

Hinkson Creek  
Collaborative Adaptive Management  
Stakeholders Meeting  
September 18, 2012

**Attending:** Diane Oerly, Shawn Grindstaff, Jeanine Pagan, Joe Engeln, Jonathan Sessions, Karen Miller, Paul Land, Ben Londeree, Paul Mehrle, Jay Turner, Daryl Dudley, Gary Ward

**Absent:** Don Stamper, Frank Gordon, Nathan Odle, Hank Ottinger,

**Agenda:** Shawn opened the meeting with the Welcome and Introductions. The committee discussed process while waiting on a quorum. Shawn asked if there were any questions regarding anything anyone had read or had seen on power point or the presentations given at the last meeting by members of the Action Team. Shawn asked if the City Council or County Commission had any priority projects from what was presented. Commissioner Miller said they haven't had any discussion about priorities; she wanted to be very neutral so that it really did come from this body so she has not reached out to the staff or Commission.

Shawn requested that the two Action Team presenters, Georganne and Steve, if willing, to participate in the dialogue by answering any questions that may arise during the deliberations. Questions that were asked of the Action team and other comments were: what would we gain and what do we want to know out of the Public Perception Survey? What value do we think it will make on our decision process? What value is the habitat assessment? Do we recommend different things if we have that assessment because we have more clear picture of the problem? The compilation of all studies may keep us from reinventing the wheel if the same study has already been completed in the past. A quick review was given by Georganne Bowman and Steve Hunt from the Action Committee on what was presented the month before concerning the Action and Science Team recommendations.

**Collaborative Adaptive Management Deliberations: Shawn and the Committee**

There are three recommended projects Georganne reviewed that the committee discussed.

1. The Public Perception Survey: There was good response to the Survey Questionnaires that was previously sent out. Questions and comments on the survey were: What do you perceive are the water concerns of Hinkson Creek? Agriculture, Construction, pet waste they were all multiple choice. A member asked how we plan to use this information once we get it. When what we are after here is to improve the water quality? In everything we do we need to keep in mind that is our mission. Do we want to spend \$30,000.00 dollars at this time? We thought about going to the University for the Survey again but thought it makes it less intrusive and didn't want to do that again. What they did was take the whole Hinkson Creek watershed and divided it into sub-groups so when they mailed it out it was mostly answered by the cross section. What are we going to

get out of this assessment? Several years ago the school system did a survey it didn't cost \$30,000.00 but it was an outreach program and it helped us understand where we were lacking in communications. We realized it was a misunderstanding with folks that kind of knew what was going on, but we were not explaining ourselves enough about what we need to do and what needs to happen. It was very helpful. There are still questions to be asked that is why the survey was proposed.

2. Physical Habitat Assessment Questions and Comments The value of this is so to figure out what bugs we are trying to save and what is actually going into the stream that is having an impact. We don't have a cost estimate on this at this point. Jason and Paul wanted to meet with grad students on the project so that it stays in our time frame. Questions discussed were; Is there a section of the stream that is a higher priority? Or do they just want to do the entire watershed? The suggestion is to do the entire watershed. Of the three, the consensus was this has the highest priority to get us started on an understanding about the hydrology and the stream morphology. IF we don't have the money to study the whole watershed maybe we should focus on the most impaired areas? Anything that is focused on is improved quicker. It is crucial that we follow very strict guide lines.
3. Body of Knowledge Compilation Questions and Comments: The science team identified this need when talking about studies; it became consistent that someone would remember a similar study done a few years ago. If this compilation took place, they could go back and look at the studies and have a better idea on how to focus moving forward. Next month, we need to have more information on cost. Is it a year study; is it a six- month study, or a two- year study?

Shawn reviewed the ground rules for the Stakeholder Committee to ultimately make decisions on the Hinkson, but he and the group agreed that in order to be as educated as possible in a relatively short time frame, the group would seek consensus at times to direct the committee and teams to the most important issues for deliberation. This focusing effort would also aid the Action Team and Science Team in their missions as well. Shawn said this was a good way for the group to construct a reasonable but efficient process by which these complex deliberations could take place from meeting to meeting. They agreed that this would be a good approach when faced with a lot of information and not a lot of time to generate recommendations at various intervals of CAM. The consensus of the body was to focus on the Physical Habitat Assessment first and get more information on costs, then develop a plan for the compilation of studies and associated costs. It was also decided to eliminate consideration of the survey at this time.

Shawn and the Stakeholder Committee then asked Steve to review each proposal and, to the best of his ability, help the group understand how each of these help move the water quality forward.

### **Steve's review and analysis of the possible options:**

1. Forum Nature Area: We have the green light from Parks and Recreation to work on it next fall. Steve will review the water quality data with the Health Department. The long- term goal is to replicate Doctor Hubbard's study of planting trees and its improvement on the habitat. If we do this it has positive benefits, but it's not necessarily an impact on water quality today. We can agree in concept but should not adopt a recommendation until it is fully vetted from a timeline and budget perception.
2. Moon Valley Restoration: This is private ownership and is the source of sediment that is getting into Hinkson. The question was raised if this is a private owner and they are responsible for the sediment on their property going into the Hinkson then is it the responsibility or the public to repair the damage? Or is it only during construction they would be responsible. The Department of Conservation has some easements to try and get control of this.
3. Trash Collection: BMP downtown. The cost would be \$200,000.
4. Forum Roadside Channel Step Pools.
5. Oak Forest Detention Retrofits: Retrofit one to hold the water. Monitor how the two are compared and how they perform, Grindstone, Wal-Mart, Kohl's is covered by the other basin. In the last six years we constructed a detention area that was inadequate, insufficient, not addressing the problem, so are we doing this constantly, are we never going to catch up because we are building something that is creating more problems. They were built in 2006 at Oak Forest Apartments.
6. Landfill Property Improvements. Riparian wetland there would hold the sedimentation.

The Stakeholder Committee opted to substantively move ahead on actions taken by passing a formal motion (vs. consensus) to prepare the teams for further discussion and deliberation at the next meeting. The motion was made to adopt this as today's priority for further plan and cost assessments.

- Forum
- Oak Forest
- Roadside Channel Step Pools
- Trash Collection
- Landfill
- Moon Valley

The motion passed.

Handouts of the Brainstorming were given. Shawn asked that we finish our homework and send it to him prior to the next meeting at [grindstaff.shawn@epa.gov](mailto:grindstaff.shawn@epa.gov).

Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting will be mid October.

DRAFT