

Minutes of the Second Impacts of Growth Subcommittee Meeting

The second Impacts of Growth subcommittee meeting was held on January 9, 2014 from 1 – 4 pm at the Chamber of Commerce in McHenry. In attendance were Bob Browning, Steve Green, Willie Lantz, Paul Weiler, Eric Robison, Rich Orr, Brian Greenberg and Deborah Carpenter.

The minutes were approved as submitted.

Speakers for upcoming meetings are as follows:

- February 13 – Jim Torrington & Reggie Breeding are confirmed. Dave Ritchie has yet to respond.
- March 13 – Jeff Broadwater & Craig Umbel are confirmed. Steve Sherrard has yet to respond.
- April 10 – Eric Null has yet to respond.

Discussion on draft purpose and goals ensued. Bob emphasized his desire to keep a positive connotation on the name of our subcommittee and noted that in past correspondence we have used the name Negative Impacts of Growth. He prefers to drop the 'Negative' and simply use the name 'Impacts of Growth'. No one objected to that change.

The group's draft purpose was then discussed. As submitted it read: *Ensure that industrial, commercial and residential growth is adequately controlled and regulated in order to strike a balance between development and environmental health.* Bob stated that he wasn't pleased with the draft because he felt it offered a negative tone. He stated that this is a 90 year old lake that is in good shape and we shouldn't lose sight of that. Paul suggested that the words 'controlled and regulated' be replaced with 'managed'. Brian suggested that the words controlled and regulated were a bit duplicative. He felt the words 'appropriately regulated' would be better, since he feels what we're really looking at are regulations and that they are appropriate, not that they are severe or permissive. Bob agreed with Brian's statement but felt that Paul's suggestion was more on point. Brian brought up the terms 'industrial, commercial and residential'. He feels that these three terms leave out some important items – public infrastructure & recreational/lake use, specifically. Adding the term 'public infrastructure' may encompass things like stormwater, roads, drainage, etc. which we do plan to look at, but are not necessarily denoted by those three terms. Rich commented that when we say 'to strike a balance between development and environmental health' that we may be implying that we will be looking at those more detailed items that Brian mentioned. Brian stated that those items don't necessarily have to be in the purpose as they may be better suited as objectives or goals. His point was really that since we mention rather particular things – industrial, commercial and residential – we should either be inclusive and add the others or take those three out and just say 'Ensure that growth is...'. Eric liked the idea of simplifying it to growth in general and picking up the details in the goals and objectives. Bob agreed that less is better. [On a side note Bob emphasized that the group needs to keep in mind that some issues, like stormwater, will overlap with the Water Quality subcommittee. Their recommendations may center around pollution; ours may center around construction.] Steve paraphrased Brian's comments saying that the purpose may be changed to 'Ensure that growth is adequately managed in order to strike a balance between development and environmental health'. Brian cautioned that by using the word 'growth' we seem to be singling out growth as the place from where impacts originate when the pre-existing built environment is also impacting the watershed. Steve suggested using '...former, present and future growth'. Paul cautioned that venturing in to the 'former growth' – the grandfathered conditions – will be something that will be harder to manage. Bob stated that for the most part, the best that we can do on pre-existing conditions may be to provide incentive programs. Brian asked if we could use the words 'existing impacts and future growth'. He cautioned that we need to ensure that all the

burden for lessening impacts to the watershed should not be entirely on the new developments and should be shared with existing home owners. Bob felt that concern needed to be addressed in the goals and/or objectives, because the purpose statement should be short and concise. Eric agreed with both Brian and Bob, in that yes, we should address Brian's concerns; however the purpose is not the appropriate place to do it. He stated that the purpose should be broad and general enough to encompass the goals and objectives that will come from it. Rich asked about perhaps including Brian's idea of enforcement by saying 'managed and enforced'. The group said that enforcement is a part of management, so that would not be necessary. Rich then asked if we could add to the statement '...a balance between development, environmental health and local economy'. Eric thought that was getting too specific and Brian thought development and local economy were so closely related so as to imply one when you say the other. Bob said we should once again go back to keeping it simple. Therefore the group decided (on a motion by Paul, second by Rich and a unanimous vote) that their purpose statement will be:

Purpose of Impacts of Growth Subcommittee: Ensure that growth is managed in order to strike a balance between development and environmental health.

