

URBAN STORMWATER WORKGROUP CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

October 25th, 2011

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Meeting Minutes

Norm Goulet

DECISION: The September meeting minutes were approved.

Feedback on Analyzing Scenarios with CAST/MAST Tools

Norm Goulet, Chair

- CAST/MAST/VAST – Chesapeake (Maryland, Virginia) Assessment Scenario Tool
- Representation of Scenario Builder to facilitate state scenario work
- Tool has been provided to jurisdictions, but there are known issues:
 - MD and VA versions have some urban BMPs that are intended for just one jurisdiction
 - Internal and outdated BMPs used only by modelers also appear
 - Error in calculating base loads for tool, so loads will change; consider only percent implementation for now

Discussion:

- Steve Stewart, Baltimore County, has used MAST for Baltimore County and found large problems with the loads and some calculations, but found it useful for estimating the effects of BMPs.
- Randy Greer, DE DENRC, based on the workshop feels that it will be easy to use and hopefully useful, but hasn't yet used it for practical applications.
- Ginny Snead, VA DCR, to deal with the issue jurisdictions are having with applying the Chesapeake Bay model and thus VAST to local levels. VA DCR is distributing a letter to localities asking them to concentrate on their strategies rather than loads. VA is not planning to submit an input deck due to the lack of confidence in the model.
- There was also the comment that we need to make the connection to the model to confirm that we can use this information to concentrate BMPs in high delivery land-river segments.

Urban BMP Cost Numbers in MAST

Dennis King, University of Maryland

- Work for these cost estimates occurred in July, August 2011
- Results will be posted at the following location on the MDE website:

Discussion:

- Although intended for Maryland, these results are applicable to the Bay region and the method used can provide an approach for other states wanting to develop cost estimates.
- A range of costs was not developed and though it would be helpful, it would require more work.
- There is no cutoff for the use of older data, though adjustments were made for inflation and most data was for 2000 or more recent.
- Karl Berger, MWCOG, found the methodology to be adjustable, but identified the need for a database and a methodology to improve, format and update a running cost database.

ACTION: Provide comments on these cost estimates to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) as the University of Maryland contract has expired and CSN will be developing a cost database.

Process for State Requests for Interim BMPs during WIP Planning **Lucinda Power, EPA**

- Lucinda was unavailable to present the information posted on the following website:
http://archive.chesapeakebay.net/pubs/calendar/USWG_10-25-11_Handout_4_11549.pdf However, materials were distributed in advance to the workgroup that described CBP's BMP protocol process, including the submission of interim BMPs.
- Norm Goulet, chair, suggested that the chair and coordinator of the appropriate workgroup be informed when an interim BMP is proposed by the jurisdictions.

ACTION: Norm Goulet will follow up with Lucinda Power on the process for interim BMPs.

Urban BMP Panel Updates

Tom Schueler, CSN

ACTION: Submit recommendations for the urban nutrient management panel to Tom Schueler.

ACTION: Tom Schueler will include the workgroup leadership on all emails to panels.

Development of Updated BMP Cost Database

Tom Schueler, CSN

- Cost information for BMPs in critical for WIP development
- Information will be solicited from both private and public sector
- Coordinating with Kevin Debell, EPA, on benefits estimates
- Most of the database work will occur in 2012
- Need consistent method for estimating pre-construction costs; distributing survey monkey poll to get information from project engineers and managers

Discussion:

- Tim Karikari, DC DOE, suggested following up with Walther Caldwell, DC DOE, as a good source.
- Dave Sample volunteered to assist with database development and also suggested that Kurt Stevenson could be helpful.
- Karl Burger, MWCOG, reminded the group that a local government doesn't like to report the same data multiple times and suggested reusing information reported for the MD cost information from the University of Maryland to make it easier on localities.
- Kate Bennet, Fairfax County, will see if there is a Fairfax County representative that can participate.

Process for Urban BMP Reporting Tracking and Verification

Tom Schueler, CSN

- Steve Stewart, Baltimore County, suggested considering at the bay wide level, because Baltimore County is reporting to Maryland and finding that they are not getting full credit in the model. He also suggested considering how some BMPs increase denitrification over time and potentially changing the credit to reflect this.
- Norm Goulet, NVRC, suggested putting together a workgroup now. Getting past estimates for BMPs is an issue and how the data will be managed needs to be considered. This is another burden on local governments that needs to be carefully considered to make it easier on them. Also, we should keep in mind that all reporting is being done through NEIEN.
- Tom Schuler, CSN, also commented that it needs to be verified that a BMP is properly functioning , i.e. that it has not been mowed, eaten, etc.

- Kahora, questioned who should do the verification: an independent entity, the implementation or the state? Tom Schueler, CSN, explained that there are multiple models for this to be considered.
- Tim Karikari, DC DOE pointed out that their inspectors are not allowed on most federal properties.

ACTION: Tom Schueler will follow up with the Federal Facilities workgroup on the issue of allowing stormwater inspectors on federal facilities.

- Sarah Lane, MD DCR, recommended reviewing the agricultural BMP matrix being developed by Bob Entringer and Dana York that could be a model for the urban community.

Miscellaneous

ACTION: Add Rebecca Stack to membership list.

ACTION: Thanks to workgroup members who commented on No.9 Technical Bulletin, comment deadline extended to November 15th.

ACTION: Provide comments or responses to the questions proposed by Tom Schueler on cost database and tracking and verification.

Participants

Raymond Bahr	MDE	rbahr@mde.state.md.us
Kate Bennett	Fairfax Co., VA- DPWES	kate.bennett@fairfaxcounty.gov
Karl Berger	MWCOG	kberger@mwkog.org
Ted Brown	Biohabitats Inc.	tbrown@biohabitats.com
Doug Fritz	VA DCR	doug.fritz@dcr.virginia.gov
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Patrick Hagan	UMD	hagan@cbl.umces.edu
Alana Hartman	WV DEP	alana.c.hartman@wv.gov
Shohreh Karimipour	NYSDEC	sxkarimi@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Tim Karikari	DC DE	timothy.karikari@dc.gov
Dennis King	UMD	dking@umces.edu
Krum		
Sara Lane	MD DNR	slane@dnr.state.md.us
Rich McEntee	USGS/CBP	rmcentee@chesapeakebay.net
Dave Montali	WV DEP	david.a.montali@wv.gov
Robin Pellicano	MDE	rpellicano@mde.state.md.us
David Sample	VA/STAC	dsample@vt.edu
Tom Schueler	CBPO/SWN	watershedguy@hotmail.com
Jim Skillen	RISE	jskillen@pestfacts.org
Ginny Snead	VA DCR	Virginia.Snead@dcr.virginia.gov
Steve Stewart	Baltimore Co. DEPRM	sstewart@baltimorecountymd.gov
Richard Street	Spotsylvania Co.	rstreet@spotsylvania.va.us
Rachel Streusand	CRC/CBP	rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net