

-Draft-

**Anacostia Watershed Management Committee
Meeting Summary**

November 17th, 2008

	Name		Organization
Chair	Ken	Yetman	Maryland Dept. of Natural Resources
Dr.	Mow-Soung	Cheng	PG DER
Ms.	Dan	Mary	USACE
Mr.	Farr	Calvin	WSSC
Mr.	John	Galli	MWCOG
Mr.	Brad	Gardner	USGS
Dr.	Ted	Graham	MWCOG
Ms.	Catherine	King	US EPA
Mr.	Aubin	Maynard	MWCOG
Ms.	Cherie	Miller	USGS
Ms.	Dana	Minerva	Anacostia Restoration Partnership- Executive Director
Mr.	Robert	Pace	USACE
Mr.	Doug	Redmond	M-NCPPC- MC
Mr.	Dave	Robbins	USACE
Mr.	Steve	Saari	D DOE
Mr.	Steven	Shofar	MCDEP
Ms.	Nicoline	Shulterbrandt	DDOE
Mr.	Rob	Shreve	MSHA
Mr.	Phong	Trieu	MWCOG

I. Call to Order/Introductions

Chair Ken Yetman (MDNR) called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

II. Approval of September 23, 2008 Meeting Minutes

The 9/23/08 meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

III. AWCAC Chair Report

Mr. John Galli gave the AWCAC report in place of AWCAC Chair Mary Barber. Mr. Galli gave a brief overview of the one-half day 9/15/2008 Stream Stewardship workshop held at M-NCPPC's Brookside Gardens auditorium. Highlights included:

- Well attended, with over 45 people from around the Anacostia watershed and several from neighboring watersheds.

- Presentations were given by Ms. Jai Cole (M-M-NCPPC), Ms. Laura Connelly (PG-M-NCPPC), Mr. Steve Saari (D DOE), Councilmen Tom Dernoga (Prince George's County) and Don Praisner (Montgomery County), and various subwatershed group representatives.

Mr. Galli explained that there will be two additional one-half day workshops, one on advocacy (February/March '09) and another on CSO's/SSO's (May/June '09). He noted that the topic for the second workshop is still being discussed.

IV. USACE Plan Update

Ms. Mary Dan (USACE) said that the second draft interim report had been distributed to the SC and MC on Oct 24th, comments had been incorporated, and the Corps planned for a November 21st public release, including: Interim Report Framework, Draft Environmental Baseline Conditions Report for the watershed and Sligo Creek subwatershed, and Draft Sligo Creek Subwatershed Provisional Restoration Project Inventory (each available at http://www.anacostia.net/Restoration_Plan/Interim.html).

Ms. Dan explained that, thus far, the public had been involved at two levels: 1) Education (e.g. public meetings and bi-monthly newsletters) 2) Engagement in the restoration efforts (e.g. Friends of Sligo Creek participated in Plan meetings assisting to identify and prioritize restoration projects). A short discussion followed:

- Dr. Ted Graham (MWWCOG) asked what the distribution plan was for the report and stated that it should be more proactive. Mr. Robert Pace (USACE) replied that the report will be distributed to members of Congress, posted on the anacostia.net website, and advertized to AWCAC.
- Ms. Dana Minerva (Executive Director, Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership) requested that local governmental officials also receive the report. Chair Yetman responded that the group should bear in mind that it's an interim product and still has a lot of holes in it. Mr. Pace agreed that the group should be careful publicizing something that contains numbers and projects that might change.

Ms. Dan then proceeded to describe how, in response to the SC's recent request, the PDT developed a proposed goal setting process for identifying post-2010 restoration targets, indicators, and goals. To begin with, the PDT feels that the original six goals and targets are still valid, but there is a need to determine how to refine and bring them into line with the Restoration Plan. They identified a 10-step process:

- 1. Dec 08:SC approves the following MC/PDT-recommended steps and timeframes**
- 2. Feb 09: MC/PDT summarizes lessons learned from 2001-2010 goals**
- 3. Jun/Jul 09: PDT completes ARP subwatershed analyses**
- 4. Jun/Jul 09: PDT completes preliminary watershed-wide restoration cost estimating**

5. **Jul 09: Executive Director completes “Anacostia Watershed Restoration Funding Strategy”**
6. **Aug 09: PDT completes its recommendations for 2020 restoration priorities, indicators, and targets, and final restoration visions for MC/SC review**
7. **Sep 09: PDT/MC/SC distributes draft 2020 restoration indicators and targets, monitoring priorities, and reporting process for peer review by scientific groups, subject matter experts, key NGO’s, subwatershed groups, and other stakeholders**
8. **Nov 09: Final Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan released for public review**
9. **Dec 09: Review and evaluate public feedback**
10. **2010: SC approves new 2020 indicators and targets**

