



Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting Summary

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

10:00 AM to 2:30 PM

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24809/>

Actions & Decisions:

ACTION: USWG members should submit feedback on the report on the Allocation of Conowingo Infill Nutrient and Sediment Loads to Olivia Devereux (olivia@devereuxconsulting.com) by July 10th.

Announcements

- Advanced MS4 Nutrient Discovery Credit Extended to 2020: The recommendation to extend the MS4 nutrient discovery credit has been approved by the Partnership.
- Fact Sheet on Urban Forest Credits Released: The fact sheet is available on the CSN website, and helps explain forest BMPs and crediting mechanisms.
- Update on the Manufactured Treat Device Team: The group had a face-to-face meeting in Annapolis in June, and is working to develop a draft protocol.
- Outfall Stabilization Panel: There has been no formal meeting of the panel, but it is in the queue. SHA has recently submitted to MDE a lot of data on this practice, who will then provide it back to the USWG.

Crediting Options for Roadside Ditch Management Practices. T. Schueler, CSN Attach B

A team was created to investigate whether a range of roadside ditch management practices could be credited for sediment and nutrient reductions within the context of existing ag and urban expert panel reports. The team has crafted a technical memo outlining their recommended options (Attach B) and is requesting feedback from both the ag and urban workgroups on the feasibility of their approach. Both workgroups are also asked whether they are interested in pursuing the crediting options.

Discussion:

- Ginny Sneed: With cost-share, since most of these practices are in rural areas – this poses a problem for large-scale crediting options. There's still a lot of uncertainty over who owns this land, who operates, whether there are easements, and not having any database of that information is generally a big issue.
- Written feedback on the technical memo is requested by early August.
- Norm Goulet agreed with the stabilization and maintenance recommendation. His main concern was spoils staying in place, and agreed that the group should look at a threshold review for monitoring data that could be considered. Long-term data would be especially useful to determine if there is a net positive/negative flux.

- Norm Goulet also mentioned that there was no existing network of roadside ditches in the CBP modeling tools.
 - Tom Scheuler replied that there is now a transport impervious cover land use. There may be potential solutions, but the question is whether the modelers can implement them and whether states/jurisdictions can report their practices.
- Comments and concerns raised over how to allocate loads between the urban and agricultural sectors for instances where both land uses are contributing to a single ditch.

Recommended Crediting Options for Performance Enhancing Devices for LID Practices

Brian Siepp, CWP, David Hirschman, HWE, T. Schueler, CSN

Attach C

As part of a NFWF grant, CWP conducted an extensive literature review to determine whether the performance of existing LID practices could be enhanced by a combination of media amendments, under drain configuration and plant density (Attach D). David and Tom presented the key research findings and some options for PED crediting. Brian also discussed initial results from some ongoing PED demonstration projects that are being monitored in the watershed.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet: Some of these modifications directly impact the work of the MTD panel, specifically coming up with a definition of what an MTD is: preliminarily, if a practice contains any proprietary elements, then it is an MTD. But most of the modifications you've mentioned are generic, so that might be something to keep in mind when we start describing this BMP – that it might not be able to contain proprietary elements.
 - Tom Scheuler: There's also intersections with ditch treatment options as well. Whatever decision we make, we'll have a lot of work to remove those proprietary elements from all of the different project components.
- Question about the distinction between crediting for retrofits versus new development? Jamie Bauer noted that they allow credit toward MS4 projects if people go above and beyond minimum construction requirements. Then, the differential goes to crediting the MS4.
- Tom Scheuler: I think giving more options to local governments makes sense, but I think it would be a shame to create a new option that wasn't implementable, source-able, and construct-able.
- Norm Goulet: Could you put together a GIT funding proposal to develop what you need for this effort? And what the states/localities would need to have for design guidelines for these facilities.
- Ray Bahr: Since we're not based on pollutant removal, but on volume, we're not really hearing a lot from this. We could support it to get an extra percentage for the Bay, but it wouldn't affect implementation of the state's program.
- Karl Berger: It sounds like there is more credit there on a runoff reduction standpoint.
- Randy Greer: DE has a placeholder for these, which says they'll be evaluated on a case by case basis. But we're like MD, with a runoff reduction that automatically correlates with a nutrient reduction.
- USWG did not raise any concerns with submitting a GIT funding proposal for advancing this work. Tom Scheuler and Norm Goulet will work to draft a proposal over the next month.

