



Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting

Tuesday, April 16, 2019

10:00 AM to 2:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

10:00 Welcome and Review of March 19 Meeting Minutes. Norm Goulet, Chair. *Attach A.*

Decision: The USWG approved the March meeting minutes.

10:05 Announcements and Updates

- STAC Workshop on Contaminants of Concern will be held May 22-23, contact Rachel Dixon (dixonr@chesapeake.org) and Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov) for details and to register.
- USWG Priorities:
 - Will be discussed at an upcoming conference call this summer. The previous list that was drafted will go out in advance of that meeting.
 - Updating membership list for USWG this summer.
 - All participants are encouraged to contact David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) with any priorities for focus at upcoming meetings and projects.
 - Upcoming Baywide Stormwater Retreat will be focusing on ongoing priorities, including climate change, and potentially other issues like microplastics and toxic contaminants.
- Update on Shoreline Management BMP Technical Appendix:
 - The calculation for nutrient removal rates will be revisited in WTWG. USWG will be updated once WTWG has come to consensus on new calculations.
- Draft Phase III WIPs have been posted. All are available online on the Chesapeake Bay TMDL website ([link](#)).
- There will be a number of meetings on updating climate change-related information for stormwater. NY, Old Dominion University, among others are looking at various climate change tools in development to assess changes to IDF (intensity-duration-frequency) curves. This information will be available to USWG late in 2019.
- Next USWG meeting will likely be in June.

10:15 Group 1 Recommendations: Stream Restoration Verification. Tom Schueler, CSN (*Attach B*)

Tom briefly introduced new guidance on simple indicators that enable the public and private sector to inspect and verify stream restoration practices, as well as acknowledging the hard work and consensus achieved by this group of experts. Group members provided their individual perspectives, and the work group will have a limited opportunity to ask questions or offer comments. Today's presentation began the formal comment period for the workgroup (and the other 3 stream groups), concluding with its approval at a future USWG meeting. No decisions will be made to approve until after all comments are received and incorporated.

Discussion:

- Chris Spaur: I know STAC did a workshop on bioavailability of nutrient forms. There was discussion that using TN and TP metrics might be inaccurate to assess benefits to the Bay. When will those biogeochemical issues be included in these kinds of efficiency calculations.
 - Tom Schueler: That's not a focus of this group, but Group 3 is looking at the prevented sediment protocol. That group is looking at abandoning the conventional sediment calculations. However, that group is only midway through that assessment, so they won't have recommendations for another couple months.
 - Norm Goulet: The Modeling Workgroup is also looking at this issue. However, they are still working on getting the data that would be needed to assess this from a modeling standpoint. We don't have the modeling or monitoring information to understand nutrient speciation in BMPs. There is also the issue of how climate change might affect the nutrient speciation and delivery.
- Norm Goulet asked about the areas where there was no concurrence.
 - Schueler: This group addressed every area of their charge. There was robust discussion on many issues but all of them were resolved. Unlike a lot of stormwater BMPs, stream restoration is on a 5 year cycle. Verifying every 5 years is more frequent than stormwater retrofits and other stormwater projects.
- Goulet: This will have to be sent out to the states after the report is finalized so they can include this in their verification documents.
 - Schueler: Yes, including many state agencies and local governments. Many private sector folks need this information also.
- Heather Gewandter: MS4 communities assess every 3 years even though the CBP requires every 5 years. This is a resource intensive protocol, so how could local governments do this with limited resources on 3 year schedules?
 - Ray Bahr: Our department is revising our technical guidance on that. We will likely update it to default to the CBP inspection frequency. We will include that updated guidance for our new batch of permits going out later this year.

11:15 Group 2 Recommendations: Outfall Restoration Crediting Tom Schueler, CSN

Tom briefly introduced the group's consensus recommendations on a new protocol 5 for crediting outfall restoration projects (*Attach C*), and recognized the great efforts by the group. Tom also described the one unresolved issue involving drop structures and hard armoring. As with the previous item, individual group members provided their perspectives on this unresolved issue. The presentation began the formal comment period for the workgroup (and the other 3 stream groups), concluding with its approval at a future USWG meeting.

Discussion:

- Alison Santoro: There were no limitations on hard armoring for this practice. This would allow piping, gabion baskets, and armoring that we know have significant negative effects on downstream habitat, and there are no limitations on placement of these practices so there is theoretical possibility for piping along the entire length of a headwater stream. That is EPA's main concern. That may not be intended for this practice, but there is no written limitation in the draft protocol to prevent that. There is

also very little required for project monitoring. We [EPA] have included recommendations that we feel should be included in the memo to address these issues.

