

Hinkson Creek Watershed Project Stakeholder Committee

810 E Walnut (Commission Chambers) Columbia, MO.

MINUTES

4:00 P.M.

Tuesday, February 24th, 2009

Attendees: Ken Midkiff, Jeanine Pagan, Stephanie Smith, Tom Wellman, John Schulz, Mike Schupp, Tina Bernskoetter, Elizabeth Marble, Allen Thompson, Jeff Barrow, Mariel Stephenson, Samuel McKee, Scott Hamilton, Bill Florea

Minutes and E-mails

The meeting was called to order shortly after 6:00. We had a bit of computer problems at the onset (projector filter was clogged, causing overheating). Scott briefly summarized the minutes from the last meeting, and explained the use of the Gmail accounts set up for the group. A disk containing the Bonne Femme watershed plan was given to all participants.

Organizational Items

John Schulz distributed a handout to the group that had a table listing stakeholders and their possible interests in the watershed/use of Hinkson Creek. John felt we needed more buy-in from stakeholders, and defining each stakeholder's specific issues would bring some of the business interests to the meetings. He brought up the point that having a document already written may be viewed by some as only wanting them to sign off on the document without input. John said that we need to know the desired future condition of the creek before we can go forward with the management plan, and said that the scope of the plan should be expanded to consider socioeconomic issues. Bill explained that the stated purpose of stakeholder meetings was for the review and revision of the watershed plan so that it reflected the social and political values of the community; and that he didn't think that the issues John mentioned were the reason for the development community staying away. Bill stated that the plan, as written, was a minimalist plan that could be expanded by following John's suggested process. However, that would take additional time and effort. It would be up to the group to decide how to proceed. Scott and Bill remarked that they planned to meet with the absentee stakeholders to talk with them about how the issues and watershed plan will impact them, in hopes of bringing them onboard. The group informally voted to concentrate on the minimal focus of the watershed plan rather than expand the scope.

Revisions

Ann Peery with DNR sent language as to how DNR was planning to address bacteria in the Hinkson, which was okay by the group. Scott showed the committee the revisions to the demographics and "CATSO 2025" plan projections that were requested at the last meeting. The committee wanted to see if the data could be broken down by watershed.

The group discussed the overall need to omit many of the details, and place these in an appendix so that the main text would be easier to read. In the section on soils, it was decided to omit the details on whether a soil was from the Putnam series, but keep pertinent information such as its permeability. The engineers in the group suggested keeping in details on permeability, depths of permeable soils, and slope. A soil map with the soil hydrologic groups would help people to see where different soils are located.

The committee discussed the need to get current information on impervious surface coverage by watershed. The data used in the report is now nearly 10 years old. It was suggested that John Fleck with the City be contacted about new data derived from the Natural Resource Inventory.

The group decided to drop the long quote in the vegetation section and include as a possible sidebar.

Next Meeting

We will meet next time at the Boone County Commission Chambers on Mar 17th at 4:00-6:00, Shakespeare's pizza will be provided. The homework is to review Chapter 3 of the plan, and send e-mail comments to Scott prior to the next meeting. Bill asked the group to give some additional thought to John Shulz's suggestion. Meeting was adjourned at 6:00.

DRAFT