



Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Urban Stormwater Workgroup Call Summary

Tuesday, November 20, 2018

10:00 AM to 11:15 AM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Action: A draft memo has been developed clarifying data deadlines for progress, milestones and model updates during the model lockdown. Contact Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov) with comments and feedback.

Action: Michelle Williams will post 2018 USWG priorities to the 11/20/18 USWG calendar page. Members can share ideas on 2019 priorities via email to David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) and Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov).

10:00 Welcome and Review of September Meeting Minutes.

Tom Schueler on behalf of Norm Goulet. Attach A.

Review of September meeting minutes will be delayed until January 2019 USWG call.

10:05 Announcements and Updates

- Outfall Restoration Team
 - New members on the outfall restoration crediting have been approved. Meeting with SHA next week to work on analyses and step by step calculations, definitions, qualifying conditions for outfall restoration crediting.
- Other Stream Restoration Team Updates
 - Memo and membership has been finalized for the verification group. That group will meet November 29.
 - Sediment protocol 1 also has several new members. That group is meeting today.
 - Using polling to determine group members' attitudes and opinions.
 - Group 4 will work on protocols for floodplain restoration. That group will meet in January 2019.
 - Stream restoration science is very fast moving right now. We will hope to feature new research at our next couple meetings to stay on top of the current research.
 - Norm Goulet approves of the plan for the next USWG focus. Stream restoration will be very important in the Phase III WIPs and for jurisdiction implementation and oversight.
- Roadside Ditch Management
 - CWP is the project lead for this GIT funded project from 2017. This will determine enhanced guidance for roadside ditches and management.

Recommendations and guidance will be available for the USWG to review in spring 2019. Upcoming webcasts on roadside ditches December 6 and 13.

- 2018 Progress Schedule
 - December 3 is due date for BMP progress and verification plans. Deadlines were sent out via email last week to progress leads.

Action: A draft memo has been developed clarifying data deadlines for progress, milestones and model updates during the model lockdown. Contact Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov) with comments and feedback.

- Upcoming Webcasts
 - December 6 and December 13. Register on CSN website for those webcasts.
- Coming Soon: The BUBBAs
 - Opening January, submissions through early April. Will be advertised through newsletters and CSN communications. There are 5 grand prizes and bragging rights available!
- Norm Goulet: I have stepped away from the USWG workgroup for a time in order to prioritize VA Phase III WIP development.

10:20 Evaluation of Nutrient Reduction Crediting Strategies for Stream Restoration Barbara Doll, NC State University. Attach B.

Barbara reviewed findings from a recent report by North Carolina (NC) State and NC Sea Grant evaluating the stream restoration crediting protocols. The report looks at the level of effort necessary to prepare nutrient credit estimates, opportunities to address shortcomings and simplify the protocols, and where appropriate, suggest new methods to improve the application and accuracy of reduction estimates. Objectives also included identifying opportunities to adapt Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) stream restoration crediting protocols for projects in NC.

- Tom Schueler asked about the relationship between watershed and floodplain area as a variation in design for calculating credits.
 - Barbara Doll: You would not give protocol 3 credit for anything that's not natural channel design. The CBP protocol requires a bank height ratio (BHR) of at least 1 for protocol 3. The protocols also depend on the length of the site area. Just doing stabilization will get protocol 1 only. NC State is looking at how they can tier some of these protocols; for instance, if they don't get that BHR of 1, but they have a buffer, can they still get some of those reduction credits?
- Norm Goulet: How many people worked on this, how long did it take, and how did you fund it?
 - Doll: This took us about 9 months on expired funds under Clean Water Act Section 319 funding. There were about 5 of us working full time on this over 9 months. But we had experts on each of these components on the team. We had an expert modeler, expert water quality gurus, and some R coding professionals to

help us with the analysis. One of our members on the stormwater side said this is the first project he's worked on that ended on time.

- Ruth Minich-Hobson: Why did Sandy Creek increase in nitrogen (N) load after modification?
 - Doll: The green hatch is based on the areal credit calculation—that green hatch is from floodplain/riparian using those areal rates.
- Tom Schueler: The Lammers and Bledsoe rates are expressed as units per hour. Do you apply that for the whole year or does it shut off during certain seasons?
- Joe Berg had a question on Protocol 2. The bank-full width was used rather than the normal wetted width. In many cases this would overestimate the hyporheic box and treatment credits.
 - Doll: For the hyporheic box, it's extended through the floodplain channel. We applied two protocols from the Lammers and Bledsoe calculations. They are saying that they found a channel and they are using channel size as the basis.
- Participant question: Would you recommend soil testing for each project or are you comfortable going with Tetra Tech's concentration numbers?
 - Doll: The cost of soils analysis was not prohibitive for the project. Our measured soils analysis results show that the soils analysis numbers are too high for the piedmont if our state took the TetraTech calculations.
 - Schueler: Many researchers are now finding that the CBP protocol credits are maybe too high, so it would be good to test that out for your specific projects.
- Participant Question: Does your suggested revision to Protocols 2/3 only consider denitrification as the process? Substantial N and P sedimentation occurs as overbank retention on floodplains, in addition to denitrification, that is effectively long-term retention. If just using denitrification, how to model P and sediment?
 - The question above was not addressed due to time constraints.
- David Wood: We had a priorities list from last year, we can discuss those issues to potentially carry over to 2019. Michelle will post to the calendar page. Members can share ideas on 2019 priorities via email to David Wood and Michelle Williams.

Action: Michelle Williams will post 2018 USWG priorities to the 11/20/18 USWG calendar page. Members can share ideas on 2019 priorities via email to David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) and Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov).

11:00 2019 USWG Priorities

USWG members will be asked to provide input on priority topics they would like to see on future workgroup agendas.

11:15 Adjourn

Attachments.

- ~~Attach A. September Meeting Minutes~~ September meeting minutes will be reviewed in March 2019 (first USWG meeting following 2018-19 federal government's partial lapse in funding).

- Attach B. Final Report: Evaluation of Nutrient Reduction Crediting Strategies for Stream Restoration