

**NORTH CAROLINA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA
TELECONFERENCE
AGENDA**

BUSINESS SESSION

Archdale Building
Room 1106-Z
512 N. Salisbury St.
Raleigh, NC 27604
August 23, 2013

Adobe Connect Pro Link: https://agr.ncgovconnect.com/dswc_swcc_082313/

Conference Number: (919) 662-4657

8:00 a.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The State Government Ethics Act mandates that at the beginning of any meeting the Chair remind all the members of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest and inquire as to whether any member knows of any conflict of interest or potential conflict with respect to matters to come before the Commission. If any member knows of a conflict of interest or potential conflict, please state so at this time.

II. PRELIMINARY - Business Meeting

August 23, 2013

Welcome

1. Approval of agenda Chair Vicky Porter

- ~~2. Consent Agenda~~
 - A. ~~Nomination of supervisors~~ ~~Ms. Kristina Fischer~~
 - Postpone until next meeting
 - B. ~~Supervisor contracts~~ ~~Ms. Kelly Ibrahim~~
 - C. ~~Job approval authority~~ ~~Ms. Natalie Woolard~~
 - Postpone until next meeting

3. Technical Assistance Allocation Ms. Julie Henshaw

4. Agriculture Cost Share Program Ms. Kelly Ibrahim
 - A. Detailed Implementation Plan
 - B. ~~Spot Check Report~~
 - Postpone until next meeting
 - C. Financial Assistance Allocation

5. Community Conservation Assistance Program Mr. Tom Hill
 - A. Detailed Implementation Plan
 - B. ~~Spot Check Report~~

- Postpone until next meeting

C. Financial Assistance Allocation

6. Agricultural Water Resources Assistance Program

A. ~~Spot Check Report~~

- Postpone until next meeting

B. ~~Financial Assistance Allocation Guidance~~

Ms. Julie Henshaw

III. ADJOURNMENT



**NORTH CAROLINA
SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION
COMMISSION TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
August 23, 2013**

Room 1106Z
Archdale Building
512 N. Salisbury Street
Raleigh, NC

Commission Members	Others Present	
Vicky Porter, Chairwoman	Pat Harris	Will Mann
Craig Frazier, Vice Chairman	David Williams	Michelle Lovejoy
Charles Hughes	Kelly Ibrahim	Linda Birdsong
Bill Yarborough	Julie Henshaw	James Murray
Donald Heath	Tom Hill	Teresa Furr
Tommy Houser	Natalie Woolard	Daniel McClellan
John Langdon	Dr. Richard Reich	Chris Childers
	Rob Baldwin	Cyd Overby
Commission Counsel	Kim Livingston	Mark Byrd
Phillip Reynolds	Chester Lowder	Dick Fowler
	Eric Pare	Kristina Fischer
	Anne Coan	Jonathon Wallin
	Mike Bowman	

Chairwoman Vicky Porter called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m. She charged the commission members to declare any conflict of interest, or appearance of conflict of interest, that may exist for agenda items under consideration, as mandated by the State Ethics Act. Commissioner John Langdon noted a conflict with agenda item 2B. No other conflicts were noted.

Chairwoman Porter welcomed everyone to the teleconference. She introduced Phillips Reynolds with the N.C. Attorney General’s Office who was serving as counsel to the commission for this meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chairwoman Porter reviewed the agenda. Commissioner Craig Frazier moved to amend the agenda by making the following changes:

- Item #2A - postpone until the next regularly scheduled meeting
- Item #2C - postpone until the next regularly scheduled meeting
- Item #2B - remove from consent agenda
- Item #2 - remove the consent agenda
- Item #4B - postpone until the next regularly scheduled meeting
- Item #5B - postpone until the next regularly scheduled meeting
- Item #6A - postpone until the next regularly scheduled meeting
- Item #6B – remove from agenda

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bill Yarborough. Motion carried.

2. SUPERVISOR CONTRACTS

Agriculture Cost Share Program Manager Kelly Ibrahim presented for approval, contract #51-2014-001 for a grade stabilization structure at a cost of \$3,712 for Johnston district supervisor and commission member John Langdon. Commissioner Yarborough moved to approve the contract. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tommy Houser. Motion carried. Commissioner Langdon recused himself from voting. The contract will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Agriculture for final approval per General Statute 139.

3. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ALLOCATION

NPS Section Chief Julie Henshaw presented the division's recommendation for technical assistance allocations.

Commissioner Frazier moved to approve the technical assistance allocation recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Langdon. Motion carried. Attachment 3, *Technical Assistance Allocation*, is attached and made an official part of the minutes.

4. (A) ACSP DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (DIP)

Ms. Ibrahim presented the draft ACSP Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) for PY2014. The proposed PY2014 DIP contained no changes from the PY2013 DIP.

Commissioner Langdon moved to approve the PY2014 DIP. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Donald Heath. Motion carried. Attachment 4A, *Agriculture Cost Share Program Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP), Program Year 2014*, is attached and made an official part of the minutes.

4. (C) ACSP FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ALLOCATION

Ms. Ibrahim presented the ACSP Financial Assistance Allocation recommendations. She noted on page 2 the PY2014 management flexibility reduction of \$18,000, transfer of \$50,000 of regular cost share funds to CREP Earmark, and transfer of \$500,000 of regular cost share funds to Impaired/Impacted Streams Initiative Earmark which is a lower amount when compared to last year.

Commissioner Heath moved to approve the ACSP Financial Assistance Allocation recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Houser. Motion carried. Attachment 4C, *Allocation of 2014 ACSP Financial Assistance Funds*, is attached and made an official part of the minutes.

5. (A) CCAP DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (DIP)

Community Conservation Assistance Program Coordinator Tom Hill presented the draft CCAP Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) for PY2014. The proposed PY2014 DIP contained no changes from the PY2013 DIP.

Commissioner Heath moved to approve the PY2014 DIP. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Yarborough. Motion carried. Attachment 5A, *Community Conservation Assistance Program Detailed Implementation Plan, Program Year 2014*, is attached and made an official part of the minutes.

5. (C) CCAP FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ALLOCATION

Mr. Hill presented the CCAP Financial Assistance Allocation recommendations. He noted that 74 conservation districts were requesting funds.

Commissioner Yarborough voiced concern about the small CCAP allocation amounts and asked staff if consideration was given to larger, higher quality projects even though funding of more expensive projects would result in a lower number of districts receiving an annual allocation. Mr. Hill explained that a rule change would be needed since the current program rules ensure each district requesting funds would receive a minimal allocation making it impossible to fund larger projects. Commissioner Yarborough suggested the commission should host a future work session to review the CCAP rules.

Commissioner Frazier moved to approve the CCAP Financial Assistance Allocation recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Yarborough. Motion carried. Attachment 5C, *Draft PY2014 Community Conservation Assistance Program Allocation*, is attached and made an official part of the minutes.

Chairwoman Porter directed the CCAP Advisory Committee to review the existing rules and to put together a set of recommendations for commission consideration to strengthen the program's impact. Discussion followed. It was noted that approximately 40% of the CCAP allocations roll over each year and the Clean Water Management Trust Fund would no longer fund stormwater projects due to recently passed legislation.

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Frazier requested the commission schedule a work session to discuss financial assistance allocation guidance for the Agricultural Water Resources Assistance Program (AgWRAP). He felt the present teleconference format did not allow for the in-depth discussion needed to fully address guidelines for AgWRAP's \$500,000 statewide recurring funding and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) settlement funding of \$500,000 for the next two years. After discussion, Chairwoman Porter scheduled a special commission work session for Friday, August 30, 2013, 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon, at the Koury Center in Greensboro, N.C. Commissioner Frazier agreed to secure the meeting space and would confirm with Director Pat Harris who, in return, would distribute the information through the meeting notice process.

With no further business, Chairwoman Porter declared the meeting adjourned at 8:55 a.m.



Patricia K. Harris, Director
Recording Secretary
Division of Soil & Water Conservation

These minutes were approved by the North Carolina Soil & Water Conservation Commission on October 1, 2013.



