

## Water Resources Planning Committee

Minutes from **Mar. 23, 2:30-3:30pm**

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 Friday, April 6, 2:30-3:30pm, in RSW 035.

### **Attendees:**

Mike Mayfield, Mike Windelspecht, Kristan Cockerill, (Jeff Colby), Jana Carp, Patrick Beville, Carol Babyak, Chris Thaxton.

### **Absent:**

Bill Anderson, Garbielle Katz, Wendy Patoprtsy, George Santucci.

**General comments.** We had healthy discussion pertaining to our goals outlined in the initial recommendations proposal posted to the website last Thursday:

[http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/kc\\_recommendations.doc](http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/kc_recommendations.doc)

See below about details.

### **Decisions reached / action items:**

1. Thanks to **Jeff C.** for the large maps of the stream – we will use these in our following discussions.
2. Amanda Todd will join us next meeting upon invitation from **Mike M.** She will discuss her experiences with Engineering firms that do stream remediation.
3. **Jana C.** will be updating our faculty involvement in KC document:

[http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/ASU\\_involvement\\_in\\_Kraut\\_Creek.pdf](http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/ASU_involvement_in_Kraut_Creek.pdf)

Please let her know directly of any updates required. When she compiles the updates, we will repost the document to the website. This will act as a key component to our recommendations to Stan so please do this soon.

4. **Jana C.** and the KCC are organizing a bus tour to Charlotte on Reading Day (April 26). Jana proposed that we “co-sponsor” the trip such that the official wording will be “Sponsored by the Kraut Creek Committee and the ASU Water Resources Planning Committee.” Although this does not require us to provide financial support directly (aside from the comfy bus that Stan agreed to provide), we all agreed that it does give this committee visibility as an active group seeking unification with the community on KC. Jana will meet with KCC to get their approval this week (I think). The trip will likely start early AM and will include visits to selected sites in Charlotte (co-arranged by **Wendy P.**) and discussion, possibly including talks (I volunteered to give our KC baseline monitoring talk).

Lunch will be provided. This will be a great chance to exchange ideas with Boone locals, politicians, etc., concerning the stream, mitigation, public perception, etc. I encourage everyone to attend if they can.

**Everyone: Please let Jana and/or me know if you are interested in going.**

**Topics Discussed (in no particular order):**

1. **Chris T.** initiated discussion on the initial recommendations proposal. Keep in mind that this document is not complete and would include all ideas that we discussed in our first meeting (see: Feb 9 meeting minutes, “Deliverables” section ([http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/WRPC\\_MM\\_Feb092007.pdf](http://pimlico.phys.appstate.edu/WRPC/WRPC_MM_Feb092007.pdf))). The general sentiment was that an “Advanced Planning Document” would need to be constructed that includes all stream remediation requirements, including human interaction with and perception of the stream, as well as, of course, designs that would accomplish some degree of ecosystem rehabilitation while providing storm water conveyance / flood control. Once this is in place, we could query engineering / consulting firms and chose which (if any) would be acceptable solutions. **Mike M.** and **Patrick B.** warned that, in general, engineering firms do not have the motivation or expertise to “get it right” (**Chris T.** argued that this is not always true and that, as **Kristan C.** agreed, the engineering design phase would need to be iterative and all inclusive). This idea is still being debated and we should continue discussion. Whether we directly produce designs (are we truly qualified?) or we “hire” someone to do some or all of it iteratively, **Patrick B.** noted that we are an academic group and asked a very pertinent question – are we sure we want to do this? – which I interpreted as “Do we want to get into the business of producing specific designs and seeing them through?” (**Patrick B.**, let me know if this is accurate.)
2. We discussed different BMPs and the value of ASU being, as **Jana C.** stated, a “model” for the rest of the town in their implementation. **Chris T.** mentioned that funding seems to be available for BMP research and implementation, possibly moreso that for stream remediation (based on input from the 2007 LID conference last week). The initial recommendation proposal contains measured and observed impacts and BMPs that could affect improvement. **Patrick B.** mentioned that an opportunity for pervious pavement studies may exist at the planned stadium parking lot and he will get with **Chris T.** concerning possible experimental designs.
3. **Mike W.** mentioned that he would support the idea of integrating a bio component to the stream baseline assessment. Robert Creed and/or Shea Tuberty may have already produced some baseline data, which **Mike W.** will check on. **Mike W.** also said that he would be willing to pull some student support this Summer onto the stream and that quarterly assessments should be sufficient. His take is that the stream is basically “dead” and that, even with a functional ecosystem, rehabilitated or not, the flashiness of the stream is such that we should expect ecosystems to be transient in nature (they get flushed out during high rain events, for example). Finally, **Mike W.** mentioned that TP and TN are likely not

- an issue (although **Carol B.** mentioned that they may start looking at these (nitrates, nitrites, ammonia?)) and that Fecal Coliform could be measured (assuming facilities are available).
4. **Kristan C.** and Jana C. stressed that human interaction and public perception are important components to our success. This seemed to synchronize with our original idea that, if we start with a selected “easy- win” scenario and measure even small improvements (e.g. **Mike W.** says that insect populations seem to recover quickly), this would be a “marketing device” and justification for the continuation of remediation and/or BMP implementation on campus and in the town itself. It is also a direct contributor to the table of measured and observed impacts (in the initial recommendation proposal) since human interaction with the stream impacts its health, both directly and as a device for sustaining a long-term community stewardship and LID attitude.

I will update the initial recommendations proposal to be more inclusive of these topics – I will post it soon and send you an email with the link when it’s up.

Thanks to everyone! We’re making good progress! Keep the input and ideas coming...  
-Chris