

Handout #1 – October 19 Steering Committee Meeting

Pennsylvania Chesapeake Bay Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP)
Steering Committee
August 24, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Approved:

Members Present:

Name	Agency
Russell Redding	Department of Agriculture
Sara Nicholas, Alternate	Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Brion Johnson	Pennvest
Karl Brown	State Conservation Commission
Andrew Dehoff	Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC)
Andrew Gavin, Alternate	
Representative Garth Everett (via webinar)	Chesapeake Bay Commission
Marel King, Alternate	Chesapeake Bay Commission
Matt Keefer	Forestry Workgroup Co-Chair
Matt Royer (via webinar)	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
John Bell (via webinar)	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Doug Goodlander	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Greg Hostetter	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
Sean Furjanic	Stormwater Workgroup Co-Chair

Other Attendees:

DEP/DCNR:

Sean Gimbel	Katie Hetherington-Confer
Nicki Kasi	Megan Lehman (via webinar)
Lee McDonnell	Lee Murphy
LeeAnn Murray	Jessica Shirley
Teddi Stark	Kristen Wolf

Other Governmental Agencies:

Kevin McGonigal, Susquehanna River Basin Commission
Natalie Sabadish, Office of the Budget (via webinar)
Tyler Shenk Susquehanna River Basin Commission
John Seitz, York County Planning
Jamie Shallenberger, Susquehanna River Basin Commission
Pam Shellenberger, York County Planning
Daryl St. Clair, PennDOT
Andrew Watson, Susquehanna River Basin Commission

Other:

Bill Angstadt (via webinar)
Seung Ah Byun (via webinar)
Harry Campbell, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Bill Chain, Chesapeake Bay Foundation (via webinar)
Gene Dice (via webinar)
John Dawes, Pennsylvania Watersheds (via webinar)
Ron Furlan
Kerry Golden, Pennsylvania House of Representatives (via webinar)
Ronald Grutza (via webinar)
Grant Guilbon, Pennsylvania Farm Bureau
Jennifer Handke, Consulting with a Purpose (via webinar)
David Hess, Crisci Associates (via webinar)
Theodora Krietz, Keller Engineers
Kristen Kyler (via webinar)
Jonathan Lutz, Pennsylvania House of Representatives (via webinar)
Jenna Mackley, Penn State (via webinar)
Casey Martin, PA House of Representatives, 99th District
Brandi Miller, Pennsylvania House of Representatives (via webinar)
Renee Reber, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Mark Spatz (via webinar)
Roger Varner, Ecology and the Environment, Inc.
Wendy Walter (via webinar)
Tim Weston, Pennsylvania Chamber

Welcome and Introductions

DEP Executive Director, Office for External Affairs Katie Hetherington Cunfer opened the meeting at 1:00 pm. Those in the room and attending via webinar introduced themselves.

Approval of May 8 Meeting Minutes -- All

Karl Brown made the motion to approve the draft meeting minutes for the July 31 2017 meeting. Lisa Schaefer seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Describing Nutrient and Sediment Pollution Across Pennsylvania's Bay Drainage – Tyler Shenk, SRBC

Tyler Shenk opened presentation describing two main objectives; (1) describing the current monitoring and trends data for the streams in Pennsylvania, and (2) showing how those data are used in the Models to assist with planning efforts. To help tie efforts into the localized level he illustrated the impaired streams in the watershed through maps and graphs, focusing in on nutrient and siltation cause impairment. Broken out by subbasin, it was noted that the Lower Susquehanna has more miles impaired by siltation and nutrients than all other subbasins combined. He then described the monitoring efforts of SRBC and the US Geological Survey (USGS) in the field collection of water quality data at 24 stations in Pennsylvania and how these raw data points are adjusted to form long-term trends by adjusting for flow conditions. The raw data showed a lot of variability over the years with the example trend showing a decreasing nitrogen trend at Conestoga, illustrating the need and advantage to use modeled results along with monitoring data to show progress. He then showed 10 year average yields for all 24 sites for

phosphorus, suspended sediment and nitrogen. It was noted by multiple people that for both nitrogen and phosphorus the highest loads were all coming from the Lower Susquehanna subbasin, while sediment had a bit more variability due to its unique behavior compared to the other two parameters. This variability was also noted among parameters at individual sites, showing that parameters do not always work in unison and that planning goals may have to be adapted to address each parameter uniquely.