Patricia K. Harris, Director

ATTACHMENT 2B

**NCACSP Supervisor Contracts
Soil and Water Conservation Commission**

County	Contract Number	Supervisor Name	BMP	Contract Amount	Comments
Johnston	51-2014-001	John Langdon	Grade Stabilization Structure	\$ 3,712	SWCC member

Total Number of Supervisor Contracts: 1
 Total \$ 3,712

**ADDENDUM TO APPLICATION FOR ASSISTANCE
NORTH CAROLINA COMMISSION COST SHARE PROGRAMS**

As a Soil & Water Conservation Commission Member, I have applied for or stand to benefit* from a contract under the commission's cost share programs. I did not vote on the approval, or denial, of the application, or attempt to influence the outcome of any action on the application. The proposed contract is for the installation of the following best management practices to improve water quality or water resources.

Program: *NCA CSP*

Best management practice: *Grade Control Structure*

Contract number: *51-2014-001-09* Contract Amount: *\$ 3,712*

Score on priority ranking sheet: *100*

Cost share rate: % If different than 75%, please list percent:
Reason:

Relative rank (e.g., ranked 8th out of 12 projects considered): *# 1 out of 4*

Were any higher or equally ranked contracts denied? *No*

If yes, give an explanation as to why the commission member's contract was approved over the other contracts:

Commission member name:

Thomas Lydon

(Commission member's signature)

8-9-13

Date

Approved by:

Douglas Lea Vice-Chair

(District Chairperson's signature)

8-13-13

Date

The Soil & Water Commission has approved the subject application for a contract.

(SWCC Chairperson's signature)
(Pursuant G.S. 139-8(b)(2))

Date

Approved by:

(Commissioner of Agriculture)
(Pursuant G.S. 139-4(e)(2))

Date

*Beneficiaries include but are not limited to applicant, landowner, and/or business partners.

Technical Assistance Allocation

The draft PY2014 technical assistance allocation is enclosed for consideration. The allocation was developed to be consistent with how technical assistance allocations have been made in previous years using the following guidelines:

- Salary and benefits capped at \$25,500.
- No increase in salary and benefits for any position.
- Neuse-Tar Pamlico district employees funded at 50% cost-share and 50% grant sources. *This is the last year grant funds will be available for these positions.*
- Dare and New Hanover funding is split between ACSP and CCAP.
- Two new positions in Caldwell and Harnett Counties. Both counties are hopeful to hire in January, so only 0.5 of a position is included for these districts in the budget worksheet.
- Using carry forward from last year and funding generated from grants, each FTE can receive \$1,083 in operating support this year. This is a decrease from last year's funding amount of \$1,175 for operating expenses.
- Continues to support the second position in Edgecombe as non-recurring, this position was placed in non-recurring status in PY2012.

Attached is the budget worksheet with the proposed allocations.

PY 2014 Technical Assistance

PY2013 allocation with \$25,500 cap on S/B imposed; No increase in S/B;
\$1,083 per FTE operating expenses, Neuse-Tar = 50/50, Dare/New Hanover
 split ACSP/CCAP; fund 2nd position in Edgecombe as non-recurring

DISTRICT	PY 2013 S/B Budget	PY 2014 S/B Requested	PY 2014 Operating Requested	FTE	Recurring		Non-recurring		CCAP Appropriations		319 and EEG Funds	
					Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating
ALAMANCE	22,500	\$ 29,015	1,250	1.00	22,500	18		1,065				
ALEXANDER	20,815	\$ 22,004	4,275	1.00	20,815	18		1,065				
ALLEGHANY	18,129	\$ 20,909	825	0.75	18,129	14		799				
	4,318	5,374	500	0.25	4,318	5		266				
ANSON	22,432	23,410	1,250	1.00	22,432	18		1,065				
ASHE	22,548	24,048	5,990	1.00	22,548	18		1,065				
	14,741	28,000	2,000	0.60	14,741	11		639				
AVERY	21,312	25,661	2,739	1.00	21,312	18		1,065				
BEAUFORT	23,347	23,923	4,106	1.00	23,347	18		1,065				
BERTIE	22,292	25,000	500	1.00	22,292	18		1,065				
BLADEN	20,763	24,369	688	1.00	20,763	18		1,065				
BRUNSWICK	25,500	30,497	925	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
BUNCOMBE	25,500	36,880	1,800	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
	12,750	33,772	1,800	0.50	12,750	9		533				
BURKE/CALDWELL	30,403	28,750	1,250	1.00	25,500	18	3,250	1,065				
CABARRUS	25,500	33,506	2,850	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
CALDWELL	-	12,750	1,250	0.50	12,750	9		533				
CAMDEN	20,804	20,804	1,500	1.00	20,804	18		1,065				
CARTERET	22,489	23,041	-	1.00	22,489	18		1,065				
CASWELL	23,428	23,428	1,000	1.00	23,428	18		1,065				
CATAWBA	25,500	26,845	1,600	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
CHATHAM	21,844	25,437	2,081	1.00	21,844	18		1,065				
CHEROKEE	20,440	21,298	1,250	1.00	20,440	18		1,065				
CHOWAN/PERQUIMANS	22,626	24,394	4,750	1.00	22,626	18		1,065				
CLAY	16,170	17,376	6,198	1.00	16,170	18		1,065				
CLEVELAND	21,136	21,616	3,365	1.00	21,136	18		1,065				
COLUMBUS	25,500	32,203	3,818	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
CRAVEN	25,500	32,583	2,020	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
CUMBERLAND	24,948	32,210	1,375	1.00	24,948	18		1,065				
CURRITUCK	25,500	34,541	2,400	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
DARE	23,735	25,140	1,250	1.00	12,570	18		1,065	12,570			
DAVIDSON	25,500	31,374	2,415	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
DAVIE	25,500	27,365	4,575	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
DUPLIN	21,366	24,643	3,339	1.00	21,366	18		1,065				
	20,372	22,213	3,339	1.00	20,372	18		1,065				
DURHAM	25,500	35,515	3,155	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
DURHAM/GRANVILLE/ORANGE/ PERSON (Neuse/Tar)	31,051	35,102	3,817	1.00							35,102	1,083
EDGECOMBE	23,020	24,892	3,784	1.00	23,020	18		1,065				
	19,964	22,322	3,784	1.00			19,964	1,083				
FORSYTH	25,500	31,500	1,000	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
FRANKLIN	25,500	29,869	850	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
FRANKLIN/VANCE/WAKE/WARREN (Neuse/Tar)	44,664	44,499	3,000	1.00	20,025	18		1,065			24,474	1,083
GASTON	25,500	26,813	3,902	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
GATES	19,375	21,902	2,450	1.00	19,375	18		1,065				

PY 2014 Technical Assistance

PY2013 allocation with \$25,500 cap on S/B imposed; No increase in S/B;
\$1,083 per FTE operating expenses, Neuse-Tar = 50/50, Dare/New Hanover
 split ACSP/CCAP; fund 2nd position in Edgecombe as non-recurring

