1	WASHINGTON SUBURBAN SANITARY COMMISSION
2	MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
3	
4	
5	X   :
6	Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed : Protection Study :
7	:  X
8	A public meeting in the above-entitled matter was
9	held on June 19, 2012, commencing at 7:01 a.m., at the Izaak
10	   Walton League of America Wildlife Achievement Chapter, 26430
11	Mullinix Mill Road, Mt. Airy, Maryland 21771.
12	narrinin niri noda, no. niri, narriana zi, ii.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

## **Deposition Services, Inc.**

25

12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210 Germantown, MD 20874 Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338 info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com

## APPEARANCES

	PAGE
Jeff Deschamps	3
Jody Smet	4
Mike Powell	11
Barbara R. Miller	24
Rob Gibbs	26
Robert Gunderman	28
John Love	31
Philip Norman	34
Melissa Daston	36
Barbara Sollner-Webb	40
Jane von Maltzhan	43
Nathan Tennies	46
Mike Caruso	49
Denis Webb	53
Maria Schwartz	56
Pat Oliva	61
Chuck McMillian	64
Debby Poole	68
Ann Coles	73
Ron Polniaszek	75
Kim Eubanks	78
Barbara Boyds	81

## PROCEEDINGS

MR. DESCHAMPS: Good evening, I'd like to welcome you all to the Wildlife Achievement Chapter. My name is Jeff Deschamps, I'm the current chapter president. For those of you who don't know who the League is, this is our 90th anniversary. The League was founded in 1922 by a group of hunters and fishermen. This chapter is also celebrating its 75th anniversary. So, both the League and this chapter have a long history. And, if you have an interest in watershed and open space, this chapter has formed partnerships to protect the reservoir and the tributaries.

Along those lines, we conduct tree plantings. We have regular trash pick ups and watershed cleanups. And we do work in basin management. In fact, our watershed cleanup, by our calculation, predates the Potomac cleanup that everybody is so familiar with, by at least two years. And early on the amount of trash that we pulled out of the river was, well, scary. It was measured in tens of tons every year. Now it's much less, which is gratifying, but there's still trash out there.

The primary goal of the League is to educate the next generation and encourage them to develop personal interests in the land, so it can continue to be maintained for recreational use. This is why the League was founded.

And, to do this, we need large areas of open space in their

natural state in conditions such as that found on the WSSC property, so we're very interested in the plans moving forward and what comes down the road. And I'd like to introduce Jody Smet, from EA Engineering Science and Technology.

MS. SMET: Good evening everyone, my name is Jody Smet. I'm with EA Engineering Science and Technology, and my role here tonight is meeting manager, kind of work us through the agenda. Have our speakers come up and provide their input. We are here tonight to talk about the Patuxent Watershed Protection Study that EA has been asked to conduct.

A few logistics. We are not using a microphone tonight, so I'm hoping that everybody in the back can hear me okay and just -- can you? Yes? -- just ask that when speakers come up you kind of project a little bit. There are bathrooms located in the front foyer where you came in, men and women. We will not be taking a break during our two hour meeting, so please just excuse yourself as you have to. And, Izaak Walton League has provided some water for us in the back, so if anybody gets thirsty, please help yourself.

So, with that, I'm going to start just by introducing EA a little bit, talking about the meeting agenda and format, and then I'll turn it over to Mike Powell, who will discuss a little bit more about the scope

of the study we're conducting.

All right, EA Engineering Science and Technology, we are a Maryland based environmental consulting firm that was founded in 1973. We're headquartered in Hunt Valley, Maryland. We have 21 offices in 13 states, and about 450 employees, four of which are here tonight. I've introduced myself, I'm Jody Smet. We also have Bill Rue. We have Mike Powell, and Wendy Bley. Everybody will have a role tonight.

EA is also working with a subcontractor on the study, Chesapeake Environmental Management, and we have Nick Walls and Nate Conway. Nick's at the back and Nate's over here on the side. They're helping us out with the study. Now, just a few words to introduce the study, and, as I said, Mike will talk about it a little bit more detail. But the study really is a study of WSSC owned lands around the Triadelphia and the Rocky Gorge Reservoirs to see if and how uses and activities on those lands are impacting water quality and the storage capacity of the reservoir. As I said, Mike's going to talk about that in a little more detail here shortly.

As far as what, how we're going to do tonight and how and why, first on the agenda, EA is going to describe the work plan, that is the study that we've been asked to conduct, what that entails. How we're going to do it, when, and those sorts of things. Then after we do that, which

shouldn't take more than 20 minutes or so, we'll answer some of your questions, and then we're going to turn the meeting over to you pretty much. We want your input. We want to hear your interests in these lands, what kind of activities, how you've used the land in the past, how you want to use them in the future, really want to understand that. So we hope to hear from many of you tonight.

We're starting on time here at 7:00. We'd like to conclude by 9:00. Last night we did run long. We had almost 35 speakers speak last night, and at 3 minutes, we ran over our time, but we thought it was really important to give everybody an opportunity that wanted to speak, to speak. So we're going to do our best to end by 9:00, but right now we have upwards of 20 speakers who want to talk. So we're going to hear everybody. We have limited the speaking time to five minutes here tonight per speaker. We said five minutes when we thought there might be 10 to 12 speakers. We're nearly double that now, so we'll just ask that you give consideration and limit it to five minutes or less.

Bill Rue is going to be doing the timing for us, and he'll give you a warning minute and 30 seconds when you're approaching three minutes. So you know that's three minutes and if you feel like you need to take the other two, please do. We want to hear what you have to say. The

2.

meeting is being audio recorded through these nice speakers right here, and will be transcribed. And in addition to that, my colleague, Wendy Bley, is also going to be up here at the flip charts taking notes. We just want to do that to make sure that we're accurately recording your comments. So, if you see us write something that you don't feel was how you intended it to be said, please just correct us. We want to make sure we're capturing your comments correctly.

From those flip chart notes, the transcription and notes we're taking ourselves, we're going to prepare a meeting summary and the meeting summary, a copy of the presentation, and last night we had a request for a copy of the sign-in sheet from the meetings, those materials are going to be made available on WSSC's website.

In addition to these two meetings that we've hosted here Monday and Tuesday nights, we are accepting any written comments that folks want to provide. So, if people were unable to attend the meetings and they want to submit written comments, we're asking that they do. Many of you who have presented your comments here orally have also provided us the written comments, the drafts, and that's very helpful to have those for the records as well. We're just asking that any additional written comments be submitted by July 19th, and at the end of the slide show we'll have an e-mail address for you and mailing address

where you can send those comments.

Meeting purpose. As I said many times now, we really want to hear from you, how you're using these lands. To do that we wanted to make sure we, you know, put the word out that we were having these meetings. So we sent out 3,500 meeting invitations to a WSSC mailing list. We also sent out an additional 300 emails. We advertised in three newspapers, and we put out news releases and got on community calendars.

Another thing that helped was you all. You shared the meeting dates and location information with your colleagues and that's helped to get more people out too. We certainly appreciate that. Now that we have you here, what are we going to do with you. We want to listen to your input. We want to get your comments and suggestions. As I said, we want to understand how these watershed lands, the WSSC owned lands around the two reservoirs are being used by you all, how you think they should be used, and above all, you know, WSSC's interest in managing these lands is to protect the water quality in the reservoirs and the storage capacity. So, as we consider the uses and activities on the buffer area, we need to make sure that they're compatible with those interests as well.

We hope to hear from a broad group of users, and last night we did. We heard from the equestrian community,

but we also heard from boaters and fishermen. We heard from the deer management folks, those that were interested in the control hunts, and others. And that was great. And I think we're set up tonight to hear from a bunch of you again.

Meeting goals and ground rules. Meeting goals.

Again, we're looking for full participation from the stakeholder groups around these reservoirs and we want equal representation. I'm not sure it will be an issue tonight, but last night we had a lot of folks that wanted to speak on behalf of one group or one organization. So we just ask that before we took, you know, repetitive representatives, that we got through all the groups first so that everybody was represented. I'm not sure that that's going to be an issue tonight but, that's how we're going to do it. We want to hear from anybody and then we'll go back to others speaking on behalf of the same group.

Another meeting goal is really the expression and understanding of everyone's interests. As an example, it's my understanding that WSSC's interest here in the reservoirs and how they manage these buffers around the reservoirs, is to protect the water quality and the storage capacity of the reservoirs. That's their interest. We want to hear your interest. And then you kind of look to see where they fit together and not, and go from there. So really, you know, want to hear each other. And I heard already tonight that

it was beneficial last night to hear, you know, how the boaters and fishermen use these lands as well. So we're making connections and we're starting to understand each other a little bit better.

To make sure the meeting goes as smoothly as possible, we've put some ground rules up here. Pretty straightforward. We're asking one speaker at a time.

Again, I'll call speakers up. We ask that you be concise on your time limits which we're saying between three and five minutes. Keep to your task and topic, listen to others and be respectful. Anybody wish to add any ground rules to the meeting? Everybody feel like that covers it generally? Not missing anything?

Our key project staff, introduce them generally, but just to give you a sense for their background and where they're coming from as they work on this project, Mike Powell focuses on water quality and modeling. He is the project manager. Mike, stand up or raise your hand so people can see you. He is managing the study on behalf of EA. Bill Rue is a water quality scientist with EA. Wendy Bley specializes in water quality, but Wendy is also a 40 year equestrian, and is an excellent resource for the study as we move forward understanding, you know, equestrians needs, horse's needs, access, those types of issues. So we're happy to have her on the team. Myself, my history and

background and experience is really in recreation, land use and shoreline management. And then we have Nick Walls, with CEM, he does urban affairs public policy, and does a lot of the digital mapping. So some of the maps we might use. So, without further ado, I'd like to turn it over to Mike Powell who's going to walk us through an overview of the study.

MR. POWELL: Good evening everyone. Again, my name is Mike Powell, I'm a scientist with EA and the project manager for this study. A quick overview of the Patuxent Watersheds, the reason for the study and then a brief overview of our study plan and we'll take some questions and answers before we turn it over to your comments.

MS. SMET: Can everybody hear Mike? Maybe speak up a little bit.

MR. POWELL: Within the 85,000 acres of the Patuxent Watershed, WSSC owns and operates two water supply reservoirs, the Triadelphia Reservoir, established in 1943 and the Rocky Gorge Reservoir, established in 1952. Both these reservoirs combined contribute about one-third of WSSC's water supply for its 1.8 million customers. WSSC is responsible for maintaining the long term water quality and storage capacity of these reservoirs. And this is the reason that WSSC has contracted EA to conduct a Patuxent Watershed protection study.

