BOARD OF TRUSTEES

CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND

MINUTES OF MEETING

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2010 9:00 A.M.

2728 CAPITAL BOULEVARD

ROOM 1A-224

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA



APPEARANCES

CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

PHILIP A. BADDOUR, JR., CHAIRMAN, GOLDSBORO

HONORABLE HAROLD A. BASS, SR., WENTWORTH

HONORABLE RONALD R. BEANE, LENOIR

DR. YEVONNE BRANNON, RALEIGH

DR. NORMAN C. CAMP, III, RALEIGH

KAREN CRAGNOLIN, ASHEVILLE

JOHN GARROU, WINSTON-SALEM

JOSEPH M. HESTER, JR., ROCKY MOUNT

WILLIAM HOLLAN, WINSTON-SALEM

CHARLES JOHNSON, GREENVILLE

CHARLES W. McGRADY, HENDERSONVILLE

JOHN McMILLAN, RALEIGH

PRESTON PATE, NEWPORT

PETER RASCOE, III, EDENTON

BETTY CHAFIN RASH, CHARLOTTE

AARON THOMAS, PEMBROKE

STAN VAUGHAN, CHARLOTTE

JERRY WRIGHT, JARVISBURG

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

TOM JONES, DEPUTY DIRECTOR - PROJECT ASSESSMENT

NANCY GUTHRIE, WATER QUALITY ADVISOR

CHRISTOPHER FIPPS, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

PENNY ADAMS, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

ROBIN HAMMOND, REAL PROPERTY COUNSEL

CHERRI SMITH, STEWARDSHIP COORDINATOR

KEVIN BOYER, RESTORATION/STORMWATER PROJECT MANAGER

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

CHERYL JOHNSON, PARALEGAL

EVERETTE MOORE, STATE PROPERTY OFFICE PROPERTY AGENT

CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND FIELD REPRESENTATIVES:

TOM MASSIE, MOUNTAINS FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

SARAH KING, SOUTHERN COASTAL PLAIN FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

WILL SUMMER, EASTERN PIEDMONT FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

BERN SCHUMAK, NORTHERN COASTAL PLAIN FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

ALSO PRESENT:

GEORGE SHERRILL, CDBG ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

LISA RIEGEL, NATIONAL HERITAGE TRUST FUND

JUDGE CRISSIE THIGPEN, NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

AGENDA

- 9:00 a.m. A. Call to Order Chairman Baddour
 - Welcome
 - Appointment of New Trustee Chairman Baddour and The Honorable
 - Roll Call Penny Adams
 - Compliance with General Statute \$138A-15
 - Revisions, Additions, and Adoption of the Agenda (Action Item)
 - · Please Put Cell Phones on Vibrate
 - Review and Approval of the Transcripts of the August 2010 Meeting of the Board of Trustees (Action Item)
 - Recognize CWMTF Advisory Committee Members
- 9:15 a.m. B. Public Comments Chairman Baddour
- 9:25 a.m. C. Executive Director's Report Richard Rogers
- 9:50 a.m. D. Attorney General's Report Frank Crawley
- 10:00 a.m. E. Discussion on Allocation of Unencumbered Funds for Remainder of FY 2010-2011 (Action Item) Chairman Baddour
- 10:15 a.m. F. Administrative Committee Report Committee Co-Chair Vaughan (Action Items)
- 10:25 a.m. G. Program Committee Report Committee Co-Chairs Hollan and Markham (Action Items)
- 10:45 a.m. H. Break
- 11:00 a.m. I. Restoration/Stormwater/Greenway Committee Report Committee Co-Chairs Brannon and Henderson (Action Items)
- 11:30 a.m. J. Review of 2010 Wastewater Applications:
 Scores and Groupings for Scope Development
 Larry Horton (Information Item)

Staff will hand out and briefly review worksheets that list 2010 wastewater applications, their scores, and other summary information from each application. Staff will also describe the basis for determining the subset of applications for which full scopes will be developed and the process for Trustees to request that scopes be developed for additional applications. The Board will consider 2010 wastewater applications for funding at the November meeting.

11:45 a.m. K. Discussion

12:00 p.m. L. Adjourn

TABLE	O F	CON	TENTS	
	<u> </u>			
Proceedings				7
Certificate of Reporter				79

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. I'd like to bring it to order. I want to welcome everyone here, and announce that we have a new Trustee with us, John Garrou. John, Judge Thigpen should be here in a few minutes, but we're going to go ahead and start. And then, when he comes in, we'll have you sworn in -- I'm pretty sure before business.

MR. GARROU: I won't say anything till he gets here.

CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. I will say -- I mentioned this yesterday, but maybe a few of you weren't here, that John is well known to John McMillan and myself, since were all classmates together in the class of 1967, so I know exactly how long he's been practicing law.

I'll tell you a little bit about John. He has two adult children and two grandchildren. His wife is Senator Linda Garrou, who's one of our champions in the General Assembly. He was a long time member of the law firm of Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge, & Rice, where he served as the managing partner. And I'll tell you he's more known as one of the outstanding lawyers in the state of North Carolina. In 1905 [sic] he was appointed as co-chair

1	to the North Carolina Commission on Global Climate
2	Change. And I understand from Richard that you all
3	have recently made your report on that. So
4	MR. GARROU: Yes. Very gleefully.
5	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So, John, we welcome you
6	to this board. And if there's anything you'd like to
7	say, we'd be glad to hear from you.
8	MR. GARROU: No. I just to
9	just to say I'm ready I'm looking forward, very
10	much, to serving on this Board. I enjoyed yesterday
11	afternoon. And I hope, within a year or two, to
12	learn fifty percent of the acronyms.
13	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, you'll be better
14	than I am if you get there. Some of us just refuse
15	to learn them. So okay, Penny, I'll ask you to
16	call the roll.
17	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Baddour?
18	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Here.
19	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Bass?
20	MR. BASS: Here.
21	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Beane?
22	MR. BEANE: Here.
23	MS. ADAMS: Ms. [sic] Brannon?
24	DR. BRANNON: Here.
25	MS. ADAMS: Mr. [sic] Camp?

1	DR.	CAMP:	Here.
2	MS.	ADAMS:	Ms. Cragnolin?
3	MS.	CRAGNOLIN:	Here.
4	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Crumpler?
5	(No	response.)	
6	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Garrou?
7	MR.	GARROU:	Here.
8	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Henderson?
9	(No	response.)	
10	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Hester?
11	MR.	HESTER:	Here.
12	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Holland?
13	MR.	HOLLAND:	Here.
14	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Johnson?
15	MR.	JOHNSON:	Here.
16	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Markham?
17	(No	response.)	
18	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. McGrady?
19	MR.	McGRADY:	Here.
20	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. McMillian?
21	MR.	McMILLIAN:	Here.
22	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Pate?
23	MR.	PATE:	Here.
24	MS.	ADAMS:	Mr. Rascoe?
25	MR.	RASCOE:	Here.

1	MS. ADAMS: Ms. Rash?
2	MS. RASCOE: She's here.
3	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Thomas?
4	MR. THOMAS: Here.
5	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Vaughn?
6	MR. VAUGHN: Here.
7	MS. ADAMS: Mr. Wright?
8	MR. WRIGHT: Here.
9	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: I might say that Kevin
10	is sick. He didn't want he said he didn't want to
11	infect us all. So we wish him well, and sorry he
12	can't be here. And some of you I got an email
13	yesterday from John Crumpler. Maybe did everybody
14	get that email
15	MS. CRAGNOLIN: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: saying that he
17	submitted his resignation to the governor. So
18	MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Rash
19	has just come in the door.
20	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. And Betty Rash is
21	with us.
22	General Statute §138A-15 mandates that the
23	Chair inquires as to whether any Trustee knows of any
24	conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict
25	of interest with respect to matters on the agenda.

1 If any Trustee knows of a conflict of interest, or 2 the appearance of a conflict of interest, please so 3 state at this time. Karen? 4 MS. CRAGNOLIN: Yes, sir. Okay. I have 5 the -- a conflict on 2001-430 [sic] and 2010-430 and 2010-212. I will not be discussing or voting. Thank 6 7 you. 8 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So noted. Are there any 9 revisions, additions to the agenda? 10 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 11 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: If not, then by consent, 12 unanimous consent, the adoption of the agenda is 13 noted. 14 I ask you to put your cell phones on --15 turn them off or on vibrate. I assume that all of you have reviewed the 16 17 transcripts of the 2010 meeting. Chuck McGrady, I 18 know you have, because you always do. I don't know 19 if -- when you leave us and go to serve in the General Assembly, as you're going to, somebody's 20 21 going to have to take up that responsibility. Are 22 there any -- any additions or changes to the -- to 23 the minutes? MR. McGRADY: 24 I move their adoption. 25 DR. CAMP: Second.

