

Shore Protection Manager

Greg L. Rudolph  
Tel: (252) 393.2663  
Fax: (252) 393.6639  
rudi@carteretcountygov.org

www.protectthebeach.com



## CARTERET COUNTY BEACH COMMISSION MEETING

Minutes

Pine Knoll Shores Town Hall

April 24, 2006, 2 pm

### **Acronyms:**

AIWW – Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway  
CBOC – County Board of Commissioners  
EI – Emerald Isle  
NCDWR – N.C. Division of Water Resources  
PKS – Pine Knoll Shores  
USACE – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

### **Attendance.**

Commission Chair Buck Fugate, Commission Members Jack Goldstein, Jerry Huml, Joan Lamson, Ted Lindblad, Pat McElraft, Jim Willis III, secretary Greg Rudolph, and the general public. Members William Donnelly (vice-chair), Tom Doe III, Stewart Pickett, and Jim Stephenson were absent.

- (1) **Call to Order.** – Chairman Fugate called the meeting to order.
- (2) **Approval of Minutes (Regular Beach Commission Meeting – March 27, 2006).** - Chairman Fugate asked the Commission if there were any corrections, additions, or comments regarding the minutes presented in the agenda packet. With no comments forthcoming from the Commission, member Goldstein motioned that the minutes be approved as presented. The motion was seconded by member Lamson and unanimously approved.
- (3) **Occupancy Tax and “Beach Fund” Update.** – Secretary Rudolph addressed the Commission by noting that the March 2006 occupancy tax report was attached to the Commission’s agenda. The March 2006 collection was up by over 38% compared to March 2005, and to date (for the current fiscal year) the collection is up by over 18%. Member Huml added that the Beach Fund has generated more than \$240,000 compared to this same point in time during the previous fiscal year. Secretary Rudolph mentioned that Easter occurred in March 2005 compared to April and therefore the April 2006 collection could also be significantly improved. Frank Rush (audience) asked how the actual collection rate compares to the Beach Commission’s projections. Secretary Rudolph replied that the Commission utilizes a 3% annual increase as an estimated figure.
- (4) **Funding Request - Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Inlet Crossing Maintenance and Beach Disposal (Boque Inlet).** – Secretary Rudolph reviewed that Boque Inlet is conceptually divided into two reaches by the public. One is the ocean bar and connecting channel that is maintained utilizing the USACE’s dredging fleet. This government fleet is also utilized for New River, New Topsail, Carolina Beach, and Lockwoods Folly Inlets and if funded, each inlet is maintained 2 to 4

times a year. The inlet crossing at Bogue is actually part of the AIWW and is where the sidecast dredging performed by the government fleet meets the AIWW. There are a total of eight inlet crossings in N.C. and dredging work for these projects are performed utilizing the industry fleet of pipeline dredges under a singular contract. Secretary Rudolph continued that if a pipeline dredge is operating, then the spoil has to be placed "somewhere". That "somewhere" is an upland disposal site or the beach. For Bogue Inlet, the disposal area is customarily located along the oceanfront beach in EI, however EI has received permission to place dredged material at the Point near the sand bags to augment the Bogue Inlet realignment project constructed last year. The inlet crossing work is conducted on a 2 - 3 year basis and the current fiscal year (2006) is when the inlet crossing work is scheduled to be completed.

Funding for the sidecast work in Bogue Inlet was not appropriated by Congress this year and was the only inlet out of the five maintained by the USACE dredging fleet to not receive funding. The local communities and State however have retained the USACE to perform 40 days of maintenance work utilizing a 75% State - 25% local government cost share formula. The inlet crossing work on the other hand is not project specific, but rather is part of the N.C. AIWW lump sum appropriation that funds the cluster of inlet crossings. The USACE did not receive enough funding from Congress to dredge the eight inlet crossings along the State's waters and soon partnered with NCDWR, who had available contingency funding. Thus the USACE was balancing the funds they had in hand, the dredging climate, and level of monetary cooperation expected from local communities. The bid for the project was opened on March 30<sup>th</sup> and the low bid accommodated the scopes of work at four of the eight inlet crossings in N.C. The total cost of the overall effort is \$3.8 million with the Corps contributing \$2.3 million and NCDWR \$1.5 million. The State in turn is seeking funding from local communities at a level of 50% or \$750,000. Thus the cost ratio is 60% Federal, 20% State, and 20% local governments. The inlet crossing work at Bogue if isolated is roughly \$207,000 State and \$207,000 local. NCDWR has requested that Carteret County contribute to the local funding portion. The local cost share has been conceptually divided into 1/3 Carteret County (\$69,000), 1/3 Onslow County (\$69,000), and 1/3 local municipalities including EI, Cape Carteret, Cedar Point, and Swansboro (\$69,000). The County's occupancy tax law states that funds can be utilized for placing sand on the dune or beach with no language confining the placement to inlet, oceanfront, or other areas of the shoreline. Thus a request of \$69,000 for Carteret County has come before the Beach Commission.

