

PRINCIPALS

Gerald F. Knapp
Thomas E. Biehl
Walter H. Alix
George E. Hubbell
Peter T. Roth
Michael D. Waring
Keith D. McCormack
Curt A. Christeson

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
J. Bruce McFarland

SENIOR ASSOCIATES

Frederick C. Navarre
Gary J. Tressel
Lawrence R. Ancypa
Kenneth A. Melchior
Dennis M. Monsere
Randal L. Ford
David P. Wilcox



HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

ASSOCIATES

Timothy H. Sullivan
Thomas G. Maxwell
Nancy M.D. Faught
Jonathan E. Booth
Michael C. MacDonald
Marvin A. Olane
James C. Hanson
Richard F. Beaubien
Margaret Synk Kuhn
William R. Davis
James J. Aiello
Daniel W. Mitchell
Joel E. Bowdan
Jesse B. VanDeCreek
Robert F. DeFrain
Marshall J. Grazioli

MEETING MINUTES
Livingston County Phase II Watershed Groups
South Branch Shiawassee River Subwatershed Group
Break Out Meeting No. 7

Date: 11/12/04
Time: 10:45am
Meeting Held: Green Oak Twp Hall

HRC Job No. 20030566.26

<u>Present:</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone No.</u>
Bill Bamber	Oceola Twp	517.546.3259
Cheryl Bartley	MDEQ	517.335.6093
Bob Batt	MDOT, University Region	517.750.0410
Merry Bering	Howell Twp	517.546.2817
Ed Fox	Oceola Twp	248.343.0137
Greg Green	Howell Twp Resident	517.545.4927
Bob Hanvey	Marion Twp	517.546.1588
Doug Kuhn	Hartland Twp	810.629.3818
Terry Lee	Tyrone Twp	810.629.8631
Brian Obrecht	Howell Twp Resident (Red Cedar Watershed)	517.552.5300
Rolly Olney	Hartland Twp	810.632.7498
Jacy L. Paul	HRC	248.535.3456
Julie Peltier	Hartland Twp Resident	586.530.8119
Nancy Sauvage	Oceola Twp	517.546.5886
Katie Schlueter	Hartland Twp Resident	810.632.4797
Becky Simpson	LCDC	517.546.0040
Bill Stone	HRC	248.454.6337
Steve Wasylk	LCRC	517.546.4250

<u>Not Present:</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone No.</u>
Cindy Ambrose	Deerfield Twp	517.546.8760
Matt Bolang	LCDPH	517.552.6870
Mike Gaden	MSU-Extension	517.546.5154
Brian Jonckheere	LCDC	517.546.0040

PURPOSE:

During today's break-out session, we revisited the draft list of road/stream crossings for watershed signage, distributed the Pollutants, Sources and Causes (PSC) matrix for review, as well as distributed a draft water quality summary and modified watershed management plan goals and their associated objectives. Careful review of these documents will be of utmost importance between now and the next meeting as consensus needs to be made on the goals and objectives to select for placement in the plan, and then move forward with selection of best management practices (BMPs) to meet the objectives and goals.

A) Watershed Signage

At the last meeting, the group asked that Level 3 (primary gravel) and Level 4 (local gravel) roadways be omitted from the road/stream crossing locations in an effort to prioritize "hot spots" or more heavily traveled areas for watershed signage. After doing so, Level 1B (primary hard top) and Level 2 (local hard top) road/stream crossings yielded the following numbers:

Primary Hard Top:	17
Local Hard Top:	5
Total Potential Crossings:	22

Level 1A crossings are MDOT roadways. At this point, there are four (4) desired crossings in this level; however, it will be up to MDOT whether or not we will be able to put up signage in their right-of-way. This will be explored further as we get closer to putting up the watershed signage. The Drain Commissioner or HRC could be a single point of contact to find out what can be arranged with MDOT for signage in their right-of-ways.

As before, the number of signs at crossings would need to be doubled to 44, since two signs would be needed at each crossing. Based on the cost estimates that Becky Simpson gave at the watershed group meeting at an average of \$22/sign, that would be at least \$484.00 for priority road/stream crossings for the South Branch Shiawassee River subwatershed area only. Discussion was held regarding communities putting up signage in other watersheds in their areas—such as the Red Cedar Watershed or Huron Chain of Lakes watersheds. This would be no problem at all, and in fact, since communities committed to implementing their public education plans community-wide, this would be a very cost-effective way to do that. Another way to look at it would be to say that priority signage will go in the permitted watershed areas in the community. It would be completely up to each community and what their budget allows for. Communities should also keep in mind budgeting for placement of watershed signs at watershed boundaries with the sign designating, "Entering the Shiawassee River Watershed".

