Chesapeake Bay Program

A Watershed Partnership

Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 20, 2018 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Welcome and Review of February Meeting Minutes. Norm Goulet, Chair. Attach A. Minutes from the February meeting were approved.

Announcements

- *Update on RDM GIT Funding Proposal (Schueler):* \$60,00 has been awarded for a team to provide additional guidance on roadside ditch management practices, which this workgroup had requested to investigate potentially crediting retrofits of those practices. We estimate a 9 month timeline to complete work.
- Joint Meeting with Stream Health WG (Schuler): Existing concerns on the stream restoration protocols prompted this meeting, and we are currently in the process of developing the agenda; Karl Berger (MWCOG) has volunteered to host. There was a request from MDE to evaluate a proposal for the outfall of one of these projects, and this will be presented during the April meeting.
- *Upcoming CSN Webcasts and CAST training (Wood):* On April 12, Permeable Pavement Part 2. This Thursday, 3/29, Olivia Devereux will host a CAST webinar focusing on local governments. There will also be a webcast in early May dedicated to pond management.
- Ad Hoc Bacteria BMPs Team (Wood): Bacteria is an issue when it comes to local TMDLs, and there is proposal to develop an ad-hoc team lead by Mary Roman to delve into bacteria BMPs. If you are interested in getting involved, please contact David Wood.

BMP "Nesting" (David Wood and Tom Schueler, CSN) Attach B. David and Tom discussed how to report and verify BMPs implemented with

David and Tom discussed how to report and verify BMPs implemented within the drainage area of another BMP.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet: What was the primary feedback you received at the forum?
 - O David Wood: Primary concerns were the mix of these older BMPs (stormwater ponds with large drainage areas), and then communities come back and implement LID practices in these drainage areas. And these communities were worried they weren't getting all of the reductions those practices could earn because they're in the drainage area of this older BMP. The other concern is making decisions about maintenance and verification, and if they're not getting all of the credit for these LID practices, then if they have to make concessions on which BMPs to verify do they skip the ones nested in drainage areas of other practices?
 - o Tom Scheuler: I think the concern is whether you get lower removal rates with multiplicative practices as opposed to additive. And this nesting concept was

- really borrowed from the agricultural sector, but there are big differences between urban and agricultural settings.
- Norm Goulet: And the big pushback we get is based on the law of diminishing returns, and there is some field research backing this up. I would suggest we bring in Gary and Jeff early-on in this process to alleviate their concerns.
- Olivia Devereux: What is the site is designed so the BMPs work as a treatment train?
 - Tom Scheuler: The expert panel was clear in performance standards that where you design for multiple practices, you look at the total volume that's treated and then look at the runoff curves.

Non-Regulated Stormwater (Tom Schueler, CSN) Attach C.

Tom facilitated a discussion with workgroup members on the proposed approaches for supporting BMP implementation/tracking/verification in non-regulated areas. Based upon feedback received, next steps will be proposed.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet: One concept that's being floated by VA DEQ is to use PVC boundaries for local planning goals. So the use of conservation districts is appropriate.
- Karl Berger: What is the incentive for any non-regulated entity to do any of this? Putting practices in MS4 permits is a major driver for action, but I'm missing the driver on the unregulated side.
 - Tom Scheuler: The driver is still the MS4s that have a need to meet their numeric goals. It may be more cost-effective to cross the border to their non-regulated neighbor and inspect, maintain, and install BMPs in their jurisdiction because they're more cost-effective. The other incentive is that many BMPs installed through state regulations in un-regulated areas are owned and installed by property owners.
- Norm Goulet: This is certainly a big challenge, but somehow we're going to have to crack this nut. My words of warning are that if these reductions don't start occurring, then there will be even more pressure on MS4s to get more reductions in the regulated areas, because that's where the hammer exists. I think there's also potential for pressure being applied to the point source community. We need to come up with a way to explain to MS4s that is may be in their best interests to be more proactive and engaged in the unregulated areas.
- Tom Scheuler: This may be presented to the WQGIT in late Spring a short memo with a summary of the issues just to make them aware.

Conservation Landscaping BMP Proposal (Tom Schueler, CSN) Attach D.

Tom discussed options for whether or not to allow nutrient and sediment reduction credit for the conversion of turf grass to the new "mixed open" land use within the Phase 6 Model.

Discussion:

- Tom Scheuler noted that this could also be brought up to the Forestry Workgroup.
- Olivia Devereux added that this is similar to urban grass buffers, which converts land to pervious urban. However, with this BMP, the frequency of mowing (etc.) would mean

- that benefits are not always realized. She added that changes would not occur in the model until 2019, but that this could be implemented into CAST.
- Cecelia Lane noted that DC DOEE supports this BMP. One way to help is being prescriptive in maintenance. She added that sediment increases are a concern, citing uncertainty in how they would be addressed.
 - Tom Scheuler replied that there wouldn't be any sediment reduction for this BMP, since there is no data to support a difference in loading between turf and mixed open.
 - O David Wood added that this practice could probably be treated as a simple land use conversion, rather than a percent reduction BMP.
- Cecelia Lane asked how tracking and reporting would work.
 - David Wood added that the wetlands BMP handles this with a land use conversion, as well as a ratio of upland acres that are treating – so there is a precedent for this practice.
 - Norm Goulet noted that verification will be difficult, and that he will meet with James Davis-Martin to see how to proceed.
- Mark Symborski noted that it may be hard to receive credit with the sediment issue still there.

Optimization Tool (Danny Kaufman, CRC)

Danny provided an update on ongoing work to develop an optimization tool that will help states and communities develop more efficient implementation plans.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet noted that the biggest issue with optimization is that a lot of the cost data is
 highly suspect, and was based primarily off of one study in the region. In CAST, users
 can submit their own cost numbers, and Norm asked if that functionality would be
 included.
 - o Danny replied that users will be able to input information, and that the entire tool will be incorporated into the CAST system. No functionality from CAST would be removed, and so specifying cost-profiles will be included.
- Norm Goulet suggested that the max numbers be set to the E3 levels for each sector, such that it cannot be exceeded.

Attachments.

- Attach A. February Meeting Minutes
- Attach B. BMP "Nesting" Overview
- Attach C. Stormwater At the Edge of Town Memo
- Attach D. Turf Conversion Credit Memo

Participants:

Norm Goulet	NVRC
Tom Scheuler	CSN
David Wood	CSN

Melissa Merritt	CRC
Danny Kaufman	CRC
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Cecelia Lane	DC DOEE
Christina Lyerly	MDE
Elaine Webb	DE DNREC
Melissa Harlinski	Anne Arundel County MD
Luke Cole	DC DOEE
Mark Symborski	Montgomery County MD
Chris Swanson	VDOT
Jeff White	MDE
Ginny Snead	Alliance for the Bay
KC Filippino	HRPDC
Raymond Bahr	MDE
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Allan Brockenbrough	VA DEQ
Jeremy Hanson	VT