APPENDIX J
PUBLIC COMMENTS AND AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

From: Matthews, Kathryn (Kathy)
To: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)
Cc: Divers, Marion T CIV USARMY CELRP (USA); Mann, Leigh; Archambault, Jennifer M; Ellis, John
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Re: [USACE Tar Pamlico Flood Risk Management Study Draft Documents
Date: Thursday, November 9, 2023 11:26:50 AM
Attachments: TarPamlicoUSACE-NOA.docx

Hi Kristi,

Thanks for the opportunity to review the study draft documents. The Service appreciates the Corps' elimination of the dry detention and other more impactful alternatives from consideration. We agree that consultation on the flood-proofing and elevation activities can be conducted by informal consultation. As you know, the tricolored bat is proposed for listing. If the species is listed prior to substantial completion of work associated with the draft EA, the Corps should also coordinate with us concerning that species.

Thanks, and let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Please note that I am teleworking Wednesday through Friday, every week. I have a new phone number - See Below!

Kathy Matthews
NC Renewable Energy Coordinator &
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
551-F Pylon Drive
Raleigh, NC 27606
NEW Phone! 984-308-0852

From: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2023 11:55 AM
To: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil>
Cc: Divers, Marion T CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) <Marion.Divers@usace.army.mil>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Notice: USACE Tar Pamlico Flood Risk Management Study Draft Documents

This email has been received from outside of DOI - Use caution before clicking on links, opening attachments, or responding.

Hello,

Please see attached Notice of Availability for the USACE release of the draft documents for the Tar

Pamlico Flood Risk Management Study for public comment.

Kristi Dobra, PG
Biologist- Environmental Resource Specialist
Environmental Section, Planning Branch
US Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh District

Kristi.s.dobra@usace.army.mil
kristidobra@pitt.edu
412-277-2039

From:	Pace Wilber - NOAA Federal
To:	Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)
Cc:	Divers, Marion T CIV USARMY CELRP (USA); Pittsburgh District Planning and Environmental Branch; Fritz Rohde - NOAA Federal; Andrew Herndon - NOAA Federal
Subject:	[Non-DoD Source] Re: Public Notice: USACE Tar Pamlico Flood Risk Management Study Draft Documents
Date:	Sunday, December 3, 2023 3:15:23 PM

Hello Kristi.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the *Draft Tar-Pamlico River Basin Flood Risk Management, Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment* dated October 2023. By letter dated July 1, 2020, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) noted the mainstem of the Tar River includes resources under the purview of NMFS, including critical habitat for the Carolina Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) and spawning or nursery habitat for striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), hickory shad (*Alosa mediocris*), American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*), blueback herring (*Alosa aestivalis*), alewife (*Alosa pseudoharengus*), and Atlantic sturgeon. The many tributaries in the basin also provide habitat for the catadromous American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*), which also is under the purview of NMFS.

The tentatively selected plan does not include in-water work. Further, the report indicates the initial alternative with in-water work would have significant negative effects to the environment and would not result in net positive benefits from a cost/benefit perspective. Accordingly, this alternative did not receive detailed study. Based on these results, NMFS has no recommendations under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act for the proposed action.

Please let us know if additional coordination is needed.

Sincerely,
Pace Wilber

On Thu, Nov 2, 2023 at 11:58 AM Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil> wrote:

> Hello,
>
> Please see attached Notice of Availability for the USACE release of the draft documents for the Tar Pamlico Flood Risk Management Study for public comment.
>
> Kristi Dobra, PG
>
> Biologist- Environmental Resource Specialist
>
> Environmental Section, Planning Branch
>
> US Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh District

Kristi.s.dobra@usace.army.mil

kristidobra@pitt.edu

412-277-2039

--

Pace Wilber, Ph.D.
South Atlantic and Caribbean Branch Chief
Habitat Conservation Division
NOAA Fisheries Service
331 Ft Johnson Road
Charleston, SC 29412

843-592-3024 (NOAA Google Voice)
Pace.Wilber@noaa.gov

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Raleigh ES Field Office
Post Office Box 33726
Raleigh, North Carolina 27636-3726

June 30, 2020

Marc A. Glowczewski, PE, PMP
Chief, Planning and Environmental Branch
Pittsburgh District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1000 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222-4186

Dear Mr. Glowczewski,

This letter responds to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) June 4, 2020 letter, requesting scoping comments for the Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study. According to the Corps' letter, the objectives of the project are to reduce flood risk within affected communities, decrease the risk to structures, industry, and public infrastructure, and to reduce life and safety risk associated with riverine and storm surge flooding events. The study area begins at the headwaters of the Tar River and stretches along the entire length of the Tar River down to the city of Washington, NC. The entirety of the Tar River Basin is part of the study area, including all associated tributaries. Flood management measures that are currently being considered include: traditional structural measures such as channel improvement (widening, deepening, straightening), flood walls, levees, channel relocation, wet and dry retention/detention, and transportation-related recommendations; non-structural measures such as flood-proofing, home acquisition and relocation, structure elevation, and emergency planning; and natural and nature-based measures such as wetland retention, riparian restoration, living shorelines, and reforestation.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has the following comments for the Corps' consideration. The Service has several trust resources in the Tar-Pamlico River Basin, including listed species and critical habitat, proposed species and critical habitat, migratory birds, anadromous fish, and bald eagles. Our comments are provided pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA), Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA).

<u>Federally Listed Species, Proposed Species, and Other Trust Resources</u>

Federally listed species that are known to be present in the Tar-Pamlico River Basin Study Area are listed below, along with species that are currently proposed to be listed. Diadromous (anadromous and catadromous) fish species are also known to be present in the Study Area, and bald eagles (protected under BGEPA), are known to migrate through, overwinter, and nest in the Study Area.

Dwarf wedgemussel (*Alasmidonta heterodon*)

- Description: The dwarf wedgemussel is listed as endangered. This species is a small freshwater mussel.
- Habitat: The dwarf wedgemussel appears to be a generalist in terms of its preference for stream size, substrate and flow conditions – it inhabits small streams less than five meters wide to large rivers more than 100 meters wide; it is found in a variety of substrate types including clay, sand, gravel and pebble, and sometimes in silt depositional areas near banks; and it usually inhabits hydrologically stable areas, including very shallow water along streambanks and under root mats, but it has also been found at depths of 25 feet. Dwarf wedgemussels are often patchily distributed in rivers. In North Carolina, most of the populations are isolated.
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: Upper Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Granville, Vance, Warren, Franklin, Nash, Halifax

Tar River Spinymussel (*Elliptio steinstansana*)

- Description: The Tar River spinymussel is listed as endangered. This species is a freshwater mussel.
- Habitat: The Tar River spinymussel lives in relatively silt-free unconsolidated beds of coarse sand and gravel in relatively in fast-flowing, well oxygenated stream reaches. It is found in association with other mussels, but it is never very numerous.
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: Upper Tar-Pamlico, Fishing Creek, Lower Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Halifax, Nash, Edgecombe

Yellow Lance (*Elliptio lanceolate*)

- Description: The yellow lance is listed as threatened. This species is a freshwater mussel.
- Habitat: The Yellow Lance is a sand-loving species (Alderman 2003) often found buried deep in clean, coarse to medium sand and sometimes migrating with shifting sands (NatureServe 2015), although it has also been found in gravel substrates. The species is dependent on clean (i.e., not polluted), moderate flowing water with high dissolved oxygen content in riverine or larger creek environments. Historically, the most robust populations existed in creeks and rivers with excellent water quality, and no populations appear to be extant below pollution point sources or areas with increased nutrient loading (Alderman 2003).
  Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: Upper Tar-Pamlico, Fishing Creek
    - Counties: Granville, Vance, Warren, Franklin, Nash, Edgecombe

Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrynchus*) (Information from NOAA)

- Description: The Atlantic sturgeon is listed as endangered. This species is an anadromous fish.
- Habitat: Atlantic sturgeon are born in freshwater, then migrate to the sea and back again to freshwater to spawn. In southern rivers, males usually enter the river in late summer when temperatures can be as high as 90°F, spawn as river temperatures approach 75 to 70°F, with females leaving immediately after spawning and males leaving as temperatures drop below 65°F. Upon hatching, larvae hide along the bottom and drift downstream until they reach brackish

waters where they may reside for one to five years before moving into nearshore coastal waters. Tagging data indicate that these immature Atlantic sturgeon travel widely once they leave their birth rivers. Atlantic sturgeon are bottom feeders. They typically look for food that includes invertebrates such as crustaceans, worms, and mollusks, and bottom-dwelling fish such as sand lance.

- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: Beaufort, Pitt, Edgecombe

Michaux's Sumac (*Rhus michauxii*)

- Description: Michaux's sumac is listed as endangered. This species is a rhizomatous shrub.
- Habitat: Michaux's sumac grows in sandy or rocky open woods in association with basic soils. Apparently, this plant survives best in areas where some form of disturbance has provided an open area. Several populations in North Carolina are on highway rights-of way, roadsides, or on the edges of artificially maintained clearings. Two other populations are in areas with periodic fires, and two populations exist on sites undergoing natural succession. One population is situated in a natural opening on the rim of a Carolina bay.
- Where Found in Study Area:
    - River Subbasin: Upper Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Franklin

Smooth Coneflower (*Echinacea laevigata*)

- Description: Smooth coneflower is listed as endangered. This species is a rhizomatous perennial herb in the aster family (Asteraceae).
- Habitat: Smooth coneflower is typically found in open woods, glades, cedar barrens, roadsides, clear cuts, dry limestone bluffs and power line rights-of-way (Weakley 2015). The species is usually found on magnesium and calcium rich soils associated with amphibolite, dolomite or limestone (in VA), gabbro (in NC and VA), diabase (in NC and SC) and marble (in SC). The species may rarely be found in oak-pine savannas of the upper coastal plain over circum-neutral clay sediments (Weakley 2015). The healthiest smooth coneflower populations receive abundant sunlight and little competition from other plant species (Gaddy 1991). Some form of disturbance, such as fire, is also essential.
- Where Found in Study Area:
    - River Subbasin: Upper Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Granville

West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus*)

- Description: The West Indian manatee was listed in 1967 as endangered, and downlisted to threatened on March 16, 2017. West Indian manatees also are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.). The manatee is a marine mammal.
- Habitat: Fresh, brackish, or marine water habitats, including shallow coastal bays, lagoons, estuaries, and inland rivers

- Where found in Study Area:
    - River Subbasin - Lower Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties - Pitt, Beaufort

Northern Long-eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*)

- Description: The northern long-eared bat (NLEB) is listed as threatened. The NLEB is a medium-sized bat.
- Habitat: In the colder portions of its range, northern long-eared bats spend winter hibernating in caves and mines. During the summer in cooler climates, and year-round in the North Carolina coastal plain, northern long-eared bats roost singly or in colonies underneath bark, in cavities or in crevices of trees, both live and dead. In the coastal plain of North Carolina, NLEB roost in trees year-round. NLEB seem to be flexible in selecting roosts, choosing roost trees based on suitability to retain bark or provide cavities or crevices. This bat has also been found rarely roosting in structures like barns and sheds.
- Where Found in Study Area:
    - Riverbasin Subbasins – potentially all
    - Counties – potentially all

Sensitive Jointvetch (*Aeschynomene virginica*)

- Description: Sensitive jointvetch is listed as threatened. This species is an annual plant in the pea family (Fabaceae).
- Habitat: Sensitive jointvetch typically grows in the intertidal zone of coastal marshes where plants are flooded twice daily. The species seems to prefer the marsh edge at an elevation near the upper limit of tidal fluctuation,where soils may be mucky, sandy, or gravelly. It is usually found in areas where plant diversity is high (50 species per acre) and annual species predominate. Bare to sparsely vegetated substrates appear to be of critical importance to this plant. As an annual, it requires such microhabitats to establish and grow. Such areas may include areas along rivers with new deposits of soil that have not yet been colonized by perennial species, low swales within extensive marshes, or areas where muskrats have eaten most of the vegetation. It appears to remain at a particular site for a relatively short period of time, and maintains itself by colonizing new, recently disturbed habitats where it may compete successfully among other early-successional species. It is frequently found in the estuarine meander zone of tidal rivers where sediments transported from upriver settle out and extensive marshes are formed. The substrate may be sandy, muddy, gravelly, or peaty. In North Carolina, sensitive jointvetch is most often found in roadside ditches, often with some connection to nearby brackish marshes.
- Where Found in Study Area:
    - River Subbasin: Lower Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Beaufort

Eastern Black Rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis*)

- Description: The eastern black rail is proposed to be listed as threatened. This species is a small marsh bird.
- Habitat: The eastern black rail is a wetland dependent subspecies. While it can be found in salt, brackish, and freshwater marshes that are tidally or non-tidally influenced, it has a very specific

niche habitat. It requires dense herbaceous vegetation to provide shelter and cover and areas for protected nest sites; it is not found in areas with woody vegetation. Salt, brackish, and freshwater marsh habitats that can be tidally or non-tidally influenced. Within these habitats, the birds occupy relatively high elevations along heavily vegetated wetland gradients, with soils that are moist or flooded to a shallow depth (Eddleman et al 1988; Nadeau and Conway 2015). Eastern black rails require dense vegetative cover that allows movement underneath the canopy. Occupied habitat tends to be primarily composed of fine-stemmed emergent plants (rushes, grasses, and sedges) with high stem densities and dense canopy cover (Flores and Eddleman 1995; Legare and Eddleman 2001). Little is known about eastern black rails during migration, including migratory stopover habitat (Eddleman et al. 1994).

- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasin: Lower Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Beaufort

<u>Neuse River waterdog (*Necturus lewisi*)</u>

- Description: The Neuse River waterdog is proposed to be listed as a threatened species. This species is from an ancient lineage of permanently aquatic salamanders.
- Habitat: The Neuse River waterdog's specific habitat characteristics include low to moderate gradient streams and low current velocity. It is a fully aquatic salamander, never leaving the water. It lacks lungs, getting oxygen from the water via external gills and needs clean, flowing water with high dissolved oxygen concentrations. The species dwells in streams wider than 15 meters but has been found in smaller creeks. The species thrives in cold water, and is much more active in colder seasons and when water is near-freezing. Researchers have documented activity decreasing after the water temperature rises above 18ºC. waterdogs spend about 85% of the time under large granite rocks or in burrows. In early spring they move into leaf beds over mud banks on the low-energy sides of riffles and where leaves were intact or only slightly decomposed and many small critters are in the leaf litter.
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: Warren, Franklin, Nash, Halifax, Pitt

<u>Atlantic pigtoe (*Fusconaia masoni*)</u>

- Description: The Atlantic pigtoe is proposed to be listed as a threatened species. This species is a small freshwater mussel.
- Habitat: The Atlantic pigtoe is dependent on clean, moderate flowing water with high dissolved oxygen content in creek and riverine environments. Historically, the best populations existed in creeks and rivers with excellent water quality, where stream flows were sufficient to maintain clean, silt-free substrates (Alderman and Alderman 2014). Because this species prefers more pristine conditions, it typically occurs in headwaters and rural watersheds. It is associated with gravel and coarse sand substrates at the downstream edge of riffles, and less commonly occurs in cobble, silt, or sand detritus mixtures (Bogan and Alderman 2008).
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: Granville, Warren, Franklin, Halifax, Nash, Edgecombe, Pitt

Carolina madtom (*Noturus furiosus*)

- Description: The Carolina madtom is proposed to be listed as endangered. This species is a small catfish.
- Habitat: The species occurs in riffles, runs, and pools in medium to large streams and rivers. Ideally, it inhabits fresh waters with continuous, year-round flow and moderate gradient in both the Piedmont and Coastal Plain physiographic regions. Optimal substrate for the Carolina madtom is predominantly silt-free, stable, gravel and cobble bottom habitat, and it must have cover for nest sites, including under rocks, bark, relic mussel shells, and even cans and bottles. The Carolina madtom is a sight feeder most active during the night, with peaks at dawn and dusk. It eats bottom-dwelling invertebrates such as larval midges, mayflies, caddisflies, dragonflies and beetle larvae.
- Where it is Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: Granville, Vance, Franklin, Warren, Halifax, Nash, Edgecombe

Diadromous Fish Species

- Description: Diadromous fish in the Tar-Pamlico River Basin include anadromous species such as blueback herring, alewife, sea lamprey, American shad, hickory shad, striped bass, Atlantic sturgeon, and one catadromous species, the American eel. Anadromous species spawn in freshwater and mature in the ocean. Catadromous species are born in the ocean and migrate into freshwater systems to mature. These species are both commercially and recreationally important in NC and coastwide. As mentioned earlier, the Atlantic sturgeon is listed as endangered. The Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have been petitioned to list the American eel, blueback herring, and alewife in the recent past but it was determined the species did not warrant listing. Much work is being done to restore the populations of these fishes. Overfishing, blockage of migratory runs, and changes in the hydrographs of waterways have all negatively impacted these species.
- Habitat: Spawning season for anadromous fish in the Tar-Pamlico River Basin begins in mid-February and extends through the end of September for the parts of the river used as primary nursery by American shad. Although not documented in recent years, it is believed that Atlantic sturgeon spawn in the Tar-Pamlico. In some rivers, there is a spring spawning run and a fall spawning run. Since spawning has not been documented, the Services have been unable to determine when sturgeon may be spawning in the Tar-Pamlico.
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: Edgecombe, Nash, Halifax, Beaufort, Pamlico, Hyde, Pitt, Martin, Wilson

Bald Eagle

- Description: Although the bald eagle was officially removed from the List of Endangered and Threatened Species as of August 8, 2007, it continues to be protected under the MBTA and the BGEPA. Bald Eagles migrate through, overwinter in, and nest in the Study Area. The Service developed the National Bald Eagle Management (NBEM) Guidelines to provide landowners, land managers, and others with information and recommendations regarding how to minimize potential project impacts to bald eagles, particularly where such impacts may constitute

"disturbance," which is prohibited by the BGEPA. A copy of the NBEM Guidelines is available at https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/national-bald-eagle-management- guidelines.

