



## **Spring Creek Watershed Association Meeting**

May 20th, 2014  
7:30 AM to 9:30 AM  
New Leaf Initiative

### **Meeting Summary**

Attendees: Rob Cooper, Lori Davis, Bob Donaldson, Ann Donovan, Bob Eberhart, Barbara Fisher, Todd Giddings, Jim May, Kristen Saacke Blunk, Mike Schmidt, Bill Sharp, Jennifer Shuey, and Judi Sittler.

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. 7:35 AM to 9:30 AM: Association Business

#### ***a. Discussion on the 'Mission Statement':***

Judi opened it up to the group to provide their input on the mission statement.

Todd – Stated that the word that impresses him the most in the mission statement is “economy”. He mentioned that as a group we have not been opposed to growth and development, but encourage growth and development in a planned way, hence the reasoning for the wording of “protect and enhance the economy” in the mission statement.

Jim – Posed the questions of what is our role, and are we the group that pulls everyone together?

Jen – Followed up Jim’s statements with her idea/vision of the group as an idea generator. Although this group doesn’t always complete projects, other entities pickup ideas generated through the group and run with them. The educational speakers are one way that helps generate ideas and attract interested groups.

Bob D – Noted that one of the key words in the mission statement is “promote actions”.

After some discussion, there was a general consensus from the group to not make any amendments to the mission statement.

#### ***b. Strategic Goals:***

Jen – Provided a background and context for how the strategic goals were developed. The goals were developed immediately following the International



Countryside Stewardship Exchange. At that time the watershed knew of the I-99 project coming to the area but didn't know how to address these big change drivers. This did lead to Vision 2020 living with I-99. This is one of the main explanations for the goal "develop a vision for the future and implement it".

Bob D – Mentioned the Spring Creek Watershed Plan and how it was also developed to serve as a vision for the future.

Bob E – Questioned the goal of "measure watershed quality" and the word "watershed" specifically. Is this the correct word to use as watershed describes a geographic area and the Water Resources Monitoring Project (WRMP) measures the water resources throughout the watershed but does not measure the watershed quality per say.

Jen – Followed up the statements made by Bob by saying that one of the benefits to keeping it as is on the watershed basis allows it to be broader and open it up to more metrics beyond what the WRMP monitors.

Kristen – Suggested a possible rewording of that goal from "measure watershed quality and set goals for improvement" to "monitor water resources and set goals for improvement".

Judi moved for a motion that would accept the change suggested by Kristen (above), Jim May provided the first motion and Bob Donaldson seconded the motion.

**c. List of Priorities:**

Judi asked the group whether there is one priority or a list of priorities that the group would like to focus on for either the remainder of the year or next year.

Kristen – Suggested that one potential priority may be a focus on private residents and what they can do to manage stormwater on their property. Perhaps through the mechanism that Ann used with the cost share. Also, could use the MS4 group as one of their minimal control measures (MCMs) is education. Therefore, we could potentially engage them to help improve homeowner's education and impact for the management of stormwater. Also, mentioned that one thing we are lacking in this area is the resources, such as landscapers, who have the knowledge and skill to implement best management practices.

Bob E – In the context of stormwater, Bob posed the question of how much of a problem do we really have?

Jim – Stated that the Planning Agency is looking at conducting an ordinance audit in order to gain more information on the municipality level of what is being done and what can be done for the future.



Todd – Suggested that one focus could be to work with other municipalities to adopt the ridge overlay which protects fingertip tributaries. It has been adopted by Ferguson and Harris Township, but has stalled at Patton Township.

Jen – Suggested that maybe we invite a few speakers with a social science based background to help educate us on how to engage the broader community. She mentioned that she spoke with Diane Epsy who did the story on the Conewago Initiative. Diane is a journalist, and as such she gets the opportunity to speak with a lot of people and ask questions about what is important to them and where they see the need in their watershed. The sociology aspect is integral in inviting people into the process.

Barb – Suggested another priority of source water protection.

