NC BEACH AND INLET MANAGEMENT PLAN
INTERNAL NCDENR WORKING GROUP MEETING
Sept 11, 2008
9:00 – 11:30 am
NC State University McKimmon Center
Raleigh, NC

ATTENDEES

Ms. Susan Cameron, NCWRC
Ms. Ann Deaton, DMF
Mr. Darren England, DWR
Mr. Jim Gregson, DCM
Mr. Jeff Harbour, Environmental Services Inc.
Ms. Julia Harrell, NCDENR-GIS
Mr. Johnny Martin, Moffatt & Nichol
Mr. Ken Richardson, DCM
Mr. Jeff Shelden, Moffatt & Nichol
Mr. John Sutherland, DWR
Dr. Ken Taylor, Land Resources (NC Geological Survey)
Dr. Paul Tschirky, Moffatt & Nichol
Mr. Steve Underwood, DCM

MEETING SUMMARY

John Sutherland and Steve Underwood opened the meeting at 9:15 and welcomed the attendees. Introductions were made around the room. Johnny Martin provided an overview of the meeting based on the agenda.

Johnny Martin then described the status of Moffatt & Nichol's efforts on the BIMP contract. Martin identified the project team (M&N, Environmental Services, Geodynamics, Dr. Bill Cleary for coastal geology, and Dr. Chris Dumas for socio-economics). Martin reviewed the legislative mandate to develop a beach management plan as well as the CHPP directive to prepare a comprehensive beach and inlet management plan to address fisheries habitat protection. Martin reviewed the M&N project work plan (data ID and acquisition, define beach and inlet mgmt regions, develop preliminary beach and inlet mgmt strategies, hold stakeholder meetings, and develop draft and final plan).

Martin introduced Paul Tschirky from M&N who spoke about spatial coastal data and the development of a GIS platform and database. Tschirky summarized the detailed activities that went into the first service of the work plan (data ID and acquisition). Datasets that have been acquired include beach profiles, USGS erosion rate data, sea level rise data, wave data, storm surge / flood data (ADCIRC models updating those data), and tidal data as well as a history of dredging / navigation maintenance and beach nourishment projects along with locations and histories of temporary and permanent coastal structures. Tschirky also reviewed the socioeconomic data that can be used to

quantify the determination of assigning values to beaches. Values can be classified by beach business economic output, beach property value, inlet and waterway use, and nature preservation value.

Tschirky introduced Jeff Harbour from Environmental Services Inc. (ESI) who was sub-contracted to work with M&N on the BIMP contract. Harbour talked about the identification and acquisition of data on ecological habitats. These data primarily focused on the six habitats identified by the CHPP: 1) water column, 2) shell bottom, 3) submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV), 4) wetlands, 5) soft bottom, and 6) hard bottom. In addition, Harbour's group is also collecting information on endangered and threatened species found in NC such as the five marine sea turtles found in NC, manatees, shortnose sturgeon, and birds (wood stork, piping plover, roseate tern).

Martin resumed his presentation on the BIMP project by discussing how the management regions were defined (numerous datasets were used such as geologic features, developed/undeveloped reaches, and erosion/accretion patterns). Four regions were identified (SC to Cape Fear, Cape Fear to Cape Lookout, Cape Lookout to Cape Hatteras, and Cape Hatters to VA). Region 1 (SC to Cape Fear) was not subdivided into subregions but the rest of the regions were. Region 2 (Cape Fear to Cape Lookout) was divided into three subregions (2a, 2b, 2c), Region 3 (Cape Lookout to Cape Hatteras) was subdivided into two subregions (3a and 3b), and Region 4 (Cape Hatteras to VA) was divided into three subregions (4a, 4b, 4c). After showing images of each of the regions and subregions and explaining why the boundaries were placed where they were, Martin reviewed the general criteria to be used in the development of draft management strategies. First the strategies must be allowable-within the State's current coastal policies. Then the draft strategies for each of the sub-regions will be based upon knowledge of local sediment movement, vulnerability, socioeconomic issues, likelihood of sustainable shoreline management, possibility of federal funding (past, present and future), and local environmental issues and constraints (strategies to be compatible with CHPP to maximum extent practicable). The suite of alternative strategies will be physics based, environmentally responsible, politically viable, and financially feasible. Funding strategies will also be incorporated into the strategy alternatives.

Martin stated that stakeholder meetings would be occurring concurrently over the next 3-4 months with the development of beach and inlet management strategies. Two meetings will be held in each management region defined earlier as well as a central meeting (perhaps in Raleigh). The first set of meetings will take place in Oct/Nov and the second set in Jan/Feb. The final report will be finished by April 2009.

Comments and questions were taken from the working group participants:

- Dr. Ken Taylor remarked that nor'easters should be considered in addition to hurricanes since these storms can greatly impact sediment movement and may have different cycles than hurricane events.
- Discussion with respect to sand sources occurred as to where there is potential and whether the existing data was clear with respect to the difference between

where no suitable sand was available and where there were just no studies done and hence no information one way or the other.

- For nourishment strategies, the intervals are important and must be considered with ecological impacts.
- Counties will have to update hazard mitigation plans by 2010 (FEMA).
- Julia Harrell questioned the interface of the BIMP data with existing state databases. Other agencies are not going to be using eCoastal. Ken Richardson said it was only the intent of the BIMP to put coastal data in eCoastal so that easy interface with the USACE could occur as the Corps is the main coastal data collector.
- Dr. Taylor asked about the comfort level with the policy of erosion rates and the metadata associated with data sets. Steve Underwood replied that these rates receive vetting through the science panel.

Sutherland led a wrap-up discussion and noted that there would opportunity for the working group to attend the public meetings for the BIMP project (one of which is likely to take place in Raleigh).

The meeting was closed at 11:40 pm.