

**Pennsylvania Chesapeake Bay Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP)**  
**Steering Committee**  
**May 17, 2018 Meeting Minutes**  
**Approved: November 20, 2018**

Members Present:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Patrick McDonnell	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)
Jim Palmer, Alternate	Interstate Commission of the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB)
Marel King, Alternate	Chesapeake Bay Commission
Matt Keefer (via webinar)	Forestry Workgroup Co-Chair
Greg Hostetter	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Doug Goodlander	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Matt Royer (via webinar)	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
John Bell	Agriculture Workgroup Co-Chair
Lisa Schaefer	Local Planning Goals Co-Chair
Davitt Woodwell	Local Planning Goals Co-Chair
Steve Taglang	Local Planning Goals Co-Chair
John Brosious	Wastewater Workgroup Co-Chair
Jay Patel	Wastewater Workgroup Co-Chair
Katie Hetherington-Cunfer	Communications and Local Engagement Co-Chair
Marcus Kohl	Communications and Local Engagement Co-Chair

Other Attendees:

**Federal Agencies:**

Rich Batiuk, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office (via webinar)  
Emily Trentacoste, EPA, Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
Rachel Felver, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
Suzanne Trevena, EPA, Region 3  
Lori Reynolds, EPA, Region 3  
Magdalene Cunningham, EPA, Region 3

**DEP:**

Hayley Jeffords                      Nicki Kasi  
Megan Porta                              Ted Tesler  
Kristen Wolf

**Other State Agencies:**

Rob Boos, Pennvest  
Chris Kelliher, Pennvest  
Chris Novak, DCNR  
Sam Robinson, Governor's Policy Office (via webinar)  
Teddi Stark, DCNR

**Other Governmental Agencies:**

Andrew Gavin, Susquehanna River Basin Commission  
Jamie Shallenberger, Susquehanna River Basin Commission

**Other:**

Harry Campbell (via webinar)  
Burt Curry, JMT (via webinar)  
Shelly Dehoff, PA Agricultural Ombudsman  
Kelly Donaldson, PA Sea Grant  
Frank Dukes, University of Virginia  
Mary Gattis  
Jennifer Handke, Consulting with a Purpose  
David Hess, Crisci Associates (via webinar)  
Brian Kauffman, Lower Allen Township Authority (via webinar)  
Amber Oyler, Larson Design (via webinar)  
Gary Peacock, York County Conservation District (via webinar)  
John Seitz, York County Planning (via webinar)  
Pam Shellenberger, York County Planning  
Ezra Thrush, PennFuture (via webinar)  
Kristopher Troup, North Londonderry Twp (via webinar)  
Katie Turner, The Nature Conservancy (via webinar)

**Welcome and Introductions – Patrick McDonnell, Secretary, DEP**

Secretary McDonnell opened the meeting at 9:08 am.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes – All**

The March 16 meeting minutes were deferred to the July 10 meeting.

**Building a Clean Water Community Toolbox Local Planning Process Meeting Recap**

**Community Clean Water Plan Toolbox Overview – Chairs, Local Area Goals Workgroup**

Lisa Schaefer started the discussion by providing a summary of the April 10 meeting in Grantville. There were over 170 attendees representing local, state and federal governmental agencies, non-profit organizations, private consultants and academia. The morning was focused on interaction of the audience with the workgroup co-chairs. The afternoon was dedicated to getting feedback from attendees on elements of the toolbox. The main points heard were:

1. Attendees wanted information that was easy to understand.
2. There needed to be a focus on communication and partnerships.
3. There needs to be opportunities to tell the local story.
4. We need to make sure reporting is easy and straightforward.

5. The next step is to focus on the process to follow to meet the established deadlines. There was general consensus the meeting was very positive, with officials talking seriously, wanting to know that assistance will be there from the state. It was obvious the meeting was a success because of the engagement of the people invited, a key lesson learned for future county meetings in that the success of these local meeting will be dependent on ensuring all the necessary people are in the room.

Secretary Dunn stated the meeting design promoted good interaction and discussion. Secretary McDonnell; responded that he appreciated the feedback, that the input highlighted the need to be open and adaptable.

Lisa Shaeffer provided a review of the revisions made to the toolbox developed by the Local Area Goals Workgroup based on feedback from the April 10 Local Planning Process. The main changes are:

1. General clean up and organization was done by Kelly Donaldson, member of the Communications and Engagement Workgroup.
2. The framework for the “Hypothetical Journey” was changed to reflect a two-track process, one for the workgroups and one for the counties with both groups working towards the center to a customized partnership and the addressing of any remaining gap in the nutrient reduction local planning goals.
3. A further definition of what the toolbox is, and is not, was added to clarify the purpose and intent of the toolbox.
4. The proposed pilot planning process was added, with a general timeline. Graphics and templates for the county’s use were added.
5. The county specific data is now an appendix.

There was a mix of comments received from attendees of the April 10 meeting:

1. Different invitees wanted different levels of detail of county specific data, from the more detailed to the one to two page summary.
2. Include a specific list of county contacts.
3. Define a specific timeline for completion of the countywide action plan.

