

**-Draft-
Attachment 1.**

**Anacostia Watershed Management Committee
Meeting Summary
May 21st, 2008**

Meeting Attendance:

	Name		Organization
Ms.	Sheila	Besse	DC Dept. of Environment
Mr.	Curtis	Dalpra	ICPRB
Ms.	Mary	Dan	US Army Corps of Engineers
Mr.	Jerry	Maldonado	PG Dept. of Environmental Resources
Mr.	John	Galli	MWCOG
Dr.	Hamid	Karimi	DC Department of the Environment
Ms.	Carol	Kennedy-Hearle	University of Maryland
Ms.	Dana	Minerva	Anacostia Watershed Partnership- Executive Director
Mr.	Aubin	Maynard	MWCOG
Mr.	Emmart	Paul	Maryland Dept. of the Environment
Mr.	David	Prevar	Beltsville Agricultural Research Center Montgomery County Department of Environmental
Mr.	Steven	Shofar	Protection
Mr.	Phong	Trieu	MWCOG
Mr.	Ken	Yetman	Maryland Dept. of Natural Resources
Mr.	Charlie	Gougeon	Maryland Dept. of Natural Resources

I. Call to Order/Introductions

Chair Steve Shofar (MC-DEP) called the meeting to order at 10:10 am.

II. Approval of March, 7 Meeting Summary

Meeting summary notes from 3/7/2008 were approved unanimously.

III. USACE Anacostia Watershed Restoration plan Update

Ms. Mary Dan (USACE) described the outcomes of the May 13, 2008 Restoration Plan public meeting. Twenty-six to twenty eight citizens attended the meeting; with most attendees affiliated with subwatershed groups. After a description of the Plan, the group had extensive time for questions. The take-away messages from the meeting were as follows: 1) the project team needs to better articulate plan objectives and outcomes, because people are concerned that the outcome of the plan will simply

be a list of un-fundable projects and 2) the plan partners need to find ways to engaged more people (i.e. the broader community, not only those belonging to subwatershed groups).

Ms. Dan then added that future outreach efforts will include: 1) three more public meetings (i.e., fall/winter 2008, spring 2009 and summer 2009), with the goal of gathering subwatershed information and input; 2) additional fact sheets (next one by the end of May) and 3) completion of the draft interim report by August 1st and reviewed internally by the Team, with a public draft out for review by the end of August.

A lengthy discussion followed:

- Ms. Minerva said that the presentation was good, but that she was disappointed with the turnout. While the Team seemed to have made a good effort to get people to attend, she wondered how everyone could further engage the public. She also said that one question asked by a participant was very important, specifically “what are the final goals of the study.”
- Ms. Dan agreed, and said the same person also suggested that the Team articulate what the specific end restoration point could be with the implementation of this plan.
- Ms. Minerva also stated that those comments highlighted the need to better articulate, for the public, all assumptions the Team is making.
- Mr. Ken Yetman (MDNR) responded that the Team had explained some, but others such as wetlands have yet to be clearly included in the discussion. The final vision will be clearer as the plan progresses and the Team is able to layout options and then ask people for their priorities.
- Dr. Hamid Karimi said that all the issues discussed are important but if the public perceives the Plan as just a plan, they will not show up. If the public does support it, it will be reflected in more political support. Mr. Yetman agreed but added that the team will have to do more than have PowerPoints and talking heads to do this. Dr. Karimi suggested that the SC could help advertise the Plan.
- Mr. Yetman responded that we should not send it to the policy arm.
- Mr. John Galli (COG) agreed, adding that is would also be difficult because the Plan still has nothing to show/advertise. Furthermore the three additional meetings will make the plan more transparent, but the team does need to do a better job of articulating goals and targeting more citizens.

Various suggestions were made for improving outreach:

- Ms. Sheila Besse (DC DOE) asked whether press releases had been written. Ms. Dan replied they were
- Ms. Minerva and John Galli both suggested that AWCAC play a larger role in helping with outreach and the topic should be considered further in future meetings.

- Ms. Hearle suggested outreach to schools be increase for longer term impacts.
- Dr. Karimi noted that former AWCAC Vice-Chair, Tom Arrasmith, suggested hiring one person for outreach. Chair Shofar replied that Montgomery County is in the process of doing that itself.