The study that EA is currently contracted to do is

focused on the 5,500 acres of buffer property that WSSC owns surrounding the reservoirs. We recognize that this is a small part of the 85,000 acres of the entire watershed. However, WSSC does intend to do a phase two study that will look at broader watershed issues. However, that is not part of EA's current contract and won't be the focus of today's presentation.

that occur within WSSC's 5,500 acres buffer with the potential to impact water quality and reservoir storage capacity. WSSC has asked EA to conduct an independent and objective study. Our study has five major components, and we'll discuss each of those in a little bit of detail. The first is develop a study work plan. We've been working with WSSC for several months now looking at existing data and collaborating with WSSC officials to develop a study plan.

Another study component is to review existing data. Most of this data is GIS or digital mapping data. We're also conducting public outreach. That's what we're doing here today as a major study component. Fourth, conduct a survey of the existing access and recreation trails. These are the shoreline fishing trails, these are the hunting trails, there's the old equestrian trails, and there are the WSSC fire access roads. We're looking at everything. And we are going to map them and then do an

evaluation of their condition and potential to impact erosion and water quality.

And then finally at the conclusion of our review of existing data and field work, we will generate a report, a draft report for WSSC, that presents our findings and provides recommendations, specific recommendations for how WSSC can better manage its reservoir buffer. So, I'll go through each of those study components in a just a little bit of detail.

First, the work plan. Again, EA has been working with WSSC since December in developing this work plan. It's a study plan that outlines what our roles are and how we will conduct the study. We have been looking at various types of reports and digital mapping or GIS data that WSSC has provided. These types of reports are WSSC water quality reports, WSSC's forest conservation plan, source water assessment, and, as I mentioned, all kinds of GIS mapping data.

The work plan calls for a couple of key deliverables. One of them is a GIS database that contains all the digital mapping that WSSC has provided, plus the maps that we will generate when we go out into the field. And also has a deliverable as the report that I mentioned that will provide our findings and recommendations, and also a time line for completion. And, the time line for

completion for EA's current study is the end of October of this year.

A little bit about the mapping and erosion potential analysis. We are conducting a desktop analysis of erosion potential within the reservoir buffer. And the way this analysis is conducted is looking at digital mapping data. This is topographic data and soils data that combined tell us areas that are vulnerable to erosion due to a combination of steep slopes and erodeable soils.

In addition to that erosion potential analysis, we're also looking at all different types of other GIS types of data. That includes land cover, canopy cover, WSSC's access road, their maps of their access roads. Maps of existing trails, ecologically sensitive areas and locations of culverts.

The next major component of the study is field work. The field work is divided into two components. The first is a survey of the public access areas. These are the shoreline fishing trails and the hunting trails primarily. And our goal here is to walk these trails, document their condition, verify the existing maps and then further document the trails potential for erosion and for water quality impacts. And we're also looking at the recreational areas. These are the access points to the reservoir, and we're evaluating them for public safety and for signage, for

adequate parking, that sort of thing.

The second component of our field work is primarily concentrated on WSSC's fire access roads. These are the access roads that circle the perimeter of each reservoir. There are about 50 miles of roads total for the Tridelphia and Rocky Gorge Reservoirs combined. And in addition to that we're also looking at the so called interior trails. These are the trails in between the access roads and the shoreline, the fishing trails. They're primarily the old equestrian trails in Rocky Gorge.

And again, when we evaluate these trails we're looking at existing conditions. We're measuring slopes.

We're looking at the trail width, trail depth. That gives us an indication of how eroded they are as well as their potential for further erosion and for water quality impacts.

We're also documenting, where visually obvious, water quality impacts related to property that abuts the reservoirs, for things like excessive trash piles and things of that nature.

At the conclusion of our field work we'll be issuing WSSC a draft report. And that draft report will document all of our findings, as well as to provide WSSC with specific recommendations for how they can better manage the buffer, and these kinds of recommendations may be something like these trails should be remediated, they

should be repaired. In some instances we might recommend that trails be moved or be closed for certain types of access. And we'll also be describing the different types of water quality impairments that we've seen. These includes both the, not just the trails but also from the recreational areas and also the culvert that bring materials from outside of the reservoir.

So that's the conclusion of our study. We'll take some question and hopefully try to answer them before we turn it over to you folks for your comments.

MS. SMET: First question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I do have a question. It seems like all of this is land based studies. Are you all going to be doing any water depth studies as far as auto profile now and what it might have been 15 years ago to see how much erosion has made it into the reservoir?

MS. SMET: Okay, I'm just going to repeat the question for the audio recording and anybody that might not have heard it. But, the comment was that the study seems to be largely land based and the question was, are we looking at the water, specifically, water depth profiles to make a comparison to depth now to in the past.

MR. POWELL: You're correct that our field work will be limited to the trails and recreational areas. It is all land based. We do have data for reservoir pool

elevation and we'll be using some of that data but, the focus of the study is on the reservoir buffer.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The question I have is, is the study taking into account any of the vegetation or any of the plant life in the reservoir area?

MS. SMET: I feel silly repeating the question but I want to make sure everybody hears it so, he's asking if the study's accounting for any of the vegetation, wildlife, those sorts of things on the buffer area.

MR. POWELL: We're mainly looking at the conditions of the trails and the access road. However, where we see things like invasive species, we are documenting that.

MS. SMET: Yes ma'am?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is it anticipated there's going to be a phase two of the study where you look at boating, on water use, use of the water from the reservoir as opposed to the buffers?

MS. SMET: The question was for those in the back, is it anticipated that they'll be a phase two of this study that looks at uses on the water, boating and such activities.

MR. POWELL: The phase two of the study that I mentioned earlier is focused on looking at the broader watershed issues. This is the 80,000 acres that are outside of WSSC's control. Our current study doesn't look at the

kind of issues that you mentioned, and I don't have any 1 2 knowledge about any further studies that would. MS. SMET: Yes, Barbara? 3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How is it determined which 4 5 3500 residents gets announcements out of the 1.8 million rate payers, hundreds of thousands of other Howard County 7 and Upper Montgomery County people who potentially may be voters, fisherman and care about the environmentally sound use of this land? Okay. The question was about the 10 MS. SMET: mailing list we used to send invitations out to the 3500 11 12 folks. How did we get to that list? How do we choose those 13 3500 out of the 1.8 million stakeholders we mentioned? Do 14 you know? 15 MR. POWELL: I know a little bit. The mailing list that we -- our mailing list was received from WSSC and 16 17 it consists of their customers and of stakeholders and their 18 stakeholder database. So our mailing list came from WSSC. 19 MS. SMET: Something that the PR folks, you know, 20 the communication folks put together. So I'm not sure how 21 they maintain that database. 22 MR. POWELL: But it consists of known 2.3 stakeholders.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do they at least have all of the boaters and fisherman who have gotten use permits in the

1 last couple of years? 2 MS. SMET: None of you got it, okay. 3 MR. POWELL: Okay, well I guess that answers your 4 question. 5 MS. SMET: Debbie? UNIDENIFIED FEMALE: Maybe you could make a 6 7 recommendation that it would be maybe slipped in the bill, you know, when it goes out every month if there's an update or a meeting coming or something, every rate payer especially would be able to get some information. 10 11 MS. SMET: Okay. Debbie had an idea that if there was an upcoming meeting or an update on the study that there 12 13 be a slip put in their bill so that it could get to 14 everyone. Yes, ma'am? 15 UNIDENTIFIED: In addition to that, people who pay 16 for permits to use the watershed. 17 MS. SMET: Okay. In addition, all the permit 18 holders should get that information as well. Yes, ma'am? 19 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How are you going to compare 20 the amount of sedimentation coming from the bordering effectors such as equestrian trails or nature trails with 21 22 the kind of sedimentation coming from the in flowing rivers 23 and culverts? So what is the standard for comparison? How do you also assess the sedimentation rate in general for the 24

reservoirs compared to other lakes?

MS. SMET: The question, how are you going to give considerations and assess not only sedimentation that might be occurring inside the WSSC owned lands from uses and activities to those that might be occurring outside of those lands, tributary inputs and whatnot? So how are you going to compare those? How are they going to be considered?

MR. POWELL: Again, what you're describing is more of what the WSSC concedes for the next phase of this study that it may or may not take place. And, EA certainly doesn't know if we would be involved in that. Our current study is focused on looking at contributions including inputs generated from within the reservoir.

MS. SMET: Yes, ma'am?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And my question is a follow up to that suggestion, is that when you post information on the website, could you post the boundaries of the watershed study that would encompass the phase two, that will be outside of the WSSC but encompassing our watershed so we get an idea as to what might be looked at in phase two for land use.

MS. SMET: She's asking that if there was a phase two part of the study that WSSC post on its website what the boundaries of that phase two would be, which I assume would be the boundaries of the Patuxent Watershed. But we will certainly pass that suggestion along to WSSC. Yes, sir?