Modeling outputs were displayed in the form of heat maps. These maps were produced for each parameter (nitrogen, phosphorus, suspended sediment) and compared what would be delivered to the local stream vs. what would be delivered to the Bay. Much of these results aligned with each other and with the monitoring data and impaired streams maps displayed earlier.

Committee members noted many areas that are high loadings are similar across all parameter heat maps, there was interest in seeing why some of these watersheds are such high loaders and can these watersheds be described to help gain a better understanding of what is going on and what could be done. There was general agreement to focus on the top ten watersheds for each parameter.

Summary of Public Comment – Nicki Kasi, Manager, DEP Chesapeake Bay Office

Nicki reviewed the summary of the public comment received through the June 5 Listening Session followed by a 30-day written comment period that ended July 7, 2017. DEP prepared recommendations for topics that each workgroup should specifically consider in the development of their section of the Phase 3 WIP. However, she cautioned that these recommendations are only a starting point. She recommended that the workgroups review all the comment to foster collaboration and ensure consistency. The final report from Dr. Frank Dukes that summarized the input from the June 5 Listening Session and a compilation of all the comments received was also shared with everyone. All three documents will be posted on the DEP website shortly. Nicki further explained that the summary of each of the topics in the Listening Session was reviewed and edited by the discussion lead of that topic. However, if the workgroup co-chairs wanted further clarification or more detail, they are encouraged to reach out to these discussion leads as needed.

There was a significant amount of discussion over the process that needs to be completed to address the public comment. Some comments were general, some identified very specific items. The focus of the review is to have the workgroups review the comments and identify what is implementable. Secretary Redding commented that some of the commenter's proposals may have ideas that the Steering Committee may want to hear more about and asked if it would be possible to have presentations from some of them at a future meeting. Nicki responded that yes that would be possible. She also stated that she realized a more formal process for the review and response to the public comments was needed and would be developed. Some way to review the comments and identify how and what to examine further is needed, with a focus on identifying common themes and new unique ideas.

Next Steps – Nicki Kasi, Manager, DEP Chesapeake Bay Office

Nicki then went over the schedule for the September and October meetings and the presentations that the steering committee members could expect to see. John Brosious emphasized the importance of moving forward. From the results of the presentation today, it is clear where the high loading areas are, so he asked if the presentations in September could be more focused on the demographics and details

Handout #1 – October 19 Steering Committee Meeting

in those areas rather than a more holistic approach. Lisa Schaefer added that she would also like to see the practices that have been installed in this watershed. She added that more information is needed before the Local Area Planning Goals can finalize the decision matrix to include all the criteria that define a priority area. There was some discussion as to the level of progress that has been reported, but there was general agreement that the presentation in September could be tailored to the top watersheds and the progress made in those watersheds as reported to the EPA Bay Program Office.

The schedule for development of sections of the Phase 3 WIP was also discussed. Matt Keefer asked for clarification on what the February/March deadline for preliminary results from the workgroup meant. Nicki responded that some level of understanding of what we can realistically accomplish needs to be defined before the planning targets are finalized. Planning needs to start now. Secretary Redding closed the discussion by stating he is not sure it is realistic to meet the 2025 goal to have everything in place, but the Commonwealth needs a credible plan that shows what can be done, by when. It is time to start thinking about how we can do this together, segregating by sector isn't going to close the gap.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Brion Johnson moved to adjourn. Davitt Wodwell second. Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

DRAFT