

**Wetlands Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes- Approved 12/11/13
November 5, 2013**

Agenda Items

1. Welcome by Mike Parkowski
2. Accept Meeting Notes from 9/25/13 and Review alternates/proxy and voting procedures
3. Discussion of 1989's Governor's Wetland Roundtable process and report, presentation given by Andy Manus
4. Review of US Army Corps of Engineers federal wetlands permitting program by Ed Bonner, US Army Corps of Engineers
5. Explanation of state mapping resources, presentation given by Mark Biddle, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) Environmental Scientist
6. Public Input
7. Navigating through and around the federal program and experiences being regulated, presentation given by Jim McCulley, Home Builders Association of Delaware
8. Wrap up and discussion of next meeting agenda topics

Materials Distributed:

1. Power point presentations given by Andy Manus, Mark Biddle, and Jim McCulley (electronically distributed on website)
2. **Handout outlining current Federal and State permitting in the state of Delaware**

Welcome by Mike Parkowski

- At 9:10 am, Committee Co-Chairman, Mike Parkowski called the meeting to order

Accept 9/25 Meeting Notes, Review Alternates/Proxy Procedures, and Review Voting Procedures

Accept 9/25 Meeting Notes:

- Frank Piorko thanked everyone for their attendance, welcomed Chris Bason from the Center for the Inland Bays as a new member of the committee. Frank asked Mike for a motion to accept the meeting notes from 9/25.
- Mike Parkowski motioned to vote to approve the 9/25 meeting notes, and the motion was seconded. Brenna Goggin wanted to correct an error in the notes: her name was bolded indicating her presence, but she was not in attendance on 9/25. With this error noted, the committee voted unanimously to approve the meeting notes.

Review Voting Procedures and Alternates/Proxy:

- *See State Wetland Advisory Committee Voting Procedures*
- Frank Piorko referenced the voting and alternate procedures that were borrowed liberally from the Sea Level Rise Committee and distributed to the committee prior to the meeting. It advocates for each member be able to identify an alternate with voting capabilities, also

recommended would require a two thirds majority vote from voting committee members, and the committee chairmen would have a vote.

- Mike confirmed that this information was distributed to the committee members prior. Mike asked for questions regarding the recommended procedures.
- Marty Ross expressed a concern about committee members from DNREC and other federal agencies voting on the committee, remarking that it could be a conflict of interest.
- Ed Bonner from the Army Corps of Engineers stated his role on the committee was advisory and as a source of reference, and agreed that his voting on the committee would be a conflict of interest.
- Sarah Cooksey from DNREC stated that she felt her role was more than advisory, and wanted to vote and work collaboratively in the process.
- Rob McCleary from DelDOT expressed that as a member of the regulated community, DelDOT would like to vote. He also mentioned that the committee was a product of legislation and the votes for committee recommendations will be sent to elected officials to decide if they will be implemented.
- Brenna Goggin from the Delaware Nature Society described DNREC's role as a facilitator, reference and a guide, and organizer and felt DNREC should have a vote.
- Sen. Venebles remarked that for the drafting of other types of regulations, DNREC and other state agencies normally don't get to vote. He also expressed a concern that representatives from federal and state agencies combined with environmental groups could conceivably hold a majority on the committee and hold undue power over the committee's proceedings.
- Sally Kepfer asked how many DNREC representatives were on the committee, and Mike Parkowski responded there were two: Frank Piorko and Sarah Cooksey.
- Mike Parkowski stated that the influence of DNREC was important to remember throughout the process, but expressed a hope that the majority of people on the committee were independent thinkers. He remarked that the committee was composed of various stakeholders from environmental, regulatory, development, forestry, and farming industries. He stated the current role of DNREC was more administrative than directive.
- Sarah noted that with the 2/3 vote not simple majority the DNREC vote may be outweighed by the rest of the committee.
- Mike reminded the group that DNREC is just administering not directing the committee process but the committee is made up of a very diverse cross section of independent thinking and thinks we can give the recommendations the consideration that they deserve.
- Mary Ellen Gray from the Kent County Division of Planning favored a voting role for DNREC on the committee.
- Bob Walls from the Farm Services Agency expressed that given the wide range of issues his agency deals with that he should have a vote. Ed Bonner agreed that in many respects, the Farm Service Agency is regulated similar to private industries. He felt there was distinction between the Farm Services Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers and agreed they should have a vote.
- Sally Kepfer from the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) expressed uncertainty that her agency would be allowed to vote on a committee and will verify with her agency if she is permitted to vote.
- Mike Parkowski motioned for a vote to allow representatives from federal agencies who wanted to participate and DNREC representatives to vote: 17 committee members voted

in favor and 6 (Patricia Anderson for Sen. Hocker, Rep. Wilson, Phil McGinnis, Marty Ross, Brian Michalski, and Sen. Venables) voted against with Ed Bonner, Sally Kepfer, Frank Piorko and Michael Parkowski abstained. Rep. Debra Heffernan was absent. The motion passed.

