

CCMP Implementation Committee

Meeting Agenda & Notes



DELAWARE CENTER FOR THE
INLAND BAYS
Research. Educate. Restore.

DATE & TIME: 11 Dec, 2019 9:30-11:30AM
LOCATION: CIB Conference Room
39375 Inlet Road Rehoboth Beach, DE 19971
Meeting called by: Chris Bason, Chair

AGENDA ITEMS

I. Call to order C. Bason

9:35AM

II. Meeting agenda review C. Bason

No changes to the agenda.

III. Approval of August 19th meeting minutes M. Schmidt

Minutes provided via email. No updates to minutes. Ted Becker motioned for approval, Hans second. Minutes approved.

IV. CIB Updates M. Schmidt

- CCMP Revision Progress
- SWMPG Application
- EPA Technical Assistance Grant
- 2019 NEPORT Reporting
- STAC Report
- Partner Updates

M. Walch
All

CCMP Revision timeline is being discussed with CCMP Signatories. Currently in review by STAC which will conclude December 20th. More information on the CCMP Revision process will be available at the next meeting of the Committee. Currently working with the CCMP Signatories on approving a new timeline.

SWMPG for Rapid Assessment Project Plan (RAPP) was recommended for approval at the next WIAC meeting on December 18th.

Center is working with EPA on a Technical Assistance Grant that the Center submitted back in September timeframe. Project would be to conduct a nutrient accounting and modeling project in Little Assawoman Bay in partnership with the Maryland Coastal Bays Program. We are still waiting to hear from EPA on that because right now they are waiting on a document from MCBP so we can finalize the project. Megan Mackey will follow up with EPA. Kasey Taylor commented that there is a potential to apply for a RCPP through NRCS. Another installation will come mid-spring, early summer. When the announcement comes out she will let us know. There is an opportunity to do an expansion of the work we have identified and also compete for funding from a national funding pool. Could be a great opportunity to address some of these items that we have identified within our plan.

Michelle provided an overview of 2019 NEPORT results. The NEPORT results for habitat acres in the Inland Bays is 315 acres protected or restored and for leveraging results \$13 million. Of that it was mostly cash reported. This information is reported each year from the EPA. Leveraging data is a little lower than last year due to previously reporting on the Rehoboth Outfall which was not reported this year. Something to think about for this FY is how the Committee can help us with this reporting for this FY. Hans asked what qualifies for leveraging funds - the answer is any non-320 funding that implements the CCMP. Example: the County reports on sewer upgrades. If the project is completed by the Center or our partners it can be counted for this reporting. The Conservation District reports on nutrient management planning, cover crops, etc. The majority of the expense is related to grey sewer infrastructure through the County. Hans commented that every year he gets a question about reporting this number and asked who else do we get this data from. The Center reaches out to SCD, University of Delaware, NRCS, DNREC, conservation easements, etc. Hans said we need to look at the data because it is "soft" data because none of the entities are required to report this data to us. It is implied accuracy when you present a number such as the one we presented. The number is an accurate accounting of the data reported to us. Megan offered some additional information on NEPORT - all of the NEPs are required to submit habitat acreage and leveraging dollars and we fill out a form with information to ensure that is as close to a real number as possible. This is a constraint the NEPs function under. Michelle mentioned that one task for this Committee is to help us with tracking and reporting and so we will look to the Committee to help us with this reporting. Mayor Becker asked if I reach out to the Open Space Council for this reporting. Michelle explained that we work with Elena who is with the OSC. In a couple of meetings we will work together to review the list of those we solicit this information from to update the list.

STAC Report from Marianne: At the last meeting we discussed the STAC's work on developing recommendations for water quality and hydrodynamic modeling. A white paper was developed and went out to STAC members and CIB staff for review. They received some comments back and now Marianne, Scott Andres and Jenn Volk are working together to make changes to the document based off of the comments. Once they have done that it will go to the CIB Board for approval. They were not able to complete this prior to the December 2019 Board of Directors meeting so it will be voted on shortly and then sent to the Board. Basically they are filling in more background information and more detail to the recommendations.

