

**Marsh and Rock Creek Watersheds Critical Area Resource Plan
Critical Area Advisory Committee DRAFT Meeting Minutes**

1:00pm-3:00pm, April 11, 2012: Ag Center, 670 Old Harrisburg Rd, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attendees:

Charlie Bennett, Pat Naugle, Charlie Skopic, Bicky Redman, Pat Bowling, Joe McNally, Sarah Weigle, Eric Flynn, Joe Breighner, Conrad Richter, Chris Kimple, Barry Towers, Bob Feister, Jay Braund, Dave Jostenski, Mike Hill, Sharon Sheppard, Duke Martin, Dean Shultz, John Jess, Mark Guise, Adam McClain, Paul Kellett, Andy Wilson, Nick Colonna, Hugh Lewis, Al Ferranto, Tom McCarty, Matt Genchur, Dejan Senic, Beverly Saunders, Jim Palmer, Heidi Moltz

Handouts:

Meeting agenda, Draft management alternatives spreadsheet, Feasibility scoring of management alternatives by pillar spreadsheet, Draft technical report on CARP management recommendations, ACPD perspectives on implementation of CARP management recommendations (attached), ACCD perspectives on implementation of CARP management recommendations (attached)

Welcome and introductions:

Charlie Bennett, committee chair, welcomed everyone and asked for introductions from anyone who is new to the group. Andy Wilson from Gettysburg College introduced himself and said that he is participating on behalf of the College as the usual participants are not able to attend today. Bob Feister also introduced himself as new to the meetings and interested in the process.

Approval of meeting minutes:

Charlie Bennett asked if the meeting minutes for the January quarterly meeting and the February workshop were acceptable as written. Hearing no objections, the meeting minutes were approved. Copies of both sets of meeting minutes can be found on the project blog.¹

ICPRB update:

Heidi Moltz shared that ICPRB has been working on compiling the scoring of management alternatives in the CWPA and utilizing those scores to develop a prioritized list of CARP management recommendations. As a reminder, a feasibility scoring process was conducted at the Feb 15th workshop. This consisted, firstly, of a screening process where each management alternative was screened as a Yes, No, or Maybe. Yes meant the group agreed the alternative was feasible and/or was moving forward. No meant the alternative was not feasible and/or was not going to happen. Maybe's were scored for feasibility utilizing 6 pillars, each worth 10 points each for total of 60 possible points. The highest possible score, Yes, was assigned a score of 60 while the lowest possible score, No, was assigned a zero. The results of the scoring process can be found in the most recent management alternatives spreadsheet and the pillars scoring spreadsheet, both of which are available on the blog.

The feasibility score, however, only provides information on how feasible implementation of a particular management alternative is. Another important aspect of the management alternatives is whether they are able to

¹ <http://www.marshrockwaterplan.blogspot.com/>

address the water resource issues in the CWPA. To this end, a second scoring system has been developed that indicates well a management alternative addresses the problem. The results of this process are available in the draft technical report on CARP management recommendations. The new score is called the technical score and ranges from 0-60. Both sets of scoring criteria (technical and feasibility) are outlined at the end of the report. The two scores are then summed to determine a total score for each management alternative.

Using the results of the scoring process, draft CARP recommendations were identified. In the technical report, the alternatives are grouped by water resources issue (e.g. availability, storage, communication, policy and management, data, etc.). Within each issue, all management alternatives and a No Action alternative are ranked by the total score. For each water resources issue, alternatives that scored in the top two categories for each of the scoring criteria were selected as recommendations because they were considered both feasible and addressing issue at hand. The write-up shows the list of management recommendations (25 of them)

Feedback was requested from the advisory committee on a couple of items. Firstly, does this approach to generating CARP recommendations seem reasonable? If not, it can be modified. If there are management alternatives that should be included in the recommendations that are not, they can be added. This may also be indicative that the approach to identifying recommendations should be reviewed. Also, do the technical scores look reasonable? If you disagree with any of the technical scores, please let us know.

