## **BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

# CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND

## MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 2011 8:30 A.M.

2728 CAPITAL BOULEVARD, ROOM 1A224
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA



### APPEARANCES

CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

JOHN MCMILLAN, CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE HAROLD A. BASS, SR.

HONORABLE RONALD R. BEANE

FRANK BRAGG

DR. YEVONNE BRANNON

KAREN CRAGNOLIN

JOHN GARROU

C.L. "RANCE" HENDERSON

JOSEPH M. HESTER, JR.

WILLIAM HOLLAN

GEORGE HOWARD

CHARLES JOHNSON

RENEE KUMOR

KEVIN MARKHAM

CHRISTINE MELE

EVERETTE MOORE

PRESTON PATE

BETTY CHAFIN RASH

AARON THOMAS

STAN VAUGHAN

JERRY WRIGHT

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE:

FRANK CRAWLEY, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

#### CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND STAFF:

RICHARD ROGERS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

BETH McGEE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR - PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

NANCY GUTHRIE, WATER QUALITY ADVISOR

CHRISTOPHER FIPPS, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

PENNY ADAMS, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

CHERRI SMITH, STEWARDSHIP COORDINATOR

KEVIN BOYER, RESTORATION/STORMWATER PROJECT MANAGER

LARRY HORTON, P.E., WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT MANAGER

#### CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND FIELD REPRESENTATIVES:

TOM MASSIE

WILL SUMMER

DAMON TATEM

BERN SCHUMAK

#### ALSO PRESENT:

JUSTICE BARBARA JACKSON

JEFF WARREN

#### AGENDA

- 8:30 am A. Call to Order Chairman McMillan
  - 1) Welcome
  - 2) Oath of Office for New Trustees Chairman McMillan
  - 3) Roll Call Penny Adams
  - 4) Compliance with General Statute § 138A-15
  - 5) Revisions, additions, and adoption of the Agenda (Action Item)
  - 6) Please put cell phones on vibrate or off
  - 7) Review and approval of the transcripts of the 2011 meeting of the Board of Trustees (Action Item)
  - 8) Recognize CWMTF Advisory Committee Members
- 8:45 am B. Public Comments (Three minutes per person) Chairman McMillan
- 8:55 am C. Executive Director's Report Richard Rogers
- 9:35 am D. Attorney General's Report Frank Crawley
- 9:45 am E. Chairman and Co-Chair Meeting, 2011 Allocation and Committee Funding Recommendations Chairman McMillan (Action Items)
- 10:05 am F. Administrative Committee Report Committee Co-Chair Vaughan (Action Items)
- 10:15 am G. Program Committee Report Committee Co-Chair Hollan (Action Items)
- 10:25 am H. Break
- 10:40 am I. Restoration/Stormwater/Greenways Committee Report Committee Co-Chairs Brannon and Henderson (Action Items)
- 10:50 am J. Acquisition Committee Report Committee Co-Chairs Hester and Wright (Action Item)
- 11:10 am K. Infrastructure/Wastewater Committee Report Committee Co-Chairs Markham and Thomas (Action Items)

12:35 pm E-B. Allocation of 2011-2012 Grant Funds - Chairman McMillan (Action Items)

Based on supplemental information to be provided to the Administration Committee, funds currently available for grant awards during FY 2011-2012 are \$9,081,495 (line 16 on supplemental materials for Agenda Item F-B-4). Session Law 2011-145 specifies that \$1,500,000 of CWMTF's FY 2011-2012 appropriation shall be used for State matching funds for military buffer projects, leaving \$7,581,495 available to allocate to all other project types including:

- Wastewater
- Restoration
- Stormwater
- Greenway
- Acquisition 2011 and 2008 (conservation easements only)
- Donated Easement Minigrants

The Funding Committee Co-Chairs will be asked to develop a recommendation to the Board on how to allocate 2011 grant funds and any funds that become available from unencumbered projects after the August meeting.

12:55 pm E-C. Discussion

1:05 pm E-D. Adjourn

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proceedings 6

Certificate of Reporter 51

#### PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Good morning everyone.

We'll get started. Welcome, everyone, to the August meeting of the Clean Water Management Trust Fund Board of Trustees. We have three new trustees to swear in, and we have two who were appointed by different parties that need to be sworn in.

We are privileged to have Justice Barbara
Jackson with us this morning. Justice Jackson is on
the North Carolina Supreme Court. She served six on
the North Carolina Court of Appeals, and has a done a
lot of different things. She started out clerking for
Burley Mitchell. She worked in Governor Martin's
office. She's been in private practice in Wake County
before she went on the Court of Appeals. And we
greatly appreciate your being here to administer the
oath to these trustees.

So, Christine, do you want to step up and take the oath of office? We're going to do this one at a time.

(Whereupon, Christine Mele was administered the oath of office by Justice Jackson.)

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Frank, you're up.

(Whereupon, Frank Bragg was administered the oath of office by Justice Jackson.)

1 (Whereupon, George Howard was administered 2 the oath of office by Justice Jackson.) 3 (Whereupon, Betty Chafin Rash was 4 administered the oath of office by Justice Jackson.) 5 (Discussion off the record.) CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Justice Jackson, thank 6 7 you very, very much for being here. You're welcome to 8 stay. We've got a fascinating Board meeting ahead of 9 us, but you're free to go. 10 JUSTICE JACKSON: Thank you very much. 11 It's an honor to be here, but the Court --12 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: I understand. Thank you 13 very much. 14 Please be aware of the fact that we are in 15 an office building and there are offices directly 16 across the hall and down the hall. So if you need to 17 make a phone call, go out to the reception area or out 18 the front door. We're going to try to keep this door 19 closed and be mindful of those trying to work around 20 us. Penny, if you will please call the roll. 21 22 Chairman McMillan? MS. ADAMS: 23 MR. MCMILLAN: Here. 24 MS. ADAMS: Mr. Bass? 25 MR. BASS: Here.

