

19 May 2004

CESAW-TS-PS

MEMORANDUM FOR: FILE

SUBJECT: Minutes of 29 April 2004 Team Leaders' Meeting John H. Kerr 216 Study

1. The subject meeting was held in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Wilmington District Headquarters Office. The following individuals attended:

Mr. Bud LaRoche attended the conference via telephone.

2. The individual Teams reported their progress as follows:

a. Team 1: Downstream Flow and Riparian Ecosystems: Jim Mead reported that this team is nearly ready to transition to Phase II. This team is having trouble producing the scopes of work because the work is being partially complete by individuals who do not work for either of the state or USACE. These individuals are not being paid to produce work and are providing work on a volunteer basis. Work is nearly complete identifying the indicator species for both flora and fauna. The issues with flora are not as problematical as fauna and as result the flora sub-team is further along. The Team indicates that it can produce a Phase II scope of work for the flora, but needs to write a scope of work for a contractor to prepare the Phase II scope of work for the faunal portion of the work. This team will use RRBROM as the flow model for their studies but needs to have a flood model reviewed and approved for use in this study. Sam Pearsall indicated that the Nature Conservancy is developing a flood model that uses input from RRBROM and produces flood simulations in ARCView. Greg Williams requested that this model be submitted for review and indicated that there are USACE models that may be applicable to the study. It was reported that Tasks 1a 1-3 and Tasks 1b 1-3 were number 1 priority with Tasks 1c 1-2 having a slightly less priority for accomplishment.

b. Team 2: Water Quality: Frank Yelverton reported that this team had divided its work into 3 major tasks. Floodplain Water Quality, River Water Quality, and Reservoir Water Quality. River Water quality studies were given the highest priority

followed by Floodplain Water Quality and Reservoir Water Quality. It is estimated that 60% of the Phase I work will be carried out by NC Division of Water Quality who will write the scope of work for Phase II work with input from USACE and others.

c. Team 3: Sedimentation & Channel Morphology: It was agreed that the problem should be narrowed to the effects of growing season flooding and the connection to mass bank wasting. Concerns were raised regarding sedimentation on the floodplain. It was agreed by the group to move the analysis of the affects of growing season flooding and the connection to mass bank wasting to Task 1.

d. Team 4: Reservoir Resources: Bud LaRoche stated that the scope of work for phase 1 is nearly complete. He mentioned the priorities for his work group's tasks are to develop phase 2 scopes of work for the following:

1. Determine the affect of hydropower generation on shoreline erosion, timber resources, reservoir fisheries, wildlife, recreational use, real estate values, and local economy response to lake level changes
2. Evaluate the relationship between reservoir water management and lake fisheries.
3. Identify recreation facilities and use and determine current and future needs as well as the relationship between reservoir water management and recreational use.
4. Review of Master Plan and appendices (includes Shoreline Management Plan).
5. Inventory shoreline condition and land use practices.
6. Evaluate relationship between reservoir water management and wildlife.
7. Evaluate relationship between reservoir water management and shoreline erosion.
8. Evaluate relationship between reservoir water management and real estate and local economic impacts.
9. Inventory and compare local land use regulations on lands close to the reservoir.
10. Evaluate relationship between reservoir water management and timber resources on project lands.

e. Team 5: Downstream Flow Based Recreation: Jim Mead reported that this group was essentially finished with its Phase I work. The draft Scope of Work which was submitted by this team is attached as attachment 1.

f. Team 6: Salt Wedge: Greg Williams reported that this issue was not very significant during periods of normal flow. He further indicated that the operation of John H, Kerr had very little impact on the salt wedge issue.

g. Team 7: Diadromous Fish & Downstream Riverine Aquatic Resources: Chuck Wilson stated that his work group ranked almost all of its tasks for this study topic as a number one priority. However, he mentioned that addressing questions related to

hydropower peaking would be a lower priority than the other tasks. It was suggested that Mr. Wilson work with the water quality group to provide input for the water quality model.

h. Team 8: Water Supply: No one representing the Water Supply Team was present. Tom Fransen submitted the following report via -mail to Ms. Hetherman.

The team posed the following for the Executive Committee's consideration:

The Water Supply Work Group seeks approval to expand the scope of the water supply study to include evaluation of the current and future withdrawals and discharges for the entire basin not just Kerr Reservoir. A good understanding of the water demands and their impact is critical to understanding the inflows into the reservoir. It is just as important to understand the downstream demands and their potential need for increased releases.

