



Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting
Tuesday, November 16, 2021
10:00 AM to 11:45 AM
Meeting Minutes
Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

Actions and Decisions

Action: Hilary Swartwood will revise the Local Government Nominee list so that Jesse Maines remains as an alternate for VA.

Decision Requested: Workgroup members will be asked to recommend 3-4 priority actions to pass along to the WQGIT in December/January.

Action: USWG should send feedback/ questions on the urban fertilizer application update to Jeff Sweeney (sweeney.jeff@epa.gov) and Norm Goulet (ngoulet@novaregion.org).

Meeting Minutes

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

10:05 Announcements and Updates

- BMP Verification Committee Updates
- BMP Protocol Revisions
 - *Trying to isolate the technical appendix from the BMP report to try to minimize decisions being made that are more policy based whereas the technical appendix is less about that.*
- Report-Out from WQGIT Meeting
 - *David Wood gave a report out from the Joint meeting with Climate Resiliency in October. We will be coming back to WQGIT in winter (Jan/ Feb) with recommendations from this WG.*
 - *Olivia Devereux said that they are walking through with other GITs what Phase 7 would entail and getting their feedback. We are trying to keep CAST separate from the Watershed Model. We felt it was confusing to people to have these together especially since they are on different schedules.*
 - *Norm Goulet does not have a vote in the WQGIT, but KC Filippino does have a vote.*
 - *James Martin is stepping down from co- chair so there are positions available. Please nominate people that you feel would be a good fit.*
 - *Dave Montali, the modeling team as directed by the Modeling WG is at the pleasure of the WQGIT. Whatever the WQGIT comes up with that's what will be done.*
- Others

10:15 USWG Governance Updates. Hilary Swartwood, CRC and Norm Goulet, Chair

Decision Requested: Hilary and Norm will review the nominations received and the voting procedures. Nominees will introduce themselves, and current USWG members will be asked to vote on the at-large and local government positions.

Governance Reminders:

- *All nominee bio/resumes are in zip files on today's calendar page*
- *A list of nominees will be sent out with voting email*
- *A list of voting membership will also be sent out*
- *Voting procedures will be detailed in an email. This email will go out to the Voting Members only.*

Each nominee provided a brief overview of their skills and how they could contribute to the USWG. An email will be sent out to the voting membership post-meeting with the link to the survey poll.

Action: Hilary Swartwood will revise the Local Government Nominee list so that Jesse Maines remains as an alternate for VA.

10:35 Coastal Plain Rising Waters Workshop. David Wood, CSN

Throughout the two-day October meeting, one initiative stood out as a short-term product that could be pursued with existing resources. David will introduce a plan to conduct a one or two-day workshop in 2022 to address unique issues caused by climate change in tidewater communities. David will ask for initial thoughts on priority items for the workshop and ask USWG members for volunteers and/or recommended steering committee members to help guide the workshop development in the coming months.

Discussion:

KC Filippino: I will gladly help with this effort and volunteer us as an event space.

David Wood: Thanks KC, and if there is anyone else that you can think of that would be good fit please let me know.

Lew Linker: I wanted to ask about the European experience with this effort, is there a budget to support an international participation in the workshop?

David Wood: I don't know if we are quite there yet, Lew.

Sadie Drescher: David, if we go for the shoreline management topic, then I'm interested to help (though if others more qualified volunteer and I'm not needed no problem) as we (the Chesapeake Bay Trust) are especially interested in revamping this as a grant program and doing more in this space with other collaborators as we investigate what is needed on this topic.

10:50 Options to Promote Urban Watershed Resilience. David Wood, CSN

Following the joint USWG/CRWG meeting in October, CSN compiled a menu of options to recommend to the WQGIT in pursuit of promoting more resilient stormwater management. David will walk through the options again and present the results from the initial survey. David will then ask for discussion from the workgroup about new or missing options.

Decision Requested: Workgroup members will be asked to recommend 3-4 priority actions to pass along to the WQGIT in December/January.

Discussion

Norm Goulet: In terms of support levels in existing workplans, how much of this can you take on?

David Wood: most of these we would tackle one at a time, and we would need multiple partners involved. There would be some funding available but not for all of these. My hope is to have a discussion in the new year once we have a more refined priority list on how these fit into other work that's going on.

Martin Hurd: the top two options (decision support tool and update design specs) seem very similar to me. Could you explain the difference?

David Wood: There is an element that's interrelated- the decision support tool would support the design specs- the design specs however would be broader and would go beyond sizing criteria.

Tom Schueler: With the decision support tool, most communities expressed a strong interest that we deal with the risk management side of the equation and how to deal with those decisions. The BMP design specs are detailed, but they are only about the stormwater BMPs.

Alana Hartman: when I was reviewing the model priorities there was a bullet point about developing a better understanding of BMP responses. I was thinking that was something that the partnership still wanted done. I understand that this isn't really part of the white paper, but it is part of the modeling needs.

David Wood: we haven't lost sight of this we just sorted it into the research bucket.