1	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Discussion?
2	TRUSTEES: (No response.)
3	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Hearing none, all in
4	favor signify by saying, "Aye."
5	TRUSTEES: Aye.
6	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: We do have some some
7	of our Advisory Committee members here who I would
8	like to recognize. Department of Commerce
9	representing the secretary is George Sherrill. And
10	George is the manager of infrastructure grants. So
11	it's very appropriate
12	MR. SHERRILL: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: that you're with us
14	here today. You know about these infrastructure
15	grants.
16	MR. SHERRILL: These are our partners,
17	right here.
18	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: And, as always, from the
19	National Heritage Trust Fund, our friend Lisa Riegel.
20	Lisa, where are you?
21	MR. ROGERS: Right there.
22	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: All right. Now is the
23	time on the agenda where we will recognize anyone for
24	public comments. Is there anyone here who would like
25	to make a public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: All right. With that -moving right along. Richard, it's time for our
Executive Director's Report.

MR. ROGERS: Thank you. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. One thing I do want to -- to note is
we are in the midst of an office building here, and
when we go in that room, it would be good if we try
to keep our voices down. At the last meeting, we all
fell out of here and made a big ruckus, and some of
the folks in Environmental Health were trying to get
some work done, and, I think, we interrupted them.
So if we could, if you leave -- leave the meeting
room, please -- please hold it down. Thank you.

I don't have a lot of things to review, but I did want to raise a few topics and some upcoming -- potential upcoming issues. With regards to our contracts, we are working with contracts and applications and grants as far back as 2008, as well as 2010. Our 2008 contracts, we have all of those encumbered or either at DENR for processing with the exception of three or four.

And the status on one of those, our

Colonnade project, is actually -- they've agreed to
the contract moving forward. Creedmoor was another

contract that has been a long time coming. At the last board meeting, we got that reconciled, and they are moving forward as well. And, then, there's a couple other contracts with Enfield and the Land Trust of Central North Carolina that we are continuing to negotiate.

So with regard to the '08 contracts, we're moving forward. And we've done about ninety-nine percent of those -- those done. There's a total of 154 contracts for that year.

And with regard to the 2010 projects, the acquisition projects that were approved back in August, all those contracts have been drafted and are out to the Land Trust and various agencies that receive grants. We are waiting to hear back from them to finalize the contracts, get their comments, and look forward to moving those through DENR and getting those encumbered in the -- in the very near future.

Just another little update from an administrative perspective, our -- we mentioned the potential of subleasing some space that we have. We are in the last stages of getting a memorandum agreement signed with Community Development out of Commerce who has space on the -- the whole second

1 floor of our building. And they're going to take up 2 four different office spaces from us, as well as some 3 land line -- some computer lines, and phone lines, so 4 that we will be able to sublet that space to them. 5 It's much needed by them, and we're welcome to have 6 They're also using some of our meeting rooms' 7 space as well, and we're coordinating that. Much 8 thanks to Penny for -- for working out those 9 schedules, and that kind of thing. 10 All right. Now, I'm going to let 11 Christopher provide a budget update for us, and --12 Christopher? 13 MR. BADDOUR: Is there a handout? 14 Yeah, there is a handout. MR. ROGERS: 15 It's -- it's Agenda C. Agenda Item C. 16 DR. BRANNON: It looks like this 17 (indicating). 18 MR. ROGERS: It's a one-pager. 19 MR. FIPPS: Thank you, Richard. It is 20 Agenda Item C. It's the -- basically, a cash update 21 of the Clean Water Management Trust Fund. 22 like the Board to quickly see in the forwarded 23 materials. This is as of August 31st. Just to 24 summarize, Line 8 is basically, as of August 31st, 25 the cash available to Clean Water Management Trust

Fund after, obviously, the funds that are set aside, and for the Stewardship Program and the long-term investment fund. So after considering those funds, there's a little over a \$120 million in the Trust Fund at the time.

Then the following lines basically add in the rest of the projected revenue for the physical year, roughly \$41.6 million still to receive toward the appropriation for this year, and about \$1.4 million in projected interest to still receive on the Trust Fund.

Then -- the following lines I then consider the remaining obligations against that balance, including Lines 16 and 17, which are the projected reversions of -- the potential reversions back to the state budget for balancing the budget to year. The one percent reversion, which is \$500,000 for Clean Water, and then potential -- that the interest that we earn for the year might also be reverted back to the state.

The remaining administrative budget and COPs debt service for the year, then the obligation of all the encumbered grants right now, which is a little over \$112 million. And then, as of August 31st, the amount that will be remaining to be

1 encumbered against awards that the Board has already 2 made. 3 Thirty-two (32) and 33 show the funds 4 coming back from unencumbered funds that were voted 5 on by the Administrative Committee yesterday, that 6 \$1.4 million that comes back from projects that 7 are -- closed at under budget or ongoing projects 8 that are coming in under budget and the grant 9 recipient has offered those funds back. 10 Thirty seven (37), 38, and 39 then show the 11 funds that are still obligated to the funding 12 committees. And that leaves us with, basically, the 13 \$1.4 million for the Board to consider using, which is equal to the amount that's being unencumbered at 14 15 this time. 16 MR. ROGERS: Any questions for 17 Christopher? 18 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Bill? 19 MR. HOLLAN: Mr. Chairman, I think in 20 the title of Line 8, "Available Cash Balance," is a 21 little bit misleading, and you might want to come up 22 with something that -- those funds are not actually 23 available. Those are funds that are --24 DR. CAMP: Obligated. 25 DR. BRANNON: Obligated.

1 MR. HOLLAN: -- many of those are 2 obligated. So I think the term "available" could be 3 confusing to somebody who, in a tight budget year, who looks and says, "We have 120 million available." 4 5 We've committed, under contracts, \$112 million of 6 that already. So, perhaps, we could just come up 7 with a different --8 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: We just call it "Cash 9 Balance." 10 MR. HOLLAN: -- name. "Cash 11 Balance," I think is fine. 12 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. Any other 13 questions? Richard? 14 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 15 One thing I did want to brief you all is I sent out 16 an email on Friday highlighting a dedication down at 17 the art museum where we had a project with the art 18 museum that we have worked on, and we're the primary 19 financier of the project that incorporated a cistern 20 system and, more or less, managing the stormwater on 21 the whole 53-acre site out at the art museum. 22 tell you that the museum has done a great job with 23 this project. It's extremely well designed, and it 24 really fits in with their vision of integrating the 25 natural resources and art into our natural

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

environment, which they're doing -- trying to work on with the museum park. So I just wanted to make sure that we had a good -- some good press on that. We were mentioned in the article as the primary financier. And the museum and Secretary Carlyle were all extremely appreciative of the effort, and that Clean Water had made on -- on the project.

We also have a couple more of these dedications going on, actually today the Brumley Tract in Chatham County. I hope that some of you all will be able to attend. And we're dedicating that property. That was a 2008 project, which is a very significant piece of property in the heart of the Triangle that we're excited to dedicate. The Triangle Land Conservancy is the applicant there, and will be putting that property into, hopefully, some public use as well. So, hopefully, that -- some of you all will make yourselves available for that. It starts at one o'clock, and should be done by two, 2:30 or so. The formalities will probably be done much sooner than that, but they are offering some opportunities to walk around the tract and see it as well.

On Wednesday, we're going down to Bolton to dedicate a waste -- dedicate a wastewater project.

Some of you all will remember this project; it's been with us a while. It's Bolton Whiteville at Lake Waccamaw, and it has evolved into what, I think, has turned out to be a very, very good project incorporating these three -- three units of government. And we're looking forward to that celebration as well.

We'll continue to try to make you all aware of these opportunities to celebrate our success. I think it provides a great opportunity for us to show the work that's being done on the ground by the Trust Fund, and the benefits that we'll bring not only to the environment, but the economy as well. Also, if you all have any suggestions or thoughts about projects that need to be celebrated, we'll be glad to take -- take those and work on those as well.

We're -- the next Board meeting is in

February, and I wanted just to bring up a couple of

topics and get you all thinking. Of course, we know

that February is more of a working meeting to take up

issues that the Board wrestles with, the staff

wrestles with. We're not approving any projects,

reviewing any projects at this time, but we'd like to

take that time to step back and look a little bit at

our organization, and, oftentimes, look at how we can

improve our -- our operations and our functions as
organizations.

Some of the topics that we'll -- we're looking at putting on the agenda is -- again, we'll be looking at the minimum score, hopefully coming up with some resolution on that so that we can -- we can move forward. One thing we thought that would be helpful is, kind of, a program overview of the different program areas that we have, and to update you all on the evolution of these programs. Believe it or not, we're always evolving, moving forward, and I thought it would be good just to brief the Trustees on our program and exactly what's going on in those programs and some issues that we were facing.

The legislature is going to be a prime topic. They would have just reconvened for the -for session, and we'll -- we'll definitely be talking about that, and looking at strategies with the legislature. I hope that folks will take some time to think about what we can do. I think last year our postcards worked well. We will continue those, and we will make sure that we get on those. And there may be some other opportunities, too, that we need to take advantage of of direct communication with our Trustees. I was talking with Chuck McGrady, I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Friday or so, and one thing he said that I thought was interesting is it would be good for us to communicate the projects that we award to -- directly to the legislators so they understand when they're awarded, that the projects that are coming in their districts just as an informational piece. And that they could -- they could also take advantage of it as well. So those are some of the thoughts that we're looking at.

