MEMORANDUM

TO:             MPCBPAA

FROM:          Jacqueline Shapo, NOAA CSC Coastal Management Fellow

DATE:          June 6, 2007

RE:            June 8th PAA Meeting

This announcement serves as notice to call a meeting of the Public Access Authority on Friday, June 8, 2007 at **11:00 a.m.** The meeting will be held in the MPPDC Regional Board Room. Lunch will be provided.

The agenda and related materials follow. If you have any questions, please call (804-758-2311) or e-mail (jshapo@mppdc.com) me at your convenience.

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of April Minutes
3. Financial Report
4. Public Comment
5. Browne Tract
   a. Improvements
   b. Ribbon Cutting Ceremony
6. Shenk Tract
   a. Property Name
   b. Maintenance
7. CELCP Update
8. Working Waterways and Waterfronts 2007 Symposium
   a. Review of Conference Material
   b. Boat US Award to MPPDC / MPCBPAA
10. Other Business
11. Chairman Observations
12. Next Meeting
13. Adjourn
1. Welcome and Introductions

The Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority held its meeting in the Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission Board Room in Saluda, Virginia, at 11:00am on April 13, 2007.

Chairman Whiteway called the meeting to order. Members and Alternates present were Frank Pleva, King William County Administrator; Terri Hale, King William County Assistant Administrator; Ron Hachey, King & Queen County Administrator; Gary Allen, Essex County Administrator; Louise Theberge, Gloucester County Board of Supervisors; and Jimmy Sydnor, Tappahannock Assistant Town Manager. Also present were Lewis Lawrence, Director of Regional Planning MPPDC; Jacqueline Shapo, NOAA Coastal Management Fellow; Sara Stamp, SAMP Director MPPDC; and Rose Lewis, Secretary - MPPDC.

2. Approval of February Minutes

Chairman Whiteway requested a motion to approve the February 9, 2007 Minutes. Mr. Allen moved that the Minutes be approved. Ms. Theberge seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

3. Treasurer’s Report

Chairman Whiteway requested that Ms. Shapo review the March 2007 Revenue and Expenditure Report. Ms. Shapo mentioned that the report will now show a budget for FY 07 PAA Administration (320012). Chairman Whiteway requested a motion to approve the March 2007 Revenue and Expenditure Report. Ms. Theberge moved that the Report be approved; Mr. Pleva seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

4. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

5. Election of New PAA Officers

Chairman Whiteway noted that Ms. Shapo had researched the MPCBPAA by-laws and found that MPCBPAA officers must be elected at the first meeting of each year. Chairman Whiteway requested nominations for Chairman and Vice Chairman. Mr. Allen nominated Mr. Pleva as Chairman and Mr. Hachey as Vice Chairman. No other nominations were
made. Chairman Whiteway moved that all in favor of Mr. Pleva as Chairman and Mr. Hachey as Vice Chairman voice their agreement by “aye”. All were in favor.

Mr. Pleva took his place as Chairman. Chairman Pleva requested nominations for Treasurer. Mr. Hachey nominated Mr. Allen to continue as Treasurer. No other nominations were made. Chairman Pleva moved that all in favor of Mr. Allen as Treasurer voice their agreement by “aye.” All were in favor.


Ms. Shapo discussed the 2007-2008 VACO insurance renewal quote of $1412.00. This amount has been budgeted in the Public Officials Insurance expense section of the FY07 PAA Administration (320012). Mr. Lawrence noted that estimated amounts for the Browne Tract signage and the footbridge were not included in the $1412 insurance quote. Chairman Pleva requested a motion to approve the 2007-2008 VACO insurance renewal quote. Mr. Allen moved that the renewal quote be approved; Mr. Whiteway seconded the motion. Motion carried.

7. DCBLA Sign Project

Ms. Shapo reported on developments associated with the Department of Conservation and Recreation – Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Division’s Dragon Run Buffer Signage Project. As of February 13, 2007, the contract with DCR-CBLA to provide educational signage on the Browne Tract was terminated. The administrative and procurement time line made the project no longer feasible.

