

Nutrient Scientific Advisory Board Meeting #22 Minutes

Friday, September 7, 2012

TJCOG - 4307 Emperor Blvd, Durham NC, 27703

9:30 am -12:00 pm

Attendees

Members: Larry Band, Matt Flynn, John Cox (& Michelle Woolfolk, alt), David Phlegar, Trish D'Arconte, Kathy Debusk (Bill Hunt's alt), Andy McDaniel (Matt Lauffer's alt), Josh Johnson, Grady McCallie, Michael Layne

Non-Members: Andy Sachs (facilitator), Jason Robinson (DWQ), Rich Gannon (DWQ), Adugna Kebede (DWQ), Heather Saunders (TJCOG), Tom Davis (Orange Co), Sandra Wilbur (Durham), Haywood Phthisic (LNBA), Brian Jacobson (URS), Forrest Westall (UNRBA), Sally Hoyt (UNC), Brian Jacobson (URS), Alix Matos (CardnoEntrix), Dan McLawhorn (Raleigh), Cy Stober (PTRC)

Agenda

- **Remodel Process**
 - Recommendation by subcommittee on the final scope of work.
 - Q&A/Discussion, as needed.
 - Decision by Board on the consultant's final scope of work.
- **Model Stage 2 Adaptive Management Program**
 - Presentation by Rich Gannon on DWQ staff's current thinking.
 - Q&A/Discussion.

Material

- Draft Agenda for September Meeting
- Draft August Meeting Minutes

Convene

- September's meeting plan was approved
- August's meeting minutes were approved

Watershed Model Process

- Heather gave a brief update on the status of the Watershed Model scope:
 - The detailed septic component and existing BMP component included in the Board's RFQ for the model were subsequently removed by Tt in its draft scope in favor of more cursory estimation methods to fit the existing budget.
 - Prompted by the August SAB meeting, three local governments eventually committed to contribute additional funds to include a detailed septic component in the model.
 - A concern raised by the scope subcommittee since last meeting was that there might be the perception that the contributing local governments may unfairly benefit by funding this component. To establish a clear record, Heather suggested that the NSAB write a letter of support for the supplemental funding and model work. Later in the meeting, the Board supported Heather revising the scope to include this endorsement.

- The next step is TJCOG signing and executing the contract. That step is contingent on the full SAB's endorsement, which would be sought following discussion of the scope subcommittee's concerns.
- Rich identified four concerns that the Subcommittee had about TetraTech's draft scope. The four concerns, and the Board's discussion on each are below:
 - How will local BMP crediting be accounted for in the model?
 - The scope is somewhat open-ended on how the model will account for existing BMPs and BMPs installed after the baseline period, including those installed as part of other programs. It was explained that assumptions would be made for the loading from areas under stormwater regulations.
 - Extensive discussion produced several observations and concerns:
 - There may be local instream data that will allow better calibration based on "uses cases" where different local stormwater regulatory assumptions are made. A variety of approaches is possible, and the QAPP design can help to address;
 - Reiteration of concern over how the varying levels of BMP data provided by local governments will be dealt with;
 - A factor will be needed for non-functioning BMPs;
 - Given the minimal scale effect of BMPs, concern for potential over-crediting;
 - Between QAPP design and model setup, validation, calibration there seem to be enough hours proposed to address this.
 - The BMP discussion bled into the second concern, how should the NSAB provide input on the QAPP to TetraTech (currently the scope included an email review of the draft QAPP and one meeting)?
 - Heather explained that currently the scope states that Tt will develop a draft QAPP and send it to the subcommittee, but not sure if it'll go to the full NSAB. The Subcommittee will then meet with Tt to discuss the draft QAPP.
 - After much discussion about potentially changing the scope to include more QAPP review, the Board unanimously voted to approve the scope as is regarding the BMPs issue, leaving it to TJCOG and DWQ to seek further specification on these concerns being addressed in QAPP development.
 - How can NSAB members provide input on the septic component, since it is being done though a separate scope of work.
 - It was decided that the scope will be revised to recognize that the septic component would be funded by others under separate scope, and this scope would parenthetically retain the content of the septic component for understanding purposes.
 - How to assuage concerns about favoritism towards the three local governments who funded the septic component.
 - Each of the funding entities voiced the intent to exercise no separate control over the development of the septic component, and expected to have input only through SAB interactions with the consultant.
 - An endorsement letter from the NSAB was dropped in favor of language in the scope itself to capture the Board's support for the detailed septic work, something like , "The Board wanted the detailed septic component in the model

but funding wasn't available for it. Several local governments volunteered to contribute enough money to fund this component, and the Board accepts this funding for model and the results it will produce. The work will be funded separately but the work effort will be controlled by the SAB."

- There was extended spinoff discussion about load reduction expectations for development that has occurred since the baseline, i.e. interim development.
 - A Board member expressed the opinion that if a UNH local government has been requiring all new development to achieve 2.2 lbN/ac/yr for all interim development, then that development is achieving a 35% reduction, and no further reductions would be needed for this interim development.
 - DWQ made the observation that such development would still add loads that in absolute terms further increase the local government's total load relative to baseline and to their allocation.
 - DWQ agreed to examine this issue more closely, and revisit the discussion potentially at the Board's November meeting.

Model Stage 2 Adaptive Management Program

Rich gave a brief update on DWQ's development of the Model Stage 2 program that is due in July 2013: The Chesapeake program is funding several panels to explore identified load-reduction practices and their associated accounting. We hope to be able to utilize some of the information that comes out of these panels, and may try to develop a contract to adapt those findings for our region and needs. Six or seven of the panels will be wrapping up their finding by December of this year.

Potential Future Agenda Items

- Watershed Model update
- Stage II Adaptive Management Program
- Interim loading discussion (moved to November when Matt will there)

Future Meeting Dates

- ~~Friday, October 5, 9:30-12:30 at TJCOG~~ [Editor's note: October meeting subsequently cancelled by DWQ. Next meeting scheduled for Friday, November 2, 2012]
- Unless specifically rescheduled, the first Friday of each month, 9:30 – 12:00 at TJCOG.