Brian asked if there would be a place where we would talk about regulations. It would seem to him that it may fit into the conversation as an activity to review regulations as to whether they are appropriate and chime in to the Steering Committee with our recommendations in relation to them. Bob said we will keep that in mind and we will be looking at a lot of regulations. Steve said that when we look at each draft goal the first thing we will do is look at existing regulations.

Steve mentioned that dissenting opinions will come out of our subcommittee and that is expected. All opinions will be made available to the Steering Committee. Eric said he thought the purpose was for the Steering Committee to know where the consensus was but also to know if there was dissension and how it broke down. Brian asked if we should get a decision about who has dominion over subjects like stormwater and roads, whether that be the Water Quality or Growth subcommittee, to avoid duplication of effort. Bob stated that we should keep our recommendations on subjects that overlap focused on development and construction issues and then when the recommendations get to the Steering Committee they will sort them out.

The group decided to take a break from reviewing the draft goals to have an educational session with John Nelson. Debbie suggested we start with discussing the fact that what is recommended in the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) does not always end up in regulations. John stated that the Comp Plan compilation was over a 2 year process of development. We had a fairly steady group of citizens that participated in that timeframe and they were pretty supportive of the policies that were being fashioned for not only Deep Creek but for the county as a whole. One of the big things that was advocated was the clustering development issue and the Comp Plan recommends that clustering should become a part of the regulatory framework. That did not happen, because when it is time to incorporate those recommendations into the regulatory framework, another public process is conducted. At that time, a new group of citizens became involved. When policies become regulations citizens realize how exactly it will affect their properties, and opposition to those ideas is not unlikely. In the case of clustering that is what happened and instead of being a mandatory regulation, clustering is optional with incentives of additional density offered to the developer who chooses to cluster. Paul asked how clustering is defined. John answered that clustering is defined by trying to salvage 65% or more of a given tract of land and cluster the lots on the remaining portion. For instance, if you have a farm in an Agricultural Resource (AR) district and have 100 acres of land, you would get 33 lots. Clustering would conserve 65% of that farm for farming or some sort of open space and cluster those 33 lots into the remaining portion of the tract. Paul asked if that rule would allow high rises to be built. John answered that depends on the district that it falls in. If it is in AR, then no, that would not be allowed because the infrastructure is not in place to support that kind of

development. Paul said he was being facetious with that statement and trying to see if there was a limit to how dense a cluster can get. Can a cluster be anywhere from one dwelling to fifty dwellings? John stated that depends on the size of the parcel, which dictates the density allowed. In the AR district the density requirement is no more than one unit per three acres. Thus, in our example a 100 acre tract would be allowed 33 units. In Lake Residential 1 (LR1) the density requirement is 1 unit per acre. Rich said that in LR1 if you had a 100 acre tract you could have 100 units, but with clustering those units would be concentrated on 35 acres with 65 acres reserved for green space. John stated that was correct but in that kind of scenario the only way that would be allowed if the parcel was served by public sewer. Without public sewer you can't get that kind of density, and so because of that clustering was only really applicable to the AR and Rural Resource (RR) districts. The real intent of that policy was to keep those areas productive either as active farmland or as forest cover. The houses would then be located on smaller lots with a working farm or timber land rather than a checkerboard of 33 3-acre lots. Rich pointed out that clustering probably wouldn't be applicable in the Deep Creek watershed and John agreed. Rich stated that the county largely regulates itself in the rural areas because it's not easy to get perks, especially a larger number of them in a smaller area.