- Habitat: Bald eagles nest in North Carolina from December through mid-May in mature trees (e.g., bald cypress, pine, etc.) near fresh to intermediate marshes or open water. Nest sites typically include at least one perch with a clear view of the water or area where the eagles usually forage. Bald eagles are vulnerable to disturbance during courtship, nest building, egg laying, incubation, and brooding.
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: All

Migratory Birds and Important Bird Areas

- Description: The Service has oversight of 1,026 avian species identified and protected under the MBTA. These include individuals that are resident, breeding, overwintering, migrating, staging, roosting, feeding, resting, and that otherwise transit through the Study Area. North Carolina lies within the Atlantic Flyway, an administrative unit that helps frame management and conservation activities that sustain the millions of migratory birds that seasonally move along Atlantic coastal corridors. Millions of individuals of many dozens of migratory species are funneled to, move through, and rest and refuel throughout North Carolina as they move to and from temperate breeding areas in the United States and Canada, and neotropical wintering areas in Caribbean and Latin America. Of these migratory species, many are also designated as conservation priorities due to declining, threatened, or otherwise vulnerable populations. These priorities are articulated in several lists that are generated by conservation entities including state wildlife agencies, Federal natural resource agencies, and international bird conservation initiatives such as Partners in Flight.

  The Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) is a set of lists generated by the Service that justify and present migratory birds of high conservation priorities at a variety of spatial scales (e.g., national, regional, ecoregional). There is a BCC list specifically for Bird Conservation Region 27 - Southeastern Coastal Plain that includes 53 species. The Service periodically updates and publishes its BCC lists. The most recent BCC lists were revised in 2008 (library.fws.gov/bird_publications/bcc2008.pdf), and present a list of bird species of conservation concern for various regions and the nation as a whole. The species identified on these lists are considered vulnerable and are among the highest bird conservation priorities for the Service and our partners. Many of these species are experiencing widespread declines and could potentially become candidates for Federal listing under the ESA in the future. It is particularly important to fully consider impacts to BCC species when assessing short-term and cumulative effects of projects that can reasonably be expected to influence habitats, behaviors and demographics of these species.

  The Audubon Society has identified Important Bird Areas (IBA) in North Carolina and around the globe (https://www.audubon.org/important-bird-areas/state/north-carolina?field_iba_status=All&priority=All&page=1). Maintaining the integrity of these areas is critical for North Carolina's birds.

- Habitat: IBAs in the Study Area include Henslow's Fields #1 (Pitt County) and #2 (Beaufort County).

- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasin: Lower Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Pitt, Beaufort

Wintering Waterfowl

- Description: Several species of ducks, geese, and swans overwinter in North Carolina. All of these species are in the family Anatidae, characterized by having a broad, flat bill, short legs, and webbed feet. North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC) conducts the Mid-Winter Waterfowl Survey in early January each year. Surveys occur in distinct geographic "units" and all waterfowl (ducks, geese, brant, and swans) and coots are counted. The Tar-Pamlico River is considered to be of very high importance, particularly near and below Washington, NC.
- Habitat: Open water, beaver ponds, and swamps
- Where Found in Study Area:
    - River Subbasin: Lower Tar-Pamlico
    - Counties: Pitt, Beaufort

Waterbird Nesting Colonies

- Description: Species included in this category are brown pelican, Anhinga, double-crested cormorant, black skimmer, Caspian tern, common tern, Forster's tern, gull-billed tern, least tern, royal tern, sandwich tern, black-crowned night heron, great blue heron, great egret, green heron, cattle egret, glossy ibis, little blue heron, snowy egret, tricolored heron, white ibis, yellow-crowned night-heron, great black-backed gull, herring gull, and laughing gull. Wood storks are also included in this category, though no wood stork nesting colonies have been documented in the Study Area.
- Habitat: The size of a waterbird nesting colony may range from a few breeding pairs to thousands of breeding pairs. Colonial waterbird species nest in several different habitats, including barrier island beaches, estuarine shorelines and islands (including dredge spoil), maritime forests, and freshwater or tidal swamps, depending on the species. Gulls, terns, and skimmers generally nest on bare sand and shell with little or no vegetation. Pelicans prefer to nest in grasses or low shrubs. Wading birds, like egrets and herons, most often nest in shrubs or trees (NCWRC 2005).
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: All

Wetland and Stream Resources

Description of Habitat Types: The Study Area includes ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams and rivers of all sizes. North Carolina Stream Assessment Method (NCSAM) places streams into 29 general categories. The determination of 28 of the stream categories is based on geographic location, geomorphic valley shape, and watershed size. The 29th stream category, Tidal Marsh Stream, is simply its own category.

The North Carolina Wetland Assessment Method (NCWAM) places wetlands into 16 general categories: Salt/Brackish Marsh, Estuarine Woody Wetland, Tidal Freshwater Marsh, Riverine Swamp Forest, Seep, Hardwood Flat, Non-Riverine Swamp Forest, Pocosin, Pine Savanna, Pine

Flat, Basin Wetland, Bog, Non-Tidal Freshwater Marsh, Floodplain Pool, Headwater Forest, and Bottomland Hardwood Forest. Most, if not all of these wetland types are present in the Study Area. The largest areas of wetlands are in the Lower Tar-Pamlico River Basins.

Compensatory Mitigation Areas

- Description: The Tar-Pamlico River Basin encompasses over 80 compensatory mitigation sites, including wetlands, streams, and stream buffers. There are at least five mitigation banks in the Tar-Pamlico River Basin.
- Habitat: All NCSAM stream types, most NCWAM wetland types
- Where Found in the Study Area:
    - River Subbasins: All
    - Counties: All

SERVICE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Service recommends that the Corps consider budgeting for the development of a Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) Report for this project. The need for a FWCA Report will depend on the scope and breadth of the alternative(s) selected for funding.

2. The Corps should conduct a GIS mapping effort to estimate the amount and extent of wetlands and streams in the Study Area. Wetland and stream totals should be presented by type, following the descriptions in the manuals for NCSAM and NCWAM.

3. Wetland and stream mitigation sites in the Study Area should be investigated for potential impacts from the various alternatives. Contact the Wilmington District Regulatory Section and/or North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services for further information. Any loss of function to mitigation sites should be accounted for, and the costs associated with replacing that mitigation (likely at a doubled or higher ratio) should be included in the cost/benefit analysis for each alternative.

4. The Corps should investigate the future flood potential in the Tar-Pamlico Basin, due to sea level rise and climate change. A reasonable timeframe for forecasting impacts should be established (e.g. 50 to 80 years).

5. The Study Area includes the entire river basin, but flooding has not been an issue throughout the entire basin. The Corps should focus the study on areas that have flooded in the last 20 years, and areas that are anticipated to become more susceptible to flood as climate change/SLR proceeds, over the life of the project.

6. Any cost/benefit analysis should include costs of monitoring, surveys, studies, mitigation, and other conservation measures that may be required for each alternative considered.

7. The Service would have concerns for most of the potential structural measures, which would likely have significant to severe adverse impacts to our trust resources.

8. The Corps should rely on non-structural, natural, and nature-based features to address flood risk. Examples of the alternatives that the Service recommends include:
    a. Buyouts or relocation of structures and infrastructure from the 500-year floodplain and other areas which have flooded in the past 20 years;
    b. Elevation of structures (without fill);
    c. Replacement of culverted stream crossings with bridges that span the floodplain;
    d. Establishment and preservation of 200-foot vegetated buffers on both sides of perennial streams in the Study Area, or to the edge of the 100-year floodplain, whichever is wider;
    e. Removal of dams and other structures that cause flooding upstream or block migratory fish runs;
    f. Constructed storm water wetlands (located in uplands) to provide additional storage and treatment;
    g. Wetland and stream restoration projects that improve hydrology and floodplain function;
    h. Floodplain restoration and preservation;
    i. Agricultural Best Management Practices, including relocation of waste ponds, expansion of vegetated stream buffers, and upgrades in waste treatment methods;
    j. Releases from dams should to the extent possible, avoid negatively impacting the aquatic environment while providing flood protection.

9. The Service would like to work with the Corps during the evaluation process to identify important riparian conservation areas for listed and at-risk species, where preservation would be crucial to both of our agencies' interests in this project.

10. Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA directs Federal agencies to utilize their authorities to further the purposes of the ESA by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of endangered and threatened species. Conservation recommendations are discretionary agency activities to minimize or avoid adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species or critical habitat, to help implement recovery plans, or to develop information. The broad scope of this study provides an excellent opportunity for conservation programs and practices to benefit listed species and their habitats. We look forward to working with the Corps to determine actions that may benefit listed species or prevent an at-risk species from needing to be listed.