8. Browne Tract Improvements

Ms. Shapo reported that suggested improvements to the Browne Tract, including installation of a canoe/kayak stand and construction of wood duck nest boxes (habitat improvement project) by local Boy Scouts or inmates of the Middle Peninsula Regional Security Center, are still pending. Ms. Shapo is currently researching material costs to build the canoe stand.

9. Browne Tract Ribbon Cutting Ceremony (Friday, May 4, 2007 – 1:00pm)

   a) **Dragon Run Conservation Roundtable:**
   Ms. Shapo reported that the Browne Tract Ribbon Cutting Ceremony will be held on Friday, May 4, 2007 at 1:00pm. The rain date is May 18, 2007 at 1:00pm. Potential funding through DCR that would have permitted the ribbon cutting ceremony to be hosted jointly with the Dragon Run Conservation Roundtable is no longer available. Ms. Stamp mentioned that monies to permit the roundtable may be available later in the Fall 2007.

   b) **Potential Speakers:**
   Ms. Shapo reported that current speakers scheduled for the ribbon cutting ceremony include Delegate Harvey Morgan, Laura McKay (VA Coastal Zone Management Program), and Mr. Lawrence. Discussion was held regarding current scheduled speakers and other potential speakers at the event. Mr. Hachey
suggested that Delegate Christopher Peace be invited and maybe say a few words about land conservation in Essex and King & Queen Counties. Delegate Peace is the representative for the 97th District, where some of the Browne Tract is located. Ms. Shapo will extend an invitation to Delegate Peace.

c) **Talking Points:**

It was agreed upon after discussion that the potential speakers limit their talking points to five minutes each. Scheduled speakers will be provided with potential talking points and will be permitted to edit their remarks.

d) **Invitee List:**

Ms. Shapo noted that the invitee list currently consists of 70 individuals, including Timothy Schotsch (BFI, Allied Waste Services), David Harmon and Sergeant Radabaugh (Middle Peninsula Regional Security Center), Essex and King & Queen County Board of Supervisors members, collaborators at the Department of Forestry, Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, the VA CZM Program, Friends of Dragon Run, the Dragon Run Steering Committee, Mary Helen Morgan (President, Middle Peninsula Land Trust), the Chesapeake Bay Program, Department of Conservation and Recreation, NOAA, Estie Thomas (Virginia Outdoors Foundation), Bill Pruitt, and members of the local press. A sheet cake to feed that many people will cost about $46; including drinks would bring the total to approximately $100. The VA CZM Program may offer a match amount of $100. The PAA agreed not to ask the CZM Program for the match. The menu can be increased to include additional food and drink if necessary; however, a simple menu of cake and punch was agreed upon as the preferred option.

Ms. Shapo asked the PAA whether Senators John Warner and Jim Webb and Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis should be invited to the ribbon cutting ceremony due to their efforts to push land conservation funding through the VA CZM Program and protect the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. It was agreed upon that the Senators and Congresswoman Davis be invited and offered the opportunity to speak. Additional invitees suggested by the PAA members included Preston Bryant (Secretary of Natural Resources), Katy Lloyd (Public Information Officer – King William County), and Lawrence Latney (Richmond Times-Dispatch).

Ms. Shapo distributed a draft invitation to the PAA members for comment. Discussion was held regarding parking, carpooling, shuttling visitors, before- and after-photos of the Browne Tract footbridge, having brochures related to the PAA projects readily available at the event, and sending invitations both by mail and email.

10. **TNC Land Donation Opportunities**

Ms. Shapo reported on the candidate parcels that TNC is looking to gift fee simple to the PAA.
a) **New Point Comfort and Trimmer Tracts:**

The New Point Comfort Tract is composed of 110.95 acres and five parcels (St. Christopher’s School, Ralph Vincent Inc., Kane Tract, Combs 1 & 2, and Hartley Tract), all of which are located in Mathews County. The New Point Comfort parcels are valuable for hunting, birding, and boating. The Nature Conservancy must develop a habitat management plan for the five parcels before potential transfer to the MPCBPAA. There is a high potential for use conflict on most of the parcels. Threats from *Phragmites* and sea-level rise/subsidence are also present. Mr. Whiteway mentioned that St. Christopher’s School, the largest parcel at 94.95 acres and currently open to public access, has an observation deck and parking lot associated with it. There is great hiking potential on this piece as well.

