

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Advisory Committee

for the Comprehensive Water Resources Plan

December 1, 2016 Conference Call

Meeting Summary

Roll Call and Agenda Review

Kristin Rowles welcomed the Advisory Committee (AC) members and thanked them for their participation on the conference call. Members participating on the call were identified by a roll call; a list of participants is provided at the end of this meeting summary. Next, Kristin reviewed the agenda and objectives for the conference call and provided some ground rules for the teleconference to support a productive discussion. Screen sharing was used during the call so that participants could view slides and consider revisions to text during discussions. For those that did not access the screen sharing portal, slides were provided in advance.

Welcome

Carlton Haywood, Executive Director of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB) offered a welcome to the AC members and thanked them for serving on the committee. He then reviewed the role of the AC in development of the comprehensive plan.

- The AC will be relied upon for input in plan development.
- The AC members have a dual role: (1) represent your particular interest and area of knowledge, and (2) take a basinwide view.
- The AC should give advice to ICPRB and help steer ICPRB in appropriate directions to develop the draft comprehensive plan.
- The Commissioners have the final responsibility for decisions regarding the plan.
- The ICPRB might not be able to respond to/address all suggestions of AC members due to staff, funding or time limitations.
- A draft plan will be circulated for AC review. The ICPRB will respond to comments as best they can.

- The final step in plan development will be presentation of a final comprehensive plan to the ICPRB Commissioners for adoption. A document from the AC may accompany the final comprehensive plan to reflect perspectives on the plan.

Committee Business

Kristin presented the summary from the September AC meeting. She also reminded the group that the meeting summaries and other relevant information is available on a section of the ICPRB website dedicated to the AC process (<https://www.potomacriver.org/focus-areas/water-resources-and-drinking-water/water-resources/planning/basin-wide-comprehensive-plan/comp-plan-advisory-comm-info/>). She said that the webpage includes a list of AC members and their affiliations. She asked members to note if any edits were needed to the list.

Kristin reviewed the schedule for future AC meetings and conference calls as follows:

- Dec 1, 2016 10am-12pm (Thursday) - teleconference
- March 2, 2017 10am-2pm (Thursday)
- May 23, 2017 10am-2pm (Tuesday)
- Sept 8, 10am-12pm (Friday) - teleconference
- Nov 8, 10am-2pm (Wednesday)

The meeting schedule is based on responses to the scheduling poll.

Jim Palmer provided an update on a contaminant spill on the Potomac near White's Ferry. Jim reported that there have been no impacts to utilities in their provision of water supplies. Emergency response personnel are looking into the cause of the spill and containment.

Vision Statement

Kristin reported on work related to drafting a vision statement that has occurred since the September AC meeting. The draft presented in the pre-meeting packet for this teleconference reflects ICPRB staff edits and AC member comments received to date. Since the pre-meeting packet, Kristin noted that she has sent two updates of the vision statement to AC members in advance of this call. The revisions were based on further AC member input.

Kristin reminded the AC that the vision statement will be a guiding and forward-looking statement that reflects shared values. It explains the purpose of the plan and will be used to support decision making in plan development. She noted that there are many different ways to approach the development of a vision statement. The style and tone of the draft vision statement

under consideration are intended to suit the culture of the organization and the nature of the plan under development.

Kristin asked the AC members for their comments on the most recent draft of the vision statement (sent to AC members on 11/30/2016). The revised vision statement was posted on the screen sharing portal and read aloud.

This plan provides a roadmap to achieving our shared vision that the Potomac River Basin will serve as a national model for water resource management that fulfills human and ecological needs for current and future generations. The plan will be based on sound science and focus on sustainable water resources management that provides the water quantity and quality needed for the protection and enhancement of public health, the environment, the economy, and quality of life in the basin. The ICPRB will serve as the catalyst of the plan's implementation through an adaptive process in collaboration with partner agencies, institutions, organizations, and the public.

Input and discussion on the draft vision statement was as follows:

- Although I have general comfort with the statement, can we add specific recognition of agriculture and food production to it? Also, while I appreciate the desire for “sound science,” there are often gaps in our information.
- I am pleased with the current version and hope that the AC can agree on it on today’s call.
- It might be a bit too wordy. Moreover, the AC needs to understand what the plan really will be. Furthermore, the comprehensive plan cannot be fully scientific document.
- The current version of the statement is comprehensive yet flexible. It’s a solid vision statement. Consider changing “catalyst of” to “catalyst for” in the last sentence to make it stronger. *There were no objections to this wording change.*

Kristin asked for comments on whether dropping the reference to sound science in the second sentence was acceptable to AC members. The following is a summary of the discussion:

- I am in favor of keeping the sound science language in the statement. It is aspirational.
- I am in favor of the intent of sound science language. I would suggest adding text to also reference “best available data.”