Thank you for the continued opportunity to provide comments on the proposed EA. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Kathy Matthews or John Ellis, of my staff, at kathryn_matthews@fws.gov or john_ellis@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

for, Pete Benjamin
Field Supervisor

cc: USACE, Wilmington District
NMFS, Pivers Island, NC
USEPA, Atlanta, GA
NCWRC, Raleigh, NC
NCDEQ, Raleigh, NC

Literature Cited

Alderman, J.M. 2003. Status and Distribution of Fusconaia masoni and Elliptio lanceolata in Virginia. USFWS Grant Agreement:1148-401 81-99-G-113. 118pp.

Alderman, J.M. and J.D. Alderman. 2014. DRAFT 2014 Atlantic Pigtoe Conservation Plan. Prepared for Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Richmond, VA. 32pp.

Bogan, A.E. and J.M. Alderman. 2008. Workbook and Key to the Freshwater Bivalves of South Carolina. Revised Second Edition.

Gaddy, L.L. 1991. The status of *Echinacea laevigata* (Boynton & Beadle) Blake. Unpublished report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Asheville, NC, 24 pp. + appendices and maps.

NatureServe. 2015. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available http://explorer.natureserve.org. (Accessed: December 19, 2016).

NCWRC. 2005. Colonial Waterbirds Fact Sheet. Available online at https://www.ncwildlife.org/Portals/0/Conserving/documents/FactSheets/nongame_colowatbird_lores.pdf. Accessed October 10, 2019.

Eddleman, W. R., R.E. Flores, and M. Legare. 1994. Black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis*), version 2.0. A. F. Poole, F. B. Gill, eds. Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, New York. Available online at https://birdsna.org/Species-Account/bna/species/blkrai/introduction.

Eddleman, W. R., F.L. Knopf, B. Meanley, F.A. Reid, and R. Zembal. 1988. Conservation of North American rallids. Wilson Bulletin 100: 458-475.

Flores, R. E. and W.R. Eddleman. 1995. California black rail use of habitat in southwestern Arizona. The Journal of Wildlife Management 59:357-363.

Legare, M. L. and W.R. Eddleman. 2001. Home range size, nest-site selection and nesting success of black rails in Florida. Journal of Field Ornithology 72:170-177.

Nadeau, C. P. and C.J. Conway. 2015. Optimizing water depth for wetland-dependent wildlife could increase wetland restoration success, water efficiency, and water security. Restoration Ecology 23:292-300.

Weakley, A. 2015. Flora of the Southern and Mid-Atlantic States. Working Draft of May 21, 2015. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Southeast Regional Office
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5505
https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/region/southeast

July 1, 2020 F/SER47:FR/pw

(Sent via Electronic Mail)

Mr. Marc A. Glowczewski
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Pittsburg District
1000 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Attention: Kristi Dobra

Dear Mr. Glowczewski:

NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) reviewed the Pittsburg District's letter, dated June 4, 2020, requesting comments on significant resources or issues of concern with regard to the proposed feasibility study to implement flood risk management measures in the Tar-Pamlico River Basin, North Carolina, (i.e., *Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study*). As the nation's federal trustee for the conservation and management of marine, estuarine, and diadromous fishery resources, the NMFS provides the following comments pursuant to the authorities of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

The study area begins in the headwaters of the Tar River and extends downstream to Washington, North Carolina. The entirety of the Tar River Basin and all associated tributaries are in the study area. The Pamlico River and Pamlico Sound are outside the study area. Possible solutions to manage flood risks include both structural measures, such as channel improvements, channel relocations, floodwalls, and levees, and nonstructural measures, such as elevating, relocating, and flood proofing structures. Natural and nature-based measures, such as wetland retention, riparian restoration, reforestation, and living shorelines, are also being considered.

The mainstem Tar River is critical habitat for the Carolina Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*). Within the study area, there is spawning and nursery habitat for the following anadromous fishes: striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), hickory shad (*Alosa mediocris*), American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*), blueback herring (*Alosa aestivalis*), alewife (*Alosa pseudoharengus*), and Atlantic sturgeon. The many tributaries in the basin provide habitat for the catadromous American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*). Just upstream from Washington, the Tar River and the associated creeks provide essential fish habitat (EFH) for a number of NOAA-trust resources, such as bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*), summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*), brown shrimp (*Farfantepenaeus aztecus*), and white shrimp (*Litopenaeus setiferus*).

Issues of concern to the NMFS are the potential structural measures. Levees and channel modifications frequently fail to reduce flooding and may alter important spawning habitats.

Levees increase the speed of the water, which will increase erosion of the shoreline downstream, and may render spawning habitats unusable. Levee construction can also increase flooding of areas downstream of the levee. Channel modifications can also have the same negative impacts. It is unlikely that the NMFS would support levees or channel modifications, if proposed. The NMFS encourages inclusion of the natural and nature-based measures described.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Please direct related questions or comments to the attention of Mr. Fritz Rohde at our Beaufort Field Office, 101 Pivers Island Road, Beaufort, North Carolina 28516-972 or Fritz,Rohde@noaa.gov.

Sincerely,

/for

Virginia M. Fay
Assistant Regional Administrator
Habitat Conservation Division

cc: COE, Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil
NCDMF, Anne.Deaton@ncdenr.gov
NCDCM, Gregg.Bodnar@ncdenr.gov
EPA, Bowers.Todd@epa.gov
USFWS, Pete_Benjamin@fws.gov
F/SER47, Fritz.Rohde@noaa.gov

Gary C. Faulkner
717 Douglas Williams Road
Castalia, NC 27816

November 29, 2023

Mr. Eric Merriam
US Army Corps of Engineers
Pittsburgh District Office

Dear Mr. Merriam:

I am writing to provide comments and recommendations to the recently completed draft Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Study (North Carolina) conducted by your project group. See this link: https://www.lrp.usace.army.mil/Missions/Planning-Programs-Project-Management/Key-Projects/Tar-Pamlico-Feasibility-Study/ I realize that the project team worked hard developing the study document and in many cases had to develop new models to provide needed data (no small task). Their development of hydrologic and hydraulic models, assessing and modeling water flow, possible rainfall and future flood events is commendable and will be of great value. Their work, the data collected and modeling will be valuable to all those who live in the basin.

Unfortunately, the project outcome (recommended alternative) has nothing to do with controlling/minimizing downstream flooding (flood depth) in the basin. As I stated in the public virtual meeting, held on 11-16-2023, (which was poorly attended) the study recommendations does not address the flooding issues of the Tar-Pamlico basin, it only provides a bandaide to a few structures within the 100 year flood zone downstream. If you look at the project study objectives, only a few of those objectives were addressed. The study appears to have been written/dictated/control by the Environmental Agencies involved, with little concern for human life, but eludes that there be no impact to the basins natural environment! You can "put lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig". Thus, this document, although filled with good current water flow data, does not address the root flooding issue in the basin.

As stated in my virtual meeting comments, there was little value/importance placed on features that will actually control flood conditions downstream by retarding water flow upstream. A permanent flood reservoir was given no consideration and that is a real travesty. The dry dam potential was only given minor consideration before tossing it aside as well. Then the study goes into minor structure dry proofing and elevating of structures (on a volunteer basis) as the "recommended" option... really? Retention of water upstream was given low priority compared to less costly bandaide type features downstream? More weight/higher priority should have been given to features that could/would control/minimize flood depth downstream. Flood water depth downstream was the major cause of loss of life, property damage and complete shutdown of downstream transportation systems (airports, railways and roadways). Thus, the document preferred alternative/option does not address the root cause

of catastrophic flooding in the basin. Therefore, the document final recommended treatment is a basic waste of public funding (3+ million dollars), although the data collected, modeled and included in the document is valuable.

For your information and as I mentioned in the virtual public meeting, every flood basin adjacent to the Tar-Pamlico basin has at least 1 flood water retention lake (Roanoke, Neuse, Cape Fear and many others). To complicate matters further, water transfers between flood basins are frowned upon, so what options do the people who live in the Tar-Pamlico basin have for potable water? The people in this basin are caught between a rock and a hard place (inadequate potable water source within the basin and the undesirable method of transferring water from other basins). Yet, for some reason, the study findings of the Tar-Pamlico basin does not warrant a permanent flood control lake? Are the Environmental Agencies directing the outcome of the study recommendations over the human environment? In my opinion, they are and the current study needs to be scrapped and started all over again! This time, the study needs to focus on minimizing the flood water heights downstream in an effort to minimize the loss of human life and the downstream transportation systems during a flood event

Based on my review of the 1931 US War Department Tar-Pamlico flood basin study (I provided you this information nearly 3 years ago), two project locations were considered worthy of further study for flood control and hydroelectric generation. It revealed that if the primary water retention lakes studied (Tar and Fishing creek) were constructed, they could reduce major flooding downstream by at least six feet at Tarboro in Nash County during a major rain event and combined they could generate in excess of 31,000 megawatts of power annually (enough to power 16,000+ homes). With today's highly efficient generators, even more power could be produced. There are many other potential benefits associated with flood retention reservoirs (lakes) as well. Just some of the possible benefits would include the following:

- **Reduced downstream flooding**: By retarding upstream water flow during heavy storms, flow to low-lying areas could be reduced by 6' at Tarboro. After storm threats pass, excess water can be released at slower rates to lower/maintain water elevations downstream, thus saving lives, property and transportation systems.

