

Exemplary Strategies to Protect and Restore Urban Watersheds: Preparing for the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and Watershed Implementation Plans

David Sample
Ted Graham
Chris Pyke
Rick Keister



Workshop Summary
Presentation to the
Chesapeake Bay STAC
Meeting, June 7-8, 2011

Top 10 Questions from Workshop

1. What authority do you use in your SW programs?
2. What is your viewpoint with respect to the Bay nutrient TMDL?
3. What has been your experience with local (non Bay) TMDLs?
4. How is your program funded?
5. What is the extent of planned retrofit activity?
6. What critical needs exist for your program to survive/thrive?
7. Where do you see the program going in the next 10 years?
8. How important is the local political climate in building effective programs?
9. What role should local elected officials play in implementing new requirements or new programs?
10. What are the most significant barriers to overcome in order to get public acceptance for strong and innovative stormwater management programs?

Major Findings/Discussion Results

Name	Recommendations
K. Antos, EPA	The connection between the Bay TMDL, WIPs, MS4 permits and local watershed plans.
B. Stack, CWP	Ongoing maintenance requirements and costs
	The results of side-by-side monitoring
S. Shofar, Montgomery County	Economics of stormwater management: Paygo vs. bonding; allocating
	Prospects of achieving water quality standards
F. Rose, Fairfax County	Measuring after-the-fact effectiveness of ESD/LID technology.
	Fairfax County's approach to local watershed planning
C. Pyke, US Green Building Council	Incorporating climate change into Bay TMDL, watershed planning, and stormwater management
K. Antos, EPA	The link between WSM WLAs and MS4 permit requirements
D. Sample, VT	Designing a stormwater monitoring program for local governments
	Stormwater monitoring as a component of adaptive management
D. Vizzini, City of Portland	Watershed planning and watershed management
	TMDLs as a watershed management driver
	The costs and benefits of green technologies
	The limits of ESD in controlling stormwater in CSO areas

Specific Recommendations

- Much interest in continued work in areas:
 - Identify “economies of scale” in LID implementation
 - Issues of BMP failure and maintenance are related, more data needs to be collected and analyzed
 - Identify strategies that create successful stormwater management programs AND identify barriers to these
 - Create a “Chesapeake Bay for Idiots” series of educational opportunities (CAC)
- Actively participate in Phase II WIP process
- Continued STAC-LGAC workshops

Short Term Next Steps

Potential Workshops/Research Areas:

- Connecting Bay TMDL, Local TMDLs, Phase II WIPs, MS4 Permits and Local Watershed Plans
- Retrofitting LID and ESD into Ultra-Urban Areas, monitoring effectiveness
- Economics of Stormwater Management
 - Investigating Operation and Maintenance Requirements and Costs for LID & ESD
 - What are the secondary (non water quality) benefits of LID and ESD?
- Using watershed models (scale?) to equitably assign wasteload allocations (WLAs) for MS4s

Long Term Next Steps

Potential Workshops/Research Areas:

- The other side of “cost-effectiveness”: Can stormwater management improve and maintain water quality and or help meet standards?
- Developing sustainable funding and implementation pathway for watershed protection in suburban settings
- Use of stormwater monitoring as part of an adaptive management strategy for local governments
- Anticipating climate change impacts in local stormwater management programs

Upcoming (non STAC) workshop: Improving SW BMP selection: Making decisions under uncertainty, June 28, 2011, MWCOCG (Mid Atlantic Water Program)