25

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is the main focus really just 2 on the amount of, for lack of a better word, dirt that's 3 coming into the reservoirs or are you also concerned about 4 other contaminants that come in as part of erosion? 5 MS. SMET: The question is, the focus mainly on the erosion, sedimentation and impacts on water quality or 6 7 are we giving consideration to other impacts that might be affecting water quality? MR. POWELL: Large focus is on erosion, but we're 9 also looking at water quality impacts and things like 10 excessive trash, neighboring properties that might have 11 12 something that impacts water quality, or things that we find 13 within the reservoir itself that would impact water quality, we're also looking at that. 14 15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think a part of that is nutrients. 16 17 MS. SMET: Additional questions for Mike before we 18 start asking you to come up to talk to us? Okay, well I 19 appreciate, oh yes? 20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just have one 21 recommendation. I'd advise your study to get out on the 22 water in a boat. And if you need help getting out on the water in a boat, it'll help your study. Look me up or go to 23

the log cabin and look up any of the people in boats. We'd

be happy to take you out for a couple of hours. You need to

get out on the water. You can't just do this from the 1 2 beach, is my recommendation. MS. SMET: Okay. The recommendation was that the 3 4 study should also get out on the water and we've had a 5 generous offer to get us out there if we need the help. So 6 thank you. Yes, sir? 7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Will you be looking at impervious land and how that contributes to the water 8 9 quality? 10 MS. SMET: The question was, would the study consider the impervious surfaces and how they may be 11 12 impacting water quality? 13 MR. POWELL: And that sounds like more of a phase two thing where they're looking at the broader watershed, 14 15 contributions to the broader watershed. But certainly in phase two that would be something that would be of primary 16 17 focus. 18 MS. SMET: Barbara? 19 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Back to the previous 20 comment. Does he know you have also all invitation for pony rides. 21 22 MS. SMET: Yes. Yes, we've been invited out for 23 pony rides too. Yes? 24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Will you be comparing your 25 result against the results that were done in '04 when the

25

WSSC did this whole forest service study? 1 2 MR. POWELL: Yeah, we have --3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you have access to their 4 data? 5 MR. POWELL: We do. MS. SMET: The question was, there was a 2004 6 forest study, and would we be looking at that and giving it 7 consideration in our study report, and the answer is yes. 9 MR. POWELL: Yes, we have that report. MS. SMET: Okay. All right, thank you so much, 10 Mike. Let's see, for those of you new to this and that 11 12 weren't with us last night, what I'd like to do is kind of 13 tee you up, so I'll announce the next three speakers so that you can be prepared to come and give your comments. 14 15 unfortunately, my first speaker doesn't get any advance warning at all and I apologize in advance. And that lucky 16 17 lady is Susan Gray. 18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: She is not here tonight. MS. SMET: Susan's not here. Okay. So, Barbara 19 20 Miller. As I said before, we are accepting written 21 comments, so even if you speak tonight and want to provide additional comments in writing or if there are others that 22 23 couldn't attend, we are accepting those through July 19th

and we're going to leave this up to get the comments into

the email address here, Tracy Eberhard or this mailing

1 address. Okay, now it's your turn.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You said you were going to mention three people.

MS. SMET: Yes. I was going down my list and got all distracted because she wasn't here. Ron Gibbs will be number three. Is Rob here? Okay. And then number four I had Robert Gunderman.

MR. GUNDERMAN: Right here.

MS. SMET: Okay, so those are our next three.

MS. MILLER: Hi, I'm Barbara Miller and since my time is very limited, I'll speak quickly and hopefully loud enough. Some of my comments might go to this potential phase two of the study, and that's because my husband and I are boaters. Specifically, we are canoeists and longtime users of Tridelphia Reservoir and occasionally users of Rocky Gorge. We regularly canoe on Tridelphia many weekends and occasionally in the evening after work. And, we're among a score of small boaters, particularly kayakers, who enjoy the reservoirs and who would be, I would say, devastated if the public use of the reservoirs were curtailed.

We treasure the opportunity to get out on the water and enjoy a great natural resource while getting some exercise in the process, and regularly see the great blue herons and the osprey and the occasional bald eagle, as I'm

sure many of you others do. After giving this a lot of thought, we don't think that our use of the reservoirs or the use by other canoeists and kayakers has an adverse impact on water quality. During a typical outing we arrive at the reservoir, park in the parking lot, carry our boat down to the water, get in and paddle away.

And we'll paddle the length of the reservoir and then do the process in reverse. We don't use our canoe as a platform for swimming and we've never seen any other kayakers or canoeists abusing their privileges by swimming, even on hot summer days. We don't think, looking at what we do, that we're contributing to any erosion problem. In fact, I'm sure we're not.

If water quality in the reservoirs is declining, and apparently it is, we don't think that small boaters are to blame. There's obviously been a tremendous amount of development in the Patuxent Watershed and it's interesting in that regard to look at the aerial of Rocky Gorge Reservoir in particular and to see the amount of houses and subdivisions and you think of the loss of tree cover that's occurred since the reservoirs were constructed. The replacement of permeable surfaces with asphalt and cement, and the increase in the number of homeowners who are applying lawn fertilizer and so on and so forth.

In our view, there are steps that could probably

be taken to mitigate these problems, but banning boating on the reservoirs is not the answer. The reservoirs and the acreage surrounding the reservoirs are used by fishermen, picnickers, hikers, and equestrians, in addition to paddlers and the occasional sailor or rower, and we hope that in EA's study, each use will be considered separately on its own merits, and that public use of the reservoirs won't in the end be banned because one use is found to have an adverse impact.

We have some further thoughts and comments, but in view of the time limit on oral presentation, we'll submit these further comments in writing. We hope you will further publicize the fact that you're doing this study because we don't think that most users had any knowledge of this evening's meeting or last night's meeting, and as some of the commenters have suggested, there are ways to reach out to the hundreds if not thousands of people who have used the reservoirs in the last couple of years.

In closing, my hope and I suspect the hope of many others, is that the public meetings, last night and tonight aren't a hollow exercise and that serious consideration will be given to maintaining public access to the reservoirs.

Thanks.

MS. SMET: Thank you, Barbara. All right, Rob Gibbs.

MR. GIBBS: To be as brief as possible, I'll just read mine. My name is Rob Gibbs. I work for Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Montgomery County Department of Parks. One of my responsibilities is to manage Montgomery County's Deer Management Program. I chair the county's Deer Management Workgroup, which has representation from WSSC. I want to express two things related to the long term use and management of WSSC lands within the Patuxent Watershed. Specifically, Montgomery County, as it relates to deer management.

First is the importance of protecting and maintaining high quality natural vegetation along the river and along the reservoirs. This buffer of natural vegetation serves and provides valuable ecological functions that are crucial to maintaining water quality, trees and other native vegetation, reduce water run off and storms, reduce erosion, help filter pollutants in ground water from the air and the water or pollution from ground water and the air. Natural vegetation, especially forested land, also provide shade to keep waters cooler, thereby increasing oxygen.

One of the biggest threats to a healthy natural ecosystem is an over population of whitetail deer. High numbers of deer can remove the forest under story and ground cover greatly reducing the ecological functions that I just described. Seedlings no longer survive to grow and replace

trees, and as those trees age and die, the forest goes into decline. WSSC has for many years conducted an exemplary deer management program around its reservoirs to ensure the long term viability of this natural ecosystem and the many ecological benefits it provides. This management is essential I feel to the long term viability of the watershed and the continued protection of the water quality.

Secondly, I want to recognize the importance of WSSC's role as an integral partner in our county wide deer management program. WSSC was represented on the original citizen task force established by Montgomery County Council in 1993, and has been an active member in that process ever since. The goal of the county's deer program is to reduce deer vehicle collisions, damage to agricultural crops, damage to home landscaping and gardens and degradation of the natural community. WSSC's deer management program has been an important part of our county wide effort to reduce deer impacts. I want to thank them for their efforts over the past 17 years or so, and encourage them to continue this important part of their overall management. Thanks.

MS. SMET: Robert Gunderman. After Robert we'll have John Love, Philip Norman and Melissa Daston.

MR. GUNDERMAN: Hello, my name is Rob Gunderman and I'm a Montgomery County resident the past 25 years. I'm a boater and a fisherman. As I heard last night, I have a

second generation going on that use the lakes. It seems to me that this whole study is to be used to shut down the lakes. There hasn't been taking into consideration that every old reservoir has sediment problems. There's actually reservoirs that have been closed from sedimentation. I've also been on the lake where after a rainfall where the water level rises three feet and turns to the color of coffee, and I haven't heard that addressed as far as going out after a hurricane like last year, where you know, the Patuxent River that's coming into it is actually creating huge amounts of sediment just from the banks. I've been from probably two miles above Tridelphia all the way down through the Patuxent in Ann Arundel County, Calvert County. Lived, fished from the top of the lake to probably the bay.

I haven't heard anybody address that the water belongs to Maryland residents, not to WSSC, and they are trying to control things and change things, and I've heard that WSSC employees are basically saying these studies are used to be able to shut down all of the properties for all the people that use it. Like I said, in my experience on the lake, I've pulled people out. They brought up safety, as far as shortening the seasons. Had an article written in it and they brought up basically safety. The people that drown there every year happen in the middle of the summer time. WSSC is not responsible for boater safety. Everybody

that boats there is in charge of their own safety, and the people that don't know how to swim shouldn't be there. Like I said, I've pulled people out of it before.

I go there from March 1st when I could to December 15th. I've been there breaking through ice. There's been years that they closed it early in the season because two weeks you had to wait for ice. They let it before where I was breaking through ice wanting to go fishing after the winter goes through, but it just seems to me this whole study is combining horse trails and erosion into being able to shut down all the properties. And WSSC won't admit that, but privately, the employees are saying that that's exactly what the case is.

Like I said, I have a second generation. I was actually with my wife fishing five days before she delivered my son, the first child. If it would have happened during the weekend we might have had him actually born at the lake. So, that's how often I go. I've actually called two weeks ago because the whole thing with shortening the season and security, called several times. Two weeks ago I called because there was a boat heading down towards the dam, probably a mile past where they were allowed to go. Luckily, it was fisherman. You know, you never know what the intentions are when you see a boat heading out all blatantly, going past all the no trespassing signs.

In the past two years the only time I see WSSC officers there is to close the gate. They bring in over \$100,000 a year from our annual permits, which is more than enough to spend for officers spending three hours a night closing it. I mean, that's all that I see them. They're not there checking permits, not checking on the security. If they were to close the lake, every time I see somebody there with a bonfire going on the bank, I report them. Now they've made it even harder. You used to be able to call the dam office. Now you have to actually know the security office number. And, like I said, nobody brings up the fact that we own the water, not WSSC. So, thank you very much.

MS. SMET: John Love. And, as you guys, I think you're doing it, but please state your name and your affiliations for the record.

MR. LOVE: My name is John Love and I'm a resident of Montgomery County for the last 22 years. The first thing I'd like to say is I'm a boater. I'm a small boater. I row a shell, a canoe or a kayak, and I do easily over a hundred outings a year. So I'm doing it every other day, if not every day. I went this morning. I would have gone tonight before I came here, but it's hot as Hades out there, so I hope no one's out there.

I'd like to first second your remarks, the first person who spoke, because I think she said very concisely

what I believe as well, and Mr. Gunderson as well, I second your remarks. The deer hunting thing, I'm sorry, I can't, don't relate to that entirely, so. I'm here about small boats. My boat, my rowing shell it's long, it's skinny, it doesn't create any wake. When I come down, I park in designated areas and I use designated ramps. In my estimation, as you pointed out, I don't think that small boaters contribute to soil erosion, silt build up, pollution in the water. So why am I here? Why are all the boaters here? Talk about surrounding buffer zones.

