

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Advisory Committee

for the Comprehensive Water Resources Plan

November 8, 2017

ICPRB – Rockville, MD

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introduction and Agenda Review

Kristin Rowles (Policy Works LLC) welcomed the Advisory Committee (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 agenda.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

ICPRB Progress Report

Carlton Haywood (ICPRB) thanked members for attending the meeting. He then reviewed the schedule and timeline for the Advisory Committee and for completing the Comprehensive Plan. He offered that ICPRB is planning to have a first draft of the Comprehensive Plan by February 15, 2018. The first draft will be reviewed by the AC and the Commissioners. A follow-up draft will be distributed around March 21 to the states for review, with a final draft provided to the Commissioners on approximately May 15. The Commissioners meet on June 5, and it is expected that they will consider final approval of the plan at that meeting.

Carlton announced that ICPRB would like to add an Advisory Committee meeting in early March, at which time the committee can discuss the draft plan. Kristin will be in contact with AC members about scheduling that meeting.

Carlton said that the Commissioners discussed the Comprehensive Plan in a briefing at its August 29th meeting, and another briefing will be provided at the Commissioners' December 5th meeting. The Commissioners have formed an ad hoc committee for review of the Comprehensive Plan. Carlton noted that at the August 29th briefing, the commissioners discussed concerns about the tone of the recommendations. In general, they noted a preference for recommendations that are not prescriptive toward actors other than ICPRB. The document should be a guidance document for all stakeholders in the basin.

An AC member commented that ICPRB should publicize completion of the Comprehensive Plan.

Federal Agency Survey Results

Carlton reported that the federal agency survey results, being compiled by the US Army Corps of Engineers, are not complete and the work product has been delayed due to personnel changes.

Comprehensive Plan Format and Presentation

Heidi Moltz presented information on the final form of the Comprehensive Plan. She offered that ICPRB is considering a hyperlinked PDF file for ease of reading and reference. Heidi also requested AC members provide any photos or graphics that may contribute to a more approachable or “user-friendly” style of the final Plan. Kristin asked the committee members for their comments:

- An AC member suggested incorporating more geo-spatial information in the final PDF.
- Several members reiterated the need for the final Plan to be valuable to a general audience rather than a purely scientific document.
- Members discussed how to gage the accessibility of the document’s text and discussed reading levels that the Plan could target. An AC member offered that a 6th grade level is a common target for general audiences, but it was also noted that different parts of the document might be geared toward different levels. For example, the Executive Summary and “take-home” summaries for each section may be targeted to a different level than appendices or the annotated bibliography.
- An AC member suggested that the conclusions and/or “take-home” messages should be the most easily accessible material in each section.
- An AC member suggested making the tools or applications developed to support the final Plan should be made available to complement implementation (e.g., GIS tools, data).
- Heidi suggested that the Plan could also include links to external resources for individuals that want additional detail or more specific information.

Discussion of Draft Plan Sections

Kristin noted that AC members had received two draft plan sections of the Comprehensive Plan as pre-meeting materials: Water Use and Supply (2nd review draft) and Water Quality (1st review draft). Heidi Moltz then reviewed changes to the Water Use and Supply section since the May AC meeting. Kristin asked for AC member comments on this revised plan section and guided the discussion with some questions about the content. The following is a summary of the AC discussion:

- An AC member suggested adding Municipal Governments to the table on pg. 7.
- An AC member suggested adding reference to the various jurisdiction’s requirements for water use reporting for the 2nd recommendation on pg. 4. Another AC member offered that an additional “side-bar” on unpermitted uses would be useful.
- An AC member thanked ICPRB for incorporating the input from the AC.

