

March 2, 2004
PADEP Stormwater Manual Oversight Committee
Rachel Carson Building First Floor Conference Room

Draft Minutes

I. PADEP Announcements/Inputs

Dennis Stum and Kenneth Murin chaired the meeting in the absence of Ken Reisinger. Durla Lathia's departure as chief of PADEP's stormwater planning and management section was announced. PADEP's Ed Ritzer will become his replacement on the committee. John Amend of Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. will be replaced on the Committee by David Klepadlo, also of Malcolm Pirnie. Scheduling issues were reviewed, as well as the need for additional Oversight Committee meetings, most likely in June, August, and October. Revised schedules for the Manual preparation process were passed out along with information on which Manual sections will be drafted and released to the Committee in accord with Committee meetings. The Manual is scheduled for Draft release to the Committee in October 2004. Initial draft sections will be released to the Committee prior to October. The release of the Draft to the public and the formal commencement of the public comment period will occur after October 2004. All of this information has been posted on the DEP stormwater webpage.

Denny indicated that some issues remain to be resolved which relate to the PADEP electronic bulletin board and the lack of ability to send very large electronic files to Committee members and the interested public. These issues will mount as the size of the sections increases, as is likely to be the case for upcoming Section 4 (Non-Structural BMP's) and Section 5 (Structural BMP's). The consensus of the committee seemed to be the desire to have both an electronic and a hard copy for review. This probably will be accomplished by posting a copy on the DEP stormwater website and sending a hard copy to committee members in the mail. Email addresses of interested observers were collected to inform these people when new information is available on the website.

II. Review and Finalization of Second Committee Meeting Minutes and Comments Received

December 8, 2003 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved without additional discussion. Hard copies of all comments received on Sections 1 and 2 were made available for distribution.

III. Review of Draft Manual Sections 1 and 2

There followed an extended discussion concerning evaluations of both Sections 1 and 2, as previously distributed. Comments at the meeting were numerous and are summarized here:

- the text is too wordy and should be edited and condensed
- some sections, such as soils, need to be expanded
- some statements are misleading and technically incorrect
- the technical nature of Section 2 provides a good opportunity to educate persons involved with stormwater issues
- use more references
- begin each section with a summary block that bullets major points/sub-sections
- use a technical editor

- many members requested more polished work products for review

Some commenters asked about the process that should be followed to provide comments to Cahill Associates. The preferred way of providing comments is electronically through use of a “show changes” mode, if that is possible.

Attached are Cahill Associates summaries of comments that were received in written form (as of March 31, 2004) relating to both draft Sections 1 and 2. Cahill is in the process of editing sections 1 and 2, based on the comments provided at the meeting and the written comments submitted.

V. Review of Draft Manual Section 3.0 Issues: Stormwater Management Standards for Pennsylvania

Dr. Robert Traver then reported on an effort which has been voluntarily undertaken by the Villanova Urban Stormwater Partnership (VUSP), to address the very difficult question of statewide stormwater management standards (Rob provided a powerpoint which summarizes his comments and which is available on the VUSP website). The input of VUSP is intended to be a recommendation for PADEP and the Committee to review and consider for use in the new Manual. This work is not complete and will be continued.

The following parameters, relative to Stormwater Management Standards, were assumed at the start of the VUSP study:

- must reflect PA Comprehensive Stormwater Policy and Implementation Goals
- must address stream channel stability issues (high flow)
- important to balance pre- to post-volume for small storms (1.5 year storm?)
- must address stream base flow issues (low flow)
- must address flood protection immediately downstream and watershed-wide
- must address groundwater quality, surface water quality

These are the recommended Stormwater Management Standards for an average site with no areas of special concern (e.g. Karst topography and other special considerations):

- hold runoff volume constant, pre to post, for up to 2-yr storm
- hold peak rates constant, pre to post, for 2- through 100-year storms
- maintain water quality. Volume/peak assumes use of BMP's which serve water quality; is separate quality standard necessary?
- offer credits for use of innovative natural systems, including tree protection, natural vegetation, green roofs, buffers, re-use, rain gardens, wetlands, etc.

Work on special consideration areas (e.g. Karst) will continue and Dr. Traver will report VUSP findings to PADEP and the Committee. A discussion followed concerning the 2-year volume control standard proposed for consideration. The Committee did not reach a conclusion or consensus regarding design standards. Volume control standards will be revisited at future Committee meetings.

VI. Review of Section 8.0 Methodological Issues: Challenges to Be Overcome

A challenge facing the Committee is the development or adoption of a suitable design method. The relatively simple methods and models of the past (and present), such as Rational and TR-55,

however limited, can be adapted to the conventional peak rate control/large detention basin approach to stormwater management. Cahill's Michele Adams presented a powerpoint on case studies integrating many Section 4.0 Non-Structural and Section 5.0 Structural BMP's and which illustrated the methodological challenges. How do you relate peak rate control and volume control to both simplify calculations and simply stormwater management plan design? The highly disconnected/distributed/decentralized management plans can be a nightmare in terms of calculations. Michele focused on several case studies (a Case Study featuring a Small Commercial Retail Development and a Case Study featuring a Large Commercial Development), demonstrating how peak rate and volume control can be integrated in a relatively straightforward manner. The much more complex plan for the Large Commercial Development with a highly distributed and decentralized stormwater management system suggests the need for a condensed and simplified "work sheet" approach which is being explored for the new Manual. Summaries of standards and approaches from NJ and MD were also discussed.

VII. Public Q & A

During the course of the meeting, the Committee provided many opportunities for comments from non-committee members on specific points of interest. At the conclusion of the meeting, the floor was also opened for public comment. One member of the audience questioned DEP's approach of allowing the public to comment on work products prior to an official DEP proposal and request for comments. Staff responded that DEP will have an official public participation component to review and comment on the draft manual, however, DEP also encourages public participation at all stages of program development to ensure all issues and views are considered.