- Mike Parkowski asked for comments regarding the other voting procedures. None were asked. Mike asked for a motion to adopt the voting procedures as distributed to the committee. There was a motion and a second. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Adopted voting procedures

Recommendations of the Advisory Committee will be made by vote, after building consensus among Committee members.

To build consensus, adequate time will be given for discussion, negotiation and compromise on items requiring a vote. Advisory Committee members will be allowed sufficient time to consult with colleagues, agency management and constituents prior to making a decision on any key recommendations.

Once it is apparent that consensus has been reached or the discussion has reached an end, an Advisory Committee member must make a motion to vote. This motion must be seconded by another Advisory Committee member.

Only Advisory Committee members can vote; if the designated Advisory Committee member is unable to attend, his/her designated alternate can vote for their organization. Advance voting by proxy will be allowed if there is just reason why an Advisory Committee member or alternate cannot vote in person.

Votes will take place in-person during committee meetings, unless prior arrangements for proxy vote have been made. The affirmative vote of 2/3 of total committee membership is required to pass any motion.

Chairs of the Committee will be voting members of the Committee

Advisory Committee members who do not agree with a recommendation can draft a dissenting opinion on the recommendation that will be recorded and reflected in any documentation referencing the recommendation.

Discussion of 1989's Governor's Wetland Roundtable process and report, presentation given by Andy Manus

- Mike Parkowski welcomed Andy Manus to present and reflected that the point of all of the presentations today was to take advantage of the expertise of the group to provide a shared general pool of knowledge of what has and hasn't worked in the past so the committee can move forward to make recommendations while all speaking with the same language. Important details of note from the presentation:
 - Governor's Wetland Roundtable was created by Gov. Castle's E.O. 56 and was charged with three tasks:
 - Develop a workable definition of fresh water wetlands

- Recommend a fresh water wetlands conservation program for privately held lands
 - Report on the budgetary ramification of such a program and recommend a time table for implementation
 - Membership was appointed by governor and represented stakeholders from development industries, environmental groups, local government, academia, forestry, and agriculture.
 - Roundtable was split into working groups that drafted background papers on topics to report to the full roundtable. The full roundtable would then discuss issues and formulate consensus recommendations.
 - Since the 1989 roundtable there have been several fresh water wetlands legislative attempts and a couple drafts of legislation that did not move forward (1992, 1993, 2002, 2005, and 2011).
 - Suggested that at the next WAC meeting all previous legislation should be presented side by side, including information on the purpose of the bill, how it defined wetlands, etc.
 - 80% of wetlands in the state are privately owned, so polling private landowners to determine what would motivate them to protect wetlands resources would be important.
 - Reflecting on past efforts, Andy stressed the importance of having a leader willing to continue to spearhead progress after the committee makes its recommendations.
- A copy of this presentation can be found at: [Wetland Advisory Committee](#)
 - Also, Mike Parkowski asked Andy Manus and Frank Piorko to work together to prepare a handout comparing past wetland legislative efforts for the next meeting. Mike Parkowski also opened the floor to committee questions on Andy's presentation. No questions were asked.

Review of US Army Corps of Engineers federal wetlands permitting program by Edward Bonner, US Army Corps of Engineers

- Mike Parkowski welcomed Edward Bonner to present. He remarked that this exercise doesn't mean anything unless we're able to blend what we're doing here to the federal level and that this presentation will help the committee understand what defines a federally regulated wetland.
- Edward Bonner opened with the four major questions that people generally have for him:
 - What is a wetland?
 - What is a regulated wetland?
 - What activities are regulated?
 - How do you get your permit?
- Edward stated that today he would be addressing the first two questions:
 - What is a wetland?
 - This question is more science based. A definition from 1975 stated it's an area that's inundated or saturated at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, under normal circumstances a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted to life in saturated soil conditions. In 1984, the Corps published a draft wetland