This request is consistent with studies NC has requested the power companies to do in hydropower relicensing in the Catawba and Yadkin-PeeDee river basins. The need to understand the relationship between water supply demands and its impact on flows is just as important in the Roanoke Basin as it is the Catawba and Yadkin-PeeDee river basins.

Also, this basic basin- wide water supply information if not collected and analyzed as part of the water supply work group will need to be done by another work group as part of any basin model update (RRBROM) or development of a new basin model. Water supply demands are one of the key model inputs."

i. Team 9: Operating Policies and Administrative Procedures: John Morris reported that this team is essentially finished. He provided a draft Scope of Work that is attached as attachment 2.

3. Water Supply Discussion: John Morris indicated that this work group was of a low priority for the State of North Carolina. He stated it would be 20 years before water supply would possibly become an issue. Sam Pearsall agreed that water supply would not be a high priority. Mr. Morris stated that he did not see a need to spend 216 dollars to study water supply. Mr. Morris and Mr. Pearsall both stated that including water supply in the 216 Study could politicize the study and could cause a significant escalation of cost. Coleman Long mentioned that water supply requests have been put "on hold" waiting for the 216 Study to be complete. He shared his view that water supply would be a very important issue in the future and that the USACE needed to have a consistent, formalized way to review requests for water withdrawal. Mr. Pearsall suggested that a threshold be set for cumulative outtakes through another funding method. Noel Clay asked if water supply was put on hold for the next 10-20 years, could we re-visit this issue under the 216 Study authority. Mr. Long indicated that

we could. Richard Lewis, Ms. Clay, and Ms. Hetherman urged the group to at least “keep it on the table” for now even if we do not fund this work right away. The USACE must address this issue at least minimally in the Feasibility Report since water supply was included in the 905(b) Reconnaissance Report and some members of the Public supported water supply as a Study topic during the Public Listening Sessions.

4. Overall Prioritization of Work Group Tasks. The Team Leaders were requested to assign priorities to each work group. The participants decided if the work was high, medium or low priority. The 11 meeting participants voted as listed in the table below.

JOHN H. KERR 216 FEASIBILITY STUDY Task Description	PRIORITY RANKING		
	High	Medium	Low
Team 1: Downstream Flow and Riparian Ecosystems	11	0	0
Team 2: Water Quality	11	0	0
Team 3: Sedimentation & Channel Morphology	0	2	9
Team 4: Reservoir Resources	1	9	1
Team 5: Downstream Flow Based Recreation	1	9	1
Team 6: Salt Wedge	0	1	10
Team 7: Diadromous Fish & Downstream Riverine Aquatic Resources	8	3	0
Team 8: Water Supply	2	3	6
Team 9: Operating Policies and Administrative Procedures	9	1	1

The group agreed to use the following as a basis for determining high priorities for the overall study:

- Effect on Study, if it touches more Study topics
- Most serious problems, known solutions, actions can be taken to fix
- Feasibility

5. Overall Priority Conclusions: The group ranked salt wedge, sedimentation and channel morphology, and water supply as low priorities for the Study as the tasks associated with these groups did not have any far reaching affects. The work within these groups would not affect the other study topics. The salt wedge only becomes an issue during a drought. It was agreed to that one of the tasks for the sedimentation and channel morphology group be moved to the Downstream Flow Regime and Effects on the Riparian Ecosystem work group. The task that will be moved is task 3.B.2 which will answer the question: “What is the affect of growing season flooding on bank erosion?”. This task was determined to be the only high priority task for sedimentation and channel morphology. Water supply was ranked as a low priority based on the discussion referenced in Section 3 of this memo.

The following groups were considered high priorities: Downstream Flow Regime and Effects on Riparian Ecosystem; Water Quality; Diadromous Fish and Downstream Riverine Aquatic Resources; and Operating Policies and Administrative Procedures. It is clear that these groups will provide essential information that will determine whether it would be beneficial to change the operation of Kerr Dam. Without consideration of

floral, fauna, diadromous fish, water quality, and current operating polices, the Feasibility Study could not be completed.

The Reservoir Resources and Downstream Flow Based Recreation study topics were considered medium priority. The information gained from these groups should be used in the Feasibility Report and considered for the final recommendations. However, they are not essential to the Study.

Lisa L. Hetherman
Project Manager

Richard H. Lewis
Lead Planner