

MINUTES
Chesapeake Bay Program
Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG) Conference Call
Tuesday, November 27th, 2012, 10:00AM – 12:00PM
<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18547/>

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS

DECISION: The October 16th conference call minutes were accepted as written.

ACTION: USWG members should contact Sadie Drescher with suggested panelists or other comments on the shoreline erosion control expert panel (sdrescher@chesapeakebay.net).

ACTION: USWG members should contact Neely Law with suggested panelists or other comments on the urban filter strips/stream buffer upgrades expert panel(nlaw@chesapeakebay.net).

DECISION: The urban BMP verification protocol is accepted for presentation to the BMP Verification Review Panel.

MINUTES

Welcome & introductions

- Tom Schueler (CSN; Coordinator, USWG) convened the call at 10:00AM, welcomed participants and reviewed the [agenda](#).
 - He asked if there were any comments or corrections to the October 16th USWG minutes ([Attachment A](#))
 - Hearing none, the minutes were approved as written

DECISION: The October 16th conference call minutes were accepted as written.

Introduction of new sediment and stream restoration coordinator

- The Center for Watershed Protection (CWP) has been contracted by the Bay Program to serve as a Sediment and Stream coordinator to various panels and workgroups under the Water Quality and Habitats Goal Implementation Teams
 - Bill Stack, Neely Law, Sadie Drescher, and Lisa Fraley-McNeal from the CWP are jointly working as the new Coordinator.
 - The position will assist expert panels, including stream restoration, urban shoreline erosion control, the ESC panel, and some of the agriculture panels
 - They described the three main objectives of the new position: 1) modeling support to refine and represent better sediment transport processes and look at BMPs; will work with workgroups and CBP staff on this; 2) leading two new expert panels – shoreline erosion control and filter strips/buffer upgrades – and 3) will also participate on other Agriculture

and Urban expert panels. Bill and Lisa have served on the stream restoration expert panel.

Review of Charge and Membership on Shoreline Erosion Expert Panel

- Sadie Drescher (CWP) reviewed the draft charge and proposed membership for the Shoreline Erosion Control BMP expert panel ([Attachment B](#))
 - She hopes to start the panel in January 2013
- Schueler: shoreline erosion is modeled in the estuarine model, not the watershed model. Should consult with Lew Linker and the CBPO modeling team about this.
 - He also suggested that Jenny Tribo is a good contact from the tidewater area in Virginia.
- Drescher: The Habitats GIT will recommend panelists with relevant habitat expertise during its December meeting
- Stewart Comstock (MDE) suggested it would be smart to include Army Corps and other federal permittees.
- **ACTION:** USWG members should contact Sadie Drescher with suggested panelists or other comments on the shoreline erosion control expert panel (sdrescher@chesapeakebay.net).
- Goulet: definitely need Corps and CBP modelers to be involved on this panel.

Review of Charge and Membership on Urban Filter Strips/Stream Buffer Upgrades

- Neely Law (CWP) reviewed the draft charge and proposed membership for urban filter strips and upgraded stream buffer BMP expert panel ([Attachment C](#)).
 - She noted it would have a similar timeline as the Shoreline Erosion Control panel. These would be considered new BMPs. Would like to finalize membership by end of December, and convene in January 2013.
- Schueler suggested Rich Laurence from UGA-Tifton, though he may be unable to participate. He also recommended including reps from PA and NY, so he asked for suggestions from the workgroup.
 - Jennifer Orr: Dianne Wilson is the relevant lead from PA DEP.
- Goulet suggested including someone from Watershed Technical Workgroup too.
- State Highway or DOTs doing any research? Sinal.
 - Comstock: SHA doing some research with MDE.
 - Schueler: MNCPPC
 - Robert Capowski (NYS DEC): New York State has updated its green infrastructure manual to include this practice, can provide some information related to that.
- **ACTION:** USWG members should contact Neely Law with suggested panelists or other comments on the urban filter strips/stream buffer upgrades expert panel (nlaw@chesapeakebay.net).

Proposed Process for USWG/AgWG/WTWG and WQGIT Review of UNM and Stream Restoration Expert Panel Reports

- Goulet explained the next two panels are ready to present their recommendations. To improve the workgroup approval process, will include a member from WTWG on future panels. He noted the two current panels overlap with other groups and teams, e.g. nutrient

management overlap with agriculture nutrient management, stream restoration overlap with Habitats GIT and Healthy Watersheds GIT. Will present panel recommendations on December 17th to urban stormwater workgroup, and invite the Agriculture and Watershed Technical workgroups to join.

- Schueler: hope to have these next two reports sent out a week in advance. Thankful to panels for all their hard work.
 - He also noted that he will brief the Agriculture Workgroup (AgWg) on the urban nutrient management panel during their next meeting on Thursday, 11/29.

