

**Attachment 1**

**John H. Kerr 216 Study  
Executive Committee/Work Group Leaders' Meeting  
June 3, 2004  
10 am to 12:45 pm  
Roanoke Rapids Power Station**

**List of Attendees**

**NAME**

**ORGANIZATION**

**E-MAIL ADDRESS**

**PHONE**

**Welcome and Introduction**

John Morris - Encouraged that the team is picking up speed. The 19 May Memo was put together well and was helpful. Pleased with the completion of the review of the Roanoke River Basin Reservoir Operations Model (RRBROM). The goal for this meeting is to set study priorities.

David Paylor – Agreed with John. Nothing new to add.

Ben Wood – Explained he was filling in for Col. Alexander who could not be present. He is impressed with the way the teams are working and their efforts to reduce the costs in their budgets.

Participants introduced themselves.

## **Team Status and Prioritization of Tasks**

Jennifer Everett, Water Quality Team Co-Leader – Ms. Everett is working on steps 1-4 in the Water Quality Phase 1 Scope of Work and Adugna Kebeede from the North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NC DWQ) is working on steps 3-7. The group agrees to the costs as listed. The NC DWQ will write the scope of work (SOW) for phase 2 using EPA's Data Quality Objectives Seven Step Process. Ms. Everett is currently studying this process and plans to have the phase 2 SOW complete by summer 2004.

Jean Richter mentioned the Clean Water Trust Fund can provide study funding and the application due dates are December 1 and June 1. Ms. Richter offered to write the proposal.

Hasan Pourtaheri, Sedimentation and Channel Morphology Team Leader – Mr. Pourtaheri mentioned that at the April 29, 2004 Work Group Leaders' Meeting, the group decided to move the mass bank wasting task to the downstream flow and riparian ecosystem work group to give it a higher priority since sedimentation and channel morphology did not get a high priority ranking at the April meeting. Mr. Pourtaheri further stated that narrowing the dynamic of the sedimentation to mass bank wasting leads us to jump to a conclusion. He mentioned we need to quantify sediment and determine how it is moving as well as its affect on vegetation.

Jean Richter stated that we are loosing topography on the flood plain due to sedimentation and mass wasting. We're loosing vegetation and fish are affected. Ms. Richter also stated that Phil Townsend's study on modeling the impact of post-settlement deposition on floodplain vegetation, which is funded by the National Science Foundation, needs to be enhanced to tease out the John H. Kerr research to produce a model. She offered to write a proposal to have Mr. Townsend include John H. Kerr research in his study.

Sam Pearsall stated that extended growing season flooding causes mass wasting and we need to get monitoring in place as 2003 was the worst year ever. Mr. Pourtaheri stated that bank pins are not enough for monitoring and we need hydrologic modeling for several years, calibrate the model, and run it for 50 years.

Bud LaRoche, Reservoir Resources Team Co-Leader – Mr. LaRoche reported that the group's priorities were provided at the April 29 work group leaders meeting. The group has not met and is waiting to hear on funding since reservoir resources was not ranked as a high priority.

Mr. Pearsall suggested that reservoir resources which has been ranked as a medium priority be raised to a higher priority. He mentioned there is an economic benefit to stabilizing lake levels and questioned the affects of lake levels on real estate. From discussion it was concluded that people are interested, but are not affected much. It was agreed that recreation is definitely affected by deviation in lake levels.

Jean Richter, Downstream Flow Regime and Effects on Riparian Ecosystem (reporting for Team Leader, Jim Mead) – Ms. Richter stated that Mr. Mead had previously submitted the group’s suggested priorities for tasks within the SOW. Completing the SOW for phase 2 is more difficult for the fauna than flora. The group is looking at how flooding during the growing season affects survival of tree seedlings. A dendrologist will study tree rings to determine. Part A of the scope of work would include contracting to get the scope of work for the dendrologist and part B would be doing the work. Mr. Pearsall stated that the team is contacting experts to find out what the key animal species are that are impacted by the flow regime. He has found it difficult to find in-state people that have time to answer questions on animals. Mr. Pearsall also noted that The Nature Conservancy’s flood model will be turned over to the Corps for review in August. He estimated the review time would include 90% for the Corps and 10% for the University of Maryland.

Ms. Richter mentioned that the group is checking with the Smithsonian and the Forest Service on what happens to small mammals during floods and how animal diversity is affected. Loss of diversity and simplification of the system are group concerns. The group is reviewing the Buxton University warbler study. The group goal is to get baseline data on animals and bird species that are most sensitive to hydrologic changes and compare the Roanoke with rivers with an unaltered flow regime.

Greg Williams, Status of Roanoke River Basin Reservoir Operations Model (RRBROM) – Mr. Williams complimented Tony Young on his review of the RRBROM. Mr. Morris stated that the flood model review and improvements are a high priority. Brian McCrodden from Hydrologics stated that the only item with a potential for high costs would be correcting the withdrawal data. It appears that in the early 1990’s the data was double counted. It will take two weeks of work to determine if it was double counted. Mr. McCrodden is making the recommended fixes and can get costs for the recommended enhancements. He is looking for guidance on the cost estimate. He suggested convening a meeting of model users. It was suggested that the model oversight group take the lead on this now. Mr. Morris agreed on getting the modeling group together to review the recommended enhancements for compatibility and invite other stakeholders as appropriate. Mr. Wood stated that we want to balance the costs and what the model can do. Mr. Pearsall agreed and further stated that the enhancements should answer the 216 Study questions. Mr. Pourtaheri mentioned that the oversight group should check existing models for their capabilities and strengths as well as if they are input and output compatible.

