

## **Urban Stormwater Workgroup Conference Call**

**February 16, 2016**

**10:00AM-12:30PM**

### **Meeting Minutes**

#### Summary of Action and Decision Items

**DECISION:** The USWG approved the January meeting minutes as-written.

**ACTION:** The USWG will review the CMAC techniques proposal. In two weeks, a poll will be distributed requesting approval to tie this practice in to the existing retrofits expert panel process. Following USWG approval, the proposal will be sent to the WTWG and Scenario Builder team for review.

#### Announcements

**DECISION:** The USWG approved the January meeting minutes as-written.

- CSN is conducting a survey of MS4 permittees to identify key capacity gaps and needs. The survey closes on February 19<sup>th</sup> and responses will be shared, likely in March or April.
- Jeremy Hanson (VT, CBPO) reviewed the timeline for approving the Tree Canopy relative land use loading rates. A webinar was presented on February 11<sup>th</sup> and there is a February 22<sup>nd</sup> deadline for sending feedback to Julie Mawhorter (USFS). The USWG will be briefed on the loading rates and asked to approve them on March 8<sup>th</sup>.
- In 2013, when the Urban Nutrient Management expert panel put forward their recommendations, one of the provisions for approval was that more accurate non-farm fertilizer sales data be provided within three years. There are likely three choices: set the nutrient application rate back to where it used to be prior to the panel report; leave the nutrient application rate where it is now, even though we don't have better data; or do something in between.
- The Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP expert panel report was presented to WTWG on February 4<sup>th</sup>. The WTWG will be asked to approve the report on March 3<sup>rd</sup>.

#### Urban BMP Decisions – Marcus Quigley, OptiRTC

Mr. Quigley presented an approach for crediting CMAC techniques that complies with the recently adopted Process for Handling Urban BMP Decision Requests (Attach B) and showed a few examples of how it would work in practice. (Attach C).

#### **Discussion:**

- Norm Goulet (NVRC, Chair): I believe this type of technology is the way forward for stormwater facilities.
- Tom Schueler (CSN, Coordinator): I am satisfied with the documentation OptiRTC has provided and compliment them for organizing it the way they have. If there are no comments now, we could have a one to two week comment period, if members would like.

- Marty Hurd (DOEE): This doesn't seem to be a new BMP. It seems we have existing processes, and jurisdictions could report new retrofit data requirements and retain records for verifications and still be in compliance with the existing methods.
  - Schueler: That is sort of the purpose of this review. We have an existing panel reporting system, and the localities and states wanted information about how to map these new technologies into the existing retrofits.
  - Quigley: We just had some questions and we feel that having this process defined is important for the practice. It would be great if the answer is that this is not a challenge.
    - Goulet: I don't see it as a challenge, it confirms for the states that this is an accepted practice under the retrofit process. We will come out with a definitive answer soon.

**ACTION:** The USWG will review the CMAC techniques proposal. In two weeks, a poll will be distributed requesting approval to tie this practice in to the existing retrofits expert panel process. Following USWG approval, the proposal will be sent to the WTWG and Scenario Builder team for review.

- Ken Murin (PA DEP): This is essentially an extended detention basin? To us, that is a pretty large ratio of size and drainage area to a relatively large basin to get that much credit. I don't know that we would approve something like that because I don't know that you would get that much reduction from an extended detention basin.
  - Goulet: I think the key is that the outlet structure can be completely controlled so you don't end up with the downstream scouring that you get with other practices.
  - Ted Brown (Biohabitats): I think another benefit is the ability to improve hydrology, and to improve downstream impacts. If we can reduce velocity coming out, out downstream systems can heal.
- Mike Hickman (PA DEP): Would there be additional verification protocols?
  - Schueler: I don't think that there would be, it would fall into the existing retrofit category.

#### Quantifying Construction Site Acreage – Jeff White, MDE

Jeff presented MDE's methodology for better quantifying construction acreages on a year-to-year basis.

#### **Discussion:**

- Goulet: I think this is great. To be able to use actual aerial imagery seems to me like an improvement. Unfortunately, not all states have the same resources, but I will be interested to see how this method works in some of Maryland's more rural counties.
- White: We hope to have some verifications for these methods done in a few weeks. Testing it on the rural counties may take another month or two.

#### Historic BMP Data Cleanup – Jurisdictional USWG Representatives

USWG representatives from each jurisdiction discussed their experience with the historic stormwater management data clean-up efforts.

