Pennsylvania Chesapeake Bay Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP)
Steering Committee
January 26, 2018 Meeting Minutes
Approved:

Members Present:

Name	Agency
Tim Schaeffer	Department of Environmental Protection
Russell Redding	Department of Agriculture
Cindy Dunn	Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Sara Nicholas, Alternate	
Karl Brown	State Conservation Commission
Brion Johnson	Pennvest
Andrew Dehoff	Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC)
Andrew Gavin, Alternate	
Marel King, Alternate (via webinar)	Chesapeake Bay Commission
Matt Keefer	Forestry Workgroup Co-Chair
Katie Ombalski	Forestry Workgroup Co-Chair
Doug Goodlander	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Greg Hostetter	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Matt Royer	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
John Bell	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Lisa Schaefer	Local Planning Goals Co-Chair
Davitt Woodwell	Local Planning Goals Co-Chair
John Brosious	Wastewater Workgroup Co-Chair
Jay Patel	Wastewater Workgroup Co-Chair
Felicia Dell	Stormwater Workgroup Co-Chair

Other Attendees:
Federal Agencies:
Rich Batiuk, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Peter Claggett, US Geological Survey
Sally Claggett, Forestry Service
Jacob Czawlutea, US Geological Survey
Mike Langland, US Geological Survey
Matt Johnston, University of Maryland, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Dianne McNally, EPA Region 3
Curtis Schreffler, US Geological Survey
Emily Trentacoste, Us EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Tammy Zimmerman, US Geological Survey

DEP:
Katie Hetherington-Cunfer   Hayley Jeffords
Nicki Kasi   Megan Lehman (via webinar)

Lee McDonnell   LeAnn Murray
Natahnee Shrawder   Peter Tarby (via webinar)
Ted Tesler   Kristen Wolf

Other State Agencies:
Bonnie McCann, PDA (via webinar)
Kelly O'Donnell, PDA
Teddi Stark, DCNR
Lori Yeich, DCNR

Other Governmental Agencies:
Jamie Shallenberger, Susquehanna River Basin Commission
Tyler Shenk, Susquehanna River Basin Commission

Other:
Dennis Auker, (via webinar)
Harry Campbell, Chesapeake Bay Foundation (via webinar)
Molly Cheatum, Chesapeake Bay Foundation (via webinar)
Ben Dannels, Greenlee Partners
Andrew Darvcalov, Exelon
Carrol Ehrhart, Skelly and Loy, Inc. (via webinar)
Mary Gattis (via webinar)
Phil Gruber, (via webinar)
Cheri Grumbine, North Lebanon Township (via webinar)
Jennifer Handke, Consulting with a Purpose
David Hess, Crisci Associates (via webinar)
Donna Morelli, Bay Journal (via webinar)
John Nikoloff, ERG Partners (via webinar)
Raffi Rodrigo (via webinar
John Seitz, York County Planning (via webinar)
Pam Shellenberger, York County Planning
Kristopher Troup, North Londonderry Twp (via webinar)
Roger Varner, Ecology and Environment, Inc. (via webinar)
Walt Whitmer, Penn State (via webinar)
Marjorie Zeff, AECOM

Welcome and Introductions – Tim Schaeffer, Deputy Secretary for Water Programs, DEP
Deputy Secretary Schaeffer opened the meeting at 1:00 pm

Approval of Meeting Minutes – All
Brion Johnson moved that the November 30, 2017 meeting minutes be approved. Karl Brown seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Brion Johnson moved that the December 13, 2017 meeting minutes be approved. Karl Brown seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Accounting for Growth in Pennsylvania for the Chesapeake Bay TMDL –
      Peter Claggett, US Geological Survey, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office

Matt Johnston, University of Maryland, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office

Peter Claggett opened the discussion by providing an overview of all the work he, the Partnership Land Use Workgroup and the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office has done compiling data for the Land Change Model to estimate the land use and wastewater impacts of future population and growth in the watershed. He provided an overview of the different data sets that went into the model including; population projections, housing demand, employment projections and land use cover. Different scenarios and simulations were run to develop final growth projections, based on different probabilities such as residential and commercial development, housing and job density and the expansion of sewer service areas. Census data for both people and agriculture was also considered.

Peter also went over the current efforts to develop future growth scenarios that are being developed to help the states address sector growth as part of their Phase 3 WIPs. There are three categories where a combination of programs and practices that can be applied to the base scenario of Current Zoning (Historic Trends factored with additional local zoning):
1. Forest Conservation (First Priority) – Additional actions to conserve forests and wetlands; including conservation areas, shorelines, riparian zones, large contiguous forest tracts and lands adjacent to protected areas.
2. Growth Management (Second Priority) – Additional actions to encourage growth in areas with supporting infrastructure.
3. Agriculture and Soil Conservation (Third Priority) – Additional actions to conserve farmland and productive soils.

In addition, Peter is offering to develop one scenario specific to each state. The deadline for submitting the specifics for that scenario is the end of March. Other next steps for his group are:
1. Establishing expectations for documenting conservation and planning actions in the Phase 3 WIPs.
2. Establishing standards to verify the effects of conservation and planning actions.
3. Develop Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership consensus on assumptions about pre-development conditions and post-development practices.