1	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Beane?
2	MR.	BEANE:	Here.
3	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Bragg?
4	MR.	BRAGG:	Here.
5	MS.	ADAMS:	Ms. Brannon?
6	MS.	BRANNON:	Here.
7	MS.	ADAMS:	Ms. Cragnolin?
8	MS.	CRAGNOLIN:	Here.
9	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Garrou?
10	MR.	GARROU:	Here.
11	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Henderson?
12	MR.	HENDERSON:	Here.
13	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Hester?
14	MR.	HESTER:	Here.
15	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Hollan?
16	MR.	HOLLAN:	Here.
17	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Howard?
18	MR.	HOWARD:	Here.
19	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Johnson?
20	MR.	JOHNSON:	Here.
21	MS.	ADAMS:	Ms. Kumor?
22	MS.	KUMOR:	Here.
23	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Markham?
24	MR.	MARKHAM:	Here.
25	MS.	ADAMS:	Ms. Mele?

1	MS. MELE: Here.		
2	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Pate?		
3	MR. PATE: Here.		
4	MS. ADAMS: Ms. Rash?		
5	MS. RASH: Here.		
6	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Thomas?		
7	MR. THOMAS: Here.		
8	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Vaughan?		
9	MR. VAUGHAN: Here.		
10	MS. ADAMS: Ms. Weston?		
11	(No response.)		
12	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Wright?		
13	MR. WRIGHT: Here.		
14	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Claudette is the only		
15	trustee not with us. Claudette had a fall this week		
16	and is recovering in Winston-Salem. I think she's		
17	doing well. She had no broken bones. She was scraped		
18	up a bit. And Christine's dog survived the night and		
19	is doing well, so we're ready to move forward.		
20	I'll remind everyone of General Statute		
21	138A-15. Be mindful of any conflicts or any potential		
22	conflicts and alert us to that fact if it occurs.		
23	We are happy to have with us Jeff Warren		
24	from Senator Phil Berger's office. Jeff is the		
25	environmental policy adviser to Senator Berger and is		

1 spending the morning with us. 2 Jeff, is there anything you would like to 3 say to the assembled group? 4 Thank you for your service. MR. WARREN: 5 Thank you very much, especially during these 6 challenging times. 7 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Are there any revisions, 8 additions to the agenda? If not, by common consent, 9 the agenda will be approved. I'll remind everyone to 10 please silence your phones and other electronic 11 devices. 12 The transcript of the June 2011 meeting of 13 the Board of Trustees has been sent to you with your 14 Board packet. Are there any corrections to the 15 minutes? Kevin? 16 MR. MARKHAM: Thank you, Chairman. 17 need to correct the spelling of Tyrell County 18 throughout the minutes. 19 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you. Any other 20 corrections? 21 (No response.) 22 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: With those corrections, 23 is there a motion to approve the minutes? 24 MS. CRAGNOLIN: So moved. 25 MR. WRIGHT: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Motion seconded to 1 2 approve the June 2011 minutes of the Board of 3 Trustees' meeting. All in favor say "Aye." 4 TRUSTEES: Aye. 5 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: All opposed "No." 6 (No response.) 7 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 8 There are no Advisory Committee members 9 present, and there are no other persons who wish to make public comments, so we'll proceed to the 10 11 Executive Director's report. 12 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 I'll just take a few minutes. Typically, in the 14 Executive Director's report I report on some 15 administration matters, and I will do that. 16 this will be a partial review of some of the activity 17 and things that we went over yesterday. 18 In general, we talked a little bit about our 19 contract status. And, again, I want to report that we 20 do have all of our funds under contract with the 21 exception of those funds I mentioned yesterday, the 22 few minigrants and the one outstanding acquisition 23 project from 2008, the conservation easement that we 24 are working to get under contract as well. 25 So just to let you know, that is the first

time, I think, since I've been here that we're in this situation in August. And I think it may contribute to staff, the work they're doing and the efficiencies that they've put into the processes that we have in getting contracts out, and then, also, getting it signed and underway. So I do want applaud the staff for their efforts there.

Also, we talked a little bit about the acquisition program yesterday. Again, a major change in the acquisition program, mainly because of staff reductions, but, again, I think, as we talked yesterday, we'll realizing some deficiencies in the program. And as we downsize and have less staff to do the work, we're going to have to do this in order to keep our flow of work up and also to keep moving these projects forward.

As we talked in June when we talked about the administrative budget, one of the major changes that we'll have -- and this will be coming in October -- we will be moving offices. We are going to be moving to the Archdale Building on the 12th floor. We have office space there. It's been negotiated, and we look forward to the move. And we'll be giving up our lease space, which is going to be savings of about \$70,000, maybe \$80,000, Christopher?

1 MR. FIPPS: That's correct. This year 2 we'll see about between \$40,000 and \$50,000, based on 3 the move, partially -- partial through the year. But, 4 yeah, in total about \$70,000 to \$80,000 for a full 5 year. 6 MR. ROGERS: So, again, trying to become 7 more efficient and take advantage of the State --8 State building where we don't to pay -- pay a lease.

The last thing I really want to talk about is just the staff. Again, I just want to -personally, this is me to staff, is to thank you for your efforts over the past few months in getting these projects reviewed, scoped, and the field reps going back out in the field doing their due diligence with regards to these wastewater projects because it was a great effort. They did a great job. I appreciate that, and to all the other staff who have been working.

