

Pamlico Citizens' Advisory Committee
Washington Regional Office
Dept. of Environment, Health and Natural Resources
Washington, N.C.
1 November 1990
7:00 p.m.

Minutes

Attendance - See Attachment A

The Pamlico Citizens' Advisory Committee met in the Conference Room of the Washington Regional Office on 1 November 1990, with Dr. Ernie Larkin presiding in the absence of Chairman Derb Carter.

Program Update - Randy Waite presented his report, noting that Joan Giordano's return date was 7 November 1990. He explained that budget problems had stalled 4th cycle contracts, but most of the remaining contracts were signed earlier that day. Members learned that the Technical Coordinator's position would be announced soon. Waite said that the Status and Trends Report public meetings would finish up in January 1991 and that the Blueprint for Action would be used at the public meetings. See Attachment B. The STR will be in final form by the Roundtable Meeting. Concerning the CCMP, Waite told the committee he was revising the outline and using the Blueprint in that preparation.

Request For Proposals - The main item on the agenda called for discussion of the Requests For Proposals which were to be out by the end of November. The requests were twofold; one for public involvement projects, and one for the technical report information acquisition projects. The committee discussed first the public involvement projects which were listed in order of priority and commented as follows.

(1) Public involvement in CCMP development includes proposals for specific events and activities fostering increased involvement and ways to include as many people as possible in the development of the CCMP. The committee discussed having a forum to get farmers together as a group to ask them what should be included in the CCMP, as has occurred with groups of fishermen. The committee agreed it was important for the various interest groups to understand the research already undertaken to address the problems they confront daily. Then we can address their ideas from that point. The committee discussed either having a scoping session with the various groups and suggesting alternatives, or focusing on specific issues and possible solutions. It was noted that the Status and Trends Report provides a tailor-made format. Waite said proposals would begin in October 1991 and end in September 1992. He noted that a 4 month project would be more feasible than a year long project which might last right up to the time of the five year management conference.

A committee member noted that at this point the general public has no idea what the CCMP means, what it is designed to accomplish, and how it will affect them. "That would be the purpose of this project" said another committee member. There was favorable comment on a suggestion to pick an issue that pertains to the livelihood of a group of people, bring that group in, present the facts to it and ask it to give us a direction in which to act. Waite commented, "you put a particular theme on an issue, propose an array of potential regulations and then

ask the public to comment on it, rather than saying, come on in and we're going to talk about this management scheme." Discussion ensued about the use of the term regulations, with a member commenting, "if the people are going to tell us what won't work, then they have to turn around and tell us what will work."

Concerning #1, Waite said he would like to see input for the CCMP early in the management plan "so we don't get to the end and have to make major revisions. I'd like to make those in the beginning. We need to gather input throughout the whole process." The committee asked if public meetings would be held for the CCMP like the ones scheduled for the Status and Trends Report. Waite noted the need for public meetings to be held toward the end of the process to get the public's stamp of approval on it. "However, I'd like to have them involved long before that, as well," he said. "We may need to hold some public meetings very early on."

David McNaught offered the following suggestions. Get somebody to take the rough CCMP, isolate a host of concepts and what the implications of that CCMP will be in various arenas, sponsor a series of meetings to do that during the first six months of this grant period, and again during the latter six months. This will provide you with a summation of what the feedback from the public is about the nuts and bolts of your CCMP. Then you refine your CCMP into something the public may not like, but you'll be educated to the parts you'll have to promote. Waite commented the objective is to get most people to like most of it. "I like what I'm hearing in terms of suggestions. I'd be willing to contract out to someone to set up the workshops, but I think we as staff would want to be there and be involved in every one."

McNaught commented, "there aren't many agencies set up to do what you want, and I think a good thing to do with this RFP is for us to actively solicit parties who might be able to do some of these pieces of work." The objective is to stimulate public involvement, and it is critical to draw people out to that meeting. It might be beneficial to have an entity with the clout to push for some sort of regulation which would stimulate people to get involved. Waite noted the importance of advertising in promoting some of these possibilities and asking for public involvement. Wayland Sermons suggested focusing on local interests as a way to get people involved.

McNaught said it wasn't a matter of finding an agency to be the mediator or educator. You need local sponsorship. In the RFP, put someone to work with the CACs to do this job, and let the CACs oversee it.

Members commented on the desirability of having a "range of alternatives", "from both ends of the spectrum to create the controversy" and engage the public's attention and support.

Item #2 concerns long term citizen involvement and finding a mechanism to facilitate that involvement. A member asked, "how are we going to continue having citizen involvement after the CCMP goes into effect?" Another suggested adding a chapter to the CCMP, institutionalizing citizen involvement and encouraging it. Find someone or some agency to do that chapter, add it to the CCMP with the approval of the existing CACs, and present it at the end of the cycle. A committee member expressed the belief that the only way to maintain citizen involvement was through education and suggested catering more to public education in the schools. One member wanted to know the purpose of continued

public involvement and the role of the public, stating, "this hasn't been addressed at all."

A member explained the purpose of the item was intentionally all inclusive at this point. "We're asking somebody for proposals about what it is we should be doing to continue citizen involvement in the great broad sense." This would include education among other things.

Waite stated that if the plan went into local government oversight and education areas, you'd have to find some group or way of overseeing it so it was implemented, and the public needed to be involved in that implementation. McNaught suggested a feasibility assessment on how the public should be involved over the next 5 years. A member asked, are you looking for someone to come up with an idea or are you seeking to fund the actual idea in this call for proposals? Waite said he assumed it would mean funding a group to come up with alternative ideas. McNaught suggested either leaving item #2 as broad as it was or refining it to the point of doing a feasibility study on alternatives to long term citizen involvement and making recommendations. Then we could deal with the education issue directly and perhaps get a permanent estuarine resource management program into the area high schools' curricula.

A member commented on the role the CACs could play over the next two years, by overseeing what goes into the CCMP, and Waite agreed on the benefits of an oversight group.

The first two items were sort of imaginative, things not done before, a member noted. Item #3 dealt with permanent educational or interpretive displays, and McNaught told the committee he had been exploring the idea of an Estuarine Resource Center to house permanent estuarine displays. He reiterated the need to institutionalize public education regarding estuarine resource management issues, noting that would cost a lot of money. Members questioned the idea of requesting funds for a building, something that is not directly management oriented and thought the idea needed to be approached carefully. Several members agreed that item #3 needed to be placed below item #4, in terms of priority.

McNaught stated the intent of item #4 was continuing community education about a host of problems that confront the systems. Focus on both local government and education, and begin with the people who will have the most input into plan implementation, the local governments. A lot of selling will need to be accomplished in #4. McNaught said that item was attempting to take the message of what APES was accomplishing to the people. Todd Miller suggested deleting items #3, #5, #6, explaining the main emphasis should be on items #1, #2 and #4.

A discussion about public service announcements (PSAs) followed. Members agreed new ones don't need to be developed; just get radio and TV stations to use the ones already produced. The newsletter will be important during the last year, and should be more frequent. A member suggested using small news bullets rather than editorials.

A consensus was reached to eliminate items #3, #5 and #6, and the committee discussed adding a newsletter as a fourth item, as information dissemination will be critical during the last year of the program.

Waite was asked to give an update on the technical or the information acquisition RFP. He stated they were still developing different subject areas including: the Riggs Sediments (heavy metals levels), cost estimates for various management alternatives as part of the CCMP, continued SAV mapping, submerged aquatic vegetation mapping, evaluation of headwater wetlands and their value to protecting streams, identification of groundwater recharge areas, and protection of well water.

