



Standards Oversight Council (SOC)

Developing effective technical standards that protect Wisconsin's natural resources

131 W. Wilson Street, #601, Madison, Wisconsin 53703
(608) 441-2677 || Fax (608) 441-2676 || socwisconsin.org

NRCS Stream Protection/Restoration Standards Team

MEETING NOTES

Thursday, February 25, 2021 ▲ 9:00am – 12:30 pm ▲

Online Meeting

9:00 Welcome (Kate, Team)

Goal: Welcome, attendance, meeting goal, approve 2/2/21 and 2/4/21 draft meeting notes.

Confirmation of attendance:

Attendance: Kate, Steve, Joe, Ken, Nate, Stacy, Jeff H, Bart, Ben, Mike, Marty, Seth

Absent: Bob, Jeff S, Faith

Guests: None

Meeting goal: Discuss and edit the draft text for Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 580 Streambank and Shoreline Protection.

Notes Approval

Drafts of both the February 2 and February 4, 2021 Meeting Notes were emailed to the team for review. No questions or edits were raised on either of these meeting notes.

Kate will finalize both sets of meeting notes and post online.

Remaining Schedule

Team review a draft timeline for completion of team work on-screen. This is still an **optimistic schedule**. There are details and sub-tasks within each of these lines. By this estimate, we'd have all 4 documents out for Initial Review in April, which would be a time that the team is not doing any work. Response to Comments steps is shown for a month, but the work depends on the quantity and extent of the comments we get in.

The Initial Review is by a short list of invited experts only. Everyone on the **Team** should think about who would be good expert reviewers and email Kate suggestions—name,

employer, area of expertise. Kate will then consolidate the reviewer ideas and we'll come back to this list for the team to decide on 5 to 10 people with the best combination of expertise. Kate reaches out to gauge interest in this invitation for review.

Companion Documents

This standard has numerous and lengthy companion documents. Some of this information is duplicate, some is a synthesis of other sources. There are also other resources like ACOE that aren't specifically referenced but may be useful on some projects. This team won't be working on companion documents.

State regulations refer to a specific standard so the companion documents were a way to create additional information that could be updated more regularly than the referenced standard. NRCS has limited staff time and companion documents are not a priority for update. The standard and companion documents are not going to be edited in lock-step.

The goal for this standard is to set up the details since that is more binding and part of policy; the companion documents are not requirements in the same way.

Review Draft 3 of CPS 580 Streambank and Shoreline Restoration (Steve, Team)

Goal: Review the proposed revised draft supplemental language and discuss alternate options as a team.

Prior to this meeting, Kate emailed the team a "Draft 4" of the CPS 580 standard for team review. Steve prepared this document from discussions at our previous team meetings and written edits to Draft 3.

Steve reviews the standard with supplemental language on-screen and the team discusses. Some wordsmithing is done on-screen together. Some key points of the team discussion:

- Condition Where Practice Applies: This practice applies to a single site less than 500 feet. The previous 580 standard used 600 feet, but this was changed to match this to the DNR threshold between General Permit and Individual Permit. This paragraph isn't entirely clear as to what 580 covers and when the assessment under 582 is required (and not necessarily the full 582). **Stacy** will wordsmith the Condition Where Practice Applies paragraph for triggering CPS 582 assessment (but not necessarily all of 582) for future team input.
- There is a statement included about not using construction and demolition debris. This is redundant to state regulations and state and federal

specifications, but Steve would like to keep this in since this has been an issue and he'd like to be clear with this requirement.