IV. AWCAC Chair Report

In Ms. Mary barber's absence, Mr. Galli gave the AWCAC Chair report. He noted that AWCAC has been very active, holding (with COG assistance) two large stormwater focused outreach events (i.e., February 23rd Maryland Stormwater Regulations Workshop and March 22nd Anacostia Citizens Stormwater Summit) and continuing strong political action towards the new stormwater regulations and TMDLs, writing letters to various representatives and agencies, and attending numerous-related meetings.

A special thanks was given to Ms. Carol Hearle (UofM) and the University of Maryland for helping to host the March 22nd Stormwater Summit. At the Summit, there were a variety of presentations by experts and perspectives from the various Anacostia subwatershed groups. Like last year, the event was facilitated by Phil Favero. Recommendations and proceeding will be available soon online at Anacostia.net. Two more min-workshops will be planned for this fall and winter possibly on CSOs, or other topics approved by AWCAC and the Summit Fund.

Internally, AWCAC has been working on its stewardship initiative. They are also discussing how to possibly fund an Anacostia outreach coordinator position.

There were several additional comments by other members of the MC:

- Dr. Hamid Karimi (DDOE) suggested that AWCAC recognize Mr. Tom Arrasmith's hard work in some manner. Other committee members agreed
- Ms. Dana Minerva (AWP) said that she thought AWCAC in next few months might be commenting further on the stormwater regulations and on the upcoming MS4 permits.

V. 2007 Upper Paint Branch Brown Trout Report

Mr. Charlie Gougeon (MDDNR) provided an update on the status of the Paint Branch brown trout fishery. After giving background information on the tributary, he said that many of its characteristics are stable or even have improved since 1980. However in the last ten years the number of adults has markedly decreased and the number of Young-of-Year (yoy) are well below their historical average. A successful trout hatch was confirmed this year, but the previous two years indicated a decline in number of redds/nests (i.e., 14 in 2006; 8 in 2007; with a 30 year average of 18.8). Because of the small size of the trout population, the Inter County Connector (ICC) has the potential to destroy the fishery.

Special Conditions Proposed for ICC Construction within the Paint Branch Watershed Include:

- Sediment and erosion controls will be a critical element and major challenge for this extremely large construction project

- SHA has committed to employing redundant erosion and sediment control measures
- An environmental monitor (hired by SHA) will be assigned during construction of stream crossings
- Clearing of forested areas will be minimized to the greatest extent possible to reduce thermal impacts on streams and destabilizing soils

Mr. Gougeon said that there are several consequences of inadequate sediment protection during the ICC construction phase. These include sediment loadings (resulting from inadequate or failed protection measures) which are expected to further impair compromised natural reproduction of brown trout and additional stormwater runoff inputs. A single, significant sediment introduction, that is capable of interrupting year class success for more than one year, may push the population to the point of questionable recovery. Given the long duration of this project, it is a very risky proposition to expect that sediment won't have a damaging impact on the self-sustaining brown trout population in the Paint Branch.

Questions:

- Dr. Karimi asked whether the amount of development that has occurred has put the stream at a tipping point after which there could be no chance of a viable trout population. Mr. Gougeon replied that the stream was near or even at such a point, only time will tell. The ICC will probably push it past that point. Mr. Galli supplied additional information regarding imperviousness increases, and then suggested it would be good for the group to receive regular updates by SHA, MDE, and others. Chair Shofar thought it might be good to have point/counter point presentations.
- Ms. Hearle asked who the person was hired to check the ICC compliance. Upon learning that the position is under the SHA, she felt that this person might also provide updates on ICC compliance.

***Action/Outcome: The MC will further discuss at its next meeting how best to include regular MC agenda updates on the ICC project. The option of having rotating presentations from agency and consultant staff will be investigated.**

V. District of Columbia Anacostia '2032' Restoration Plan

Dr. Karimi described D.C.'s Anacostia '2032' Restoration Plan. The plan was developed at the request of Mayor Fenty, and came out of the CapStat program. While federal and neighboring county activities and information are absent, the plan takes a comprehensive look and prioritizes activities within the District. Using an Environmental Management System (EMS), still being developed, activities will be tracked within each department and deliverables monitored. This provides incentives for each department to follow the plan. It is hoped that D.C.'s plan will complement the Anacostia Restoration Plan.

Overall the plan sets the following priority order for the river. 1) visually presentable, 2) boatable, 3) restore river ability to support fish and wildlife, 4) swimmable, and 5) fishable/fish consumption.

