



Chesapeake Bay Program  
A Watershed Partnership

## Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 15, 2017

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

### Meeting Materials:

[http://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/urban\\_stormwater\\_workgroup\\_conference\\_call\\_august\\_2017](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/urban_stormwater_workgroup_conference_call_august_2017)

---

**Welcome and Review of June 27 Meeting Minutes.** Norm Goulet (Attach A).  
Minutes from the June meeting were approved.

### Announcements

- *USWG Proposal on PEDs/RDM for WQGIT* (Schueler/Goulet): Common feedback on the roadside ditch report was that states needed more implementation guidance. To address this, the USWG submitted a GIT funding proposal for a contractor to help develop more detailed guidance.
- *MTD Project and Face to Face Meeting* (Goulet): The group has developed a very preliminary draft of an outline for a protocol, which is currently being reviewed by some members. The group plans to have a follow-up conference call in September.
- *Bay Stormwater Network Survey to be Released* (Schueler): CSN plans to have their survey distributed to their membership soon.
- *Agricultural Stormwater EPEG* (Schueler): Tom Scheuler has been asked to participate on an expert panel establishment group to help convene a panel on agricultural stormwater and nursery capture and reuse management practices.
  - Cecelia Lane asked if this group would capture urban agriculture on green roofs. Tom replied that he did not believe the panel would be considering that.
- *CSN Fall Webcast Scheduled* (Schueler): August 31<sup>st</sup> webcast will be on conducting effective pet waste outreach programs. September 14<sup>th</sup> webcast will be on stream restoration - revisited. September 28<sup>th</sup> webcast will be on river-smart homes. October 12<sup>th</sup> webcast will be on roadside ditch management.
- *Listening Sessions with State Stormwater Agencies* (Schueler): CSN has received support from EPA for the next 12 months to conduct listening sessions with each jurisdiction on their issues and needs that the CBP can assist with in regards to stormwater.
- *Headwater State Stormwater Workshops and Regional Forums* (Schueler): The state stormwater workshops will be held in DE, WV, NY, and PA. The regional forums will likely be held on the eastern shore of MD and in the metropolitan Washington area.

### Stream Restoration FAQ Document

T. Schueler, CSN (Attach B1/B2/C)

CSN and CWP have drafted a "frequently asked questions" document for the stream restoration crediting protocols that also includes design examples that show how they are applied to real stream restoration projects in the Bay watershed. The document will also describe how the stream restoration practice will be represented in the Phase 6 watershed model, in terms of sediment delivery from the project reach to the Bay watershed (these modeling decisions are

expected to be finalized by early Fall). CSN presented the highlights from the FAQ document and requested initial review by members. The document will be finalized by the Sept USWG meeting along with the modeling decisions.

*Discussion:*

- Norm Goulet: We've realized that if a BMP changed any kind of reporting unit between Phase 5 and 6, there are problems with that transition. In terms of stream restoration in Phase 6, the only thing we need to change in Protocol 3 is with sediment. Is there anything else we need to keep in mind with this transition?
  - Tom Scheuler: Protocol 1 and 2 are fine (reporting units are the same). The issue is with Protocol 3 because in Phase 6, there were concerns about upland sources of sediment versus sediment in the banks and floodplain. So we're working with the CBP modeling team to resolve this. I think there will be some workarounds, and we've made it a priority with the modeling team.
- Norm also reminded the workgroup that street sweeping will now be reported in terms of length, as opposed to pounds. Jurisdictions should be cognizant of reporting procedures that may have changed in Phase 6.
- Luke Cole: For jurisdictions who report street sweeping, could you describe the program used to calculate that? People are welcome to reach out to me directly regarding this request.
  - Norm Goulet: We didn't specify that in the expert panel; we left it up to the state to figure that out. The only requirement is that they have to document that.
  - Tom Scheuler proposed potentially having an online workshop to discuss this topic.

**Implications of the Phase 6 Watershed Model for the Urban Sector** (Schueler/Goulet)  
(Attach D)

This included a short presentation on the major changes in land use and nutrient loading for the urban sector in the shift from Phase 5.3.2. to the Phase 6 watershed model. Norm reviewed technical comments and fatal flaw issues that were submitted in July. Members will also have an opportunity to discuss the implications of the new model on the urban sector,

*Discussion:*

- Norm Goulet (to Karl Berger): Has Peter Claggett made any progress looking into differentiating agricultural impervious land?
  - Karl Berger: I don't think so, but if we look at the total amount of impervious land, we see that it's increased - likely due to the better quality of data and imagery that informed the classification.
- Karl Berger noted that Peter Claggett is working on a resolution to the issue identified by WV that turf grass was severely over-estimated. This issue will be tackled by the LUWG during an interim meeting that will be scheduled before September 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Dave Montali: Are the loading rates presented here representative of No Action scenarios?
  - Tom Scheuler: I believe they are No Action.