John then touched on the fact that the MD Sustainable Growth and Agricultural Preservation Act which mandated Tier designations will have the most dramatic effect on density in the County. That regulation stipulates that all Tier 4 areas, those dominated by agricultural and forest cover and without access or planned access to public sewer, will be prohibited from having any major subdivisions (more than 7 lots). Brian asked why wouldn't someone subdivide and then subdivide further under this regulation. John's answer was two-fold. (1) Some developers that were aware that this regulation was coming did subdivide prior to the deadline in order to do exactly what Brian has suggested. That deadline has passed. The statute very clearly states a date of record of the code. After that date any lot subdivided in a Tier 4 gets no more than 7 lots. If a developer got their preliminary plans approved by the Planning Commission prior to that date, those lots were grandfathered, and each of those lots can be further subdivided 7 times, depending on compliance with current density standards. After that date those lots and all others are considered the parent tract and must comply with the law. Very few developers took advantage of that opportunity simply because of the state of the economy at the time. (2) If you now subdivide, the number of development units is recorded with your plat and can therefore be tracked to assure compliance with this law. The intent of the law was environmental and largely focused on the health of the Chesapeake Bay. The idea is that septic systems contribute nutrients that are harmful to the Bay and the state wanted to put a law in place to limit them. However, it's turned out to also be a Smart Growth bill that limits development in rural areas and pushes it towards the more densely populated areas with public infrastructure. In response to a question by Rich about whether the county should have taken a stronger stand against that bill, John stated that Garrett County, our delegate, our senator and most rural jurisdictions did vociferously oppose this bill, but to no avail. Bob asked if you have public sewer can you do major subdivisions. John responded that if you have that infrastructure you are not going to be in a Tier 4 area. Tier 1 areas are those with existing public sewer. Tier 2 are areas currently designated in the County's Water & Sewer Master Plan as planned for sewer. At the time of Tier designation the County's Water & Sewer Plan was being developed, so no Tier 2 areas were able to be designated. When the Plan is adopted the Tier maps will be amended to include those planned areas as Tier 2. Most of the Deep Creek Watershed either has sewer (Tier 1) or is planned for sewer (will be Tier 2). There are some areas of the watershed that are Tier 4 because they are AR or RR (which are automatic Tier 4), but there is not much land area in the watershed under that designation. Tier 3 are areas that the county planned for low density residential growth. These would be areas similar to the Lake Residential 2 (LR2) classification. In those areas you can have more than 7 lots on septic, but it's a lot harder to get an approval. You have to get approval from MDE, have a public hearing, and other such mandatory requirements for approval.

Bob then asked about the Accounting for Growth regulations that MDE will be coming out with this year. Those regulations will require a person with a septic system to pay a fee to account for the pounds of nitrogen, phosphorous and sediment the system creates, or enter into a statewide trading market to account for them. That fee is assessed at the time of construction, not annually. MDE is not expected to have the draft regulations out until after this current legislative session. We don't think that it will be applied to our entire county as it is intended to decrease the amount of nutrients going to the Bay. It should only be applied in that portion of our County that is in the Bay watershed, but we won't know until the draft regulations are released.

Steve asked if John could expand on Chapter 4 of the Comp Plan in which it states that there is potential for 26,000 or 30,000 new lots in the watershed, but in reality that number is not going to be developable. There was some confusion about where those numbers came from and Brian referred to a section that talked about projected numbers being constrained, possibly by as much as half, by a lack of public sewer. John stated that it's important to remember that the projections made during the making of the Comp Plan, were made based on growth being seen at the time and under the assumption that growth would continue at that pace. Those were the boom years and that growth has obviously not continued. We see that in our permitting as it is 1/3 or less of what it was in those boom years. Rich asked if anyone would update those numbers. John stated that the Planning Office is required to submit an Annual Report to the Commissioners and the MD Dept of Planning. In 2010 we did a countywide re-calculation of growth projections, but we did not break it out by watershed like was done in the Comprehensive Plan. The countywide projected numbers were down in 2010 significantly, not only because of the slowing rate of growth but also because of the effects of some of the recommendations in the Comp Plan that were implemented. Specifically the AR and RR areas were expanded. Previously a lot of outlying areas had a Rural (R) designation with a 1 unit per acre density. Now many areas that used to be R are now AR or RR, both of which have a 1 unit per 3 acre density. Now with the restrictions introduced with the Tier bill, John predicts our next projections will be significantly lower than even the 2010 projections. Bob stated that though it would seem that no matter what size the tract is in AR and RR you can build a maximum of 7 lots but really depending on the size of parent tract you may get less because of density restrictions. John pointed out that in AR and RR districts there is an exception to the 1 unit per 3 acre density if the parent tract of land is 20 acres or less. If you have a tract of land in AR or RR that is, for example, 19.9 acres, you can create 1 acre lots instead of 3 acre lots. Bob stated that he thought that a septic wasn't allowed to be put on a 1 acre lot. John clarified that in the Deep Creek Watershed only the Health Dept has instituted a 60,000 square foot (~1.5 acre) minimum lot size for septic. Eric asked if there is a required 100 ft separation between well and septic, and John confirmed that is the requirement.

