DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

STEERING COMMITTEE

OF THE

ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP

Thursday, September 24, 2009

The 20th meeting of the Anacostia Restoration Partnership Steering Committee was held on Thursday, September 24th, 2009 in the Board Room on the 3rd floor at COG. The attendees, in alphabetical order, were:

	Name		***Organization***
Ms.	Sheila	Besse	DC Department of the Environment
Mr.	Jon	Capacasa	EPA Region 3
Ms.	Brooke	DeRenzis	DC Appleseed; Guest
Mr.	Raed	El-Farhan	Louis Berger Group
Mr.	Andy	Fellows	Clean Water Action
Mr.	Stuart	Freudberg	MWCOG
Mr.	John	Galli	MWCOG
Ms.	Elizabeth	Gill	Patton Boggs
Dr.	Ted	Graham	MWCOG
Ms.	Amy	Guise	USACE
Ms.	Carol	Hearle	University of Maryland
Ms.	Linda	Howard	The Summit Fund of Washington
Mr.	Bob	Hoyt	Montgomery County DEP
Dr.	Hamid	Karimi	DC Department of the Environment
Ms.	Catherine	King	US EPA
Dr.	Bill	Mallori	University of Maryland
Mr.	Aubin	Maynard	MWCOG
Ms.	Dana	Minerva	Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership
Dr.	Sam	Moki	Prince George's County DER
Mr.	Robert	Pace	USACE
Mr.	Stephen	Pattison	Maryland Department of the Environment
Ms.	Lisa	Pelstring	NOAA; in place of Pat Montanio
Ms.	Harriette	Phelps	University of the District of Columbia

Mr.	David	Robbins	USACE; Speaker
Mr.	Steve	Shofar	Montgomery County DEP
Mr.	Eric	Siegel	The Cohen Companies; Riverfront BID
Mr.	Mike	Smith	AWCAC
Ms.	Nancy	Stoner	NRDC
Mr.	Phong	Trieu	MWCOG
Mr.	David	Tuchmann	Akridge
Mr.	Charles	Wilson	Prince George's County DER
Mr.	Ken	Yetman	MD-DNR

The National Park Service, DNR, and the City of Hyattsville were not represented.

Follow Up to the Anacostia Steering Committee Meeting of September 24, 2009

There were no follow-up items.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Pattison called the meeting to order at approximately 10:02 am.

Introductions and Overview - Mr. Pattison requested those present to introduce themselves and noted that the meeting would be devoted to presentation of key products of the Anacostia Restoration Plan (ARP).

II. ARP Summary of Efforts

Introductions - Mr. Robert Pace began by thanking all the partners who made the ARP possible, specifically noting COG, County, District of Columbia, and state representatives. After briefly reviewing the day's agenda, Mr. Pace requested Steering Committee members consider what they would like to see as headlines when the final product is rolled out.

Suggestions included,

- The ARP represents the most collaborative assessment and plan for the watershed ever prepared.
- The health of the Anacostia River watershed will improve by taking actions cited in the ARP.
- The Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership is committed to improving the watershed.

- Major progress can occur over the next 10 years. Complete restoration of the watershed is complex and challenging…this may take decades.

Scope of Study - Ms. Mary Dan (USACE) detailed the background leading up to the ARP and concluded by summarizing the findings, to date, of the 10 year plan. She began by thanking all individuals and agencies involved and indicated her pleasure of being part of such a diverse group so engaged in restoration efforts. Ms. Dan indicated that the final product would include the watershed master plan, 15 subwatershed baseline condition reports, 15 actions plans and 15 project inventories.

