

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – August 26, 2020 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Decision: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee approved the June 19th actions and decisions with the exception that the voting records for draft CWIP scenarios are changed from consensus and majority to the exact tally of votes.

Action: Dan Nees will cut and rework the financing strategy section of the Conowingo WIP to include language about the goals of the financing strategy and simplify the finance jargon for public review. A draft will be completed by the first week of September for Steering Committee review. **COMPLETE**

Action: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee members will review the sentence on leveraging Maryland's pilot on dredging as a BMP to recommend an Expert Panel within the Conowingo WIP and bring forward any concerns.

Action: The CWIP Steering Committee members will "reply all" on the August 10th email with draft WIP by COB today (08/26) with all comments on the draft Conowingo WIP. **COMPLETE**

Action: A revised timeline with the CWIP Steering Committee members' suggestions will be distributed to members. **COMPLETE**

Decision: The Principal Steering Committee members will communicate via email to EPA or Secretary Strickler that they approve the WIP going out for public comment.

Action: Meetings for the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee members will be scheduled through the end of the calendar year. **COMPLETE**

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – June 19, 2020 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Decision: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee approved the May 29th actions and decisions.

Action: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee began presenting the draft CWIP scenario voting results and focused on any scenarios that do not have a clear outcome.

- *Scenario 1: 8/8 No, 0/8 Yes*
- *Scenario 2: 8/8 No, 0/8 Yes*
- *Scenario 3: 5/8 No, 2/8 Yes, One stand aside*
- *Scenario 4: 4/8 No, 3/8 Yes, One stand aside*
- *Scenario 5: 0/8 No 7/8 Yes One stand aside*
- *Scenario 6: 7/8 No, 1/8 Yes, One stand aside*
- *Scenario 7: 7/8 No, 1/8 Yes*
- *Scenario 8: 2/8 No, 5/8 Yes, One stand aside*
 - o *Ann Jennings (VA): Scenario 8 is twice as costly at Scenario 5*

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP) STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

- *Katherine Antos (DC)*: Questioned some of the scenarios with sole focus on agriculture and questioned cost-effectiveness. As a result, leaned towards scenarios with both agriculture and urban.
- *Ann Swanson (Bay Commission)*: We were looking at cost and favoring end-based approach. Looking for geography that was larger and would give us more option. In case of 8 we felt it was too expensive and the geography too limited.
- ***Scenario 9: 4/8 No, 3/8 Yes, one stand aside***
- ***Scenario 4/8 No, 4/8 Yes***
- ***Scenario 11: 7/8 No, 1/8 Yes***

Decision: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee decided to include Scenario 5 as the body of the WIP recommendation to the PSC for approval. In addition, the Steering Committee decided to include the other top-tier scenarios of 8 and 10 for transparency to the PSC with the other scenarios in the appendix.

Action: Jill Whitcomb and Matt Rowe will work on the presentation for the PSC that will run through the Steering Committee. **COMPLETE**

Action: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee will develop a revised near-term timeline for PSC approval and public review of the Draft CWIP.

Decision: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee agreed to make a recommendation to the PSC to release the draft WIP as soon as possible relative to the upcoming EC meeting on Aug. 18.

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – May 29, 2020 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Decision: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee approved the May actions and decisions.

Action: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee began voting on which CAST scenarios to include in the draft Conowingo WIP (see below). The remaining scenarios will be voted on via email. All responses should be submitted by **COB, June 12th**.

- ***Scenario 1: should we include in the WIP?***
 - PA: No, too expensive (too much Urban) ○ MD: No, too expensive ○ NY: We will review decisions and officially submit at end of Day (tentatively, do not include).
 - DE: No, too expensive
 - CBC: No, geography not consistent with PSC ○ DC: No, too expensive ○ VA: No, too expensive- the cost effectiveness should be the driving factor.
 - WV: No, too expensive
- ***Scenario 2: should we include in the WIP?***
 - PA: No, too expensive ○ MD: No, do not include
 - NY: Will provide response via email (tentatively, do not include) ○ DE: No do not include
 - CBC: No, geography is consistent but mix of practices ○ DC: No do not include ○ VA: No, do not include ○ WV: No, too expensive

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

- ***Scenario 3: should we include in the WIP?*** ○ PA: We do not support this one because we are pinning it all on ag. Not sure how that would be positively responded to. Having a WIP that is solely Ag based is not going to be supported.
 - MD: We would vote to remove this because it is ag only, although there may be some value for illustrative purposes to show ag vs. ag/ urban. ○ NY: Will provide answer via email. ○ DE: We do not support this since we are included. ○ CBC: One of the messages we heard was about diversity in the options, ag only is not good.
 - DC: I don't dislike this scenario because it isn't more cost effective. I think we should consider scenarios that are ag only and ag/ urban in order to illustrate the difference in cost effectiveness. ○ VA: Before VA can render a final decision, I need to understand the Commonwealth's expectations first for some of these but right now I would support including this in the WIP but I am happy to reconsider as we go to the list and that we support just one scenario.
 - WV: I could agree to this as long as there is a caveat that it is drawing from new money instead of preexisting programs. If there is a new financial strategy, then we would be able to support this. Generally, it's okay, but depends on some factors.

