

Lower Susquehanna Water Resources Regional Committee Meeting

June 7, 2004
DEP-Southcentral Regional Office, Harrisburg, PA

Meeting Summary

Attendance

Committee members in attendance:

William Achor	Walter Leis
Jineen Boyle	Thomas Mealy
Betty Conner	Jeffrey Osman
Melanie Hesse	Donald Robinson
Cynthia Hitz	Craig Robertson
Chris Hoffman	Steven Seidl
Michael Kyle	

Committee members not in attendance:

Jolene Chinchilli	Gerrit Strathmeyer
Ed Goodhart	William Morris
Don Baldwin	Ronald Evanko
Tom Beauduy	James Hostetter
	Daniel Mains

Others in attendance:

Dale Glatfelter	Sue Weaver
Bob Edwards	David Jostenski
Susan Cohen	Pam Bishop
Susan Parry	Leslie Sarvis
Lisa Nicholas	John Hines
Hillary Bright	Stuart Gansell
Mike Makuska	Michael Buchwach

Administrative Items

- 1.) Three Changes were made to the summary draft from the previous meeting on April 5, 2004. The Final Summary reflects these following changes:
 - 1.) Walter Lyon was included in the "others in attendance" list.

- 2.) Page 3 - E. Drannon Buskirk was listed as being of the Paxton Creek Watershed Association but it is actually the "Paxton Creek Watershed and Education Association (PCWEA)".
- 3.) Last line of the same paragraph should read "Mr. Buskirk emphasized the need for ground water recharge and proactive support from the committee".

Then the summary was approved.

Motion was made by: William Achor
Motion Second: Thomas Mealy
Motion was carried.

2.) Chairman, Donald Robinson, announced the resignation of Mr. William Fulton from the Committee membership. Actions are being initiated at the Governor's office regarding the replacement of this Committee seat.

DEP Summary of Activities

- 1.) Leslie Sarvis distributed the updated and approved Act220 fact sheet.
- 2.) Dave Jostenski reported on some registration statistics:

Of somewhere around 15,000 possible registrants; about 5,000 have reported. The goal being at least having 10,000 registrations. The breakdown of received applications to date is as follows:

950 farming operations; 2,300 public water suppliers; 2,000 non-agriculture; 200 yet to be determined.

Middle Conodoguinet Creek River Conservation Plan

Susan Parry of the Capital Resource Conservation & Development Council representing the Conodoguinet Creek Watershed Association detailed the Plan.

The primary goal of this plan was to develop recommended management actions based on identified and prioritized problems and opportunities of water resource management inherent in the middle third of the Conodoguinet watershed. The recommended management actions encourage proper land use planning, including multi-municipal planning to address corridor-wide issues. Based on the growth potential of the corridor, increased development pressure is likely to occur. Heightened water quality and quantity related issues will likely affect the Middle Conodoguinet if not planned and managed carefully. This Plan is a resource to be used by the county and municipalities when creating and implementing land use plans and policies for the Middle Conodoguinet Creek corridor and watershed.

Northern Lancaster County Water Budget Study

Bob Edwards of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission detailed a project where the SRBC in partnership with the Lancaster County Conservation District and five watershed groups, is spearheading to address water quantity issues in a 32,000- acre limestone-based area underlying parts of Chiques Creek, Cocalico Creek, and Lititz Run Watersheds in Lancaster County.

Goal is the development of a model watershed water budget analysis for this heavy growth area. Donald Robinson queried as to whether this study may be a template for future statewide studies especially in regards to detailing critical water resource areas. Bob Edwards commented that it may be just one approach as development of such studies is a learning process.

Summary of Statewide Committee Meeting

John Hines summarized the first statewide water resources committee held on May 10th.

Adopted and seated an interim chair (until end of year) and a vice chair.

Basically an information session to bring them up to speed with the regional committees.

Significantly, the committee broke up into three working groups which is important if moving the process forward. These groups are:

1.) Critical Water Planning Group
2.) Policies and Guidelines Group
3.) Approval of Education and Outreach Group

Next statewide meeting is on July 22nd and by the meeting in September, a standard schedule will be developed.

Lastly, funding procurement efforts seeing possible positive indications at the congressional level with Senator Santorum giving indications of support (not official) as a letter to the appropriations committee supporting our efforts was sent.

However, funding Initiatives associated with the Water Resources Development Act, on a national level, appear to be going nowhere.

Juniata Watershed Management Plan

Hillary Bright and Mike Makuska (Executive Director) of the Juniata Clean Water Partnership presented. This organization seeks to engage local communities in the watershed planning process and build public participation/education about

watershed issues. Conducts watershed and regional studies, assessments, and modeling as needed. Engages in actual design and execution of conservation projects only when a 75% local consensus is achieved.

Hillary Bright will be forwarding a CD of the Plan to committee members.

Discussion initiated by Chair: As we are seeing all these presentations of various water resources plans, what is needed is a comprehensive system to track all water resources plans done by various agencies so we can inventory data and identify data gaps. Needs to be done on a GIS mapping basis. Leslie Sarvis suggested the idea that a presenter could come in and detail how to break up basins (using DEP watershed basins).

Summary of Ad Hoc Outreach Workgroup Meeting

Betty Conner reported on the meeting where DEP staff and representatives from each of the Regional Committees and Statewide Committee were in attendance. Outlined the goals for achieving successful public acceptance of the State Water Plan. Basic idea being to get the message out early while maintaining the effort over five years. A public universal message will soon be available (July) as well as an outreach plan for Public Officials. Also DEP has prepared the Act 220 information sheet. Other tools and strategies are being developed and implemented including inserts to newsletters, newspaper articles, radio, TV and building on other events such as Drinking Water Week, Rivers Month, annual conventions, trade shows, fairs, etc.

Update on PCPG Act 220 Symposium

William Achor reported that the event was well attended and presented while supplying much information. Leslie Sarvis reported that the DEP update article on the Symposium has been distributed.

Leslie also, at this point, distributed the new expense forms.

Committee Structure Proposal

Leslie Sarvis led discussion on how we should be thinking in regards to developing subcommittees. What should they look like? Should they mirror the statewide subcommittees? Collection and Integration of data is an important component necessitating such a subcommittee. Stu Gansell forwarded the idea that a lot is going to occur before the next regional committee on August 2nd. The consensus is that the regional committee should wait until after the August 2nd meeting before tackling the development of subcommittees - until which time things like regional and state guidelines will be fleshed out. We will then also have a more comprehensive picture of what watershed information is available.

Wrap-Up/Next Steps/August Meeting

Next regional committee meeting is here on August 2nd at 9:30. Act 220 fact sheets are official and ready and all are encouraged to distribute where seen fit.

Leslie Sarvis will be on maternity leave for the next several months in which case Sue Weaver and Lori Mohr will be filling in.

The following topics were set forward for the committee to ponder until next time:

- 1.) What do we want to get done by next August
- 2.) How are we going to pursue the USGS mapping so we have a more complete picture of what's out there planning/data wise and what is the overlap of federal, state, and regional watershed projects
- 3.) How can we increase registration numbers

Note: expense Mileage change from 36 to 37.5 cents per mile.