# **BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

# CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND

# MINUTES OF MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2016 1:02 P.M.

LAKE NORMAN STATE PARK
759 STATE PARK ROAD
TROUTMAN, NORTH CAROLINA



#### APPEARANCE OF CWMTF BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Dr. Troy Kickler, Chairman
Johnny D. Martin (via telephone)
Frank Bragg
E. Greer Cawood
Frederick Beaujeu-Dufour
Renee Kumor
William Toole
Charles Vines

### APPEARANCE OF STAFF

Will Summer Nancy Guthrie Justin Mercer Damon Hearne

### ALSO PRESENT:

History and Parks

Jonathan Avery, Esq.

Bryan Gossage, Executive Director

Beth Farrell, Department of Agriculture

Greg Schneider, Superintendent of Lake Norman State Park

Susan Kluttz, Secretary of Natural and

Cultural Resources

Dr. Kevin Cherry, Deputy Secretary for Archives,

#### **AGENDA**

Clean Water Management Trust Fund Board of Trustees Meeting
June 9, 2016 - 1:00 p.m.

Lake Norman State Park, Visitor's Center Auditorium 759 State Park Road - Troutman, NC 28166

### Board of Trustees:

Dr. Troy Kickler (Chair), Frank Bragg, Greer Cawood, Frederick Beaujeu-Dufour, Robin Hackney, Renee Kumor, Johnny Martin, William Toole, Charles Vines

#### COMMENCEMENT

- 1) Call to Order (Chairman Kickler)
  - a) Welcome
  - b) Roll Call
- c) Compliance with General Statute § 138A-15
  General Statute § 138A-15 mandates that the Chair
  inquire as to whether any Trustee knows of any conflict of
  interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest with
  respect to matters on the agenda. If any Trustee knows of a
  conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of
  interest, please state so at this time.
- 2) Consent Agenda (Chairman Kickler)
  - a) Minutes of the March 2016 Board Meeting
  - b) Request to extend the date to enter into a construction contract for existing infrastructure Grant
- 3) Legal Update Jonathan Avery
- 4) Executive Director's Update Bryan Gossage

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public is invited to make comments to the Board - Chairman Kickler (Three Minutes per person)

#### OLD BUSINESS

- 1) Administrative Committee Recommendations Greer Cawood
  - a) Allocation of grant funds for 2016 applications
  - b) Donated Minigrant Program expansion
  - c) Assessing changes in project scope after funding
- 2) Grant Programs Committee Recommendations Troy Kickler
  - a) Military scoring procedure clarification
  - b) Stewardship Endowment Deposit Agreement Revision

3)	Stewardship	Program	_	Will	Summer
----	-------------	---------	---	------	--------

- a) Stewardship Program Report
- b) Stewardship Endowment Report & Annual Deposit and Withdrawal Request

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Background on Field Tour Sites - Will Summer 1)

7 5	-	TITOI	NME	1270
411			NIVIH	: M·I·

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: I'd like to call this June 9th Clean Water Management Trust Fund meeting to Thank you for taking the time to be here on this beautiful day at a different conference venue site. We picked a -- or just happened to meet on a beautiful day. Apparently, the weather is going to get a lot hotter tomorrow and on Saturday, but today is a beautiful day. And I think this is an exciting opportunity for us to visit a site that a Clean Water Management Trust Fund has helped funded previously. And then tomorrow we can have a rewarding and learning experience by visiting some stream restoration sites that we have helped fund previously, as well. And, hopefully, that -- we can see what we funded, and then that will help us make more -- fuller informed decisions in the future, as well.

Before we go any further, I would like to take the roll call. When I call your name, please say -- indicate your presence. I, Troy Kickler, Chair, am present. Frank Bragg?

MR. BRAGG: Present.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Greer Cawood?

MS. CAWOOD: Present.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Frederick Beaujeu-Defour?

25

1	MR. BEAUJEU DEFOUR: Present.	
2	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Robin Hackney?	
3	(No response.)	
4	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Renee Kumor?	
5	MS. KUMOR: Present.	
6	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Johnny Martin?	
7	(No response.)	
8	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: William Toole?	
9	MR. TOOLE: Present.	
10	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Charles Vines?	
11	MR. VINES: Present.	
12	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. We have seven	
13	board members present, so we definitely have a quorum	
14	and we will proceed. I'm required, as chair, to read	
15	General Statute 138A-15 and inquire whether we have a	
16	conflict any of us have a conflict or a perception	
17	of a conflict of interest.	
18	General 138A-15 mandates that the Chair	
19	inquires to whether any Trustee knows of any conflict	
20	of interest or the appearance of a conflict of	
21	interest with respect to matters on the agenda. If	
22	any Trustee knows of a conflict of interest or the	
23	appearance of a conflict of interest, please state so	
24	at this time.	
25	(No response.)	

1 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: There is -- out of an 2 abundance of caution, because I -- one of the items in 3 the consent agenda involves North Carolina State 4 University. Out of an abundance of caution, I'm 5 recusing myself from that. I'll be handing the gavel over to the vice-chair, Greer Cawood, to take care of 6 7 those matters. But I wanted that to be stated for the 8 -- the record. 9 And, again, if you become aware of a 10 conflict of interest or the appearance of one as we go 11 along, you may recuse yourself before we get to that 12 particular item. Just make sure you do so before we 13 start discussing that item in detail. 14 Also, as a friendly reminder to you and to 15 myself, make sure you put your cell phones on off or 16 silence your cell phones, and the same thing with your 17 computers, as well. 18 Are there any revisions or additions that we 19 know of to this June 9th agenda? 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Hearing none, is there a motion to -- to adopt the agenda? 22 23 MR. BRAGG: So move. 24 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you, Trustee Bragg. 25 MS. KUMOR: Second.

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: There's a second by Renee
2
         Kumor. If there's no other discussion regarding the
3
         agenda, I'll take a vote. All those in favor say
         "Aye."
4
5
                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER:
6
                                      Opposed?
7
                   (No response.)
8
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: The motion has been
9
         adopted.
10
                   So at this time, we're moving on to the
11
         Consent Agenda. And I will turn this portion of the
12
         agenda over to Trustee Cawood.
13
                   MS. CAWOOD: Okay. First, we will begin
14
         with approval of the minutes of the March 2016 Board
15
         Meeting. Does anybody have any changes or revisions
16
         to those?
17
                   (No response.)
18
                   MS. CAWOOD: If not, then I'll entertain a
19
         motion.
20
                   MR. BRAGG: I move they be adopted as
21
         written.
22
                   MS. CAWOOD: Second?
23
                   MR. VINES: Second.
24
                   MS. CAWOOD: Thank you, Charles. Okay. On
25
         to Consent 2(b), which is the request to extend the
```

