



DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
December 4-5, 2014
Talbot Main Library
100 W. Dover Street, Easton, MD

Members Present: Richard Baugh, Ruby Brabo, Janine Burns, Diane Davis, Dave Dunmyer, Sheila Finlayson, Penny Gross, Larry Land (Thurs.), Ernie Lehmann, Ann Simonetti, John Thomas, James Wheeler, and Bob Willey.

Staff Present: Mary Gattis (LGAC Coordinator, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay); Amy Robins (LGAC Staff, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay) and Al Todd (Executive Director, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay)

Speakers/Guests Present: Carin Bisland (EPA CBPO), Mark Bryer (Heathy Waters GIT Chair), Peter Claggett (USGS/CBPO), Lee Karrh (MD DNR), James Davis-Martin (VA DNR), Nick DiPasquale (EPA CBPO), Rachel Dixon (STAC), Natalie Gardner (STAC), Rhonda Manning (PA DEP), Beth McGee (CBF), Elizabeth Nellums (NFWF), Sammy Orlando (NOAA), Reggie Parrish (EPA CBPO), Jake Reilly (NFWF), Peyton Robertson (NOAA), Joanne Throwe (Environmental Finance Center), Suzanne Trevena (EPA), Shirley Vaughn and Ruth Ann Sobnosky (Davey Resource Group, Jennifer Volk (Water Quality GIT Chair), Jennifer Walls (Delware DEP), and Neil Weinstein (Low Impact Development Center).

Meeting presentations and materials: www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/local_government_advisory_committee

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Call to Order, Introductions

Chair Penny Gross called the meeting to order at approximately 11:30 a.m. New Virginia delegates Larry Land (VACo) and Ernie Lehmann (North Old Town Independent Citizens Civic Association) and Pennsylvania delegate Malcolm Derk (Snyder County Commissioner) were welcomed and introduced themselves. Other members and guests introduced themselves.

Chesapeake Bay TMDL Update: Mid-Point Assessment, Watershed Model 6.0 Land Uses, Progress to Date

Suzanne Trevena, US EPA Region 3

See [presentation](#). The majority of 2012-13 programmatic milestones were achieved. Permit reissuance was an issue. The trajectory and pace for the 2014-15 milestones indicate a need for enhanced implementation rates and capacity building. Members questioned funding sources to complete additional improvements since the low hanging fruit has been accomplished. Members also cited frustration over federal properties within their jurisdictions not participating.

Jennifer Volk, Water Quality GIT Chair

See [presentation](#). Jennifer explained the 2017 Mid-point Assessment (MPA) as a tracking snapshot to review of progress towards meeting the 60% interim target and 2025 Bay TMDL goal though implementation of the WIPs. The Mid-Point Assessment will take place in 2018, allowing for full reporting of activities implemented through 2017. Version 5.3.2 of the Model will be used for the MPA. A new version of the model (6.0) will be used after the MPA.

Peter Claggett, USGS/CBPO, Land Use Workgroup Coordinator

See [presentation](#). Peter discussed the Bay Programs attempts to improve land use and land cover data used in the model. Satellite imagery can determine land cover (e.g. developed vs. forest) but can't distinguish land use (e.g. commercial, residential, etc). So far, attempts to gather data from local government have met limited success. Any additional local data (tax parcel, land use, zoning, etc.) is needed by March 15, 2015. The collected data will be used to build the Phase 6 Land Use Raster Database. The Phase 6 will be an upgrade from Phase 5.3.2.

Follow up:
LGAC Members agreed to pass along their data and encourage their peers to do so.

Lunch Presentation – The Economic Benefits of Cleaning Up the Chesapeake

Dr. Beth McGee, Senior Water Quality Scientist, Chesapeake Bay Foundation

See [presentation](#). Beth presented the findings of this recently released CBF report. The report focuses on eight ecosystem services: aesthetic value, air pollution treatment, climate stability, food production, recreation, waste treatment, water supply and water regulation. See the presentation and associated report for additional information.

Members questioned which jurisdiction received the cost benefit of Blue Plains since half of the flow is from Virginia and Maryland. Larry Land brought up the Blue Ribbon Panel report on Financing the Cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay (2004). Penny suggested that this report is still relevant.