DISTRICT	PY 2013 S/B Budget	PY 2014 S/B Requested	PY 2014 Operating Requested	FTE	Recurring		Non-recurring		CCAP Appropriations		319 and EEG Funds	
					Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating
GRAHAM	18,174	19,454	2,150	1.00	18,174	18		1,065				
GRANVILLE	25,500	32,419	750	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
GREENE	21,168	25,183	1,150	1.00	21,168	18		1,065				
GUILFORD	25,500	35,650	1,250	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
HALIFAX	19,359	21,230	1,675	1.00	19,359	18		1,065				
HARNETT	-	24,000	1,190	0.50	12,000	9		533				
HAYWOOD	25,500	31,090	4,716	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
Area I Eng. Pos.	35,972	38,902	5,313	1.00	35,972	18		1,065				
HENDERSON	25,500	40,634	3,127	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
	12,285	25,963	3,127	0.50	12,285	9		533				
HERTFORD	25,500	29,838	1,600	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
HYDE/BEAUFORT/ WASHINGTON (Neuse/Tar)	49,176	49,626	3,000	1.00	24,813	18		1,065			24,813	1,083
IREDELL	25,000	26,936	1,725	1.00	25,000	18		1,065				
JACKSON	25,500	32,587	3,875	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
JOHNSTON	25,500	38,864	2,500	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
	25,500	29,844	2,500	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
JONES	23,976	24,857	1,463	1.00	23,976	18		1,065				
JONES (Neuse)	10,373	11,447	650	0.50							10,373	542
LEE	25,500	27,116	875	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
LENOIR	25,500	30,087	3,666	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
LINCOLN	25,500	33,151	2,513	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
MACON	25,500	30,645	2,000	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
MADISON	25,500	29,866	4,300	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
MARTIN	-	-	-	-	-	-		-				
MCDOWELL	18,625	18,625	2,500	1.00	18,625	18		1,065				
MECKLENBURG	21,359	32,728	4,975	1.00	21,359	18		1,065				
MITCHELL	22,050	23,261	588	1.00	22,050	18		1,065				
MONTGOMERY	19,825	21,188	1,903	1.00	19,825	18		1,065				
MOORE	25,500	32,094	1,250	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
NASH	25,500	30,000	1,500	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
NEW HANOVER	24,180	25,132	2,750	1.00	12,090	18		1,065	12,090			
NORTHAMPTON	16,877	24,751	3,213	1.00	16,877	18		1,065				
ONslow	25,500	27,934	2,400	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
ORANGE	25,500	40,590	2,545	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
	25,500	41,469	2,545	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
PAMLICO	20,255	20,755	588	1.00	20,255	18		1,065				
PASQUOTANK	11,842	12,000	1,500	0.50	11,842	9		533				
PENDER	23,726	25,267	1,413	1.00	23,726	18		1,065				
PERQUIMANS	17,305	19,201	3,228	1.00	17,305	18		1,065				
PERSON	23,230	24,065	-	1.00	23,230	18		1,065				
PITT	24,638	24,809	200	1.00	24,638	18		1,065				
PITT/MARTIN/LENOIR (Neuse/Tar)	55,155	49,617	1,500	1.00	24,809	18		1,065			24,809	1,083
POLK	14,391	20,079	2,125	1.00	14,391	18		1,065				
RANDOLPH	25,500	31,397	3,065	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
RICHMOND	16,834	21,750	2,875	1.00	16,834	18		1,065				

PY 2014 Technical Assistance

PY2013 allocation with \$25,500 cap on S/B imposed; No increase in S/B;
\$1,083 per FTE operating expenses, Neuse-Tar = 50/50, Dare/New Hanover
 split ACSP/CCAP; fund 2nd position in Edgecombe as non-recurring

DISTRICT	PY 2013 S/B Budget	PY 2014 S/B Requested	PY 2014 Operating Requested	FTE	Recurring		Non-recurring		CCAP Appropriations		319 and EEG Funds	
					Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating	Salary/Benefits	Operating
ROBESON	22,348	29,288	619	1.00	22,348	18		1,065				
ROCKINGHAM	25,500	29,650	1,250	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
ROWAN	21,960	25,273	1,975	1.00	21,960	18		1,065				
RUTHERFORD	18,453	24,387	1,250	1.00	18,453	18		1,065				
SAMPSON	25,500	31,339	1,625	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
	23,815	22,640	1,625	1.00	22,640	18		1,065				
SCOTLAND	23,500	23,500	3,600	1.00	23,500	18		1,065				
STANLY	25,406	29,338	1,868	1.00	25,406	18		1,065				
STOKES	21,613	24,347	1,575	1.00	21,613	18		1,065				
SURRY	25,500	33,554	2,560	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
SWAIN	16,369	32,102	3,454	1.00	16,369	18		1,065				
TRANSYLVANIA	25,500	33,472	3,641	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
TYRRELL	22,134	19,541	5,325	1.00	19,541	18		1,065				
UNION	25,500	34,196	1,000	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
VANCE	25,500	22,992	1,100	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
WAKE	25,500	34,213	4,400	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
WARREN	20,227	21,496	2,520	1.00	20,227	18		1,065				
WASHINGTON	10,244	22,072	-	0.50	10,244	9		533				
WATAUGA	22,818	26,486	2,163	1.00	22,818	18		1,065				
WAYNE	22,234	33,229	775	1.00	22,234	18		1,065				
	6,375	33,195	250	0.25	6,375	5		266				
WAYNE/JOHNSTON (Neuse)	56,341	59,394	2,500	1.00	25,500	18		1,065			33,894	1,083
WILKES	25,500	28,880	2,940	1.00	25,500	18		1,065				
WILSON	21,741	24,385	2,800	1.00	21,741	18		1,065				
YADKIN	24,857	29,193	2,500	1.00	24,857	18		1,065				
YANCEY	25,488	27,318	2,172	1.00	25,488	18		1,065				
SUB-TOTAL	2,625,477			108.35	2,446,723	1,905	23,214	113,813	24,660	-	153,465	5,957
TOTAL			-			\$ 2,448,628		\$ 137,027		\$ 24,660		\$ 159,421

Recurring ACSP Appropriations	\$ 2,448,778
CCAP Appropriations	\$ 24,660
Carry Forward from PY2013	\$ 109,814
Grant Funds (319 and EEG)	\$ 159,421
NRCS Funds	\$ 17,150
EEP	\$ 10,000
Total Available	\$ 2,769,823

AGRICULTURE COST SHARE PROGRAM DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (DIP) PROGRAM YEAR 2014*

(REVISED August 2013)

Definition of Practices

- (1) Abandoned tree removal means to remove Christmas and/or apple tree fields for integrated pest management and for reducing sedimentation. An abandoned tree field can be of any size or age trees where standard management practices (e.g., maintaining groundcover, insect and disease control, fertilizer applications and annual shearing practices) for the production of the trees are discontinued or abandoned. The field must have been abandoned for at least 5 years. Abandonment leads to adverse soil erosion formations such as gullies and to production of disease inoculums and increased pest population. Conversion to grass, hardwoods, or white pine on abandoned fields further protects soil loss by preventing runoff on steep slopes due to a better groundcover thereby providing additional water quality protection. Benefits include water quality protection, prevention of soil erosion, and wildlife habitat establishment.
- (2) An abandoned well closure is the sealing and permanent closure of a supply well no longer in use. This practice serves to prevent entry of contaminated surface water, animals, debris, or other foreign substances into the well. It also serves to eliminate the physical hazards of an open hole to people, animals, and farm machinery. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$1,500 per well at 75% cost share and \$1,800 per well at 90%.
- (3) An agrichemical containment and mixing facility means a system of components that provide containment and a barrier to the movement of agrichemicals. The purpose of the system is to provide secondary containment to prevent degradation of surface water, groundwater, and soil from unintentional release of pesticides or fertilizers. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$16,500 per facility at 75% cost share and \$19,800 per facility at 90%.
- (4) An agrichemical handling facility means a permanent structure that provides an environmentally safe means of mixing agrichemicals and filling tanks with agrichemicals for application and storage to improve water quality. Benefits may include prevention of accidental degradation of surface and ground water. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$27,500 per facility at 75% cost share and \$33,000 per facility at 90%.
- (5) Agricultural pond restoration/repair means to restore or repair existing failing agricultural pond systems. Benefits may include erosion control, flood control, and sediment and nutrient reductions from farm fields for better water quality. This practice is only applicable to low hazard classification ponds. For restoration projects involving dam, spillway, or overflow pipe upgrades, cost share is limited to \$15,000 per pond at 75% cost share and \$18,000 per pond at 90%. For restoration projects involving removal of accumulated sediment only, total charge to NCACSP is restricted to a total of \$3,000 per pond at 75% cost share and \$3,600 per pond at 90%.

- (6) Agricultural road repair/stabilization means repair or stabilization of existing access roads utilized for agricultural operations, including roads to existing crop fields, pastures, and barns.
- (7) Agricultural temporary water collection pond means to construct an agricultural water collection system for water reuse or irrigation to improve water quality. These systems may include construction of new ponds, utilizing existing ponds, water storage tanks and pumps in order to intercept sediment, nutrients, manage chlorophyll a. These systems may have the added benefit of reducing the demand on the water supply, and decreasing withdrawal from aquifers but these benefits shall not be the justification for this practice.
- (8) Chemigation or fertigation backflow prevention is a combination of devices (valves, gauges, injectors, drains, etc.) to safeguard water sources from contamination by fertilizers used during the irrigation of agricultural crops. The practice is intended to modify or improve fertilizer injection systems with components necessary to prevent backflow or siphoning of contaminants into the water supply thereby improving and protecting the state's waters.
- (9) A conservation cover practice means to establish and maintain a conservation cover of grass, legumes, or other approved plantings on fields previously with no groundcover established, to reduce soil erosion and improve water quality. Other benefits may include reduced offsite sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances. Eligible land includes that planted to Christmas Trees, orchards, ornamentals, vineyards and other cropland needing protective cover.
- (10) A three-year conservation tillage system means any tillage and planting system in which at least (60) sixty percent of the soil surface is covered by plant residue for the same fields for three consecutive years to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduction of soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances. This incentive is broken down into two categories depending on the crop(s) to be grown:
- (a) Grain crops and cotton
 - (b) Vegetables, Tobacco, Peanuts, and Sweet Corn

Cost share for each category of this practice is limited to \$15,000 per cooperator in a lifetime.

