PASQUOTANK RIVER BASIN REGIONAL COUNCIL

US Fish & Wildlife Service Fish Hatchery 1104 W. Queen Street Edenton, NC 252/482-4118

AUGUST 4, 1999

AGENDA

| 4:00 | Welcome & Call to Order Chairman | | |
|------|---|----------------|--|
| 4:05 | Introductions | ALL | |
| 4:10 | Acceptance of Minutes from 6/16/99 Meeting in Edenton | Chairman Haste | |
| 4:15 | DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS:1. Highway BMP Monitoring Project2. Fertilizer Injection Project3. Ocean Sands Water & Sewer District Project | ALL | |
| 5:30 | Next Steps: Developing Demonstration Project Proposals | ALL | |
| 5:45 | New Business/Public Comment | ALL | |
| 5:55 | Plans for Next Meeting | ALL | |
| 6:00 | Adjourn | | |

PASQUOTANK RIVER BASIN REGIONAL COUNCIL

USFWS Edenton Fish Hatchery 1104 W. Queen Street Edenton, NC

August 4, 1999

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Erie Haste, Jr. at 4:10pm. He welcomed those present and asked that self-introductions be made as there were new members in attendance. (See Attachment A). The quorum requirement was determined to be satisfied and he asked that the minutes from the last meeting (6/16/99) be approved. By motion of Cheryl Byrd and a second by Lloyd Griffin, the minutes were accepted as mailed. Motion passed.

Chairman Haste then called upon Guy Stefanski to provide an overview of demonstration project proposal status for those proposed projects outlined on the agenda. Jack Simoneau reported that the NC DOT does one project per year in various DOT regions. Unfortunately, the Highway Monitoring Project in the Pasquotank area will not begin until next year and he felt that time frame would not mesh ours, therefore this was not a viable choice for the PRBRC. Chairman Haste suggested that Mr. Simoneau contact the DOT District Engineer and inquire about the possibility of identifying an area that might need an implementable BMP. At the conclusion of discussion following Mr. Simoneau's presentation, Yates Barber introduced a guest, Bo Dame.

Mr. Dame is the APNEP Citizens' Water Quality Monitoring Network (CWQMP) coordinator. He is headquartered at ECU where he is a Doctoral candidate at the Institute for Coastal and Marine Resources. Mr. Barber reported that Mr. Dame was up at Mackey's Island preparatory to training water quality monitoring volunteers in that region. The CWQMP is funded from the APNEP grant from EPA, and through contract between ECU and DENR.

The second demonstration project proposal, the Fertilizer Injection Project, was briefly described in the absence of Harry Lee Winslow and his expected written draft. Guy Stefanski reported on the project. Because there was not a detailed draft available, some questions were left unanswered. Chairman Haste referenced his conversation with staff which centered on the propriety of awarding demonstration project money to a PRBRC member. This issue had been brought up during a conversation between staff and the APNEP Project Officer at EPA Region IV in Atlanta. Chairman Haste explained that Mr. Winslow, of course, was not expecting to turn a profit on the project, but that EPA's concern was with the perception others might have of the situation. Some discussion ensued with Chairman Haste stating that Mr. Winslow should be reimbursed for "out-of-pocket" expenses and that he (Winslow) should again be contacted by staff and be requested to prepare a detailed proposal of the project, including budgetary considerations. Chairman Haste recommended that the proposal could take the form of a letter.

Lloyd Griffin addressed the group saying that he, too, had concern with the perception of Mr.

Winslow being on the PRBRC and also being the recipient of grant money to do a demonstration project. He said there are others in the area doing the very same thing Mr. Winslow proposes and that it was a little bit late in the fertilizer season to get the full benefit of the injection method. He added that he felt the technology was good, and that Mr. Winslow's estimate of 20% less fertilizer being used with this method, was very commendable. He felt Mr. Winslow should recommend someone else to do the project and thus would escape direct involvement and the perception of conflict. Chairman Haste reiterated his recommendation for written details from Mr. Winslow and now agreed to having them done in a project summary format rather than a letter. Guy Stefanski was tasked with contacting Mr. Winslow again.

In additional discussion, the monitoring role ECSU could play in the demonstration projects was "put on a side burner" until the project proposals were complete and the decision was made about which one would be submitted to the Coordinating Council. Finally, the decision was made to have Guy Stefanski contact Harry Lee Winslow for a project summary, then approach Rodney Johnson of the Mid-East RC&D relative to his interest in submitting the proposal, and pending that, getting Mr. Winslow and Mr. Johnson, together.

The third proposal, the Ocean Sands Water & Sewer District Project, was addressed next. (See Attachment B of 6/16/99 minutes). Chairman Haste requested Jack Simoneau approach Currituck Co. and ACHEMCO to inquire about our participation in a demonstration project.

