



**LAND DEVELOPMENT
WORKGROUP MEETING
Meeting Notes
March 19, 2009**

Attendees

David Batts (Construction EcoServices), Craig Maske (Dodson, HCEC), Nick Russo (Harris County), Lythia Metzmeier (TCEQ), Mark Wharton (Construction EcoServices), David Beyer (Storm Water Solutions)

H-GAC Staff Present

Erin Anderson, Rachel Powers

Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions

Erin initiated self-introductions. Craig Maske was chosen to be the reporter to the BIG. Erin then reviewed the agenda.

Discussion

Discuss sources and priorities

There were questions about the overlap between the scope of this group and where the boundaries are. For example, on our list, we have animals listed, but this probably ought to be addressed in the animal workgroup.

Folks asked how green infrastructure ended up on the prioritization list for the BIG meeting last Tuesday. It was e-mailed in.

Nick provided a bit of information about how the table was filled out since the last meeting.

Michael asked if there is a baseline for us to compare to? Nick mentioned the International BMP database that provides some information.

There are four implementation activities that have been identified, in general terms:

- Evaluate and implement post-construction BMPs for bacteria as required in Phase I & II stormwater programs. Encourage these activities in communities outside of phase I and phase II areas. Examples might include:
 - Extended duration detention ponds
 - Vegetative swales



- Hydrodynamic separators
 - Trash racks
 - Rain gardens
 - Water harvesting systems
 - Green roofs
 - Porous pavement/more pervious surface
 - Provide incentives to maintain open space as stormwater controls
- Petition TCEQ to allow MUDs to fund water quality BMPs including low impact development, wet stormwater quality basins, riparian buffers, and other green infrastructure.
 - Provide incentives to preserve and create open spaces and natural reserves
 - Establish and maintain vegetation in yards, openspace, and common areas.

Florida is doing a lot of stormwater retrofit projects. These projects are often funded through grants, stormwater utility fees,

We discussed whether standards should be applied to the runoff. In the Edwards Aquifer, there are standards, particularly for TSS (90% removal during a 20 year storm??). Should these be applied here?

Maintenance of BMPs are not happening, so they need to be selected carefully.

There was a discussion of research needs. There are a lot of questions, but there has also been quite a bit of testing on various BMPs in situation that might be similar to Houston situations. In Edwards Aquifer, the TARP test and the TAPE test are being relied upon by TCEQ to determine whether BMPs (largely proprietary mechanisms) are appropriate. Developers might participate in research projects, as might Phase II MUDs.

We might want to consider having MUDs evaluate post-construction BMPs—possibly a requirement in the Phase II permits.

Would developer reimbursement agreements be a mechanism for implementing or funding BMPs? No, the phase I or II permits would probably be a better mechanism.

Areas outside of phase I and II communities might have the most development in coming years, and mechanisms to implement BMPs in those areas might be valuable (if they are phase I or Phase II, they are already developed, to an extent).

Discuss implementation activities and priorities

Introduction to the Coordination and Policy prioritization tool

Wrap-up

Review tasks

- Research more stormwater BMPs (refer to research)
- Identify EPA or other funding for BMP projects and evaluation
- Generate map showing areas covered by Phase I and II stormwater permits vs. TMDL areas.

Next meeting date: Monday, May 11, 2009, 1:15 PM to 2:30 PM, Conference Room B





**CONSTRUCTION
WORKGROUP MEETING
Meeting Notes
March 19, 2009**

Attendees

David Batts (Construction EcoServices), Craig Maske (Dodson, HCEC), Nick Russo (Harris County), Lythia Metzmeier (TCEQ), Mark Wharton (Construction EcoServices), David Beyer (Storm Water Solutions); John Moss (Construction EcoServices)

H-GAC Staff Present

Erin Anderson, Rachel Powers

Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions

Erin initiated self-introductions. Craig Maske was chosen to be the reporter to the BIG. Erin then reviewed the agenda.

Discussion

The discussion began with a request to discuss one item all the way across the spreadsheet. We started by discussing the row beginning with "sediment."

- a. Sediment was ID'ed as a source because of the correlation between sediment and bacteria transport.
- b.
- c. The 85% reduction number was provided, but may not have applicability. H-GAC to provide information.
- d. For technical assistance, research is needed for each individual BMP. Financial assistance might be provided by product developers who sell products.

Texas Transportation Institute might have some estimated load reduction values based on Texas research.

There was a discussion about where research would fall in the table, and what the various tables actually mean.



The group then discussed the significance of background loads, and re-referred the prior land use issue to the research group.

We reiterated the assumption that reducing the sediment runoff, the bacteria loading would also be reduced.

- e. Columns e through j are all covered under a SWPP.

Discuss/finalize source priorities

Erin asked what the group felt are the most important

- Erosion control BMPs in the construction general permit
 - more compliance
 - more enforcement *** (hiring more people to do inspections, particularly in non-Phase I communities)
 - More widespread application (outside of Phase I & II programs)
- Research to identify most effective BMPs

The group discussed the effectiveness of fines pursuant to enforcement in improving compliance with stormwater programs, citing a recent case of fines against four national developers, other cases against Wal-Mart, etc.

The group also discussed the fact that bacteria limits are not included in current permits, but if/when they are, much more attention will be focused on it.

Discuss/finalize implementation activity priorities

Introduction to the Coordination and Policy prioritization tool

Wrap-up

Next meeting date: Monday, May 11, 2009, 2:45 PM to 3:45 PM, Conference Room B

Review tasks

- Provide VA DEQ documentation discussing bacteria removal efficiency
- Refer the following topics to research:
 - Identify potential background loading based on a property's prior use (e.g., chicken farm, etc.) and figure out whether it has any significance.

