**Participants:**

Deb Klenotic, PA DEP (Lead)

Rebecca Chillrud, CRC/CBP (Staff)

Rachel Felver, ACB/CBP

Mary Gattis, ACB/LGAC

Phil Miller, DNREC

Jennifer Starr, ACB/Local Leadership Workgroup

Kathy Stecker, MDE
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| 1. **Welcome and roll call**
2. **Member updates**
	* CCWC: Guides are going through state review and are almost ready to be issued. These will be shared with the Action Team. PA has one-page handouts focusing on agriculture, municipalities and environmental organizations (wholesale level – but really need more of a retail level as well). Idea is that anyone can take these and fully adjust them for the asks of the states. Kristin will pass around after her TMDL Workgroup finishes their review.
	* PA: Lancaster and York County have completed county-level action plans. Franklin and Adams will complete theirs at the end of February and will present at the March Steering Committee meeting. Sector workgroups have created recommendations for ag, stormwater and wastewater. Different communications related to these are being developed.
	* DE: Communications subcommittee met last week to updated communications plan and engagement strategy to include EPA expectations, including timeline and the role of our partners. Putting each strategy on a timeline.
	* MD: Writing draft WIP; all teams have submitted their info. Will present to Bay Cabinet next Wednesday (2/13) for approval and to incorporate their feedback. Have meetings with some organizations coming up to discuss how MD incorporated feedback.
3. **Gathering success stories**
	* Working with local WIP III planners to talk about benefits of BMPs, especially talking about successful projects that had non-environmental benefits: other community benefits or economic benefits. Many communities identify infrastructure, public health, economic issues as their priorities, so can we find stories that show how BMPs bring broader benefits to these priorities.
	* Deb crated a template for success stories that we can use. We would like to have success stories from all seven jurisdictions. Should include name of business, farm, landowner or town; funding; contact info; location; successful nonenvironmental benefit they’re getting from the BMP; environmental gain they’re getting; which BMP is in place; is the story already available in some format or is this something we can provide?
	* Happy hollow farm in PA that put in multi-functional buffers and is getting economic benefits from honey sales
	* Rachel: Richmond VA green alleys pilot project; for stormwater management program to show how low-impact development projects could be used and would be helpful for public infrastructure. Transformed alleys into models for environmental infrastructure. Nonenvironmental benefit: opened up opportunity for development in areas that were previously run-down. Environmental: urban tree canopy, stormwater, air pollution.
	* Commentary from group:
	* Jennifer: Q: Are the landowner case studies that are available on the new Wetlands Work website appropriate for this? A: Yes, these are pretty much tailor-made for this kind of thing and could easily be repurposed for this. Jennifer will ask Margot to take that on.
	* Who can we reach out to for these stories? Deb has shared with DCNR and other DEP contacts to see if they have good example stories or leads. Kristin: is a good role for CCWC, are putting together some videos about various member projects throughout the watershed and will include info on funding and benefits. Can always cut the videos differently for different purposes. Jennifer: Mark Roberts, State College partner 814 234 7457 for USFWS, works with private landowners to implement a variety of habitat restoration projects, many of which could be repurposed for this and are BMP practices. Mark would be able to point us to landowners that would be able to talk about benefits and esp. non-environmental benefits. Would B4B be a good source? It’s not generally BMP focused, more focused on general green business practices. TetraTech has been helping us put together a database of success projects, which includes some from MOST, NFWF. Kristin: Lancaster Clean Water Partners would be a good source for success stories, esp. related to Turkey Hill. President of Turkey Hill gave a talk at CCWC conference last year and talked about why as a business he’s involved with clean water efforts. He works with producers and requires certain environmental practices, may be able to connect us to producers that have implemented practices successfully.
	* Action: Everyone identify five stories that could be used from your area of the watershed, or broader, by next meeting – February 19th.
	* Deb put together list of nine benefits that are non-environmental that we should aim to focus on with these success stories. Second-level environmental benefits from the co-benefit fact sheets are included as well. ACTION: Everyone review the list of nine and share any edits or additions.
4. **Dashboard demo**
	* WIP Data Dashboard
	* Emily coordinates technical support to jurisdictions, including data that will help with WIP planning and implementation.
	* Online dashboard ties together the technical info that would be helpful for WIP development and implementation. Have brought to partners and gotten feedback – plan to do some outreach with partners on how to use it.
	* MPA was recently completed, we have new expectations, and we have a lot of new info and science available to us now, including monitoring and trends; modeling and tools; and new research.
	* Challenge: how do we pull together and integrate this new data and information for our partners in a way that they can use it?
		+ Local area goals
	* Telling local stories to demonstrate utility of data: created individual local stories and took them out to partners, who wanted to be able to access that info and be able to use it themselves rather than waiting for CBP to create something with it. For example, PA is creating county-level toolboxes that each county can use to build their WIPs.
	* Dashboard provides info on:
		+ Water quality of streams: looks at water quality monitoring stations from throughout the watershed, provides long-term trends, provides info for sub-watershed, can compare overall loads from different sub-watersheds
		+ Tidal water quality: looks at water quality standards attainment, segment by segment; trends over time; water quality monitoring; wastewater treatment plant discharges; most effective watersheds influencing Bay water quality; SAV trends
		+ Targeting restoration efforts: allows users to visualize outputs of watershed model to understand sources and loads; nutrient application management; wastewater treatment plants
		+ Management practice implementation: allows users to visualize BMP implementation across watershed, including effectiveness and cost-effectiveness; forest buffer opportunities
		+ Planning for change: planning for urban growth and development; shows different forest, wetlands or agricultural conservation options
	* Emily can send out presentation and poster about dashboard
	* Q: When will this be launched? A: It’s currently just going through a couple of workgroups for review. Beta version will be released after that, likely in early March. It will continue to be improved and updated after that.
	* Q: Are you able to look at practices across multiple priorities – for example, agriculture and riparian? A: Yes, you’re able to look at various sectors together and compare them together, for overall effectiveness and cost effectiveness. You can also combine counties to look at the average
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