Brian asked for clarification on the Accounting for Growth regulations. He asked if the nutrient assessment will be on new development or existing development. Further, Brian questioned what the rationale was for setting an assumed rate of leaching of these nutrients, given that every site will be different. Also is there a proximity to water or drainage component to it that makes it less punitive as you move away from the bottom of the watershed? John began by answering the last question regarding proximity to water, by stating that the answer is no. The way we understand it is stakeholder groups have come up with the average pounds of nutrient (be it nitrogen, phosphorous or sediment) the septic for an average single family home leaches out per year. As an example, John thinks the average number for nitrogen was about 7.5 pounds of nitrogen leaked per year from the standard single family residence. The best available technology septic systems (BATs), now mandatory for all new development within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, should cut that number in half, bringing it to 3.75 pounds of nitrogen needing to be accounted for by the home owner. The proposed regulations would require the homeowner to pay a fee to account for each pound of nitrogen not accounted for by the BATs and the fee we've heard proposed is \$3500 per pound of nitrogen. So the homeowner will be asked to pay \$3500 x 3.75 or \$13,125 at the time of construction. That's just the nitrogen component and doesn't include assessments for phosphorous or sediment. There is also an option to enter the trading market instead of paying the fee. These

will be assessed at the time of construction only, but the end result is it will significantly increase the cost of construction. Steve asked if he was correct in assuming that the folks on the other side of the divide in our county (in the Bay watershed) are already falling under some of these regulations. John stated that those folks are required to install BAT septic systems for new construction, whereas the rest of the county doesn't have that requirement. Upon asking if that requirement has a retrofit standard John said he believed that the law requires any failing systems to be replaced with BAT. That is the extent of the retrofitting required. Bob asked if John knew the difference between the old ones and the BATs. John said his understanding is that the BAT is an aeration type of system. There is a lot of maintenance required to keep that air moving, and there is a rigorous maintenance schedule that has to be maintained for that system. So homeowners that put in that system have to budget for not only the initial costs but also the on-going maintenance of the system. Paul asked if a foul odor would be produced during the maintenance/aeration. John said he really didn't know that much about the system and those types of questions are probably best directed to Steve Sherrard in Environmental Health.

Steve asked with the different limiting factors, both natural and regulatory, assuming the economy picked up, how much development could potentially be seen in the Deep Creek watershed. The 2008 Comp Plan said 24,160. John clarified that there were two numbers in the Comp Plan – the projection of how many units would be built based upon the boom year rate of growth by 2020 and 2030 and the projection of maximum number of units based on current laws and limitations of the general topography. The latter is the number Steve is referring to. John said he cannot answer Steve's question in regard to the Deep Creek watershed only, because in 2010 we only did a countywide projection. We can do that and will probably seek to do that in the next Annual Report. Brian asked if it is a true statement that the Deep Creek watershed growth is approximately 40% of the county growth. That assessment is based on the Comp Plan numbers and John stated that he believes that not only are the projected growth numbers inflated but also the percentage of total county growth attributed to the watershed. The percentage of growth occurring in the Deep Creek watershed compared to the percentage of growth for the county as a whole is probably not what it used to be back when the market was booming. The percentage used to be almost as high as 60%. Now it is closer to 40%. Brian stated that presumably market saturation effects may be coming in to play as well.

