



To: Jon Laria, Chair, Maryland Sustainable Growth Commission
Maryland Sustainable Growth Commissioners

From: Alan Girard, MSGC WIP Workgroup Chair
Pat Langenfelder, MSGC WIP Workgroup Vice-Chair

The Maryland Sustainable Growth Commission Watershed Implementation Plan Workgroup (WIP Workgroup) is pleased to provide this progress report and preliminary recommendations to the full Commission.

Workgroup members met on March 22, May 11, and June 23 with good attendance. Members and principal staff include:

Alan Girard, Chair
Pat Langenfelder, Vice-Chair
Jennifer Bevan-Dangel
John Dillman
Candace Donoho
Jason Dubow
Kurt Fuchs
Dave Goshorn *
Brigid Kenney *
Les Knapp
Amy Owsley
Carol West *

Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Maryland Farm Bureau
1000 Friends of Maryland
Upper Shore Regional Council
Maryland Municipal League
Maryland Department of Planning
Maryland Farm Bureau
Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Maryland Department of Environment
Maryland Association of Counties
Eastern Shore Land Conservancy
Maryland Department of Agriculture

* Principal Staff

Workgroup Meetings Summary

March 22

- Briefing on the WIP's role as it relates to growth and Maryland's nutrient trading policies (page 6, meeting minutes)
- Introductory conversation about the WIP Workgroup charge

May 11

- Continued dialogue about the WIP Workgroup charge
- General agreement to support WIP implementation by developing pollution reduction resources for local governments (page 8, meeting minutes).

June 23

- Finalization of WIP Workgroup recommendations to the Commission (page 15, meeting minutes).

Workgroup Recommendations Summary

1. Endorse the importance of the WIP and its associated offset and WWTP growth allocation strategies in achieving the State's economic, growth, resource protection, and planning policy.
2. Direct the WIP Workgroup to serve in an advisory capacity to the interagency Growth Offset Workgroup.
3. Support the establishment of offset generation capacity and its integration with growth management strategies at the local level.
4. Publish a "toolbox" of pollution prevention policies and strategies for local governments.

Detailed descriptions of these recommendations and a summary of the WIP policy context in which they are made are below.

WIP Policy Summary as it Related to Growth and Development

The Maryland Phase I WIP describes how concentrating development in areas served by advanced WWTPs lowers the amount of damaging nitrogen pollution affecting Maryland waterways. The WIP establishes an offset policy to encourage new development in sewerage areas by requiring 1) higher offset ratios for development that contributes high levels of per capita pollution (e.g., low-density development in non-sewered areas), 2) lower offset ratios for development that contributes low levels of pollution per capita (e.g., higher-density development in sewerage areas), and 3) no offsets for redevelopment in Low Per Capita Loading areas. The policy conceptually defines Per Capita Loading Areas (PCLAs) in order to determine where and to what degree offsets will be required to account for pollution from new growth. "Per capita" means nitrogen loads per total number of residents plus jobs accommodated within a given geographic area. As part of the policy, room for growth in sewerage areas is expected to be maintained under current WWTP caps. Specific offset requirements as discussed in Maryland's Phase I WIP are as follows:

- Development and redevelopment in Low Per Capita Loading areas and Moderate Per Capita Loading areas will not be required to offset increased point source loads from wastewater.
- Redevelopment (defined per State Stormwater Management Regulations) within Low Per Capita Loading areas will be required to meet established stormwater management requirements (relating to impervious cover, Environmental Site Design (ESD) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP), or watershed management plans) as provided in the approved local ordinance. Redevelopment projects in these areas will not be required to offset post-development non-point source loads.
- New (or Greenfield) development within Low Per Capita Loading areas will be required to satisfy stormwater management regulations and offset post-development non-point source loads above the standard forest loading rate established by MDE.
- All development in Moderate Per Capita Loading areas would be required to offset increased point and post-development nonpoint source loads (including septic system loads) in excess of the standard forest loading rate established by MDE.
- High Per Capita Loading areas may be subject to greater offset requirements, i.e., development may be required to offset point and post-development nonpoint source loads in excess of the standard forest loading rate established by MDE, at a ratio that is higher than that required in Low and Moderate Per Capita Loading areas.

