Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan
Meeting Minutes
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting 6: June 21, 2013

The sixth meeting of the Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) was held at the Metedeconk River Yacht Club on Friday June 21, 2013 between 10:00 AM and 1:00 PM. A copy of the meeting agenda and sign-in sheet is attached.

Robert Karl, Project Manager for BTMUA, opened the meeting saying its intent is to mark the end of the planning phase of the project and start of the implementation phase. He thanked the Metedeconk River Yacht Club and Commodore Colette Commisso for allowing the use of their facility for the meeting. He then introduced BTMUA Chairman Allan Cartine and invited him to make some opening remarks. In his remarks, Mr. Cartine briefly discussed the importance of water resource management to address problems caused both by natural forces, such as Superstorm Sandy, and the human population, and the role the Metedeconk watershed plan will have in the sound management of the Metedeconk River and BTMUA's water supply. Mr. Karl asked the attendees to introduce themselves, and then introduced Ms. Kyra Hoffmann, Project Manager for NJDEP, and invited her to make some opening remarks. Ms. Hoffmann briefly discussed the grant-funded project and the expected improvements in Metedeconk River water quality that will result, which translate to the health of the Barnegat Bay. She noted that, in terms of planning area, it is one of the largest watershed restoration plans to be completed in the State. She acknowledged the importance of the stakeholders' involvement for both the plan development and its implementation.

Mr. Karl provided a brief overview of the project, discussing its intent, funding sources, planning area, and requirements that the plan be prepared in accordance with USEPA's *Handbook for Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters*. The various project tasks and meetings that have taken place through the planning process were briefly reviewed. Activities by the project team since the last stakeholder meeting in April 2012 were summarized, including the public comment period on the draft plan and subsequent revisions, meetings with municipalities to gather additional local-priority implementation projects, meetings/presentations with NJDEP, and plan review by both NJDEP and USEPA.

Mr. Karl announced formal plan approval was received from NJDEP on May 23, 2013, and acknowledged the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) for its support and commitment to the project. The SAC along with the Steering Committee and Education & Outreach Committee were vital to the success of the project. The plan is based upon the input of a diverse and representative group of watershed interests. It is built on consensus and is broadly supported, which will help secure successful plan implementation.

There has been considerable public interest in the Metedeconk plan. Presentations were given this spring at the New Jersey Environmental Federation Annual Conference at Georgian Court University and the New Jersey Water Environment Association Annual Conference in Atlantic City, and both were well

received. There have also been some awards for the plan. BTMUA was presented the Guardian of the Bay Award by the Barnegat Bay Partnership and the Clamdigger Award by the Ocean County Freeholders last summer. More recently, this past spring BTMUA accepted a Wave Award in the Forward Thinking Category from the NJ Association of Environmental Authorities.

Mr. Greg Auriemma asked about how the plan addresses the tremendous growth anticipated in Lakewood Township. Mr. Karl responded that, as was discussed at the start of the planning process, our plan is not a growth management plan. All indications are that Lakewood is going to grow, and the additional development that occurs will need to be built to properly manage stormwater, maintain groundwater recharge, and avoid water quality degradation. Fortunately, Lakewood Township has been a very active partner in the planning process and is supportive of the plan. Mr. Karl turned the presentation over to Mr. Dan O'Rourke, Project Manager for CDM Smith, to provide a brief overview of the watershed plan.

Mr. O'Rourke provided a general overview of the condition of the watershed and the main problems, citing various water quality impairments and site-specific examples. As documented within the Metedeconk plan, stormwater is the primary cause of many of the issues within the watershed. Although overall water quality is holding despite increases in impervious cover, it is degrading with regard to various constituents as defined by TMDLs and 303(d) List impairments that have been identified throughout the watershed. Nitrogen concentrations at the BTMUA intake, although still excellent with regard to drinking water standards, have exceeded 1 mg-N/L and are generally between 0.5 and 1.0 mg-N/L, which may be problematic to Barnegat Bay. In addition, phosphorous concentrations are generally below the surface water quality criteria for streams, but quite often are at or near the surface water quality criteria for lakes.

