

## Water Resources Planning Committee

Minutes from **July 11, 3:00-4:00pm**

Look for your **name** in **underlined bold letters**, which indicates a request for information or action. The **everyone** tag applies, as you would expect, to everyone.

---

**Next Meeting**: Our next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 25, 3:00-4:00pm, in RSW 035.

### **Attendees:**

Kristan Cockerill, Patrick Beville, Mike Mayfield, Gabrielle Katz, Jana Carp, Julie Elmore, George Santucci, Chris Thaxton.

### **Absent:**

Bill Anderson, Carol Babyak, Gary Walker, Robert Creed, Shea Tuberty, Mike Windelspecht, Jeff Colby, Wendy Patoprtsy.

### **New documents available:**

- These meeting minutes (from July 11):  
[http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/WRPC\\_MM\\_Jul112007.pdf](http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/WRPC_MM_Jul112007.pdf)
- The recommendation document will be available soon – check for an email that will provide the link.

### **Topics Discussed.**

1. Recommendations document: The recommendations document is coming together nicely. **Our initial deadline for the document is AUGUST 1, with delivery to Stan targeted AUGUST 22.** I will post the newest version, broken down by Chapter, so that you can download them individually and so that we can “check off” each chapter as it is completed. It will include all of your inputs to date - look for an email from me soon with a new link. **Jana C.** mentioned the value of adding a statement and section (right after the ‘site description’ section) on “context”, which will be included in this new version (at least, a first attempt and place holder by me). We will keep the ‘human interaction’ section as before. **Jana C.** and **Kristan C.** will provide verbage on human interaction and ‘scholarship, instruction, and outreach’ soon. As you will see, the biggest holes now are the bio-related sections. **We need biology text ASAP on the following sections;**

**Baseline monitoring, Continuing (bio) assessments, Ecosystem design requirements, Ecological benefits to implementation, Ramifications of non-implementation, and any input on external funding.**

We are assuming that **Shea T, Robert C, Gary W, and Mike W** can get together and portion out the work...it really shouldn't take that long to get something of value down.

2. The pervious pavement WILL happen – they have already paved then planned section of the stadium lot but **Chris T** will meet with **Patrick B** on Friday morning to plan out the new system. The main result from our discussions was that we basically had miscommunication concerning the funding of the pervious pavement project – primarily, the groups ‘concern’ was over the implication from D&C that efforts toward LID are primarily an academic responsibility, as stated in the related emails by **Mike M.** and **Chris T.** We seemed all in agreement that we should all continue to strive to work together with D&C as an integrated team.
3. The Varsity Gym section plans are in the works (by Site Solutions / Baker). The group expressed to **Patrick B** that we would like to be involved in assessing the eventual designs prior to implementation. **Julie E.** mentioned that she feels that the ‘right people’ are on the job and that we should not be overly concerned with the nature of the anticipated design plans. She also offered to act as a link for transferring concerns/info/data to Baker. However, many of us provided input on how to ‘sell’ the idea of our involvement to Clyde and others, including:
  - We already have a faculty group together (unlike Rocky Branch that was delayed)
  - This would create research and teaching opportunities (that should not be neglected by a ‘university’ D&C group).
  - We can provide a report on the + and – impacts and repercussions of the proposed designs which would assist D&C and minimize potential backlash.

Although **Patrick B.** mentioned that he would like to view us as ”the customer” of an outdoor laboratory, this may be viewed to “separate” academia from D&C and may also imply a cost responsibility that may or may not exist.

4. Ginn Co. approached me about discussing stream monitoring. We all agreed that we can all be considered “available” for discussion and potential involvement (to varying degrees), but it is contingent on previous contractual discussions and dependent on the freedom of research publication rights. **Chris T** will obtain a copy of the current contract(s) for further discussion.