

Appendix C
Stakeholder Meetings – Presentation and Summaries

Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed Protection Study

Stakeholder Input Sessions

**EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc.
&
Chesapeake Environmental Management, Inc.**



**EA Engineering, Science,
and Technology, Inc.**

18 & 19 June 2012

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc.

- **Maryland-based environmental consulting firm founded in 1973**
- **Headquartered in Hunt Valley, MD**
- **21 offices in 13 states with >400 employees**
- **Subcontractor**
 - **Chesapeake Environmental Management, Inc. (CEM)**
- **EA is conducting an independent watershed protection study which will make recommendations to WSSC**

Meeting Agenda and Format

- EA to describe our workplan
- Stakeholders provide input on watershed uses
- 2+ hour meeting time (7 – 9+ p.m.)
- Speaking time limited to 3 minutes; speakers given notice when 30 seconds remain
- Meeting will be audio-recorded and transcribed, comments will be summarized on flip charts, and a meeting summary will be prepared
- Written comments accepted through July 19, 2012

Meeting Purpose

- **Solicit Public Input:**
 - 3,500 meeting invitations to a WSSC mailing list plus 350 e-mail invitations
 - Ads placed in 3 newspapers, plus news releases and community calendars
- **Listen:** Stakeholder comments and suggestions
 - How the watershed is being used
 - How it should be used
 - Ensure compatibility with its primary function as a public water supply
- **Seek a Variety of Opinions:** Hear from a broad group of users

Meeting Goals

- Full participation and equal representation
- Expression and understanding of public interests

Ground Rules

- One speaker at a time
- Be concise
- Honor time limits
- Keep to task and topic
- Listen
- Be respectful

Key Project Staff

- **Mike Powell, MS, MSE** – Water quality and modeling
- **Bill Rue, MS** – Water quality scientist
- **Wendy Bley, MS** – Water quality & 40+ year equestrian
- **Jody Smet, MS** – Recreation, Land Use, and Shoreline Management
- **Nick Walls, MS** – Urban Affairs and Public Policy, and digital mapping

Overview

- **Patuxent Reservoirs**
 - WSSC owns and operates 2 water supply reservoirs within the 85,000 acre Patuxent River watershed
 - Triadelphia Reservoir (1943); Rocky Gorge Reservoir (1952)
 - Provide 1/3 of WSSC's drinking water supply
 - WSSC responsible for protecting long-term water quality and storage capacity
- **EA's tasks**
 - Objectively evaluate activities within the WSSC buffer with the potential to impact reservoir water quality and storage capacity
 - Make reservoir buffer management recommendations to WSSC.

Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed Protection Study Overview

Purpose: Objectively evaluate potential for water quality impacts from stakeholder activities within the WSSC-owned buffers

Major Study Tasks:

1. Develop Study Work Plan
2. Review existing data
3. Conduct public outreach
4. Conduct a survey of existing access and recreation trails, prepare an updated trail map, identify potential sources of water quality impacts
5. Prepare report and make recommendations

Development of Work Plan

- Review existing relevant information from WSSC, public agencies, industry, and other sources
 - WSSC water quality reports
 - WSSC regulations
 - WSSC Forest Conservation Plan
 - Source Water Assessment
 - Maps and recreational user materials (brochures, websites, etc.)
- Description of deliverables
- Schedule for completion

Mapping and Analysis of Erosion Potential

- Use existing data to develop digital maps of Rocky Gorge and Triadelphia Reservoirs
 - Watershed boundaries, WSSC's ownership , full pool elevation
 - Topography, land cover, soil data, canopy cover
 - Access roads and recreation access points
 - Natural/sensitive areas
 - Reservoir and culverts

Field Reconnaissance of Public Access Areas

- Conduct field reconnaissance of the reservoir buffer areas to
 - Verify the maps
 - Document condition of shoreline recreational trails
 - Further assess existing erosion and erosion potential
 - Determine proximity of the trails to the reservoirs
- Assess potential for erosion and contamination arising from public access and use
 - Nutrient pollution, sediments, shoreline trash dumping
- Public safety

Field Reconnaissance of WSSC Access Roads and Interior Trails

- Evaluate the condition and suitability of the WSSC access roads for designated uses
- Evaluate public access points for traffic safety, signage, off-road parking, and suitability for horse trailers and other users
- Document uses of the WSSC buffer land and adjacent properties with the potential to impact reservoir water quality