Mr. O'Rourke went on to summarize the six primary management strategies for the Metedeconk watershed:

1. Retrofit existing stormwater detention basins
2. Install structural BMPs at existing direct discharge outfalls, where feasible
3. Implement source control and flow path BMPs (runoff reduction at the source) and utilize the treatment train approach
4. Resource conservation and protection
5. Strengthen stormwater management ordinances for more low impact development
6. Aggressive watershed education and outreach

The numerous watershed-related reports/studies that have been developed by various organizations throughout the past 15 years should be referenced and utilized to the fullest extent. For example, priority parcels for conservation identified by the Trust for Public Land and University of Massachusetts should be coordinated with municipal open space preservation programs. In addition, detention basins identified by the Rutgers Stormwater Management Planning Tool (SWMPT) as potential restoration projects should be targeted for early retrofits.

More than 90 projects have been identified by the stakeholders and are listed in the plan. Prioritization of subwatersheds and individual projects was based on stakeholder priorities. During the fourth Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting, the stakeholders were polled and results indicated that water quality improvements and runoff reduction were most important for watershed restoration. Therefore, each subwatershed was prioritized based on the number of water quality impairments within each (as listed on the 303(d) List) as well as the amount of urban land and impervious cover. The highest priority

watersheds were NB2, NB5 and SB5. Although more than 90 projects have been identified to date, there are a lot more which need to be identified through the implementation of the plan, presumably by the Metedeconk River Watershed Implementation Committee.

Mr. Karl announced that at this point he was calling the planning phase of the project "completed" and the meeting was shifting to an implementation phase "kickoff" meeting. He proceeded to discuss the need to maintain the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, no longer as a planning committee but now as an implementation committee, to oversee the process over the long-term. It will be important to convene on some regular schedule to discuss, coordinate and prioritize things like projects, funding and education and outreach programs.

A total of ~$1.2 Million in funding has been secured for the immediate implementation of high-priority projects that are identified in the plan. Specifically, $466,000 is available from the current grant, plus BTMUA was just awarded an additional $700,500 319(h) grant from NJDEP. Stan Hales noted that there may be opportunities to achieve some implementation objectives through Hurricane Sandy recovery efforts and funding that becomes available.

A new Metedeconk watershed website is under development, which will be the main "go to" portal for information on the Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan. An early version of the website was brought up for a demonstration. The website address/URL will be distributed to the stakeholders shortly.

Public education & outreach will be a critical, if not the most important, part of plan implementation. A very comprehensive program has been developed by the Education & Outreach Committee which targets both the general watershed audience and specific groups, such as municipalities and landscapers. Education and outreach programs will also be targeted to the communities around stormwater BMP projects. Presentations will be made to municipal planning and zoning boards, as recommended by the SAC. Water quality monitoring will also be conducted, in accordance with the Quality Assurance Project Plan, to evaluate long-term trends and progress towards meeting water quality objectives.

Mr. Karl noted that the highest priority implementation project identified by the SAC was the creation of a Metedeconk watershed-specific model stormwater management ordinance that identifies preferred stormwater BMPs, strengthens the use of Low Impact Development (LID) design practices, and addresses the need for better long-term maintenance of stormwater management facilities. It is anticipated that this model ordinance will be developed with the available grant funding early in the implementation process. Ms. Lisa Auermuller noted that a model stormwater ordinance alone as a tool may not be enough and additional education, training or other materials may be required to go along with the ordinance so people understand what their options are when looking at low impact design. Mr. Karl added that some towns have indicated they would appreciate having an ordinance developed, particularly one that addresses long-term maintenance concerns and can withstand challenges. With all of the towns having participated in the planning process, we are hopeful that if everything in the ordinance was not palatable to a given town, at least some elements would be and they can take an 'a la carte' approach. Mr. Karl turned the presentation over to Mr. O'Rourke to review the five (5) conceptual designs prepared for the project, cautioning the group that these designs have not yet been finalized or reviewed by the municipalities/property owners and, as such, are subject to change.

Mr. O'Rourke went on to discuss the conceptual designs that have been developed. Prior to discussing each project, Mr. O'Rourke made a general statement that the costs were developed assuming a private contractor was doing the construction and that a conservative approach was taken with costs since the designs are only at a conceptual planning level and there are still many unknowns that need to be determined. Major uncertainties include the depth to seasonal high water table at each of the project sites as well as a lack of as-built drawings and detailed surveys. Drainage areas were determined using LiDAR topographic data, but need to be verified with drawings if possible. In addition, although not addressed in the conceptual designs, TMDLs need to be implemented. Ms. Auermuller inquired about the design storm used for the conceptual designs, and brought up the possible need for a different design storm from what is currently being used as the standard in light of future climate changes and storm severity predictions for our region.

The five projects that were identified and selected for conceptual design were based on some of the higher priority sites that were identified in the Stream Visual Assessments. It was important that one or more components of each design be able to be implemented using funds available for Phase 2, Plan Implementation. As education and outreach is critical to the success of the Metedeconk plan, each of the five projects includes an education and outreach component. The five projects are as follows:

1. Moses Milch Drive in Howell – detention basin retrofit. Major uncertainties include the presence of a liner and underdrain system as per design drawings and the seasonal high water table. However, the BTMUA Watershed Division dug numerous test holes throughout the basin and determined that neither a liner nor the water table was present to a depth of 3.5 to 4 feet below the surface of the basin. Education and outreach materials would be distributed to the residents within the area.
2. Clinton Avenue Outfall in Lakewood – constructed wetland and source control. This 84-inch outfall discharges stormwater that is generated over approximately 200 acres in downtown Lakewood. The constructed stormwater wetland would be constructed near the end of the pipe within a utility right-of-way. The cost of this component would be too great for implementation using available Phase 2 funds. However, a source control component is also included which includes installing infiltration tree box filters (or other urban green stormwater infrastructure) and rain barrels throughout the drainage area. Major uncertainties for this project include the alignment/slope of the major outfall, water table elevation and land availability. Education and outreach materials would be distributed to the residents within the area in addition to signage at the wetland.
3. Brick Plaza in Brick – pervious asphalt and rain gardens. This site presents a number of different opportunities for green stormwater infrastructure and has excellent potential for education and outreach. The projects identified in the conceptual plan are only samples of projects that can be completed at this site through a partnership with the owner (early discussions with the owner were positive). Education and outreach signage will be placed near the installed BMPs.
4. Arkansas Drive/Woodlane Road in Jackson – rain garden, pervious asphalt, soil decompaction and source control. A rain garden would be constructed at the eastern end of Woodlane Road to improve drainage at that location. A portion of the park area would be excavated to allow stormwater to be routed to the rain garden. Additionally, a portion or all of the parking lot adjacent to the athletic fields is proposed to be changed to pervious asphalt. The conceptual design includes the entire lot, although refinements can be made to reduce cost. Coordination with the town will be helpful so that if/when the parking lot is replaced or re-paved, it is constructed with pervious asphalt. The source control component includes rain barrels and tree filter boxes within the neighborhood around Arkansas Drive, but these should be constructed to

not allow infiltration (trees within an enclosed concrete casing). The tree boxes would provide filtration and treatment, but would not infiltrate the stormwater due to a shallow water table within the neighborhood (potentially localized perched condition). Education and outreach materials would be distributed to the residents in the area.

5. South Lake Drive in Lakewood – rain garden. A rain garden would be constructed within the open space/park area near the intersection of South Lake Drive and Hope Chapel Road. Education and outreach would consist of signage at the rain garden and materials distributed to the residents in the area. The major uncertainty with this project is the seasonal high water table elevation and condition of an existing 15-inch corrugated metal pipe which would serve as the discharge point for the under drain from the rain garden.

Mr. O'Rourke concluded the conceptual design discussion with a general statement that the costs and designs themselves are likely to change during design, but some components of all of the projects should be able to be implemented during Phase 2.

Mr. Karl offered some general conclusions regarding the implementation process. He noted that implementation will be a long process and the active involvement of the stakeholders will be very important. BTMUA will continue to serve a leadership role and spearhead implementation. However, he underscored that the plan does not belong to BTMUA or NJDEP or any one group or agency, but rather it belongs to all of the Stakeholders within the watershed. As such, everyone can/should implement elements of the plan as opportunities arise. Clemens Bremer (and others) questioned funding sources. Mr. Karl responded that the plan has a section that specifically discusses funding mechanisms but grants will be a primary means of funding, at least early on. With limited funding sources, it will be very important to build partnerships and leverage funding to get the most out of what is available. The Barnegat Bay Partnership is very good at facilitating that type of coordination. Finally, the plan will be "living document" with updates (particularly to Table 5-3) as projects are completed and new ones are identified, and the new Metedeconk website will be portal for status and updates.

The meeting was closed with all invited to enjoy lunch courtesy of BTMUA.

A copy of the PowerPoint presentation has been posted to the eRoom.

cc: Stakeholder Advisory Committee Distribution

Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

Metedeconk River Yacht Club

June 21, 2013

10:00 am – 1:00 pm

Agenda

10:00 – 10:15 am	Welcome and introductions
10:15 – 10:30 am	Overview/update of project tasks status
10:30 – 11:45 pm	Watershed plan implementation
11:45 – 12:00 pm	Discussion and next steps
12:00 – 1:00 pm	Lunch (courtesy of Brick Township MUA)

Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
June 21, 2013

SIGN-IN SHEET

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
1	Don Fiss Education	Save Barnegat Bay	610-217-3687	DonF4320@verizon.net
2	Richard Quigley	JTMUA	732-928-2222 x 244	RQuigley@jacksonmua.com
3	Lisa Auermuller	JCHEER	609-812-0049 x 204	auermuller@marinevillages.org
4	Michael J Hill	FSCM	732-683-8500	MHill@freeholdsoil.org
5	Britta Wenzel	SBB	732-830-3600	bwenzel@savebarnegatbay.org
6	Ron Bilger	USGS	609 771 3923	rbilger@usgs.gov
7	AG Auriemma	Sierra Club	732-451-9220	Sierraclubnjcc@aol.com
8	Mr & Mrs Carfine	BTMUA		
9	Moira Edge	VRC	732-966-7732	Eco.Warriors1@gmail.com
10	Paige Wootton	Georgian Court	732 987 2349	wootton@georgian.edu
11	Kathy Hagke	TPL	973-292-1100 x15	Kathy.Hagke@TPL.org
12	TMPB	Leigh Bailey	732-458-1711	TPB.LMB@verizon.net
13	David Sorensen	Monmouth County	732-431-7456	David.SorensenBco
14	Stan Hales	BBP	732-255-0472 x3	Shales@ocean.edu
15	Daniel Burke	Jackson Twp	732-928-1200	dburke@jacksontwpnj.net
16	Vidal Peccheneda	Ocean Co.	732-929-2054	vpeccheneda@co.ocean.nj.us
17	Kirk Moore	Asbury Park Press	609.709.5036	kmoore@NJPressmedia.com
18	Tara Paxton	Twp of Brick	732-262-4783	tpaxton@twpbrick.nj.us
19	Justin Hanslovan	~~justin~~ Lakewood	732.363-4422	justinf@lakewoodnj.com
20	Danielle Dankerskoor	NJDEP MUA	609-633-1441	danielle.dankerskoor@dep.state.nj.us
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
June 21, 2013

SIGN-IN SHEET

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
26	DAVID P. POLLISON	Foundation	732-456-0494	candd pollison @ comcast.net
27	Richard Berry	374 MLA	928 222) x201	DBERYS@OPTONLINE.NET
28	Vic Poretti	NJDEP/BFBM	609 292 0427	Victor.Poretti@dep.state.nj.us
29	Linda Brennen	Mon. Co. Planning	732-431-7460	linda.brennen@co.monmouth.nj.us
30	JIM LACEY	B.T.M.U.A	732-458-7000	
31	Elissa Cummins	Brick Twp	732-262-1040	ecummins@twp.brick.nj.us
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				

Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
June 21, 2013

SIGN-IN SHEET

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
51	CLEM BREMER	P.P. BEACH	732-892-3134	CJBREMER@BELLATLANTIC.NET
52	Bryanne McMillon	Ramapo College	609-513-7281	
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				
61				
62				
63				
64				
65				
66				
67				
68				
69				
70				
71				
72				
73				
74				
75				

Metedeconk River Watershed Protection & Restoration Plan
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
June 21, 2013

SIGN-IN SHEET

	Name	Affiliation	Telephone	Email
76	Andrew Gruna	Sierra Club	908-783-7271	Andrew.Gruna@gmail.com
77	Steve Specht	Black Utilities	732-458-7000	SPECHT@BRICKNJA.COM
78	Ernie Kuhlwein	OCOSWM	732-506-5047	ekuhlwein@co.ocean.nj.us
79	Kyra Hoffman	NJDEP	609-984-5863	kyra.hoffman@dep.state.nj.us
80	Christine Raab	OCSCD	609-971-7002	craabe@soildistricts.org
81	Jim Vasslides	BBP	732 914-8107	jvasslides@ocean.edu
82	JIM HERRMAN	HOWELL TWSP.	908-303-9338	jherrman@twp.howell.nj.us
83				
84				
85				
86				
87				
88				
89				
90				
91				
92				
93				
94				
95				
96				
97				
98				
99				
100				