- ***Scenario 4: should we include in the WIP?***
 - PA: For same reasons as last time, PA cannot support this one ○ MD: We would be a maybe and need to confer with our Ag folks first ○ NY: Will provide response via email ○ DE: We are okay with this scenario
 - CBC: We are against this scenario for same reasons as above ○ DC: We are okay with Scenario 4 but yes to 5
 - VA: We are okay with this scenario- it's cost effective- with the caveat that we do not support the multiple scenario approach.
 - WV: I would be okay with scenario, it's cost effective. - ***Scenario 5: should we include in the WIP?***
 - PA: we support including scenario 5 ○ MD: we support including scenario 5 ○ NY: Will provide response via email ○ DE: we support including scenario 5
 - CBC: I suggest using this as a comparison with others that have a broader geography ○ DC: We support including scenario 5 ○ VA: We support including scenario 5 ○ WV: WE support including scenario 5 - ***Scenario 6: should we include in the WIP?***
 - PA: No to scenario 6 but yes to scenario 6.1
 - MD: We agree with DC, why vote for this one when 6.1 is similar and more cost effective. We would vote no to this and yes to the next one.
 - NY: Will provide response via email ○ DE: We would not support including this scenario as it is a P- effectiveness. No for 6.1 as well.

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

- CBC: To be consistent, we would be a No on this one because it is not based on P-effectiveness and does not follow the guidance we have been given. 6.1 uses the P- geography so we do not support it
- DC: No to scenario 6 but yes to scenario 6.1. It might be worth looking at the Conowingo Shell as a whole.
- VA: No for 6 and yes for 6.1 ○ WV: No for 6 and yes for 6.1
- **Scenario 7: should we include in the WIP?**
 - PA: We do not support Scenario 7
 - MD: We would need to defer to our Ag folks and see what they say ○ NY: Will provide response via email ○ DE: Will provide response via email ○ CBC: No
 - DC: It is worth leaving in because it demonstrates that Ag is cheaper ○ VA: okay ○ WV: okay

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – May 13, 2020 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Action: Hilary Swartwood will send a poll to the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee members to schedule meetings for late May and mid-June. **COMPLETE**

Action: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee Chairs will update the matrix and draft a Gant timeline with guiding principles, which will be sent to the Committee to review.

Action: After the PSC meeting, the Steering Committee will provide feedback to the grantees on any changes needed to the Conowingo WIP narrative based upon selected scenario(s).

Decision: The group approved including multiple scenarios in the final draft Conowingo WIP narrative for public comment (*post- meeting note: VA was not present for this decision*).

Action: The Conowingo WIP Steering Committee Chairs will prepare a presentation for the PSC meeting on Friday, May 22, 2020 and send to the group for feedback. **COMPLETE**

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – April 3, 2020 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Decision: The Actions and Decisions were approved as long as Hilary Swartwood adds the grantee's Scope of Work to the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership's [Conowingo WIP homepage](#) on chesapeakebay.net. **COMPLETE**

Action: EPA and the Steering Committee Chairs will share the Actions and Decisions for the priority geographies from the December 2017 PSC meeting (*Post- meeting note: after looking into this further, no record of a PSC decision regarding a priority geography was found*). **COMPLETE**

Action: The Activity 1 grantees will aim to share all CAST scenario information (e.g., CAST scenario, including summary tables) with the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee by COB April 10th. If jurisdictions have additional contacts that need this information, they should send their names to Bryan Seipp (bts@cwip.org). **COMPLETE**

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

Decision: For the April 15, 2020 meeting, the Activity 1 grantees will use the shell geography from Scenario 1 to create an adjusted scenario to include most cost-effective BMPs (both agricultural and urban practices) for nitrogen in the most nitrogen effective loading areas within the shell; adding in more practices, if needed, to achieve the Conowingo planning target for nitrogen and phosphorus.

