

SUMMARY
Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG)
Teleconference
June 17th, 2014
9:30AM to 12:30PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/21154/>

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS & ACTION ITEMS

DECISION: The April minutes were approved as submitted.

ACTION: USWG members should provide feedback on the NDGI report by July 8th to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com).

ACTION: The reprioritized BMP panel queue will be typed up and distributed to the workgroup for their confirmation. At its joint July meeting with the LUWG, the USWG will determine whether impervious disconnection should be addressed as a land use or as a BMP.

MINUTES

Welcome and Review of April Minutes

- Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; USWG Chair) convened the call, welcomed participants and reviewed the agenda.
- Goulet called for comments on the April workgroup minutes ([Attachment A](#)); none were raised.
 - **DECISION:** The April minutes were approved as submitted.

Announcements

- Cecilia Lane (Chesapeake Stormwater Network) noted there were 76 entries in the Best Urban BMP in the Bay Awards (BUBBAs), sponsored by the Chesapeake Stormwater Network (CSN). The grand prize was awarded to the City of Lancaster for their Plum and Walnut Green Intersection project.
 - View the BUBBAs webpage for more information:
<http://chesapeakestormwater.net/the-bubbas/bubbas-voting/>
- Tom Schueler (CSN) explained the WQGIT approved the urban filter strips expert panel report on June 9th.
 - Schueler explained the materials from the STAC *Peculiarities of Perviousness* workshop are posted to the meeting page:
http://www.chesapeake.org/stac/workshop.php?activity_id=230
 - He explained there will be a joint USWG/LUWG meeting on July 15th in Annapolis

The schedule for CSN's fall stormwater webcast series "MS4 Implementers and the Bay TMDL" will be available soon

Milestones and Progress Runs for the Urban Sector

- Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO) explained there are two parts to the milestone evaluations, programmatic milestones and numeric milestones. The 2015 milestones will become public later in June. He reviewed results from the 2013 milestones, noting that overall the urban loads are not on track to hit the sector's 60% reduction goals by 2017.
 - View [his slides](#) for more details.
- Goulet: slide 6 raises some questions about the goals set by the phase 2 WIPs. Expect the Phase 3 WIPs will be significantly different.
 - Bill Keeling (VA DEQ) noted that after the BMP history gets clean up for the Phase 6 Model, the 2009 numbers on slide 6 may be smaller.
 - Schueler noted the states did not have the benefit of the numerous expert panel reports that have been approved in recent years. The Phase 3 WIPs will be much more informed and more options will be available to the states.
- Goulet asked Sweeney if there was analysis of regulated versus non-regulated urban land. He suggested starting to look at that, and it may make a difference in some of the states.
- Keeling noted that the NEIEN codes list currently does not have a distinction for regulated or MS4.
 - Goulet: if that is the case then the Watershed Technical Workgroup will need to make that update to the NEIEN codes list.
- There was discussion about the new performance standards BMP and reporting to the Chesapeake Bay Program and the relevant state agencies. Keeling noted that nothing has been reported to him yet as a performance standard BMP using the curves. Joan Salvati (VA DEQ) asked for clarification how the reporting would be done under the panel report. Schueler explained that if a site follows the new LID standards then they would report the total treated volume and use the curves to determine the reductions, rather than report individual practices or the dominant practice on the site.
 - Ray Bahr (MDE): We have been getting data from the counties and passing it on the CBP.
- Lane noted that CSN has done a few webcasts on the approved expert panel reports, and the webcasts are archived on the CSN website: <http://chesapeakestormwater.net/training-library/archived-webcasts/>
- Sweeney noted that after a few years for Urban Nutrient Management the jurisdictions will need to demonstrate nutrient reductions through non-farm fertilizer sales data.
- Goulet: will states have opportunity to modify their 2015 milestones or will these be final?
 - Sweeney: They will have the opportunity to modify them, and there is a Milestones workgroup that discusses issues like that.
- Schueler noted that Katherine Antos (EPA, CBPO) will discuss the 2015 milestones and programmatic milestones at the July USWG.

