

SUMMARY
Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG)
Teleconference
Tuesday, June 18th, 2013
10:00 AM to 12:30 PM
www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19171/

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS & ACTION ITEMS

DECISION: The May minutes were accepted as submitted.

ACTION: USWG members with relevant literature on Floating Treatment Wetlands or street-sweeping (post 2008) should submit it to Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com).

ACTION: By July 1st, USWG member should submit feedback or comments on the draft FAQ document to Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com).

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of 5/21 Minutes

- Tom Schueler (Chesapeake Stormwater Network; USWG Coordinator) convened the call at 10:00AM and reviewed the agenda. He noted Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; USWG Chair)
- He asked for comments or corrections to the May USWG minutes ([Attachment A](#)); hearing none, the minutes were accepted as written.
 - **DECISION:** The May minutes were accepted as submitted.

Announcements

- Schueler: Urban Tree Canopy panel is nearing its final report. ESC Panel also expects to report by end of summer. He encouraged participants to consider attending the 2013 LID symposium in Minneapolis. He noted he will be on extended leave until August 7th and CSN will be effectively closed during that time.

Update on Status of USWG Urban Verification Protocols

- Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; USWG Chair) explained that Rich Batiuk suggested some minor revisions to the protocol. Goulet is working on the changes. Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP) provided some comments that primarily focused on recent expert panel reports.
- Goulet asked for any technical concerns from the workgroup on the protocol.
- Raymond Bahr (Maryland Department of Environment): expound on sliding scale for non-MS4 areas.
- Goulet explained there was a need for options for non-MS4 areas. He described the options previously developed by the workgroup.
 - Schueler noted the sub-sampling options are described in more detail in the last couple pages of the protocol. Jeremy Hanson (CRC) can re-post the latest version of the protocol for the workgroup's reference.

- Joe Kelly (PA DEP): we've discussed before that there will be many sites, e.g. less than one acre, which are required to install BMPs; there is currently no mechanism to verify all of these practices. Yet to be seen how this gap will be addressed in Pennsylvania.
 - Goulet pointed out that Pennsylvania is not alone on this.
- Goulet will share [the revised version](#) with the workgroup when it's available.
 - **Post-meeting note:** Revised version of the protocol is available at http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/19172/uswg_urban_bmp_verification_principle_and_practices_06272013.pdf

Final Rosters for Floating Wetland and Street Sweeping/Bulk Sediment Panels

- Schueler noted the prospective membership had been updated on both charges ([Attachment B](#) and [Attachment C](#)). He noted the FTW panel will likely convene in mid- to late- August. If there are any workgroup members with relevant literature for either panel they should send it to Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com). Street sweeping literature should be post-2008 so that it is newer than the previous review from Law (2008).
 - **ACTION:** USWG members with relevant literature on Floating Treatment Wetlands or street-sweeping (post 2008) should submit it to Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com).

Update on STAC Research Proposal and Land Use Loading Rate Lit Review

- Schueler described the updated STAC proposal ([Attachment D](#)). Should be hearing soon on STAC's decision.
 - **Post-meeting note:** The workshop was approved for funding by the STAC membership.
- Schueler: For midpoint assessment, will be reviewing the land use loading rates for incorporation in the next version of the Watershed Model. The CBPO Modeling team has been working on a Technical Directive for Tetra Tech to perform an in-depth literature review for land use loading rates.
- Schueler asked for questions on the workshop or Loading Rate Lit Review
 - Katherine Antos (EPA, CBPO): will workshop include some of the literature identified under the technical directive?
 - Schueler: it will be up to the members of the workshop steering committee to consolidate and coordinate between the two efforts.
- Goulet thanked Schueler for his work on the proposal and the Technical Directive.

Reprioritization of Urban BMP Queue

- Goulet directed participants' attention to [Attachment E](#). He noted the workgroup discussed this the previous month. He reviewed the BMP reviews that are underway or in the queue.
- Goulet noted some of the practices bulleted under coastal buffer zones would be the lower priority items, given last month's discussion. Perhaps some of them could be lumped into other panels.
 - Schueler: coastal buffers and coastal wetland restoration will be handled under the Habitats Goal Team, so they will be dropped from the USWG queue.
- Schueler asked for thoughts from workgroup on the order or priority of the BMPs?
- Steve Stewart (Baltimore County): vote for outfall stabilization as number one.
- Sandra Goodrow (Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control): vote for MS4 minimum management measures.