B) PSC Matrix

The group was given the draft PSC matrix that was distributed at the break-out meeting of the Public Meeting in October. It's basically a table version of the designated and desired use impairments list that was distributed at Break-Out Meeting No. 5. This list shows the designated use and whether it is impaired or threatened (shown in *italics*). For each pollutant or problem discovered in the watershed area, a comprehensive list of sources and causes are listed for each. Whether or not the pollutant, source

or cause is known (k) or suspected (s) is also noted. The group was asked to review this list and inform HRC if anything needs to be added, modified or omitted. A more comprehensive discussion of this table can be found in the draft water quality summary distributed today.

C) Draft Water Quality Summary

The water quality summary, as outlined in the Blue Book (watershed planning guide), will serve as the basis for the watershed management plan. Towards the end of the watershed planning process, this summary will get finalized and will act to provide an accurate picture of the watershed and a clear link between the goals and conditions in the watershed.

This draft outlines the following topics:

- Designated and Desired Uses threatened or impaired,
- Watershed Management Plan Goals and Objectives (general statements)
- Detailed description of the Designated Use Impairments/Threats from point source and nonpoint source pollution

Again, this is the very first draft of this document, and will likely be modified many times as the planning process continues. However, it's a good start to getting all known water quality information in one spot to begin to provide a summary of what's going on in the watershed.

D) Draft Goals and Objectives

This document begins to provide an outline of the goals and associated objectives we might like to see in the plan. The group was asked to carefully review the long-term goals and their associated objectives to meet the goals. If we can get commitment from the watershed communities to meet these goals and objectives, we can begin to compile which tasks could be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives. That will be the next step is to compile as many possible tasks, or BMPs that each community can implement. A large part of meeting the goals and objectives will also be do look at land use planning principles and each community's master plan to ensure inclusion of water quality and quantity protection that correlates with the goals of the watershed plan.

A number of resources will be evaluated to compile this information, such as:

- Publications put out by the Livingston County Planning Commission
- Great Lakes Better Back Roads Guidebook—Clean Water by Design (2000)
- Guidebook of Best Management Practices for Michigan Watersheds (MDEQ)
- Catching the Rain—A Great Lakes Resource Guide for Natural Stormwater Management (2004)
- Internet research on BMPs recommended by the USEPA to meet the various objectives of the plan.

These are just a handful of the resources that can be used to pull some ideas together. A draft list of BMPs and recommendations to evaluate land use planning principles will be given at the next group meeting in January.

In regards to a local land use issue that might need to be addressed in the watershed plan, Doug Kuhn of Hartland Twp brought up the topic of manure management at small, local run farms; he felt this would be a very appropriate issue to address. This topic would fit nicely under Long-Term Goal 2: To protect and improve partial and total body contact recreation. It would also fit under Objective 2.4: Provide educational materials to residents and riparian landowners on the potential impacts to public health from nonpoint source pollution sources (household hazardous waste, failing OSDS, misuse of pesticides/fertilizers, *mishandled animal wastes and husbandry operations*, etc.).

The final handout was a comprehensive matrix taken from the Rouge River Main 1-2 Subwatershed Management Plan Project. Jacy Paul of HRC brought along this matrix to provide an example of a good schematic to pull the ultimate product of the watershed plan together. The matrix provides a means of a summary to show which watershed communities will be implementing particular BMPs to achieve watershed plan goals and objectives. It provides a snap shot to anyone looking at the watershed plan to know who's doing what.

E) Next Meeting

The next break out meeting is scheduled to meet after the regularly scheduled LCDC Subwatershed Group's meeting on **Friday, January 14, 2004** at **Green Oak Township Hall**. At this meeting, the group will be asked to provide any comments on the draft documents distributed today. The next steps will be to begin compiling a laundry list of BMPs for each community to choose for implementation.

These minutes are intended to be a summary of those items discussed. Any corrections and/or comments should be noted to the writer as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.

Jacy L. Paul

JLP/jp

pc: All present
HRC; M. Synk Kuhn; J. Booth; File