- Karl Berger noted that it would be interesting to look at how much imperviousness is over roads versus buildings, and the relative loading between the two.
- Kate Bennett: Why is the TN loading rate from IC with tree canopy higher than TN loading from MS4 buildings/other?
  - Jeff Sweeney replied that he will provide additional information located in the Phase 6 documentation.

## **Conclusion of Fatal Flaw Analysis and Next Steps in the MPA** (Goulet)

Norm guided the work group on a discussion on whether we can make an affirmative decision on whether there are no fatal flaws in the Phase 6 watershed model with respect to the urban sector. Norm then discussed the next modeling steps in the mid-point assessment that will be used to establish the final load allocations.

### *Discussion:*

- Dave Montali noted that a week before the September 25-26 WQGIT face-to-face meeting, technical experts will be able to provide information on the differences between the June and September calibrations of the Phase 6 model.
- Norm Goulet also reviewed recent comments from the Agriculture Workgroup regarding potential sector inequity issues regarding soil P data in the model and implementation levels in Phase 6 E3 scenarios.
- Norm asked the workgroup if there were any comments on the urban sector's Phase 6 E3 scenario.
  - No comments were raised.
- Jeff Sweeney suggested raising the question of why potential sector inequity and soil P would be a fatal flaw under the Partnership-approved guidance.
- Norm Goulet: Another potential fatal flaw is relative fertilizer applications on turf. Virginia feels that because there are orders of magnitude differences in fertilizer rates between the jurisdictions, that this constitutes a fatal flaw.
  - West Virginia: We are not too concerned in variation in rates, because there are significant differences in the context of jurisdictions.
  - Virginia: We agree that the data being used is better. But when you start looking state to state, would you really expect that portions of MD would be that different from VA? I think our main concern is the magnitude of difference here.
  - Norm Goulet noted that he believes comment does not meet the fatal flaw criteria of a failure to execute a Partnership decision.
- Delaware: One issue we raised as a comment was that it appeared in the model that, unless a state had legislation for a P-ban, they were not getting a credit. We just want to make sure that states are given protocols for providing that kind of data when we go to prepare our WIPs.
  - Norm Goulet: While there is 0 P in almost all of the states, we still have to reckon with fertilizer being available with a high P content. We can't take P to 0 on fertilizer – there has to be some in-between.
- Norm Goulet proposed that the soil P issue brought up by the AgWG is not an USWG issue, but rather an issue to be considered by the MWG.

- Dave Montali: I suspect the Modeling Team will say this is not a fatal flaw comment for the reasons cited so far.
- Jeff Sweeney: The CBP Office and AgWG are reaching out directly to DE DNREC and DDA, trying to find out more of what category of fatal flaw it fits into, and moreover how to fix it if it is an issue. The WQGIT will then be considering this issue again at their second August conference call.

#### **September USWG Agenda Item Planning – N. Goulet**

- Stream FAQ document

#### **Attachments.**

- Attach A. June 27 USWG Meeting Minutes
- Attach B1. Draft Stream Restoration FAQ Document
- Attach B2. Stream Restoration Design Example
- Attach C. FAQ Presentation
- Attach D: Model Comparisons from Phase 5.3.2 to Phase 6

#### Participants:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Tom Scheuler	CSN
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Julienne Bautista	DC DOEE
Cecelia Lane	DC DOEE
Luke Cole	DC DOEE
Derick Winn	VA DEQ
Ruth Minich-Hobson	VA DEQ
Jamie Bauer	VA DEQ
Elaine Webb	DE DNREC
Randy Greer	DE DNREC
Greg Busch	MDE
Christina Lyerly	MDE
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Dave Montali	Tetra Tech/WV DEP
Jim Caldwell	Howard County MD
Kate Bennett	Fairfax County VA
Heather Gewandter	City of Rockville MD
Ted Brown	Biohabitats

Steve Stewart	Baltimore County MD
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Jill Sunderland	HRPDC
Ginny Sneed	Louis Berger Group Inc.
Karen Coffman	MDOT SHA
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Center for Watershed Protection	