Local Area Goals (LAG) Workgroup Recommendations

Today we will update you on our recommendations and lessons learned for outreach and planning assistance for the counties in the Bay Watershed.

**Agenda**
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- LAG Workgroup Recommendations
  - Outreach and Engagement
  - Community Clean Water Toolbox
  - Staffing Resources
  - Regionalized Support
  - Counties with Minimal Loadings
  - Two Options for Planning in Remaining Counties
- Questions
The challenges pilot counties faced fall into three categories:

1. Universal Challenges
2. County Specific Challenges
All four counties struggled with figuring out how and where to start. Even with support and the resources provided to them, they were doing something new, and had no examples to follow.

Here are some questions they all asked:
• Where do I start?
• Who is responsible? Who can help?
• Why does on-the-ground data not match what is reported?
• How will this be accomplished without additional funding, flexibility and resources?
Where do I Start?

Finding a Starting Point
- Understanding the WIP & WIP process
- Building the coalition
- Stakeholder buy-in

Developing a Plan
- What BMPs to include?
- Priority Initiatives

Implementation of a Plan
- Who is responsible for implementation of planned practices?
Voluntary Action vs. Regulatory Action
  • Understanding the WIP is a voluntary action
  • Creating goals with the fear of regulation
  • Limited County authority

Coalition Building
  • Who can provide valuable information?
  • Limited staff resources and funding
On the Ground Data Does Not Match

The Data Does Not Match

- Disconnect between currently reported data vs. real world data
- Monitored Results vs. Reported Results

Examples of Reporting Methods That Need Improvement

- Manure Transport
- Cover Crops
- Non-manure Nutrient Management

Reporting and Tracking of New and Existing Practices

- Currently not a standardized central recording system
- The need for confidentiality
County Specific Challenges

Some of the challenges the pilot counties faced were unique to their own local situation.

- Existing Coalitions/Water Quality Groups
- Planning Processes
Lancaster and York
• Existing coalitions
• Had to pivot to incorporate existing plans

Adams and Franklin
• No existing water quality coalitions
• Had to build coalitions from scratch

Diversity of Stakeholders
• Each county brought unique groups of stakeholders/partners
### Planning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Planning Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lancaster | - Led by existing nonprofit coalition  
- Smaller plan writing team  
- One-on-one outreach to stakeholders  
- Public meeting - shared draft plan and received input |
| York    | - Led by Planning Commission and Conservation District  
- Utilized existing clean water coalition  
- Meetings open to public throughout process – continuous input  
- Smaller plan writing team |
| Adams   | - Led by Planning Commission and Conservation District  
- Held large stakeholder kickoff and final plan meetings  
- Smaller agriculture and stormwater workgroup meetings |
| Franklin | - Led by Planning Commission and Conservation District  
- Smaller workgroup and stakeholder meetings |
1. Conduct outreach and engagement to other counties in the watershed
2. Countywide groups need more of a framework to get started (e.g. who to invite to the table, timing/schedules)
3. Community Clean Water Toolbox is too large for one document
4. Coordination and technical staff resources will be key to successfully completing the rest of the countywide plans
5. Need to give countywide groups sufficient time to complete the planning process
6. Implementation is just as important as planning
1. Outreach and Engagement
2. Community Clean Water Toolbox
3. Staffing Resources
4. Regionalized Support
5. Counties with Minimal Loadings
6. Two Options for Planning in Remaining Counties:
   • Watershed-Wide Approach
   • Staged Approach
1. Outreach and Engagement

Phase 3 WIP and Countywide Action Plan Webinar to Remaining Counties

• Schedule a webinar(s) or similar event for the remaining counties to provide an overview of the WIP and planning process before the draft Phase 3 WIP is released.
Community Clean Water Toolbox

Split the toolbox into two separate documents:

- **Community Clean Water Planning Guide**: Standardized introduction to the planning process.

- **Community Clean Water Technical Toolbox**: Customized toolbox populated with county-specific data.
Community Clean Water Planning Guide

- Clearly defined framework for process, directions
- Remove duplicate information
- Better define timeline and expectations
- Give real world examples from pilot counties

Community Clean Water Technical Toolbox

- Simplify technical information provided
- Provide clarity on in-stream monitoring
- Add information the pilot counties found helpful
- Incorporate the state workgroup recommendations
Staffing Resources. New, permanent, dedicated internal and external staffing needed for successful planning and long-term implementation.

Recommended staff and estimated costs:

- DEP Staff
  - Internal Coordinators, $100,000/coordinator
- Contractors
  - External Coordinators, $100,000/coordinator
  - Technical Coordinators, $90,000/coordinator
  - Facilitation Coordinator, $100,000/coordinator
  - Outreach Coordinator, $100,000/coordinator
Regionalized Support. Staffing resources/coordinators should be provided on a regionalized basis, rather than by county.

- Regional groupings would be proposed based on existing networks, partnerships and resources.
- Countywide Action Plans would still be submitted by each county in the region.
- Counties in regional groupings are not required to work together, or to develop a regional plan.
Counties with Minimal Loadings. One coordinator should be made available to all counties with minimal loadings.

- Coordinator works with counties to implement statewide workgroup recommendations
- Separate countywide plan not required in these counties
- Seven counties with less than 200,000 pounds of nitrogen per county
  - Wyoming, Elk, Indiana, Wayne, McKean, Jefferson, Carbon
Planning and implementation of the Phase 3 WIP will require significant staff and financial resources.