- **Reduced potential for loss of life and structures due to flooding**: With water flow control, more advance warnings can be issued and water retained upstream. Fewer roads, buildings and homes will be flooded and lives saved. Thus, less damage to property and improved human safety.

- **Production of "clean" electricity (less fossil fuel**): The water retention lakes could produce clean electricity to homes/businesses and will assist in the nation's efforts of zero carbon emissions. Thus, it could help reduce our need for fossil fuels in the future, which is a benefit to both the human and the natural environment.

- **Enhanced recreational opportunities:** With the construction of retarding/retention lakes, recreational activities such as boating, hiking, camping, fishing, bird watching and

many other water activities may be enjoyed. Nature trails, picnic areas, marinas and camp sites could be established to support those activities.

- **Improved quality of life**: The water retention lakes would support privately-owned businesses such as convenience centers, food facilities, tackle and bait shops, boating supplies, outdoor sports shops and water-related supplies in the area. These potential jobs would promote growth to a poor and economically-distressed area.

- **Provide a potable water source**: Potable water is/has become a major component of safe drinking water and will allow improved quality of life for those in the region. It can also spear quality growth in an area that is struggling to survive.

- **Financially feasible**: Construction of water retention lakes can be economical when land prices are low, population is low and it can provide other services (electricity, potable water, recreation and flood control, etc.). While the B/C ratio will not justify the high cost of building the reservoirs, the long term benefits to the human environment (as well as the natural environment) can be achieved and are worth the cost.

The citizens (tax payers) of the Tar-Pamlico flood basin deserve better than this "slap in the face" draft study recommended alternative. It is time to look at real flood control measures that can benefit all and stop putting "lipstick on a pig" to improve the short term appearance.

I look forward to your response and further updates to this critical flood control study.

Sincerely,

Gary C. Faulkner

CC:
US Army Corps of Engineers, Col. Brad A Morgan, Wilmington NC
US Congressman, Ted Bud and Thom Tillis
NC Governor , Roy Cooper
NC Representative, Matthew Winslow
NC Senator, Lisa Barnes
Franklin County Manager, Kim Denton
Nash County Manager, Stacie Shatzer
Edgecombe County Manager, Eric Evans
Pitt County Manager, Janis Gallagher
Beaufort County Manager, Brian Alligood
Halifax County Manager, Dia Denton
Warren County Manager, Vincent Jones
Vance County Manager, C. Renee Perry
Granville County Manager, Drew Cummings

ROY COOPER
Governor
MICHAEL S. REGAN
Secretary
S. DANIEL SMITH
Director

NORTH CAROLINA
Environmental Quality

June 25, 2020

Kristi S. Dobra, PG
Environmental Resource Specialist
Planning & Environmental Branch
Pittsburgh District, Corps of Engineers

RE: USACE Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study Scoping Letter

Dear Ms. Dobra,

The North Carolina Division of Water Resources (DWR) Planning Section submits the following comments in response to the USACE Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study Scoping Letter. DWR appreciates the opportunity to participate in this important effort.

Both the Neuse and the Tar-Pamlico River Basins are designated Nutrient Sensitive Waters and have long-standing nutrient management strategies in place (https://deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/water-resources/planning/nonpoint-source-management). These strategies require reductions in nutrient loads from both point and non-point sources. Any measures taken here to reduce flood risk should also consider the impacts of water quality through the reduction of stormwater inputs and restoring natural floodplains. The filling of wetlands and adding impervious surfaces within the study area should be avoided to the greatest extent practicable.

Of particular concern to DWR is the creation of new impoundments/retaining water structures as these do create significant and costly water quality problems through the accumulation of nutrients and resulting excessive algal production. There has been an increasing effort to provide mitigation credit for the removal of existing dams to improve the connectivity of habitats for fish and mussels throughout this basin.

In general, the DWR Planning Section would also recommend that the following conclusions and recommendations from the NC Emergency Management and NC Department of Transportation 2018 Tar River Basin Flood Analysis and Mitigation Strategies Study report be considered and addressed in the proposed study. The following are the conclusions based on this planning level study:

Page ix:

- *The strategy of Elevation, Acquisition, and Relocation was the most effective strategy evaluated for flood damage mitigation based on the following criteria:*
    - *Timeframe to implement*
    - *Scalability of funding allocation*
    - *Ability to target most vulnerable structures and communities*
    - *Best Benefit/Cost ratio of the options considered*

- *Positive environmental impact.*

- *Further investigation of flood-proofing solutions, particularly for commercial and public structures, should be pursed in conjunction with elevation, relocation, and acquisition.*
- *The effect of implementation of each strategy on other strategies should be investigated [e.g., integrated management].*
- *Further investigation of environmental impacts should be considered prior to selecting a mitigation strategy, particularly for new detention facilities. The purpose of this study was to evaluate strategies for effectiveness in flood damage reduction. As such, considerations of water quality impacts and environmental concerns were not fully developed. Of particular concern are the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) rules for the Tar Basin and the presence of rare and endangered species within the basin.*

Page 106, Additional study suggestions:

- *NFIP hydraulic models assume no blockage at structural crossings of the river during storm events. This can result in underprediction of the water surface elevation during a flooding event. Local emergency officials should be aware of this. Planning officials should also consider this when new construction or reconstruction is planned following a flood. A study should be considered to investigate how best to prevent this issue. The study would include working with local officials to determine which crossings are causing the most significant flooding issues and options for solving the problem. These options may include routine maintenance solutions or reconstruction of the crossings in a way that minimizes blockage.*
- *The FIMAN site is a valuable tool for local officials that helps them anticipate flooding issues and issue warnings as well as take preventative and mitigating actions. Installation of additional gages and development of inundation mapping should be considered to continue to enhance emergency operations and disaster response.*
- *A study should be considered on to determine how other communities throughout the country initially fund and then manage and maintenance {sic} flood mitigation projects such as those discussed in this report.*
- *Further investigation of flood-proofing solutions, particularly for commercial and public structures, should be considered in conjunction with elevation, relocation, and acquisition. This study would best be conducted on more of a community level basis to allow for better estimates of variables such as property values. Dry flood-proofing and ringwall solutions may make more sense economically and logistically for many commercial facilities or structures that are not reasonable to relocate such as a building associated with a park or utility.*

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. DWR recognizes the urgent need for flood mitigation measures in this basin. We look forward to working with the Corps throughout this process.

Sincerely,

Karen Higgins

Karen Higgins
DWR Planning Section Chief

From: Jennifer Tavantzis
To: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)
Cc: Jim Wrenn; "barry.baker@granvillecounty.org" (barry.baker@granvillecounty.org); Michael Felts
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Input on Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study Comment
Date: Friday, July 3, 2020 10:17:45 AM
Attachments: image001.png
image003.png

Good morning. The comment below is provided on behalf of Granville County, NC in response to the Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study scoping letter dated 4 June 2020.

> Parts of central Granville County ("County") are positioned near the headwaters of the Tar River Basin, and are included in the study area of the *Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study*, authorized under the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution adopted April 11, 2000, and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution adopted May 21, 2003, and sponsored by the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NC DEQ).
>
> The County is concerned about the economic impacts of additional regulation within the basin, especially regulation that might compel the County to implement more stringent development requirements. This phenomenon has been observed in southern parts of the County, which are situated in the Neuse River Basin and are subject to the Falls Lake Nutrient Management Strategy, regulations that have prompted significant changes to development requirements throughout the region, sometimes in areas that are largely rural, and are considered a financial hardship to the affected jurisdictions and their citizens.
>
> Through this comment, the County offers its perspective that any future flood risk management solutions studied should have an extremely limited environmental impact. The County understands that environmental impact assessments are part of the evaluation for any strategy. These assessments should consider long-term environmental, financial, and development-related implications of the strategies upstream and downstream of the specific study location. The County strongly objects to the possibility of future unfunded mandates to change development standards or install additional stormwater control measures as a results of this Study.

Thank you.

—

Jennifer (Fitts) Tavantzis Manager
P 919 475 5257 / E jtavantzis@raftelis.com
raftelis.com

Raftelis is a Registered Municipal Advisor within the meaning as defined in Section 15B (e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder (Municipal Advisor Rule). However, except in circumstances where Raftelis expressly agrees otherwise in writing, Raftelis is not acting as a Municipal Advisor, and the opinions or views contained herein are not intended to be, and do not constitute "advice" within the meaning of the Municipal Advisor Rule. This message may contain information that is confidential or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender and immediately delete this message.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more Click Here.