Brian asked John to further clarify what he meant when he said that when it came time to implement the recommendations from the Comp Plan he ran into opposition. Certainly the subcommittee would not like to run in to the same complications with the recommendations they will be making. There were a number of policies that the Comp Plan advanced – like clustering, protecting the crestlines in Deep Creek watershed and architectural design criteria – that did make it in to regulatory documents but ended up being 'watered down' from its original intent. The people who supported the policies in the Comp Plan did not abandon the cause, but when it came time to put these policies into regulation, there was a greater majority in opposition to them. Bob stated that's a lesson for us, because the recommendations in the Watershed Management Plan will be recommendations much like the recommendations in the Comp Plan, and when it comes time for the County or DNR to try to implement them in a regulatory fashion a similar public hearing process will be held. The same thing could occur.

As to architectural design the intent in the Comp Plan policy was that specifically in the McHenry and Thayerville areas there would be a much more critical look at architectural design and building materials. The actual regulations merely sets limits on metal siding and some roof line standards for commercial structures. Brian asked if the original intent was more than just commercial and what was the reasoning for not including residential structures. Bob stated that most of the residences are in HOAs that have their own architectural standards within their deeds and covenants. Rich said that is fair to say except for the older lines of development along places like Marsh Hill Rd and Deep Creek Dr. John pointed out that at the time of the Comp Plan compilation there were a number of specific instances that people pointed at as examples, that brought

this issue to the forefront. The Plan came up with some ideas and it did make it in to the regulations in a lesser form. One reason why this particular idea got watered down is that in many cases it comes down to what is considered 'nice' is in the eye of the beholder.

Eric asked about tree canopy issues and how they were addressed in regulations. The tree canopy was part of the crestline protection policy. The original idea was that the owner on a ridgeline would have to maintain a certain number of trees in front of the structure to somewhat camouflage the structure against the skyline. The actual regulations ended up simply making sure the house is not silhouetted against the sky, so the owner would be required to place trees behind the house from the viewpoint of the lake. All the issues about aesthetics came out in the 2004 Deep Creek Watershed Economic Growth and Planning Analysis Study, and as a result the 2008 Comp Plan tried to take those issues into consideration. But then in 2010 when the Ordinances were updated to reflect those policies the aesthetic issues that were an issue, were not so much of an issue anymore and the regulations ended up being a watered down version of the Comp Plan recommendation. Rich noted that the final accepted regulation is what is reflected in Article 4 of the Deep Creek Watershed Zoning Ordinance. Eric noted that it would seem that the intent of keeping tree canopy was in the interest of aesthetics and not watershed health. Bob agreed that was an accurate statement.

Brian asked John if he could flag any gaps or oversights in the Comp Plan or if he feels reasonably satisfied with the completeness of the document. John said he'd almost have to go back to the 2004 study that did a good job of capturing citizens' opinions of problem areas in the watershed. He thinks there were some that the Board of County Commissioners at the time of the Plan didn't want to touch. John can't remember what those issues might have been. Rich asked if there was anything that hasn't happened during John's tenure that he would like to see happen after he retires. John said one issue that he thought would come up today but hadn't yet was the issue of gas drilling. When the update to the Deep Creek zoning regulations were drafted in 2010 the original draft had all drilling marked as not permitted in the watershed. This was early in the process of learning about drilling of Marcellus shale gases, but we did know that there was potential for surface spills related to transportation, handling and for other reasons. For that reason, ERM and office staff decided to recommend that drilling not be permitted in the watershed at all. The Planning Commission decided not to prohibit it but to invoke a 2000 foot buffer from the shoreline of the lake instead, which would apply to the drilling site only. Eric acknowledged that the 2000 foot buffer is actually a pretty good one compared to other states which usually set them at about 600 feet. When asked his personal opinion about what should be done, John stated that he supported the idea in the original draft to not allow it in the watershed. He still feels the same, because he sees no reason to chance any potential spills in the Deep Creek watershed. The impact would be potentially devastating, not just in to the environment but also considering the economic engine that the watershed is to the county. Rich stated he just recently was dealing with a customer well within the 2000 foot buffer that wanted to keep his mineral rights. John and Eric both stated that the state proposed BMPs (best management practices) wouldn't allow drilling on any lot that is not large enough or far enough away from other residences. Brian suggested that the concern is more that a company could set up outside of the buffer and drill horizontally to the customers property. Eric and John said that could only happen if the company purchased contiguous leases from the drill site to the customer's property. Steve asked for clarification: is it 2000 feet from the lake and not any tributaries to the lake? John said that is correct. It is from the high water elevation of the lake, 2462. Eric asked if the lake is classified for drinking water and the answer was no. If it were Eric said there are additional regulations that could be applied for setbacks from tributaries. Bob thought it pertinent to mention that if you look at the Table of Uses in the Deep Creek Watershed Zoning Ordinance there are a lot of industrial uses allowed in the watershed. For example, you can have a strip mine. John clarified that mining and drilling had always been permitted in the watershed, prior to the advent of the knowledge of existence Marcellus shale drilling potential. It was recommended in 2010 to make it not permitted in the watershed but the Planning Commission chose instead to amend the Ordinance to add the 2000 foot setback condition. John noted that

