| Date | Individual (Affilitation) | Section or page reference |
|---|---|---|
| 7-Feb | Brittany Strugis (DNREC) | ES, Wasn't phosphorus mistakenly used? |
| | | p. 4" The decision to develop a CWIP by the PSC is based on the studies , indicating that conditions in the watershed have changed since 2010 …" Comment: Good place to get into some more detail and explain how dynamic equilibrium has been met and the dam is no longer trapping sediment/nutrients |
| | | p. 6, 1st paragraph "Geography of the Conowingo WIP:. This statement conflicts with the sentence that I highlighted in the Executive Summary |
| | | p. 6Effective for N or P? Map says P but narrative says N. |
| | | p. 21 Targeted Implementation, 1st paragraph: This list conflicts with others throughout the document. This is the only place urban BMPs are mentioned. Forest and grass buffers are broken out in other parts. |
| | | Figure 5. I suggest breaking this map out into grass buffers and forest buffers to remain consistent |
| | | Figure 8. Urban BMPs are not discussed anywhere else in this doc. |
| | | p. 26. Pay for Performance. Overall, this strategy if confusing to me and needs to be clarified a little more. |
| | | pp 26, 27: editorial comments, PFP, project offer offerors (p. 27) |
| | | p. 27 comments and editorial comments on the PFP approach requested additional clarification/description. |
| | | p. 28 I know we aren't focusing on P, but it'd be helpful to see how close we are with the proposed BMPs. |
| | | p. 29. CAST is in the midst of updating their cost estimates. I believe the new analyses will be available sometime within the week. I'd contact Olivia Devereux for more information. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Response to Comment | Suggested change |
|---|---|
| The ES was written with extensive input from MDE, Matt Rowe. This commen was addressed in the revised version to identify the priority watersheds and most effective basins. | |
| This is explained in the revised draft without extensive detail, however on the modeling to determine the dynamic equilibirium. If desired, this documentation as provided by the Partnership may be included in a technical appendix. | |
| The revised WIP was edit to address this conflict between N and P. | |
| See above. | |
| The revised WIP includes a revised set of BMPs. | |
| The revised CWIP includes forested buffers. | |
| The revised CWIP includes bioswales as an urban BMP as well as stream restoration. | |
| The revised CWIP provides greater details on how this approach would be implemented for the CWIP. | |
| Revised to correct acroynm PFF. The phrase offer offerors was a typo and was not used in the revised draft. | |
| The revised CWIP provides greater details on how this approach would be implemented for the CWIP. | |
| As per the PSC decision, the CWIP was developed to address N. The revised CWIP achieves the N load reduction of 6M lbs. | |
| The most recent version of CAST was used (2/27/2020). | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | |
| --- | --- |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| Comments on Response | Draft/Final response |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |