						Potential		Resourc	es <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Partners	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	Implementation Challenges or Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Suggested Source	Financial	Suggested Source
riori	ty Initiative 1: (County Progra	mmatic Initi	atives										
1.1	Develop a Perry County Integrated Water Plan	Develop an integrated water plan to address water quality concerns in Perry County. Utilize existing plans that incorporate water quality goals to define more precise goals and leverage	PCPC, Multi- partners, County Comprehensiv e Plan, Hazard Mitigation Plan, Perry County Greenways, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan,	Countywide	2022	Connect County plans in meaningful ways to meet local water quality goals	Existing Perry County Water Supply Plan, Comprehensiv e Plan	PCPC, PCCD	TBD – Will require a substantial revision		1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Planning Commission 1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Conservation District	Planning Commission Conservation District	\$130,000 per year \$130,000 per year	DEP
		resources.	Act 167, Act 537 Plans, Source Water Protection, existing TMDLs								Plan development	Consultant	\$150,000	DEP

		Green - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	icles <u>Red</u> - action	on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.2A	Implement County	Encourage that	County	All 30 Perry	Ongoing	Educating	Outreach and	Planning	\$62,100 (A	Perry County	2 – Municipal	Municipalities,	\$280,000 per	DEP
	Comprehensive	growth activities	Commissioner	County		municipalities,	Education	Commission	portion of the	Planning	Engineers	Planning	year	
	Plan policies and	address existing	s, Perry	Municipalities		updating local		staff	budget)	Budget		Commission,		
	actions	water quality	County	Duiouition		plans and	Plan				1	Dlamaina	¢120,000 man	DED
		impairments through	Planning Commission,	Prioritize public spaces		ordinances, growth	Preparation		All 30	Funding	1 – municipal planner	Planning Commission,	\$130,000 per year	DEP
		stormwater BMP	Municipal	public spaces		areas not	encouraging		municipalities	Available:	platifier	Municipality,	year	
		implementation	Governing			consistent with	buy-in with		are eligible	Three level		etc.		
		already required	Bodies,			Census urbanized	the Perry			options (Level				
		by local	Municipal			areas	County			1 \$2,400,	1 – FTE Clean	Planning	\$130,000 per	DEP
		ordinance	Planning			Venue space for in-	Comprehensiv			Level 2	Water	Commission	year	
			Commissions,			person meetings.	e Plan (One			\$1,200, and	Coordinator			
		Annual review of	Municipal				size-fit-all			Level 3 \$600) Each fee is an	for Planning			
		municipal comprehensive	Zoning Officers, Perry			Limited staffing.	approach)			annual	Commission			
		plans for action	County				, ,			contract.				
		items providing	Greenways,			Municipal Officials	Ordinances							
		water quality	Parks,			have a tendency to	preparation				1 –	Planning	\$75,000 per	DEP
		benefits	Recreation			chart their own					Administrative	Commission	year	
			and Open			direction.	Field work and				Assistant			
		Annual	Space Plan				project						¢3.000 = ==	DEP
		solicitation of municipal				Outdated	identification						\$2,000 per acre of forest	DEP
		interest in the				Municipal plans	Held 30						easement >	
		Local Planning				and lack of action	meetings with						\$6M total	
		Assistance (LPA)				attending to water	the Natural							
		Program				quality.	Resources and							
						4.5	Recreation							
		Encourage the					Workgroup							
		adoption of stream buffering					and the							
		and natural					Economic Issues							
		resource					Workgroup							
		protection					(15 apiece)							
		ordinances					, ,							
		3,000 acres of												
		forest conserved												

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	icles <u>Red</u> - actio	on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.2B	Prepare an	Develop Basic	Multi-partner	Perry County	2021 and	Encouraging 100%	Current	PCPC	PCPC Budget;	US Census	1 – FTE Clean	Planning	\$130,000 per	PA Rural
	updated Comprehensive Plan	Studies component Solicit municipal projects (action items) Develop the Plan (Framing our Future) Develop the Action Plan	effort County Board of Commissioner s, PCPC, all interested municipalities, PCCD, PC EMA, etc.	and Multi- Municipal	ongoing	buy-in from municipal governing bodies to adopt the county plan for their own use. Local control/increased enforcement may be a barrier.	County Comprehensiv e Plan; Municipal Comprehensiv e Plans; 2020 US Census figures; community surveys		Potentially supplemented by PA DCED through a MAP Program Grant	Data	Water Coordinator for Planning Commission 9 community surveys to be conducted, and draft reports prepared for municipal projects	Commission	\$150,000 for updated comprehensiv e plan	Water, DEP Funding DEP
1.2C	Implement the Source Water Protection Plans	(Picture in Motion) Help ensure the groundwater and surface water resources of the county are protected from overuse or degradation. Work with municipal authorities to educate on benefit of Source Water Protection Plan – work with DEP on development of Plans where needed.	Bloomfield Borough Council, New Bloomfield Water Authority, Blain Borough, Millerstown Borough, Newport Borough?, Liverpool Borough	Bloomfield Borough Blain Borough Millerstown Borough Other interested municipalities	Ongoing	Overcoming lost farm revenue where BMPs take up crop land and pastureland. Educating local farmers on the municipal well recharging areas. The ability to provide real value in exchange for anticipated land production loss in areas where manure application should be reduced.	Coordination of meetings and continued education.	Perry County Planning Commission	Bloomfield Borough	Bloomfield Borough Budget (Level 2 participation \$1,200 annually)	1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Planning Commission Manure application offset expenses to reduce manure application to certain well influencing areas.	Planning Commission DEP/PDA	\$130,000 per year \$ TBD for new Source Water Protection Plans	PA Rural Water, DEP Funding USDA/FSA/NR WA Source Water Protection
		Installation of cautionary signage												Program

			n has been comp			Potential			es Available		taken or has enco		es Needed	
								Resource	Available	1		Resourc	es <u>iveeded</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.2D	Evaluate areas to	Identify	Municipalities,	Countywide	5-10 years		Landowner	Tri County			1 – FTE Clean	Planning	\$130,000 per	DEP
	establish riparian	landowners	Conservation			ordinances, may	outreach; on	Regional			Water	Commission	year	
	buffers to stabilize	willing to	District, PCPC,	Prioritize		require a pilot	the ground	Planning			Coordinator			
	stream banks and	participate and	NRCS, CBF,	public land:		project in a willing	riparian	Commission –			for Planning			
	limit encroachment	work with the	watershed	Lynn Sheaffer		municipality to	project	Ongoing,			Commission			
		following	groups,	Dum		demonstrate	execution	PCCD						
		partners to	Central	Memorial		success.					1 – FTE Clean	Conservation	\$130,000 per	DEP
		identify (5) buffer	Pennsylvania	Park,			GIS	Tri County	Portion of	TCRPC	Water	District	year	
		opportunities –	Conservancy	Millerstown		Lack of technical		Regional	County		Coordinator			
		41 forested		Park, Wagner		assistance to		Planning	Planning		for			
		riparian buffer		Park, Alta		support			Budget		Conservation			
		acres (portion of		Nage Park,		implementation					District			
		Action 3.6)		Little Buffalo		goals for forest								
				State Park,		buffers.							Expand Buffer	Funding
				Marysville									Bonus	Options:
				Lions Club		Buffer funding							Program to	
						programs must							provide	CFA
						include 5-10-year							\$10,000 per	Watershed
						minimum							acre of buffer	Restoration
						maintenance plan,							installed to	and Protecti
						incentive money							include 5-year	Program
						for landowners,							maintenance	
						along with							contract→	PA Fish and
						volunteers to							\$410,000 total	Boat
						establish the								Commission
						buffer.								
														CBF, Alliance
														for the Bay
														DCNR,
														Growing
														Greener,
														NFWF