Recognizing this, the Workgroup proposes two options for completing the planning process in the remaining counties:

- Watershed-Wide Approach
- Staged Approach
Option 1: Watershed-Wide Approach

Watershed-Wide Approach

- 39 counties have 4 to 6 months to complete plans
- Support staff provided on a regionalized basis
- Each county completes an individual plan
- Resources needed by July 2019 (*43 coordinators, approx $4.2 million*):
  - 21 contracted external coordinators, $2,100,000
  - 10 internal coordinators, $1,000,000
  - 10 contracted technical coordinators, $900,000
  - 1 contracted facilitation coordinator, $100,000
  - 1 contracted outreach coordinator, $100,000

### Option 1: Watershed-wide Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed-Wide Pros</th>
<th>Watershed-Wide Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● All county planning complete in 12 months</td>
<td>● Shortened 4-6 month planning process for each county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Implementation begins sooner</td>
<td>● Less one-on-one state support with regionalized support approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Regional partnerships leveraged for planning and implementation</td>
<td>● All counties competing for limited state and partner resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Less time for county outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Does not recognize unique variation in nutrient loads across counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Challenges to building coalitions with limited county partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Challenges to scaling up on designated timeframe on both funding and staffing fronts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Option 2: Staged Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2 - Second 25% of Reductions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tier 3 - Third 25% of Reductions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tier 4 - Last 25% of Reductions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Schuylkill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Juniata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>Tioga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Susquehanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mifflin</td>
<td>Clearfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lycoming</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lackawanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luzerne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1:

- Four Tier 2 counties complete their plans over a 6 to 8 month timeframe, and continuation/implementation in four pilot counties
  - 54% of Pennsylvania’s total Nitrogen load
- Support staff provided on an individual county basis
- Each county completes an individual plan
- Resources needed by July 2019 (approx. $1.4 million):
  - 8 contracted external coordinators, $800,000
  - 3 internal coordinators, $300,000
  - 2 contracted technical coordinators, $180,000
  - 1 contracted facilitation coordinator, $100,000
  - 1 outreach coordinator, $100,000
Phase 2:

- Remaining 35 counties complete their plans over a 6 to 8 month timeframe
  - 46% of remaining goal
- Support staff provided on a regionalized basis
- Each county completes an individual plan
- Resources needed by February 2020 (approx. $2.7 million):
  - 13 contracted external coordinators, $1,300,000
  - 7 internal coordinators, $700,000
  - 8 contracted technical coordinator position, $720,000

Option 2: Staged Approach
## Option 2: Staged Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staged Approach Pros</th>
<th>Staged Approach Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● All county planning complete in 18 months</td>
<td>● Longer 18 month timeframe to full watershed implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Counties have more time to complete planning process (6-8 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Implementation begins sooner in higher loading counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Counties get more one-on-one support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Phase 1 counties have less competition for limited state and partner resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● More time to scale up funding and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● More time for coalition building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Recognizes unique variations in nutrient loads for individual counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Watershed-Wide Approach vs. Phased Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed Wide Approach</th>
<th>Staged Approach Phase 1</th>
<th>Staged Approach Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 2019</strong></td>
<td>Begin outreach and engagement – all counties</td>
<td>Implementation phase begins – Pilot counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 2019</strong></td>
<td>Tier 2, 3 and 4 planning efforts</td>
<td>Implementation phase begins – Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2019</strong></td>
<td>Implementation phase begins – Pilot counties</td>
<td>Tier 2 planning efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin outreach and engagement – Tier 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 3 and 4 planning efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are finalizing the WIP pilot planning process and shifting into the WIP implementation phase.

What are the next steps with the pilot counties to begin a pilot implementation phase?

- Formation of implementation team?
- Who is responsible?
- Where are the resources identified by the counties?
LAG Questions for Consideration

The pilot process has shown us the extensive outreach that is required to engage and educate county WIP teams.

How can we consolidate our efforts to be most efficient and effective, given limited resources?

- Current and projected resource staffing
- Regional approach (geographically)? How do we group counties?
- Counties under a certain threshold treated differently?
Given the remaining counties, current and projected staffing resources, and the workload required for each county, what should the timeline look like for the remaining counties?

• How long will each county be allowed for planning?
• How long will the overall timeline be, for completion of remaining counties?
1. **Outreach and engagement.** Schedule a webinar or similar event for counties to provide an overview of the WIP and planning process before the draft Phase 3 WIP is released.

2. **Clean Water Toolbox.** Split the toolbox into two documents
   a. Community Clean Water Guide with edits
   b. Community Clean Water Technical Toolbox with edits

3. **Regionalized support.** Staffing resources/coordinators should be provided on a regionalized basis, rather than by county

4. **Counties with minimal loadings.** One coordinator should be made available to all counties with minimal loadings.

5. **Countywide Planning.** Planning in the remaining 39 counties should be completed on a phased approach to maximize potential for success.
Questions?
Contact Information

Lisa Schaefer
Director of Government Relations
County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania

lschaefer@pacounties.org
(717) 736-4748

DEP Chesapeake Bay Program Website:
http://www.dep.pa.gov/ChesapeakeBay

Phase 3 WIP Website:
www.dep.pa.gov/chesapeakebay/phase3