As you know, the reduction is -- we don't lose a lot of the workload, but people are taking up extra tasks in their workload, and I do appreciate it. And I just wanted to express that to the Trustees. You all are supportive of the staff; you know how good they are. But you -- they are just fantastic, and they need to be appreciated, and I do so much on a

2425

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 daily basis. 2 Mr. Chairman, that's my report. 3 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you. Any questions 4 for Richard? 5 (No response.) 6 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: All right. Frank, 7 Attorney General's report? 8 MR. CRAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 9 Several weeks ago I received a phone call 10 from a citizen in Rutherford County, and he had some 11 disparaging remarks with respect to a neighbor who had 12 used some money that originated in a grant from this 13 organization with respect to fencing animals out of a 14 stream in order to enhance water quality. 15 So I, in turn, contacted the field 16 representative, Tom Massie, and asked Tom to go down 17 and investigate. And he did go down and investigate 18 and reported back to me and found that the -- there 19 weren't any cows present to be getting into the 20 Limbs that had fallen during a storm onto the stream. 21 fence were in the process of being removed, but the 22 buffer was intact and in pretty good shape. And so 23 that was the report from Tom Massie. I thought that 24 would be of interest to you. 25 Also, with respect to members of the Board

of Trustees, there's an ongoing duel in federal court between the owner of a golf club in Alamance County, that there was a grant to extend the sewer line out to the residents around this golf club, and a man named Mr. Dale Swiggett. And during the duel and filing the motions and responses in federal court, Mr. Swiggett has added names as defendants, including the former chairman of this board, one of the field representatives, and the governor.

But the status is that there has been no amended complaint filed and has been no service on any of the members named by Mr. Swiggett as defendants. So we're monitoring it, but they have not been brought in. So that's my report.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you. Any questions of Frank?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: We'll proceed with committee reports. Committees met yesterday. For the record, we started 12:30 and went until almost 6:00 with 20 out of 21 trustees present for most of the discussions of those meetings. So if our discussion today is not elaborate on some items, it's because we already debated a lot of things yesterday and will make today go more quickly.

1 The first meeting was the committee of the 2 chair and the co-chairs. We met to recommend to the 3 Board the allocation of the 2011, 2012 grant funds 4 based upon the funds available, which total 5 \$9,081,495. After discussion and recommendation from 6 staff and in compliance with the budget provisions 7 that directed how we should allocate our funds, the 8 committee recommends that wastewater be allocated 53 9 percent or \$4,831,000; restoration/stormwater, 10 \$2,000,000 or 22 percent -- that includes greenways; 11 acquisitions, \$2,250,000 or 25 thousand [sic], which 12 represents conservation, easements and donated 13 easement minigrants only. The recommendation of the committee is 14 15 before you, and I move its adoption. It does not need 16 a second. Is there discussion of that motion? 17 MR. HESTER: Mr. Chairman, the only 18 correction is that that figure 2,250,000 includes 1.5 19 million on military bases. 20 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Correct. 21 Any other discussion? Bill? 22 MR. HOLLAN: In looking last night at the 23 results of the Wastewater Committee, it occurred to me

that there may be some unintended consequences that

will come out of this, in that, we've always tried to

24

25

1 keep a balance around the state in funding the east, 2 west and the Piedmont. And it turns out that most of 3 the wastewater applications come from the east and the 4 Piedmont. If we look at the recommendations we've 5 made, should not there be any revisions, we'll have no 6 wastewater projects at all coming from the west. And, 7 typically, a lot of the acquisitions were in the west. 8 I think the military will all end up in the east. 9 And so just -- we ought to think, going 10 forward, about attempting to provide some balance 11 around the state. That's been one of the objectives 12 that we've had, and it looks to me like an untended 13 consequence of dividing the funds the way we have to. 14 I don't think we have any choice, and I support this. 15 But I just raise that question for the staff to look 16 at in the future. 17 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you very much. 18 That's a very good point. 19 Any other discussion? 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 22 favor of the motion say "Aye." 23 TRUSTEES: Aye. 24 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Opposed "No." 25 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 2 The committee then discussed the action to 3 take if funds become available for unencumbered 4 projects during the August meeting. There was a 5 motion that passed, and the committee recommends that 6 wastewater projects -- money coming from wastewater 7 projects that have reversions, that they remain within 8 the Wastewater Committee and be applied to projects, 9 and that stormwater -- restoration/stormwater projects 10 within -- coming from that committee remain within 11 that committee. 12 The committee voted to recommend that action 13 to the Board on behalf of the committee as so moved. 14 Is there discussion? 15 (No response.) CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 16 17 favor of the motion say "Aye." 18 TRUSTEES: Aye. 19 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Those opposed say "No." 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 2.2. that completes the work of the committee of the 23 chairs. 24 We then had the Administration Committee, 25 and call on Stan Vaughan.

1 MR. VAUGHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 met yesterday afternoon briefly. There's no action 3 required on our discussion, but we did review the 4 2011/12 appropriation and the current status of the 5 overall budget for clean water. Richard and 6 Christopher gave us a good presentation. And if 7 anybody wants to refer the -- the documents under "F" 8 that were included in the package that we received 9 before the meeting. But there was no action required 10 and we had a very good update on the status of our 11 budget. 12 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you, Stan. 13 The next committee is the Program Committee, 14 and Bill Hollan chaired that committee.

MR. HOLLAN: Mr. Chairman, the Program

Committee met yesterday. We had quite a bit of

discussion about a number of items, and I think action

on many of them will be deferred until October. We

talked a little bit about the impact of the 2011

budget provision on review. Much of this will

actually be handled in the individual committees.

We talked a little bit about capping our -capping of any award for the stormwater projects.

After a lot of discussions on the pros and cons, it
was decided that that would probably be better handled

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the individual committees.

We did agree -- we discussed the need to be careful about funding projects that are not ready to go and asked the staff to continue to focus on projects that are ready to go.

With respect to -- we've got so little money this year and so many backed up applications, there was a question about whether we wanted to amend our recent policy of not allowing applications to carry over from one year to the next. I think after, again, a good deal of discussion, it was decided that we'd ask the staff to come up with a procedure by which applicants could re-apply or re-certify their existing applications through some kind of expedited process to avoid the expense of doing a new application.