Waite asked the committee to suggest issues that need to be examined. Concerning the issue of trawling, Waite said the problem there was how to determine an impact. In streams we have specific indices. We don't have that tool yet in estuarine areas. The Technical Review Subcommittee came up with a more qualitative approach to this, mapping where different fishing practices were taking place in the estuary.

In response to a question, Waite said this year was the target to begin developing the management plan, and he noted in technical acquisition this year, they looked at studies that could be narrowed down and effectively handled in a year. Discussion ensued.

Waite was asked about the cost of beefing up present programs and whether we're asking for funding for someone else to do that. Waite thought an outside financial consultant was needed. This might involve interviews with division managers in the department. "It's difficult when you're asking for your own money."

In the technical study, we're dealing with very distinct watersheds in the APES region. Waite said the subcommittee was looking at uses of the GIS system and how it could be used for planning purposes. He mentioned its possible use in developing small watershed plans. We may need to write a model on how to do a plan for each watershed.

In response to a question, Waite said the CCMP should be final in November of 1992, and the EPA grant would probably run till the end of December.

"On the technical work everything needs to be management oriented. We'd like to see the Department keep on with the monitoring program," said Waite. He then explained the groundwater project, stating it should be a relatively simple exercise to map the potential for groundwater pollution.

Waite said he saw the management plan being used as a planning tool also. We need to see how all the programs interrelate. If we set up a model on how to do the plan, a lot of the research we are doing will feed into that in future years.

Waite was asked how frequently the CACs will be involved with the development of the CCMP. He said the subcommittee would contain members of the CACs and they should be asking for input from the CACs. "You should be involved all along the way, much like the technical committee is," he said.

In final action, the committee asked that Lee Brothers and Dan Windley be added to the mailing list for the PCAC. They also requested to meet each time in one specific location, and Washington was chosen as the meeting site.

Waite stated that further comments on the Requests for Proposals, especially on the public participation side, needed to be in to Joan by 7 November so she could get them to Mike Orbach for revision. He noted that further thoughts on the technical acquisition proposals should be sent to him immediately.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

The next regularly scheduled P-CAC meeting will be held jointly with the A-CAC on 28 January 1991 in Windsor at the Windsor Community Building, beginning at 3:00 p.m. The meeting will be devoted to CAC evaluation for funding of 5th cycle proposals. We will have sandwiches brought in at dinner time as I anticipate the meeting running into the evening hours. A meeting notice will be sent as the time draws closer.

P-CAC MEETING - WASHINGTON

ATTENDEES LIST11-1-90

RANDALL G. WAITE	A/P STAFF
WAYLAND J. SERMONS SR.	- WASHINGTON
Vincent Bellis	. Greenville
Ann Carter	Beaufort
Roger Johnson	Washington
Butt Burns	Manteo.
Todd Miller	Currituck County
JOHN T. SPAGNOLO	GREENVILLE
Frank Sommerkamp	PCAC
Ernie Parkin	
Eddie Smith	PCAC - Greenville
David McNeught	PTRF

Status and Trends Public Meetings

- Asheville - Jan. 15, 1991 at UNC-A 7:00-10:00 PM
Owens Conference Center - Room 302
- Greensboro - Jan. 16, 1991 at UNC-G 7:00-10:00 PM
Ferguson Auditorium - Room 100
- Raleigh - Jan. 17, 1991 at Archdale Building,
Salisbury Street 7:00-10:00 PM
Ground Floor Hearing Room
- Elizabeth City - Jan. 22, 1991 at College of the Albemarle
7:00-10:00 PM
Lecture Auditorium - Room B202
- Beaufort - Jan. 23, 1991 at the Duke Marine Lab 7:00-10:00 PM
Auditorium
- Greenville - Jan. 29, 1991 at Regional Development Institute (RDI)
First & Reade Streets 7:00-10:00 PM
Auditorium
- Wilmington - Jan. 31, 1991 at UNC-W 7:00-10:00 PM
University Union - Room 100