

DRAFT

MEETING SUMMARY

STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE

ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP

Thursday, October 27, 2011

The Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership Steering Committee met on Thursday, October 27, 2011 in the Training Center on the 1st floor at COG.

The attendees, in alphabetical order, were:

Name			Organization		
Members and Alternates				Present	Absent
Mr.	Dan	Bierly	US Army Corps of Engineers	X	
Mr.	Tom	Brosnan	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration		X
Ms.	Diane	Cameron	Audubon Naturalist Society	X	
Mr.	Jon	Capacasa	EPA Region 3		X
Mr.	Dennis	Chestnut	AWCAC		X
Mr.	Cary	Coppock	AWCAC	X	
Mr.	Frank	Dawson	MD-Department of Natural Resources	X	
Ms.	Judith	Davis	City of Greenbelt, Mayor		X
Dr.	Richard	Eskin	Maryland Department of the Environment		X
Mr.	Jim	Foster	Anacostia Watershed Society	X	
Mr.	Andy	Fellows	College Park, Mayor		X
Mr.	Jim	George	Maryland Department of the Environment		X
Mr.	Amy	Guise	US Army Corps of Engineers		X
Mr.	Alan	Hance	Chesapeake Bay Trust (Alt. Member)	X	
Mr.	George	Hawkins	DC Water		X
Ms.	Linda	Howard	Summit Fund of Washington	X	
Mr.	Bob	Hoyt	Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection	X	
Ms.	Lisa	Mendelson-Ielmini	National Park Service		X
Dr.	Hamid	Karimi	DC Department of the Environment	X	
Ms.	Dominique	Lueckenhoff	EPA Region 3	X	
Mr.	Ramsey	Meiser	Forest City		X
Dr.	Sam	Moki	Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources	X	
Mr.	Alex	Ramero	National Park Service	X	

Anacostia Steering Committee Meeting Summary – Draft – Subject to Revision
 October 27, 2011

Mr.	Peyton	Robertson	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration		X
Mr.	Steve	Shofar	Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection	X	
Mr.	Eric	Siegel	The Cohen Companies; Riverfront BID	X	
Mr.	Mike	Smith	AWCAC		X
Mr.	Michael	Stevens	Capitol Riverfront BID		X
Mr.	David	Tuchmann	Akridge	X	
Mr.	Christophe	Tulou	District of Columbia Department of Environment (DDOE)		X
Ms.	Kim	Turner	DC Water and Sewer Authority	X	
Mr.	Samuel	Wynkoop	Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources		X
Mr.	Ken	Yetman	MD-Department of Natural Resources		X
Executive Director, Staff, Consultants					
Ms.	Dana	Minerva	Exec. Director, Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership	X	
Mr.	Karl	Berger	MWCOG	X	
Mr.	Steve	Bieber	MWCOG	X	
Ms.	Amanda	Campbell	MWCOG	X	
Mr.	Stuart	Freudberg	MWCOG	X	
Mr.	John	Galli	MWCOG	X	
Dr.	Ted	Graham	MWCOG (Consultant), via phone conference	X	
Mr.	Aubin	Maynard	MWCOG	X	
Guests					
Ms.	Brooke	DeRenzis	DC Appleseed Center	X	
Ms.	Emily	Ferguson	National Park Service	X	
Ms.	Amy	McDonnell	DDOE	X	
Mr.	Jared	Piaggione	DDOE	X	
Ms.	Tammy	Stidham	National Park Service	X	
Other Participants					
Mrs.	Sheila	Besse	District of Columbia Department of Environment (DDOE)	X	

I. Call to Order and Chair Items

Mr. Dawson called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

A. Introductions

Meeting participants and those on the phone introduced themselves.

B. Approval of August 25, 2011 Meeting Summary

The August 25, 2011 Steering Committee meeting summary was approved as written. Linda Howard requested that future meeting summaries contain more detail than the August meeting summary, similar to the types of summaries prepared for past meetings. She also requested that summaries be issued within 2-3 weeks of each meeting.

Action: Staff agreed to enhance meeting summaries to add more content, and to issue the drafts on the timetable requested.

C. Review of Agenda

Chair Dawson reviewed the meeting agenda and asked for any amendments. The agenda was agreed to as presented.

II. Reports of the Ad Hoc Committees and Discussion of Next Steps by the Partnership

A. Messaging Committee

Sheila Besse reported on the work and recommendations of the Messaging Committee. The committee held three meetings, two via conference call. The committee categorized the plethora of ideas into two purposes: building public support for the Anacostia restoration and assisting Partnership members in meeting public outreach and education goals. The committee developed three recommendations for building support, and two for outreach and education.

Building Support:

1. A1-Request that the LPSA study results be presented to the Steering Committee in February or April 2012 meeting. The results will assist the Messaging Committee in developing a messaging campaign to recommend to the Steering Committee.
2. A2-Invite Stratus Consulting to present results of Philadelphia's ecosystem services study. Continue working with NOAA and present the proposed scope of work and budgetary requirements for undertaking a similar study in the Anacostia Watershed.
3. A3-Continue to explore the feasibility of encouraging one or more municipalities in the Anacostia watershed to develop a green-focused economic development/land-use plan.

Outreach and Education:

4. B1: Develop and implement a shared outreach and education program to address common MS4 requirements. This may draw from an inventory of NVRC's current efforts in the region, a COG-developed "Green Living" challenge, and EPA's Urban Waters Initiative.
5. B2: Convene a half-day outreach and education workshop for local government staff with both MS4 and watershed restoration responsibilities. The Messaging Committee recognized that much of the outreach responsibilities are defined in MS4 permits while many of the staff involved in watershed restoration activities does not have day-to-day MS4 involvement. The workshop will familiarize staff with activities within their own agencies and also what's occurring in other jurisdictions.

Ms. Besse said that the committee would look into using the Philadelphia benefits study as a proxy for the Anacostia area in response to Frank Dawson's comment.

Chair Dawson suggested inviting the EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program to NOAA's presentation of the Philadelphia study at a future meeting.

Ms. Lueckenhoff suggested exploring a cash register donation campaign as a way to foster awareness.

Another suggestion was to piggyback on NVRC's Outreach and Education partnership radio and web campaign, which was very successful. Many members agreed that it would be efficient to join with other jurisdictions, share resources, and use other effective programs as models.

B. Demonstrating Approaches Committee

Eric Siegel presented the report from the Demonstrating Approaches Committee. The key purpose of this committee is to share information on costs, return on investment, and performance data on LID projects. Mr. Siegel reported on the summary of applicable existing LID studies, review of recent and future planned demonstration projects, and efforts to collect LID cost/benefit and performance data.

The committee found a lack of accurate and consistently collected data on LID costs and performance across the area, and lack of awareness about the benefits of various techniques. More affordable techniques such as planting trees in dry ponds may be available – this is an area in need of further research.

The committee presented five recommendations:

1. LID-GI costing, benefit and performance data collection and sharing should be integrated into Standard Operating Procedures for public and private land development and construction managers; stormwater managers; and site designers, including engineers; landscape architects, and architects. The Committee and AWRP Steering Committee should identify ways to spur this information collection and sharing so that it will become routine.
2. A future design competition be held related to the Anacostia watershed include documentation of costs and benefits as a clearly-framed requirement and part of the basis for the judging.
3. Support the proposed D-DOE Design Competition. The Demonstrating Approaches Committee offered to work with D-DOE to help enhance their planning, structuring, outreach, and conducting of this design competition, and in keeping with Recommendation #1, D-DOE should include costing, benefits and performance as integral parts of this Competition.
4. Support EPA Region 3's proposed Demonstration Project and the Committee offers to work collaboratively with EPA, and in particular with Dominique Lueckenhoff, to further develop and conduct this program.
5. The Committee pledged a commitment to continued research and data-sharing on LID-GI costing, benefits, and performance data-gathering in the greater Anacostia region over the next three years.

Diane Cameron added that over time, costs for green infrastructure are decreasing. Ms. Cameron indicated two reports were available to the committee. The first involves measuring the cost of stormwater facilities in Maryland counties. The second is an unpublished EPA report from the Office of Water. Montgomery County's study compared costs of implementing different techniques to offset precipitation on one acre.

In response to Sam Moki's inquiry about credits through Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), Diane Cameron responded that currently MDE is not allowing credit towards permit requirements for tree plantings. She is interested in helping communicate with MDE on this issue. Ms. Cameron suggested that the Demonstrating Approaches subcommittee add a recommendation that MDE add low-cost practices to their guidance along with removal efficiencies so that they can earn credit.

Chair Dawson noted that the process to get new practices approved for the Bay Program is difficult due to lack of data and lack of MDE scientists' agreement of acceptance of new technologies, but that acceptance of credits is the main impetus for implementing stormwater measures. John Galli noted that the Anacostia Watershed Plan used a cost of \$100,000 per acre for their plan rather than \$200,000. He recommended that low-cost measures be defined carefully based on effectiveness, and should specify locations where conservation landscaping and tree plantings should be implemented (i.e. not on steep slopes). Ms. Cameron responded that she and Steve Shofar are collaborating to assess the effectiveness of planting trees in dry ponds.

Dominique Lueckenhoff explained that the EPA demonstration projects should help with data needs. Maintenance and correct installation need to be taken into account. Next generation LID technologies can infiltrate five times more water than traditional ones. EPA is seeking to identify lower cost, effective, and adaptable approaches.

Sam Moki suggested that MDE officials present at a future AWSC meeting and begin to discuss issues.

Mr. Karimi commented that urban methods are more expensive, but phosphorus and nitrogen are not as much of an issue, so perhaps focusing on the sediment TMDL makes sense in urban areas. Chair Dawson commented that other factors will play into location decisions. The people who are paying for Bay cleanup will want to see best management practices in their community.

Dana Minerva pointed out that heat island and property values could be other drivers of implementing green approaches. Ms. Lueckenhoff noted that other benefits such as aesthetics will be included in the EPA demonstration data. She also noted that the stormwater industry is resistant to new approaches that differ from traditional gray pipe solutions. Another barrier is that the industry tends to promote more expensive green technologies over low-cost options. On the other hand, if they are effective, new technologies can lead to job creation.

Chair Dawson and Dana Minerva suggested that the committee should send background information to MDE before they present to the committee. One idea is to engage MDE in smaller groups. Mr. Karimi suggested that the decision makers should be the key targets.

C. Financing Committee Report

Kim Turner presented the financing committee's report and recommendations. The committee's two major focus areas are 1) financing the Anacostia Restoration Plan's projects and 2) incentivizing green stormwater retrofits with emphasis on private land. To move forward with watershed restoration and demonstrating commitment by Partnership members, the committee made the following recommendations:

Use of existing resources:

1. The Partnership should map federal, state and local funding programs to determine opportunities
2. The Financing Committee recommends that a Montgomery County representative present to the Partnership on their experience using municipal bonds to fund MS4 permit-required projects.

3. The Partnership should submit a joint Congressional budget request, and explore innovative Section 319 funding options.

Incentivizing green stormwater retrofits:

4. Partnership members should research the optimal balance of retrofit credits and revenue-raising in stormwater fees. The Environmental Financing Center at University of Maryland may provide assistance on this matter.
5. The Partnership should prepare a letter (signed by Mayor Gray and Governor O'Malley) to the Congressional Research Service that explains the need and benefits of stormwater retrofit tax incentive programs.

The committee discussed various issues related to the scarcity of funding for watershed restoration actions, and balancing stormwater fee credits with the need to earn revenue. Mr. Siegel said that Rockville's 50% credit for green infrastructure covers overhead expenses and community-wide facilities. He said that stormwater treatment revenues should match needed expenses. Kim Turner opined that even though Section 319 funds are limited, it is worth exploring. Ms. Derenzis pointed out that bonds may not work in the District of Columbia due to the debt limit. Mr. Hoyt expressed that Montgomery County would be happy to share their experience with the committee.

Stuart Freudberg recommended discussing the joint jurisdiction budget request further offline. Ms. Minerva added that local government affairs coordinators should be involved.

Seeing the applicability of messaging, demonstration projects and fundraising, Mr. Tuchmann recommended further work on integrating the set of three recommendations.

Action Items Summary

1. Messaging, Financing, Demonstrating Approaches subcommittees stay in place to oversee implementation of recommendations.
2. Further work should integrate the three sets of recommendations.
3. Look into feasibility of holding a cash register donation drive.
4. Further define 'green-focused economic development/land-use plan' to determine feasibility of promoting it among municipalities.
5. Request that the Lake, Snell, Perry and Associates study results be presented to the Steering Committee at the February or April 2012 meeting.
6. Figure out how to encourage MDE to add low-cost practices to their guidance along with removal efficiencies so that they can earn credit.
7. Hold a design competition, with cost/benefit data.
8. Support EPA's Region 3 Demonstration Project.
9. Promote data collection and sharing as Standard Operating Procedure.
10. The Partnership should map federal, state and local funding programs to determine opportunities.
11. The Partnership should submit a joint Congressional budget request, and explore innovative Section 319 funding options.
12. Partnership members should research the optimal balance of retrofit credits and revenue-raising in stormwater fees. The Environmental Financing Center at University of Maryland may provide assistance on this matter.
13. The Partnership should prepare a letter (signed by Mayor Gray and Governor O'Malley) to the Congressional Research Service that explains the need and benefits of stormwater retrofit tax incentive programs.
14. Hold a half-day workshop to share MS4 O & E practices and work towards adopting a shared program. Invite NVRC, EPA UWI, COG CEC. Invite Doug McKenzie-Moore to speak.

15. Invite MDE to present and engage MDE in a discussion about innovative practices and how they will be credited under MS4 permits, and send MDE background research in advance of the meeting.
16. Invite NOAA to present results of the Philadelphia study for December meeting.
17. The Financing Committee recommends that a Montgomery County representative present to the Partnership on their experience using municipal bonds to fund MS4 permit-required projects.

III. Management Committee Report

Sam Moki reported that the Management Committee has four updates:

1. While infiltration approaches are desirable, having MDE adopt a more flexible approach is a higher priority.
2. The Center for Watershed Protection presented on Sligo Creek illicit discharge detection. Although 17-20% of illicit discharges involved a nitrogen or phosphorus issue, the program is expensive, and stormwater runoff is a bigger challenge.
3. The committee learned about Maryland's Fertilizer Act of 2011, which reduced the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus allowed in fertilizers.
4. Aubin Maynard (COG Staff) presented the website updates and GIS-based project tracking tool. The web-based version provides an interface that does not require GIS software to access.

IV. Report on Cleanup of Shore-Based Contaminated Sites

Amy McDonnell and Jared Piaggione from DDOE presented an update on the District-controlled cleanup sites.

- The Washington Gas case involves an old plant that extracted gas from raw coal. The coal tar waste was dumped into the river or used as fill. In the 1930s, dredging re-exposed contaminated areas that are continuing to leach toxins into the river. A groundwater pump is in place to treat groundwater contamination. The final consent decree is still in process.
- The Pepco case is based on six old releases of oil and other contamination. The case was originally filed on January 31, 2011, but was re-lodged in July jointly with NRDC. The parties have entered into consent decree.

Both cases involve community input components.

Emily Ferguson and Alex Romero presented an update on National Park Service (NPS) responsible sites.

- NPS is finalizing a feasibility study for the Kenilworth site, following which a plan will be developed and a public meeting held, with a 30-day review period. After these take place, NPS can issue a Record of Decision. NPS will conduct further analysis of the groundwater at the site.
- At Poplar Point, NPS is working with the District of Columbia to develop a feasibility study work plan. So far the plans are on track for restoration. After the plan is produced, NPS will hold public meetings.

Although funding is not an issue, clean up at either site will begin summer 2013 at the earliest, due to the time required to respond to public comments.

Linda Howard suggested that the cleanup site updates be presented only when new information is available on them.

Action Items Summary

- A. Amend standing agenda item “report on clean-up of shore-based contaminated sites” to present updates only when new information is available.

V. Executive Director’s Report

- A. Dana Minerva reported that the Capitol Riverfront Business Improvement District’s Anacostia Summit was a success, with 250 attendees. Mr. Siegel may hold the summit annually or bi-annually.
- B. Ms. Minerva reported on progress towards implementing a bag fee in Prince George’s county. The campaign is working with lawmakers and gathering 10,000 free tote bags to hand out at a ‘Green it Clean it’ event. Committee members suggested soliciting the Chesapeake Bay Foundation for tote bags, and looking into sourcing locally due to lead concerns and local economic benefits.
- C. Ms. Minerva reported on the Economic Analysis of Benefits project. She drafted an RFQ in conjunction with NOAA requesting \$50,000 to support a study. It will likely cost a total of \$150,000-200,000. The study would help identify benefits of restoration beyond nitrogen and phosphorus abatement, such as heat island and property values. Mr. Siegel moved to approve of RFQ, Ms. Howard seconds. Motion passed.