Following the discussion of the demonstration project proposals, Yates Barber introduced a draft resolution entitled "Resolution Supporting a General Investigational Study of Currituck Sound by the Corps of Engineers" (See Attachment C). The members present discussed the resolution and made minor changes. NOTE: The change is included in Attachment C. Through a motion by Marvin Davenport, and a second by Cheryl Byrd, the resolution was approved to be sent to the full membership for deliberation and for inclusion on the next meeting agenda. Motion passed.

During the public comment period Cheryl Byrd mentioned to the group that there is money available from DOT, at the federal level, through the T-21 Bill, which can be used for projects involving transportation. Such things as acquiring land along waterfronts for the installation of bikeways, etc. Chairman Haste asked that Ms. Byrd prepare more on the subject to be presented at the next meeting. She also mentioned an initiative being pulled together under the Albemarle Commission (COG) called "Sustainable Development and Livable Communities."

Ernie Brown mentioned that there is also money available through the Water Resource Development Act, section 510, for shoreline restoration targeted to municipalities. He agreed to sending the specifics of the Act to staff.

Mr. Barber mentioned that the Joseph P. Knoop Foundation was another source of grant money and that he would find out more about it.

The next meeting date was set for September 26, 1999 at Edenton. Staff will inquire about the availability of the fish hatchery meeting room for this meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

en de la composition La composition de la La composition de la

T

en de la companya de la co

en de la companya de Notas de la companya de la companya

attendance PRBRC 8/4/99

NAME AFFILIATION Joan Siordano APNEP Clarette Libbs Hyde Co. Partnership for the Sounds COMM Just COLUMBOR Hay Davinger County all Semeneare Corphock CITY of E City PHSQUOTANK Hoyd Dulp Carl Coston Kim bruse DARE Guy Stefanski APNEP Hereford ne Fre Hastel Derguman Eleg. City N. C. Vasquotark Tates M. Borber EKNIE BROWN UADUR Cheryl Byrd 30 Dane Dare County , Southern Sheres CWOMP , Ontenin coord.

| | | | - more than a management of the second |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | ta da | |
| | | • | |
| and the control of the communication of the control | | and the state of t | V |
| | | en e | Ann Mellering research |
| | | | |
| | | | 35. A |
| | | | a more than a second of the control of |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | and the second s | The second secon | ". Colored Colored Col |
| | | and the second s | |
| | | | |
| | a ann an ann an an an an an an an an an | | en entre examination en externation or |
| en er krieger i den men mankkrieger i de green van de | | and the state of t | aladores acondra camba Origina a como e |
| | | | |
| | and the second s | | wheelers at the water the material environment and account of the contract of |
| Annual control of the | | | N. PRINTER SERVICE SER |
| | | | |
| | | . Administration of the Community of the | |
| | | en e | Serving general constitution and a |
| | , | | |
| | | - | • |
| | e en | and the second second and the second | |
| | en e | | alamin (1.15.24 Sunsayanah. |
| | | | |
| | | The control of the co | Scotter constitution and the second second |
| | 6., | | |
| | | | para . M |
| | | and the second s | 1999 M. vedd weliaberband to be differenden i a ne veze e |
| | and the second s | en e | Protest and an experience and a state of the second and the second |
| | | | The second secon |
| | | | |
| | | and the second s | errorent in externication formation of the second s |
| Andre seemente en | | | andermagning properties and an analysis of the second |
| | | | |
| ere getamen meg te mente e sterio e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e | | and the control of th | epineerinelle bereigingen gebeken helik behende kommen van deer helik van van de verschied van de verschied verschied van de verschied van de verschied vers |
| | | en e | And the second s |
| | | | |
| | | and the second statement of the second statement and the second second statement of the second statement of the | |
| | anne sente e a compansa de la compa La compansa de la co | and the same of the same and the same state of t | entitivesteament |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | • | |



Draft 8/4/99

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING A GENERAL INVESTIGATIONAL STUDY OF CURRITUCK SOUND BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

WHEREAS, the Currituck Sound is a vital natural resource for the people of North Carolina and in the past has supported a thriving freshwater fishery and provided nursery grounds for many recreational and commercial fish species; and

WHEREAS, the Currituck Sound is a major flyway for migrating water fowl; and

WHEREAS, fluctuating salinity levels have caused a marked decline in the fisheries that are most important to the local and state economy; and

WHEREAS, a number of potential causes of the salinity changes have been identified; and

WHEREAS, to restore the Currituck Sound to its former state of productivity the development of effective management strategies need to be implemented and the first step to accomplishing this is to better understand the hydrodynamic and ecological functions of the Sound through study; and

