

## **6 April 2007 WRPC meeting**

**Attending:** Bill Anderson, Carol Babyak, Patrick Beville, Jana Carp, Kristan Cockerill, Jeff Colby, Gabrielle Katz, Mike Mayfield

### **Expert Guest**

Amanda Todd is a Geography/Planning alumna with many years experience with stream restoration. She presented a typical process for a stream restoration project and highlighted some key things to think about.

#### Process:

1. Feasibility study – what are the limitations; identify restrictions; identify what can/can't be done
2. Negotiations on design – what are options for restoration? Includes some field work
3. Fieldwork – stream survey; data gathering
4. Reference - find reference stream and base design on that; need comparable watershed; look at other urban streams

#### Ideas/Issues:

- There are curves available for urban sites and the design company should be looking at this.
- Definitely need a design and a construction company with experience; they should provide options in design; look for more than Rosgen training; look for biologist/plant person – not all engineers; experienced firms know how to handle permitting.
- NC only requires monitoring for five years.
- Is a good idea to have design and construction work together.
  - ASU requires pre quals for design and construction firms
- Often not much client involvement in design; significant involvement in construction
  - Sometimes find things (e.g. sewer pipe) not in feasibility study, then have to redesign
- Culverts, bridges, working around utilities, and materials are expensive
  - Materials require precision placement
- Doesn't know of other funders – CWMTF; Mitigation Bankers, but project may be too small; EEP, project too small
- Would recommend Baker (formerly Buck Engineering)
- Has contacts in field, happy to continue talking with us. Barbara Dahl (sp?) at NC State is key contact on Rocky Branch

### **WRPC Planning Document**

Thanks to Chris for such a great start on this.

Overall structure:

Immediate driver is for WRPC is to provide Stan with recommendations to take to design and construction regarding Kraut Creek.

Segregate WRPC info/mission/objectives from Kraut Creek project. Options include:

Make separate documents

Put WRPC “stuff” at end of document

Maybe add “other potential projects” to highlight that Kraut Creek is the first of hopefully many water-related efforts on campus

Specific to the Kraut Creek Project:

Draft document jumps into specifics. Preceding those specifics we need:

- a vision statement (short) on what we want the creek to be in 20 years
- a guiding document that clearly explains what we want to accomplish and is the “guide” for the specific actions/activities

Should have a meeting focused on getting to an agreed upon vision for the Kraut Creek effort

Before the next meeting send Kristan “keywords” or phrases describing your vision of the creek in 20 years. She will compile and get back out to everyone and at the next meeting we will try to frame the short vision statement and begin work on the guiding document.

Before the next meeting read the version of Chris’ document with Kristan’s edits/additions and add your own comments/ideas.

### **Other Info**

Patrick has approval for 3 parking spaces to test the pervious concrete. Needs people to get with him on what we want to do, specifically.

### **Next Meeting**

20 April 2007, 2:30