Workgroup Findings and Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Commission endorsement of the importance of the WIP in achieving the State's economic, growth, resource protection, and planning policy. The workgroup agrees with the WIP finding that generally speaking, areas served by sewer accommodate additional development at substantially lower per capita nitrogen loading rates. The load from new development on well and septic is up to 10 times greater than new loads from sewered areas. We also agree that sewer service or lack thereof is not the only important determining factor contributing to water quality impacts. Larger average lot sizes (common in unsewered areas) generally increase overall stormwater runoff volumes, reduce forest cover and wetlands, and increase impervious surface, suggesting that zoning and other land use management plans, polices, and procedures also shape the nature of development and its post-development loading rates.

The WIP Workgroup supports the methodology in the WIP to maintain room for growth in WWTP loads under existing caps and establish offset requirements for new urban stormwater and septic tank loads, with greater offset requirements in areas where per capita pollution is higher. Given the critical role this policy plays in preventing pollution and limiting impacts from growth, the WIP Workgroup recommends the Commission endorse the concept of the accounting for growth policy in the WIP. A statement of support from the Commission can underscore the importance of the policy in helping create healthy, sustainable communities in Maryland – particularly as the policy seeks to enable continued growth while ensuring goals for clean water are achieved under the Bay TMDL.

Commission endorsement of the WIP can elevate the role and importance of this critical aspect of growth policy in Maryland. Because the supply of potential offsets for water quality impacts under the accounting for growth framework is finite, the WIP will encourage local jurisdictions to renew focus and attention on smart growth by maximizing economic development in appropriate areas while limiting per capita pollution under revised land use plans. The framework plays a vital role in promoting pollution prevention as the preferred means to avoid offset requirements. By supporting the WIP, the Commission can help prompt development of local land use policy in the near term that adequately prepares communities for the expected implementation of the accounting for growth program in 2013. Commission endorsement of the WIP is consistent with the Commission's charge to recommend policies

and procedures to achieve the State's economic, growth, resource protection, and planning policy, including the directive to carefully manage land and water resources to restore and maintain healthy air and water, natural systems, and living resources.

Recommendation 2: Direct the WIP Workgroup to serve in an advisory capacity to the interagency Growth Offset Workgroup, once that workgroup is ready to receive input into the development of offset strategies that will implement the WIP. The interagency Growth Offset Workgroup, convened by the Bay Workgroup in 2010, established the WIP accounting for growth strategy and is now developing options for a draft State-level accounting for growth program, which will be shared with stakeholders in late 2011. Growth Offset Workgroup members have suggested strategy development could benefit from perspective and input from WIP Workgroup members. The WIP Workgroup recommends the Commission direct the WIP Workgroup to serve in an advisory capacity to the Growth Offset Workgroup, once it is ready to receive input in support of the development and finalization of Maryland's offset policy implementation strategy.

Recommendation 3: Advise State and county governments to establish and track offset generation capacity by county or watershed trading geography. The WIP Workgroup recognizes it will be both difficult and costly to offset pollution from new growth. Every new household increases the nutrient load to the Bay, but some more than others. Maryland is projected to add approximately 500,000 households by 2035, with about 74% served by WWTPs and 26% served by well and septic. While the number of new households on well and septic will be substantially fewer in number, they will produce three times the amount of pollution generated by new households served by central sewer. In other words, 26% of the State's future growth will account for three-fourths of its future wastewater and stormwater pollution. Recognizing that a larger percentage of development occurring in areas served by advanced WWTPs will result in a lesser increase in nitrogen pollution overall, the WIP offset policy is an appropriate and needed tool for discouraging growth on well and septic.

It is unrealistic, however, to expect growth on well and septic will not occur. Where are the offsets for this growth to be found? Except for agricultural BMPs, few options exist in any sector to cost-effectively achieve offset requirements, and agriculture is already being asked to implement BMPs to achieve significant reductions just to meet its allocation. Even for those farms that may be eligible to install BMPs and sell nutrient credits to offset impacts in other sectors, preliminary analysis indicates limited capacity to achieve gains from such a program. Of 125 farmers surveyed by MDA in the Upper Chester watershed, 63 were eligible to participate with 25 of those expressing interest in selling nutrient credits.