Dr. Karimi also spoke about the District's trash TMDL and its implementation, which are being done together. D.C. is working with MDE on the trash TMDL for the Maryland portion, because it is known that D.C.'s effectiveness is based on the actions of the two counties (i.e., D.C. is downriver).

Fees for supporting these restoration efforts must cover the \$2.2 billion needed for LTCP implementation, and will come from a fee based on imperviousness. A second fee for MS4/CSO implementation requires an additional \$10-20 million /year. For this cost, strong public buy-in is required, so D.C. is increasing outreach efforts and working with MD in similar efforts.

Finally, the District's MS4 permit will require LID measures (unless proved infeasible), with the goal of controlling the first inch of runoff. Also, any new building, starting in 2009, will need to be LEED certified. A short discussion followed:

- Mr. Galli asked whether there was a summary table that added up all of the various associated restoration costs, and whether it is known how much the whole effort will cost? Dr. Karimi responded that it was intentionally left out, because the price is at first staggering and it was thought people would not be supportive. Ms. Minerva said she held the same fear of the Anacostia Restoration Plan. Mr. Galli congratulated D.C. for taxing itself and suggested that's what the rest of the jurisdictions will need to do.
- Ms. Hearle stated that D.C.'s approach privatizes restoration actions and wondered if the values/costs had been examined. Dr. Karimi responded that there is currently a \$7 fee, but it will be in the mid \$20s (with the new bill based on imperviousness). D.C. had to calculate what it would cost to change the behavior; saving \$1.50 a month doesn't do it.

VII. ARPW Monitoring Database Report.

Mr. Galli provided a summary of the collection of Anacostia watershed-related data. He distributed a summary table which identified the nine top monitoring priorities by the ARPW and their respective status. Due to time constraints, he asked that everyone review the list and send any questions to him. Chair Shofar noted that he intended to use this table at the upcoming SC meeting. Mr. Galli then provided a second, sample table showing current watershed monitoring efforts organized by jurisdiction and by subwatershed. Mr. Galli asked whether additional analysis or summary was needed, or if the table was what the MC wanted. Importantly, the table identified the monitoring "holes". The MC members agreed that the table satisfied their needs and did a good job of capturing monitoring information.

***Action/Outcome: Members should further review both tables and send comments to COG staff as soon as possible. COG staff will complete draft monitoring tables for all three jurisdictions and have them available for the June 3rd SC meeting.**

VIII. COG FY08 Progress Report and Recommended FY09 (ARF Work Program and Budget)

Mr. Galli began by reviewing the COG's accomplishments for FY08 and recognizing Mr Phong Trieu, Mr. Aubin Maynard and Mr. Kerry Choi for their tremendous hard work. He explained that with one

lone exception (i.e., the Currents Newsletter), all of the FY08 goals had been met. Mr. Galli suggested that, in order to help save meeting time, the MC members review the COG accomplishments at their earliest convenience. He then drew attention to how COG to fill some of the Partnership's data gaps through COG's monitoring of anadromous fish, macroinvertebrates, and fish blockage-related conditions in portions of both Prince George's County and the District. Chair Shofar complemented COG staff for their FY08 accomplishments and efforts. Ms. Minerva suggested that she collaborate with Mr. Galli to better highlight her and other COG staff accomplishments.

The recommended FY09 Integrated Work program and Budget was then briefly reviewed. Mr. Galli began his presentation by acknowledging that over the past year the Partnership has been formalized, and that the ED's work has been invaluable. He also noted that over same period, COG has been trying to get all of the jurisdictions to pay equal amounts (i.e., \$83,000 each). Specifically, letters were sent out last fall to both Montgomery and Prince George's Counties asking each of them to increase their FY09 funding support by \$14,124; so as to match District of Columbia and state of Maryland contribution levels. Mr. Galli added that both counties had given their general approval for the requested increase, and that in FY09 COG will increase its contribution by approximately \$2,000. The COG recommended FY09 ARF budget is \$374,388. Mr. Galli stated that additional money is needed for administration costs (i.e., networking, coordination, technical support, etc) associated with the growing Partnership. Finally, the FY09 work program identifies proposed deliverables for each major task. A brief discussion followed:

- Chair Shofar inquired about why COG is asking for more money in FY2010. Mr. Galli responded that since the grant funding base support (which provides partial funding support for the SC and total funding support for the ED position) is expected to expire, and that more partners are being added to both the SC and MC, that an increase is needed.
- Ms. Minerva added that she is putting a financial plan together for the Partnership which will lay out various options for funding the ED position. She further recommended that the SC consider assembling a financial committee, and that the MC create a communications/outreach committee.