Member Lindblad asked if other future Town-sponsored small-scale waterway dredging projects with beach placement would be eligible for funding via the Beach Fund. Secretary Rudolph replied that the answer is "yes" and is why the topic before the Beach Commission today can be considered precedent setting. Secretary Rudolph added that NCDWR has worked very hard to cost-share the inlet crossing work despite its moving target nature. Likewise NCDWR has been a very willing partner for the Section 933 project, Shore Protection Project, and the Bogue Inlet Project. Therefore the wrong signal may be taken if the Commission says "no" to the inlet crossing request.

Member Huml asked if a 15% dredging contingency is normal. Secretary Rudolph replied that the 15% figure is high but just like the dredging quantities forecasted for the project, the estimates are high to ensure no shortfalls occur. Member Huml expressed that NCDWR is a great partner and it is important to support NCDWR. Likewise, the local cost share is divided appropriately and the \$69,000 request should be supported. Member Willis noted the Beach Fund

was created for the Shore Protection Project, which looks like will not occur anytime soon. The Bogue Inlet crossing work gets sand on the beach now and therefore should be funded. However, the sand is going to nourish an accreting area not an eroding area, like the EI oceanfront. Member Willis also mentioned that children enjoy the pools and ponds that have formed at Bogue Inlet and the sand should not be placed at the Point and fill the pools. Therefore although he (member Willis) is supportive of using occupancy tax funds for the inlet crossing work, he will vote against the measure if sand is placed at the sand bags near the Point, and will let everyone know the reasons for his objections. Member McElraft disclosed that the inlet crossing work needs to be done especially in light of the Federal and State funds that have been leveraged. Although member McElraft declined to help PKS when a request for Section 933 Project funding was made, this project is much smaller from a monetary standpoint and there have been other projects that the Beach Commission has executed that have helped one portion of the island over the other (e.g., the Olsen Associates Report.). Also the Commission needs to keep a good relationship with the USACE and NCDWR.

Chairman Fugate asked if Onslow County has agreed to fund \$69,000. Secretary Rudolph replied that Carteret County (via the Beach Commission) would be the first local government to approve a local monetary request. Chairman Fugate subsequently asked what would happen if Onslow County decided not to provide \$69,000. Frank Rush (audience) mentioned that the truth of the matter is that NCDWR has already submitted \$1.5 million to the USACE and the work will likely be performed regardless of the level of local monetary participation. Chairman Fugate cautioned that the Commission needs to be cognizant of funding small projects even though there is a need. Ultimately he believes there will be a Shore Protection Project via mitigation and accordingly, there will be some cost-sharing involved with a mitigative Shore Protection Project. Thus, it is important to keep the "Beach Fund" reserve at a healthy level. Therefore it seems that the Commission will need to address these small projects on a case by case basis. Secretary Rudolph added that if approved, the \$69,000 expenditure will need to be subsequently approved by the CBOC as well.

Member McElraft asked if the Commission would be willing to develop a grant program to accommodate small water dredging/beach nourishment requests. The general consensus of the Commission was that predicting future needs are difficult and it would be best to consider small projects on a case-by-case basis. Member Goldstein agreed by taking a case-by-case approach and supports the current \$69,000 request, especially considering the assistance NCDWR has provided Bogue Banks in the past. Also, member Goldstein cautioned against over estimating the occupancy tax revenue as gas prices are up and it will take a while for the new condominiums to be built and start bringing in revenue. Member Huml subsequently made a motion to approve the \$69,000 request for the AIWW inlet crossing work at Bogue Inlet. The motion was seconded by member Lamson and approved by a 5-1 vote (Yay - Goldstein, Huml, Lamson, Lindblad, and McElraft; Nay - Willis).

(5) **Public Comment.** – None.

(6) **Other Business.** – Chairman Fugate briefed the Commission regarding the Olsen Associates Sand Transport Study. The Commission had two good meetings with State Resources Agencies earlier in the month and then a second meeting with State and Federal agencies last week (April 20<sup>th</sup>). The report was well-received and although there is apparently a lot that can't be done in the long term to change the USACE's dredging protocols, NCDWR recommended the development of

a subcommittee to help expedite the process. Also, there may be an opportunity to form a memorandum of agreement between the Corps, Port, other State agencies, and the County to help rectify the dredging issues at the Morehead City Harbor.

- (7) **May 2006 Meeting Date (May 22, 2006 – proposed)**. – It was agreed upon that the May Beach Commission meeting would be held on May 22<sup>nd</sup> at 2:00 pm.
- (8) **Adjourn**. – Chairman Fugate asked for any additional comments and with no additional comments forthcoming, the meeting was adjourned.