The Trimmer Tract is 35.28 acres and is located 0.7 miles northwest of the New Point Comfort parcels in Mathews County. It also is a viable hunting ground for waterfowl. Federal Threatened State Threatened species on the Trimmer Tract include the bald eagle, loggerhead sea turtle, piping plver, and the northeastern beach tiger beetle. Additional threats present include *Phragmites* and sea-level rise/subsidence.

Mr. Pleva requested that Ms. Shapo inquire whether the New Point Comfort Parcels and the Trimmer Tract must be acquired from TNC together or if they can be acquired separately.

b) **Mattaponi River Megasites:**

These two properties constitute a total of 16.5 acres but may be acquired individually. The Garrett Tract (12.5 acres) is located in King William County and the Taylor’s Marsh Tract (4 acres) is located in King & Queen County. The Garrett Tract has a General Warranty Deed and is viable hunting ground for waterfowl. This tract is downstream from Aylett Landing and upstream from Melrose Landing and Waterfence Landing, all of which are public access sites.

The Taylor’s Marsh Tract has a Special Warranty Deed and is an Important Bird Area. This area has high potential for use conflict. It is located directly across from Walkerton Landing and is downstream from Aylett Landing, both public access sites.

c) **Guinea Marshes:**

The Guinea Marshes Tract comprises 188.5 acres and has a General Warranty Deed. This area contains viable hunting ground for waterfowl and is an Important Bird Area. Gloucester Point Beach and Gloucester Point Landing are the two closest public access points to this parcel. Ecotourism potential is very high, and there are significant cultural advantages to the PAA owning these islands.
Discussion was held regarding title work, attorney’s responsibilities, and public meetings to obtain any or all of these parcels. Acquisition of The Nature Conservancy’s land donation opportunities were prioritized as follows:

1. Trimmer Tract (Mathews County)
2. Guinea Marshes (Gloucester County)
3. Garrett Tract (King William County)
4. Taylor’s Marsh Tract (King and Queen County)
5. New Point Comfort Parcels (Mathews County)

Mr. Whiteway questioned whether Andy Lacatell (TNC) might be willing to come and speak to the PAA Board at the next meeting about the individual parcels. Mr. Lawrence requested, on behalf of Mr. Lacatell, that this matter be discussed with him after mid-May 2007, when Mr. Lacatell’s workload priorities at TNC have decreased. Chairman Pleva requested a motion to accept the proposed prioritized list of TNC land donation opportunities. Mr. Hachey moved that the prioritized list be accepted; Mr. Whiteway seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

11. CELCP Update

a) Current Acquisitions and Match Property:

The Special Award Conditions through NOAA have been satisfied for the three current CELCP acquisitions; i.e., Haworth, Dragon Bridge, and Jackson. Ms. Shapo submitted a Cash Advance Request to the VA CZM Program to permit payment of all remaining FY05, Task 1.01 CELCP funds ($414,097.44) to the PAA. These monies would permit closure on the three properties; however, release of the remaining funds by the CZM Program is still pending.

Elisabeth Morgan at NOAA requested that Ms. Shapo submit an amended Scope of Work to NOAA to create a nexus (ecologically and physically) between the match property, Batten, and the 3 CELCP acquisitions. After conversations with Estie Thomas (Easement Specialist and local CELCP contact with the Virginia Outdoors Foundation), Ms. Shapo also amended the Scope of Work to include VOF as a PAA CELCP partner. VOF currently co-holds the conservation easement, with the PAA, on the Batten match property due to its location in Middlesex County. The amended Scope of Work was submitted to the CZM Program and to NOAA on April 5, 2007 and is currently pending at NOAA. The three current CELCP acquisitions must be closed on by June 30, 2007.

b) New CELCP Acquisitions:

After discussions with TNC, three new potential properties are under consideration for acquisition with the remaining FY 05 CELCP funds ($568,810). These include the Robert Norman Property (30 acres, King and Queen County, adjacent to the current Haworth CELCP acquisition), the two Rhoads and Parmenter Tracts (212 acres total, Gloucester County), and the Irish Roads Tract
(270 acres, King and Queen County). The application for any or all of these three tracts must be started by July 1st and submitted to NOAA by mid-September at the latest, so that the properties may be closed on by the FY 05 CELCP deadline of December 31, 2007.

