Lick Creek Watershed Restoration Plan
Summary of Stakeholder Meeting #5
August 15, 2007

Introductions & Agenda

The Stakeholders guiding the Lick Creek Watershed Restoration Plan met on Wednesday, August 15 at 3 p.m. in the East Durham Regional Branch Library on Lick Creek Road.

Meeting attendees:

Name	Project Partner or Stakeholder	Organization	Contact Information
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 Pub. Utilities Dept.	796-7926
Jeff Kilpatrick	Stakeholder	Watershed resident	596-8716 / gwannyK@hotmail.com
Nora Deamer	Stakeholder	NC Div. of Water Quality	Nora.deamer@ncmail.net
Bill Patrick	Stakeholder	Watershed Resident	596-1692 / 475-4131 (cell)
Jack Adcock	Stakeholder	Rhein Brightleaf	834-2766 / jadcock@rheiinnc.com
Richard Broadwell	Stakeholder	Triangle Land Conservancy	rbroadwell@tlc-nc.org
Shari Bryant	Stakeholder	NC Wildlife Resources Commission	Bryants5@earthlink.net
Jim Fyfe	Stakeholder	Watershed resident	jandbfyfe@touchnc.net
Amy Poole	Stakeholder	Rollingview Marina	Rollingview@aol.com
Chris Dreps	Partner	UNRBA	dreps@tjcog.org

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

3:00 Welcome and Introductions

3:05 Announcements

3:15 Draft Restoration Priorities*

4:30 Subwatershed Analysis*

5:00 Adjourn

Announcements

The UNRBA has begun organizing a technical committee to guide the critical lands protection analysis. The volunteers expressing interest to date are:

- Greg Schuster (Durham County)
- Paul Clark (NCDWQ)
- Richard Broadwell (Triangle Land Conservancy)
- Bev Norwood (Triangle Greenways Council)

Chris Dreps is resigning as UNRBA Coordinator, but he will continue to work for the UNRBA on the Lick Creek project.

Draft Restoration Priorities

Chris Dreps discussed the term watershed restoration, which refers generally to any of the approaches typically used to reduce existing impacts that degrade water quality and aquatic habitat in Lick Creek. This can include stream repair, buffer restoration/enhancement, and retrofitting sites with stormwater management practices. It can also include reducing specific sources of pollution such as failed septic systems, illegal trash dumps, or changing land management practices through education.

The restoration prioritization process focuses primarily on traditional restoration practices of stream repair, buffer restoration, and stormwater retrofits.

The stakeholders reviewed restoration goals 1-3, which aim to find and address the causes of biological impairment and water quality degradation in Lick Creek.

At our June 20 meeting, the Lick Creek stakeholders discussed possible criteria. Since the meeting, Chris Dreps developed draft criteria, and the Lick Creek Project Partners reviewed these criteria. Chris has begun scoring run 1 of the restoration prioritization. Each of the 27 potential restoration and retrofit projects are scored based on 1) environmental benefits criteria, 2) community benefits/support criteria, and 3) feasibility of implementation criteria.

The stakeholders received the draft restoration criteria (updated criteria attached). They first discussed environmental criteria. Bobby Louque advised Chris that the hydrologic benefits scores are too low (2 possible points) relative to the water quality benefits score (5 possible points). In Lick Creek, hydrologic impacts are critical because of the high potential for in stream erosion. For run 2, Chris will change the scores to raise the hydrologic benefits score (to a possible 3) and lower the water quality score (to a possible 4).

George Rogers suggested that we consider estimating mass pollutant loading reductions for the potential retrofit / restoration projects. Chris responded that this will be done for select projects (using the Upper Neuse Site Evaluation Tool). George suggested that quantified nutrient reductions will be critical to procuring funder support for these projects.

The stakeholders then discussed the Community Benefits and Support Criteria (aesthetics, long-term public involvement, citizen education, potential to remove pathogens, citizen involvement in construction). Although the overall value of these criteria is low (2 total points, or 10% of overall score), removal of harmful bacteria and citizen involvement in construction receive flags in run 1, which will call attention to when a project meets these criteria. The stakeholders discussed the value of weighting these projects differently or changing the flagging. Jim Fyfe said that he would like to see more detail about how to get citizens involved. Chris will rethink how we are flagging these projects for the next run.

The stakeholders then discussed Implementation Feasibility Criteria (cost, owner support, physical constraints, public land, implementation agency criteria). In general, the group agrees with the relatively heavy weighting of these criteria (8 total possible points, or 40% of the total

possible score for a project). George Rogers strongly suggested that the analysis ought to not only flag projects meeting funding agency criteria, but we ought to figure out what the scoring criteria of those agencies are and assess our projects using those criteria.

In addition, the stakeholders discussed the value of prioritizing subwatersheds based on their relative need for restoration. The information available to us in prioritizing includes fieldwork findings (Feb. 2007), existing land use analysis (by Triangle J Council of Governments), the Watershed Treatment Model (Center for Watershed Protection), and water quality monitoring data (City of Durham and NC State University Water Quality Group). Chris provided a brief background summarizing the information to date. The following table summarizes the draft relative restoration needs of each subwatershed by analysis type (this table was meant for discussion purposes only and is not being used to make subwatershed prioritization decisions).

DRAFT Lick Creek Subwatershed Restoration Needs					
		Relative Needs by Analysis Type			
Sub-watershed	Area (Sq. Miles)	Fieldwork	WTM	Land Use Analysis	Water Quality Monitoring
1	1.69	✓	✓	✓	*
2	2.05	✓		✓	*
3	1.18	✓	✓	✓	*
4	1.09		✓		*
5	2.50				*
6	2.34	✓			*
7	2.42		✓		✓
8	2.02				
9	3.06				
10	2.23		✓		
11	1.38				
Total	22.0				

** More data required from NCSU short-term monitoring to establish need*

The stakeholders agreed on the value of prioritizing subwatersheds for restoration. Chris asked the stakeholders the following questions.

Should we focus restoration recommendations (and subsequent implementation efforts) solely in priority subwatersheds? The response was that it is valuable to focus on these subwatersheds, but we do not want to miss out on easy projects (e.g. volunteer projects) in non-priority subwatersheds.

Should we boost the score of any project in a subwatershed? The response was to just continue to "flag" (or acknowledge) these projects rather than trying to include watershed need as part of the project's score.

Subwatershed Analysis

The stakeholders briefly discussed the approach that we will take to identify the subwatershed-level need for adopting management strategies to meet Lick Creek Goals 3 and 4, which focus on maintaining water quality in restored areas and mitigating future changes to watershed hydrology and water quality. We discussed the information available for making these

decisions, the fieldwork, future land use analysis, and future conditions Watershed Treatment Model.

Our next steps:

- Identify key criteria to guide future management strategies;
- Begin the critical lands analysis in August / September; and
- Begin reviewing the first 7-9 months of water quality data taken by NC State University.

Next Meeting

The next meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, October 17 at 3 p.m. (Chris Dreps will announce the place)