A better accounting of "offset generation capacity" in each jurisdiction is necessary for local governments to balance available offsets with the projected need for them, or develop plans to generate offsets. Offset generation capacity is the maximum number of BMPs required to offset water quality impacts from new growth after all BMPs needed to meet pollution load allocations are assigned. A local accounting of offset generation capacity could include:

- A list and amount, within each trading geography, of agricultural BMPs (manure transport, precision agriculture, alternative crop production, etc.) that can be implemented on farms already achieving target nutrient reduction levels and available by jurisdiction to offset pollution from projected new growth, and;
- A list and amount, within each trading geography, of non-agricultural BMPs (such as nitrogen-reducing septic systems, stormwater retrofits, and non-major WWTP upgrades) available by jurisdiction to offset pollution from projected new growth.

The WIP Workgroup suggests the Commission, consistent with its charge, recommend that offset generation capacity in Maryland be established by county or watershed trading geography. The effort could build on the existing State system for tracking BMP implementation, and should be developed cooperatively by State and county jurisdictions. The accounting should describe the BMPs available, their cost, and the amount of pollution from new growth they will offset. This is especially important to provide predictability and stability in the development market. It also supports the EPA directive to fully account for pollution from new growth and achieve the Bay TMDL within the required timeframe.

Recommendation 4: Produce a publication that serves as a “toolbox” of pollution prevention policies and strategies for local governments. Given the challenges of offsetting projected pollution loads from new growth, the WIP Workgroup believes it is essential that all new development patterns prevent pollution to the maximum extent possible. Pollution prevention not only will help local jurisdictions meet and maintain pollution load targets, it will also reduce the amount of pollution needed to be offset.

Local jurisdictions are in need of tools and resources that can support pollution prevention and implement the WIP. An efficient way to provide this information is through a publication that serves as a “toolbox” of policies and strategies for local governments to utilize. The publication could be structured as follows:

1. Introduction: growth and development’s role in achieving and maintaining pollution reduction targets under the WIP
2. Offsetting pollution from new growth
 - a. Maryland’s offset policy under the WIP
 - b. Determining offset generation capacity at the local level – filling the gaps with BMPs beyond those assigned to meet pollution load allocations
 - c. The value of pollution prevention in reducing the need for offsets
3. Pollution prevention tools for counties, cities, and towns. Tool descriptions should quantify pollution reduction potential
 - a. Accounting for growth in comprehensive plans
 - b. Promoting higher density through incentives
 - c. Redevelopment options and opportunities
 - d. Market mechanisms
 - e. Successful models
 - f. Tracking and reporting best practices
4. Pollution prevention at the site plan level
5. Altering codes and ordinances to encourage green building practices
6. Technical and financial resources

This proposed publication is beyond the capacity of the WIP Workgroup to produce internally. We therefore recommend the Commission identify external resources to support this project. Potential funding sources include the Chesapeake Bay Trust, the Abell Foundation, Town Creek Foundation, the Harry R. Hughes Center for Agro-Ecology, and EPA. A third party such as the University of Maryland Center for Smart Growth Research and Education could be commissioned to create the publication, and the Commission could disseminate it on the web and through public forums. To maximize value, the publication should be delivered within six months, the period during which local jurisdictions need to be hearing most about their responsibilities related to the WIP and resources available to support their work. We recognize the draft State-level accounting for growth program won’t be available for stakeholder review until late 2011 and will not be implemented until 2013. However, local governments can still act now to prevent pollution from new development and to consider offset generation capacity when creating and revising land use plans.

**Maryland Sustainable Growth Commission
Watershed Implementation Plan Workgroup**

**Meeting Minutes
March 22, 2011**

Present

Alan Girard
Pat Lagenfelder
Jason Dubow
John Dillman
Jenny King
John Rhoderick
Brigid Kenney
Jennifer Bevan-Dingle
Kim Hoxter

Introductions

Participants introduced themselves and spent a few moments discussing their reasons for participating in the Workgroup.

Agenda

Alan Girard proposed the following agenda and discussion topics:

- Briefing on WIP and, specifically, its role as it relates to growth
- Maryland nutrient trading policies and role in WIP
- Questions for discussion:
 1. What are the tools related to the WIP and growth that the Workgroup would like to focus on?
 2. What is the charge of the Workgroup?

