

**INITIAL DRAFT
FINALIZED AND APPROVED 2/12/02**

Date: December 3, 2001
To: Members of the Rouge Project Steering Committee
From: Carolyn DuBose
Subj.: Rouge Project Memorandum - Steering Committee Meeting of November 27, 2001

The following initial draft memorandum of the Steering Committee Meeting of November 27, 2001 is provided for your review and comment. Please provide comments or corrections to Carolyn DuBose at the Wayne County Department of Environment, Tel. (313) 224-3785/Fax (313) 224-0045. All comments or corrections that are received will be incorporated into a general draft for review and approval at the next scheduled meeting. In the event no comments or corrections are received in advance of the meeting, this Initial Draft may be review and approved by the Committee.

Committee Members Present

Paul Tait	(Chair)	Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG)
Vyto Kaunelis	(alt)	Wayne County Department of Environment (WCDOE)
Thomas Biasell		City of Farmington Hills (Main 1-2)
Aaron Machnik		Canton Township (Lower 1)
James Anulewicz		Charter Township of Plymouth (Middle 1)
Kurt Heise	(alt)	City of Dearborn Heights (Middle 3)/(RRAC)
Robert Beckley		City of Livonia (Upper)
Dennis Dembiec		City of Birmingham
Don Russell		Ford Motor Company
Philip Sanzica	(alt)	Oakland County Drain Commission (OCDC)
Janis Bobrin		Washtenaw County Drain Commission (WCDC)
Paul Blakeslee		Mich. Dept. of Environmental Quality (MDEQ)

(alt)=alternate

Other Attendees

Kathleen Leavey	DWSD
Karen Shaw	TAI
Jim Graham	FOTR
Margie Synk	HRC
Amy Mangus	SEMCOG
Chuck Hersey	SEMCOG
Teresa Seidel	MDEQ-SWQD
Carl Johnson	CDM
Dale Bryson	CDM
Mindy Carr	ALMN
Noel Mullett	WCDOE
Barbara Farrah	WCDOE
Josephine Powell	WCDOE

Kelly Cave
Carolyn DuBose

WCDOE
WCDOE

I. Opening Remarks (Chair)

Paul Tait, Chair, SEMCOG, called the Rouge Project Steering Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.. Attendees introduced themselves and Mr. Tait welcomed everyone to the meeting. The summary notes from the previous meeting were approved; two additions to the agenda were added while key points of the discussion are summarized below.

II. Subwatershed Advisory Groups/Watershed Issues

Retreat Summary: Kelly Cave gave highlights from the recently held Rouge Watershed Permittees' retreat. She began by reminding the Committee of the purpose of the proposed retreat. She said the retreat would be held to assess where they are with the Rouge Project and to lay a foundation for the future. She said at the request of community members on the Steering Committee the retreat was limited to just those communities and agencies that have water pollution control permits in the Rouge.

She advised prior to the retreat, that a survey was sent out to those communities and agencies invited in order to get their input on four areas: 1) feedback on Wayne County's proposed grant criteria for the current round of funding and for the future; 2) the subwatershed management plans and how we can integrate them watershed wide; 3) watershed wide forum (what needs to be done with a group such as the steering committee to move into the future); 4) what kinds of services the communities and agencies think they need.

She informed the group the survey results were previously distributed and that the survey was used to frame the topics that were focused upon at the retreat. She said what resulted was 1) "what should be the structure and function of the watershed wide forum;" 2) "what are the shortfalls, if any, of the subwatershed management plans?;" 3) "how should Rouge River sampling and monitoring activities be modified to better support the SWPPIs and the watershed plans and the issue of services?;" 4) "how can technical and support needs be best met?"

Ms. Cave reported that there were 42 representatives from the communities and agencies. She said the turn out was great and explained how the three groups were organized for the retreat day.

