

Final - Approved December 6, 2013

Minutes of the DEEP CREEK Lake Watershed Management Plan Steering Committee (SC)  
November 4, 2013

Held at the Garrett County Health Department, Room 107  
1025 Memorial Drive, Oakland, MD, 21550

Attendance:

David Myerberg, Chair  
Steve Green,  
Lulu Gonella,  
Bob Browning,  
Bob Hoffmann and  
Willie Lantz.

Absent:

John Forman,  
Pete Versteegen.

Staff:

Catherine Shanks of MD DNR,  
Deborah Carpenter of Garrett County  
Mike Bilek of the Hughes Center for Agro-Ecology, U. of M.

Welcome, Introductory Remarks and the approval of the September 11, 2013, minutes

Chair David Myerberg called the meeting to order at noon, and noted that there are six SC members in attendance. He asked if there were any members of the public who did not know the members of the SC, and seeing none, he decided to dispense with the introductions. He added that Mr. Forman, who represents forestry on the SC, could not be present today and has emailed his proxy to David for approval of the minutes.

Dr. Myerberg announced that Brookfield Power has withdrawn from participation on the SC. Their concern is that there may be a potential conflict of interest in serving the needs of the committee, as there is a license agreement in place to which Brookfield must adhere to and comply with. From David's perspective this is unfortunate. The signers of the Memorandum of Understanding (DNR and Garrett County) are aware of this and as of this moment they do not wish to add anyone to the SC to replace Brookfield. The original number of members for the SC, according to the MOU was between 7 and 9, so the number of the group is now 8 and the quorum is still 5. David added "I hope personally that the SC chooses to have a subcommittee on the topic of water levels and dam releases and that Brookfield may serve on that subcommittee".

David added that SC vice chair Pete Versteegen was hospitalized about 10 – 12 days ago for surgery and he is doing extremely well. We hope to have him back soon. On a lighter note, David added that Pete did not ask to participate today by phone. The SC wishes him well.

David continued by asking if everyone has a copy of the minutes from the September 11 meeting. The draft minutes were posted on the DNR website. Mike Bilek noted a few changes from the posted draft minutes. The first change is from Pete Versteegen and is related to the capability of the DCL Answers webpage that Pete maintains. A sentence has been removed.

Also, Bob Hoffmann's name appeared incorrectly, and was changed, as well as a correction to some of the information provided by Bob during the introduction. There were no other changes.

David asked if there were any other changes. **Seeing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes, motioned by Bob Browning with a second by Bob Hoffmann. The motion passed unanimously.** The approved minutes will be posted on the DNR webpage at <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/deepcreekwatershedplan/>.

#### Recap of the October 5, 2013, Public Meeting

David Myerberg provided the following update for the record. On Saturday October 5<sup>th</sup>, we had a public meeting to hear the watershed issues that members of the public thought this committee should address. Staff and all members of the SC attended. The Executive Committee of the SC as well as the SC members publicized the meeting in a variety of ways at least three weeks before the meeting. At least 28 citizens attended. After a brief introduction, the audience split into four groups. Over the next 90 minutes, the groups were led by members of the SC and discussed and prioritized the issues facing Deep Creek Lake. The list of issues and the detailed group summaries can be found on the DNR website at <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/deepcreekwatershedplan/>.

Additional comments were requested in writing on the following topics. The public also had the opportunity to submit comments over the next month through the DNR web page.

- Water quality,
- Agriculture,
- Lake levels,
- Quality of recreation,
- Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV)
- Economic impacts of remediation,
- Growth, industrialization and commercialization,
- Sediment and erosion,
- Lack of public information
- Other issues

The SC's Executive Committee synthesized these comments along with the comments on the issues as raised by SC and discussed at the 9-11-13 meeting. The product of this synthesis will form the basis for the SC discussion later in this meeting on whether these issues should be those we deal with and what should be the problem statements related to these issues that we address later in the plan. David asked if anyone had anything else to add to this summary of the public meeting. Hearing no additions, he moved to the next part of the agenda.

#### Steering Committee Education

David stated that education is next on the agenda. The thinking behind this part of the agenda is that the members of the SC come from a variety of backgrounds. Each of us have a particular area of interest when it comes to the lake and watershed, but none of us are watershed experts. There are many aspects to watershed management that we need to learn. The SC's Executive Committee proposed areas we need to learn about before we can best piece together the watershed management plan. One of the areas that most of the group agreed upon is the area of agriculture in Garrett County. In some watersheds, agriculture produces a lot of nutrients that finds its way into the water and we need to know something about this subject in Garrett County. Willie Lantz, a member of the SC, represents agriculture on the SC. Willie is working with the

University of Maryland as an agricultural extension agent. He grew up on a dairy farm and currently farms 100 acres south of Oakland. He recently served on the County's Comprehensive Plan development process working on land use issues. He has spent considerable time preparing a presentation for the SC and the public on agriculture in the DCL watershed and Garrett County.

Willie began by indicating that he really appreciated the opportunity to present this information today, the state of agriculture in Garrett County and in the DCL watershed. The U of M Extension mission is to have an office in every county and to take the message to the county residents. Over the years the message has grown to now include natural resources planning as well as Sea Grant, which deals with water issues.

Willie spoke from a power point presentation which can be found at the DNR website at <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/deepcreekwatershedplan/>. Following is a brief highlight of the topics that Willie covered: Facts about agriculture: 23% of Garrett County is in agriculture and the largest agriculture use is dairy cattle, or about 3800 cows, in addition to beef cattle. Garrett County farms 7 to 8 thousand acres of corn, as well as oats, soybeans, and hay. In order to analyze DCL watershed specifically, Debbie Carpenter extracted watershed specific info using Maryland Department of Planning's 2010 Land Use data (see map). There are very few dairy cow farms within the DCL watershed. The map shows the agriculture parcels with some close to the lake. Well-managed agriculture uses are one of the better land uses that can be found in any watershed. *(Note to reader: the URL links at the bottom of several of the slides link to the source document.)* The Maryland Nutrient Management Law (NM) was discussed in detail (slide 6). Every farmer must have a nutrient management plan regardless of whether they are in or out of the Chesapeake Bay watershed (slide 9). The farmer, not the landowner, must do the plan. The plan is confidential. Some changes in NM were made recently (slide 13). AFO's (animal feeding operations) are discussed on slide 15. The Urban Nutrient Management slide (slide 16) discusses lawn care and the law change of 2011. Lawn fertilizer accounts for 44% of fertilizer sold in Maryland. The Garrett Soil Conservation District (SCD) is discussed on slide 17, and the Maryland Agriculture Cost Share program (MACS) on slide 21. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) is discussed on Slide 25, and Ag Land Preservation on Slide 26. The presentation concluded with several 'before and after' photos of best management practices (BMP's). Cheryl DeBerry provided the agriculture facts brochure.

Willie asked if there were any questions from the SC. Bob Hoffmann asked if fertilizer and manure are the two key things that deserve the focus to make sure they don't get into the streams and lake. Willie responded that the answer is yes. Pretty much everything in the presentation focused on these. Also, nutrient management is state law. However it is important to note that putting the Best Management Practices in place is voluntary. NRCS and the SCD cannot force a farmer to put some of these practices in place.

Catherine Shanks asked if any kind of assessment has been done for opportunities for stream buffer plantings for stream stabilization and is this something to which the SC could contribute. Willie responded yes, it would be an opportunity and probably needed. He gave examples of at least one project of that type that had been implemented in the county. The assessment would be good and could have a positive impact.

Steve Green asked how long farmers have been using commercial fertilizer as opposed to manure. Willie replied that since the 1930's or 40's farmers have been using commercial fertilizer. In the 70's more variety of fertilizer became available and as modern fertilizer

evolved, people began using more and more alternatives. The trend now is to manage the use of fertilizer. The Nutrient Management program takes a look at the use of fertilizer. Both the NM program and economics (the cost of fertilizer) contribute to the more limited use of fertilizer in the county.

Bob Hoffmann asked Willie if, from a regulatory standpoint, the State of Maryland regulates agriculture more or less than other states. Willie replied that Maryland is more regulatory. Maryland enacted Nutrient Management regulations in 2001. None of the other states in the Chesapeake Bay watershed have this level of planning regulation that applies to the small farmer the way Maryland does. Maryland has good people who are well respected throughout the agricultural community throughout the country because of the NM program. Maryland is doing a good job with this, thanks to science-based decisions. Seeing no other questions, Dr. Myerberg added that any other questions for Mr. Lantz could be posted on the DNR webpage.