- delineated manual that first utilized the “multi-parameter method”. This multi-parameter method focused on plants, water, and soil. A delineator needs to find evidence of plant life adapted to wet soils, hydric soil types, and evidence of water to determine if a piece of land is a wetland.
- Edward mentioned some challenges inherent in using this method. For example, some soils that are technically hydric soils may no longer be saturated because of past modifications to drainage and hydrology and therefore no longer function as wetlands. Also, the presence of water can be very seasonally dependent in some wetlands and most mapping is done from high altitude or using information that may be outdated.
 - Edward also went on to outline modifications that were made to the manual in 1985, 1986, 1987 and 1989. The National Academy of Science was tasked with improving the manual and published a report in 1993. The 1993 report recommended that regional difference be accounted for. Regional manuals were published in 2008. Delaware wetlands are defined using the Piedmont or Mid-Atlantic manuals, depending on the location.
- What is a federally regulated wetland?
 - Edward stated that prior to 1972, the Corps was only regulating navigable waters, but the Clean Water Act expanded that jurisdiction to primary tributaries, leading to headwaters becoming more protected. This produces a legally complicated situation for wetlands. For example, how does one define wetlands that are near a stream, but not directly on it? Is it distance based? Is it biologically based? Edward noted that prior to 1991 the Corps avoided using the term “isolated” when describing wetlands.
 - Edward illustrated the legal problems that arise from defining which wetlands are under the Corps regulations by reviewing two U.S. Supreme Court cases: *SWANCC vs. Army Corps of Engineers* (2001) and *Rapanos vs. United States* (2006). He remarked that the legal process the Corps has to go through really backlogs the amount of time it takes to get back to homeowners.
 - Edward stated that the more inland you move, the more tenuous the handle is from the Corps perspective of what is regulated. Some states have their own freshwater wetlands protections. One position would be to look at where the weaknesses are in the federal program.
 - Sally Kepfer wanted to clarify that when Edward mentions “federally regulated wetlands”, he’s speaking to the wetlands the Corps regulates, not wetlands other agencies such as the NRCS regulate.
 - As a point of clarification, Sarah Cooksey stated that in the Senate Bill 78 it says that 25 states, including at the mid-Atlantic states have freshwater wetland protection and asked if that means they’ve assumed the § 404 program. Edward responded that NJ and PA both have freshwater wetlands program. NJ assumed a §404 program and PA decided against it in favor of programmatic general permits, in which only cases that are controversial or complex get forwarded to the Corps.
 - Sen. Venables asked if Edward would say the Corps is doing a good job of protecting Wetlands in DE. He asked because he was concerned about the state assuming these responsibilities if federal agencies are already offering adequate protection. Edward responded that the Corps was doing a good job with the very limited resources available

to them. Sen. Venables remarked that he was still unsure of why the state would want to assume a §404 program. The most common response he has heard is that it can speed up the permitting process. Edward responded that you can develop permits that are more streamlined through the programmatic general permits, and that a state program can provide a lot more control over what is protected. Sen. Venables responded that this increase in state control concerns many of his constituents, who are concerned about more rules and regulations they will have to follow.

- Brenna Goggin asked how much time it takes to get a permit in DE compared to PA, and Mike Parkowski responded that Ed's presentation today was focused on what is a regulated wetland, and asked Brenna's permission to table the discussion of permit wait times until next week, to which Brenna agreed. Andy Manus remarked that one of the four legislative efforts in his presentation was the legislation from NJ, which was on the table of discussion for next week.
- As a last point, Edward Bonner added that an advantage of the programmatic general permit was the Corps and the PA DEP were able to share resources (PA DEP devoting more time to permitting process and less to mapping) which decreased workload and time for both agencies.
- Mike Parkowski stated that at the next meeting, hand-outs of different permits from different states could be distributed. Brenna Goggin asked for a chart of how the 50 states or the mid-Atlantic region handles freshwater permitting. Andy Manus noted that the 2010 ELI report that the state contracted for includes a state comparison. Marty Ross stated that only Michigan and New Jersey have assumed a §404 program. Mike Parkowski stated that this was all information the committee would need to consider moving forward and will be addressed at the next meeting.

