**Lycoming County’s Countywide Action Plan (CAP) Kickoff Meeting**

*January 27, 2021*

*9am-10:15am*

Meeting Notes

1. Meeting goals
   1. Introduce the Watershed Implementation Plan Phase 3 (WIP 3) and the Countywide Action Plan (CAP)
   2. Understand the roles of diverse stakeholders
   3. Begin discussing countywide projects and initiatives
2. What led up to WIP 3
   1. In 2010, the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) was established, pollution limits and reduction goals were assigned, and a deadline of 2025 was set to meet those goals. Each of the 6 Bay states and the District of Columbia (PA, MD, VA, DE, WV, NY, DC) are accountable for reducing pollution locally and in the Bay. The WIP was the phased set of plans to achieve these goals.
   2. Phase 1 WIP began in 2010; Phase 2 WIP began in 2012, and the final WIP phase, Phase 3 WIP, began in 2019
3. Timeline and process
   1. Lyco County’s CAP will comprise of about 6-8 months (September 2021) of planning where stakeholders meet regularly to identify, select, and prioritize projects and initiatives that will help achieve our pollution reduction goals.
   2. Lyco County’s CAP will comprise of about 4 years (2025) of implementation where stakeholders will implement and report initiatives that were selected during the planning phase.
4. CAP documents
   1. Planning and Progress Template
      1. Will help our planning team identify how it would like to reach its local clean water goals, the resources they have available, and the resources needed to accomplish their goals, the responsible parties needed, and potential challenges to implementation. This is the main document we will use during implementation.
   2. Programmatic Recommendations Template
      1. Identifies needed changes to statewide programs, resources, funding, etc that will help our county complete the WIP 3. It will be reviewed by the Commonwealth and may be incorporated into PA’s WIP 3.
   3. Narrative
      1. Provides a high-level summary overview of Lycoming County’s plan and planning process (executive summary).
5. Importance of CAP
   1. Benefits of success
      1. Counties retain control of local water resources agenda
      2. Counties are able to identify the solutions they want to see for pollution and flood reduction
      3. Counties are able to identify previously-unknown grant and cost-share opportunities
   2. Consequences of non-participation
      1. Missed opportunities to address local water pollution and flooding
      2. More regulation and government oversight
      3. Higher costs for compliance
      4. EPA may withhold or redirect funding
   3. What the CAP is NOT
      1. The county’s clean water goals do NOT establish any new requirement of regulatory obligations on counties. The goals are a way to engage with local partners on shared issues, and to focus resources on efforts that help our local water quality.
6. Targets (PA and Lyco County)
   1. Lycoming County’s load reduction targets came from Lycoming County’s Technical Toolbox, which can be found on Lycoming County’s web page for the CAP at: <https://www.lyco.org/CWAP>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Nitrogen (lbs/year) | Phosphorus (lbs/year) |
| Delivered to local Lyco County Waterways | Delivered to local Lyco County Waterways |
| 1985 | 6,536,000 | 598,000 |
| 2019 | 5,387,000 | 348,000 |
| 2025 (Final TMDL Planning Target) | 4,152,000 | 272,000 |
| Remaining Load to be achieved through local planning goals | 1,235,000 | 76,000 |

* 1. PA’s Targets
     1. Nitrogen: Reduce by 34 million lbs/year
     2. Phosphorus: Reduce by 0.7 million lbs/year
     3. Sediment (soil): Reduce by 531 million lbs/year

1. Best Management Practices (BMPs)
   1. BMPs are calculated with State assistance, and will help determine how much nutrient load a specific project or action will reduce.
2. Lycoming County Technical Toolbox
   1. This is a document that came from DEP in October, and it will be instrumental in our planning efforts. The document provides us with specific data about polluted areas in the county, where pollution is coming from, and some strategies to reduce pollution loads according to pollution sources.
3. Role of stakeholders
   1. Stakeholders in CAP planning and implementation will provide a broad spectrum of expertise to identify and collaboratively prioritize projects, policies, initiatives, and resources that will reduce Lycoming County’s pollution loads.
   2. We cannot complete a successful CAP without stakeholder involvement!
4. Next steps
   1. Meeting strategy
      1. Conduct large monthly check-in meetings with all stakeholders
      2. Conduct small peer group meetings around the monthly check-in meetings for specific planning issues and goals
   2. Communication strategy
      1. Consistent, multi-platform communication will be key
      2. Monthly check-in meetings will be recorded, and meeting notes and recordings will be uploaded onto Lycoming County’s web page <https://www.lyco.org/CWAP>
      3. A regular newsletter will be distributed
      4. Targeted outreach for those who do not have reliable internet/cell service or cannot attend meetings will be conducted
5. Questions from participants
6. How does this program interface with the MS4 BMPs and pollutant reductions? How are the CAP BMPs funded?
   1. MS4 projects can be included in the CAP documents, but they could not be counted toward the CAP BMPs. Funding could come from multiple sources depending on the project.
7. Are dirt and gravel road projects on the list? I know the County Conservation District works with many of the townships in today's meeting.
   1. Yes, Dirt and Gravel Road projects can be included.
8. Do the reductions that you showed in your presentation include the anticipated MS4 and point source reductions in the current permit cycle?
   1. Yes, but these MS4 reductions could not be counted toward the CAP BMPs. MS4 projects cannot “double dip” with CAP BMPs.
9. How can the pollutant levels be reduced so relatively much from 2019 to 2025 compared to (the original period) to 2019?
   1. PA’s goal is to reduce pollution loads by 2025. Our local efforts, as well as the state’s resources and guidance, will be what drives the WIP initiative. It is a lofty goal, and we can do our best to achieve it. A tool we can use is one of the CAP documents, the Programmatic Recommendations Template. In this document we can describe needed changes at the state level to help accomplish our goals.
10. Projects, policies, initiatives, and resources from participants
    1. Dr. Mel Zimmerman, Director of Lycoming College Clean Water Institute – Over the years I have assisted in monitoring restoration projects. Currently in partnership with County Conservation District on stream monitoring of BMP’s on 4 farms on Wolf Run. I have also worked with the county on documenting outfalls in MS4. Lycoming College has a biology field station with 116 acres along Loyalsock Creek. We are looking into projects to reduce sedimentation to the Sock.
    2. Marita J. Kelley, Central Office Regional Director, Department of Community and Economic Development - May be able to assist with funding.
    3. Kathryn Beats – Chesapeake Bay Office - I encourage everyone to sign up for the Phase 3 WIP Newsletter. This is where we share updates on funding, county and partner progress, and anything that touches the Bay. You can sign up, and read past copies, at <https://www.dep.pa.gov/Business/Water/Pennsylvania%E2%80%99s%20Chesapeake%20Bay%20Program%20Office/WIP3/Pages/Newsletter.aspx>
    4. Mike Miller, Williamsport Sanitary Authority & Williamsport Municipal Water Authority - The Lycoming Creek Watershed Assoc. is working with and supporting Larry from US Fish and Wildlife Service on the midway project on Lycoming Creek. Carey from the conservation district did some work in Old Lycoming Twnsp over the summer. We also repaired a log vane at Sheshequin camprground this summer. Any projects or activities you can think of for our watershed are welcomed and good ways for us to bring our community together.
    5. Megan Lehman, DEP - I wonder if DEP, DCNR, and the counties could work together to try to change that issue of planting trees on buyouts. It just seems so counterintuitive, considering the state's clear interest in forested buffers.
    6. Larry Brannaka, FWS – Trout Run Park project, Roaring Branch Creek project. I can provide technical assistance for sediment reduction
    7. Renee’ Carey, Northcentral PA Conservancy – Remove earthen berm to restore/re-stabilize stream bank, riparian buffer, stabilized crossing for livestock
    8. Carey Entz, Lyco Conservation District – project with USFW, fish habitat project needs funding
    9. Tim Heyler, Lyco Conservation District – manure management, USFW project on pine run
    10. Carly Dean, Chesapeake Conservancy – Stream delisting strategies
    11. Wes Fahringer, DCNR – State has money for riparian buffer projects/plantings, and the grant round is currently open and closes in mid-April

***For questions or additional information, please contact:***

Eve Adrian   
Lycoming County Natural Resource Planner  
[eadrian@lyco.org](mailto:eadrian@lyco.org)   
570-329-4761

***Or visit*** [***https://www.lyco.org/CWAP***](https://www.lyco.org/CWAP)