Continuing on the idea of education, David discussed the Education table handout and asked the SC what other education topics were needed. (*Note to reader: The document is available on the DNR webpage at <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/deepcreekwatershedplan/>.)* The Executive Committee created the table but it is still an open topic. The footnote indicates that water quality, recreation and fisheries topics will be handled by assembling handout materials but asked if they should be presentations. David indicated there would be a vote at the end of this discussion to accept this. A question about where the discussion on lake levels would occur was raised, and David responded it would be during the presentations on sediments. A second question was raised about septic, and that there is a different set of rules for the part of the county on the other side of the divide. David replied that he hoped all of that would be covered during the next session on growth and development. A third comment was that DNR's John Wilson, who convenes the ad hoc Water Quality committee, is very knowledgeable when it comes to that topic of water quality and recommended that the entire SC would benefit if he would be willing to address the group. David replied that a packet of info, summarized by John Wilson, would likely satisfy the need since much of this information has been presented over the years. A request was made that the information, as well as sources and authors, be communicated to the recipients. The lead-time for getting the information to the SC members for the November meeting was sufficient. David offered that we have not made any decisions about the presenters, and that who presents is also open for discussion. Catherine Shanks added that we would look for the speakers who have the best local knowledge about the topic. The experience with John Wilson's Water Quality group has been excellent. **A motion to accept the Education table was made by Lulu Gonella, and seconded by Bob Browning and passed unanimously.** David reminded the group that suggestions for presentations are still welcomed.

#### Process: Getting from the issues to the product

David introduced Catherine Shanks and Mike Bilek for the next part of the agenda to discuss moving from the issues to the Problem Statements to the goals and an actionable plan. David indicated that staff has framed the process as one way to look at it. However, it is up to the SC to determine the final issues to vote upon, and to come up with the final iterations of the Problem Statements, goals, and so forth. The SC will vote at the conclusion of this session on these issues, as well as if we want to use sub committees to address these problem statements and come up with actionable recommendations to bring back to the full SC.

Catherine began by referring to documents from her Context and Framework September presentation. (Note to reader: refer to Section A of 9-11-13 as well as a slide on definitions from Pete Versteegen's presentation meeting handout which can be found at <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/deepcreekwatershedplan/>. For the next discussion look at the working document to be found on the DNR webpage under [http://www.dnr.state.md.us/ccs/pdfs/dchwmp/110413\\_Issues-to-Goals-Working-Doc.pdf](http://www.dnr.state.md.us/ccs/pdfs/dchwmp/110413_Issues-to-Goals-Working-Doc.pdf) )

Catherine continued that we had a lot of input on the issues, from the SC, from the public meeting and from submissions on the DNR website. We compiled what we heard about the issues into Problem Statements. The compilation was sent to the SC for their review about a week ago. We are looking for your feedback and agreement on the problem statements first. The list of Problem Statements follows:

- **Lake levels:** Catherine listed the three items under that topic. Discussion followed. It was suggested that a line be added about Brookfield, specifically that they depend on the lake for the generation of electricity. Catherine suggested that we add a statement that any changes in lake levels could impact Brookfield's profitability. Bob Hoffmann asked where in those three statements does it say that in dry years lake residents are worried about impacts on their recreation? Catherine replied that aspects like boating and swimming are included in statement 1 under this topic. Lulu asked about the scope of the area that we are to cover with the plan, and wondered if the SC should be considering economies outside of the watershed. Catherine replied that this is up to the SC, and to illustrate, took the presentation to the next slide to look at the concept that goals would be set by the SC to address each element of concern for each of the problem statements.
- **Water Quality:** David asked for and received agreement on this one.
- **Residential, industrial and commercial growth:** Catherine read the statement. A question about wellhead protection was raised and answered. Agreement followed.
- **SAV:** Agreement was indicated.
- **Erosion and sedimentation:** Development was not included in the sediment and erosion problem statement and should be; also wave erosion should be modified to include weather/wind. Sedimentation from movement throughout the lake as well as from unstable stream channels, shoreline erosion, and impervious surfaces should be added.
- **Accountability, agency coordination and lake management responsibility:** This was not identified by the SC but rather from the public. Agreement was indicated.
- **Recreation:** The comment about the bass fishery may be overstated. Catherine will keep it in but will check with staff experts at DNR. Boat noise was another example of leaving comments in the problem statement to assure the public that their comments were heard and became part of the record.
- **Public understanding:** A suggestion was made to better develop the points of public access to the lake. This issue might be better placed under the recreation category.