Action Item: Approval of Final Urban BMP Verification Process

- Schueler reviewed the latest (sixth) version of the Urban BMP Verification Protocol ([Attachment D](#))
- Schueler highlighted the changes, including the new part B (definitions). No substantive changes to Parts C or D. Part D was changed to reflect Maryland's comment on cycles. Part E is new and offers four options for "semi-regulated BMPs." Tom asked for thoughts on the four options described.
 - No comments were raised.
- Schueler: Part F was also added. It suggests how to verify legacy BMPs. Schueler explained that reviewing these older BMPs provides some opportunities to local governments, e.g. identifies retrofit prospects.
 - No comments were raised.
- Schueler explained Part G and the table for the various stormwater BMPs. He noted that for traditional, CBP-approved BMPs, it was agreed to use the Performance Standards expert panel's verification protocol.
 - Katherine Antos (EPA): so when this takes effect, if a jurisdiction cannot verify, for example, a pre-1990 BMP, it would be removed from the progress?
 - Schueler: Correct. It's a two edged sword – will remove nonexistent or nonfunctioning BMPs, but will also discover previously unreported practices.
 - Antos: So jurisdictions will need to make decisions on what is removed from progress reporting and how we distinguish the two?
 - Schueler: We will have to talk to the Scenario Builder team on this, but it would be wise to include a physical geographic location for the practice and an installation date.
 - Karl Berger (MWCOG): How do local communities get the inventory from the Bay Program? CBP receives BMPs from the state agencies that receive through local MS4 permit reports.
 - Schueler: focus is to focus on more accurate local BMP reports data reports to the state.
- Schueler asked for additional questions, comments or concerns before the protocol is submitted for the BMP Verification Review Panel's consideration.
 - Hearing none, the protocol was accepted for presentation to the BMP Verification Review Panel.

DECISION: The urban BMP verification protocol is accepted for presentation to the BMP Verification Review Panel.

Discussion Item: CBP Mid-Point Assessment and USWG Work Plan

- Goulet recapped the midpoint assessment process. Following the WQGIT October face-to-face meeting, the workgroups were asked to draft workplans for their high priorities. He described his concern that the workgroup may not have staff or resources.
- Lucinda Power (EPA) reviewed the USWG's draft workplan for its high priority ([Attachment E](#))
 - Power asked for input on necessary datasets, analyses, and decisions.
 - Schueler: helps to know general timeframe. Do not expect this needs to be completed by early 2013.
 - Antos: We are looking at longer term schedule and working backwards. PSC will be asked to make decision on Phase 3 WIPs in 2018...wouldn't need Phase 6 model until fourth quarter 2016. So the recommendations need to be implemented by September 2016. Try to complete in 2015 so there is time for other workgroups to review.
 - Schueler: of A through D, which ones can be completed by an expert panel or other groups
 - Power: perhaps helpful to have more discussion about level of effort with modelers
 - Antos: A and B. Top priority from meeting was land uses, charged to LUWG with collaboration from USWG. Clarifying question—give feedback on A and B to LUWG or is this all wrapped into hydrologic network priority.
 - KB: decision to quantify the land uses will depend on multiple criteria. LUWG members are not loading rate experts, but they are knowledgeable of LULC data and tools.
 - Antos: Agree.
 - Schueler: can probably handle one priority in 2013. If we were to allocate staff time to one of these, which one (A through D) would be priority?
 - Bill Stack (CWP): item D was something the CWP plans to address through its work.
 - Kate Bennett (Fairfax County, VA): Aren't they sequential? Would vote for A first.
 - Antos: clarify that hydrologic networks will follow the loading rates, or are recommending that it's no longer a priority?
 - Goulet: We will have to see. Will include Berger and LUWG in discussion.
 - Antos: STAC may be able to assist on this.
- Power: will adjust workplan based on today's discussion and then submit to the WQGIT.

Adjourned

Next meeting:

Monday, December 17th, 2012

10:00AM-3:00PM

Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fish Shack)

Annapolis, MD 21401

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18983/>

Conference Call Participants

Normand Goulet (Chair)	Northern Virginia Regional Commission	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	power.lucinda@epa.gov
Tom Schueler (Coordinator)	Chesapeake Stormwater Network	watershedguy@hotmail.com
Jeremy Hanson (Staff)	Chesapeake Research Consortium	jhanson@chesapeakebay.net
Ginny Snead	VA Dept. of Conservation and Recreation	Ginny.Snead@dcv.virginia.gov
Jennifer Orr	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection	jeorr@state.pa.us
Jennifer Tribo	Hampton Roads Planning District Comm.	jtribo@hrpdcva.gov
Kate Bennett	Fairfax County	kate.bennett@fairfaxcounty.gov
Robert Capowski	NY Dept. of Environmental Conservation	rmcapows@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Donna M Murphy	U.S. Forest Service	dmmurphy@fs.fed.us
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Joseph Kelly	PA Dept. of Environmental Protection	josephkel@pa.gov
Julie Winters	EPA, CBPO	winters.julie@epa.gov
Karl Berger	Metro. Washington Council of Governments	kberger@mwkog.org
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO	Antos.Katherine@epamail.epa.gov
Lisa Ochsenhirt	VA and MD Stormwater Associations	lisa@aqualaw.com
Sara Lane	MD Dept. of Natural Resources/Univ. of MD	slane@dnr.state.md.us
Stewart Comstock	MD Dept. of Environment	scomstock@mde.state.md.us
Ted Brown	Biohabitats	tbrown@biohabitats.com
Jack Frye	Chesapeake Bay Commission	jfrye@chesbay.us
Pat Bradley	Limnotech	
Beth Zinecker	USGS, CBPO	bzinecker@chesapeakebay.net
Lisa Fraley-McNeal	Center for Watershed Protection	lfraley@chesapeakebay.net
Bill Stack	Center for Watershed Protection	wstack@chesapeakebay.net
Sadie Drescher	Center for Watershed Protection	sdrescher@chesapeakebay.net
Neely Law	Center for Watershed Protection	nlaw@chesapeakebay.net