBJECTS FOR A/P STUDY FACT SHEETS

Presented to the CACs February 13, 1991

1. AQUATIC DISEASES

Sources: *Shell Disease in Blue Crabs* (A/P 90-22)
Proceedings of Fish Disease Workshop (A/P 87-05)
Oyster Success in the Pamlico (A/P 90-08)
Red Tide Persistence (A/P 88-09)

2. WATER QUALITY

Sources: *Water Quality Trends* (A/P 89-11)
*WQ as a Function of Discharge from the Roanoke River
During Hydropower Generation* (A/P 90-12)
Eutrophication and Nutrients Algal Blooms (A/P 90-15)
Reduction in Nutrient Loadings (A/P 90-14)

3. STATUS AND TRENDS REPORT

Sources: *Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Systems: Preliminary
Technical Analysis of the Status and Trends (Technical
Document)* (A/P 89-13A)
*Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Systems: Final? Technical
Analysis of the Status and Trends (Technical Document)*
(A/P 91-?)

4. HEAVY METALS IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS

Sources: *Heavy Metal/Mud Pollutants in Pamlico River Estuary*
(A/P 89-06)
Heavy Metal/Mud Pollutants in Neuse River (A/P 90-07)
Heavy Metal/Mud Pollutants in Albemarle River Estuary
(A/P 90-17)
Scoping of Water-Column and Bottom Sediments (A/P
89-05)

5. **HUMAN ENVIRONMENT/PUBLIC ATTITUDES**

Sources: *Baseline Demographic Trends (A/P 89-03)*
Public Attitudes Toward Water Quality and Management Alternatives in the A/P Estuarine System

6. **WETLANDS**

Sources: *Analysis of Fringe Wetlands in the A/P Sounds (A/P 88-14)*
Inventory of Natural Areas (A/P 90-01)
Recent USFWS Inventory of Wetlands (Maps)

7. **SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION**

Sources: *Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (Eastern) (A/P 88-10)*
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (A/P 89-10)

8. **FISHERIES**

Sources: *Obstruction to Anadromous Fish Migration (A/P 88-13)*
Fish Stock Assessment (A/P 89-02)
Evaluation of Nursery Area Data (A/P 89-09)
Abundance and Viability of Striped Bass Eggs Spawned in the Roanoke River in 1989 (A/P 90-11)
Food/Feeding Larval Fishes (A/P 90-16)

9. **BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

Sources: *Jim Cummings, Division of Soil and Water Conservation*
David Sides, Division of Soil and Water Conservation

10. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Sources: *Joan Giordano, A/P Study Public Participation Coordinator*
Tom Stroud, Pamlico-Tar River Foundation
Carolyn Hess, Albemarle Educational Association
Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study Publication List



COPY

School of Medicine

Department of Pathology
and Laboratory Medicine
Brody Medical Sciences Building
919-551-2356
919-551-3320 Fax

Department of Pathology
Pitt County Memorial Hospital
919-551-4495

TO: Jim Turner, Chairman, Technical Review Subcommittee
FROM: Ernie Larkin, Vice-Chairman, Pamlico CAC *EL*
DATE: February 19, 1991
SUBJECT: CAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INFORMATION ACQUISITION PROJECTS, FIFTH FUNDING YEAR

Attached is the CAC's numerical ranking of the information acquisition studies of the fifth funding cycle for the APES program. I am unable to attend the meeting of the technical review subcommittee on February 20 and 21, but I would like for you to take these comments and this ranking into consideration as the subcommittee develops funding recommendations for the final year.

The two CAC's met together in Edenton on February 13, 1991. We split into two subcommittees, one to deal with public participation projects and the other to deal with the remainder. I chaired the subcommittee on information acquisition and this information is from that subcommittee meeting. The report of the subcommittee and its recommendations were endorsed by the full CAC's later that evening.

In the ranking, we gave four points for the highest score and one point for the lowest score, so the scores run from 1.0 for the lowest to 4.0 for the highest. There were from 12 to 14 people present at the subcommittee at different times but the scores represent the average of everyone voting on a particular project.

The studies identified by an * are discussed a bit below, since there were some ideas and thoughts that may be pertinent to your subcommittee which would not come through just from the numerical listing. These additional comments will be considered in the order as presented on the two page listing from Randy Waite.

*filed to Jim Turner
and Randy Waite
2/19/91*

NUMERICAL RANKING OF THE JOINT CAC'S PROPOSALS FOR THE FIFTH-YEAR FUNDING CYCLE

<u>Critical Areas</u>		<u>Human Environment</u>	
510	3.6	550	3.5
526	2.3	533	3.2
501	1.0	543	3.0
		548	2.5
		507	1.5
		545	1.5
		544	1.3
		523	1.2
		*522	1.2
		*528	1.2
		*518	1.0
		*532	1.0
		521	1.0
		*551	NR
<u>Fisheries</u>		<u>Action Project</u>	
552	4.0	*512	NR
*527 mod.	3.5	*546	NR
541	3.1		
*505	2.6		
*537	1.8		
516	1.0		
534	1.0		
<u>Water Quality</u>			
538	3.6		
539	3.5		
*520	3.1		
509	3.1		
*506	2.9		
536	2.7		
540	2.6		
549	1.2		
554	1.0		
511	1.0		

I have drawn a line in each of the four funding categories to denote which studies are recommended by the CAC's for funding and which ones are not. As you can see by the numbers, there was a fairly natural breakpoint in the prioritization, with the possible exception of fisheries, in which the line might well have been drawn beneath 537 instead of above it to indicate funding recommendation for that study.

ACTION PROJECTS

512 and 546: These two studies deal with composting of animal waste. It was the feeling of our subcommittee that composting is already an established BMP and we questioned whether early demonstration or action plan project funds should be spent for these projects. The thinking was that perhaps there are some other projects currently listed in other areas which might better be considered as early demonstration projects particularly as funding gets tight.

CRITICAL AREAS

No Comments.

FISHERIES

505: This study, a form of which was the number one priority of the CAC's last year, was not ranked as high this year, although we did recommend it for funding. The reason for this change probably has more to do with the constitution of the subcommittee and who could come that day and who couldn't rather than any other factor. I think it is safe to say that the Pamlico CAC would still prefer this study or one like it, which tries to evaluate the effects of trawling on both the benthic community and the bycatch, to be a very high priority.

527: This study was rated at 1.8 without any modifications but at 3.5 with the following modifications: We would recommend that Dr. Noga modify his study in order to bring to the APES study whatever conclusions he can best draw as to the cause of the crab disease and the possible solutions based on those causes. We would ask him to recommend management changes that would deal with this problem. It was the feeling of the committee that these investigators could go on studying this disease for a number of years, and would probably like to do so. We would like conclusions to be drawn, however.

537: It was the feeling of the subcommittee that this project was dealing with small scale gear when studies of larger scale gear should be done. This is the reason why it received the low recommendation.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

522: It was felt that this study might be considered for an early demonstration project.

528: It was felt that this study might be considered for an early demonstration project.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT (continued)

551: The subcommittee did not rate this project, but would consider it prudent to allow some funding for such a study and to allow the staff, possibly with the assistance of the co-chairs of the technical committee or the technical review subcommittee, to allocate funding for certain specific projects as needed.

518 and 532: The statement of some members of our subcommittee that the agricultural extension service and/or the soil and water conservation service