

Hinkson Creek

Collaborative Adaptive Management

Stakeholder Committee Meeting

September 17, 2014

Members Attending: Jeanine Pagan, Joe Engeln, Jonathan Sessions, Karen Miller, Paul Land, Jay Turner, Gary Ward, Dave Michaelson, Ben Londeree, Nathan Odle, Barbara Hoppe, Shawn Grindstaff

Members Absent: Diane Oerly, Don Stamper, Frank Gordon, Paul Mehrle, Hank Ottinger

Staff: Theresa Thomas, Nicki Fuemmeler, Bill Florea, Erin Keys

1. Shawn opened the meeting , asking members of the Stakeholder Committee to introduce themselves to those in attendance.
2. The Minutes of the August 13, 2014 meeting were approved on a Sessions/Engeln motion.

3. Science Team Presentations.

Dave Michaelson, MDNR gave the presentation regarding Hinkson Creek Sampling Report results. See link-

http://helpthehinkson.org/documents/HinksonCk_Bioassessment_Year_2_Final_001.pdf

Questions for Michaelson followed.

Question: Your test site 8 is directly below the City Landfill? Does the Landfill present any problems to your findings in the Creek?

Answer: Not that we have been able to see; however, we are collecting only a few parameters of the chemistry of the creek.

Question: One of the comparisons you made was between the upper Hinkson and lower Hinkson watersheds. I couldn't figure out which stations were in each in the upper and the lower?

Answer: I-70 is the dividing line between the upper and lower.

Question: In looking at the station to station differences, can you talk about non-pollutant bacteria sites? Can the shape of the stream and things like that influence those scores from station to station?

Answer: This study is not looking for individual point sources such as bacteria.

Question: Have you figured out how that section of stream compares to others in baseline compared to other streams that are affected by storm waters?

Answer: You may remember we have a few studies completed on that habitat. Once we see the Hinkson Habitat assessment data, we will have a better idea where those points may be. We anticipate providing that information to the Stakeholders by January.

Question: Would it be fair to ask for a two cents answer to a citizen that Hinkson Creek looks healthier today than it did fifteen years ago according to the last of our studies--but it is not quite good enough to meet all standards?

Answer: I think so from what we are seeing today.

Question: So what happens next?

Answer: Under the agreement the department agreed to do three spring and three fall samples at a minimum because we thought that was the minimum amount of data we needed to make a judgment. So we are committed to do more sampling. Michaelson then spoke about 2014 and plans for sampling.

When you look at it from in the beginning where the first tests were done and there were areas where there were point sources. These sources have been cleaned out of parking lots. There's also a large area where chemicals were stored that is no longer in use. There were other issues in that general area that have been improved. Maybe according to the fact that we are getting lower numbers are in the 16 and above. Actually the State Highway Department is now storing salt in a totally different area.

Question: So the sewer was really not measured prior to this?

Answer: These studies are to show overall stream health; we are not trying to catch the extreme events. One of the reasons we did not sample during Fall 2014 was that the creek was so dry. There no water in the upper two sampling sites. We strive to sample during average or more typical conditions.

Questions: So where do we go from here?

The Clean Water Act, the department establishes the parameters for the state, and it is delegated authority to implement procedures to address water quality issues. Every two years, we state how we make decisions, present that work to the state stakeholders. These get reviewed and approved by EPA. We use them for the next two years, making adjustments as needed, subject to Clean Water Commission approval. The next time we can change the status of the creek would be in 2016 when we will do our next assessment of state waters.

Science Team Presentation #2 for Stakeholder Committee

Fish Study Proposal- Joe Engeln presented the proposal tabled earlier by the Stakeholder Committee on behalf of Amanda Rosenberger. This would be a four-year study conducted by a Masters' degree student. The value of the proposal to the CAM process would be to provide an idea what the fish populations are at various sites. We would get an idea of baseline fish populations as well as current environmental conditions. This study would supplement Jason Hubbart's work, giving us more information about the health of the stream and providing an additional perspective.

Questions from the Committee- What was the original proposal?

The original proposal was \$185,604.00 for four years.

Shawn reminded the Stakeholder Committee that the review of it is part of the CAM process but not an actual funding decision. The recommendation, if given, would advance to the three funders for their approval.

After some discussion and clarifications led by Gary Ward, the Committee unanimously recommended the four-year fish study be forwarded to the partners for consideration with the understanding that they deserve a better awareness of how this fits into other research being done (as well as the CAM process itself) before making a final funding decision.

The partners will report at the November meeting.

Meeting adjourned.