With respect to -- we talked a little bit about the way we ought to amend our applications to reflect the likely reduced level of funding for the next cycle. We don't have a recommendation to make on that. We'd like the staff to continue to work on that and maybe give us a recommendation at the October meeting.

We talked about the provision -- we reviewed the provision in the budget and the language, and I think we pretty much agreed or learned that the

directive with respect to military spending was a directive that we fund a million and a half dollars worth. It may be that we don't have enough projects in the pipeline right now to fulfill that, so the committee suggested -- and there was action taken on this in the Acquisition Committee, but we thought that we ought to -- there was some discussion about how we ought solicit additional applications. There was a concern that it not be a closed process where we just go to one or two land trusts who are in the vicinity of these military bases, but that this proposal be put out statewide to all the land trusts and all the municipalities who might be interested in these military projects.

We next turned to a discussion of another new law which had to do with developing criteria for water supply and reservoir applications. We had a good deal of conversation about that. It's a fairly complicated project, that the federal government is involved in permitting these. But there are issues as between the environmental, EPA part of the federal government, the Corps of Engineers, and that this can be a very lengthy and time-consuming process. And we want to be certain that we don't get involved in putting money into projects that either are not going

to be done or can't be done for 25 years or so.

develop some criteria building on some previous awards that we've made that related to water supply reservoirs. In the past, we have been involved in projects that protected -- repairing buffers around water supply reservoirs or proposed water supply reservoirs. We've never seen it as part of our mission to buy the land underwater that become a part of the water reservoir. But we did ask the staff to look at how we could extend the efforts that we've made in the past to protect water supply reservoirs to come up with criteria that would address this -- the provisions in this House bill.

Finally, we talked a little bit about our stewardship endowment. We had a report from Christopher having to do with some additional information he had gathered from the State Treasurer's office about how endowment funds might be invested, and a portion of the endowment funds might be invested in equities or other alternative investments to -- in hope that we would get a higher return over a long period of time, since these stewardship endowment funds are to support activities that go on forever, or are proposed to go on forever. And we will consider

1 additional information on that at the October meeting. 2 Mr. Chairman, that concludes the report of 3 the Program Committee. 4 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you, Mr. Hollan. 5 Restoration/Stormwater/Greenways Committee, 6 Yevonne? 7 MS. BRANNON: Mr. Chairman, we had two 8 items yesterday discussed at our committee. The first 9 is a recommendation to the Board to modify the 10 projects both for work and extend the construction 11 contract date for project number 2010-710, which is 12 the City of Conover, the Conover Station Stormwater 13 BMP's Design and Construction project. 14 The committee recommends to the Board 15 modifying the scope of work, provide grass walls and 16 two smaller constructed wetlands between the 17 stormwater. The committee also recommends to extend 18 the date from which the City can enter into the 19 construction contract from April 11, 2012, to, I 20 believe, from October currently -- this October to 21 next April 11, 2012. That's the recommendation of the 22 committee. 23 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the recommendation of the committee. Is there discussion? 24 25 (No response.)

1	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Hearing none, those in			
2	favor of the motion say "Aye."			
3	TRUSTEES: Aye.			
4	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Oppose "No."			
5	(No response.)			
6	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it.			
7	MS. BRANNON: And then last, Mr. Chairman,			
8	there was a request to release the grant contract			
9	requirement for a conservation easement, which is the			
10	2008-423 contract number with the Southwestern NC			
11	RC&D. And the committee requested or committee's			
12	recommending that we pull this from the agenda and we			
13	discuss this in October when we have more information.			
14	So that was the recommendation of the committee, to			
15	not take up this item today but to defer until			
16	October.			
17	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the			
18	recommendation of the committee. Is there discussion?			
19	(No response.)			
20	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in			
21	favor of the motion say "Aye."			
22	TRUSTEES: Aye.			
23	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Those opposed "No."			
24	(No response.)			
25	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it.			

1 MS. BRANNON: That concludes our report. 2 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you very much. 3 Acquisition Committee, Jerry Wright and Joe 4 Hester? 5 MR. HESTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd first like to mention that we discussed 6 7 some new legislation regarding acquisitions, which 8 eliminated acquisition. It also directed us to fund 9 \$1.5 million for buffers around military installations 10 here in the state, and it specifically provided that 11 funding for minigrants. And, therefore, the \$2.25 12 million that was allotted to acquisitions is for those 13 very things that are directed by the statute. So I 14 wanted to mention that first. 15 The second thing is that we reviewed the 16 procedure that the Trust Fund uses for closings which 17 streamlines and makes more efficient our closing 18 process. The new timetable presented to everybody in 19 the committee and the Board, and there is an action 20 item regarding that. The committee recommended 21 approval of the revised documentation and provide the 22 new acquisition closing process that was presented to 23 the Board yesterday. That is committee's 24 recommendation. 25 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the

1 recommendation of the committee. Is there discussion 2 of that recommendation? 3 (No response.) 4 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Hearing not, so many as 5 in favor of the motion please say "Aye." 6 TRUSTEES: Aye. 7 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Those opposed "No." 8 (No response.) 9 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 10 We also considered trying to MR. HESTER: 11 abide by the statute regarding military bases. 12 know that there is already an application for the same 13 in our application pool. However, it left 14 approximately half a million dollars that the 15 legislature said we shall spend with no applications. 16 So the committee considered requesting proposals to be 17 submitted for all applicants. 18 We also understood that there were a number 19 of projects that were ready to go around military 20 bases where funds had already been set aside and 21 otherwise available to match any funds that we were to 22 spend. 23 So the committee recommended that we accept 24 the RFP and that we submit that to our applicants to 25 obtain applications for projects to spend the balance

of \$1.5 million as directed by the legislature.

