

MEETING AGENDA
NC Mountain Resources Technical Advisory Council
February 14, 2011
10:00 AM - Noon
RENCI Engagement Center in the Grove Arcade, Asheville, NC

Members Present: Jim Fox, Todd Cherry, Rick Wooten, Karen Smith, Marvin Hoffman, Eric Romaniszyn, Andy Brown, DJ Gerken

Others Present: Judy Francis

Call to Order

Jim Fox called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM and welcomed all in attendance to the RENCI Engagement Center.

Approval of January 21, 2011 Meeting Summary

Rick Wooten offered several amendments to the summary that provided clarification about the slope mapping areas and the workshop that will be held at Appalachian State University. Karen Smith made a motion to approve the summary as amended. Todd Cherry provided a second to the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Discussion of Slope Issue

Karen Smith explained the sub-committee had met again to further refine the slope recommendations. She provided a handout of the current recommendation language and associated narrative based on information clarification received from members. Rick Wooten said he liked the recommendations as presented though he couldn't vote on one pertaining to Governor's budget. He also suggested that recommendation A should have added language stating that the purpose of the mapping project is to protect public health and safety. Max Hoffman added that the fourth paragraph of recommendation B should include read as follows - to ensure that a particular building site is *sufficiently* stable. In the last paragraph of recommendation B, substitute the word *utilization* in place of the word *frequency*. Jim Fox said his students are working on multi-hazard risk analysis tool for some counties, and Buncombe County is completed. Macon and Watauga counties are still in draft form. Rick Wooten said he will review the drafts one more time before they are publicly released. The tool integrates tax values in hazard and risk areas to provide information about potential property loss and liabilities. Additional counties will be done as slope information becomes available. Information included in the tool can be viewed at individual parcel scale. Buncombe County tax updates are automatically sent to RENCI to incorporate, but that relationship has not yet been established with Macon and Watauga Counties. Jim did a brief demonstration of the tool and there was general discussion that it accomplishes much of what is part of Recommendation C. The tool is funded through RENCI, but it all depends on on-going funding from state. Judy said this should be demonstrated to MRC at the next meeting. Jim said he could do that if there is an internet connection. Andy asked if there will be a link to the tool on the county websites. Jim said that would be the best way to get the information out to the various people that would be able to use it. Todd said the tool should be mentioned as part of the language in

Recommendation C. A sentence should be added about disclosure to buyers of property. Andy said it should require geotechnical analysis or the posting of a bond. Jim reminded everyone that step is policy and could be something that is forwarded as a way to implement the recommendation. DJ said the Council should provide ideas about implementation with the recommendations. Jim said another thing might be to provide a link to geotechnical engineers that are licensed to provide the information. Rick said prices vary quite a bit to have the analysis, it really just depends on the specific site. Karen asked if there should be a mention that the technology exists to provide the information in Recommendation C. There was consensus that the mention should be included. Eric asked if the narrative should highlight the financial impacts on community if the recommendations are not implemented? This could be accomplished by a statement about it in the introductory section, or in the text of Recommendation C. Rick said that the clean up from the landslide at Ghost Town is over a million dollars, and that's enough to map another county. Andy said that's a great statistic and it really tells the story. Andy asked if there could be a reordering of the recommendations so they serve one another in a logical progression. Karen said she thought that was a good idea and will make the changes. She will circulate a new version of recommendations with discussed changes to ascertain consensus prior to the next meeting when the entire group will officially vote on them.

Jim passed out hard copies of the draft slope maps indicating locations of public land and percent slope. He asked about appropriate scale. Judy said the map was not particularly helpful because the scale is too big. It would be better to keep it on-line where various scales can be available for viewing. Rick said that's true with county landslide map that is 3' x 5' in size – the necessary details just can't be seen at the scale that is easy to print out of the whole area. Todd said the question being asked is what should determine the appropriate map size.

Discussion of Regional Sustainability Report Card

DJ said that he, Todd Cherry, and Bill Yarborough talked about various metrics to expand agriculture and economics issues in report card. One issue to consider is that some data is not available in continuous sets. It might just be counties, and some might be better to display in tables rather than maps. Jim said that can still be mapped and he showed a demonstration from another project. If CGIA has it, he can map it. Todd – focus on what questions you want to answer, and then find the data sets. Jim said the cost is mostly determined by staff time to figure out the priorities. DJ –said Bill had a good data set of items for agriculture that is used regularly. These data sets are % of county economy that is attributed to agriculture, average age of the farmer, average farm size over time, farm profitability over time, prime farmlands, investments in agricultural infrastructure, farm conversation rates, etc. Jim said it would be important to have a narrative to go with the maps to tell the whole story.

Todd said he was thinking about what types of economic questions could be asked. Jim reminded everyone that the product has to satisfy the U.S. Forest Service, the Mountain Resources Commission, and the Blue Ridge National Heritage Area. He said that typically, groups respond better to proposals. Based on the Council's expertise, what can we say about these issues? Andy described the Blue Ridge National Heritage Area's general management

plan. Todd said he has done some in-depth analysis on particular counties for music heritage, but not at a region-wide scale. Jim said they would develop some metrics for the issues. Economic metrics are not all grounded in natural resources. Judy said that the place-based economic issues are the ones to target. Jim said that there will likely be a version one, and then they will get feedback for a future second version. Craft, music, natural resources, Cherokee, and tourism are the issues to focus on. They will develop at least five indicators for each issue in version one.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on March 18, 2011 in Hendersonville.

Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 PM.