

Date: February 28, 2013

To: Urban Stormwater Work Group
Watershed Technical Work Group

From: Tom Schueler, Chesapeake Stormwater Network
Bill Stack, Center for Watershed Protection

Re: Supplement: Panel Response to VA DCR Comments on Stream
Restoration Expert Panel Report

VA DCR submitted comments on 1/28/2013, but they got lost in the ether. The comments have been posted to the meeting website. This memo serves as a supplement to 2/21/2013 Comment Response memo to address the VA DCR comments.

The major thrust of the VA DCR comments involved three issues, as shown below:

1. The Protocols are not workable and no justification for using site specific details in a lumped parameter model.

The Panel respectfully disagrees, as the protocols rely on stream assessment data that is routinely collected to support the design of stream restoration projects. The four VA practitioners and regulators represented on the panel deemed the protocols a practical and workable approach.

The protocols, either individually or in combination, provide a reliable estimate of the mass of sediment and nutrients that are reduced by various types of stream restoration projects, accounting for the delivery factors that are incorporated into the model at the river segment scale.

The panel did make numerous recommendations for how low order streams could be better simulated in the context of CBWM (see Section 8.4 of report, and Part B response # 9 in the 2/21 memo), and the CBP Sediment and Stream Restoration Coordinator (CWP) is actively working with the modeling team to try and implement the panel recommendations in the upcoming mid-point assessment.

In addition, the adaptive management approach outlined in the panel will allow users to test drive the protocols on real world projects (see Part A. Response #6 in the memo).

2. Need for a default value for historical projects.

At the rollout meeting in December, the panel recommended that the historical stream restoration projects be allowed to use the interim rate that VA requested and was granted in January 2012 (see Section 2.4 of the report). Localities would have the option to apply the new protocols on older projects, but would have to accept the final mass nutrient and sediment reduction that was calculated.

We will add language to the final report to make sure states and locals are aware of the two options.

3. Drop Protocol 4 (Dry channel RSC)

Regenerative stormwater conveyance has always been a “tweener” as it is located at the transition between upland areas and the stream corridor. An informal poll of the members of the prior retrofit expert panel indicated that they were supportive and comfortable with the stream restoration panel’s decision to classify dry channel RSC as a new category of retrofits. Both panels are supportive of creating another retrofit option to allow localities and others to find cost-effective ways to achieve load reductions to meet the TMDL.