From:	Ratcliffe, Judith
To:	Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)
Cc:	Butler, Rodney A
Subject:	[Non-DoD Source] Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping - NC Natural Heritage Program Data
Date:	Thursday, June 25, 2020 1:23:35 PM
Attachments:	project_report_usace_tar_pamlico_basin_flo_25478_25478 (1).pdf
Importance:	High

Good Afternoon Ms. Dobra,
The NC Natural Heritage Program appreciates the opportunity to provide natural heritage resource information for the scoping of the US Army Corp of Engineers Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study. Attached please find a report generated for the study area from our North Carolina Natural Heritage Data Explorer. Numerous aquatic and terrestrial species and natural communities as well as conservation lands are documented within the study area. Our program can provide GIS data for use in the feasibility study to ensure that the potential for impacts to these resources can be appropriately addressed. Please contact me for further information on how to best provide this detailed information to you.
Sincerely,
Judith Ratcliffe

JUDITH RATCLIFFE
Zoologist, NC Natural Heritage Program

121 W Jones St MSC 1651 Raleigh, NC 27699
919 707 8628 office

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Facebook Twitter Instagram YouTube

#StayStrongNC
Learn more @ nc.gov/covid19
And don't forget your Ws! Wear. Wait. Wash.
WEAR a face covering.
WAIT 6 feet apart from other people.
WASH your hands often.

-----Original Message-----
From: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2020 6:30 PM
To: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil>
Subject: [External] Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to report.spam@nc.gov<mailto:report.spam@nc.gov>

Hello,

Attached you will find a letter from the Planning and Environmental Branch of the US Army Corps of Engineers'

Pittsburgh District regarding the Flood Risk Management Study that we are conducting within the Tar Pamlico River Basin in North Carolina. We are looking for your input on the study. A map of the study area is attached here as well.

We are looking forward to hearing your input on this study, and appreciate your time.

Kristi S. Dobra, PG
Environmental Resource Specialist
Planning & Environmental Branch
412-395-7219

RECIPIENT LIST FOR NEPA SCOPING LETTERS

Agency	Title
Pitt County Soil and Water Conservation	Resource Conservation Specialist
Edgecombe County Soil and Water Conservation District	District Office Manager
Beaufort County Soil and Water Conservation District	Office Manager
Franklin County Soil and Water Conservation District	NCACS Conservationist
Nash County Soil and Water Conservation District	Director
Granville County Soil and Water Conservation District	District Administrator
Halifax County Soil and Water Conservation District	Director
Halifax County Soil and Water Conservation District	Administrative Director
Vance County Soil and Water Conservation District	Resource Conservation Manager
Warren County Soil and Water Conservation District	Director
USDA NRCS Raleigh State Office	State Conservationist
USFWS Raleigh Ecological Field Office	Fish and Wildlife Biologist
USFWS Raleigh Ecological Field Office	
USFWS Raleigh Ecological Field Office	General FWS Email
NC SHPO/ NCDNCR	Environmental Review Coordinator
NCDA&CS Division of Soil & Water Conservation	Director
NC DEQ	
NC DOT	Engineer, Hydraulics Unit
NC Natural Heritage Program	Director
NCDEQ Division of Coastal Management Washington District Office	District Manager
NCDEQ Division of Coastal Management Washington District Office	District Manager
NCDEQ Division of Marine Fisheries Washington Regional Office	Northern District Manager
NC DEQ Waste Management UST Section Corrective Action Branch	Environmental Regional Supervisor
NC DEQ Water Resources -Water Quality Regional Operations Section	Regional Supervisor
NCDEQ Brownfields Program	Brownfields Program Manager
NCDEQ Haz Waste Facility Management Branch (Permitting and Corrective Action)	
NCDEQ Haz Waste Compliance Branch	Compliance Branch Head
NCDEQ Dry Cleaner Program	Compliance Unit Supervisor
NCDEQ Water Quality Regional Operations- Washington District	Regional Supervisor
General NOAA Atlantic ESA Email	Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
NOAA Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office	ESA Section 7 Coordinator
NC Wildlife Resources Commission	Division Chief, Habitat Conservation
NC Wildlife Resources Commission	Division Chief, Inland Fisheries
NC Wildlife Resources Commission	Division Chief, Wildlife Management
NC Wildlife Resources Commission	Program Manager; Wildlife Interaction, Regulated Activities & Permits
NCDOT- Highways Division 2	Division 2 Engineer
NCDOT- Highways Division 4	Division 4 Engineer
NCDOT Bicycles and Pedestrian Division	Deputy Director, Planning and Programming
NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit	Unit Head
City of Washington, NC City Hall	
City of Washington, NC	Mayor
City of Greenville, NC	Mayor
City of Tarboro, NC	Mayor
City of Rocky Mount, NC	Mayor
City of Louisburg, NC	Mayor
City of Princeville, NC	Mayor
City of Nashville, NC	Mayor
NC Emergency Management Association	President
Beaufort County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Beaufort County	Vice-Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Beaufort County	Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners
Beaufort County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Beaufort County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Beaufort County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Beaufort County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Beaufort County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Granville County	Vice-Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Vice-Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Franklin County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Nash County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Nash County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Nash County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Nash County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Nash County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Nash County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Edgecombe County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Edgecombe County	Vice-Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Edgecombe County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Edgecombe County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Edgecombe County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Edgecombe County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Edgecombe County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Vice Chair District B, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Pitt County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Halifax County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Halifax County	Vice Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Halifax County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Halifax County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Halifax County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Halifax County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Halifax County	General Commissioner Office
Warren County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Warren County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Warren County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Warren County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Warren County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Warren County	Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners
Vance County	Vice Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Vance County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Vance County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Vance County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Vance County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Vance County	Commissioner, Board of County Commissioners
Vance County	Chair, Board of County Commissioners
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians	THPO
Haliwa-Saponi Tribe	
Haliwa-Saponi Tribe	
Sappony Tribe	

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
PITTSBURGH DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD FEDERAL BUILDING
1000 LIBERTY AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222-4186

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

Environmental and Cultural Resources Section

4 June 2020

Dear Sir or Madam:

The US Army Corps of Engineers Pittsburgh District (Corps) is in the process of developing and analyzing alternatives for a feasibility study for a flood risk management project located within the Tar-Pamlico River Basin. This project, entitled the *Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study,* is authorized under the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution adopted April 11, 2000, and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution adopted May 21, 2003. The sponsor for this project is the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NC DEQ).

The objectives of the project are to reduce flood risk within affected communities, decrease the risk to structures, industry, and public infrastructure, and to reduce life and safety risk associated with riverine and storm surge flooding events. The study area begins at the headwaters of the Tar River, and stretches along the entire length of the Tar River down to the city of Washington, NC. The entirety of the Tar River Basin is part of the study area, including all associated tributaries. The Pamlico River and Pamlico Sound are outside of the study area; the study area does not extend east beyond Washington, NC. Flood management measures that are currently being considered include: traditional structural measures such as channel improvement (widening, deepening, straightening), flood walls, levees, channel relocation, wet and dry retention/detention, and transportation-related recommendations; non-structural measures such as flood-proofing, home acquisition and relocation, structure elevation, and emergency planning; and natural and nature-based measures such as wetland retention, riparian restoration, living shorelines, and reforestation. The study is still within the scoping phase, and therefore the list above may not include all management measures that are ultimately considered for the project; additional measures may be considered, and measures may be removed from consideration, as the study develops.

Pursuant to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and associated environmental laws and regulations, [including the Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Clean Water Act, National Historic Preservation Act] the Corps will be preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the potential effects of identified alternatives. Based on the initial array of management measures that are being considered as part of the study and the information gathered thus far, it is likely that an EA is the appropriate NEPA compliance pathway; however, we

recognize that information gathered during this scoping effort and over the course of the study may require that we reevaluate the NEPA compliance pathway. At this time we request your feedback on the scope of issues to be addressed in the EA, any resources or habitats of concern in the study area, information on ongoing projects in the area, and any feedback you may have on the management measures we're considering.

Please provide your input within 30 days of receipt of this letter regarding this project. If you have any questions on this matter, please feel free to contact Kristi Dobra by email at kristi.s.dobra@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Marc A. Glowczewski, PE, PMP
Chief, Planning and Environmental Branch

From:	noreply@dma.mil
To:	Pittsburgh District Planning and Environmental Branch
Subject:	Pittsburgh District Contact Form: Pitt County"s comment on the Tar Pamlico Basin (NC) Flood Risk Management Feasibility Study
Date:	Tuesday, November 28, 2023 10:39:00 AM

CAUTION: Your email client may display clickable links. The data in this email is provided without modification, as the user entered it. Before you click or use any link provided in this email, please confirm the authenticity of the link.
This message was sent from the Pittsburgh District website.

Message From: Thomas Shrader

Email: thomas.shrader@pittcountync.gov

Phone:

Response requested: No

Message:

Pitt County has historically avoided elevating homes using federal or state recovery funds. It has been the viewpoint of the County that elevating existing structures does maintain the structure of the community, but can lead to additional challenges. These challenges include increased risks and costs for rescues during flood events, as well as increased difficulty in daily life for the residents of elevated homes. While the County is not opposed to property owners elevating their properties through their own means, the County has not supported using federal funds for elevation in the past. Pitt County would prefer and recommend acquisition and relocation activities for affected properties.

