



## State Water Plan Update Statewide Committee Meeting

November 12, 2020  
9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.  
Virtual Meeting via SKPYE

### Committee Members in Attendance:

Andrew Dehoff	Kevin Moore
Andrew Gutshall	Kristina Peacock-Jones
Daniel Gold	Len Bradley
Deb Simko	Matthew Wolford
Gary Merritt	Patty Elkis
Heather Smiles	Richard Harrison
Heidi Moltz, Ph.D.	Sean Donnelly
Jeff Jumper	Simeon Suter
Jennifer Fetter	Steven Tambini
Jessica Trimble	Theresa Eberly
Kate Harper	Tim Westin
Kelly Anderson	Trish Salvia
Michael Roth	

### Committee Members Not in Attendance:

Brian Eckert  
Jan Bowers  
Matthew Genchur  
Shannon Rossman

### Others in Attendance:

Mark Matlock - DEP	Monica Gould - Strategic Consulting Partners
Mike Hill - DEP	Bob Whitmore - Strategic Consulting Partners
James Horton - DEP	
Summer Kunkle - DEP	
Brian Chalfant – DEP	
Heather Smiles - DEP	
Rhonda Manning – DEP	
Taylor Nezat - DEP	

### Visitors:

Alex Riyard – Philadelphia Water Department  
Ben Lorson - PA Fish & Boat Commission

Curtis Schreffler - U.S. Geological Survey  
Teresa McCurdy

### **Welcome:**

Mark Matlock, DEP, welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the meeting was being recorded and provided helpful hints on the use of the technology. Chair Tim Weston welcomed everyone attending the meeting. Monica Gould completed a roll call for attendance and each member of the committee and visitors present introduced themselves and the agency or professional discipline they are representing.

### **Minutes of August 19, 2020 Meeting**

The minutes of the August 19, 2020 Statewide Committee meeting were approved as presented on a Len Bradley / Kate Harper motion.

### **Amendment to the Bylaws**

A proposed change to Article XI of the Statewide Committee Bylaws was presented by Chair Weston. The proposed change had been sent to Committee members in accordance with the existing bylaws. The proposed bylaws change modifies the requirement to send bylaws changes from certified mail to email. A discussion of the proposed change to the Article added the wording of email acknowledgment to the process statement. The revised Article XI would now read:

“The By-Laws may be amended at any meeting of the Statewide Committee by two-thirds vote of the full voting Statewide Committee membership (16 voting members) provided that written notice of such change has been sent via email with a read receipt or email acknowledgment from each member at least two weeks prior to the meeting.”

The proposed Bylaws change was approved unanimously on a Matt Wolford / Andrew Dehoff motion.

### **Public Comment**

Chair Weston opened the meeting for public comment. No public comment was offered.

### **DEP Summary of Activities**

Mark Matlock, DEP staff, provided an update on DEP activities. The USGS Water Use Data and Research Grants data sharing projects are still progressing. The project for improving Chapter 110 data input is about 80% complete. The project involving data sharing between agencies has been initiated and the IT architecture and data sharing protocols are being finalized.

Staff within the Department are gathering noteworthy activities and projects achieved over the past 10 years that coincide with the State Water Plan. This information will be spotlighted in the State Water Plan update.

The stormwater program is in the process of developing an updated stormwater best practices manual to incorporate green infrastructure. The Energy Programs Office, who

is responsible for updating the Governor's Climate Action Plan, is currently in the revision process for the 2021 iteration of the plan. Valuable input provided by Committee members will be passed along to these DEP programs.

DEP staff are continuing to work on better data sharing tools. One of those tools is Power BI, which will display water use data to the public in a more user-friendly way.

A Committee member asked if the revised Stormwater Management Plan, revised BMPs and the Climate Action Plan updates will be released before the State Water Plan update. Mark stated the Climate Action Plan update is in draft form and will be published late 2021 or early 2022. The Stormwater Management Plan revisions are expected to be published in late 2021.

### **Presentation on POWER BI**

Michael Hill, DEP Geologist, provided a visual presentation and overview of Power BI. Power BI is a data sharing tool designed to expand the number of existing online water use report viewers by eliminating the need to crunch a large dataset for a summary report. It is a Microsoft application. The data presents visually the amount of surface and ground water used within the state. It does not assess water availability.