Based on an AC member suggestion, Kristin asked if the following edit to the second sentence would be acceptable: “The plan will be based on the best available science and data and focus on

sustainable water resources management that...” The following is a summary of the discussion of this proposal:

- Isn't it implied that we'll rely on the best science and data?
- Perhaps it is, but for clarity, I think we should include the proposed language in the statement.
- Carlton Haywood (ICPRB) suggested breaking the statement into two sentences.

Kristin suggested that the AC consider conditionally approving the proposed language, with a follow-up e-mail regarding how to break the sentence up into two sentences for readability. She will ask AC members to confirm that the further revisions are consistent with the intent of this discussion and decision. She asked if there were any objections to the proposed change to the second sentence (“The plan will be based on the best available science and data and focus on sustainable water resources management that...”) *There were no objections.*

Next, Kristin asked the AC for comments on the suggestion that specific references to agriculture and food production be added to the vision statement.

- I am concerned about singling out a particular sector in the vision statement. I would want to see my sector identified as well if we highlight agriculture.
- Agriculture is a significant water user in the Basin, and the agricultural community wants to be sustainable. The agricultural community is concerned about their access to water. We should acknowledge that “the economy” (in the second sentence) includes agricultural production.

Kristin suggested editing the latter half of the second sentence as follows: “...needed for the protection and enhancement of public health, the environment, all sectors of the economy, and quality of life in the basin.” Further discussion supported this edit.

Kristin asked the AC to consider the vision statement with revisions from today's discussion:

This plan provides a roadmap to achieving our shared vision that the Potomac River Basin will serve as a national model for water resource management that fulfills human and ecological needs for current and future generations. The plan will be based on the best available science and data and focus on sustainable water resources management that provides the water quantity and quality needed for the protection and enhancement of public health, the environment, all sectors of the economy, and quality of life in the basin. The ICPRB will serve as the catalyst for the plan's implementation through an adaptive process in collaboration with partner agencies, institutions, organizations, and the public.

She asked if there were any objections to recommending this proposed vision statement to the Commission. *There were no objections, and the revised vision statement was recommended by AC consensus.* Kristin said that she will follow-up next week with an e-mail request to review edits to the second sentence to break the sentence into two for readability.

Water Resource Challenges List

Kristin described how the challenges list had been revised since the last AC meeting, in which the members indicated and discussed priorities on the list. The list has been revised based on AC input and through work with a subcommittee of AC members. The list is reorganized, and it now includes an introduction that provides context for the list. The list is divided into five challenge areas, which are the overall priorities. Under each challenge area is a list of example challenges. These example lists are not comprehensive, and the plan will not be able to address them all in detail. The five challenge areas provide an overall outline for plan development. The revised list was provided in the pre-meeting packet for this teleconference.

Kristin emphasized that this document is about listing problems for the plan to address and not the solutions. The solutions will be the focus of the work that comes next in plan development.

Members of the subcommittee that worked on the challenges list provided comments on the revised list:

- The revised list synthesizes comments from the AC and has good content. Developing this list raises other questions to consider. The list is not particularly unique to the Potomac River Basin; it could apply to nearly any river basin. I think we need further discussion about how the plan will be used. Will the plan recommend solutions and identify who will be responsible? We should also consider how the Potomac compares to other river basins across the country. One unique feature of the Potomac is the presence of numerous administrative entities within a relatively small geographic area.
- We have had a good process to revise the challenges list. The challenges list is not the plan. We still have work to do on determining what degree the plan can address the various challenges identified. We should review other similar plans for possible guidance. It would be instructive to see what from the 1960's plan for the Potomac was implemented and what barriers created problems in implementation.
- I am pleased with the process of developing this revised list, and I am pleased with the outcome. This list is only one part of the whole planning process, and we should resist urge to list every possible challenge.

Kristin reviewed comments from AC members on the revised list that have resulted in further edits:

In the list of example challenges under “2. Protect and Improve Water Quality”:

- Add “endocrine disruptors” as a specific example of “emerging contaminants”
- Drop “abandoned” from mine drainage to capture a broader range of mines
- Add “septic systems” as a pollutant source to address

In the list of example challenges under “3. Protect Ecological Health”:

- Drop “exotic” before “species” because there are beneficial exotics; target invasive species

In the list of example challenges under “4. Manage Human Land Use for Sustainability”:

- Add “and floodplains” after “Discouraging development on steep slopes”

AC member discussion on the revised challenges list was as follows:

