



## Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting

**Tuesday, September 15, 2015**

**10:00 AM to 12:15 PM**

**<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/22424/>**

### **Minutes**

---

#### **Summary of Action and Decision Items**

**ACTION:** Cecilia and Tom will put together a memo to send to NFWF describing the USWG's top research priorities so that it can feed into NFWF's annual RFP.

**ACTION:** The 3<sup>rd</sup> research priority should be revised to include an investigation of all nitrogen and phosphorus (not just organic), and should mention paired watershed studies.

**ACTION:** Maryland should send their AACSPPO data they are using for non-farm fertilizer sales to Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO).

**DECISION:** The USWG did not reach consensus on approving the Urban Tree Canopy land use proposal. The official USWG representative from each signatory should send any comments/concerns with the proposal to Norm Goulet, David Wood and Tom Schueler by September 22.

**ACTION:** The USWG will seek answers to the following questions related to the UTC land use proposal:

1. How will the urban tree canopy land uses be mapped and hindcast?
2. Is the additional 1.5% reduction of nitrogen (compared to phosphorus) justified for TC over impervious?
3. What is the mechanism for ensuring there is no double counting of tree canopy benefits?

#### **Welcome and Review of June 16 Meeting Minutes.** N. Goulet, Attach A

Norm (Chair) and Cecilia Lane (CSN) provided several announcement and updates:

- Impervious Disconnections BMP Expert Panel is holding their open stakeholder meeting this afternoon (September 15) at 1:00pm and all USWG are invited to attend.
- Update on the Street Cleaning Expert Panel: Comments from the panelists are due to Tom Schueler (CSN) later this week. They will hold a debut webinar on Tuesday, September 29 at 10:30am to discuss their recommendations. That webinar will open the 30-day comment period.
- Update on the Urban BMP Factsheets: Five are finished and were distributed in August. They are currently posted on the CSN website. Three new factsheets are expected before the end of 2015.
- The CSN fall webcast series will be focusing on engagement with residential stewardship and urban nutrient management. That series will begin next week, September 24, with a webinar on neighborhood engagement in restoration.

**Walkable Watersheds.** Alisa Hefner and Vernice Millers-Travis, Skeo Solutions

Alisa and Vernice presented on the Walkable Watersheds initiative to help facilitate a discussion on some of the barriers to implementation in the urban sector and to share with USWG members some ways to promote implementation and make sure they are aware of technical resources that are available that may address these barriers. (Attach B1-4).

**Discussion:**

- USWG members recommended that Alisa and Vernice reach out to LGAC to discuss the topic and to increase the visibility of their Walkable Watersheds approach.
- Norm agreed that it would be useful to speak with LGAC and CAC, and suggested that their effort would likely have to be driven by stakeholders rather than local governments.
- For those looking for more information, Skeo Solutions will have a 90 minutes session at the Chesapeake Watershed Forum and their contact info is posted in their Powerpoint presentation.

**Urban BMP Research Priorities.** C. Lane (CSN)

Cecilia presented the results of the workgroup's vote on top research priorities that have been identified by the work group and expert panels over the last several years (Attach C).

**Discussion:**

ACTION: Cecilia and Tom will put together a memo to send to NFWF describing the USWG's top research priorities so that it can feed into NFWF's annual RFP.

ACTION: The 3<sup>rd</sup> research priority should be revised to include an investigation of all nitrogen and phosphorus (not just organic), and should mention paired watershed studies.

**Agriculture Fertilizer Statistics.** Carol Holko (MDA), Dan Woodall (DDA) Larry Nichols (VDACS)

Carol, Dan and Larry provided updates on fertilizer sales statistics for Maryland, Delaware and Virginia (Attach D).

**Discussion:**

- Maryland is inputting all data on the 4 categories into a database. All FY14 data has been entered for the non-farm sectors. They are now putting those tonnage numbers into an official report.

ACTION: Maryland should send their AACSPPO data they are using for non-farm fertilizer sales to Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO).

- Delaware changed their reporting form to include turf and golf course categories and they are getting that data in. They will be able to provide tonnage numbers for those categories by early 2016.

- Virginia's data is broken into farm and non-farm data. They collected data for 2014-15 but that has not been entered into their database yet. Last year's data is available on their website. There was a slight decrease in non-farm fertilizer sales in the last fiscal year, but they don't have the breakdown for turf and horticulture applications. Virginia is working on another database system with online reporting that comes in from manufacturers, which will hopefully be done in 6 months or so.
- Goulet: We need to keep in mind that the automatic credit will go away if a plan isn't in place for fertilizer sales statistics. Karl and I will get together to discuss a 6 month game plan because the removal of that credit could have a major influence on annual progress numbers.
- There was an expressed desire among workgroup members to keep fertilizer sales reporting separate from the NEIEN reporting process.