- (11) A cover crop means a crop of grasses, legumes, or small grain grown primarily for seasonal protection, erosion control and soil improvement. It usually is grown for one year or less. The major purpose is water and wind erosion control, to cycle plant nutrients, add organic matter to the soil, improve infiltration, aeration and tilth, improve soil quality, reduce soil crusting, and sequester carbon. Benefits may include reduction of soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances. Cost share for this incentive practice is limited to \$15,000 per cooperator in a lifetime.
- (12) A critical area planting means an area of highly erodible land that cannot be stabilized by ordinary conservation treatment on which permanent perennial vegetative cover is

- established and protected to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion and sedimentation.
- (13) A cropland conversion practice means to establish and maintain a conservation cover of grasses, trees, or wildlife plantings on fields previously used for crop production to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances.
- (14) Crop residue management means maintaining cover on sixty (60) percent of the soil surface at planting to protect water quality. Crop residue management also provides seasonal soil protection from wind and rain erosion, adds organic matter to the soil, conserves soil moisture, and improves infiltration, aeration and tilth. Benefits may include reduction in soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved sediment-attached substances. Cost share for this incentive practice is limited to \$15,000 per cooperator in a lifetime.
- (15) A diversion means a channel constructed across a slope with a supporting ridge on the lower side to control drainage by diverting excess water from an area to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances.
- (16) A field border means a strip of perennial vegetation established at the edge of the field that provides a stabilized outlet for row water to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances.
- (17) A filter strip means an area of permanent perennial vegetation for removing sediment, organic matter, and other pollutants from runoff and waste water to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation, pathogen contamination and pollution from dissolved, particulate, and sediment-attached substances.
- (18) A grade stabilization structure means a structure (earth embankment, mechanical spillway, detention-type, etc.) used to control the grade and head cutting in natural or artificial channels to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion and sedimentation.
- (19) A grassed waterway means a natural or constructed channel that is shaped or graded to required dimensions and established in suitable vegetation for the stable conveyance of runoff to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances.
- (20) A heavy use area protection means an area used frequently and intensively by animals, which must be stabilized by surfacing with suitable materials to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved, particulate, and sediment-attached substances.
- (21) A land smoothing practice means reshaping the surface of agricultural land to planned grades for the purpose of improving water quality. Improvements to water quality include:

- (a) Reduction in nutrient loss.
 - (b) Reduction in concentrated flow of water from an agricultural field.
 - (c) Improved infiltration.
- (22) A livestock exclusion system means a system of permanent fencing (board or barbed, high tensile or electric wire) installed to exclude livestock from streams and critical areas not intended for grazing to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation, pathogen contamination and pollution from dissolved, particulate, and sediment-attached substances.
- (23) A livestock feeding area is a sized concrete pad where feeders are located, surrounded by a heavy use area. The livestock feeding area is designed for the purpose of improving the lifespan of the heavy use area and to reduce the runoff of nutrients and fecal coliform to adjacent water bodies. The practice is to be used to address water quality concerns where livestock feeding areas are in close proximity to streams and where relocation or rotation of feeding areas is infeasible due to physical limitations (e.g., slope) and where other stream protection measures are insufficient to protect water quality. Cost share for the concrete pad for this practice is limited to \$4,200 at 75% cost share and \$5,040 at 90%.
- (24) A long term no-till practice means planting all crops for five consecutive years with at least eighty (80) percent plant residue from preceding crops to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances. Cost share for this incentive or this incentive combined with 3-year conservation tillage for grain and cotton is limited to \$25,000 per cooperater in a lifetime.
- (25) A micro-irrigation system means an environmentally safe system for the conveyance and distribution of water, chemicals, and fertilizer to agricultural fields for crop production. A micro-irrigation system is for frequent application of small quantities of water on or below the soil surface as drops, tiny streams, or miniature spray through emitters or applicators placed along a water delivery line. This practice may be applied as part of a conservation management system to support one or more of the following purposes:
- (a) To efficiently and uniformly apply irrigation water and maintain soil moisture for plant growth.
 - (b) To efficiently and uniformly apply plant nutrients in a manner that protects water quality.
 - (c) To prevent contamination of ground and surface water by efficiently and uniformly applying chemicals and fertilizers.
 - (d) To establish desired vegetation.
- Cost share for this practice will be based on actual cost with receipts required not to exceed \$25,000 charge to the NCACSP at 75% cost share and \$30,000 at 90%, including the cost of backflow prevention.
- (26) A nutrient management means a definitive plan to manage the amount, form, placement, and timing of applications of nutrients to minimize entry of nutrients to surface and groundwater and improve water quality.

- (27) A nutrient scavenger crop is a crop of small grain grown primarily as a seasonal nutrient scavenger. The purpose is to scavenge and cycle plant nutrients. The nutrient scavenger crop also adds organic matter to the soil, improves infiltration, aeration and tilth, improves soil quality, reduces soil crusting, provides residue for conservation tillage, and sequesters carbon. Benefits may include reduction of soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances. Cost share for this incentive practice is limited to \$25,000 per cooperator in a lifetime.
- (28) A pastureland conversion practice means establishing trees or perennial wildlife plantings on excessively eroding land with a visible sediment delivery problem to the waters of the state used for pasture that is too steep to mow or maintain with conventional equipment to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion and sedimentation.
- (29) A pasture renovation practice means to establish and maintain a conservation cover of grass, where existing pasture vegetation is inadequate. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances.
- (30) A portable agrichemical mixing station means a portable device to be used in the field to prevent the unintentional release of agrichemicals to the environment during mixing and transferring of agrichemicals. Benefits may include prevention of accidental degradation of surface and ground water. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$3,500 per station at 75% cost share and \$4,200 at 90%. Cost share is also limited to one station per cooperator.
- (31) Precision Agrichemical Application means using a system of components that enable reduction and greater control of fertilizer and pesticide application. This is accomplished through avoidance of excessive overlapping, unnecessary application to end/turn rows, and more precise control of application rates.
- (32) Precision nutrient management means applying nitrogen; phosphorus and lime in a site-specific manner (with specialized application equipment or multiple application events) based on the site specific recommendations for each GPS-referenced sampling point to minimize entry of nutrients to surface and groundwater and improve water quality. Cost share for this incentive is limited to \$15,000 per cooperator.
- (33) Prescribed grazing involves managing the intensity, frequency, duration, timing, and number of grazing animals on pastureland in accordance with site production limitations, rate of plant growth, physiological needs of forage plants for production and persistence, and nutritional needs of the grazing animals. The goal of this practice is to reduce accelerated soil erosion and compaction, to improve or maintain riparian and watershed function, to maintain surface and/or subsurface water quality and quantity, to improve nutrient distribution, and to improve or maintain desired species composition and vigor of plant communities. Productive pastures maintain wildlife habitat and permeable green space. Cost share for this incentive is limited to \$15,000 per cooperator.
- (34) A riparian buffer means a permanent, long-lived vegetative cover (grass, shrubs, trees, or a combination of vegetation types) established adjacent to and up-gradient from watercourses or water bodies to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced

soil erosion and nutrient delivery, sedimentation, pathogen contamination and pollution from dissolved, particulate and sediment-attached substances.

