

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

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

Attendees:

Charlie Bennett, Pat Bowling, Mark Guise, Pat Naugle, Charles Wilson, Sarah Weigle, Hugh Lewis, Adam McClain, Scott Dellett, Roger Steele, Rusty Ryan, Dick Waybright, Barbara Underwood, Nick Colonna, Chris Kimple, Eric Flynn, Nate Merckel, Dave Jostenski, Jay Braund, Mike Hill, Veronica (Nicki) Kasi, Beverly Saunders, Tom McCarty, Paul Kellett, Jim Palmer, Heidi Moltz

Handouts:

Meeting agenda, Synthesis of water resources issues, Draft management alternatives

Welcome and introductions:

Charlie Bennett welcomed the group and asked for introductions from anyone new to the group. Rusty Ryan from ACCD introduced himself. He noted his interest in stormwater issues, particularly the difficulty of volume control due to the soils in the county. He thinks a BMP manual containing BMPs that are appropriate for the local soils would be most useful. Volume control, retention, and re-use are all desirable components of stormwater management in the county.

Approval of meeting minutes:

A motion was made by Dick Waybright to approve the October meeting minutes. The motion was seconded and no objections were made. A motion was made by Barbara Underwood to approve the November meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Paul Kellett and no objections were made. Therefore, both sets of meeting minutes were approved. Copies can be found on the project blog.¹

ICPRB update:

Charlie noted that the purpose of the meeting is to get management ideas documented and to flesh them out where possible. Discussions on implementability and feasibility will be conducted at a later date. He then asked Heidi Moltz to give an update from ICPRB.

Heidi noted that two new technical analyses (stormwater and floodplain management and water quality) are available for review and comment. Revised versions of the current water uses and water availability technical reports are also available. The major revision to these documents was the method of disaggregating the streamflows from the Bridgeport USGS gage. The technical reports can be downloaded from the project blog.¹

Two documents were presented to the group. The first is a draft of watershed issues, resulting from the technical analysis. Management actions in the watershed will be proposed to address water resources issues. This document attempts to explicitly define what those issues are. Additions to the list of issues and comments on the document are encouraged. It is a draft document and changes are expected. The second document presented to the group was a draft list of management alternatives. They were compiled based on previous CAAC discussions and based on literature review. Two primary purposes of this meeting are to add detail to the actions already on

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

the list and add any actions that should be included but are not currently on the list. To this end, the document as it stands is not expected to be comprehensive. The list is grouped by recommendation type and is not in order of importance or preference. Heidi then described the meaning of each column. Of particular importance is the “issue addressed” column which relates the suggested management alternative to a water resources issue facing the watershed (provided in the first document). Also of importance is the “questions for future evaluation” column which lists technical, funding, political, or other questions related to the alternative that will need to be considered during the evaluation process. It was noted that the goal of this meeting is not to answer these questions, only to identify what questions will need to be evaluated at a later date.

Pat Naugle asked if it would be possible to look into gaged flow values from Bridgeport over a long period of time to understand changes in consumptive use over time and the effects of these changes on instream flows. Heidi pointed out that the consumptive use values that are currently available are estimated – so it was agreed that comparing the values to observed data would be an interesting analysis. Heidi M. and Jim Palmer noted that a challenge of this analysis would be to understand the causes of streamflow changes over time. Given two years with similar streamflow, one historic and one recent, differences may be attributable to changes in land use/land cover, soil characteristics, consumptive uses, or other factors.

Barbara Underwood noted that not many municipalities were represented at the meeting and asked how best to get municipal participation. Charlie noted that 12 municipalities received invitations. Nick Colonna suggested that participation through the Economic Development Council and the COG may foster that participation. It was asked of Dave Jostenski how other CWPAs are doing with municipal participation. He said there is very little for comparison as this is one of only two advisory committees.

Facilitated discussion:

Charlie turned the meeting over to Nicki Kasi (DEP) to facilitate the discussion. The purpose of the discussion is to flesh out the draft list of management alternatives and to add any additional alternatives. The rules are: only one person speaks at a time, there are no bad ideas, and alternatives will not undergo evaluation at this point. The discussion was recorded by adding new rows to the draft management recommendations. A new version of the spreadsheet, including all new suggestions, will be compiled and distributed for review prior to the February 15th advisory committee workshop. A preliminary technical evaluation of each alternative, including CAAC discussions on the topics from this meeting, will also be prepared prior to the February 15th advisory committee workshop.

Announcements:

- Ideas for management alternatives to address the water resources issues in the watersheds can be submitted after the meeting. If at all possible, please submit them by February 10th so all ideas can undergo evaluation at the February 15th workshop.
- The next meeting of the CAAC will be from 9-3pm at the Ag Center on February 15th. The purpose of the workshop will be to evaluate and prioritize management recommendations.

Closing:

Charlie thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.