

**Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Plan
Summary of Technical Team Meeting #6
October 5, 2005**

Prepared October 7, 2005

Introductions, Agenda, and Announcements

The Technical Team guiding the Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Plan met at 2:00 P.M. on Wednesday, October 5, 2005 in the Rollingview Community Center on Falls Lake.

Meeting attendees are listed below.

Name	Technical Team or Community Stakeholder	Organization	E-mail address or phone number
Charles Recktenwald	CS	Local landowner	
Jane Recktenwald	CS	Local landowner	
John Cox	TT	Durham Stormwater Services	John.cox@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
Allen McNally	TT	The Crossings Golf Club	Amcnally2@nc.rr.com
Chris Mankoff		NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program	Chris.mankoff@ncmail.net
George Rogers	TT	City of Raleigh	George.Rogers@ci.raleigh.nc.us
Steve Kroeger	TT	NC Division of Water Quality	steve.kroeger@ncmail.net
Cherri Smith	TT	Durham City/County Planning	Cherri.smith@durhamnc.gov
Chris Dreps		UNRBA	dreps@tjcog.org
Sarah Bruce		UNRBA	sbruce@tjcog.org

Chris Dreps presented the agenda (decision items marked with *):

- 2:00 Announcements
- 2:15 Prioritizing Restoration Projects*
- 3:30 Subwatershed Restoration Needs*
- 4:15 Meeting Adjourned

Announcements

- 1) Chris Dreps announced that a local Girl Scout Troop is adopting a Little Lick tributary. There was good turnout at the Big Sweep event in Little Lick as well.
- 2) George Rogers announced that the Triangle Area Water Supply Monitoring Project is adding stream gages and conducting monitoring in Ellerbe and Knap of Reeds Creeks. Also, Raleigh has re-joined the project.
- 3) Chris Dreps said that it is time to start planning the next public meeting for the Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Plan. The meeting would be held in early December. The group agreed that the Bethesda Ruritan (site of our project kickoff meeting) is a good location and that the meeting should be held at 7 p.m. to make it easier for the public to attend.

The technical team also discussed who should receive invitations. It was suggested that we invite any landowners or businesses whose parcels are involved in the restoration, retrofit, hotspots, or lands protection analyses; riparian property owners who received fieldwork notification letters; and property owners whose parcels are designated as "agricultural use," as they are possible partners for critical lands protection efforts.

Prioritizing Potential Restoration Projects

Chris Dreps showed a map of 3 types of potential restoration projects that have been identified during the fieldwork: stream repair, buffer restoration, and stormwater retrofits. In August, the Technical Team agreed on a general approach and a weighting system to prioritize the projects according to three types of criteria: environmental benefits, community benefits or support, and implementation feasibility. Chris handed out a spreadsheet that shows the two scoring approaches he has tried so far (called "run 1" and "run 2").

Chris said that he had encountered some difficulty quantifying environmental benefits of the projects, particularly in terms of a particular project's benefit to Falls Lake. George Rogers feels that benefit to Falls Lake is not a strong criterion because it is difficult to measure. He feels that the size of a project is a better criterion and proximity to the lake would be better criteria. The Technical Team articulated that this goal remains important to consider, but that the water quality benefits of restoration to Falls Lake are limited. The benefits are more localized, and they are mainly to sediment loading and aquatic habitat. Improving local conditions is the goal of restoration.

Cherri Smith and George Rogers commented that aesthetics is a difficult criterion, because people have such vastly differing aesthetic preferences. This is most notable in our case with regard to stream restorations, which appear messy and unkempt to people who prefer manicured lawns and don't mind eroded stream banks. They agreed with reducing the score of this criterion.

Many potential projects in Little Lick scored low on the long-term viability criterion because the watershed is not near "buildout" conditions. Cherri Smith commented that stream restoration projects are supposed to be designed for buildout conditions, so this criterion will not have great effect.

Cherri Smith added that she thinks the cost criterion is not a "deal breaker" that would stop a good project.