That's the committee recommendation.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the recommendation of the committee. One thing that I noted was the short turnaround time of September 9th that's in the application. But I talked to some of the folks that who were here yesterday representing the land trust community, and that they indicated that they didn't think that would be a problem, that they thought they could comply with that time frame. So that is a part of the current application. It's not cast in stone, but the recommendation of the committee is to solicit applications to comply with this portion of the statute.

Is there discussion on the motion of the committee?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would like say a few words.

About three or four years ago we went down to the Camp Lejeune area and visited one of the sites that, over the years, we have tried to protect. The Clean Water Board, over the last ten years, has had a mission of trying to protect natural and water-related properties around our military establishments to help protect those jobs in military establishments from

encroachment from other places.

I live up in the northeast part of the state just below Norfolk and Oceana and Virginia Beach.

There's not many days that I don't look in the paper and there's conflicts between aircraft and military operations up in Virginia that long term could jeopardize those bases continuing to be an established area.

So North Carolina has always had the reputation of either being number one or number two in the nation in terms of supporting our military establishment, and it is one of the areas in North Carolina where we actually have had job growth to our economy in the last two years.

And so we were down in Camp Lejeune and were standing out on one of those tracts, and the firing range for the M-1 tank was about four miles from where we were doing it, and they firing that particular day. And you could stand on a piece of property and feel the ground the shake when one of those tanks would pop one of those rounds off in that tank range, and it gave you a clear understanding of why we need good open spaces around our military establishments to reduce conflict between our civilian populations and our military operations and training.

(919) 676-1502

1 Thank you. 2 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you, Jerry. 3 Is there further discussion? 4 (No response.) 5 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 6 favor of motion of the committee say "Aye." 7 TRUSTEES: Aye. 8 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Any opposed "No." 9 (No response.) 10 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 11 Mr. Chairman, the last thing MR. HESTER: 12 I would like to discuss -- we were doing a list of 13 projects, of course, the -- which included acquisition 14 projects, and we are not to consider any of those and 15 will not scope any of those considering those 16 projects. 17 However, in the event that there should be 18 some reversion of funds to the Trust Fund with regard 19 to an acquisition, number one, we're not a part of the 20 motion to pay us saying that we will definitely spend 21 those funds in our committee, recognizing that it may 22 be important, particularly for the economy and jobs, 23 to possibly use that money elsewhere where more jobs 24 could be created. 25 Having said that, the staff, I think, needs

some direction -- and I've discussed --1 2 MR. ROGERS: Joe, we're going to take this 3 up on another agenda item, and we'll get a list 4 distributed out to the trustees. 5 MR. HESTER: They don't have those yet? 6 MR. ROGERS: They don't have that yet. So 7 we'll get to that, and by the time we're going, it 8 will be about three minutes, I think. 9 MR. HESTER: We'll discuss that later, Mr. 10 Chairman. Then that concludes our report. 11 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you, Joe. 12 That brings us to Infrastructure/Wastewater, 13 and Trustee Markham chaired that meeting. 14 MR. MARKHAM: Thank you. The 15 Wastewater/Infrastructure Committee met yesterday. 16 had all committee members present, other than 17 Claudette Weston, who was unable to join us. 18 We took several items up for consideration. 19 And I believe the first item that we'll be bringing 20 forward to the Board was related to discussion of 21 construction projects not under construction contract 22 within one year. The committee recommends approval of 23 the proposed date of November 30th, 2011, by which the Town of Lilesville will enter into a construction 24 25 contract; and the proposed date of November 30th,

1 2011, by which the Town of Morven will enter into a 2 contract. 3 That is the recommendation of the Board --4 I'm sorry -- of the committee. And I'll also put on 5 the record, those project numbers are 2008-524 and 2008-527. That is the recommendation of the 6 7 committee. 8 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the 9 recommendation of the committee. Is there further 10 discussion? 11 (No response.) 12 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 13 favor of the motion say "Aye." 14 TRUSTEES: Aye. 15 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Opposed say "No." 16 (No response.) 17 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 18 MR. MARKHAM: The second item we're 19 bringing to the Board for action is the potential 20 transfer of the WaDE contract, which is project 2010-21 616, due to programmatic changes. After hearing from 22 staff about the status of the WaDE program and its 23 defunding at the state level, we recommend terminating 24 the contract with the Department of Environmental 25 Health based on the defunding of the program.

the recommendation of the committee.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the recommendation of the committee. Is there discussion?

MR. HOLLAN: Mr. Chairman --

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Bill Hollan.

MR. HOLLAN: -- this is elimination of straight piping in the creeks up in -- mainly in the western part of the state. Homes are built right along the creeks because that's the only flat area up in some of this hollows. And this was a program we've been involved in for 15 years -- or 14 years. When we initiated this, it was a no-brainer. You just don't want people running their straight pipes into the creeks.

And surveys have been done up there. We've developed a program to make loans so people would have to participate and grants to people who couldn't. And I hate to see this program die, so I hope that we will -- I don't know exactly what happened between the WaDE administrators and the funders, but this is a program that we ought attempt to see continue because it's doing good work and, again, just from the point of view of balance around the state, we don't -- typically, we don't have many wastewater treatment plants out in the western part of the state. So I

2.2.

hope that we'll find a way to continue this program.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Kevin?

MR. MARKHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Just to continue on, there's another request by the committee to deal with that, Mr. Hollan. The committee's also asking the staff to contact western councils of government to determine the interest in continuing the program and requesting that staff make a recommendation to this committee in October regarding the use of remaining funds in that project. But we're looking for the action on the recommendation to terminate the contract at this point.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Richard?

MR. ROGERS: Also, Mr. Hollan, I think the administration of the program is — in changing the administration to the local level is a result of legislative action that eliminated the program. And I think the program was doing fine, but the fact that the legislature and the government recommended elimination of the program, I believe sent a message to us that it would better be administrated at the local level. So that's the intent of staff, and we'll come back in October with a recommendation to continue the program at the local level.

