

Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting Meeting Minutes Tuesday, May 19, 2020 10:00 AM to 12:00 AM Meeting page link

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The USWG approved the April meeting minutes.

Action: USWG members should submit feedback on the fourth stream restoration memo, "Consensus Recommendations to Improve Protocols 2 and 3 for Defining Stream Restoration Pollutant Removal Credits" by no later than June 19, 2020. Please send any comments to David Wood (Wood.CSN@outlook.com), Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com), and Norm Goulet (NGoulet@novaregion.org).

Action: Hilary Swartwood will send a recording of the May USWG meeting to any interested parties from today's meeting. Please reach out (swartwood.hilary@epa.gov) if you would like to be sent this information.

Meeting Minutes

10:00 Roll Call, Review of April Meeting Minutes and Welcome of Stream Health Work Group. Norm Goulet, Chair. Attach A.

Decision: The USWG approved the April meeting minutes.

10:05 Announcements and Updates

- Archived "Watershed Hacks" Webcast Series Available
- Update on ICR/ICD Cleanup Effort
 - o Tom said he will be talking to Olivia Devereux about this effort.
- Ag Workgroup and Streams
 - The AgWG will be discussing stream restoration at their May meeting this Thursday. Anyone that is interested should join the call.
- Update on BMP Resiliency for Climate Change Project.
 - Norm had a kick-off meeting with the contractors last week. They will need to have a joint meeting between the Modeling and Climate Resiliency WG in June. As a heads up, there could be a change in the meeting date and time in order to accommodate all three groups.
- Other Announcements

10:10 Presentation of Final Stream Restoration Memo Schueler/Wood (40 minutes) (Attach B/C, expected to be available by 5/16)

Tom and David will present the consensus recommendations of Group 4/5 on updates and revisions to Protocols 2 and 3 of the original stream restoration expert panel report. The memo also presents a review of unintended consequences of stream restoration projects and best practices for minimizing them. The presentation will kick off a 30-day external comment period on the memo, with formal workgroup consideration scheduled for either the June or July meeting.

Key Topics from presentation:

- 1. Key floodplain restoration concepts
- 2. Comparing LSR and RSB

- 3. Summary of protocol adjustments
- 4. Environmental considerations
- 5. External review process
- 6. Comments and feedback

10:50 Comments from Group Members and SHWG

Individual members of Group 4 and 5 will be offered the opportunity to provide their perspectives on the recommendations and what is needed to effectively implement them in their jurisdictions. In addition, members of the other three groups are invited to provide comments/concerns, as well as members of the stream health work groups.

No questions at this time.

11:30 Comments from USWG and other interest parties

The Workgroup will continue its December discussion to finalize the priority list of urban practices to investigate in the second half of 2020, based on feedback from DC and MD.

Discussion (includes Zoom Chat):

Jeff Hartranft: Member for Group 4 and thanked Tom, David and Norm for their incredible work in getting these memo's together. PA DEP is happy about the effort and direction to incorporate this.

Norm Goulet: I too am impressed with how far they have come in stream restoration, but we have a long way to go and looking forward to working more on this topic.

D. Myers: Shouldn't site selection be a best practice worth exploring rather than just assuming all sites can be restored without unintended consequences if they have the right design and practices? I would add eels and river herring runs as special protection.

Tom Schueler: If you have a stream in good functioning shape you stay away from TMDL credit. What still needs to be done at State level and EPA is to come up with a more definitive guide as to what are acceptable streams to restore and which ones should be left alone.

Aaron Blair: The Water Resources Registry could also be used to help the site selection process.

Kristen Saacke Blunk: Would you recommend that the AgWG utilize the guidance developed here and drop pursuing having a default option?

Olivia Devereux: The Ag folks need a default because they do not have detailed data required to calculate load reductions for these Protocols. Ag folks get much of their data from NRCS and the engineering parameters are not available to the people reporting the implementation.

Kristen Saacke Blunk: Thanks Olivia. Perhaps we should ask NRCS to require this level of documentation in their standards.

Norm Goulet: It is important that AgWG looks at this issue.

Loretta Collins: Decisions regarding Ag stream restoration were made a long time ago. I know we are talking about protocols 2 and 3 and the NRCS issue is predominantly related to the prevented sediment protocol. Please join our AgWG call on Thursday, if you wish as we will be discussing this issue. This default removal was added and USWG was not happy about it and now the folks working with NRCS are worried about losing the default rate because they don't have anything else to use. I am wondering if the same thing is going to happen at WQGIT as with the first protocol. I think AgWG was trying to undo the puzzle of whether NRCS practices fit into the definitions in this report. So, my question is whether the new report is going to have a label on the front of if it's for Urban only. Is it your view that it's just for urban projects period, so on the non-urban side we would figure out what needs to be done?