Discussion was also held related to acquisition of the Hundley Tract (2 parcels, 18 acres, Essex County) valued at $3,600.00. It was the decision of the Board that the Hundley Tract ($3,600.00), Robert Norman Property ($30,000.00), Rhoads and Parmenter Tracts ($260,000), and 123 acres of the Irish Roads Tract ($246,769.50) be acquired using the remaining FY 05 CELCP funds; i.e., $540,369.50 ($568,810.00 - 5% administration costs).

12. Other Business

a) Possible Land Donation - Gloucester:

Mr. Lawrence reported that there is a potential land donation opportunity from a developer in the Woods Cross Roads development area (Gloucester County). If accepted, this land would be gifted fee simple to the PAA, but concerns were raised due to its being swamp land with little public access potential.

b) Working Waterways & Waterfronts 2007 Symposium:

Mr. Lawrence reported that the Working Waterways & Waterfronts 2007 Symposium will be held at the Sheraton Norfolk Waterside from May 9-11. Mr. Lawrence will be presenting at the symposium on May 10th and encouraged all to attend if possible. The full conference fee is $325.00. Attendance for one day of the symposium costs $115.00.

c) General Assembly Budget:

The General Assembly awarded $75,000 to the PAA, which will be conveyed to the PAA via the Department of Conservation and Recreation. A conveyance strategy will need to be developed by the PAA to determine how the $75,000 will be spent. Discussion was held related to potential use of these funds to cover the legal work behind the TNC land donation opportunities. Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Theberge, and Mr. Hachey also mentioned the opportunity to use the funds to purchase the second phase of road endings in Tappahannock, Gloucester County, and/or King and Queen County. Mr. Lawrence also suggested that his time could be pulled off of the Coastal TA grant and budgeted to this new grant. Chairman Pleva suggested that the legislation supporting the award, as well as the strategy for expenditure of these monies, be revisited at the next PAA meeting.

13. Chairman Observations

Chairman Pleva thanked former Chairman Whiteway and current Treasurer Gary Allen for their services in 2006-2007. Chairman Pleva also congratulated Mr. Hachey on his election to Vice Chairman of the MPCBPAA.
14. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority will be held Friday, June 8, 2007 at 11:00am.

15. Adjourn

Chairman Pleva requested a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Ms. Theberge moved that the motion be approved; Mr. Hachey seconded the motion. Meeting was adjourned.

______________________________
Frank Pleva
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**Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission**

**Run Date:** 06/04/2007  
**Run Time:** 9:24:08 am  
**Page -1 of 1**

**Period:** 07/01/04 to 05/31/07

**Project Period:** 7/1/2004 to 6/30/2010

### 320010 Brown Tract Management

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Code &amp; Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Proj Tot</th>
<th>Un/Ovr</th>
<th>% Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44010 MPLT/BFI Award</td>
<td>37,500.00</td>
<td>19,894.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,605.25</td>
<td>37,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44900 Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>1,661.00</td>
<td>1,661.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,661.00</td>
<td>1,661.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td>39,161.00</td>
<td>21,555.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,605.25</td>
<td>39,161.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Code &amp; Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Proj Tot</th>
<th>Un/Ovr</th>
<th>% Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53400 Office Supplies</td>
<td>204.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>204.06</td>
<td>204.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54500 Lodging/ Staff Expense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>686.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-686.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54900 Travel Expense Other</td>
<td>1,133.15</td>
<td>1,133.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,133.15</td>
<td>1,133.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55150 Subscriptions/Publication</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55200 Workshops</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>162.60</td>
<td>162.60</td>
<td>162.60</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>98.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56400 Consulting/Contractual Services</td>
<td>2,237.55</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>675.00</td>
<td>1,562.55</td>
<td>30.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56600 Construction</td>
<td>17,208.24</td>
<td>15,732.95</td>
<td>85.88</td>
<td>879.97</td>
<td>16,612.92</td>
<td>595.32</td>
<td>96.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56700 Contractual Other</td>
<td>14,700.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>31.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57400 Public Officials Insurance</td>
<td>3,503.00</td>
<td>3,503.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,503.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>39,161.00</td>
<td>21,555.75</td>
<td>248.48</td>
<td>27,000.73</td>
<td>12,160.27</td>
<td>68.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance:</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-248.48</td>
<td>12,160.27</td>
<td>12,160.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 320012 FY07 PAA Administration