- Schueler noted some aspects of MS4 measures are already being addressed through other panels, e.g., Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination and Erosion and Sediment Control.
- Ginny Snead (Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation) echoed the importance of MS4 management measures.
- Bahr: Maryland would like to keep impervious disconnect first, vote outfall stabilization second, and MS4 min management measures third.
- Schueler: may be possible to handle all three of those in 2014.
- Goulet cautioned that even with contractor support for the land use loading review, Schueler's time may be too limited for many expert panels.
- Jennifer Tribo (Hampton Roads Planning District Commission): thought impervious disconnect and outfall stabilization were covered in retrofit report.
 - Schueler: impervious disconnect is not treated explicitly as a retrofit, but it is one of the strategies for meeting state performance standards, so it is covered in a sense. There has been running issue with impervious disconnect and difference between suburban and low-density or exurban loading rates. Perhaps this is a topic for the literature review on loading rates to consider.
 - For outfall stabilization, Tribo is correct that if it is an upland regenerative stormwater conveyance system it qualifies as a retrofit or new performance standard BMP.
- Stewart: the Baltimore County Public Works Department is investing time/money in fixing problem outfalls. So it would be great to receive sediment or nutrient BMP credit for those actions.
 - Goulet: this could be a difficult BMP, depending on status of the literature.
- Goulet: seems that MS4 min management measures should be bumped to top practice. The other two seem slightly below that.
- Schueler: a year from now we can determine which of the bulleted practices will be prioritized.
- Forand noted that dry Regenerative Conveyance Systems (RCS) are included in the stream restoration report, while wet RCS are included in the stormwater retrofits report.

Continued discussion: FAQ Documents for Approved BMPs

- Goulet noted the draft FAQ document ([Attachment F](#)) was also discussed at the previous USWG call.
- Schueler explained this will be a companion document so that state, local, and other parties have a sort of user's guide for the panel reports.
- Schueler described [two additional questions for the document](#), suggested by Ray Bahr and MDE.
- Bahr: second question gets to same point as the first. Maryland feels that it would be best for the state to perform the calculation and submit it to the Bay Program.
 - Schueler noted the units are convertible.
- Johnston: would states have ability to submit inches per impervious acre, and we could skip over the equation in the modeling tools?
 - Schueler: believe so. Every state has a unique computational methodology.
 - Johnston: would states prefer to do it a different way?
 - Snead: would have to check with Bill Keeling on this.
 - Greer: Like Bahr said, in Delaware we have an explicit calculation and we use inches, so it's easy to go straight to the curves.
 - Sebastian Donner (WV DEP): would also stay with the units on the chart.
 - Schueler: fine with that flexibility. If a state has a different method or units to get to the charts, just need to communicate with engineers and local governments.

- No other questions were raised.
- Schueler asked the workgroup to provide any additional thoughts or comments on the draft FAQ document by July 1st.
- Bahr: where will this be posted?
 - Schueler: It will be included with the reports on the CBP website, and also on the CSN website. It will be a living document so that questions can be added down the road and on a regular, perhaps annual scale.
- **ACTION:** By July 1st, USWG member should submit feedback or comments on the draft FAQ document to Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com).

Performance Standards and Retrofits in Scenario Builder and NEIEN

- Goulet: there has been some issues and confusion about the procedure for integrating panel recommendations into Scenario Builder. For future panels, the report will be considered and revised by the CBPO modeling team as necessary before the report goes through the workgroup approval process.
- Johnston reviewed some issues (framed as questions) outlined in [Attachment G](#).
- Practice lifetime
 - Donner: seems like reasonable solution.
 - Greer: seems generous
 - Bahr: we are on three year inspection schedule, so should be able to meet...would this 10 years of credit apply to MS4 and non-MS4 areas alike?
 - Schueler: this would apply to all BMPs, for MS4 and non-MS4.
 - Bahr: sounds good
 - Kelly: should not be a problem for MS4s but still need to address non-MS4 gap discussed earlier.
- Not enough land for practice
 - Schueler: does this apply more to some states than others?
 - Johnston: there are some localities where this happens to a greater extent.
 - Antos: for the second situation, when there are less total urban acres available. For example, say a lot of BMPs were reported in 2010 and 2013. Would the BMPs reported in 2013 or 2010 be the priority? Ask because of the lifetime issue.
 - Johnston: right now, history is applied first.
 - Schueler: perhaps it could be a first applied, first removed approach where newer practices could take priority over the oldest ones.
 - Greer: that would be our preferred approach. Would prefer newer BMPs to be placed in Scenario Builder over older practices.
 - Goulet agreed that it would be a reasonable compromise.
 - Dave Montali (WV DEP): is this at the county scale or land river segment?
 - Johnston: Currently Land River Segment, but the states report the practices at different scales, but everything gets transferred into the Watershed Model and the LRS scale.
 - Bahr asked what reduction rates will be applied to historical stream restoration projects.
 - Schueler: the Stream Restoration and Urban Nutrient Management reports will go through a similar process as they are incorporated into Scenario Builder.

