Watershed Advisory Committee Meeting  
December 9, 2015

Location: Gerwig Lane, CA Maintenance Facility, Large Conference Room


Meeting called to order at 7:10 pm.

Brian England: Allan Klein and Dick Bolton say we should be clear about what our recommendations to the board are, and pass them in a formal procedure, and get them up to the board in clear form. Someone from the board will be present at future meetings.

Agenda Approved

Minutes of October 14th meeting Approved

Resident Speakout: Elaine says farewell, thanks us for our attention and says we’re doing a nice job.

Bob Grossman introduces himself. Just finished watershed stewards academy, and is planning on working on putting together a rainbarrel presentation for Dorsey Hall village board. I should add him to the WAC google group rbtgross@gmail.com [Done]

Bob Moynihan is a retired engineer who worked on mostly stormwater issues in New Hampshire

Manager’s Report: Wilde Lake Barn bioretention facility is complete; they are now working on signage. Bids for Dobbin Rd bioretention came in high, but John’s got the county to pay for half if we take care of permitting. Update on watershed brochure for new residents is in process. Working on keeping tone positive and not too rule-based. Balance of emphasis on open space for wildlife and for human use. Working on education about ponds, algae, broad spectrum of use. Complicated discussion of fishing rules at Wilde Lake. New Business- improvements at Dannon Garth: Veg management will be out there for a while, but otherwise it’s pretty much done. Wading Spring in Long Reach is now top priority – there is a problem with the outflow pipe. The pond has a big berm with houses below, so there’s a safety issue. John found recorded easements on the plats, indicating that the county might have partial responsibility for maintaining this dam. John’s sent the easement deeds, etc. to County, with a letter indicating
that it’s the County’s obligation to fix the dam. We expect to hear something from the County’s Law Division pretty soon. CA Counsel will defend CA’s position, in case a court hearing is required.

A new Wilde Lake BR facility in Running Brook is the 2017 CA budget.

The CA has received order from County to remove sediment from pond off Pushcart in OM. That pond has an active 45 acre watershed. Outfall from pond was rebuilt in 2001. No drainage easement shows up on any plat that John’s found.

Village Updates

Wilde Lake: CARES committee wants to have a community meeting to talk about fishing & other lake-related issues. Details to come from Rhoda.


Hickory Ridge: WAC Meetings continue, new members. Hoping to have John come and talk about water features in new Park across from Giant. But plans are in doubt because of changing park/housing layout issues. Village requests Deborah to meet with county to understand what’s going on with the Howard County watershed assessment.

Long Reach Rethinking about community identity, etc. The county’s going to put out an RFP to replan the village center. Tim is aiming to have a charter meeting for the Long Reach WAC. Dannon Garth, Jackson Pond, Wading Spring will be on the agenda early.

Oakland Mills nothing to say

Harper’s Choice Working on a sustainability committee for HC. Jeremy points out that loss of stormwater utility fee is a big loss for stormwater policy in the county. As it stands money is less than half of what’s needed to meet TMDL standards.

King’s Contrivance Alan Pflugrad wrote in to say that the Village WAC has:

● Wrote several letters to County Exec and council in support of the Storm Water Remediation Fee.
● Briefed the WSA HOA Partnership Program at the Maryland Water Quality Monitoring Conference
● KC Environment Committee:
  ○ Village Cleanup 10/24
  ○ requested CA provide Trash Cans between Village Center and HHS
  ○ requested HoCo Parks to brief committee on planned Patuxent Trail paving – set for 1/14/2016
- planning KC “walk with Ned Tillman” with CA in the spring 2016  (hopefully combined with a watershed education activity).

**New Business**

*County Assessment*

County whittled 800 initial sites down to 148 site reviews, hundreds of pages long. Report is here: [http://goo.gl/forms/EmswGvNifV](http://goo.gl/forms/EmswGvNifV)  $220 million for the 148 projects over 10 years. John adds that county has already come to CA offering to do watershed improvements on Lilac lane, Cradlerock & Homespun, and 5th District VFD outfalls stabilization.

Deborah moves that we recommend to the CA Board that they:

**Request the Howard County DPW to include a number of the watershed remediation projects on CA property in the current county budget request, and in future budget requests for the duration of the program, and support the budget request with testimony relevant to these projects.**

Passed.

Justification:

148 watershed remediation capital projects were identified and prioritized in the recent Assessment of the Howard County portions of the Little and Middle Patuxent watersheds. Of these projects 75% were on private property including the attached list of projects on CA property. The county needs these projects to be completed to meet the TMDL requirements of the state and EPA for water quality. Funds from the county watershed utility fee and/or general fund will be used to implement these projects. CA may need to provide the county with some easement rights to enable them to contract/perform implementation and maintenance of the projects.

If the county funds these projects

- CA is alleviated of the financial burden to correct these issues
- will benefit from the resulting improvements and
- can use the funds it would have spent on these projects to carry out other watershed remediation to retain water where it falls.

**Resolution that the WAC recommend to the CA Board that they oppose the repeal of the Stormwater Utility Fee.**

Passed.

**Meeting Adjourned at 8:30 pm.**

MOTION voted on and approved by the Watershed Advisory Committee:

Recommend to the CA Board that they
Oppose the repeal of the Stormwater Utility (Watershed Protection) Fee by Howard County.

JUSTIFICATION:

- The Stormwater Utility Fee, known as the Watershed Protection Fee provides a dedicated fund for the County to use to implement the 148 watershed remediation capital projects that have been identified and prioritized in the recent Assessment of the Howard County portions of the Little and Middle Patuxent watersheds.
- Repealing the enabling legislation for the Watershed Protection Fee will mean stormwater projects will have to compete with Education, Public Safety and any other priority in the County for money from the General Fund.
- The General Fund is funded with tax revenues and bonds used for Capital projects are paid for through tax revenue so in essence repealing the Fee just swaps a dedicated fee for a general tax if in fact the revenue levels are to be maintained.
- The County needs these projects to be completed to meet the TMDL requirements of the State and EPA for water quality.
- If the county is able to fund the current list of proposed projects
  - CA is alleviated of the financial burden to correct these issues,
  - Columbia’s residents will benefit from the resulting improvements and
  - CA can use the funds it would have spent on these projects to carry out other watershed remediation to retain water where it falls.