One other issue that is becoming more and more apparent, that the legislature is probably going to take this up, is the dealing with nutrient credits. With recently passed nutrient rules with regards to Falls Lake and Jordan Lake, we're starting to get some calls from communities that want to apply our projects to get credits for nutrient offsets, and to help them comply with the -- with the new rules that are in place. There's obviously legislation that requires mitigation that they cannot be used for that purpose. We have all along, for the most part, with regards to Clean Water Funds that go into projects cannot be used for any nutrient credits. And we have a history of the Board taking these topics up and not allowing the state funds to be used for this. We have, however, allowed some of the

matching funds in those projects to be used for credits in the Neuse, and I believe in the Tar-Pam.

We are meeting with the Department of Environment & Natural Resources to get a better understanding of the rules and how they're going to be implemented. It's my opinion that we need to make sure we know the process, and make sure that those regulatory agencies have information from our -- our fund on the projects so that they can make decisions with regards to the use of those projects as credits.

I think the Board needs to come down and figure out where we are with regards to allowing those credits to move forward, and have a discussion on exactly what's being requested and how we move forward. I think we can probably preempt any legislative action, and we'd like to -- like to have some discussion on that in -- in February.

You know, I don't know whether I should do
this topic or not. I'm going to throw it out there.
But we have a great -- great Board of Trustees,
and -- and sometimes you all receive honors,
recognitions. And there's one I know and I'm sure
there's some that I don't know about. But one of
our -- one of our Trustees has received several -several recognitions over the last couple weeks, John

McMillan. He was voted by his peers, I believe, as the top lobbyist in the North Carolina General Assembly, and he's also received a general -- Distinguished Alumni Award from the UNC Law School, so we do want to make note of this.

(Applause.)

MR. ROGERS: And I will pay for that later. The final thing I wanted to -- we have handed out a draft schedule for next year, and I just wanted to get this before -- before you. The intention and our normal procedure is to approve next year's schedule in November. But we wanted to, kind of, give you all a highlight of what we're looking at next year.

The schedule, for the folks that have been here, is very typical with the exception of there's an April meeting scheduled. The idea here is for us to get out and go and have some site visits. And we're looking to go up to Boone and see some of the sights that we've funded in the past. How we're doing this is that we did not have our October meeting, and we had budgeted funds for that. So we're looking to use those funds to have, basically, the Board meeting time frame in Boone, and going to see some sights and those kind of things.

1 Again, the location is where we can hear 2 suggestions and thoughts. But the idea is that we 3 went down east last time, we wanted to hit the 4 western part of the state. The Boone area has some 5 great projects, and we'd like to get up that way. So 6 we're making arrangements, and looking into 7 arrangements to head out there. If you all have got 8 comments on this -- again, typically, the dates for 9 our Board meetings are the -- on the second Monday of 10 the month, and the Sunday before. There are a few 11 except -- an exception or two to that, I think, but 12 you will note that our February meeting will be held 13 the 13th and 14th of February. We have spent 14 Valentine's Day together before, and I leave it up to 15 you all to, kind of, make the decision on that. 16 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, if I might, I may 17 have a conflict that weekend, and so we may want to 18 think about the 20th and the 21st. Look at your 19 calendars, and if you've got a particular preference 20 on that we can -- I wish you would email Richard and 21 let him know. I don't want to change it for me that 22 would create conflict for too many other people. But 23 that's one change I'd like for us, at least, to look 24 at. 25 DR. CAMP: Richard?

1	MR. ROGERS: Yes, sir?
2	DR. CAMP: Did you mean to say that
3	the next meeting is February and not November?
4	MR. ROGERS: No, sir. We have our
5	scheduled November meeting.
6	DR. CAMP: Okay.
7	MR. ROGERS: This is next year's
8	schedule
9	DR. CAMP: Next year? Okay.
10	MR. ROGERS: that's starting in
11	February.
12	DR. CAMP: Okay.
13	MR. ROGERS: Yes, sir.
14	MR. BEANE: Now, Richard?
15	MR. ROGERS: Yes, sir?
16	MR. BEANE: In that Boone meeting, I
17	would if I can, I'd like to help you, maybe,
18	coordinate some activities for the group, if that's
19	all right.
20	MR. ROGERS: We'll let you do as much
21	as you want to.
22	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay.
23	MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, that
24	concludes my report.
25	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: All right. Thank you

1 very much. What we're going to do is I'm going to 2 switch Item F for Item D, which I think will be 3 obvious why we're doing that, and ask for the 4 Administrative Committee's Report. Chairman Vaughn? 5 MR. VAUGHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 We met yesterday, and had one item on the agenda. 7 That was the request to unencumber 1,430,210.60 in 8 funds that had been previously encumbered. There's a 9 list that was furnished everybody called Item F-B; 10 it's -- gives you a detail on that. 11 recommendation of our committee is that we unencumber 12 those funds. 13 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. You've heard the 14 committee recommendation. Is there any discussion? 15 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 16 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Committee recommendation 17 does not require a second. What was that, Yvonne? 18 DR. BRANNON: Well, do we need to 19 include in that to reallocate to the committee --20 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: That's what we're going 21 That's why I did that one first. We're going 22 to go back and do that as an Item E. Okay. So as 23 many as favor the motion, signify by saying, "Aye." 24 TRUSTEES: Aye. 25 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: All opposed, "No."

1 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 2 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. Now 3 we'll go back and do Item E, which is the allocation 4 of the funds that we just encumbered. Do -- we 5 talked about this yesterday. I believe the proposal -- the committee operated on the assumption 6 7 that we would allocate the funds in the same manner 8 that we had done originally. Richard, do you want 9 to --10 MR. ROGERS: Yeah. The --11 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: -- remind us of that? 12 MR. ROGERS: -- we typically have this discussion on an annual basis to provide the 13 14 Board with flexibility to make decisions for the 15 current -- current situation. Most of the time -what we did in 2008 was -- was allocate the funds 16 17 back into the committees up to a certain point until 18 we had funded all the projects, and then we started 19 rolling them into other -- into the acquisition 20 arena, I believe. But, typically, the funds stay 21 with the committee that they were previously 22 allocated, as long as they have projects to -- to 23 move forward. 24 I think that the typical notion is that we 25 do that until we're done with the funding cycle, and

1 then after the funding cycle, which ends in November, 2 then we'll get back together in June and I'm sure 3 we'll have some projects and some things that may 4 need some funds. But we usually collect those funds, 5 and then apply them to extenuating circumstances with 6 current contracts or look towards the next cycle to 7 put the funds in. 8 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. I need a motion, 9 Richard. Can you give the -- somebody, a prompt here 10 on the percentages, how they should be allocated? 11 MR. ROGERS: I think what we need to 12 do is just allocate all unencumbered funds from 13 program areas, that they stay within that program area for the opportunity to reallocate through our 14 15 November Board meeting. 16 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: All right. I 17 understand. I understand. 18 MR. McGRADY: Mr. Chairman, isn't that 19 reflected then on the bottom of F-B? Isn't -- aren't 20 those numbers at the very bottom what we're talking 21 about here? 22 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Yes. 23 MR. McGRADY: That's what I assumed 24 then. 25 MR. ROGERS: That's right.