A lengthy discussion on the proposed process and anticipated cost of Plan implementation followed:

- Ms. Minerva began the discussion by stating that the funding strategy (step 5) is already required and will be updated annually.
- Chair Yetman replied that knowing both the budgetary resources and associated timeline are critical to effectively setting realistic restoration goals.
- Mr. Steve Shofar (MC DEP) agreed and added that the SC should take up the budgetary issue and tackle how to communicate incremental costs. Chair Yetman concurred.
- Mr. Steve Saari felt that the process steps were good and that, ultimately, the Plan will help the District of Columbia figure out how to delist impaired waterways.
- Ms. Minerva then expressed concerns that highlighting a possible \$2 billion price tag for restoring the watershed in the Plan may dissuade jurisdictional leaders from aggressively pursuing implementation actions.
- Mr. John Galli replied that, in his opinion, one of the major problems with the past 20-years worth of restoration agreements and subsequent implementation is that we have not addressed the true cost of restoration, nor have we budgeted accordingly. He added that there are many ways to accomplish restoration objectives. For example, implementation of a bottle bill and the elimination of the use of plastic bags may prove “far cheaper than building trash netting systems across the watershed.”
- Mr. Steve Shofar commented that the “cost” topic is very important and that the possibility of “low balling” costs is a real concern.
- Mr. Robert Pace noted that as the PDT gets a better grasp of the total restoration costs that priority projects might be bundled together, so as to provide more options for elected officials to consider. The PDT can also develop multiple implementation options based on both “time and aggressiveness.”
- Chair Yetman noted that many restoration actions may be required through the regulatory process (i.e., TMDL’s and NPDES)

- Ms. Minerva noted that the Plan needs to acknowledge that the restoration effort will extend well beyond 2020. She added that the SC's funding subcommittee will focus its attention on the cost issue.
- Dr. Mow-Soung Cheng (PGDER) commented that he recently presented the Sligo Creek restoration project inventory to his department heads and received some rather negative responses. The concern was that the overall stormwater retrofit/restoration cost is very high for limited reductions in Sligo Creek peak discharges and pollutant loadings. The question that arises when looking at the cost is, "is our tax money being spent wisely?" Dr. Cheng felt that the SC should be alerted to this issue.
- Ms. Minerva then made several more suggestions regarding the Plan: 1) While PDT members have said they would look at programmatic and other options, it has not yet considered what would happen if all impervious areas were controlled or alternative programmatic approaches were implemented. 2) SC Chair (Mr. Steve Pattison) likes the idea of interim targets, and a post-2020 vision. 3) The PDT needs to revisit step 7 (peer review). She recommended inviting 5-10 outside scientific experts to come in and review the indicators and goals.

Following the discussion, Chair Yetman stated he would like to see target dates established for both the revised Action Agenda and for the yearly four-page, Key indicators-based report. Ms. Minerva said she would solicit updates from the Partnership on proposed restoration actions in January 2009, and update the Action Agenda by summer 2009. Mr. John Galli said that, at this point in time, establishing specific dates may be problematic. However, target months/seasons would be more realistic.

***Action/Outcome: The PDT will review and revise step 7 before the next Steering Committee meeting, and determine if there is a clearer way to incorporate outside review input into the goal setting process.**

***Action/Outcome: The MC Chair will raise the restoration implementation cost issue, for further discussion, at the December 4, 2008 Steering Committee meeting.**

V. Anacostia Restoration Potential Workgroup (ARPW) Report

Mr. Galli gave a brief update on recent ARPW's activities. He noted that the ARPW's monitoring-related recommendations had been presented at the October SC meeting, and that it has been working to update the monitoring recommendations/status table. Some noteworthy updates included: 1) EPA funding for spring '09 tributary system herring monitoring has apparently fallen through and 2) The NPS Goose Management Plan will not be finished until spring/summer 2010.

He then described ARPW recommendations/ 8-step process for changing the yearly reporting process. The group recommends a yearly 4 -page report (tied specifically to the 12 Key indicators) that will be incorporated within the annual Action Agenda. Importantly, the current 20-page annual, progress report will be discontinued. However, where appropriate, project

specific, restoration implementation information together with a restoration progress summary will be incorporated within the Action Agenda. The Action Agenda will be updated annually and distributed both electronically and via hard copy.

