Welcome/Meeting Objectives

Kate Charbonneau called the natural and nature based features (NNBF) subgroup meeting to order and welcomed Council members. Nicole Carlozo then gave a presentation on the Coastal Resiliency Master Plan. Renee Orenstein then presented on Natural and Nature Based Features. Kate Charbonneau spoke about the critical area State Development Regulations and how they could tie into the Coast Smart Siting and Design Criteria.
Nicole’s Presentation on Coastal Resiliency Master Plan
- Nicole Carlozo of DNR gave a brief overview of the Coastal Resiliency Master Plan, including tidal regions of Maryland’s coastal zone, coastal impacts of sea level rise, storm surge, and climate change, and she discussed the North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study released by the Army Corps of Engineers earlier this year.

Renee’s Presentation on Natural and Nature Based Features
- Renee Orenstein of DNR gave a brief overview of natural and nature based features, examples of what they are, and their intended benefits. She discussed the possibility of incorporating more NNBFs into the Coast Smart Siting and Design Criteria.

Kate’s Discussion about the Critical Area Commission
- Kate reviewed some of the language that the Critical Area State Development Regulations use and how they could possibly be incorporated into the Coast Smart Council’s Siting and Design Criteria.

Discussion: Draft Coast Smart Siting and Design Criteria – Natural Resource-Related Provisions:

The group discussed the language of the Siting and Design Criteria pertaining to ecological/natural resource-related provisions. There was concern over language that called for creation of NNBFs rather than just the protection of existing NNBFs, such as the language in the Criteria Section b(i)(5).

Members discussed the possibility of including language similar to what is in the Critical Area regulations pertaining to future migration of wetlands. The consensus was that since these projects had to go through the Critical Area process anyway, so there was no point in repeating the same provisions in the Siting and Design Criteria.

The Siting Criteria language in b(i)(5) (“whenever possible”) concerned some Council members. The question arose as to whether the Council should require certain actions or merely require the state to consider these actions. Council members decided to change the language in b(i)(5) to: “Whenever possible, onsite mitigation measures should enhance, restore or create natural and nature based features to provide additional protection against future sea level rise and coastal storm impacts.”

Another issue of concern was whether shoreline protections exist that will affect the project, and will these protections need to be improved in the future. The Council decided to add an additional question to the Project Screening Checklist, stating: “Is there adequate shoreline protection at the proposed project’s site?”

To stay consistent with current language used by the Army Corps of Engineers in its North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study, Council members decided to change the term “ecological features” to “natural and nature based features” in the Criteria.

The Council decided not to add any new NNBF language to the Design criteria at the meeting. One member said he may email Zoe Johnson a suggestion. Other members stated that it may be better to fit the natural NNBFs into the Siting criteria because the Design criteria are very structure-based.

The Council also discussed how the Criteria will apply to new versus rehabbed structures. For new structures, the engineer should consider where NNBFs are or could be built or located. For existing projects, the engineer can correct previous issues in order to fix facilities or enhance NNBFs.
Wrap Up

Kate Charbonneau closed the meeting by encouraging members to send any other changes they would like to see in the Siting and Design Criteria to Zoe Johnson.