*Follow up:
Mary to provide link to Blue Ribbon Panel report*

Urban Tree Canopy – Presentation and Discussion

Ann Simonetti, LGAC Liaison to UTC Workgroup

Ann reviewed the Vital Habitats Goal and Tree Canopy Outcome from the Watershed Agreement. That outcome calls for expanding urban tree canopy by 2,400 acres by 2025. The increase must be 2,400 acres net gain. For reporting purposes 1 acre = 100 trees planted. Progress will be tracked using tree planting data submitted to Chesapeake Bay Program, cross-checked with periodic canopy assessments. Ann asked Mayor Willey to talk about Easton's Tree Canopy program.

Mayor Bob Willey, Mayor, Town of Easton

Mayor Willey explained that Easton's forest conservation and stormwater plan both address tree canopy. They experienced some push back from developers who saw the requirements as too expensive but development has not been hindered. Mayor Willey introduced speakers from Davey Resource Group who was hired through NFWF's Technical Assistance program to assist the town with tree canopy planning.

Shirley Vaughn & Ruth Ann Sobnosky, Davey Resource Group

Shirley provided an overview of the Urban Tree Canopy (UTC) Assessment and Planting Plan for the town of Easton, Maryland. She explained the scope of work they followed and noted that tree plantings efforts will help improve water quality. The Town of Easton aspires to increase the UTC to between 35% to 40% over the next 40 years. Ann asked about maintenance costs. Shirley suggested using iTree for costs/benefit calculations.

Members identified actions, tools, technical support needed by local government: technical assistance with assessments, planting plans, etc.; community education; ordinances; list of partners/resources communities can go to for help; guidance on proper tree for proper location, should focus on natives; best evergreens to plant; best practices documents; need credit for tree planting. Partners include Arbor Day, faith communities, Shade Tree Commissions. Agreed that personal sales pitches are most productive. Must address cost of maintenance, particularly in smaller communities that don't have resources for leaf pickup, etc.

The following people agreed to participate on LGAC's Urban Tree Canopy Team: Ann, Diane and Bob

*Follow up:
Larry to check into Virginia statutory/regulatory issues.
Richard to provide link to VML.
Mary to send links to UTC Summit materials.*

Implementing the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement: LGAC Input on Outcomes

[Management Strategies](#): What are they? Who's writing them? When will they be approved?

Nick DiPasquale, Director, Chesapeake Bay Program

Nick provided a brief overview of how the Chesapeake Bay partners work and the new Watershed Agreement. Goals and Outcomes contained in the Agreement should be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely (SMART). Management strategies for each Outcome are being drafted over next few months and must be finalized by June 2015. Key elements of Management Strategies include: Executive Summary; Outcomes and Baselines; Jurisdictions and

Agencies participating in the strategy, including local governments; Factors Influencing Ability to Meet the Goal; Current Efforts and Gaps, including actions, tools and technical support needed at the local level; Management Approach, including steps to include locals; Monitoring Progress; Assessing Progress; Adaptively Manage; Biennial Workplan.

Local Government Engagement in Management Strategies: Requirements and Process to Date

Mary Gattis, LGAC Coordinator reported that she has been involved in drafting sessions for several management strategies. In reviewing Management Strategies, LGAC members should focus on how they as local government leaders can help ensure that local government's role in achieving outcomes is accurately portrayed in the Management Strategies and that the resources needed to empower them to assist in achieving the outcome are identified.

Local Leadership – Janine Burns, LGAC Liaison to Local Leadership Workgroup and Carin Bisland, CBPO, Co-Chair Local Leadership Workgroup

Janine gave a brief overview of the Local Leadership Workshop held December 3, 2014 at the Patuxent Wildlife Center in Maryland. Carin provided additional information about the December 3 workshop including overview of attendees, intended outcomes of the workshop which were to gain insight into how participants became leaders, identify unique leadership characteristics of current leaders in local conservation actions, identify elements of and barriers to effective leadership training and education programs, gather input for the development of a management strategy for local leadership, and solicit volunteers to serve as advisors. LGAC members provided additional insights: just because someone is elected does not mean they are a leader; need to focus on conveying knowledge that leads to informed decision making; reaching non-regulated communities will be a challenge; finding “how-to” information is a challenge.

Recommendations: use existing credentialing programs, e.g. VACo; incorporate natural resource component into core curriculums; approaches should be state specific; target newly elected officials; use outgoing members for training so you don't lose institutional knowledge.

