



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

Wednesday, March 10, 2021 ▲ 9:00am – 12:30 pm ▲

Online Meeting

9:00 Welcome (Kate, Team)

Goal: Welcome, attendance, meeting goal, approve 2/25/21 draft meeting notes.

Confirmation of attendance:

Attendance: Kate, Steve, Ken, Joe, Mike, Seth, Jeff H, Nate, Stacy, Ben, Jeff S., Bob

Absent: Bart, Faith, Marty

Guests: None

Meeting goal: Discuss and edit the draft text for Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 582 Open Channel. We'll try to get it nearly ready for Initial Review today.

Notes Approval

A draft of the February 25, 2021 Meeting Notes was emailed to the team for review. The team still needs to decide if the 4 standards will be going out for Initial Review as a group of 4 together or individually. We will discuss this when we pick Initial Reviewers (either today or Friday)—it may be obvious as we identify reviewers and their areas of expertise.

No edits were raised on the meeting notes. **Kate** will finalize the notes and post online.

Review Draft 3 of CPS 582 Open Channel (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 3 of the CPS 582 standard for team review. Steve prepared this document from discussions at our previous team meetings and written comments he received.

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

- Open Channel historically has not been contracted much by NRCS. These edits are intended to make the standard more likely to be implemented, though it is aimed at the design engineers since this kind of stream work is more involved. The audience isn't entry level or technicians; practitioners at the field level would avoid getting to Open Channel work.
- Companion documents can be referenced in the standards, but they can't be made criteria. The companion documents are updated differently and don't go out for public comment.
- Should we have a Glossary section? – **Team** should look at the text and identify if a Glossary would be useful and which words should go into a Glossary section.
- Condition Where Practice Applies: appropriate in adjusting channel cross-section, improve floodplain connectivity, increase sinuosity.
- Language adjusted related to design of alluvial channels to be stable to 100-yr flood. We clarify language in Channel Stability subsection so there's less interpretation to rock the full 100-yr area to stabilize, into the floodplain.
- The federal language under the channel stability as-built condition can't be edited but we can add some clarification outside of that paragraph/bullets. Added definition to evaluate alluvial channels for stability up to the 100-yr flood.
- Mannings n value reference – **Steve** will confirm consistency with 580 language.
- Geomorphic assessment – includes some references to NEH Part 654 where more detail was appropriate. **Steve** will add a few more references to these sub-bullets for comparable referencing throughout.
- Soil investigation was previously in the parking lot.
 - It is important to understand geology when moving a channel. Boring 2 feet below the channel bottom not always possible in cobbles or rock. Assumption is that it could be backhoe work if site conditions require it but the methodology won't be specified.
 - Boring density - logging every 200 feet can be too dense for a uniform stream. The language is adjusted to indicate logging of representative areas performed based on observations of different soil types.

Continue Review of Draft 3 of CPS 582 Open Channel (Steve, Team)

Goal: Work to complete team editing of the proposed draft supplemental language.

After a break, the team reconvenes and Steve continues review of Draft 3 the standard on-screen. Some minor wordsmithing is done on-screen together. Some key points of the team discussion:

- Two stage ditch language is largely the same as the last WI standard. This is being used more frequently, like adjacent to cropland and tile drainage. Citation to drainage curves needs adjustment; **Steve** will research and adjust for next draft.
- Additional vegetation language was too prescriptive so we pare down the additional language and leave federal as-is.
- References section still needs work; **Team** should send Steve additional citations.
- **Team** should send Steve any comments by the end of this week. **Steve** will then create a Draft 4 of CPS 582, for final team input before Initial Review.

What's left for CPS 582? Discuss Plan of Action (Kate, Team)

Goal: Identify the next steps related to CPS 582. Review Action Items.

Initial Review Preparation - The Initial Review is by a short list of invited technical experts only.

1. Team review the consolidated list of reviewer recommendations on-screen together. We narrow down the list and try to maintain diversity in expertise.
2. The Team narrows down the reviewers to 13 people with the best combination of expertise. Anyone not selected will still be invited to participate in the public, Broad Review. Most reviewers identified are qualified to review all 4 standards, though some will review just one specific to their expertise.
3. **Kate** will reach out to the final short list of reviewers to see if they are interested and available for this review, expected in April. If any are unable to review, Kate will let the Team know for input on a replacement.

Action Items:

1. Previous Action item – **Steve** editing CPS 580 based on 2/25 meeting and will be emailing Draft 5 of CPS 580 to the Team.
2. Mid-Process survey—**Kate** will email the **Team** an anonymous online team survey about the process and this teamwork. Please fill out the survey this week so we can continue to improve.

3. Next steps for this team related to CPS 582. Steve has some items to incorporate based on discussion today.
 - Should we have a Glossary Section? – **Team members** should look at the text and identify which words should go into this section. Send this list to Steve.
 - **Steve** has some editing to clear up language based on meeting today (Mannings n reference – confirm citation is EFH Chapter 3 WI supplements and that this is consistent across standards; add reference to WI supplemental companion documents; clarify 2-stage ditch drainage curve ref; References).
 - **Team should get Steve edits to Draft 3 THIS WEEK.** He will then email Draft 4 of CPS 582 to the Team next week.
 - The **Team** should review Draft 4 of CPS 582 and identify FINAL TEAM EDITS before we go out for Initial Review.
4. **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.
5. **Kate:** reach out to the final short list of 13 Initial Reviewers to confirm their interest and availability for review.
6. **Kate:** finalize 2/25/21 meeting notes and post online.
7. **Kate:** prepare 3/10/21 draft meeting notes, **Steve** reviews, then full **Team** reviews.
8. **Kate and Steve:** prepare and post agendas at least 1 week prior to team meetings. General plan for meetings is:
 - Next team meeting is on March 12, at which we’ll discuss further edits to Draft 3 of CPS 584. We may also get to CPS 395 if time allows.
 - March 19 - CPS 395
 - March 25 - open for remaining issues.

12:15 End