

**Urban Stormwater Workgroup Conference Call**  
**May 17, 2016**  
**10:00AM-12:00PM**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Summary of Action and Decision Items**

ACTION: In June, the USWG will be asked to make decisions related to fertilizer application on urban lands. The Workgroup will specifically be asked to make decisions about whether fertilizer application methodologies should vary by jurisdiction and through time.

DECISION: The Urban Stormwater Workgroup endorsed the Land Use Workgroup's recommendation to classify road right of ways that display as barren and low vegetation land cover as 100% Turf Grass in the Phase 6 Model.

DECISION: The Urban Stormwater Workgroup endorsed the Land Use Workgroup's recommendation to use the Fraction Land Use Methodology for classifying barren and low vegetation land cover in the Phase 6 Model.

ACTION: Norm will work with MDE to revise the CMAC crediting proposal.

ACTION: Tom and Norm will draft up a potential E3 Scenario for the urban sector and will present it to the USWG for discussion and editing at an upcoming meeting.

**Announcements**

- Floating Treatment Wetlands Panel: Report was distributed to the panel members for final review. Debut webinar will be held during the third week of June, which will kick-off the 30 day open comment period.
- Impervious Cover Disconnection Panel: Report was released to the public yesterday, May 16<sup>th</sup>. Debut webinar will be held on Friday June 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- Urban Tree Canopy Panel: Debut webinar will be held on Friday, May 20<sup>th</sup>. Comments on the report are due by June 9<sup>th</sup>.
  - Greg Busch (MDE): If the urban tree canopy panel makes a recommendation that impacts the urban sector, does the report need to get approval from the USWG, even if it was convened by the Forestry Workgroup?
  - Norm Goulet (Chair, NVRC): The WQGIT will want the USWG blessing even if the protocol doesn't ask for our formal approval. That said, we have a very tight timeline and I suggest that states not wait until the last minute to review and start gathering data for all of these practices. If you have a major flaw comment, please get those in as early as possible in the process.
- Street Sweeping Panel: Management Board will make a final decision on the report on Thursday, May 19<sup>th</sup>.
- Erosion and Sediment Control Fact Sheet Released

**Milestone and Progress Run Updates** – Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Jeff presented state by state results on the pace of nutrient and sediment loads being achieved by the urban sector through BMP implementation, and whether they are on track to achieve 60% of their planned urban nutrient reductions by 2017.

**Discussion:**

- Norm requested that implementation numbers be broken out by regulated versus non-regulated communities.
  - The Bay Program's tracking and modeling tools are able to split out regulated and non-regulated lands, but the state WIPs don't distinguish where the practices will go. Most infiltration practices are likely in the MS4s, but states are not required to make that designation.
- There was interest in seeing how results will be impacted by Phase 6 Model changes.
- Heather Gewandter (City of Rockville): How confident are we that the MS4s are reporting good information?
  - Jeff Sweeney (EPA, CBPO): It is variable across the watershed.
  - Goulet: This does not incorporate the historic data cleanup effort, and we do know there were problems with BMP data in Phase 5.3.2. We don't know yet if that data will be corrected in Phase 6, but there was a major effort by states to get that corrected. I suspect that to some degree we still have the same problem.
- It was suggested that Phase III WIPs will need to address the costs of retrofits in order to be more realistic about implementation.

**Fertilizer Statistics Update** – Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Jeff provided an update on where things stand with states' tracking and reporting of fertilizer sales to support the automatic fertilizer reductions, briefed the workgroup on the status of the alternative approach and reminded jurisdictions that they are encouraged to collect and submit more accurate fertilizer sales data by September 1, 2016.

**Discussion:**

- There will be a need, especially for phosphorus, to look closely at the 2006-14 data to see what changes occur because of legislative changes.
  - Norm Goulet recommended that once the USWG gets the new data, to see if there is an inflection in phosphorus application around 2006. There may be a need to vary application curves by state and by year.
- Karl Berger expressed concern with using linear regression for some states where the patterns do not seem linear. There are several inflection points that seem visible in the data.
- Bevin Buchheister (CBC) pointed out that the fertilizer law wasn't passed until 2011 in Maryland, so the inflection point in application rates might be later.
- Norm suggested two regression equations, one for before the legislation and one for after.
- Alisha Mulkey (MDA): Maryland, as of FY14, has implemented our annual reporting. We have data from FY14 that may not be good quality due to it being the first year of the program. We also have FY15 data that is still being quality checked. We would just need to talk about time constraints for when you need the data and when it is ready for the public.

- Goulet: We are confident that we will get more accurate data moving forward, so the question is what we do from 1985 to the present.
- Sweeney: You need to start making decisions about how to do this, because we don't want to make this change at the last minute. We have a third Model calibration in July. You have enough information here to know if you want a Bay-wide number or to vary things, etc. While the actual data will come in during June, you have the big pieces you need to make general decisions.

**ACTION:** In June, the USWG will be asked to make decisions related to fertilizer application on urban lands. The Workgroup will specifically be asked to make decisions about whether fertilizer application methodologies should vary by jurisdiction and through time.

#### **Fractional Land Use** – Peter Claggett, USGS

Peter briefed the workgroup on how to classify land uses that will show up as herbaceous or barren in high resolution data.

