

**Urban Stormwater Workgroup Face-to-Face Meeting
January 17, 2017
Meeting Summary**

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24804/>

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

ACTION: USWG members should submit topics or issues that they would like addressed in an FAQ document regarding the stream restoration protocol to David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) by no later than COB February 3rd.

ACTION: USWG members should submit agenda topics for the February workgroup meeting to David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com).

Announcements and Updates

- David Wood recently accepted a position with the Chesapeake Stormwater Network, and Lindsey Gordon will be providing staff support through the CRC.
- The deadline to submit nominations for the Best Urban BMP in the Bay Award is now closed.
- The Impervious Cover Disconnection Expert Panel report was approved by the WQGIT in December, and should be available on the CBPO website later this month.
- There will be a webcast on March 15, 2017 featuring a user's guide to urban BMPs in the Chesapeake Bay. Additional information is forthcoming.
- CSN has formed a Roadside Ditch Management Team, composed of experts on dirt and gravel roads, agricultural ditches, etc. The team will develop options for crediting ditch management practices in the Phase 6 model, and will present these recommendations back to the USWG and WQGIT.
- The final draft of the Phase III WIP Expectations was released on December 20th, and comments were incorporated into a revised interim final draft that is expected to be released soon. The interim final draft will be posted to the USWG webpage when it is available.

Special Session on the Stream Restoration Practice

Stream Restoration Overview

Tom Schueler framed some of the key issues involved in interpreting and applying the stream restoration protocols developed by the 2013 Expert Panel.

- Tom Schueler: There are lingering questions on how to use the stream protocols, what the default rates are, and what streams they apply to. This session will identify what these special challenges are and discuss avenues for addressing those challenges. The Stream Restoration Expert Panel is not being re-opened; this work will help to prepare a FAQ document clarifying the stream restoration protocols for users.

Problems Encountered in Applying the Stream Restoration Crediting Protocols.

[Attach B.](#)

Bill Stack provided an overview of the primary questions and concerns that have been raised regarding the three stream restoration protocols from the 6-month test drive to the present.

Discussion:

- Tom Schueler: One of our goals is to collate all of the information relating to this panel report and protocols in one single location.
- Bill Stack and the USWG are seeking feedback on: 1) whether there are stream restoration protocol issues that are a concern that were not addressed, and 2) which issues does the USWG strongly agree or disagree with.
- Debbie Cappuccitti: I strongly agree with raising issues on the sediment delivery factor.
- Tom Schueler suggested developing a technical guidance on the appropriate procedure for estimating the runoff volume treated by a dry RFC. He also recommended providing design examples with the level of detail that engineers use in the document.
- Randy Greer: Did the panel ever look at the Fish and Wildlife publications on the Piedmont and Coastal Plain that developed regional curves using stream gauge data.
 - Bill Stack: The expert panel report suggested that states put resources towards developing local curves. I recommend we provide some guidance on the regional curves that are available and which ones to use.
- Tom Schueler: PA relies heavily on legacy sediment removal projects, and that research did not come out until after the expert panel was completed. We could provide an update on that in this document.
- Karl Berger raised the question of how monitoring data is used, and how to determine the sufficient amount of monitoring data for load reductions. Tom Schueler and Bill Stack recommended this be included in the FAQ document.
- Lee Murphy: We've been told we have to use sediment delivery factors, but I think we would be better off using edge of stream loads. So we have a bit of confusion on what the appropriate number to use is when we're looking for edge of stream loads.
 - Tom Schueler recommended that question get addressed in the FAQ document.

ACTION: USWG members should submit topics or issues that they would like addressed in an FAQ document regarding the stream restoration protocol to David Wood

(wood.csn@outlook.com) by no later than COB February 3rd.

Streams and Stream Restoration in the Phase 6 Watershed Model

Gary Shenk [briefed the workgroup](#) on how streams and sediment delivery are now represented in the new version of the Phase 6 watershed model.

Discussion:

- Gary Shenk noted that the effects of impoundments are captured in the land-to-water factors, and that the Phase 6 model will be simulating the effects of roughly 4,000 impoundments.
- Tom Schueler suggested inviting Greg Noe from USGS to present to the workgroup about his research on stream bank and floodplain sediment flux.
- Randy Greer: Once the stream load is determined, how is it allocated among the different sectors?
 - Gary Shenk: The stream load is its own loading source, so it won't be allocated to any sector other than stream. The method used by Greg Noe factors in land use, so you would see that reflected in the stream loads with that method.

Discussion: Stream Restoration Crediting Protocols FAQ

[Attach C.](#)

David Wood discussed the proposed FAQ-style document and the work group will be asked to provide feedback on the how the existing stream restoration crediting protocol could be improved, and what specific guidance should be provided in a future FAQ document.