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Code &amp; Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Proj Tot</th>
<th>Un/Ovr</th>
<th>% Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41900 VDHR</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Code &amp; Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Proj Tot</th>
<th>Un/Ovr</th>
<th>% Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53400 Office Supplies</td>
<td>142.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>142.09</td>
<td>142.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53500 Meeting Supplies</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>74.18</td>
<td>301.06</td>
<td>301.06</td>
<td>148.94</td>
<td>66.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54500 Lodging/ Staff Expense</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>152.50</td>
<td>23.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56300 Legal Services</td>
<td>6,914.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,914.83</td>
<td>6,914.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56400 Consulting/Contractual Services</td>
<td>8,935.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>693.00</td>
<td>693.00</td>
<td>8,242.17</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57400 Public Officials Insurance</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,412.00</td>
<td>1,412.00</td>
<td>1,588.00</td>
<td>47.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57500 Miscellaneous Other</td>
<td>357.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>257.91</td>
<td>27.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>74.18</td>
<td>9,610.48</td>
<td>9,610.48</td>
<td>10,389.52</td>
<td>48.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance:</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-74.18</td>
<td>10,389.52</td>
<td>10,389.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Revenues:** 59,161.00 21,555.75 0.00 37,605.25 59,161.00 0.00 100.00%

**Project Expense:** 59,161.00 21,555.75 322.66 15,055.46 36,611.21 22,549.79 61.88%

**Project Balance:** 0.00 0.00 -322.66 22,549.79 22,549.79
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### Project Period:  
7/1/2005 to 6/30/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Code &amp; Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Proj Tot</th>
<th>Un/Ovr</th>
<th>% Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320050 Dragon CELCP Acquisitions($420667TNCMatch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41300 VDEQ</td>
<td>420,667.00</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,559.91</td>
<td>6,569.56</td>
<td>414,097.44</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>420,667.00</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,559.91</td>
<td>6,569.56</td>
<td>414,097.44</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50000 SALARIES</td>
<td>1,022.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>1,071.60</td>
<td>1,071.60</td>
<td>-49.60</td>
<td>104.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50500 FRINGE BENEFITS</td>
<td>367.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>382.06</td>
<td>382.06</td>
<td>-15.06</td>
<td>104.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56300 Legal Services</td>
<td>14,307.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>14,289.75</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56301 Appraisals</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,200.00</td>
<td>4,200.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56400 Consulting/Contractual S</td>
<td>399,760.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>399,760.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57100 Postage</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>-31.53</td>
<td>426.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57500 Miscellaneous Other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59700 INDIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>701.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-28.57</td>
<td>692.43</td>
<td>690.26</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>98.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>420,667.00</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>-19.30</td>
<td>6,394.25</td>
<td>6,403.90</td>
<td>414,263.10</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>165.66</td>
<td>165.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Revenues:</td>
<td>420,667.00</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,559.91</td>
<td>6,569.56</td>
<td>414,097.44</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Expense:</td>
<td>420,667.00</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>-19.30</td>
<td>6,394.25</td>
<td>6,403.90</td>
<td>414,263.10</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Balance:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>165.66</td>
<td>165.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Revenue and Expenditure Report by Element

**Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission**

**Period** 07/01/04 to 05/31/07

**Project Period** 10/1/2006 to 3/31/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element Code &amp; Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>Proj Tot</th>
<th>Un/Ovr</th>
<th>% Bud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320060 Browne Tract Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41700 VDCR</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56400 Consulting/Contractual S</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57500 Miscellaneous Other</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-300.00</td>
<td>-300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Revenues:</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Expense:</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Balance:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-300.00</td>
<td>-300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In August 2006, the Waterfront Access Study Committee was created by the North Carolina General Assembly and charged to study the degree of loss and potential loss of the diversity of uses along the coastal shoreline of North Carolina, and how these losses impact access to the coastal public trust waters of the State. After seven months of meetings, discussions, public comments, study of waterfront-dependent uses, and review of public access issues regarding coastal public trust waters, the Committee determined that the State is experiencing a significant loss in the diversity of waterfront-dependent uses and in public access.