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. That's right.
2
         Thank you for that. If you'll look at Agenda Item
3
         F-B -- then this is the way the allocation would go.
4
         They would stay in the committee that they were
5
         unencumbered from.
                   Do I hear a motion?
6
7
                   MR. McMILLAN: Mr. Chairman, I make
8
         that motion.
9
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR:
                                      Okay. Motion by John
10
         McMillan. Is there a second?
11
                   DR. CAMP:
                                       Second.
12
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Second by Dr. Camp. Any
13
         discussion?
14
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       (No response.)
15
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR:
                                      Hearing none, so as many
         as favor the motion, signify by saying, "Aye."
16
17
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       Aye.
18
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR:
                                      Opposed, "No."
19
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       (No response.)
20
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR:
                                       The ayes have it.
21
         Frank, I didn't mean to skip over Number D. Let's go
22
         back to your -- the Attorney General's Report.
23
                   MR. CRAWLEY:
                                       Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24
         A week or so after the August meeting, the Court of
25
         Appeals issued its opinion in the Crawford Creek
```

Conservation Easement issue where there's a case a 1 2 landowner wanted to construct driveway or road across 3 the state's conservation easement. And the Court of 4 Appeals upheld the decision of the jury and the judge 5 in the Superior Court of Haywood County. And as you recall during the trial of case, it was in front of a 6 7 jury and our western representative, Mr. Tom Massey, 8 was a key witness who obviously could communicate to 9 the jury, and was a real asset to the state in that 10 case. And that's my report. 11 I have a copy of the Court of Appeals' 12 decision. If anybody would like to take it home, 13 it'd be good reading at bedtime. 14 DR. BRANNON: Amen. 15 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. Thank you, Frank. 16 Any questions? 17 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 18 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. In case you're 19 wondering, the judge, it didn't get on his calendar 20 somehow, and he will be here about 10:30 21 MR. JONES: Yes, sir. 22 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Is that right? 23 MR. JONES: That's correct. 24 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. We'll move right 25 along to our Program Committee Report. Chairman

Hollan?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLLAN: Mr. Chairman, the Program Committee met yesterday at a little after noon to review various items, to discuss some items that were brought up at our February work session last year, and review the information prepared by their staff. The first item that we talked about was from 2010 grant contract changes. These are mainly updates. For instance, we had referred to a prospective stewardship program, and that's now been built and put in place so our contracts have been altered to reflect that. We're going to clarify and make consistent some of the language. We sometimes used approval dates, sometimes used award date. We sometimes used grant agreement or grant agreement contract, and we've changed that to read "grant contract."

We had a few things that we needed to do to conform to state laws. The state now requires that DUNS numbers are required from the nonprofit recipients, so our contracts have been altered in that way. And the committee — on review of these, the only thing that the committee would have a recommendation to the Board today is Item 6 having to do with signs. We have discontinued providing signs.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The rationale for that is that many of the -- many of the grantees had more than one funding organization, and they wanted to recognize all of them, and they didn't want to have a whole lot of signs. But the Board -- or the committee yesterday felt that we ought to provide signs in those cases where the applicants are willing to take the signs, and, in the alternate, we can provide them with artwork and specifications as to size, materials and colors for them to put our -- put our logo on their own signs. So, the committee would recommend that we reestablish the process of providing signs to grantees who desire them.

MR. ROGERS: Can I make one -- one -- one comment with regards to that? I think we heard loud and clear from the committee that we need to continue to provide signs on the projects. I think the thing that we'll do is add the option of providing our logo on a multiple projects that have multiple funders that they want to acknowledge on a single sign. One thing else we'd like to do with regards to our signs is, perhaps, redesign it a bit and get our logo on it and take a look at it, and, I think, we can do this at no cost. But at least have an updated sign.

We'll bring back some examples for you all to take a

25

1 look at. The large signs that we use run around \$82 2 a piece, and then the smaller signs are around 10 3 bucks a piece. So -- and, I think, we'll -- we'll 4 check in with the Department of Corrections about 5 producing these. We continue to have these on hand. And I think one other thing, as a result of 6 7 the conversation, is that we'll make sure that we 8 follow up on the sites with some visits and ensure 9 that the signs do get up appropriately on the 10 projects. And we'll report back to you all with 11 regards to that. Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Do we need a motion on 13 that? MR. ROGERS: 14 No. 15 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. 16 MR. ROGERS: Trust me. 17 MR. HOLLAN: If you shout loud and 18 clear the committee's suggestion that we provide 19 signs, I don't think we need to do that motion. 20 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Bill, I think you did 21 have, also, a motion on Item G-E, which had to do 22 with matching funds associated with --23 MR. HOLLAN: Right. I was going to 24 get to that. 25 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: I'm sorry.

1 MR. HOLLAN: I'm sorry. I was going 2 to talk next about G-C --3 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Go ahead. 4 MR. HOLLAN: -- unless you'd 5 rather me --6 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: No, no, no. I thought 7 you said that was the only item. I was just -- go 8 ahead. 9 MR. HOLLAN: Well, that was the only item that in G-B. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. 10 11 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Excuse me. 12 In G-C -- in 2005 the MR. HOLLAN: 13 General Assembly passed legislation that mandated 14 that we consider certain common criteria, and the 15 purpose of this was to get various state granting 16 institutions, the Rural Center, us, commerce, and 17 some others to have the same criteria, and so we 18 established -- based on that we established, kind of, 19 a parallel system of scoring projects. We have -- we 20 continue to have our water -- what we call our "water quality criteria," which take into account all the 21 22 elements that our specific legislation requires us to 23 consider and assigns points. And then we also have a 24 scoring system that takes into account the common 25 criteria. These -- these are used to give priority

among various projects as part of the overall evaluation process. And one of the things that came up yesterday was that the Chairman was asked that Mr. Crawley ascertain whether the way in which we're using our existing water quality criteria together with the common criteria, does, in fact, comply with what the legislative language would require.

During 2010, the last session, the legislature added five new common criteria related to an asset management plan, additional language on how you get a cost threshold, regionalization, the state water supply plan, and water conservation measures for drought. And so the staff reviewed our existing common criteria and made some adjustments. In your mail-out, Agenda Item G-C, there was information about the places where the new common criteria requirements that were added. Those are ten through thirteen. And then some of -- one of the common criteria was simply added to one of our existing common criteria evaluation elements.

And there was also a copy of the House Bill 2010-151. The -- it's proposed that we all review this further. If you have any questions, we're going to get the opinion from the Attorney General's Office as to whether this is what we, in fact, need to do,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and we'll -- we'll be prepared to act on this at the November meeting.

CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Good.

MR. HOLLAN: The next item, Item G-D, was a follow up on the February Board meeting on -discussion about minimum score. And a number of interesting things, I think, came out of this evaluation by our staff. There were two things really that we wanted them to look at, and I think this particular exercise that we reviewed yesterday focused on one. And that was to evaluate the process we've had of making grants, and determine -- see if we could get some statistical information about whether we were funding the right kinds of projects rather than across many lines, we were making the right decisions, whether there was some inconsistency. And I think that -- I don't want to say it was surprising, but I think it was gratifying to find out that the changes that we made in our criteria back in 2004 and our point system to try to make it so that each type of project -- the various acquisition, restoration and stormwater and wastewater projects would all have a chance to score in, roughly, the same range. And we determined that, actually, over this six-year period, the average

score for acquisition projects is 90, the average for restoration and stormwater was 91, and the average for wastewater was 88. So, they're very consistent averages for their scoring and seems to be very well normalized.

The other thing the staff looked at was the extent to which we were funding the better projects. And it turns out that overall, over that six-year period, again, they -- to do that, they took the scores in the various categories and determined the percentile ranking. It turns out there, that they were -- there was a much wider range in wastewater and restoration and stormwater than there was in acquisition, and so the percentiles were -- were somewhat different.

