

HINKSON CREEK WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT

BOONE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, ROOM 220

801 E. WALNUT, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI

(573) 886-4330

Minutes

4:30 P.M.

Tuesday, June 2, 2009

Present:

Ben Londeree
Anne Peery
John Schultz
Jeff Barrow
Bill Florea

Ken Midkiff
Tom Wellman
Todd Houts
Jeanine Pagan

Samuel McKee
John Holmes
Stephanie Smith
Mariel Stephenson

The meeting was called to order at approximately 4:30 p.m.

DISCUSSION

Bill said the goal of this group is not to micromanage this watershed and design it but to establish community guidelines for how it is managed. Tom believes there needs to be enough specific guidance so that the engineers and other people can proceed with enough detail.

Discussion of categories identified during the last meeting:

New Construction was added as a category.

Focus: Geographically based focus

- Account for changes in watershed (positive or negative)
- Should include a temporal element: past – present – future
- Multiple focal points of varying priority.

Determine which portions of the watershed to focus on because we have already identified the two spots in the plan already; (listed on page 37 of the management plan). Not only is it geographically, but time based because of possible new development in the future. The group discussed some of these areas. The geographic focus would be where the data has identified a hot spot. We want to identify what we think are hot spots now but we also want this plan to be adaptable so that it quickly reacts to changes in the water shed. So when new developments occur it refocuses on those areas.

Information:

- What information do we need to make better decisions
 - Information for policy development
 - Flow Control
 - Pollutants (Chemical & Biological)
 - Information for implementation
 - Flow Control
 - Pollutants (Chemical & Biological)
 - Monitoring

- Flow Control
- Pollutants (Chemical & Biological)

We want to define this category as information we need to help make better decisions about the watershed. There is other information we need other than hydrological type information. Jeff believes we need more data to find out where we are now to see if our measures are helping to reduce the peak flow and if that action is actually going to improve the creek. We also need information for policy development and information for implementation of a policy.

Education/Outreach activities:

- Inform all stakeholders (Identify various audiences)

Under our current permit with DNR; it has given the co-permittees the opportunity to deal with and correct what has been identified in DNR's testing. That is through education; you can target specific areas and educate businesses and the public. We can't target everything but if there are specific problems educational programs can be held to address those issues. During the planning process the plan will be updated. At some point we would like to find a way to get other stakeholders involved in the process.

Ben believes we need to identify who we are targeting and we need to make the various stakeholders aware of all of these issues. That means we need to talk to developers, builders, people who do and don't live along the creek, and the pocketbook people and the people who implement it.

The group discussed possible sources of contamination.

Ken said we have overall goals of the plan and asked how the goals here differ from the goals of the plan. Bill said those goals haven't been established yet. At the last meeting was there was a free-flow discussion but it didn't really form a clear direction. It was suggested that we not go through the sixth chapter line by line as we had before and instead set it aside and take that discussion and make some coherence out of it. They may or may not come up with the same recommendations or goals that are already there, there may be a lot more goals than there are now. It was not suggested that we toss out chapter 6. There was just not a good feeling about how we were going to collect all the information that was thrown out at that last meeting and incorporate it in to chapter 6. The suggestion was to set that aside for now and do our own thing and generate that information and look at the two and see if we can justify it at that point.

Ken said we have already reviewed 1 through 5. What you are saying is the goals to implement the main goals may be more detailed. Todd explained that much of the recommendations in chapter 6 have already become dated. The recommendations we make should not become out of date in a very quick period. The plan should give more of a vision than it did originally.

The group discussed items that need to be addressed in the plan such as high flow rates, bacteria, sedimentation, and runoff.

A member asked if there was a deadline for improvement of Hinkson Creek. It was explained that there is a deadline for writing the TMDL but not for implementation.

Retrofitting

- Recommendations for developed areas.
 - Will break down into subcategories, ie: residential, commercial, public infrastructure.

New Construction

- Current controls need modification for watershed management needs.

New construction is going to have to meet current codes. Ben asked if there are things that need to be done over and above current codes. Members agreed that yes, there should be additional requirements as the current controls are not adequate. It was also suggested that regulatory requirements that are found to be not effective, in the context of the Hinkson Watershed, should be eliminated or modified.

The group discussed government bodies and whether they should be exempt from the guidelines. The group felt that government bodies should not be exempt.

Cost Share Program - Retrofitting

- Government subsidizing/incentivising preferred practices that exceed minimum requirements.

Bill asked if we want government to provide some sort of cost share arrangement to private land owners for retrofitting. The group stated yes. Todd asked if the cost share program be only for things beyond what they are required to under the program. Is the cost share only for what is above the minimum or is toward what we are mandating has to be done. Ben mentioned that with the Bonne Femme project we learned that you better cover a lot of it or it is not going to be done. If the stakeholder has to put any money in to it, it is going to take more of an incentive than if it something they want to do anyway. Do we want to recommend granting incentives for meeting the minimum standards or do we want to grant incentives to those who go well beyond the standards? Todd suggested that the stakeholders cost of meeting the minimum work could go toward their part of the cost share.



It was suggested that the two most important topics are Focus and Information Needs. That should be the place to start at the next meeting. Then comes Education/Outreach, Retrofitting, New Construction, and Cost Share.



NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be June 30, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. in Room 220 of the Boone County Government Building. Bill Said he would type all of this up and we will discuss Focus and Information Needs at the next meeting.