



Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 21, 2020

10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Action: USWG leadership will provide an update on the Group 4 Memo for Stream Restoration at the May meeting.

Action: USWG members should provide feedback to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) on Impervious Cover Removal by COB May 15, 2020.

Action: USWG members should provide feedback regarding the STAC workshop report on Toxic Contaminants to Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov) and Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov).

10:00 Welcome and Review of February Meeting Minutes.

Norm Goulet, Chair. Attach A.

10:05 Announcements and Updates

- Webcast Schedule
 - CSN webcast series every Friday called “Watershed Hacks for Uncertain Times.”
 - Dates of upcoming webinars: April 24, April 30, May 8, and May 14.
- Thanks to Allie Wagner and welcome to Hilary Swartwood
- Stream Restoration Update
 - Currently reviewing the draft Group 4 memo (last one) with the goal to have an update to the group in May.
 - **Action:** USWG leadership will provide an update on the Group 4 Memo for Stream Restoration at the May meeting.
 - AgWG on separate track looking at Stream Restoration, which came out of the Group 3 memo. AgWG was tasked with putting together a group to look at the NRCS practices and default rates and time period. They are making a decision on how to proceed at their May meeting.
- CSN Climate Work Update
 - The second memo is almost completed (state by state engineering design criteria and models being used for climate resiliency).
 - 3rd memo will be released at same time (looks at different research on down scale precipitation projections with IDF curves)
 - Early to mid-summer release.
- COVID- 19 Discussion:

- Norm Goulet discussed the budgetary impacts of COVID- 19 and how implementation is going to be impacted in the coming months/ couple years.
- Sebastian Donner said that it certainly a concern, but in WV he believes they will be able to stay on track for regular urban stormwater BMPs.
- Kate Bennett from MDE said that they are looking at implementation of impervious BMPs and raised concerns of whether they would be able to fulfill their WIP 3 obligations on this front.
- Christina Lyerly from MDE concurred with Kate Bennett that this is something on every one's radar.

10:20 Impervious Cover Removal

Tom Schueler and David Wood, CSN. Attach B.

Last meeting, the USWG discussed the need to provide more clarity for how to track and report impervious cover removal as a BMP. Tom and David will review a potential path forward for the practice.

- *Initial Recommendation:* rely on reduced unit loading rates that reflect the effective hydrologic response achieved by small practices.
 - *Norm Goulet:* how can the MS4 jurisdictions play into this?
 - *Christina Lyerly:* This is something we can talk about as we go through this process. In our draft accounting guidance, we do have a soil restoration credit that we are moving forwards with.
 - *Norm Goulet:* How much time do you want to give for this memo?
 - *Tom Schueler:* Provide comments to me by May 15th, 2020 and additional volunteers. So far, I have Karl Berger, Cecilia Lane, State Highway (not identified yet). KC Filipino as well. Need more state reps. Randy Greer can be added to the list. Christina Lyerly will let them know who the volunteer will be. Alana from WV said this isn't in their WIP. PA should be included.
 - **Action:** USWG members should provide feedback to Tom Schueler (watershedguy@hotmail.com) and David Wood (wood.csn@outlook.com) on Impervious Cover Removal by COB May 15, 2020.

10:45 STAC Workshop Report on Toxic Contaminants

Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher, USGS

Scott and Emily will report the findings from the recently completed STAC report: "Integrating Science and Developing Approaches to Inform Management for Contaminants of Concern in Agricultural and Urban Settings".

- STAC Recommendations and initial CBP Response:
 - STAC: Gaps in compiling and communicating potential removal efficiencies for contaminants
 - CBP Response:
 - Enhance communication materials to inform decisions
 - Compile results and expand BMP studies

- Selected BMP results into CBP tools
- STAC: Close working relationship between researches and management community
 - CBP Response:
 - Enhanced interaction with audiences for contaminant information
 - Take advantage of Phase 3 WIP Implementation
- Initial Feedback from USWG:
 - *Norm Goulet*: GIT funded projects are coming up; you may be able to get some of these ideas funded through that process.
 - *Sebastian Donner*: One thing that would be great to know is the additional benefits these BMPS provide and additional guidance in how to manage these BMPs once contaminants are removed. For example, if plants take up the heavy metals, what do you do with them? What is the removal process for long term benefit? For example, sediment caught in a storm retention pond- what do you do with it?
 - *KC Filipino*: There is a lot of good data available with the Elizabeth River work, which is a sediment remediation success story. I can put Scott and Emily in contact with someone to get more information.
 - *Sebastian Donner*: It is wonderful to have this in CAST, but not sure how feasible it is. I have no fundamental flaws though.
 - *Scott Phillips*: we will follow up with Olivia Devereux and bring back the final document for approval.
 - If you have additional feedback or questions reach out to Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov) and Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov).
 - **Action**: USWG members should provide feedback regarding the STAC workshop report on Toxic Contaminants to Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov) and Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov).

11:15 Projecting Stream Conditions Under Future Land Use and Climate Scenarios

Kelly Maloney, USGS

Kelly will present the findings from his recent study that examined the possible effects of a suite of land-use and climate scenarios on the biological condition of 70,772 small streams in the Chesapeake Bay watershed for the years 2030, 2060, and 2090.

- *Norm Goulet*: we are not there yet with the bay modeling. It may be interesting to work with the modeling group to obtain the watershed information for what they have done with the two RCP runs, the watershed flows they are currently using for the modeling, and the rainfall data. For example, the eastern shore showed a huge increase in rain fall. It would be good to sync up with the Phase 6 modeling folks.
- *Kelly Maloney*: that is the next step- we have been working with the Phase 6 modeling folks to do this.
- *Norm Goulet*: this is right up the Habitat GIT's alley.
- *Scott Phillips*: we can reach out to Jennifer Greiner and other associated workgroups.

- *Norm Goulet*: would love to have you come back at a future meeting and show how more of this is being integrated

11:45 IDF Curve Development Update

Norm Goulet, Chair

Norm will introduce the contractor selected to develop downscaled, future IDF curves for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed and provide a brief update on the anticipated timeline for the work.

- Rand Corporation and Cornell University were selected for this project. One driving factor was that Rand decided to provide some of their own money into this project in order to develop curves for the entire Bay Watershed, instead of just one part. Contract was signed this week.

12:00 Adjourn

Call Participants

Norm Goulet, NOVA

David Wood, CSN

Kelly Maloney, USGS

Emily Majcher, USGS

Scott Phillips, USGS

Tom Schueler, CSN

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting

Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal

Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Jeremy Hanson, VT

Ruth Minich- Hobson, VA DEQ

Sebastian Donner, WV DEP

Jeff Sweeney, EPA

Christina Lyerly, MDE

Mark Hoffman, CBC

Cecilia Lane, DOEE

Randy Greer, DNREC

KC Filipino, HRPPDC

Elaine Webb, DNREC

Doug Austin, EPA

Hilary Swartwood, CRC

Kate Bennett, Montgomery County

Ginger Ellis, MDNR