since there are zoning protections in this watershed he thinks it would be beneficial to suggest making drilling not permitted in the watershed. If drilling is permitted in MD and the county, companies would still be able to access the gas under the watershed; however, why run the risk of allowing the bore hole and any associated spills within the watershed when zoning could be used to prevent it.

The next issue the group asked John related to wind farms in the watershed, specifically about the proposed amendment to allow a wind farm with certain conditions. Eric asked if it was correct to say that under current regulations wind farms are not allowed in the watershed. John said that is correct. An agricultural or residential turbine is permitted by Special Exception but an industrial turbine connected to the grid is not permitted at all. The current request is to amend the ordinance with conditions that will allow the installation for turbines in RR outside of a 20,000 foot buffer from the shoreline of the lake and with a 200 ft height restriction. Rich suggested that perhaps our recommendation should be to continue the not permitted status of industrial wind turbines in the watershed. Eric suggested that a similar recommendation should be made to prohibit natural gas drilling or any associative items in the watershed.

Steve asked if John could foresee any other industrial impacts that the group might want to consider. John said it's difficult to foretell what technology will bring. The only thing he could think of is solar power. Presumably there could be huge fields of solar panels, but its ability to be sustained in Garrett County is questionable. Eric asked about electrical generation in general aside from the drilling. For example, could natural gas generators be permitted? John directed the group to category 10 on page 31 of the ordinance that refers to electric power generating plants or substations. The regulations found there make such facilities Special Exception uses across all zoning categories.

John said the other largely aesthetic issue is signage. Bob said he really didn't think that was in the purview of this group. Personally, though, he feels the zoning ordinance regulations for signage are antiquated. John feels they are adequate. Some discussion ensued about signage. This is a topic more appropriate for discussion during the Comp Plan and subsequent Deep Creek Watershed Zoning Ordinance update. The group thanked John for his willingness to speak with the group and wished him well on his pending retirement.

The group then started a discussion on draft goal #1 which as submitted read: *Protect, improve and maintain existing stormwater infrastructure that results from both existing developments and transportation features to decrease pollution from nonpoint sources and ensure healthy watershed conditions. Explore incentive programs to improve the performance of existing and future stormwater systems.* Paul called for less words. Words like nonpoint and transportation features shouldn't be put in there if they are not generally understood. Paul suggested using the word infrastructure instead of transportation features. Brian agreed with that and further suggested that the last sentence be deleted since they will be covered in the objectives and strategies. Paul asked if we are limiting ourselves by saying 'stormwater infrastructure' or is that the focus of that goal. Should we include septic? It was clarified that this goal is to revolve around stormwater and impervious surface issues, while another goal was intended to address issues associated with septic.