Ref Id: tGQs5Gq4D02S9xZQfTn32w

PITT COUNTY
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY MANAGER
1717 W. 5TH STREET
GREENVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 27834-1696
TELEPHONE: (252) 902-2950 FAX: (252) 830-6311

D. Scott Elliott
County Manager
scott.elliott@pittcountync.gov

June 16, 2020

Marc A. Glowczewski, PE, PMP
Chief Planning and Environmental Branch
Department of Army
Pittsburgh District, Corps of Engineers
William S. Morehead Federal Building
1000 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-4186

Dear Mr. Glowczewski:

This letter is in response to yours of June 4, 2020, concerning the proposed Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On behalf of the Pitt County Board of Commissioners and citizens, I am offering full support of the study.

In 1999, flood waters associated with Hurricane Floyd extended beyond the 100-year flood plain of the Tar River causing tremendous damage to personal and public properties, agricultural operations and transportation infrastructure, and resulting in the loss of human life. Subsequent flooding associated with the Tar River and its tributaries has occurred several times. One contributing cause of the flooding is vegetative debris that is lodged in the drainage ways. Pitt County has been successful in securing funding for debris removal for certain tributaries, however a comprehensive approach to these efforts is needed. In addition, the capacity of drainage features is further reduced by sedimentation.

Pitt County is encouraged by the various flood management measures that are to be analyzed through the study. The County is a leader in the State for hazard mitigation initiative, and welcomes guidance on additional ways of reducing risks.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this very important project. Please feel free to contact Pitt County Planning Director James Rhodes if you have questions or need more information.

Sincerely,

D. Scott Elliott

D. Scott Elliott
County Manager

cc: Board of Commissioners
James Rhodes, Planning Director
Tim Corley, Engineering Director
Jonas Hill, Assistant Planning Director
Kristi Dobra, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (via email)

North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission

Gordon Myers, Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kristi Dobra
Pittsburgh District
US Army Corps of Engineers

FROM: Maria T. Dunn, Coastal Coordinator
Habitat Conservation Division

DATE: July 1, 2020

SUBJECT: Scoping for US Army Corps of Engineers Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study, Tar-Pamlico Basin, North Carolina.

Biologists with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC) reviewed the June 4, 2020 scoping notice with regard to impacts on fish and wildlife resources. The US Army Corps of Engineers Pittsburgh District (USACE)is in the process of developing and analyzing alternatives for a feasibility study for a flood risk management project located within the Tar-Pamlico River Basin, entitled the *Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study* (FRM Study). Our comments are provided in accordance with provisions of the Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, as amended, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), Coastal Area Management Act (G.S. 113A-100 through 113A-128), as amended.

The USACE has requested agency comments to assist in the preparation of their Tar-Pamlico FRM Study. The study area begins at the headwaters of the Tar River and stretches along the entire length of the Tar River down to the city of Washington, NC. The entirety of the Tar River Basin is part of the study area, including all associated tributaries. The Pamlico River and Pamlico Sound are outside of the study area; the study area does not extend east beyond Washington, NC. The USACE has stated they are investigating water resource improvements for the Tar-Pamlico Basin that may include structural measures, nonstructural measures, and natural and nature-based measures.

The Tar River within the project area has numerous important aquatic species. The mainstem of the Tar River is designated a Primary Nursery Area (PNA) by the NCWRC from N&S railroad at

Mailing Address: Habitat Conservation • 1721 Mail Service Center • Raleigh, NC 27699-1721
Telephone: (919) 707-0220 • **Fax:** (919) 707-0028

Washington upstream to Rocky Mount Mills Dam in Nash County. This reach and several tributaries, including Swift, Fishing, and Conetoe creeks, are also designated as Anadromous Fish Spawning Areas (AFSAs). These designations encompass waterbodies within Nash, Edgecombe Wilson, Pitt and Beaufort counties and are recognized due to the important habitat opportunities they provide for the spawning and rearing of egg, larvae, and juvenile fish species. Species that benefit from these habitat opportunities include the anadromous striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), hickory shad (*Alosa mediocris*), American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*), blueback herring (*Alosa aestivalis*), alewife (*Alosa pseudoharengus*) and catadromous American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*). The mainstem Tar River is also designated by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as critical habitat for the federally listed Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) from its confluence with the Pamlico Sound upstream to the Rocky Mount Mills Dam.

Numerous freshwater mussel species are found within the Tar-Pamlico Basin. Dwarf wedgemussel (*Alasmidonta heterodon*), Tar River spinymussel (*Elliptio steinstansana*), and yellow lance (*Elliptio lanceolata*), are federally listed by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and found within the Tar River and several of its tributaries. Mussel species recognized as candidate species for potential listing by the USFWS are also found in the Tar-Pamlico Basin. These species include green floater (*Lasmigona subviridis*), and Atlantic pigtoe (*Fusconaia masoni*). The Carolina madtom (*Noturus furiosus*), and Neuse River waterdog (*Necturus lewisi*) are state listed species under consideration for federal listing with critical habitat designations within the Tar-Pamlico basin under consideration. While not listed federally, creeper (*Strophitus undulatus*), eastern lampmussel (*Lampsilis radiata*), notched rainbow (*Villosa constricta*), Roanoke slabshell (*Elliptio roanokenis*), triangle floater (*Alasmidonta undulata*), yellow lampmussel (*Lampsilis cariosa*), Carolina ladle crayfish (*Cambarus davidi*), Carolina darter (*Etheostoma collis*), and Roanoke bass (*Ambloplites cavifrons*) are important state recognized species found within the basin.

Aquatic habitats and species are not the only resources affected by management measures within the Tar-Pamlico basin. Along the river and its tributaries are several important natural areas and conserved lands that preserve wildlife and ecological resources. The Tar River Wilton and Camassia Slopes, Medoc Mountain State Park, the NCWRC's Shocco Creek, Sandy Creek, Lower Fishing Creek, and Voice of America Game Lands, as well as numerous Tar River Land Conservancy and NC Division of Mitigation Service (NCDMS) conservation easements are all within Tar-Pamlico River Basin. These areas protect wildlife habitats for a myriad of species, serve as wildlife travel corridors, provide educational opportunities, and along with other local parks, county and state access areas provide public recreational opportunities.

Therefore, the NCWRC requests the USACE carefully consider the purpose and need of the EA for the Tar-Pamlico FRM Study and fully evaluate a suite of alternatives to determine appropriate management measures. To provide adequate information to assess the benefits and impacts to wildlife and public trust resources, we request the USACE consider the following:

- The scoping notice states the Pamlico River and Pamlico Sound are not within the study area, but that the study area extends to Washington. It should be noted that the Tar-Pamlico River is one waterbody, but the name changes from the Tar to the Pamlico at the

NC Hwy 17 Business Bridge. The majority of the City of Washington is along the Pamlico River. The map included with the notice indicates the study area extends past the NC Hwy 17 Business Bridge and therefore includes a portion of the Pamlico River. The exact study area should be clarified to determine if the entirety of Washington and nearby tributaries are included in the study.

- The project area is vast and exhibits different topographies and habitats. Alternatives and management strategies should take into account the different regions and discuss if an activity affects the entire basin or is region specific.

- Adequate details for project proposals should be provided. This includes the presence of important environmental resources, Natural Heritage Areas (NHAs), wetlands, and conservation lands; public access areas and infrastructure presence; and the type of proposal, benefits toward the purpose and need, impacts to adjacent features, methodology, schedule, and projected costs. Considerations for methodology, schedule, and cost should include management measures, such as avoidance and minimization of impacts to wetlands and wildlife habitats, moratoria, surveys and monitoring for wildlife species, and potential mitigation.

- Several municipalities such as Oxford, Henderson, Louisburg, Nashville, Rocky Mount, Tarboro, Princeville, Greenville, and Washington may be affected by flood management strategies. In addition to a statement of any benefits, proposals should detail changes to existing infrastructure effectiveness or condition that would occur as a result of project implementation.

- Many of the areas along the Tar and adjacent floodplain have witnessed significant flooding from large scale storm events. These events are not predictable and difficult to manage. While management measures should take large events into consideration, their effects cannot be eliminated. To better assess these floodprone areas, the frequency, duration and magnitude (aerial extent and depth) of various flood recurrence events should be analyzed.

- A review of highway infrastructure, including culverts and bridges that impede flows, should be conducted. Often during large storm events flows restricted by inadequately sized culverts can lead to road wash outs and erosion. Spanning these areas with larger or adequately sized structures or bridges could be considered to minimize loss of infrastructure and reduce impounded floodwaters during large events while improving year-round hydrologic flows and aquatic passage. Structure assessments and modeling would demonstrate changes that may occur upstream and downstream the structures, allowing alternatives to be considered with benefits and impacts assessed.

- The Town of Princeville along the Tar River has a separate USACE FRM study. Consultation with the USACE Wilmington District regarding the Princeville FRM study and its relationship with the Tar-Pamlico FRM Study is recommended.

- Sea level rise and shoreline erosion should be discussed. This discussion may include potential effects and management options for public infrastructure and private development as well as transitions in habitat types and wildlife.

The information obtained from the above would provide important data to consider while determining management strategies. The NCWRC would like to state the following general concerns and recommendations regarding any proposed management measures:

- In general, the NCWRC would not support new or expanded traditional structure measures. Traditional structural measures include dams and reservoirs, levees, and channel modifications. These structures significantly alter the natural hydrograph, water quality conditions, aquatic passage, and habitat quality for the entire basin. Our agency has worked extensively with other agencies to remove dams and impoundments within the Tar-Pamlico and other basins. The addition of these structures would be counterproductive to our other efforts.

- Non-structural methods include elevating and relocating structures, flood proofing, and educating the public. Natural and nature-based measures include green infrastructure, floodplain/channel restoration, and agricultural best management practices. These management tools address specific needs in floodprone areas without radically affecting the entire basin. The NCWRC supports these measures.

- The NCWRC recommends the inclusion of buffers along waterbodies and wetlands throughout the basin. These buffers may need larger areas than the NC Division of Water Resource's Tar-Pamlico Basin Buffer Zones for waterbodies containing listed species and their habitats.

- The NCWRC recommends restoring stream connectivity to floodplains, particularly in areas without development. This creates increased floodwater capacity and increases habitat opportunities.

- Coordination is recommended on the state and local level to establish local land use plans that prevent future development in floodplains. Flooding associated with extreme events and/or certain geographic areas may be most effectively managed with the relocation of development out of floodplains and the elevation of any remaining structures.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during this scoping process. We understand the FRM EA is forthcoming in short time. During the development of the FRM EA and subsequent evaluations we encourage the USACE to continue discussions with state and federal resource agencies to provide comments on wildlife impacts and conservation opportunities. If there are any comments, questions, or concerns for the NCWRC, please do not hesitate to contact either Maria Dunn at maria.dunn@ncwildlife.org and 252-948-3916 or Gabriela Garrison at gabriela.garrision@ncwildlife.org and 910-409-7350.

From: Jordan McMillen
To: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach
Date: Thursday, June 18, 2020 9:39:22 AM

Thanks. Here are some comments on behalf of Vance County.

The Tar-Pamlico basin encompasses the southern half of Vance County from the City of Henderson down to the Tar River which is our southern border. For the most part flooding within the Tar-Pamlico basin in Vance County is concentrated along the Tar River in times of heavy rainfall. Fortunately from a flooding standpoint most of this area is wooded, farmland, or undeveloped. The County has two road crossings over the Tar River (Charlie Grissom Road and US 1 South) and one railroad crossing going into Franklin County. During and following heavy rainfall events, flooding is noticeable from the crossings and covers a wide area in the most noticeable area where US 1 crosses the river. The most impactful areas of flooding occur along Charlie Grissom and Egypt Mountain Roads where some rural residential development has occurred. We also see some flooding impacts to residences along Briggs Road and Geranium Lane in times of heavy rainfall.

Vance County is supportive of the Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study.

Jordan D. McMillen, County Manager
Vance County
122 Young Street, Suite B
Henderson, NC 27536
Phone: (252) 738-2002 · fax: (252) 738-2039
E-mail: jmcmillen@vancecounty.org
Website: Blockedwww.vancecounty.org

@VanceCountyGov

-----Original Message-----
From: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) [mailto:Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2020 3:34 PM
To: Jordan McMillen
Subject: RE: Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach

Please just submit electronically to me, at this email address. Thank you!

-----Original Message-----
From: Jordan McMillen [mailto:JMcMillen@vancecounty.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2020 3:28 PM
To: Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA) <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach

Kristi,

I received the letter concerning the NEPA Scoping Outreach for the Tar Pamlico Basin. Is there an online area or preferred method for submitting public comments. I may have overlooked it in the letter.

Thanks,

Jordan D. McMillen, County Manager

Vance County

122 Young Street, Suite B

Henderson, NC 27536

Phone: (252) 738-2002 · fax: (252) 738-2039

E-mail: jmcmillen@vancecounty.org <mailto:jmcmillen@vancecounty.org>

Website: Blockedhttps://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fBlockedwww.vancecounty.org&c=E,1,ikRe9gMz7F7oqpHAjRAhguUXfhoLnQe8mEgZQ6qMJLlnZ55yYl9Kw_X8Pai-zp4gvrBCty0aEcsgMSJdl1UF3UkbCd45awIgleKriMkQIosNbz1GLU5AvqIe&typo=1 <BlockedBlockedhttps://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=http%3a%2f%2fwww.vancecounty.org%2f&c=E,1,bOhgFYwgA3g74dFg86yzz8NJwHIUJVIWrfbxJx4FV4NBVF1KcG5n2h0qWDG3ZvtmsyEf67sohf3DUJCzDcbfeN-p3TBSvzFC1ieHyu5QJ3VQ4ze9qw,,&typo=1>

<BlockedBlockedhttps://www.facebook.com/pg/VanceCountyGov/about/?ref=page_internal> @VanceCountyGov
<BlockedBlockedhttps://www.facebook.com/pg/VanceCountyGov/about/?ref=page_internal>

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)" <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil <mailto:Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil> >
Date: June 4, 2020 at 6:31:48 PM EDT
To: "Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)" <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil <mailto:Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil> >
Subject: Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach

Hello,

Attached you will find a letter from the Planning and Environmental Branch of the US Army Corps of Engineers' Pittsburgh District regarding the Flood Risk Management Study that we are conducting within the Tar Pamlico River Basin in North Carolina. We are looking for your input on the study. A map of the study area is attached here as well.

We are looking forward to hearing your input on this study, and appreciate your time.

Kristi S. Dobra, PG
Environmental Resource Specialist
Planning & Environmental Branch
412-395-7219

PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: Please note that all emails, information and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Act and, subject to certain statutory exceptions, may be disclosed to third parties.
PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: Please note that all emails, information and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Act and, subject to certain statutory exceptions, may be disclosed to third parties.

From:	Mark M. Johnson
To:	Rob Boyette; Denise Stinagle
Cc:	Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)
Subject:	[Non-DoD Source] RE: [EXTERNAL]Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach
Date:	Friday, June 5, 2020 11:00:52 AM

TO: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PITTSBURGH DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD FEDERAL BUILDING 1000 LIBERTY AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15222-4186
SUBJECT: Wilson County Feedback on Environmental Assessment (EA)
DATE: June 5, 2020

This in response to the request of feedback from Wilson County concerning proposed Flood Management Measures under consideration to reduce the risk of damage to structures and safety associated with riverine and storm surge flooding events.

Wilson County has in place as part of its Unified Development Ordinance, Article 14, which is our Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. The purpose of Article 14 is to promote public health, safety, and general welfare and to minimize public and private losses due to flood conditions within flood prone areas by provisions designed to:

1. Restrict or prohibit uses that are dangerous to health, safety, and property due to water or erosion hazards or that result in damaging increases in erosion, flood heights or velocities;

2. Require that uses vulnerable to floods, including facilities that serve such uses, be protected against flood damage at the time of initial construction;
3. Control the alteration of natural floodplains, stream channels, and natural protective barriers, which are involved in the accommodation of floodwaters;

4. Control filling, grading, dredging, and all other development that may increase erosion or flood damage; and

5 Prevent or regulate the construction of flood barriers that will unnaturally divert flood waters or which may increase flood hazards to other lands.

Wilson finds that the Flood management measures that are currently being considered are consistent with the County's Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. These measures currently under consideration include the following: traditional structural measures such as channel improvement (widening, deepening, straightening), flood walls, levees, channel relocation, wet and dry retention/detention, and transportation-related recommendations; non-structural measures such as flood-proofing, home acquisition and relocation, structure elevation, and emergency planning; and natural and nature-based measures such as wetland retention, riparian restoration, living shorelines, and reforestation.

Mark M. Johnson, M.A., AICP, CFM, CZO
Wilson County Development Services Director

From: Rob Boyette <rboyette@wilson-co.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2020 10:07 PM
To: Mark M. Johnson <mmjohnson@wilson-co.com>; Denise Stinagle <dstinagle@wilson-co.com>
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL]Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)" <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil>
> **Date:** June 4, 2020 at 6:33:07 PM EDT
> **To:** "Dobra, Kristi S CIV USARMY CELRP (USA)" <Kristi.S.Dobra@usace.army.mil>
> **Subject: [EXTERNAL]Tar-Pamlico Basin Flood Risk Management Study- NEPA Scoping Outreach**
>
> Hello,
>
> Attached you will find a letter from the Planning and Environmental Branch of the US Army Corps of Engineers' Pittsburgh District regarding the Flood Risk Management Study that we are conducting within the Tar Pamlico River Basin in North Carolina. We are looking for your input on the study. A map of the study area is attached here as well.
>
> We are looking forward to hearing your input on this study, and appreciate your time.
>
> Kristi S. Dobra, PG
> Environmental Resource Specialist
> Planning & Environmental Branch
> 412-395-7219
>
> ** CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless sender is verified.**