```
1
         date to enter into a construction contract for
2
         existing infrastructure grant. And you had that
3
         information sent to you. And are there any questions
4
         about that or any need to pull this item or --
5
                   (No response.)
                   MS. CAWOOD: I will entertain a motion to
6
7
         approve.
8
                   MR. MARTIN: Hello?
9
                   MR. BRAGG: Do you want a motion to approve?
10
         So moved.
11
                   MR. GOSSAGE: Somebody's calling in.
12
                   MS. CAWOOD: Do we have a second?
13
                   MR. TOOLE: Second.
                   MS. CAWOOD: All in favor?
14
15
                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
                   MS. CAWOOD: Wonderful. And based on us
16
17
         completing that item, I will turn it back to Chairman
18
         Kickler.
19
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER:
                                       Thank you, Trustee
20
         Cawood.
                  Did someone call in?
21
                   MR. SUMMER: I think Johnny is on the line.
22
         We're working on --
23
                   MR. HEARNE: Can you hear me?
24
                   (No response.)
25
                   MR. HEARNE: Can you hear me? Okay.
                                                          We are
```

1 on the phone here at the meeting. We just got 2 started. We've had some -- a couple phone 3 difficulties, so we're going to put you on speaker 4 phone and let's hope you'll be able to hear us. It's 5 not our normal phone, so we'll do the best we can. 6 Can you hear us now? 7 MR. MARTIN: Yes, I can. 8 MR. HEARNE: All right. 9 MR. SUMMER: All right. 10 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay. Thank you. 11 the record show -- Johnny, right? 12 MS. CAWOOD: Uh-huh. 13 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Johnny, is that you --14 you on the line? 15 MR. MARTIN: Yeah, this is Johnny Martin. 16 Sorry. 17 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay. Let the record 18 show that Trustee Johnny Martin is on the line and is 19 participating in the June 9th meeting. 20 We'll go on to agenda item commencement 21 four, and that is Executive Director Bryan Gossage's 22 update. 23 MR. GOSSAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24 have several items to update you on. One is just an 25 internal process that we've been working on to improve

our grants management system. You may recall I've
briefed you on this in the past. We were on a system
that, essentially, used either hard copy or Excel
spreadsheet to keep track of the grants. And so we've
been working with the North Carolina Department of
Information Technology on an existing software
platform that they have. We have a contract with
them. And we've been moving the the current grant
load into that system. It's actually pretty neat.
And by the end of this year or the next grant cycle
that begins December 1st, or the first Monday in
December, applicants should be able to go online when
they apply. It'll put their information directly into
the grants management system. And we will be able to
to track the entire process through that through
that program, which is really neat. It's a huge
advance. And internally it works very well with our
budget and finance office and will help reduce
paperwork and time all the way around. So my
understanding is they're pretty excited about it, as
well, and are hoping to expand it to other divisions
within the agency. So it's kind of kind of neat to
be at the cutting edge of that.

Legislative update, the -- the governor's budget and the house budget and the senate budget have

all come out and are pretty much the same in agreement on refunding the trust fund with the same level of funding for the next year, including the five million dollars that was nonrecurring. There are some -- some little things in there that I'm sure will work out, including a \$500,000 annual earmark for the UNC system, things like that that tend to kind of trickle out as the -- as the process goes on, so we'll be keeping an eye on those.

I did want to introduce some new staff to you. We have Damon Hearne with us. He'll be our western field rep. He's sitting behind me. And Damon comes to us from Trout, Unlimited. And he'll be in Asheville. And Justin Mercer is our eastern field rep. And Justin comes to us from the Wildlife Resource Commission. So we're proud to have both of them with us.

Lastly, in your blue folder, you should have the snapsnot -- the budget snapshot that we always provide to you. And it is -- it is literally a picture of the moment in time that it was -- that it was printed, so it gives you a look at where things stand. You should also have a list of the provisional award list that has been updated as of the 7th of this month. And then you should also have a sheet of this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

meeting info and logistics, as well as tomorrow.

And going forward, I was thinking more about the budget snapshot, and being out here at a different location, giving you all a chance to see a different part of the state and different projects that we're going to look at tomorrow. So one of the things that I thought is that going forward, once or twice a month we're going to send out an e-mail to you that provides you with that budget snapshot, that has an update of any provisional items that have been funded, and that are -- that has, maybe, some photos that our field reps, that Justin and Damon have been taking while they're out in the field, so you can see some of the projects that you've already voted to fund. And so we'll send that out to you once or twice a month, just to provide you with a regular update as to what's going on with the -- with the Clean Water Management Trust Fund.

I'll also add that the Natural Heritage

Program, which we are very closely connected with, the governor's budget included a restoration of 6.2 positions for that program. The house budget has the same 6.2 positions refunded. The senate budget has zero positions funded for the Natural Heritage

Program. And they're very critical to us, to the

25

1 Clean Water Program, for field staff and other 2 information as to what is out there on the ground. 3 if there's anyone that you talk to along the way that 4 you want to share the importance of that program with, 5 by all means, please feel free to. 6 Mr. Chair, that's all I have. 7 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay. Thank you. 8 you for the update. Yeah, I think those snapshots 9 will be very helpful to the Board. It will be some 10 good information for us to review as we go further. 11 As chair, I want to take this opportunity to 12 recognize some special quests that we have with us 13 today who have shown interest in the Clean Water 14 Management Trust Fund. The Secretary of Natural and 15 Cultural Resources is here with us today, Secretary 16 Kluttz. And then --17 MS. KLUTTZ: Thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: -- Deputy Secretary, Dr. 19 Kevin Cherry. And I was going to turn the time over 20 to Secretary Kluttz --21 MS. KLUTTZ: Okay. Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: -- to say a few words. 23 MS. KLUTTZ: I appreciate that. And I won't 24 take very long. But I'm just here today for a couple 25 of reasons, on behalf of Governor McCrory, to say

thank you again to you for the time that you take and the dedication you have because this is so important to the State of North Carolina. And just on his behalf, thank you.

Also, on behalf of my department, the

Department of Natural and Cultural Resources, I'm here
with Dr. Kevin Cherry, Deputy Secretary for History,

Archives and now Parks, and Greg Snyder, who is the

Superintendent of this beautiful park, Lake Norman

State Park.

And I will have to tell you that -- and I'm

-- and excuse how I'm dressed. I don't normally show

up for work like this, but I've been on my 15th tour

of our state parks since the transfer happened, when

the budget was passed last September, and it's just

really been incredible. And I had a wonderful tour

all day today to see what's available right here, so I

hope you'll get to see the entire park.

But I just wanted to also update you on the merger or the transfer. It is officially called a transfer, but the governor very much wanted it to be a merger of Natural and Cultural Resources. And it's going extremely well, but I will tell you it is not easy. It sounds very easy to transfer one thing from one division -- one department in state government to

another. It is very complicated, especially with budget and HR. It'll take us, probably, a good total year to get all the details worked out, but it's working amazingly well.

And what we're finding is how similar we are and how our mission and vision really is the same, to protect the wonderful state-owned treasures of North Carolina.

I will tell you, too, that -- that up until the minute that the budget passed and this transfer happened, which more than doubled our department to 2,500 staff members, I was fighting very hard -- we were, for the, among other things, the Historic Preservation Tax Credits to be restored. And we had been told that that was impossible. I was told by leaders in the legislature that I was wasting my time to do anything about it, that they would kill it in the end, no matter what we did.

And so I set out on a tour. And within that last year, I made 73 stops in 52 different cities and towns. And I'm tell you this for a reason. But what I found was that our beautiful historic buildings in North Carolina told the North Carolina story that North Carolina has such a rich history. And North Carolinians, I learned, value that history very much,

and they let it be known to the legislature.

But what I saw when I put it all together was it told the North Carolina story in buildings.

And seeing such things as a peanut mill in Edenton, or a post office in Clinton, or a wagon company in Hickory, or a buggy factory in Sanford, in addition to what I knew I would see, which was text -- our history of textiles and manufacturing of tobacco and furniture, but I saw so much more. And I can go on and on and tell you the examples of how -- what I say tell -- told the North Carolina story. And that's how we sold this to the public and to the legislature.

And so the reason I'm telling you this is since the budget passed and we took natural resources — as I said, I've been on a tour of state parks, and what we have in natural resources that I had not been to before. And in my 15, so far, visits of the parks, I have seen such incredible things that this state has that I hope that everybody will be able to see.

But, you know, to be at the top of Mount
Mitchell, which to me is like -- was like being in a
church, it was like a religious experience. It's so
beautiful up there. I feel like you're right so close
to Heaven. Or then being at the bottom of Stone
Mountain when I visited there with the governor, and

the opposite of looking down to up and how beautiful that was. It was right before Christmas and there was red and green foliage at the top. And it actually looked like it was decorated for Christmas to me.

But then being, also with the governor, at Hammocks Beach State Park and seeing the beach, or being at Jordan Lake and seeing the lake, and just the really incredible things that I've seen have shown me that what I'm learning is the North Carolina story of natural resources, like I have seen the North Carolina story of cultural resources.

So, you know, we feel like it's just a perfect fit for us to be able to conserve what we have, and I've learned that preservation and conservation are so similar, that they're all really just alike. So thank you for what you're doing. It's so important. And we have got to -- I'm so proud, and I was telling Greg today I'm so proud of this state, that in 100 years that we had the vision in North Carolina to save what we have because we wouldn't have it today if people before us hadn't been so wise to do it.

So, anyway, what you're doing is so important. And I just wanted to tell you how much our department values what you do and how grateful we are

1 to have you a part of this department today. So thank 2 you so much. I'm -- I'm taking off right now, but I 3 just wanted to have a minute just to say that to you, 4 so thank you. 5 DR. CHERRY: And Bryan is right. We are 6 pushing hard for the --7 MS. KLUTTZ: Yes. 8 DR. CHERRY: -- Natural Heritage Program 9 restoration. MS. KLUTTZ: We are. And I did leave that 10 11 out, but the governor very much wants this. He 12 realizes how important it is. And we are working so 13 hard for it. We're thrilled that it was in the 14 governor's budget and in the House. And we're 15 fighting as hard as we can to get it in the senate, so 16 any help that you can be will be great, but just know 17 that we in our department are working very hard for 18 it. We know how important it is, and we have got to 19 get it back, so we're working for it as well. But 20 thank you all again. 21 MR. BRAGG: Thank you. 22 MS. KLUTTZ: Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you, Secretary. 24 -- that's good news to hear. Also, I mean, I'm sure 25 Trustees are aware, this is a good time to remind the

Trustees that one of the criteria changes that we made was to try to get applicants to think holistically about the applications because they're -- too many times people compartmentalize the natural heritage aspect of the state and then the cultural heritage aspect of the state. But many times they dovetail and can tell -- if you think of it in that way, it can tell a more complete story of North Carolina. So our criteria reflects the blend of natural and cultural resources. I thought that would be a good opportunity to remind us of that.

We also have another special guest, Park
Representative Greg Snyder. He was mentioned by
Secretary Kluttz, but I think you want to tell us a
little bit more about this particular --

MR. SYNER: Sure, sure.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: -- park

MR. SNYDER: And, first of all, I'd like to parrot Secretary Kluttz's welcoming remarks. Thank you guys for coming to Lake Norman State Park and for being here. And I'm going to stand in front of the window because I don't want you to look at me. I want you to look beyond me to my beautiful resource. I'm not much to look at, but certainly we have 2,000 acres here that is something to look at. So thank you for

inviting me, Chairman Kickler, to address this group.

You earlier mentioned how wonderful the weather is today. Well, us park superintendents do have the authority to control local weather, so we wanted to make sure that your visit to Lake Norman was as nice and as pleasant as it could be.

I will tell you just a little bit about my park and welcome and hope that you get an opportunity to get out and enjoy some of the park while you're here today. If nothing else, a rocking chair on the back porch overlooking Park Lake for a brief 15 minutes might be a good calm down after a contentious or -- hopefully, not contentious meeting that you're having here.

Lake Norman State Park, the 12th oldest state park. This park was begun by a grant of land from Duke Power Corporation, gave 1,328 acres to start this project and this park in 1962. And we opened to the public in 1963.

This park is -- started as a recreation area, and that's -- that's truly what we are. It is your big back yard. It's 2,000 acres of green right here next to Charlotte and in this very growing area of the state. Many folks come out here to enjoy boating activities, whether it's small rental self-

propelled boats that we have here in Park Lake or to use our boat ramp. The vast majority of people come here to hike on our six or eight miles of hiking trails, or to bike on 30 1/2 miles of biking trails, single track trails that have been installed in this facility through a partnership -- a public/private partnership between us and the Tarheel TrailBlazers out of Charlotte.

Tarheel TrailBlazers have provided the manpower to construct those trails and to actually assist us in maintaining those trails.

We also offer camping at this facility. Of course, lake bathing, we have a swimming area far into the park, and other outdoor pursuits, not only just hiking, but a lot of birding, a lot of butterflying, a wonderful park for butterflying.

So it is your big back yard. I don't have a beautiful mountain here a Lake Normal. I don't have a wonderful waterfall, but I do have 2,000 acres of property that has been maintained in its current condition for now over 60 -- or right, approximately, 60 years, so it's just a -- just a wonderful resource.

I would like to congratulate this body on their largesse in providing property to this park.

The Clean Water Management Trust Fund provided funding

for purchase of properties between Wildlife Road and Morrison Farm Road. That additional property not only helped us protect a creek that's flowing into Lake Norman, but also allowed us to expand our recreational pursuits. And, in fact, put in the wildlife -- the wildlife part of the Itusi Trail, which is that very important bicycle trail system here.

So every day multiple visitors come out to enjoy either bicycling or hiking on that wildlife loop of that trail, very low impact recreational pursuit that allows us to maintain that particular couple hundred acres in its natural state, while allowing and bringing people in to enjoy that -- that property. So the largesse of this -- this group, this organization, has really benefited Lake Norman State Park.

Again, welcome to the park. And if me or my staff can be of any assistance to you, feel free to call upon us.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: We'll move on to the next item on the agenda, which is public comments. There aren't many of us here today, but let me just say I'll turn this time over to the public, but remind three things for the record. If you want to make a public

comment, please state your name and affiliation. Each person has three minutes, and I'll keep track of the time. And then also as a reminder, you can't -- because these public comments are before our business, you can't discuss any particular agenda item on the agenda. Is there anyone who would like to say a few words?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: No. All right. Hearing none, we'll move on to the next agenda item, which is Old Business 1.

Since our last full board meeting, the Grant Programs Committee has been meeting. And, in particular, the Administrative Committee has been meeting. And since this is a newly reconstituted board, the Administrative Committee has had a lot of work to do. And so I'd like to commend them on a lot of their work and a lot of their meetings and thank them publicly for taking the time out of their work schedules, possibly social schedules, to serve on this volunteer board.

The chair of the Administrative Committee is Greer Cawood, so I'll turn the time over to her to say a few remarks about Old Business 1(a).

MS. CAWOOD: Great. And the Administrative

Committee, I would like to thank our members, Charles and Johnny, for their time. And I especially -- also to Nancy and Will for their assistance in the work that we did.

To start with, Administrative 1(a), which is the allocation of grant funds for 2016 applications.

And, Nancy, before I turn it over to you to explain that, this was discussed. Our committee did approve this recommendation. And, Nancy, if you'll just walk the trustees through it.

MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. The percentage of allocation for program -- or through the fund's programs is the same as it has been for the last two years as the recommendation. And that was derived from looking at -- even going back further historically with the funds that went to the acquisition program and the stream restoration program and wastewater, and that was part of the program, and how those funds have been used -- or have been split historically. It also looks at the current applications, percent of applications, as well as the requested amount to see if programs were receiving -- kind of how much of the request and how that matched up historically.

So the recommendation for the 2016 project,

