

Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Plan
Policy Advisory Council Meeting
October 20, 2005

Meeting Summary

The Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Study Policy Advisory Council (Council) convened for its second meeting Thursday October 20, 2005 in the Board Room of the Arkansas Arts Center. A box dinner was served at 5:30 P.M. with the business meeting beginning at 6:00 P.M.

Annotated Agenda

6:00 P.M. Overview or previous meeting and discussion of development of Management Plan

Ms. Leslie Shoemaker, Ph.D. presented the agenda for the evening which included endorsing the refinements of the plan, understanding the indicators established by the Technical Committee, discussing targets, and addressing tasks. Dr. Shoemaker presented the Goals and Objectives from the previous meeting as the “revised Goals and Objectives” and Mr. Chuck Nestrud, representative of Deltic Timber, stated that these should be stated as “revised” because they have not been endorsed by the Policy Committee yet.

Mrs. Ruth Bell, representative of the League of Women Voters of Pulaski County, stated these were draft Goals and Objectives. Dr. Shoemaker then gave a brief synopsis of issues discussed at the previous meeting, which included, addressing quantity in the overarching water supply goal, linking uses and stewardship under the recreation goal/objective, and including administrative feasibility under the community values goal/objective.

These objectives were presented to the Policy Committee for endorsement. All members endorsed the water supply goal as read. The recreation objective initiated much discussion over the use of “aesthetics” as a goal/objective. The recreation objective was read as “Allow limited recreation that reflects environmentally sound stewardship of the lake and...” Mr. Nestrud took issue with the inclusion of aesthetics. He stated that the objectives should deal strictly with water quality issues. Ms. Jane Dickey, representative of the CAW Board of Commissioners, also objected to the inclusion of aesthetics as a goal. Aesthetic values are very subjective and should not be included. The Committee agreed to revise that goal and come back with a second half of the recreation objective.

The “administrative feasibility” goal was again reiterated as a community objective. Within this goal is management, which includes watershed Best Management Practices (BMPs), limits on housing density, and forestry BMPs. Mrs. Bell asked the difference between “administer” and “manage”. Mr. Clements explained that we “administer” things that can’t be “managed”.

Jonathan B. Butcher, Ph.D., P.H., Associate Director of Tetra-Tech, presented the models to the Policy Committee that the Technical Committee had deemed appropriate and best suited for Lake Maumelle and the objectives of the committee. The targets chosen by the Technical Committee support anti-degradation of the current water supply. The methods used for evaluating goals and objectives were indicators and targets. Indicators are a way of “keeping score” and targets are the score we need to get. The Technical Committee feels three types of models should be used: lake models, watershed models, and site-scale models. CE-Qual-WR and EFDC were selected as the lake models; HSPF was selected as the watershed model, and WEPP and the site evaluation tool were selected for the site-scale model. These models will look at toxics, pathogens such as Cryptosporidium and Giardia, algae, sediment, land use restrictions/cost of development, rate increases, impacts of development and invasive species.

In the discussion, it was brought up that there are some state standards already in place. However, it was emphasized that state standards are **minimum standards only** and are not indicative of high quality nor do they lead to improving the quality of the water. Ms. Dicker then asked if we could improve the water quality we currently have. Can we move toward this instead of just maintaining the current quality? Improvement was not felt to be the objective of this committee.

The Policy committee then asked for further information on environmentally sustainable development and design standards, development patterns in other states, potential management options, and information on package plants/septic tank issues for that area. It was also brought up that there are 800 property owners in the area and they have should be made aware of what CAW is doing in regards to this committee. CAW will send out letters to these property owners to notify them of the process.

Mr. Clements then discussed the dates of future meetings. The next policy meeting will be Thursday Dec. 8 at 5:30 p.m. All meetings will be held the third Thursday of every month. The meeting was adjourned.