

Red Bird River Watershed Collaborative Meeting – September 24, 2013

Meeting Minutes

Location: Big Creek Elementary School, Clay County

In attendance: Julian Campbell, Claudia Cotton, Thomas Dozier, Lynn Garrison, John Hull, Paula Jones, Angie Muncy, Mike Rock, Robert Sitzlar, Jon Walker, and Stewart West.

Opening Comments

Lynn Garrison reviewed the agenda and introduced the speakers.

Agenda

1. Opening Comments
2. Overview of the Red Bird River Collaborative Restoration Project, Jon Walker, USFS
3. Using the Recovery Potential Tool to prioritize the sub-watersheds, Claudia Cotton, USFS (Brooke Shireman, KDOW and Amy Newbold, USEPA were to make additional comments but they had car trouble in Lexington and could not attend the meeting)
4. Information about additional sampling, Jon Walker (Brooke Shireman was to discuss)
5. Questions and Discussion
6. Announcements and Next Steps, Jon Walker, USFS
7. Educational Field Trips Proposal, Julian Campbell
8. Adjourn

Overview of the Red Bird River Collaborative Restoration Project, Jon Walker, USFS

Jon Walker discussed where we are in the project. His points included:

- To finish Chapter 6 we need to prioritize sub-watersheds. We are using the KDOW and EPA Recovery Potential Tool (RPT) to help inform this decision. The Red Bird River Project is a pilot for using the RPT. KDOW is doing additional sampling in the watershed for *E. coli*. This may result in additional stream segments being added to the 303d list.
- Funds have been budgeted for PRIDE for additional cleanups.
- Funds have been budgeted for Kentucky Waterways Alliance for Tessa and Lynn to help complete the watershed plan.
- We plan to apply for a 319 grant in the 2014 cycle.
- Jon challenged us to think outside the box and include the social context.
- We should be able to complete the prioritization of sub-watersheds in October.

In response to Jon’s social context challenge, Angie Muncy suggested that we involve “Friends of Coal” in our next cleanup, and Julian suggested we look for common ground and develop education programs. The group agreed that these ideas had merit. Angie will communicate with “Friends of Coal.” Julian will prepare a detailed educational field trip proposal.

Using the Recovery Potential Tool to prioritize the sub-watersheds, Claudia Cotton, USFS

Claudia Cotton gave an overview of the Recovery Potential Screening Tool (RPST). She discussed how the RPST uses indicators from 3 categories (Ecological, Stressor, and Social) to estimate recovery potential. Participants were given a copy of indicators with the ones used in the first trial run highlighted in yellow (see following pages). Attendees were asked to use the list to recommend other indicators on the list that should be used in future RPST calculations. There were questions about how each indicator is defined. Lynn shared a document that can be downloaded at USEPA Water Recovery Potential Screening: www.epa.gov/recoverypotential/ that explains each indicator. EPA recommends using 5-10 indicators from each class (ecological, stressor, social); however, using 3 to 5 for first runs while learning to use RPST is recommended.

US EPA-Recovery Potential Screening Tool

Kentucky Division of Water Indicator List (Note: indicators used in first calculation with emphasis on pathogens are highlighted in yellow)

<u>Ecological Metrics</u>	<u>Stressor Metrics</u>	<u>Social Metrics</u>
NFHAP_HCI_Condition	Percent_Cropland	Active_Volunteers_Count
Stream_Density	Percent_Pasture	Consent_Decree_Count
Stream_Order	Percent_Impervious	Percent_Length_Assessed
Topo_Complexity	Percent_Length_Impaired	Percent_Waterbody_Assessed
Percent_Forest	Percent_Waterbody_Impaired	Percent_Watershed_Protected_Lands
Percent_Forest_In_Corridor	Dams_Count	Low_Jurisdictional_Complexity
Percent_Wetlands	Percent_Pasture_at_Channel	TMDL_Count
HUC_Size_Small	Percent_Crop_at_Channel	TMDL_Per_Impairment_Ratio
Percent_Woody_Veg	Percent_Septic	Percent_Source_Water_Protection_Area
Percent_NaturalCover	Percent_Sewered	Applied_Practices_Count
Percent_Maint_Natural_Cover	Impairments_Count	
Percent_Gain_Natural_Cover	N_Impairments_Count	
Percent_Natl_Eco_Framework_In_KY	Percent_Urban	