But not withstanding that, 89 percent of all the projects that we've funded were in the top 75 percentile. So we are making -- awarding grants based on our criteria. It turned out that 93 percent of the acquisition projects were in the top 75 percentile, 86 percent of restoration stormwater, and 83 percent of wastewater. And this makes sense, because in restoration and wastewater, both, we take into account some of the elements of the common criteria that aren't applicable to acquisitions such

as the high unit cost, the distressed area, and so on.

One of the things that we -- one of the -the other reason for doing this is to determine how to proceed with our funding allocations. In the most recent years, we have had -- in order to enable grants to be awarded during the whole year as committees meet rather than waiting until the end of the year, we've come up with percentages of our funds to assign to various committees. Until this year we held back some percentage, 10 or 15 percent for the final meeting so that we could look at, sort of, the best of the rest. And we would allow acquisitions to expend 85 percent or 90 percent of its allocated funds. Restoration stormwater and wastewater to do the same, and then we'd come back in November and somehow merge the list and come up with some agreement.

This year we did not do that because our funds were cut back so much. We wanted to get the money to work as quickly as possible. But I think that this -- these numbers over a term of years will give us the ability to analyze, in each cycle, whether or not we have a "good year" or -- in quotes -- or a "bad year" in, say, restoration

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

stormwater. We compare the range and the percentile ranking and determine whether this is a good year or a bad year, whether we've got to hold back some functions or not. So I think there is a possibility to make some progress on this. The -- we will -- the idea is that we'll talk about this again at our February meeting and try to come up with a more comprehensive policy. But we do have good information at this point.

The other thing that this -- one thing that the staff wanted to make clear, and I think it's a good point, is that the score doesn't always tell the whole story. We give points for particular water bodies' sensitivity, either they're highly polluted or they're pristine waters. And if you have a failing wastewater treatment plant that is discharging and polluting a stream that's not badly polluted, but is also not pristine, they just can't get the points that -- that projects in other areas can.

So we need to always have the ability, I think, to evaluate these projects. If all we needed was a scoring system, then we wouldn't need a Board, and so I think the staff wanted to make clear that they are not trying to get this thing to the point

where we do it totally by the numbers, but we can use the numbers to -- as feedback.

The other thing we've talked about in the past is whether there should be some minimum score below which we just do not fund. And there's been some -- on a number of occasions, the question has been do we -- if somebody didn't get 70 points, is that failing? You fail in the school at a certain score. I think that's something we need to continue to talk about to whether we want to do that or not. But I think based on the staff's comments about the fact that you can have a very good project, and a project that is needed, that still may not score well, we should be careful in moving in that direction. But be prepared to talk about this more in February.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we wanted to talk about G-E. This relates to difficulties that have arisen, particularly for restoration and stormwater projects, in evaluating or in quantifying the value of donated easements. We assign points for donated easements. We've had a number of applicants who provide us with estimates of the value of donated easements, which turn out either to be inaccurate or to be too expensive to -- to establish whether or not

1 they are accurate. In one case -- in the second 2 case, the question is whether it makes any difference 3 how much the land is worth. Or whether for 4 restoration and stormwater, you're really interested in the width of the buffer, the area of the buffer, 5 6 the length of the buffer or the quality of the buffer 7 apart from those three items. But what the -- we 8 have -- in other cases in terms of acquisition of 9 greenways, we've allowed -- in lieu of having to get 10 individual appraisals for small properties, we've 11 allowed applicants to use the tax assessment value. 12 And the -- the staff would like and has recommended 13 to us that they extend that policy to the evaluation 14 of these easements, and allow -- let's see what 15 the -- see if I can find the exact recommendations, 16 if I have it. 17 Nancy, do you have the exact recommendation 18 there with --19 MR. JONES: I --20 MS. GUTHRIE: No, I don't. 21 MR. JONES: -- I can read it. Do you --22 MR. HOLLAN: What -- go ahead. 23 MR. JONES: You did -- you were taking 24 those notes, too, weren't you? Excuse me, Nancy. 25 MR. HOLLAN: Tom, if you have the exact

1	recommendation						
2	MR. MASSIE: No. No, I no, I						
3	don't. I got confused as to who was taking the						
4	minutes for which committee.						
5	MS. GUTHRIE: I I'm sorry. I have						
6	for the recommendation of establishing the donated						
7	easement value.						
8	MR. HOLLAN: That's it. I'm sorry.						
9	Yeah. The staff recommends that the donated easement						
10	values on restoration and stormwater projects use						
11	accounting assessment tax card value as our default						
12	approach unless they can provide a valid appraisal						
13	for the donated easement.						
14	DR. BRANNON: Okay. Mr. Chairman						
15	MR. HOLLAN: Mr. Chairman, that's the						
16	committee recommendation.						
17	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: You heard the committee						
18	recommendation, is there any discussion?						
19	TRUSTEES: (No response.)						
20	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So many as favor the						
21	adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by						
22	saying, "Aye."						
23	TRUSTEES: Aye.						
24	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No."						
25	TRUSTEES: (No response.)						

1 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. 2 MR. HOLLAN: Mr. Chairman, that 3 concludes the report from the Program Committee. 4 To add just one -- I MR. ROGERS: 5 wanted to reference back to House Bill 1744 Common 6 Criteria, and just provide just a bit of background 7 with regards to what this -- what this is. And one 8 thing that we're working hard to do is work with our 9 partners -- the Rural Center, the Department of 10 Commerce, as well as DENR and their -- their 11 revolving water funds -- on coming up with a common 12 report as well. The common criteria, though, I think 13 is important because it, kind of, brings a standard 14 for which everybody has to get in order to receive 15 state funds. And we're raising the bar. 16 One of the things that we don't make a 17 whole lot of mention of is just the asset management 18 fees that was added to the common criteria this past 19 year. I was extremely supportive of this, because I 20 think it's important that the local units of 21 government start looking at asset management so they 22 can value their system, and also look long-term with 23 regards to managing their system and making sure they 24 have the resources to manage it so that they are not 25 asking granting agencies on a regular basis to come

back and fund the upkeep and the maintenance with regards to these systems. So I think it's a good step.

I think we have some work to do to get that asset management implemented into system -- into the local units of government. I know the Rural Center is stepping out on this and trying to get some educational forums together for local units of government about asset management. There's simple ways to do this. So I think, in the long run, this is -- this is going to pay off for us.

Also, as we reported earlier, throughout the legislative session we had provided some interested legislators a letter about what we were going to do to better coordinate our efforts. We have a common application that we've been working on and are implementing. We also have a common report that we reviewed this past week of all the projects under state funding agencies that are under -- under contract and being managed by the different programs. I believe, total, there's over 780 different wastewater and water projects going on in the state this past year. I believe there was over \$240 million towards wastewater and infrastructure in this state. It is a huge, huge amount of money. A lot of

1 this was -- was helped by the stimulus funds that 2 came down from the Feds, but there's an ongoing 3 effort from the different funding agencies to 4 coordinate. And the common criteria, again, is 5 something that is used amongst all of these agencies 6 in evaluating their projects. And I think that it's 7 also a good -- a good product -- this revised common 8 criteria -- with regards to helping local units of 9 governments start to manage their systems in a better 10 way. 11 And so I think this is a step in the right 12 direction. I think it shows that we're managing the 13 projects that are out there, and that we will 14 continue to do that, and cooperate and coordinate our 15 efforts among the different agencies. 16 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Thank you. Karen? 17 MS. CRAGNOLIN: What did -- do we have 18 a -- and that's a lot of money. 240 million you 19 said? 20 MR. ROGERS: (Nods affirmatively.) 21 What is the -- I can't MS. CRAGNOLIN: 22 remember what the number is, but it's staggering what 23 the total estimated need is for the state. 24 MR. ROGERS: Yeah. Well, one of 25 the -- one of the issues out of a study commission

this past year is: What is -- what is -- what is the state's needs? The Water 2030 Report estimated about 14 billion with regards to needs. The need -- and one of the -- one of the challenges that we have is trying to see how we are providing for that need through our common funding and through the funding that we have throughout the state. And the whole effort is looking to -- is to start surveying on a regular basis, and asking these questions of these utilities so that we can get a better handle on what the need is. And then, from there, you can have a better idea of what needs to be funded on an annual basis with the federal funds coming in and those kind of things to help meet some of the needs.

And then the other thing that the legislature is very interested in is, of course, the critical needs that are -- that are out there. So discerning the critical needs out of all the needs that will be reported is another -- another task that we'll have to do as well.

MS. CRAGNOLIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. Bill, I didn't -thank you very much for your report and your
committee's report. Okay.

Karen [sic], what we're going to do is

