

**-Draft-**

**Anacostia Watershed Management Committee  
Meeting Summary**

**Wednesday, September 3rd, 2008**

	Name		Organization
Chair	Ken	Yetman	Maryland Dept. of Natural Resources
Dr.	Mow-Soung	Cheng	PG DER
Ms.	Laura	Connelly	M-NCPPC-PG
Mr.	Curtis	Dalpra	ICPRB
Dr.	Jonathan	Essoka	EPA
Mr.	John	Galli	MWCOG
Mr.	Jim	George	MDE
Dr.	Ted	Graham	MWCOG
Ms.	Amy	Guise	US Army Corps of Engineers
Ms.	Carol	Kennedy-Hearle	University of Maryland
Mr.	Aubin	Maynard	MWCOG
Ms.	Dana	Minerva	Anacostia Watershed Partnership- Executive Director
Ms.	Alison	Mize	Alison Ferguson Foundation
Mr.	Todd	Nichols	MSHA
Dr.	Harriette	Phelps	UDC
Mr.	David	Prevar	BARC
Mr.	Steve	Raabe	Opinion Works
Mr.	Doug	Redmond	M-NCPPC- MC
Mr.	Steve	Saari	D DOE
Mr.	Steven	Shofar	MCDEP
Mr.	Rob	Shreeve	MSHA
Mr.	Phong	Trieu	MWCOG

**I. Call to Order/Introductions**

Chair Steve Shofar (MCDEP) called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

**II. Rotation of AWMC Chair**

Chair Shofar formally introduced Mr. Ken Yetman (MDDNR) as the new Chair of the Management Committee.

### **III. Approval of May 21, 2008 Meeting Minutes**

The 5/21/2008 meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

### **IV. Discussion of the Roles of the Steering and Management Committees**

Chair Yetman briefly reviewed the Roles and Responsibilities document. He emphasized that it is his intention to work closely with the SC to avoid duplication of effort between the two committees. The MC's role is to serve as the technical arm of the SC, dealing with restoration, coordination of restoration activities, monitoring, and developing and suggesting goals to the SC. A short discussion followed:

- Ms. Carol Hearle (U of M) asked about the role of the AWRP in relation to the MC. Chair Yetman replied that the AWRP is a technical subcommittee of the MC, and reports directly to the MC. Chair Yetman then listed the current workgroups as ARPW, AWTA, Trash Reduction, and the ad-hoc Corps' Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan Project Team. In addition, AWCAC reports to both the SC and MC.
- Dr. Ted Graham (COG) added that the confusion over both roles and bylaws should be resolved once the SC updates the bylaws (expected to occur in the next 4-6 months).
- Mr. Shofar added that he thought the new organization of the MC meeting agenda was good and would improve MC efficiency.

### **V. USACE Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan Update**

Ms. Amy Guise (USACE) provided an update on the AWRP. She indicated that the draft interim report would soon be completed and reviewed internally within the Corps. It would include the Sligo Creek Subwatershed Action Plan (S-SWAP) and likely be released to the MC in early November 2008.

Ms. Guise said that the Corps was in the process of negotiating contracts for the following services: 1) report preparation and 2) subwatershed restoration project identification. The intent is to have all of the remaining 13 subwatershed evaluations completed by spring of '09. In addition, a public meeting will likely be held sometime in late fall 2008. A discussion followed.

- Chair Yetman stated that the Plan Development Team (PDT) would wait until the remaining subwatershed analyses are completed before developing detailed recommendations for presentation to the SC. He also noted that the draft S- SWAP had not yet gotten into policy issues or dealing with private property issues.
- Mr. Shofar asked what general level of stormwater management control and what the associated cost would be if all of the Sligo retrofit projects were constructed. Chair Yetman replied that building all 84 stormwater retrofit projects identified in the Sligo Creek Restoration Project Inventory would result in the additional control of only 11 percent of currently uncontrolled impervious surfaces. Mr. John Galli (COG) added that the

estimated cost for constructing all 171 Sligo restoration projects (i.e., including stream restoration, fish passage, wetland restoration projects, etc) is over \$41 million; strongly suggesting that programmatic changes are necessary.