- Bedding and Filter additions are detailed and more than technical standard. This language is more of a procedural that's appropriate somewhere else, not in a technical standard. It's in the EFH and specifications. **Steve** will shorten this section up quite a bit, leaving in the NEH reference. The more expansive detail IS important for future trainings and specs but won't be as lengthy in the standard.
- Additional Criteria for Streambanks: Add reference to companion documents. The text in this section is work in addition to the companion documents. Standard tells us *what* but not *how*. Team pares down some language that are related more to critical sites or 582.
- Soils investigation kept limited. Boring depth or spacing not cited (as in some ag standards), but not here since it's often discreet areas of stabilization. Team has no further changes to this.
- Shear stress method seems to require more rock. This will also be an issue with CPS 582.
- Team agrees to use rock slope as steep as 1.5:1 as maximum in select circumstances with 2:1 as recommended slope.

Continue Review of Draft 3 of CPS 580 Streambank and Shoreline Restoration (Steve, Team)

Goal: Continue review of the proposed draft supplemental language and discuss alternate options as a team.

After a break, team editing continues with document on-screen. Some key points of the discussion:

- Opposite bank landowner – Team discusses consultation vs notification vs approval for flow changing techniques. The tech standard should include an evaluation for impact for flow-changing techniques, but the notification/consultation isn't language for a tech standard (it's more policy). Steve wants to leave this in to see how the external reviewers take this. If the reviewers push back on this, there is also team support to move this as a Consideration; however, Steve wants to ask for input at NRCS before moving it.
- Critical sites are important and team agrees to address them separately. This seems to be outside of a technical standard but more policy.
 - Water surface slope – 0.8 percent is a low trigger
 - Geotech investigation requirement is onerous for smaller project—is this paper research study or a drill rig with borings and a third-party geotech engineer?
 - Doing HEC-RAS could show that it's a stable design and then the project moves on.

- **Stacy** will look at some of her project experience and get back to Steve on issues with DATCP work in northern WI.
- Plans and specs – cross-section requirement is too elaborate for small sites for CPS 580. CPS 582 would capture the assessment requirements for larger sites but not the other requirements.
- References – Team should let Steve know if there are any WI-specific references to add (e.g., DNR regs or database, companion docs).

Steve will make additional edits to the CPS 580 text based on the discussion today and send out Draft 5 for team review. The **Team** should review and identify exactly what is a serious problem. **Steve** will review the input and make a decision so work can move forward. He'd like this to be ready for Initial Review after written team comments to Draft 5.

What's left for CPS 580? Discuss Plan of Action (Kate, Team)

Goal: Identify any substantial remaining areas of discussion and refinement related to CPS 580. Review Action Items.

Next team meeting is March 10, at which we'll discuss further edits to Draft 3 of CPS 582.

Action Items:

1. Everyone on the **Team** should think about who would be good experts for the Initial Review and email Kate your suggestions—name, employer, area of expertise.
2. Next steps for this team related to CPS 580
 - **Stacy** will wordsmith the Condition Where Practice Applies paragraph for triggering CPS 582 and allow other Team members to further refine.
 - **Stacy** will look at a cross-section of DATCP project experience in northern WI and get back to Steve on suggested changes to Critical Sites language.
 - **Steve** has some editing to clear up language based on meeting today, and will then email Draft 5 of CPS 580 to the Team.
 - The **Team** should review Draft 5 and identify exactly what is a serious problem. **Steve** will document and make a decision so work can move forward.
3. **Team** should review and redline text for Draft 3 of CPS 395, Draft 3 of CPS 582 and Draft 3 of CPS 584—these were emailed by Kate on 2/22. Send redlined comments and suggested edits to **Steve** prior to the meetings for each. Consider this review as part of your “vote” on issues that need work.
4. **Kate**: finalize 2/2/21 and 2/4/21 meeting notes and post online.

NRCS Stream Protection/Restoration Standard Team

MEETING NOTES

February 25, 2021

Page 5

5. **Kate:** prepare 2/25/21 draft meeting notes, **Steve** reviews, then full **Team** reviews.
6. **Kate and Steve:** prepare and post agendas at least 1 week prior to team meetings. General plan for meetings is:
 - March 10 - CPS 582
 - March 12 - CPS 584
 - March 19 - CPS 395
 - March 25 - open for remaining issues.

12:30 *End*