```
1
         we're going to do "I," so we get all your committee
2
         report except the --
3
                   MR. ROGERS: Yvonne.
4
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: -- Yvonne. What'd I
5
         say, Karen?
6
                   MR. ROGERS:
                                      Karen.
7
                   MR. McMILLAN:
                                      Karen.
8
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Yvonne?
9
                   DR. BRANNON:
                                      Yes, sir. I'm ready.
10
                   MR. BEANE:
                                      She might be under some
11
         pressure.
12
                   DR. BRANNON:
                                      I'm ready, Mr. Beane.
13
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. I want to do "I,"
14
         and then we're going to take a break.
15
                   DR. BRANNON:
                                      Okay.
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Then after the break
16
17
         we'll come back and do the -- the awards. Okay?
18
                   DR. BRANNON:
                                      Yes, sir. Yesterday our
19
         committee met, and we did have a quorum. And I thank
         you, everyone, for coming, and I especially thank
20
21
         Kevin Boyer for doing a great job of preparing the
22
         materials. Now, I do want to say quickly that the
23
         field reps are so impressive, when you get around to
24
         this point on the stage, and you look at their
25
         presentations and the materials they present, and the
```

1 way they're able to answer any question about any 2 project without hesitation, it's really remarkable. 3 I don't know how they keep all the information in 4 their heads. But I appreciate their diligence at --5 at studying these projects and bringing us great 6 recommendations. We had some wonderful projects. 7 We're going to start with a few items 8 before we review all the projects this morning. 9 is that we had a recommendation from the staff that 10 we -- that we look at N.C. State University's Stream 11 Restoration and Assessment Project. These funds have 12 run out, and our staff is recommending that we 13 reinitiate a new contract with N.C. State University 14 to look at aspects of stream restoration as they 15 appear to be effective ways towards achieving our 16 goals. And this recommendation comes with a price 17 tag that we enter into a two-year contract for a 18 \$100,000 for this report, this study, and this 19 assessment. This is what our committee recommends to 20 the Board. 21 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. All right. 22 You've heard the committee recommendation. Is there 23 any discussion? 24 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 25 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Hearing none, so as many

1 as favor the adoption of the committee 2 recommendation -- that's in Item I-B -- signify by 3 saying, "Aye." 4 TRUSTEES: Aye. 5 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No." 6 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 7 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. 8 DR. BRANNON: The next order of 9 business is that, periodically, we have contracts --10 this is not on it. I'm very sorry. 11 thanks, Karen. 12 We have three contracts that we would like 13 to ask to extend the dates on those contracts. One 14 of those is with the N.C. Division of Coastal 15 Management, 2008-412, to extend that contract to 16 the -- April 27th of 2011; to extend the contract 17 City of Winston-Salem, 2007-425, to June 30th of 18 2011; to extend the Southwestern NCRCND project, 19 which is 2007-423, to March 31st of 2011. The staff 20 has looked at these projects and they recommend these 21 extensions. I think this is reasonable, and that 22 they have good reason to need to extend this to 23 complete their work. The committee agreed and 24 recommends that we extend these contracts. 25 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: And you've heard the

1 committee recommendation. Is there any discussion? 2 TRUSTEES: (No response.) So as many as favor the 3 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: 4 adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by 5 saying, "Aye." 6 TRUSTEES: Aye. 7 Opposed, "No." CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: 8 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 9 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. 10 DR. BRANNON: The next issue is the request 11 to reduce the matching funds contribution for a 12 project 2008-420, the research [sic] -- Resource 13 Institute, Pine Orchard Creek Stream Restoration 14 Project. And the recommendation from the staff was 15 that -- that we do accept -- this is where, I think, 16 one of those things we talked about yesterday, having 17 a different appraisal value; is that correct, between 18 what was put in the contract and what the actual 19 county value is. Beth, did you want to say a few 20 things about that one to make sure I present it 21 correctly? 22 MS. McGEE: It was a -- a letter 23 from a realtor that established the original -- their 24 thoughts of what the original value was, and the 25 value was split between a couple of contracts, but

1 the tax value is much less. 2 DR. BRANNON: Okay. So staff and the 3 committee recommend that these matching funds 4 amount -- this project be reduced from \$72,612 to 5 zero. That's the recommendation of the committee. CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: And you've heard the 6 7 committee recommendation. Is there any discussion? 8 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 9 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So as many as favor the 10 adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by 11 saying, "Aye." 12 TRUSTEES: Aye. 13 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No." 14 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 15 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. 16 DR. BRANNON: Okay. Now, I'm going to 17 look at our Greenway Projects for 2010. CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, here's where I 18 19 want to stop for a minute. 20 DR. BRANNON: Okay. 21 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay? What we have left 22 are the award, and I think it would be a good time to 23 take a break, and, maybe, give time for our judge to 24 be here, and -- and then we'll finish our meeting. 25 (Comments off the record.)

1	MR. RASCOE: Mr. Chairman							
2	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: You want to do							
3	MR. RASCOE: how about, could we							
4	entertain, possibly, toward the wastewater report in							
5	the interim? That won't take too long and we can get							
6	that out of the way.							
7	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: We can. That's what							
8	staff was just trying to tell me.							
9	MR. BEANE: Sorry about that.							
10	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Would you mind your							
11	committee report being interrupted?							
12	DR. BRANNON: Is that okay with you,							
13	Ron?							
14	MR. BEANE: I would I had to put							
15	a time table on her to see how brief she could be.							
16	That's an issue with brevity this morning. Brevity							
17	is calling. Excuse me.							
18	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Good idea. Good idea.							
19	Richard was whispering the same thing in my ear, but							
20	I I didn't understand what he was saying							
21	completing.							
22	DR. BRANNON: I can be done in five							
23	seconds.							
24	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay.							
25	DR. BRANNON: I was on a roll, Mr.							

1 Chairman. 2 MS. CRAGNOLIN: Yeah, you were. 3 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, I was trying to 4 give John an opportunity to vote on some things that 5 would be fun to vote on. DR. BRANNON: 6 Giving out money. 7 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Giving out money, that's 8 right. 9 (Comments made off the record 10 while documents were being 11 distributed to Board Members.) 12 Mr. Chairman, while this MR. VAUGHAN: is being pointed out, may I make a comment? 13 14 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: You may. 15 MR. VAUGHAN: I quess you're here 16 today and many of them are often here on Sunday. Τo 17 see our meeting going today, the way it runs so 18 smoothly is because of all the work we do on Sunday, 19 and I think the -- we ought to acknowledge that. 20 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: It looks like the table 21 was rigged, I think. But we did have a good 22 discussion. Thank you, Stan, for bringing that to 23 our attention and reminding everyone of that. 24 Okay. Chairman Rascoe? 25 MR. RASCOE: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman. And, on behalf of my co-chair, Dr. Camp, I 2 believe Larry is going to present us with where we 3 are in anticipation of the November meeting. But I 4 do have a couple comments, myself, as co-chair. 5 to remind the committee and the full Board that the allocation, the total allocation for wastewater 6 7 projects is only \$7,839,415. So you can see -- you 8 can see on the list how far that goes down -- a very 9 short distance. So our challenge is to, between now 10 and November, is to try to see if we can apply some 11 different benchmarks and different thresholds to try 12 to keep viable projects that are viable, doable, and 13 as well as to spread some of the funding down to 14 encapsulate some of the other projects that the Board 15 might consider to be good projects. So that -- that 16 is our challenge between now and November in dealing 17 with these numbers, and with that, I guess turn --18 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, and since you said 19 that, I think particularly, John -- the reason all of 20 this is so low -- or two reasons, really. One is our 21 appropriation of a \$100 million, which we enjoyed for 22 a few years, is 50 million, which cut it in half. 23 And then because the governor had to use \$100 million 24 of our funds when things went sour, we chose to 25 finish funding our 2008 projects. And that took

1 about half, roughly half. So we really -- rather 2 than operating on \$100 million in awards, we're 3 really looking at about \$25 million in -- with regard 4 to new projects this year. So -- okay. Peter, could I ask --5 MR. BEANE: MR. RASCOE: 6 Ron. 7 MR. BEANE: -- could you give us 8 those figures one more time, your total? 9 MR. RASCOE: The allocation is 10 \$7,839,415. So you can see it only goes down a very 11 short distance on the list. If we were just to award 12 based on what's in front of you now, only about four 13 projects would be funded during this year statewide. 14 Larry? 15 MR. HORTON: Thank you, Chairman 16 So my plan is to just, kind of, give you a 17 brief overview of the -- of the spreadsheet that you 18 have before you, just sort of a guided tour. And 19 then -- then can talk a little about this spreadsheet 20 and -- and what it means, and the purpose of it as 21 far as this meeting goes. 22 So as far as the tour goes, you'll see that 23 the spreadsheet basically has got a summary table up 24 in the top left-hand corner, and that talks about the 25 Group 1 and Group 2 and the total amounts of -- of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

funds that were in those two groups. I'll talk a little bit more about each one of these things after I get through with the tour here. So then you'll see that a -- for reference of each project has got a line number on the far left, and each column has got a referenced letter across the top so for terms of -- for ease of discussion.

As Chairman Rascoe said, the committee allocation is only \$7,839,415. The projects have been split into -- into Group 1 and Group 2, similar to the way that it was with the other two programs areas for acquisition and for stormwater and stream restoration. And the Group 1 applications go all the way through page one, and almost to the bottom of page two. The group -- the groups were -- the dividing line between Group 1 and Group 2 was set at a score of 100. That was based on our discussion with the co-chairs in our meeting prior to this. If you'll look back at the summary table, you'll see that that takes us through an amount requested. you just look at this based only on a running total of amount requested, that would be \$26,273,524. that is quite a bit further, and should easily encompass all of our \$7,839,000 in funding.

So just as a review of the purpose was to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

get the -- a consensus or approval of the Board about the definition of -- of Group 1 and Group 2. Staff will -- once the -- we have a set consensus on Group 1, that's what staff will use to prepare full scopes and for presentation in the November meeting. If the -- of course, if any of the Trustees sees any projects in Group 2 that you would like to also see a full review on, to see a full scope on, if you could just let the staff know, then we will be glad to do that for you. As a target, it -- it would be -- we would appreciate it if we could get that as soon as possible, at least within a week. Of course, we will take them after that, but that would -- that would definitely help us get out ahead of preparing the scopes for the Board packet if we could -- if we could do it that way.

So just -- the projects were scored and, as we talked yesterday, they're sorted by score. First, by a clean water score first, that's in column "c." And then, secondly, by common criteria score, that's in column "d." And as you can see if you look down, especially if, like, at -- in Lines 9, 10, 11, 12, and -- and 12, those were all a score of 105. So that -- the common criteria score may end up being a little more important this year than it has been in

1 years past because of -- because we have so little 2 funding for these projects. So we had one or two 3 high-scoring projects. The average score was a bit 4 higher this year. I think the average score this 5 year was 90. And I think in a cumulative total for years past it's been 88, so we're -- there were a 6 7 little bit higher scores this year. 8 The projects are very good. We have quite 9 a few regionalization projects, which are -- they 10 always do very well on -- on scores. So that's 11 really -- that's really all I have. I'll be -- I'll 12 be glad to take any questions that the --13 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Are there any questions? MR. HORTON: 14 -- that the Board has? 15 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Any questions? Clarification. Can we 16 MS. RASH: 17 assume that the scores we're seeing now will be the 18 scores that we see in November? 19 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Larry? 20 MR. HORTON: I wouldn't stake my life 21 on it. But they should -- they should not change 22 drastically, I don't think, unless something shifts 23 with regard to the project. They should not shift 24 drastically. But there may be some changes. They 25 may -- they may be tweaked a little bit. That's

1 possible. 2 MS. RASH: Thank you. 3 MR. ROGERS: Just in Larry's defense 4 on that, one of the things that we do as staff is we 5 can get you to take information in, and we have -we, again -- time and time again ask for finals from 6 7 our applicants, but I think it's all fair in that we 8 want to provide the Trustees with the most up-to-date 9 information with regards to the projects. So there 10 is times when they -- the numbers are tweaked. 11 Believe you me, Larry has been through these 12 projects, and he has given his -- the due diligence 13 that they deserved to this point. But 14 notwithstanding other actions outside our control, 15 those projects may shift a little bit. 16 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Mr. Pate? 17 MR. PATE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 A question for Larry: On Line 6 there's some shading 19 differences for that project that highlights the 20 "Ability to Pay Rank," and unhighlights the county 21 ranking. Can you explain that? 22 MR. HORTON: Yes. Thanks for asking 23 I probably should have mentioned that before. Those -- those two columns, the "e" and "f" columns 24 are the columns that demonstrate whether or not the 25

project is economically distressed. And really the most detailed explanation of that, of those two columns, is in the notes one and two that's in the top right-hand corner of your spreadsheet. It's, kind of, difficult to digest all this at one time, but what -- what we've done in the past in order to determine whether a project is non-distressed or not -
CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, not the project,

CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, not the project the county.

MR. HORTON: The --

MR. ROGERS: County or the applicant.

CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Yeah.

MR. HORTON: Thank you, yes. It's to determine whether the applicant is in an economically distressed area or not. We -- first of all, we used the county rank based on Department of Commerce tier ranking. And projects that are -- have a rank of 65 or below are determined to be economically distressed, and that's -- that's based on our general statute, I believe, our legislation. And that's what the Board only used that for some time, for several years, and then in an effort to capture the -- the effect for towns that were poor or less affluent, that would be in a more affluent county. For

1 instance, if you had a very -- a less affluent town 2 in Wake County -- Wake County, of course, is going to 3 be a very high rank -- then they may be economically 4 distressed. You could have an economically 5 distressed place in a -- in a non-distressed county. 6 We went to using -- in order to capture 7 that, we decided to use the Division of Community 8 Assistance's ability to pay rank, and they calculated 9 an ability to pay rank for 508 municipalities. So 10 that's a long way to say that that number in the 11 Morehead column is -- what that means is, based on a 12 county -- county tier rank by commerce, their -- they 13 are in a non-distressed economically distressed 14 county. But based on their ability to pay rank of 15 373, we have -- the Board has set that as being a 16 mark that would show that they are distressed as a --17 as a community. 18 Does that help? 19 MR. PATE: Yes. Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Good question. Any 21 other questions or comments -- anything else, Mr. 22 Rascoe or Dr. Camp, our co-chairs? 23 MR. RASCOE: Is staff requesting 24 direction about where to draw the line on preparing 25 scopes, or have we done that in the past?

1 MR. ROGERS: Yeah. The -- the line 2 that we have put in the spreadsheet is basically the 3 line we're looking at. And we, kind of, drew the 4 line at 100 -- at a score of 100, giving you a lot of 5 room with regards to the total amount that's requested. The fact that Group 1 has \$26 million in 6 7 requests, which is more than three times the amount 8 that we have to spend -- thinking that after the 9 staff recommendation gets put in place there will 10 still be plenty of opportunity with regards to the 11 amount that we'll review. The idea is that we would 12 like for the Trustees to get back with us, if they 13 see projects down below that list, so that we can 14 fully scope those and get those prepared for 15 presentation to the Board in November. 16 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Is that satisfactory to 17 the co-chairs and the Board? 18 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 19 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. 20 MR. ROGERS: And we will continue to work with the co-chairs with regards to presentation 21 22 of the project list when we -- when we present it to 23 the Trustees in November. 24 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. Anything further 25 from the Wastewater Committee? Dr. Brannon, after

