



**Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District**  
**Watershed/Stormwater Subcommittee of the**  
**Technical Coordinating Committee**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**October 27, 2015**

The Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District's Wastewater Subcommittee of the Technical Coordinating Committee met on Tuesday, October 27, 2015, at 1:00 p.m. at the ARC Offices (40 Courtland St., Atlanta, GA).

Attendance

Reginald Anderson, City of Chamblee	Katherine Macias, DDCWSA
John Butler, Gwinnett County	Sara Martin, DeKalb County
David Chastant, City of Johns Creek	Anderson Mycroft, Fulton County
Tammie Croy, Hall County	Kevin Osbey, CCWA
Jennifer Flowers, City of Gainesville	Tim Pugh, Paulding County Water System
Kris Garcia, City of Atlanta	Tim Schick, City of Sugar Hill
Brenda Hamrick, City of Duluth	Barbara Seal, Gwinnett County
Renee Hoge, Forsyth County	Kim Tucker, Henry County Stormwater
Tiffany Hunter, Henry County Stormwater	Beth Parmer, City of Sandy Springs
Angel Jones, DeKalb County	Keith Watkins, CCWA
Corey Jones, City of Gainesville	Brian Wiley, City of Gainesville

Others Present

Paul Moisan, GA EPD	Marzieh Shahbazaz, GA EPD
Dagny Pariani, GA EPD	

Welcome and Introductions

Chris Faulkner, Planner with the Metro Water District, opened the meeting. He initiated introductions.

## Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

## 2014 Implementation Survey Assessment – Watershed

Sarah Skinner, Metro Water District, reviewed the results of the 2014 Implementation Survey Assessment. The results are available on the District website. The next implementation survey will occur in January 2017 for the 2016 calendar year.

## 2016 Water Resource Management Plan Status Update

Chris Faulkner provided an update on plan update activities. He said that a Governing Board Working Group is discussing board level considerations for the plan update process. This group will be evaluating plan topics including commercial conservation, possible District-wide expansion of the Chattahoochee/Lanier conservation measures, septic policy, and reuse policy.

A TCC Septic Subcommittee is also meeting and has identified the range of potential initiatives related to septic management. This subcommittee is currently looking at the following: defining critical areas, required initiatives within critical areas (education and maintenance), data tracking, septage receiving policies across the District. If other TCC members would like to join the subcommittee, they should notify Mr. Faulkner.

Mr. Faulkner pointed out that the plan template now includes a section regarding Technical Assistance, in which the text will detail how the District can support implementation for each implementation action. This item was added at the request of the Board member.

There will be another WS/SW TCC meeting on November 19. Mr. Faulkner reviewed the general schedule for the remainder of the update process, including:

- Fall 2015/Winter 2016: Draft Water Management Plan development
- 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2016: Board, TCC, and BAC review of the draft plan
- Spring/Summer 2016: Public review of draft plan
- Fall 2016: Completed plan

## Review of Draft Implementation Action Items

Chrissy Thom, CH2M, reviewed the changes in format for the presentation of the implementation actions in the plan, and then, he reviewed selected draft implementation actions and asked for committee input.

### **Formatting comments and questions:**

- Subtasks section needs to be clear to all parties: What do we have to do to pass the audit?
- Post development has a twist – if the ordinance is not the same as the District's, but is equivalent to GSMM, those equivalencies need to be highlighted
- Format – not clear which items are standalone and which ones are subordinate
- This is not a menu of option – this is a, “you will do all of these things”. That needs to be made clear

- Implementation action - does that mean action item? If so, don't change the language. But make it consistent. If it means action item, then say it.
- Regarding formatting for the sub-task:  
Don't like the bullets. Use numbers instead. Will make a difference to the ability to reference them later.... Number the sections, too. But you don't have to number all the sets of bullets, just the subtask bullets.
- Description – when consolidate multiple action items can you say what they are? ... Audit periods overlap the version of the plan
- Confused about the description – boiler plate language for the first sentence of the action item.
- Implementation Guidance: local responsibility, specifically for post-development - local jurisdictions don't have authority. The 'other' box needs to be checked and 'owner' written in.
- Caveat: some only apply if you do have jurisdiction in this area. Have something that differentiates responsibility.
- Points of integration: no comments
- Considerations for: no comment
- Tech assistance opportunities: no comment

#### **Comments on overall list of Implementation Actions:**

- Did any of the action items not change? A few. For some, the only changes were to clarify language. The stream buffer (specifically called out by TCC member) will not change.
- Another TCC in Nov for the next set of major revisions. Other minor revisions will be handled over email.

**WM.01.01 - Post-Development Stormwater Management:** The following is a summary of the TCC discussion of this implementation action:

- Content: for post-development, first bullet in the implementation guidance add the 'equal to' sign under greater than. Should be 'equal to or greater than 1'
- Overuse of the word 'all'... if there is a rain garden in someone's backyard, I don't want to have to go inspect that. Gets down to such a level of intrusion.... Just be more aware of what 'all' means.
- Need language to explain maintenance agreement after the creation of this ordinance. Don't want to include ordinances from the 70s.
- Do you have maintenance agreements defined? Sometimes it's not a separate document, but rather an ordinance. Not everyone's maintenance agreement looks the same.
- Construction phase – other mechanisms in place to manage through the construction phase? It includes provision and methods. Is that what the ordinance includes? Because if so, it isn't clear.
- For the first subtask bullet: it says, "adopt the ordinance or equivalent". Later it says something else ... need to make it consistent
- Take the word 'all' out every time it appears
- Once the blue book is done, do you plan to revisit it? Yes, and after the phase II permits are issued. Do you anticipate the model ordinance to change? No, maybe after new MS4 phase II permits come out.

- On redevelopment projects – challenge is that it is difficult to follow blue book and incentivize projects. The bullet is tough because if you want to get credit, you have to ‘break the rules’... But we don’t want to disincentivize projects.
- A lot of projects are on private property and we don’t have the jurisdiction.
- If half your project can be about water quality, it’s a good thing. But sometimes, it’s all or nothing.
- If you can get stormwater management in a redevelopment project, shouldn’t have to worry about water quality.

**WM.10.01 – On-going Stormwater System Management:** The following is a summary of the TCC discussion of this implementation action:

- For local responsibility, check every box, including ‘other’
- Where does it say, “you are in compliance with this action item if you have an MS4 permit”? Make it clear, but not in the description... put it in the subtasks, so that EPD sees it.
- Need to figure out a way to get all the local responsibility folks at the TCC
- Make sure sub-tasks remain consistent with 2009 plan
- EOS/LOS policies - is “policies” the right word? Perhaps, “ordinance” or “other local mechanism”
- Local operations program – public facilities - making sure there is a program in place for public owned facilities... change wording to “publicly owned”
- 19 jurisdictions don’t have an MS4 permit? Can we just make applicable ‘above and beyond’ to those 19. Reduce redundancies that way... a note at the subtasks will help with this confusion
- Does this also apply to post-development? Look at that again to see if it needs to be combined into this ongoing measure.
- Data collection schedule vs inspection schedule? Are they the same and if so, is this redundant?
- How many of our local governments have not completed mapping of storm sewer systems? Need to keep it in because we may want to improve it for the future.

**Long-term Monitoring:** The following is a summary of the TCC discussion of this implementation action:

- First bullet – phase I ... also have impaired water bodies
- Remove the population parameter
- Intend to bring in TMDL – macro and habitat? That’s a different action item
- Some impairments for biota F and M. Those are ‘done’ differently, so it gets fuzzy. If you’re really NOT including those, then you need to specifically exclude it. Clarify that it doesn’t include F and M impairments
- Annual reporting of data – Metro Water District is not sure what staff is planning to do with the data yet
- In the sub-task – throw out the language, “plan consistent with”. Instead say, “if you have a plan approved by EPD, or \_\_\_\_\_, etc., then you meet this action item”. We are not trying to add additional requirements.
- The requirements, as laid out, are not consistent with the delisting process.

- The monitoring approaches through programs needs to be consistent.
- If the data is reported annually, and because we will have audits before, we need to put the language in “will be developed”
- In the description: Calculation based on people that actually live in the jurisdiction, we need to put the language in “will be developed”
- In the description: Calculation based on people that actually live in the jurisdiction? Yes
- If you tie it to impaired segments in the jurisdiction, you don’t need population – get rid of population
- Impaired segments permanent stations are harder to deal with... all stations are permanent until delisted.
- Keep track of electronic reporting and if there is any overlap.
- Can use excel spreadsheet and submit to District, too.
- For jurisdictions without EPD approved plan; we understand why you’d want standards. Say, “you should have EPD approved plan or \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_.”
- County and cities should work together. One entity run sampling locations. If meets all requirements, should have flexibility.

**Watershed Improvement Projects:** The following is a summary of the TCC discussion of this implementation action:

- We don’t own most of the stream miles at the City of Atlanta. Most miles are privately owned.
- Watershed improvement projects are diverse.
- Will hit the saturation on these at some point.
- Think about water volume reduction vs water quality improvement.
- Need to be able to explain to rate payers the added benefit of a project.
- Make it ‘Watershed improvement projects’ and BMPs’ so we can get credit for those, as well.
- Can’t guarantee will reduce TSS in waterbodies because we don’t own them.
- Evaluate nonstructural BMPs based on effectiveness. If can evaluate BMPs as ongoing, would like to combine actions where makes sense.
- Watershed improvement projects with nonstructural BMP approaches may make sense.
- WIP – make it sort of a menu
- In the description: WIPs restore to meet designated use. Include physical improvements, both structural and nonstructural.
- Can only restore portions we have jurisdiction over.
- Put actual project types in the resources section.
- Raingarden program- a citizens assistance program to build raingardens

### Next Steps

Mrs. Skinner said that the District’s 2016 calendars are available for pre-order. They will be distributed to TCC members at the February meeting, but those that would like them before then should pre-order a calendar. Mr. Faulkner adjourned the meeting.