Discussion:

- David noted that broader questions raised on the protocols may be triaged to a separate list that could be addressed by a potential panel in 2025.
- Greg Sandi: These questions aren't going before the expert panel, correct?
 - David Wood: Correct. We'll work with the CWP and CBP Modeling Team to address these questions to the best of our ability.
- Tom Schueler noted that this document would be presented back to the USWG for approval.
- Karl Berger suggested holding an outreach session for consultants that conduct this work. Tom Schueler noted that the CSN will begin a major outreach effort to the consultant community once this work is complete.

Briefing: Update on the Municipal On-line Stormwater Tool (MOST)

Medessa Burian and Jennifer Cotting from the UMD EFC provided an overview of the [MOST Center](#). The work group provided ideas for online training and how to integrate the tool with the Chesapeake Bay Program to better serve the local stormwater community.

Discussion:

- Karl Berger: Do your training courses have any relation to workplace certification efforts that are on-going around the region?
 - Medessa Burian: We would like to develop these type of partnerships moving forward.
- Tom Schueler asked if the EFC has the capability to deal with finer-scale segmentation.
 - Medessa Burian: We've tried to make a lot of our materials applicable to Bay-wide audiences, but would be interested in developing state-specific information.
- Heather Gewandter: Do you see any opportunities for hosting certification programs if localities are willing to partner with you to educate their segments of the public?
 - Medessa Burian: Down the line, this could certainly be a platform for that kind of networking.
- Jeremy Hanson: To what extent has there been discussion of where BMP panel reports or updates fit in?
 - Medessa Burian: We've been in conversations with the CSN over the last few months, and we would be very interested in developing that kind of content.
 - Tom Schueler noted that their 2017 workplan committed to moving expert panel reports and other resources to the MOST website.

Briefing: York County Stormwater Reporting Tool

Colin Stief from the Chesapeake Conservancy demonstrated the York County Consortium Stormwater BMP Calculator Tool (tied to BayFAST). The tool allows users to store project information and uses high resolution land cover to calculate impervious/pervious surface in the project drainage area.

Discussion:

- High-resolution land use data can be accessed online using the following link: <http://chesapeakeconservancy.org/conservation-innovation-center/land-cover-data-project/>
- Tom Schueler: To what extent in future versions could you incorporate additional mapping layers that would help identify threats to projects?
 - Colin Stief: We would definitely be able to add that data into this project, but we just have to make sure we narrow down the types of data available.
 - Tom Schueler: I could also see this tool being useful to help capture legacy BMPs in order to help reconstruct the BMP inventory that communities may not have mapped.

- Heather Gewandter asked if the project had tried to incorporate mapped storm drains. Colin Stief replied that they did not include that data for a multitude of reasons but could potentially incorporate it in a future iteration of the tool.

USWG Agenda Item Planning

- The next meeting is February 21st from 10:00 – 12:00 PM. Based on feedback received, the workgroup may discuss the proposed FAQ document (otherwise it will be teed up for March).
- Potential presentation from Greg Noe (USGS) regarding bank and floodplain sediment flux.
- Update from Modeling Team on Phase 6 model calibration.
- Fact sheet for Urban Tree Canopy Expansion and Forest Planting BMPs (Jeremy Hanson).
- Discussion of Wetlands Expert Panel and practices that impact the Urban sector.

ACTION: USWG members should submit agenda topics for the February workgroup meeting to David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com).

Participants:

Tom Schueler	CSN
David Wood	CSN
Bill Stack	CWP
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Jill Whitcomb	PA DEP
David Goerman	PA DEP
Lee Murphy	PA DEP
Kelsey Brooks	VA DEQ
Pantea Westermann	VA DEQ
Derick Winn	VA DEQ
Randy Greer	DNREC
Elaine Webb	DNREC
Sebastian Donner	WVDEP
Chad Thompson	WVDEP
Greg Sandi	MDE
Christina Lyerly	MDE
Paul Emmart	MDE
Debbie Cappuccitti	MDE

Julie Winters	EPA CBPO
Jeff Sweeney	EPA CBPO
Lucinda Power	EPA CBPO
Donna Marie Foster	USFS
Joe Wood	CBF
Gary Shenk	USGS
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Heather Gewandter	City of Rockville MD
Raghavenderrao Badami	Anne Arundel County MD
Rick Fisher	Anne Arundel County MD
Melissa Hurlinski	Anne Arundel County MD
Nathan Forand	Baltimore County MD
Brad Chao	Prince William County MD
Tony Marquez	Prince William County MD
Marty Hurd	Fairfax County VA
Mark Symborski	M-NCPPC
Cecelia Lane	DOEE
Ted Brown	Biohabitats