WHEREAS, the County of Currituck is amenable to such study;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Pasquotank River Basin Regional Council, a basinwide board of local government officials and interested citizens, whose establishment is mandated through Executive Order of James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor of NC, and whose charge and responsibility is to advise the NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources and others on environmental protection, do hereby endorse the US Army Corps of Engineers and the State of NC to engage in a comprehensive study of the Currituck Sound for the purpose of providing the most efficient assessment of Sound conditions.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that such information as is gained from this effort will result in production of a model designed specifically for the restoration and benefit of the Currituck Sound.

| Adopted this | day of | , 1999 | |
|---|---------------|--------|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| T. Erie Haste, | Jr., Chairman | | Carlyle Harrell, Secretary |
| Pasquotank River Basin Regional Council | | | Pasquotank River Basin Regional Council |

,一个大型,在一个大型,在一个大型,不是一个大型,一个大型,不是一个大型,不是一个大型。 在一个大型,在1000年,一个大型,一个大型,一个大型,在1000年,一个大型,1000年,一个大型,1000年,一个大型,1000年,1000年,1000年,1000年,1000年,1000年,1000年,1000年





Draft 8/4/99

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING A GENERAL INVESTIGATIONAL STUDY OF CURRITUCK SOUND BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

WHEREAS, the Currituck Sound is a vital natural resource for the people of North Carolina and in the past has supported a thriving freshwater fishery and provided nursery grounds for many commercial fish species; and

WHEREAS, the Currituck Sound is a major flyway for migrating water fowl; and

WHEREAS, fluctuating salinity levels have caused a marked decline in the fisheries that are most important to the local and state economy; and

WHEREAS, a number of potential causes of the salinity changes have been identified; and

WHEREAS, to restore the Currituck Sound to its former state of productivity the development of effective management strategies need to be implemented and the first step to accomplishing this is to better understand the hydrodynamic and ecological functions of the Sound through study; and

WHEREAS, the County of Currituck is amenable to such study;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Pasquotank River Basin Regional Council, a basinwide board of local government officials and interested citizens, whose establishment is mandated through Executive Order of James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor of NC, and whose charge and responsibility is to advise the NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources and others on environmental protection, do hereby endorse the US Army Corps of Engineers and the State of NC to engage in a comprehensive study of the Currituck Sound for the purpose of providing the most efficient assessment of Sound conditions.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that such information as is gained from this effort will result in production of a model designed specifically for the restoration and benefit of the Currituck Sound.

Adopted this day of , 1999

T. Erie Haste, Jr., Chairman Pasquotank River Basin Regional Council Carlyle Harrell, Secretary
Pasquotank River Basin Regional Council

ALBEMARLE-PAMLICO NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

The Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) of the Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program (A-P NEP) was officially endorsed by the Governor of North Carolina and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in November 1994. In September 1994, EPA awarded the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) a grant to demonstrate specific recommendations or action items contained in the CCMP. The Division of Water Quality (DWQ) is administering the grant and has oversight of the CCMP implementation process. The EPA grant has been extended to September 30, 1999 and the total amount of the grant is \$1,755,363.

As a part of the implementation strategy, the CCMP recommends the establishment of Regional Councils to foster public input from each of the five major river basins in the Albemarle-Pamlico region. Membership to the Councils consists of citizens and local government officials, representing every county and interest group in the region. In March 1995, Governor Hunt issued an Executive Order directing the creation of the Councils. All five Regional Councils have been established and meet on a regular basis.

A primary role of the Regional Councils is to establish local environmental priorities, based on those outlined in the CCMP, Governor Hunt's Coastal Agenda, and the DWQ's basinwide management plan recommendations. In addition, their role extends to developing support for the most cost-effective methods of dealing with those recommendations. Priorities of resource management vary from basin to basin because concerns for water quality, habitats and fisheries are diverse and widespread. The Regional Councils have been encouraged to develop and implement strategies which are most amenable to local action. Funds from the existing EPA grant have been dedicated to help support local demonstration projects recommended by the Regional Councils. Total funds available for demonstration projects are approximately \$130,400. Individual projects approved for funding are eligible to receive a total of \$26,080 for a single watershed and \$52,160 for a combined watershed project.

Demonstration projects are scaled-down versions of innovative or unique engineering or management strategies that are designed to test the cost and effectiveness of these actions in addressing priority problems in a particular watershed. These projects also aid in defining the time and resources required for basinwide implementation. Demonstrations may include engineering projects, model ordinances, improved management of living resources, and modifications to remove institutional barriers to achieving progress on priority problems.

In order to be eligible for funding, proposed demonstration projects must address a priority problem identified in the CCMP and involve the demonstration of specific management or engineering strategies (not planning or assessment activities). Each Regional Council may submit its own demonstration project proposal or work with another Council(s) with similar problems and submit a combined proposal. Proposals should include all the required information outlined in the "Criteria for Selection of Demonstration Projects" and the "Demonstration Project Checklist".