Citizen Stewardship – Al Todd, Co-Chair, Citizen Stewardship Workgroup

Al reviewed the Citizen Stewardship Outcome, emphasizing that this is the People part of the new Watershed Agreement. Local government needs citizen support and motivating broad grass roots actions is essential for many management strategies. This is a new/non-traditional emphasis for the Chesapeake Bay Program: to ensure restoration actions are widespread. The Citizen Stewardship Framework identifies individual citizen action and behaviors, volunteerism and Collective Community Action, and to find the Citizen Leaders/Champions to mobilize/increase the base. Several strategy questions were posed to the committee for further consideration. Al pointed to the importance of have metrics to measure general awareness and effective of programs/approaches while making sure the metrics add value. Members asked for list of existing local organizations.

***Follow-up:
Mary to send link to list of local organizations.***

Healthy Watersheds – Mark Bryer, Healthy Watershed GIT Chair

Mark provided the broad definition of a healthy watershed as waters and watersheds, recognized for their exceptional quality and/or high ecological value. He showed maps of the state identified healthy waters within the Watershed. LGAC members noted that Pennsylvanians have a hard time buying into impaired watersheds pointing to the map and the prevalence of “healthy waters” along the northern tier. All of the signatories signed onto the Healthy Watersheds Outcome states “100 percent of state-identified currently healthy waters and watershed remain healthy”. Mark pointed out that this is the only outcome focused on protection and that trajectory (loss of healthy watersheds) is not good.

LGAC input: need education campaign about healthy waters to include distinction between healthy and “impaired”; need to be able to balance protection with desire for economic development (reference to PA buffer law change); need to address legal challenges (reference to Fairfax County); protection must be articulated in terms of public benefits and economic benefits.

Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcomes - Peter Claggett, Land Use Workgroup

Peter reviewed the Land Conversation Goal and the Land Use Methods & Metrics Development Outcome. He listed elements as assessing rate of conversion of forest, wetlands, and farmland; monitoring changes in impervious surfaces; quantifying impacts of land conversion on water quality, healthy watersheds, and communities; and communication

results to the public, elected official, and CBP partners. LGAC members pointed out that while jurisdictions like Virginia may have control over conservation that Pennsylvania has no control over conversion. LGAC member also suggested a rewording of the outcome. Nick DiPasquale pointed out that the current wording allowed for land use to make it in the agreement.

LGAC input: rather than focusing on rates of conversion, focus on managing and mitigating impacts; quantifying impacts to communities is very important; need to clarify whether focus is on what's planned/permitted or what is built.

Land Use Options Evaluation Outcome – Mark Bryer & Mary Gattis

The signatories that signed onto the Land Use Option Evaluation Outcome were: DC, PA, DE, and the CBC. This outcome calls for an evaluation of policy options, incentives and planning tools with the direct involvement of local governments and the development of strategies to support local governments' and others' efforts to reduce the rate of conversion of ag, forest and wetlands. Members considered the following questions: What does an evaluation of policy options, incentives and planning tools look like to you? What types of policy options, incentives and planning tools should be evaluated? Are you aware of similar efforts?

LGAC input: legislative authorities, demographic impacts and growth pressure must be considered; having a master's student evaluate the posed questions by jurisdiction would be helpful; American Planning Association, Smart Growth America, Urban Land Institute have done many similar studies ; George Washington Regional Commission (VA) and others have done growth projection scenarios (very informative); VA funded similar project (James Davis-Martin); present information as policy alternatives.

SAV (Underwater Grasses) Outcome – Lee Karrh, MD DNR, Workgroup Lead

Lee provided a review of the Vital habitats Goal and the Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) Outcome. He emphasized the importance of underwater grasses within the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. In 2013, there were an estimated 59,927 acres of SAV achieving 32% of the 185,000 acre goal. Factors influencing ability to meet the goal include habitat conditions (e.g. water clarity), human activities (e.g. physical disruption), and research gaps. Research is showing that shoreline development is impacting SAV. Lee requested more involvement from NGOs and local governments.

LGAC input: local governments need information on shoreline development; consider role of local government in monitoring.

Diversity Outcome – Reggie Parrish, CBPO

Reggie reviewed findings from first gathering of Diversity Action Team. Recognize need to address workforce issues and make connection to locally relevant issues (housing, food deserts, jobs, etc.) Penny raised concern about lack of diversity represented at first meeting. This outcome will be linked to eight other outcomes. Reggie pointed to the need for communications and outreach to be able to reach all diverse communities, tackling environmental justice issues, and tracking what is working. The workgroup is collecting baseline data to assess what programs already exist.

LGAC input: contact Leadership Washington and pursue graduate placements in environmental non-profits.

Business Meeting

The September 2014 minutes were approved on a motion by Ann Simonetti, seconded by Ruby Brabo.

