

Nutrient Scientific Advisory Board Meeting #11 Minutes

Friday, August 5, 2011

TJCOG - 4307 Emperor Blvd, Durham NC, 27703

9:30 am -12:00 pm

Attendees

Members: Matt Flynn, Michael Layne, John Cox (and Michelle Woolfolk, alt), David Phlegar, Trish D'Arconte, Grady McCallie, Kathy Debusk (Bill Hunt's alt), Andy McDaniel (Matt Lauffer's alt).

Non-Members: Andy Sachs (facilitator), Jason Robinson (DWQ), Rich Gannon (DWQ), Kathy Stecker (DWQ), Adugna Kebede (DWQ), Robert Patterson (DWQ), Sarah Bruce (UNRBA), Michael Schlegel (TJCOG), Heather Saunders (TJCOG), Cy Stober (PTRC), Fred Royal (Brown and Caldwell), Sally Hoyt (UNC), John Huisman (DWQ), Trevor Clements (TT), Josh Johnson (AWCK), Dominick Libera (AWCK), Sandra Wilbur (Durham)

Agenda

- Jordan Watershed Remodel per 3(d)(2)(b)
- Methods for Assigning Credits to Candidate Practices per 4(b)(1) and (4)(b)(3)

List of Materials

- Jordan Watershed Remodel Elements – Benefits and Priorities

Convene

- Board members and guests introduced themselves.
- After being asked, DWQ explained that Fred Royal had resigned from the Board because he had left his position with Chatham County and so could no longer satisfy his legislatively defined Board position as “representative of a local government.”
- The agenda was approved and the July minutes were adopted

Jordan Watershed Remodel per 3(d)(2)(b)

NSAB and remodel sub-committee member Trish D'Arconte led the Board in a discussion of the document she drafted and distributed, “Jordan Watershed Remodel Elements” (attached at end of these minutes).

- **GIS-based 2001 landuse/landcover**
 - The Board agreed that this element is essential.
 - The Board discussed why, in order to determine baseline reduction needs, the 2001 baseline loading needs to be calculated before the percent reductions are applied.
 - It was pointed out that new development programs will begin at the same time for all local governments whose programs are initially approved (Aug 2012), and that state and federal entities began having to meet new development requirements when the new development accounting tool was approved in March 2011.
 - Dave Phlegar asked about how changes in corporate limits and ETJs would be handled. DWQ explained that this issue would have to be revisited, but a potential solution is that the local governments’ “universes” would have to be adjusted for these types of changes.
- **BMP/sanitary/septic/stormwater infrastructure existing at time of baseline period**
 - The Board discussed whether and how reductions achieved by BMPs that existed prior to the baseline period should be accounted for in the remodel. The possibility was

discussed of running the model without addressing the BMPs (“unmanaged”), and then accounting for them after the model produces loadings. DWQ suggested that this may be an item on which to call for candidate contractors to specifically make proposals.

- It was recognized that it would be a serious undertaking by some local governments to identify all BMPs in their jurisdictions, but may be worth it for the credit. An alternative suggestion was to more generally adjust land cover export rates for areas that are treated. No resolution was reached on this issue.
- Grady noted that it could be important for the baseline to not give credit for failed existing BMPs, since that would make repairs or replacements ineligible for reduction credits, and those projects may be among the most cost-effective retrofits.
- Discussion shifted to a later agenda element, “Validate to 2011 Data and back-cast to 2001”, and there was extensive discussion of the merits of this idea. The subcommittee agreed to develop input on this topic for the next full meeting where the model would be on the agenda.
- In response to a question, DWQ pointed out that the Session Law does not bind the remodel to the non-point source load numbers that are described in the Jordan Purpose and Scope Rule (.0262).

After the break, remodel sub-committee member Sally Hoyt talked about four options for the relationship between the remodel and the existing development load reduction accounting method (ELDRAM). These four options can found on page three of the NSAB Remodeling Subcommittee Summary Document at the end of July’s meeting (#10) minutes.

- DWQ suggested that they may be able to pre-designate FY2012 319 funds to supplement the \$100,000 that is currently being held for the remodel. Members should not confine their considerations based on the \$100,000 figure.
- The Board decided that option #2, where the Watershed Remodel informs the EDLRAM, is the most reasonable. The Board agreed that the tool should be updated when possible, and could potentially evolve into option #4 pending clarification of differences. “Sound-off” points made included:
 - Vast scale differences between watershed loads and single BMP load reductions, no one estimation tool can do both well; hence need for separate credit tool that uses watershed model to route changes to lake;
 - Local governments should retain individual choice on what credit tool to use;
 - Credit accounting will need to evolve to reflect this young field; it needs to be designed to allow updates.

Potential Future Agenda Items

- September: Methods for assigning credits to candidate nutrient-reduction practices per 4(b)(1) and 4(b)(3)
- October: Watershed Remodel Subcommittee presentation

Next Meeting

- Unless specifically rescheduled, the first Friday of each month, 9:30 – 12:00 at TJCOG
- The Board had asked DWQ to poll members following the meeting to evaluate a change of date for September. [DWQ subsequently determined that there would be no change]