

-DRAFT-

**Anacostia Watershed Management Committee
Meeting Summary
Thursday, December 17th, 2009**

Meeting Attendance:

	Name		Organization
Mr.	Ali	Abbasi	Guest, EA Engineering
Ms.	Mary	Barber	Anacostia Watershed Citizens Advisory Committee
Mr.	Brent	Bolin	Anacostia Watershed Society
Mr.	Jim	Connolly	Anacostia Watershed Society
Mr.	John	Galli	MWCOG
Mr.	Charlie	Gougeon	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Mr.	Dan	Harper	Montgomery County Department of the Environment
Mr.	Pete	Hill	DC Department of the Environment
Ms.	Anna	Kasko	Maryland Department of the Environment (by phone)
Ms.	Catherine	King	US Environmental Protection Agency
Mr.	Aubin	Maynard	MWCOG
Ms.	Dana	Minerva	Anacostia Restoration Partnership- Executive Director
Mr.	David	Prevar	USDA
Mr.	Jim	Rosenstock	NPS
Mr.	Steve	Shofar	Montgomery County Department of the Environment
Mr.	Rob	Shreeve	Maryland State Highway Administration
Mr.	Phong	Trieu	MWCOG
Chair	Ken	Yetman	Maryland Dept. of Natural Resources

I. Call to Order/Introductions

Chair Ken Yetman (MDNR) called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and requested that everyone introduce themselves.

II. Approval of September 18, 2009 Meeting Summary

The 9/18/09 meeting summary was approved unanimously.

III. AWCAC Chair Report

Mr. Brent Bolin (AWS, AWCAC Vice-Chair) provided a brief update on AWCAC activities. AWCAC Chair Mike Smith recently sent several letters on behalf of AWCAC including letters to Montgomery and Prince George's County Councils pressing for strong stormwater regulations, and a letter to the Governor of Maryland and state representatives regarding the decrease in ICC-related mitigation projects. Mr. Bolin indicated that, in response to another AWCAC letter, the USACE will begin removing large debris obstructing rowers upstream of the CSX bridge (up to once a month). Finally, AWCAC is waiting on the new logo to push for Anacostia specific road signage and are working to invigorate AWCAC. A brief discussion followed.

- Chair Yetman inquired if any consideration was given for keeping some of the large woody debris for fish habitat above the CSX bridge.
- Mr. Jim Connolly (AWS) indicated that he would be leaving AWS, and Mr. Bolin would begin as Director of Advocacy.
- Chair Yetman thanked Mr. Connolly for his many years of hard work and commitment to the Anacostia River.

IV. USACE Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan (ARP) Update

Mr. Dan Bierly (USACE) reported on the status of the ARP. Drafts of all inventories except Lower Beaverdam Creek (to be finished the following week) had been delivered by the contractor, and would likely be posted on anacostia.net and sent to subwatershed groups for review by the end of the year. Comments are due back by 1/15. The main report is being updated by the Lewis Berger Group based on feedback received to date, and is expected to be completed by the end of February. Additional public involvement includes a public meeting sometime in March. Mr. Bierly indicated the USACE Office of Public Affairs has written articles for both public and elected officials. Articles will be published in the Capital Hill Rag and radio announcements are also possible. Comments related to Mr. Bierly's presentation included:

- Mr. Steve Shofar (MC DEP) inquired if all of the comments received would be included in the ARP document.
- Ms. Dana Minerva (AWRP, Executive Director) suggested that the ARP document include only main comments.

Ms. Minerva indicated that Ms. Linda Howard (Summit Fund of Washington) will fund a communications firm to effectively get the ARP message out to the public. In response, COG quickly published a RFP, and then the selection committee will meet soon to score respondents. The RFP includes creation of a tag line/slogan, logo and informational brochure, and a revised ARP Executive Summary. Deliverables would include some options (i.e. several logos and slogans) to choose from. The firm will also be responsible for developing a long-term communication plan for the ARP.

An ARP release event is tentatively planned for March 2010. Ms. Minerva will work with the PDT to plan this event which will hopefully include congressional representatives and other high profile figures, and requested that AWMC members send her suggested location suggestions. A second event of note is the Capital RiverFront BID Summit to be held at the Nationals Stadium, with the hope of attracting at least 300 people. A lengthy discussion followed.

