

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

Thursday May 6, 2010

9:30 A.M. to 11:30 A.M.

Oldham County Fiscal Courthouse, La Grange, KY

**Curry's Fork Bacteria Solutions**

**1) Welcome and Introductions**

Paul Maron welcomed nine stakeholders to the meeting. Agency representatives included La Grange Utilities Commission, Oldham County Fiscal Court, Natural Resources Conservation Services, Health Department, and Kentucky Division of Water (KDOW).

**2) Project Updates**

a) Web site Updates

i) The Web site was updated with meeting minutes and materials from our last meeting. If you are unable to attend a meeting and would like to review the materials, please visit the Web site. ([http://www.oldhamcounty.net/Curry\\_Fork/Currys\\_Fork\\_Plan.htm](http://www.oldhamcounty.net/Curry_Fork/Currys_Fork_Plan.htm))

ii) A sign is being constructed to post at the stream restoration site pointing to the Website for more information.. Additional information will be added to the website to provide stream restoration project status updates, pictures, and educational information.

b) Existing Program Narrative Reviews

The Existing Program narratives to be incorporated into the Watershed Plan were distributed to the agency/program representatives. Feedback is being incorporated into watershed inventory text for the watershed plan. If you received a narrative, please review it for accuracy and return it as soon as possible.

c) Stream Restoration Update

Stream restoration construction was temporary stopped due to new easement issues. The earliest the stream restoration tour will take place is early to mid summer.

d) Next Meeting

The meeting in June will be held the first week or the last week based on the availability of stakeholders.

**3) Watershed Goals**

a) Watershed Goals

Watershed goals were developed based on feedback from roundtable participants, technical committee, and community feedback. A total of four goals were compiled based on the community feedback. The technical committee discussed and revised the wording of the goals. The revised goals are listed with a short description of the committee discussion.

b) Improve and protect water quality for our generation and future generations

The proposed goal was reduce pollution for our generation and future generations. The committee wanted a more positive goal that was specific to water pollution. The alternative text was “Improve and protect water quality for our generation and future generations.”

c) Promote a safe, healthy, and accessible watershed for recreation and wildlife  
Create a safe, healthy, and accessible watershed for recreation and wildlife.

The proposed goal was create a safe, healthy, and accessible watershed for recreation and wildlife. The critical part of this goal was access to the stream. ‘Create’ was thought to be inappropriate and the committee agreed to revise the goal to “Promote a safe, healthy, and accessible watershed for recreation and wildlife.”

d) Utilize programs and practices to decrease flooding potential impacts.

The proposed goal was Minimize Flooding. In general, this goal was revised to add more detail to the goal and to be specific about the plan’s accomplishments concerning flooding. Alternative wording accepted by the committee was “Utilize programs and practices to decrease flooding potential impacts.”

e) Develop and implement a cost-effective watershed plan that economically uses funds.

The text after ‘plan’ seemed redundant. The committee decided to delete the text. “Develop and implement a cost effective watershed plan” was sufficient.

f) Review Bacteria Sources and Causes that Inhibit Goals

During the April 2010 Technical Committee meeting, sources for each subwatershed were discussed. The committee reviewed the sources summary and provided additional local insight for each subwatershed. Global comments were to add wildlife and livestock/horses as sources to all subwatersheds. Sources were classified into categories based on the likelihood of being probable or significant pollutant sources in the watershed. Classifications were made based on watershed knowledge from living and working in the watershed and applicable water quality data.

**Asher’s Run Sources**

### Upper Area (High Priority Restoration)

#### More Probable Pollutant Source

1. Animal waste from low-intensity animal operations (small numbers of goats, horses, etc. as well as some 'nontraditional' livestock on relatively small properties).
2. Failing septic systems
3. Wildlife

#### Less Probable Pollutant Source

1. Pets
2. Livestock/horses

### Downstream Area (High Priority Protection)

#### More Probable Pollutant Source

1. Wildlife
2. Re-suspended sediment with bacteria loads

#### Less Probable Pollutant Source

1. Pets
2. Upstream contributions
3. Failing septic systems
4. Livestock/Horses

### g) Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 A.M. with plans to continue discussion of sources and solutions for the three remaining subwatersheds at the June meeting.