1 MR. HOLLAN: Thank you. 2 The motion of -- as far CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: 3 as from the committee, terminates the contract with 4 the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. 5 Is there further discussion? We had a lot of 6 discussion about this yesterday afternoon. Mr. Massie 7 gave us some good information about the interest of 8 council governments in that part of the state. 9 Further discussion? 10 (No response.) 11 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 12 favor of the motion say "Aye." 13 TRUSTEES: Aye. 14 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Those opposed "No." 15 (No response.) 16 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 17 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MR. MARKHAM: 18 Our next action item is a lengthy one. 19 took up the funding recommendations for the 2011 20 wastewater applications. We'll take care of a couple 21 of housekeeping actions to begin with. 22 First, the committee recommended accepting 23 the withdrawal request from the City of Lenoir for 24 2011-518; accepting withdrawal for Moore County, which 25 is 2011-521; and accepting withdrawal for the Village

1	of Simpson for 2011-608.			
2	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the			
3	recommendation of the committee. Is there discussion?			
4	(No response.)			
5	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in			
6	favor of the motion say "Aye."			
7	TRUSTEES: Aye.			
8	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Opposed "No."			
9	(No response.)			
10	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it.			
11	MR. MARKHAM: The second housekeeping			
12	measure was to we need to approve the request of			
13	transfer of the application 2011-508 from Cramerton to			
14	the City of Gastonia.			
15	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: We discussed this			
16	yesterday. Any further discussion of that motion?			
17	(No response.)			
18	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in			
19	favor of the motion say "Aye."			
20	TRUSTEES: Aye.			
21	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Opposed "No."			
22	(No response.)			
23	CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it.			
24	MR. MARKHAM: Thank you. The next action			
25	is the Board for the Board is that the staff			

provided summaries for projects in Group 1 of the spreadsheet that was provided to us. These are the projects that scored highest using our criteria. And the committee recommendation is that the Board consider funding lines 1 through 14 on the spreadsheet, based on the staff and the committee recommendations.

Eight of these projects were recommended for funding. One project, the City of Lenoir, was withdrawn, which we just approved. And five were recommended to not be further considered for funding in the 2011 cycle.

And for the record, projects that the committee has recommended -- is recommending funding in the 2011 cycle are 2011-508, the City of Gastonia, South Fork Catawba River, and that's the amount of \$600,000; 2011-534, Town of Troy, Discharge Reduction and Land Application for Denson's Creek in the amount of \$600,000; 2011-513, Johnston County, the Community College Reclaimed Water System, the recommendation is \$580,000; the Town of Maysville, Treatment System Upgrades for White Oak River, committee recommendation in the amount of \$440,000; 2011-526, City of Salisbury, Wastewater Treatment Plant Elimination for Second Creek, committee recommendation in the amount

of \$600,000; Camden County for the South Mills Septic Tank Elimination to the Dismal Swamp Canal, committee recommendation in the amount of \$600,00; Town of Stantonsburg, Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements for Phase 1 in Contentnea Creek, committee recommendation in the amount of \$600,000; Town of Bath, Wastewater Treatment Plant and Disposal Upgrade for Carter Creek, committee recommendation in the amount of \$600,000.

The following projects, as part of this first motion, that are recommended not be further considered for funding in 2011: These are 2011-606, Town of Hoffman, Design Permitting and Acquisition for Hoffman Wastewater Collection in Drowning Creek; Town of Parkton, Regional Wastewater System Implementation for Dunns Marsh; 2011-514, City of Kannapolis, Reclaimed Water Plant for the Rocky River; 2011-512, Hoke County, Water Refuse, Rockfish Creek; and 2011-507, City of Claremont, Regionalization Planning and Design Implementation in Lyle and McLin Creeks.

That is the recommendation of the committee.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the recommendation of the committee. You have the handout with the listing of those projects, project numbers, and that requested score and the committee

recommendation. Is there further discussion on the 1 2 motion? Yes? 3 MR. PATE: I'd like to ask a question, 4 if I could, maybe for Larry. 5 We came down -- and Mr. Hollan mentioned 6 this this morning. Is there going to be any money 7 with the anticipated \$390,000 return, any money left 8 over that might be able to help the Taylorsville 9 project since they are so low on the -- they're 15th, 10 and they're in the west? I'll just ask that question. 11 Yes, that will be in our MR. MARKHAM: 12 second motion -- or second recommendation. 13 MR. PATE: All right. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Any further discussion? 14 15 (No response.) 16 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 17 favor of the motion say "Aye." 18 TRUSTEES: Aye. 19 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Opposed "No." 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 22 MR. MARKHAM: Thank you. The next action 23 for the Board's consideration is that the committee 24 reviewed the remaining projects in the Group 1 25 listing, and the committee is recommending that the

Board take action on the projects listed as lines 15 through 20 on the spreadsheet, based on the staff and committee recommendations as funds become available up to and through June 2012. These will be provisionally approved by me based on reversion of funds, unencumbered funds coming back to wastewater.

These projects include -- four of these projects are recommended for funding, based on that funding. And those projects are: 2011-609, Town of Taylorsville, the Millersville, Lower Little River Catawba project in the amount of \$600,000; 2011-535, Town of West Jefferson for the Sewer Rehabilitation and Little Buffalo Creek in the amount of \$86,500; the Town of Green Level, Sewer Rehabilitation in the Haw River, the committee recommendation in the amount of \$220,000; and 2011-510, Town of Fairmont, Sewer Rehabilitation Phase 1 in the Lumber River in the amount of \$600,000.

The other projects rounding out the Group 1 are not recommended for further consideration in the 2011 cycle, and those include: 2011-522, Onslow Water and Sewer Authority, Package Plant Elimination in the New River; and Town of Spring Lake, Reclaimed Water System in the Lower Little River.

