

**INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN**  
**Advisory Committee**  
**for the Comprehensive Water Resources Plan**

**March 2, 2017**

**ICPRB – Rockville, MD**

**Meeting Summary**

**Welcome, Introduction and Agenda Review**

Kristin Rowles welcomed the AC and thanked them for their participation. Members and guests introduced themselves and are listed at the end of this meeting summary. Kristin reviewed the meeting objectives.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**ICPRB Progress Report**

Carlton Haywood and Heidi Moltz (ICPRB) provided the Committee an update on Comprehensive Plan development. Topics covered included:

- *Feedback from ICPRB Commission* – Carlton said that the commissioners have been briefed on the planning process and provided positive feedback and appreciation for the Advisory Committee’s work. ICPRB Commissioner Willem Brakel offered that the Commission is overall very pleased with the vision statement, challenges list, and planning process to date. One Commission member asked how the plan will address climate change, and Willem said that he pointed out that the vision statement calls for consideration of the best available science and data.
- *Comprehensive Plan Timeline* – Carlton reviewed the planning timeline and noted that the process is currently in the stage of evaluating water resource challenges and identifying possible recommendations. The next meeting (May 23) will be focused on water quality and water use.
- *Email Distribution List* – Heidi said that the email distribution list to inform stakeholders about the planning process has grown to approximately 190 people. She sent the vision statement and challenges list to the e-mail distribution list in early January and asked for comments. Several comments were received; most were brief and appreciative of the process. She received one set of substantive comments from Adams County (PA). The list will continue to be used in this way during the planning process. Heidi reminded the AC members to send names and contact information for people to add to the e-mail distribution list.

*March 2, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Summary*

- *George Mason University Project* – One of the comments from the e-mail distribution list was from a professor at George Mason University (GMU): Dann Sklarew. He is the associate director of the Potomac Environmental Research and Education Center at GMU. Dr. Sklarew is interested in coordinating with ICPRB to support the development of the comprehensive plan. In early February, Heidi Moltz and Jim Palmer met with Dr. Sklarew and some of his graduate students. They had a brainstorming session on recommendations to consider for the comprehensive plan. Heidi and Dr. Sklarew will share more about the collaboration with GMU at an upcoming AC meeting.
- *Draft Table of Contents for the Comprehensive Plan* – Heidi reviewed the draft Comprehensive Plan Table of Contents, which was shared with the AC as a pre-meeting material. She asked the AC members for their comments on the Table of Contents, and the following is a summary of suggestions that were made in the discussion:
  - Add a history of planning in the Potomac River basin with an emphasis on lessons learned.
  - Include descriptive information on aquatic and terrestrial life and habitat in Section 5.
  - Include detailed implementation steps and milestones in the plan. Be as specific as possible.
  - Consider alternative ways to present the plan that take advantage of dynamic web-based tools to facilitate searching and linking of information instead of a print document.
  - Keep recommendations simple and concise, especially when targeting local governments as actors.
  - Look for opportunities to prioritize important implementation steps.
  - Develop a communications plan to support its roll-out when the comprehensive plan is complete.
  - Be explicit in the plan about information and resource sharing as well as opportunities for collaboration.

Other discussion points included the following:

- An AC member noted that there is a great amount of water quality information available to include in Section 5 and asked what level of detail the plan will include. Heidi said that she expects to use regulatory information to document water quality impairments and high quality waters.
- Heidi said that the GMU students suggested that the plan include a “story line” that links the plan in a narrative way and reads less like a technical report.
- Kristin asked what AC members thought about plan length. She noted that in previous discussions, some members had warned not to make the plan lengthy and not to re-invent the wheel by repeating material from other plans.
  - One AC member said to include enough background information to provide credibility.

*March 2, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Summary*

- Another AC member commented that many people just do not read much anymore. Concise recommendations for action will be important to reach the audience.
- Several AC members emphasized the importance of conciseness to support understanding and adoption of the plan.
- An AC member said that the plan should not try to be all things to all people or it will not be useful.
- An AC member noted the importance of focusing on the purpose of the plan. Carlton said that the plan should: (1) Guide future efforts of the ICPRB in the basin, and (2) Serve as a reference document for the member jurisdictions of the Commission regarding water resource management in the basin. For this audience, he said it should document challenges and provide guidance on strategies to address those challenges. It should also serve as a tool to evaluate progress. He noted that the plan will be voluntary, not regulatory.
- An AC member commented on the challenges of implementation of a voluntary plan. It was noted that consensus recommendations from groups like the AC can be helpful in prompting local or state jurisdictions to act.
- In response to a question, Heidi said that forecasts (population, land use, water use) are not being developed specifically for the plan, but the information will be provided from other sources when it is available.
- The group discussed the primary audience for the plan. It was suggested that the audience is similar to the set of people who are on the e-mail distribution list. It was also suggested that the audience is not the general public.