Nutrient discharges from grey infrastructure expert panel report

- Goulet explained there were some changes to the name of the BMP expert panel, which was originally called Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE). The panel renamed the suite of practices as nutrient discharges from grey infrastructure (NDGI).
- Tom Schueler reviewed the panel members, charge, findings and recommendations.
 - View [his presentation](#) for more information.

- View [the panel report](#) for the full set of recommendations.
- Bevin: does the Model assume that grey infrastructure does not have these discharges?
 - Schueler: These discharges are not explicitly simulated in the Model, but are implicitly captured through the calibration. The panel felt that these discharges account for a significant portion of the dry weather nutrient loads from urban pervious land. The panel did not recommend explicitly simulating the discharges in the Watershed Model.
- Schueler reviewed the various types of discharges that are covered in the panel report. He explained the data requirements to compute the credits. He noted that comments can be sent to Tom Schueler and Cecilia Lane by July 8th.
- **ACTION:** USWG members should provide feedback on the NDGI report by July 8th to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com).
- Ted Brown (Biohabitats) asked if the panel considered the role that watershed groups or volunteer efforts might play for this practice.
 - Schueler explained that if a watershed group is hired by the local government to do outfall screening or water quality monitoring, and discovers nutrient discharges, then the local government could in turn do the more complex sleuthing to eliminate the discharge.

Action item: reprioritization of queue for urban BMP review

- Goulet noted that a number of expert panels have been approved or launched over the past year. He reviewed the panels that have been completed and the BMPs in the queue.
 - Goulet asked the workgroup for their priorities and noted the panel queue from the previous year ([Attachment C](#)).
- Schueler noted that the CSN survey included a question on BMP panel priorities. The top response was for new bioretention designs with enhanced nutrient reduction features. Education and outreach, and impervious cover disconnection were the next two top responses.
- Schueler explained that stormwater expert panels will be shifting away from CSN toward Virginia Tech.
- Goulet: given the limited resources and constraints for Virginia Tech, suggest we identify our top two BMPs as a workgroup.
 - Keeling: Do not think the research and science is there to link education/outreach to nutrient reductions. An expert panel on that subject would be premature.
 - Goulet agreed. We know that the science is lacking from the UNM expert panel, which looked into this.
 - Salvati: Number 2 and number 4, and number 1 would be my priorities.
 - Jenny Tribo (Hampton Roads Planning District Commission) agreed with Keeling that education and outreach is difficult to quantify for reduction credit. There may be data in terms of pet waste programs though. 11:28...Impervious disconnect seems that it would be fairly simple and it is already in new construction standards, at least in Virginia. Would vote for bioretention enhancements if it includes information on varying efficiencies for Coastal Plain adaptations when unable to separate from groundwater. No discharge zones would also be a priority for coastal areas.

- Bahr: We have five priorities, in order. First, impervious disconnect. We are looking at development that was pre-1980s that may be more disconnected and essentially de facto meet performance standards. Then second outfall stabilization, trash reduction third, sub-soiling, and finally industrial pollution prevention practices.
- Schueler: Personally never seen much, if any, literature on nutrient reductions for outfall stabilization. Are we talking about dry channel RSC, or other methods like energy dissipaters and repairing erosion at end of pipe?
 - Bahr: It would be the latter. We would recommend working with MD SHA on this practice.
- Sebastian Donner (WV DEP): Impervious disconnect. Dry detention pond conversion, whether on its own or on purpose. With outfall stabilization, not sure how much we could take from the ESC BMPs that could be helpful on that. Based on the CSN survey there does seem to be a lot of interest in new bioretention designs.
 - Schueler: Dry detention pond conversions do not count as a retrofit. Think Steve Stewart has an ongoing research project to see if there is a benefit from that natural conversion.
- Randy Greer (DE DNREC): Disconnection first, and bioretention enhancements second. Also intrigued by alternative pervious cover as a third option. We have been wrestling with aforestation and reforestation.
- Karl Berger (MWCOG): DC is investing pretty heavily in outfall stabilization. It would be great if the USWG had a list of research priorities...
 - Goulet: This has come up at the GIT and CBPO staff is compiling a list based on the expert panel recommendations.
- Lane summarized the priorities from the participants: Impervious disconnect was the top priority. A lot of interest in outfall stabilization and bioretention with enhanced nutrient removal.
- Bucheister asked for clarification on the expert panel process with Virginia Tech.
 - Schueler noted that Brian Benham (Virginia Tech) will be invited to the July USWG meeting to discuss the Virginia Tech process. He is the project lead.
- Brown noted there is interest in the relative cost-per-pound of reduction for the practices.
 - Goulet noted that BMP unit costs have been incorporated into CAST/MAST/VAST.
 - Schueler: going forward perhaps the panels could include economic information if they find it.
- Tribo: We should discuss impervious disconnect at the joint July meeting. May be able to capture that BMP as a land use for the next Model, without a full expert panel.
 - Bahr agreed there is a nexus. Want to see it addressed from either direction. Some localities have done some field work on this issue already and could help provide information.
 - Goulet asked Bahr to gather some information to help inform the July LUWG/USWG discussion.
- **ACTION:** The reprioritized BMP panel queue will be typed up and distributed to the workgroup for their confirmation. At its joint July meeting with the LUWG, the USWG will determine whether impervious disconnection should be addressed as a land use or as a BMP.

