

Conowingo WIP Steering Committee
Meeting Notes and Action Items
July 8, 2021
Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Action: Matt Rowe, MDE, will distribute his notes on the dredging expert panel process and his meeting with the Chesapeake Bay Program Office.

Action: Cassie Davis, NYSDEC, will bring the proposed CWIP Steering Committee comments to New York (see below) and report back to the group.

Action: Pending New York approval, Ruth Hocker, Center for Watershed Protection, will update the Conowingo WIP with proposed edits from the Steering Committee. The Center for Watershed Protection will then send the final WIP document to the Steering Committee and the PSC for final review.

Action: Lucinda Power, EPA, will locate and distribute the numeric milestone document with alternate trajectory options to Ruth Hocker and the Steering Committee.

Action: Ruth Hocker, CWP, will draft an implementation document with strategies for developing milestones. She will circulate it to the group by July 26th, 2021.

New York Comment Responses

Comment 1. Page 49 “A jurisdiction may also voluntarily opt to accept loads and incorporate them into their Phase III WIPs at a future date instead of participating in the Conowingo WIP.”

- Add language to clarify that the jurisdictions can update their WIPs to incorporate additional loads (via an amendment) *at any time*.

Comment 2. Page 23 and 22

- P23: Add language to clarify that no jurisdictional funding commitments have been made *at this time*.
- P22: Request to reframe or remove this sentence: “Without this critical additional information, jurisdictions will be unable to effectively consult with affected stakeholders and undertake necessary budgetary and staffing evaluations”
 - Suggested reframe: “Jurisdictions may be unable to effectively gain stakeholder support without knowing how much funding will be available.”
 - Reasoning: funding availability is not directly tied to evaluation of budgetary needs, workload analyses, staffing evaluations, consulting with stakeholders. Funding does not preclude the ability to do those things.

Comment 3: page 23 - Agreeing to load changes due to climate change or if another geography is selected in the future.

The CWIP SC agreed that the WIP itself has identified the one scenario that has been agreed upon by jurisdictions and gotten PSC approval. If changes occur in the future or if an alternative geography is selected, it would have to go back to the jurisdictions and the PSC for another approval. Therefore, no jurisdiction would commit to additional planning targets without a formal review process.

Suggested reframe: “If an alternative geography is selected in the future, the selection process would need to go through the Conowingo WIP Steering Committee and the Principal Staff Committee (PSC) for support and approval of that alternative geography.

- Can point to official governance document for the PSC if needed

Comment 4: page 42 footnote to Table 2.

The SC agreed to remove the footnote.

Comment 5: page 52 updating language for implementation timeframe. “The final CWIP will also include alternative timeline options for having practices in place to achieve the needed CWIP load reductions by 2025 and other timelines. ...”

The SC agreed to be more specific about the timing of the implementation scenario in the WIP.

Suggested reframe:

The scenario and geography that was selected for the final CWIP was based upon the 2025 implementation timeframe. There is an alternative 2035 scenario included in Appendix [X] to illustrate what a longer implementation horizon would look like. Any decisions to change an implementation timeframe beyond 2025 would need EC approval.

Action: Ruth Hocker will update the language in the WIP about Comment 5 (see below).

Comment 6: Inclusion of Phosphorus and Sediment

The SC discussed the inclusion of phosphorus and sediment in the WIP. There was agreement that it would be beneficial to at least recognize the potential for reduction, even if they aren't the primary focus. EPA mentioned that in other jurisdictional WIPs, the sediment targets were developed *after* the N and P targets. The SC agreed to add in clarifying language to the WIP to follow this same approach.

Suggested additions:

- Update tables with phosphorus
- “Consistent with the jurisdictional WIPs, the sediment targets will be developed at a later date.”
- Add some language with methodology about how sediment targets were established after the N and P targets.
- Add sediment process fact sheet as an appendix

Comment 7: Page 29 - NY risk comment

The SC agreed that this is more opinion based and is better served just as a comment separately from NY.

Comment 8: Page 33 - NY comment under public funding

The SC agreed that this could be provided through another means and isn't really necessary.