Action Items Summary

1. Approved RFQ for Economic Benefits study for Anacostia Watershed

VI. Other Business

Ms. Minerva announced an event to celebrate the designation as an urban water of national significance

Mr. Foster suggested that the committee invite someone to present on the intermodal facility option in Beltsville at a future meeting due to its relevance.

Action Items Summary

1. Invite someone to present on the intermodal facility option in Beltsville at a future meeting.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1:23pm.

Attachments

Draft Action Items After the 10/27/11 Steering Committee Meeting			
Item	Action	Lead	Status
Standing Items and Current Meeting Actions			
SC Meeting Support	1. Distribute draft prior meeting summary 2. Prepare agenda for next meeting	1. COG 2. COG	1. Done 2. Pending
Toxic Sites	Provide bi-monthly updates on three sites: Poplar Point, Kenilworth Landfill and Washington Gas— <i>only when new information is available (amendment 10/27/11).</i>	1. NPS; District	1. Done
VC. Executive Director's Report	Approve RFQ for Economic Benefits study for Anacostia Watershed	1. All	1. Approved
New Action Items at October 27, 2011 SC Meeting			
Agenda Item	Action	Lead	Status
IIA. Messaging and IIC. Financing	1. Look into feasibility of holding a cash register donation drive	1. TBD	
IIA. Messaging Subcommittee	1. Further define 'green-focused economic development/land-use plan' to determine feasibility of promoting it among municipalities	1. Minerva	
II. All Ad-Hoc Subcommittees	1. Messaging, Financing, Demonstrating Approaches subcommittees stay in place to oversee implementation of recommendations 2. Further work should integrate the three sets of recommendations	1. Workgroup Leads 2. Workgroup Leads	
IIB. Demonstrating Approaches	1. Figure out how to encourage MDE to add low-cost practices to their guidance along with removal efficiencies so that they can earn credit. 2. Hold a design competition, with cost/benefit data 3. Support EPA's Region 3 Demonstration Project 4. Promote data collection and sharing as Standard Operating Procedure	1. D.A. workgroup 2. DDOE 3. D.A. workgroup 4. D.A. workgroup	
IIC. Financing Subcommittee	1. The Partnership should map federal, state and local funding programs to determine opportunities 2. The Partnership should submit a joint Congressional budget request, and explore innovative Section 319 funding options. 3. Partnership members should research the optimal balance of retrofit credits and	1. Financing workgroup 2. Financing workgroup 3. Financing workgroup 4. Minerva	

	<p>revenue-raising in stormwater fees. The Environmental Financing Center at University of Maryland may provide assistance on this matter.</p> <p>4. The Partnership should prepare a letter (signed by Mayor Gray and Governor O'Malley) to the Congressional Research Service that explains the need and benefits of stormwater retrofit tax incentive programs.</p>		
For Presentation at Future SC Meeting			
IIA. Messaging Subcommittee	<p>1. Request that the Lake, Snell, Perry and Associates study results be presented to the Steering Committee in February or April 2012 meeting.</p> <p>2. Invite NOAA to present results of the Philadelphia study for December meeting.</p> <p>3. Hold a half-day workshop to share MS4 O & E practices and work towards adopting a shared program. Invite NVRC, EPA UWI, COG CEC. Invite Doug McKenzie-Moore to speak.</p>	<p>1. Minerva 2. Minerva 3. COG Staff</p>	
IIB. Demonstrating Approaches Subcommittee	<p>4. Invite MDE to present and engage MDE in a discussion about innovative practices and how they will be credited under MS4 permits.</p> <p>5. Send MDE background research in advance of the meeting.</p>	<p>4. Minerva 5. Minerva</p>	
IIC. Financing Subcommittee	<p>6. The Financing Committee recommends that a Montgomery County representative present to the Partnership on their experience using municipal bonds to fund MS4 permit-required projects.</p>	<p>1. Hoyt</p>	
VIII. Other Business	<p>7. Invite someone to present on the intermodal facility option in Beltsville</p>	<p>1. TBD</p>	