

LGAC Members Present: Markus Batchelor, Richard Baugh, Ruby Brabo, Phil Briddell, Ed Bustin, Sheila Finlayson, Chip Jones, Leo Lutz, Don Phillips, John Thomas, Bruce Williams and LGAC Staff – Monica Billig, Ola Davis, Mary Gattis, Harriet Newquist, and Jennifer Starr

Speakers/Guests Present: Rachel Felver (CBP), Les Knapp (MACo), Joan Salvati (VA DEQ), Lisa Schaefer (PA County Commissioners Association), Phil Stafford (MD DNR), Kathy Stecker (MDE), James Sullivan (DNREC)

Jurisdiction meetings convened over breakfast.

Call to Order

Chair Bruce Williams officially called the meeting to order at 8:44 a.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided updates on LGAC membership.

- Danene Sorace, Mayor of the City of Lancaster, was appointed by Governor Wolf to replace Rick Gray who resigned in June 2018. Rick sends his regards to the committee.
- Ron Fithian, Kent County Commissioner, was appointed by Governor Hogan in August 2018.
- Bob Willey regrettably submitted his resignation in August citing the increasing demands of his position and the challenge of getting to meetings.

With Bob's resignation two seats remain open in Maryland and one in New York.

Local Government Forum Wrap-Up/ Next Steps

Mary Gattis, Director of Local Government Programs, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

This quarter's meeting was held in conjunction with the LGAC Local Government Forum. Mary thanked members for their participation in the Forum, adding that NFWF was very pleased with the turn out. She then introduced two new members of the LGAC Staff, program assistant, Ola-Imani Davis, and temporary program assistant, Harriet Newquist who together with Jennifer Starr, provided staff support for the Forum.

Mary asked members for general reflections and feedback from the LGAC Forum. Overall, the members felt very positive about the outcome of the Forum. Specifically, Leo Lutz enjoyed how we have "started from the back end, and moving to the front end." He felt that even though a lot of progress was made, we will still need to revisit this process a few more times until we reach our goal. Ed Bustin agreed and is interested in the new challenges ahead.

Ed continued stating, one challenge that can help LGAC, is the development of circuit riders. John Thomas added that the circuit rider can bring specific issues to the forefront, and get them on the agenda to be discussed. Members agreed that the circuit rider will be a bridge between a community

and technical assistance providers. They also agreed that the function of the circuit riders is what is important, while the specific job title can be altered if need be. For example, if a community already has someone in place who performs similar duties to the perceived circuit rider, then their role will be tailored to fit those constructed ideas, without changing the job title to, or hiring a brand-new “circuit rider.”

Phil Briddell commented that LGAC’s Circuit Rider (2009) should serve as a model. Members are in agreement about the following outcomes from the Forum:

- Circuit rider recommendations need to be solid and actionable.
- The purpose of a circuit rider needs to be clearly communicated.
- Gap analyses need to be administered, per state, in order to understand specific need.
- State, federal, and local participation/ contributions, especially in low capacity communities, needs to be effective.

Members agreed that no new bureaucracies should be introduced. A budget and financial strategy needs to be developed. Members suggested low capacity communities may contribute by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), in order to receive the resources they need. Leo offered this option, which is modeled after an Economic Development planning circuit rider employed in Lancaster County, PA.

LGAC members identified essential characteristics of a “circuit rider.” A circuit rider is a person who understands local government. Chip Jones suggested that a circuit rider should also be a liaison who is capable of speaking the language of engineering. The communities who already possess someone in a position relating to the proposed circuit rider, will need to have their skill set and pay grade refined, and will need to be open to additional training if necessary. A network of circuit riders would create greater efficiencies. Some members questioned the idea of a technical assistance collaborative. Some members were concerned about not being able to hire their own contractor. They feel as though, simply possessing an attainable list of contractors, may work better. Mary pointed out that NFWF already has a list of technical assistance providers available on their website but communities still lack adequate assistance. She agreed to provide additional details about the collaborative for future consideration.

Action: Recommendations will be refined and presented at the November LGAC meeting.

Chesapeake Bay Program Update: Conowingo WIP

Greg Barranco, EPA CBPO, Office of Partnerships & Accountability

Greg Barranco briefed LGAC members on the Midpoint Assessment. He gave brief updates on progress stating, between 2009 and 2017, nitrogen levels were down due to wastewater treatments and agricultural reductions. The Partnership is pursuing development of a Conowingo WIP. So far, a framework has been drafted and funding is under discussion. They are hoping each jurisdiction will contribute a certain part of EPA grants for development and implementation of the Conowingo WIP. Greg concluded his update by sharing, the next meeting of the Principals’ Staff Committee will take place on October 12, 2018. He also assured members that, the concerns about the Conowingo WIP RFP raised by LGAC, were received, however, he cannot provide any additional information in regards to the matter.

Mary clarified the two issues raised by LGAC:

- Funds from the states devoted to the Conowingo WIP may allow Conowingo WIP to mobilize quicker, essentially leaving local governments with the more challenging, and more costly of implementation alternatives.
- An element in the Request for Proposal (RFP) for Conowingo assistance (which has not been released yet), regarding tracking and recording practices, could be a challenge to most, especially in unregulated areas. What is being asked of the contractors in terms of enhancing the capabilities of local partners?

Local Leadership Workgroup

Mary introduced Jennifer Starr as the new Coordinator of the Bay Program's Local Leadership Workgroup. Mary also noted that LGAC should have a liaison to the workgroup.

Jennifer briefly described the workgroup's mission, goals and membership. Specifically, the Watershed Agreement has 10 goals and 31 outcomes, and when it comes to achieving these goals and outcomes, a common challenge is reaching and engaging with local government. A suggestion was made to have local government officials sitting in on these goal teams.