Agenda Item #1: Growth allocations and considerations in the WIP

- Jason Dubow briefed the Workgroup on the “Accounting for Growth” section of Maryland’s Phase 1 WIP submission.
- The full Phase 1 WIP submission can be downloaded at http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/TMDL/Documents/www.mde.state.md.us/assets/document/MD_Phase_I_Plan_12_03_2010_Submitted_Final.pdf. The Accounting for Growth section is located in Chapter 3
- Maryland’s approach to accounting for growth in the WIP (and approved by EPA) is to allow for a growth allocation in WWTP’s. All other growth must be offset by BMP implementation that results in an equal reduction in nutrient and sediment loads.
- Important Terms / Concepts:
 - “Offset Generation Capacity”: the smaller the footprint/acre of new growth, the more growth you can accommodate. For example, it is easier to offset growth in sewered areas (lower footprint) than in septic areas.
 - “Post Development Load”: applied measurement in the WIP is nutrient load after development, not net change from previous nutrient load. This is to

prevent consideration of conversion of agricultural land (higher nutrient loading) to development (lower nutrient loading) as a BMP.

Agenda Item #2: Maryland Nutrient Trading policy and role in WIP

- John Rhoderick briefed the Workgroup on Maryland's Point to Non-Point Nutrient Trading Program and its possible role in the WIP.
- More information can be viewed at: www.mdnutrienttrading.org
- Basic concepts:
 - Before a farm can sell nutrient credits, they must first meet "baseline" – defined as that farm's portion of the nutrient reduction necessary to meet the watershed's TMDL requirements.
 - 10% of nutrient credits generated will be retired to realize a net nutrient reduction.
- To date, 126 farmers have been evaluated to participate in the program
 - 50% of those met the baseline requirements
 - 40% of those that met baseline expressed an interest in participating
 - 3 of the interested farmers have applied
 - 2 of the applicants were subsequently rejected
 - 1 remains pending review.

Agenda Item #3: General Discussion

- There was brief discussion of possible issues that the Workgroup could address. Possible items for Workgroup efforts included:
 - How do we encourage/require counties to be more pro-active in their growth vs responding individually to each developer's proposal?
 - Should we institute a graduated series of offsets for development, i.e. minimal offset for development in sewered area, moderate offset in infill, large offset in undeveloped rural areas?
 - Need to better communicate the need for smart growth and its role in meeting out TMDL to the public at large.
 - Need to encourage/require counties to incorporate WIP criteria and strategies into their Comprehensive Plans

Action Items before Next Meeting

- Workgroup members were asked to respond to Dave Goshorn (dgoshorn@dnr.state.md.us) with their responses to the following three question by **April 22** in preparation for the next meeting:
 1. What is the outcome of the WIP Workgroup you want to see, bearing in mind our responsibility to advise and make recommendations to the full Commission? (Please be specific as you can.)
 2. Name three specific actions the Workgroup should take to achieve this outcome. These can be certain areas of focus, policy alternatives, program ideas, or anything else that will help our group produce useful results.
 3. List research or educational needs of the Workgroup you suggest we fulfill, including ways to address them (resource people, publications, etc.)

**Maryland Sustainable Growth Commission
Watershed Implementation Plan Workgroup**

**Meeting Minutes
May 11, 2011**

Present

Alan Girard
Jason Dubow
Jenny King
Brigid Kenney
Jennifer Bevan-Dingle
Kim Hoxter
Dave Goshorn
Candace Donoho
Meg Andrews
Kurt Fuchs

Introductions

Participants introduced themselves.

Agenda

Alan Girard proposed a two-part agenda:

1. Review written responses to the three questions posed at the end of the March 22, 2011 meeting (see below), and provide opportunity for additional responses from other members.
2. Collectively agree upon priorities for Workgroup attention.

Questions for Discussion

1. What is the outcome of the WIP Workgroup you want to see, bearing in mind our responsibility to advise and make recommendations to the full Commission? (Please be specific as you can.)
2. Name three specific actions the Workgroup should take to achieve this outcome. These can be certain areas of focus, policy alternatives, program ideas, or anything else that will help our group produce useful results.
3. List research or educational needs of the Workgroup you suggest we fulfill, including ways to address them (resource people, publications, etc.)