Reservoir Buffer Assessment and Recommendations

- Identify and discuss potential water quality impacts
- Make recommendations to reduce water quality impacts
 - Buffer management
 - Policies for managing public access
 - Designated access points
 - Suitable trail locations
- Describe reasonable measures WSSC could implement to improve water quality

Written Comments

Please send written comments by July 19, 2012 to:

Ms. Tracy Eberhard
teberhard@eaest.com

or

Patuxent Watershed Study
c/o EA Engineering, Science
and Technology, Inc.
15 Loveton Circle
Sparks, MD 21152

**Summary of Stakeholder Outreach Meeting for Patuxent Reservoirs
Watershed Protection Study – Rocky Gorge Reservoir
18 June 2012**

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology (EA) held stakeholder outreach meetings on the Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed Protection Study (Study) on June 18 and 19, 2012.. EA is authorized by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) to conduct the Study. This summary describes stakeholder comments at the 18 June 2012 meeting.

Meeting Date: June 18, 2012 (7 pm to 10 pm)

Location: Laurel Boys and Girls Club
701 Montgomery Street 26430
Laurel, Maryland 20707

Speakers: See below

Agenda Items:

- EA presented an overview of the Study work plan
- EA answered questions about the Study
- EA listened to and recorded stakeholder comments and suggestions regarding recreational use of the WSSC-owned lands adjacent to Rocky Gorge and Triadelphia reservoirs and potential impacts to water quality

Meeting Format:

- Stakeholder speaking time limited to 3 minutes
- Meeting was audio-recorded and transcribed
- Written comments will be accepted through July 19, 2012

Meeting Summary

Jody Smet, EA, gave a PowerPoint slide presentation (available separately) that provided:

- background information on EA ;
- meeting agenda and format;
- meeting purpose and goals;
- meeting ground rules; and
- key project staff

Mike Powell, EA, gave a PowerPoint slide presentation (available separately) that provided a brief overview of the Study, which will include:

- a review of existing data and information relating to water quality, forest conservation, watershed boundaries, and various physical characteristics;

- field reconnaissance of WSSC access roads and interior trails for the verification of maps, documentation of erosion potential or contamination, and threats to public safety; and
- recommendations regarding buffer management, public access points, and trail locations in order to improve water quality.

Questions and Answers about Study

Mike Powell answered questions about EA's contract with WSSC, availability of information and data, field methodologies including an assessment of erosion, water quality, the extent to which recreational activities could be limited or eliminated, and whether additional factors like sedimentation, vegetation, water depth profiles or damage to culverts would be included in the scope of the Study.

Stakeholder Comments

A diverse group of stakeholders provided comments. The following briefly summarizes key stakeholder comments and concerns by recreational use/activity.

Equestrians

Many speakers stated that the vast majority of the horse trails along the reservoir show no traces of erosion and that issues related to sediment and erosion are caused by culverts and steep access roads instead of properly constructed switchback trails previously used for horseback riding. They said that issues related to fecal matter are more pertinent to deer and other wildlife, not horses. Rather than contributing to litter and excessive waste, many riders explained that they are active in cleaning up trash along the trails. Additionally, the equestrian community feels that they are important stewards of the watershed and have played a pivotal role as WSSC's eyes and ears for many years. Several stakeholders questioned reports of erosion along the trails and want WSSC to present the scientific rationale that horseback riding in these areas has negative impacts on the reservoir and its water quality.

Another concern frequently expressed was the overall dissatisfaction of and negative impact on the commercial horse stables due to:

- prohibiting use of the old bridle trails (e.g., Terry Ledley trail and Pat Oliva trail);
- the winter closure of all designated equestrian trails; and
- closing private horse entrances to the trails.

According to one speaker, the horse economy represents \$5.6 billion, and a reduction in riding could negatively affect both local businesses associated with the horse industry, as well as property values near the reservoir. One speaker cited real estate experts who have said that closing the horse trails has hurt property values in West Laurel.

Many stakeholders shared their frustration with the closure of trails due to a lack of other existing areas for horse riding. Not only does the closing of trails affect local residents, but it discourages outsiders from traveling to such areas and spending money to support local businesses dependent upon horse related retail and services.