Maps, tables, and charts are available to show water withdrawals, water usage types and a breakdown of water users. The data can be viewed for each Pennsylvania County, state water planning regions, subbasins, and watersheds. The information can be exported to an Excel spreadsheet or csv format.

The current map, charts, and tables show data for 2018. Eventually data will be available for multiple years and show trends in water usage. 2019 data should be available early 2021 when it is confirmed all suppliers have provided their data. Power BI will be available to the public on the DEP website soon. The system is currently completing internal review by IT and Communications staff prior to approval for public use.

Committee members asked if there is a similar chart going to be available for consumption use of water and return of water. Mike stated it is possible to view this information in a viewer such as Power BI but is not part of the current program initiative.

### **Regional Committee Updates**

An update of Regional Committee activities was provided by a representative from each Regional Committee.

1. **Delaware Regional Committee** - Update provided by Kate Harper. The Delaware Committee is concerned with land use and development within the region. Integrating land use planning, stormwater management planning and water resources management are important to the Committee. The Committee also prioritizes collaboration and regional planning initiatives. The Committee recognizes the term climate change can be controversial and suggests using terms such as climate resiliency and intensity of storms.

2. **Great Lakes Regional Committee** - Update provided by Matthew Wolford. Climate change has not been identified as a high priority for the Great Lakes Committee. The priority is not to label events or anticipate climate change but to focus on addressing events that are going on now and the impact on the region. Assessing existing infrastructure needs and funding to address infrastructure is a priority. Great Lakes region is different from other parts of Pennsylvania with the dependence on Lake Erie. The commercial navigation on Lake Erie, economic impact of the fishing industry, and issues with invasive species coming into the region from other states and Canada are priorities. A priority is proactively promoting legislation and collaboration and communications with partner jurisdictions that will protect the quantity and quality of water in Lake Erie.
3. **Lower Susquehanna Regional Committee** - Update provided by Jennifer Fetter. The region has two of the fastest growing counties in Pennsylvania and a growth in distribution centers because of proximity to population areas on the east coast. Priorities for the region include addressing a significant number of impaired streams and legacy sediment created by mill dams that is impacting stormwater management. Stormwater management and addressing flash flooding caused by more volatile weather patterns are also important priorities.
4. **Ohio Regional Committee** - Update provided by Deb Simko. The regional committee approved 18 members for an advisory board for the two CARPs in the region. The Ohio Committee's priorities include interagency water resource planning which the Committee feels can address many of the region's key issues and water priorities. Severe weather events are having a significant impact on stormwater management and flooding within the region and developing adaptive initiatives and funding are top priorities for managing stormwater. The Committee recommends regional authorities and watershed districts to support stormwater management efforts.
5. **Potomac Regional Committee** - Updated provided by Kevin Moore. The Potomac Committee is working on completing the CARP updates. Stormwater management, flooding, capturing runoff from large storm events and drought planning are priorities for the region. These priorities are impacted by aging infrastructure and the unique geology and soils within the region and this is not supported through standard BMPs. The Committee prioritizes integrated planning at a regional or county wide level and developing land use programs that protect water quality and quantity.
6. **Upper / Middle Susquehanna Regional Committee** - Update provided by Andrew Gutshall. The Upper/Middle Susquehanna Committee feels the term climate change is polarizing and suggests using alternative terminology such as climate resiliency and supporting discussions with scientific data. The Committee discussed BMP design standards and are hopeful the new BMPs will address differences in geographic regions. Priorities for the region include protecting source water areas, headwater habitats and recharge areas, recognizing the differences between rural and suburban

areas, and planning for flooding and stormwater management. The Committee also prioritizes multi-municipal planning and coordination and financial resources needed to support smaller rural municipalities.

### **IWRM / IWRP Discussion**

Committee members were surveyed prior to the meeting regarding Interagency Water Resources Planning and Management.

The first survey question asked participants: “What comes to mind when you hear the term Integrated Water Resources Planning/Management? Responses to the survey included:

- I do not understand the terms; we need clarification on the definition
- Agencies, NGO’s local government, local stakeholders, and citizens working collaboratively to leverage limited financial and manpower resources
- Coordination among programs to protect a shared water resource
- Whole community planning; holistic approach of watershed
- Integrating various regulatory and programmatic approaches across departments and agencies
- Watershed protection, landscape conservation, groundwater protection, protecting aquatic ecosystems

The second survey question asked: “In what ways do you see Integrated Water Resources Planning / Management benefitting your program or causing potential challenges?

- Could benefit by bringing partners together with common goals
- Poorly defined roles and relationships, compete for limited resources
- Benefits include improved water quality, decreased flooding, decreased impacts of climate change
- Challenges – too many fragmented programs and local governments which makes funding and consistency difficult
- Water quality infrastructure is complex and expensive to plan for execute and maintain for local municipalities
- Unless there is a water budget produced from this plan that is enforceable, it will sit on the shelf like county comprehensive plans, Natural Heritage inventory plans, stormwater plans. Lots of money spent on plans but no accountability.
- Act 167 floodplain documents are older, outdated and no longer effective.
- Developers and municipalities need to be incentivized to go above and beyond regulatory minimums
- Potential benefits far outweigh potential challenges.

Comments from Committee Discussion on IWRP/IWRM

- Planning is evaluation of the current situation, a look at alternatives, and development of a plan; implementation is the management of the plan
- Integrated planning brings various stakeholders into one process
- Need to look at things from a watershed perspective

- Would be helpful if DEP provided templates
- Statutes, regulations, and agencies create silos for completion of work, how do you eliminate silos
- Provide incentives for developers
- The last Stormwater Plan recommended watershed, county, multicounty planning efforts
- Do other states provide models that Pennsylvania can copy?
- The Committee made suggestions last time for IWRP and nothing happened, DEP needs to show how IWRP can be completed and implemented
- DEP should integrate internal departments to model IWRP
- The state water plan needs to be a strong advocate for IWRP
- Implementation of plans happens at the county level
- Water does not know boundaries
- PennDOT Connect program is a model that could be used
- Pilots for IWRP - One Water Task Force, York County Planning, Chester County, Lehigh County, Delaware County
- DEP should define roles for different levels of planning and management; provide guidance and best practices
- Need to identify priorities and needs for each watershed
- Language on IWRP in last plan was good, but needs to be strengthened in this plan
- DCNR has their own plans and may not always be aligned with DEP in the development of plans
- Funding is always an issue, how powerful is the Committee to advocate for funding support for planning entities
- Obstacles:
  - Process takes a long time, 6 to 9 months for DEP to approve
  - DEP should be integrated to support counties throughout the process
  - Do we need changes to laws or regulations to clarify roles and foster integration?
  - Municipal government structure with 2500 municipalities
- The new state water plan should include the following on IWRP/IWRM
  - Summary of what was included in the last plan
  - Updated information on the status of IWRP and problems encountered in implementing the previous goals,
  - A vision for the future,
  - Recommendations on how to achieve the vision, provide structure
  - Be an advocate for IWRP.
- The State should provide guidance on what IWRP plans should look like, the outcomes to be developed, and BMPs
- Integrated planning opportunities (from chat comments)
  - DEP Central office RPCO (Regional Permit Coordination Office)
  - Can DEP manage permit processes to require cross collaboration or does this require legislation?

- Lancaster and York counties are identifying properties where larger stormwater projects for regional benefit should be located
- Different areas have different priorities and different hydrologic systems
- What are the roles of DEP, counties, municipalities in terms of implementing integration? Do we need changes to laws or regulations to clarify roles and foster integration?
- PennDOT Connect is a useful model to look at integration
- In the Stormwater Management Act the legislature assigned watershed planning process to counties. Can that model be used for sewage, flood plain issues?
- Obstacles should include a reference to government agencies being “siloed” as programs. Programs around statutes results in specialized administration and enforcement and creates a challenge for integrated management.

### **Resources Provided in the Chat**

- <https://www.moorecountync.gov/images/departments/planning-transportation/Ordinances/2016-05-19%20-%20Unified%20Development%20Ordinance.pdf>
- <https://www.phila.gov/water/wu/Documents/StormwaterManagementPublicPrivate.pdf>
- <https://www.penndot.gov/ProjectAndPrograms/Planning/Pages/PennDOT-Connects.aspx>

### **Future Meetings**

The Committee decided to move to a bi-monthly schedule instead of quarterly meetings and meetings will be scheduled so they do not conflict with other DEP advisory committees. The tentative dates for the Statewide Committee to meet in 2021 are:

- January 21 from 9:00 am to 12:00 noon and will be a virtual meeting.
- March 17
- May 19
- July 21
- September 15

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 am on a Richard Harrison / Kate Harper motion.