**Spring Creek Watershed Commission**

May 15, 2019

Bellefonte Council Chambers

236 West Lamb Street

7:00 PM

**1) Call to Order:** 7:01 PM

**2) Introduce members: –** Janet Engeman (State College Borough), David Whiteman (Potter Township), Bill MacMath (Spring Township), David Wise (Benner Township), Peter Buckland (Ferguson Township), Dennis Hameister (Harris Township), Joanne Tosti-Vasey (Bellefonte), Carla Stilson (College Township), Don Franson (Walker Township), Chris Hurley (Patton Township)

*Not present:* Halfmoon township, Milesburg Borough

**3) Approval of minutes,** March 20, 2019 distributed

* Bill Sharp noted that the vote regarding the Benner Township letter was not 7-3, but 6-4.
* Bill Macmath approved with this addition, Joanne Tosti-Vasey seconded

4) **Citizen Comments:** The public is invited to address the Commission on items not on the agenda, (5 minutes per commentary) Electronic copy of comments should be submitted to SCWC & will be included in meeting minutes.

Todd Giddings, Local Groundwater Geologist, Ferguson Township

* Reported on the state of the Spring Creek Watershed. Giddings noted that last year was the wettest year on record and 2019 has also been very wet. The groundwater levels in Ferguson are 40 feet higher today than one year ago, the streamflow is at 536 ft/s3, where the median flow is 220 ft/s3. The stream flow is 2 and a half times faster than normal, surface water flow and groundwater resource levels are unusually high, and that is a good thing for the watershed.

Bob Vierck, Spring Creek Chapter of Trout Unlimited

* Reported that the Kissinger meadow off of Branch Road is being established as a pollinator garden, therefore enhancing the environment. White silt socks were donated as a part of this project and contain seed mixes for pollinators.
* Also mentioned Tussey Mountain Great Outdoors Day, which will be held on 6/2.

David Roberts, Nittany Valley Environmental Coalition, Benner Township resident

* Stated that unlimited growth and a healthy ecosystem cannot exist and mentioned his support of the one water plan and urged others to support it

Deb Nardone, Clearwater Conservancy

* Reported that 2019 Watershed cleanup day a huge success. 15 tons of garbage was removed, 300 volunteers were present, and 59 different locations were visited.
* 2019 season of Centred Outdoors has started. Events feature all-accessible hikes and free to the public. Most of the events happen Sunday afternoon and Wednesday evening and you can learn more on the Clearwater Conservancy website.

Motion from David Whiteman to move Old Business up to before Educational Topic, Janet Engemann seconded

**6)** **Old Business:**

A) Spring Creek Watershed Atlas, Bob Carline

* Four more articles are available on the Atlas site
	+ Water Quality, David DeWalle
	+ Temperature, David DeWalle
	+ Value of Trout Fishery, Jason Detar
	+ Gristmills, Robert McLaughlin
* There are now 36 articles up on the site

B) Update from PSU “Water Symposium” from attendees

* In attendance: Dennis, Joanne, and Bill
* Bill Sharp presented on the progress of the Phase II report.
* Todd Giddings presented on how Centre region handled all the rain it received last year.
* Overall the conference was well-liked and well-attended, and the talks presented were designed for a wide range of audiences.

5) **Educational Topic**: Roundtable discussion of “One Water Report”

 Introduction: Bill Sharp

 One Water Vision: Jason Detar

 FAQ from comments: Cory Miller

 Values Statement: Terry Melton

*(Relevant attachments: FAQ document, Fact sheet)*

Dennis Hameister: Since January, the technical workgroup has met twice to clarify issues and questions that were common in the public comments received on the Phase II Report. The next steps of this process will be determined based on the discussion tonight.

