

3.8 Landowner Concerns and Interests

Throughout the process of developing a stream management plan for the Broadstreet Hollow, landowners have played a critical role in providing historical information and photos.

Landowners also answered survey questions and spoke out at Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings, expressing concerns and opinions. This information sharing helped the DEP and the SWCDs to identify and address some of the most unstable reaches of the Broadstreet Hollow. The following section will summarize concerns that landowners communicated during the stream management planning process. To understand how concerns vary according to location along the stream, the comments are divided among the various management units (MU1-MU19).

MU1

The two landowners who responded from MU1 both identified streambank erosion and flooding of property and the top two concerns. They both replied that flooding has caused road and bridge access to wash out more than once and that the quality of fishing on the Hollow has deteriorated. One landowner described in more detail the problems in this management unit, writing that inadequate rip-rap continues to wash out, large trees fall into the stream, and a lack of riparian vegetation prevents bank stabilization.

MU2

Landowners in MU2 hold the concern for flooding, streambank erosion, and the deterioration of fishing as well. With three bridges in this management unit, two private and one county, the concern for bridge stability is high. In addition, the time and cost required for proper stream care concerns MU2 landowners.

MU3

The high report of flood damage and turbidity in MU3 explains the placement of the demonstration restoration project in this section of the Hollow. Most comments are related to pre- or post- construction. Like the above management units, MU3 landowners worry about streambank erosion, flooding of property, and bridge/road washout. Upon the completion of the restoration project, landowners have an interest in learning how to monitor the project in order to know whether or not it is successful. Also, because the project involved moving the stream, the banks have yet to establish viable riparian, or streamside, vegetation that will serve to stabilize the banks as one function.

MU4

Landowner comments about the stream and its banks along MU4 include a frequent flooding problem, lack of riparian vegetation, and impaired fishing. In addition, a taxidermy shed that emits a bad odor stands close to the streambank and a landowner wonders if any regulations exist that would require its removal or clean-up.

MU5

Streambank erosion and flooding do not have the same concern for upstream landowner as for landowners in MU5. Rather, they are worried about effluent contamination from a summer camp. The camp sits on a tributary that runs into the stream in this section of the Hollow.

Landowners believe that fishing has deteriorated due to the camp's pollution into the stream, acid rain, and turbidity.

MU6, 7, and 8

The comments for MU6, MU7, and MU8 were very similar to MU5. They remarked on the decreased fishing quality and worry about pollution (i.e. pesticides, sewage etc.) from upstream runoff. One landowner from MU 7 and MU8 also noted flooding and streambank erosion as a frequent problem.

MU9

Landowners MU9 are also concerned about pollution in the stream (see MU6,7&8).

MU10, 11, and 12

While a landowner responded that MU10 is in good condition, the same is not true for MU12. Landowners have noted excessive erosion over the last 25 years in MU12. One landowner has received a couple permits for stream work, but hopes to receive additional advice on the extent of property damage and the requirements for proper stream work. Another landowner also hopes to see the eroded area stabilized through the use of grant support for consulting and riparian plantings.

MU13

The main concerns in this section include streambank erosion and pollution from upstream runoff.

MU14 & 15

One landowner reported that these two management units are in good condition and they have no history of major flooding.

MU16

No comments were received.

MU17 & 18

Flooding has been a frequent problem for MU17 and MU18 landowners. It has cause damage to property and homes. Landowners have acquired permits to address streambank erosion. They, too, hold the concern about upstream pollution from runoff and dumping.

MU19

No comments were received.

Unknown MU

A few landowners offered opinions anonymously, making it difficult to assign to a specific management unit. These comments range from little flooding influence to great flood damage. These comments also note deteriorated fishing from the "muddy water" created by the summer camp and the negative influence of rip-rap on fish habitat.

Generally, if high waters have affected landowner property and bridges, flooding remains the highest concern. Where flooding has not presented a problem, concerns focus on the quality of fishing along the Hollow, extending the concern to the quality of water affected by upstream pollution and runoff. It is apparent that portions of the Hollow require a long-term solution of proper stream stewardship to not only promote a more stable stream, but also to eliminate the re-application for stream work permits and to reduce the overall cost of stream maintenance. Landowners have expressed an interest in learning more about these long-term solutions and how to implement them.