Exploring Land Based Strategies to Address Conowingo Infill Phosphorus and Sediment Increases--Bruce Michael, DNR Attach E

This is the first of a three-phase approach that would explore opportunities for land-based practices to reduce phosphorus and sediment as a result of the Conowingo Reservoir at full capacity. This work is being performed through the modeling work group and modeling team.

Discussion:

- Karl Berger noted that by distributing the additional loads further among the watershed, then additional P would need to be reduced.
- Recommendation from the USWG to re-run these scenarios using the Phase 6 model and BMPs.
- Karl Berger: I'm worried you end up with an apples to oranges comparison with cost here. You're building on WIP II costs, but they weren't done on least cost basis. In MD, their WIP II was probably more cost efficient than other states, but now their incremental costs may not be reasonable.
- Norm Goulet: We recognize that of the problems trying to do the cost analysis using the WIP, but you can't go the opposite direction where you put all of the most cost effective BMPs. With this here, we've entered the realm of politics.
- Karl Berger: But to the extent that some of these scenarios approach E3, then I don't know how realistic that will be.
- Ginny Sneed: Would it be possible to re-run the scenario in the WIPs with Karl's suggested adjustments? If you're looking at a cost, could you re-run the Phase II WIPs with a cost-effectiveness filter in it?
- Norm Goulet: I think you're going to have to present a number of different scenarios for this. I'm not sure how states would feel about re-running their WIPs, but perhaps there's another set of scenarios that you could develop to help address this issue.
- Olivia Devereux summarized that another option would be to take existing WIPs and proportionally increase the BMPs so that all load reductions are met.
- Tom Scheuler noted that an over degree of precision might not be useful for managers and policy makers.

ACTION: USWG members should submit feedback on the report on the Allocation of Conowingo Infill Nutrient and Sediment Loads to Olivia Devereux (olivia@devereuxconsulting.com) by July 10th.

Phase 6 E3 and No Action Scenarios

J. Sweeney Attach F

Jeff Sweeney, EPA, will present to the workgroup recommendations of the Phase 6 No Action and E3 scenarios for urban stormwater.

Discussion:

- Jeff Sweeney asked what the basis was for setting a 15% restoration for urban streams for the E3 scenario.

- Jamie Bauer suggested reviewing the assumptions, citing projects in VA that aren't meeting 2x the default rate.
- Tom Scheuler noted that the group that developed the expert panel report for dirt and gravel roads felt that their efficiencies should be reconsidered, and they have a new method in the appendix that they are recommending.
- Olivia noted that the CPB needs a domain of dirt and gravel roads for purposes in addition to developing the E3 scenario.

Phase 6 Watershed Model Review: Phase 1

N. Goulet

In early June, the Modeling Team released the Phase 6 Watershed Model for partnership review. In particular, the USWG was assigned to review Chapters 1 to 3 of the model documentation and request any model scenarios to show the effect of urban BMPs. The work group is also asked to complete a fatal flaw review by the end of July. This meeting will be devoted to getting initial impressions from USWG members on the implications of the Phase 6 model and what if any additional information they need to conduct this review. A second work group meeting will be devoted to this review in July.

Olivia Devereux gave a demonstration of the new Phase 6 CAST tool.

Participants:

Norm Goulet	NVRC
Tom Scheuler	CSN
Lindsey Gordon	CRC
Sebastian Donner	WV DEP
Julienne Bautista	DOEE
Randy Greer	DNREC
Elaine Webb	DNREC
Jamie Bauer	VA DEQ
Dave Hirschman	HWE
Chris Swanson	VDOT
KC Filippino	HRPDC
Jill Sunderland	HRPDC
Ray Bahr	MDE
Christina Lyerly	MDE

Robin Pellicano	MDE
Greg Sandi	MDE
Steve Stewart	Baltimore County MD
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Greg Busch	MDE
Mark Hoffman	CBC
Brian Siepp	CWP
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Ginny Sneed	Louis Berger Group Inc.
Bruce Michael	MD DNR