***Phase II History – Bill Sharp, SCWC Member***

* SCWC founded in 1996 not as a regulatory body, but to give advice and consultation. The mission statement regarding vision, leadership, and developing a watershed plan was created in 1997.
* December of 2003: Phase I of watershed plan was published
	+ Money ceased, so momentum on the plan halted
* 2016: Celebration of the watershed commission to see what has been done since its founding. Over 100 accomplishments that helped the watershed were displayed.
* January of 2018: Started to put watershed plan project together again
	+ In that time, 15 years had passed and the population grew 30,000
	+ There are over 80 entities that are involved in land and water decisions within the watershed.
* April of 2018: The public forum was held, which had 120 participants
* July of 2018: Stakeholder forum, 80 participants. Created a watershed vision for the next 50 years
* August of 2018: Technical workgroup formed, looking at water quality and quantity. Met 8 times and produced information created from Phase II report
* December of 2018: Phase II Report meeting, done by Janie French, 40 attendees.
* January of 2019: Educational Topic, Janie French presented to SCWC about Phase II Report and municipalities / planning commissions / local groups invited to comment

***Fact Sheet - Jason Detar, Fish and Boat Commission and Technical Workgroup Committee member***

* Fact sheet can be viewed / downloaded here: <https://www.springcreekwatershedcommission.org/fact-sheet>
* The fact sheet is a summary of the Phase II report and provides a quick overview of what a one water plan is
* Its purpose is also to give to people, municipalities, and local government groups who might not have the time to read the full report
* Key points of the one water vision, including the what, why, where, and when, are covered

***Terry Melton – Nittany Valley Environmental Coalition and Technical Workgroup Member – Value Statement***

* “Why a ‘One Water’ Plan?” question that is part of the FAQs focuses on the fact that the Spring Creek Watershed is great now, but we want to protect it

***Comments and Questions from technical workgroup members and SCWC members***

Dennis Hameister: Additional comments from College Township were received and Caitlin will add the comments to the Google Docs folder.

Ford Stryker, Spring Creek Chapter of Trout Unlimited and technical workgroup member

* Styker supports the plan and noted there are many details moving forward, including the cost. The estimate could vary widely and a fundamental organizational construct is necessary for success.
* Bill Sharp noted that when this process began in 2003, the SCWC had staff.

Peter Buckland, Ferguson Township, SCWC Member

* Asked what the possible mechanisms for implementation are and suggested a one water task force. He also stated that incorporation of one water principles must be at the county level as well and there needs to be a structure to implement this process. An agreement with stakeholders must be constructed so that another expensive project that does not go anywhere does not happen.
* Bill MacMath agreed with Buckland and referenced the York County one water plan, which is county-wide and included 6 or 7 watersheds.
* Dennis Hameister and Joanne Tosti-Vasey said their meetings with two county commissioners went well and they were in support of the plan.

***Frequently Asked Questions – Cory Miller, UAJA Director and technical workgroup member***

* FAQs can be viewed here: <https://www.springcreekwatershedcommission.org/faqs>
* Stated this document was crafted from questions and comments suggested in writing through public comments and heard at various meetings.
* Most common question was in regard to the Commission having regulatory teeth. This is part of the plan, but not the primary focus. One water plans look for win-win situations and compromises where all involved want the same result, so the nature of this should prevent forcing people to follow the plan. It should help groups work together.
* Another clarification addressed in the FAOs is the assumption that someone must lose. For example, if there is going to be growth, there will be environmental harm. The goal of the plan is to enhance the environment so that it can better withstand what humans are doing and the impact of growth.
* It is possible to make significant changes and improve the environment; resiliency is key.
* Another clarification: The appendix of citizen comments featured in the Phase II Report is not a list of what the one water plan aims to do. It is just for reference for what was said.

***Comments and Questions from technical workgroup members and SCWC members***

Brian Heiser, State College Borough Water Authority and technical workgroup member

* Stated that if we have a successful one water plan written, the incentive may be coordinated efforts between organizations to meet regulations easier together than would be separately. (MS4 partners, water providers)
* Great value to those organizations: cost for meeting regulatory requirements is skyrocketing, which is passed onto taxpayers and customers.
* Monetary incentive to work together and regulatory teeth are not necessary, as this will be much more successful in the long run.