- (35) A rock-lined outlet means a waterway having an erosion-resistant lining of concrete, stone or other permanent material where an unlined or grassed waterway would be inadequate to improve water quality. Benefits may include safe disposal of runoff, reduced erosion and sedimentation.
- (36) A rooftop runoff management system means a system of collection and stabilization practices (dripline stabilization, guttering, collection boxes, etc.) to prevent rainfall runoff from agricultural rooftops from causing erosion where vegetative practices are insufficient to address erosion concerns and protect water quality.
- (37) A sediment control basin means a basin constructed to trap and store waterborne sediment where physical conditions or land ownership preclude treatment of a sediment source by the installation of other erosion control measures to improve water quality.
- (38) A sod-based rotation practice means an adapted sequence of crops, grasses and legumes or a mixture thereof established and maintained for a definite number of years as part of a conservation cropping system which is designed to provide adequate organic residue for maintenance or improvement of soil tilth to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances. Cost share for this incentive practice is limited to \$25,000 per cooperator in a lifetime.
- (39) A stock trail or walkway means to provide a stable area used frequently and intensively for livestock movement by surfacing with suitable material to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved, particulate, and sediment-attached substances.
- (40) A stream protection system means a planned system for protecting streams and stream banks that eliminates the need for livestock to be in streams by providing an alternative-watering source for livestock to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation, pathogen contamination, and pollution from dissolved, particulate and sediment-attached substances. System components may include:
 - (a) A spring development means improving springs and seeps by excavating, cleaning, capping or providing collection and storage facilities.
 - (b) A stream crossing means a trail constructed across a stream to allow livestock to cross without disturbing the bottom or causing soil erosion on the banks.
 - (c) A trough or tank means devices installed to provide drinking water for livestock at a stabilized location.
 - (d) A well means constructing a drilled, driven or dug well to supply water from an underground source.
 - (e) A windmill means erecting or constructing a mill operated by the wind's rotation of large vanes and is used as a source of power for pumping water.
- (41) Streambank and shoreline protection means the use of vegetation to stabilize and protect banks of streams, lakes, estuaries, or excavated channels against scour and

erosion. This practice should be used to prevent the loss of land or damage to utilities, roads, buildings, or other facilities adjacent to the banks, to maintain the capacity of the channel, to control channel meander that would adversely affect downstream facilities, to reduce sediment load causing downstream damages and pollution, or to improve the stream for recreation or fish and wildlife habitat.

- (42) A stream restoration system means the use of bioengineering practices, native material revetments, channel stability structures, and/or the restoration or management of riparian corridors in order to protect upland BMPs, restore the natural function of the stream corridor and improve water quality by reducing sedimentation to streams from streambank. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$50,000 per cooperator per year at 75% cost share and to \$60,000 per year at 90%.
- (43) A stripcropping practice means to grow crops and sod in a systematic arrangement of alternating strips or bands on the contour to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation, and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances. The crops are arranged so that a strip of grass or close-growing crop is alternated with a strip of clean-tilled crop, fallow, or no-till crop, or a strip of grass is alternated with a close-growing crop.
- (44) A terrace means an earth embankment, a channel, or a combination ridge and channel constructed across the slope to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation and pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances.
- (45) A waste management system means a planned system in which all necessary components are installed for managing liquid and solid waste to prevent or minimize degradation of soil and ground and surface water resources. System components may include:
- (A) A closure of waste impoundment means the safe removal of existing waste and waste water and the application of this waste on land in an environmentally safe manner. This practice is only applicable to waste storage ponds and lagoons. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$75,000 per cooperator at 75% cost share and \$90,000 at 90% cost share.
 - (B) A concentrated nutrient source management system is a system of vegetative and structural measures used to manage the collection, storage, and/or treatment of areas where agricultural products may cause an area of concentrated nutrients.
 - (C) A constructed wetland for land application practice means an artificial wetland area into which liquid animal waste from a waste storage pond or lagoon is dispersed over time to lower the nutrient content of the liquid animal waste.
 - (D) A drystack means a fabricated structure for temporary storage of animal waste. Cost share for drystack for poultry and non-.0200 animal operations are limited to \$33,000 per structure at 75% cost share and \$39,600 at 90%.
 - (E) The feeding/waste storage structure is designed for the purpose of improving the collection/storage of animal waste and to reduce runoff of nutrients and fecal

coliform to adjacent water bodies. The practice is intended to be used where livestock feeding areas are in close proximity to streams and where relocation or rotation of feeding areas is infeasible due to physical limitations (e.g., slope) and where other stream protection measures are insufficient to address water quality concerns. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$27,500 per structure at 75% cost share and \$33,000 per structure at 90%.

- (F) An insect control system means a practice or combination of practices (planting windbreaks, pre-charging structures, incorporation of waste into soil, etc.) which manages or controls insects from confined animal operations, waste treatment and storage structures, and waste applied to agricultural land.
- (G) Lagoon biosolids removal means removing accumulated biosolids from active lagoons to restore required treatment volume at on-going operations. The biosolids will be properly utilized on offsite farmland or processed to a value-added product, including energy production, to reduce nutrient impacts. Lagoon Biosolids Removal Incentive payments shall be limited to \$15,000 in a lifetime.
- (H) A livestock mortality management system is a facility for managing livestock mortalities such as to minimize water quality impacts or to produce a material that can be recycled as a soil amendment and fertilizer substitute. Cost shareable mortality management system components include: composter, rotary drum composter, forced aeration static pile composter, mortality freezer, mortality incinerator, and mortality gasification system.
- (I) A manure composting facility is a facility for the biological treatment, stabilization and environmentally safe storage of organic waste material (such as manure from poultry and livestock) to minimize water quality impacts and to produce a material that can be recycled as a soil amendment and fertilizer substitute.
- (J) Manure/litter transportation means transporting dry litter and dry manure from livestock and poultry farms that lack sufficient land to effectively utilize the animal-derived nutrients. The litter/manure will be properly utilized on alternative land or processed to a value-added product, including energy production, to reduce nutrient impacts. Manure/Litter Transportation Incentive payments shall be limited to 3-years per applicant and \$15,000 in a lifetime.
- (K) An odor control management system means a practice or combination of practices (planting windbreaks, pre-charging structures, incorporation of waste into soil, etc.) which manages or controls odors from confined animal operations, waste treatment and storage structures and waste applied to agricultural land.
- (L) A retrofit of on-going animal operations means modification of structures to increase storage or to correct design flaws to meet current standards. This practice may also be used to close waste impoundments on on-going operations, including the safe removal of existing waste and waste water and the application of this waste on land in an environmentally safe manner.
- (M) A solids separation from tank-based aquaculture production means a facility for the removal, storage and dewatering of solid waste from the effluent of intensive tank-based aquaculture production systems. The system is used to capture

organic solids from the effluent stream of intensive fish production systems that would otherwise flow to effluent ponds for storage and further treatment. This waste comes from uneaten feed and feces generated by fish while being fed within a tank-or raceway based fish farm.

- (N) A storm water management system means a system of collection and diversion practices (guttering, collection boxes, diversions, etc.) to prevent unpolluted storm water from flowing across concentrated waste areas on animal operations.
 - (O) A waste application system means an environmentally safe system (such as solid set, dry hydrant, mobile irrigation equipment, etc.) for the conveyance and distribution of animal wastes from waste treatment and storage structures to agricultural fields as part of an irrigation and waste utilization plan. Cost share for this practice is limited to \$35,000 per cooperator in a lifetime at 75% cost share and \$42,000 in a lifetime at 90%.
 - (P) A waste storage pond means an impoundment made by excavation or earthfill for temporary storage of animal waste, waste water and polluted runoff.
 - (Q) A waste treatment lagoon means an impoundment made by excavation or earthfill for biological treatment and storage of animal waste.
- (46) A water control structure means a permanent structure placed in a farm canal, ditch, or subsurface drainage conduit (drain tile or tube), which provides control of the stage or discharge of surface and/or subsurface drainage. The management mechanism of the structure may be flashboards, gates, valves, risers, or pipes. The primary purpose of the water control structure is to improve water quality by elevating the water table and reducing drainage outflow. A secondary purpose is to restore hydrology in riparian buffers to the extent practical. Elevating the water table promotes denitrification and lower nitrate levels in drainage water from cropping systems and minimizes the effects of short-circuiting of drainage systems passing through riparian buffers. Other benefits may include reduced pollution from other dissolved and sediment-attached substances, reduced downstream sedimentation and reduced stormwater surges of fresh water into estuarine area.

This practice is not intended to be used to control water inflow from tidal influence (i.e., no tide gates).

- (47) A wetland restoration system means a system of practices designed to restore the natural hydrology of an area that had been drained and cropped.