### **Urban Tree Canopy Land Use Proposal.** Rebecca Hanmer (Chair, FWG)

Rebecca, Sally Claggett (USFS) and Neely Law (CWP) updated the USWG on the proposal from the Forestry Workgroup and Urban Tree Canopy expert panel to include three categories of Urban Tree Canopy land uses: UTC over Impervious, UTC over open space, and UTC over Turfgrass. (Attach E1-2)

### **Discussion:**

- Norm expressed concerns about the relative loading rates for the urban tree canopy (UTC) land uses being a little high because of the compacted soils in urban areas.
  - Neely Law (CWP): Tree roots help improve soil conditions, so it isn't directly accounted for, but the panel felt 0.2 was an adequate representation because of the wide range of soils in the watershed.
- Karl Berger (MWCOG): Was the 17% interception rate conservative?
  - Law: This is the midpoint value of all the studies we reviewed. I think it is a reasonable value, though not overly conservative. The panel was very conservative in the transpiration value.
- Goulet: Are the numbers annualized and taking into account that the trees are not intercepting for months out of the year?
  - Law: Yes.
- Bill Keeling (VA DEQ): I'm questioning how easy it is to map this land use. I have concerns about distinguishing the underlying land uses, not so much the leaf-on imagery. Can all urban BMPs be put on these tree canopy land uses, do they need to be tracked on these land uses?
  - Julie Mawhorter (USFS): If you don't know underlying land use, the BMPs get distributed across the urban land uses.
- Goulet: I can't recommend that we move forward with this land use proposal unless we know whether jurisdictions will get double counted for load reductions. My concern is that the Tetra Tech loading rate numbers very likely include data that already incorporated tree canopy effects, and this would likely be providing additional benefits. I think we need to know the mechanism for how we keep from double counting in the Watershed Model before we approve these loading rates.

- Rebecca Hanmer (FWG Chair): If we have more information to improve the loading rates later, can we incorporate the land uses now and make revisions to the loading rates later?
  - Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting): Yes, that is correct.
- Keeling: I also have concerns about hindcasting these tree canopy land uses. I don't think we have good data on mapping.
  - Mawhorter: That is an issue for all land uses. Peter does have tree canopy mapped and has the acreage numbers for the entire watershed. While these acreages are not perfect, as the high resolution data comes in, they will improve.
- Goulet: Can we get an answer to the hindcasting methodology from Peter? We will not have a decision today. I don't think the GIT would approve this without knowing the loading rates.
- Keeling: Expressed concern over the very small pool of literature. The main area of reduction is interception and the 14 studies listed included 12 modeled studies and only 2 measured ones. The primary ones used by the panel were Mid-Atlantic and Baltimore. CBP usually puts more weight on measured long term studies not modeling ones since the underlying assumptions or other issues with those models influences the outcomes. EPA and others questioned the AgNM panel's TP recommendations because that panel utilized modeling to help produce their recommended TP reductions.
- The workgroup expressed concern about the impact of loads being shifted to non-tree canopy urban land uses to account for the relative differences.
- Keeling: The inclusion of these land uses does not provide clarity to me but confuses the situation for SWM BMPs placement on the landscape. Concern over the issue of field studies of SWM BMPs already have the effect of tree canopy.
- Hanmer: I propose approving the expert panel's proposal with the understanding that we need to delve deeper into the double counting concern.
- Jenny Tribo (HRPDC): I think that given the schedule and the impact of not making a decision, I think it is a mistake to not include these tree canopy land uses because if we don't do it now, it is game over. However, if we include it, some of these discussions can still happen.

**DECISION:** The USWG did not reach consensus on approving the Urban Tree Canopy land use proposal. The official USWG representative from each signatory should send any comments/concerns with the proposal to Norm Goulet, David Wood and Tom Schueler by September 22.

**ACTION:** The USWG will seek answers to the following questions related to the UTC land use proposal:

4. How will the urban tree canopy land uses be mapped and hindcast?
5. Is the additional 1.5% reduction of nitrogen (compared to phosphorus) justified for TC over impervious?
6. What is the mechanism for ensuring there is no double counting of tree canopy benefits?

**GIT Funding Proposal Update.** N. Goulet

- There were no GIT funding proposal updates.

**Other Business and Adjourn.** N. Goulet

- Verification will be covered at the next USWG meeting. A schedule of upcoming verification activities and the links to some of the feedback reports on the draft verification program plans submitted by the jurisdictions on June 30 is posted on calendar page.

**Adjourn**