- Chair Yetman suggested a bus tour of sites, including future restoration sites and current examples of stormwater control for the release event. March weather should also be considered when determining the event location.
- Mr. Pete Hill (DDOE) suggested the event location occur at a place that the committee feels should be highlighted (e.g. federal lands, parks, etc.).
- Mr. Connolly suggested LID facilities, or, to attract the politicians, an event involving kids (e.g. Northwood High School).
- Ms. Minerva requested that MC members email her additional ideas and indicated she would run location ideas by MC members by email. She also requested that MC members send her some supporting facts (i.e. how the ARP projects will improve aesthetics, create jobs, etc.) to use in the Executive Summary.
- Mr. Shofar and Mr. Dan Harper (MC DEP) stated the need for SC/MC to review and have input on the communication firms products, especially the Executive Summary.
- Chair Yetman and Mr. Harper underscored the importance of the Executive Summary representing the conclusions and science of the ARP. For example, job statistics were not included in the report, so specific numbers relating to jobs should not be used in the Executive Summary. Such information could be included in the brochure.
- Ms. Minerva indicated there was no set plan for review of the communication firm's products. Though there is little time for review, she explained they would at least be made available by email. Ms. Minerva also suggested that the communication firm could be urged to finish the executive summary by March 10th or 15th, to give the SC/MC time to review it.
- Chair. Yetman indicated he would present a detailed schedule of the final ARP products to the SC the following week.

ACTION/OUTCOME:

- **MC members will email Ms. Minerva with location and other suggestions for the ARP release event.**
- **MC members will email Ms. Minerva with suggested "selling points" for the ARP.**
- **Ms. Minerva will request that the communications firm complete the Executive Summary before March 15th. The Executive Summary will then be sent to MC members by email for review.**
- **Chair Yetman will present the ARP schedule, as defined at the MC meeting, at the December SC meeting.**

V. Anacostia Funding Strategy:

Chair Yetman explained that the ARP lacks a clear funding strategy, a significant issue as the Plan is currently unfunded. Chair Yetman indicated the Partnership needs to prepare such a strategy and accompanying message, which should not be about raising taxes through stormwater fees, and he then asked the MC for ideas on how to approach the funding issue.

Ms. Minerva added that while the current Funding Strategy is still rough, efforts are underway pursuing money on the hill and in other places. Due to the effort on the part of several people, including the Chair, the governor of Maryland has requested \$50 million in WRDA funds. Several other elected officials are working for larger implementation funding levels for the ARP. She inquired if the USACE could get funding authorization to award WRDA funding in the form of grants. This inquiry led to a lengthy discussion.

- Mr. Bierly indicated that direct grants are rarely awarded by the USACE, and they usually work with some form of a cost-sharing agreement.
- Mr. Shofar explained that the usefulness of a cost-share program depends on the timeframe in which the funds become available. While the USACE has historically worked slowly, funds would be needed by counties within the next 5 years to meet MS4 requirements.
- Mr. Galli suggested it would be difficult for many jurisdictions to meet cost-share obligations, since they are already having financial difficulties. Mr. Galli added that it is imperative to develop a comprehensive list of funding sources for the projects (e.g. 319, other EPA grants, toll road fees, bag bills, mitigation projects, foundations, etc). He concluded by reiterating the need by Maryland and EPA to designate the Anacostia a high priority watershed, and fix the issues related to receiving 319 grants.
- Mr. Connolly suggested the need for creative approaches to funding. He recently spoke with a union representative looking to invest union pension funds in municipal construction bonds that could be used for stormwater and restoration projects.

VI. Anacostia Trash TMDL Monitoring Report

Mr. Phong Trieu (COG) provided a summary of Anacostia trash TMDL-related baseline conditions monitoring results. Mr. Trieu summarized the data collected from 30 streams sites, six stormwater outfalls, six road survey sites, and Fresh Creek Trashtrap netting systems. This data was also analyzed by land use type.