In terms of project next steps, additional work on wastewater re-use is underway with some additional funding from DEP and SRBC. The plan is to identify opportunities for implementation of wastewater re-use and pair them with appropriate technologies to add to the list of recommendations. If you know of wastewater re-use opportunities, please let us know. Draft CARP prepared by end of May (likely will be distributed to full committee in June) with review over summer – currently incorporating received comments – please submit any that you have.

Discussion regarding the scoring process and the selection of management recommendations included the following. Mike Hill, DEP, asked for a more detailed explanation of the technical scoring process. Heidi pointed out that the technical scoring criteria are documented in the new draft technical report. Basically, it is a 0-60 scoring (to be of equal weight with the feasibility scoring) that defines several grades of measurable progress towards solving the water resources issue. Dave Jostenski, DEP, noted that the scoring process takes only the most significant of the management alternatives. Perhaps, some of the alternatives that take smaller, incremental steps towards the goal should be considered as well and may be part of the overall puzzle.

Sharon Sheppard noted that land use planning with growth expectations must be developed with true natural resource capacities in mind. GMA, for example, wants to bring in additional water, but this isn't true water budgeting (and that's not GMA's responsibility). These decisions need to be made in a multi-faceted way. Heidi responded that there are a couple of management alternatives dealing with comprehensive planning, zoning, etc. If there is some additional/modified language to reflect these thoughts in the alternatives, they can certainly be added. On this same topic, Nick Colonna suggested an identification of the core items needed to help implement management alternatives at different levels. These could be used as umbrella recommendations, with some of the more specific, detailed ones listed underneath. Charlie Bennett provided the example of Knouse Foods installing waterless urinals. If Knouse is the only organization that implements these efforts, there will be little overall impact, however, if it is one step towards many organizations implementing this technology in the watersheds, then there is the potential for a larger, cumulative impact on the overall problem.

Pat Naugle pointed out that this has been a simplified process from the beginning and that many of the management alternatives are complex issues with multiple sides. Previous discussions of the alternatives have been limited in length and a full discussion is needed to evaluate the alternatives in all of their complexity. Heidi

noted that an evaluation of the alternatives is underway (first draft presented at the last advisory committee meeting) and is aimed to address the multiple aspects of each alternative.

Paul Kellett noted that the screening process may need to be expanded to look at the various impacts of each alternative. He said that under the current scoring system that application of DDT would have a high score. He also noted the need for time to discuss additional details of the bullets. Beverly Saunders said that perhaps the scoring system needs some way of including environmental sustainability.

Pat Naugle said that he thinks the screening tool works, but the alternatives need to be looked at from multiple directions. Dave J. agreed that more details is needed in evaluation of alternatives with complexity of issues versus less complexity, perhaps different tiers of issues, so the final plan embodies a more extensive look at the complex issues. Again, Heidi pointed out that an evaluation of the alternatives is underway and is aimed to address the multiple aspects of each alternative.

Dean Shultz noted the need to determine how to provide water for future development. A method is needed to determine sustainable water yields. This varies depending on geology.

Panel discussion - implementation of CARP management recommendations:

Nick Colonna, Joe McNally, Mark Guise, and Adam McClain presented perspectives on implementation of the CARP recommendations. Nick began by saying that quality of life is a major consideration. From the county planning perspective, the primary component needs to be about outreach/education. The Planning Department is going to take on the Water Resource Element of the county plan. Nick also provided a handout with recommendations of interest from the county planning perspective (handout attached to meeting minutes). Interests include the locations of appropriate sources of water and wastewater and how to implement water and wastewater reuse.

Joe McNally, Geoservices Ltd, said he speaks primarily from a technical perspective and has worked to develop water supplies and has worked on a study of Conewago Creek in the past. He thinks reliable raw data is essential for supported, accepted recommendations – whatever those recommendations end up being. Regarding data collection, Joe noted the importance of stream gages. Stream gages are very important because they allow you to look at baseflow, which relates to the understanding the water budget (mentioned earlier in the meeting). Joe also noted that groundwater recharge of hundreds of thousands of gallons per square mile occurs in the area. Groundwater can also be considered storage, but perhaps not a whole lot dependent on the geology. Joe also mentioned land preservation. Purchasing areas now for protection for future groundwater use may be important because a 400' radius around the well is needed for a DEP permit. Once development occurs, identifying locations that meet this requirement and are good for groundwater development may be difficult. Preserving the land ahead of time is a proactive way of solving this problem.