- Mr. Jim George (MDE) explained that the Watershed Treatment Model (WTM) water quality model included only loadings from land surfaces and not from stream channel erosion. Modeling results indicate that, even if all of the stormwater retrofit projects are built, Sligo Creek TMDL-related load reduction goals for sediment, nutrients and bacteria will not be achievable.
- Ms. Dana Minerva (AWRP) indicated that she still had many questions regarding the S-SWAP, such as how the cost analysis was performed, what will happen if the TMDL is not met, and the impacts of MS4 permit requirements, new MDE stormwater regulations and possible changes to existing road codes.
- Ms. Guise replied that the Sligo case study is further identifying what the PDT still needs to do, and that the issues raised by Ms. Minerva and others will be addressed. She then added that the Corps' consultants are required to run the WTM, identify potential restoration project sites, and perform cost analyses. They also must complete 2-3 subwatershed action plans within the first 45 days and continue with the others on a similar schedule.

## **VI. Post 2010 Restoration Targets and Process**

Ms. Minerva began the discussion by noting that SC Chair Pattison requested that a goal identification process be determined to identify post- 2010 goals before the end of calendar year 2009. She identified the Hudson River Estuary Process as one possibility. This process included posting watershed data prior to holding a one-day long workshop, attended by local and external experts, and public representatives. She indicated that while other potential non-Hudson River processes may exist, the MC would be directly involved.

- Mr. Galli briefly described previous, 2001 Anacostia Restoration Agreement-related goal setting activities. He indicated that the one-year process cost \$225,000, featured three public meetings and included both Anacostia experts and representatives from the environmental community. The process narrowed down 132 potential restoration indicators and targets (linked to the six broad restoration goals) to the 50 currently in place. Mr. Galli added that while the process was lengthy and expensive, it was highly inclusive and effective.
- Chair Yetman emphasized the need for linking possible new goals to desired restoration outcomes, and recommended that a committee be created to help set post-2010 goals.
- Ms. Minerva suggested that if 2020 watershed restoration is not achievable, then specific restoration targets (which can be met) must be established. She emphasized that both the Plan's goals and post-2010 goal setting need to be coordinated. Ms. Minerva then cautioned that if the Hudson River Estuary Process is employed, the two outcomes might not align. Therefore, a subcommittee might be the best approach.

- Ms. Guise agreed that the two processes must be coordinated. She added that restoration goals developed through the Plan are specifically linked to what is expected to be accomplished over the next 10 years, and that broader long-term goals will additionally be identified. Regardless of how the Partnership's post- 2010 goals are developed, she felt that the goal setting process must be embedded within the PDT's efforts (which also includes outside review).
- Mr. Jim George (MDE) added that the peer review of goals, versus key indicators, would point out if something were missed through our existing suite of indicators, or if we are double counting.
- Dr. Mow-Soung Cheng (PG DER) stated that he was not convinced that establishing another subcommittee to determine goals was a good idea. He noted that the Sligo inventory will be a reality check of realistic goals and will point out what is actually possible. For example, spending \$41 million in 10- years for just Sligo Creek restoration is not realistic.
- Ms. Hearle concurred that goals must also be pragmatic to pull in the public.
- Ms. Minerva added that funders (e.g., Congress) should also be kept in mind.
- Mr. Dave Prevar (USDA-BARC) added his support for the need for considering the education of the public.
- Chair Yetman suggested an "exploratory" committee to help flush out the goal setting process.
- Ms. Guise suggested that the PDT develop the process, and in fact, she had already communicated this need to her staff.
- Ms. Minerva agreed that the PDT is an excellent place for discussing the process. They could bring back their suggestions to the next MC meeting and present an update at the October SC meeting.
- Dr. Harriette Phelps pointed out that such prioritization must include toxics, if it is to be comprehensive.

**\*Action/Outcome: The PDT will discuss at its next meeting how best to proceed with setting post 2010 goals. They will give their recommendations at the next MC meeting, and provide a brief update at the October SC meeting.**

## **VII. Anacostia Restoration Potential Workgroup Report**

Mr. Galli stated that there was little new to report, since the ARPW has not met since April 15, 2008. The ARPW is currently scheduled to meet on Sept 10.<sup>th</sup> Mr. Galli will provide a full report at the next MC meeting.

## **VIII. Lower Paint Branch Restoration Study and Anacostia Site 11 Update**

Ms. Laura Connelly (M-NCPPC- PG) gave a brief update on both the Lower Paint Branch watershed restoration study and the completion of tidal wetland restoration work at Site 11. She indicated that a consultant (URS) is now under contract and that approximately 90 percent of the required background data had been collected. Ms. Connelly expects that this task will be completed before the end of September 2008, and that the entire study will be completed by late October/early November 2009. Regarding Site 11, she reported that the tidal guts are working well, over 80,000 emergent wetland plants were planted, the goose exclusion fencing is working well, and geese should not be a problem after the plants have become established.

Chair Yetman added that both the MC and M-NCPPC needed to figure out how to make their efforts at the Site 11 mesh together with the Plan's subwatershed work. Ms. Connelly indicated that she had shared the format of the Sligo case study with URS, so they could follow it as best as possible. Ms. Connelly gave additional site details, and then stated that a Ribbon Cutting event will be held on September 17<sup>th</sup>.

**\*Action/Outcome: There will be a Ribbon cutting event on September 17<sup>th</sup> with the Governor and other officials invited. The Governor will be attending as part of his "Capital For a Day" tour.**

## **IX. Maryland State Highway Administration ICC Report**

Mr. Rob Shreeve (MSHA) gave an overview and update on ICC construction. After reviewing the location of the ICC alignment, he explained about the precautions taken and restoration efforts included within the project. He noted that long bridges, depressed culverts, flood relief cells, stormwater management and erosion and sediment controls are all being utilized to minimize the ICC's impact on Anacostia streams. The ICC's stormwater BMP's will treat 1.5" storm events (except on bridges) and provide stormwater management control for approximately 2,415 acres. The project also features 43 acres of wetland restoration, 78,000 linear feet of stream restoration and replacement of 53 acres of forest destroyed by the ICC. Project costs include \$47 million for required mitigation project-related work and \$52 million for environmental 'stewardship projects' beyond those requirements.

## **X. PROACT: An opinion poll on why people litter in the Potomac River Watershed**

Ms. Alison Mize (Alison Ferguson Foundation) gave a brief overview of the Trash Free Potomac Watershed Initiative, and then introduced Mr. Steve Raabe (OpinionWorks) who described the results of the trash survey. The survey included 1,004 interviews and several focus groups, which were given to people throughout the Potomac River watershed. Among the findings, 77 percent of

the respondents were uncertain (or wrong) when asked if trash thrown on the street is physically removed from stormwater runoff at a downstream sewage treatment plant. The survey results led to some general findings and approaches needed for effective messaging: messages must be believable, not exaggerated in their eyes; use few words; and be concrete, straightforward. It was also determined that messages need to be designed with a regional or local focus.

#### **XI. AWTA ‘White Paper’**

Dr. Jonathan Essoka (NOAA) stated that EPA has provided \$20,000 for the completion of the final ‘White Paper’ report by spring 2009. He reminded the committee members that the focus of the white paper is Anacostia River toxic hot spots. A draft report should be available this fall. It was also noted that Ms. Minerva will hold an informal discussion with AWTA about ongoing PCB contamination in Lower Beaverdam Creek.

#### **XII. September 17, 2008 Leadership Council Meeting**

Ms. Minerva explained that the Leadership event would be September 17<sup>th</sup>, but it would not be a Leadership council meeting. She hoped that at that time they would plan the first Leadership council event. The Action Agenda is scheduled to be released at this event.

#### **XIII. Draft Anacostia Communication/Outreach Strategy**

Ms. Minerva indicated that the communication/outreach strategy was  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the way completed. She would appreciate it if the MC would review it, and possibly take an active role in both outreach and communication. Chair Yetman felt that it might be outside the MC’s role set by the SC, but said the group could discuss it at the next MC meeting.

#### **XIV. MDE Stormwater Regulations**

Mr. Jim George (MDE) said that the stormwater management manual updates are on track and expects the public comment period to close at the end of September. Ms. Hearle suggested that, at the next MC meeting, MDE provide an in-depth presentation on the new stormwater regulations.

#### **XIV. Summary of Actions**

##### **Post 2010 Restoration Targets and Process**

- The PDT will discuss at its next meeting how best to proceed with setting post 2010 goals. They will give their recommendations at the next MC meeting, and provide an update at the October SC meeting.

## **Lower Paint Branch Restoration Study and Site 11 Update**

- There will be a Ribbon cutting event on September 17<sup>th</sup> with the Governor and other officials involved. The Governor will be attending the Ribbon cutting during his 'Capital for a Day' tour.

### **MC Meeting dates for the coming year:**

November 17, 2008

March 5, 2009

June 18, 2009

September 17, 2009

December 10, 2009