

**Minutes**  
**Black Creek Watershed Coalition**

Wednesday, December 21, 2005

Present: Rochelle Bell, Monroe County Department of Planning and Development; Charlie Knauf, Monroe County Department of Public Health; Caroline Myers, Monroe County Soil and Water Conservation District; Don Hoyt, Town of LeRoy; Jeff Van Skiver, Town of Bergen; Robert Remillard, USDA NRCS Lakes Plains RC&D; Bob Wilkins, Monroe County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board; Joe Carr, Town of Chili; David Klein, Nature Conservancy; Pat Tindale, Town of Chili.

Action items are underlined throughout the minutes.

**Introductions, assignment of roles, questions about minutes.** Rochelle introduced David Klein of The Nature Conservancy to the group. R. Wilkins managed and kept time, R. Bell facilitated and C. Knauf scribed.

**Grant Updates: Controlling Sediments in the Black and Oatka Creeks:** D. Zorn reported to R. Bell that the grant period has been extended for an additional 6 months to June 2006. G/FLRPC has met with Bethany on the development of ordinances, but has not yet met with Sweden or Riga, and it is currently unclear if Riga will still want to participate as they have a new supervisor. Clarendon has still not received the initial visit. C. Knauf asked if there will be another solicitation to all the towns to participate in the ordinance analysis, considering the extension, but R. Bell didn't think so as the four towns that have signed up is close to the percentage participation that G/FLRPC has received when this process was followed in the Finger Lakes. J. Carr said that the ordinance that he has seen is similar to the one the stormwater coalition has developed for construction and post construction phases of development, and for Chili to get involved would be redundant of prior efforts with the Stormwater Coalition. A suggestion was made to compare the NYS model ordinances with those of the Stormwater Coalition. R. Bell said that they have met on this. However, it was suggested that this could be a tool that G/FLRPC could use, especially in non-MS4 areas.

**Legislative meetings/grants:** R. Bell reported that this would be part of the NYS Budget process.

**5 Star Grant:** R. Remillard sent an announcement of these grants to R. Bell, who determined that these would not apply to mitigation wetlands. R. Remillard said this would have to be an on-the-ground project. C. Knauf also pointed out that Monroe County had received one of these grants used for the Caring for Creeks workshop a couple of years back, so would drop lower on the list in relation to new projects. The deadline is in March, so there is time to think about a project.

**Display Boards:** The one that was in the Wheatland library was going to be moved to the Scottsville library, but hadn't gone yet. C. Knauf requested use of the boards for the Remedial Action Plan meeting in Rochester. As an action, the group suggested that he get the trifold board from George Squires at the next Oatka Creek meeting.

**Nature Conservancy:** David Klein attended to speak about The Nature Conservancy modeling project. The reason for his visit to the committee was to consult with the Black Creek Watershed Coalition on a project that the Conservancy is involved in to model areas of the Great Lakes. The project involves the Natural Heritage Institute, a not-for-profit law firm; the Toronto Region Conservation Authority, Cornell University, and the Conservancy, with funding from the Great Lakes Protection Fund. They are also involving local watershed groups and agencies such as BCWC to get input on what uses the model might have to be useful. They are focusing on eight watersheds around Lake Ontario, and expanding on existing Cornell University methodology. They have currently identified three kinds of impairments: flood plain encroachment, obstacles to fish passage and altered hydrology. They want to add additional impairments and add predictive capacity so that the model might be useful in informing management decisions and choices. The model describes and assesses problems in the watershed, a sort of descriptive phase, but will not tell what the impact of the problem is. Some of the other target impairments discussed include: sedimentation and sediment inputs, nutrient inputs, alterations of natural flows, loss of connectivity with the floodplain, habitat fragmentation and invasive species. All the selected watersheds are similar in size, but have other differences. Black Creek is predominately agricultural in land use, and has significant biological resources, especially in terms of the Bergen Swamp.

David asked the group for input, suggestions, or concerns. There followed a dialogue on things coalition members would like to see incorporated. David said that they were currently adding sediment and nutrient inputs to the model. They want to be able to use it on a watershed basis, but also make it regionally important. C. Myers said it might be of utility to the WQCC phosphorus effort if it could help identify the sources and determine which are the highest priorities for remediation. David said that the starting point of the model is land use. He also indicated that point sources can be added if they are available as a GIS layer. D. Hoyt questioned how detailed the analysis could be unless the land use layer was detailed enough to look at crop type, as there a difference in the amount of nutrient lost depending on the crop. David acknowledged that this is an issue, as some of the data will be lansat and he is unsure if that level of detail will be available. D. Hoyt felt that the way this is handled could have a profound impact on the usability of the model and where it points to issues. B. Wilkins said that Cornell can know what the optimized nutrient inputs are, and that could be compared to what the model predicts and sees. J. Carr wondered if the model will identify relative quantities of sediments, and identify where the sedimentation is prevalent. David said it could break out impervious surface as a percentage of the total land, and the soil layer should contain some data on erosivity and erodability. In terms of alteration of natural flows, they hope to be able to look at impacts of water withdrawal, impacts of land use on stream flashiness, irrigation and the number of people irrigating. C. Myers suggested that USDA collects information on the percentages of what crops are being grown. It was also suggested that the permit database might reveal irrigation sites. Another possible thing for incorporation into the model would be the impact of clearing and dragging and modification of channel characteristics. David asked individual to get him any further thoughts at 546-8030 extension 24, or [Dklein@TNC.org](mailto:Dklein@TNC.org). A motion was made by R. Remillard, seconded by

D. Hoyt and passed by the members present that the BCWC support the modeling process. David also said their timeframe is approximately 18 months. R. Bell asked how this group would participate. David said the modeling group would seek to come to meetings and present the modules and data as they are completed. R. Remillard commented that since the intent of the Coalition is to develop a watershed management plan, the recommendations could be valuable as well. Ultimately, the modelers envision a web accessible module where local data could also be added.

The next meeting will be held on Thursday 1/26/2006 at 5:30 PM.