Members shared observations from their experience:

- Chip explains a rising threat in Loudoun County, VA, where a flood zone interpreted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is causing conflict with a planted buffer. Sheila Finlayson commented stating, this is also being considered by Annapolis. Chip feels that participation from the LLWG is necessary.
- Joan Salvati (VA Department of Environmental Quality) said the goals are not consistent with the actual challenges of certain localities. She also mentioned the Goal Implementation Team (GIT) 3 program may focus on topics and issues that are not relevant to them, but should instead be handled by the LLWG.
- Sheila asked how the Conowingo Dam WIP will impact downstream communities. She referred members to photos showing the impact of a recent flood. Greg Barranco noted that it is not just the dam's openings that contributes debris, but also the Anacostia River as well as storms that have hit the area.

Chesapeake Bay Program Update: Communications Office

Rachel Felver, Chesapeake Bay Program Communications Director

Rachel Felver began by discussing the action items from the Executive Council meeting. See Advisory Committee Comments to the Executive Council handout. They focused on the assigning of the Agricultural Technical Assistance Directive and the changing targets from the diversity indicators. She also gave an update on specific LGAC recommendations. She said that these recommendations will be considered by the Principals' Staff Committee in October. Bruce offered clarifications about the recommendations. Items # 1a, 1b were advisory, not Recommendations. Rachel agreed to correct the document. Rachel then presented on the Bay Barometer, briefly explaining its intention, and impact. She asked for feedback regarding the handling of information within the Bay Barometer. Members

suggested restructuring it a bit to strengthen visibility and presentation of information for local officials. Chip recommended including a graph showing trend overtime, also incorporating corresponding blurbs. Rachel clarified, they do not have one large graph measuring all 31 outcomes. Instead, they would need to create 31 separate graphs. She asked for a way to simplify this recommendation. She would like to construct a state-specific fact sheet. Ruby Brabo is in favor, however, she suggested highlighting only the most significant data when referring to state-specific outcomes. An example given was, overall, in VA, what is the impact on tourism and outdoor recreation? She stated, she “should be able to, quickly look at it, and take away, why I should care?” She said that busy elected officials should be able to grasp the information with a quick first impression. Members recommended the fact sheets include information about the financial impact of achieving outcomes. Rachel thanked members for their feedback and said she will share a draft at a later time.

Action: Rachel will follow up with Jennifer and send a draft update.

Business Meeting

June 2018 minutes were approved on a motion by Ed Bustin and second by Markus Batchelor. Chip Jones, Sheila Finlayson, and Ruby Brabo abstained.

Future LGAC Meetings: Reminder that the next LGAC meeting will be held Thursday November 29 – Friday November 30. Sheila questioned future LGAC meeting dates, asking why meetings are alternating between Wednesday-Thursday and Thursday-Friday. Mary reminded the committee that this was decided at a prior meeting as a trial for 2018. Ed requested we avoid the second and fourth Thursdays of the month. John said he also has conflicts on those dates. Markus requested we avoid the first and third Thursdays. Mary confirmed that the September 2019 meeting date at National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) in Shepherdstown, is locked in to a Wednesday – Thursday date. Staff agreed to poll members for availability for the remaining 2019 meetings.

Action: Create poll to determine which meeting dates are most favorable among LGAC members.

Staffing Changes: The Alliance secured funding from the Bay Program to staff the Local Leadership Workgroup. Jennifer has assumed the position of Workgroup Coordinator. Ola will be working 20 hours a week, out of the Annapolis office, providing LGAC staff support. Finally, Monica Billig will continue working to provide committee support. Mary recognized staff accomplishments and thanked Harriet Newquist, as well, for her assistance over the last several months.

Communications: Mary noted that staff will use the LGAC@allianceforthebay.org email for contacting committee members. This should make it easier for members. Feedback is welcome.

Next Steps for LGAC Staff:

- Coordinate two (2) roundtables in Virginia.
- Coordinate four (4) roundtables in Pennsylvania in November.
- Mary will serve on the Local Leadership Workgroup.
- Draft Local Government Forum Report and Recommendations for consideration at November 2018 quarterly meeting.

LGAC Support of Chesapeake Monitoring Cooperative MOU: Members approved the draft letter supporting the PSC's adoption of an MOU with the Chesapeake Monitoring Cooperative.

New Business/ Future Agenda Items/ Open Discussion

Future Agenda Items

- Have a member from the National Associations of Counties speak on legislative decisions surrounding integrated water resources management.
- Look at federal agencies and their role in federal funding. LGAC wants to raise the issue of the federal level, not only engaging the state, but also engaging the local governments. Because of their increased interests, Ruby, Andria McClellan (LGAC, VA), John Thomas, and Markus Batchelor, will be consulted on this issue.
- Chip suggested that LGAC look into concentrated animal facilities in urban and suburban areas. An example of this issue is a homeowner has 6 horses to one acre of land, and the horses do not have enough room to graze. Kathy Stecker seconds the relevancy of this issue.
- Expanding the FEMA issue and addressing the impact. Chip, Ed, and Joan second the relevancy of this issue.
 - In order to increase relevance in regards to the Chesapeake Bay Program operations, Mary suggested including the hazard mitigation planning in this discussion. Members concurred.
- Don requested more case studies based on relevant topics.

In closing, a few LGAC members shared their appreciation towards the chemistry and engagement of this LGAC meeting. They feel these meetings have made a great impact thus far. Mary proposed LGAC collaborating with the LLWG in a joint meeting, in order to have specific program and policy-level conversations. She and Jennifer will pursue a joint meeting in March 2019.

Joan shared that this may be her last meeting with LGAC. She reflected on her time with the members and thanked them all for their continued support and participation.

The meeting formally adjourned at noon.