Partner updates:

Mayor Becker: Bethany purchased 12.5 acres off of Rt 26 for \$1.4 million that they will keep as Open Space. It is not contiguous to the City but it is between Bethany and Route 1 and the main commercial area on Rt 26. They have earmarked their lodgings tax for a redevelopment fund in case of an emergency or tragedy. On Monday night Lewes passed a motion to send to their planning commission a request that they develop an ordinance banning fill of any kind in the 100 year floodplain zone. They are looking to expand on their current ordinance. This would be a major adaptation policy for the State of Delaware. It will be on the Planning Commission's agenda for next Wednesday December 18th. More information to come. Another thing of note is there was a RCPG awarded by DNREC which Rehoboth is administering but all 7 coastal communities signed on to look at impervious coverage. The project is almost finished. The final meeting of the group is December 16th and at that point they will be developing BMPs. The communities will have to adopt their own version of the model ordinance.

Hans Medlarz: Unincorporated areas lodging tax has been earmarked for targeted spending on environmental and water quality related projects. It looks like the funding will touch maintenance of channels and beach replenishments. There were 5 additional areas identified for this funding but Hans

believes that only these two will receive funding due to the activity for the tax. Mayor Becker commented that Todd reported this at the last ACT meeting and it was well received. There was some anxiety around the prioritization activity but they were pleased with the outcome.

Kasey Taylor: Will send out NRCS' official year end report. NRCS has been partnering with state and local levels to expand agland easement and wetland easement programs. The Agland easement program is their priority because it still allows farmers to farm the land. They have partnered with DDA and Agland preservation award for \$5mill in FY19 and \$5mill in FY20 to leverage and match the State of Delaware's \$10mill investment. They are looking at procuring 43 ag parcels and have already procured 18 parcels by the time they finished FY19. They have an additional \$3.5 mill that has to be finalized by early March. When they go into the new round they will have that additional funding. The second part is to expand the wetland restoration to preserve those lands in perpetuity (they can do permanent or 30 year easement). They are working with SCD and Georgetown office to get those larger easements in place. They have two that they are working on which will total 400 acres restored. They are going to produce a video promotion for the program and the benefits of the program. In addition they are looking at finalizing the rule making process for EQIP which gives producers the ability to maintain farmer's interest but also to protect resources of concern that have been identified. They are getting more information back and the rule making process will be opened for public comment in December/January. After which they will go into their open enrollment period. They average at about \$7.5mill for that program. With the addition of the RCPP they have gone as high as \$8.5mill for the State. They have a goal of getting up to \$9.5-10mill dollars within the next couple of years. Over in Maryland they have the state MACS program which helps to bridge the gap between what funding is available for these programs and what the landowner has to pay which the State of Delaware does not offer. NRCS has also been successful with getting watershed program funding for the State which looks at the tax ditch structure. They will work on the Nanticoke and Marshy Hope and already have approval for the Nanticoke tax ditch. They will continue to go into the tax ditch structure to make improvements and complete maintenance on the ditches. Some issues are that the SCD is close to being maxed out on the work they are able to complete. They will work to complete the design for the Marshy Hope tax ditch and then eventually will move into implementation in FY21. The hope is that as one construction starts, there is the adoption of the next plan so that we can continually work on these projects. Hans asked if these two projects are renaturalization projects. Kasey believes that some of the project will be and others will be excavation. Hans thinks that if it is just a bank stabilization then it is a drainage component. Bryan Jones commented that right now it is just the planning stage - the main priority is to maintain the drainage and bank stabilization but their office and partners are always looking at adding practices that add to the water quality aspect. They will involve the tax ditch managers. But again - this is just the planning stage.

Hans: For the cover crop program, is there a differentiation between harvest and burn down? Bryan responded that in Sussex County they will not pay for harvested acres. In the past they would pay a half payment but now they only pay in the Spring when crops are destroyed. Hans commented that winter wheat won't pay for itself and so for a nutrient benefit it's not the best. Bryan responded that the reasoning is because for a cash crop they would apply nutrients for a better crop whereas for a cover crop you cannot add nutrients. Hans' last question is if they talked about actual restoration of wetlands or conservation and what kinds of restoration? Kasey responded that they were doing restoration and mostly grading and shaping. Some they did ditch plugs and some were truly earth moving. Hans asked how they used federal funding for shaping because he has a really difficult time to get the permit for wetland building? Kasey responded that they could continue that conversation - it isn't an easy process but it does depend on the practice. Hans asked if they calculate a water quality benefit and the answer was yes.

Megan: The award recipient for the NEP Coastal Watershed Cooperative Agreement was selected and it is RAE. It is \$4mill over 4 years for restoring coastal areas and includes a variety of types of projects. Range is \$75,000 to \$250,000 but the RFP hasn't been released yet. Currently we are unsure when the call for proposals will be released.