- An AC member suggested adding academic entities and utilities that may not be part of a municipality to the list of organizations in Table 1 (pg. 5).
- An AC member offered that the main text should be in the form of a bulleted list at a coarse level of detail but should include an easily accessible link to more detailed information.
- An AC member commented that the Plan should not set ICPRB up for failure. He said to be sure that ICPRB can do the things the plan recommends. Expectations should be achievable.
- Several AC members commented on concerns about alternative water supplies and water storage in the Basin. An AC member commented that the milestone regarding the 2020 Water Demand Study could be expanded to address or acknowledge these concerns.
- An AC member suggested that potential issues with groundwater availability should be acknowledged in the 1st recommendation on pg. 4. Several members offered examples of wells going dry and issues of contaminated groundwater sources.
- An AC member asked whether the recommendations should include on-going efforts to evaluate the CO-OP low-flow protection agreement. Carlton said that the evaluation might be complete prior to issuance of the Comprehensive Plan, but noted that it could be acknowledged. The effort could be listed as a short-term milestone.
- AC members suggested that in the final recommendation on pg. 5, a summary of the complementary actions should be included in the text. It was also noted that the content of Appendix C provides too much information on the process of how it was developed. A summary of the complementary actions in the main body of the plan will suffice.

Next, Heidi presented the Water Quality draft plan section. Kristin asked for AC member comments on the draft plan section and guided the discussion with some questions about the content. The following is a summary of the AC discussion:

- An AC member suggested that draft plan sections should follow generally the same general format and be self-contained. It was suggested that it is ok to repeat things from other sections, to some extent, to allow for users to consume the document by only consulting those areas of interest to them.
- An AC member asked how the efforts of federal agencies on water quality should be addressed in the plan. It was noted that input from the federal agency survey will inform the discussion of the role of the federal agencies in the plan. For water quality, many federal agencies have clearly defined areas of responsibility. It was suggested that the plan could acknowledge these roles and recommend continued support for their efforts. It was also suggested that ICPRB could continue to serve in a “convening role” to foster coordination among agencies and states, as it did with the federal agency workshop it held in August.
- An AC member suggested that specific reference to the Executive Order cited on pg. 1 be removed.
- An AC member suggested that additional tools or information on BMP effectiveness would be useful to guide implementation.

- An AC member suggested that the roles and responsibilities section include agricultural and forestry agencies for their role in water quality programs.
- An AC member commented that there is a “risk” involved in convening a meeting or workshop to develop specific criteria or recommendations on water quality, as described in the short-term milestones. It was suggested that the results of such a workshop be carefully presented.
- An AC member noted that the list of TMDL documents on pg. 17 did not appear to be complete. It was suggested that a general link to all TMDL documents for the Basin might be better.

Human Land Use Challenge Area

Kristin introduced the next agenda item as a discussion of the Human Land Use Challenge Area, and she said it would be similar in format to the discussions of the previously discussed challenge areas. To start, Heidi presented some background information related to the challenge area. Slides from her presentation were provided to the AC in the pre-meeting materials. In summary, Heidi reviewed the challenge area statement/background, certain land use related studies by ongoing or completed by ICPRB, potential roles of the Comprehensive Plan for this challenge area (e.g., focus on assistance for local government with information), and offered an initial set of draft recommendations for discussion.

Next, Kristin divided the AC into groups to develop potential recommendations related to this challenge area. She noted that because land use is primarily a local government activity, it was important to think about the role of the Comprehensive Plan recommendations and avoid prescriptive recommendations for local governments. Instead, recommendations will likely be focused on information sharing, coordination, and education at the regional or basinwide level that can support land use planning.

She asked that each member write down a few potential recommendations to discuss within their small groups. Each group was asked to present recommendations which received the support of the group. Following the small group discussion, the AC members reviewed each group’s recommendations. Then, the AC members indicated their individual priorities among these recommendations by placing stickers on the flip charts with the recommendations. Some members asked to include the initial set of recommendations from the slides in this exercise. Results from the recommendation development and prioritization exercise are summarized in Table 1. The following is a summary of AC member discussion of the recommendations for this challenge area:

- An AC member suggested this section include an inset box (or boxes) with examples of good local land use programs to highlight the best practices.
- An AC member suggested that there are barriers to the flow of relevant information to local jurisdictions and decision makers to support them in improving land use management in a manner that will support improved water resource management. An AC member commented that there seems to be a lot of information “lost” before it gets to decision makers.