		<u>Green</u> - action	on has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	ction has encount	ered minor obst	tacles <u>Red</u> - actio	on has not been to	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resourc	es <u>Available</u>			Resourc	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.3	County Sewage Plan – prepare an	One-time adoption of	Interested municipalities,	Municipalities	2023: 1 st year is	Landowner education will be	Current County	PCPC	PCPC Budget; Potentially	Municipal act 537 direction	Inventory of latest	Consultant, PCPC	\$125,000	DEP, Municipal
	updated Act 537	ordinance with	Board of	Howe –	plan	needed to	Sewage Plan;		supplemented	for	municipal			budgets and
	Plan	enforcement,	Commissioner	Township	developm	promote proper	Municipal Act		by PA DCED	municipalities	sewage			on-lot sewage
		inspection, and	s, PCPC	recently	ent	on-lot septic	537 Plans;		through a	to implement	facilities			permit fees
		tank pumping.		introduced	2024. 2nd	system	2020 US		MAP Program	on-lot sewage	4 FTF Class	DCDC	¢120.000	DED
		Proparo grants		pumping schedule	2024: 2 nd	maintenance.	Census		Grant	management	1 – FTE Clean Water	PCPC	\$130,000 per	DEP
		Prepare grants, develop basic		scriedule	year is implemen	Encouraging 100%	figures, Pumping			programs	Coordinator		year	
		studies			tation	buy-in from	Schedules				for Planning			
		component,				municipal					Commission			
		develop the				governing bodies								
		action plan				to adopt the								
						county plan for								
						their own use.								
						Funding limitations								
						and enforcement								
						of Act 537.								

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	eted or is moving	g forward as	olanned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - action	has not been t	aken or has encou	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.4	Implement County	Improve flood	County	29 of 30	2023 -	Funding, land for	Existing digital	FEMA, TCRPC,	None/Not		1 – FTE Clean	PCPC	\$130,000 per	DEP
	Hazard Mitigation	prone areas with	Planning	Municipalities,	2025	BMPs, site	floodplain	PCPC and	applicable		Water		year	
	Plan	BMPs that also	Commission,	only exclusion		constraints for	mapping	Perry County			Coordinator			
		enhance water	municipalities,	is Landisburg		enlarging		GIS			for Planning			
		quality	Perry County	Borough (no		culverts/raising					Commission			
		_	EMA	floodplain is		bridges.							4400.000	
		Encourage	(Floodplain	mapped)		F . C					Additional	Initially PEMA	\$100,000	FEMA and
		municipal	Administrator)			Enforcement and					detailed flood	and/or FEMA		PEMA -
		officials to enact stormwater				compliance of stormwater					mapping where there	through PEMA request		Requests have been made to
		management				ordinances.					are no	request		PEMA for
		ordinances				oramanees.					immediately			areas in
		consistent with									available base			Carroll
		Act167 and									flood			Township and
		Act102									elevations			Rye Township
											established			to be
		Maintain current												considered for
		capital												mapping
		improvement list												improvements
		update on												
		annual basis											\$186,000	PEMA/FEMA
													project	
													implementatio	
													n, obligated	
													10% of the project cost	
1.5	Act 167 Plan	Phase 1: Prepare	PCPC, all	Countywide	2021 -	Should local	Institutional	PCPC Budget,			1 – FTE Clean	Planning	\$130,000 per	DEP
1.5	Development	Grants, Inventory	T	Countywide	2025	involvement exist,	knowledge	PCCD Budget			Water	Commission	year	JE!
		of waterway	Board of			additional	in our cage	. 002 200800			Coordinator		,	
		obstructions,	Commissioner			responsibility for					for Planning			
		look to	s, multi			enforcement.					Commission			
		incentivize	partner needs											
		ordinances to				Find funding to					Consultant	PADEP	\$150,000	DEP
		protect water				develop a						Stormwater		
		quality				Countywide Act						Program		
						167 Plan.								
		Phase 2: Prepare												
		Grants and Plan				Lack of DEP								
		Preparation				funding for plan								
						update.								

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obstac	cles <u>Red</u> - action	has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.6*	Implement County	Total farmland	Lancaster	Ag land use	2021-	Time/technical	Priority	Farmland			Farmland	1 PCCD staff	\$130,000 per	American
	Farmland	preservation (69	Farmland	areas that fit	2022 –	assistance to	recommendati	Preservation			Preservation	person	year	Farmland
	Preservation	farms in program	Trust and	farmland	explore	coordinate	ons, easement	Board, 1 PCPC			Staff			Trust, PDA
	Program with	currently –	Perry County	preservation	incentive	preservation plans	revision	staff			Administrator			
	farmland	approx. 9844	Farmland	criteria	opportuni	with funding and	recommendati							
	preservation	acres)	Preservation		ties	technical	ons,				1 – FTE Clean	Conservation	\$130,000 per	DEP
	program incentives		Board, NRCS,			assistance	supplemental				Water	District	year	
	enhancement	4 additional	Perry County				BMP funding				Coordinator			
		farms will be	Greenways,			Preserved farms	research				for			
		added by 2022	Parks,			are required to					Conservation			
		totaling 10,500	Recreation			have an NRCS					District			
		acres	and Open			Conservation Plan,								
			Space Plan			work with farmers							\$250,000 per	American
		Look to fund 1-2				to ensure							farm funded,	Farmland
		additional farms				Conservation Plan							total of 8	Trust, PDA,
		per year in				is reported in							farms → \$2M	SCC
		preservation				PracticeKeeper.								
		program.				Recommend								
		– 10,700 acres of				making this a								
		farmland				program								
		conservation				requirement								
						statewide.								
						Sharing NRCS data								
						is challenging								

		Green - action	n has been compl	eted or is moving	g forward as I	olanned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encounte	ered minor obstac	cles <u>Red</u> - action	has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.7*	Establish funding	Approximately	PCCD,	Countywide	2021-	Limited	Field	PCCD, USDA			6 – additional	District/NRCS/	\$780,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
	and staff support	100 farms have	Contracted	•	2025	compliance	verification,	NRCS, Private			Ag Planners to	Private Sector	year	SCC/PDA
	to assist the	their plans	planners, Act			activities by DEP.	troubleshootin	Consultants			provide	Farm Visits		
	Agricultural	(Conservation/	38 operators,			·	g				technical			
	community &	Ag E&S and/or	preserved			Lack of Technical					assistance and			
	conduct one on	nutrient/manure	farms, Organic			assistance to	Site visits and	Conservation			ag planning			
	one farm outreach	management	Farmers,			support the	plan review	District						
	visits	plans) in Perry	Integrators			farming					3 – FTE	Private Sector/	\$420,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
		County, goal is to				community.	Inspections –	Chesapeake			Design,	PCCD	year	SCC/PDA
	759 farms exist in	complete 200 by					50 per year, 1	Bay			Engineer,			
	Perry County	2025.				Private sector Ag	hour per plan	Technicians			Permit			
						plans are not	for data entry,							
		Work with				required to be	3 hours per				3 – FTE	Private Sector/	\$315,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
		private ag				shared with	inspection				Inspector	PCCD	year	SCC/PDA
		consultants to				District staff.	(some				Construction			
		document plan					operations				Services			
		reporting.				All counties will	much longer)							
						work with Act 38,					1 – FTE Clean	Conservation	\$130,000 per	DEP
		Implementation				Preserved farms					Water	District	year	
		challenges				and organic farms					Coordinator			
		(continued):				to report Ag E&S and NRCS					for			
		In order to communicate				Conservation					Conservation District			
		effectively with				Plans. These					DISTRICT			
		the farming				operations are					1-	Conservation	\$75,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
		community one				required to have					Administrative	District	year	SCC/PDA
		on one farmer				them, but no					Assistant	District	year	Sec, i bit
		outreach must be				requirement to					71351314111			
		conducted.				report the plans. It								
						is recommended								
		The most				state agencies								
		effective way to				make changes to								
		capture and				Act 38 and								
		report BMPs is				farmland								
		through one-on-				preservation								
		one farm visits.				programs to								
		Farmers do not				require								
		participate in				PracticeKeeper								
		surveys or other				reporting.								
		methods.												

