



Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting

Meeting Summary

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24808/>

Welcome and Review of April Meeting Minutes. Norm Goulet, Chair. Attach A.

- Meeting minutes were approved.

Announcements

- Roadside Ditch Management Update, T. Schueler: The roadside ditch team has met 3 times, and will be meeting again next week to finalize their decision on how to credit the 7 ditch management practices.
 - Norm Goulet: Are you looking at piggy-backing off an existing BMP?
 - Tom Scheuler: Yes, that's the basic recommendation. The hope is that we can use existing expert panel reports to inform the 7 practices, as well as the on-going Agricultural Ditch panel.
- MTD Update, N. Goulet: The group will be meeting towards the end of May, and again in June.
- Performance Enhancing Devices for BMPs Update, T. Schueler: The final report has been drafted, and provides information on improving filter media, altering underdrain condition, and managing vegetation over current bioretention design. It will be released in the coming weeks through the CSN, and will be presented to the USWG in June.
- Jeremy Hanson is working on a BMP guide to provide overview information on CBP-credited BMPs. Contact Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu) for more information.
- There will be a webinar on the Phase 6 Watershed Model Inputs on Thursday, May 25th from 1:00 – 3:00 PM. Information is available [here](#).

Phase 6 Land Use Overview. Peter Claggett, USGS and Karl Berger, MWCOG. Attach B.

Peter and Karl covered the following topics as an [overview](#) of the Phase 6 Land Use:

- Phase 6 Land Use Inputs: Characterize the breakdown of urban sector land uses, including MS4 overlays; what is considered urban regulated and nonregulated; how areas around farms classified as developed; and comparisons to Phase 5.3.2.
- Methodology for Projections and Hindcasting: Discuss the methods used to project 2025 land use conditions

Discussion:

- Tom Scheuler asked why there was such a change in the total mapped water between Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6. Peter Claggett replied that Phase 5.3.2 did not fully map streams

and rivers, and did not include surface water ponds. The Phase 6 land cover draws on mapped surface water combined with modeled streams.

- Karl Berger: So impervious acres increased because of our better ability to capture that land use, but I notice that mixed open grew and cropland shrank. Can you explain?
 - Peter Claggett: There's lots of agricultural open space, as well as institutions that we map as mixed open or turf grass.
- Norm Goulet asked if impervious was separated out between urban versus agricultural impervious acres. Peter Claggett replied that that this distinction was not made.
- Discussion surrounding loading rates for rural/agricultural impervious areas versus urban impervious areas. Increases in rural/agricultural imperviousness will be considered as an increase in total urban loads.
- Jamie Bauer: It seems like the very basis of our review or discussion will lead back to understanding differences between Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6. Will there be information or documentation on the differences between the two model versions?
 - Documentation will be made available by June 1st, and Peter Claggett will work to incorporate key differences between the two model versions.
- Norm asked why there were such differences between the regression metrics for the land use forecasting models between Virginia and Maryland. Peter replied that he would look into it.
- Ginny Sneed noted that the projections for James City County in VA seemed plausible to her, due to amenities such as schools that serve as a draw for migration. Peter Claggett replied that his team would be working to incorporate amenities in additional forecasts.
- Norm Goulet raised concerns about forecasted loading rates on a future land use, and how that may not be reflective of the scale at which the forecasts were developed.
 - Peter Claggett: I've shown some very fine-scale renditions of land use/land cover, but when this information is inputted to the model, it's aggregated to LRSEGs. For future scenarios, it's an aggregation of the mean or median value across multiple iterations. We're trying to address, through the aggregation process, the scale issues. The issue of loads from future land use is very important, and it's something that the source sector workgroups need to weigh in on, but I would hope that we consider that in the fall so that we can focus on finalizing these scenarios right now.

Phase 6 Review Kick-off. N. Goulet. Attach C, D.

The USWG was tasked with assisting in the review of the Phase 6 Model. We discussed where to focus review efforts and how to distribute the workload.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet suggested that individual state representatives do a thorough analysis based on documentation chapters 1-3.
- Jamie Bauer: How this review aligns with the state-by-state review? I want to make sure we're not duplicating efforts.
 - Norm replied that he anticipates VA DEQ colleagues relying on Jamie for her urban stormwater expertise, and that reviews will be unique to each jurisdiction.

- Tom asked how to structure the June meeting to address state and local government comments. Norm replied that the group should have at least a draft on a state-by-state basis of comments. Tom suggested that the June meeting be a first blush discussion of the model, with issue resolution during the July meeting.

USWG Agenda Planning for June. N. Goulet

- Round-table discussion of initial thoughts on the Phase 6 model documentation and calibration outputs.
- Jamie asked if the group should consider moving back the June meeting until the last week of the month. Workgroup seemed amenable, and Lindsey will distribute a poll to find a date that works for most members.
- Roadside Ditch Group recommendations
- Performance Enhancing Devices Recommendation Report
- Stream FAQ document

Attachments.

- Attach A. April USWG Meeting Minutes
- Attach B. Presentation on Phase 6 land use, forecasting, and hindcasting
- Attach C. Proposed Phase 6 Model Review Strategy Memo
- Attach D. Revised Midpoint Assessment Schedule

Participants:

Name	Affiliation
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Tom Scheuler	CSN
David Wood	CSN
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Julienne Bautista	DOEE
Diane Davis	DOEE
Randy Greer	DNREC
Elaine Webb	DNREC
Greg Busch	MDE
Jeff White	MDE
Raymond Bahr	MDE
Lee Murphy	PA DEP
Jamie Bauer	VA DEQ
Kate Creef	VAMSA/MAMSA
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Sebastian Donner	WVDEP

Chad Thompson	WV DEP
Chris Swanson	VDOT
KC Filippino	HRPDC
Jesse Maines	Alexandria VA
Steve Shofar	Montgomery County MD
Nathan Forand	Baltimore County MD DEPS
Ted Brown	Biohabitats
Peter Claggett	USGS
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Ginny Sneed	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.
Karl Berger	MWCOG