*To be used in conjunction with the most recent version of the APA Rules for the North Carolina Agriculture Cost Share Program for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control and the NC-ACSP Manual.

BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ELIGIBLE FOR COST SHARE PAYMENTS

- (1) Best Management Practices eligible for cost sharing include the practices listed in Table 1 and any approved District BMPs. District BMPs shall be reviewed by the Division for technical merit in achieving the goals of this program. Upon approval by the Division, the District BMPs will be eligible to receive cost share funding.

Table 1

<u>Practice</u>	<u>Minimum Life Expectancy (years)</u>
Abandoned Tree Removal	10
Abandoned Well Closure	1
Agrichemical Containment and Mixing Facility	10
Agrichemical Handling Facility	10
Agricultural Pond Restoration/Repair	10
Agricultural Road Repair/Stabilization	10
Agricultural Water Collection System	10
Backflow Prevention System	
Chemigation	10
Fertigation	10
Conservation Cover	6
3-Year Conservation Tillage System	3
Cover Crops	1
Critical Area Planting	10
Cropland Conversion	10
Crop Residue Management	1
Diversion	10
Field Border	10
Filter Strip	10
Grade Stabilization Structure	10
Grassed Waterway	10
Heavy Use Area Protection	10
Land Smoothing	5
Livestock Exclusion	10
Livestock Feeding Area	10
Long Term No-Till	5
Micro-Irrigation System	10
Nutrient Management	3
Nutrient Scavenger Cover Crop	1
Pasture Renovation	10
Pastureland Conversion	10
Portable Agrichemical Mixing Station	5
Precision Agrichemical Application	5
Precision Nutrient Management	3
Prescribed Grazing	3

Riparian Buffer	10
Rock-lined Waterway or Outlet	10
Rooftop Runoff Management System	10
Sediment Control Basin	10
Sod-based Rotation	4 or 5
Stock Trail and Walkway	10
Stream Protection System	
Spring Development	10
Stream Crossing	10
Trough or Tank	10
Well	10
Windmills	10
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	10
Stream Restoration	10
Stripcropping	5
Terrace	10
Waste Management System	
Closure of Abandoned Waste Impoundment	10
Concentrated Nutrient Source Management System	10
Constructed Wetland for Land Application	10
Drystack	10
Feeding/Waste Storage Structure	10
Insect Control System	5
Lagoon Biosolids Removal Incentive	1
Livestock Mortality Management System	
Incinerator	5
Others Systems	10
Manure Composting Facility	10
Manure/Litter Transportation Incentive	1
Odor Management System	1 to 10
Retrofit of On-going Animal Operations	10
Solids Separation from Tank-Based Aquaculture Production	10
Storm Water Management System	10
Waste Application System	10
Waste Storage Pond	10
Waste Treatment Lagoon	10
Water Control Structure	10
Wetlands Restoration System	10

- (2) The minimum life expectancy of the BMPs shall be that listed in Table 1. Practices designated by a District shall meet the life expectancy requirement established by the Division for that District BMP.
- (3) The list of BMPs eligible for cost sharing may be revised by the Commission as deemed appropriate in order to meet program purpose and goals.

Allocation of 2014 ACSP Financial Assistance Funds

DISTRICT	REGULAR ACSP (CS)			Impaired/Impacted Earmark (II)		TOTAL PY 2014 ALLOCATION
	REQUESTED	RECEIVED July 2013	RECEIVED August 2013	REQUESTED	RECEIVED August 2013	
ALAMANCE	\$ 212,257	\$ 20,546	\$ 21,294	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41,840
ALEXANDER	\$ 149,000	\$ 21,601	\$ 30,546	\$ 50,000	\$ 18,859	\$ 71,006
ALLEGHANY	\$ 150,000	\$ 18,387	\$ 24,899	\$ 20,000	\$ 15,655	\$ 58,941
ANSON	\$ 303,000	\$ 20,242	\$ 29,764	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,006
ASHE	\$ 775,000	\$ 18,503	\$ 26,294	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,797
AVERY	\$ 183,286	\$ 17,674	\$ 27,736	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,410
BEAUFORT	\$ 143,900	\$ 19,402	\$ 25,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,674
BERTIE	\$ 439,845	\$ 12,708	\$ 16,822	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,530
BLADEN	\$ 80,000	\$ 18,594	\$ 25,476	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,070
BRUNSWICK	\$ 50,000	\$ 17,411	\$ 20,666	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38,077
BUNCOMBE	\$ 317,000	\$ 20,452	\$ 31,018	\$ 64,500	\$ 18,615	\$ 70,085
BURKE	\$ 50,000	\$ 15,530	\$ 24,324	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,854
CABARRUS	\$ 80,000	\$ 19,915	\$ 27,257	\$ 20,000	\$ 17,060	\$ 64,232
CALDWELL	\$ 70,000	\$ 16,042	\$ 33,588	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49,630
CAMDEN	\$ 54,300	\$ 12,507	\$ 16,297	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28,804
CARTERET	\$ 40,000	\$ 18,119	\$ 19,803	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,922
CASWELL	\$ 85,000	\$ 18,946	\$ 41,154	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,100
CATAWBA	\$ 145,000	\$ 17,714	\$ 23,566	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41,280
CHATHAM	\$ 220,550	\$ 22,966	\$ 30,524	\$ 126,389	\$ 19,345	\$ 72,835
CHEROKEE	\$ 97,000	\$ 18,272	\$ 14,078	\$ 75,000	\$ 11,699	\$ 44,049
CHOWAN	\$ 40,000	\$ 16,393	\$ 21,251	\$ 15,000	\$ 13,614	\$ 51,258
CLAY	\$ 100,000	\$ 11,993	\$ 18,307	\$ 30,000	\$ 10,958	\$ 41,258
CLEVELAND	\$ 60,600	\$ 17,649	\$ 35,087	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,736
COLUMBUS	\$ 118,050	\$ 19,151	\$ 25,460	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,611
CRAVEN	\$ 46,483	\$ 14,400	\$ 19,393	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,793
CUMBERLAND	\$ 101,765	\$ 9,881	\$ 13,917	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,798
CURRITUCK	\$ 22,500	\$ 8,000	\$ 14,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,500
DARE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
DAVIDSON	\$ 80,780	\$ 20,040	\$ 30,334	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,374
DAVIE	\$ 70,000	\$ 20,020	\$ 27,680	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,700
DUPLIN	\$ 350,000	\$ 28,649	\$ 39,890	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,539
DURHAM	\$ 50,000	\$ 14,925	\$ 18,679	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,604
EDGECOMBE	\$ 174,193	\$ 14,404	\$ 18,314	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,718
FORSYTH	\$ 75,000	\$ 14,035	\$ 16,912	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,947
FRANKLIN	\$ 211,336	\$ 20,025	\$ 26,621	\$ 13,368	\$ 13,368	\$ 60,014
GASTON	\$ 84,305	\$ 18,657	\$ 23,962	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,619
GATES	\$ 83,500	\$ 10,483	\$ 14,438	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,921
GRAHAM	\$ 38,000	\$ 10,537	\$ 17,866	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28,403
GRANVILLE	\$ 85,000	\$ 21,050	\$ 24,296	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,346
GREENE	\$ 84,500	\$ 18,359	\$ 23,925	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 45,284
GUILFORD	\$ 269,875	\$ 17,860	\$ 20,701	\$ 48,750	\$ 13,946	\$ 52,507
HALIFAX	\$ 908,300	\$ 17,290	\$ 23,297	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,587
HARNETT	\$ 70,000	\$ 15,959	\$ 21,507	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,466
HAYWOOD	\$ 290,000	\$ 16,368	\$ 21,832	\$ 85,000	\$ 13,815	\$ 52,015
HENDERSON	\$ 220,000	\$ 21,074	\$ 28,886	\$ 50,000	\$ 18,068	\$ 68,028
HERTFORD	\$ 141,640	\$ 12,453	\$ 19,256	\$ 60,000	\$ 11,468	\$ 43,177
HOKE	\$ 149,625	\$ 12,464	\$ 16,587	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,051
HYDE	\$ 100,000	\$ 14,940	\$ 18,270	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,210
IREDELL	\$ 165,000	\$ 18,950	\$ 25,799	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,749
JACKSON	\$ 65,500	\$ 15,129	\$ 18,878	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,007
JOHNSTON	\$ 302,541	\$ 21,190	\$ 31,394	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 57,584
JONES	\$ 104,450	\$ 19,483	\$ 23,738	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,221
LEE	\$ 69,525	\$ 17,161	\$ 22,731	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,892
LENOIR	\$ 132,750	\$ 14,526	\$ 19,512	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,038
LINCOLN	\$ 70,000	\$ 21,786	\$ 27,586	\$ 40,500	\$ 17,856	\$ 67,228
MACON	\$ 100,000	\$ 13,586	\$ 21,812	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,398
MADISON	\$ 75,000	\$ 18,243	\$ 24,812	\$ 50,000	\$ 15,571	\$ 58,626
MARTIN	\$ 459,575	\$ 11,003	\$ 13,185	\$ 25,000	\$ 8,747	\$ 32,935
MCDOWELL	\$ 75,000	\$ 12,413	\$ 22,764	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,177
MECKLENBURG	\$ 40,000	\$ 10,008	\$ 15,559	\$ 10,000	\$ 9,246	\$ 34,813
MITCHELL	\$ 218,125	\$ 18,853	\$ 30,492	\$ 50,000	\$ 17,846	\$ 67,191
MONTGOMERY	\$ 434,000	\$ 15,053	\$ 20,142	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,195