Lew Linker: David I think your response was spot on and will add that this is a long- term problem and we will be spending the coming years on this. I think the urban stormwater workgroup is out ahead of most of the other workgroups. Is there a 'greater good neighborhood' that could address things watershed wide or statewide?

David Wood: the nice thing of any of these tools is that they would be applicable in any part of the watershed.

Lew Linker: are there any that would have that characteristic- broad application- for the watershed?

David Wood: I don't think so, in theory they all have the same potential.

Norm Goulet: I don't know so much if it's the driver, it may be a co-driver. Flooding is a significant driver.

Lew Linker: That makes perfect sense. We are talking about incentive (property damage, etc.). We would need a group that could frame what that kind of incentive looks like. For example, expert teams have assigned BMP stormwater efficiencies, but they can be updated based on influence from climate change etc.

Dave Montali: when would this information be available for us to develop something like this. When would we be able to say where the credit can be applied / have an expert panel evaluate it?

Norm Goulet: that's kind of what I was referring to, the research is just starting to trickle out. We may have to start with best professional judgement.

Heather Gewandter: from a local government perspective, the difference between using the local tools and using state tools, we only use it on an as needed basis. Most of the information I get is from the local or state level. I believe we will get a lot further with updating the state tools. When it comes to the vulnerabilities between neighborhoods and critical infrastructure- can they be one effort? Or can they be separate?

Dave Montali: I think you are spot on that some of the vulnerability assessments could be lumped together.

Ginny Snead: David, if you go with design standards, I am happy to help. I am currently helping some stormwater clients with this.

David Wood: thanks Ginny, I will reach out.

Low Linker: Getting an update of key stormwater BMP efficiencies to reflect the increase in nutrient and sediment removal efficiency if the BMPs were "right-sized" for current/future climate change would be very useful to have as we go through the milestone tracking of nutrient loads for the 2025 Assessment. Seems like this should be a priority and I agree with Tom's statement that "this is overdue."

11:30 Urban Fertilizer Application Update. Jeff Sweeney, EPA

New urban fertilizer data, incorporated into CAST21, has resulted in new urban fertilizer application rates for each Bay jurisdiction. Jeff will review the new data and explain the changes.

Discussion

Norm Goulet: I am not sure I can sign off on a rate of zero, but I am glad to see that some of the legislation is finally taking effect.

Jeff Sweeney: If you have a suggestion for what we can do, that would be great.

Karl Berger: I will echo what Jeff said then, he is only doing what he can with the method and data source available. My guess, it is not reflecting what happened on the ground but what happened in the reporting. I've never been happy with the methodology even before this. I don't know what this means for CAST 2021 but this reinforces the needs for further model development to find a better handle on this information.

Norm Goulet: we need to go back and look at the nutrient management BMP report and may need to come up with a carrot stick approach.

Dave Montali: For WV, we are going to ask that this not be implemented in CAST 2021 because this is a 800% difference based on data that is shaky. I understand the rules and I understand that Jeff will give me the raw data, but even if I can't find the errors it's absurd to make this kind of change. One might say that earlier application might have been low, certainly multiplying it by 9 and making it the highest application rate makes no sense either.

KC Filipino: It's clear that the fertilizer data is challenging but you are also using new land use data as well. How much is that compounding the application rate? Has anyone looked at turf grass acres?

Jeff Sweeney: slide 12 shows turf grass acres. What is driving the application rate is the fertilizer sales data.

Martin Hurd: For getting the correct guidance in place, my understanding is that the default rates are used for turf grass. It's a small percentage of overall turf grass. Most of the turf grass is mowed only but is not considered for credit. In terms of local and statewide, I don't know how those modeling results compare.

Jeff Sweeney: we use the total mass; we don't have information on percentage of the households use fertilizers and those that do not use fertilizer.

Action: USWG should send feedback/ questions on the urban fertilizer application update to Jeff Sweeney (sweeney.jeff@epa.gov) and Norm Goulet (ngoulet@novaregion.org).

12:00 Adjourn. *There will be no December USWG meeting.*

Call Participants

Hilary Swartwood, CRC

Liz Ottinger, EPA

Norm Goulet, NOVA

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

David Wood, CSN
Ted Brown, Biohabitats
Ginny Snead, AMT
KC Filippino, HRPDC
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
Kate Bennett, Montgomery County
Tom Schueler, CSN
Alana Hartman, WV DEP
Allan Brockenbrough, VA DEQ
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Fernando Pasquel, Arcadis
James Dunbar, DOEE
Eliza Cava, ANS
Monique Dykman, Londonderry
Jeff Colella, WVSA
Alex Foraste VDOT
Teresa Coon, WV DEP
Sophia Grossweiler, MDE
Randell Greer, DNREC
Nora Jackson, NVRC
Mark Hoffman, CBC
Lew Linker, EPA
Kevin Hess, PA DEP
Elaine Webb, DNREC
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Aileen Craig,
Brenda Morgan,
Jesse Maines,
Jamie Alberti,
Martin Hurd,
Heather Gewandter,