Action: By the April 15, 2020 Conowingo WIP Steering Committee conference call, the Activity 1 grantees will create a new title for Scenario 1, instead of “constrained.” **COMPLETE**

Action: Hilary Swartwood will share the link to the zoom recording for today’s meeting with the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee members. **COMPLETE**

Action: Hilary Swartwood will send out a doodle poll the week of April 6, 2020 to schedule the May conference call. **COMPLETE**

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – March 4, 2020 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Action: Hilary Swartwood will add the Scope of Work for each grantee to the Conowingo WIP homepage. **COMPLETED**

Decision: The states have until COB Friday, March 6th to submit additional comments. **COMPLETED** **Action:** Activity 1 grantees will compare the priority geographies to their respective basins and provide a more in depth explanation of why each priority geography was considered.

Action: Activity 1 grantees will remove bioreactors as a BMP because these are not partnership approved.

Action: Activity 1 grantees will run 2-3 more CAST scenarios for different years (2025 / 2035 / 2045). The EPA recommends the following: **COMPLETE**

1. Steering Committee constraints
2. Broader BMP list and priority geographies
3. Broader BMP list and broader priority geographies

Action: The EPA will set up a meeting with the Center to discuss expectations for the additional CAST scenarios. **COMPLETED**

Action: Activity 1 grantees will clarify in the Conowingo WIP that states implement the suggested BMPs, but they do not fund them.

Action: The Center for Watershed Protection will meet with EPA and Conowingo Steering Committee Chairs to discuss expectations and timeframe for the Conowingo WIP. **COMPLETE**

Action: The Steering Committee will revise the Conowingo WIP timeline to give grantees more time to generate additional CAST scenarios and update the draft WIP. **COMPLETE**

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

Action: Activity 1 grantees will identify current, existing programs that are effective for a suite of BMPs and make connection between WIP implementation and those programs. Additionally, they will also track Conowingo specific implementation within those areas.

Action: Hilary Swartwood will schedule more meetings for April to go over the new CAST scenarios.

COMPLETE

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – February 2020

No meeting in February.

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – January 31, 2020 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Action: EPA will work with the grantees to revise the schedule to incorporate the review period for the Principal Staff Committee for the financial strategy. This will be brought back to the Steering Committee for approval at the March 4, 2020 meeting.

Action: The Steering Committee will send any additional feedback on the draft Conowingo WIP to the Activity 1 grantees by COB February 7, 2020. **COMPLETE**

Decision: The steering committee approved adapting the timeline to give the grantees more time to develop the WIP. The grantees will have until February 28, 2020 to finalize the WIP and then they will send this version to the Steering Committee for review before the March 4, 2020 meeting. Once approved, it will be sent to the Principal Staff Committee.

Action: The Conowingo WIP leadership will update the timeline to include Principal Staff committee's review of the financing strategy and develop a Gantt chart of the timeline and milestones.

Action: The following suggestions will be incorporated into the Watershed Implementation Plan:

1. Add a description to the phosphorous shell geography map to clarify that, although originally constrained to this map, the priority geographies focus on nitrogen in the Watershed Implementation Plan.
2. Update the Map on page 6: MD would like Cecil and Harford counties outside of Susquehanna removed (only want their section of watershed that flows into Conowingo shown).
3. Change “urban land” to “developed land” for clarification.
4. Expand list of BMPs:
 - a. Oysters
 - b. Stream restoration
 - c. Living shorelines
 - d. Bioreactors
 - e. Land retirement cap
 - f. Manure treatment

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

- g. Urban forests
- h. Wastewater (tentative)
- 5. Ensure the Watershed Implementation Plan incorporates the most current stream restoration protocols and clearly delineates that urban and ag are separate stream restoration protocols.
- 6. Create different scenarios that will get to 6-millions lbs.
- 7. Create a more extensive outreach strategy for expanded geographies.

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – December 19, 2019 (meeting materials: [link](#))

There were no actions and decisions for December.

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – November 21, 2019 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Action: The list of financial advisory committee members will be provided to the Steering Committee (see below). **COMPLETE**

- Gabe Cohee, Director for Restoration Finance at Chesapeake and Coastal service, MD DNR
- Jens Damgaard, Eckert Seamans.
- Joe Gill, Prince George’s County
- Mark Bryer, TNC
- Erik Michelsen, Anne Arundel County
- Jake Reilly, NFWF
- Brian VanWye, DC government
- Nick Dilks, Ecosystem Investment Partners

Decision: The financial advisory committee advises the Trust and not the steering committee. However, updates from financial advisory committees meetings will be provided to the steering committee.

