

**Curry's Fork Watershed Plan
Technical Committee Meeting**

Thursday, September 2, 2010

9:30 A.M. to 12 P.M.

Oldham County Fiscal Courthouse, La Grange, KY

Curry's Fork Bacteria Solutions: Costs, Feasibility, and Responsible Parties

1) Welcome and Introductions

Paul Maron welcomed twelve stakeholders to the meeting. Agency representatives included La Grange Utilities Commission, Oldham County Fiscal Court, Oldham County Stormwater District, Oldham County Sewer District, Health Department, Board of Education, NRCS and Kentucky Division of Water (KDOW).

2) Project Updates

a) Bacteria Roundtable Discussion, July 15 at John Black Center

The Bacteria Roundtable was held July 15 at the John Black Center with approximately 50 concerned citizens. Proposed bacteria solutions were presented and feedback was collected. Overall, the survey results indicate support for the proposed solutions. The highest ranking solutions were creating buffer zones around streams and the lowest ranking proposed solutions were linked to proposed potential fees associated with onsite wastewater operation, management, maintenance.

b) Technical Committee Survey Participation

The Technical Committee survey had 12 participants. The results are summarized with average score and percentage of each response. The feedback was incorporated with the Roundtable feedback to outline the proposed bacteria solutions.

c) Stream Restoration Update

The stream restoration project is on hold pending an attorney in Real property's approval. Discussions between Beth Stuber (Oldham County Engineer), Nick Ozburn (Fish and Wildlife) and Eric Dewalt (stream restoration contractor) are continuing to get movement on the project. The Board of Education has cleared all easement issues and construction is ready to begin. To meet project deadlines the stream restoration project needs to begin within the next 6 months.

d) Web Site Updates

The Web site was updated with the Roundtable results, Technical Committee survey results and past meeting minutes. If you are unable to attend a meeting and would like to review the materials, please visit the Web site at http://www.oldhamcounty.net/Curry_Fork/Currys_Fork_Plan.htm.

3) Bacteria Solutions Review

The Curry's Fork Pathogen Pollutant Solutions were reviewed by the Technical Committee. The feedback from the Roundtable and Technical Committee surveys was

used as a screening tool for proposed solutions. The solutions outlined include information such as target audience, feasibility and costs to implement BMPs. The solutions were organized by subwatershed and entire watershed bacteria solutions.

a) Ashers Run- Upper

The geometric mean of fecal coliform was about 1,300. The subwatershed is identified as a high priority restoration area for bacteria.

Septic tank maintenance was discussed and possible triggers for inspection. There are various types of levels of inspection and costs vary depending on what activities are performed. A septic tank inspection verses a pump out –are examples of different levels of service of inspections. Possible triggers for septic tank inspections are during property owner transfer, septic district inspection interval, or Health department based on complaints. Septic inspections can include lateral field probing, and inspection of the distribution box. It was noted that currently, the property owner needs to be receptive to the inspection as it can be an intrusion on private property. Septic tank inspection is not included in a typical home inspection. Oldham County Sewer District took a survey of approximately 50 people and they were in favor of learning about their septic tanks. Costs and best management practices were discussed with proposed edits to text and figures.

b) Ashers Run- Lower

The geometric mean of fecal coliform was about 910. The subwatershed is identified as a high priority protection area for bacteria.

The tone or perspective of the pollutant load reduction/ dollar “Usually not cost-effective BMP for bacteria only control” was not in written with the goal of protection and will be reworded. Many different entities can hold conservation easements. Currently in Oldham County, Oldham County Fiscal Court, NRCS (only agricultural land), PACE, American Farmland, River Field. Factors to consider during purchase of easements are who is eligible to hold conservation easements, does the property owner wish to gain a tax benefit, and is this a fee simple agreement. Planning and zoning currently has a 50’ wide no disturbance buffer on the blue line streams. Discussions of expanding the no-disturbance zone to include the 100 year floodplain. There was minimal negative feedback from the development community during the discussion to expand the no disturbance zone.

c) North Curry’s Fork- Upper

The geometric mean of fecal coliform was about 270. The subwatershed is identified as a medium priority restoration area for bacteria.

The comments received during the review of Ashers Run upper will be carried over into these best management practices.

d) North Curry’s Fork- Lower

The geometric mean of fecal exceeds water quality standard and was 670, 935, 1280 (from upstream to downstream sampling location). The subwatershed is identified as a medium priority restoration area for bacteria.

The comments received during the review of Ashers Run upper will be carried over into these best management practices. Bacteria concentrations increase as you travel downstream with the most downstream sampling point with the highest concentrations of bacteria. Revise stormwater management quality management plan per comments.

KDOW noted that livestock may have been observed in streams in this subwatershed. KDOW was going to check and report back to the group.

e) South Curry's Fork- Upper

The geometric mean of fecal coliform was about 790. The subwatershed is identified as a medium priority restoration area for bacteria.

There have been unconfirmed reports of livestock in the streams of this subwatershed which are being followed-up.

f) South Curry's Fork- Lower

The geometric mean of fecal coliform was about 1,700. The subwatershed is identified as a medium priority restoration area for bacteria.

There are two wastewater treatment plants in the subwatershed, Lakewood and Lockwood. Treatment plants contribute a pollution load but they are meeting their permits and have not had any notices of violations.

Karst topography can have impacts on pollution and streams distribution throughout the watershed. The limestone geology of the area raises areas of concern for probably karst topography. The Health Department indicated that Lake Louavilla is a problematic septic area.

g) Curry's Fork Main Stem

The geometric mean of fecal coliform was about 1370, 1260 and 820 (from upstream to downstream sampling locations). The subwatershed is identified as a high priority protection area for bacteria.

There are two treatment plants near the main stem Ash Avenue and Friendship Manner. They are outside of the Currys Fork watershed boundary. There are no plans for decommissioning of either treatment facility.

h) Curry's Fork Entire Watershed

There are bacteria water quality exceedances found throughout the watershed. The geometric mean for all samples taken in the watershed was 1,000. BMPs are identified as appropriate watershed wide.

Onsite wastewater design criteria is dictated by state requirements. Currently the minimum lot size is 1 acre for an onsite system. An increase in the lot size would allow for relocation of leach fields.

Additional BMPs to add to the entire watershed bacteria solutions were sampling to differentiate between human and agricultural contributions, general homeowner education, development of farm tracking list, support urban/rural interface, and karst monitoring including dye tracing. Additional detail was requested for monitoring to specify E. Coli as testing parameter. Wastewater and water planning was requested to be reworded to focus on concurrent efforts.

2) Steps Forward

The next step is to integrate and summarize the bacteria solutions into the watershed plan. The warm water aquatic habitat data analysis, identification of pollution sources and proposed activities process are activities planned for the next three months. The comprehensive watershed plan deadline is December 2010. The meeting adjourned at 12 P.M. with plans to discuss warm water aquatic data results at the November meeting.