#### **Discussion:**

- Peter asked the USWG to make a recommendation regarding how road right-of-ways should be classified if they show up in the land cover imagery as barren or herbaceous.
- Marty Hurd (DOEE): Classifying it as 100% Turf seems to be the better option.
- Chris Swanson (VDOT): Post-construction, if it is compacted, we manage it like turf. There are places where, because of vegetative practices, we allow it to return to more natural state, and then we report it that way.
  - Goulet: Those larger, natural sections would be picked up by the land cover imagery. I think it is more of the fringes.
- Are states comfortable with road right of ways that display as barren and low vegetation land cover being classified as 100% Turf Grass in the Phase 6 Model?
  - Greg Busch (MDE): Maryland is comfortable with the recommendation.
  - Ken Murin (PA DEP): Pennsylvania is comfortable.
  - Kelsey Brooks (VA DEQ): Virginia is comfortable moving forward.
  - Marty Hurd (DOEE): D.C. is comfortable.
  - Alana Hartman (WV DEP): West Virginia is comfortable with turf.
  - New York and Delaware were not present on the call.

**DECISION:** The Urban Stormwater Workgroup endorsed the Land Use Workgroup's recommendation to classify road right of ways that display as barren and low vegetation land cover as 100% Turf Grass in the Phase 6 Model.

- Peter asked the USWG for a recommendation regarding the use of the fractional land use methodology to help classify barren and low vegetation land cover in the Phase 6 Model.
  - Considering the small acreage across the watershed that would be impacted by this methodology, the USWG felt comfortable following the LUWG's recommendation.
  - There were no objections to endorsing the Land Use Workgroup's recommendation to use the fractional methodology.

DECISION: The Urban Stormwater Workgroup endorsed the Land Use Workgroup's recommendation to use the Fraction Land Use Methodology for classifying barren and low vegetation land cover in the Phase 6 Model.

#### **Overview of the Impervious Disconnect Panel Recommendations** -- Bill Stack, CWP

Bill Stack provided a brief overview of the recommendations of the Impervious Disconnect expert panel.

#### **Discussion:**

- Berger: Did the panel look at pervious land amendments and that would reduce runoff from rainfall as opposed to diversions from impervious surfaces?
  - Stack: We looked at that, but the panel agreed and strongly recommend that another group do that work. Because we were using the adjustor curves, we did not have the time to get into that.
- Ted Brown (Biohabitats): Maybe simple edits could be made to clarify how this report differs or expands upon the retrofit panel report.
- Heather Gewandter (City of Rockville): I think there will be a need to talk about how these practices will be verified and preserved.

#### **CMAC Crediting Proposal** -- Norm Goulet, NVRC

Norm presented the revised CMAC crediting proposal to the urban stormwater workgroup and discussed next steps for moving it forward.

#### **Discussion:**

- Ray Bahr (MDE): Our concern is that this write-up implies that if you implement this technology to a riser structure in a pond, you instantly get more storage and improved efficiencies. I think we can support this with the qualifying language you included, but please incorporate some of that qualifying language from the introduction into the examples, in order to show it is part of the retrofit design. I can work with you on the language.
- Goulet: We will try to move this forward, but we need to put it on the back burner for a bit.

ACTION: Norm will work with MDE to revise the CMAC crediting proposal.

#### **Everyone, Everywhere, Doing Everything (E3) Scenario Discussion** -- Jeff Sweeney, EPA

The E3 Scenario is an estimate of applying management actions to the fullest possible extent. Jeff provided a brief overview of what the E3 scenario is and how it has been used in the past.

#### **Discussion:**

- Goulet: I see a high reliance on the new performance standards, stormwater retrofits, and urban nutrient management. I can also see a decent number of stream restoration practices and high reliance on the highest tier of erosion and sediment control.

ACTION: Tom and Norm will draft up a potential E3 Scenario for the urban sector and will present it to the USWG for discussion and editing at an upcoming meeting.

- Busch: What is the decision making process for this?

- Goulet: Every source sector workgroup will have to develop one of these scenarios, and I'm sure the Watershed Technical Workgroup will be involved as well. Each scenario will go to the WQGIT for final approval.
- Cecilia Lane: Is there a deadline for this effort?
  - Sweeney: The USWG is the first workgroup to start talking about it, so you have some time.
- Berger: Do we expect to end up with lower loading numbers in an E3 scenario compared to last time because the new practices may have higher efficiencies?
  - Goulet: I'm not sure, but my gut is that there would be it will be similar.
- Jeff recommended looking at Maryland's E3 method that was outlined in his presentation. The scenario shouldn't be too complex, but needs to help educate and explain how you got to the allocation.

### **Adjourned**

### **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
Steve Stewart	Baltimore Co.
Ted Brown	Biohabitats
Bevin Buchheister	CBC
Jesse Maines	City of Alexandria
Heather Gewandter	City of Rockville
Marty Hurd	DOEE
Julienne Bautista	DOEE
Alisha Goldstein	DOEE
Liz Ottinger	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Ginny Snead	Louis Berger
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Ray Bahr	MDE
Christina Lyerly	MDE
Greg Busch	MDE
Pam Parker	Montgomery Co.
Jamie Lefkowitz	OptiRTC
Ken Murin	PA DEP
Ryan Doran	SHA
Peter Claggett	USGS

Kelsey Brooks  
Chris Swanson  
Jeremy Hanson  
Alana Hartman  
Felicia Dell

VA DEQ  
VDOT  
VT, CBPO  
WV DEP  
YCPC