

# UNRBA Technical Advisory Committee February 7, 2006 Meeting Summary

Prepared February 8, 2006

---

*UNRBA mission: To preserve and protect the water quality in the Upper Neuse River Basin through innovative, cost effective and environmentally sound strategies and to create a coalition of local governments and stakeholders in a water resources partnership.*

## **Introductions and Meeting Objectives**

The Technical Advisory Committee of the Upper Neuse River Basin Association (UNRBA) met at 1:30 p.m. on Monday, February 7, 2006 in the Triangle J Council of Governments conference room. The meeting objectives were to:

- Discuss a strategy for prioritizing recommendations and setting milestones;
- Discuss nutrient management and the Upper Neuse Watershed Management Plan;
- Discuss sewer recommendations (Recommendations 8 and 9); and
- Approve recommendations 2, 6, and 12.

Meeting attendees are listed below.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>E-mail address or phone</b>
Chris Dreps	UNRBA	dreps@tjcog.org
Sarah Bruce	UNRBA	sbruce@tjcog.org
Will Autry	Orange Co. Sed. & Erosion Control	wautry@co.orange.nc.us
Amy Hathaway	City of Raleigh Stormwater	Amy.Hathaway@ci.raleigh.nc.us
Barry Baker	Granville County Planning	Planning@granvillecounty.org
Joe Pearce	Durham County Engineering	jpearce@co.durham.nc.us
Katie Ertmer	Franklin County Planning	kertmer@co.granville.nc.us
Kathleen Snyder	Durham City/County Planning	kathleen.snyder@durhamnc.gov
Dave Brown	City of Durham Stormwater Services	dave.brown@durhamnc.gov
Anne Coan	NC Farm Bureau	acoan@ncfb.net
Nancy Newell	City of Durham Water Management	nancy.newell@durhamnc.gov
Paula Murphy	Person County Planning	pmurphy@personcounty.net
Nora Deamer	DWQ-Planning Section (Neuse Basin)	nora.deamer@ncmail.net

## **Announcements**

Chris Dreps announced that there will be a workshop on Financial Benefits of Conservation Easements: Conservation Programs and Tax Incentives in Oxford on March 28, 2006. To register, visit [www.tarriver.org](http://www.tarriver.org) or call 919-496-5902.

Chris Dreps reminded the TAC that he will be in Mexico from Feb. 17 to June 18. Sarah Bruce will be the main contact for UNRBA matters in his absence (919-558-9343). Sydney Miller, TJCOG Water Resource Program Manager, will be helping with UNRBA financial matters (919-558-9392).

### **Project Updates**

South Granville Water and Sewer Authority (SGWASA) is in the process of taking over service provision from Butner. SGWASA and Roxboro may join the UNRBA this coming year.

The Site Evaluation Tool (SET) 319 grant is finished, and UNRBA will be using SET on various projects this year. The Site Evaluation Tool, the SET user guide, and SET model documentation are available on the UNRBA website at <http://www.unrba.org/set/index.shtml>.

The Watershed Evaluation Tool (WET) will be available to partners next week. UNRBA will create a web page to make the WET available online.

UNRBA will develop a web page about the recently completed Little River Riparian Corridor Conservation Plan where the plan summary will be available.

The Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Plan contract with the NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program is being extended through 2006.

### **Prioritizing Recommendations for Implementation**

Chris Dreps led the TAC in a discussion of how to prioritize recommendations for implementation. There are three reasons to prioritize implementation: 1) so that those managing the watershed know where to focus efforts, 2) to give UNRBA members confidence that all jurisdictions are using the same criteria, and 3) to provide a way to measure progress.

The next version of the UNWMP will assess whether short-term milestones have been met and reassess mid- and long-term milestones. Short-term milestones are usually stated in terms of geographic areas where implementation of the recommendation needs to happen in the very near future in order to protect the water resource; UNRBA typically uses 14-digit hydrologic units to make such assessments.

The TAC agreed to develop specific priorities and milestones, possibly with the help of the recommendation's reviewers. Barry Baker suggested that the UNRBA create and present maps of priority areas for each recommendation to help illustrate how priority areas intersect with member government jurisdictions. Anne Coan pointed out the potential pitfall of regulating some areas more strictly than others: development simply shifts to the less-regulated areas.

Chris presented an example of prioritization, Recommendation 4: Stormwater Control Inspections. Anne Coan commented that the way that agricultural BMPs are inspected is to use a computer to randomly select a certain percentage for inspection in any given year.

### **Nutrient Management and the Upper Neuse Watershed Management Plan**

Chris Dreps reminded the TAC that the nutrient targets in the nutrient management recommended watershed management strategy (Recommendation #1) assumes that the buffer (Rec. 2) and peak flow management (Rec. 3) recommendations were implemented. Therefore, regardless of the nutrient management approach a local government chooses to adopt, implementation of Recommendations 2 and 3 is essential to meeting the watershed goals in the Plan.

### **Sewer Recommendations**

Sarah Bruce said wanted the TAC to consider whether the recommendations for sewer (Recs. 8 & 9) should be combined due to overlap with regard to management measures. Joe Pearce said that they should be combined. Due to time constraints, the TAC decided that the recommendation reviewers should decide how to proceed. If the reviewers decide that combining the recommendations is the more sensible approach, they will suggest that to the TAC.

### **Approval of Recommendations Sheets**

Sarah Bruce presented **Recommendation 2, Riparian Buffers**, to the TAC for their consideration.

Will Autry commented that a significant number of water features are not showing up on USGS and/or soil survey maps, which means that not all intermittent and perennial streams are receiving buffer protections. The group felt that this issue was worth noting, but was adequately dealt with under the 3<sup>rd</sup> item in the Above and Beyond Basic Implementation section of the recommendation sheet. Will stated that he feels that applying a Neuse Buffer to all intermittent and perennial streams, regardless of mapping, should be a basic implementation step, not an “above and beyond” item.

Barry Baker commented that minimum lot size has significant impact on the affect of a 100-foot buffer requirement on a landowner. For example, a 1-acre lot is more likely to be rendered unbuildable by a 100-foot buffer requirement than a 3-acre lot would be.

Anne Coan commented that another cost of riparian buffers that should be included is lost property tax revenue from when people with buffers obtain special valuations for their property. The TAC agreed that this should be listed as a cost in the recommendation sheet.

The TAC decided to send the recommendation sheet back to the reviewers to reconcile the comments. The TAC will consider Recommendation 2, Riparian Buffers, for approval at the March meeting.

The group decided to postpone discussion of **Recommendation 6, Enhanced Septic System Maintenance and Inspections**, until the next meeting due to time constraints.

Barry Baker moved to adopt **Recommendation 12, Targeted Lands Acquisition and Conservation Easements**. Paula Murphy seconded the motion. Anne Coan commented that the mention of the Natural Heritage Inventory under Above and Beyond Basic Implementation was unclear with regard to the water quality purpose. The group decided to amend the text to read “Counties with areas not yet covered by Natural Heritage Inventories should obtain countywide Natural Heritage Inventories to protect lands critical to water quality and aquatic habitat.” The motion to pass the amended recommendation sheet passed unanimously.

### **Next TAC Meeting**

UNRBA will schedule the March TAC meeting via email.