Tom Schueler: Our understanding was that any project that used protocol 1,2,3 would get credit. The difference was that for any project that used the NRCS standards it would be up to the AgWG to provide some consistency on what needed to be done.

Loretta Collins: As long as the stream restoration falls into the protocols that Urban Stormwater set up then it's fine, but if it doesn't then AgWG needs to address it.

Neely Law: Thanks to Tom, David and all other's that contributed. The SHWG is encouraged by the future direction by how these protocols can be set up for future verification. SHWG has a GIT Funded Project that they sent to USWG and they would like to collaborate

Lee Epstein: Should best practices include going beyond the borders of the stream and its floodplain? That is, should there be a recommendation to regularly go beyond the design of the bed and the related zones of effect, and connect to what is being done in the uplands to complement the project so as to prevent later adverse effects to it?

Tom Schueler: Quick note to Neely, last week we spoke to the Forestry WG and they are interested in putting forth a similar proposal and I would recommend collaborating with them. In terms of Lee's comment, the difficulty is that every knows that there should be an assessment of the watershed but it's hard to put it in a descriptive way. This is why we need more input from the state permitting guys because no one has been able to resolve this issue so far to provide more regulatory oomph.

Norm Goulet: Currently our office is working on a stream restoration FAQ and often we run into controversy on this topic. It would be really nice to get further guidance to close that nexus on the regulatory side.

D. Myers: Sounds like a decision support pre-amble on site selection would be in order.

Jeremy Hanson: Norm, it'll be helpful for the group to see those NVRC materials when they're done. *Norm Goulet:* yes, we will get those out to the group once they have been reviewed. This protocol is now open for comment for 30 days. Email David, Tom and I and we will go ahead and start working on those comments as we receive them.

Loretta Collins: Is this presentation recorded so that AgWG members can view it later if they wish? *Norm Goulet:* Yes, Hilary will send it out later.

Action: USWG members should submit feedback on the fourth stream restoration memo, "Consensus Recommendations to Improve Protocols 2 and 3 for Defining Stream Restoration Pollutant Removal Credits" by no later than June 19, 2020. Please send any comments to David Wood (Wood.CSN@outlook.com), Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com), and Norm Goulet (NGoulet@novaregion.org).

Action: Hilary Swartwood will send a recording of the May USWG meeting to any interested parties from today's meeting. Please reach out (swartwood.hilary@epa.gov) if you would like to be sent this information.

11:55 Wrap-up and Next Steps

N. Goulet

12:00 Adjourn

Call Participants

Hilary Swartwood, CRC
Norm Goulet. NOVA
David Wood, CSN
Tom Schueler, CSN
Jeff Hartranft, PA DEP
Jeff White, MDE
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
Alison Armocida Santoro, MDNR
Kate Bennett, Montgomery County
Bhanu Paudel, DNREC
Nathan Forand, Baltimore County DEPS
Christina Lyerly, MDE

Doug Austin, EPA

Elaine Webb, DNREC

Greg Pond, EPA

Katie Ombalski, Open Waters Consulting

Mark Hoffman, CBC

Sandy Davis, USFWS

Sebastian Donner, WV DEP

Cecilia Lane, DOEE

Karl Berger, COG

Liz Ottinger, EPA

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Ginny Snead, AMT

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Allie Wagner, NOVA

Chris Swanson, VDOT

KC Fillippino, Hampton Roads Planning District

Jeremy Hanson, VT

Paul Myer, EPA

Mary Gattis, Bay Journal

Aaron Blair, EPA

Julianna Greenberg, CRC

Lee Epstein, CBF

Jesse Maines, Alexandria Gov.

Randy Greer, DNREC

Heather Ambrose, Fairfax County

Sophia Grossweiler, MDE

Tracey Harmon, VDOT

Bree Stephens, Resource Environmental Solutions

Matt Meyers, Fairfax County

Jamie Alberti, RiverSmart Homes

Neely Law, CWP, SHWG Chair

Ginger Ellis, MDNR

Kathy Hoverman, KCI

Mark Southerland, Tetra Tech

Travis Vance, MDOT

Loretta Collins, UMD, AgWG Chair

Affiliation?

D. Myers