

Nutrient Scientific Advisory Board Meeting Summary
August 4, 2017
TJCOG - 4307 Emperor Blvd Suite 110, Durham, NC 27703
9:30 am – 12 pm

Attendees

Members / Advisors

Eric Kulz - Cary
Andy McDaniel - NCDOT
Allison Schwarz Weakley – Chapel Hill
Haywood Phthisic - UNRBA
Sally Hoyt - UNC
David Phlegar - Greensboro
Peter Raabe – American Rivers
Josh Johnson - AWCK
Forest Westall - UNRBA

Guests

Jen Schmitz - TJCOG
Alix Matos – Brown & Caldwell
Sarah Waickowski - NCSU
Diana Hales - Chatham County
Teresa Andrews - AWCK
Lauren Kabrick - UNC Stormwater
Megan Walsh - Durham

Facilitator – Dispute Settlement Center

Andy Sachs

DWR Staff www.deq.nc.gov/nps

Patrick Beggs
Rich Gannon
John Huisman
Jim Hawhee

Agenda Topics

1. NSAB Charter
2. Storm Drain Cleaning Practice

Meeting Materials are available online: www.deq.nc.gov/nps

Meeting Summary

[Andy Sachs opened the meeting with introductions.](#)

The June 2, 2016 meeting summary was offered for approval but there was not a quorum present early in the meeting to approve it. Eventually 9 of 10 voting members were present but we did not come back to this point. **The June 2, 2016 meeting summary will be offered for approval at the next meeting.**

NSAB charter

Patrick Beggs presented a draft NSAB charter, dated Aug 4, 2107. The charter was written using information and decisions since 2010 which the NSAB was already using to govern itself. The charter pulls all that information into one document.

The NSAB helped update the participant representation table.

A conversation followed concerning NSAB membership, including filling open seats and adding new nonvoting members. There is not a current protocol for adding members.

A decision was made to reserve the word ‘member’ for voting participants. Non-Voting Members will be named Non-Voting Advisors. This will be reflected in the next draft of the charter.

Comments collected (not acted on) from the charter discussion:

- Require RSVPs for meetings. Member contacts DWQ if they will be absent.
- Require an attendance minimum for members and their alternates, such as 75%.
- Open the alternate spots to other communities not represented by the members.
- Consider 15 total participants at the table (10 members + 10 advisors).
- Let’s not limit participation if the interest is there.
- I don’t want our focus to get lost or out of control.
- Gauge interest among potential members.
- Chatham County needs representation on the NSAB.
- The legislation says the NSAB is about all waters, not just Jordan Lake, should we open this up to a wider audience?
- We need a way for other affected interests to have a voice.
- Can staff solicit interest from other local governments?
- We need clarity on the scope of the NSAB versus the scope of other SABs and similar entities. (This comment was also brought up in June and staff is working to come up with this information.)

Staff will amend the charter, propose a plan to include more participants, and present it at the next NSAB meeting.

Storm Drain Cleanout Nutrient Reduction Practice

Patrick Beggs presented Storm Drain Cleanout Nutrient Reduction Practice. The presentation and draft document are [online](#).

Presentation Overview:

- Storm Drain Clean out is the periodic removal of gross solids from storm drain catch basins.
- It may include organic debris, litter, and/or coarse sediments.
- The basin may be unaltered or have a specific device installed.
- The weight of removed solids is converted to labile weight of Nitrogen and Phosphorous.
- Weight of solids will depend upon location, size, drainage area, tree canopy, tree species, etc.
- The practice would comply with Existing Development rules

- Conversion factors
 - 0.00207 lb labile N / lb wet weight
 - 0.00014lb labile P / lb of wet weight
- Range available
 - labile TN 0.10 to 11 lb/ac/yr
 - labile TP 0.01 to 1 lb/ac/yr for

- Local government responsibilities include:
 - Collection, weighing, and disposal of solids
 - Annual reporting.
- This credit will not be used for street sweeping, street-side leaf pickup, instream devices, or removal of leaves and other gross solids from ditches, gutters, or swales.

Comments collected (not acted on) from Storm Drain Cleanout practice discussion:

- It is difficult to weigh this material.
- We cannot weigh individual storm drain debris, it needs to be per truck since the trucks go along and empty many storm drains in a row.
- UNC has 50 of these insert devices and cleans out about 5000 drains annuals.
- It is possible to estimate different loadings based on catchment area, land use, and cleanout frequency, possibly removing the need to weigh material. NCSU has the data for this.
- There is other data from the Chesapeake on this, possibly including research without insert devices, as well as simple conversions from wet to dry.
- NCSU has NC specific data.
- Do we need to separate storm drain cleanout from street sweeping? It all goes into the drain.
- Three-month cleaning recommendation is based on flood avoidance.
- Does it need to be based on labile T and labile P? Answer: This is the best way to compare the data, apples to apples.
- It needs to be based on Total N and P since it all breaks down eventually. No other aspects of these strategies use labile N and P.
- Is the debris leaching labile N and P as it sits, for example longer than 3 months? Answer: We don't know.
- If we can make this work it could be a really winning practice.

Staff will work with comments, new data, NCSU researchers, and subject matter experts to write a new draft of the Storm Drain Cleanout Practice.

Potential revised nutrient practice approval process

Comments from previous meetings concerning the NSAB not receiving feedback about changes to the nutrient practices after NSAB and public comments were received and incorporated predicated a potential change to the approval process. DWR is fine with the approval process but is seeking a way to keep the NSAB better informed while also keeping to a realistic timeline. A brief discussion followed and this will be added to the next meeting agenda.

Comments:

- This process may not need to be so complicated.
- The NSAB doesn't get to read comments that come to DWR outside of the NSAB meetings.
- Can the NSAB also see the final draft before it is sent for director approval?
- Can the NSAB be given the chance to formally endorse the process when it is sent to the director?
- Don't waste the public's time without first running it by the NSAB.

Using this information, staff will suggest a potential approval process for discussion at the next meeting.

Updates

- A handout of Nutrient Credit Practices Status (July 26, 2017) was distributed and is available [online](#).
- A Nutrient Trading Framework Discussion Draft is being written.
- Buffer Restoration Nutrient Credit Practice will come back to the NSAB in Fall 2017