David interjected at this point that it would be appropriate to vote on these problem statements as stated and with the additions discussed. This does not limit adding other issues in the future. **A motion to accept these Problem Statements based on what we've just discussed and to use this as a planning document was made by Bob Browning and seconded by Bob Hoffmann and unanimously passed.**

After a five-minute break, Catherine continued the discussion of moving from problem statements to goals. Many of the problem statements are not written in an actionable way and there is some duplication. Referring back to the draft example, she focused the presentation on

Goal #3, Water Quality. Goal #3 includes issues that can be covered in more than one goal.

(Note to reader: See the slide for the PERT Chart at [http://www.dnr.state.md.us/ccs/pdfs/dclwmp/110413\\_Issues-to-Goals-Presentation.pdf](http://www.dnr.state.md.us/ccs/pdfs/dclwmp/110413_Issues-to-Goals-Presentation.pdf).) The Executive Committee, in planning for this meeting felt this approach made sense. Again, this is a draft for the consideration of the SC.

Goal 3 was shown and described as the example of how one goal can lead to six or more objectives. A discussion ensued. Catherine explained that refining objectives and strategies would be the kind of work that the subcommittee would do. David added that different subcommittees could both come up with similar objectives.

David asked “How do you (assign topics to) the subcommittees?”. Are they based on the goals or Problem Statements, or on something else? Bob Hoffmann added that there needs to be agreement on the goals in order to go forward. A subcommittee would need to be working on topics beyond the issues. David suggested looking again at the PERT chart pages. The SC has voted on the problem statements, and now needs to look at the goals. Are there additional goals to be added? Another lengthy discussion ensued involving the extent of the area to be considered and whether the SC should be looking at concerns affected by lake releases outside the watershed. Catherine added that issues outside of the watershed cannot be ignored. The “Influence Area” would be the downstream users, to include fisheries, Brookfield Power and whitewater recreation. Catherine reiterated that the goals etc. must be actionable. One comment SC member commented that using good hard data and developing a water budget is one way. The group agreed that there is so much already to cover, but water levels should be addressed. David added that water levels could also be objectives under a goal or several goals. A goal could be to determine the way to allocate the water of DCL. This relates back to the water budget and could be a plan by itself. Other comments included where restoration could occur or dredging placed. Discussion continued around whether to develop the subcommittees around problem statements or goals.

David was asked by Lulu how many subcommittees might there be. David’s vision, (his alone he reminded the group as he’s only one member of the committee) may be to have one subcommittee to deal with water levels, water budgeting, allocating of resources, and to be comprised of knowledgeable experts several of whom were named, to look at the issues and make recommendations. If we align subcommittees around the goals, we will have a subcommittee that only deals with water levels. The reporting back process would have to be very strong, to avoid duplication of efforts. Also majority and minority opinions could come from the subcommittees, and it would be the work of the SC to sort out the work of the subcommittees. A question arose, again, about how many subcommittees are envisioned? “...Not sure” was the answer. If we organize around goals, there might be five or six subcommittees. Bob Browning would be interested in serving on most of them (in order) to be part of the decision making process, but knows it is not possible. He still wants to know what is going on in each subcommittee. David reiterated that we can set up the structure however we want.

Steve Green suggested that we think about making it more linear to duplicate work. We can define water quality to include SAV & sediment and erosion and that will simplify the overlap problem. We can then write the goals from the problem statements. David clarified that in Steve’s model, the subcommittees would be based on the problem statements. Willie agreed with Steve, that this would help to avoid the duplication. David echoed that subcommittees

would propose goals from each problem statement. We can direct the subcommittees to either define the goals themselves, or specify the goals to be addressed. The subcommittees will report back to the SC.

To clarify, Catherine suggested the four subcommittee categories:

- Lake Levels
- Water Quality (to include sediment and erosion and SAV)
- Growth
- Accountability, agency coordination and public understanding.

Is there one needed on recreation? Deb clarified the definitions of Growth and Accountability, quoting from the Staff Report document: “Negative Impacts of Growth: to address concerns that uncontrolled industrial, commercial and residential development will adversely impact water quality, increase traffic, degrade roads and impair the aesthetic beauty of the lake and watershed. Specifically concerns involve increased impervious cover, increase in pollution from stormwater runoff, impacts from septic systems, wastewater treatment capacity and gas extraction development and reduction in tree canopy from clearing.” “Accountability: to address the concern that there is a lack of understanding, clarity and accountability regarding who/what agency is responsible for different management actions on and around the lake and in the watershed; to address concerns that agencies are not working together in a coordinated fashion and a localized management authority is needed; to address concerns that there is a lack of access to information on the lake governance as well as information on the watershed and the lake.”