Skyrocketing market demand for this limited, finite shoreline resource, accelerating non-waterfront-dependent development of the shoreline, and steadily increasing real property taxes are among the factors contributing to this loss and strongly suggest that, without State intervention, this disturbing trend will continue to the detriment of the people of the State of North Carolina.

The Waterfront Access Study Committee believes that the need to ensure existing waterfront-dependent uses, to ensure future diverse waterfront-dependent uses of the shoreline, and to retain and enhance public access to coastal public trust waters is an important and urgent issue confronting the people of North Carolina, and that there are grounds for an immediate, comprehensive, and creative response by the State.

Therefore, the Waterfront Access Study Committee offers the following recommendations:

**Retaining and Enhancing Working Waterfronts**

- The N.C. Waterfront Access Study Committee recommends that the N.C. General Assembly extend eligibility of present use value taxation to working waterfront properties, as defined in this report, or as subsequently redefined, given consideration of this report.

- The Committee recommends the establishment of a working waterfronts trust fund, or some other separate and distinct set-aside of State funds, to assist in the retention and enhancement of working waterfront land uses along coastal public trust waters of the State.

- The Committee endorses ongoing efforts on the part of the N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources’ One NC Naturally program to develop a statewide strategic conservation plan, which proposes, among other actions, to develop a Geographic Information Systems-based model that will identify “working lands”—including working waterfronts.

**Enhancing Public Access to Coastal Waters**

- The Committee recommends that the N.C. Wildlife Resources Commission’s (WRC) Boating Infrastructure Program be funded at significantly higher levels,
and be charged to allocate a majority of these new resources to projects enhancing coastal public trust water access.

- The Committee endorses the N.C. Wildlife Resources Commission's (WRC) continuing efforts to reach agreements with the N.C. Department of Transportation (DOT), power companies, local governments, nonprofits, and other State agencies to proactively and cooperatively address public access to coastal waters in infrastructural programs. In particular, the Committee urges the DOT to work closely with the WRC to see that expanded public coastal access is a priority in its road project planning and construction programs.

- The Committee recommends that the N.C. Division of Coastal Management (DCM) Public Beach and Coastal Waterfront Access program be funded at significantly higher levels.

- The Committee recommends that the N.C. Division of Water Resources' Water Resources Development Project Grants Program give greater priority to grant applications that seek to enhance access to coastal public trust waters, via coastal waterfront recreation site development. To accommodate such new prioritization, the Committee also recommends that the program's annual funding level, via General Assembly appropriation, be increased.

- The Committee recommends and endorses efforts within the N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) and the N.C. Wildlife Resources Commission (WRC) to allocate a reasonable share of proceeds from the new Coastal Recreational Fishing License to public coastal fishing access enhancements.

- The Committee supports various findings and recommendations of the Joint Legislative Commission on Land and Water Conservation that would allow for additional funding ($1 billion over five years) to finance conservation and cultural and historic preservation activities in North Carolina.

- The Committee recommends that consequent and/or attendant public recreational access enhancements be elevated as a criterion for the awarding of grants through the State's Clean Water Management Trust Fund (CWMTF), and, as corollary, that the CWMTF require public access enhancements in awarded projects that may, upon its review, offer multiple-use potential and benefits, such as public recreational access.

- The Committee recommends that those State agencies engaged in management of the State's coastal resources catalog and prioritize those waterfront sites required to conduct resource management activities, such as DMF oyster cultch collection sites.

Planning and Zoning Approaches to Waterfront and Access Issues

- The Committee recommends that the N.C. Coastal Resources Commission (CRC) amend its Land-Use Planning Guidelines to include, in the management topics, a requirement of local governments to inventory, assess and develop policies concerning working waterfronts within their planning jurisdiction.
• The Committee recommends that additional funding be provided to the N.C. Division of Coastal Management's (DCM) Planning and Management Grant Program to assist local governments in the development of public access inventories and plans.

