



Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 16, 2019

10:00 AM to 11:15 AM

Conference Line: 929-205-6099

Meeting ID: 679-285-024

Zoom: <https://zoom.us/j/679285024>

10:00 Welcome and Review of June Meeting Minutes.

Norm Goulet, Chair. Attach A.

- **DECISION:** The USWG approved the March meeting minutes.

10:05 Announcements and Updates

- Webcast Schedule:
 - Starting on Thursday, September 12 we will start part 1 out of 4 tree series webcasts that are specifically about reforestation programs. Registration will open at the end of the week.
- Stream Restoration Update:
 - Group 3 met at the end of June. We are hoping for their recommendations at the USWG in September or October.
 - Group 4 has been on a hiatus and will reconvene at the end of August.
- Shoreline Management Update:
 - Revisions to the report and path forward are in discussion at the Modeling Workgroup and Watershed Technical Workgroup.
- MTD Update:
 - The group has met several times. A technical proposal is developed, and we are looking to integrate with the nationwide STEP effort.
- RDM/PED Update:
 - Tom presented our proposal at the June USWG meeting. Please reach out if you have feedback or would like to be involved. The presentation is available on the June USWG calendar page.
- Norm Goulet noted that feedback must be submitted by the deadlines given in USWG meetings to keep things moving forward up the chain. If the deadline cannot be met, please reach out to ask for more time.
- Welcome the new USWG staffer, Allie Wagner

10:15 Stream Restoration Outfall and Gully Memo

David Wood, CSN. Attach B.

Decision Requested: USWG members will be asked to approve the Outfall and Gully Stabilization Memo.

- David Wood noted that the paragraph highlighted in green on page 12 is the area of focus. We need to decide to keep this paragraph, remove it, or propose alternative language.
- Allison Santoro noted that there was confusion about this paragraph. If the idea is to prevent hardening, it should be more obvious in the language.
- Carrie Traver: Perhaps we could remove the headcut areas sentence that introduces a lot of confusion. I also see the current version does not have the appendices or photos.
 - David Wood: The photos will be added, and the appendices will include examples of applied projects and planning tools for screening purposes.

- Carrie Traver: The language still falls short of what we hoped. We would like to see discussion on unintended consequences in the memo.
- Norm Goulet called for current decision stances on the memo.
 - WV: Keep language as is
 - DE: Change in qualifying language for fish passage
 - DC: Change in qualifying language for fish passage
 - MD: Keep language as is
 - VA: Abstain
 - EPA, Region 3: Alternative language removing “headcut areas” sentence
 - Jesse Maines: Keep language as is
 - KC Fillipino: Keep language as is
 - Heather Gewandter: Change in qualifying language for fish passage
 - Chris Swanson: Keep language as is
- Norm Goulet: Is anyone opposed to adding fish passage language?
 - Unanimously, the group was unopposed to adding fish passage language.
- David Wood: To clarify, the idea behind removing the headcut areas sentence is that it is not allowable to use protocol 5 as an alternative to protocol 1 within these areas?
 - Carrie Traver: Yes, we did not discuss this thoroughly when it was added. We did not consider how that would affect other stream protocols.
- Ryan Cole: I think the headcut areas sentence is an important concept that needs to stay in the document.
 - Sebastian Donner: Without this language there would be no incentive for headcuts.
- Norm Goulet asked what language changes would be necessary to bring Carrie Traver and company into consensus for this to move forward?
 - Carrie Traver: I think our issue is that it needs to be less vague, and intentions need to be spelled out more explicitly.
 - Ryan Cole: The intention is to properly document the erosion losses and to incentivize targeting headcut areas for restoration.
- Cecilia Lane: Have the comments we submitted been addressed yet?
 - David Wood: Those are the last comments to be addressed, I will send them out to the group for feedback and work with you directly to incorporate those.
- David Wood suggested the following language:

“OGSPs are typically applicable to the HTZ that lacks perennial or seasonal flow. However, headcuts within perennial stream channels are a major source of sediment erosion, and the OGSP protocol is intended to provide a better option for estimating prevented sediment erosion in headwater channels with severe vertical incision (progressive bed-lowering). Therefore, the OGSP protocol may be applied as an alternative to Protocol 1, only in headcut areas (the credit is not additive), if it meets the following criteria:

 - The project **MUST** meet the more stringent stream restoration qualifying criteria outlined in the original Stream Restoration Expert Panel report for Protocol 1, in addition to the qualifying criteria outlined earlier in this document.
 - The project **MUST** meet the conditions of any and all state and federal permits.
 - The project **MUST NOT** introduce barriers or challenges to aquatic organism passage. Projects should always seek to improve passage of aquatic organisms where possible.
- **ACTION:** Please see the proposed language below to replace the green paragraph on page 12 of the attached Stream Restoration Outfall and Gully Memo. Please send comments to David (Wood.CSN@outlook.com) and Norm (NGoulet@novaregion.org) by COB this Friday, July 19. If no comments are received, it will be considered approved.

10:45 USWG Plan to Address Climate Change and Stormwater

Norm Goulet, Chair and David Wood, CSN. Attach C.

As a follow-up to our June meeting, David presented the work plan for maintaining the resiliency of stormwater and restoration practices in the face of climate change. Workgroup members provided feedback on the approach.

- Norm Goulet noted that we have submitted a GIT funding proposal through the WQGIT to develop IDF curves as a pilot for the entire Bay region.
- Heather Gewandter: A challenge as a community implementer is difficulty to potentially “do more” without the support of different regulations from state and federal partners. This has to be a wholistic approach.
 - Norm Goulet: I agree, however I’m hoping what David and Tom put together will kickstart effort for all states to focus on climate.
- David Wood: Feel free to email us any key groups we should reach out to and/or questions we should ask. We are hoping for initial stakeholder engagement in the Sept-Nov timeframe.
- ACTION: Please reach out to David and Tom if you are interested in participating in this effort.
 - Interested volunteers: Sebastian Donner, KC Fillipino, representative from DC to be decided, and Karl Berger

11:15 Adjourn

Next meeting: September 17, 2019 conference call 10 AM – 12:45 PM

Call Participants:

Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission (Chair)

Tom Schueler, CSN (Coordinator)

David Wood, CSN (Coordinator)

Allie Wagner, CRC (Staffer)

Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC

Ray Bahr, MDE

Liz Ottinger, EPA Region 3

Cecilia Lane, DOEE

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Allan Brockenbrough, VA DEQ

Chris Swanson, VDOT

Dianne McNally, EPA Region 3

Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO

Mark Hoffman, CBC

Heather Gewandter, Rockville MD

KC Fillipino, HPPRD

Chad Thompson, WV DEP

Jeff White, MDE

Adrienne Kotula, CBC

Ryan Cole, MDOT SHA

Allison Santoro, DNR

Julienne Bautista, DC DOEE

Jessica Martin, EPA Region 3

Bill Stack, CWP

Jesse Maines, City of Alexandria, VA

Carrie Traver, EPA Region 3

Sebastian Donner, WV DEP