David asked if water quality, including sediment and erosion and SAV takes on too much? Steve answered that they do fit together. In addition, one could make a case that lake levels also impact sediment. Bob Hoffmann added that this goes back to making sure we keep each other informed, and the need for occasional briefings from the subcommittees to the larger SC.

Again, Lulu asked for David’s vision of the subcommittees’ work product. His idea is for subcommittees to develop goals, objectives and strategies. Catherine stated that subcommittees would review the background information available on the topic, develop goals, objectives, and strategies, and then prioritize them, either long term or short term.

A question remains; do we add recreation as a separate subcommittees? One possibility is to include recreation as an objective under each subcommittees. Steve replied that there are nominal conflicts under recreation.

As of now, we have four subcommittees. Bob Browning said the first two are fine; the last two need some refinement. Catherine clarified what some of the strategies and objectives could be. Bob Browning continued his concern about growth. What does that include? The county has a comprehensive plan and that should be incorporated in the background considered by this subcommittees. Regarding the wording, would stresses affecting the watershed be a better way to state growth? The concerns are not with growth but with what the topic says, all the things that growth can bring. So do we need a subcommittees or just a report from Garrett County Planning & Land Development? For example, here is the reality, here is what you must do in order to have growth. David thinks we need a report. Deb states that whatever comes out of this will help with the next comp plan, and zoning ordinances. In addition, there will be a presentation next month on land use. Septics may require a separate presentation since it is

complicated. David states that we probably do need a subcommittees on the topic of growth. The recommendation was to try this and see where it goes.

Bob Hoffmann talking about the accountability issue: We could think about the way things are now, the current state, and develop SC recommendations to be the desired, improved state... are the agencies not working together. Then, perhaps, recommend ways to make it work better. Also, what is the entity that will have the responsibility to implement or execute the DCLWMP? This could be the focus of a recommendation. Willie agreed with Bob Hoffmann's comments, and asked when do we start this subcommittee process and what is the time frame.

David replied "soon." We don't have a lot of time and there is a lot of work to be done, we'll keep up and coordinate between them to limit duplication. As to recreation needs and conflicts, allow Steve to think about this. Steve replied that perhaps the health of the lake watershed is the way to state it. While it seems simplistic, there are still the lake management regulations to consider. David replied that they could be addressed under the accountability subcommittee and added that we should continue to think about it. If we need to add it, we can, but it cross cuts everything.

The SC agreed to have four subcommittees:

- Lake Levels,
- Water quality to include sediment and erosion and SAV,
- Growth as defined in the problem statement topic, and
- Accountability, also as defined in the problem statement topic areas similarly named to include public understanding.

The SC discussed how to populate the subcommittees. SC members need to be on the subcommittees. Subcommittees are not public meetings, however, they can be, but not necessary since no quorum of appointed SC members will serve on any one subcommittee. David asked which SC member is willing to serve on each subcommittee. Bob and Bob are willing to serve on Lake Levels; Bob Browning, Steve and Willie will serve on Water Quality; Accountability will be David and Lulu; and Growth stressors will be again Bob and Bob. We will ask John Forman and Pete Versteegen on what committee they can serve.

Executive Committee will send something out in a couple of weeks regarding forming these subcommittees. David will need suggestions as to who should serve on these subcommittees, from the SC, the staff and the public. The first meeting of subcommittees should be in early December.

**David asked for a motion for the four subjects of the subcommittees based on the problem statements, as we have just discussed. Willie made the motion and Lulu seconded it. David asked for any further discussion, then stated "Motion and second, and we have subcommittees"** and he thanked the SC for their work, stating, "it has been very productive."

#### Updates

Next on the agenda are the Updates. David asked Debbie Carpenter to provide, for the record, the dates and time for the upcoming SC meetings. The meetings are scheduled for the first Monday of each month, from noon until 3 pm in Room 107 of the Garrett County Health Department, 1025 Memorial Drive in Oakland, 21550. The next seven dates are December 2, 2013, January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014, February 3<sup>rd</sup>, March 3<sup>rd</sup>, April 7<sup>th</sup>, May 5<sup>th</sup> and June 2<sup>nd</sup>. Next, David



reminded the members of the SC to keep their various constituent groups informed, to remind them to make use of the Steering Committee webpage that DNR maintains at <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/deepcreekwatershedplan/> and to sign up for the email alerts that DNR can send to people who are interested. The website update from Catherine Shanks was essentially the information that David had just shared about the email alerts. David asked for any other updates from the SC and there were none.