Agenda Item #1: Written responses by Workgroup members

Each member summarized their responses below and high points were recorded on flip charts.

Pat Langenfelder

Question 1: Recommend policies/strategies to reduce pollution loads associated with growth, rather than relying on offsets.

Question 2:

- encourage “smart” planning by counties to lessen impact of growth to environment
- educate local governments as to WIP requirements
- strategies to encourage counties to incorporate smart growth and improved water quality goals in local planning

Question 3:

- Information/studies on septic technology, costs, availability, etc.
- Studies/information on inhibitors to growth in urban/growth areas – zoning, APFOs, etc.
- Growth trend shifts since the downturn in economy: not just population, but the type of housing desired by consumers, consumption of land per dwelling

Jason Dubow

Question 1: There are four outcomes the WIP Workgroup could contribute to:

First, as part of the Phase II WIP process, County-level teams will discuss how to allocate pollution reduction responsibilities among “responsible parties” within the County geography, including municipal and County government, as well as among “source sectors”, including agriculture, WWTPs, septic tanks, and urban stormwater. The Bay Workgroup and Bay Cabinet will have a role in this as well. This dividing up of responsibilities can influence our ability to sustain the agricultural industry and to implement smart growth. **The SGC WIP Workgroup could ensure it is a part of this decision process by providing recommendations for how these allocations should take place at the local and State level.**

Second, also as part of the Phase II WIP process, because of the new Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) model run (results scheduled for release in mid-July), the Bay Workgroup and Bay Cabinet will need to take a new look at the Phase I WIP strategies and decide whether they should be changed, expanded, or reduced in order to achieve the new source sector allocations provided by the new CBP model run. In addition, based on the efforts of the County-level teams, the Bay Workgroup and Bay Cabinet will need to integrate the commitments made by the local teams

with the State-level strategy to implement the new source sector allocations. In both cases, the decisions will have ramifications on whether we can sustain the agricultural industry and implement smart growth. **The SGC WIP Workgroup could ensure it is a part of this decision process by providing recommendations on what Maryland’s final Phase II WIP strategies should be.**

Third, as discussed at the 3/22 SGC WIP Workgroup meeting, given the finite number of BMP opportunities available to both reduce current amounts of pollution and to serve as “offset credits” to account for new development, the best approach is to limit the amount of nutrient and sediment pollution from new development. New development in sewered areas results in about 10 times less nitrogen pollution than new development in non-sewered areas. **The SGC WIP Workgroup could examine local and State smart growth, land use planning, and zoning measures to limit the amount of nutrient and sediment pollution from new development, and could provide recommendations for new or revised programs and policies for limiting this impact further.**

Fourth, as discussed at the 3/22 SGC WIP Workgroup meeting, at the direction of the Bay Workgroup, the Growth/Offset Workgroup has convened to develop a draft statewide accounting for growth program. **The SGC WIP Workgroup could review and provide feedback on the draft statewide accounting for growth program once it’s available for review this fall/winter.**

Question 2:

The WIP Workgroup should review the Phase I WIP strategies and allocations and consider the impacts on smart growth and agricultural conservation measures.

Before the State makes key decisions on Phase II WIP allocations and strategies, the WIP Workgroup should meet with the Bay Cabinet to discuss the WIP Workgroup’s recommendations on Phase II WIP allocations and strategies.

Review materials regarding local and State efforts to reduce pollution from new development through smart growth and agricultural conservation measures. Consider participating in meetings of the Task Force on Sustainable Growth and Wastewater Disposal, which will focus in part on this issue.

Review and provide feedback on the draft statewide accounting for growth program.

Question 3:

Rich Eskin (MDE) could present on the Phase I WIP process and strategies and the Phase II WIP process.

Jennifer Bevan-Dangel (1,000 Friends) could present on local and State smart growth efforts.