Bob D – Noted that the Spring Creek Watershed Commission has worked with Mark Stephens at DEP to see how the Commission could be of assistance to them. Mentioned because of the Commission role in this that it would probably be better left to the Commission to handle on a watershed basis as opposed to involving other entities such as the Centre Region. In reference to the Commission's projects, Bob asked Todd about the recharge map since he was working with the Commission to address this.

Todd – Responded to Bob's question in saying that the recharge map is currently dormant. There was some opposition from landowners and municipal officials to the map because of the potential loss of value that protecting a recharge area would involve. Also stated that there is a need for it to be completed on a science basis to eliminate subjectivity and so that the rankings could then be defensible.

Rob – Stated that although it was controversial it is still necessary. He suggested that maybe some entity, like the municipalities, could compensate them for the loss of value.

Jen – Mentioned that USGS conceptual model for Spring Creek does include a recharge map. Therefore, once this model is made available it will have a recharge component, but because it is a model scale may be a problem. It won't be able to model recharge on an acre scale for instance because they did it on the watershed scale.

Bill – Mentioned that there is a current development plan underway called 3B33 which is trying to drive the county's annual private sector revenue to 3 billion by 2033. One item under this initiative is how this new economy has to be a sustainable economy, especially in terms of resources.

Barbara provided a synopsis of the priorities suggested: 1.) Stormwater – one part being the homeowners aspect, and the other aspect being educating landscapers, engineers and others on different approaches to stormwater management; 2.) Sociological aspect – inviting speakers to educate the group on how to better



## SPRING CREEK WATERSHED ASSOCIATION

*A grassroots stakeholder initiative*

understand the community and the needs of the community; and 3.) Watershed plan – one aspect that could help with this is the identification of recharge areas.

### **d. Next Steps:**

Given the suggested priorities, a few speaker ideas were suggested as next steps to pursuing priorities such as Diane Espy and Eric Eck to speak on the second priority (listed above) and Todd Erdley who is the developer of the CBICC's 3B33.

### **e. Outreach:**

Judi asked whether the group felt if there was another group that was not being represented or underrepresented that we should reach out to.

Mike – In an early discussion related to the topic, he suggested that there is a need to characterize the entire watershed community and not just the upper reaches of the watershed which seems to be the majority of individuals represented by the Association in the past.

Kristen – Mentioned the need to use what is called community based social marketing so you can really understand the audience and what the audience's understanding and need is.

Lori – Asked that in light of next month's speaker is there a group we want to target such as landscapers.

Barb – Suggested that there be standing agenda item at the end of each meeting in which the group offers up suggestion for groups and individuals to invite and reach out to related to the speaker's proposed topic.

Kristen – Mentioned that one group she'd like to see represented would be someone from the Builder's Association. It may also be useful to engage the MS4 either by inviting them into a conversation or see if we could attend one of their meetings to determine how we can be more supportive of them.

## 3. Partner Updates

### a. ClearWater's Watershed Cleanup Day-

Lori provided a brief update on Cleanup Day. More than 470 volunteers participated in the event which is up from previous years of around 350 volunteers. A total of 56 tons of trash was collected from 57 sites throughout the county. Thank you to all who participated.



b. CCCD Stormwater Cost Share –

Ann provided an update on the stormwater workshop and cost share money after the first agenda item. She mentioned the sponsors in the workshop: University Area Joint Authority, Penn State University, University of Maryland, Hazen and Sawyer, State College Borough, and Ferguson Township. The total funds expended for the workshop \$4,710 and because of the donations, only \$1,967 were used from the grant. The cost share program was also a success. There were 6 request but only 5 could be filled. The project fund recipients included Talleyrand Park in which the park committee purchased 15 shrubs, two homeowners in Shingletown one who will be planting a rain garden and the other rooftop planters, a homeowner who will be using the funds to build a native meadow, and another, Judi Sittler, who will be planting a riparian buffer.

4. The next meeting will be June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014 at Patton Township Municipal Building. Mark Gutshall from LandStudies is scheduled to speak on best management practices LandStudies has completed for managing stormwater.