The major highlights from the Plan include the following:

- Over 2,700 projects identified
- Projects control 8,587 acres of impervious surface
- Includes LID Green Street, Street Sweeping, and Private Property controls
- Cost - ~ $1 Billion
- N, P, TSS pollutant reductions would be achieved but fall far short of TMDL goals

While the plan is aggressive and can make significant improvements within its 10-year timeframe, the inability to reach TMDL goals underscores the importance of programmatic and attitudinal changes, and indicates a full suite of programmatic measures are needed. Additional lessons learned include:

- Urban watersheds are very challenging to restore
- Concentrated population
- Many pollution sources
- Land use changes – impervious surface
- Government cannot do it alone
- Homeowner and private help is needed
- Programmatic changes are necessary
- Partnership is needed

Anacostia Existing Conditions - Mr. John Galli detailed the baseline information gathered for the Plan, and steps in the project inventory. Mr. Galli described the GIS information gathered and used as a basis for the Plan, and highlighted some of the more interesting layers including imperviousness, stormwater controlled areas, forest cover and mapping of existing BMPs. It was noted that information on toxics was included in the main report and space had been reserved in the individual baseline reports for addition information on toxics.

Mr. Galli described the steps for identifying restoration projects developed by COG the previous year for the Sligo Creek case study. These steps are summarized as follows:

1. Land Use/ Land Cover/Imperviousness Analyses
2. Existing Storm Drainage and Stormwater Management Controlled Area Analysis
3. Review of Existing Restoration Inventory and Watershed Problem Information
4. WTM Pollutant Modeling Results Interpretation
5. Low Level, High Resolution Aerial Photography Interpretation
6. Field Survey/Site Visit
7. GIS Candidate Restoration Project Map/Database Creation
8. Project Cost Estimation and Prioritization

Mr. Galli concluded by emphasizing the importance of the Plan identifying and modeling restoration projects, as institutions had already had begun to use the list and implement projects.

Methodology for Identifying Solutions - Inventories - Mr. Dave Robbins (USACE) described the project identification process conducted by the contractor Louis Berger, which was based on COG's work with Sligo Creek. Using GIS, existing data was used to identify potential restoration sites. Due to the sheer size of the watershed (176 square miles), potential projects were marked on 143 maps of 910 acres and were used to conduct site visits to determine project viability, type, and collect data. One third of the sites visited were unviable due to issues such as presence of many old trees, utilities, fire hydrants and difficult topography. Alternate projects were considered whenever possible. Fact sheets were developed for viable sites, and finally combined into a geodatabase.

Additional analysis was conducted for residential areas to identify priority neighborhoods for LID projects, land acquisition, and prioritized areas in the tidal river reach for green alleys, street trees, and green roofs. Neighborhoods were prioritized on lot size, ownership, soils and opportunity. Mr. Robbins concluded that data and information gathered for the Plan will be key to facilitating future restoration efforts in the Anacostia River watershed.

Ms. Dana Minerva suggested that it was worthwhile to include descriptions of the process in the final report.

Methodology/Technical Tools - Mr. Andrew Roach (USACE) explained how baseline loadings and pollution reduction values were calculated. The hydrologic segments and loading rates (HSPFO) model, along with imperviousness data, landuse, and BMP information were fed into the Watershed Treatment Model (WTM) to model baseline conditions and the individual and cumulative effects of proposed projects. Outputs from the model included nitrogen, phosphorous, total suspended solids, and bacteria loads. Individual projects were then scored according set criteria and prioritized into Tier I, II, and III projects within each subwatershed and in the entire watershed.

A lengthy discussion focused on the scoring and prioritization process, with several questions and ideas expressed regarding the scoring metrics and process. Mr. Roach explained how the scores were calculated and how they related to the six ARP goals. Several committee members suggested that the scoring process, specifically allocation and prioritization, should be clearly documented in the final report.

Results and Analysis – Ms. Angie Sowers (USACE) began by describing the limitations of the WTM model, then indicated that for each subwatershed the peak discharge reduction potential was calculated and homeowners, street sweeping, green streets, and a cumulative analysis were conducted. After exploring the outcomes of these analyses, it was noted that within the 10-year timeframe and for longer term scenarios, the existing TMDL could not be achieved even if all projects were built at a cost of more than one billion dollars.