Regional Councils are tasked with the solicitation, review, ranking, and selection of projects to be funded. In addition, Regional Councils are strongly encouraged to utilize an existing and approved system or process to evaluate project applications. One example is the evaluation system used by the Clean Water Management Trust Fund in its review of proposals. The Coordinating Council must approve all projects selected for funding.

Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program Regional Councils

Criteria for Selection of Demonstration Projects

Preparing a Demonstration Project Proposal

A demonstration project is a scaled-down version of an innovative or unique engineering or management strategy. The project proposal should call for immediate action. Available funding will not pay for planning, but is strictly intended for implementation of specific management or engineering strategies (shovel in the ground type projects). These projects are being funded to demonstrate the process of implementation and the effectiveness of a specific control strategy prior to basinwide or regional application. The demonstration project proposals submitted to the Coordinating Council for funding should discuss each of the components described in the Demonstration Project Checklist. It is important that each of the components be addressed under its own section in the proposal. Use of the checklist will ensure that the proposal is complete.

Selection Criteria

Regional Councils convened under Governor Hunt's Executive Order #75 (as amended #118) are eligible to receive funds from the existing U.S. Environmental Protection Agency grant to support local demonstration projects. In selecting demonstration projects, proposals will be reviewed according to and funds provided based on the following criteria:

- 1. Projects must address a priority problem in the estuary or its watershed as identified in the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP), Governor Hunt's Coastal Agenda, or a basinwide management plan approved by the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources.
- 2. Proposals should demonstrate that the problem identified for action has been adequately characterized and evaluated and show that the cause(s) of the problem have been adequately assessed.
- 3. A majority of the members of the Regional Council(s) should support the project(s) recommended for funding. The proposal must be signed by the chair(s) or co-chair(s) of the Council(s).
- 4. Proposals should establish the commitment to action made by the respective local government entity, other agencies and/or educational institutions and the private sector. Commitment to ensuring regulatory, administrative, financial, and political cooperation that would enhance project success would be beneficial.
- 5. Proposals should establish that the opportunities and likelihood for success and improvements in environmental quality are good.

- 6. Proposals must accurately and thoroughly address all required components, as described in the Proposal Checklist.
- 7. Demonstration of innovative techniques or approaches which can be transferred throughout the watershed or other watersheds in the region will improve chances of selection or approval.
- 8. Proposals must guarantee that the project will include the development of cost estimates for full-scale application of the strategy throughout the watershed.
- 9. The proposal should describe appropriate public education and outreach methods to reach constituents and stakeholders throughout the watershed/region.

Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program - Regional Councils Demonstration Project - Proposal Checklist

| 1. | affected. |
|---------|--|
| 2. | Statement of the specific objectives of the project related to the problem, source, or cause. |
| 3. | Discussion of the various management options considered. |
| 4. | Discussion of the chosen option with reference to likelihood of success, public support and time and resources (cost effectiveness). |
| 5. | A complete outline of the specific plan needed to abate and control the problem or protect the resource. Each outline should address: |
| | What: Describe specific environmental objectives and related measures of success and what will be done to attain them. For example, specify nutrient load reductions and us designations in the proposed location. |
| | Who: Identify who will act, plan, and enforce; spell out roles and resource commitments for each participating agency, institution, or other entity. |
| | How: Outline the procedure/process used to perform this project. |
| | Where: Describe the location this project will affect. |
| | When: Include schedules. |
| | Budget: Provide detailed cost estimate. |
| 6. | Description and schedule of activities to monitor success of the project. |
| 7. | Timetable and description of reports (e.g., quarterly, final) concerning progress, costs, and results. |
| 8. | Discussion of methods and schedules for review, evaluation, and redirection of the project. |
| 9. | Discussion of possible basinwide and/or region wide application of the strategy. |
| 10. | Commitment to develop cost estimates for basinwide application of the project. |
| 11. | Discussion of public education and outreach methods. |
| 12. | Formal endorsement of the demonstration project by the Regional Council(s). |

Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program Regional Councils

Format for Demonstration Project Proposals

- I. Discussion of Priority Problem(s)
- II. Options Considered
- III. Discussion of Selected Option/Project Abstract
 - A. Project Title
 - B. Lead Agency/Organization
 - C. Objectives
 - D. Likelihood of Success
 - E. Public Support
 - F. Time and Resources Required
 - G. Cost Effectiveness
 - H. Deliverables
- IV. Detailed Project Description/Scope of Work
 - A. What
 - B. Who
 - C. How
 - D. Where
 - E. When
 - F. Budget
- V. Activities to Monitor Success
 - A. Monitoring Requirements
 - B. QA/QC Plan
- VI. Reports on Progress, Costs, and Results
- VII. Review, Evaluation, and Redirection
- VIII. Basinwide or Regional Application
 - A. General Discussion
 - B. Cost Estimate
- IX. Public Education and Outreach
- X. Endorsement by Regional Council(s) and Other Partners