Explanation of state mapping resources, presentation given by Mark Biddle, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) Environmental Scientist

- Mike Parkowski welcomed Mark Biddle to present mentioning that DNREC has done an excellent job in providing the committee with materials. One of those materials is an assessment of wetlands that uses an aerial mapping approach the committee should understand because a lot of stats come from this assessment report. In order to understand what the committee is aiming to protect, Mark has been tasked to explain how the mapping exercise took place and how wetlands were determined for the report. Important details of note:
 - Delaware Wetland Mapping is done with the most recent 2007 "leaf off" aerial imagery and involves photointerpretation of soil "wet signatures". 2007 wetland maps are the most accurate to date and were used to produce the "Delaware Wetlands: Status and Changes from 1992 to 2007" assessment report.
 - H-Wetland subset was created for areas with hydric soils that had natural vegetation but lacked a wet signature.
 - Ground truthing of wetlands classifications was performed with an emphasis on drier wetlands and H-Wetlands. In both situations, roughly 70% were classified as wetlands.

- Mapping identified 320,076 acres of wetland, including 20,000+ acres of open water (such as Inland Bays) and 62,291 acres of H-Wetlands. Farmed wetlands were not mapped.
- Findings: Net loss of 3,126 acres of wetlands, 92% of wetlands lost were non-tidal wetlands (mostly forested headwaters), pond gain of 2,285 acres. H-Wetlands were not used in the determination of wetland loss.
- A copy of this presentation can be found at: <http://de.gov/wetlandadvisorycommittee>
- Mike Parkowski asked if counties or municipalities required wetland delineation when a project is planned or a property is rezoned. Committee members from counties and municipalities responded that they do. Sally Kepfer asked for clarification on whether all projects required wetland delineations or just projects where wetlands were suspected based on aerial maps, because this is very different. Sally Kepfer and Mark Biddle reflected that this distinction is important because the maps are to be used as guidance not a definitive source of where wetlands are and are not. Marty Ross responded that in Sussex County, any major development that requires a land use change has to have a wetland delineation.
- Mike Parkowski remarked that one of the examples in the presentation, a shopping center built in Laurel that resulted in a loss of wetlands according to the assessment, must have required a permit and delineation because of the magnitude of the project. Edward Bonner remarked that projects can take several years to go through the permitting process and that policies and practices also change over that kind of timescale. Mike Parkowski then asked if there was a perception that development was occurring on federally regulated wetlands without going through the proper permitting steps. Marty Ross remarked that for the Laurel project specifically, he can speak to the fact that all permitting procedures were followed and the site had a wetland delineation. Marty Ross commented that the discrepancies between what was aerially mapped in the assessment and what wetland delineations on the ground can create a lot of slippage and make the wetland trends assessments from the report difficult to reconcile with reality of wetland delineations and federal permitting on the ground. Mike Parkowski commented that there is a difference between the way DNREC mapped wetlands in their report and the way the Army Corps of Engineers performs permits on a case by case basis and expressed that the committee will eventually need to decide if its focus will be on federally regulated wetlands or if there is a class of wetlands above and beyond what is already regulated and permitted.
- Andy Manus asked if the land use conversions in the presentations were permitted or potential violations under investigation. Mark Biddle responded that the examples were just meant to show land use changes over time. Andy Manus asked if Mark knew if the projects were permitted. Mark responded that it was not known, which is why DNREC started to meet with the Army Corps to try to verify some of the conversions. Unfortunately, the Corps does not have the resources to create and maintain the type of database DNREC would need access to in order to verify the permit status of losses. Phil McGinnis inquired if the Laurel shopping center site was a §404 wetland. Mark responded that due to issues with the Corps database and data tracking, they can't be sure if a delineation was required or if a permit was needed. Phil McGinnis then asked Mark to go back to an agricultural field expansion from a pivot irrigation system that resulted in a wetlands loss and asked if that was a §404 wetland, and if the placement of the center

pivot would be considered a negative thing. Mark responded that there are certain exemptions for agricultural practices. Ed Bonner commented that the most complex and time consuming question is whether or not something is a §404 regulated wetland.

