

SUMMARY
Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG)
Teleconference
Tuesday, May 21st, 2013
9:30 AM to 12:30 PM

www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19171/

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS & ACTION ITEMS

DECISION: The February minutes were accepted as submitted.

ACTION: Center for Watershed Protection to follow up with Sally Claggett and Tom Schueler regarding the relation of coastal buffers.

ACTION: USWG members are encouraged to recommend additional experts for the Floating Wetlands and Street Sweeping/Bulk Sediment Removal/Catch-basin clean out panels. Nominations should be sent to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com).

ACTION: Based on votes, CSN and CBPO staff will write up the priorities and order the queue to share in June. For land use loading rate, there will be some internal meetings on how to organize that effort and will report back in June.

ACTION: Comments on the draft FAQ document should be submitted to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and Cecilia Lane (watershedgal@hotmail.com) by July 1st. They will bring the document back for the USWG's approval in August, followed by WTWG.

ACTION: if any workgroup members have comments on land use projections for future progress runs, submit to Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net) and Norm Goulet (ngoulet@novaregion.org).

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of 2/21 Minutes

- Tom Schueler (Chesapeake Stormwater Network; USWG Coordinator) convened the call at 9:30AM and reviewed the [agenda](#). He noted Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; USWG Chair) was unable to attend the call and agreed to chair the call in his absence.
- He asked for comments or corrections to the February USWG minutes ([Attachment A](#)); hearing none, the minutes were accepted as written.
 - **DECISION:** The February minutes were accepted as submitted.

Announcements

- Schueler announced the WQGIT approved the urban stream restoration report
- Cecilia Lane (CSN) noted that the webcasts from the 5th Annual Baywide Stormwater retreat are archived and available on the CSN website here:
<http://chesapeakestormwater.net/2013/03/urban-bmps-and-the-bay-tmdl-webcast/>
- Schueler noted there will be multi-year funding available to work out the land use loading rates analysis during 2013 and 2014.

- There is a pilot project underway for a homeowner BMP crediting program in Howard County, MD. The program will allow homeowners to get credit for BMPs under the County stormwater utility and in the Bay Model. Based on results of the pilot, there will be recommendations for a Baywide rollout for homeowner BMPs.

Update on Current Expert Panels

- Neely Law (CWP): Urban filter strips/stream buffer upgrade panel is examining a new practice. Began in February and have been holding monthly meetings since. There are not many studies in the Bay watershed, though there is a lot of literature from North Carolina.
 - When asked if the panel was planning to recommend interim rates, Law indicated no, since interim rates would be confusing at this point.
- Sadie Drescher (CWP): Just had fifth meeting and have finished the literature review. Hope to release the recommendations by the end of the year.
 - Katherine Antos (EPA CBPO): has the panel considered whether the BMP would be built into the Watershed Model or the estuarine model?
 - Drescher: we'll continue to discuss this issue and have yet to make a decision. She noted Lew Linker is on the panel and is able to advise on modeling issues.
 - Shafer: will the shoreline or buffer panel cover "forested buffers"?
 - **ACTION:** CWP to follow up with Sally and Tom re: relation of coastal buffers.
- Lane: The Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE) panel is working with panelists at the CWP to draft a crediting approach.
- Jeremy Hanson (Chesapeake Research Consortium): the Erosion and sediment control panel has completed its literature review and hopes to have its recommendations to the workgroup in the summer.
 - Schueler: the panel still has to determine what the efficiency rates will be, but there is evidence to suggest that there may be no overall nutrient removal.

Action Item: Approval of Proposed Charge for Floating Wetland and Street Sweeping/Bulk Sediment Panels and Recruitment of Experts

- Schueler described floating treatment wetlands (FTW) and directed participants' attention to the draft charge ([Attachment B](#)).
 - He noted STAC has recommended two additional experts for the panel.
 - Antos: the charge seems to be right on the mark. Haven't spoken with him yet, but perhaps Lew Linker would be good to have on the panel.
 - Brown: Some vendors like BioHaven may have information or data that could be useful to the panel.
 - Antos: There is a WQGIT policy against having panel members with a conflict of interest, but the vendors can certainly be invited to present to the panel or provide information.
 - Schueler: We could use some more local government reps. Ask USWG members to recommend additional experts over next two weeks.
 - Asked for amendments to the charge; none were raised.
 - Steve Stewart, Baltimore County, nominated Kevin Bingham (sp?) to serve on the panel
- Schueler noted there was a previous street sweeping expert panel that concluded its work in 2011. There has been a lot of additional research on the subject. State and local governments have requested that the BMP be revisited. He directed participants' attention to [Attachment C](#).

