

**Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Plan
Summary of Technical Team Meeting #11
February 8, 2006**

Prepared February 13, 2006

Introductions & Agenda

The Technical Team guiding the Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Plan met at 1:00 P.M. on Wednesday, February 8 in the Rolling View Marina on Falls Lake.

Meeting attendees are listed below.

Name	Technical Team or Community Stakeholder	Organization	E-mail address
Amy Poole	TT	Rollingview Marina	rollingview@aol.com
Cherri Smith	TT	Durham Parks & Recreation	cherri.smith@durhamnc.gov
Chris Outlaw	TT	Durham Stormwater Services	chris.outlaw@durhamnc.gov
Bobby Louque	TT	Durham Stormwater Services	robert.louque@durhamnc.gov
Joe Albiston	TT	Durham County Engineering	jalbiston@co.durham.nc.us
Sarah Bruce		UNRBA	sbruce@tjcog.org
Chris Dreps		UNRBA	dreps@tjcog.org

Chris Dreps presented the agenda:

- 1:00 Welcome & Announcements
- 1:05 Watershed Management Strategies
 - Rec. #1 — Stream Repair Projects
 - Rec. #2 — Buffer Restoration Projects
- 3:00 Discussion of Major Conclusions for Technical Memo #5
- 3:30 Adjourn

Announcement

Bobby Louque announced that the Triassic Basin water quality study is underway; data is being collected in the Basin and a reference site is being chosen. Cherri Smith suggesting asking NC EEP for their reference sites.

Little Lick Creek Management Strategies

Technical memorandum #5 recommends nine strategies:

1. Stream repair projects
 2. Buffer restoration projects
 3. Stormwater retrofit projects
 4. Critical lands protection
 5. Better site design
-

6. Improved enforcement of existing rules
7. Watershed outreach and education
8. Adopt-A-Stream programs
9. Stream monitoring

Recommendation #1: Stream Repair Projects

Chris passed out a new version of the recommendation with comments from John Cox. The group discussed how to handle the discussion of impairments and causes thereof, especially in light of the paucity of information specific to the Triassic Basin. Bobby suggested that the memo point out that DWQ cannot rate some impaired streams. Chris Dreps argued that Triassic Basin streams may not be "bad" so much as fragile. Cherri Smith said that Laurel Creek, a major tributary to Lick Creek, may be a good reference area. Bobby said that better aquatic life can often be found near diabase sills, and that this should be considered in stream restorations.

The group also discussed NC EEP criteria for stream restoration projects, especially length criteria. The Technical Team felt that more flexibility is needed, especially for urban areas and to keep problems such as downcutting from worsening. Chris Dreps agreed to include recommendations to NC EEP regarding their criteria after discussing them with Chris Mankoff and/or Deborah Amaral.

Recommendation #2: Buffer Restoration Projects

The group had a lengthy discussion of how buffer impacts affect aquatic ecological communities. The group noted that raw EPT scores are not good indicators of such shifts, which often are from groups of more tolerant species to less tolerant species that perform similar ecological functions. NC DWQ has performed a functional feeding analysis of the aquatic insect data from LLC sites. Bobby Louque explained that sites with impaired riparian areas experience degraded ecological community structure. Bobby will craft some language for the recommendation and forward DWQ's functional feeding group analysis to Chris Dreps.

The group also decided that the purpose of the project location maps in recommendations 1-3 are simply for illustration. In each of these recommendations, the UNRBA will reference the more detailed map and table of potential restoration sites in *Little Lick Creek Technical Memorandum #4*.

Major Conclusions

The Technical Team discussed the recommendations in general and which points were the most important to emphasize in this section. Specifically, the group discussed including the recommendation (by Joe Pearce and John Cox) for NC DWQ to consider listing Little Lick Creek for impairment due to turbidity in the major conclusions. Joe Albiston pointed out that it is important to consider the effects of precipitation on turbidity.

The group also discussed the importance of separating recommendations to the City and recommendations to the County as much as possible. Because LLC occupies only a small portion of the City and the County, it is difficult for them to justify devoting a large amount of time to addressing its problems. However, the number of issues identified through this local

watershed planning process demonstrates the need for additional resources and portends that additional resources will be needed to address issues identified through future local watershed planning processes.

Next Steps

Chris Dreps will update the recommendations and incorporate them into Technical Memorandum #5: Recommended Watershed Management Strategies.

This was the last Technical Team meeting until Chris Dreps returns from Mexico in summer 2006.