Amy Owsley

Question 1: On your questions, my perspective has been focused a bit more parochially - mainly on how to help Eastern Shore counties in their goals/deadlines. As such, I've talked with several planning staff about the tmdl/wip process and have found most to be eager and willing to engage - but also stuck behind several difficult roadblocks. I wonder if this WIP workgroup can help facilitate targeted support to local governments to make the implementation of sound and innovative land use practices a reality. Some issues brought up locally are: good data (especially loading and targets upon which to base plans); process streamlining (pretty heavy reporting requirements that aren't necessarily dovetailing with each other or with existing county reporting requirements); opportunities for cross county/regional sharing of resources; and plan for ground-truthing loading data in the future. Also, I think the workgroup can help identify to highest priority education needs for local governments - at this point it seems they are scrambling to just keep up with the timeline, and not able to think about how the WIP will affect their current and future plans for land us.

Dave Goshorn

Question 1: The two primary outcomes I would like to see the workgroup develop and recommend to the full commission are. 1) a suite of recommendations on how the state, local governments, NGOs, and general public can best work collaboratively on implementing the significant requirements of the WIP (i.e. not get stuck on specifics of individual WIP actions, but rather how to the above groups work together to achieve the ultimate goal), and 2) recommendations on an outreach effort to educate the general public, special interest groups, local governments, etc on the economic and social benefits of achieving a restored Chesapeake Bay – not just the environmental benefits.

Question 2:

1. Understanding among the workgroup members of the requirements of the WIP and how we go to this point.
2. Understanding of the workgroup members of the implications to the state, local governments, private interests, and general public if Maryland does not meet its TMDL by the deadline.
3. Identification, discussion, and understanding for possible recommendation of innovative approaches (ex. ecosystem markets) in addition to traditional tools in order to help Maryland meet the TMDL requirements.

Question 3:

1. Discussion of economic impacts and value of a restored bay (Doug Lipton, UMD)
2. Discussion of innovative approaches to achieving our TMDL (Dave Goshorn, others)
3. Discussion of outreach approaches (?)

Jennifer Bevan-Dangel

Question 1: Shift the conversation away from the final step, offsets, and towards the first step, integrated land use planning into the Phase II WIPS. Have a hierarchy of actions counties, and the state, can take, starting with changing zoning to encourage redevelopment and limit rural sprawl, then going to having developers create the smartest developments possible, and ending with creating a strong offset program for whatever growth is not accounted for.

Question 2:

1. Produce a policy document that lists the possible ways to integrate land use into the WIP process. This list could include state actions, such as limiting new development on septic systems in rural areas, and local actions, such as recommended zoning in rural areas.
2. Have some recommended requirements that are quite easy to do, for example the counties should include in their Phase II WIPS a promise to link WIP efforts to their comprehensive plan re-writes when their comp plans come up for revision.

Question 3: I think local governments would find useful a document (maybe a white-paper) on the WIPs that details what the growth allocation element is and how to implement it into their planning efforts. Much of the WIPs really takes existing work of TMDL plans and moves it one step forward. The growth piece is the most new and different element they are tackling.

Brigid Kenney

Question 1: The portion of the WIP most relevant to the work of the Commission is the “accounting for growth” section. The preliminary schedule for developing offset policies and procedures for septic systems and land development is:

- 2011 Research and develop more detailed approaches for offsets. Evaluate the need for legislative and regulatory changes for the strategy. Obtain stakeholder and public comment. If needed, seek necessary authority to undertake research, the appointment of a task force, and/or authorization to implement elements of the offset procedures.
- 2012 Finalize the development of the offset policies and procedures.
- 2013 Initiate the implementation of the offset policies and procedures.

I would like to see the WIP Workgroup function as a stakeholder and be the conduit for comments from the Commission to those developing the detailed approach. Once the policies and procedures are final, the Workgroup might arrange a conference for local governments to discuss options for implementing them in their jurisdictions.