Regarding the issue of the "watershed wide form" she read some of the things the group reached consensus on. They reached consensus on: 1) new name for Steering Committee; 2) voting membership limited to communities and agencies with permits; 3) membership should come with an obligation to provide monetary support for either an organization or for activities that need to be done. Ms. Cave reported that there was strong agreement that there should be a role for other stakeholders, such as state agencies, regional organizations, citizen groups, businesses and others. To encourage participation and input, they talked about the organization having its own staff to do certain things. They liked the general assembly concept similar to how SEMCOG is organized now.

She said that there were six functions that the group came to consensus on that this organization would do. One function was planning for water quality, quantity issues and monitoring in the watershed; 2) establishing priority for projects that relate to goals, targets and schedules; 3) providing advocacy at local, regional, state and federal level; 4) coordinating the activities and plans of the subwatershed advisory groups; 5) and 6) addressing regional concerns such as providing a forum to better coordinate with DWSD.

She said it was very obvious that there is a need for a group of people to work on a transition plan. Currently the structure now is with local units of government and swags and steering committees doing things and flushing out more of the functions,. How voting would happen and how much money such an organization might need and how it might be staffed is going to take some time. She said they are not quite sure what the name of the new group is; however, looking back at the notes it appears the name is "Drafting Committee." Jim Anuelwicz, the chair confirmed the name of the group is "draft committee." Kelly informed that a number of people volunteered to be on the group, representatives from the counties and the local communities. What they are going to do is try to put together an outline of the structure of a new watershed wide forum. They asked for two reports to be prepared to help them with that. The first report is to do a literature review of other organizations across the country that do this kind of thing and look at how they are organized. She advised that this was prepared already and about forty or fifty different organizations summarized services with two that seem to be good models for where to go. She said they also have a little report that summarizes the services that are currently provided by the project office which includes the consulting team and a lot of the functions that Wayne County do on behalf of the watershed. She advised this report would not be distributed because she wanted to share it with the committee first to see if that was the kind of information they are looking for. She said perhaps the report would be made available to others after the committee has had an opportunity to review it.

Jim Anuelwicz reported that on December 11, 2001 the group would hold an organizational meeting at the Plymouth Township, DPS building, located at 46555 Port Street. He said at this meeting the tasks and next steps would be outlined. Jim Anuelwicz reiterated that for those that were not there, they were not intentionally left out of the group. He said they simply wanted people to come together understanding that funding will probably run out to a great degree. He said it is very easy to talk when someone else is supplying the dollars. He said everyone recognizes the seriousness of this delimna; and knows that there is a core group that must come together and put the dollars up.

Kelly Cave said that she would add to what Jim Anuelwicz had said. She said she was encouraged that everybody thought that there was a lot of value in working together rather than just dissolving and going separate ways after the grant.

Chuck said that aside from discussing the summary that were two other things that needed to be talked about. He said the role of the present steering committee in the interim period needed to be discussed n and then secondly people that were not at the retreat or those who have thought of things since the workshop need to be given an opportunity to share things they think the

drafting committee needs to work on. He asked if it was the desire of the group to continue the steering committee in the interim period.

Jim Anuelwicz's said to abandon the current steering committee group at this time would not be a wise decision. He said he thinks that the Steering Committee should continue and progress and should there be a sense of urgency to adjust, they can always come back to the committee and make those suggestions. Tom Biasell said that a core group was still necessary and needed. Paul Tait reiterated where SEMCOG is concerning this matter. He said they want to be supportive wherever needed and virtually everyone around the table is a partner, however if there are changes in structure, SEMCOG will go with what makes sense.

Paul Blakeslee expressed from the State's perspective that they are delighted that the group is moving in the direction it is moving and planning for the future. He said when there may not be things/funds that have been relied on in the past for support it makes the steps the group is taking a very positive one.

Dennis Dembiec said that he agreed. He said the retreat helped to come up with a lot of great ideas and ways of bridging what is needed in order to move forward. He said he had some concerns because of revenue sharing cutbacks and higher sewer services and that staff people must be careful on how to do this.