DISTRICT	REGULAR ACSP (CS)			Impaired/Impacted Earmark (II)		TOTAL PY 2014 ALLOCATION
	REQUESTED	RECEIVED July 2013	RECEIVED August 2013	REQUESTED	RECEIVED August 2013	
MOORE	\$ 219,000	\$ 17,338	\$ 22,680	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,018
NASH	\$ 1,068,000	\$ 19,740	\$ 27,808	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,548
NEW HANOVER	\$ 20,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000
NORTHAMPTON	\$ 183,000	\$ 14,856	\$ 19,967	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,823
ONSLow	\$ 60,000	\$ 19,294	\$ 22,244	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 41,538
ORANGE	\$ 236,232	\$ 20,841	\$ 29,636	\$ 32,190	\$ 18,255	\$ 68,732
PAMLICO	\$ 125,000	\$ 19,125	\$ 25,085	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,210
PASQUOTANK	\$ 61,300	\$ 16,505	\$ 21,256	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 47,761
PENDER	\$ 130,750	\$ 14,143	\$ 20,093	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,236
PERQUIMANS	\$ 55,000	\$ 15,566	\$ 20,794	\$ 20,000	\$ 13,150	\$ 49,510
PERSON	\$ 207,882	\$ 17,658	\$ 28,026	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,684
PITT	\$ 134,000	\$ 17,906	\$ 23,314	\$ 29,000	\$ 14,907	\$ 56,127
POLK	\$ 75,000	\$ 13,958	\$ 29,708	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,666
RANDOLPH	\$ 130,000	\$ 22,212	\$ 28,490	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,702
RICHMOND	\$ 188,950	\$ 14,198	\$ 21,424	\$ 140,550	\$ 12,883	\$ 48,505
ROBESON	\$ 248,400	\$ 24,141	\$ 30,968	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,109
ROCKINGHAM	\$ 120,500	\$ 19,064	\$ 31,314	\$ 96,260	\$ 18,220	\$ 68,598
ROWAN	\$ 229,000	\$ 21,551	\$ 36,822	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58,373
RUTHERFORD	\$ 108,988	\$ 18,408	\$ 26,802	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,210
SAMPSON	\$ 248,000	\$ 23,877	\$ 33,157	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,034
SCOTLAND	\$ 143,500	\$ 11,371	\$ 19,351	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,722
STANLY	\$ 199,050	\$ 21,526	\$ 30,468	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 51,994
STOKES	\$ 193,419	\$ 14,477	\$ 36,054	\$ 25,000	\$ 18,275	\$ 68,806
SURRY	\$ 190,000	\$ 24,866	\$ 33,591	\$ 30,000	\$ 21,141	\$ 79,598
SWAIN	\$ 67,075	\$ 9,516	\$ 18,326	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,842
TRANSYLVANIA	\$ 80,275	\$ 15,007	\$ 27,034	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,041
TYRRELL	\$ 75,000	\$ 17,529	\$ 28,615	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46,144
UNION	\$ 157,500	\$ 18,683	\$ 30,283	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48,966
VANCE	\$ 60,000	\$ 17,143	\$ 20,110	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,253
WAKE	\$ 231,000	\$ 18,963	\$ 26,783	\$ 25,000	\$ 16,544	\$ 62,290
WARREN	\$ 102,300	\$ 16,232	\$ 25,995	\$ 9,200	\$ 9,200	\$ 51,427
WASHINGTON	\$ 60,000	\$ 16,062	\$ 23,407	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,469
WATAUGA	\$ 321,350	\$ 18,419	\$ 31,479	\$ 145,000	\$ 18,046	\$ 67,944
WAYNE	\$ 238,758	\$ 16,492	\$ 26,886	\$ 26,401	\$ 15,688	\$ 59,066
WILKES	\$ 1,122,925	\$ 20,324	\$ 33,164	\$ 48,373	\$ 19,344	\$ 72,832
WILSON	\$ 169,145	\$ 11,650	\$ 20,275	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 36,925
YADKIN	\$ 160,000	\$ 19,720	\$ 31,323	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 51,043
YANCEY	\$ 218,000	\$ 16,615	\$ 26,504	\$ 37,000	\$ 15,594	\$ 58,713
TOTALS	\$ 17,620,355	\$ 1,692,948	\$ 2,431,188	\$ 1,520,481	\$ 499,983	\$ 4,674,119

SOURCE	AMOUNT
2013-14 Appropriation	\$ 4,228,566
Rollover from cancellations, releases and unencumbered Regular Cost Share funds	\$ 861,987
PY 2014 Management Flexibility Reduction	(18,000)
Correction from 2012 transfer not received	(126,000)
Correction from 2012 Reduction not taken in PY 2013	(26,358)
TOTAL AVAILABLE FUNDS	\$ 4,920,129
Less Funds Allocated July 2013	\$ 1,692,948
5% Contingency Reserve	\$ 246,010
Total Allocated August 2013	\$ 2,981,171

The proposed allocation transfers \$50,000 of regular CS to CREP Earmark and \$500,000 of regular CS funds to Impaired/Impacted Streams Initiative Earmark. CREP Earmark funds will be allocated to districts as CREP contracts are received.

**COMMUNITY CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
PY2014**



All practices defined below are to be maintained by the landowner of a single-family residence for a five-year period; all other types of properties are to be maintained by the landowner for a 10-year period.

Definition of Practices

- (1) Abandoned well closure is the sealing and permanent closure of a supply well no longer in use. This practice serves to prevent entry of contaminated surface water, animals, debris or other foreign substances into the well. It also serves to eliminate the physical hazards of an open hole to people, animals and machinery.
- (2) Bioretention area is the use of plants and soils for removal of pollutants from stormwater runoff. Bioretention can also be effective in reducing peak runoff rates, runoff volumes and recharging groundwater by infiltrating runoff. Bioretention areas are intended to treat impervious surface areas of greater than 2500 ft².
- (3) A backyard rain garden is a shallow depression in the ground that captures runoff from a driveway, roof, or lawn and allows it to soak into the ground, rather than running across roads, capturing pollutants and delivering them to a stream. Backyard rain gardens are intended to treat impervious surface areas of less than 2500 ft².
- (4) Stormwater wetland means a constructed system that mimics the functions of natural wetlands and is designed to mitigate the impacts of stormwater quality and quantity. Stormwater wetlands are intended to treat impervious surface areas of greater than 2500 ft².
- (5) Backyard wetlands are constructed systems that mimic the functions of natural wetlands. They can temporarily store, filter and clean runoff from driveways, roofs and lawns, and thereby improve water quality. The wetland should be expected to retain water or remain saturated for two to three weeks. Backyard wetlands are intended to treat impervious surface areas of less than 2500 ft².
- (6) A cistern is a system of collection and diversion practices to prevent stormwater from flowing across impervious areas, collecting sediment and reaching the storm drains. Benefits may include the reduction of stormwater runoff thereby reducing the opportunity for pollution to enter the storm drainage system.
- (7) A critical area planting means an area of highly erodible land, which cannot be stabilized by ordinary conservation treatment on which permanent perennial vegetative cover is established and protected to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion and sedimentation and improved surface water quality.
- (8) A diversion means a channel constructed across a slope with a supporting ridge on the lower side to control drainage by diverting excess water from an area to improve water quality.