Results of CSN stormwater implementation survey

- Cecilia Lane (CSN) and Tyler McCafferty (CSN) described the results from the Chesapeake Stormwater Network's 2014 BMP implementation survey.
 - View [the presentation](#) for more information
- Schueler noted the survey included a number of questions asked about the practices that have been implemented over the past year.
- Julie Winters: LGAC specifically mentioned a lack of trained stormwater professionals to implement these practices as a concern in its comments to the EC.
- Lane noted it was a much larger survey than what was discussed in the presentation. The full results will be made available next week.
 - Goulet noted that communication seemed to be a common concern throughout the survey results.

Proprietary BMP STAC workshop proposal

- Goulet explained that manufactured treatment devices (MTDs) are not currently credited in the Watershed Model, but it has been a frequent point of inquiry from the manufacturers and others. He noted there have been several states that have tried to establish programs to establish credit for these devices.
- Goulet: put together [Attachment F](#) as a concept for the workgroup to consider. This is not a BMP expert panel. Currently envision a group of 12-15 individuals. Somewhat based on Virginia Technology Assessment Protocol. This concept is for the Chesapeake Bay Technology Assessment Protocol (CBTAP). Asking the workgroup to add this to its workplan for the next year. Have spoken with Rich Batiuk and there is support for the idea.
- Working with Dave Sample on a STAC workshop proposal on this issue. Would use that workshop as a launching point for this process.
 - Randy: DE certainly supports this.
 - Schueler: CSN strongly supports this, and everyone wants to see innovation, but there are snake oil salesmen out there.
- Bucheister asked for examples of these MTDs
 - Schueler: Stormceptor, Filterra. See ads in Stormwater magazine for examples.
- Salvati: there is a long history for DCR and DEQ on this issue as we try to determine scientifically defensible efficiencies.

Other business

- Goulet noted the next meeting on July 15th will be a joint meeting with the Land Use workgroup. The main point of discussion will be urban land uses for the next Phase 6 Watershed model.
 - Berger: the goal is to pass on these recommendations to the WQGIT. We have limited time to get these land uses into the Phase 6 WSM.
 - Goulet encouraged the USWG members to review the materials in advance of the July 15th meeting.
- Goulet thanked participants for their time and input.

Adjourned

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Norm Goulet, Chair	Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Tom Schueler, Coordinator	CSN
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC, CBPO
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO
Ray Bahr	MDE
Kaitlyn Bendick	EPA Region III
Kate Bennett	Fairfax Co. (VA)
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Ted Brown	Biohabitats
Bevin Bucheister	CBC
Meo Curtis	Montgomery Co. (MD)
David Foster	Phoenix Initiatives
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Randy Greer	DE DNREC
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Bill Keeling	VA DEQ
Cecilia Lane	CSN
Marya Levelev	MDE
Tyler McCafferty	CSN
Pam Parker	
Joan Salvati	VA DEQ
Ginny Snead	Louis Berger Group
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County
Jeff Sweeney	EPA CBPO
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Julie Winters	EPA, CBPO