



## **TETRA TECH, INC.**

3200 Chapel Hill - Nelson Highway  
Cape Fear Building - Suite 105  
P.O. Box 14409  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
Telephone: (919) 485-8278      Telefax: (919) 485-8280

## **MEMORANDUM**

**To:            Technical Advisory Council Members**

**From:        Trevor Clements and Kimberly Brewer**

**Subject:     February 2, 2006 Technical Advisory Council Conference Call Summary**

---

A conference call for the Lake Maumelle Technical Advisory Council (TAC) was convened February 2, 2006 at 2:00 pm CST. Ten of fourteen members were in attendance, along with three Policy Advisory Council members (see attached attendance record). Trevor Clements moderated the call, and was supported in technical discussion by Kimberly Brewer, Barry Tanning, and Heather Fisher on behalf of Tetra Tech, Inc.

Trevor Clements took roll call, and then reminded TAC members of the context of the call. We are in the second phase of the project, which is focusing on assessment tool development, baseline analysis, and exploration of management options. During our last conference call January 6th, we discussed assumptions for future land development scenarios to use in the baseline assessment, and we reviewed the draft white paper on Low Impact Development (or LID for short) before it was sent to the Policy Advisory Council. The focus of this conference call continues to be on management exploration. Four white papers were sent to TAC members before the call. They were reviewed during the call in the following order:

- Wastewater Management
- Forestry BMPs
- Land Acquisition
- Good Housekeeping Practices

### **Wastewater Management Options**

Kimberly Brewer provided a brief overview of the white paper on wastewater management options. After reviewing some key definitions and introductory points, Kimberly focused on the considerations for wastewater management decisions provided in section 5.6 of the paper. She then opened it up for discussion by TAC members.

Ashley Pope asked which methods of management would be best for protection of Lake Maumelle. Barry Tanning (principal author of the white paper) responded that it would likely be best to pump wastewater out of the watershed where possible. He mentioned, however, that this would require more centralized facilities and that there was a trade-off in that centralized facilities would likely stimulate higher density growth in the watershed.

Bruno Kirsch asked Dick Cassart and Roger Miller whether DEQ and the Health Department could mandate professional management of all facilities. Dick answered “No,” and added that there is not a good track record for facilities being well operated. While some are designed poorly (e.g., on a steep slope), much of the problem is related to poor maintenance. Barry indicated that inspection and maintenance requirements vary for different systems, with relatively infrequent requirements for septic systems to daily operation and maintenance for more complex facilities. The potential for requiring a professional management entity was asked again. Bruno wondered if the local governments could require the water and wastewater plan for developments to include a professional management entity, and said that he would like follow up input from Walter Malone and any others.

Jim McKenzie indicated that he preferred the options to pump out of the watershed to the Little Rock municipal system or that smaller community systems be maintained by the Little Rock utility. Kimberly indicated that flexibility was likely key to obtaining buy-in, but whatever methods are selected that proper management of the systems would be critical. Jim mentioned that the City of Austin may be a model; there they own and operate smaller plants and subdivisions pay for constructing their own treatment systems and pay a management fee to the City to operate them thereafter.

Kimberly asked how this could be set up legally for the Lake Maumelle watershed. Dick mentioned that third party rulemaking would be an option (i.e., CAW could request a special rule). Barry added that this should address professional design and construction in addition to operation.

Bruno had some additional references that he thought should be cited in the paper and would provide more comments to Tetra Tech following the call.

### **Forestry Best Management Practices (BMPs)**

Kimberly provided a brief review of key points in the paper. John Shannon offered several editing suggestions including:

- Clarify that the use of subsoiling is intentional.
- Clarify in text that waterbars direct runoff rather than detain (noted that definition in the glossary was correct).
- Use terminology of “timber harvesting” rather than “forest” or “forestry” harvesting to be more technically accurate.
- Clarify that unpaved roads are an issue overall, not just forestry unpaved roads.
- Add that off-road use of ATVs is a problem in addition to their use on unpaved roads.
- Use “forestry practitioners and landowners” rather than foresters when recommending use of the BMPs.
- Use the term “implementation” rather than “compliance” when discussing the level of application by landowners.
- Reference the official Arkansas forestry BMP manual.