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	acles <u>Red</u> - act	ion has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.8	Juniata River Watershed Management Plan Identify a rapid delisting watershed as part of the plan.	WPC applied for DCNR C2P2 grant to update the Juniata River Watershed Management Plan. CAP can help leverage	Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, Chesapeake Conservancy	Juniata River Watershed (Blair, Fulton, Huntingdon, Juniata, Mifflin, Perry)	2021 – Conserva ncy Exploring funding options	Performance Target Continued: Our goal is basically to update the existing plan with work that has been done since the original plan,			DCNR Grant	Western PA Conservancy	1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Planning Commission 1 – FTE Clean Water	Planning Commission Conservation District	\$130,000 per year \$130,000 per year	DEP
	or the plan.	funding for the Juniata River Watershed Management Plan.			outreach and planning 2023 –	do some more indepth GIS analysis, and get public and municipal input into what they see					Coordinator for Conservation District	Bistrict		
		Work with the Chesapeake Conservancy to rapidly delist a			start implemen tation	are the issues in the watershed. I think the GIS analysis will be a big part of the							WPC applied for \$37,785 with \$37,286 match	DCNR
		watershed within the Juniata River Watershed Plan.				process. We're planning on using the new 1-meter resolution data set, incorporating some of the buffer gap analysis work from Chesapeake Conservancy, etc.							Rapid Delisting Approach Project and Program Budget \$1M	Growing Greener/ DCNR

						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
1.9A	Water quality	Develop	CBF,	Countywide	2022 –	Simplifying the	ArcGIS Hub	Tri County			Website	Tri-County	\$10,000 per	Administrative
	communication	messages and	Chesapeake		2025	resources that are	Website	Regional			development	Regional	year	budget tag-
	plan, leveraging	audience;	Conservancy,			available, targeting		Planning			and continued	Planning		along to
	existing documents	execute plan and	NRCS, PCCD,			Perry County		Commission			maintenance	Commission		project-
	and covering topics	distribute	TCRPC, Private			farmers and other								related grant
	including	messaging	Sector			landowners.	1 – lead	Conservation						award
	Comprehensive	through staff and	Agriculture				county contact	District and						
	Plan, Hazard	partners	Farm Visits,			Sharing staff		Planning			1 – FTE	Planning	\$130,000 per	NFWF
	mitigation plan,		municipalities,			resources across		Commission			Marketing and	Commission	year	
	Act 167,	Utilize the DPJM	Farm Bureau			the 4-county					Outreach			
	Greenways Plan,	County				region.					Coordinator			
	Perry County	<u>Countywide</u>												
	Water Supply Plan	Action Plan									1 – FTE Clean	Planning	\$130,000 per	DEP
		(arcgis.com) -									Water	Commission	year	
	Utilize existing	ArcGIS website as									Coordinator			
	TMDLs as part of	a source of									for Planning			
	the messaging	consistent									Commission			
		communication												

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as I		tion has encount	ered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - act	ion has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
# 1.9B	Agricultural Communication Strategy	One on one farm outreach is the best way to communicate with farmers in addition to reporting practices. Work to develop a plan to complete one on one farm visits. Work to develop a communication plan to engage integrators. Attend private partner ag meetings to provide information.	Partners PCCD, County Farm Bureau, Integrators, County Farmland Preservation Board, PSU Extension, NRCS, CBF	Location Countywide	7imeline 2022-2025	Recommendations Funding to support the technical assistance required to complete one on one farm outreach Outreach to integrators is a challenge due to the number of integrators and multiple county boundaries they serve. It is recommended DEP/PDA/SCC communicate with integrators on a frequent basis to reduce mixed messages.	Technical	Source	Financial PCCD – portion of funding	Source PCCD	6 – additional Ag Planners to provide technical assistance and ag planning 1 – FTE	District/NRCS/Private Sector Farm Visits Planning Commission Conservation District	\$130,000 per year \$130,000 per year \$130,000 per year See 1.9A for website costs. Costs for meeting attendance and administration would be	Source DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA NFWF DEP
		Utilize Farm Bureau Newsletter for											covered through other funding	
		announcements											requests.	
		announcements											requests.	

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	eted or is moving	g forward as p	olanned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - acti	on has not been t	aken or has encou	intered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
Priori	ty Initiative 2: F	Reporting and	Tracking											
2.1*	Existing BMP	Expand use of	Local	Countywide	2022 –	EPA acceptance of	Precision	Chesapeake	N/A	N/A	Further GIS	Chesapeake	\$46,000 (2022	EPA/DEP
	cataloguing	existing buffer	University or		cataloguin	the approach,	Conservation	Conservancy			and data	Conservancy	only)	
	(quantity and	layer with urban	Students who		g	further refine	Tools				processing/me			
	location) for select	hydrology layer	live locally but			guidance in QAPP					thod			
	BMPs, expanding		attend nearby		2023 –	so that counties	General	QAPP			refinement			
	on general	R&D into	Universities,		Practice	can accomplish	methodology							
	recommendations	distinguishing ag,	Chesapeake		Keeper	this or so that the	outline				5 – Student	Local	\$50,000 per	TBD
	provided in QAPP	pasture, and turf	Conservancy,		batch	State can take the					Internships to	University	year	
		covers from	Stakeholder		upload	burden off of	BMP field	Varies by BMP			Support CAP	Student or		
	BMPs = forest	grassed buffers	peer review -		processin	counties, utilize	backcheck				Implementatio	local student		
	buffers, urban		USGS, Farm		g and field	the approach to					n	attending		
	forest buffers,	Manual digitizing	Bureau,		views	catalogue existing						nearby		
	grass buffers,	where leaf-off <1	PDA, EPA			BMPs and do on						university etc.		
	urban grass	ft resolution				the ground								
	buffers, manure	imagery is				verification where					6 – additional	District/NRCS/	\$780,000 per	PDA/SCC/
	storages, grassed	available				required for					Ag Planners to	Private Sector	year	NRCS/DEP
	waterways, wet					reporting					provide	Farm Visits		
	ponds and	Back check with				purposes, this is an					technical			
	wetlands, fencing	staff field views,				accelerated BMP					assistance and			
		where required				reporting catchup					verification			
						approach while we					support			
		Add data to				continue to								
		Practice Keeper				provide support to								
		or another batch				farmers on								
		upload option				planning and BMP								
		(FieldDoc)				installs, reduce the								
						amount of								
						interruption of								
						government								
						entities to								
						compliant farm								
						operations								

		Green - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ad	ction has encoun	tered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - act	ion has not been	taken or has encoι	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
2.2*	Identify future ag/urban project opportunities using automated means	BMP opportunity analysis – ag conservation, land retirement, alternative crop, forest conservation, stream restoration Back check with staff field views Batch upload to FieldDoc to calculate credit opportunity	Lead - Chesapeake Conservancy Stakeholder peer review – Harrisburg/ SHIP/PSU/Etc. University, USGS, Farm Bureau, PDA, Marysville Borough, Municipal Engineers, PCPC	Marysville Borough Countywide where feasible	2022 – cataloguin g 2023 – batch upload processin g and field views 2024 – 2025 – implemen tation focus	Different data set	Precision Conservation Tools Batch upload processing BMP field backcheck	Chesapeake Conservancy DEP/SRBC Varies by BMP	N/A	N/A	Further GIS and data processing/me thod refinement 5 – Student Internships to Support CAP	Chesapeake Conservancy Local University Student or local student attending nearby university etc.	\$46,000 (2022 only) \$50,000 per year	DEP/EPA TBD
2.3*	Develop a local system to capture data collection on urban structural and non-structural practices	Add development related BMPs to PK/FieldDoc so that as land use data sets are updated, there are accompanying BMPs	Municipal engineers, Chesapeake Conservancy, PCPC, Municipalities	Urban/suburb an landscape	2022	Currently municipalities are not collecting BMP data because it is not required in non-Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) communities. Must incentivize communities to report, no existing system in place.	Reporting platform	FieldDoc	N/A	N/A	Training 5 – Student Internships to Support CAP Implementatio n 1 – Municipal Planner	Local University Student or local student attending nearby university etc. PCPC, Municipality, etc.	\$50,000 per year \$130,000 per year	DEP TBD