- Sally Kepfer responded that NRCS did the delineation for the agricultural example used in the presentation, and that no wetlands were found. Frank Piorko asked if it were possible that hydrology changed in the 15 years between the two sets of images (1992 to 2007). Mark responded that 15 years was a long time and regulations change, which could certainly have an effect and new drainage could have been added. Andy Manus inquired if the center pivot example in the presentation was included in the assessment's loss statistic. Mark responded that it was. He also remarked that no mapping effort is 100% accurate, even given a 50% accuracy rate of the mapping efforts, 1,500 acres of wetlands still would have been lost.
- Mike Parkowski noted that one of the aspects the committee will have to consider is the disconnect between what many people think of when they think of a wetland and some drier wetlands that don't appear as visibly wet but still provide the ecosystem function of wetlands. He remarked that the committee coming together and deciding what it wants to focus on will be important in the coming meetings.

Public Input

- Mike Parkowski noted that time was running short. He asked for Ed Bonner to come back next meeting to discuss different state's permitting processes. He also asked to push Jim McCulley's and Mary Ross's presentations back until next meeting in order to provide time to open the floor to public input.
- Virgil Holmes, Manager of Tidal Wetlands Program at DNREC and former environmental consultant, noted that the wetlands shown in the center pivot example was one of the driest wetland types and is one of the areas of greatest confusion between the Corps determination and mapping efforts.

Navigating through and around the federal program and experiences being regulated, presentation given by Jim McCulley, Home Builders Association of Delaware

- Since public comments were brief, Mike Parkowski welcomed Jim McCulley to present on his experience with the Home Builders Association of Delaware and his experiences dealing with regulation. Important details of note:
- Jim noted that the HBADE was not happy to see that residential development was a leading cause for reported wetland losses in the DNREC Status and Trends Report. Jim highlighted 2 of roughly 15 reviewed projects that occurred during the 1992-2007 span: The Peninsula (in Millsboro) and Walmart in Georgetown. The report stated the project resulted in a loss of 16.54 acres. That site had a delineation and JD. He reported that 1.98 acres were filled under a permit, 3.85 acres of wetlands were created for mitigation, 39.89 acres of previously filled tidal marsh were enhanced, and the preservation of 245 acres of wetlands through permitting conservation easement. There were 20.8 acres lost reported; Mike Green's delineation deemed that there were no wetlands on site.
- Jim stated that in his experience there are very few wetlands in the Philadelphia District that are not regulated.

- Jim suggested that as long as there is population growth, a policy of no net wetland loss may not be the best policy, because other types of valuable habitats that are not wetlands will be lost instead.
- A reason for the loss of these resources is because of a lack of value to the property owner. It will be very difficult to protect resources that are valuable to the public if there is not value to the property owner. Highlighted an example of a landowner removing a high quality loblolly pine forest for fear that it would have to be protected and lower his property value. Another example of a naval air base in MD where 500 acres of old growth forest had been removed to avoid having a resource that might limit how the land could be used in the future.
- Jim recommended an incentive-based program that benefits the landowner to protect important wetland and non-wetland habitat areas. Estimated habitat value could be confirmed by DNREC and encourage property owners to save not eliminate resources. By-right density bonus incentives would preserve most natural resources, incentivizes the property owners, and provides value to resources that are valuable to the public.
- A copy of this presentation can be found at: <http://de.gov/wetlandadvisorycommittee>
- Mark Parkowski commented that it would be useful to know what is involved on Jim's part for getting delineations done. Jim responded that it depended on the site. A typical delineation takes a few days in the field for data collection and deciding whether to submit to the Corps for a JD. A preliminary JD takes about 6 months to get, but isn't as certain. Most counties require a delineation to be done and that the report be submitted to the counties for review. A JD could take 5 years.
- Mike asked Jim for his view on the permitting delay issue. Jim responded that his clients want to get things done as quickly as possible, so they try to work in upland areas or to work under Nationwide Permits which is a 90 day process once you submit your PCN. Individual permits are more frequently done for DelDOT or other agencies because of the uncertainty in what comes back.
- Mike asked about the IP review. Individual permits can take up to 2 or 3 years to go through the process. There is no time table like with NWP's which after a 30-day window the application can be assumed to be complete and then 15 days after that you automatically are granted the permit if the Corps does not make a decision. Jim also remarked that the inter-agency review process takes place for all permits. As part of the PCN process the application is reviewed by multiple agencies during a 30 day window.
- Jim was asked if Delaware moving to a parallel permitting process with existing federal processes would be a benefit to his clients and if based on his experience, the state of Delaware would have the resources to make such a step. Jim responded that he didn't think an added parallel process that mimics the federal program would be of value unless we decide that there are other areas beyond what the Corps regulating that need to be protected.
- George Haggerty asked Jim to further clarify his statement about other areas beyond the wetlands the Corps already regulates. Jim responded that homebuilders will not mind if the State wants to protect valuable resources as long as it is clear what they are and what the rules are. Property owners need to know the value of what is on their property without the rules frequently changing, and if a property owner knows something will reduce the value of their property, they will get rid of it before it is sold to a developer.