• The Committee recommends that the Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA) be amended, commensurate with adequate funding, authorizing the N.C. Division of Coastal Management to provide grants to local governments proposing to inventory, and plan for, retention or enhancement of working waterfronts.

• The Committee recommends that coastal local governments explore potential uses of special zoning techniques, including conditional zoning, as means to retain or enhance areas for working waterfronts and/or public access facility development, consistent with approved Coastal Area Management Act land-use plans.

Purchase or Transfer of Development Rights

• The Committee recommends that the General Assembly consider enacting legislation to authorize Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs at the local government level, for use in local working waterfront and/or public access retention and enhancement programs.

Fishing Piers: A North Carolina Heritage

• The Committee recommends that private fishing piers providing public access be given present use value taxation classification as working waterfronts, with all attendant advantages.

• The Committee recommends the State explore, with all due speed, sources of funding and financing mechanisms to be used in assisting owners of private fishing piers providing public access with storm damage repair, including the possibility of tapping the proposed working waterfront trust or set-aside fund to finance a low-interest loan program.

• The Committee recommends that the North Carolina Aquariums be authorized and funded to pilot the design, development, and operation of three (3) public fishing piers that not only would provide angling access, but also would offer public educational opportunities.

Fees for Public Trust Submerged Lands and Easements

• As one approach to identifying and creating a more substantive source of revenues for State development of access to coastal public trust waters, the Committee recommends that the General Assembly re-examine and reformulate the State’s public trust submerged lands easement fee structure.
• The Committee also recommends that the General Assembly explore new means by which to generate a source of State revenues to be directly allocated for both working waterfront and public access retention and enhancement programs.

• The Committee recommends that the General Assembly, in concert with the N.C. Department of Justice and the N.C. Coastal Resources Law, Planning and Policy Center, examine the nature and legality of the long-term or permanent sale of docks or “dockominiums” that occupy coastal public trust submerged lands.

Meeting Environmental Compliance Costs

• The Committee recommends that funding sources and mechanisms, including those recommended in this report, be made available and tapped to assist working waterfront and public access facility developers, pursuant to local government approval, in developing or redeveloping facilities along the waterfront in ways that comply fully with environmental regulations.

Need for a Comprehensive Socioeconomic Study

• This Committee recommends that the General Assembly provide funding for a socioeconomic study of working waterfronts and access to coastal public trust waters, and/or for an ongoing series of such studies, to examine these issues comprehensively and in detail.

Cooperative State-Local Partnerships and Approaches

• The Committee recommends that the General Assembly encourage coastal counties and waterfront municipalities to establish working waterfront and public access advisory bodies, having appropriate ex-officio State agency representation, to address and seek cooperative State-local solutions to waterfront and access issues.

Educational Outreach

• The Committee recommends that the General Assembly, contingent upon the level of its response to the recommendations in this report, endorse and financially support educational outreach programs to improve retention and enhancement of working waterfronts and public access to coastal waters.

Further Study and Oversight

• The Committee recommends that the General Assembly establish a formal joint legislative commission to continue the work of the Waterfront Access Study Committee, and to guide any programs or actions implemented, either out of this Study Committee’s recommendations or other related deliberations.
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Executive Summary

A tide of demographic and economic change is moving through coastal towns, harbors, and communities throughout the United States. As the various regions and states confront the resulting conflicts over access to beaches, shorelines, and waterways, they are recognizing the need to identify and share tools and solutions.

In December 2006, Maine Sea Grant, with support from Hawaii Sea Grant and an advisory committee from the National Sea Grant network and Coastal Zone Management programs, surveyed over 140 extension professionals, coastal managers, and other individuals to characterize the scope of coastal access issues nationwide and the effects on coastal communities, and to inventory solutions and tools being implemented by Sea Grant and other programs.

Viewed through the eyes of survey respondents, there are no exclusively regional trends—access to and from the coast is a challenge in communities from Alaska and Hawaii to California, Oregon, and Washington, along the Gulf Coast states, around the Florida peninsula, and up the entire East Coast to Maine. With nowhere to swim and nowhere to land, recreational, commercial, and industrial users of the coast are competing for access.