1 which you will look at and make funding decisions on 2 in the fall, is for acquisitions program to receive 75 3 percent of the funds, 20 percent of the funds 4 allocated to the stream restoration projects, and up 5 to five percent of the funds allocated to the 6 innovative stormwater projects. 7 And then if there are not five percent of 8 the funds worth of really quality innovative 9 stormwater projects, those funds would be further 10 divided two-thirds to the acquisition program and one-11 third to the stream restoration program. 12 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Are there --13 MS. GUTHRIE: Any questions for me on that? 14 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Are there -- are there no 15 questions? Well, since it came from the committee, 16 that means there's been a motion and a second, so are 17 there any --18 (No response.) 19 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Hearing none, all those 20 in favor of the Administrative Committee's recommendation as stated in Agenda Item Old Business 21 22 1, please say "Aye." 23 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 24 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those opposed? 25 MR. MARTIN: Aye.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay. The motion -- the recommendation -- the motion has been carried.

Administrative Committee also did some more work. And so part of this was to make the Minigrant Program guidelines a little bit more formal, so I'll turn it over to Greer.

MS. CAWOOD: Great. And, Trustees, so you know -- and this is something that was brought up by staff, which I think was a great thing to notice, is that our donated Minigrant Program did not include the full scope of what Clean Water Management Trust Fund now has under its purview. So we wanted to look at what -- currently, it only dealt with -- with waterways, and now we have cultural resources, now we have military installation, so there are lots of different lands that we're looking at. So we met a couple of times to look at this. And, Nancy, thank you again for you. And I think Will did some on this one too to help us out in coming to what we hope is a very clear process and understanding for folks to expand the Minigrant Program to include the other entities under our purview.

So, Nancy, if there's anything you want to add on that or --

MS. GUTHRIE: I think that covers well the

intent. And do you want to see if there are any questions on the new guidelines -- or the proposed guidelines because I can point out maybe what was added to them to see how it was changed without going through a lot of detail on this for you.

But in the overview section -- Damon, if you would scroll on down to the revised guidelines. In your Board packet, you have the previous guidelines that the committee started with, and here are the revised guidelines.

So in the overview section, we added back in the eligibility of donation of fee simple property.

The committee and staff, we do not know a reason why it should be limited to only easements.

The other big changes in this section are the bullets. The first set of bullets there is expanding it to all of Clean Water's purposes at this point.

The second group of bullets, we wanted to clarify that in our acquisition program, we use more than just a conservation easement. We also have restrictions -- restrictive covenants and the dedication in the Nature Preserves Act. So, again, getting the Minigrant Program sort of inline a little bit more with the larger acquisition program, all of

1 those instruments are acceptable under the donated 2 Minigrants, as this is proposed. 3 There were no other major changes in the 4 overview section, so I'll move on if no one has 5 questions on that section. MS. KUMOR: Just --6 7 MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. 8 MS. KUMOR: -- you need just one or the 9 other of those instruments and not all three of them; 10 is that --11 MS. GUTHRIE: Correct. 12 MS. KUMOR: Okay. 13 Nancy, may I ask -- so with this MR. BRAGG: 14 view, I'm assuming we approved this, which I'm 15 assuming we will. Every project really should make 16 application for this because almost everything 17 qualifies, does it not? 18 MS. GUTHRIE: In all of the --19 MR. BRAGG: It's pretty broad. 20 MS. GUTHRIE: Yes. Yeah. The committee, I 21 believe, wanted this to be broad to say if restrictive 22 covenant is the best tool for that piece of property 23 to restrict it, and it's next to a military base, then 24 that is now -- or would be now eligible for the 25 program, as long as it's a donation.

1 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Are there any other 2 questions for Nancy or maybe the Administrative Committee? 3 4 (No response.) 5 MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. So --6 MR. BRAGG: Nancy, I'm just trying to think 7 about that statement about the military restrictive 8 covenant. We don't really do that many of those that 9 I -- that I can recall, do we? I mean, not -- not 10 that -- I mean, I think it's fine to include that, but 11 I'm trying to think of the significance of including 12 it and what it might cost us. 13 MS. GUTHRIE: There have not been many of 14 those project, if any, to this point, mainly because 15 of the criteria within the larger -- the statute and 16 what that named as purposes for Clean Water, as well 17 as the fact the Minigrant Program would not have 18 included those properties unless there had been a 19 stream on the property. 20 MR. BRAGG: Yeah. So, again, that is a 21 permanent covenant, correct? 22 MS. GUTHRIE: Yes, sir. 23 MR. BRAGG: Okay. 24 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Any other questions? 25 Yes, ma'am.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MS. KUMOR: When we started out the 2 statement that it's going to now cover cultural, as 3 well as natural, can I have an example of how this 4 would function then? 5 I mean, I understand if it's an -- we're 6 talking about an easement on a buffer or some piece of 7 property. What else would it -- are we now including? 8 MS. GUTHRIE: It could be if a landowner was 9 willing to donate an easement or a piece of property 10 to the Department of Cultural Resources to add to the 11 edge of a battlefield. 12 MS. KUMOR: Okay. 13 MS. GUTHRIE: There's also other historic sites where land trusts sometimes are working --14

MS. GUTHRIE: There's also other historic sites where land trusts sometimes are working -- really focused on the land, but it's protecting the view shed from that historic site. Those are important for the feeling of a historic site. So those would be the types of cultural historic sites I would imagine --

MS. KUMOR: Okay.

MS. GUTHRIE: -- to be included. It could also, without streams, protect some of the natural heritage, a particular ecosystem that doesn't have water running through it, but that would then also be eligible.

MS. KUMOR: Well, thank you. I -- I just 1 2 wondered what that was opening up for us, but it's 3 still -- it's understandable to me now. Thank you. 4 MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. 5 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Yes. 6 MR. TOOLE: Help me understand what this 7 does that's different from the general grant 8 application. 9 MS. GUTHRIE: I'll step back kind of on --10 on that with the history of the donated Minigrant 11 Program, which I did just jump right into the changes. 12 The -- this program allows up to \$25,000 to 13 facilitate a donation which has to be a free and clear 14 gift with no funding going to the owner for the land 15 at all. And that speeds up the process considerably. Twenty-five thousand is often enough to cover the 16 17 transaction costs. And instead of having people come 18 into the kind of regular grant cycle in February, have 19 to wait until the fall, and then receive a pretty small grant, the history of this has been to go ahead 20 21 and allow these to come in throughout the year and facilitate these donations, which is a streamline 22 23 process. 24 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: But we put a limit on the 25 amount every year.

1 MS. GUTHRIE: It's up to \$25,000 or the 2 value of the donation. 3 MR. TOOLE: All right. And a total dollar 4 amount --5 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: And a total dollar 6 amount. 7 MR. TOOLE: -- for the program? 8 MS. GUTHRIE: Oh, yes. 9 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Yeah. 10 MS. GUTHRIE: Each year the Acquisition 11 Committee sets the total funding for the program for 12 the year. 13 MR. BRAGG: My only reservation about this 14 is that the \$25,000 minigrant is not relative to any 15 number of the value, so you might have a restrictive 16 covenant on a property. And those of us who work on 17 the other side of the table, on the receiving end of 18 funds from the state, will figure out how to get that 19 \$25,000, regardless of the value of that covenant. 20 And this actually happened, I think, Nancy, 21 with quite a few projects during 2010 and '11, when 22 minigrants were the only thing that we would fund to 23 any large degree. And a lot of those went for 24 projects that were tiny, as I remember this, along the 25 New River. It would be very little, small parcels of

1 land that may be a private easement. And the 2 minigrant was more significant than the value of a 3 donated easement. So I do have a reservation about 4 this. 5 MS. GUTHRIE: I do want to clarify on that 6 though because it's \$25,000 or the value of the 7 donation, so we do have --8 MR. BRAGG: So it's equal -- so it has to be 9 equal to the value of the donation, not the cost of 10 the funding and to survey and -- I mean, that's what 11 we're talking about, is it not, the stewardship and 12 cost for the process? 13 MS. GUTHRIE: Right. So the stewardship and 14 what's referred to as the transaction costs --15 MR. BRAGG: Right, right. MS. GUTHRIE: -- the survey and the closing 16 17 costs, that is capped at either the value of the 18 donation or \$25,000, whichever is less. 19 So in some areas, the value of the donation, 20 based on a tax appraisal or -- or, excuse me, a tax 21 assessment or an appraisal, might be \$8,000 or \$14,000 22 and that would be the cap at that point. 23 MR. BRAGG: So, actually, we're talking 24 about two things. We're talking about the value of 25 the donated easement, and then we're talking about the

1 cost. And our grant can't exceed the cost, and our 2 grant can't exceed the value of the donated easement, 3 correct? It's not ideal, but I'll -- I'll vote for 4 it. 5 MS. CAWOOD: Trustee Bragg, do you think 6 that there is a change that needs to be made to it? 7 Because we'd be happy to go back and -- and work more on a particular part of it if you think that there's a 8 9 way because safeguarding the funds is important. 10 MR. BRAGG: Well, the way -- the way I 11 understand it, if there's a project out there that has 12 the kind of space you need and a value of \$25,000, 13 then they're eligible for \$25,000 from us if they can show us that they spent \$25,000 in soft cost, 14 15 appraisals, surveys, stewardship, to do the \$25,000 16 deal. 17 So it's -- it's a lot of money when you look 18 at it that way. I mean, it's 100 percent of the -- my 19 experience in the land trust business is that the 20 biggest challenge that we have is finding the monies 21 to do these soft costs. 22 If you've got a farmer who wants to do an 23 easement and he doesn't have any money, and we say, 24 "Look, it's going to cost you \$15,000 for the survey 25 and for the appraisal and for the stewardship," then

he may say, "I can't do it."

So that's why this came about, you know, we may need to help that guy. We need to help the land trust pay for these costs.

But if the guy is given an easement on a 100 acre farm that's worth a million dollars, probably, minimum in the state, so, I mean, it's big. So \$25,000 is not a big deal. But I'm just saying on -- you know, without having relative to a percentage of the total value of the easement, it looks like every single deal ought to apply for this \$25,000 because they can get it, just about. They can figure out how to get it. The cap is going to cut them off, but I think it's a very lenient way to give away money.

MR. TOOLE: So if I can just --

MR. BRAGG: Yeah.

MR. TOOLE: -- suggest. What you're thinking then, Trustee Bragg, is that this is the kind of grant that's more -- should be targeted to the smaller deals? The ones where the transaction costs are a larger percentage of the -- of the value of the donation than to the more valuable donations? Is that you're thinking? Where, for example, if it's a \$25,000 donation, the transactional costs are, proportionately, quite large? If it's a million

1 dollar transaction, the transactional costs, 2 presumably, don't drive the gift nearly as -- they're 3 not as fundamental to the gift? 4 MS. CAWOOD: I was hearing it, actually, the 5 opposite way. 6 MR. BRAGG: Well, it is the opposite. 7 Well, it is the opposite. Okay. MR. TOOLE: 8 That's why I'm asking the question, yeah. 9 MR. BRAGG: Gosh, I'm sorry I muddied up 10 this thing. And let's go ahead and approve it like it 11 is today and I'll continue to work on it because I do 12 think there's a better way. And a lot of this is all 13 driven by my experience in this business. 14 For an example, Reid Wilson and Conservation 15 Trust have had a private donor who has funded all 16 these because we stopped doing them for a while. And 17 since then, that family paid for it. And Reid had the 18 discretion of how to do it. And he did it on a need 19 basis. 20 I mean, I did an easement on a tract of land 21 in Avery County, and they called me from Blue Ridge 22 Conservancy, and said, "Do you want us to pay for your 23 soft costs?" And I said, "No." I could afford to pay 24 my own." The money would have come from Stanback in

that case because he literally funded this around the

25

1 state. But there was a discretionary control of the 2 monies, and it just wasn't every deal got it because 3 you can always come up with a way to get the \$25,000 4 if you're on the land trust side of things, I can tell 5 We could always say, "Yeah, the survey was expensive." And it's just kind of a carte blanche, 6 7 every deal gets \$25,000, regardless of the value of the easement. And I think there's a little bit better 8 9 way. But I'm going to stop because I talk way too 10 much. 11 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: I -- maybe it does need 12 some tweaking, but I think something to keep in mind, 13 too, is that, one, there is a total overall cap on the

MR. BRAGG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: And then staff asks questions when these applications come in. And then when they come before the Chair, the Chair has an opportunity to ask questions or recommend it to the -- the full board. So, I mean, it's not first come, first serve.

MS. KUMOR: You -- I thought it might be in -- in that we're saying it's open at any time to make application.

MS. GUTHRIE: Well, proposal in an updated

25

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

money.

1 -- or in the revised guidelines is to change the 2 process of approval --3 MS. KUMOR: Okay. MS. GUTHRIE: -- a little bit. We hadn't 4 5 gotten there yet. 6 MS. KUMOR: Okay. 7 MS. GUTHRIE: But the idea there is to batch 8 them quarterly so that a few will be looked at at a 9 time, and it'll be that in a process of -- of passing 10 over one that meets -- that meets just the minimal 11 criteria, holding it maybe till later in the year and 12 seeing if some of the more million dollar projects 13 come in, and being able to control that a little bit 14 as opposed to first come, first serve, which is how 15 it's --16 MS. KUMOR: Okay. 17 MS. GUTHRIE: -- set up --18 MS. KUMOR: Right now. 19 MS. GUTHRIE: -- right now. 20 MS. KUMOR: Okay. 21 MS. GUTHRIE: Yeah. 22 MS. CAWOOD: And, Trustee Kumor, another 23 part of it is to get, like, some cultural resource 24 staff, if it's a cultural resource land, in to provide 25 their input. So it is providing too what, I think

1 Trustee Bragg is talking about, just not everybody 2 gets it, but more of a process of review. 3 MS. KUMOR: So that we would have a batch 4 come in in the first quarter, and of those we would 5 have determined that there's so much money we will allot or -- and then see who may or may not qualify? 6 7 MS. CAWOOD: Uh-huh. 8 MS. KUMOR: And then it's possible, if you 9 were in batch one, you can roll into batch two if you 10 don't --11 MS. CAWOOD: Uh-huh. 12 MS. KUMOR: Okay. And -- but then that pot 13 of money will have been determined. And we also have 14 -- are we changing -- this money is allocated from our 15 interest or -- or --16 MS. CAWOOD: Annually, we determine how 17 much --18 MS. KUMOR: Okay. 19 MS. CAWOOD: -- we want to go with the 20 program --21 So that's another thing --MS. KUMOR: 22 MS. CAWOOD: -- as a Board. 23 MS. KUMOR: -- we control that we'll be 24 giving away is by determining the amount of money we 25 allocate.

1	MS. CAWOOD: Uh-huh.
2	MS. KUMOR: Okay.
3	MS. CAWOOD: Uh-huh.
4	MS. KUMOR: Are we getting more confusing,
5	Frank?
6	MR. BRAGG: No, no, huh-uh, I'm there with
7	this.
8	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: So it's, like because
9	we have lowered the amount, haven't we, Nancy, from
10	\$300,000 to \$200,000.
11	MS. GUTHRIE: We the amount has been
12	lowered in the last few years. And the demand has
13	also been lower in the last few years. If you'll
14	recall the Conservation Tax Credit in North Carolina,
15	it's 2013 that was the last year for the tax credit.
16	Before that is when Mr. Stanback and land
17	trust were very busy getting anyone who was interested
18	in donating to donate at the end of 2012 and 2013.
19	I am seeing more interest in the program
20	again, getting phone calls and a couple applications,
21	so I think it will increase again in the requests to
22	the trust fund.
23	MS. CAWOOD: And, Nancy, you'll keep us
24	apprised if it looks there are abuses that are and
25	then we can change the guidelines accordingly, if it

4	
1	looks like there's some issues developing?
2	MS. GUTHRIE: Yes. I think it's important
3	to know I think, Mr. Bragg, you're making a really
4	good point. If Clean Water is, in fact, paying
5	\$20,000 and getting \$20,000 in value, or if our
6	benefit to the cost is increasing, because through the
7	history of the program, it has been a very cost
8	effective way to get thousands of acres under
9	conservation.
10	If that does change, and we're getting fewer
11	and fewer acres, I think that is in another committee
12	and Board discussion the program.
13	MS. CAWOOD: So I think from this
14	discussion, I'd say if you see red flags starting up,
15	we will want to meet again as a committee and take
16	care of that.
17	MS. GUTHRIE: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: So were there any other
19	questions for Nancy?
20	(No response.)
21	MS. GUTHRIE: I'm going to
22	MS. CAWOOD: Okay. You were going to do
23	eligible applicant?
24	MS. GUTHRIE: Move on to the other sections.
25	The eligible applicant, to this point, it has been a

nonprofit corporation. It's been local governments that have been eligible to apply and receive funding.

The committee had some discussion about state agencies. Previously, State Parks and Wildlife Resource Commission were the two programs really applying to Clean Water Trust Fund, and it was felt that they had their own funding mechanism. They have funds that they can receive, Wildlife Resource Commission, from the federal government, and Wild -- and Parks have their own appropriated funds. And they could cover these costs to receive land for which they did not have to pay any funding.

But with the expansion into the Department of Cultural -- of Natural and Cultural Resources, where we have the Historic Sites Program and, also, the Plant Conservation Program, which works very heavily with Natural Heritage communities, those programs do not have a dedicated source of funding that is easy for them to come up with 20, 25 thousand dollars to receive -- really, to help facilitate accepting donated land.

So the committee did discuss this a good bit and decided to -- to expand this to a state agency without a dedicated land acquisition funding mechanism. But that is a change in this section. Any