```
1
         the break, you will be --
2
                   MR. ROGERS:
                                       Back on stage.
3
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: -- up for the grand
4
         finale.
                                       I'm ready.
5
                   DR. BRANNON:
6
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: All right. We will take
7
         about -- maybe, about a 15-minute break.
                              (Off the record from
8
9
                              10:15 a.m. to 10:34 a.m.)
10
                              (Judge Thigpen arrives.)
11
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Come to order. It's my
12
         very special privilege to be able to introduce Judge
13
         Crissie Thigpen of the North Carolina Court of
14
         Appeals. Judge Thigpen was appointed in August of
15
         this year to the Court of Appeals, but he has served
16
         as a superior -- a special Superior Court judge from
17
         2008 to 2010. And before that he had a long and
18
         distinguished career as an -- as an attorney in the
19
         state -- among other things, served as president of
         the North Carolina State Bar. He is running for
20
21
         election on November the --
22
                   JUDGE THIGPEN:
                                       Second (2nd).
23
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: -- second (2nd) in that
24
         very challenging race where we get to vote two or
25
         three times. But I know he hopes that you'll be
```

1 number one on his list. So Judge Thigpen, we're glad 2 to have you here with us, and you've met John Garrou. 3 And we're glad for you to be here and swear him in. 4 And you can do it right there. You all are right 5 there. Let's just do it right there. 6 JUDGE THIGPEN: All right. Mr. Baddour, 7 thank you very much. Raise your right hand. 8 Do you, John Garrou, solemnly swear that 9 you will support the Constitution of the United 10 States? Do you solemnly swear that you will 11 faithfully -- that you will be faithful and bear true 12 allegiance to the State of North Carolina and to the 13 constitutional powers and authorities which are or 14 may be established for the government thereof, and 15 that you will endeavor to support, maintain, and defend the constitution of said state not 16 17 inconsistent with the Constitution of the United 18 States? Do you swear that you will -- will and truly 19 execute the duties of your office as a member of the 20 Clean Water Management Trust Fund Board of Trustees according to the best of your skill and abilities 21 22 according to all, so help you God? 23 MR. GARROU: I so swear. 24 JUDGE THIGPEN: Congratulations. 25 MR. GARROU: Thank you.

1	(Applause.)						
2	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Thank you very much,						
3	Judge.						
4	JUDGE THIGPEN: Thank you very much.						
5	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Of course, you're						
6	welcome to stay with us, but we also know that you're						
7	very busy, and I understand if you have to leave.						
8	(Comments made off the record.)						
9	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Mr. Beane?						
10	MR. BEANE: Early voting begins						
11	October the 14th.						
12	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Pardon?						
13	MR. BEANE: You said November the						
14	2nd, but early voting begins on October the 14th.						
15	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Early voting begins on						
16	October 14. You're exactly right. How could I						
17	forget?						
18	MR. GARROU: Thank you. Good luck,						
19	Judge						
20	JUDGE THIGPEN: Thank you all very much.						
21	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.						
22	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Thank you, Judge.						
23	(Judge Thigpen leaves.)						
24	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Now, Dr. Brannon, we'll						
25	recognize you to continue your report of your						

1 committee. 2 DR. BRANNON: Okay. We're going to 3 start first with the Greenway applications. And I 4 want to thank very, very much Nancy for all your hard 5 work on these projects. This is our first attempt at 6 doing this. And I know that we've had a struggle 7 getting all the information, pulling together the 8 recommendations, and I really greatly appreciate 9 that. 10 I'd like to report on the Committee's 11 recommendation. If you'll look at your spreadsheet, 12 we would like to recommend funding in project --13 MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry. The revised 14 should be handed out to you up on -- above your 15 workplace, and it's a one-page referred as 16 "Greenway." 17 DR. BRANNON: Okay. Thank you. Ιf 18 you will look at Group 1, we're going to going to --19 I'm going to read through the recommendation of the committee to fund. And I'm going to leave out 2010 20 21 and 2012 and we'll vote on that separately. 22 Project 2010-2007 [sic] Jackson County; 23 2010-2000 [sic] -- 2066, Franklinville; 2010-210, the 24 City of Raleigh; 2010-204, Davidson County; 2010-214,

Town of Tryon; 2010-201, Town of Aberdeen; 2010-213,

25

1	City of Rocky Mount; 2000 these are the projects							
2	that we are recommending at this time for funding.							
3	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. You've heard the							
4	committee recommendation. Is there any discussion?							
5	TRUSTEES: (No response.)							
6	MR. McMILLAN: Mr. Chairman, are the							
7	amounts listed the amounts that are recommended?							
8	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Yes.							
9	MR. ROGERS: Yes. The committee							
10	recommendations are the amounts that are recommended.							
11	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: On this page, though							
12	MR. ROGERS: It's the committee							
13	recommendation only is highlighted.							
14	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Committee							
15	recommendation. Okay. So for the for the record,							
16	the amount being funded is shown as the committee							
17	recommendation.							
18	And if you could attach this sheet to the							
19	minutes							
20	COURT REPORTER: (Affirmatively nods.)							
21	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: it says "2010 Cycle							
22	Greenway Applications."							
23	Thank you, John. Is there any discussion?							
24	TRUSTEES: (No response.)							
25	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So as many as favor the							

1	committee recommendation to fund the Greenway						
2	applications as listed by Chairman Brannon in the						
3	amounts under "Staff Recommendation" on the exhibit,						
4	signify by saying, "Aye."						
5	TRUSTEES: Aye.						
6	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No."						
7	TRUSTEES: (No response.)						
8	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it.						
9	(Ms. Cragnolin leaves.)						
10	DR. BRANNON: Now, I'd like to vote						
11	make a recommendation on RiverLink Project 2010-2012						
12	$[sic]$, and ${ t I'}{ t d}$ like to note that Karen Cragnolin is						
13	not voting on this project. And we're recommending						
14	that project be funded at the 186,000.						
15	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. You've heard the						
16	committee recommendation. Is there any discussion?						
17	TRUSTEES: (No response.)						
18	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So as many as favor the						
19	adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by						
20	saying, "Aye."						
21	TRUSTEES: Aye.						
22	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No."						
23	TRUSTEES: (No response.)						
24	CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it.						
25	DR. BRANNON: Finally, we would like						

1 to recommend that these projects not be funded this 2 cycle, and encourage these applicants to reconsider 3 the next funding cycle. This is project 2010-208, 4 2010-209, 2010-215, 2010-203, 2010-211, 2010-202, 5 2010-804. We're recommending that they not be funded 6 this cycle, but they are -- can reapply for the next 7 one. 8 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: You've heard the 9 committee recommendation. Is there any discussion? 10 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 11 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So as many as favor the 12 adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by 13 saying, "Aye." 14 TRUSTEES: Aye. 15 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No." 16 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 17 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. 18 DR. BRANNON: Now, we will turn to our 19 Restoration Stormwater projects. And I think, 20 Richard, there is also a new handout for that. Is 21 that right? 22 MR. ROGERS: Yes. Again, it's two 23 pages, portrait. 24 DR. BRANNON: I'd like to read to you 25 the list of the projects that the committee and staff

1 are recommending for funding. And, again, as you 2 mentioned earlier, this is the -- the funding amount is listed under "h." This is a committee 3 4 recommendation. And this is the amount that we are 5 recommending for each of these projects, and it will 6 be attached with the court reporter. 7 For beginning of Group 1, if you would look 8 at 2010-403, Carolina Mountain Land Conservancy; 9 2010-415, North Carolina Coastal Federation; 10 2010-411, Mecklenburg County; 2010-413, the National 11 Committee for the New River; 2010-727, Carolina 12 Beach; 2010-722, Piedmont Conservation Council; 13 2010-432, City of Wilmington; 2010-703, Cabarrus; 14 2010-437, Town of Wilkesboro; 2010-710, City of 15 Conover; 2010-414, the National Committee for the New River; 2010-434, Pilot View RC&D; 2010-724, Town of 16 17 Tarboro; 2010-714, Henderson; 2010-728, Centralina 18 COG; 2010-809 N.C. State University Planning Project. 19 These projects and the amounts listed under 20 "Committee Recommendation" are being recommended at 21 this time for funding, Mr. Chairman. 22 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: You've heard the 23 committee recommendation. Is there any discussion? 24 MR. McGRADY: Mr. Chairman, just out 25 of an abundance of caution, 2010-714, Henderson

1 County SWCD, that's a -- while it does relate to 2 Henderson County, and I am a Henderson County 3 Commissioner, that's actually put forward by our 4 independent board, our Soil & Water Conservation 5 Board. I don't believe I have a conflict, but I 6 wanted to disclose the relationship there. That is 7 an independently-elected board, although it does 8 relate to Henderson County. And unless a Trustee has 9 a specific concern, I intend to vote on this. I just 10 wanted to disclose it. 11 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Thank you, Mr. McGrady. 12 Any further discussion? 13 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 14 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Hearing none, so as many 15 as favor the adoption of the committee 16 recommendation, signify by saying, "Aye." 17 TRUSTEES: Aye. 18 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No." 19 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 20 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. Dr. 21 Brannon? 22 DR. BRANNON: Mr. Chairman, there are 23 two other projects in the list that the Committee recommends to the Board that we retain these two 24 25 projects, and keep them eligible until -- then they