Multiple factors are driving these changes, including increasing population and development, rising coastal property values, declines in fishing and other industries, and shifting land ownership patterns. Resulting pressure on remaining public areas and infrastructure also means increased stress on fragile coastal habitat, and coastal managers have limited resources to address this pressure. Disasters like hurricanes and storms magnify and exacerbate conflicts.

But solutions are emerging, and Sea Grant, Coastal Zone Management, and numerous other public and private entities throughout the country are developing tools to create and preserve access. Private entities are conserving land, fishermen are partnering with land trusts, and citizens are voting for bonds to protect working waterfronts. States are implementing tax relief programs, while towns are revising zoning ordinances and mapping access points, and extension agents are designing education programs. But they need help. Case studies and stories from around the country, taken from the survey and follow-up discussion with respondents, exemplify the geographic and demographic scope of the issue, prompting discussion of a nationwide strategy to address coastal access conflicts at the local, regional, and national level. Such a strategy would include funding for infrastructure maintenance, land acquisition, code enforcement, planning, research, and data collection. This funding would be supported through legislative and policy action at the national, state, regional, and municipal levels. A national coastal access clearinghouse Web site would enable the continued sharing of solutions and tools, as well as outline the roles of various entities and organizations, ranging from Sea Grant programs to federal, state, and local governments, among others.

Open and seamless access to and from the water, supported by a national strategy, will ensure that our nation is vibrant and diverse, and that the delicate ecosystems where land meets water continues to sustain and inspire future generations.
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PROGRAMS WILL BE OPERATED IN THE FOLLOWING GENERAL AREAS:

(1) MPCBPAA ADMINISTRATION
(2) PUBLIC ACCESS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
(3) LAND ACCESS ACQUISITION
(4) ACCESS INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS
(5) WATER ACCESS STRATEGIC PLANNING
(6) SPECIAL ACCESS PROJECTS
(1) Program: **General PAA Administration**

**Description:** This program allows the overall program to function by supporting the individual projects and operation of the Authority.

**Activities:** Personnel administration; financial management; administrative grant reporting; and other general Authority functions.

**Responsibility:** ??????

**Support:** ??????

(2) Program: **Local Daily Technical Assistance**

**Description:** This program responds to daily requests for assistance from local government staff. In order to properly manage the workload, requests should be channeled through Authority members to ?????

**Activities:** Consultation on public access related issues; review of local public access projects; and GIS and other public access technical assistance provision, as necessary.

**Responsibility:** ??????

**Support:** ??????

(3) Program: **Land Acquisition**

**Description:** This program responds to land acquisition opportunities. Private donations and grant funded acquisitions are coordinated and administered. The assessment of acquisition opportunities; coordination with member localities to ensure compatibility with local planning initiatives; and strategic acquisition planning also fall under this program.
Activities:
a. Private Donations
   i. NGO Land Donations
   ii. Private Development Donations
   iii. Private Landowner Donations

b. Public Acquisitions
   i. Dragon Run CELCP
   ii. VDOT Road Ending Transfers

Responsibility: ??????

Support: ?????

(4) Program: Access Infrastructure Improvements

Description: This program includes public access studies; infrastructure planning and development; project coordination assistance to the Authority and local governments in public access grant funding programs; and project administration and coordination of public access infrastructure improvement projects.

Activities:
a. Ongoing Acquisition Planning and Management
   i. Browne
   ii. Shenk
   iii. CELCP
   iv. VDOT Road Endings

Responsibility: ??????

Support: ?????

(5) Program: Water Access Strategic Planning

Description: Those activities, which promote and support efforts to study and plan for local and regional water access needs. These include identifying and articulating local and regional needs and wants and working under the concept of “preserving and managing access to the water”.

Activities:
a. Regional Waterfront Access Master Plan
(6) Program: Special Access Projects

Description: This program includes opportunities not currently identified or recognized but potentially play an important role in future public access initiatives. Included are special topic analyses and special program developments.

Activities:

a. Dredging and Public Access
b. Preservation of Working Waterfronts Initiative
c. Wetlands Mitigation Banking

Responsibility: ??????

Support: ??????