Steering Committee members reaction to the toolbox revisions and feedback received was as follows:

1. Providing different levels of data makes sense; high level broad data to provide a general picture of what this means vs detailed data on what each county individually will need to do.
2. The Hypothetical Journey bar makes more sense, but may not be any more palatable. The process will be complex, it can’t be so complex to promote the proliferation of local ordinances since the generation of those ordinances would provide an easy solution. On the other hand, the goal shouldn’t be to forestall locals from incorporating local permitting as an effective tool, when and where needed. As a start, add the word “statewide” to the left side of this bar.
3. Listing of examples of potential scenarios under consideration for potential reductions may, or may not, be a good idea. For example, listing municipalities forcing the hookup of septic systems to public treatment systems would be a problem for the wastewater sector. The wastewater sector has done what they have been asked to do. There is a concern that listing examples become a focus for ensuring reality.

1. Permitting is a continuum, the state programs have an implementation factor at the local level. Just from an optics viewpoint, the boxes depicting these programs in the “Hypothetical Journey” should be split between the different boxes. Perhaps to build on the consensus message, start with the assistance initiatives, rather than the permitting and enforcement initiatives. The message has to also further the fact that everyone will share in the benefits as well as the burden of implementation.
4. Some form of graphic that shows progress and where we are going is needed. The general theme of the existing graphic is a good one, but may need simplified.

John Bell moved to move forward with the draft toolbox as edited as a pilot. Katie Hetherington-Cunfer seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**“WHY Participate in the WIP?” Outreach – Marcus Kohl, Communications and Local Engagement Workgroup Co-chair**

Marcus explained the purpose of the Why Fact Sheet. This document is designed to:

1. Engage individuals in the process and introduce the toolbox
2. Answer “Why?” an individual would want to engage in the planning process and become familiar with the material in the toolbox.
3. Inform county level local leaders in the process to begin the engagement process and brief them on future expectations,

Steering Committee members agree the document was well-written, a good draft. The document is a good base to compel different individuals to action. There was some discussion on how to deliver the document, the process for mailing it, how to identify the addressees and timing. There was some agreement that this needs to get out sooner than later, perhaps for the next round of counties. This needs to get out sooner than later, so that a county that is ready to go isn’t held up from proceeding. Some suggested edits:

1. Emphasize local economic benefit, identify cost savings.
2. Add the Potomac Basin.
3. While the tone is good, the document is too long. Perhaps separate the invitation to action and the remaining text into first four separate pieces. Another option would be to include the Executive Summary of the Toolbox as an attachment rather than the entire document.
4. This document could be used in a variety of ways. Perhaps edit it for use by either the counties or the agency representatives.
5. Include an expectations section, define how they will participate.

Marcus concluded the discussion saying he would relook at the document and edit. The point of the document is to get people interested and excited in the effort.

## **County Planning Process – Nicki Kasi**

Nicki provided an overview of the pilot planning process. This includes the following steps:

1. Convene Countywide Action Team members
2. Identify water quality and other goals
3. Identify local resources
4. Select actions
5. Report your work

She then described the proposed 5 to 6 month process to implement these steps with a proposed draft plan submitted to DEP by October. She also described the Support Team that was available to the counties to facilitate completion of their Countywide Action Team.

Comments from the Steering Committee:

1. Incorporate implementation into the steps.
2. It will be key that the workgroup reductions numbers and recommendations from the workgroups are done by July.
3. The timeline is aggressive. There needs to be broad ownership of the plan and there may not be enough time to get feedback as quickly as expected to build that ownership. At the end of this pilot, we will get a lot of good insight on what it will take to build the necessary partnerships and capacity to create this plan, based on the counties selected.
4. Each county will be different, the feedback and the process for obtaining that feedback needs to be different. The leaders of each county planning team will define that as part of the process.
5. DEP Regional staff need to be included on the Support Teams.

## **Chesapeake Bay Agreement Outcome Co-Benefits – Rachel Felver, Director, Chesapeake Bay Program Communications Office**

Rachel Felver presented an overview of the other co-benefits that can be achieved from the other outcomes in the Watershed Agreement selected by the Bay Program Partnership that can facilitate implementation of the Phase 3 WIP. There are 12 of them. This presentation was created for use by each of the states to promote these outcomes and incorporation of them into the Phase 3 WIP. Templates describing specific practices that achieve these outcomes that can also achieve nutrient reductions were also developed.

Steering Committee comments were:

1. Customize the presentation to make it more Pennsylvania-centric, more localized. Use examples of local people doing good things.
2. The material in this presentation will be good to use in the first or second meeting with the counties.
3. Emphasize the monetary savings by achieving multiple priorities with one practice, with the priority outcome being improved water quality.

The Steering Committee concluded the presentation would be of use and decided to assign it to the Communications and Engagement Workgroup for enhancement to make it more local and Pennsylvania-specific.

**Chesapeake Bay Program Updates – All**

Secretary Redding provided a progress report on the finalization of the Farm Bill in Congress. This bill has some key components of financial assistance for Pennsylvania farmers. He asked for members' support on proposed changes relative to the Chesapeake Bay and the Conservation Title language.

The Fertilizer Bill (HB792) will be the subject of a hearing on June 5. This bill needs to get passed.

**Public Comment**

Mary Gattis, Coordinator, Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC), announced the roundtables LGAC is hosting in Pennsylvania. Two have been held already. Two more are planned for May 30 in Centre County and June 20 in Franklin County. These roundtables are to solicit input from local government officials. She asked the Steering Committee members for help in getting the word out on these roundtables.

Lisa Shaeffer moved to adjourn. Davitt Woodwell seconded. Meeting adjourned at 11:25 am..