### Public Comment

The next part of the meeting is the public comment. While the sign up sheet was being circulated, a member of the audience asked if the sub-committee meetings were going to be open to the public. The issue was not resolved during the discussion, since the comment was made that they can be open but do not have to be open. David asked for opinions, and a SC member mentioned that they need to be open to the public. A further question from the SC had to do with membership on the subcommittees, and if members were going to be officially appointed. If meetings are open to the public, then they are covered by the public meetings act, we want input from people in attendance and we should have a public comment period similar to the SC's at the end of the meetings. Could meetings possibly take place by phone? Again, Catherine reiterated since there is not a quorum, the meetings are not subject to the open meetings law, so we have latitude as to how we hold the meetings. Conference call meetings would be OK, but difficult. These details would be up to the members of the individual sub-committees. The greater SC would not mandate anything. We would also need to find meeting space. David asked: "Is it the pleasure of the group to decide now, or wait till the first meeting of the subcommittee and decide?" Bob Browning replied that the public needs to be involved and we should follow the same format that we do here (at the SC meetings). We can publicize it, people can come and listen and we can allow them to speak at the end, etc. This comment can be taken in the form of a motion. Steve Green seconded it. Further comments included Willie mentioning that if conference calls were still an option, the public could call in. There is a free conference number that the public could use. We do not want to limit the ability of using a conference call option. Can we wait to see how this works out before we have a motion that binds us? There are still a lot of unknowns. David suggested we keep the issue under advisement, but restated that the sentiment of the group is to have as much public participation in the process as possible, but we don't want to limit the sub-committee's ability to meet and do business. The motion was withdrawn with no further comments or discussion.

Paul Durham, the next speaker, wanted to springboard off David Myerberg's comment regarding fostering the public participation, and Bob Hoffmann's comments earlier. He stated that there has been a common theme for these meetings related to the lack of information, lack of awareness, lack of access. This SC can start a new culture and ask "is the public aware of what we're going to be discussing?" He has a standing request to receive advance copies of materials the SC will discuss at the meetings; however, these documents have not been provided in advance. He further stated that a need for broader consensus on the goals from stakeholders that goes beyond this group. Many people out there have a financial stake in what is being discussed by the SC. He recommended making it a point of business at the next meeting to publicly announce meetings and share the documents. He also recommended to assemble and publish the flipchart notes from the public meeting so the participants can see that their comments were recorded and considered.

Eric Robison echoed some of what Paul said regarding public participation. To a degree, there has been public participation. However, today, he could not read the screen or follow anything that was said. He had no idea what the SC had been talking about since he did not have a copy of the documents being discussed. To have a comment at the end based on what he could not hear is frustrating. Based on the work he does as president of Citizen Shale, as co founder of Save Western Maryland, and now on the Marcellus Shale advisory committee and based on the work he does involving natural gas, he'd like to participate on the subcommittees but doesn't want to come to a sub-committee meeting and wait around for the opportunity to speak for just two minutes. So, from his perspective, this is his last meeting unless there is some change.

Lulu Gonella responded that the public serving on the subcommittee as members would be full members. David further clarified the commenter's misconception. Mr. Robison also asked how to sign up for the subcommittees' work and David and Lulu again clarified that the SC had just decided to convene the subcommittees and the information will be coming out shortly to solicit participation from people like him. David mentioned the call for resumes would be coming soon.

Barbara Beelar spoke on the same theme. She stated that the SC wants people involved, but they only get two minutes at the end of the three-hour meetings. Her concern is about the people who are in the watershed but not 'lake people'. Of the outreach done for the public meeting there were only 2 or 3 or 4 who were non-lake people. The public outreach effort is not sufficient. Friends of DCL is still waiting for the results of the October public meetings, because they see it as their responsibility to communicate what happened at that meeting to their constituents. The Deep Creek Lake Watershed Management Plan Steering Committee outreach component is not yet effective.

David responded , that working documents are for the SC. There were documents that the SC got prior to this meeting. Now after the discussions and changes from today's meeting, the documents will be on the DNR website. This will show the entire process that the SC went through.

As a final comment, Paul Durham interjected that while you, the SC, are not obligated to share this information ahead of time, you may want to consider doing this anyway. There is no prohibition to you doing this, but it is good professional public participation and a courtesy.

David asked "Any other public comments?"

Seeing none, he called for and got a motion and a second to adjourn. The meeting closed at approximately 3:25 pm.