Jim Anuelwicz said that if anybody has been in the position for more than three years that is an apparent issue to them. He said that ultimately whatever is decided, it is going to have to be brought back to the people who are going to have to say why.

Kurt Heise said part of his comments is that the October meeting should not be seen at all as some kind of anti-SEMCOG type of thing. He said that he sees the restructure as a mid-course correction since we know that we are coming to the end of a regulatory era. He said most everybody in the room have adopted a SWPPI and they know what they need to do for the next two years. He said a lot of the ground work has been taken care of and we need to now go and look beyond that. Mr. Heise said he thinks the Steering Committee group needs to still meet according to plan. He advised that the group needed to keep meeting because the drafting group was asked to have something put together within six months. He communicated the group is looking at the middle of next year before there will be anything anybody can agree on.

He said that the members of the drafting committee are not in agreement on every detail and that there are still a lot of internal things that need to be worked out. He said that he hopes the group can continue to work with SEMCOG to at least provide a forum to discuss issues. He said that he found it remarkable that there has only been one Rouge related hearing in front of Judge Feikens all year. He said that our willingness to explore a new institutional arrangement should not be seen as walking away from the table and he does not want the Judge to intervene. He said that the group is sensitive to that and he wanted everybody to know that the group is going to be coming back with something. He said the group needs to talk about new institutional arrangements that may be out there. He said there are a lot of good ideas that may be floating around in Oakland County and Wayne County that we need to look at; we have got to talk about funding, coordinated planning and start looking at that as a group. Kurt Heise said that the one

thing that he is concerned about is overlap with Judge Feikens' Water Quality Consortium. He said that entity is still out there and he is still not sure where the new steering committee is going to overlap with the water consortium or what exactly is the goal of the water consortium; how they differ and how they are similar. He said it would not be wise to have too many groups out there doing their own thing and possibly being at a cross purpose. He said maybe the water consortium can be molded together with the new group being put together. He summed up by saying that these are some of the institutional arrangements the group would like to look at within the next six months.

Chuck Hersey said it sounded to him that it had been answered clearly that the Steering Committee group should continue. He said that the third leg of the stool of discussion was the suggestion for the transition team. He said that he had a couple of suggestions to throw on the table. He said that in the regional plan when they were talking about watershed approaches and how to do this, the suggestion is try and distinguish between what happens at the local governments level, the subwatershed group and watershed levels. One suggestion is that the drafting committee look at the different issues on one column, i.e., storm water and sort of discuss which of the things in the column are strictly local government and does not belong in the subwatershed process and which of these things lend themselves to the subwatershed process and what lends themselves to more of a watershed wide coordination process. Sort of like developing a charge for the new group so that you will know which issues you are trying to grapple with on a watershed wide basis and what specifically you are trying to accomplish, for example sewer infrastructure issues might lend themselves more to watershed wide concerns.

Kurt Heise said that he thinks generating public interest for financing options is a key thing. He said he did not want to beat up on SEMOG's transportation plan, but that is the kind of thing that the group needs to do on a watershed level, that is to say that we have a \$26 Billion fee, what are we going to do about it and put it in the forefront.

Paul Tait said that as part of that there is still a fair amount of discussion on whether a transit tax ought to be a transit tax or an infrastructure tax. Given those needs and road needs in addition to the public transit there is a lot sentiment that there should be an infrastructure tax. And that is one of those issues that the consortium is looking at.

Informational Video: Proposed Ford Rouge Transformation: Don Russell, Ford Motor Company showed a video which was prepared by Bill McDunn & Partners, architectural firm working on the Rouge Project. He said McDunn & Partners are a visionary group and came up with a video which shows the transformation of the Rouge. What it looks like today and what the project may look like after reconstruction.

Round III Grant Funding: Carl Johnson, Rouge Program Office reported on Round III Grant funding to the communities. He reported that the past two rounds have been designed to support the general permit process with the development of the subwatershed management plans and the last two rounds

were to promote projects that were being fostered as a result of those plans. He said right now there are the Storm water pollution prevention initiatives (SWPPIs). He said basically the RPO wanted to wait until the SWPPIs were done so that each community could have them clearly

identified and once identified the Round III dollars could be used to support the beginning of the SWPPI activities. He said a draft notice was being put together for comments from the watershed stakeholders. He shared some of the key points from the draft notice.

