

UNRBA Technical Advisory Committee May 29, 2007 Meeting Summary

Prepared May 30, 2007

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 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 29, 2007 in the Triangle J Council of Governments conference room.

Meeting agenda:

- Local Involvement Update
- Recommendation Sheet #1: New Development Site Management for Nutrient Reduction
- Recommendation Sheet #10: Enhanced Animal Operations*
- Recommendation Sheet #15: Agricultural BMP Education & Outreach*

* Approved, contingent on TAC email approval of amendments agreed upon at meeting.

Meeting attendees are listed below.

Name	Organization	E-mail address
Nancy Newell	City of Durham Water Management	nancy.newell@durhamnc.gov
Lynwood Faison	Durham Soil & Water Conservation	lynwoodf@durhamcountync.gov
Scott Miles	Town of Wake Forest	smiles@wakeforestnc.gov
Terry Hackett	Orange County Planning	THackett@co.orange.nc.us
Melinda Clark	Wake County Environmental Services	melinda.clark@co.wake.nc.us
Nora Deamer	DENR- DWQ	nora.deamer@ncmail.net
Chester Lowder	NC Farm Bureau	chester.lowder@ncfb.org
George Rogers	City of Raleigh Public Utilities	george.rogers@ci.raleigh.nc.us
Barry Baker	Granville County Planning	planning@granvillecounty.org
Paula Murphy	Person County Planning	PMurphy@personcounty.net
Chris Dreps	Upper Neuse River Basin Association	dreps@tjcog.org
Sarah Bruce	Upper Neuse River Basin Association	sbruce@tjcog.org
Jason Roberts	Upper Neuse River Basin Association	jason@tjcog.org

Local Involvement Update

Sarah Bruce reported that presentations to local governments were underway. Presentations have been made to governing and advisory bodies for SGWASA, Wake County, Granville County, Person County, Franklin County, Raleigh, Stem, Butner, and Creedmoor. Over the next two months, Sarah will give presentations to Orange County, Hillsborough, Wake Forest, Durham, and Durham County.

These presentations are being conducted to solicit support from members and to solidify and formalize the working relationships necessary for effective Implementation Planning.

Recommendation Sheet #1: New Development Site Management for Nutrient Reduction

The TAC read the recommendation sheet and provided the following feedback:

1. An explanatory reference describing the development and determination of the nutrient targets should be included.
2. The performance standards recommended for the different zones should be more specific where applicable. The text should also discuss how these figures were determined from the targets.
3. Reconcile the two nutrient management alternatives. For example, the zoning density approach could be considered one alternative to achieve the performance standards. Emphasize why the performance standards approach is a more flexible approach.
4. The difference between urban/suburban zones and conservation zones should be explained within the text. The map of the Upper Neuse Recommended Watershed Management Zones should be made larger and more user friendly.
5. A mechanism to address the inequities between those who are faced with implementing more stringent versus those with less stringent standards is needed.
6. Emphasize how the Plan is proactive. Connect this concept to a mention of the Falls Nutrient Management Strategy in the third paragraph of the description.
7. Basic Implementation Step #2 will be changed to mention contracting out development proposal reviews to private firms or other local governments.
8. Above and Beyond Step #1 should note that floodplain policies are currently being updated. The wording of this step is needs to be re-worked.
9. Mention the need to develop a useful tax credit program to provide developers with more incentive to approach target attainment.

Sarah will revise the Recommendation Sheet and bring it to the TAC at a future meeting for further discussion.

Recommendation Sheet #10: Enhanced Animal Operations

The TAC read over the text of Recommendation Sheet #10 and offered the following comments:

1. The title is somewhat vague and should probably be changed. One suggestion was "Animal Operations Management."
2. A number of logistic details needed to be addressed within the description section. Sarah will speak with Mr. Lowder to finalize the permitting specifics.
3. Definitions of agriculture vary for different policies.
4. State policies are likely to pre-empt any policies passed by local governments that overlap in scope. Some nuisance ordinances may be possible; however, if they are subsumed under a Unified Development Ordinance, the pre-emption/right-to-farm laws will trump them because they trump the local government's planning and zoning authority.

5. The number of small-scale animal operations is likely to increase as rural areas are downzoned.
6. Basic Implementation step #5 will be moved up to become #2.
7. UNRBA members need to understand that Soil and Water Conservation Districts will need additional resources to carry out the work that the Implementation Plan is likely to propose for them.
8. A staffperson of an applicable section within the Division of Water Quality should review the Recommendation Sheet.

Sarah will revise the Recommendation Sheet in light of the discussion and share it with the TAC via email for approval.

Recommendation Sheet #15: Agricultural BMP Education & Outreach

The TAC read over the text of Recommendation Sheet #15 and offered the following comments:

1. The fourth paragraph in the description section should be changed to note that croplands where agricultural waste is applied under an NRCS-certified animal waste management plan meet the Neuse Nutrient Management Rule.
2. Basic Implementation step #4 should be changed to reflect that Voluntary Agricultural Districts are not required to undertake additional conservation measures.
3. The last sentence of Above and Beyond step #4 should be removed.
4. The Farm Bureau should be removed from step #5 in Above and Beyond; they do not maintain data on farms.
5. The number of small-scale agricultural operations is likely to increase as rural areas are downzoned.
6. Outreach for small landowners should be encouraged in Above and Beyond step #6.

Sarah will revise the recommendation sheet in light of the discussion and share it with meeting participants and other reviewers.

Next Meeting

Sarah Bruce will solicit availabilities and announce the next meeting via email.