

**CECIL COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
WATER RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
3rd September 2008**

Attendance

Member	Present
Eileen Butler (Co Ch)	Y
Dan Derr	Y
Robert Gell	Y
Randy Hutton	
Ann Jackson	Y
Phyllis Kilby (Secr.)	Y
Daniel Polite	Y
Vic Priapi	
Rupert Rossetti (Ch)	Y
Henry (Dick) Shaffer	Y
Chuck Smyser	Y
Tony DiGiacomo (Staff)	Y
Ben Sussman	Y
Maggie Cawley	

Other Attendees	Affiliation
Joseph DiNunzio	Artesian

Call to Order 18:35 3rd September 2008, Cecil College Admin Building - 1st Floor Conf Room

Approval of Minutes

- Minutes for August were approved.

WRE Existing Conditions - Follow-up with the Municipalities

- We have received comments back from Cecilton & Rising Sun, and need to follow up with the rest of the Municipalities. It was agreed to split the task as follows:
 - Bob Gell - Charlestown
 - Dan Derr - Port Deposit
 - Ben Sussman - Elkton
 - Chuck Smyser - North East
 - Rupert Rossetti - Perryville
 - Randy Hutton - Chesapeake City
- We need to get their comments and corrections to our WRE Existing Conditions document, which they received at the July 24th COG meeting. Each of the towns has some specific numbers and statements embedded in the Drinking Water & Wastewater Assessments. All we are looking for is confirmation that these are correct.

- If their own WRE is ready, or is releasable to us in draft form, we would welcome the opportunity to review it for the best available info.
- Please pass any feedback to Ben, with a cc. to Rupert

Scenario Review

- Ben Sussman led us through a review of the three scenarios, asking us to focus our feedback as a subcommittee in terms of whether the various scenarios meet the broad goals of the subcommittee, and if not, give our reasons why.
- The Scenarios and supporting narratives can be found at http://www.ccgov.org/uploads/PlanningAndZoning/Meetings/cpcoc/CPC_Maps/CPCO_C_Scenarios_8_26_08.pdf
- Highlights of the discussion include:
 - The scale at which the Scenarios are drawn does not lend itself to a close comparison with our goals and policies. E.g. the buffering along stream corridors to protect water quality and provide wildlife habitats do not show up at this scale.
 - Once the scenarios have been finalized on 17th September, three models will be run against each Scenario: Transportation; Growth Simulation and Water Resources. Note: We remain uncomfortable with the Non Point Source nutrient load factors in MDE's spreadsheet, and may make some adjustments.
 - The Growth Corridor & Growth Centers Scenarios assume full build-out of an additional 67,500 households. The Green Belts Scenario assumes an as yet unspecified lower number of additional households.
 - The 67,500 is a theoretical buildable capacity calculated by MDP based upon existing zoning, environmental considerations and available plots (i.e. if a house occupies an acre, and the allowable density is 4 houses per acre, then the capacity would be 3 additional households).
 - "Development" areas are intended to eventually be on water and sewer.
 - Densities required to support mass transit depend upon the mode. 4 units per acre for Park & Ride; 6-8 units per acre for rail.
 - The Mixed Development areas are intended to depict Bainbridge and the Stewart properties, for which detailed plans exist. This does not mean that Planned Unit Developments can't happen elsewhere.
 - The "Resource Lands" (dark green) would be the new Priority Preservation Areas
 - Discussion of the pros & cons of clustering and shared facilities in rural areas, the outcome of which was a request to follow up with our MDP reps on their perspectives.
 - How will county-maintained water and sewer services and municipal water and sewer services "co-exist"? Will they interconnect?
 - Historically, the towns stop where the utilities stop. When new development next to a town needs / wants water & sewer, it gets annexed. This will continue until the county can offer a better deal.
 - How will the Land Use Plan actually be implemented?

- There are several tools in the tool box, including Comprehensive Re-zoning; Provision of infrastructure in the Growth Corridor
- Some specifics:
 - Additional intersections proposed for I-95 are uncomfortably close to Principio Creek and Little Elk Creek
 - An additional train station is needed (Note: this has been added - see updated Scenarios 1, 2, 3 - attached)
 - Cecilton has expansion planned as well as a proposal for a surrounding green belt. (Note: this has also been added)
 - The Growth Corridor and Growth Centers Scenarios ignore the northern Fair Hill Rural Legacy Area.
 - The "Rural" designation seems to "devalue" the area that is currently the NAR, even though the northern tier has some of the best soils and best streams and still has a lot of prime farm and forest land. (This will likely come up in the APM subcommittee.)
 - Ignoring the Fair Hill RLA will make it harder to secure funds for Land Preservation up in that area.
 - You have to answer the question: What is the resource you are trying to protect? Is it "just" farm land? What about forests? Wildlife? water quality?
 - The area south of Elkton, North of Chesapeake City and adjoining the Newcastle County line that is "Rural" on the Growth Centers & Green Belts scenarios and "Development" on the Growth Corridor scenario may have some severe limitations to development. On the NCC side of the line globally rare species have been identified as well as Federally listed species (bog turtle) protected under the Endangered Species Act. How stressed are the streams?
 - How do the scenarios take the State's Wildlife Action Plan into account?
 - If the Scenario scale is not granular enough, should we have a Water Quality and Wildlife Overlay?
 - We need some additional details on the Scenarios:
 - What is protected?
 - What is annexed?
 - What is Sensitive Area?
 - We would like to see an additional scenario that places everything that is not in the Growth Area as Resource Lands (i.e. do away with the light green and replace with Dark Green)
- Choosing By Advantages:
 - There was some concern expressed about the effectiveness of Choosing by Advantages in this particular instance, and whether we should have a "Plan B".
 - On what bases will the selections be made? Will there be such options as:
 - % loss of Forest Interior Dwelling Species (FIDS) areas, or other habitat loss measures?

We agreed to meet again on 1st October, 6:30 pm County Admin Building - Perryville Room, if a meeting is needed.

The meeting adjourned at approx 20:15 hrs

Questions for the Subcommittee

- follow up with our MDP reps on their perspectives on clustering & shared facilities in rural areas.

Questions for Staff

- Do we have a Plan B, if CBA does not yield a satisfactory result?

Recommendations/Action Items for Staff and Consultants

1. See above

Recommendations/Action Items for Oversight Committee

Adjournment: ~20:30

Next meeting: 1st October, 6:30 pm County Admin Building - Perryville Room

Rough agenda:

- Approval of Minutes
- Topics as dictated by outcome of full COC Meeting on 17th September. Otherwise, let's take the month off!