Mean_Combined_Natural_
Habitat_Index
Percent_Assessed_No_
Pathogens
Mean_Corridor_Slope

Percent_Urban_In_Corridor
Percent_Impervious_In_
Corridor
Phosphorous_Impairments_
Count
Percent_Ag_Gain
Percent_Ag_Gain_In_Corridor
NFHAP_HCI_Risk

Percent_Agr_Contiguous_
Water

Percent_Impervious_Over5_
In_Corridor
Percent_Impervious_Over5_
In_Corridor_Change
Percent_Impervious_Over15_
In_Corridor
Pathogen_Impairments_
Count
Percent_Urban_Contiguous_
Water
Percent_N_Uchange_Contiguou
s_Water
Corridor_Percent_Ag_On_
Steep_Slope
Stressor_Count
Unknown_Stressor_Count

Population

Population_In_Corridor_With_
Septic

Percent_Septic_In_Corridor
Percent_Permitted_Mines
Mining_Outfalls_Count
Percent_MS4
CSO_Count
Road_Density

Indicators Recommended by Participants at September 24, 2013 Red Bird River Watershed Meeting from Kentucky Division of Water Indicator List. (This list does not include indicators previously chosen—highlighted in yellow above)

<u>Ecological Metrics</u>	<u>Stressor Metrics</u>	<u>Social Metrics</u>
% Woody Vegetation	Septic	% Length Assessed
% Maint Natural Cover	Impairments Count (specifically <i>E. coli</i>)	% Waterbody Assessed
% Forest	Road Density	% Source Water Protection Area
Stream Density	% Pasture	
% Gain in Natural Cover	% Sewered	
	% Urban	
	% Urban in Corridor	

Indicators Recommended by Participants at September 24, 2013 Red Bird River Watershed Meeting to be added to the RPST (not on Kentucky Division of Water Indicator List)

<u>Ecological Metrics</u>	<u>Stressor Metrics</u>	<u>Social Metrics</u>
Stream Health Indicator, such as endangered species, MBI, and IBI. (Note: KDOW List does include NFHAP_HCI_Condition)	Opposition of mines to Redside Dace (participant may mean Kentucky Arrow Darter) Stream Bank Failure	Educator Involvement (Red Bird Mission)

Results from first trial run with emphasis on pathogens

AUTO-CALCULATED DATA - DO NOT ENTER DATA OR MAKE EDITS IN THIS WORKSHEET!

This worksheet contains the auto-calculated recovery potential summary index values for the ecological, stressor, and social context indicator classes, and the overall RPI SCORE value.

Summary index values have a maximum of 100. They are calculated by adding the values along each row for all weight-adjusted, normalized indicators then dividing by the weight and multiplying by 100.

RPI SCORE (Recovery Potential Integrated Score) values calculated by adding the social and ecological indices then dividing by the stressor index.

HUC_ID	HUC_Name	ECOINDEX	ECORANK	STRESSORINDEX	STRESSORRANK	SOCIALINDEX	SOCIALRANK	RPIScore	RPIRANK
15100203020	Upper Red Bird Creek	68.38	7.00	10.60	1.00	57.37	7.00	11.86	1.00
15100203020	Phillips Fork-Red Bird Rive	75.48	4.00	15.17	2.00	65.07	2.00	9.27	2.00
15100203020	Lower Creek-Red Bird Rivi	73.68	6.00	37.17	4.00	63.50	4.00	3.69	4.00
15100203020	Elisha Creek-Red Bird Rive	73.88	5.00	20.90	3.00	63.27	6.00	6.56	3.00
15100203020	Double Creek-Red Bird R	80.30	3.00	40.87	5.00	65.03	3.00	3.56	5.00
15100203020	Big Creek	61.43	8.00	50.00	6.00	63.30	5.00	2.50	7.00
15100203020	ector Branch-Red Bird Riv	86.10	2.00	76.60	8.00	51.63	8.00	1.80	8.00
15100203020	Bear Creek-Red Bird Rivei	87.90	1.00	58.63	7.00	82.40	1.00	2.91	6.00

Educational Field Trips Proposal, Julian Campbell

Julian Campbell proposed that we have a series of educational field trips that would increase people's understanding and appreciation of the ecology of the area. These field trips would be fun as well as educational. They would be scheduled at regular intervals and led by people with knowledge of the subject chosen for each field trip. This proposal was favorably received by the group. Julian with assistance from others will further refine the proposal.

Adjourn