Todd Giddings, Ferguson Township

* Noted that Ferguson Township passed a sourcewater overlay protection zone and some people do not know how much harm they can do to the public water supply. Suggested an overlay zone to protect sourcewater areas watershed wide would be good. Ferguson has an example of this overlay ordinance that could be looked at by other municipalities

Chris Hurley, Patton Township, SCWC member

* Asked what is the definition of resiliency here and how is it being used in this report?
* Bill Sharp stated it is the capacity to adapt to change and potentially thrive through change. It also involves making the system more robust.
* Cory Miller added that this region is very susceptible to drought. Resiliency means the really wet and dry periods are both taken care of.

David Roberts, technical workgroup member

* Stated another important element are the springs in the watershed. Vital recharge areas that need to be clearly identified. An overlay map would be extremely valuable.

Peter Buckland, Ferguson Township, SCWC member

* Said input is needed from the agricultural community and the land-use practices. Geospatial expertise is important, and an advisory partner would be wise. Also need the planners involved, not just the planning commission. Unclear how everything is working together from an outside perspective not in the technical workgroup.
* Bill Sharp noted that the extended list shows how many entities are involved and that a professional team of people to put this data together is needed.

Chris Hurley, Patton Township, SCWC member

* Asked if the ag community represented in the technical workgroup
* Bill Sharp stated that the Centre Conservation District was involved and the Farmland preservation was interested.

Joanne Tosti-Vasey, SCWC Vice-chair

* Noted that many municipalities were afraid that the cost would be on their dime. In a press conference on the Restore Pennsylvania program, it was mentioned that it is a 4.5-billion-dollar program. Two sections provide funds for storm preparedness, disaster relief and green infrastructure. Will share the information with the Commission.

Carla Stilson, College Township council member

* Suggested that the Commission do a study case with a focus group with future documents to find out immediate reactions before distributing wide.

Janet Engeman, State College Borough, SCWC Member

* Asked if any of these locations have a closed system like we do, since working with a closed different is very different.
* No one present was sure of the answer.
* Terry Melton stated that it is important to use a relatable watershed.

***Moving Forward***

Dennis Hameister suggested on voting in July on whether or not SCWC accepts the plan.

Terry Melton stated that in the technical workgroup, there was discussion on having places who adopted one water plans come and speak, such as Berks or York County. Dennis stated it would be good for them to attend the July meeting as an educational speaker.

Peter Buckland suggested a special meeting in June focused on the FAQ document and with relevant entities present.

Ford Stryker suggested voting in September, since this is a lot to fit in between now and then with it being summer and many taking vacations.

Deb Nardone, Director of Clearwater Conservancy, stated that the workgroup needs to identify who needs to be at the table and how you are going to proceed. She also stated that the very basic next steps need to be identified and a timeline for these steps should be crafted. More work also needs to be done to effectively engage the community and each municipality should be told how it will benefit them directly.

Bill Sharp suggested that the technical workgroup becoming more of an advisory / steering committee and should be referred to as such.

Peter Buckland stated that this plan needs to have its own structure and the relationship between these entities needs to be formalized.

The workgroup will meet again to look over the restructured documents (FAQ, fact sheet, and history) and Commission members are invited to attend. Caitlin will send out the date when it is chosen.

**10) Financial Reports** *(April, 2019)* Jon Eaton & Bill Sharp

 **General Fund**: Debit: 1044.00 **Project Fund:** Debit 110.00

 Balance: **16447.34** Balance: **5833.71**

**11) Once Around the Watershed:** Members are asked to share relevant water related news from their municipality.

Ferguson: Continuing to work on phase II of stormwater impact fee and this is Peter Buckland’s last meeting on the Watershed Commission.

College: Nestle has donated 7.12 billion dollars to Starbucks

**Remaining meetings for 2019: July 17, Sept. 18, Nov. 20.**

CNET Air Times: This meeting can be viewed on Channel 7 (CGTV) on

Monday, May 27 - 8:30 p.m.

Wednesday, May 29 - 10:00 a.m.

Thursday, May 30 - 2:00 p.m.

Friday, May 31 - 9:30 p.m.

Sunday, June 2 - 4:00 p.m

*Thank you to* ***College Township f****or sponsoring the airing of the meeting*

*Attachment for Roundtable Discussion*