

# **APPENDIX IV**

## **SUMMARY OF BASINWIDE PLANNING WORKSHOP**

**June 2, 1994**

**NCSU Mountain Horticultural  
Crops Research and Extension Center  
Fletcher, NC**



# North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & LIFE SCIENCES

Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering • Box 7625 • Raleigh, NC 27695-7625 • Tel: (919) 515-2675 • FAX: (919) 515-6772

PHONE: (919) 515-6795

June 10, 1994

To Participants in the June 2 French Broad Basinwide Planning Workshop:

Thank you for participating in the June 2 French Broad Basinwide Planning Workshop in Fletcher. The French Broad Basinwide Water Quality Management Plan being developed by the North Carolina Division of Environmental Management will affect all residents of the French Broad, Pigeon, and Nolichucky River Basins. Your input is necessary to make this program successful in meeting its water quality protection goals.

Attached is a summary of the June 2 Workshop. Participants identified many issues and recommended actions to address these issues. Some of these recommendations require state action, but many require that local governments and citizens become involved in managing water resources.

The next step in the Basinwide Planning process is development of the Draft Management Plan. The Division of Environmental Management will send you a copy of the Draft Management Plan's Executive Summary to review when it is available. A full Draft Management Plan will be sent to you upon request. A series of public meetings will be conducted in the French Broad River Basin to receive public comment on the Plan this Fall.

Thank you again for participating in the Workshop. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Gregory D. Jennings, Ph.D.  
Extension Specialist

cc: Alan Clark, NC Division of Environmental Management  
Paula Thomas, NC League of Municipalities

Employment and program opportunities are offered to all people regardless of race, color, national origin, sex, age or handicap.  
North Carolina State University, North Carolina A&T State University, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and local governments cooperating.

# French Broad Basinwide Planning Workshop Summary

Prepared by Greg Jennings, Extension Specialist  
North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, North Carolina State University

The French Broad Basinwide Planning Workshop was conducted June 2, 1994, at the NCSU Mountain Horticultural Crops Research and Extension Center in Fletcher with 108 participants representing the following interests:

17 County Government	13 City Government	6 Regional Agencies
15 State Agencies	5 Federal Agencies	13 Business / Industry
11 Farmers / Landowners	14 Private Organizations	14 Cooperative Extension Service

## Workshop Objectives:

1. Describe local implications of the French Broad Basinwide Water Quality Management Plan; and
2. Increase public involvement in developing and implementing the French Broad Basinwide Plan.

## Workshop Agenda:

- 9:00 Introduction and Video Presentation - Greg Jennings, CES - NCSU
- 9:30 Description of DEM Basinwide Water Quality Management Program and Implications for the French Broad River Basin - Alan Clark, DEM
- 10:30 Discussion Groups to Answer: "Based on your knowledge of water quality in the French Broad River Basin, what are the key issues and how should they be addressed?"
- 11:15 Presentations by Discussion Group Facilitators
- 11:45 Summary of Discussion Group Comments and Wrap-up - Frank Humenik, CES - NCSU

Workshop participants were randomly divided into 6 discussion groups to respond to the question: "Based on your knowledge of water quality in the French Broad River Basin, what are the key issues and how should they be addressed?" Facilitators summarized key issues and recommended actions in 5-minute presentations to Workshop participants.

## Priority Issues Identified by Two or More Discussion Groups:

- Agricultural pollution sources
- Point sources of pollution
- Development and land use planning
- Drinking water protection
- Education and public involvement
- Sedimentation
- Recreation impacts on water

## Recommended Actions Identified by Two or More Discussion Groups:

- Increase public education and involvement
- Increase technical and financial assistance for nonpoint sources, including agriculture
- Develop land use plans considering environmental and economic impacts
- Increase DEM resources for monitoring and enforcement
- Improve communications and coordination among all parties involved with water quality
- Emphasize practical, simplified regulations to meet water quality goals
- Support new technologies for preventing and remediating pollution

Below are summarized the priority issues and recommended actions of the 6 discussion groups:

