

1 MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
2 OF THE EMERALD ISLE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
3 THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 2004 - 6:00 PM – TOWN HALL
4
5

6 Present for the meeting were Mayor Art Schools, Commissioners Nita Hedreen,
7 Robert Isenhour, Floyd Messer, Pat McElraft, and John Wootten. Others
8 present were Town Manager Frank Rush, and Town Clerk Rhonda Ferebee.
9

10 Also in attendance were representatives from Coastal Planning & Engineering,
11 Tom Jarrett, Erin Haight, Craig Kruempel, and Tom Campbell.
12

13 **3. PRESENTATION – STATUS OF BOGUE INLET CHANNEL EROSION**
14 **RESPONSE/WESTERN PHASE NOURISHMENT PROJECT**
15

16
17 Mayor Schools welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Tom Jarrett
18 with Coastal Planning & Engineering.
19

20 The staff of Coastal Planning & Engineering gave a PowerPoint presentation of
21 the status of the Bogue Inlet Channel Erosion Response Project. **(A copy of**
22 **this report is attached and incorporated into these minutes).** The following
23 is the outline of topics discussed for the Board:
24

25 Presentation Outline
26

- 27 a. Introduction of Coastal Planning & Engineering Team
- 28 b. Contract Scope and Compensation
- 29 c. Work Completed to Date
- 30 d. Review of Preliminary Project Design/Issues
- 31 e. Remaining Work/Project Schedule
- 32 f. Review of Project Budget
- 33 g. The Future of Bogue Inlet
34
35

36 Mr. Jarrett explained that the purpose of the meeting tonight was aimed at
37 bringing the new Board of Commissioners up-to-date on the status of the Bogue
38 Inlet Channel Erosion Response Project. Mr. Jarrett introduced others with
39 Coastal Planning & Engineering involved with this particular project for Emerald
40 Isle beginning with their President and Founder Tom Campbell, Craig Kruempel,
41 and Erin Haight all from the Boca Raton office.
42
43
44
45
46

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE EMERALD ISLE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JANUARY 15, 2004
Page 2 of 4

1
2 Mr. Jarrett noted the key dates and events beginning in May of 2002 when
3 Coastal Planning & Engineering was selected by the Town. He said they met in
4 August of 2002 with the State and Corps to review the EIS preparation. It was at
5 that time that the Town decided rather than try to go the Environmental
6 Assessment route, knowing the input from the resource agencies at the May
7 meeting, they decided they wanted to pursue a full Environmental Impact
8 Statement. He noted that decision was driven primarily by the experience that
9 New Hanover County had with the Mason Inlet Project, and the demands that
10 were put on New Hanover to respond to environmental and engineering
11 concerns associated with that particular project. He continued to list other key
12 dates and events up to December 26, 2003 which was the close of public
13 comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

14
15 Mr. Jarrett noted the tasks completed as follows:

- 16
17
- 18 • Engineering, Geological, and Geomorphic Report – April 2003
 - 19 • Draft Biological Assessment – July 2003
 - 20 • Final Essential Fish Habitat Analysis – September 2003 (included in DEIS)
 - 21 • Revised Cumulative Effects Assessment to Corps – October 2003
(included in DEIS)
 - 22 • Draft EIS released for public review and comment – November 7, 2003.
- 23

24 Mr. Jarrett noted that we are still moving along on a schedule that still has the
25 Town obtaining a Corps and State permit in August of 2004.