The committee recommendation further

1 warrants that these projects be considered in the 2 priority order of their clean water scores as funds 3 are available. 4 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: You've heard the motion. 5 Is there discussion? (No response.) 6 7 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as --8 excuse me. Charles? 9 I have a question, since I MR. JOHNSON: 10 think it's been discussed between some of the 11 Trustees. 12 Looking at the fact that we want to try to 13 make sure, if we possibly can, that our funds are 14 distributed totally throughout the state, are any of 15 these projects that we're talking about here as money 16 becomes available, are any of those in the western 17 part of the state? 18 MR. MARKHAM: Yes. The first two projects 19 in the provisional list are in the western part of the state, including Taylorsville, which is in Alexander 20 21 County, which would be their first grant. And we 22 believe that we should have funds reverting to balance 23 this year that would cover this project and possibly 24 further down the list. 25 MR. JOHNSON: To iron out this type

1 situation and put a priority on those in the western 2 part of the state, what I would like to do is -- it 3 looks like it's already done. 4 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you, Charles. 5 Is there other discussion? 6 (No response.) 7 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 8 favor of the motion say "Aye." 9 TRUSTEES: Aye. 10 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Opposed "No." 11 (No response.) 12 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 13 Thank you. And the committee MR. MARKHAM: 14 has one further recommendation, is that the projects 15 in Group 2 of the spreadsheet not be funded in the 16 2011 cycle, but the applicants be encouraged to re-17 apply doing an abbreviated process. 18 And, Mr. Chair, would you like me to read 19 those into the record? 20 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: I don't believe it's 21 necessary. We've got the documents. 22 MR. MARKHAM: Okay. This was a quick 23 measure as well, as I don't believe the committee 24 officially made the same recommendation for those 25 projects not funded in Group 1 in the 2011 cycle. So

1 if it's all right, we'd like to include those in the 2 same motion. 3 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: All right. You've heard 4 the motion. Is there discussion? 5 (No response.) CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 6 7 favor of the motion say "Aye." 8 TRUSTEES: Aye. 9 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Opposed say "No." 10 (No response.) 11 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 12 MR. MARKHAM: And that concludes the 13 committee report. 14 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: All right. I guess to 15 summarize, we have allocated \$4.831 million to -- and 16 to wastewater there were requests for \$47 million, so 17 you'll see that we are leaving an awful lot on the 18 table. A lot of those projects we approved were 19 scaled back to accommodate the \$600,000 capital we put 20 -- put on those. Of the total applications for this 21 year, we had \$157 million worth of applications, and 22 we have \$9,081,495 to deal with those \$157 million in 23 applications. There are a lot of our partners out 24 there who are going to be disappointed. 25 Anything else from that committee?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Richard had passed out a minute ago some handouts. You want to discuss those, Richard?

MR. ROGERS: Yes. And what we're going to do is, what we have is a preliminary list of scores for two different program funding committees, the Acquisition Funding Committee and also the Restoration/Stormwater/Greenways Funding Committee. The Restoration/Stormwater is one sheet and then there's one sheet for Greenways and then we have the Acquisition.

The way we're going to handle this is that we'll let the co-chairs of the committee have a brief discussion, give some of their thoughts with regards to -- and direction to staff on those. And at this point, we also would welcome the input from the Board as a whole as we continue to finish analyzing these projects, fully scoping some, and as we move forward and prepare for the October meeting where the committees will consider these projects.

Yevonne, if you'll go first, we'll take up the Restoration/Stormwater/Greenway list.

MS. BRANNON: The co-chairs met with the staff last week to kind of review kind of an overview

of -- these glasses aren't working too well. I'm talking about one sheet and looking at the other.

But we have the list here in front of you for the Restoration/Stormwater, and separately there's a sheet for the Greenway application. And during our meeting last week the direction for the staff that we gave -- primary directions to the staff at this meeting, was to look at those projects that were a hundred or above. And you can see that staff has kind of drawn that line here. There are -- 16 projects are in that group, Group 1, with -- and in the Greenway projects that you see on a separate sheet as Item Agenda L, we've asked them to look at those projects that scored 70 or above.

I remember on the Greenway, it was a scale of 100, so the scores for the Restoration and Stormwater is a scale of 160. So the 70s are in 70 percent, which is over in the Stormwater/Restoration. When you have a scale 160, you know, when you're scaling at 100 and 113, 112, you're kind of a comparable level. But this is the direction that was given to the staff at the meeting.

And, further, we actually also asked them to look at three other things. Charles, you reminded me of that. One was to try to look at these projects

over the next couple of months in terms of if they are construction ready. Since the applications have been put in, look back now and see if they are actually kind of ready to go, to also see if there are any that would be able to pare their request, recognizing our level of funding we have available for these projects, and to see if there's any other adjustments to match.

And then, further, to put a cap on these at around \$400,000 to -- in an effort to try to spread the \$2 million as far as we could go. And then, finally, to do what you mentioned, Charles, to kind of look at those across the state. So this is a really big challenge for the State to look at these projects, many of which are very high quality, with \$2 million available to spread across all these little categories I just mentioned, the ready to go with construction, ready to go within a year, those that scored in the top tier -- and I'm looking across the state -- and then having \$2 million.