Steve noted that when Jim Torrington spoke to the Steering Committee it was clear that they really didn't have problems with stormwater from new development as current regulations are adequate to take care of that. The problems are more with developments that occurred prior to regulations. In our proposed goal we speak of existing stormwater infrastructure, but we don't speak of places that do not have any infrastructure in place currently. An example would be Roman Nose where the only stormwater control mechanisms are ditches. Rich suggested that perhaps our objective with those types of situations would be to suggest working with HOAs or the homeowners if an HOA does not exist to help them find a more environmentally friendly method of stormwater control. Bob suggested we might want to suggest bonding or getting grants to address those types

of old developments. Steve said his point really was to ask if the goal as currently stated covers these types of issues that we plan to address in our objectives. Bob thought it did because it says 'protect, IMPROVE and maintain existing stormwater....'. Eric asked why we wouldn't change those three words to manage, and Bob agreed that would probably be more concise and accurately reflect the intent. He did highlight that as currently stated it focuses on existing stormwater and perhaps it should say existing and proposed. Brian asked if we should include references to both the guiding regulatory framework and incentives. Steve noted that looking at the regulations and considering incentive programs are activities that we are conducting but not appropriate in a goal. Eric added that he thinks those activities are implied in the word managed. Brian suggested that the words development and infrastructure are a bit redundant. Eric then proposed we drop 'development' and simply say 'existing and proposed infrastructure'. He then asked whether it's necessary to specify non-point. Bob stated that we seem to be getting in to some redundancy issues. Paul suggested 'manage existing stormwater infrastructure that results from both existing and future developments to decrease pollution and ensure healthy watershed conditions'. Brian suggested that we still had some repetition in that proposal and suggested saying 'from existing and proposed infrastructure' instead of 'from existing and future developments', because infrastructure was a broader term. Paul stated that to him the term development was the broader term, because in his view it encompasses housing, business, etc and the infrastructure is that which makes that development possible. Brian agreed with that assessment, but did note that we have 'existing and proposed' in the statement twice and we could remove one. Therefore the group decided (on a motion by Paul, second by Brian and a unanimous vote) that their draft goal #1 will be:

Draft Goal #1: Manage stormwater infrastructure that results from both existing and proposed development to decrease pollution and ensure healthy watershed conditions.

The group then started a discussion on draft goal #2 which as submitted read: *Protect the watershed from the adverse effects of impaired on-site sewage disposal systems and ensure adequate capacity of public systems.* Steve stated that this goal as stated does not seem to address leakages from the public system. Should we address infrastructure concerns? Rich suggested we add a statement about management of the systems. Therefore the group decided (on a motion by Eric, second by Brian and a unanimous vote) that their draft goal #2 will be:

Protect the watershed from the adverse effects of impaired on-site sewage disposal systems and ensure adequate capacity and management of public systems.

The group then started a discussion on draft goal #3 which as submitted read: *Promote land use policies that value environmental and economic sustainability.* Brian asked about adding land and lake use policies. It was decided that idea would be more appropriate in goal #4. Paul asked if we could get rid of the word value. He recommended using the word manage. Brian stated that you don't really manage sustainability. You manage to ensure sustainability. Paul then suggested using the word ensure. Therefore the group decided (on a motion by Paul, second by Steve and a unanimous vote) that their draft goal #3 will be:

Promote land use policies that ensure environmental and economic sustainability.

The group then started a discussion on draft goal #4 which as submitted read: *Preserve and enhance the quality of recreational opportunities while ensuring those opportunities are in harmony with environmental stewardship.* The group asked Brian if the way this was stated brought in to light his concerns regarding lake uses and Brian felt it did. Therefore the group decided (on a motion by Eric, second by Bob and a unanimous vote) that their draft goal #4 will be:

Preserve and enhance the quality of recreational opportunities while ensuring those opportunities are in harmony with environmental stewardship.

Debbie then discussed that the next steps will be for the group to start thinking about objectives that will pertain to these goals. Specifically between now and the next meeting the group needs to think start generating ideas for objectives relating to land use based on the discussion with John today. She asked what the group thought she could provide to help them to accomplish this task. The group suggested cleaning up the goals list and providing the minutes from today. It was suggested that some studies and documents would be useful; however, Debbie cautioned that it may be a lot of documentation. It was decided that it may be most useful for Debbie to conduct a data mining activity that pulls out things that most pertinent to the group.

The meeting adjourned at about 4:00.

DRAFT