**Group 1 Priority Issues (Facilitator: Kenneth Reeves, CES - Buncombe County):**

1. Agriculture
2. Development
3. Drinking water protection
4. Public policy education
5. Point sources

**Group 1 Recommended Actions:**

1. Implement buffers with compensation to landowner for non-use of land near streams
2. Increase enforcement for development and point sources
3. Increase public education:
  - Agricultural BMPs
  - Public policy education for local officials
  - Responsible development
4. Use available data to evaluate sources of drinking water
5. Implement realistic regulations

**Group 2 Priority Issues (Facilitator: Jim Ray, CES - Yancey):**

1. Agriculture:
  - How to reduce runoff?
  - Need for technical assistance
2. Recreation uses - need for clean streams
3. Cost-benefit relationships for taxpayers
4. Need for studies to support regulatory efforts
5. Private property rights

**Group 2 Recommended Actions:**

1. Increase enforcement of point sources
2. Increase technical & financial assistance to reduce nonpoint sources
3. Address urban development & residential nonpoint sources (e.g. pesticides)
4. Provide guidance for developers in methods of reducing sedimentation
5. Increase education & public involvement

**Group 3 Priority Issues (Facilitator: Jeff Owen, CES - Avery County):**

1. Sedimentation from construction & development
2. Education & Public involvement
3. Regulatory enforcement
4. Identification and prioritization of pollution sources and water quality impacts
5. Pesticides
6. Drinking water protection
7. Recreation impacts

### **Group 3 Recommended Actions:**

1. Increase local involvement in identifying and prioritizing problems
2. Improve communications among competing groups
3. Increase education on solutions (e.g. soil conservation, buffers)
4. Implement a community stream watch program with a hotline for reporting problems
5. Conduct a risk analysis and inform the public of water quality concerns
6. Use incentives & disincentives for protecting water quality (consider profitability)
7. Use ethical, unbiased permitting process
8. Promote scientific basis for water quality protection instead of perception basis

### **Group 4 Issues (Facilitator: Steve West, CES - Haywood County):**

1. Agriculture including timber production & logging
2. Public education on water issues & existing initiatives
3. Development and landscaping impacts
4. Sediment and erosion control
5. Nonpoint source control:
  - nutrient management
  - golf courses
  - waste
  - dumping

### **Group 4 Recommended Actions:**

1. Implement major education programs:
  - Workshops
  - Schools
  - Promote interagency understanding
2. Recognize and reward positive efforts concerning water quality
3. Develop and evaluate realistic proactive regulations addressing all segments of society
4. Clarify roles of all governmental agencies

### **Group 5 Issues (Facilitator: Greg Jennings, CES - NCSU):**

1. Development and land use planning
2. Agriculture: Pesticides, Sediment, Animal waste
3. Residential & recreation impacts
4. Community awareness & education
5. Watershed protection for water supplies (addressing point and nonpoint sources)
6. Pigeon River restoration
7. Sedimentation

### **Group 5 Recommended Actions:**

1. Increase technical assistance, cost-share, and enforcement for agricultural problems
2. Education and public awareness of problems, policies, and time frames for solutions:
  - Schools
  - Watershed residents affected by permit changes
3. Protect drinking water supplies through increased watershed protection and water testing

4. Develop a comprehensive land use plan:
  - Evaluation impacts of development
  - Basinwide zoning
  - Identify and regulate nonpoint source impacts
  - Implement long-term public remediation plans
  - Consider public transportation
  - Regulate storm water in smaller communities
  - Reduce government regulation
5. Pigeon River restoration:
  - Force Champion Mill to eliminate chlorine bleaching & meet color standards
  - Require independent testing of industrial discharge quality
  - Require new technology for cleanup of industrial discharge problems

**Group 6 Issues (Facilitator: Frank Humenik, CES - NCSU):**

1. Point sources: Municipal & industrial discharges
2. Development
3. Urban runoff
4. Animal waste

**Group 6 Recommended Actions:**

1. Increase DEM field resources to support regulatory enforcement
2. Consolidate individual waste treatment systems to improve effectiveness
3. Implement land use planning with environmental impact assessment
4. Increase education and public awareness of problems and solutions
5. Develop and implement new technologies and BMPs
6. Simplify rules
7. Consider 3 sub-basins independently
8. Conduct more workshops in the interim as the basinwide plan is being developed