1 questions on that? 2 (No response.) 3 MS. CAWOOD: And then funding? 4 MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. For the funding 5 section, the change in this section that is -- I think will catch the attention of our applicants is to 6 7 continue paying 100 percent of the costs for many of the transactions, but to only pay 50 percent of the 8 9 costs for the stewardship endowment. 10 And the stewardship endowment is an amount 11 of money that land trusts know that they have to put 12 into their own endowment to steward a piece of 13 property with a conservation easement on it. But to 14 put in -- for Clean Water to contribute only 50 15 percent of that forces the land trust or the landowner 16 to put some funding into the project. This is one way 17 to kind of get that contribution from the land trust 18 into the program. 19 MR. BRAGG: I like that, of course. That's 20 the first thing I've really liked. 21 MS. GUTHRIE: Well, we'll keep that one. 22 MR. BRAGG: You know, if you think about 23 this project, last year, as I recall, we approved 62 24 projects at \$25,000, that's a million-and-a-half 25 dollars. And I know our cap is three-and-a-quarter.

I think it was \$600,000 a couple years ago. And maybe that's the way we want to encourage conservation easements, is just fund every project \$25,000. It might make it easy for them to apply and have a -- and have what you have, that the easement value has to be at least \$25,000, and just write them a check. And it helps the land trust, that's for sure, because they constantly struggle with all this. But the little deal is the one who gets a huge bonus for this. I'm all about little deals. That's fine. But it's really relative to the size of the deal that it might -- it might be 100 percent of the value of the deal, so.

MS. CAWOOD: And I would say, based on Trustee Braggs, that it be noted in the record that it is the intention of the program not to have the value of the land or what we get from it be near the \$25,000.

MR. BRAGG: But it will be. The land trusts know how to make those numbers work out, I can tell you. They — they will do that. I mean, I'm — I've been involved with a land trust a long time. And they will justify the numbers and you'll never question them because they'll be valid numbers. The deals, when you get into trying to make these things work, there's a huge amount of negotiation with the

landowner, and the land trust, and saying, "I'm not giving you \$8,000 for this stewardship. I just won't do the deal." The land trust comes back and negotiates, says, "All right, give us six."

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: So do you --

MR. BRAGG: And then you come along and say, "We're going to give you 25 every time, all you've got to do is just show us the numbers, and we're going to write you a check." So the land trust -- I love it for the land trust reasons.

MS. GUTHRIE: Well, I would like to make sure that you all are aware, we do have some checks in place.

MR. BRAGG: Okay.

MS. GUTHRIE: Because they can estimate the survey is going to be \$20,000, but then we do need to see the invoice from the surveyor. And we have to see the invoice for the work on the environment assessment or any other documents. We have to have an invoice from the attorney showing the closing costs. So we are reimbursing based on actual invoices. And, usually -- I will not argue that there's usually \$25,000 worth of closing costs in projects. But we do have -- with this system, we would still require applicants to fill out a stewardship endowment

calculation sheet that we use for our grant -- our larger grant, and show us how they calculated the endowment that would be required for the program. And then we would take 50 percent of that for Clean Water's contribution.

So it's interesting. I think land trusts kind of argue with me that I make this as hard for them to get their \$25,000 check as I make it for them to get their million dollar check. And I'm not trying to make it difficult. I'm trying to, in fact, make sure that we are paying -- we are actually reimbursing real costs through the program.

MS. CAWOOD: Thank you, Nancy. I think that continues with the integrity that all of us are that these are state funds and we want to make sure that they're used in the best possible way.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: If I may, Greer, just -how about -- because we're getting into like some of
the checks and stuff, how about we just go through the
revised guidelines, and -- maybe not line by line, but
we go through it category by category, maybe, and then
if people have questions because it seems like some of
the questions that we're having are answered later on
in the guidelines.

MS. GUTHRIE: Right. Okay. I think to this

point, probably we're good with the sections we've gone through.

MS. CAWOOD: Uh-huh.

MS. GUTHRIE: So the next section on this -speaking of the funding section, to complete that,
there is information here on -- Clean Water has, in
this program, not funded the appraisal. That is up to
the land owner to do that, with the thinking not at
the state level at this point, but still at federal
level, there is a tax deduction that is -- some of the
projects are eligible for. So the landowner or,
again, the land trust needs to cover that cost.

The matching resource requirement, again, this is where it's saying the value of the donation is considered the match for the project and that it must be -- it must exceed the transaction cost.

The next sub-section or the next section in here on the conservation agreements requirements, this is a little additional information added to the guidelines because of the addition of allowing restrictive covenants or the State Nature Preserves Act dedication. And in here there are more details that the conservation -- it must be held by a local government, unit of government or non-profit that is qualified to receive funds from Clean Water Trust

Fund. So it has to stay within line of who we are typically working with. It has to protect significant riparian buffers, natural heritage communities, historic sites, and -- or view sheds from the historic sites, and limited activities that would interfere with military installations. And those will be restrictions specific to a property and its values.

It has to grant an executory interest to the State of North Carolina. The State of North Carolina, we have a right of access and a third-party right of enforcement of the easements, if we find the land trust or the recipient is not upholding their end of the enforcement.

And it also gives the requirement that if the easement is transferred to a third party, the organizing -- the organization receiving the easement has to be a qualified organization to receive that. So those are written into the conservation easement.

With restrictive covenants, again, it has to protect significant riparian buffers. And that is a little bit open because we don't want to put a minimum in there because that's what people aim for. If we say it has to be at least 50 feet, then everyone will protect 50 feet. We'd like more than that. And so a lot of times when I see applications with a 50-foot

buffer, I ask why they only went 100 or only went 50 feet, and they say, "Because that's what the guidelines said." And I will ask if they'll go 100 or 200 and often they will. So it's hard to put a number without making that the target because we also recognize that in a lot of areas, particular mountainous areas, 200 feet is just giving up too much of the property to keep any of it viable for farming or any other uses.

And then in restrictive covenants, include a notice of funding from Clean Water for the purpose of conservation. And that is some language I'm working with State Property Office on to just make certain that there is in the public record as much information restricting the use of this property in the future as we can put in there. So there would just be language that this was purchased with public funding for the purpose of conservation.

The State Nature Preserves Act dedication will be required of any tracts that are donated to state agencies, which, again, with this program, I would anticipate would be the Plant Conservation Program or Department of Natural and Cultural Resources.

So any questions to this point?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(No response.)

MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. So the application and review process, this -- there are some changes in this Troy and I currently are the two people who section. reviewed the application. It comes to me. through it, ask questions. I give it to Dr. Kickler. He has a chance to look at it and ask questions. And the authority to approve the grant has been delegated to the Chairman. And Troy and I have discussed that while we are working well together, maybe we want to make this process a little more robust and -- and, actually, develop more of a work group with more staff, more expertise with cultural resources, with natural heritage, as is appropriate for the projects that are coming in. And that way, we get more input and more thoughts on it. And I think the recommendation is a little bit more supported from various backgrounds.

And, also, this is the area where I was -discussed earlier batching these and having quarterly
reviews. The Acquisition Funding Committee would
appropriate funds, or determine the overall cap at the
fall meeting, which has always been done. And then to
have the review group get together in October,
January, April and July and look at the applications

(919) 676-1502

1 that have come in to that point and make decisions or 2 help answer any questions Dr. Kickler has in making decisions. 3 4 MR. BRAGG: So, Nancy, well, now, you 5 approve them each quarter, and we approve on -- so you 6 pay them out each quarter? 7 MS. GUTHRIE: It would be contracted each 8 quarter, yes. 9 MR. BRAGG: So it's a first come, first 10 serve basis on the cap? I mean, once we get the cap, 11 we don't -- there wouldn't be anymore? 12 MS. GUTHRIE: Yes. 13 MR. BRAGG: We don't get -- get them all in 14 and prorate the amount? It's first come, first serve? 15 MS. GUTHRIE: Well, as Trustee Kumor was 16 saying, the group and the Chairman can certainly look 17 at what comes in the first group and say, "This one, 18 its value is \$25,000, and it has a 50-foot buffer, and 19 it's just meeting the minimum. We want to hold and 20 see if we have greater value later in the year that 21 come in." So I guess the fund would not be committing itself to approve or deny at each quarter, but could 22 23 move a project forward and make decisions on it at the 24 last meeting of the year. MS. CAWOOD: You could defer it? 25

1 MS. GUTHRIE: Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Right. 3 MR. BRAGG: So at that last meeting, we've 4 got a million dollars in requests, are we going to 5 prorate across -- everybody gets less than 25, or how 6 do we --7 MS. GUTHRIE: I'd say --8 MR. BRAGG: I mean, are we going to rank 9 them like we do our projects or --10 MS. GUTHRIE: That is not what I was 11 envisioning. I think this is still open for some 12 discussion. But the proposal is more the application 13 would be reviewed and approved, denied or deferred at the next available meeting. 14 15 And if the funding -- you know, if we had 16 fantastic applications, we could, in fact, spend the 17 funding before the July meeting, before that fourth 18 meeting of the year, or we may get there and still 19 have 100,000, and just the group and the chairman may 20 still not be satisfied that a couple of the 21 applications are really of high value. 22 MR. GOSSAGE: Mr. Chairman --23 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Yes. 24 MR. GOSSAGE: -- if I may? Nancy, do you 25 recall this past cycle and the one before that the

1	total amount that was provided by the Board for this
2	program, the totals for each of those years? Was it
3	200,000; is
4	MS. GUTHRIE: I think it was.
5	MR. GOSSAGE: And
6	MS. GUTHRIE: Certainly, not more than that.
7	MR. GOSSAGE: do you recall the demand?
8	MS. GUTHRIE: This past year we have had
9	three applications. And we have a fourth one that
10	came in, had some questions, and they are working on
11	those questions right now, so.
12	MR. GOSSAGE: Of those three, rough,
13	approximate dollar amount?
14	MS. GUTHRIE: One was less than 25. I want
15	to say one was about 14,000. And I think the other
16	two were at the 25,000.
17	MR. GOSSAGE: Okay. And do you recall the
18	prior year? And I know that's stretching things a
19	little.
20	MS. GUTHRIE: I think in the prior year, we
21	only had one.
22	MR. GOSSAGE: Yeah.
23	MS. GUTHRIE: Okay.
24	MR. GOSSAGE: For a dollar amount?
25	MS. GUTHRIE: It was with the Tar River

1 Land Conservancy, and their land value is fairly low, 2 so I'm going to say it was a little bit less than the 3 25,000. MR. GOSSAGE: Okay. 4 5 MS. GUTHRIE: Because it was also not a 6 really large project. 7 MR. GOSSAGE: Okay. So I don't know if --8 if understanding the -- you know, the amount that's 9 funded for the program and the demand helps provide 10 any context for the importance at this stage of the 11 deep dive of really drilling down and nailing down 12 some of the criteria and what not that -- you know, I think if we hit -- if we hit -- if we're at a 13 14 situation where the program is funded at 200 or 250 15 thousand, and you have a problem of more applicants than funds, but I -- historically, that's not been an 16 17 issue, so I just want to kind of throw some of those 18 numbers out there so that everyone is kind of thinking 19 with that picture in mind. 20 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Yeah. 21 MR. GOSSAGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. Thank you for 23 the input. 24 MS. GUTHRIE: So I'll go on to the -- we're 25 getting toward the end here -- the application

e-mail. Bryan Gossage has discussed the grants management system that we're moving to. And so discussing this point with the committee, we will change this process at the staff level as we move into that grants management system and have this integrated into a management system where the application and all the information is within the system that we're using for all of the other larger grants, as well. And we will just work on that at staff level.

The application requirements, this is for folks to -- who are applying, that there will be a required budget, a brief description, a legal description of the property, and then that stewardship calculation, so maps and a copy of the proposed agreement for the land, and then the tax parcel part so that we can just verify values.

The contract process, this is just getting down into how staff handles if the request is approved. I will work with the recipient to send them a contract, get that in place, giving them specific instructions along the way.

With donations, we expect these projects to move along. So they do have 60 days to sign a contract after receiving the first draft. After that,

1 the award may be withdrawn. And they have one year to 2 complete the donation. And the contract for donated 3 minigrants are not extended. That has always worked 4 well. 5 A reminder to everyone that the contract and requirements by the State of North Carolina and Clean 6 7 Water apply to this program, as they do to anything 8 else. 9 MS. CAWOOD: Right. 10 MS. GUTHRIE: We're trying to streamline 11 this fund, but we cannot let them off the hook on 12 contract requirements. CHAIRMAN KICKLER: If there are no other 13 14 questions, the recommendations come from the 15 Committee, so that means there's a motion and a 16 second. If there are no other questions, let's take a 17 vote. All those in favor of revising the Minigrant 18 Program as shown on the Donated Minigrant Program 19 revision attachment, known as Old Business 1(b), 20 please say "Aye." 21 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 22 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those --23 MR. MARTIN: Aye. 24 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. All those 25 opposed?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: The motion has carried.

We'll go through our next item, then we'll take a short, five-minute break after that. The next item is Old Business 1(c). And I believe that this is just a report and not any action --

MS. CAWOOD: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: -- is required for this.

MS. CAWOOD: At our last Board meeting, there were some questions brought up about assessing changes and project scope after the funding. We discussed this as a Committee and decided that there really weren't any changes needed to the decision matrix. It is set up in a proper way now for -- you know, there's a certain level where staff can make a decision with a change in scope, and -- or next it goes to the Chairman, and then next it goes to the Board. So there was just a reiteration from our Committee that we wanted staff to be very comfortable at any point that if something doesn't feel right to them, they can elevate it to the Chairman and elevate it to the Board, and not to be held too close to particular, you know, acreage or particular money change. But if something just did not feel right to staff, we wanted them to err on bringing it to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Chairman or to the Board so that we make sure that when it is a permanent easement, it remains a permanent easement, which has been the discussion of this board. So we just wanted to give y'all a report. We did talk about it. We did look at it. And we think that things are well stated as they are.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you.

MS. GUTHRIE: So that's it, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. If there are no other questions for Administrative Committee Chair, let's take a five-minute break and let's reconvene for the rest of our agenda.

(WHEREUPON, a short break was taken.)

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Let's reconvene. next item on the agenda is Old Business 2(a). the last full Board meeting, as you are aware, of course, the Administrative Committee met a couple The Grant Programs Committee met, also, as well. And one item that we discussed was the military scoring procedure. We've had two grant cycles now for acquisitions, two full grant cycles, just getting feedback from the community, our customers. And we thought it might be a good idea to tweak the military scoring procedure.

So the Grant Program -- before I turn it

over to Nancy to explain further, the Grant Program Committee recommendation is to award five points in the military buffer category for projects that match REPI or ACUB funds that have been committed by the Department of Defense.

These projects may be adjacent to military installations, near military installations, or protect military flyways. And that's the committee's recommendation. And Nancy will have a short presentation --

MS. GUTHRIE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: -- about the rationale behind that recommendation.

MS. GUTHRIE: Okay. So the trust fund, one of the purposes is to provide buffers around military bases or as State matching funds for the REPI, which is Readiness and Environment Protection Initiative.

And we found that's a criteria, which is also there in the center of the screen, has come from the previous criteria. It has not been changed significantly for — since the 2013 changes with the fund. But for any project that is adjacent to a military installation, it would have five points added to the score; near a military installation, three points.

And let me just give you, you know, an

example there. Something may be a priority to the military, such as the corridor between Mackall and Fort Bragg, but it won't be necessarily adjacent to one of those bases; or it may be an important training facility that is a little bit isolated, but still an important component to the military; and then to protect military flyways, and those are more of the training routes coming into Dare bombing range, for example, but it's still a good ways out.

So when the criteria was set up for Clean Water, those were the areas, the categories that made sense. But it did not take into account the priority placed by the military on projects where they are willing to commit their own funding through the REPI program.

And discussing this, the Committee felt that any time that the state is matching federal funding, even if it is not adjacent to a base, if it is near or if it was a flyway that has commitment from the Department of Defense, that that should get the full five points. And the scoring criteria should not be limited to proximity of the property.

Are there any questions on the change or the thought behind it?

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Are there any questions,