		Green - actio	n has been compl	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ad	tion has encount	ered minor obst	acles <u>Red</u> - action	on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	es <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
2.4*	Implement a	Support fertilizer	PSU Extension	Countywide	TBD	Education of	TBD based on	TBD based on	TBD based on	TBD based on	1 – FTE Clean	Planning	\$130,000 per	DEP
	documentation	legislation –				responsible	fertilizer	fertilizer	fertilizer	fertilizer	Water	Commission	year	
	program for	where legislation				parties, receiving	legislation if	legislation if	legislation if	legislation if	Coordinator			
	commercial and	requires				timely information,	passed	passed	passed	passed	for Planning			
	homeowner	reporting, be the				training on					Commission			
	nutrient	data				reporting system,								
	applications in	clearinghouse				will need direction							Urban	DEP/PDA
	developed lands					from State on							Nutrient	
		Legislation will				what's expected							Management	
	Support current	support the				and any reporting							\$10 per acre	
	legislation for	implementation				system that's							→ \$12,000	
	fertilizer bill.	of Urban				developed.								
		Nutrient												
		Management –												
		1,200 acres												

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g torward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ad	ction has encoun	tered minor obstac	cles <u>Red</u> - actio	on has not been	taken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Implementation Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
2.5*	Improve Agricultural BMP reporting utilizing PracticeKeeper, Capital RC&D Transect Survey, PSU Survey, Manure Transport Reporting and Remote Sensing	Enter agriculture plans into PracticeKeeper Work with Capital RC&D to improve current transect survey routes to be more inclusive Work with PSU to produce better response rate to the PSU survey for Perry County Work with PDA/DEP to improve manure transport reporting	DEP, PCCD, NRCS, PDA, NRCS, Perry County Farm Bureau, Capital RC&D, Chesapeake Conservancy, PSU Survey, Manure Brokers	Countywide	2022-2025	Private sector ag planners do not have access to PracticeKeeper. County Ag planners do not have time to report private sector plans into PK. Current Capital RC&D routes are not all inclusive and could be improved. Current response rates are low and miss a large demographic of Perry County farmers. Manure brokers are not required to report data annually. Data is not inclusive.	Technical Support to enter plans into PK	Conservation District			5 – Summer interns for reporting and verification	Local University Student or local student attending nearby university etc.	\$50,000 – paid internships See 3.5 for funding needs to improve cover crop reporting for capital RC&D	DEP/PDA/SCC

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ad	ction has encount	tered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - action	on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
2.6*	Ensure accurate	Work with	Marysville	CSO and	2022-	Need DEP to work	Municipal	Larson Design			1 – FTE Clean	Planning	\$130,000 per	DEP
	reporting of Water, Sewer and Wastewater Treatment Plant nutrient loading and plant upgrades	Water, Sewer and Waste Treatment facilities to accurately document plant upgrades to capture nutrient reductions.	Borough just applied for reduced rates. Newport is doing storm sewer separations Suez (private sewer/water utility)	Waste Treatment Facilities	2025	with waste facilities to accurately document plant upgrades. Need reductions to be accurately captured in CAST. Work with DEP to determine how composting helps to reduce nitrogen and phosphorus. Accurately	Engineer				Water Coordinator for Planning Commission 1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Conservation District	Commission Conservation District	\$130,000 per year \$TBD Infrastructure Funding	DEP
Priori	ty Initiative 3: A	Achieve New F	 Pollutant Re	ductions		document								
3.1	Development of watershed plan for Baken Creek	Partner to include CAP Goals into the development of the watershed plan. Mimic the Chesapeake Conservancy Rapid Delisting approach for this watershed Add 2 instream monitors logging	PCCD	Baken Creek Watershed	2021- 2022 (plan develope d) 2022- 2031 (impleme ntation begins)	Lack of technical assistance and funding to support with BMP implementation.	Engineering Tech		\$10,000 in stream monitoring	Section 319	1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Conservation District	Conservation District	\$130,000 per year \$1,000,000 for implementatio n of Baken Creek Plan	DEP
		real time data (streamflow, turbidity, nitrate)												

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	eted or is moving	g forward as _l		tion has encount	ered minor obstac		n has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.2*	Help farmers and	Soil and Water	4R Alliance,	Countywide	2022-	Lack of DEP					6 – additional	District/NRCS/	\$780,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
	operators to be in	Quality	PCCD, Perry	Ag Land	2025	inspections.					Ag Planners to	Private Sector	year	SCC/PDA
	compliance with	Conservation	County Farm			Reporting and					work with	Farm Visits		
	state and federal	Plans (Ag E&S)	Bureau, NRCS,			verification of Ag					farmers to			
	requirements: Ag	13,300 new acres	Private Sector			Plans, NRCS plans					develop			
	Compliance and		Agriculture			expire and do not					required plans			
	Nutrient	Nutrient	Farm Visits, PA			get reverified,								
	Management Plans	Management &	Sustainable			private plans are						Conservation	\$15 per acre	DEP/SCC/PDA/
		Manure	Agriculture			never entered.						Plans	for a total cost	NRCS
		Management	(PASA), ACT 38										of \$199,500	
		Plans 19,300 new	farms,			Lack of Technical								
		acres of Core N	Preserved			assistance to						Core N and	\$15 per acre	DEP/SCC/PDA/
		and 15,300 new	Farms,			support agriculture						Core P	for a total cost	NRCS
		acres of Core P	Integrators			planning and							of \$289,500	
						implementation,								
		Work with Act 38				one on one farm								
		operators (33),				outreach is best								
		Preserved Farms				way to capture								
		(69), and certified				existing plans.								
		organic farms to				Act 38 and								
		document plans required as part				Preserved Farms								
		of their				not required to								
		respective				enter plans in PK,								
		programs				recommended to								
		programs				require programs								
		Work with the				to enter plans into								
		submittal of Act				PK.								
		39 Nutrient												
		Balance Sheets				State agencies								
		for				must work with								
		documentation				integrators to								
						ensure they are								
		Implementation				requiring								
		challenges				compliance by								
		(continued):				farmers. Some								
		Recommended				integrators require								
		for DEP to				compliance, but								
		continue funding				not all, great way								
		for Ag Plan				to communicate								
		development –				with farmers as								
		CEG Program				well.								

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been compl	eted or is moving	forward as p		tion has encount	tered minor obstac	cles <u>Red</u> - actior	has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.3	Advanced Nutrient	Work with	4R Alliance,	Countywide	2022-	Landowner	Educational	CBF/4R			6 – additional	District/NRCS/	\$780,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
	Management (4R)	manure	PCCD, Perry	Ag Land	2025	interest, BMP	support	Alliance			Ag Planners to	Private Sector	year	SCC/PDA
	Practice Education	management and	County Farm			verification burden					work with	Farm Visits		
	and	nutrient	Bureau, NRCS,			(annual).					farmers to			
	Implementation	management	Private Sector								meet 4R			
		plans to	Agriculture			Lack of Technical					standards			
		document and	Farm Visits, PA			assistance to								
		report 4R	Sustainable			support agriculture							\$10 per acre	DEP/PDA/SCC/
		practices	Agriculture			planning and							of advanced	NRCS
		Increase existing	(PASA)			implementation.							nutrient	
		4R practice (N/P											management	
		Rate, Timing and				Additional funding							planning per	
		Placement by				to support soil							type → total	
		1,800 acres)				testing. Soil testing							cost for all is	
						is key to meeting the							\$108,000	
						recommendations								
						of supplemental								
						BMPs.								
						DIVIFS.								
						Machine								
						dependent for								
						most farming								
						operations.								
						Cost of fertilizer is								
						self-regulating								
						farmers to use less								
						fertilizer;								
						therefore, lower								
						rates result.								

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been compl	eted or is moving	g forward as p	olanned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obstac	cles <u>Red</u> - action	has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.4*	Implement Practice	Determine	PCCD, Perry	Countywide	2022 –	Capacity to	Transect	Capital RC&D			6 – additional	District/NRCS/	\$780,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
	to improve soil	feasibility of	County Farm	Ag Land	investigati	manage the	survey				Ag Planners to	Private Sector	year	SCC/PDA
	health and	having a	Bureau, NRCS,		on	program,					transition	Farm Visits		
	sustainability	county/state cost	Private Sector			landowner interest	4 - Existing	Conservation			farmers to			
	(Tillage	share program to	Agriculture		2023 –		No-Till farm	District			high residue			
	Management and	enhance	Farm Visits, PA		next steps	Lack of technical	equipment for							
	Cover Crops)	adoption of the	Sustainable			assistance and	Rent				CD District	PDA	\$75,000 drill,	PDA
		annual practice,	Agriculture			farm planners to					shared No-till		with	
		pay per acre of	(PASA)			work with farmers					Drill		maintenance	
		cover crop				to transition to								
		implemented.	All partners			High Residue					County PCCD –	Cover Crop	\$90 per acre	PDA, SCC,
			need to be on			Tillage					staff to	Incentive	traditional per	Growing
		Implement	the same								administer the	Program	year →	Greener,
		tillage	page,			Current					program		\$1.53M for a	Pennsylvania
		management	following the			verification							5-year total of	Association of
		and cover crops	same			methods do not							\$7.7M	Conservation
		on an annual	guidance.			accurately capture							(incentive	Districts
		rate of 32,500				implemented							payment,	(PACD)
		acres High				amounts – work							administration	
		Residue, 12,500				with Capital RC&D)	
		acres				to improve								
		Conservation				Transect Survey							\$50 per acre	
		Tillage, 3,000				Routes							fall nutrients	
		acres Low				_							per year →	
		Residue, 17,000				Farmers are							\$600K for 5-	
		acres of cover				harvesting cover							year total of	
		crops and 12,000				crops for forage,							\$3M	
		acres of cover				need accurate					Control DCC D		¢50.000	555
		crops with fall				efficiency crediting					Capital RC&D	Improved data	\$50,000	DEP
		nutrients				for commodity					Transect	reporting		
		Implementation				cover crops					Survey			
		Implementation challenges				Existing Cover Crop								
		(continued):				Programs have								
		Organic farmers				strict plant by date								
		are using tillage				that does not work								
		to manage weeds				with changing								
		and vertical				weather patterns								
		tillage is				and wetter years								
		becoming more				and wetter years								
		popular among												
		farmers.												
		idillicis.				<u> </u>								

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been compl	leted or is moving	forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - act	ion has not been ta	aken or has encou	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.5	Implement more	Prescribed	PCCD, NRCS,	Countywide ag	2025	Landowner	Landowner	NRCS	Existing	Capital RC&D	6 – additional	District/NRCS/	\$780,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
	pasture	grazing - 3,000	Private Ag	lands –		education, BMP	education		funding	partners with	Ag Planners to	Private Sector	year	SCC/PDA
	management BMPs	acres	Consultants,	landowners		funding for non-			available	Perry County	provide	Farm Visits		
		O.C. C.	CBF,	who raise		buffer work, plan				District to	technical			
		Off Stream	Chesapeake	horses, dairy,		updates, data				fund these	assistance and			
		watering without	Conservancy,	beef, and		gathering.				projects	ag planning			
		fencing/pasture alternative	Capital RC&D, PA Sustainable	other pasture grazing		Lack of Technical					3 – additional	Chesapeake	\$390,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
		watering – 1,800	Agriculture	animals		assistance to					FTE	Conservancy,	year	SCC/PDA/
		acres	(PASA)	arminais		support agriculture					environmental	CBF, etc.	year	DCNR/NFWF/
		30.30	(1.101.1)			planning and					technician	02.,000.		Growing
		Forest buffers on				implementation.								Greener/ EPA
		fenced pasture												
		corridor – 5 acres				Old NRCS plans							Prescribed	DEP/NRCS/
						need to be							grazing \$540	SCC/PDA/
		Grass buffers on				updated to comply							per acre →	DCNR/NFWF/
		fenced pasture				with prescribed							\$1.62M total	Growing
		corridor – 20				grazing definition –								Greener/ EPA
		acres				difficult to get landowner buy-in –							Off stream	DEP/NRCS/
		Land Retirement				fund alternative							Watering \$500	SCC/PDA/
		to Ag Open				watering and							per acre ->	DCNR/NFWF/
		Space – 200				fencing; most							\$900K total	Growing
		Acres				pastures are								Greener/ EPA
						streamside.								
													FB Buffer W/	DEP/NRCS/
						Increasing							Exclusion	SCC/PDA/
						construction costs							\$10,500 per	DCNR/NFWF/
						are resulting in							acre →	Growing
						canceled NRCS contracts.							\$53,000 total	Greener/ EPA
						contracts.							GB Buffer W/	DEP/NRCS/
													Exclusion	SCC/PDA/
													\$2,750 per	DCNR/NFWF/
													acre →	Growing
													\$55,000 total	Greener/ EPA
													Land	DEP/NRCS/
													Retirement	SCC/PDA/
													\$500 per acre	DCNR/NFWF/
													→ \$100K total	Growing
														Greener/ EPA

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	acles <u>Red</u> - actio	on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.6*	Riparian buffer and	400 riparian	CBF,	Countywide	2022 –	Landowner	Materials	PCCD (in-kind,	Budget	CBF, NFWF,	6 – additional	District/NRCS/	\$780,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
	re-forestation	forest buffer	Chesapeake		line up	partnerships,		annual tree	available to be	NFWS, NRCS -	Ag Planners to	Private Sector	year	SCC/PDA
	BMPs	acres, (365) acres	Conservancy,		landowne	landowner		sale efforts),	determined	CREP	provide	Farm Visits		
		lost since 2017	NRCS, PCCD,		rs	education,		CBF			technical			
		need reverified	Private Sector			volunteer					assistance and			
			Agriculture		2023-	acceptance of	Mapping	Chesapeake			ag planning			
		500 riparian	Farm Visits		2025 –	buffer plantings,		Conservancy						
		grass buffer			implemen	buffer					3 – additional	Chesapeake	\$390,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
		acres – (40) acres			tation	maintenance guide					FTE	Conservancy,	year	SCC/PDA/
		lost since 2017				for farmers,					environmental	CBF, etc.		DCNR
		need reverified				routine site visits					technician			
						to confirm buffers								
		250 acres –				are thriving,							Forest Buffer	DCNR, NFWF,
		Agriculture Tree				invasive species							\$10,000 per	PACD,
		Planting				removal during							acre → \$410K	TreeVitalize,
		_				establishment.								DEP,
		6 acres – urban											Grass Buffer	Coldwater
		forest buffer				Flash grazing must							\$2,500 per	Heritage
						be allowed with							acre → \$1.2M	Partnership
		1 acre – urban				buffer installation.								Implementatio
		tree canopy											Tree Canopy	n Grants,
						Funding program							\$5,000 per	Landscape
		1 – acre of urban				must include a 5-							acre → \$5K	Scale
		forest planting				10-year							T /5	Restoration
						maintenance							Tree/Forest	(LSR) Grant
						program to							Planting	Program – US
						establish buffers							\$10,000 per	Forest Service,
						along with							acre → \$2.5M	Pennsylvania
						incentive program								Habitat
						\$4K minimum per								Stewardship
						acre payment.								Program,
						No ovtopded lees								Alliance for
						No extended lease								the Bay, CBF,
						or easement.								Chesapeake
														Conservancy