Top trash items included:

- Streams: Plastic Bags, Food Packaging, Construction Debris, Styrofoam
- Road/Parking Lot: Paper, Food Packaging, Miscellaneous, Aluminum Cans
- Storm Drain/Outfalls: Styrofoam, Food Packaging, Plastic Bags, Plastic Bottles.

Ms. Minerva inquired as to whether a follow-up study is planned to document the effectiveness of the DC bag bill.

VII. Anacostia Trash TMDL Update

Ms. Anna Kasko (MDE) briefly reviewed the background of the trash TMDL, indicating it was based on the Los Angeles TMDL. The TMDL would require 100% removal of the baseline waste load, but would be continuously improved as more data is collected and better linked to land use and rainfall intensity. In Maryland, UMD performed regression analyses on 30 stream monitoring sampling sites to calculate loads, and the contractor Tetrattech calculated loads based on six storm drain traps and two trash nets in addition to stream sites. Two allocation approaches will be implemented: 1) WLA (Waste Load Allocation, point source) calculated based on storm drain monitoring samples and consisting of smaller items that can reasonably be conveyed through storm drain system (bottles, plastic bags, Styrofoam, etc.), and 2) LA (Load Allocation, non-point source) calculated based on stream monitoring samples and consisting of larger items that cannot reasonably be conveyed through storm drain system (bricks, tires, wood, etc.). Ms. Kasko concluded by laying out the tentative schedule for completion of the TMDL:

- December 18, 2009: Draft TMDL available for MD/DC/EPA review
- January 8-15, 2010: Comment period for larger TMDL Workgroup (Counties, Alice Ferguson Foundation, NRDC, etc.)
- January 25- February 23, 2010: 30-day public comment period
- February 4, 2010: Joint Public meeting (Tentative)

VIII. SHA ICC Report

Mr. Rob Shreeve (SHA) provided a brief update on the status of the ICC construction. Mr. Shreeve indicated that contract A was 61% complete, B was 21% complete and contract C was 47% complete. Work will begin in the Special Protection Area (SPA) of Paint Branch the following week. Several contractors had gone to great lengths to minimize disturbance and control runoff, highlighting a contractor at one site adding fencing, not required, to stop any unforeseen erosion of a stream bank while heavy machinery was operated nearby. Contractors who avoided impacts would receive incentives. Several mitigation and stewardship sites were also described.

Mr. Shreeve focused on the changes in the number of stewardship and mitigation projects. First, less wetlands/forests were impacted than expected so less mitigation was actually required. However, instead of dropping projects altogether, other projects were enhanced. Mr. Shreeve expressed his concern about rumors that projects were being cancelled haphazardly and described the reasoning why some projects were dropped, often due to site considerations. Several questions followed.

- Ms. Mary Barber (AWCAC, Vice-Chair) described the importance of follow-up monitoring, to see both improvements and if the activity (e.g. reforestation, stream

restoration) functioned as planned. Ms. Barber inquired if such monitoring would take place for mitigation and stewardship sites.

- Mr. Shreeve replied that wetland/streams related activities would be monitored for 5-10 years, and goals for each project were clearly defined when the monitoring plan was created. Reforestation contracts include a two year warranty of each planting.
- Mr. Galli inquired if there was a dollar for dollar substitution for the changes in projects, to which Mr. Shreeve said there had been an approximate change from 9.4 to 9.2 million dollars.

IX. Upper Paint Branch Brown Trout Report

Mr. Charlie Gougeon (MDDNR) briefly updated the committee on the status of the brown trout fishery in the Paint Branch. Monitoring since 1972 of adult and young-of-year trout indicates a steady decline since 1997. The major contributing factor was habitat loss due to increased water volumes and sedimentation. Even with the SPA, 2009's survey found only one adult and one YOY. Five redds were seen, and an adult was spotted outside the sample area. Mr. Gougeon indicated he was pessimistic about the survival of the population, given ICC construction had not yet started (even with the assurance that no stormwater from the ICC would enter the Good Hope Tributary). Finally, he recommended additional stormwater retrofitting in the SPA, and especially in the Good Hope tributary subwatershed to reduce stormwater volumes and stream sedimentation.