- (9) A grassed swale consists of a natural or constructed channel that is shaped or graded to required dimensions and established in suitable vegetation for the stable conveyance of runoff to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, and sedimentation and improve the quality of surface water pollution from dissolved and sediment-attached substances.
- (10) Impervious surface conversion means the removal of impenetrable materials such as asphalt, concrete, brick and stone. These materials seal surfaces, repel water and prevent precipitation from infiltrating soils. Removal of these impervious materials, when combined with permeable pavement or vegetation establishment, is intended to reduce stormwater runoff rate and volume, as well as associated pollutants transported from the site by stormwater runoff.
- (11) Permeable pavement means materials that are designed to allow water to flow through them and thus reduce the imperviousness of traffic surfaces, such as patios, walkways, sidewalks, driveways and parking areas.
- (12) A pet waste receptacle means a receptacle designed to encourage pet owners to pick up after animals in parks, neighborhoods and apartment complexes so as to prevent waste from being transported off-site by stormwater runoff.
- (13) A riparian buffer means an area adjacent to a stream where a permanent, long-lived vegetative cover (sod, shrubs, trees or a combination of vegetation types) is established to improve water quality. Benefits may include reduced soil erosion, sedimentation, pathogen contamination and pollution from dissolved, particulate and sediment-attached substances.
- (14) A stream restoration system means the use of bioengineering practices, native material revetments, channel stability structures and/or the restoration or management of riparian corridors to protect upland BMPs, restore the natural function of the stream corridor and improve water quality by reducing sedimentation to streams from streambanks.
- (15) Streambank and shoreline protection means the use of vegetation to stabilize and protect banks of streams, lakes, estuaries or excavated channels against scour and erosion.
- (16) Marsh sills protect estuarine shorelines from erosion, combining engineered structures with natural vegetation to maintain, restore, or enhance the shoreline's natural habitats. A sill is a coast-parallel, long or short structure built with the objective of reducing the wave action on the shoreline by forcing wave breaking over the sill. Sills are used to provide protection for existing coastal marshes, or to retain sandy fill between the sill and the eroding shoreline, to establish suitable elevations for the restoration or establishment of coastal marsh and/or riparian vegetation.
- (17) A structural stormwater conveyance includes various techniques to divert runoff from paved surfaces where a vegetated diversion is not feasible. The purpose is to direct stormwater runoff (sheet flow or concentrated) away from a direct discharge point and divert it to an approved BMP or naturally vegetated area capable of removing nutrients through detention, filtration, or infiltration.

DRAFT PY2014 Community Conservation Assistance Program Allocation

County	PY2014 BMP funds requested (CC - state appropriated funds)	PY2014 BMP funds allocated August 2013 (CC - state appropriated funds)
ALAMANCE	\$ 22,000	\$ 3,954
ALEXANDER	\$ 8,000	\$ 3,587
ALLEGHANY	\$ 3,500	\$ 1,712
ANSON	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
ASHE	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,855
AVERY	\$ 8,280	\$ 2,772
BEAUFORT	\$ -	\$ -
BERTIE	\$ -	\$ -
BLADEN	\$ -	\$ -
BRUNSWICK	\$ 30,000	\$ 3,068
BUNCOMBE	\$ 63,900	\$ 3,791
BURKE	\$ 25,000	\$ 3,862
CABARRUS	\$ 31,600	\$ 3,954
CALDWELL	\$ 25,000	\$ 3,985
CAMDEN	\$ 2,200	\$ 1,500
CARTERET	\$ 50,000	\$ 2,803
CASWELL	\$ -	\$ -
CATAWBA	\$ 12,000	\$ 4,066
CHATHAM	\$ 46,500	\$ 3,730
CHEROKEE	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,539
CHOWAN	\$ -	\$ -
CLAY	\$ -	\$ -
CLEVELAND	\$ 6,200	\$ 3,424
COLUMBUS	\$ 2,375	\$ 1,500
CRAVEN	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,364
CUMBERLAND	\$ -	\$ -
CURRITUCK	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,500
DARE	\$ 15,000	\$ 1,500
DAVIDSON	\$ 10,000	\$ 3,710
DAVIE	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,444
DUPLIN	\$ 12,000	\$ 1,559
DURHAM	\$ 50,000	\$ 4,525
EDGECOMBE	\$ 9,510	\$ 2,436
FORSYTH	\$ 71,600	\$ 3,750
FRANKLIN	\$ 3,510	\$ 3,149
GASTON	\$ 35,788	\$ 4,148
GATES	\$ -	\$ -
GRAHAM	\$ -	\$ -
GRANVILLE	\$ -	\$ -
GREENE	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,500
GUILFORD	\$ 34,000	\$ 3,944
HALIFAX	\$ -	\$ -
HARNETT	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,947
HAYWOOD	\$ 26,500	\$ 2,925
HENDERSON	\$ 33,250	\$ 3,944
HERTFORD	\$ 25,500	\$ 1,500
HOKE	\$ -	\$ -
HYDE	\$ 13,000	\$ 1,500
IREDELL	\$ 30,000	\$ 3,271
JACKSON	\$ 15,750	\$ 2,283
JOHNSTON	\$ 16,000	\$ 3,068
JONES	\$ 162,000	\$ 1,500
LEE	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,762
LENOIR	\$ 3,500	\$ 1,500
LINCOLN	\$ -	\$ -
MACON	\$ 15,000	\$ 2,242
MADISON	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,222
MARTIN	\$ 21,000	\$ 1,500
MCDOWELL	\$ 10,000	\$ 2,884

County	PY2014 BMP funds requested (CC - state appropriated funds)	PY2014 BMP funds allocated August 2013 (CC - state appropriated funds)
MECKLENBURG	\$ 50,000	\$ 3,373
MITCHELL	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,364
MONTGOMERY	\$ 15,500	\$ 1,845
MOORE	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,947
NASH	\$ 72,500	\$ 3,628
NEW HANOVER	\$ 110,000	\$ 4,209
NORTHAMPTON	\$ -	\$ -
ONSLow	\$ 5,500	\$ 3,373
ORANGE	\$ 34,100	\$ 4,209
PAMLICO	\$ -	\$ -
PASQUOTANK	\$ 7,000	\$ 2,161
PENDER	\$ 7,500	\$ 2,099
PERQUIMANS	\$ -	\$ -
PERSON	\$ -	\$ -
PITT	\$ 23,000	\$ 2,670
POLK	\$ 6,000	\$ 2,059
RANDOLPH	\$ 10,000	\$ 3,618
RICHMOND	\$ -	\$ -
ROBESON	\$ -	\$ -
ROCKINGHAM	\$ 10,650	\$ 2,650
ROWAN	\$ -	\$ -
RUTHERFORD	\$ 2,900	\$ 2,842
SAMPSON	\$ -	\$ -
SCOTLAND	\$ -	\$ -
STANLY	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,763
STOKES	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
SURRY	\$ 30,000	\$ 2,741
SWAIN	\$ 5,531	\$ 2,548
TRANSYLVANIA	\$ 16,500	\$ 2,273
TYRRELL	\$ -	\$ -
UNION	\$ 8,300	\$ 3,394
VANCE	\$ -	\$ -
WAKE	\$ 95,000	\$ 3,740
WARREN	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
WASHINGTON	\$ -	\$ -
WATAUGA	\$ 60,250	\$ 2,792
WAYNE	\$ -	\$ -
WILKES	\$ 27,162	\$ 2,527
WILSON	\$ 29,800	\$ 2,629
YADKIN	\$ 8,500	\$ 2,385
YANCEY	\$ 14,000	\$ 2,466
TOTALS	\$ 1,695,156	\$ 200,985

PY2014 Appropriation	\$136,937
5% withholding	\$6,847
TA funds for New Hanover and Dare Districts	\$23,958
Rollover from cancelations, releases, and unencumbered funds	\$94,853
Total allocated PY2014 (8/23/13)	\$200,985