Mr. Galli then requested that the MC make a motion acknowledging that they had both received and reviewed the FY09 work program and budget, and that they are recommending forwarding it to the SC for final review and action/approval. The MC unanimously agreed. Mr. Yetman then noted a typographical error on page three of the document. Chair Shofar requested that FY10 be included in the summary.

***Action/Outcome: The MC has reviewed the COG recommended FY09 work program and budget and while generally supportive, will transmit it to the SC for their review and action.**

VIII. Old Business

An update on the Action Agenda was given by Ms. Minerva. She said that the next draft was still being assembled and reiterated that this was the MC's last chance to submit pictures or actions to be added. She also pointed out that she is still working on the date for the spring 2008 Leadership Council event.

Mr. Emmart Paul (MDE) gave a brief update on Maryland's stormwater regulations. He said that the six focus groups have concluded and wide ranging comments were received. These concerns will be summarized and answers will hopefully soon be posted on the MDE Web site. Currently, MDE staff is internally discussing redevelopment-related issues. In addition, Chapter 5 Stormwater Management Manual updates are in progress. Comments on waiver and utility fees will also be summarized, but the draft regulations will likely be pushed into June (due to the extensive comments received). He also added that the AWCAC letter, related to the nutrient/BOD TMDL, has been received and being given consideration. TMDL-related responses have been submitted to EPA, and MDE is waiting to hear back. Finally, he stated that the trash TMDL (to be finished by the end of calendar year 2009) base monitoring contracts are in place (four seasons of monitoring), after which protocol modifications can be made.

IX. New Business

2008 River Herring Report

Mr. Phong Trieu (COG) gave a brief update on the spring 2008 herring survey. He noted that the survey looked at strength of run and extent, and has been conducted since 2000. This year, only two sites were monitored and in general the strength of run has been weak for the past two years. Last year, eggs were found above 38th Street on the Northwest Branch. This year no eggs were found. Both alewife and blueback herring have been listed as 'Species of Concern' by NOAA, and some reduced monitoring will continue next year.

X. Open Discussion

Chair Shofar began the discussion by noting that the SC had specifically requested that the MC discuss MC/SC roles. Because of time constraints, he asked the MC members if they would like to defer the discussion. The members thought that a short, preliminary discussion was in order. Discussion highlights are as follows:

- Mr. Yetman pointed out several troubling concerns/issues: 1) the same state, university and jurisdictional member/representatives are attending both the MC and SC meetings, diluting the purpose of having two distinct committees, 2) in theory, the MC is supposed to send recommendations to the SC. However, because the MC meets four times per year while the SC meets six times, this has resulted in the SC mining the MC for agenda items and actions, 3) the high number of annual SC/MC meetings appears to be lowering attendance and 4) the by-laws also lay out the specific roles of the SC/MC, which are not being adhered to.
- Ms. Minerva added that perhaps the SC meetings were too long.
- Ms. Hearle said that MC is very important to the U of M's work, and thought it is central to the Partnership. She also concurred with Mr. Yetman that alternates should not be attending both meetings.
- Chair Shofar pointed out that some duplication of work and effort between the two committees is a given, but that it could be reduced.

- Mr. Yetman agreed, but pointed out that technical issues such as riverbed sediment ‘capping’ should have been first discussed at the MC then gone up to the SC with MC recommendations.
- The group agreed that the issue would be brought up both at the upcoming SC meeting and again at the next MC meeting (Wednesday, September 3rd).

***Action/Outcome: The MC will discuss the overall number of meetings, and relationship between the MC and SC and finalize recommendations at the September 2008 MC meeting.**

XI. Summary of Actions

Upper Paint Branch Brown Trout Report

- The MC will further discuss at the next meeting, how to include a regular update item on the ICC project as part of its agenda.

Monitoring Database Report.

- MC members should review and send comments to COG staff regarding how to improve the monitoring tables before the June 3rd SC meeting.

COG FY08 Progress Report and Recommended FY09 ARF Work Program and Budget

- The MC acknowledged that they had received and reviewed the FY09 ARF work program and budget, and will pass it on to the SC for their final review and action/approval.

Open Discussion

- MC/SC Roles. The MC will further discuss the number of meetings, and role/relationship between the two committees and finalize recommendations at the September 2008 MC meeting.