- Although this list may resemble those of other river basins, it is important to remember that ICPRB is a non-regulatory commission. Therefore, the plan should emphasize coordination with regulatory entities and signatory bodies. We are making recommendations to them. Also, keep in mind that when the 1960’s plan for the Potomac was developed, the ICPRB did not have a water supply role.
- There are significant differences among the many jurisdictions that manage the challenge items listed. We need to be careful in how we consider and address these differences, and it will be a challenge to do so.
- The five challenge areas listed adequately capture the overarching challenges. Also, invasive species are a significant concern.
- The voluntary nature of the plan is addressed in the introduction to the challenges list. Although the ICPRB is non-regulatory, federal, state, and local regulations apply that address many of the challenges. ICPRB can play a coordinating function among the various entities and jurisdictions.
- We need to greatly improve coordination with federal agencies in the basin and encourage them to support implementation of the comprehensive plan.
- The challenges list has good coverage of what we need to address.

Kristin asked the AC to consider the revised challenges list (with the edits presented above). She asked if there were any objections to recommending the revised challenges list to move forward with as an organizing guide for plan development. *There were no objections, and the revised challenges list was approved by AC consensus.*

ICPRB Technical Work Plan for Comprehensive Plan Development

Carlton Haywood introduced the technical work plan as a strategy for the ICPRB to support plan development. He noted that the strategy will be subject to time and funding constraints. Heidi Moltz provided an overview and timeline for the technical work plan (slides available). She explained that technical work to support the plan will include existing ICPRB projects, plan-specific analyses, and information gathering from outside sources. The AC will review the technical work in presentations and discussions at AC meetings, and the AC will make recommendations to the Commission based on the technical work presented. Heidi reviewed a schedule for presentation of the technical work to the AC at its upcoming meetings, and she mentioned the possible addition of an in-person meeting for the AC to review the draft comprehensive plan in March 2018. The following table is a summary of the schedule:

Date	Meeting Format	Planning Timeline	Tentative Technical Presentations by Challenge Area
December 1, 2016	Teleconference	Finalize list of water resources challenges	N/A
March 2, 2017	In-Person	Evaluate water resources challenges; Identify possible recommendations	Panel on Energy-Water Issues*
May 23, 2017	In-Person		Water Quality; Water Use
September 8, 2017	Teleconference		Human Land Use; Ecological Health
November 8, 2017	In-Person	Review and finalize recommendations	Support Plan Implementation
March 2018 - TBD	TBD	Review draft plan	N/A

Discussion of the technical work plan was as follows:

- How can we prioritize our recommendations? Can we quantify effectiveness of possible strategies?
 - Heidi offered that the ICPRB has previously “scored” recommendations based on various metrics.

- We need information on what goals, policies, and requirements are already in place that address the challenges. That knowledge can help in developing the Plan recommendations, and in showing where those recommendations are consistent with, or can enhance implementing existing goals, policies, and regulations. This is especially a concern because of the variation among the multiple jurisdictions in the basin. We need to keep our perspective on our limits that might arise due to this variation.
- It would be helpful to have a mechanism to request review and input from regulatory entities during plan development.
 - Carlton offered support for this suggestion and commented that the quarterly ICPRB meetings may be a vehicle for keeping regulatory entities updated and engaged.
- We need to give explicit thought to how we will keep the public updated on the comprehensive plan development process.
 - Kristin reminded the group of the “keep informed” list and said that AC members should continue to offer additions to the list.

Meeting Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Kristin reviewed the next steps for the AC including:

- Grammatical revisions to the second sentence of the vision statement will be circulated to the AC for review next week.
- A meeting summary will be circulated for review by ICPRB staff and AC members.
- The next meeting will be on March 2 at the ICPRB office in Rockville, MD.

In response to the request from Heidi, the AC did not offer any objections to distributing the approved challenges list to the “keep informed” list, but a member suggested that perhaps waiting for review by the ICPRB Commissioners would be appropriate. The commissioners meet next week. Carlton offered that he will present to the vision statement and challenges list to the ICPRB Board next week. If there are no objections to doing so from the commissioners, the challenges list will be distributed to the “keep informed” list.

Kristin thanked the AC for their commitment and contributions and for a productive meeting. The teleconference was adjourned.

December 1 Advisory Committee Conference Call Participation

Members:

Charlie Bennett
Willem Brakel
Tolessa Deksissa
Tom Devilbiss
Marty Gary
Mark Guise
Nancy Hausrath
Sara Jordan
Adam McClain
Mishelle Noble
John Odenkirk
Jennifer Orr
Mark Peterson
Herb Sachs
Donald Schwartz
Mark Symborski

Other:

Carlton Haywood (ICPRB)
Heidi Moltz (ICPRB)
Jim Palmer (ICPRB)
Kristin Rowles (facilitator)
Mark Masters (facilitator)