```
clarification?
1
2
                    (No response.)
3
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Well, the Grant Programs
4
         Committee has made the recommendation. No -- since
5
         they've done so, there's been a motion and a second.
         If there's no other discussion, is there -- well, if
6
7
         there's no other discussion, all those in -- all those
8
         in favor of accepting the committee recommendation,
9
         Old Business 2(a), military scoring procedure, please
10
         say "Aye."
11
                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
12
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those opposed?
13
                   MR. MARTIN: Aye.
14
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER:
                                       Thank you. All those
15
         opposed?
16
                    (No response.)
17
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER:
                                       The motion has carried.
18
                   We'll move on to the next item, Old Business
19
         2(b), the Grant Programs Committee recommendations for
20
         the stewardship endowment deposit agreement revision.
21
                   There have been some changes to this
22
                   And I'll leave it to Will to explain what
         program.
23
         those are because he's been in contact with others in
         the Treasurer's office. But the Committee
24
25
         recommendation is that the Committee moves that the
```

funds into the new investment options and adjust the allocation as follows: That the short-term investment fund be at 22 percent, the bond investment fund be at 8 percent, and the equity investment fund be at 70 percent. That is the Committee's recommendation.

And, Will, I'll turn the time over to you for a brief presentation.

MR. SUMMER: Excellent. Thank you. So as I believe you know, we -- we have our stewardship endowment invested in three funds. And we've been in these funds since 2012 when we moved away from the long-term investment fund. And that is the short-term investment fund, which is essentially like a checking or savings account. We've got some of our endowment in a long-term investment fund, such as bonds. And then we have a portion of our endowment in equities. Since 2012, we've been investing these through the Treasurer's office in, essentially, the same actively invested tools that they use for the pension.

As of this year, they contacted me and let me know that they were changing the program for their non-pension funds, which we are -- you know, we are one of, and said, we're no longer going to be available to -- those funds are no longer going to be available to us. And if we don't take action, all of

our funds will be converted into the short-term fund until we do take action.

So what they have made available to us is similar funds with similar exposure that are passively invested, sort of index funds, that are kind of, for lack of a better term, like for like. So in -- for the long -- where we used to have our long-term investment program, we now have a bond investment fund that we can move into. And for our public equity funds, we can move into what's now called the Equity Investment Fund.

As I said, the exposure is similar. But as you'll note from the chart here, the fees on these across the board tend to be much, much lower, plus it's the only option we have, other than short-term funds, so it's really move into these funds at some allocation or go all in a short-term fund, which earns roughly half a percent a year, so it's -- I think this definitely is the better option.

And with the recommendation of the Committee, with the special committee guest, Frank Bragg, the Committee has come up with the allocation that you see at the bottom of the screen, which is only slightly adjusted from where we are now.

Our current investment, or exposure, is

about 20 percent in short-term, 10 percent in the 1 2 bonds, and 70 percent in equities. And this at the --3 at the suggestion of Trustee Bragg, we slightly 4 increased the short-term investment and decreased the bond investment fund amount to what you see on the 5 6 screen. 7 There's some supporting materials in your I've got another 70 pages that the committee 8 packet. 9 was privileged enough to receive. I really won't get 10 into it. But with this recommendation, what you would 11 be authorizing is for us to enter into a new deposit 12 agreement with the Treasurer. And, as previously was 13 the case, the Chair will be the signatory for the funds, which is what we have now currently. 14 15 So with that, I'll take any questions on the 16 proposal or recommendation. 17 MR. BRAGG: Will --18 MR. SUMMER: Yes, sir. 19 MR. BRAGG: -- this is a great new change because the funds are very inexpensive because they're 20 21 passively managed. 22 My question is: With the Treasurer's 23 office, they charge to up to 15 basis points. Is 24 there a scale or are we charged according to assets as

a percentage of the total pot, which is billions of

Raleigh, North Carolina 27624-8475

25

1 dollars? How does that work? 2 MR. SUMMER: That's a good question. 3 date, they actually haven't charged us. They've --4 but that -- in our existing deposit agreement, they 5 have that same right, up to 15 basis points --MR. BRAGG: All right. 6 7 MR. SUMMER: -- but they have not charged us 8 anything -- anything for that so far, so. 9 MR. BRAGG: Don't tell them. 10 MR. SUMMER: And I asked the representative, 11 and she indicated there was no plan to change that. 12 They're just, I guess, are reserving that right in 13 case they run into costs associated with management of 14 our funds. 15 MR. BRAGG: That's great. 16 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Are there any other 17 questions for Will? 18 (No response.) 19 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All right. If there 20 aren't any, all those --21 MR. BRAGG: I will make a comment about it 22 though. You know, if you look at the numbers at the 23 bottom, when we started -- when we decided to go with 24 some equities, what year is that, about '10? 25 MR. SUMMER: 2012 is when we actually got --

1 MR. BRAGG: 2012. 2 MR. SUMMER: -- began --3 MR. BRAGG: We started about 60/40, I think, 4 60 percent equities and 40 percent split between the 5 long-term and the short-term bond portfolio. And the equities have grown for -- they're at 70 percent. So 6 7 we have a 70/30 mix, which I think is quite good, considering that we have a long horizon time frame. 8 9 And the only tweaking that was done was 10 reducing the long-term bond exposure from 10 percent 11 to eight, a mild tweak, assuming that one day the 12 Federal Reserve will raise rates and the long-term 13 bond portfolio will be hurt a little bit. So a little 14 bit shorter duration is better. That's my only 15 comment. 16 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. 17 MR. TOOLE: How much is in the stewardship 18 endowment, roughly? 19 MR. SUMMER: You know, on the presentation 20 that I've got, coming up two -- two agenda items from 21 here, I'll tell you exactly, but it is -- let's see --22 three point -- total endowment, 3.4. 23 MR. TOOLE: Okay. Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: If there are no other 25 questions, Will, or comments, all those in favor of