VI. Anacostia Watershed Toxics Alliance (AWTA) Report

Ms. Catherine King (EPA) provided a brief AWTA update. The group recently met to discuss toxics monitoring-related activities in the Anacostia watershed. Presentations were made by USGS, Dr. Harriette Phelps (UDC), Dr. Greg Foster (GMU) and others. Work on the 'White Paper' is underway, with completion expected by February 2009. The White Paper will examine various alternatives and costs for dealing with toxics sediment remediation in the tidal river, including doing nothing to capping with various types of materials. EPA will work to integrate White Paper /AWTA information with PDT Restoration Plan efforts. A brief discussion followed.

- Chair Yetman commented that AWTA needs to do more to connect the hot spots with probable sources and that he is concerned with data indicating a potential problem and major source of PCB's from Lower Beaverdam Creek.
- Ms. Minerva responded by noting that both MDE and EPA are aware of the situation and that she is working with both agencies to address the problem.
- Chair Yetman expressed his reservations that the capping option might only be a temporary fix, and that contaminants such as PAH's can be expected to be deposited within river sediments for years to come.

VII. Lower Paint Branch Restoration Study Update

Item Deferred. Ms. Laura Connelly was not present.

VIII. SHA ICC Report

Mr. Rob Shreve (SHA) gave an update on ICC construction and mitigation. He indicated that contract 'B' (Rte 97 to Old Columbia Pike) has been issued a notice to proceed and that contract 'C' (Rte 29 to I-95) is under construction). He highlighted environmental stewardship projects that are underway or about to begin, including: 1) PBC stormwater project features the employment of bioswales (will provide ~ 400 acres of additional water quality control) and 2) NW-128 wetland now has 1 year of groundwater data, and that a companion native tree planting will occur in spring 2009.

Chair Yetman asked if monitoring was being done on the bioswales. Mr. Shreve replied that SHA will provide first year monitoring, then MCDEP will take over.

Mr. Shreve explained that the contracts for segments 'A' and 'C' construction are going well. Erosion/sediments control grades are all in the high 80's (>85 considered to be in conformity; 100 is perfect).

IX. USGS Anacostia Watershed Monitoring

Mr. Brad Garner (USGS) gave a presentation on real-time data available in the Anacostia watershed. He focused on four locations:

- 1) Northwest Branch: flow data since 1938, and water quality data since 2003.
- 2) Northeast Branch: flow data since 1938, and water quality data since 2003.
- 3) Paint Branch: continuous flow data, and new HOC monitoring starting 08 or 09.
- 4) Sligo Creek: continuous flow data.

Additional water quality data was collected from 2003 to 2005 and summarized in the report Anacostia Monitoring, 2007-present (<http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2007/5142/>). The data was used for modeling pollutant loads (<http://water.usgs.gov/waterwatch/wqwatch>).

Funding for NEB & NWB is split four ways between Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, DC and USGS. Ms Cherie Miller (USGS) noted that there does not appear to be any additional USGS cost-share funding monies available for calendar year 2009 or 2010.

X. District of Columbia Real-Time DO River Monitoring Update

Ms. Nicoline Shulterbrandt (DDOE) described DC's two new real-time water quality stations. DC has placed the two stations in the tidal river, with data streamed to the internet (<http://www.ysieconet.com/public/WebUI/Default.aspx?hidCustomerID=167>), and updated every 30 minutes. Next year, D DOE expects to place two additional probes in the Potomac River.

XI. Maryland Anacostia Trash TMDL Monitoring Update

Mr. Phong Trieu (MWCOC) gave a brief update on trash monitoring for Prince George's and Montgomery Counties. Project tasks include determining in-stream baseline trash levels of the Anacostia tributary system at 30 sites; Performing baseline trash monitoring of associated storm drain outfalls; Performing companion baseline land-based/roadway trash monitoring to help characterize loading rates from representative land use types (6 sites); Monitoring the Fresh Creek trash netting system (Prince George's County only).

XII. Chesapeake Bay 2010 Trust Fund Update

Chair Yetman provided a brief update on the status the 2010 Trust Fund. He reported that the fund had been reduced to \$13 million (from the original \$25 million). Although the Anacostia is in top tier of projects, there may be no money in this year's budget to fund it. It could, however, be funded in the next fiscal cycle and an additional grant proposal submission will not be needed.

XIII. MDE Stormwater Regulations, Manual and TMDL Updates.

Ms. Minerva gave a brief update on MD Stormwater Regulations in place of Mr. Jim George. The draft stormwater regulations have been completed and there will be a December 8th public hearing. Written comments are due by December 22nd. Ms. Minerva indicated that both she and the environmental community were disappointed with MDE's proposal to only require control for the first 1" of runoff from one-half of a redevelopment site. However, groups were generally pleased with the proposed regulations pertaining to new development.

XIV. Adjourn

Chair Yetman adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:20 pm.