

UNRBA Implementation Steering Committee December 18, 2006 Meeting Summary

Prepared December 19, 2006

UNRBA mission: To preserve and protect the water quality in the Upper Neuse River Basin through innovative, cost effective and environmentally sound strategies and to create a coalition of local governments and stakeholders in a water resources partnership.

Introductions and Meeting Objectives

The Implementation Steering Committee (ISC) of the Upper Neuse River Basin Association (UNRBA) met at 1:30 p.m. on Monday, December 18, 2006 in the Triangle J Council of Governments conference room.

Meeting agenda:

- ISC Role and Topics to Tackle
- Implementation Process & Tools
- UNRBA Internal Communication
- Processes for TAC Nonagreement
- Next ISC Meeting & Homework

Meeting attendees are listed below.

Name	Organization	E-mail address
Nancy Newell	City of Durham, Water Management	nancy.newell@durhamnc.gov
Barry Baker	Granville County, Planning	planning@granvillecounty.org
George Rogers	City of Raleigh, Public Utilities	george.rogers@ci.raleigh.nc.us
Tommy Craven	City of Raleigh, City Council	tfcraven@nc.rr.com
Melinda Clark	Wake County, Environmental Services	melinda.clark@co.wake.nc.us
Pat Young	Franklin County, Planning Dept.	pyoung@co.franklin.nc.us
Sarah Bruce	Upper Neuse River Basin Association	sbruce@tjcog.org
Shelby Powell	Kerr-Tar Council of Governments	spowell@kerrtarcog.org
Chris Dreps	Upper Neuse River Basin Association	dreps@tjcog.org

ISC Role

Chris Dreps briefly discussed the ISC's role: to be an independent committee to address implementation issues that are beyond the scope or interest of the Board or TAC by making recommendations to them and staff as appropriate. Chris emphasized that the Board and TAC will continue to communicate directly on technical issues and policy decisions.

The ISC will discuss internal communication, internal education & empowerment, external education and communication, prioritizing management strategies, and local government implementation and cooperation. No topics were added to this list at this meeting.

Implementation Planning Process and Tools

Chris Dreps reminded the group that Sarah had given them a copy of Implementation Planning Terminology for their review. No one had any questions or comments. Chris said the document was online at the Management Plan webpage (<http://www.unrba.org/mgmtplan.htm>) and would be updated as needed.

Chris then went over the Implementation Planning Process and Timeline. The Timeline was given as a handout:

Implementation Planning Timeline

DRAFT 12/18/06

Task/Step	2007												2008		
	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR
Draft and approve recommendation sheets	█	█	█	█											
Create LMSR template	█	█	█	█											
Determine Focus Areas for each strategy	█	█	█	█											
Analyze Focus Areas wrt LG boundaries			█	█	█										
Fill out LMSRs						█									
Translate LMSR results into data						█	█	█							
Overlay LMSR results with Focus Areas							█	█							
Write Gap Analysis								█	█						
Determine priorities											█				
Communicate Implementation Priorities to local boards												█			
Determine currently feasible alternatives and action steps												█	█		
Determine action steps for alternatives not currently feasible													█	█	
Write, review, and adopt plan													█	█	█

The process and timeline generated a considerable amount of discussion, which is loosely transcribed below:

- When the recommendation sheets are completed, there should be some significant announcement or other indication of the significance of this accomplishment. For example, we could compile recommendation sheets into a binder and give one to each Board member. This could also be a good opportunity to get Board backing for the Local Management Strategy Reviews, which will require some local staff efforts to complete in a timely manner.
- We need a feedback opportunity between completing recommendation sheets and adopting plan.
- This schedule is tight and should not slip.

- Steps in timeline/process need concrete & clear definitions.
- Show this timeline and descriptions of each task at the January Board meeting
- Ask Board for some directives on how rigidly timeline should be followed.
- Get Board to support/commit to/endorse strategies and also to prioritizing them.
- Get buy-in and feedback on the strategies from the local boards before we complete the process and ask them to implement.
- Make periodic reports on implementation planning to local boards.
- Be wary of using too much implementation jargon; e.g., present plan in terms of water quality improvements.
- Balance regional goals with local buy-in and implementation.
- Stress cross-watershed benefits of implementation. Use examples of situations where members have benefited when other members implement strategies or when members implement Upper Neuse strategies in other basins (such as Tar-Pamlico).
- Information on watershed management needs (e.g., Focus Areas, the Gap Analysis) should be presented to the local boards as well as the UNRBA Board. (This is an opportunity to ask for feedback; we shouldn't "show up with a baked cake.")
- Information on priorities and needs should be given to the local governments before late 2007, as some area already in the process of budgeting for the coming fiscal years and there are not many budget cycles before the Nutrient Management Strategy.

In general, the questions of when to ask the UNRBA Board and the local boards to commit to action arose again and again. The group discussed also what KIND of commitments we should expect. Sarah mentioned that "agreement in principle" may be the best we can hope for when it comes to "adoption" of the Implementation Plan.

The group also discussed involving the UNRBA Board in this discussion. Specifically, we will ask the Board

- What information (needs/costs/benefits) they want to see, and when
- What information (needs/costs/benefits) they want local boards to get, and when

Chris proposed walking through a Local Management Strategy Review for a particular strategy to increase the Board's understanding of the process. The ISC thought this would be a valuable exercise.

Process(es) for Technical Advisory Committee Nonagreement

Chris reported that the TAC's concerns about feasibility and/or capacity to implement strategies were preventing the group from agreeing to forward recommendation sheets to the Board for approval. Because the TAC needs a vehicle for expressing these concerns, the ISC decided to recommend that the TAC members with concerns each write a statement, 50 words or less, on their concerns. Statements should be specific (what is it about the strategy that concerns the person) and not technical in nature (technical concerns should be addressed by

recommendation sheet reviewers and/or the TAC). UNRBA staff will share this recommendation with the TAC and George Rogers will report it to the TAC at the January 29 meeting.

Sarah said that she would put the statements into the body of the email that accompanies the recommendation sheet when it is emailed to the Board for approval. The ISC also suggested posting the statements on the internet along with the recommendation sheet.

Next ISC Meeting & Homework

Chris Dreps gave out a one-page handout on the Five-Finger Scale method for consensus decision-making and asked ISC members to review it before the next meeting. Sarah Bruce proposes that the ISC use this method for its own internal decision-making.

The ISC decided not to extend ISC meetings to two-and-a-half hours.

Sarah Bruce will solicit dates for the next ISC meeting for mid-February from the group via email.

The group decided that the topic of the next meeting should be internal communication and a continuation of the discussion on when to involve the UNRBA Board and when to involve local boards in Implementation Planning.