```
1
         the Grant Programs Committee's motion to move the
2
         funds into the new investment options and adjust the
3
         allocation as follows: Short-term investment fund at
4
         22 percent, bond investment fund at eight percent, and
5
         equity investment fund at 70 percent, all those in
         favor of this motion and second, please say "Aye."
6
7
                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
8
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those --
9
                   MR. MARTIN: Aye.
10
                                       Thank you. All those
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER:
11
         opposed?
12
                   (No response.)
13
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. The motion
14
         has carried.
15
                   We'll -- moving right along, our next agenda
16
         item, for the record, Old Business 3(a), Stewardship
17
         Program Report, which does not require an action from
18
         us, but we look forward to an update.
19
                   MR. SUMMER: Excellent. Thank you. Let me
20
         see if this -- is it going to cooperate this time,
21
         Damon?
22
                   MR. HEARNE: I've got to make that setting
23
         change again.
24
                   MR. SUMMER: Just one moment.
25
                   MR. HEARNE: There we go.
```

MR. SUMMER: All right. Thank you. So once a year you hear me throw a lot of numbers at you about our stewardship endowment and ask you to move monies around between the principal and the interest. And I thought it would be useful before I get into that just to briefly talk about what I plan to do with the money and what I am charged to do with the money so that under the next item, when I ask you to move it all around, you guys have a -- kind of a better picture of what for.

So with that, I'll give you just a few brief slides about the stewardship program and what we do with it. The stewardship program is charged with maintaining the conservation values that are protected by our easements. Right here today, we had 273 easements totally a little over 78,000 acres under our stewardship. Keep in mind that whenever we fund a project, it goes to a state agency. That's not included in these numbers because the state agency stewardship is in force, so this is just the projects that have our state-held conservation easements that are in our program.

Every site -- each of these 273 sites is monitored annually through either an MOU with our partners, or if there is money set aside in the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

endowment, a contract with the -- with the partners.

We also fund management activities that protect and improve these sites. And I'll talk a little bit more about those in a moment. It's my responsibility to address any easement issues that come up. And all of these activities are funded by the interest earned from the stewardship endowment.

So to talk a little bit more about annual monitoring. I throw that term out as if you guys have been there or seen it, but I'd like to tell you a little bit more about it. What are agents do, it's one of the two dozen land trusts that we partner with. They meet with the landowner, and discuss the restrictions of the easement, ask if anything has changed, kind of just remind the landowner that the easement is there and what its restrictions are. walk the site, look at the status of the signs and boundary markers, make sure it's all clear. And then they submit to me a monitoring report. And the monitoring report is a simple four-page form and it has about 30 or 40 questions that give me the information I need to know about our easement. often include a map showing where the monitors walk. They often include monitoring points and photo pictures, particularly if there's anything that needs

my attention. That way, I know when I get the report, here's the issues, here's what it looks like, here's where it is. And then I can go work with them and the landowner to get things straightened out.

Moving on to what we'll be asking some months forward, the projects that closed this year that have a state-held easement, we'll be moving those into the stewardship program. So that's nine projects totaling a little over 2,800 acres they're moving in this year.

So in these grant contracts, they had a total of \$149,786.50 that was set aside for the endowment. And when the contracts close each year, Nancy gives that money over to me, and I ask you to move into the -- or approve me moving it into the endowment principal.

In addition to the annual monitoring, we have management awards that we award once a year.

Now, these awards are up to \$2,500 per site per year.

The purpose of them is to protect or enhance the conservation value and the easement. I'll give you an example of that in a moment.

The decisions on these awards have been delegated to staff per Board policy. And what they really do is leverage match the funds and mostly sweat

equity from our partners so that our initial investment conservation easement can be protected and many times enhanced. So it's a good bang for our dollar.

Examples of things we would provide management awards for, and these are things we've actually done in the past. On the left, you see Little Fishing Creek, which has some issues with ATV trespass -- they're trespassing on our easement and they're using it to access the stream. And, obviously, there's a direct impact to water quality with that that we want to fix. So what we do is help the land trust put in a gate or a fence to stop that trespass.

This is an example of one that is in one of our more urban projects. There's been a lot of dumping. This is a project just in Durham that Ellerbe Creek manages. Folks are, obviously, walking on the property, dumping mattresses, and anything they have that they don't want anymore. So we've been helping them put a fence in there to prevent trespass and prevent dumping in these areas.

Other things that we fund, sometimes some of the tracts need the riparian area to be restored, so we would help them with planting native hardwoods.

1 Obviously, there's any number of different invasive 2 species issues in North Carolina. And they can be 3 removed mechanically, sometimes chemically, and we 4 would assist with getting those out so that the native 5 understory has a chance to come back and provide more of the conservation benefit that we wanted when we 6 7 protected the property. 8 So those are just a few of the examples of 9 things we have done. I have asked for proposals and I 10 received them all in May. We got 10 requests, 11 totaling 23,000. Five of them are to improve gate, 12 fencing or barriers to prevent trespass. Two of those 13 are to remove invasives. One is to replant native hardwoods. One is to improve boundary marking. And 14 15 another one is to rehabilitate some erosion that was 16 on an existing logging road that just hadn't been 17 properly seeded and provided with erosion control 18 devices. 19 So with that, that's the entirety of the 20 stewardship program report. 21 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Do you have any questions 22 for Will regarding the report? 23 (No response.) 24 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: If not, we'll move on. 25 The next item of business, which is Old Business 3(b),

Raleigh, North Carolina 27624-8475

of course, this did not come out of a committee, but this is something that we deal with on an annual basis, so I'll turn the time over to Will to tell us a little bit more about this written request.

MR. SUMMER: Sure. Thank you very much. So as we've already touched on today, we have a deposit agreement with the Treasurer's office. And that is the mechanism we use to deposit and withdraw funds to our endowment.

while I manage the stewardship program, the endowment -- the deposit agreement, per the Board's request, has to be signed by the Chair at the request of the Board. So each year I request and let you folks know what -- how our endowment fund is doing and then request for you to move specific dollar amounts in and out of the endowment as needed to run the program. So let me talk to you about that.

This is the last page of your agenda, if you want to follow along in -- on that or you can look at the screen. And this is the top half of that last page.

So what we have here are three blocks, and each of these blocks represents the three different types of investments that we currently have. So on the top line of the first one, I've got lines running

down the left-hand side, so we can kind of all get on the same page quickly.

Line one is for the long-term investment fund. And this is what we had at the beginning of last year, going across the first row.

On July 1st last year, I made a deposit into the principal and a withdrawal from the interest. And these lines show the net interest and an unrealized gain or loss.

And the -- at the bottom column, you see the total principal. These two make up the total interest. And there's the total value. And at the end, this is the percentage of the fund balance. So this -- this is how it sits today. Obviously, when we move into the funds, it's going to be readjusted slightly.

I would like to point out -- so this is repeated for each of our three funds. We'll go down to the bottom and just show you that lines 18 and 19, if you recall this time last year, what I requested that you deposit into the principal is \$103,589, which is, in fact, exactly what happened. And this is what I requested that you withdraw from the interest so that I could run the program for this last fiscal year.

Line 20 and 21, I think, are the most important on this slide. The total interest earned fiscal year to date, as of the April 30th statement, is actually in the negative. So in the grand scheme, we did lose some money on interest. I think that was — that was in the equity fund.

However, our total interest earned since we've been in this fund -- this is the current value minus what we've set aside specifically as principal -- is \$739,000 and change. So despite the fact that there was a debt this year, overall, we are very well situated to take this year's expenses out of the interest and still leave gracious plenty behind to continue earning interest.

So scrolling down to the bottom half of that page, as we've already discussed, here's the current fund balance and our old asset allocation range, again, this was made sort of moot by our previous item and action, but this is -- line 25 begins with where we are in the stewardship program.

So the current cash reserves, this is what I have unencumbered in my program now, is \$41,235.03.

The stewardship contracts that I need to do all the monitoring for next year will cost \$110,618.72. And the management funds, if staff elects to fund all of

them at the request, would cost up to \$23,100.

So, as proposed, the amount that I need to withdraw from the endowment to meet this next fiscal year's needs is \$92,483.69, which we will round up to \$92,484.00 because the Treasurer's office will not deposit pennies.

So, in addition to that, per the nine projects that we closed this year, that have money that needs to go into the principal of the endowment to earn interest to steward these new projects, the total of that is \$149,786.50. So these are the two, kind of, important numbers with respect to the action that I would request of the Board.

Kind of just a summary of points, the endowment did have negative returns, but due to several strong years prior to this, the interest is still well more than adequate to cover necessary costs. The balance between the fund types is well within the range established per the old deposit agreement. And \$92,484 is what we need out of interest. And \$149,787 is what we need to put in to the principal.

So with that, I'll take any questions. And, as written here, the Board actions I'm requesting on behalf of stewardship endowment.

1	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you, Will. Are
2	there any questions for Will?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Well, if there are no
5	questions for and if you could bear with me, for
6	clarity's sake and for the record's sake, we'll go
7	through each one of these motions here.
8	Is there a motion to approve the staff
9	recommendation to allocate up to \$23,100 for
10	stewardship management awards?
11	MS. KUMOR: So moved.
12	MS. CAWOOD: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Trustee Kumor made a
14	motion. Trustee Cawood seconded it.
15	MR. SUMMER: I'm sorry, please go ahead with
16	the motion. I do need to make a correction on point
17	number two though.
18	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay. But not number
19	one?
20	MR. SUMMER: No, sir. I'm sorry.
21	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay. If there's no
22	discussion, all those in favor, please say "Aye."
23	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
24	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those opposed?
25	(No response.)

1	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: The motion has carried.
2	The Board has approved the staff recommendation to
3	allocate up to \$23,100 for the stewardship management
4	awards.
5	So, Will, what do you have for us?
6	MR. SUMMER: I'm sorry, I'm checking. I, in
7	fact, do not need to make a change. My apologies. I
8	was getting ahead of myself. Everything is good.
9	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: So nothing on number
10	three either?
11	MR. SUMMER: No, it's good. Everything is
12	good.
13	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All right.
14	MR. SUMMER: Nothing needs correction.
15	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay, excellent. Is
16	there a motion to approve the staff recommendation to
17	allocate \$110,619 for stewardship monitoring
18	contracts?
19	MR. BRAGG: So moved.
20	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Trustee Bragg makes a
21	motion.
22	MS. KUMOR: Second.
23	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Trustee Kumor makes a
24	second. If there's no discussion or questions or
25	comments, all those in favor, please say "Aye."

1	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
2	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those opposed?
3	
	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: The motion has carried.
5	Thank you for bearing with me.
6	Let's go to number three. Is there a motion
7	to approve the staff recommendation to deposit
8	\$149,787 to the endowment principal and withdraw
9	\$92,484 in interest to fund the program expenses?
10	MR. VINES: Make that motion.
11	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Trustee Vines makes a
12	motion. Second? Is there a second?
13	MR. BRAGG: Second.
14	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Trustee Bragg makes a
15	second. Assuming that there are no question or
16	comments
17	MR. GOSSAGE: Can we have it noted that
18	that's to fund the program expenses for the current
19	the upcoming year?
20	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: For the
21	MR. GOSSAGE: Can the motion reflect that?
22	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Yes, I guess we can make
23	that.
24	MR. GOSSAGE: Okay. Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Is there a motion to

1 amend -- upcoming year? 2 MR. GOSSAGE: If the -- if the motion will 3 just reflect that, that will be sufficient. 4 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Okay. Let the motion --5 let the record show that the motion reflects -- let the record show that this motion is up to the upcoming 6 7 year. Okay. We have a motion and a second. All 8 those in favor, say "Aye." 9 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye. 10 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those opposed? 11 (No response.) 12 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: The motion has carried, 13 up to the upcoming year. 14 All right. We'll move to new business, 15 which will be Will Summer telling us a presentation 16 about our learning opportunities. 17 MR. SUMMER: Thank you very much. 18 first, Trustee Martin, the presentation I've given the 19 rest of the trustees today is too big to e-mail at the 20 moment, but I will be sure to get it to you when I 21 return to Raleigh. I apologize for you not being able 22 to see what I've got to discuss with you. 23 MR. MARTIN: Don't worry about it. I just 24 hate that I can't walk with you guys this afternoon. 25 MR. SUMMER: It's a beautiful day.

Raleigh, North Carolina 27624-8475

All right. So in anticipation of our visits for stream restoration sites tomorrow, in addition to kind of giving an overview specific to those sites, I thought I would take a few moments of your time to also back up and do a little overview on stream restoration as a whole, and what we get out of the project, the benefits, a little bit about the practice, just to give everyone who's not in this every single day as a profession a little more background.

So with that, I'll talk a little bit about our program. Since our beginning, we have funded 219 stream restoration projects, totaling 111 million dollars, and a little over 838,000 feet -- linear feet of stream restored. And this map depicts the distribution of these projects across the state.

So we'll go back to fundamentals here, a stream is a system composed of the following: You've got the channel, which is the little part where the water is; you've got the flood plan, which is everything that is on either side, usually the flat, broad areas in a functioning stream the water reaches generally, annually, if not more; you've got the water, obviously; you've got the sediment in the stream and flowing through; plants on the side and in

the stream; and, of course, the critters.

So, kind of, starting from the beginning, I want to talk about what causes a stream to need restoration. Why aren't -- I mean, these are natural systems. Why do they need our intervention to get back on track? There's a couple reasons -- a couple causes of this, the most significant, particularly in urban and suburban areas, is land use changes in the watershed.

And on the right you've got your kind of typical forest. I'll start with the rain. So as the rain is coming, the first thing it hits is leaves and trees, so a certain percentage of rainfall never even makes it to the ground. It sticks on the leaves. It evaporates from the leaves. There's a little bit siphoned off right there. What does make it to the ground hit leaves. The same thing, it hits the leaves, a little bit of it is stuck there. It, eventually, will evaporate. It gets through the leaves into the soil there.