Further evidence of the value of the horse riding trails was articulated by those who stated that such activities provided valuable outdoor interactive learning experiences for young children. Additionally, one person referenced the value of trained riders in the case of potential search and rescue operations.

Overall, the stakeholders commented that the study is not focusing on the right issues related to erosion and sedimentation and water quality. Instead of focusing on recreational activities within the WSSC-owned buffer, they suggest that a more effective approach would include more analysis of tributary inputs, and land uses such as deforestation and overdevelopment in the larger, surrounding watershed.

Anglers and Boaters

Anglers and boaters alike said that they specifically bought their houses because of the close proximity to the reservoir and its associated benefits. Some stakeholders expressed their gratitude for the fishing opportunities that are permitted in the area. Others commented on the currently imposed restrictions on use and asked that the boating season be extended once again. Stakeholders also commented on lack of WSSC policy enforcement at the reservoirs.

Hunters/Deer Management

A few stakeholders commended WSSC's active deer management program and discussed the need to have better deer control in the watershed.

Pollution Sources from Outside WSSC Reservoir Buffer

Several stakeholders recognized the importance of protecting the reservoir's water quality as it is a major source of drinking water for many citizens. One speaker insisted that pollutants in the reservoir, and erosion and sediment from housing developments are more responsible for contamination within the watershed than are permit holders (i.e., recreational users).

Many stakeholders commented that the study was using bad data and focusing on the wrong issues. They would like to see a greater emphasis on other relevant issues such as surrounding development, tributary health, wetland preservation, and biodiversity. Stakeholders commented that WSSC should make the results of the study available to the public.

Stakeholder Speaker List: 18 June 2012

1. James Robinson
2. Chuck Seldon
3. Barbara Sollner-Webb
4. Brian Eyler
5. Donald Chamberlin
6. Stan Hopkins
7. Clara Gouin
8. Annette Ashby Knox
9. David Armstrong
10. Debby Poole
11. Virginia Henriksen
12. Patty Sobel
13. Lucy Errter
14. Denise Raynor
15. Peter Shumacher
16. Fran Koch
17. James Putman
18. Denis Webb
19. Dana Grabiner
20. Priscilla Huffman
21. Maria Schwartz
22. Laurel Santamarina
23. Alyce Ortuzar
24. Thomas Porter
25. Ravi Khanna
26. Jane Van Molton
27. Pat Oliva
28. Elizabeth Yuster

**Summary of Stakeholder Outreach Meeting for Patuxent Reservoirs
Watershed Protection Study – Triadelphia Reservoir
19 June 2012**

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology (EA) held stakeholder outreach meetings on the Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed Protection Study (Study) on June 18 and 19, 2012.. EA is authorized by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) to conduct the Study. This summary describes stakeholder comments at the 19 June 2012 meeting.

Meeting Date: June 19, 2012 (7 pm to 9 pm)

Location: Izaak Walton League Wildlife Achievement Chapter
26430 Mullinix Mill Road
Mt. Airy, Maryland 21771

Speakers: See below

Agenda Items:

- EA presented overview of study work plan
- EA answered questions about the study
- Listen to stakeholder comments and suggestions for how the reservoir buffer is being used, and how it should be used in the future

Meeting Format:

- Stakeholder Speaking time limited to 3-5 minutes
- Meeting was audio-recorded and transcribed
- Written comments accepted through July 19, 2012

Meeting Summary

Jody Smet, EA, gave a PowerPoint slide presentation that provided:

- a brief background on the EA firm;
- meeting agenda and format;
- meeting purpose and goals;
- meeting ground rules; and
- key project staff

Mike Powell, EA, gave a PowerPoint slide presentation that provided a brief overview of the Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed Impact Study, which includes:

- a review of existing data and information relating to water quality, forest conservation, watershed boundaries, and various physical characteristics;
- field reconnaissance of WSSC access roads and interior trails for the verification of maps, documentation of erosion potential or contamination, and threats to public safety; and

- recommendations regarding buffer management, public access points, and trail locations in order to improve water quality.