- Brenda Morgan: I also want to ask that we tighten up the location requirements to specify where these practices can be done. This should be explicitly an outfall practice, not in-channel practices. This also generates a lot more credit than other stream restoration practices, which may incentivize use outside of the intended scope of this practice. We see benefit in addressing sediment above streams, but it's not a restoration practice per se. However, I think we can find a way forward with some compromises.
- Dianne McNally: I also want to point out the 100-foot minimum. There is no justification in the document for that number. Also, addressing iron floculate is in the charge for this group, so I want to make sure that all the charges are being addressed. Because these practices fall under the larger stream restoration expert panel, I want to make sure that these protocols do not relax the basic requirements that the expert panel recommended in the original stream restoration protocols. I appreciate the opportunity to come to consensus here. I want us to be consistent in placement limitations for this practice.
- Goulet: As chair of the workgroup, I encourage all parties to draft specific language that the workgroup can react to and discuss. This is a collaborative process, and disagreements happen from time to time. In the past, we have taken concerns from dissenters, documented them, and passed them up the line to the WQGIT and the Management Board. Most of the time, dissenters lose out. I encourage you to work to an agreement in this body to work out these issues and come to a conclusion that everyone will accept.
- Tom Schuler asked about the credit for Protocol 5.
 - David Wood: We chose to use the stream bed and bank load to estimate the credits, and we can run that by the Modeling Workgroup again.
- Karen Coffman: We will work on comments in the next couple weeks and get something to you. I do think this does fill a need in the stream restoration practices, I just think we need to work out some of the details. We will work to get consensus on this issue.
- Tracy Harmon: If I can help reach a conclusion please let me know.

12:15 Lunch

12:45 WIP Data Dashboard

Emily Trentacoste, EPA

Emily introduced an online Data Dashboard to aid in WIP development and implementation. The dashboard consolidates and visualizes a broad range of technical information that can help partners at state and more local levels make decisions related to their restoration planning efforts.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet asked about the selecting jurisdictions feature—there is currently no feature to select multiple jurisdictions. I would also suggest including other geographies like soil conservation districts and MS4 boundaries in the map—for all information including loads and BMP implementation.
 - Trentacoste: We will be adding in that feature to select multiple counties, and we will work with the CAST team to see how we can import those other geographies into the dashboard tool.

- Emily will also look into including a comment feature on the dashboard for reviewers to leave comments directly in the tool.
- This tool has been going through soft release to WQGIT and workgroups since March 2019. Once review internally is finalized, a more formal announcement will be made. The Dashboard is available to the public at <http://gis.chesapeakebay.net/wip/dashboard/>. More formal trainings and releases to come this summer.
- There is an additional feature in development, the “build-your-own-story” tab, currently a GIT funded project in progress. There is also an open data portal in development at CBP, where a lot of individual data available in the dashboard will be available for download.
- All participants are encouraged to send feedback to Emily Trentacoste (trentacoste.emily@epa.gov) on the data dashboard features and opportunities for improvement.

1:15 CLASIC Tool Sybil Sharvelle and Tyler Dell, Colorado State University

Sybil and Tyler introduced the workgroup to a new urban stormwater tool that the Water Research Foundation has been developing, called “Community-enabled Lifecycle Analysis of Stormwater Infrastructure Costs (CLASIC) Tool.” This tool is still in development but may be useful to CBP in future planning. This is a planning-level tool, designed for use without bringing in custom information, but the more information practitioners can provide, the better the tool will perform. This is a national dataset, so any areas within the US can be identified for the tool.

Discussion:

- CLASIC is being updated based on studies working through methodology of building the modeling behind the tool. The papers on the study will be released concurrent with CLASIC, and the papers will be available on the tool website along with user guides.
- Additional questions can go to Tyler via email at tyler.dell@colostate.edu or Harry Zhang, Water Research Foundation (PI) at hzhang@waterrf.org.
- David Wood: We might be interested in sharing this presentation with our modeling team at CBP. Tyler concurred.

1:45 Adjourned

Attach A: March 19 Meeting Minutes
 Attach B: Group 1 Memo on Stream Restoration Verification (to be posted around 4/13)
 Attach C: Group 2 Memo on Outfall Restoration Crediting

Call Participants:

Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission (Chair)
 Tom Schueler, CSN (Coordinator)
 David Wood, CSN (Coordinator)
 Michelle Williams, CRC (Staffer)
 Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC

Ray Bahr, MDE
Shannon McKendrick, MDE
Cecilia Lane, DOEE
Sebastian Donner, WV DEP
Alanna Hartman, WV DEP
Ruth Minich Hobson, Va DEQ
Allan Brockenbrough, VA DEQ
Jeff S, VA DEQ
Chris Swanson, VDOT
Diann McNally, EPA Region III
Carrie Traver, EPA Region III
Jeremy Hanson, VT
Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO
Mark Hoffman, CBC
Nathan Forand, City of Baltimore
Heather Gewandter, Rockville MD
KC Filipino, HPPRD
Ginny Snead, AMC
Chris Spaur, ACE
Margot Cumming, CRC (Habitat GIT)
Brenda Morgan, Anne Arundel County WPRP
Alison Santoro, EPA
Audra Lew, Montgomery County Parks
Brock Reggi,
Diron Baker, Anne Arundel County WPRP
Tom Brown, PA DEP
Natalia Sanchez, UMD
Rebecca Cope, EPA
Alex Foraste,
Karen Coffman, EPA
Tracy Harmon, VDOT
Emily Trentacoste, EPA CBPO
Tyler Dell, Colorado State University