**Panel on Federal Agency Involvement in Plan Development**

Next, the AC participated in a panel discussion with federal agency partners about opportunities for federal participation and involvement in comprehensive plan development. Carlton Haywood noted that there is a diverse group of federal agencies that are active in the Potomac basin, and he said it is important that their activities be captured in the comprehensive plan. He introduced the following panelists:

- Nicholas DiPasquale, Director, Chesapeake Bay Program Office
- Anna Compton, Study Director, Chesapeake Bay Comprehensive Water Resources Restoration Plan, USACE Baltimore District
- Ed Ambrogio, Deputy Associate Director, Office of State and Watershed Partnerships, Water Protection Division, USEPA Region 3

Each panelist made a presentation, and the presentations were followed by a discussion with the AC members. Two speakers had slides, which will be distributed to the AC members. The following are summary points from the presentations by the panelists:

***Nicholas DiPasquale, Chesapeake Bay Program*** (handout attached to meeting summary):

- Provided an overview of the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP)

*March 2, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Summary*

- Emphasized the ecosystem approach of the CBP to restoration
- Said that the CBP agreement among six states and Washington DC was renewed with a 2014 agreement
- Noted that the Chesapeake Bay TMDL is separate from the CBP, but an important component of Bay management
- Reported on CMP initiatives that could support comprehensive plan development, including:
  - High-resolution land use/land cover data that is available for use by partners; will be updated every 2-3 years; can be used to target BMPs
  - LIDAR data that can be used for BMP verification
  - Incorporation of an additional 20+ indicators to the portfolio of Chesapeake Bay health indicators tracked by the program over time
  - New staff tasked with program coordination and integration
  - Water quality monitoring trends analysis
  - Goal implementation teams focused on engaging federal agencies in CBP Agreement implementation
  - New focus on co-benefits, which occur when a program or action provides multiple benefits to the Bay (ex., stormwater management and toxics reduction)
  - Education and outreach on improved stormwater management

***Anna Compton, USACE*** (slides available)

- Provided an overview of the USACE Chesapeake Bay Comprehensive Water Resources Restoration Plan (focused on Bay watershed area)
- Noted that USACE has focused particular attention on aligning its plan with existing plans and not duplicating other work done in the Bay area
- Said that USACE is identifying at least one collaborative project with each Bay state jurisdiction and requesting each state identify one sub-watershed to be the focus of additional study
- Posted a “data call” for information from partners on (1) restoration actions and (2) candidate restoration projects (due March 7)
- Said that she will provide follow-up information to AC members on informational webinars and plan development

***Ed Ambrogio, USEPA Region 3*** (slides available)

- Discussed USEPA work that relates to the Water Resource Challenges identified by the Advisory Committee (see slides)
- Described numerous programs in the region that would coordinate with and support implementation of activities related to AC identified challenge areas for the comprehensive plan

The following is a summary of the discussion that followed the panelist presentations:

*March 2, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Summary*

- Mr. Ambrogio clarified that reference to COOP in his slides meant “continuity of operations” and not the ICPRB Section for Cooperative Water Supply Operations on the Potomac (CO-OP).
- The Chesapeake Bay program can provide ICPRB with information on its Bay indicators for incorporation into the comprehensive plan. It can also provide the high-resolution land use data and LIDAR data to support planning.
- With federal budgetary challenges, federal agencies need to be nimble and look for opportunities to collaborate and make the most of limited resources.
- Panelists suggested that ICPRB can serve a role in managing and hosting data about the basin from various state and federal sources.
- The Chesapeake Bay Program has a new “stewardship indicator” that is focused on human behavioral change. They have also developed a survey tool that can be used to evaluate when a particular community might be ready to consider and adopt a new program or practice.
- The Chesapeake Bay Program notes that minorities are under-represented in its programs and wants to provide more outreach to engage these communities in its work.
- Several people noted that is great value in the collaboration among jurisdictions via the Chesapeake Bay Program. Collaboration is expected to continue, but some uncertainty was noted for future availability of funding for grant programs.
- At this time, science indicates that climate change forecasts do not anticipate significant impacts on Bay water quality through 2025, but beyond 2025, forecasts are uncertain.
- This year marks a mid-point evaluation for the Bay TMDL.

**Lunch Break****Panel on Energy/Water Planning Nexus**

Jim Palmer (ICPRB) introduced the following panelists to inform the development of the Comprehensive plan as it relates to the inter-relationships between on energy and water resources:

- Zachary Clement - Water-Energy Tech Team, Office of Energy Policy and Systems Analysis, US Department of Energy
- Susan Gray - Deputy Director, Power Plant Research Program, Maryland DNR

Presentation slides from both presenters will be shared with the AC members.