Janine Burns nominated Ruby Brabo to serve as Virginia Vice-Chair. Richard Baugh seconded. Motion passed unanimously. ***Congratulations Ruby!***

Chair Penny Gross gave a brief Executive Committee Report stating the Executive Committee met by phone to plan the December agenda. No other business was discussed.

Chair of Communications Committee, Sheila Finlayson, reported that several LGAC Members spoke at various events (Ann presented at Rotary; John presented at PSATC). The LGAC Coordinator requested that all members send her notification when they speak so it can be recorded in the Strategic Plan. Sheila thanked Dave Dunmyer for his service to LGAC and within the Chesapeake Bay community. She presented a Resolution honoring Commissioner Dunmyer. The resolution (attached) was adopted by consensus.

The LGAC Coordinator, Mary Gattis, reported that there no major new business to report in the Strategic Plan since September. She will update presentation log to reflect recent presentations by members as noted above.

*Follow up:
Mary to update Strategic Plan.*

LGAC members discussed the 2015 Meeting Dates/Locations handout. There was general agreement about moving to one day meetings. The conversation was tabled for continuation on Friday.

Meeting Recessed at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Friday, December 5, 2014

Members met with their jurisdictions' delegation and state representatives over breakfast.

Call to Order, Introductions

Chair Penny Gross called the meeting to order at approximately 9:30 a.m.

Choptank Complex Habitat Focus Area Presentation and Discussion

Peyton Robertson and Sammy Orlando, NOAA

Peyton acknowledged the vital role of local governments and recognized the need for more leadership training, identifying local voice leaders who have reach within communities, identifying and providing incentives to motivate community groups, and the advantage of working on a watershed scale. Sammy gave presentation on the Choptank Complex Habitat Focus Area. The major road block that NOAA has experienced is how to connect all of the diverse groups for the Choptank. Members supported habitat focus area approach. Members suggested beginning where there is support from the community. Peyton responded that there needs to be habitat drivers. Need to address retraining workforce (oysters, agro-tourism, etc.), short-term versus long-term economic impacts,

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) – Local Government Assistance Programs

Jake Reilly, Director, NFWF Chesapeake Bay Programs

Jake explained how NFWF's Chesapeake Bay Stewardship Fund (CBSF) supports local governments; asked how CBSF can better serve local governments; and asked how LGAC can be more engaged in the CBSF grant programs. He provided a simple visual chart of the CBSF Program's Delivery Cycle. The technical assistance program's purpose is to deliver technical capacity to local partners, catalyze increased and more targeted local investment, and support the establishment of long-term strategies in three areas: stormwater, agriculture and habitat restoration. Approximately 20% of the applications are funded. A member was concerned that funding for stormwater projects would be limited by including agriculture in the technical assistance program. Jake said this would be taken into consideration when apportioning funds among the three categories. Jake gave a brief overview of the Small Watershed Grants (\$20K-\$200K) and the Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Grants (\$200K-\$500K). The 2014 Implementation Grant Priorities were provided noting they were likely to shift somewhat in 2015. A member asked for list of current projects. Members will be invited to assist with reviewing grant applications.

*Follow up:
Send members link to NFWF project map.*

Municipal Stormwater Training and Outreach Center

Neil Weinstein, Low Impact Development Center

Joanne Throwe, Environmental Finance Center

Jake Reilly, NFWF

With funding from NFWF, the Low Impact Development Center and Environmental Finance Center are launching a new web-based resource and training center to meet the needs of a variety of users, including funders, local governments, engineers, planners, etc. They envision this website to be a central place where requirements for continuing education can be earned. Year one will focus on identifying user needs and seeking proposals for technical services. The on-line

learning center will be launched in year two. Will tie into existing resources (e.g. videos). LGAC members pointed out that the training would need to be complex due to the different departments within a given local government in addition to the ordinances differences between jurisdictions. Members asked that Mary Gattis be appointed to serve as their representative on the advisory group.

New Business/Announcements for the Good of the Committee/Future Agenda Items

Jennifer Walls the Chesapeake Bay liaison for Delaware was introduced. She expressed Delaware's desire to work with the LGAC.

Members recommended Takoma Park Green Streets, Fracking and Riparian Forested Buffers as future meeting topics.

Members discussed the benefits of having a two day meeting schedule vs a one day schedule. Preference is for a meeting that includes one overnight. Sheila expressed a preference for holding tours during the meeting as opposed to before or after.

With no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 12:07 p.m.