Matt Johnston then provided a brief overview of where the 0.1% increase in nitrogen due to sector growth is coming from. He then broke this down for three counties; Lancaster, York and Centre Counties. He then went over the changes in agriculture between now and 2025. There is projected to be a significant decrease in pasture land, a significant increase in double crop lsnf. Dairy populations will be going down, swine and poultry are projected to increase. Changes in nitrogen and phosphorus application from fertilizer are projected to decrease significantly, while manure applications are projected to increase.

Rich Batiuk, from the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office, announced EPA is releasing a request for proposals to continue to generate the 1-meter land use data, to keep this data set up to date. This proposal will also allow for the mapping of slopes, to more accurately define where the riparian buffers are and where they should be. The contractor will also be accessible to the states for the purposes of using remote sensing for best management practice verification.

Discussion points from the Steering Committee:
- There was some concern expressed over the combinations of practices in the three categories of scenarios and the percentage of implementation required for each. A request to allow for adjustments in the percent implementation was made.
- The change in animal populations would be more accurately expressed as animal equivalent units, rather than actual number of animals.
- There are a lot of unknowns in this data, particularly with the provision to update this every two years. This essentially "changes the bar" that must be reached every two years. What happens if through this process, it is found there is actually more nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment to the Bay? This only adds another ring of uncertainty to the process.
- A better understanding of how the zoning information is used and how the areas without zoning are treated is needed.
- The more this keeps changing, the more chances we take of losing buy-in.
- The information presented is helpful, it does put this in perspective and does give us a good way to assess the impacts from sector growth. This has to be part of the conversation, but in a way that is achievable. Recognizing that this task can be overwhelming, this has to be put in context. We need to be careful with the message and the narrative.
- The one take away is the overall change is an increase of 0.1 % in nitrogen. This is not monumental. There is the caveat that the impact of wastewater still needs to be added to the numbers presented today.

Local Area Planning Goal Process – Local Area Goals Workgroup Co-chairs
Lisa Schaeffer provided an overview of the DRAFT Toolbox for the Local Planning Process to meet the County Goals developed by the Local Area Goals Workgroup. She emphasized that this toolbox needs further input from the workgroup members, which they plan to solicit over the following month. She asked the Steering Committee for approval to move forward with the framework, recognizing the Toolbox will change based on the input of the workgroups. Brion Johnson moved that the Local Area Workgroup move forward with the finalization of the Toolbox as presented. Greg Hostetter seconded. John Bell emphasized the need to keep the toolbox flexible and there will be a need to change the toolbox over time as it is utilized. The motion passed unanimously.

Davitt Woodwell provided an overview of the next steps for engaging the counties in this process, emphasizing the fact that this is an iterative process, starting with the "charrette" planned for April. It needs to be recognized that it is infeasible to develop the countywide plans for all the counties before the Phase 3 WIP is drafted and submitted for review. In addition, the process may be different, depending on where in the watershed the county is located. As a result, future "charrettes" will need to be planned, the number and location of which is still under discussion. Recognizing the agenda he submitted for review is not complete, he asked the Steering Committee for approval of the idea of the "charrette". Lisa further asked for recognition of the tiered approach to the development of the countywide plans. Brion Johnson moved for approval of the concept and agenda of the charette and the tiered approach for the development of the countywide plans. Kate Ombalski seconded the motion. John Bell added that this first meeting has to be a test pilot of the approach. It will be very important that broad

representation of the key players at the local level attend this meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Development of Public Engagement Strategy – Nicki Kasi
Nicki announced that while the workgroups do not need to comply with provisions of the Sunshine Act; however, for the purposes of transparency, these meetings will be opened to the public starting in February. Monthly meetings of the Workgroup Co-chairs are strictly held for the purpose of managing and coordinating the process; and, therefore, will not be opened to the public. Workgroup meeting dates, times and locations will be posted on the DEP Chesapeake Bay webpage at the beginning of each month. Members of the public will be given 5 to 10 minutes at the end of each meeting to provide input and comment. There will not be any formal meeting minutes developed, nor will workgroup agendas be posted.

Nicki also provided a brief overview of the Communications Plan and Engagement Strategy timeline that is under development with assistance of the Workgroup Co-chairs. This plan and timeline will define the main messages, the format and forum for local engagement for the Phase 3 WIP process from now through final publication in June, 2019. It will be a dynamic document that will be modified as needed as it is implemented. Once the plan and timeline is in a more final format, they will be submitted to the Steering Committee for final review and approval.

Discussion from the Steering Committee members included the following points:
- Once the "charrette" is held, what happens next to ensure the counties have the assistance needed to develop the local, countywide plans? Perhaps a SWAT team should be identified that would go to each county, comprised of members around the table to assist the counties.
- Steering Committee members need a 30 to 40 minute presentation that can be used at annual conferences and workshops to highlight the main messages and what this effort is trying to accomplish. A list of conferences and potential opportunities to use this presentation is also needed. It should be kept in mind that this is not a once and done effort. This presentation and the message conveyed in the presentation will change as progress is made. The presentation can be done in installments to capture what has been learned, the direction being taken, and the approaches being utilized.
- Another approach is to provide a series of webinars.
- Answers to the following questions should be part of the content of either, or both, the presentations and the webinars:
  1. What is it that we are asking them to do?
  2. Where are we asking them to do it?
  3. Where can they go for assistance?

Public Comment
There were no public comments.

Brion Johnson moved to adjourn. Karl Brown seconded. Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.