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ad	ction has encoun	tered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - actio	n has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	s <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.7	Wetland	5 - acres of	Chesapeake	Countywide	2022 –	Willing landowner;	Landowner	1 PCCD staff			3 – additional	Chesapeake	\$390,000 per	DEP/DCNR
	restoration implementation on marginal production ag land	Wetland Restoration 30 - Acres of	Conservancy, PCCD, NRCS, Private Sector Agriculture		2025	appropriate siting, design, and construction for successful	outreach	person			FTE environmental technician	Conservancy, CBF, etc.	year	DED/DCAID/DA
		Wetland Enhancement and Rehabilitation	Farm Visits, CBF			Lack of technical assistance for					2 – stream biologist	PAFBC, USGS, PCCD, etc.	\$280,000 per year	DEP/DCNR/PA FBC/USGS
		Identify 1 large property owner from University of Vermont restorable wetland layer to help identify where wetland restoration is feasible				landowner outreach and agriculture planning to identify potential site locations							Wetland Restoration \$30,000 per acre → \$1.1M	DEP/DCNR/ USDA Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or NRCS Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)
3.8	Stream Restoration (Urban and Agriculture)	14,000 Linear feet (~3 mile) Urban Stream Restoration 6,000 Linear feet Agriculture Stream Restoration	CBF, Chesapeake Conservancy, TU National, PFBC Stream Restoration Team, PCCD, PCPC	Rapid delisting areas top priority & Countywide based on landowner interest	2022 – 2025	Design/permit/con struction cycle seems to work in two-year increments, there is an assumption that eroded/degraded streams exist based upon 403(d) listing – should that not be the case in the field, adjust quantitative goal down and ensure buffers are in place. Lack of funding to					Design, permit, construction services 2 – Municipal Engineers 3 – FTE Design, Engineering, Permit	Private sector, USFWS, TU Municipalities, Planning Commission Private Sector/ PCCD	Assume \$900/LF - \$13M Assume \$400/LF - \$2.4M \$280,000 per year \$420,000 per year	Growing Greener, NFWF, DEP, DCNR TBD DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA
						cover engineering design.					2 – stream biologists	PAFBC, USGS, PCCD, etc.	\$280,000 per year	DEP/DCNR/ EPA

	_	<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as		tion has encount	ered minor obstacle	es <u>Red</u> - actio	on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources <u>A</u>	<u>vailable</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.9	Implement more barnyard runoff control/loafing lot management	60 acres of barnyard runoff controls 500 acres of agricultural drainage management	PCCD, Chesapeake Conservancy, NRCS, Perry County Farm Bureau	Countywide Farms	2022-2025	Landowner buy-in and project development/fund ing. Lack of Technical assistance to support agriculture planning and implementation. Lack of funding to cover engineering design.					6 – additional Ag Planners to provide technical assistance and ag planning 3 – FTE Design, Engineer, Permit 3 – FTE Inspector	District/NRCS/ Private Sector Farm Visits Private Sector/ PCCD Private Sector/ PCCD	\$780,000 per year \$420,000 per year \$315,000 per year	DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA
						Increasing construction costs are cancelling NRCS contracts.					construction Services		Barnyard Runoff Control \$175K per project, assume 1 acre per project \$6.8M in total Agriculture Stormwater Management \$10K per acre → \$5M	DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	<u> </u>	ction has encount		acles <u>Red</u> - action	on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	es <u>Available</u>			Resource	s <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.10	Animal waste management BMP	2,800 new AUs of livestock	PCCD, SCC, CEG Program,	Livestock & Poultry farms	2022- 2025	Time to get through planning,	Project implementatio	NRCS, PCCD, Private Ag	Average NRCS Cost share is	NRCS	6 – additional Ag Planners to	District/NRCS/ Private Sector	\$780,000 per year	DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA
	implementation for livestock	1,600 new AUs of poultry	County Farm Bureau	,		design, and construction; outreach to smaller farms that likely need the	n	Sector	about \$75,000 per acre		provide technical assistance and ag planning	Farm Visits	·	
						assistance; match cash value for small farms; readiness to plan/implement					3 – FTE Design, Engineer, Permit	Private Sector/ PCCD	\$420,000 per year	DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA
						projects when outreach efforts yield willing landowners.					3 – FTE Inspector construction Services	Private Sector/ PCCD	\$315,000 per year	DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA
						Lack of funding to cover engineering design.							Animal waste management system \$175,000 per project, assume 100 AUs per project \$7.7M in total	DEP/NRCS/ SCC/PDA
3.11*	Manure Transport out of Perry County	Transport 750 dry tons per year out of Perry County	PCCD, NRCS, Perry County Farm Bureau, Manure Brokers	Countywide	2022-2025	Current reporting standards do not require manure broker and haulers to report manure transported. New regulations must be developed to require haulers and brokers to submit information to DEP.					1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Conservation District	Conservation District	\$130,000 per year	DEP

		Green - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as		ction has encount			on has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resource	es <u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.12*	MS4-related Chesapeake Bay Pollutant Reduction Plan Implementation	Plan implementation by end of current permit term Vegetated Open Channels – 29 acres treated Infiltration Basin – 5 acres treated Dry Extended Detention Basin – 43 acres Storm Drain Cleanout – 13,900 lbs of solid removed Marysville Borough has signed lease with Lions Club to implement Projects near the pond. (70% of requirement)	Marysville Borough PCPC, Tri County Regional Planning Commission	Marysville Borough	2022-2023	Municipal capacity to implement plans (technical, financial). Flexibility to work outside of designated urbanized area.	Municipal engineer design/permit, construction readiness	Municipalities, public works departments	Unknown	Municipal budgets (taxes, stormwater fees, grants)	2 – Municipal Engineers 1 – municipal planner	Municipalities, Planning Commission, Planning Commission, Municipality, etc.	\$280,000 per year \$130,000 per year \$700,000	TBD DEP Marysville Borough, DEP grants

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ac	tion has encount	ered minor obsta	cles <u>Red</u> - action	n has not been t	aken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier		
						Potential	ential Resources <u>Available</u>				Resources <u>Needed</u>				
						Implementation									
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested	
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	
3.13*	Urban Stormwater	Implement	PCPC, PCCD,	Countywide	Ongoing	Coordination/	Reporting	FieldDoc			5 Summer	Local	\$50,000 – per	NRCS/PDA/	
	Management Non-	existing	developing	·		training for	platform				interns for	University or	year	DEP	
	Regulated	ordinances at	municipalities,			municipal staff,					reporting and	local student			
	Communities	local municipal	Tri County			FieldDoc batch					verification	attending			
		level	Regional			upload						nearby			
			Planning			opportunity, non-						university etc.			
		Catalogue	Commission,		2022-	MS4 engagement									
		existing BMPs	contracted		2025	(what's in it for					2 – Municipal	Municipalities,	\$280,000 per	TBD	
		that fit into this	engineer,			them?), difficulty					Engineers	Planning	year		
		category and	water			obtaining past						Commission,			
		newly built ones	authority			information (MS4s					4	Diamaina	¢120,000	DED	
		Runoff				typically have databases from					1 – municipal	Planning	\$130,000 per	DEP	
		Reduction				2003-present; non-					planner	Commission, Municipality,	year		
		Performance				MS4s typically						etc.			
		Standard – 82				have no database)						Ctc.			
		acres treated				nave no database,							Stormwater	DEP	
													BMP budget		
		Wet Ponds and											\$750,000		
		Wetlands – 100													
		acres treated; 5											Wetland		
		acres conserved											conservation		
													→ \$10,000		
		Impervious													
		surface													
		reduction – 1													
		acre													
		Advanced grey													
		infrastructure													
		IDDE – 130 acres													
		treated													
		Work with													
		municipalities to													
		document street													
		sweeping													
		activities – Goal													
		TBD													

Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned Vellow - action has encountered minor obstacles Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier														
			Potential		Resource	es <u>Available</u>		Resources <u>Needed</u>						
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.14	Conservation Landscaping/Turf to Meadow Conversion	Promote new program and enable one large tract landowners' participation	TCRPC, PCCD, Municipalities, Chesapeake Conservancy, CBF, DCNR,	Developed areas in County municipalities	2022 - 2025	Landowner education and acceptance Existing mowing	Planting plan assistance	Alliance for the Bay (in- kind)			1 – FTE Municipal Planner 3 – additional	Planning Commission Chesapeake	\$130,000 per year \$130,000 per	DEP/DCNR DEP/DCNR/
		80 new acres of Conservation Landscaping	Western Pennsylvania Conservancy			ordinances and weed ordinances can be a challenge to implementation					FTE environmental technician	Conservancy, CBF, etc.	year	SCC/PDA/ NRCS
													\$2,500 per acre meadow → \$200,000 budget	DCNR/USFW/ NFWF/DEP
3.15*	Continue dirt and gravel road program	19 miles overall restored through past projects and	PCCD	Countywide	2025	Continue D&G Road program funding	Education, technical assistance,	PCCD, Center for Dirt & Gravel Road	\$2.4 Million since 1998	State Conservation Commission	1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator	Conservation District	\$130,000 per year	DEP/PDA/ SCC
		Continue to implement the program annually				Expand Dirt and Gravel Road Program to include farm and residential lanes	project oversight	Studies, SCC			for Conservation District		Dirt and Gravel Roads \$40 per foot→ TBD	SCC
3.16*	Work with PennDOT and local municipalities to reduce frequency of mowing/ spraying road	Educate local municipal leaders and work with PennDOT to address state owned roads on	Local Municipalities, DEP and PennDOT	Countywide	2023	PennDOT's and Municipal willingness to cut back on mowing programs. DEP Chesapeake Bay					1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Planning Commission	Planning Commission	\$130,000 per year	DEP
	ditches and along roadways	the importance of keeping higher vegetation along roadways to prevent erosion and increase nutrient uptake.				Program will need to assist in the education of PennDOT.					1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Conservation District	Conservation District	\$130,000 per year	DEP/PDA/ SCC
		Potential to use sustainable mowing for hay for ag use												

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been compl	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ad	ction has encoun	tered minor obstac	cles <u>Red</u> - action	on has not been	taken or has enco	untered a serious	barrier	
						Potential		Resources	<u>Available</u>			Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	_
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
3.17	Private Funding &	Identify some	Existing	Countywide	2022-	Need to expand	Financial	HRG (CAP			1 – FTE	PCCD	\$130,000 per	TBD
	Grant	private funding	project		2023	network,	services	coordinator)			Conservation		year	
	Administration	sources that may	implementer			educational aspect					District Grant			
		be able to	networks			of less common					Manager			
		supplement				funders, logistics of							4400000	
		public funding				utilizing unproven					1 – FTE	Planning	\$130,000 per	TBD
		sources/existing				funding sources (or					Planning	Commission	year	
ı		sources utilized for stakeholders,				lesser known).					Commission Grant			
		continue to work				Grant					Manager			
		with partners to				administration is a					ivialiagei			
		facilitate				challenge due to					2 – staff	Planning	\$140,000 per	TBD
		additional				limited staff and					accountants	Commission	year	.55
		funding				time-consuming						and District	,	
						nature of grant								
						reporting and								
						administration.								
Prior	ity Initiative 4: I	Research, Edu	cation, and 1	Fraining										
4.1*	Develop new water	Successful data	ALLARM,	Ag impaired	2023	Data precision,					Volunteers for	Local	N/A	TBD
	quality monitoring	input/acceptance	Keystone	streams and		QAQC, opportunity					Water quality	environmental		
	data into	by ALLARM and	Water	Countywide		to educate					monitoring	groups		
	Chesapeake Data	other	Resources			landowners about								
	Explorer/	environmental	Center,			local stream health					New	PCCD	\$125,000 – 25	ALLARM
	Chesapeake	groups program	Juniata			and what they can					monitoring		new monitors	
	Monitoring	by end of 2021.	College,			do about it.					equipment			
	Cooperative database	Man ovisting	Juniata County Watershed			Currently no					3 – additional	Chesapeake	\$130,000 per	DEP/NRCS/
	uatabase	Map existing	Association,			groups doing water					FTE		·	DEP/NRC3/ DCNR/PDA
I		monitoring locations.	Harrisburg			quality monitoring.					environmental	Conservancy, CBF, etc.	year	DCINITYFDA
		iocations.	University			Limited USGS					technician	CD1 , CtC.		
		Implement 25	3			monitoring								
		new water				(streamflow only).					2 – stream	PAFBC, USGS,	\$280,000 per	DEP/DCNR/
		quality				. "					biologist	PCCD, etc.	year	PAFBC/USGS
		monitoring												
		stations.												

		<u>Green</u> - actio	n has been comp	leted or is moving	g forward as	planned <u>Yellow</u> - ad	tion has encountered minor obstacles Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier							
						Potential	tial Resources <u>Available</u>					Resource	es <u>Needed</u>	
						Implementation								
Action		Performance		Geographic	Expected	Challenges or						Suggested		Suggested
#	Description	Target(s)	Partners	Location	Timeline	Recommendations	Technical	Source	Financial	Source	Technical	Source	Financial	Source
4.2	Supporting watershed associations for short-term success and long-term sustainability aligning with their goals	Develop new or reestablish existing watershed associations to support with CAP implementation. Watershed organizations can support with outreach, engagement,	Conservation District, Tri- County Regional Planning Commission	Countywide Shermans Creek Buffalo Creek	Ongoing	Willing volunteers and leaders to establish and run watershed organizations to be successful and support with implementation.	Social media shares Project development support	County – department to be determined CAP Coordinator (HRG)			1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Planning Commission 1 – FTE Clean Water Coordinator for Conservation District	Planning Commission Conservation District	\$130,000 per year \$130,000 per year	DEP DEP/PDA/ SCC
		new project identification and implementation.											\$5000 per organization to produce promotional materials (hats, shirts, stickers) for members -> \$5,000 per year	Enhance the capacity of local watershed associations for short-term success and long-term sustainability

Each county-based local area will use this template to identify:

- 1. Inputs These are both existing and needed resources, public and private, to implement the identified priority initiative. These include both technical and financial resources, such as personnel, supplies, equipment and funding.
- 2. Process what is each partner able to do where and by when. These are the action items listed under each priority initiative.
- 3. Outputs and outcomes both short and long-term. These are the priority initiatives identified by each county. The performance targets are the intermediate indicators that will measure progress.
- 4. Implementation challenges any potential issues or roadblocks to implementation that could impede outputs and outcomes.

Asterisk: Place an asterisk next to the action number(s) for action items that appear in both the County Planning and Progress Template and the Programmatic Recommendations Template.

For each Priority Initiative or Program Element: Use the fields, as defined below, to identify the inputs and the process that will be followed to achieve each priority initiative. This is the "who, what, where, when and how" of the plan:

Description = What. This may include programs that address prevention, education, or as specific as planned BMP installations that will address the Priority Initiative. A programmatic or policy effort will require some ability to quantify the anticipated benefits which will allow calculation of the associated nutrient reductions.