26
27 Mr. Jarrett noted the remaining tasks as follows:

- 28
- 29 • February 19, 2004 – Submit revised EIS to Corps and State for review
 - 30 • March 11-12, 2004 – Meeting with Corps and State to review comments
 - 31 • March 25, 2004 – Corps releases revised FEIS for public review and
32 comment.
 - 33 • May 23, 2004 – Corps publishes Record of Decision
 - 34 • August 8, 2004 – State issues CAMA permit.
 - 35 • August 28, 2004 – Corps issues permit
 - 36 • August 29, 2004 – Advertise project for construction
 - 37 • November 15, 2004 to February 21, 2005 – Construction period
- 38

39 Mr. Jarrett gave a brief summary of contract details as follows:

- 40
- 41 • Original contract amount - \$385,700
 - 42 • Contract amount revised in January 2003 to include pre-project
43 environmental monitoring identified by PDT – Amount of contract
44 modification - \$105,000

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE EMERALD ISLE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JANUARY 15, 2004
Page 3 of 4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

- Contract amount revised in May 2003 to include added CPE cost (\$170,000) and additional habitat mapping and ground truth (\$101,400) identified by PDT.
- Added CPE costs due to project coordination, environmental tasks, and project design.

Mr. Jarrett outlined the Plan Formulation which included the following:

- Problem Identification
- Geotechnical Analysis
- Channel Design
- Alternative

The following environmental impacts for the preferred alternative were listed as follows:

- Apart from physical changes, environmental impacts predicted to be minimal.
- Only identified direct impact would be the net loss of shallow bottom habitat due to channel construction and dike construction.
- Existing channel expected to fill over 4 to 5 years replacing shallow bottom habitat.
- Town will be required to monitor project impacts and mitigate if project related impacts identified.

Mr. Jarrett, introduced Erin Haight, Lead Project Scientist with Coastal Planning & Engineering.

Ms. Haight described in great detail to the Board the biological monitoring requirements (bird, salt marsh, and macroinvertebrates/Infauna), schedules, and commitments for the Town of Emerald Isle Bogue Inlet Channel Erosion Response Project. **(A copy of the Proposed Monitoring/Mitigation Plan including an estimate of probable cost is attached and incorporated into these minutes.)**

Town Manager Frank Rush discussed with the Board the Proposed Monitoring/Mitigation Plan, most specifically the last page, the Estimate of Probable Cost. He said this spread sheet outlined timelines and costs associated with what they project the monitoring requirement will be for the next five years. He noted the bottom line of project cost was \$468,000. There is currently a total available budget for monitoring of \$200,000, which means we are \$268,000 short right now. He added that this doesn't include some of the

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF
THE EMERALD ISLE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JANUARY 15, 2004

Page 4 of 4

1 things being covered by the County Shore Protection Officer, for example the
2 beach profile surveys that are done, as well as the turtle monitoring. Mr. Rush
3 said that fortunately the Environmental Impact Statement does not predict any
4 negative impact on the resources so they feel confident that it will not become an
5 issue but he wanted the Board to be aware that there is the potential risk should
6 something different occur than what is predicted by the EIS.

7
8 Mr. Rush advised the Board that there was some additional consideration being
9 given by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the North Carolina
10 Wildlife Resources Commission regarding the bird management plan and also
11 possibly replacing some of this monitoring noted on this sheet with some
12 research done by UNC-W or some other research institutions, so it is still a work
13 in progress. He thought this would probably be finalized in the permit conditions
14 from the Corps and the Division of Coastal Management.

15
16 Mr. Rush pointed out to the Board regarding the Bird Management Plan, the
17 basic concept that has been discussed is delineating an area on the spit that
18 would be protected, and designated as a bird habitat. He said this would
19 probably be marked by ropes or signs informing the public about the sensitive
20 bird habitat in that area, and there would be some type of enforcement action
21 associated with that. He said the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission
22 and the Fish and Wildlife Service were currently working a proposal to
23 accomplish some of the management goals out there.

24
25 Mr. Rush advised the Board that the total construction budget was \$4,150,000
26 which is for the mobilization of the dredge, the demobilization and also the
27 pumping costs. He added that Mr. Jarret believed that the figures used in
28 calculating this budget were reasonable.

29
30 There was a short question and answer/Board comment session following Mr.
31 Jarrett's presentation.

32
33 ***Mayor Schools called for adjournment at 8:10 p.m.***

34
35 Respectfully submitted:

36
37
38
39 Rhonda C. Ferebee
40 Town Clerk
41
42
43
44
45