V. CCMP Implementation Committee Work plan for FY20

All

Michelle led the group through an activity to brainstorm and discuss implementation goals for the Committee to work on in FY20. The Committee was asked to think in terms of the charge of the CCMP Impl. Committee which is to implement the actions in the Inland Bays CCMP. Each participant was given three sticky notes and three colored sticky dots. The activity steps are listed below.

Step 1: Participants take a moment to individually reflect on what our goals are for working together. Think about the question: "What would you like this group to achieve?" Once you've had a moment to think and reflect, write it down on a piece of paper. You can have two, or if you need three, but try to keep them limited and concise.

Step 2: Take a moment and share your goals with a neighbor or two. If you find there are overlaps in your goals, combine them.

Step 3: Each small group reads out what their goals are. After each group has presented, discuss which goals are widely held. Facilitator (Michelle) writes the goals on the poster board and asks the group to review and ensure nothing has been missed or misclassified.

**Note one goal was clarified: The goal on the poster board reads "assist in developing metrics for CCMP" and this was further clarified to mean that the group is instrumental in identifying projects that are actually marking the progress on achieving these actions.*

Step 4: Participants are asked to vote on the goals posted on the poster board. Participants have 3 colored dots: Green, Yellow, and Red. The Green dot is for your top choice, the goal you deem as most important. The Yellow dot is for your second choice and the Red dot is for your third choice. You can choose to put all your dots on one choice or spread them out amongst all the options.

Step 5: After everyone has voted, the group discusses which goal has the most total dots and which goal has the most green dots.

The results of the activity are followed with the colored dots showing the outcome of voting activity:

The goals listed on the poster board are:

1. Strengthen partnerships ●●●
2. Increase exposure of CCMP and accomplishments ●
3. Produce an end of year implementation report
4. Preserve open space ●●●●●
5. Increase funding for wetland and agland preservation ●
6. Increase cover crops in the Inland Bays ●●
7. Provide guidance for buffer implementation for non-developed areas ●●
8. Focused BMP implementation on stream networks ●●●●●
9. Watershed modeling, planning, and tracking ●●●
10. Develop a mechanism for reporting progress on implementation
11. Identify projects that mark progress towards achieving CCMP metrics ●●●●●
12. Trash/litter reduction ●

The four goals pulled out because they either had the most votes or the most green votes are:

- 1. Strengthen partnerships*
- 2. Preserve open space*
- 3. Focus BMPs on stream networks*
- 4. Watershed modeling, planning, & tracking*

After the group reviewed the results of the voting activity, Kasey Taylor offered a suggestion that perhaps what we should do is to put each of the 12 goals into major categories since they are all interconnected. Then whichever ones fall out we can link under one of the major categories.

At this point in the exercise, the group was running out of time and was unable to complete the activity which was to select a few goals for the Committee to focus on and then discuss how the Committee can accomplish those goals. Kelly Sommers asked if any of these goals are already in existing plans such as the Pollution Control Plan.

Hans commented that some of the goals require legislative action and those should be pulled out and further discussed because achieving them is a different process.

Michelle asked the group how they felt about the four goals that were starred because they had the most votes or most green votes. Does everyone agree that those are the priorities for the group? Chris agreed with Kasey's suggestion that some of the goals are higher order and some are cross cutting - for example: strengthen partnerships is cross cutting.

The next goal to bump up if we remove the strengthen partnerships is to identify projects that mark progress towards CCMP metrics.

Megan offered that there are several questions to ask including what impediments are there to accomplishing the goals, what work is already in the pipeline that could help towards success for these?

DNREC and other partners are not present and we need to get their input into the activity and goal setting.

Michelle asked the group how they feel about working on this in the interim? The group agreed.

Chris offered his opinion on how focus can be good given the limited capacity and Michelle will have to do the coordination to show results of increased implementation so perhaps focus on a smaller set of goals.

Megan commented that as partners, everyone will have a responsibility to take on this work and that the Center shouldn't have to facilitate all conversations or work necessary to accomplish the goals of the group.

It was decided that this information would be shared with all Committee members, particularly those who were unable to join and ask for their input on the goal setting activity. From there we can continue our conversations on how we will accomplish the goals we settle on.

VI. Open

All

Michelle let the group know that Jules Bruck with the University of Delaware will be joining our Committee but she was unable to join this meeting.

VII. Schedule Next Meeting

All

March 18, 2020

VIII. Adjourn