

**Kerr 216 Downstream Flow-Based Recreation Task Group  
Meeting Notes  
March 03, 2004**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Leon App (VADCR)	Jim Mead (NCDWR)	Jim Thornton (Dominion)
Frank Snipes (USACE)	Steve Wolfe*	Bob Munson (VADCR)
Kent Nelson (NCWRC)	Jean Richter (USFWS)	

[\\*daswolfe@coastalnet.com](mailto:daswolfe@coastalnet.com) (interest as landowner on river and eco-tourism)

**AGENDA:**

Review four tasks assigned at previous meeting.

**REVIEW OF TASKS:**

**6.A.1 Bibliography:**

- Reports listed by Kent include one statewide study, one nationwide study, and three specific to the Roanoke River. Kent will check to see if the Schuhmann report covers from Roanoke Rapids dam to Plymouth, as do the other two Roanoke studies. Kent has subsequently verified that the Schuhmann economic study extended the length of the Roanoke River below Roanoke Rapids Dam.

**6.A.2 – User-based analysis:**

- See Scope of Work to address carrying capacity (handout from Bob M.). In general, define the questions in the scope of work, but leave the methods somewhat open-ended. Established models are fairly complex and incorporate configuration of river corridor (farms, forests, development, access points etc.). Bob mentioned need to talk further with consultants about how this approach applies to moving water. Suggest adding “and flooding” versus just relating recreation use to flow rates.
- **Fishing/boating:** Possible analysis might include current use. Kent said NCWRC has about 10 years of data (estimates of fishing effort and boat trailer counts) for the spring striper season. NCWRC also has capacities of boat ramps they manage – how does this change at flow/flood levels. Consult literature for economic multiplier and number of persons per boat.
- **Hunting:** USFWS limits permits for hunters on its land through NCWRC, so use State developed carrying capacity. NCWRC maintains their database records of permits only for 3 years. Maximum number of permits is based on acreage. Use Federal and State land as indicator of user days and extrapolate to private gamelands. Refuge hunting is only 3 days per week. Contractor to determine user days lost due to flow/flood condition. The impact we are trying to assess is the number of user days lost – either because acreage is closed or people don't come.

- **Camping/Canoe Trail:** Roanoke River Partners has number of users from permits for camping platforms. If hunters can't access gamelands, then campers also not likely to engage in use.
- **Nature Observation:** Additional potential data point is outfitters for nature based recreation. If hunters can't conduct hunts, then nature observation also not likely to be possible. Do outfitters have flow limit to putting people safely out on the river?
- The key question for each of the 4 indicator uses selected is: at what flows/flooding does the number of user days start to decline?
- Part of SOW should be to recommend a user-day economic multiplier. Lots of literature available to review for this.
- There is lots of overlap between the acreage-based carrying capacity used in 6.A.2 and the GIS data in 6.A.3. Suggest re-ordering the tasks to do 6.A.3 first so that data has been compiled and reviewed prior to 6.A.2
- Hunting and Fishing/boating have a good deal of data already available for carrying capacity and how it is affected by available acreage. Nature observation is also correlated to hunter acreage and land flooded as determined in 6.A.3. How do we determine the effect of reduced use due to high water conditions out on the river? Also how do we determine seasonal variations within each use? For these questions we should focus on the nature observation and camping/canoe trail uses and approach through interviews with outfitters and platform users. May need a survey using approved questions listed at:  
<http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/omb/ombhomea.HTM>

### **6.A.3 - GIS based analysis:**

- Reviewed SOW developed by Jim M.

### **6.A.4 – Analytical Tool (“Model”) Scope of Work:**

(See handout from Frank). Add or change first bullet to utilize data developed from User Based Analysis and GIS database. Wording was modified to have terms agree and to prevent duplication with those developed in 6.A.2 and 6.A.3. Bullet numbers 3 and 4 were dropped.

This task to be forward looking, consideration for future demand.

Jim M. suggested changing title for this task to “Determination of How Recreation User Days are Influenced by J. H. Kerr Reservoir Operations.”

Developing a reservoir operations alternative that produces maximum, minimum, and optimum downstream recreation conditions for each activity should be a goal of this

task. Frank states this in #2 of the handout. Developing specific alternatives like max/min/optimal is a good initial step in the process of reviewing options. However, this analytical tool will also have the ability to develop a continuum of operating possibilities and is likely to be used by the Integration Task Group.

**Draft Phase 2 Cost Estimates:**

The 216 Executive Committee needs a budget for their review of the proposed scopes of work.

6.A.3 GIS task estimate: \$15,000

6.A.2 User Based Analysis estimate: \$35,000

6.A.4 Analytical Tool estimate: \$10,000

Likely a single contractor to perform all tasks.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**Frank** to update Recreation Demand task and send to Jim M.

**Jim M.** to integrate three tasks into one scope of work. Jim will circulate for review by end of March.

Next meeting will be called as needed, but will try to address finalizing of proposal through electronic communication and possibly a conference call.