Okay, I believe the following. The results of this study could be used to further limit access to the two reservoirs. Already access has been limited in 2012 by a whopping 20 percent. You just do the number of days it's available, subtract out the number that you just lost, it's over 20 percent, depending on whether you go to sunset and beyond. I've heard people say that now they're very strict on sunset and it really should be dawn to dusk, because there's still light out there, okay.

There was even talk last year that the staff at WSSC is considering closing the reservoirs entirely to boaters like me, Mr. Gunderson, and all the other people who are here. So that talk is out there. I believe WSSC handled the whole horseback issue horribly, and that's what has gotten this whole ball rolling, and that has brought us

into it and we are being regulated because of mishandling that issue, losing over 20 percent of our access to the reservoir. That's a real cut. So, I don't see them necessarily stopping with the 20 percent. That's one of the points I'm making here. It's a ridiculous position for us to be in. Why are we up here talking about this when we're not contributing to the problem?

So, I second your remarks about hoping that this study will distinguish where the sources of the problem are and regulate the problems according to their contribution, and recognizing that there are other folks, like Mr.

Gunderson and others, who are like the eyes and ears for WSSC when it comes to the reservoir. We're there. We're seeing things that are happening. We're helping people that are in trouble down there. We're reporting problems as we see them, and their police staff is not really contributing. We're doing it for them. And that's fine, let us do it.

Okay, I hope for the following. Number one, that the results of this study can be used to justify returning to a longer season for boaters like me and others. If other activities on the buffer areas need to be restricted to prevent erosion in late winter and late fall, boating could still be allowed. For example, I just would point out that the study team should look at other similar reservoirs, Seneca Lake at Black Hill, March 1. Liberty Pretty Boy

Reservoir is near Baltimore, March 1. So, I don't understand why it is that we are the ones who lose a month on the front and a month on the back.

I hope WSSC will see from the process that we're engaged in tonight, that consulting the user community on decisions about reservoir access and activities is helpful outreach. There are a lot of people who think WSSC is somewhat arrogant in the way they make their decisions. Not really relating to the user community in a way that makes us feel good about them.

Finally, I hope WSSC will continue to allow boaters access to these beautiful reservoirs to the maximum extent possible, finding that all of us are good stewards of the lake and careful not to denigrate the natural surroundings that we enjoy. Thank you.

MR. NORMAN: Good evening, I'm Philip Norman. I'm the Deer Project Manager for the Howard County Department of Recreation and Parks, Natural Resources Division. And I want to thank WSSC for this opportunity. I believe that all of the recreational uses of the watershed all have one thing in common, and that is that we appreciate a healthy forest ecosystem in the watershed lands. That watershed forest and its health is my prime concern as a natural resources manager, and specifically as the deer project manager for Howard County.

WSSC has been running managed deer hunts and has allowed regular bow hunting on certain parts of the watershed for many years, and that management has been a vital component of overall efforts to balance deer density with other natural resources in the area, as well agricultural and residential interests in the area.

WSSC's managed hunts and the areas opened for regulated bow hunting result in several hundred deer being removed from the population annually. I'm sure WSSC could provide specific numbers. Forest ecologists recommend a deer density of 15 deer per square mile for forest health. Surveys we've done in Howard County on average over the last 12 years have shown 57 deer per square mile. Nearly four times as many as recommended by forest ecologists.

The WSSC managed hunts have an excellent safety record. There's never been an injury to non-hunters in the history of bow hunting in the State of Maryland. This safe, well regulated hunting is an important component of overall management in the county and it needs to continue. Just for reference, conveniently, the average white tail deer consumes approximately one ton of vegetation annually. With several hundred deer being removed from the watershed annually by the managed hunts, we're seeing tremendous amounts of vegetation allowed to continue in the watershed, which contributes to both water quality and to the

1 recreational qualities that we all enjoy. Thank you very 2 much.

MS. SMET: Next we have Melissa Daston. After Melissa we're going to have Barbara Sollner-Webb, Jane von Maltzhan, and Nathan Tennies.

MS. DASTON: Good evening. As our colleague noted, I'm Melissa Daston. I am President of the West Laurel Civic Association. West Laurel is a community bridging both Montgomery and Prince George's County. Has about 1700 homes which abut the watershed within a mile to literally in the watershed. Many of the things that have been said tonight were, we're in agreement with, and some not.

I'll be honest up front. I am not a rider, kayaker, boater, fisher or hiker. And so you might wonder, why would I be here speaking passionately about the value of the watershed, maintaining the watershed. And the answer is because I think it is good for the watershed to have stewards such as those who are represented here and those who were there last night. Because WSSC needs partners like this.

I will point out that there are unintended consequences to every action. Many of us work as managers in the federal government and I will tell you, every action has many things that you never intended to happen. And a

good example has been brought up several times tonight, which is curtailing trail riding has resulted in a number of unintended consequences in the West Laurel Area. We have residents calling me and other members of the board talking about fires in the watershed, coming across hikers saying well, since the horses aren't here we thought we were free to be here. Swimmers, motor bikes in particular, and lots and lots of people with dogs befouling the pathways.

So I want to point out that WSSC and in this study needs to assess in addition to the erosion and the soil conservation issues, some of the unintended consequences of illegal usage which occurs when you remove the existing stewards of the watershed who not only pay for that privilege but have actively engaged with the partnership of WSSC.

I also want to mention two other things. A second indirect but very costly impact has been to those small businesses who make their livelihood from the watershed. It is not a large group. In West Laurel we have four commercial stables ranging up to 14 horses. So these are not large businesses. Since the abrupt curtailment of trail riding, they're basically saying they're seeing about a 25 percent drop off in their business. When you go from 14 horses down to seven horses, that does no longer makes the business viable, and people are in danger of losing their

jobs. I don't think that's what WSSC intended, because these are not large scale organizations riding.

Last, but not least, I wish to talk about -- well, two other things -- one, the other unintended consequence impacts all of us here. If you live anywhere near the watershed, frankly your property values will decrease. I just came from unfortunately a funeral viewing of one of the senior realtors in the Laurel area. He lives in, or lived abutting the watershed and in the past six months we've had long discussions on what has been the impact of closing the watershed to recreational use on property values. Now, WSSC is not concerned about this, but many of their own employees live in these communities, so I would think that there's a vested interest from employees.

Finally, our opening comments from our colleagues at EA who are commissioned to do the study, I'd like to point out a few methodology issues, which I don't believe have been taken into account from what I've read, heard and listened to. One, the methodology is extremely inconsistent. If you're studying erosion, you have a mixed message. You have boaters, anglers, and other official users on the trails, on the watershed, but you no longer have the horseback riders. So, how do you compare the impact of riding? That's one example of where you have users and non-users.

You don't have a baseline study. It's not consistent. Everybody's using. I measure it. I then stop and measure again during the winter when no one is using to look at the difference in soil erosion, run off, etcetera. The other part of it is, you are not being able to capture some unofficial as well as semi-official uses that WSSC sanctions. For example, the group of army employees who are given permission to have a paintball fight in the West Laurel Rocky Gorge watershed adjoining a large soccer game. We had over a thousand children on the fields less than an eighth of a mile away, and when I questioned them, when I was down checking the watershed, which I do every weekend, they said they'd been given permission and they gave me the name of an employee at WSSC.

Now, we were able to stop that by calling security. Iron Man competitions which have been held by WSSC is a semi-sanctioned event. I would imagine that the impact of a hundred, 200, 300 people on the trails is more significant than the one or two people who are doing that. Finally, as been mentioned, the deer hunters perform a service but they also leave an impact on the environment. So I would request that you look at the methodology and look at the consistency of how you measure it, otherwise, the data will be valueless. Thank you very much for your time tonight. I want to leave you with a statement that says we

2.3

appreciate WSSC. I don't believe that we are in a war with them. I would like to think that we can reach resolution and once again restore our partnership where we all value the watershed, the quality of the water and the recreational uses. Thank you very much for your time.

MS. SMET: Barbara.

MS. SOLLNER-WEBB: Thank you. Hi, I'm Barbara Sollner-Webb, Vice President of the civic association that Melissa's president of. John Hopkins University Professor, and a true environmentalist, including a long time member of the state's Patuxent River Commission, and for many years WSSC's environmental advisory committee, now abolished.

Like most everyone who came last evening, we would not want to be out using the WSSC lands and water if it damaged the reservoir as WSSC alleges. But the equestrian trail is in excellent shape as determined by certified trail masters. The vast majority shows no hint of erosion from its countless decades of use because it's carefully used and contoured diagonally. Most everyone who sees the trail including a WSSC commissioner, state delegate, two state delegates, a state senator and county council member, who I've taken out on the trail, have commented on its lack of erosion.

WSSC's environmental advisory committee members determined that far less than one ten thousands of the

reservoirs sediment is from the horse trail, and less than one, one hundred thousands of the reservoirs phosphate comes from the horse use. Last year WSSC closed their trail, the equestrian trail based on unsupported claims that its use makes quote, the reservoir water hard to treat, is quote, the biggest factor in generating the reservoir settlement, and is generating quote, pollution.

Questioning these assertions are over 1100 signatures on petitions, as well as countless letters to WSSC and eventually 43 Maryland public information act requests filed on behalf of over 3500 citizens asking for the data. Although extremely unforthcoming, WSSC has made some data available including their own data showing that the water quality actually improves as it runs along the length of the equestrian trial, not gets worse as you might think.

Maryland's multi-million dollar TMDL analysis and a lot of discussions with the folks who have prepared it, also confirm that the equestrian trail use contributes less than one, one hundred thousands of the phosphate to the reservoir. WSSC moved riding to their access road claiming it is very flat and very negotiable, yet topo maps such as from the USGS show it very steep and most of that is seriously eroding and channel directly into the reservoir.

WSSC also banned all winter riding claiming those

are quote, the wettest months of the year. Completely opposite even to WSSC's own data obtained through the MPIA process. Thus, WSSC's claimed reasons for stopping equestrian use just don't hold water. In fact, equestrians markedly help the reservoir. WSSC's previous watershed patrol previously called equestrians their eyes and ears. For instance, we discovered an enormous sediment flow, traced it to an uncontrolled highway project, and sheparded it through its correction along with Maryland Department of Environment who estimated we saved the reservoir between 15,000 and 50,000 tons of sediment.