Questions surrounded the contribution represented by landowners, and the limitations of the WTM model. Questions and comments included,

- What is the possibility of achieving the TMDL?
- How is the CSO program woven into the evaluation?
- Achieving the TMDL was not the point of the Plan.
- The failure of all the projects to reach TMDL highlights the need for increased emphasis on programmatic and policy elements.
- Would each project be linked to a specific goal, possible funding sources, and design status?

Comprehensive Evaluation – Mr. Robbins explained that the 13 subwatersheds and tidal river subwatershed action plans (SWAPs) would detail project benefits and costs, and the main report would be a roll up of the SWAPs. Public feedback had been sought from watershed groups on each of the SWAPs.

Individual project results were fed into final scoring, and watershed priorities will be determined by clustering projects around Tier I stormwater projects to determine priority subwatersheds. Several questions and ideas were posed:

- A clear rational for clustering projects is needed to use it as basis for implementation and priority setting.
- Many projects in a small geographical area will be easy to monitor and good for public outreach.
- To make the Plan acceptable to the public, the scope of the cost verses the benefits must be highlighted.

Metrics – Measures of Success – Mr. Robbins described the AWRP monitoring strategy of the 12 key indicators as a good avenue for tracking Plan progress. Mr.

Robbins indicated that use of 319 grants and regulatory requirements of NPDES' would also be avenues to document progress. Without monitoring, success would be difficult to document.

Policy and Programmatic Components - Ms. Dana Minerva summarized the policies and programs section of the Plan. The section includes consideration of major infrastructure plans like the long-term Control Plan for CSO and SSO and redevelopment regulations. Additional portions include examples of policies and homeowner and commercial programs effectively working in other regions. Ms. Minerva ended by reviewing comments regarding the section to-date. Among the key points and questions raised during the discussion were:

- Local and regional green street initiatives should be pushed at the DC and state level.
- The nonwater quality benefits of projects and green initiatives must be highlighted.
- The ARP and Plan schedules must be coordinated to maximize efficiency of partners' work and outreach efforts.
- To implement the smaller LID programs problems with receiving 319 grants must be fixed.
- Has population growth or climate change been considered in this plan?
- Steering Committee members need to be briefing their agencies and organizations on what to expect when the Plan is released. Everyone should be ready to talk about the Plan when it is released.
- Talking points for the Plan should be created so that all members are passing on the same message.
- Will funding for maintenance or education be included in funding strategy or policy section?

Public Outreach – Dave Robbins highlighted public involvement throughout the project process and outreached tools used by the team. Future public input will include a public comments period on the final draft and an additional public meeting. Mr. Robbins emphasized that it is key to manage expectations and explain the magnitude of efforts in all public communications. Partnership members are critical for continuing outreach and inclusion of all interested parties.

Remaining Tasks & Schedule – Ms. Dan described the remaining tasks for the Plan, including completing the prioritization analysis, USACE agency review, and congressional briefing. *At the September meeting, the timeline was as follows, however it has since been updated.*

1. September 28, 2009 Report to SC, MC

2. October 2009 Agency Technical Review
3. October 29, 2009 Comments due from SC, MC
4. November 2009 In-progress review
5. November 30, 2009 Draft Final ARP Public release
6. January 15, 2010 Public comments due
7. February 2010 Final ARP Public Release

Among the key points and questions raised during the discussion were:

- The uniqueness of the Anacostia watershed and the Partnership should be highlighted in the document. It is a good "selling point" for the Plan.
- The Plan must contain a positive message if the public is going to back such an expensive plan, examples might include jobs or aesthetics.
- The communication strategy should be used as a road map for getting information out.
- The final product should include an enforcement page signed by each partner in the ARP.
- A letter of appreciation should be sent to Louis Berger when the Plan is complete.
- It would be useful to ID all projects by category, district, state legislative district, and councilmanic district for outreach and lobbying purposes.

III. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.m.