There's a very important difference between a native forest soil and urban soils. An intact soil actually has a lower bulk density. That is, in a forest soil, roughly 50 percent of it is air, so it gets voids that, basically, water can soak into. In

addition, those voids are very well connected in forest soils. They haven't been compacted and smashed down and sealed off. The opposite is true of soil that's had heavy equipment or vehicles run across it.

So right from the get-go, water that does make it down to the soil, instead of running across the top of it, it soaks right in and some of it goes into long groundwater storage and some of it will actually get to the stream the long way, down through the soil, weaving around little particles for hours, months and -- days and months.

In a parking lot, none of that is true. So the soil (sic) hits the pavement, maybe a couple hundredths of an inch is instantly evaporated because it's so hot. Maybe another couple hundredths of an inch gets in the teeny, tiny cracks in the pavement, but everything else goes shooting across the top of it right into a stream.

So when you change the watershed from what's on the left to the right, it really impacts the amount and the timing of water that gets to your stream.

So this is a picture of stream restoration that we'll actually see tomorrow. This is recently restored, so it hasn't had the vegetation. But I want you to note between the time it starts raining and

this much water appears in this small stream is one hour. Actually, I'll play it again, but the time stamp on the bottom, it starts raining at 3:30, and by 4:30 this stream is -- and everything you see is completely underwater.

And this is, actually, one of the visits tomorrow. This is right in Huntersville, so just -- just like that. That's -- that's the kind of stream response that you would see in an urban or suburban watershed that you wouldn't see in a forested watershed. So that's a pretty big different in what happens to the stream.

Other impacts that can change the stream are impacts to the vegetation, you know, additionally providing shade and leaves and other inputs. The deep-rooted vegetation holds on to the soil. And when you remove it, and we have something that's shallower, like grass, it just doesn't do as good a job at keeping the banks stable. So you can impact a stream that way.

This one has always amused me. Sometimes streams need restored because we have intentionally changed them very drastically. You know, very common in older days is to -- you know, if you've got a stream meandering across your property, is just to

move it over to one side, so you've got a nice, clean, straight piece of land that you can farm or put houses on.

And this is a publication from 1935 put out by the good people at DuPont, who happen to manufacture dynamite. But, you know, this -- this is just a -- kind of a snapshot of how thinking has changed on streams in the last 80 years.

Now, the unintended consequences of straightening a stream could be that you put it on the path to further destabilize and further channelize, a you get loss of habitat. So you've straightened it, which is one impact, but it kind of puts it on a self-destructive course to kind of build on that, as well. Well, so what? I mean, the streams are impacted. We can see that. What is it that we need to do that -- or why -- why do we justify the improvement? Why spend the money? I can see that it's different, but let's talk about that.

So why is what's on the left better than what's on the right? Obviously, it's more aesthetically pleasing. And I would like to make one note because I'm going to use pictures from this restoration quite a bit.

This is a young restoration, which is why

the woody vegetation has not grown up. And I chose those pictures because it's easier to see what's going on. You know, five years from now, these -- the trees will be larger and be shading the stream, so this is not -- this is not the ideal on the left. It is year two of what will be ideal. But if I use the year seven, we wouldn't be able to see anything, so I wanted to make that caveat.

So what's on the left is more stable.

There's less bank failure. There's less sediment

being delivered downstream, less tree loss. And you

can see in the picture on the right, as the banks

fail, the trees that depend on -- or that are on the

banks are going to start falling in, as well.

There's more connection to the floodplain.

That means more storage of floodwaters during rain events. You can kind of envision the channel on the right, if you had a certain quantity of water moving down that, it's going to be going very fast and getting down to the next town downstream or the next property downstream quickly. And in the piedmont and the mountains, that -- that is a flooding issue.

On the right, that same amount of water going through the channel on -- I'm sorry, on the left-hand side, is going to get up and have access to

a wide floodplain, which means the water slows down, which already has it less -- gives it less energy to move sediment to begin with. So, you know, these deep channels, when the water is -- is deep and flowing fast, it has more ability to move sediment.

Why also is it better? There's more habitat for critters. So what's on the right is kind of all one depth, all one width, all -- it's fairly homogenous. There's not a lot of other things in there for pools and ripples and runs. The one on the left has more interstitial spaces, which is just a fancy word for nooks and crannies. And critters like nooks and crannies. More leaf maximum and wood debris, all things -- all things that small critters need. So, you know, May flies in this habitat, trout need May flies, and trout are important, to me anyway and Damon.

So, you know, the critters and the habitat are -- you know, they're at the base of the food chain. And it goes all the way up and affects those of us that like fish.

So the primary goal of a stream restoration is stable banks, improved habitat and cleaner water.

You know, that's -- that's a big nexus there. So looking at the things that I told you that a stream

consists of, I mean, we kind of want to look at what things we might hope to change in a restoration, which things are out of our control.

So the channel, we can certainly get in there with a trackhoe and move the channel around and shape and sculpt it and get the dimensions that we think it needs.

The floodplain requires even more moving of dirt, but we can do it. We can get in there with dozers and front-end loaders and move sediment or move dirt to make a floodplain. The water we don't have any control over. That comes to us from upstream. That really is whatever the watershed delivers to the point of the upstream restoration is what we get, so we can't change the water.

Sediments, it's kind of half and half. I mean, sediment, like water, is delivered into the system from upstream. But what we do in the reach of a restoration can affect the sediment that we are contributing to the stream.

Plants, we can certainly manipulate the plants by planting what we choose in these restorations. And the critters, that's something that we generally don't -- we don't try to grow bugs or fish and dump them into the streams. We let -- if

we've done the other things right, and the habitat is there, and the water is clean, the critters have legs and wings and fins and they will find the stream again once it's suitable to their living. So these are the things we want to do.

How to reconnect the stream with a floodplain? If that's important to the stream functioning well, how do we physically do that? And the -- the terms in stream restoration are a couple.

The priority one, which I will describe now, is to raise the channel up to the existing volume. So in the picture on the left, you can see the floodplain is way up here and the stream is six feet below it.

If we want to get the stream closer to the floodplain so it can access it when a heavy rain comes, we're going to literally move the stream up by filling in the old channel and creating a new channel that's right on the surface. And this is what we see in the left. This is actually before and after, same stream. So they filled in the old channel and they've made a channel that you can see is going to get out into that broad, open floodplain much more -- much more quickly.

And, as I said earlier, that does a lot for you. If you can imagine a volume of water moving down on the left, it's going to be going very fast. It's

going to be picking up sediment and pushing it down the stream. It's going to be further eroding the banks.

And on the right, the same amount of water, instead of being six feet and 10 feet per second, it's going to be two feet deep and three feet per second. And, you know, if you've ever tried to hose off your patio with a -- the hose, you know that whether or not it will move there off the patio is a function of how hard the water sprays. So you put your thumb over the end of the hose and you can move the dirt that the water coming out of the hose without the added pressure would do.

And, you know, hydrolic engineers would call that tractive force, which just means the faster the water is and the deeper the water is, the more sediment it can pick up and move. So the system we've engineered on the right is going to be slower and shallower when it gets to flood stage.

So another way to do this in certain situations is a priority two. Instead of bringing the stream up to the floodplain, we're going to go in there with heavy equipment, and this dirt that these folks are standing on, we're going to actually drop it down, in this case, three or four feet. So we'll

bring the floodplain down to the stream. It does the same thing. The stream is connected to the floodplain. When it gets up a little bit, it can get out over its banks, slow down, drop out sediment, drop out pollutants, just dissipate a lot of energy that could otherwise would be destructive, as well as just store a lot of water upstream so it's not all shooting downstream and compiling the flooding problems that you have down there.

And this is a before and after on the same stream. And what they've done is just moved truckloads and truckloads of sediment offsite so that now the stream has a lot of floodplain to get into.

And you would do this in cases -- it depends on the site constraints, but you can't always elevate the stream six feet because of what might be on either end of it. I mean, you don't have the same from top to bottom. You might only have one or 2,000 feet that you can play with. And at the end of the stream, it has to line up with what's down there, likewise at the upstream end. So, you know, you choose this depending on your site constrains.

Priority three, it's kind of like a priority two. You're going to bring the floodplain down to the level of the stream. You're not going to move the

level of the stream at all. However, in this scenario, you don't quite have as much floodplain as you would like. So it would be disingenuous to say this was all the floodplain that you really wanted for this stream. It needs more, but in urban -- some urban areas -- I believe this may be one at NC State or like one at NC State. You take what you can get. And this is still better than doing nothing at all. It gives you half as much flood storage, but, you know, the stream can get out, access some floodplain, remove some of its energy, drop some of the sediment and pollutants, and still provide quite a lot of benefit.

So these are the -- kind of the three classifications of, you know, conventional stream restoration. You may or may not hear that when we talk about our projects. The applicants may describe this or they may just simply refer to generically a stream restoration. But when someone says "stream restoration," they're talking about one of these three things, for our purposes on our funds.

Now, there may be cases where you either have too many constraints to do a stream restoration; you can't bring the stream up to floodplain; you can't bring the floodplain down to the stream; you simply

don't have the real estate. However, you've got a situation like this on the left where that, obviously, isn't good.

So you can do some enhancement. Or sometimes bank stabilization generally costs much less on the whole picture; it has less benefits. But you can certainly see that this situation is much preferable to this situation in terms of the sediment that that's going to deliver. Even though I would argue, you probably don't have any more floodplain connection or really much more flood capacity than what's been done here, but you've addressed a major sedimentation problem in this.

Here's another one. I believe this is Mount Airy, Ararat River. You can imagine how much sediment this bank is putting into the stream every year. Yeah, it's quite a bit. So, you know, what they would do is kind of sculpt this back, give it the kind of slope that it could sustain and withstand the floods without washing away each year.

So we've move a lot of dirt around to create the system that we want to create. But if dirt won the battle of the soil, we wouldn't have any of this conversation. Water wins against soil every time. It just does. It's got too much power. So we've got to

Raleigh, North Carolina 27624-8475

do some more things to keep this channel that we've just built stable and at roughly the same shape that we think is the best design for it. And this is where end-stream structures come in.

So end-stream structures do a couple of things. They provide stream bank protection. They provide habitat enhancement. So below this particular structure, there's going to be some shaded habitat under the log. There's going to be a deeper area to pool at the bottom of it. It provides grade control, which is a fancy engineer way of saying bed elevation.

So, you know, at this point right here, we've got rocks that will keep the stream bed. If it was, say, eroding, it would stop right there. We've got a hard structure that is going to set, but the elevation of the stream right here is not going to go down. It can't because there's a hard surface there. So structures are important for maintaining grade control. And by keeping the channel within its dimensions, it ensures that what sediment does come into the system from above is able to move through the system and not clog it up and cause other -- other issues.

So I'd like to talk about a few of these that you'll see. This is a boulder cross vane. The

way it works is there's these two walls that work on either side and they are slanted slightly downstream. As you go downstream, they get a little higher. So as the water comes down, it hits these and rolls into the middle of the channel, and that protects the left bank and the right bank simultaneously by keeping the water concentrated in the middle of the stream where it's supposed to be and that saves your banks. And, as well, there's -- just under the water, there's large boulders that go right across the middle, at the orange arrow, that, again, set that bed elevation so you can control the level of the water by installing one of these devices.

This is a boulder J-hook vane. It's, essentially, like a half of a cross vane. And what this does is sort of the same sort of thing, but only for half the river. So you put this on the outside of a bend where, normally, water is moving faster, it's moving with more force and you always get these erosional issues on the outside of the bend. Well, this J-hook vane, again, as the water runs up against it on the slope, it kind of folds itself back into the middle of the river and it protects the outer bank. It keeps the stresses of the stream from eroding that outer bank.

This is a long J-hook vane, exact same design, just different material. It does the same thing. You tend to see these in smaller streams and used preferentially when there is more trees than quarries around.

So here's an example of, you know, a really -- kind of nasty outside bend with probably an eight to ten-foot bank that is subject to erosion, as you can see. And it's hard to see, but each of these yellow arrows is a log vane. And what it is designed to do, again, is to keep stress off of that outer bank so that this can vegetate and stabilize and you won't have this continuing issue that you had prior.

Some other structures are constructed riffles. You know, a riffle is just kind of a narrow, shallow, rocky area, where you lose elevation.

Another important thing of this and all of the structures that we talked about is they dissipate energy. So if you think of a 10-foot waterfall, at the bottom of that waterfall, you can imagine how much force that water has. When the water falls, the higher it falls, the more force it has when it gets to the bottom.

So if you took a 10-foot waterfall, and instead of having it hit all at once, broke it up into

(919) 676-1502

tiny, little six-foot drops, you've dissipated that energy without doing damage. And that's an important part of nearly all these features is that they remove the elevation in small steps and reduce the energy without -- without the damage.

Here's riffles with log steps, the same sort of thing. We see the log steps there and the riffles. This energy is kind of safely dissipated without -- without damaging the stream.

And, finally, the last layer of this that you're going to use to hold this in place is plants. You want woody vegetation that has deep roots. This picture is only separated by six months, so you can see it really -- this was a really good one. It really took off. And you can imagine in just a few short years, this will have very mature riparian vegetation. And it already looks great and quite stable.

So having given you a little bit of background on stream restoration, I want to talk a little bit about the projects we're going to see tomorrow morning.

The first tour stop is McDowell and Torrence Creeks. I want to grab the number that I had written down. So on McDowell and Torrence combined, we have

GARRETT REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

funded, since 2002, about 1.8 million in the various streams we'll see tomorrow. It's, roughly, seven or eight projects. It's quite a lot. But we've done a lot in these creeks and I think to a lot of benefit.