- George Haggerty noted that New Castle County protects wetlands 100% which results in plans being designed around the resources. He asked if Jim has gone back after the project to evaluate the site hydrology in relation to those resources. Jim responded yes and that storm water ponds sometimes prevent water from going to a wetland that needs water, so there is room for improvement there. Jim and George agreed that this is an area that could be improved. He remarked that 100% wetland protection is resulting in loss of other valuable resources and protecting questionable wetlands.
- Edward Bonner added that in some cases, the efforts to stay out of the wetland can cause a loss of wetlands by cutting off the source of wetland hydrology. Storm water management is a significant way this can happen by trying to control and contain 100% of the water goes against natural processes. There is a learning process to handle recharge basins and allowing water to continue through the wetland. However, ACOE agents cannot regulate those upland areas without exceeding their authority. Need to consider the land management outside of the wetland.
- Marty Ross asked how the 90 day review process work in conjunction with other permits for a major subdivision or commercial. Jim responded that the subdivision will take much longer. A developer will typically get their wetland delineation done first then submit to local land use jurisdiction to determine what they can get approved, submit to local land use jurisdiction, and then apply for the Nationwide Permit somewhere along the line and have the NWP in advance of getting final approval.
- Sarah Cooksey asked if when Jim mentioned that 100% of wetlands are protected [by the Corps], are Delmarva Bays included? Jim responded that in the Philadelphia district it is very difficult to get any wetland declared as an isolated non-jurisdictional wetland. Asked Melanie if the state has been seeing any high value isolated Delmarva Bays under pressure to be built. Melanie responded not often, it is usually the non-jurisdictional areas because they are prior converted or farmed wetlands. Jim believes that under this new rule making the isolated wetlands will be included.
- Andy Manus asked if Jim could provide a description of his incentive programs. Jim responded that the plans are more concepts right now than concrete ideas, but that he would be happy to share them.

Wrap up and discussion of next meeting agenda topics

- Mike Parkowski asked for general house-keeping suggestions or comments. Brenna Goggin suggested that meeting minutes be attached to emails sent to the committee with the agenda for the next meeting.
- Mike Parkowski also requested on Porter Schutt’s behalf that presenters showing presentation slides send the files of the presentation out to committee members, through Frank Piorko, before the meeting so they can review the presentations and have more time to formulate questions.
- Meeting adjourned at 11:57 am.

Attendees: (bolded names were present)

Edward Bonner	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Chris Bason	Center for the Inland Bays
Sarah Cooksey	DNREC- Coastal Programs

Mark Davis	Dept. of Agriculture
Tim Deschepper	Town of Middletown- LLG
Hal Godwin	Sussex County Planning
Brenna Goggin	Delaware Nature Society
Mary Ellen Gray	Division of Planning- Kent County
George Haggerty	New Castle County Planning
Rep. Debra Heffernan	Delaware House of Representatives
Sen. Gerald Hocker (Patricia Anderson sent as alternate)	Delaware Senate
David Hugg	Town Hall Smyrna- LLG
Sally Kepfer	Natural Resource Conservation Service
Josh Littleton (Charles Anderson sent as alternate)	City of Seaford- LLG
Andy Manus	Retired conservationist
Robert McCleary	Del DOT
Jim McCulley	Home Builders Association of Delaware
Phil McGinnis	Delaware Association of Realtors
Brian Michalski	Delaware Forestry Association
Paul Morrill (Deidre Smith sent as alternate)	Committee of 100
Michael Parkowski (Co-Chair)	Delaware Bar Association
Frank Piorko	DNREC- Watershed Stewardship
Marty Ross	Delaware Farm Bureau
Alex Schmidt	Council of Engineering Companies
Porter Schutt (Co-Chair)	The Conservation Fund/Open Space Council
Sen. Robert Venables	Delaware Senate
Bob Walls	Farm Services Agency
Rep. Dave Wilson	Delaware House of Representatives

In addition, 3 non-voting committee alternates, and 20 DNREC supporting staff were in attendance.