Jean Richter, Downstream Flow Based Recreation (reporting for Team Leader, Jim Mead) – The SOW for phase 2 was handed out. Ms. Richter stated that the group needs to get out and talk with people. It was discussed that we must follow the Office of Management and Budget procedures for a survey. Mr. Lewis mentioned he is familiar with the process. He had a survey approved within a few days.

Greg Williams, Salt Wedge (reporting for Team Leader, John Hazelton) – Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Hazelton has been deployed for the past three months and will return within the next month. The group agrees to the phase 1 SOW with no changes. The salt wedge group has been ranked as a low priority so no work has been done since the last Executive Committee Meeting. The salt wedge is only a problem during a drought. It

was suggested that the salt wedge work be given to the water quality group as the water quality model will address much of the questions regarding the salt wedge.

Chuck Wilson, Diadromous Fish and Riverine Aquatic Resources Team Leader – Mr. Wilson reported there is no change to the phase 1 scope of work. It was agreed to in discussion that studies would be limited to the most sensitive species. Pres Brownell from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is working with Mr. Wilson on the phase 2 scope of work.

Terry Wagner, Water Supply Co-Team Leader – Mr. Wagner reported that the water supply group needs to know what geographic area to focus on. The group has requested expanding the scope to the entire basin and are waiting for approval. Currently the scope of work only covers the Kerr area. Nodes are needed downstream to capture withdrawals for modeling. However, water supply is ranked as a low priority. Mr. Morris stated the priority was based on the appropriate time to study water supply and we will learn what we need as we go along.

Mr. Paylor stated that lower priority work, such as water supply, is important. However, it was determined that the work could be done later. Mr. Wagner stated that water supply may be a lower priority, but if it is predicted that problems will arise in twenty years, it would be better to start studying now. We need to look at downstream communities as well for modeling inputs. Population predictions can be used as inputs to the model. We don't know how to predict future requests for inter-basin transfer.

Joe Hassell and John Morris, Operating Policies and Administrative Procedures Co-Team Leaders – Mr. Morris reported that phase 1 is complete. The revised SOW for phase 2 was handed out. Mr. Morris would like to use the tasks in this work group as work-in-kind.

Lisa Hetherman, Proposal for Modeling Oversight Team – There was discussion on the role of the modeling oversight group. It was agreed that the group is needed to determine what the model should do and review the model. The purpose of the modeling oversight team would be to ensure all models are appropriately synergetic and not competing, but working congruently. Ms. Hetherman mentioned that the group should be comprised of two representatives from North Carolina, two from Virginia, two from the Corps of Engineers, and one from The Nature Conservancy. Mr. Morris and Mr. Paylor stated the team leader should be from USACE. It was suggested that the model group invite a stakeholder to their meetings to be sure we know what information we need to get out of model and where we want to go. The following persons were identified as the appropriate modeling group members:

It was recommended that the modeling group costs be covered by the work group each participant is currently involved in. There should be a clear line item for modeling oversight in each affected work group's scope of work.

Lisa Hetherman, Overall Priorities Within the Nine Work Groups – Ms. Hetherman went over the priority ranking hand out. Mr. Morris pointed out that the groups were ranked by timing, not importance. He stated he would like to fund all of the high priority work groups first. It was determined that there was funding to cover the four high priority work group's number 1 priority tasks as well as to document where we are to date with the other five groups. Ms. Hetherman stated what the approximate costs would be for this work in Fiscal Year 2004. She suggested that a coordination and documentation line item be added in the scope of work to capture the cost for the lower priority work groups. Mr. Pearsall suggested completing the Study in 2006. He stated this would give us two growing seasons and one year to write the report. Mr. Wood stated the schedule was funding driven. There was a question about the State of North Carolina getting ahead with in-kind services. Ms. Hetherman stated that this is possible, but the Sponsors cannot get ahead with cash. Mr. Wood stated the Corps would check the "in-kind" services South Atlantic Division Policy.

### **Executive Committee Comments**

All work group proposals were accepted.

- Move forward on the four high priority topic areas: downstream flow regime and effects on riparian ecosystem; water quality; diadromous fish and downstream riverine aquatic resources; and operating policies and administrative principles.
- Work groups not ranked as a high priority need to complete a general scope to capture work completed and the rationale for any further work recommended.
- Modeling team was approved.
- Water supply group should answer the question: "How is the available amount of water calculated for water supply?". It was agreed that the Corps will look into this and be prepared for a discussion at the next meeting.
- Write proposal to recommend that the salt wedge tasks be included in the SOW for water quality to eliminate redundant tasks.

### **Next Meeting**

September 28 was the date the group selected for the next meeting. Mr. Morris suggested that this meeting be at the McKimmon Conference Center in Raleigh. Mr. Wood agreed and recommended that the December meeting be at the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir.