

## Ashokan Watershed Stream Management Program (AWSMP)

**What:** Highway Superintendents Working Group Meeting

**When:** February 3, 2010, 9-11:00am

**Where:** AWSMP Office, Phoenicia, NY

**Next Meeting:** March timeframe – discuss Best Practices

<b>Present:</b>	John Farrell	Doug DeKoskie
	Jake Wedemeyer	Dan Davis
	Deron Davis	Eric Hofmeister
	Mike Reynolds	Cory Ritz
	Adam Doan	Jim Fugel
	Elizabeth Higgins	Clyde Russell

### 1. Check In / Welcome / Introductions

- Recognized the limited attendance of the previous meeting, and thanked all in attendance today. Cory reviewed the previous two meetings.

### 2. Review of High Priority Sites

- CCE Funding Review

Liz reviewed the Tier levels with review of the evaluation scoring criteria and advised that the towns are encouraged to review and submit applications for the Tier II funding levels of <25000, for such items as culverts and ditch maintenance, or leverage the funding for match in other grant proposals.

The need for additional engineering services available to municipalities was discussed along with the constraints of problems on private property. Liz stated that issues located in the watershed that affect public safety and infrastructure should be noted and brought forward. CCE and SWCD will work with the private landowners to secure their participation and secure any needed sustainability releases and agreements.

The Mini-Grant program was also presented as a resource for municipalities to apply for up to \$5000 in funding for Conferences and Training opportunities relating to stream management and water quality enhancement. Trainings conducted at Cornell was discussed as well as conducting tours of BMP projects.

- Project Review Committee

Cory discussed with the group the role and process of the 10% design review committee. A Town of Shandaken project “Fawn Hill” was used as an example of the 10% design phase. This project is one of 5 projects submitted to FEMA. Drawings of the plans were reviewed. The minimum standard of 25 year storm was reviewed along with all of the stream data available for this site. The design will utilize a higher 50-100 year storm construction. Dan suggested that all plan proposals include a summary of the historical problems if any and how it affects the NCD and its cause, which should then dictate what solution you are

proposing along with presentation of several alternative solutions. Adam suggested that this project also be reviewed for possible vegetation remediation to possibly remove some of the seepage from above the road.

Daron outlined the USDA EWP program limits for fixing and repairing specific sites, and the limitations to replace only what was there previously, no modifications or improvements or assessment of reaches upstream or downstream can be done with EWP funding. That is where this program best benefits the process.

Discussion regarding provision for maintenance for repairs in both the timeline of requesting extensions to DEC permits and the contingency of funding reserve.

### **3. Best Management Practices (BMP's) for Road and Stream Interactions**

- Discussed the proposal of the county to the municipalities of exchange of maintenance on roads in exchange the county would replace bridges. Several bridges were reviewed as potential “pinch’ points in the stream and or designs where a center support structure was causing channel modification.
- Adam mentioned the upcoming Bio Engineering workshop, April 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> to the group, a two day workshop where alternatives in vegetative stabilization are taught.
- Michael outlined the Ashokan Watershed Summit, May 1st, at Belleayre, sessions and speakers.

#### **Next Steps:**

- Cory and Jimmy Fugel to review his projects in February
- Discuss solutions for work on private property