Mark Guise, GMA, said there are a lot of alternatives under consideration that are important, but a major interest of GMA is water conservation and education (school presentations, fliers, etc.) GMA's daily production in the early 1990's was 1.5MGD. In 2011, it was 1.2MGD. So, water is being conserved as the population continues to grow. But, as people conserve, revenues go down. Perhaps a way around this is to investigate rate structures that can encourage conservation and meet budgeting needs. Water storage in tanks is limited. This is recognized. Trying to find additional storage locations can be an issue – in some areas, for example, water quality becomes an issue. Or, storage may not be feasible before growth necessitates service to a particular area. On another note, GMA has been conducting water audits for about 15 years to try to understand metered sales versus daily production. So, what is the loss from the system? Recently, it averages around 15-17%. Soon, GMA will complete installation of new meters to all customers (residential, businesses, etc.) to help with water accounting.

GMA is continuing to pursue importation of water and is continuing to undergo the preliminary studies. The original plan for the water importation was 1MGD average with a max of 3MGD. GMA is taking a new look at these numbers to see if lower numbers will work. This revolved around the water needs on the system.

Adam McClain, Adams County Conservation District, highlighted management alternatives that are of particular interest to the Conservation District (handout attached to meeting minutes). He also noted that the county has no authority for adoption of ordinances, related to the ordinance alternatives, but the county could likely help with model ordinances. Municipalities are the ones to implement many of the alternatives. Perhaps most important type of alternative for the Conservation District is outreach, as noted from others.

Nick Colonna noted that the benefits/drivers for CARP implementation for the Planning Office is that good understanding in the CWPA will benefit the county-wide efforts.

Bicky Redman said that it is a challenge to look at preservation of large areas of land, but could map identified areas. Joe said that he was thinking about Zone 1 for a well (16-20 acres) rather than large tracts of land. These smaller areas may be more manageable than large scale land preservation. One recommendation is for a conservation easement. Bicky said that provided the language is inserted into the easement agreement ahead of time, then it's acceptable to put a well in an easement area.

Pat Naugle pointed out that when we pull water out of wells, it often doesn't make it back to the stream. It is important to plan for aquatic life use too. SRBC has new proposed guidance system based on 70% exceedance. There is a need to protect the ecosystem uses. Joe McNally noted that sometimes it is not considered because of problems, but there is a need for a whole process of investigation of potential resources while protecting ecosystems. Pat said that sometimes the best use/re-use of water is putting it back into the stream.

Nick Colonna pointed out the need to put broad things on top with the screening tool, then all the details fall out under them. He thinks this is the reason why the screening system works.

Sharon H. asked who performs the source water protection plans. Can this information be shared with municipalities to incorporate into local plans? Because municipalities are the only ones that can legitimately implement the recommendations - the county is an advisory entity. There is concern about the way to coordinate all of the different aspects so we're not back here again. Charlie B. noted that if this process succeeds, then good. But once the door is open we may be involved forever. Nick pointed out that we can cultivate recommendations into framework where possible so we're not back here in this same capacity. Charlie said that approximately 15 watersheds were originally nominated for CWPA's. This process is part of the tool, an example, for solving the other areas' issues as well.

Pat Bowling said that source water assessments were supposed to be widely distributed, but since 9/11, we have to be careful about how that information is shared. In a well's zone 1 area, activities are precluded that are not related to drinking water protection. But conservation reserve program can be used for automatic wellhead protection enrollment. The program could be used to compensate agricultural operators for taking land out of protection. A 2000' buffer is required in PA, but there are none or only very few examples in state. Perhaps this is an underutilized program.

Charlie said that Arendtsville and Biglerville have source water protection efforts currently underway. It helps to seat municipalities on the committee. Also may help to have municipalities on GMA committee. The interconnection pipe is an issue that affects everyone here.

Currently people are charged more water for increased water use (graduated charge). Tiered water use could encourage conservation which may help meet SRBC requirements for interconnection. Mark Guise said that GMA currently has a usage (flat) scale, but have to do some research on use of stepping scales.

Investigations have already continued and may continue to be done. It was then asked whether GMA has considered a cap and trade system. Mark said no.

A question was asked to the Planning Office about the greenspace program. Specifically, do people conserving land get tax break? Nick responded that the county can recommend this, but they don't have the authority to implement it. A question was asked of GMA as to whether they have considered getting a balanced culture on GMA board (currently pro growth, economic growth, etc.). Mark says he doesn't necessarily agree with this statement but that there are ongoing conversations about who is seated on the board. Board members have to understand municipal law, etc. you can't just seat anybody. Folks that are appointed are seated elected officials from Gettysburg Borough.

Charlie asked the panel about well testing to determine impacts on streams. If a new well is drilled, what type of study should be conducted (e.g. 24 hour pump test, flows then ok, etc.) for either public or private wells? Mark said that from the public well standpoint, he would recommend a 48-72 hour pump test with monitoring of nearby wells. Joe said that for municipal wells, SRBC has a good program in place that includes a description of how wells should be tested, rates, monitoring, availability (recharge, recharge area, etc.), etc. Private wells, at a minimum, need well construction standards (HB 1855). Nick said it is important to look at impacts of long term sustainability to meet environmental demands. Adam said that well construction standards for residential wells would be an improvement and that public suppliers already do this. Private well yield tests might be too expensive. Joe said it would be helpful to have some background study (e.g. well drilling in diabase).

There are costs to the county residents and water users for the GMA-York Water interconnection. What information is there about increased cost of water from York versus other methods? Mark said that there is an economic impact of connecting the two companies by pipe, then there is the cost of paying for the daily water usage. The initial costs of the pipeline are estimated at \$2-\$2.5 million. The ongoing cost for the water transfer may be approximately \$250,000-\$300,000 per year for about 150,000 gallons/day. Bringing water into the CWPA is to improve redundancy, reliability, sustainability in the system. But GMA does not cover the entire CWPA area, only one portion.

It was also asked whether the new water transfer could be cut off due to water restrictions/droughts in the Susquehanna. If water is stopped, then what happens to the development that depends on it? Mark and Charlie agree that this is one potential issue with the transfer. Charlie said that it is recognized that the transfer is a crutch, but at least GMA is working towards the long-term sustainability of the system.

Pat Bowling asked what the cost is to install and permit a new public supply well. Mark said the cost is approximately \$1 million. Charlie said that the cost for industrial wells with SRBC compliance is approximately \$30,000.

Paul Kellett asked how many rate payers the GMA system currently has. Mark said approximately 4,000.

Sharon H. pointed out that GMA is a water supplier and is not responsible for watershed planning.

Dave Jostenski said that currently, the area is still under normal conditions, but surface water conditions are deteriorating in terms of drought. But there is no significant precipitation expected in the near future. Future declarations are also under consideration – committee meetings are being initiated. The monitoring portion of the DEP webpage has current conditions while the drought map doesn't change until formal declarations are made.

It was also noted that a sustainability factor should be considered in the management alternative screening process.

Announcements:

- If you have any comments regarding the management alternative screening process or if you would like additional details regarding any of the management alternatives included in the evaluation, please submit the information at your earliest convenience via email to marshrockpa@gmail.com; phone (301.274.8116); or mail to ICPRB, 51 Monroe St PE-08, Rockville, MD 20850.
- The next advisory committee meeting will be Wednesday, July 11 from 1-3pm at the Ag Center.

Closing:

Charlie thanked everyone for attending and pointed out that there were comments heard at today's meeting that have not been voiced before, which is great. He then closed the meeting.