He noted on page 2 RPO identified projects that are listed in the storm water pollution prevention short/long term projects, including recreation projects. He said that other eligible projects include water quality monitoring focusing on biological/habitat/recreation monitoring within a subwatershed itself. Specifically excluded from Round III is flow monitoring or water chemistry. He said changes would be coming from the flow monitoring projects. He said that planning and design of CSO control facilities, and design and construction of SSO projects, and planning and design of sanitary sewers, along with routine operation of public works departments are all things that will be moved beyond in the next round of grant funding.

Kurt Heise asked if funding included street sweeping. Carl Johnson said that a number of the SWPPIs have identified street sweeping as one of their programs. He advised if it is tied to the SWPPI there should be no problem, however not everything in the SWPPI can be funded but they will look at the criteria and take it back for discussion.

Kelly Cave made the point that funding is from the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration project and there is an obligation to EPA to demonstrate technology that will be used across the country; however, in the last couple rounds of proposals, they have noticed that communities have seemed to have gotten away from that demonstration aspect. She said that they want to fund projects that may be innovative, and useful so Congress and EPA can see that we are keeping up our obligation. She said that is the motivation for having no O&M kind of categories. She said that it is kind of hard to see what can be done in an innovative way.

Carl Johnson continued the Round III grant funding presentation and said that as part of the preparation for the Rouge retreat there was a survey sent out to communities asking about their satisfaction with the subgrant program. He said that there were some comments about the role of the subwatershed advisory groups in terms of ranking the projects that come through the subwatersheds. He advised that there was a mix vote. He said in the Round III funding scenario, the solution would have a ranking by categories and the subwatershed advisory groups would be allowed to put more than one project in any category.

Regarding the criteria for evaluating proposals he said some of the past criteria dealt with supporting the general permit process but now that the permit process is over it can be taken out. He said that they were looking very heavily at (30%) of goals of subwatershed management plans and Rouge restoration effort. He said projects that provided the greatest water quality benefit would be rated highest by the evaluation committee. Comments were offered regarding the timeliness of the Round III schedule. Following comments, Carl Johnson requested that other comments be submitted to Kelly Cave or their SWAG facilitators by December 17th.

Public Education Commercial: Amy Mangus shared with the group a “car washing commercial” video. She provided extra copies for all of the communities in the Rouge and those in attendance.

Ordinance Review Request: Chuck Hersey reported that one of the issues raised at the last meeting was the issues of consistencies between ordinances. He said that there has been some discussion on this issue but there was a lack of clarity. He asked the group to share what they had in mind with respect to ordinances.

Jim Anuelwicz said that the issue with stormwater ordinances is that Plymouth Township has an ordinance in place and the County has one and Canton Township looked at that and people were confused about the two ordinances. He said that at the least there must be an effort to try and compare and see what difference there is language and then if there is not a lot of differences in language, then examine where the difference is in terms of implementation and interpretation and how to take care of it.

Chuck Hersey clarified and said that from Anuelwicz's perspective the issue is the storm water ordinance as opposed to the generic question of ordinances.

Kelly Cave said Michelle Bononi brought this issue up. Janis Bobrin said what was described typically sounds like a Wayne County issue. She said that in Washtenaw County and the three communities that fall within the Rouge watershed all have storm water reviews done by the county drain commissioner so there are no coordination problem and the local ordinance specifically reference the most current rules of the Washtenaw County Drain Commissioner as the prevailing rules in the community. She said she did not know if that is typical in Wayne County but Washtenaw form that kind of partnership and basically serve as the consulting engineer for the township when it comes to stormwater. She said it helps developers in her County because at least in the township where they undertake a review, they know that they are going to get some consistency. They learn what the rules are and it makes life easier for everybody. She said however, when we start spanning across county boundaries throughout the watershed, then she does not have strong feelings about whether everybody needs to have the same ordinance. She said she certainly thinks that consistency helps everybody as we push toward more consideration of water quantity management as well as water quality management. Ms. Bobrin concluded by stating that to the degree that a variety of things across the region can be consistent, consistency will make life easier for everybody.