Question 2:

1. Make formal contact with the interagency group working on developing the policy and request a preliminary briefing.
2. Discuss ideas about improvements or alternatives, first within the Workgroup and then with the entire Commission.
3. Communicate the recommendations of the Commission to the interagency group

Question 3: No current ideas

Agenda Item #2: Group identification of priorities

The Workgroup identified the following X major points based on the above and then voted on prioritization as topics for Workgroup attention:

1. **7 Votes** Produce a white paper listing policy, strategies, tools, etc for local governments to utilize in developing and implementing the WIP (“Toolbox”). White Paper should identify existing tools and also direct agencies to develop identified new/innovative tools. White Paper would also direct local governments to targeted support (ex. data, process streamlining, report requirements, etc). Workgroup would not develop the toolbox, but rather would identify needed tools and lead agencies / groups for populating it.
2. **6 Votes** Recommend new programs / policies designed to limit pollution from development and/or maximize growth within offset generation capacity limits. Ask local governments to provide a list of offsets currently available (ex. fee-in-lieu, banks, etc)
3. **4 Votes** Make recommendations on ways to increase local government planning to improve water quality and quantity (i.e. pro-active vs re-active). Integrate WIP activities into Water Resources Elements and visa versa. Ensure that Water Resources Elements provide for clean water outcomes
4. **3 Votes** Educate local governments (including municipalities) on WIP requirements.

5. **2 Votes** Provide feedback on the draft Statewide Accounting For Growth element of the WIP once it is available for review.

6. **1 Vote** Recommend components of public outreach campaign on economic, social, and environmental value of a restored Chesapeake Bay and WIP's role in realizing.

7. **1 Vote** Develop specifics and recommend a Sustainable Growth Commission on-going forum (beyond 2011) on WIP Development and Implementation.

8. **0 Votes** Provide information on inhibitors to Smart Growth in designated areas.

9. **0 Votes** Provide input into Phase 2 WIP allocations and strategies.

10. **0 Votes** Be aware and avoid duplication of efforts of other existing groups.

11. **0 Votes** Make recommendations on how to share resources for WIP development and implementation at the local level.

12. **0 Votes** Make recommendations on how all sectors can contribute appropriately to meeting WIP requirements (i.e. sectors with more expensive BMPs should not be excluded, but rather we should identify means for them to provide support to other sectors with more cost effective BMPs)

Next Meeting

To be set soon for early June.

**Maryland Sustainable Growth Commission
Watershed Implementation Plan Workgroup**

**Meeting Minutes
June 23, 2011**

Present

Alan Girard
Amy Owsley
Candace Donoho
Jason Dubow
Jenny King
Jennifer Bevan-Dingle
Kim Hoxter
Dave Goshorn
Kurt Fuchs
Pat Langendfelder
John Rhoderick

Introductions

Participants introduced themselves.

Agenda

Alan Girard proposed a two-part agenda:

3. Review and discuss draft memo on WIP recommendations to Sustainable Growth Commission.
4. Discuss invitation to respond to Sustainable Growth Commission with comments on PlanMaryland.

Agenda Item #1: Discussion of draft memo from WIP Workgroup to Sustainable Growth Commission on “WIP Workgroup Progress Report and Recommendations”

- Alan Girard reviewed and summarized draft memo to be delivered and reported out to Sustainable Growth Commission at their July 25, 2011 meeting.
- Discussion followed on each of the four recommendations contained in the memo and suggested revisions. Alan Girard and Jenny King will work to make specific changes and send back out to the workgroup. General comments / revisions were as follows:
 1. Recommendation #1: In addition to recommending that the Sustainable Growth Commission (SGC) endorse the importance of the WIP process, the memo should also recommend a recognition of the relationship between the WIP and PlanMaryland and that the two documents should be more tightly coordinated.
 2. Recommendation #2: The workgroup had no general changes to this recommendation.
 3. Recommendation #3: The workgroup recommended that the first sentence of the last paragraph be rephrased to emphasize the state as the lead, in consultation with

the counties and municipalities, in developing the offset generation capacities and requirements. The workgroup also recommended that there be a more refined definition of “offset generation policies”.

4. Recommendation #4: There were a variety of text revisions which Alan Girard will incorporate.

Agenda Item #2: Comments on PlanMaryland

- The Workgroup decided to respond to the invitation by the Sustainable Growth Commission to comment on PlanMaryland.
- Candace Donoho and Dave Goshorn will work with Greg Bowen (Calvert County and member of Sustainable Growth Commission PlanMaryland Workgroup) to develop a short list of specific recommendations and forward them to Alan Girard by COB July 8.

Next Meeting

Next meeting was set for Monday, August 1, from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm at DNR headquarters in Annapolis.