#### **Discussion:**

- Randy Greer (DE DNREC): The implementation numbers that Jeff Sweeney showed in January do not look like the numbers I reported, and I am currently trying to find out why. There seems to be some order-of-magnitude error. Between erosion and sediment control and stormwater, we should be around 10,000 acres. I haven't talked to Jeff yet, but I have the data I passed along to our data reporters and I am trying to find where the problem happened.
- Marty Hurd (DOEE): I think there are some reasons for why our numbers are lower in Phase 6 than in Phase 5.3.2. Inspection teams keep a lot of records on paper, so they are difficult to track down and report. Also, a lot of BMPs prior to 2005 were retired because of a lack of inspection or verification, which we're ok with because we don't know that they are actually still there and working. There were also a few small data errors. Finally, we are starting a data validation and verification effort to update the digital record, confirm or remove non-functional BMPs, and obtain necessary information on new stormwater performance standards.
- Ray Bahr (MDE): We did QA/QC on BMPs and acreages. Many practices were missing drainage areas or as-built dates, and we have been using MS4 annual report reviews to find that information. In the Phase 5.3.2 Model, we made a few assumptions for how to generate data based on stormwater management by era using growth projections. There are also a number of BMPs that our MS4 geodatabases can't pick up, so we asked locals to submit MS4 restoration data. Finally, we are striving to only credit BMPs that have been verified. We still need to reach out and do more BMP verification in MS4s, as well as state and federal properties. Over time these numbers will go up as we verify more BMPs, but we support the implementation numbers Jeff Sweeney showed in January.
- Jaimie Bauer (VA DEQ): In Phase 5.3.2, we didn't have a lot of verifiable data, so we had to take a best guess estimate to figure out what was actually implemented and we did that based on laws and regulations enacted. We weren't surprised at some level of discrepancy, but after talking with Bill Keeling (VA DEQ), there may be some circumstances to contribute to that. We ran out of time to get some data in that was submitted late by the localities. We also had some localities submit data in a format that wasn't NEIEN-compatible that didn't make it in. We also had thousands of manufactured treatment devices for which we can't provide data. Has there been analysis from a more recent point forward? Say 2005/2006 forward to see if data is more compatible?
- Sebastian Donner (WV DEP): We initially reported BMPs based on permit data. Now we have cleaned that up to verified BMPs that were actually implemented.
- Ken Murin (PA DEP): We did have more BMPs available that we wanted to report that we didn't have acreage available for in the Model. We also had struggles with paper records.
  - Goulet: I would be leery of trying to make implementation numbers fit with the land use estimates from Phase 5.3.2. More than likely, you will get more urban land in Phase 6 than in Phase 5.3.2.
  - Murin: I agree that we need to be careful with that.
- Goulet; It sounds like there is a general level of comfort with the information that Jeff presented last month. That brings up several discussions: 1) when these numbers hit the streets, there will be a lot of eyebrows raised from a political stand point because it will show that a lot of the BMPs that were being reported were not actually there; 2) we have a lot less BMP coverage going into the Phase 6 Model than we previously thought, but the water quality is what it is. Does that mean our practices are more efficient than we thought? Or is the urban loading rate

way too high? For jurisdictions still working on their historic BMP data inventory, I would expect a drop dead of June or July to get that data in.

- Katherine Antos (EPA): This is very helpful information and I will pass this along to Jeff along with the questions that this information is raising.
- Donner: I think some of the loading rates seem awfully high. I don't know what our options are for adjusting those at this time.
- Kate Bennett (Fairfax Co.): It sounds like there is still a need for more review of the data, and we would be happy to work with D.C. to see if our data matches what we're seeing in the Model.

#### Revisiting the BMP Removal Rate Adjustor Curves – Mike Hickman, PA DEP

Pennsylvania discussed the retrofit curve removal rates for the BMP Enhancement category as outlined in the Expert Panel Report. As Pennsylvania's NPDES PCSM regulations require approximately 2.8-inches of volume removal, there is concern that there is no mechanism to obtain pollution removal credit by enhancing BMP performance.

#### **Discussion:**

- Goulet: I don't think there was anything hard and fast about the 2.5 inch threshold in the adjustor curve. I will be curious to see what the results show.
- Hickman: We want to explore what we can do to extend the curves further because we want to provide all the available tools to our MS4s.
- Brown: My understanding is the Pennsylvania criteria is unique because you are treating the difference between what the retrofit was treating and what it will be treating. How does that difference in volume translate to an equivalent rainfall depth? I would think it would be less than 2.8 inches. Also, that is a new development criteria and I am confused about retrofit opportunities versus what new development is required to do to meet the new criteria?
  - Hickman: We run a curve number analysis, look at the pre-condition and the post-condition, and run 2.8 in the curve analysis and find the difference. Given the impervious acre percentage in that analysis, it comes very close to 2.8 inches. My concern is infiltration basins. There are a lot of basins built after 2010 and there will be a desire to look at retrofitting basins put in after 2010.
    - Brown: So you are targeting facilities to retrofit beyond your already stringent criteria.
- Goulet: Once you get to cost-benefit analysis, I don't see this being a high priority, but I don't see why the curve can't extend beyond 2.5 inches, so I look forward to see what you can put together.

#### Adjourn

List of Call Participants

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Norm Goulet (Chair)	NVRC
Tom Schueler (Coordinator)	CSN
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Cecilia Lane	CSN
Ted Brown	Biohabitats
Jesse Maines	City of Alexandria
Heather Gewandter	City of Rockville
Randy Greer	DE DNREC
Elaine Webb	DE DNREC
Julienne Bautista	DOEE
Marty Hurd	DOEE
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO
Kate Bennet	Fairfax Co.
Jim Caldwell	Howard Co.
Mary Gattis	LGAC
Ginny Snead	Louis Berger
Ray Bahr	MDE
Christina Lyerly	MDE
Jeff White	MDE
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Carol Lafay	NYSDEC
Marcus Quigley	OptiRTC
Jaime Lefkowitz	OptiRTC
Ken Murin	PA DEP
Mike Hickman	PA DEP
Joel Whitman	PA DEP
Doug Goodlander	PA DEP
Jaime Bauer	VA DEQ
Kelsey Brooks	VA DEQ
Chris Swanson	VDOT
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Alana Hartman	WV DEP