CSO/Stormwater BMP Issue

- Schueler introduced Ning Zhou (Virginia Tech, CBPO; Wastewater Treatment Workgroup Coordinator) and directed participants' attention to [Attachment H](#).

- Zhou explained how CSO loads are simulated in the Watershed Model. The Phase 5.3 Model included 64 CSO communities. Several CSO communities have already eliminated their CSOs. The loads are estimated using data from Long Term Control Plans. Blue Plains has its own Model to estimate its overflow loads; Tetra Tech was contracted to estimate overflow loads from other communities. There are two BMPs associated with CSO areas: elimination, which removes the CSO load and converts the CSO land to urban land, and; reduction, where projects such as DC's deep tunnels reduce the CSO load through increased storage. The states can report (1) estimated load reductions and (2) the area removed from CSO and converted to urban.
- Schueler noted the Bay states have adopted more stringent performance standards that promote LID and runoff reduction practices.
- Johnston pointed out that all the practices are included in Scenario Builder whether they are CSO or non-CSO. The difference is that it only calculates the load reduction if it is on non-CSO.
- Schueler: some areas have very refined understanding of their CSO service areas, whereas some smaller communities do not have the same knowledge.
 - Zhou: if there is not information about the extent of the CSO, then by default we have to assume that the whole local area is covered as CSO.
- Goulet: would opt for option 3, as it allows for most flexibility.
- Greer: question about extent of reductions
 - Zhou: if a CSO is eliminated, then the load is transferred to a WWTP.
 - Greer: then the stormwater BMPs, even at a high efficiency, does not seem to come close to the removal efficiency of a treatment plant. Not sure if this is really an issue or not.
 - Schueler: the biggest issues arise in Richmond and DC.
 - Schueler: based on the Wastewater Treatment Workgroup's input, we can revisit this and report back to the Watershed Technical Workgroup in September.
 - Johnston: as a follow-up, would like more information about the models used by DC and Tetra Tech to estimate the CSO loads.
 - **Future agenda item:** Brief the workgroup on DC's CSO project to understand the timelines, etc.
 - Zhou noted the CSO load is very small compared to the overall wastewater load. So even if there was double counting, it would probably fall within the error bar of the total wastewater load.
 - Goulet: spills and upsets far exceed CSO. Would like to see more equity in this approach.
 - Schueler noted the IDDE panel is looking at SSO issue.

Update on Homeowner BMP Pilot Project

- Schueler noted the time and postponed the Pilot Project update until the next call or meeting.
- Goulet: the Management Board is working on a new Chesapeake Bay Agreement. They hope to get the new Agreement signed later in 2013.
- Goulet: there will be no workgroup meetings or calls in July or August.

Adjourned

Next meeting/teleconference:

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Time TBD

www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19175/

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Norm Goulet (Chair)	Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Tom Schueler (Coord.)	Chesapeake Stormwater Network
Jeremy Hanson (Staff)	CRC, CBPO
Katherine Antos	EPA CBPO
Raymond Bahr	MDE
Bob Capowski	NYS DEC
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Nathan Forand	Baltimore County
Sandra Goodrow	DE DNREC
Randy Greer	DE DNREC
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Joseph Kelly	PA DEP
Cecilia Lane	CSN
Sara Lane	MD DNR
Neely Law	CWP
David Montali	WV DEP
Glynn Rountree	NAHB
Ginny Snead	VA DCR
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County (MD)
Jennifer Tribo	HRPDC
Ning Zhou	Virginia Tech, CBPO