Zachary Clement presented the US Department of Energy’s strategic pillars for the water-energy nexus and preliminary results from the agency’s Sankey Diagram Project. The diagrams illustrate the relationship between energy and water in terms of their sources, uses, distribution, products, and disposal. He said that he could prepare such a diagram for the Potomac basin and would share it with the AC in the future. Cooling water is generally the largest use of water in thermoelectric generation. Once through cooling withdrawals large amounts of water, but returns most of that water to the source. Closed-loop cooling withdrawals less water, but has a greater impact in terms of consumptive water use. He said there is a trend toward increased utilization of

*March 2, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Summary*

dry cooling and wastewater as cooling water at thermoelectric facilities, and he also noted that some facilities in Maryland use saline water in cooling.

Susan Gray gave a presentation on Maryland's electricity use, generation, and environmental impacts. She noted that Maryland is a net importer of electricity. The state is a part of the PJM power grid shared with multiple states. She traced the development of the electricity generation sector in Maryland. She noted that the impact of future power generation on water resources will depend on the mix of technologies adopted.

The presentations were followed by a discussion with the AC members. The following is a summary of the discussion:

- In response to a question about fish impingement at the Morgantown facility, an assistant of Susan Gray's, Shawn Seaman, reported that the new 316(b) rule is now being applied to Morgantown. Additional data may be available in the next two or three years.
- An AC member noted concerns about coal ash at Dominion Energy in Virginia. Ms. Gray said that, in Maryland, the NRG Morgantown STAR facility processes coal ash to remove moisture. After processing, the ash can be reused in concrete and wallboard manufacturing. NRG is mining and processing some of its legacy coal ash with this new facility.
- Power generation technology choices are market-driven. Generally, new fossil fuel facilities use gas instead of coal, and closed loop cooling is also becoming more common in new facilities than once-through cooling.
- Renewable energy generation in Maryland is incentivized to offset cost of installation and operation.
- There was some discussion regarding the reliability of Maryland's power supply given that it is a net importer of electricity. The panelists noted that reliance on a larger network can improve reliability, but concern was noted that complex systems might be more vulnerable to disruption. Shawn Seaman said that Maryland could improve its electrical grid best by adding transmission lines into Maryland to alleviate congestion.
- An AC member commented that 68% of withdrawals (11% of consumptive use) from the Potomac River are related to power generation. He listed several other energy-water nexus concerns, including: consumptive water use, acid mine drainage, waste heat, coal ash management, storage of nitrogen from air scrubbers, hydroelectric dam impacts, fracking and potential contamination concerns, transportation risks with fuel sources, and energy requirements for water and wastewater treatment. He said that it is important that the comprehensive plan consider the full range of concerns.

### **Meeting Wrap-Up and Next Steps**

Kristin thanked the AC for their commitment and contributions to a productive meeting. She reminded members that presentations will be provided to members in the coming days. Also, members are to submit comments on the draft Table of Content to Heidi within the next two weeks. Kristin will send a reminder. The next AC meeting will be held at the ICPRB office in Rockville, MD on May 23, 2017. The meeting was adjourned.

*March 2, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Summary***March 2, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Participation****Members:**

Hedrick Belin  
Willem Brakel  
Tolessa Deksissa  
Tom Devilbiss  
Marty Gary  
Mark Guise  
Sara Jordan  
Adam McClain  
Mishelle Noble  
John Odenkirk  
Mark Peterson  
Dusty Rood  
Donald Schwartz (by phone)  
Ed Snyder  
Mark Symborski  
John Wirts

**Observers/Panelists:**

Nicholas DiPasquale (Chesapeake Bay  
Program Office)  
Anna Compton (USACE Baltimore District)  
Ed Ambrogio, (USEPA Region 3)  
Zachary Clement (USDOE)  
Susan Gray (Maryland DNR)  
Amie Howell (USEPA Region 3)  
Leo Essenthier (USEPA Region 3)  
Shawn Seaman (Maryland DNR)  
Nick Kuttner (Potomac Riverkeeper Network)

**Staff:**

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

**ICPRB Advisory Committee  
for the  
Comprehensive Water Resources Plan  
30 W. Gude Drive  
Rockville, MD 20850**

March 2, 2017  
10:00 am to 2:00 pm

1. Administration Priorities
2. Budget Uncertainty
3. Information and Resource Sharing
4. 2014 Watershed Agreement Goals/Outcomes
  - a. Management Strategies/Workplans
  - b. Indicator Progress & Development
  - c. Program Coordination/Integration
5. 2017 Mid-Point Assessment
  - a. High Resolution Land Cover/Updated Land Use Data
  - b. Landscape Change over Time
  - c. Water Quality Monitoring Trends Analysis
  - d. Climate Impacts
6. Co-Benefits
7. Source Water Protection
8. Army Corps of Engineers Chesapeake Bay Comprehensive Plan