Questions and Answers about Study

Mike Powell answered questions regarding the study. Questions related to the project included details of the contract with WSSC, details of and the potential for a Phase 2 of the watershed project, communication with stakeholders to increase outreach to all bill payers and permit holders, erosion measurement techniques, and whether additional factors like sedimentation, vegetation, water depth profiles or damage to culverts would be included in the scope of the study.

Stakeholder Comments

A diverse group of stakeholders provided comments. The following briefly summarizes key stakeholder comments and concerns by recreational use/activity.

Equestrians

Many speakers stated that the vast majority of the horse trails along the reservoir have no significant erosion and that issues related to sediment and erosion are caused by culverts, steep access roads and nearby development instead of properly constructed switchback trails previously used for horseback riding. Rather than contributing to litter and excessive waste, many riders explained that they are active in cleaning up trash along the trails. Additionally, the equestrian community feels they are important stewards of the watershed and have played a pivotal role as WSSC's eyes and ears for many years. Several stakeholders questioned reports of erosion along the trails and want WSSC to present the scientific rationale that horseback riding in these areas has negative impacts on the reservoir and its water quality.

Another concern frequently expressed was the overall dissatisfaction of and negative impact on the commercial horse stables due to:

- prohibiting use of the old bridle trails (e.g., Terry Ledley trail and Pat Oliva trail);
- the winter closure of all designated equestrian trails; and
- closing private horse entrances to the trails.

Reduced access to equestrian trails was stated to have negatively affected both local businesses associated with the horse industry, and property values near the reservoir because many people chose to live in the area specifically for access to the trails. Many stakeholders shared their frustration with the closure of trails due to a lack of alternative local horseback riding trails.

Further evidence of the value of the horse riding trails was articulated by those who stated that such activities provided valuable outdoor interactive learning experiences for children and other outreach groups.

Overall, the stakeholders commented that the study is not focusing on the right issues related to erosion and sedimentation and water quality. Instead of focusing on recreational activities within the WSSC-owned buffer, they suggest that a more effective approach would include more analysis of tributary inputs, and land uses such as deforestation and overdevelopment in the larger, surrounding watershed.

Anglers and Boaters

Anglers and boaters alike said that they specifically bought their houses because of the close proximity to the reservoir and its associated benefits. Others commented on the currently imposed restrictions on use and asked that the boating season be extended once again. Boaters stressed that they feel their use on the water has had no impact to water quality and the imposed restrictions should be removed. Stakeholders also commented on lack of WSSC policy enforcement at the reservoirs. A stakeholder expressed concern over sedimentation from the Patuxent River. Many of the anglers/boaters stated that WSSC has mishandled the equestrian issue, and are concerned that WSSC will use the Watershed Impact Study to justify closing the reservoir completely.

Hunters/Deer Management

Several stakeholders spoke in support of WSSC's active deer management program and the need to have better deer control in the watershed. Vegetation was stressed as providing a major role in preservation of water quality; and deer were directly impacting the vegetation which results in invasive species and the loss of a natural protection against sedimentation. The importance of deer management was emphasized and it was suggested that there be more WSSC managed deer hunts.

Pollution Sources from Outside WSSC Reservoir Buffer

Additionally, several speakers said that they recognize the importance of maintaining and cleaning the area since the reservoir is a major source of drinking water for many citizens. One speaker insisted that pollutants in the reservoir, erosion and sediment from housing developments are more responsible for contamination within the watershed than are permit holders.

Similar to those interested in preserving horse trails, many of these stakeholders commented that the study was using bad data and focusing on the wrong issues. They would like to see a greater emphasis on other relevant issues such as surrounding development, tributary health, and biodiversity. Many stakeholders shared their desire to have greater public outreach from WSSC to the stakeholders and bill payers. They would like WSSC to provide more information about the study, and release results of the study when it is completed.

Stakeholder Speaker List: 19 June 2012

1. Barbara Miller
2. Rob Gibbs
3. Robert Gunderman
4. John Love
5. Philip Norman
6. Melissa Daston
7. Barbara Sollner-Webb
8. Jane von Maltzhan
9. Nathan Tennies
10. Mike Caruso
11. Denis Webb
12. Maria Schwartz
13. Pat Oliva
14. Chuck McMillian
15. Debby Poole
16. Ann Coles
17. Ron Polniaszek
18. Kim Eubanks
19. Barbara Boyds