Performance Target = How. This is an extension of the Description above. The Performance Target details the unique BMPs that will result from implementation of the Priority Initiative and serves as a benchmark to track progress in addressing the Priority Initiative. Performance Targets may be spread across multiple Responsible Parties, Geographies, and Timelines based on the specifics of the Initiative.

Responsible Party(ies) = Who. This is/are the key partner(s) who will implement the action items though outreach, assistance or funding, and who will be responsible for delivering the identified programs or practices.

Geographic Location = Where. This field identifies the geographic range of the planned implementation. This could extend to the entire county or down to a small watershed, based on the scale of the Priority Initiative, range of the Responsible Party, or planned funding/resources. NOTE: Resource limitations alone should not limit potential implementation as additional funding may become available in the future.

Expected Timeline = When. Provide the expected completion date for the planned activity. This should be a reasonable expectation, based on knowledge and experience, that will aid in tracking progress toward addressing the Priority Initiative.

Resources Available: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources secured/available to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the resources identified in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if available, to each action.

Resources Needed: Technical & Funding = This field will note technical and financial resources needed/outstanding to implement the program (Description). This is the total of the additional resources projected and identified as needed in the County Resources Inventory Template below allocated to the priority initiative as a whole; or, if possible, to each action.

Potential Implementation Challenges/Issues = This field will note challenges and issues that may delay program implementation (Description).

GLOSSARY

- ACT 167 Plan. The Pennsylvania Stormwater Management Act of 1978, or Act 167, required that each county must prepare and adopt a watershed stormwater management plan for each watershed located in the county as designated by DEP, in consultation with the municipalities located within each watershed.
- Ag E&S Agricultural Erosion and Sedimentation Plan. Agricultural Erosion and Sedimentation plans document best management practices on crop and pasture fields to mitigate erosion and protect soil health. Any landowner that disturbs the soil (including no tillage) more than 5,000 square feet (~ 1/10 acre) must have a written Agricultural Erosion & Sediment Control Plan according to Pennsylvania State law, Chapter 102.
- ALLARM Alliance for Aquatic Resource Monitoring. ALLARM is a program of Dickinson College that enhances local action for the protection and restoration of waterways by empowering communities with scientific knowledge and tools.
- BMP Best Management Practice. Best management practices describe a type of water pollution control. Using agricultural BMPs can help to prevent or minimize the effects of nonpoint source pollution.
- CAST Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool. CAST is a web-based nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment load estimator tool that streamlines environmental planning.
- CBF Chesapeake Bay Foundation. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation is a non-profit organization devoted to the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay in the United States.
- **PCCD Perry County Conservation District.** The Perry County Conservation District serves as the primary local source of assistance to all individuals and organizations who benefit from the county's natural resources that we collectively strive to sustain and improve.
- PCPC Perry County Planning Commission. The Perry County Planning Commission makes recommendations and decisions to maintain and enhance the high quality of life for all residents, in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, and other laws and regulations of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the County of Perry.
- CHMP County Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Perry County Hazard Mitigation Plan was developed for the purpose of providing a blueprint for reducing property damage and saving lives from the effects of future natural and human-caused disasters in Perry County; Qualifying the County for pre-disaster and post-disaster grant funding; Complying with state and federal legislative requirements related to local hazard mitigation planning; Demonstrating a firm local commitment to hazard mitigation principles; and Improving community resiliency following a disaster event.
- **DCNR Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.** DCNR is responsible for maintaining and preserving state parks and forests; providing information on the state's natural resources; and working with communities to benefit local recreation and natural areas.
- **DEP Department of Environmental Protection.** The Department of Environmental Protection's mission is to protect Pennsylvania's air, land and water from pollution and to provide for the health and safety of its citizens through a cleaner environment.
- EPA Environmental Protection Agency. The Environmental Protection Agency is a United States federal government agency whose mission is to protect human and environmental health.
- FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency. FEMA supports citizens and emergency personnel to build, sustain, and improve the nation's capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate all hazards.
- FieldDoc FieldDoc is a protected, online database that uses geographic information to generate baseline nutrient and sediment loading information and calculate load reductions for planned BMPs.
- GIS Geographic Information System. GIS is a computer system that analyzes and displays geographically referenced information.
- **HUC12 Watershed.** A local sub-watershed level delineation that captures tributary systems draining into the larger Chesapeake Bay watershed.
- MMP Manure Management Plan. Manure management plans document how a landowner plans to capture, store, treat, and utilize animal manures in an environmentally sustainable manner. Every landowner that has livestock or spreads manure on their property must have a written Manure Management Plan according to Pennsylvania State law, Chapter 91.
- MS4 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System. A separate storm sewer system is a collection of structures, including retention basins, ditches, roadside inlets and underground pipes, designed to gather stormwater from built-up areas and discharge it, without treatment, into local streams and rivers.
- **NFWF National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.** NFWF works towards sustaining, restoring, and enhancing the nation's fish, wildlife, plants and habitats for current and future generations through innovative public and private partnerships, and by investing financial resources and intellectual capital into science-based programs designed to address conservation priorities and achieve measurable outcomes.
- NMP Act 38 Nutrient Management Plan. Nutrient management plans are required under Pennsylvania State law Act 38 which applies to operations with more than 2,000 pounds live animal weight per acre of pasture and crop fields.
- NRCS Natural Resource Conservation Service. NRCS's programs help farmers reduce soil erosion, enhance water supplies, improve water quality, increase wildlife habitat, and reduce damages caused by floods and other natural disasters.
- **PACD Pennsylvania Association of Conservation Districts.** Provides support for Pennsylvania's conservation districts.
- PEMA Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency. PEMA is tasked with the response to, preparedness for, recovery from, and the mitigation or prevention of disasters and other emergencies.
- PracticeKeeper. PracticeKeeper is a protected, online database Used for reporting conservation plans, BMPs, E&S plans, nutrient management plans, watershed plans, complaints, DEP inspection reports and data exports to DEP.
- QAPP Quality Assurance Project Plan. A QA Project Plan documents the technical and quality aspects of a project, including project management, implementation and assessment. It specifies responsibilities, monitoring objectives, sampling design, sample collection methods, analytical methods, quality control, data management and data validation activities. It is required by EPA prior to any monitoring or data collection.
- QAQC Quality Assurance Quality Control. QA/QC is the combination of quality assurance, the process or set of processes used to measure and assure the quality of a product, and quality control, the process of ensuring products and services meet consumer expectations.
- 4R Nutrient Stewardship Precision Conservation. Right fertilizer source at the Right rate, at the Right time and in the Right place for optimal crop management.
- SRBC Susquehanna River Basin Commission. SRBC's mission is to enhance public welfare through comprehensive planning, water supply allocation, and management of the water resources of the Susquehanna River Basin.
- **SWM Stormwater Management.** Stormwater management is the effort to reduce runoff of rainwater or melted snow into streets, lawns and other sites and the improvement of water quality.
- **SWP Source Water Protection.** Source Water Protection is a planning process conducted by local water utilities, as well as regional or national government agencies, to protect drinking water sources from overuse and contamination.
- **USGS United States Geological Survey.** USGS provides science about the natural hazards that threaten lives and livelihoods; the water, energy, minerals, and other natural resources we rely on; the health of our ecosystems and environment; and the impacts of climate and land-use change.
- WIP Watershed Implementation Plan. Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) are the roadmap for how the Bay jurisdictions (including Pennsylvania), in partnership with federal and local governments, will achieve the Chesapeake Bay TMDL allocations.
- WWTP Wastewater Treatment Plant. Wastewater treatment plants process contaminants from sewage and convert it into an effluent that can be returned to the water cycle with acceptable impact on the environment or reused for various purposes.