- AC members suggested that use of examples or success stories may help bridge the gaps in communication and that an emphasis on benefits will help to tailor the message to the audience.
- Another AC member said that to improve information delivery, work back from the decision maker and determine what is the best message and who is the best messenger for that message.
- An AC member suggested that a basinwide evaluation of local or regional regulations would be helpful.
- An AC member suggested that this section include a discussion of ecosystem services.

Discussion of Plan Implementation Challenge Area

Kristin explained that the discussion of the implementation challenge area would focus on how these topics would be addressed in the plan. A list of implementation challenge issues has been developed based on prior AC discussions and forms the basis of a table that was provided to AC members as a pre-meeting material. The table, developed by Heidi Moltz, indicated where in the Comprehensive Plan each issue will be address in the plan document. Heidi reviewed the table with the AC. AC members discussed the handout, but generally supported the approach as presented.

Meeting Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Kristin thanked the AC for their commitment and contributions to a productive meeting and process to date. She reminded members a meeting summary will be provided to members in the coming days. The first draft of the Comprehensive Plan will be distributed to the AC for review in February with the next AC meeting to be scheduled in early March 2018. Kristin and Mark will work with AC members and ICPRB to develop the meeting agenda, and Kristin will be in touch with AC members soon about possible meeting dates. The meeting was adjourned.

TABLE 1: Human Land Use Challenge Area Recommendations from AC Small Group Exercise

Group	<u>Recommendations</u>	<u># of Stickers</u>
A	1) For urban areas, ICPRB will share with the COGs water quality studies that will help local governments understand future development implications for water.	4
	2) For rural areas, ICPRB will compile a list of best practices from like local governments.	0
B	1) Research most effective locations for stormwater management.	1
	2) Identify and/or develop creative use of zoning, water/sewer service provisions, insurance, preservation, and buffers to achieve goals	1
C	1) Identify gaps across jurisdictional boundaries	0
	2) ICPRB should encourage and support a watershed approach for mitigation and restoration	5
	3) Identify and promote creative, effective use of local, regulatory, programmatic, and financial tools	7
	4) Promote and increase riparian buffer protection and tracking buffers in GIS	5
D	1) Compile scientific data and information on the relationships between: land use, natural resources, development, impervious cover, stormwater management, water quality, water supply, ecological health, ecosystem services, green infrastructure, human health, economic health, and success stories where these have been well-balanced.	7
	2) Effectively disseminate scientific data and information compiled by on-going research.	7
Example Recommendations (from slide presentation)	<i>Research</i>	
	1) Study correlation of drinking water treatment costs and water quality, as well as correlation to conserved lands. (E.g. WRF Forestry Project)	0
	2) Identify and/or develop creative use of zoning regulation, water/sewer service provisions, and insurance rules to achieve goals	1
	<i>Communication</i>	
	1) Assist with BMPs –prioritization and promotion of most effective; improve implementation through enhanced communication and coordination	1
	2) Encourage multi-jurisdictional synergy/cooperation	0
	<i>Education</i>	
	1) Guidance on getting “bang for your buck” out of preservation/conservation areas; improve ecosystem services in protected areas	5
	2) Onsite infiltration and reuse of stormwater	0
3) Improved protection of riparian buffers (note similarity to C(4) above)	1	

November 8, 2017 Advisory Committee Meeting Participation

Members:

Hedrick Belin
Willem Brakel
John Wirts
Marty Gary
Mark Symborski
Ed Snyder
John Odenkirk
Adam McClain
Sara Jordan
Mark Guise
Tom Devilbiss
Greg Prelewicz for Mishelle Noble
Donald Schwartz (phone)
Mark Peterson (phone)

Staff:

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