

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

9:00pm-3:00pm, February 15, 2012: Ag Center, 670 Old Harrisburg Rd, Gettysburg, PA 17325

Attendees:

Charlie Bennett, Pat Bowling, Mark Guise, Pat Naugle, Sarah Weigle, Adam McClain, Bicky Redman, Bill Chain, Mark Bream, Eric Flynn, Robert Reichart, John Brummer, Frank Skomorucha, Fran Koch, Jay Braund, Mike Hill, Beverly Saunders, Tom McCarty, Larry Redding, Charles Wilson, Al Ferranto, Joe McNally, Dean Shultz, Roger Steele, Pat Bowling, Hugh Lewis, Paul Kellett, Dejan Senic, Jim Palmer, Heidi Moltz

Handouts:

Agenda, draft spreadsheet of management alternatives, preliminary background information for each management alternative

Welcome and introductions:

Charlie Bennett thanked everyone for coming and welcomed the group. He used a stress ball and an onion to convey to the group that it would be important to work together to discuss and evaluate the management alternatives. Although everyone might not always agree, it is important to be respectful of other opinions. He also made the point that the Act 220 process has been underway for some years and that we are now in the stage of developing the recommendations for actions that can be taken to address the water resources concerns.

Big picture, role of workshop:

Heidi Moltz discussed how this workshop fits in with the overall CARP process. Over the last several advisory committee meetings, the results of the technical analyses have been presented and feedback has been requested. The results of the technical evaluations were utilized to identify and quantify, where possible, the water resources issues in the watersheds. Then, a list of management alternatives was compiled that address the identified water resources issues, based on previous advisory committee discussions, literature reviews, and submissions from individual committee members and other stakeholders. The purpose of this workshop is to evaluate the list of management alternatives in terms of feasibility. After the workshop, additional technical evaluations of the management alternatives will be conducted to understand the ability of each management alternative to solve the water resources issues. Information gathered, in addition to the feasibility scores, will be utilized to develop the recommendations for the CARP document.

Heidi noted that there is a lot of ground to cover during the workshop. This is a great problem to have because it means there are a lot of ideas on the table to evaluate. Getting through the entire list of management alternatives, however, will require that the discussion stays on track. She then provided an overview of the day. The first section of the morning will focus on screening management alternatives to identify those that will proceed, those that are not at all feasible, and those that require further discussion. The remainder of the day will focus on scoring and discussing the management recommendations that were designated for such.

Heidi also introduced Dejan Senic, a graduate student from the University of the District of Columbia's Professional Science Masters in Water Resources Management. His area of expertise is hydrogeology. Dejan will be working with ICPRB on the technical evaluation of management alternatives.

Preliminary screening of management practices:

Beverly Saunders, a graduate student from Texas State University-San Marcos reminded everyone that this workshop is utilizing an ILBM methodology. Two hard copies of an ILBM report were made available for workshop participants to read. This report is also available online¹. Beverly reminded the group that many advisory committee members are representing a stakeholder group – so while personal perspectives on the management alternatives are valued, answers to questions need to represent the general feeling of the entire stakeholder group.

Beverly then explained the screening process. Five groups of management alternatives were designated. Each group has an allocated amount of time for screening purposes. For each group, the following questions were asked: 1) Which practices in this group of management alternatives are not feasible? These management alternatives were designated as a “No.” They will not undergo further evaluation during the workshop. 2) Which practices in this group are going to proceed and are feasible? These management alternatives were designated as a “Yes” and did not undergo further evaluation during the workshop. 3) The rest of the practices in the group are considered maybes. Of the maybes, the following question was asked: Which practices in this group do you consider the most important for the group to discuss today? These were designated as high priority maybes to ensure that time would permit discussion of these items.

The results of the screening process will be made available in the revised management alternative spreadsheet. The score column contains a Yes, No, or a numerical score. The numerical score is a result of the subsequent evaluation process and indicates that the alternative was considered a Maybe during the screening process.

Evaluation of management practices:

Each of the management practices identified as a maybe was then scored in terms of information, funding, policies, institutions, stakeholders, and timeframe. The results of the scoring process enable management alternatives to be ranked numerically in terms of feasibility. The scoring definitions and the results of the scoring process will be provided in a separate document. Discussion notes on each management alternative will also be presented in a separate document.

Announcements:

- The next meeting of the CAAC will be from 1-3pm at the Ag Center on April 11th.
- Comments are welcome on any of the technical reports. They can be downloaded from the 1/4/2012 project blog posting. Or you can request a copy by calling 301.274.8116.

Closing:

Pat Naugle, CAAC vice-chair, thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

¹ http://www.potomacriver.org/cms/pacarp/Development_of_ILBM_Platform_Process.pdf