



Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 15, 2018

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The USWG approved the April USWG meeting minutes.

Action: USWG members and interested parties interested in participating in an ad-hoc group to develop best practices and review findings related to bacteria reductions in local TMDLs should contact David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) for more information and to participate in this ad-hoc group.

Decision: The USWG approved the conservation landscape crediting proposal. This homeowner BMP option is consistent with the homeowner BMP memo that was approved in 2014. This decision does not need formal approval from the partnership but will be transmitted to the WTWG for review and informational purposes.

Action: CSN will put together a 1-2 page charge for the group, which will be shared with the USWG via email in the next 2 weeks. Nominations will be open to serve on this group until the end of May 2018. Initial charge and list of group members will go back to the USWG in June for review. Contacts for questions, comments and nominations will be Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com), David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com), and Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu).

Action: All Partnership groups, including USWG, will be notified via email in the next couple weeks when the final EPA Phase III WIP expectations are released.

Welcome and Review of April Meeting Minutes (Norm Goulet) Attach. A

Decision: The USWG approved the April USWG meeting minutes.

Announcements

- *Upcoming CSN webcasts (Wood):* May 24 [webcast](#) on trash reduction programs (monitoring to establish program goals, tips and guidance for successful programs). Might have one more later this spring, otherwise will start again in the fall.
- *2019-2020 Model Input deadlines for data submission (Attachment B).* This is still draft, has not gone before the WQGIT. This will come around again once we have feedback and we will have a better sense what this will look like when we retire Phase 5.
- *Shoreline Management Report Update (Schueler):* We are working with Lew Linker and Bill Stack to release amendments by the end of this week. The biggest change will be nutrient reduction credits under the shoreline management practices.

- Dianne McNally: Are you bringing the revised shoreline management report back to the WQGIT?
 - Tom Schueler: The changes were approved last year at the WQGIT< but the changes were never made to the recommendations report itself. That has already been approved.
- *Joint Stream Health/USWG Meeting:* There will be an agenda out soon for our June 4 joint meeting with the Stream Health Workgroup. The meeting will include verification of stream restoration, regulatory and permitting processes, and other challenges in stream restoration.
- *Other Announcements:*
 - Jeremy Hanson: The draft response letter to STAC for BMP siting and design workshop is out for review and comment. We are receiving feedback until June 1 on that draft response letter.
 - David Wood: We are starting an ad-hoc team to work on bacteria removal. We have not had a meeting yet, and we are inviting volunteers to join that effort if you can. We will be looking at loading rates and hotspot targeting and tracking, as well as reduction practices and BMP removal rates. This will be a literature review effort and we will come out with a short recommendation report and some webcasts this fall. Contact David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) by email if you're interested in participating.

Action: USWG members and interested parties interested in participating in an ad-hoc group to develop best practices and review findings related to bacteria reductions in local TMDLs should contact David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) for more information and to participate in this ad-hoc group.

Conservation Landscape Crediting Proposal (Tom Schueler and Norm Goulet) Attach. C

Tom and Norm walked through a proposed approach for crediting conservation landscaping practice as a USWG BMP interpretation.

- Cecelia Lane: DOEE provided comments, and we do support the proposal as written.
- Tom Schueler: There is a typo in the second bullet of section 6—2019 should be changed to 2009.
- Asked if it can be reported immediately or is there a lag time to allow this to be reported and credited in the model.
- Hanson: Homeowner BMPs can be lumped together as a performance standard BMP—so I think this would be included in that set of homeowner BMPs.
- Schueler: Most of these BMPs are going to be reported through the SMART tool, still under development.

Decision: The USWG approved the conservation landscape crediting proposal. This homeowner BMP option is consistent with the homeowner BMP memo that was approved in 2014. This decision does not need formal approval from the partnership but will be transmitted to the WTWG for review and informational purposes.

Outfall Restoration Credit (Norm Goulet) Attach. D

Norm reviewed the feedback received on the outfall restoration BMP proposal and discussed the next steps and path forward.

- The original presentation was given at our [April USWG conference call](#). The USWG was asked to weigh in on the options for a path forward.
 - Option 1: develop an expert panel—would take about 2 years and would be subject to the BMP closure window so would not be included in CAST until 2021 for use in the 2023 milestones.
 - Option 2: could be considered a sub-class of the stream restoration panel and a smaller ad-hoc group could be formed to work on a protocol under stream restoration (similar to approach for Agricultural Stormwater EPEG recommendations)
- Feedback received from MDE in April —MDE supports the second option.
 - Jeff White: Regular stream restoration deals with lateral bank erosion while outfalls cause vertical erosion, so this would need to be a substantial addition to the stream restoration protocols if we go with option 2.
- Allan Brockenbrough: VA is leaning towards the second option, but we don't have consensus yet. We'd need to confer internally before VA makes a recommendation.
 - Schueler: Chris Swanson in VDOT is very supportive of Option 2.
- DE needs more review before they can make a recommendation.
- Norm Goulet: I like option 2 but am open to whatever the workgroup recommends.
- McNally: EPA Region III is with MD. We are concerned with the applicability of the current protocol and what the process would be for amending that stream restoration protocol. If we consider this a SW retrofit, we would need to do some work there. EPA R3 is also concerned with the N and P reductions that would be credited through this approach. What comments did you and Norm have with SHA that you handled offline?
 - Schueler: One issue was a model accounting issue of where the reductions would be credited from stream banks or from upland impervious cover. Other concern was 0 order vs 1-3 order streams and difference between practices for 1-3 orders and upland areas. Issues with larger coarse grain particles and their delivery to the Bay downstream. That's something a team would need to assess.
 - McNally asked what the scope of an ad-hoc group would be to amend the stream restoration protocols.
 - Schueler: Not sure yet, would need to ask the modelers. Our question would just be to determine how this should be credited and what the reductions would be.
- Cecelia Lane: It seems that this could work under stream restoration protocol one but would need tweaks to go forward.
- McNally: Protocol one is for lateral erosion. These aren't really streams, so maybe they fit more into protocol 4 for dry streams?
 - Schueler: We might consider a protocol 5. It might use the basic approach for protocol 1 but would have some tweaks for this unique practice. We would