```
will be -- can be reconsidered. And that -- if
1
2
         you'll look under there, it's Line 40 and Line 29.
3
         Line 40 is the Town of Colerain, and Line 29 is --
4
         and that number, Line 40, let me read the project
5
         number, please, 2010-709. And then, for Line 29, if
         you'll see the project number 2010-431, Surry SWCD.
6
7
         These two projects, we would like to recommend that
8
         they stay active until November.
9
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. You've heard --
10
         you've heard the committee recommendation. Is there
11
         any discussion?
12
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       (No response.)
13
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So as many as favor the
14
         adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by
15
         saying, "Aye."
16
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       Aye.
17
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR:
                                       Opposed, "No."
18
                                       (No response.)
                   TRUSTEES:
19
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR:
                                       The ayes have it. Dr.
20
         Brannon?
21
                                       Finally, we've -- we'd
                   DR. BRANNON:
22
         also like to recommend these -- these projects are
23
         not funded in this cycle; again, encouraging
24
         applicants to be -- to look at the next funding
25
         cycle. And I'll read these numbers:
                                                2010-707,
```

```
2010-406, 2010-702, 2010-715, 2010-436, 2010-424,
1
2
         2010-717, 2010-74 -- I mean, seven -- 2010-404,
3
         2010-810, 2010-811, 2010-806, 2010-814. We would
4
         like to recommend these projects not be funded.
5
                   I would also like you to look at the
6
         bottom, starting with Line 30 and going through
7
         Line 67, with the exclusion of Line 40, which was
8
         2010-709, we recommend these projects also not be
9
         funded.
10
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: You've heard the
11
         committee recommendation. Is there any discussion?
12
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       (No response.)
13
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So as many as favor the
14
         adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by
15
         saying, "Aye."
16
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       Aye.
17
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: All opposed, "No."
18
                   TRUSTEES:
                                       (No response.)
19
                   CHAIRMAN BADDOUR:
                                       The ayes have it.
20
                   DR. BRANNON:
                                       And, finally, back to
21
         the Greenway Projects for one second. I overlooked
22
         an item earlier. If you'll let me, bring this back
23
         up?
              The committee also recommends for that being --
24
         the Board will look at -- yesterday we discussed
25
         2010-2012 [sic]. And Nancy, could you explain to the
```

1 Board what this -- where did she go -- what this 2 recommendation was? MS. GUTHRIE: 3 The recommendation 4 concerns 2010-208, the Jonesville Phase -- Phase II. 5 The recommendation is to not fund that, but instead expand the scope of an existing project, which is 6 7 2008-023 that was just funded as Jonesville, Phase I, 8 and allow Jonesville to include any parcels from the 9 application 2010-208 in that existing project. 10 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okav. 11 MR. ROGERS: And I --12 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Sorry. 13 MR. ROGERS: Just we're expanding the 14 scope, but not providing any more money. 15 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Right. I believe that 16 was a committee action yesterday, right? 17 DR. BRANNON: Yes, it was. And I just 18 wanted Nancy to explain it better than me. 19 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Right. So you've heard 20 the committee recommendation. Is there any 21 discussion, any questions? 22 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 23 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: So as many as favor the 24 adoption of the committee recommendation, signify by 25 saying, "Aye."

1 TRUSTEES: Aye. 2 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed, "No." 3 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 4 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: The ayes have it. Dr. 5 Brannon? DR. BRANNON: That is the end of our 6 7 Committee Report. CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Your committee did a 8 9 terrific job. Thank you very, very much. I don't 10 We're getting pretty good at this, aren't we? 11 DR. BRANNON: We're trainable. 12 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. We -- we now come 13 to the point on our agenda for any Board member who 14 would like to bring up anything that they would like 15 to discuss or bring to our attention. 16 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 17 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Well, let me bring just 18 a couple of things. We've talked about it a little 19 bit. The -- I want to remind you all about the 20 February meeting, again, and the April meeting. 21 Since we put a calendar out, I hope you will put 22 these meetings on your calendar, and we intended, at 23 the February meeting, for it to be a little bit 24 longer. We might start a little bit earlier; we 25 might finish a little bit later. Because we are not

1 really having -- it's -- we called it a retreat, but 2 we may have some business that we have to take care 3 of. But it really is an opportunity for us to talk 4 in depth. So I hope that all of you will go ahead 5 and put that on your calendar. 6 MR. ROGERS: And -- I'm sorry -- just 7 one edification with regard to that. We got some 8 comments and feedback about the date, and looking, 9 perhaps, at the 20th and 21st of February. 10 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Right. 11 MR. ROGERS: And unless we hear 12 objections, we'll probably just ahead and move it to 13 that date for your -- for your planning purposes. 14 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Okay. It seems that 15 there was some others, other than me, who had -- who 16 had that interest, also. 17 April, you know, remember that we -- we 18 suspended, because of financial considerations, the 19 idea of going around and looking at projects. I just 20 think it's so important for us to see projects that 21 we are doing. And, by the way, in February we will 22 build in a time for us to see a project or two, also. 23 That will be built into the -- to the retreat. But, 24 in April, I want to remind you that the one time we

did this, we tried to include our spouses or

25

1 significant others. I'd like for you to do that, to 2 think about that, to ask them to put it on their 3 calendar. I do think the opportunity for us to get 4 together and know each other and talk to each other 5 in a context other than the Board meeting is important. It's an important part of being on the 6 7 Board. So I just want to emphasize that so, maybe, 8 you can look at your calendars in that respect. 9 Okay. Is there anything else? 10 TRUSTEES: (No response.) 11 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: If not, do I hear a 12 motion that we adjourn? 13 MS. RASH: So moved. 14 DR. BRANNON: Move to adjourn. 15 DR. CAMP: Second. All in favor say, "Aye." 16 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: 17 TRUSTEES: Aye. 18 CHAIRMAN BADDOUR: Opposed "no." The ayes 19 have it. 20 MR. ROGERS: Meeting adjourned. 21 (Meeting adjourned at 10:52 a.m.) 22 23 24 25

	CERTIFICATE	OF	NOTARY	-	COURT	REPORTER
STATE OF NOR	TH CAROLINA)					
COUNTY OF WAR) KE)					

I, Amelia W. Mount, 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, Raleigh, North Carolina, on the 11th day of October, 2010.

I further certify that I am neither of counsel to this agency or interested in the event of this agency on this 17th day of October, 2010.

Amelia W. Mount, Court Reporter Notary Public, Wake County, North Carolina Notary Number: 20021680310