

Hinkson Creek CAM Science Team
DRAFT Notes of the June 3, 2014 meeting

Team Members Present: Bob Angelo, Paul Blanchard, Joe Engeln, John Holmes, Jason Hubbard, Robb Jacobson, Dan Obrecht

Bill Florea, Catherine Beatty and Erin Keys from the Action Team were also present.

Joe updated the team on the discussions about the three science proposals at the last Stakeholder Committee meeting.

1. The flow and sediment data analysis proposal was recommended for funding and the three local partners agreed to find a way to fund this proposal.
2. The stakeholders felt that the proposed symposium would not be well-attended if it were to be as long as proposed. They suggested a two-hour or shorter program for the general public. Multiple options were discussed.
 - a. A two hour session with four components, process and background, science, actions and panel-based questions.
 - b. A more science-focused Science Café or Saturday morning science approach.
 - c. Bring in an external party for both a professional and general audience. Larry Band from UNC was mentioned as a possibility as he is doing the Birdsall lecture for the Geological Society of America this coming academic year.
 - d. Present materials through a poster session that provides a less intimidating environment for non-experts to ask questions.
 - e. Jason mentioned the plan for a Water Center symposium in March that might fit into one or more of these options.
 - f. The team also supports an electronic recording of any presentation to make it widely available.
3. The stakeholders requested that the fish study be shortened to two years, but gave no clear indication of what they would wish to see reduced. The science team decided to ask Amanda Rosenberger to prepare the following three items: A proposal that would try to accomplish as much of the work proposed in the original analysis in two years; A proposal that would reduce the work proposed to fit readily into a two year period; and A summary of what would be lost in terms of scientific value to the CAM process if there scope of work were reduced.

Physical Habitat Assessment – Jason noted that the field work was half done and is still on target for an August completion. The team did run into an electric cattle fence and is not taking more hiking time to get to sites as the area where they are working (N of Rogers Road) has fewer road crossings. Jason still plans to have the final report completed by December with the idea that additional analyses may stretch beyond that time.

Jason reported that his team had found a significant headcut. This led to a discussion of what this might mean in terms of the CAM process and the management decisions that might be made.

The potential need for grade control was mentioned together with some enthusiasm for visiting that site.

Project near Landfill - John presented some preliminary work that he was doing on design of a streambank stabilization project west of the landfill. This would protect a sewer line that was planned. The team noted that the feature seemed to be migrating downstream rather than laterally. They supported the design of the project, but wondered as to its value and the message that it would send.

2013 DNR data – Team members asked whether the spring 2013 DNR data were available. (Joe checked with Dave Michaelson after the meeting. These are under review and should be out relatively soon.)

Level Spreader – The team asked about the level spreader, how it was operating and the measures being used to determine its success. Erin reported that it was working and that it had been overtopped once this year. The team discussed how often overtopping was expected to occur and the general conclusion, based on positioning, was about twice to four times a year. Jason noted that he and Tom Wellman had to finalize the monitoring, but that it would focus on soil moisture.