John also mentioned that EQIP funds are available in Arkansas to provide up to 75% cost-share for small landowners. He also commended those forestry practitioners that are becoming certified by the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI); the USFS has hard numbers that show those following the state guidelines make a difference in water quality protection. John confirmed that the information on the SFI was accurate, and stated that he was glad that Tetra Tech had included it in the document.

Bruno asked if the numbers in the white paper actually reflected BMP implementation in the Maumelle watershed. Heather Fisher (principal author of the white paper) confirmed that there were sites in the watershed and near vicinity.

### **Land Acquisition**

After a quick introduction to the topic, Kimberly focused on the material in Sections 8.3 (Criteria Used to Target Investment in Conservation Land) and 8.4 (Applicability to the Lake Maumelle Watershed). Bruno mentioned that one of the examples looked at proximity to the entire lake as opposed to proximity to the intake. He felt that in the case of Lake Maumelle, proximity to the intake would be more important. Kimberly concurred; the OWASA example reflected a relatively small lake and watershed, whereas the size of the Lake Maumelle watershed and the configuration of the lake make proximity to the intake a more appropriate indicator (note that travel time to the intake is one of the evaluation indicators already selected).

Jim McKenzie suggested being proactive by developing a comprehensive conservation design plan (i.e., for the entire watershed) ahead of time. Within parcels, the plan would identify the sensitive and high priority preservation areas. This could help with ensuring that the overall result would match the watershed plan goals and objectives if this option is a major portion of the plan. Jim thought it would also give certainty to the landowner what could be developed. Kimberly said that she would further explore this option with Jim.

### **Good Household Practices**

Kimberly indicated that the information in this white paper was pretty straightforward and, given the limited time remaining on the call, asked whether there were any comments from TAC members. Bruno thought that the content was very good and had no comments. The rest of the Council concurred. Trevor indicated that if anyone thought of anything further after the call to be sure and email or call us as soon as possible as the papers would be revised as appropriate and sent to the Policy Advisory Council members the following week.

Trevor reminded members that the next call was scheduled for March 2 at 2 PM EST. Tetra Tech will send out a reminder and a draft agenda one week in advance of the next call. Trevor also reminded members of the public meetings that would be held February 13 – 15, and that the next PAC meeting would be on February 16 at the Arkansas Arts Center in Little Rock.

Tetra Tech thanked the Council members for their participation, and the call was adjourned.

## Technical Advisory Council Member Attendance

Meeting Date: February 2, 2006

(P indicates present; NP indicates not present)

<u>MEMBER NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
<u>NP</u> Brazil, Ken	ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
<u>P</u> Cassart, Dick	ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
<u>P</u> Clingenpeel, Alan	U.S. FOREST SERVICE
<u>P</u> Cranmer, Morris	UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS FOR MEDICAL SCIENCES
<u>P</u> Green, Reed	U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
<u>NP</u> Hymel, Stephanie	AUDUBON ARKANSAS
<u>P</u> Kirsch, Bruno	CENTRAL ARKANSAS WATER
<u>NP</u> Malone, Walter	LITTLE ROCK DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
<u>P</u> Mckenzie, Jim	METROPLAN COUNCIL OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
<u>P</u> McPhillips, Munsell	DELTIC TIMBER CORPORATION
<u>P</u> Miller, Roger	ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
<u>P</u> Pope, Ashley	PULASKI COUNTY DEPARTMENT PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
<u>P</u> Shannon, John	ARKANSAS FORESTRY COMMISSION
<u>NP</u> Stapleton, Carl	UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES
 <u>OTHERS</u>	
<u>P</u> Brewer, Kimberly	TETRA TECH, INC.
<u>P</u> Butcher, Jon	TETRA TECH, INC.
<u>P</u> Clements, Trevor	TETRA TECH, INC.
<u>P</u> Fisher, Heather	TETRA TECH, INC.
<u>P</u> Toning, Barry	TETRA TECH, INC.
<u>P</u> Dicker, Herb	POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER
<u>P</u> Dicker, Pat	POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER
<u>P</u> Oleson, Kathleen	POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBER