Lick Creek Watershed Restoration Plan
DRAFT Summary of Stakeholder Meeting #4
June 20, 2007

Introductions & Agenda

The Stakeholders guiding the Lick Creek Watershed Restoration Plan met at 3:00 P.M. on Wednesday, June 20 in the Rollingview Community Center on Baptist Rd. in Falls Lake State Recreation Area.

Meeting attendees:

Name	Project Partner or Stakeholder	Organization	Contact Information
Bev Norwood	Stakeholder	Triangle Greenways Council	Ndesign@bellsouth.net / 743-3399
Jennifer Brooks	Stakeholder	Durham SWCD	560-0558
Chris Outlaw	Partner	Durham Stormwater Services	chris.outlaw@durhamnc.gov
Bobby Louque	Partner	Durham Stormwater Services	Robert.louque@durhamnc.gov
George Rogers	Stakeholder	City of Raleigh CORPUS	796-7926
Jeff Kilpatrick	Stakeholder	Watershed resident	596-8716 / gwannyK@hotmail.com
Heather Boyette	Stakeholder	NC Div. of Water Quality-Planning	Heather.boyette@ncmail.net
Bill Patrick	Stakeholder	Watershed Resident	596-1692 / 475-4131 (cell)
Jack Adcock	Stakeholder	Rhein Brightleaf	834-2766 / jadcock@rheiinnc.com
Joel Sholtes	Stakeholder	Interested Party	jsholtes@gmail.com
Chris Dreps	Partner	UNRBA	dreps@tjcog.org
Jason Roberts	Partner	UNRBA	jason@tjcog.org

The meeting agenda included (decision items marked with *):

3:00 Welcome and Introductions

3:05 Announcements

3:10 Lick Creek Watershed Management Goals and Objectives*

3:45 Lick Creek Fieldwork Findings Review

4:15 Prioritizing Restoration Projects

5:00 Adjourn

Announcements

Chris Dreps announced that the NCSU Water Quality Group has installed rain gauges and water samplers in subwatersheds 4 and 6 (monitoring sites 4 and 1, respectively) in order to supplement their collection of water quality and hydrologic data.

Jeff Kilpatrick announced that he would be willing to have a rain gauge installed on his property if this would be beneficial to the group. Bill Patrick also stated that he would be willing to help with such efforts.

Lick Creek Watershed Management Goals and Objectives

Chris Dreps discussed terminology the group would be using during the course of the watershed management planning process (differences between goals, objectives, and strategies). He then illustrated the proposed process for developing objectives and management strategies using Goal 2 as an example.

The stakeholders agreed upon the general approach to determining goals and objectives during the watershed management process.

Joel Sholtes was concerned as to whether the NCSU Water Quality Group would also be looking at hydrology parameters during their data collection in the watershed. It was noted that the NCSU Water Quality Group will be collecting hydrologic data (e.g., stage level, stormflows) at its monitoring sites.

Lick Creek Fieldwork Findings Review

Chris Dreps presented a review of the Lick Creek fieldwork findings and recommendations presented by Sally Hoyt from the Center for Watershed Protection (CWP) at the May stakeholder meeting. The major findings were:

- Many Lick Creek tributaries are in good shape from a geomorphic perspective.
- Though this stream is biologically impaired, the impairment may be attributed to sparse in-stream habitat created by the geology and historic impacts.
- Few potential restoration opportunities were found.
- Conversely, many impacts from ongoing construction activities were found, and these activities are impacting existing good quality streams and wetlands.
- The focus of the Lick Creek Restoration Plan should therefore be to prevent future impacts and to preserve high quality areas, and a few restoration activities will complement the overall “prevention” strategy.

The overall conditions of the watershed as determined by fieldwork provides important information that will be combined with the land use and modeling analyses (to b presented in August) and water quality monitoring data (to be presented in October) to guide Parters and Stakeholders in developing objectives and management strategy recommendations.

A short discussion ensued regarding the inherent difficulties involved in classifying a Triassic Basin stream as biologically impaired when using a generalized Piedmont stream formula/model.

A discussion addressed the appropriateness of focusing the management plan on prevention of future degradation within the watershed as opposed to restoration of the watershed.

The major fieldwork findings and recommendations are detailed in the CWP’s fieldwork findings technical memorandum (www.unrba.org/lick/downloads.htm). The findings are summarized below:

1. Erosion and sediment control enforcement—the percentage of violations found in the field was very high, particulary in subwatershed 1. Although Durham has good sediment and erosion control programs, there was a general lack of compliance.
2. Agriculture exemption abuse regarding erosion and sediment control regulations—a few large, nontraditional sites (nursery, dirt storage, bovine breeding) are causing stream degradation, especially in Rocky Branch (subwatershed 7).
3. Allowable standards for post-construction stormwater management—under current standards, no stormwater management for water quality control is required for developments under 23.0% impervious cover.
4. Buffer rule enforcement—new development sites had extensive buffer impacts, most of which had been allowed (as variances from the Neuse buffer rules) by the NC Division of Water Quality.
5. Protection of high ecological value streams and wetlands—Many stream corridors and wetlands are of high quality, and impacts to these should be avoided.
6. Major projects—there are very few restoration opportunities, possibly 25 total acres of stormwater treatment (retrofits) and 1 linear mile of stream bank revegetation.
7. Volunteer projects—there exist opportunities for small restoration projects that can utilize volunteer efforts.
8. Outreach and education—there are a few opportunities to educate homeowners (riparian buffer improvements) and business owners (pollution prevention practices). and

George Rogers had a question about obtaining information on the original monitoring plans. He also wanted to see explanations of reach identifications, site identifications, and map nomenclature contained within the body of the Lick Creek fieldwork findings memorandum.

Bobby Louque asked if sediment and erosion controls were required to be in place prior to disturbance. Jack Adcock responded that silt fences can be in place after logging but prior to grubbing. Bobby Louque suggested that Triassic Basin soils may be vulnerable enough to erosion that sediment and erosion controls should be in place prior to any disturbance. It was suggested that Joe Pearce briefly (5-10 minutes) discuss the sediment and erosion practices and process at a future meeting.

Bobby Louque suggested that a wetlands assessor perform a cursory analysis of high quality wetlands to provide a comparison to Division of Water Quality (DWQ) ratings for the same sites. George Rogers suggested that the Watershed Evaluation Tool (WET) could also be used for this purpose.

Prioritizing Restoration Projects

Chris Dreps led a discussion about the development of appropriate and feasible project restoration criteria to determine the relative value of the potential restoration projects identified during fieldwork. Chris proposes that the prioritization process will be a relative weighting scheme and will begin with the following general categories for prioritizing projects:

1. General need for restoration (by subwatershed)

2. Project's environmental benefits
3. Project's community benefits or potential to garner community support
4. Project's feasibility for implementation

These criteria would be assessed separately and potentially combined. Some criteria would be weighted numerically, while others might simply raise flags.

The Stakeholders and Partners discussed general restoration prioritization, using subwatersheds as the "management unit" for identifying project need, and 3. Community benefits/support. The comments will guide Project Partners as they identify draft criteria during the coming month. The major discussion points are summarized below.

General restoration prioritization

Using the subwatershed as the unit for analysis was generally agreed upon as an effective way to identify the need for restoration projects. However, Partners and Stakeholders agreed that no project should be excluded based on subwatershed-level need. Chris agreed that partners will work to develop criteria that give special consideration to potential projects in areas of need (need for restoration based on water quality monitoring, fieldwork, and professional judgment of partners) while not excluding potential projects in areas of lesser need.

Given the small number of subwatersheds, it was pointed out that a ranking system (in addition to prioritizing) might be an effective way of prioritizing future restoration projects.

It was generally agreed that no potential project should be excluded until the planning process has had a chance to progress and more information has been gathered.

It was generally agreed that upstream water quality impacts in hydrologically degraded subwatersheds should be given priority and addressed prior to (along with) implementing downstream restoration.

There was some additional discussion by watershed residents that they support restoration but do not want to see a project done if the project has the potential to be ruined by subsequent upstream impacts. This was seen as a "waste of money."

Criterion 3: Project's community benefits/support

A project's potential to make aesthetic improvements was determined to be highly subjective as it is based upon a particular landowner's objectives. Therefore, it should be given only minor weight during the prioritization process.

A project's potential to remove harmful pathogens from the environment was considered advantageous in gaining community support.

A project's potential to involve or educate the public was considered somewhat minor, as there is no guarantee that the project would receive exposure or that community members would be interested. Jennifer Brooks suggested that for each project, partners would have to investigate before prioritizing to determine if the local citizens would actually be interested in the project.

A project's potential to involve the citizens in construction is considered especially helpful on small projects. Projects with this potential could be flagged to make implementing groups aware of this potential.

A project's potential to foster long-term public involvement was also considered somewhat secondary, as it requires a long-term commitment to educating the general public and promoting the benefits of the project. Again, research would have to be done before undertaking a project such as this, in order to determine the differences between perceived and realized benefits.

Next Meeting

The next meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, August 15 at 3 p.m. in the East Durham Regional Branch Library on Lick Creek Road.

We will review the Lick Creek land use analysis, the watershed treatment model, and establish project prioritization criteria.