Action: In Activity 1, the grantees will: **COMPLETE**

1. Exclude Adams County as a priority geography
2. Revisit Lebanon County as a potential priority geography in place of counties in the Upper Susquehanna
3. Align schedule with PA DEP outreach planning

Decision: In Activity 1, the grantees and Steering Committee determined the focal geographies for Conowingo WIP analysis, outreach, and implementation. The priority geographies (listed below) will be located in the Susquehanna, Western Shore, and Eastern Shore geobasins (major river basins segmented by geologic factors):

1. PA geographies:
 - a. Upper Susquehanna (portions of Tioga, Bradford, Susquehanna)
 - b. Portion of Luzerne
 - c. Confluence region (portions of Lycoming, Northumberland, Montour, Union, Snyder)
 - d. Central (portions of Clinton, Centre, Mifflin)
 - e. Western (Blair, Bedford)
 - f. South Central (Cumberland, Lebanon)
2. MD geographies:

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

- a. Top of the Bay (portions of Harford, Cecil)
- b. Mid-Eastern Shore (Portions of Kent, Queen Anne's)
- c. Lower Eastern Shore (portions of Caroline, Talbot, Dorchester)

Decision: Due to the tight timeframes for the Conowingo WIP, differing opinions on the preferred most effective basins geography as well as what has been or needs to be approved by the PSC regarding the most effective basins geography, the Steering Committee agreed the grantees should continue using the most effective basins geography map included in the PSC-approved Conowingo WIP framework document, which are based on phosphorous not nitrogen. The Steering Committee also agreed that this can be revisited as part of the adaptive management process for the WIP and as necessary to facilitate WIP implementation.

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – October 30, 2019 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Action: Activity 1 grantees will update the terminology in the WIP3 – E3 formula to “possible opportunities.”
COMPLETE

Action: By the November 21st meeting Activity 1 grantees will provide the following: **COMPLETE** 1.
Draft maps/geographies and associated methodology documentation for review and comment
2. Information on prioritized geographies
3. Draft outreach strategy factsheet
4. Draft outline of outreach strategy for review and discussion

Action: By the November 21st meeting Activity 2 grantees will provide an update on/related definition of the financial strategy system. **COMPLETE**

Action: Before the November 21st meeting, Activity 3 grantees will provide an outline of the WIP process.
COMPLETE

Action: Activity 3 grantees will provide a live demo of the WIP process during the November 21st meeting.
COMPLETE

Action: The Steering Committee will get more information on the Exelon Settlement and keep the group apprised of new developments as it pertains to Conowingo. **ONGOING**

Decision: the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee approved the September Actions and Decisions.

Decision: the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee decided that future meetings will be conference calls with the option for in-person meetings as more materials become available.

Decision: Activity 2 grantees and the Chesapeake Bay Trust will keep the CWIP steering committee apprised of any new/major developments for the financial strategy system, and the Trust can schedule some time if there's interest from the Steering Committee in following up directly with any of the advisory work session members.

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

ACTIONS & DECISIONS – September 23, 2019 (meeting materials: [link](#))

Action: Grantee contact information will be sent to the Steering Committee members. **COMPLETE**

Action: Grantees will provide tables on effectiveness to support the loading rates maps developed by Tetra Tech. **NO LONGER RELEVANT PER NOVEMBER 21ST DECISION**

Action: Hilary will add the grantees to the WQGIT distribution list so they can participate in relevant conference calls. **COMPLETE**

Action: The Steering Committee and grantees will develop a narrative section on climate resiliency in the Conowingo WIP. Part of this will be determining how climate and climate resiliency should be factored into the WIP. **ONGOING**

Action: Gary Shenk will explain how effective basins are determined at a Conowingo WIP Steering Committee Meeting. **COMPLETE**

Action: The Steering Committee will present a revised timeline (e.g., the draft (and not final) financing strategy is due in December 2020 in order to accommodate a Steering committee review and comment period) to the PSC. **INCLUDE TIMELINE IN JANUARY 24TH PSC UPDATE**

Action: The Steering Committee and grantees will test Google for file sharing for working documents. If this does not work, CWP will look at other file sharing services. **REVISIT DURING DECEMBER 19TH CALL**

Decision: EPA will inform the jurisdictions of the source(s) of future Conowingo grant funding to provide as much advance notice if additional cuts to jurisdiction WIP III support are planned.

Decision: The Conowingo WIP will evaluate dredging as an option for meeting the reduction target.

Decision: The grantees will evaluate manure transport as a viable BMP practice for the Conowingo WIP.

Decision: The Steering Committee and grantees will use the CBP Conowingo website page to post meeting materials, draft documents, etc. with the goal of keeping everything in one location.

Decision: The Steering Committee and grantees will use the official CBP logo on documents.

Decision: The Steering Committee, in coordination with the grantees, decided that the Conowingo WIP will: (1) focus solely nitrogen loads, (2) focus on most-effective basins, (3) map sector highest loading areas both

CONOWINGO WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (WIP)

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS: ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

individually and combined, and (4) focus on cover crops as a priority BMP instead of conservation tillage.

REVISED: REFER TO DECISIONS FROM NOVEMBER 21ST MEETING (see above):