approve an approach and come up with a protocol 5 and then send it to the WQGIT and WTWG for feedback.

- McNally: Are we agreeing that this is a stream restoration protocol 1 rather than a stormwater retrofit?
- Schueler: This is essentially a class of stream restoration from 0 order headwater streams.
- Jeff White: This is not a SW retrofit, as we are not trying to provide any kind of SW retention for volume with this practice.
- Tom Schueler suggested developing a 1-2 page charge for an ad-hoc group to develop an additional protocol 5 for the stream restoration report and recommendations, and call to the workgroup for nominations to serve on this group. This ad-hoc group will conduct about 3-4 phone calls and will bring back recommendations to the USWG for approval to review by WTWG and WQGIT in late summer/fall.
- Hanson: If MD or others want an interim BMP for this before the Aug 31 deadline for inclusion of interim BMPs in CAST, we could piece something together if there is a need from the states.
 - Tom Schueler agreed that the ad-hoc group would aim for the August 31 deadline for approval of this protocol as an interim BMP.
 - MD SHA, VDOT, and others have volunteered to guide this group and protocol development process. Would have about 3-4 phone calls to put together guidance as a protocol 5.
 - DOEE will provide a volunteer. Will follow up via email.
 - MDE will also contribute a representative.

Action: CSN will put together a 1-2 page charge for the group, which will be shared with the USWG via email in the next 2 weeks. Nominations will be open to serve on this group until the end of May 2018. Initial charge and list of group members will go back to the USWG in June for review. Contacts for questions, comments and nominations will be Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com), David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com), and Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu).

Phase III WIP Expectations Memo (Lucinda Power, EPA CBPO) Attach. E

Lucinda discussed the interim expectations released in 2017. The final expectations memo is still under review at EPA but is expected to be released in the next few weeks.

- Power: Many of these expectations are the same from the last expectations. We want 2 year milestones and annual progress reporting. Factoring new science information into the Phase III WIP documents. Three key policy issues are outlined for Conowingo, Climate Change and growth. Local Planning Goals are also a new addition to the expectations. PSC approved 2025 as the base year condition for establishing the Phase III WIPs. Those projections will be updated every 2 years with milestone updates. And projections will be subject to state and local review as well. Conowingo has own watershed implementation plan. ~6 million lbs N will be assigned to the Conowingo WIP. EPA will be taking proposals from states and partners on planning and financing

strategies for Conowingo. Climate change will be acknowledged in the Phase III WIPs, and beyond 2025 jurisdictions will address additional loads related to climate change. Co-benefit considerations are also encouraged for jurisdictions to use in developing their Phase III WIPs. Expectations also developed for PA. Federal agency expectations for milestones will also be released.

- Mary Gattis: Asked about the MPA schedule from postponing PSC decision on planning targets in July. Draft WIPs will change from March 1, 2019 and final June 6, 2019. Jurs need a year between when final planning targets are released and submitting final WIPs, but we want to stick to the overall schedule as well.
- Mary Gattis: Where does SW sit in the lagging discussion for Phase III?
 - Power: Each jurisdiction decides how they want to approach their source sector strategies. But we will want to see more attention in neglected sectors in their Phase III WIPs—particularly the unregulated sector. We have been working with jurisdictions and focusing on where they have more to reduce.
 - Schueler: Unreg SW is the largest challenge that the urban sector faces, and we will be having a discussion on that at the June 11 WQGIT call.

Action: All Partnership groups, including USWG, will be notified via email in the next couple weeks when the final EPA Phase III WIP expectations are released.

Topics for next call (June 19): Regenerative SW conveyance discussion with EPA.

Call Participants:

Tom Schueler, CSN
David Wood, CSN
Elaine Webb, DNREC
Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville
Jeff White, MDE
Jill Sunderland, HRPDC
Mark Hoffman, CBC
Mary Gattis, LGAC Coordinator
Allan Brockenborough, VA
Heather Ambrose, Fairfax County
Cecelia Lane, DOEE
Luke Cole, DOEE
Jullienne Bautista, DOEE
Sebastian Donner, WV DEP
Chad Thompson, WV DEP
Dianne McNally, EPA R3
Rebecca Cope, EPA R3
Lucinda Power, EPA CBPO
Jeremy Hanson, VT
Ted Brown, BioHabitats
Renee Reber, American Rivers

Melissa Harlinski, Anne Arundel County