This is the area of the restorations. As you can see, it's a very developed area. There's all neighborhoods and a shopping center, not a lot of open land, forested land in this little watershed here.

This is a before picture of McDowell Creek, so that when we're out there tomorrow you folks can appreciate what a change it's been. You can see it's variant in size. It's a very deep channel. It's got very steep banks. I doubt that it gets out onto that floodplain very often at all. Here's another before picture, sort of similar situation.

Here's a before and after. And I've kind of got the yellow lines in there showing you the profile of the stream. So on the left, you can see the before picture. It's very steep. It's very variant in size. In the after picture, you can see that it's a much shallower stream. It, obviously, has a much better chance of getting out onto the floodplain, spreading out, slowing down, dropping its pollutants, dropping its sediment, and just not tearing itself up.

Here's another before and after, kind of a

similar -- similar structure. You can see how homogenous the stream is on the left. And there's not a lot of variation or habitat or even substrate for critters to hold on to. I mean, you can imagine, that's all sand and silt. Every time it rains, everything moves. And if you're a small critter who depends on holding on to something to stay in place, you get flushed out of the system every time it rains in an area like this. So there's a lot more diversity in the bed forms and diversity in habitat in the restored version. And, again, this is shortly after restoration, so the trees are probably, you know, months to maybe a year old. It's going to be much -- significantly taller as the time goes by. And we will see some mature restoration tomorrow, as well.

So David Woodie with Mecklenburg County sent me this slide, as well as some of these pictures. And he just this week got back from a stream restoration conference in Texas. And this was lifted right off his summary slide, but I think there's a lot of really interesting things here that I'd like to highlight.

So they've been working in this watershed for quite a while. They've done about seven percent of the stream in the watershed, which, as a whole, is not -- I mean, there's still 93 percent that hasn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

been restored. But, obviously, they focused on the areas that needed the most work, and -- and they've improved their flooding conditions, and seen a 20 to 25 percent sediment load reduction at the cove. Now, that's the cove at the lake. So at the lake, there's that much less sediment getting in from these streams. And I think that's really something to talk about because as you may or may not know, from the second you put a dam on a lake, it becomes a sediment trap. When the water slows down, it drops its sand first, then its silt and its clay, and every -- you know, 99 percent of all the sediment that goes into a lake does not leave over the dam. What comes out over the dam is largely clear water. And these things that we depend for our drinking water supply lose their capacity over time. And every one of these things has a finite life span. And when you can start, you know, reducing sediment that goes in, your drinking water supply just lasts that many more years longer. And I think it's a really tremendous benefit that they've seen.

And another point that he made is that from one of their publications, they found it is three times cheaper to remove a pound of sediment through stream restoration than the most cost-effective

1 alternative B&P that they've found. So I thought that 2 was really a -- a really interesting point that he had 3 made. So --4 MR. BRAGG: Will? 5 MR. SUMMER: Yes, sir. 6 MR. BRAGG: You know, I might add, since 7 we're talking about Mecklenburg County, that McDowell 8 Creeks jumps into Mountain Island Lake right where the 9 city of Charlotte draws its water, so that's why this 10 is such an important project. 11 MR. SUMMER: That's an excellent point. 12 our second tour stop tomorrow is Little Sugar Creek 13 Greenway down in Charlotte. This is an aerial photo. 14 This is kind of a current. And you can see there --15 and there she is right there. Now, these are some 16 before and afters. And I think all the ones I'm going 17 to show you before are roughly 2002 and the afters are 18 2012. 19 What I didn't show you, in talking about 20 stream restoration types, is daylighting. I'm getting 21 ahead of myself here. 22 So as you can see on the left, the stream, 23 itself, is buried under a parking lot and underground, 24 and it gets -- you know, every foot of stream that you

restore there and bring back to daylight is a foot of

Raleigh, North Carolina 27624-8475

25

stream did not exist effectively at all. So you can see on the right-hand side, all that stream has been created, you know, from underneath parking lots. And that's not a cheap thing to do either.

Here's another before picture, again. The blue line on the left is where the stream is, or my best guess at it, underneath all of these buildings and parking lots. And on the left you can see Little Sugar Creek, as well as the greenway along the right-hand side.

Again, let's see if we can find it. My little blue line should show up here in a minute. There we go. Just a stark difference in the before and the after on this. So this is kind of the wholesale view of it. It went from something that was under a parking lot, under a mall, that no one really thought of or knew of, and as you'll see when we go to this greenway tomorrow, it is a well-loved greenway. And this thing that people didn't know existed, wouldn't have thought twice about, it's now a destination. People are running here. When we go to these store fronts that are along the greenway, they're facing the greenway. That's not the back of their store. That's the front of their establishment, which I think is just — it's just a remarkable

turnaround for these urban streams. And, you know, urban streams, they've kind of been beat up and they take a lot of love to get back to this point. But, you know, with the help of Clean Water -- and over the years, we've put, I think, 2.8 million into Little Sugar Creek through all of its many phases of restoration. And Charlotte and Mecklenburg put in much more. It's really -- you know, they've turned something into what I think is a real resource and a destination for folks.

So let me just talk to you a minute or two about logistics, and then I will be -- I will be done. So the third and fourth pages of your Board map have addresses, as well as maps that you can use to get to where we need to go. But on the first stop, we're going to meet at Earth Fare. And there's an address and some simple directions in there.

Mecklenburg County has a 15-passenger van for us because there's so many stops, as you can see from all the red arrows along this tour. We're going to try to get into one van, maybe one van and a vehicle, but this will allow us to drive to all these places and not having, kind of, parking nightmares when we get there. So we'll do this circuit in the morning. I think we'll meet onsite at nine, if I'm

correct on the agenda, and then get in the van. And then for the second site, we will be getting back into our own cars and just parking and walking.

So site number two, again, there's directions and an address for the parking deck in your packet. And at the first site, I'm going to get a printout of this picture to hand out to folks, just so they know how to walk from the parking deck. There's a parking deck located at the corner of Charlottetowne and Kings Street. And from the parking deck, just walk right behind the Wendy's and we're going to meet right over here. There's the greenway. There's Little Sugar Creek. We're going to meet right here at this little greenway roundabout sort of feature.

At the second spot, we'll walk along the greenway, see some of Little Sugar. And then right down here there's a restaurant called The Hickory

Tavern where Hailey has made some reservations for the folks that want to stay for lunch along the greenway.

And those that don't, I anticipate we'll be done around 12 or 12:15 or so. And I think that is all that I've got to say about logistics.

Since we are here at Lake Norman, there's some nice things to see here. There's a few trails that lead -- leave right from this end of the

1 building. There's a nice paved walking trail that's 2 very short on this section, as well as a slightly 3 longer dirt trail for folks that are inclined to enjoy 4 the weather and see a little bit. 5 And aside from that, let me just put my phone number up on the board for folks to write down. 6 7 In case you get lost at any point tomorrow, you can 8 get in touch with me. And with that, I will turn it 9 back over to Dr. Kickler. Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you, Will. 11 looks like an eventful Friday morning. If you have 12 any questions for Will regarding logistics, please ask 13 him after our meeting is over with. Are there any -- excluding the logistics for 14 15 the trip tomorrow, are there any comments or questions 16 that any Board member has at this time? 17 MR. TOOLE: Will, what can you say is the 18 success and failure rate of these stream restoration 19 projects? 20 I'll have to get an engineer to MR. SUMMER: 21 tell you whether or not it succeeded or failed, but 22 MR. TOOLE: And I'm sure that's a big 23 question, you know, what's the success. 24 MR. SUMMER: So, certainly, the science has 25 evolved quite a big since -- I mean, this was in its

Raleigh, North Carolina 27624-8475

infancy in the late '90s. And, really, North Carolina was one of the states, because of the -- what was a Wetland Restoration Program, then Ecosystem Enhancement Program, now DMS, and Clean Water, we kind of helped figure out and guide the science to figure out what works and doesn't work.

Now I would say of the ones that we've funded, I am aware of one that Larry and I were just working on, having the contractor go back in and repair. But aside from that, we don't have a lot of total failures. You know, one structure out of 10 may have an issue, but by and large, I've never seen anything go back to anything near like it was before restoration. So I, honestly, can't put a number on it, but it is — today it's quite good.

MR. TOOLE: Do we have enough experience here to know whether there's, like, maintenance required. I'm thinking like --

MR. SUMMER: So they're designed to be self-sustaining. And that's what the designers are trying to do. And in order to get that, what they do is they go and find what they call a reference stream, which is a stream that is as it should be, and they build to that floodplain dimension, that channel depth. I mean, they kind of put it on a curve. There is not

meant to be maintenance on these things.

MR. BRAGG: Will --

MR. SUMMER: Yes, sir.

MR. BRAGG: -- the piedmont was pretty much devastated, by according to this, the channel of these creeks. I mean, almost every creek in Mecklenburg County, including the one I'm thinking that we're going to see tomorrow, was channeled, which meant they just dug it out and made a ditch, straightened it, piled all the dirt on the sides. It looks like there ought to be a restitution of the Federal government. I'm serious. The creek where I live has been channeled and it's just a disaster. After 60 years, you would think it could reclaim, but it can't.

MR. SUMMER: Well, once it gets channelized, it only hurts itself more. Now, in the long term, I will tell you the way that this works. A stream gets very channelized and it starts — the banks start failing, and the stream starts to build back up. Eventually, that narrow channel, from years of bank failure — I mean, the water is going to get its floodplain back, but it's going to take hundreds of years. And in the process, all of that sediment is going to end up in our lake.

MR. BRAGG: Yeah.

MR. SUMMER: So what we're doing is skipping ahead 200 years and keeping untold millions of tons of sediment -- we put it where we want to. We put it back on the landscape. We don't dump it in the reservoir.

MR. BRAGG: And tomorrow, I mean, if we had an extra 15 minutes, right past McDowell Creek there is a creek in this county that was not channeled called Gar Creek. And it's absolutely beautiful. And Clean Water has funded many projects along Gar Creek because it dumps into the lake close to McDowell, right down at Mountain Island Lake and Latta Plantation Park. But it's lovely. I mean, and that's the way the creeks used to be. But, anyway, Clean Water did fund a lot of protection along that creek, too.

MR. GOSSAGE: And there are a couple things that I would add. You know, we're always trying to explain why this is important. And Will, when he touched on -- you know, he had the photo there with the fishermen and the trout. I did a radio interview with NPR a year or so ago and made the same point. I got a lot of positive feedback on that, right, you know, trout love clean water; but so do we.

And so there's a cost that's associated with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

all of that sediment going down in the stream to where a city, a municipality, has to clean out that water before it can be turned into clean drinking water. So it's -- you know, yes, there's an impact, maybe on a dam, but there's -- there's sometimes a real cost to actually cleaning out that water so that it's suitable for drinking.

And the other one that he, you know, touched on here a moment ago in terms of once that stream that should look like this starts to go like this, then it goes like this, and it starts to eat away at the banks. And the next thing you know, you have a farm use that -- you know, an agriculture use, or whatever it is that might be there, where that bank has eroded and pushed itself into that area that now you can't use. So there is -- there may be a productivity issue. So there's an economic impact from that or some sort of a land use impact from that stream bank that has pushed itself in. And my understanding is there's also, maybe, some tax implications there, too, where someone is still getting taxed on property that they no longer have control over because of how that stream has eroded.

So there are some -- you know, some other issues that go along with this that once you start

explaining to people, here's why this is important, it just makes them aware of things that they've never really thought.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Are there any other comments? I'm sure we can continue this at dinner or on the site trips tomorrow. But if there aren't any --

MR. MARTIN: This is Johnny. I just -- I don't know if you guys can hear me. Can you guys hear me?

MR. GOSSAGE: We can.

CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah. So, you know, just given the conversation, I think Will did a great job. But, you know, just given my engineering background, I do want to say how important these projects are, and just to kind of jump on with what Frank was saying. You know, I started my engineering career about 20 years ago with Dr. Rooney Malcom at State. And it was kind the tail end, but -- and we were taught back in that time to get the water down as quickly as possible. So it's really only been within the last 15 years that the mindset has changed to do this. So, you know, I'm really happy that we are continuing to do these projects that, you know, help to kind of keep the

sediment in place and sort of dissipate the energy.

You know, there was a question made about do these help, you know, what's the failure rate is.

And, you know, I would just say, from an engineering perspective, is that -- and Will kind of got into this, too -- that when we have adequate space to put in these floodplains as -- you know, with the amount of the water that pass -- that's going to go through them, they are more susceptible.

Where we -- where we have our challenges is in urban settings where the -- where we have tighter spaces to work within. And, you know, it's always sort of a -- you know, a weighing of how much can we get people to give up on easements to fit as much as we can in.

So, you know, I think it's still a relatively new way, you know, of doing this, so we're continuing to learn. But, you know, I think that we're getting better every day at it, you know, dissipating structures, things of this nature to try to get these things to work even in urban settings.

But, you know, I think the scientific basis by these -- about these projects is very solid. And, you know, just wanted to add that to the -- all that information for everybody.

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. All those --
2
         well, is there a motion to adjourn?
                   MS. CAWOOD: So moved.
 3
4
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you --
5
                   MR. GOSSAGE: You're ready to go.
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: -- Trustee Cawood.
6
7
         there a second?
8
                   MR. BRAGG: Second.
9
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Second. Now, again, I
10
         continue -- I encourage you to continue the
11
         conversation after the meeting at the site visits
12
         tomorrow. Thank you for a protective Board meeting.
13
         We have a motion and a second to adjourn. All those
14
         in favor to adjourn, say "Aye."
15
                   BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
16
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those opposed?
17
                   MR. MARTIN: Aye.
18
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: All those opposed?
19
                   (No response.)
20
                   CHAIRMAN KICKLER: Thank you. We are
21
         adjourned.
22
                       (Meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.)
23
24
25
```

Raleigh, North Carolina 27624-8475

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY - COURT REPORTER

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF CABARRUS
)

I, Heather L. Smith, Notary Public in and for the above county and state, do hereby certify that the foregoing CLEAN WATER MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING was taken before me at the time and place hereinbefore set forth and was duly recorded by me by means of Stenomask, 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.

I further certify that I am neither of counsel to this agency or interested in the event of this agency.

This 24th day of June, 2016.

Heather L. Smith, Court Reporter Notary Public, Cabarrus County, North Carolina Notary Number: 19932170009