And we initiated the effort at correcting WSSC's severely neglected culverts. Several of which have blown out the access road, since WSSC's decision to stop culvert maintenance and caused a lot of sediment into the reservoir. Equestrians are not damaging, but helping the reservoir and their use of the sound trail should be reinstated. The amount of effort in rate payer funds WSSC is expending on reducing recreational use and on a study designed to not address the true serious water impairments, is mind boggling.

And if WSSC has repeatedly made disingenuous statements about equestrian use, is there an issue that citizens might not believe their assertions about water quality?

MS. SMET: Jane, Jane von Maltzhan. After Jane we have Nathan Tennies.

MS. VON MALTZHAN: I'm Jane von Maltzhan. I'm a resident of Montgomery County and Silver Spring. Member of Chesapeake Paddlers Association, and a retired humanities professor from the University of Texas at Arlington. My connection to water quality is that I served for five years in the German city of Essen as a translator on documents on the water quality of the Ruhr River, which is a model for any country. But as a stakeholder and a consumer here, I welcome efforts to guarantee the safety and the purity of our water, including scientific studies. After all, because of mismanagement and skewed priorities in the world, more than a billion people in the world lack decent water supplies, and twice as many lack access to sanitation.

By the year 2025, four billion people will not have access to clean water. We count ourselves lucky here in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and we wish to cooperate fully with you in guaranteeing the safety and purity of our supply. However, the problems which can affect reservoirs are many and varied and extremely complex. The problem with the phase one study is that it reduces itself to a few very minor variables.

For instance, just for starters, the time that water is retained behind a dam is very important. The

longer the retention the more lethal the problems. Levels of dissolved oxygen, water temperature. Water temperature stratifies the layers of water. Why is that important? Some temperatures cause metals such as iron and manganese to be soluble in anaerobic low oxygen conditions, whereas they will precipitate anaerobic conditions. Dams are not clean sources of electricity in the world. Studies reveal that dam reservoirs are actually significant sources of greenhouse gases, particularly in the tropics. Worse than even the dirtiest fossil fuel power plants.

In short, myriad and multiple factors contribute to water quality in reservoirs. Any good scientific study will study as many of the variables as possible, be fact based and give a complete picture. So, the problem here is the data we're looking at, three data, for rec. users, kayak, canoe users and picnickers are insufficient, insignificant and irrelevant data to the larger problems.

For instance, to determine the amount of sedimentation, we need to know the possible sources, the amount of sediment entering, the relative quantities to each other from the different sources. We need to know the yearly sedimentation rate of other water bodies including seasonal variances. Channels entering the reservoir must be evaluated for erosion, resistance, as well as capacity. So tonight I'm here to make a plea to both WSSC and to EA to

conduct a study which is both ethical and scientific.

by counseling WSSC to include more variables.

The study as presented to us last night in Laurel seems to be neither because of the very tight restriction on the number of variables they're going to consider.

Eventually the mythical phase two might be broadened.

However, very far reaching decisions will be made with lasting consequences on the basis of a too limited study.

So, to EA I would say protect the reputation of your company

To WSSC I would say, resist the temptation to justify possible funding cuts for patrolling the watershed by participating in the study. And, I do want to honor the fact that a WSSC employee died at the reservoir not to long ago, a year and a half perhaps ago, while patrolling, while picking up trash, an apparent drowning, and it's always regrettable when something like this happens.

Therefore, you need more than the eyes and ears of your own staff. So, if the real reason is to justify staff cutting, then save the \$220,000 the study is going to cost and use people to patrol the area so that we can tell you if illegal dumping and illegal usage on a much larger scale is taking place.

So, my personal plea is for us to work together.

Work together with us, your greatest supporters. We are the environmentally friendly groups currently using the

reservoir for environmentally friendly activities. Policing us is like establishing a police barricade on I-95 to stop every Prius owner to check them for emission controls.

Employ us as your eyes and ears. Connect with us as your scout so that we can report to you regularly as we already do, and have for many decades, on environmental problems and disturbances.

You will find in us what you have always found, a loyal, dedicated and responsible group of environmental supporters who wish for nothing less than to protect our water supply for generations to come. Thank you.

MR. TENNIES: Hi, I'm Nathan Tennies, I'm here representing my wife and myself. We've been residents of Montgomery County for, I think, 11 years, and I'm going to focus mostly on how we use the watershed, the reservoirs, because it sounds like that's what EA is mostly interested in, and WSSC.

We're paddlers, so we're not hunters or fishermen or equestrian people. And we're avid hikers, but we've never ever hiked here. We really, our usage of this is, are the boat ramps and that's all we've ever used. We put our boats in there, we take them out. And we really just use a couple of them. We typically put in at, I guess it's Greenfield, down here, Greenbury, thank you, or the Triadelphia one, and over here on Rocky Gorge we put in at

Brown's or over at Scott Cove. So that's really, I mean, that's what we use the land for.

What I did want to mention though was that, and we go paddling all up and down the East Coast, but 80 percent of the time we paddle within about an hour and a half of our house. So we're doing things, you know, in this general area. And, within that, 80 percent of the time we're on those two reservoirs. Really, from our perspective, there's really nothing else like them in the area for a couple of different reasons.

And, we're out there pretty much every weekend and we're somewhere, but usually here, and we have a canoe. So usually we go out together. And I also have a kayak, and so, as other people have mentioned, often after work in the evenings or early in the morning, I'll be out there paddling as well. So anywhere from like one to three times a week we're out on these.

I wanted to talk a little bit too about why we spend 80 percent of the time on these two of the stuff we do in this area. One of the reasons is accessibility. So, we live in North Chevy Chase so we're actually inside the Beltway kind of halfway between downtown Bethesda and downtown Silver Spring, and it's half an hour to get there, you know, excepting traffic. So the, you know, we come up New Hampshire, we come up 29 and we're at either of these,

2.

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you know, put in on either of these reservoirs really very quickly. And, if you look at a map of Maryland, there's really nothing else, you know, bodies of water like this that are that accessible to people in the Silver Spring/Bethesda/Chevy Chase area. Anywhere near that close.

Seneca Lake is probably the only other place that's anywhere near that. But to go any place else it's about, you know, an hour, hour and a half to get there. But the other reason besides accessibility is really that these are just incredibly beautiful and unique. You know, there are all the places we paddle in the area, out on the Chesapeake and on parts of the Potomac, places like that out on the Eastern Shore, they're all beautiful, but these are unique in that you have these, you know, beautiful forested shorelines with no houses. You have incredible diversity of wildlife and so, you really can't go any place else in the area anywhere nearby and see something like this. brought people in from out of town and they're really amazed that we have, you know, recreational resources like these available to us. So, that's really what I wanted to focus on.

I agree with other people. I would like to see the season really be year round for paddlers and other people too but, certainly for paddlers. I'm not sure fisherman want to fish in the middle of the winter. And, I

think I'd also like to see the days be a little bit longer.

For those of us who paddle out on the, you know, like to

paddle out at sunset, you know, the boat ramps officially

close right at sunset. It really would be nice to see those

be a little bit longer.

But like other people have mentioned, I would like to have a way if I do see people violating, you know, the rules or I see things that I think are going to impact water quality, to have a way to be able to report that to WSSC and know that that's actually making a difference. You know, find out that they've actually heard that and that something is being done about that report. And I don't really feel like I have a way to do that today. Thank you.

MS. SMET: I'd asked Mike Caruso to come to speak.

After Mike then Denis Webb, and then Maria Schwartz.

MR. CARUSO: Hi, good evening, I'm Mike Caruso. I'm a Howard County resident, I'm an equestrian and I do ride the Rock Gorge equestrian trails. I want to kind of change the focus a little bit and follow up on a testimony by James, an excellent presentation by Jane Sputman last night, on another issue we need to keep an eye on.

I am here to acknowledge by all the facts as I understand them, I have contributed to the poor water quality at Rocky Gorge and the Tridelphia Reservoir in present time and for generations to come. This is solved on

clean water, it comes not from my riding a horse on the trails according to WSSC's own data, my assault comes indirectly from the local government that is supposed to represent me.

Howard County has allowed the building of Grace
Church close the banks of Rocky Gorge Reservoir with many
acres of impervious surface along with the run off and oil
and other toxic surfaces with thousands --

MS. SMET: Sorry to interrupt. Can you just speak up a little bit?

MR. TENNIES: Howard County has allowed the building of Grace Church close to the banks of Rocky Gorge Reservoir with many acres of impervious space, along with run off from oil and other toxic substances from thousands of cars that visit there regularly. That surely has an effect on water quality with years to come. Howard County allowed the building of Villas of Cattail Creek with a shared septic system with close proximity to the Tridelphia Reservoir. This project was known to have only 30 percent of the perkable land required by state law. Eight years and court battles by concerned citizens with solid evidence was not enough to stop the building of this project.

Residents moved in 2005 to their \$800,000 dream homes only to find the sewage was backing up and their homes were for a time worthless. One million dollars later and

rebuilding septics processing center, which is now working, but who know for how long this risky fix will hold up on a very undersized septic system. It should be mentioned that prior WSSC management put their focus there and made a strong statement against that project only to be run over by the local government and the courts.

The short term financial interests of some developers over shadows the concerns of citizens and future generations and are currently able to push past the courts. Google perkable land and the first hit last night was Howard County issues. Follow the evidence for the evidence in that case. It is nationally recognized that Howard County is a big problem in the way they handle land. The courts seem to have gone astray again against the interests of residents and future generations. Prince George's County is now forced by court order to approve the building of Reaching Hearts Church on a 17 acre parcel of land adjacent to Rocky Gorge with 33 percent of it impervious surface.

Horses are a value to the community and should be supported. I am a physical therapist, and I've seen what happens when you couple a disabled person with a horse. I have talked to therapeutic riding therapists who have put an out of control autistic child on a horse and they magically become calm and settled. The Wounded Warriors Program puts disabled Iraq Vets on horses and in no time the effects of

post-traumatic stress syndrome is lifted for a time as they become joyfully focused in the present. The contribution of horses in our community is immeasurable.

It is sadly ironic that across the street from the prior mentioned Grace Church is the Cedar Lane School, which is dedicated to the training of severely disabled children. It is an excellent facility and dedicated staff that are very concerned about the study rise of autism in our community. Creative forward thinking Howard County leadership might have better approved the building of a stable for therapeutic riding in place of Grace Church and had many times less impact on water quality for generations to come.

I'll wrap up by saying that we seem to be living in a time where the balance between the interest of concerned citizens and those who stand to make money from how land is used and developed is way out of balance. And for this WSSC management to say they represent the interest of the public by closing this land to horses and using misstatements and fear tactics is a gross dishonoring of the WSSC management of the past which did establish themselves as a credible public service institution worthy of the public trust.

It seems clear to me that the only real recourse is a public outcry that reaches every citizen in our entire

1 | region. Thank you.

MS. SMET: All right. Denis.

MR. WEBB: My name is Denis Webb. My wife and I own a small private horse farm which abuts the buffer zone of the Rocky Gorge Reservoir. Last night at the hearing in Laurel on the same topic, there was considerable discussion of the rationale or lack thereof for moving the interior equestrian trial, quotes interior, to the access road and reducing the period where WSSC recreational facilities are open to all users, boaters, fishermen, as well as equestrians, and you've heard a little bit about this schedule reduction this evening also.

Another change implemented in the recent WSSC watershed access regulations did not, in my opinion, receive adequate attention last night. And that is, the closure of all private entrances to the horse trails and limiting access to only official WSSC entrances. And I would like to briefly address this issue now.

When we moved into our farm abut 20 years ago, we approached WSSC Watershed Patrol and asked for their help and blessing to lay out an access route from our farm to the equestrian trails, and they readily complied and this basically enabled us to ride out the back gate of our property and immediately be on the WSSC trails. They subsequently even sent us a document saying, giving us this,

2

3

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

officially giving us this right, and I have a copy of this I'm going to enclose in the testimony actually.

Under the new rules we cannot use this access, but must trailer our horses to one of the eight official WSSC entrances. Even this is misleading and you mentioned as part of the study you're going to look at some of the suitability of the access to various people and so I'd like to bring this to your attention. If you look at all of these accesses, there is only, let's see, two entrances require parking on private property, therefore, really aren't useful entrances. One requires parking along a dangerous road. You wouldn't think of unloading a horse at that point. There is only one suitable parking lot east to Route 29 which is, and admittedly that's a very good parking place and you can fit a lot of trailers and we've had rides out of there with a number of people. That's a very good access point.

There are three marginally suitable parking lots west of Route 29 at Edna or Batson and Brogdon, but they have very limited space. If you want to take a couple of friends you're in trouble. There's anywhere for maybe two to four, so and you have to contend with the fishermen and also the buses uses those as turnaround, and I don't know if you officially can't use it when the buses have access to it or not, but anyway, that's an issue that you have to

consider.

In practice no trail rider would buy a property or board their horses at a facility abutting the buffer zone and then trailer to an official trail site. Much of the attraction of these properties is being able to quickly and easily hop on your horse after a tough day at work, in that little bit of spare time you might have or just on an impulse to go out and commune with nature. None of this of course would be possible if you had to first trailer somewhere and you just don't do it, there's too much of a barrier.

Even more insidious is the effect the rule has upon commercial boarding facilities. Many boarders do not have trailers due to the expense and the effort of purchasing and maintaining one and those individuals would obviously seek barns elsewhere on other trails or other barns that do have access to the trail. Even those with trailers are boarding at the facilities because of their ready access to the road, the trail riders.

Implementation of this regulation requiring using only the official WSSC entrances thus would inflict a severe financial penalty on the commercial barns and would likely jeopardize their very existence. This regulation makes absolutely no sense to me. And I have yet to hear a reasonable justification for its existence. I would ask EA

2.

engineering to consider the environmental aspects of this regulation, if there are any, and unless a cogent explanation for its existing existence is forthcoming, I urge WSSC to rescind it. Thank you.

MS. SMET: After Maria I've got Pat Oliva, Debby Poole speaking for herself as well as Ainslee Sadler, and then Chuck McMillian.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Good evening. My name is Maria
Schwartz, I'm a member of Trail Riders of Today, TROT. it's
an organization of approximately 700 plus members. I am a
horse owner and a trail rider. I keep my horses at a farm
that abuts the 5500 acres of the WSSC land that is the
subject of EA's study. I also live right off the watershed,
but I don't have enough land to support two horses.
However, for several years I kept my single horse in my
backyard. I moved to my home in 1986 specifically because I
could ride from my home to the trails without having to rely
on a trailer, which I did not have for many years. I moved
my horses to their current location for the same reason.

I support the concerns of my fellow stakeholders that have raised at this meeting and at the meeting last night in Laurel. The first concern I wanted to raise which is on that Denis just spoke about, is that by virtue of the WSSC's current regulations, anyone without a trailer that is without a trailer that is not next to a designated access

point is not able to ride on the watershed.

Additionally, I don't understand how the WSSC can institute a regulation that has such a negative impact on the environment generally. Since this regulation requires a trail rider to get into a large car or truck and use gas that adds nasty things to our air quality in order to pull a trailer to an access point rather than as was previously the case allowing riders to access the watershed trails by horseback.

The second concern I have focuses on the lack of information that I have had access to in order to prepare for these meetings. Let me give you some details. After the announcement that EA would be conducting a study that was looking for stakeholders, I called EA to let them know I would like to participate as a stakeholder. The person that took my call did not know about the study and did not even know where to direct my call in the organization. But I was told that someone would call me back. No one did.

Two weeks later I called a second time and spoke with a gentleman. He told me that he couldn't give me any information about the study and suggested that if I wanted information, I would have to get it from WSSC. To accomplish that I made a very limited request for documents specifically related to the EA study through the Maryland Public Information Act. WSSC responded that this was such a

huge request that they needed an additional 30 days to work on it. When the WSSC wrote to say that they had completed the document review, it indicated that they were charging me for six and a half hours of time including other expenses related to their search for a grand total of \$491.69, which does not include copying fees.

Because this is big deal of money for me to pay and I planned to use the document to share with my fellow equestrians, I requested a waiver of the fee based on the fact that the only way I could get this information was through an MPIA request and that having these documents is necessary to be an informed stakeholder, and therefore in the public interest. WSSC emailed a response they were sending my request to their general manager for review and consideration.

Rather than next receiving an answer to my request for a waiver, I received a second bill for the WSSC's search time. I thought this was just in error and that the WSSC had sent this bill out not realizing that I was requesting a waiver. However, the next time I heard from the WSSC was again to request payment for their search and informed me that if I didn't pay the fee, they would turn my bill over to their legal department. I am still waiting for a response to my request for a waiver.

What the WSSC's actions in this situation indicate

to me is that WSSC does not want educated stakeholders. They want to keep us in the dark and this behavior leads me to ask why. And in response to that question to conclude that the WSSC has a hidden agenda. And appears to me that their hidden agenda not only includes equestrians, whose horses are supposedly fouling our drinking water, but also boaters, fishermen, picnickers and all the folks who

treasure and gently use watershed resources.

While it's not pleasant but understandable when an ex-spouse has a hidden agenda, or the person trying to sell you something for more than its worth has a hidden agenda, it is not okay for county, state or federal representatives to have hidden agendas. In fact, it is contrary to good government. The communication of information is critically important in a healthy democracy. This means that our representatives must be as transparent as possible in their interactions with the public. My real fear and the reason I am here today and was here yesterday is to speak to you all, is that I believe that something is rotten in Denmark.

While we are laying off teachers and curtailing other services in Maryland, we -- and as a rate payer, I do mean we -- are apparently paying EA \$225,000 to scope out a study that no one outside the WSSC can see a basis for. And neither EA nor WSSC is forthcoming in helping us to understand the issue at hand. Instead, the WSSC is

publishing wild statements in papers such as the Washington Post, which people not familiar with the watershed read and respond to with oh my goodness, horses are pooping in our drinking water.

The groundless impression that the WSSC is creating is so wrong on so many levels one might find it hard to figure out where to start. I am honestly not sure of the results of any study that WSSC initiates on this issue will not be skewed to serve the WSSC's own hidden agenda. And this gets to my third concern. If EA is only looking at 5,500 acres that buffer the water directly, what about run off from storm drains from areas where individuals have dumped trash, from fertilized lawns, from road construction that abut WSSC land, outside of the 5,500 acres. EA's study is already skewed.

And on a less than minor note, as EA does its study of the horse trails, they should not identify the fire break as the horse trail. The fire break and its horrible erosion is completely of WSSC's own making and has nothing to do with equestrian use which began for the first time in March of this year when trail riders were forced to use it per revised WSSC regulations. The so called interior trails which show no sign of erosion and run off should be labeled as the horse trails, not as the interior trails as has been described here tonight by EA.

Finally, when this is all said and done, especially if phase one of EA's study provides information that indicates that there is no basis to proceed to phase two of the study, the Office of Legislative Audits should take a serious look at the waste and abuse that WSSC has engaged in over the last year and a half. Thank you very much.

MS. SMET: Pat.

MS. OLIVA: Hello, I'm Pat Oliva, I'm the TROT
Coordinator for Howard County, and I just want to emphasize
that right now, as it stands, Howard County has no trails in
the watershed. Tridelphia Reservoir, if you do your study
in the Triadelphia Reservoir, there are no trails. Horses
are not allowed in there, and basically we would like to
have them in there. If your study shows that the trails
that we have, and we have made them. I walked with Paul
Hancock with a group of TROT members. He told us where to
lay the trails. We laid them down. He called his engineers
for the big logs that had fallen across, otherwise TROT did
all the work on those trails. But we put the trails where
we were told to put them.

I am now a trail master. I have taken all the courses, I've got all the certification. Some places I would not put the trails, especially over by -- I would move them a little bit further, they're not, within the

2.

acceptable 10 degrees, but most trail masters like their trails. But, they could be changed, you know, if WSSC wants them. If the WSSC says don't change the trails, we can't change them. But they were laid there by WSSC personnel who told us to put them where we did.

Also, I would like to say I wrote in '04 to the WSSC to request not more than a 50 foot access under 97 when the highway department put the new higher bridge up there to access the Patuxent State Park that's on the east side of 97. I got a letter from them October 18th, '04 saying that oh, we can't do anything or let you do anything now because we are doing a forest study and a modeling effort thing. That you have said that you've got the results of. I have never gotten the result back. The zoning department, the parks department or myself have never been able to access this. I have called them and it's, they might have done it, but that was eight years ago, and we still have not heard from them if we can put a 50 foot right of way underneath 97 so the horses don't have to cross a highway.

Also, a lot of the land in Howard County is on the Tridelphia Reservoir, is very suitable for trails. I would like to put in an emphasis when you're doing the study, you can't study what we've done because we haven't been there, but I would like to put that, if everything is working out for Rocky Gorge, I would like to work with WSSC or with EA

to figure out where we could best put some trails into the Howard County side. It's very important. Also, there's a huge large parking lot that's suitable for anything right off of 97 going into the Patapsco State Park and going up, you know, because the trails go up river from there. So it'd be a wonderful connection. There's just a small section of state park, but it is large enough to make some trails in there for the people who are coming, who have horses on the east side of 97. I think it's a very important thing. But again, there's no communication.

I have got an easement through a development from Schooley Mill to the watershed on the Howard County side which would open up a beautiful array of trails, but it's like we don't exist. My letters and my phone calls go totally unanswered, you know. Also, when you're looking at that trail, horses have been banned from that trail, so it's going to be very hard. How are you checking for the horse erosion if the horses have not been allowed on that trial since last fall?

You know, don't just look for the one thing the WSSC wants you to find. It would be very important for you to make a total evaluation of the watershed, not looking to keep horses off the trail, which is WSSC wants. I'm just asking you to be fair and I think you are, but what we've heard about you, Howard County has a great deal of respect

1 for your organization. But, you know, be honest. That's 2 all I'm asking. Thank you.

MS. SMET: We had Debby next, but we'll let Chuck since he's up here.

MR. MCMILLIAN: I'm here. I'll do it. Sorry,
Debby. Hi, my name is Chuck McMillian. I directly
represent a group of almost 400 kayakers called Chesapeake
Kayak Adventures. But I also speak with permission from
numerous other paddling groups in the metropolitan area
whose members number in the thousands. And yet in a larger
sense, I speak for all recreational users that enjoy the
natural beauty of Tridelphia and Rocky Gorge Reservoirs
whether they're paddlers, fishermen, hunters, equestrians,
or they just like to take the dog for the walk around these
gorgeous bodies of water.

There is no getting around the fact that

Tridelphia and Rocky Gorge are drinking water reservoirs and

WSSC as well as all recreational users need to be committed

to protecting them. They are very special places with lots

of restrictions and both sides need to work together to live

around those restrictions. In recent years, however, WSSC

has done a number of things that have upset recreational

users of the watershed. I think they've kind of gone out of

their way to tick us off. Most notably, these include

shortening of the season by an astounding two months.

Reducing the length of the day that people can use the reservoirs, and restricting access to equestrian trails that have been used for years.

These actions and others have created an agitated and antagonistic relationship with the very people whose best interest is to help WSSC protect the watershed. The seasonal closings and time changes obviously have nothing to do with water quality, and are probably an attempt to reduce payroll budgets rather than improve water quality. A little extra time in the evening doesn't sound like much unless you're rushing to get to the boat ramp and paddle a little bit before the sun sets.

If WSSC doesn't have the resources to oversee recreational use of the reservoirs on a year round basis, perhaps that responsibility needs to be turned over to some other authority who can more adeptly manage the situation. Even the way these meetings were presented to the public demonstrated WSSC's total lack of willingness to be open, honest and forthcoming with the recreational user community.

They asked to come and speak at a meeting but numerous calls and letters by several individuals including myself to EA and WSSC couldn't uncover the nature of the study or of what we should consider addressing when we spoke. Why have the meeting. I heard the lady's story about her bill that she got from WSSC when trying to get

information about the study. It's just wrong. If I understand it all correctly, EA Engineering has contracted with WSSC to provide a study of the 5,500 acres of buffer land immediately surrounding the reservoirs related to how erosion and other factors on those lands affect the water quality in the reservoirs.

EA is also holding these public meetings to fulfill their contract, but the meetings are more of an albatross around EA's neck than any real part of the study. Nothing said here tonight or last night will have any real serious impact of the findings of the scientific findings that EA does in their study. Don't misunderstand. I think the EA people are very nice and they are here listening to us. Quite simply, WSSC is extremely deficient in the way they deal with and treat recreational users of the reservoirs. These meetings which have no impact on the findings of the study are just more proof of that.

I personally believe that WSSC sees them as a way to placate recreational users and rationalize any kind of new restriction they chose to put in place whether it has any effect on water quality or not. Preserving and improving water quality in the reservoirs is a goal that can be peacefully and successfully coexist with recreational use. It happens every day with fewer restrictions than WSSC imposes at hundreds of other reservoirs across the country.

Recreational users want to work with WSSC to make it happen here, but we need someone on the other end who is listening.

WSSC can't, if they can't say their way clear to listen to the needs and work with recreational users, if they continue to be less than open, honest and forthcoming with the recreational use community, then kayakers, fishermen, hunters, equestrians, hikers and dog walkers alike need to unite and take this discussion to the authorities that WSSC is accountable to. Fortunately, a simple internet search yields several models of how that can be successfully accomplished. It certainly would be a lot easier and more cost effective for both sides to work together. You know, come up with a plan that works for everybody, WSSC and the recreational users.

Certainly we need to protect the water quality, but it can be done in ways that encourage even more recreational use by the surrounding communities than WSSC currently allows. Maintaining and improving water quality is not contingent upon imposing more restrictions. Water quality and recreational use are not mutually exclusive goals. Thank you.

MS. SMET: All right. Debby Poole, as I mentioned earlier is speaking on her own behalf, but also is reading comments from Ainslee Sadler who was unable to attend tonight. So Bill will give her due time for both speakers.

MS. POOLE: And I'm not going to rush as much tonight. Everybody said, I couldn't understand. First of all, I just want to thank the league for having us. It's a great building, really enjoyed it. The building here is really nice. I appreciate them having us here. I also want to say in both meetings WSSC has been here. I think you had five or six here last night, and there are several here tonight. So WSSC is here and they're listening.

And, I also am so excited that we have the boaters and kayakers and everything, because let me tell you, the equestrians last year, we went to so many commissioner meetings. We were on TV. We sent letters, letters, letters, letters. I mean, we really tried to get the word out to you guys, and I'm so thankful that you finally got it. You know, I don't know why we couldn't connect with you guys last year, but I'm really thankful that you understand, you know, what's happening and you're with us.

A couple of things I want to say before I actually get on my notes was one, when Mr. Webb was talking about the access areas, I've been to his place and literally the gate to his, back of his farm, you open it and you reach the bridle trails. And he had a written deed or easement or whatever from WSSC that he was allowed to do that. They had it for all those years, and from what I understand, they never got a letter that said you had to stop using it. So

2.

that's the kind of thing that's been a little hurtful with the communication of all this.

So, if you want to know what the actual trail entrances look like or the whatever, yeah, trail entrances, the little pamphlets that were given out by EA and WSSC on the back table lists those. So you drive around and see where you think you would want to take your truck and trailer to park it to get to the bridle trails. You can't do it on almost all of them. And I buffer the trail, so I'm lucky I don't have to trailer anywhere to get on mine.

I wanted to mention one thing too before I start is that it's kind of confusing. If you go on a lot of the entrances you will see that the big old wood signs that say it is absolutely illegal to ride on the fire break are right next to the brand new blue signs that say, you can ride on them now. And they're calling them the access road. So, it is still confusing. The pamphlets are still a little confusing.

The deer population. Riders are not against hunting and managed deer hunts. They go on all over the place. The days are put on a calendar. You understand that there's going to be deer hunts. You don't go riding those days. We agree. The deer, they impact the trails, the erosion, and the cars. I mean, we just, all get that deer, you know, is a problem. All that. So, anyway, the managed

deer hunts we're good with that.

The one lady, I don't think she's here anymore, that mentioned about the WSSC man that drowned. I think actually he was picking up a deer during the deer hunt. I don't think it was trash. But, I just wanted to correct that. And as far as shortening the season, we're with you boaters. Having to stop early November in the most beautiful time of the year with the fall colors is just, it's a killer.

Okay, so I'm going to start. Hello, my name is Debby Poole, owner and operator of BelCo Horse Farm since 1968. I've been asked to speak to you today on behalf of the well over one thousand equestrians, business people and land owners who have expressed their concern about WSSC (1) closing their equestrian trails, moving riding to unsuitable access road, banning winter riding and closing previously approved individual barn entrances, as well as changes to other recreational activities, fishing, boating, picnicking, etcetera. We are very interested in progress in resolving any problem areas. We would like to reinforce our desire to work with WSSC and make the equestrian trail and other areas environmentally sound.

I want to say too that, we were talking about how much the EA study is, and we equestrians last year took to the commissioners at WSSC this offer, during the interim of

broader watershed study or perhaps to work along with EA Engineering Science and Technology Group, we would like to again offer free and expert trail assessment and plans for rerouting if necessary, by Prince George's County environmental experts from the Soil Conservation District Office. These individuals, Steve Darcy and Eileen Beard, are certified trail masters. They're very committed to environmental land use, environmental assessments of horse farms. They do the nutrient plans that every farm, horse farm has to have. You have to turn in, you know, your soil samples and that kind of stuff.

They have offered to come out to assess WSSC's equestrian trails and access roads in both Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, determining where riding is or is not environmentally harmful, and how the preferred route can be improved. And so this was free. This was offered for free to kind of do what I think you guys are going to be doing, because if you're not doing the outer stuff, then you're basically, they would be doing what you're doing, the maps and the, you know, that kind of thing.

Just so you know, for me personally, my children are the fifth generation Pooles to ride these trials which have changed very little in all these years. Great Grandpa Poole sold his land at the end of Crumb Road to the WSSC.

So, I would say we would certainly be aware of the original

bridle trails and the changes that might have occurred over the last, you know, he was 1905, so a long time before WSSC ever was there. And they, you know, in fact, remain pretty much the same. Where as the deer population and the impact they have is a serious ever changing problem.

Okay. Mrs. Sadler moved from Bethesda to, she also kind of buffers the property, in 1969. My name is Ainslee Sadler and I live in Burtonsville, Maryland. I have lived in closed proximity to the Rocky Gorge Reservoir for a number of years. Over the years my family have both used the riding trails and assisted with maintaining those trails. Approximately 10 years ago I began to see a decrease in patrols and/or maintenance of the entire watershed to include recreation areas, horse trails and fishing areas. I have discovered many cross drainage culverts which are washed out and impassable due to lack of maintaining.

These culverts are located throughout the watershed and allow streams to move from one side of the fire break to the other without crossing the surface. For many years these culverts were being properly maintained and allowed watershed operations to continue and no erosion was taking place. However, once maintenance of these culverts stopped, erosion took place and debris built up causing collapse of the fire break roadways. For reasons unknown,

the WSSC then moved the horseback riding from the well established and maintained horse trails to these dangerous eroded and washed out fire breaks.

To date I have not seen any documented evidence of damage to the watershed, water quality, or habitat caused by horses who trail ride alone on the original designated bridle trail. In closing, we need to make every effort to control erosion to our watershed but moving the horse trails to an area already in desperate need of repair was not the solution. I am asking for the trails to be reopened and corrective action to be taken to update the watershed regulations. Thank you. Mrs. Ainslee Sadler and Family.

MS. SMET: We're about 10 minutes 9. I have three remaining speakers on my list, so we're going to ask those folks to speak and then I'll follow up to see if there are additional folks that I may have missed who would like to speak. So my next three are Ann Coles, Ron Polniaszek and Linda Mishler. Ann? Oh yes, you were giving riding lessons.

MS. COLES: Yeah, that's right. Hi, my name is
Ann Coles, and I'm the owner/operator of Greystone Farm in
Brookeville. I've been in the horse riding stables business
for over 40 years in Montgomery County. I've been a
longstanding part of the horse community and I've watched
and been personally impacted by development in our area.

2.

And, as I've listened to everyone else tonight, I was thinking, well, I could just say a little bit more. I don't have a lot here but, my personal feeling about the development and the lake, in the 1990's I worked with the Maryland National Park and Planning Commission when they developed my side which is the Tridelphia, and they had put in this, you know, huge plan to develop, you know, 300 homes. I mean, they were just going to stuff them in and you know, the people that lived in the area came and said, you know, you can't do this. This is, you know, you're going to have septics right on the lake and at least in Howard County, that county seemed to have been a little better about that, so we actually by our input did have less development and did not have, you know, the septics right up against the lake.

But they did ask me at the time, you know, while I've been riding there, you know, for decades and you know to go ahead and map out the trails and so forth. So I did that. But, to be honest with you, you know, the trail ended up being running alongside two yards and, you know, people would have their dogs run out and you know, it just changed for us. It really did. We don't feel very safe to cross the road and ride. And I did notice tonight that they didn't have the equestrian trails on the little map that they gave us. But they should have been there because I was

the one that designated those trails and I did work with Naomi Mandress in the 1990's. She was in charge of the equestrian trails and, in fact, did a lot of trying to link the trails together. And it isn't very forthcoming, not really. And, it is a shame.

The horse community is a vital part of our society here in Maryland. Without exercise for our horses, we really just can't continue. Horses are large animals, they need a lot of exercise. Horses help people in many ways. A lot of the stuff is, you know, has been said before now, physically and therapeutically. It's proven by many programs that are offered to the public. So it really would be a great loss if we cannot, you know, continue.

So, please be aware of this important move. To keep all trails open year round to riders who are generally very good stewards of the land that they are permitted to ride on. Also, it is a well known fact to most equestrians that ATV and other motorized vehicles are the major source of erosion problems, not the horses. Horses have been used for centuries for logging, as did Grandpa Poole and so forth, and farming in sensitive areas because they did not cause soil problems or pollution. Thank you very much.

MR. POLNIASZEK: Hi, my name is Ron Polniaszek.

I'm here I guess in two aspects. One, I'm a property owner.

I have a lot between Nicholas Cove and Pigtail. And mostly

here on behalf of the Howard Bird Club, and also the Audubon Society of Central Maryland. The Audubon Society of Central Maryland uses the property once a year thanks to WSSC allows us access. We do a survey, Christmas bird survey. We walk the fire road from one end of the reservoir to the other. The Howard Bird Club does a three times a year bird survey, as part of their breeding bird survey census. They do it in the Spring, in Fall and also Winter. The only impact we have is basically to walk the fire road on one day at each survey.

As we walked through the property we noticed that the landscape has changed a great deal since we started 20 years ago. The lush under story is now gone. It's been replaced primarily with spice bush and ferns. The breeding birds that use the ground cover for nesting, the oven birds, the vieries, the worm eating warblers, birds of that nature, Kentucky Warblers, they're all gone from the reservoir or in very reduced numbers.

Living next to the reservoir I've also noticed that when I moved into the lot 25 years ago, every spring there was a big cover of under story. You couldn't see more than 50 feet away the under story was so lush. Now it's totally gone. You can see through the woods. The browse line on all the trees are cut off. The height of the deer. There are times when I've seen as much as 44 deer walk

across my property in the morning, in the afternoon. At the very least I see 12 deer a day. I've watched total families of deer grow up. The deer are very smart. Every time there's a managed hunt, they go close to the houses. They're not stupid. They know where the safe zones are.

There is a 300 foot exclusion zone where you can't hunt at all, but that's where all the deer are. And they just have to hear the first shot and bango, they're right there against the house. And they don't move, you know, you sort of kind of shag them away. I've had deer tick, Lymes Disease three times, my wife has had it three times. And the deer tick population, we never have to worry about walking any where along the property because the deer are just so out of hand.

My suggestion, again, is very brief. I think there has to be more managed hunts. There has to be some way to call the deer. I mean its fine to say a hundred deer, but there's still 600 deer left. And each of these deer, there's no deer being born every year. This morning I just saw a couple of fawns. You need to sort of monitor the amount of deer there are still left and somehow go after them.

I think the property owners are all in the same boat. Their landscaping is being eaten. The deer sort of spend the day in the reservoir property. I live next to

- Tridelphia. In the morning and the afternoon they walk through and go and browse on the lawns during the evenings. Again, I just, the only point I'm trying to make here is the landscape is greatly changing in the reservoir. Some study has to be made of the natural forestation. This area is too valuable for migrating birds. There's a great reduce in population of birds and it's getting worse, and it's not getting any better, and we don't seem to be doing anything to change that. That's all I have to say.
- MR. GUNDERMAN: Excuse me. Can I make a statement real quick before the next speaker?
- 12 MS. SMET: Real quick.
  - MR. GUNDERMAN: I have a petition about the season that I started last year, having it reinstated to what it had been forever, about March and December and sunrise and sunset. I would appreciate it if everybody signs it. Thank you.
  - MS. SMET: All right. We had comments by Linda Mishler, who's not here, but you are going to give them on her behalf. And then after these comments I have Barbara Boyds who needs to speak.
  - MS. EUBANKS: Hello, my name is Kim Eubanks and I'm a local teacher and an avid kayaker, and I use the reservoir all the time. But I'm actually speaking on behalf of Linda Mishler who could not be here tonight. And so, I'm

reading this letter, you know, as if she wrote it. Or she did write it. It says, thank you for this opportunity to speak. It seems to me that there has been an adequate number of detailed responses addressing the interest and use of the WSSC properties by various recreational groups. I, myself, am an avid kayaker and hiker, but after listening and researching, I'm not sure that the issue at hand is really the impact of recreational users upon the WSSC properties.

She is afraid that the WSSC has a specific agenda that includes precluding and/or limiting recreational use of the properties, not because they are causing damage but rather because they are convenient excuse or scapegoat for their plans. I say this for two reasons. First, the study that is being done regarding silt accumulation and damaging run off impacting the areas is not inclusive all reasonable and probable causes. It appears to be solely focused on recreational activities that are in fact the most minimal cause of such ecological damage.

In her opinion, this will result in a skewed and incomplete survey. The survey will not answer the question of environmental protection at all. Secondly, the WSSC has not tried to work with the recreational users in a constructive manner. In fact, these recreational users are a tremendous asset to the WSSC in that they embody a large

group of ecologically minded people who have been and would be continuing to be advocates to preserve the WSSC properties.

There are many hands that make light work. What a waste to disregard such a dedicated populace of who undoubtedly donate many hours of uncompensated time in the effort to preserve the WSSC grounds were they treated as partners rather than as enemies. It seems only logical to her that if you were trying to really solve the problem, you would tap into such an obvious resource not ignore or ignite it.

The second point that she would like to make is that by fragmenting the different groups, recreational users and specific interest groups, boaters, fishermen, equestrians, hikers, etcetera, they're weakening our voice. She thinks we need to unite and attempt to discover what the real agenda is here so that we as a group can pull together and make an impact together. All of us have an enormous stake in this and she and I would hate to see our energy spent defending the minimal impact of our recreational use if the powers to be are really not interested in that recreational impact beyond having it as an excuse to further their hidden agenda. So, thank you on Linda Mishler's behalf.

MS. SMET: Barbara?

MS. BOYDS: Good evening. I think you've had a lot of response from the citizens and the people -- talk a little bit louder -- I am not a speaker at all but, let's work together is what I would like to say.

In 1980 was a grand opening of an equestrian trail at the WSSC, the official as long with Paul Hancock, I don't know if you remember him, and TROT designed and cut trails through Burtonsville, through Tucker Land Road and Ashton, and probably further in Maryland. After 30 years, over 30 years of the use of the trails, there is very, very limited erosion. The trails are in excellent shape. And I'm sure that you've found that when you went through these trails and walked through there.

Equestrians have always maintained these trails from trash and debris, and put them, you know, and kept them open. The WSSC even named a few trails, one trail which goes under 29, that was called the Pat Oliva Trail, and the signs are still there. Another trail, Terry Ledley, over there by Mr. and Mrs. Webb's area. These signs are still posted. Let's work together and please let's continue to work together and keep our precious WSSC trails and the waters and everything else for us to protect them and to use them. That's all I have to say. And thank you.

MS. SMET: Are there additional folks in the room who would like an opportunity to speak that haven't had that

opportunity yet? All right. Seeing none, I'll just make a 1 2 few concluding remarks. First, I want to sincerely, we sincerely appreciate everybody's time tonight, all your well 3 thought out comments, your written comments. Again, a reminder that if anyone wants to provide additional comments in writing, we'd like to get those by July 19th at this web 6 7 address, e-mail address or this mailing address. As we said before, we have audio recorded, a transcription will be available. We have taken notes on the flip charts, and we'll be preparing a meeting summary. 10 11 Those documents as well as copies of the sign-in 12 sheets from both meetings will be available on WSSC's 13 website. So, I think that's it and we'll just adjourn the 14 meeting. (Whereupon, at 9:07 p.m., the meeting was 15 16 concluded.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

 $\underline{\lor}$  Digitally signed by Keena Lukacinsky

## ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the foregoing pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the matter of:

Patuxent Reservoirs Watershed Protection Study

Kota in the second seco

Keena Lukacinsky

June 27, 2012