The team discussed the relative importance of different orders of stream for pollutant removal, restoration, and riparian buffer protection. Cherri Smith commented that lower order stream buffers are very important to intercepting pollutants before they reach streams.

The team discussed the idea of prioritizing projects by catchment (small runoff areas to individual streams within a subwatershed). Many liked the idea and felt that the plan should identify catchments with multiple potential restoration projects or stable catchments that include projects (stable catchments are defined as those with very little potential for land use change). Some even wondered whether the team ought to consider prioritizing catchments instead of single projects.

Chris Dreps contrasted the results of the first weighting system (called "run 1" in the power point presentation and handouts) with a revised weighting system ("run 2"). In the first system (run 1), the example project at The Crossings Golf Club (reach 5-10B) received over 50% of its scoring from its implementation feasibility criteria, and environmental benefits were the smallest portion of the project score. Using the revised scoring system (run 2), this project received more than 1/3 of its score from its environmental benefit, and about 1/3 from implementation feasibility. The group agreed that the revised run 2 was more compatible with the goals of the project.

Chris Dreps said he will test another weighting system (run 3) that will flag projects on public land, projects in catchments that include multiple potential projects, and projects in catchments with stable hydrology. The group will need to decide whether to prioritize catchments in addition to or instead of reaches.

The next steps to prioritizing restoration projects are to prioritize stormwater retrofits, finalize project prioritization, and revise technical memorandum #3 to include the prioritization results.

Subwatershed Assessment

Chris Dreps passed out a table that summarizes several basic subwatershed characteristics (current and future impervious cover, land uses) for all 13 subwatersheds. Chris said that so far, the Technical Team has said that impervious cover should affect subwatershed prioritization.

John Cox and Joe Albiston commented that restorations are designed to deal with development, especially since the Neuse stormwater rule minimizes changes to hydrologic regimes. John suggested that we might follow the Center for Watershed Protection's guidance of focusing restoration in subwatersheds with 10% to 25% impervious cover.

George Rogers asked how this plan would help avoid future impacts. Chris Dreps responded that the Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Plan would be a comprehensive watershed plan that will likely include recommendations for each of the 8 tools of watershed protection (Center for Watershed Protection: www.cwp.org).

The group also discussed some preliminary thoughts on how to deal with the prevalence of failing sand filter onsite wastewater systems in Little Lick Creek. Fixing the problem could have a very large water quality benefit. Outside funding would definitely be needed to assist property owners with tap-on fees and plumbing; however, property owners that are already on lines should already have paid tap-on fees when the lines were run.

Chris Mankoff and Deborah Amaral are looking into whether NC EEP could fund any projects of this nature, since they are concerned with nitrogen removal for mitigation purposes.

John Cox wants to convene a meeting with the:

- County Environmental Health Department (Drew Morgan and Brian Letourneau);
- NC Division of Water Quality's Raleigh Regional Office (Mack Wiggins and Ken Scheuster);

- State Division of Waste Management (Brad Atkinson, also on Neuse Nonpoint Source Team);
- NC Division of Environmental Health (Barbara Grimes, Onsite Wastewater Division);
- Durham Public Utilities (City Stormwater Services and City Sewer and Engineering—Don Greeley and possibly Jim Harding);
- Durham County Engineering (Glenn Whisler and Joe Pearce or Joe Albiston); and
- NC EEP (Chris Mankoff and Deborah Amaral).

The UNRBA will initially contact these people (with help from John Cox) and request a meeting.

Chris Dreps said that the Subwatershed Assessment Subcommittee will continue to review the data for Little Lick Creek and will meet before the next technical team meeting.

Next Steps

The next Little Lick Creek Local Watershed Planning Technical Team meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 9 at the Rollingview Community Center. By that meeting, we will:

- Convene the LLC Watershed Assessment Committee;
- Attempt to set up a meeting regarding sand filter systems;
- Complete draft Technical Memoranda Numbers 2 and 3; and
- Begin organizing the public meeting, to be held in early December.