**Water Quality GIT Comments on Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP Expert Panel Report**

**Background:** The WQGIT was asked to review and approve the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP Expert Panel's final report and recommendations on March 28, 2016. Virginia could not support the report as-written, and submitted a proposed amendment to the report to create an alternative BMP option, SCP-12 (see Appendix A) for WQGIT consideration. On April 25th, the WQGIT was again asked whether they support the expert panel's report, both with and without Virginia's proposed amendment. Consensus could not be reached on the approval of the panel's report, either with or without Virginia's proposed amendment, and per the WQGIT's *Governance Protocols* the decision has been elevated to the Management Board for decision.

**Polling Results:**

Does the WQGIT support the Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning expert panel report as originally written, without the Virginia DEQ's proposed addition of SCP-12?

*Support:* **13**
*Do Not Support:* **1**
*No Stance:* **1**

| **Member** | **Support** | **Do Not Support** | **Did not provide stance*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| John Schneider (Delaware) | x | | |
| Mary Searing & George Onyullo (District of Columbia) | x | | |
| Jim George & Dinorah Dalmasy (Maryland) | x | | |
| Ben Sears (New York) | x | | |
| Kristen Wolf (Pennsylvania) | x | | |
| James Davis-Martin (Virginia) | | x | |
| Dave Montali (West Virginia) | x | | |
| Marel King (CBC) | x | | |
| Jen Sincock (EPA) | x | | |
| Beth McGee (At-Large) | x | | |
| Bill Angstadt (At-Large) | x | | |
| Tanya Spano (At-Large) | x | | |
| Jenn Volk (At-Large) | x | | |
| Chris Thompson (At-Large) | x | | |
| Sarah Diebel (At-Large) | | | x |
| *Member was either not present for the meeting and did not provide decisive comments prior to the meeting, or did not feel they had sufficient information to make an informed decision. | | | |

Does the WQGIT support the expert panel report as-amended, with the inclusion of Virginia DEQ's proposed addition of SCP-12?

*Support:* **2**
*Do Not Support:* **9**

*No Stance:* **4**

| Member | Support | Do Not Support | Did not provide stance* |
|---|---|---|---|
| John Schneider (Delaware) | | x | |
| Mary Searing & George Onyullo (District of Columbia) | | x | |
| Jim George & Dinorah Dalmasy (Maryland) | | x | |
| Ben Sears (New York) | | x | |
| Kristen Wolf (Pennsylvania) | x | | |
| James Davis-Martin (Virginia) | x | | |
| Dave Montali (West Virginia) | | x | |
| Marel King (CBC) | | x | |
| Jen Sincock (EPA) | | x | |
| Beth McGee (At-Large) | | x | |
| Bill Angstadt (At-Large) | | | x |
| Tanya Spano (At-Large) | | | x |
| Jenn Volk (At-Large) | | x | |
| Chris Thompson (At-Large) | | | x |
| Sarah Diebel (At-Large) | | | x |
| *Member was either not present for the meeting and did not provide decisive comments prior to the meeting, or did not feel they had sufficient information to make an informed decision. | | | |

**Summary of Individual WQGIT Member Comments and Concerns with the Panel Report As-Written:**

- Following release of the 2011 street sweeping panel report, many localities invested in street sweeping equipment to try to address water quality and other municipal interests. Changing the rules after these localities have already made investments in this technology has the potential for damaging credibility with local governments. Allowing for lab analysis of street solids mass would allow for continued crediting using existing technologies with increased scientific validity. The panel report includes the use of a less scientific mass load reporting approach (default assumptions of nutrient content rather than lab analysis) for storm drain and catch basin cleanouts. The report also identifies the need for additional data regarding the particle size distribution and nutrient content in swept material.
- Concerns were raised over the possible double counting of sediment reduction credit in the Phase 6 Model. The way in which in-stream attenuation and sediment delivery factors are calculated in Phase 6 and interact with the reductions derived from the WinSLAMM model used by the panel could result in double counting of reduction credits. This issue has been sent to the Modeling Workgroup for consideration.

**Summary of Individual WQGIT Member Comments and Concerns with the Panel Report As-Amended:**

- Concerns were expressed about modifying a panel's report based on what some feel are policy – and not scientific – issues.

- A suggestion was made to apply a discount factor to the pounds reported under the proposed SCP-12 practice in order to provide a more conservative estimate of material collected from the hopper. (The amendment includes limits to constrain the TSS reduction to the panel defined “fine” fraction of the collected material and further places a cap on the total nutrient and sediment benefit from this practices to no more than 30% of the available load. Neither of these constraints apply to the mass load reporting for storm drain cleanouts.)
- Concern was expressed that not all panel members thought that the science supported credit for the proposed SCP=12 mass balance approach. (When polled, half of the panel members supported the SCP=12 mass balance approach.)
- The proposed amendment, SCP-12, is not implementable as currently written because the methodology lacks sufficient details to provide proper assurance that the reduction credit that would be reported is actually being achieved. (When polled, the majority (8/10) of the panel members felt that the proposal was not implementable as currently written.)
- Some members would be interested in taking more time to further develop the details of the proposed crediting approach and adding it as an amendment once members and panelists felt there was sufficient scientific justification for the proposed crediting methodology.
- The proposed SCP-12 crediting methodology is too general, and would allow everyone to develop their own statistically valid sampling regime to validate the credits being reported for this practice. At this time, no proposed refinements to the proposal have been submitted to VADEQ.

**Appendix A.**

**Proposed Addition to Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning Expert Panel Report**

Submitted to the WQGIT by Virginia DEQ: March 25, 2016

**SCP – 12: Laboratory Analysis of Street Solids Mass**

Collected material will be weighed and a statistically valid sample of the collected material sent to a laboratory to measure the:

- Dry weight of the wet material
- Particle size distribution of the material
- Average carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus content of the material

The results of the lab analysis would then be applied to the mass of the material collected to derive the reportable reductions:

- TSS mass = dry weight mass of fine fraction (≤ 75 microns) based on the lab analysis of particle size distribution
- TN mass = dry weight mass of nitrogen based on the lab analysis of nitrogen content
- TP mass = dry weight mass of phosphorus based on the lab analysis of phosphorus content

Credit under the SCP-12 practice would be capped annually at 30% of the impervious urban N, P and TSS in the LRSEG where the practice is reported.

Qualifying conditions:

(1) The loads must be tracked and verified using a field protocol to measure the mass or volume of solids collected. The locality must demonstrate that they have instituted a standard operating procedure (SOP) to keep track of the mass of the sediments and/or organic matter that are removed and a sampling method for laboratory analysis that is representative of mass collected

(2) Material must be properly disposed so that it cannot migrate back into the watershed.