Karen Shaw, shared regarding ordinances in Oakland County. She said the soil erosion amendment ordinance has been submitted to MDEQ and that it should be effective within the next two to three months. She also said that Oakland is heavy into the onsite sewerage disposal program that will follow a local ordinance and one of Oakland's SWPPI items will be to review their design and engineering standards beginning January 2002.

Continuing on the topic of ordinances, Kelly Cave explained Wayne County's storm water and onsite ordinance program and asked if there was a task on the storm water matter for the Steering Committee. Chuck Hersey suggested that maybe the task should be to look at how to make local ordinances and "home-rule" compatible with the watershed approach. He asked, What are the merits or consistency? Where does it make sense to have inconsistencies because it meets local needs? He said maybe the issue should be approached first maybe using storm water and onsite as an example. He said given the continued activity in this area, there will be other ordinance related activities and maybe some guidance should be developed.

Jim Anuelwicz said local municipalities do not want anyone above them coming in and dictating to them. He said how one gets around that is we must take the approach where all come to the table as equals and discuss what is in the best interest of the watershed as a whole.

Kurt Heise indicated that he sees the issue as a Western Wayne issue and should be discussed in the SWAGs. Janice Bobrin said that there is a tremendous opportunity to establish a technical working group to look at various needs as they arise and bring more information to the table on who is doing what.

Lower 1 and Middle 1: Written activity report. ***(See Attachment A)***

III. Discussion Items

Discussion of RAP Update Process: Kurt Heise reported that the upcoming RAAC meeting will be held on December 5th in Bloomfield Township. He said Kathleen Leavey will be the special guest talking about the 40-year plan for DWSD. He said the last RRAC meeting focused on explaining the new institutional arrangements as discussed at the recent retreat.

Discussion of Role of MDEQ/EAD in Public Education: Paul Blakeslee reported that a 2-year grant has been received from EPA for the development of a statewide storm water public education outreach program. He reported that some of the things that will be done under the grant include establishing an advisory group and developing a statewide media campaign. ***(See Attachment B)***

Status of State Revolving Funds for use of Operational Purposes. Chuck Hersey shared a letter from Chip Heckathorne of the MDEQ. The letter states that state revolving funds are not used for operational purposes.

IV. Report to the Court

Paul Tait advised that no Court date has been held in awhile.

V. Other Reports

BUSINESS: (See Section II- “Informational Video”)

STATE: Paul Blakeslee reported that there will be a transition on the Steering Committee whereby Frank Baldwin will take his place. He also informed the committee that the SSO regulation notice will proceed without much change. He said that the re-notice is targeted for Fall 2002.

COUNTIES:

Washtenaw: Janice Bobrin reported that a series of homeowner brochures are available by calling Michelle Bononi at the Washtenaw County Drain Office.

Oakland: Karen Shaw emphasized Oakland County's ordinance status.

VI. Upcoming Events

VII. Open Discussion/Public Comment

James Graham, Friends of the Rouge (FOTR), reported that a great deal of environmental concern is currently ongoing around the City of Detroit Dehoco property.

Basement Flooding: Regarding basement flooding it was reported that a quick snapshot legislative meeting is planned. Notices will be distributed before year's end. It was stated that being one voice in the process has caused a lot of successes to occur on this issue.

VIII. Summary of Follow-ups/Future Agenda Items

-Ordinances - Technical Committee to keep track of the state of the art;
Should group vote to have this as an item for action for the committee?

IX. Future Meeting Dates

February 12, 2002 - 1:30 P.M.
SEMCOG Conference Room

t:\watershed\steeringcom\ReconscFeb02.wpd