So with that in mind, if the Board agrees, they are going to look at fully scoping the first 16 projects for Restoration/Stormwater. And if you look on the Greenway, that would be -- looking very carefully, there are only five projects, so if they fully scope three or four or five, I don't think it's

1 going to matter, but they'll probably be looking 2 pretty close at all five of those projects. 3 MR. ROGERS: Also, while we draw the line 4 at 100, if there's any trustee that is interested in 5 having one of the projects that are below that line 6 fully scoped and presented to the Board, staff would 7 be prepared. And we'd just like for you all to inform 8 of us the project and we'll be glad to fully scope 9 that project and put into the Group 1. 10 MS. BRANNON: Richard, is there anything 11 else I forgot? 12 MR. ROGERS: No, ma'am. Any discussion --13 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Any questions for 14 Yevonne or Richard? 15 MR. ROGERS: Joe? 16 MR. HESTER: Thank you. We had similar 17 discussion. It was on a different degree. First of 18 all, as I began earlier, pertaining to funds with 19 regards to the Acquisition Committee, first of all, they're not automatically spent in our committee until 20 21 we look at needs elsewhere. One of the top things we 22 consider, of course, would be jobs in terms of what we 23 can do for our economy. 24 Having said that, if you'll look at the 25 list, it is our recommendation that staff scope 95 and

above where the request was less than one million. It may be that we don't fund any of these. These are only easement projects. There are no acquisition projects that will be scoped. These are only conservation easements, which is directed by the statute. So everything 95 -- scores 95 and above where the request is less than a million, we would recommend that staff scope those and only those in case -- or in the event that some monies will become available.

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Any questions for Joe?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: We have gone through the agenda with the exception of our executive session.

Are there any other matters to come before us, other than executive session and the meeting with the Personnel Committee?

Karen?

MS. CRAGNOLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to announce that Buncombe County Conservation Board has nominated the Clean Water Management Trust Fund for an award. Even in these difficult times, the Buncombe County Commissioners have been able to award a million dollars this past year, and two million in previous years for conversation projects in Buncombe County,

1 many of which have had a partner with the Clean Water 2 Management Trust Fund. And the Commissioners and the 3 members of the Conservation Board wish to acknowledge 4 that in a ceremony that will take place in September. 5 I've spoken to Richard, and he is going to 6 be able to attend that. And there will be a plaque 7 presented and -- and all the commissioners in Buncombe 8 would like to thank the Clean Water Management Trust 9 Fund for a long-time partnership and all the things 10 that they have done for the western part of the state. 11 Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you, Karen, and 13 thanks for helping to make that happen. We appreciate 14 your efforts in that regard. 15 Anything else to come before us? 16 MR. HOLLAN: Mr. Chairman --17 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Bill? 18 MR. HOLLAN: -- can I go back for just a 19 second to the stormwater? I was just reviewing this. 20 We've got two projects that are well into the 90s. 21 One of which is a CREP program. One of which is just 22 -- it's got a 64 percent match, and the match 23 indicates that there would be a lot of bang for our 24 buck on that. And could we get an update on that if

-- we've got another one, RiverLink's got a 68 percent

25

1 match, again, a big bang for the buck. If we could 2 move those up into the category projects that would be 3 scoped, I would appreciate it. 4 MR. ROGERS: So noted. 5 MR. HOLLAN: Thank you. 6 MR. ROGERS: I would also say that we'll 7 give you our report with regards to continuing the 8 CREP program for both and the progress they're making 9 in that program when we report to you in October. 10 MR. HOLLAN: Thank vou. 11 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: All right. Kevin? 12 MR. MARKHAM: Yes. I apologize. We should 13 have mentioned this in our committee meeting, but we 14 do need to acknowledge the co-chairs who are the 15 predecessors for Aaron and myself; that's Dr. Camp and 16 Chairman Rascoe. They did an excellent job for the 17 committee. Unfortunately, we're not reappointed, but 18 they did the serious work for the committee, all very 19 important. And the field reps, and I would 20 acknowledge the work they did in working with the 21 applicants to find project savings, deductions, 22 alterations to make it possible for the Board to 23 spread our money further than we would have otherwise. 24 Thank you. 25

CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Thank you, Kevin.

And

1 we're inviting them and Chairman Baddour back to the 2 October meeting to thank them for their service, so we 3 look forward to seeing them then. 4 Recognize Ron Beane for a motion. 5 MR. BEANE: Mr. Chairman, I move we go 6 into closed session pursuant to General Statute 143-7 318.11(6) for the purpose of discussing the 8 performance evaluation of our executive director, 9 which is required of this committee. 10 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: I've heard the motion. 11 Is there a second? 12 MS. CRAGNOLIN: Second. 13 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Any discussion? 14 (No response.) 15 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: If not, so many as in 16 favor of the motion say "Aye." 17 TRUSTEES: Aye. 18 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it. 19 will go into closed session at five minutes till 20 10:00, so we'll take a 10-minute break. 21 (Recess taken from 9:45 a.m. to 9:55 a.m.) 22 (Closed session from 9:55 a.m. to 10:15 23 a.m.) 24 CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: We're back in open 25 session. And I believe there is a -- someone wants to

```
1
         make a --
2
                    MR. HOLLAN:
                                    I move we adjourn.
 3
                    CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: Bill Hollan makes a
4
         motion that we adjourn. (Seconded by unidentified
5
         Trustee.) All those in favor say "Aye."
6
                    TRUSTEES:
                                   Aye.
7
                    CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: The ayes have it, so
8
         this is adjourned.
9
10
                       (Meeting adjourned at 10:16 a.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		CE	ERTIFICATE	OF	NOTARY	-	COURT	REPORTER
STATE	OF	NORTH	CAROLINA)					
COUNT	Y OI	F WAKE	)					

I, Patricia L. Roush, CVR, Court Reporter, Notary
Public in and for the above county and state, do hereby
certify that foregoing CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING was taken before me at the time and
place hereinbefore and was duly recorded by me by means of
stenomask and speech recognition; which is reduced to
written form under my direction and supervision, and that
this is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and
correct transcript of the meeting of the Board of Trustees
of the Clean Water Management Trust Fund held at 2728 Capital
Boulevard, Room 1A224, Raleigh, North Carolina, on the 15th
day of August, 2011.

I further certify that I am neither of counsel to this agency or interested in the event of this agency on this 4th day of September, 2011.

Patricia L. Roush, CVR, Court Reporter Notary Public, Wake County, North Carolina Notary Number: 19990990089