- Law: In a CWP study we are finding very high nutrient in the organic matter and vegetative matter that is collected by screens. Report is forthcoming once Talbot County finalizes the results.
- Schueler: If everyone agrees, we'll change charge to read biomass collection rather than leaf collection.
- Shafer: is there any sediment removal associated with these screens?
 - Schueler: probably not.
 - Law: the nets we are using in Talbot Co. have openings around 20 mm. The sediment would pass through prior to a "debris dam" forming.
- Schueler noted the list of potential panelists was pretty short. He asked for volunteers or recommendations.
 - Sebastian Donner, WVDEP: would certainly be interested in serving in the panel.
 - Justin Shafer: if you don't mind another member from Hampton Roads, would be interested.
 - Steve Stewart also volunteered. Law: WI DNR or USGS folks would be great reviewers for the panel.
 - ACTION: Neely Law to follow-up with Wisconsin DNR and USGS folks in Boston regarding serving on the panel.
 - Bill Frost, KCI will be added to the panel roster
- Schueler asked workgroup members to recommend or volunteer additional expert panelists. Provide additional comments on the charge.
 - Ken Murin (PA DEP) noted some of FTW the systems require permits when applied in open water.
- **ACTION:** USWG members are encouraged to recommend additional experts for the Floating Wetlands and Street Sweeping/Bulk Sediment Removal/Catch-basin clean out panels.

Re-Prioritization of the Urban BMP Queue

- Schueler noted that the workgroup had not discussed the BMP review queue ([Attachment D](#)) for a while, so he asked for the workgroup's feedback and thoughts.
- Bahr: Didn't seem like trash was included in urban detritus, but there's interest in quantifying or estimating the nutrient or bacteria benefits associated with trash removal. Outfall stabilization
- Shafer: Restoration of coastal wetlands.
 - Schueler noted there is a wetland restoration BMP, but will need to check if it includes coastal areas or not.
- Unidentified participant suggested no-discharge zones for boats
- Hanson noted the Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG) is looking at algal turf scrubber technologies.
- Stewart: Baltimore County is looking at self-converting dry detention ponds...the study will not be done for another year or two
- Shafer: Oyster restoration?
 - Antos: STAC and VIMS have put together a proposal for STAC to look at that. Those recommendations will determine if a BMP panel is necessary or not
- Bahr: Alternative Native pervious covers, e.g. switch grass
- Mine reclamation:
 - Hanson noted the WTWG will likely take on the mine reclamation review.
- Bahr asked about phragmites removal/harvest (perhaps including in coastal wetlands restoration)
 - Schueler: Looking for credit for tangible actions. It is difficult to credit education.

- Schueler asked participants for their top priority of the BMPs in the queue
 - Bahr: outfall, impervious disconnect, and soil amendments. Impervious disconnect is higher priority.
 - Donner: agree with impervious disconnect
 - Ted Brown (BioHabitats): outfall stabilization
 - Shafer: the Region did a poll, and MS4 minimum management measures was a priority. Norfolk votes for coastal wetland restoration.
 - Berger: urban land use loading rates should be a priority as well, though it's not a BMP.
 - Antos: echo Karl's point that land use loading rates should be a priority, separate from the BMP panels. For BMPs, would vote for impervious disconnect too.
 - She noted that the WQGIT is proposing an amendment to the BMP review protocol requesting interim recommendations for the current Watershed Model from panels/workgroups when applicable.
 - Ken Murin (PA DEP): echo urban land use loading rates and impervious disconnect
 - Sandra Goodrow: MS4 minimum management measures
- **ACTION:** Based on votes, CSN and CBPO staff will write up the priorities and order the queue to share in June. For land use loading rate, there will be some internal meetings on how to organize that effort and will report back in June.

Proposed Frequently Asked Questions Documents for Approved BMPs

- Schueler explained there have been numerous questions on how to interpret and apply recommendations from the expert panels. Schueler and Lane put together a FAQ document ([Attachment E](#)) to respond to the common questions.
 - The final document would be complete by the end of the summer and would accompany the approved reports.
- He asked for comments by July 1 on (a) the format, (b) any omitted questions, (c) any state specific guidance that would be important to add.
 - Donner: have not looked through it all yet. The format seems nice and easy to use. Will continue to look through and submit comments on additional questions to include.
 - Bahr: one of the reporting parameters is runoff storage volume. We would like to have similar reporting requirements to Delaware.
 - Schueler and Johnston agreed to follow-up offline on this.
 - Schueler: the FAQ document is DRAFT until every state and the workgroup feels comfortable with it.
 - Antos: would this become an appendix to the report, or is this completely separate from the panel report?
 - Schueler indicated it would be a companion document. A lot of the information, e.g. Matt's flow-charts, was developed post-approval of the report, but should accompany the report as a supplemental document.
 - Antos: Makes sense. Complimentary to, but not substituting any aspects of the report.
 - **ACTION:** Comments on the draft FAQ document should be submitted to Tom and Cecilia by July 1st. They will bring the document back for the USWG's approval in August, followed by WTWG.

Update on Land Use Workgroup

- Berger: the Bay Program is working to finalize funds and a contract to support the analysis of land use loading rates. Assuming that goes forward, members from LUWG and USWG will need to coordinate and develop a framework
 - STAC proposal: still seeking additional information
 - There was a joint FWG/LUWG meeting ... would like to see an urban tree canopy developed, not just as a BMP. The loading rate would be somewhere between forest and urban pervious.
- Schueler: you mentioned urban tree canopy panel. Any sense of the timeline for that panel?
 - Berger was unsure of the timeline for the urban tree canopy expert panel.
- Berger noted there is a data call from the LUWG to the states. The states are passing on the request to local governments. The deadline is June 30, though it is not a final call. After this data call the LUWG will have a lot of data and information to consider.

Update on Urban BMP Implementation Summary in State WIPs

- Jeff Sweeney (EPA CBPO) explained the BMP Verification Review panel asked for information about which BMPs contribute the greatest relative reductions towards their targets in the Phase II WIPs.
 - He noted the wastewater sector reductions are from current (2011) conditions, whereas the other sectors are from a no-action baseline scenario.
 - Each BMP's relative contribution to overall reductions is estimated for nitrogen, phosphorous, and sediment.
 - Slides are also included for each state and Baywide.
 - Lane: so these are based on commitments in the WIPs?
 - Sweeney: Correct. These are fractions or percents of the total reductions planned in the WIPs, e.g., 5.5% of total nitrogen baywide reductions in the states' WIPs are from urban infiltration practices.
 - Sweeney explained the Review Panel asked for this information, since some of the panelists feel that verification efforts should be focused on practices that contribute the greatest reductions.
 - We can do a similar study of the practices on a per-acre basis.
- Schueler: as we go through new expert panel reports, these numbers will change?
 - Correct: these are based on the old or existing methods and efficiencies as they stood for the Phase II WIPs.
- Sweeney asked for any additional questions; none were raised.
- Schueler encouraged participants to study the slides.

Land Use Projections for 2014 Progress Run

- Johnston described some of the discussions from the Milestones and Agriculture Workgroups and the WQGIT.
 - CBPO staff sends land use projections to the states for their review. Will share 2013 land use projections in September. In 2014, there will be some great new data coming in (2010 National Land Cover Dataset), plus the 2012 Ag Census data. All of these are anticipated to pick up some of the trends resulting from the recession. We've been asking the WQGIT how to use these projections to evaluate milestones. The Milestones Workgroup (MWG) has asked to judge 2015 milestones on a land use projected this summer (2013). This would mean the forthcoming data (LCD, Census, etc) would not be included for the projection. The Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) feels the new data should be included. Judging progress one way, and milestones another.

- **ACTION:** if any workgroup members have comments on land use projections for future progress runs, submit to Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net) and Norm Goulet (ngoulet@novaregion.org).
- Johnston: MWG and WQGIT members could benefit from hearing thoughts/perspectives from the urban sector.
- Antos: Personal opinion, we should always be using the best available data. Understand why the MWG wants an initial projection this year to help set 2015 milestones. It would make sense to include the additional data when it becomes available next year. If these new 2015 projections are different, perhaps the partnership could find a way to amend or update the milestones accordingly.
- Johnston: the SB and modeling team is working through the approved reports and is also working to get a head start on reporting requirements for panels underway.
- Schueler noted that Rich Batiuk provided comments on the USWG's draft BMP Verification protocol. The edits are mostly minor edits or links to outside documentation. The goal is to provide a clean protocol by July 1st so the package of all workgroups' protocols can be distributed to the Verification Review Panel by mid July.

Adjourned

Next meeting/teleconference:

Tuesday, June 18th, 2013

10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19172/

Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Tom Schueler, Coord.	CSN
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC, CBPO
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO
Raymond Bahr	MDE
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Ted Brown	Biohabitats
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Sadie Drescher	CWP
Sandra Goodrow	DE DNREC
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Joseph Kelly	PA DEP
Cecilia Lane	CSN
Neely Law	CWP
Ken Murin	PA DEP
Donna Murphy	U.S. Forest Service
Pamela Parker	
Justin Shafer	Norfolk, VA
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County (MD)
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Julie Winters	EPA, CBPO
Beth Zinecker	USGS, CBPO