

UNRBA Technical Advisory Committee November 14, 2005 Meeting Summary

Prepared November 15, 2005

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, November 14, 2005 in the Triangle J Council of Governments conference room. The meeting objectives were to:

- Discuss recommendations 13, 4, 7, and 10; and
- Discuss prioritizing recommendations.

Meeting attendees are listed below.

Name	Organization	E-mail address or phone
Chris Dreps	UNRBA	dreps@tjcog.org
Sarah Bruce	Triangle J Council of Governments	sbruce@tjcog.org
Shelby Powell	Kerr-Tar Council of Governments	spowell@kerrtarcog.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
Darlene Kucken	NC Division of Water Quality	Darlene.Kucken@ncmail.net
Nancy Newell	Durham	Nancy.newell@durhamnc.gov
Paula Murphy	Person County Planning Dept.	pmurphy@personcounty.net

Announcements

Next UNRBA Board meeting—December 21, 2005 in Hillsborough, location TBA.

Upper Neuse Implementation Planning

Sarah Bruce brought several detailed recommendation sheets before the TAC for discussion and approval. The first recommendation discussed was **Recommendation #13, Adopt-A-Stream and Other Watershed Education Programs**. Sarah said that she had obtained information from Raleigh but not from Durham, and that she and the group of reviewers would calculate the information on staffing levels and program components and re-present the recommendation once that information was obtained. The group said that similar info from Phase II communities would not be useful.

Next, the group discussed **Stormwater Control Inspections (Recommendation #4)**. The group took some time to review and discuss Joe Pearce's comments on performance guarantees and other subjects.

- Joe Pearce stated that performance guarantees are important because they provide a mechanism for rectifying shortcomings identified through the inspections process. Durham County can provide sample ordinance language and other specific examples.

- Joe Pearce commented that requiring annual inspections is problematic because of the assumed liability concern and the unreasonable frequency it implies for staff inspections. He prefers having BMPs “inspected by a licensed professional.”
- Will Autry mentioned that the School of Government has been hosting monthly meetings of the Stormwater Implementation Group, a group of local government staff working on stormwater issues. The November 23 meeting is on maintenance. [Contact Richard Whisnant (Whisnant@iogmail.iog.unc.edu) if you are interested in attending SWIG meetings.]

The TAC agreed that UNRBA staff, reviewers, and other appropriate TAC members should work on finalizing the text of the recommendation.

The TAC discussed **Recommendation #7, Enhanced Construction Site Inspections and Enforcement Action:**

- Will Autry and Joe Pearce commented that the Basic Steps could be simplified if the larger step of obtaining delegated authority to administer sedimentation and erosion control locally were recommended. (The existing basic steps all would then fall under this heading as components of the recommendation.) Barry Baker agreed that this approach was a good one to recommend.
- Darlene Kucken mentioned that the state is considering a sort of hybrid approach to local sedimentation and erosion control program delegation, under which the state would still have inspections responsibilities but local governments could take on some plan review responsibilities. [This legislation did not pass.]
- Will Autry suggested that we ask Mell Nevills about the language that will be included in the state SEC manual.

The TAC agreed that UNRBA staff, reviewers, and other appropriate TAC members should work on finalizing the text of the recommendation and re-present it at a later TAC meeting.

The TAC discussed **Enhanced Animal Operations (Recommendation #10):**

- Barry Baker commented that it needed to be much clearer when a recommendation was for a voluntary program, as in this instance.
- Barry Baker said that recommendation language needs to more clearly spell out benefits and impacts of implementation.
- Darlene Kucken said that Madison County might provide a good example of an approach to better managing animal operations built on cooperative partnerships.
- Joe Pearce commented that the recommendation should mention the Neuse Nutrient Management Strategy requirements for agriculture and nutrient application.

The TAC agreed that UNRBA staff, reviewers, other appropriate TAC members, and other appropriate professionals (e.g., local SWCD staff) should work on finalizing the text of the recommendation and re-present it at a later TAC meeting.

Staff and reviewers will revise the text of the recommendation sheets to address these comments and will distribute revised drafts via email to the TAC.

TAC members made several informal decisions on process.

- The group reversed the decision of the October TAC meeting to approve recommendations via email; therefore, recommendations will be on the next appropriate agenda.

- The group also suggested grouping recommendations for TAC discussion and approval by subject to help ensure that the appropriate reviewers and TAC members are present at the TAC meetings where a given recommendation is discussed.
- The TAC agreed that, with the current detailed level of discussion occurring at TAC meetings, the TAC should have more than a week to review the recommendations and an opportunity to comment prior to meetings as well. (Sarah reminded the TAC that the detailed recommendations are not intended to be exhaustive; the TAC can recommend to the Board of Directors that additional studies or technical memoranda be done if issues are unclear.)

Prioritizing Recommendations for Implementation

Chris Dreps led the TAC in a brief discussion of how to prioritize recommendations for implementation, both by jurisdiction and basin-wide. There are two reasons to prioritize implementation: 1) to allow UNRBA to assess progress on the Watershed Management Plan, and 2) to provide local governments guidance on watershed priorities. Because some areas are more critical than others, and some areas are more threatened than others, prioritizing recommendations allows jurisdictions and the UNRBA to focus on the resources that are most critical and the most threatened.

Chris presented a matrix that shows two axes: one for priority (which is a proxy for how critical the recommendation is to protecting water quality) and another for milestone (which is a proxy for how important the recommendation is to implement in terms of time and growth projections). For each jurisdiction in the Upper Neuse, each recommendation will fall somewhere on that grid of priority and milestone.

These priorities will be integrated into the gap analyses and summarized on a watershed level on the recommendation sheets for each recommendation.

Next TAC Meeting

TAC members present tentatively agreed to hold the next meeting on December 12 at 1:30 P.M. UNRBA will confirm the meeting time via email.