



Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Robert F. Phillips, P.E., City Engineer

City-County Building, Room 115
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
Phone: (608) 266-4751
Fax: (608) 264-9275
engineering@cityofmadison.com
www.cityofmadison.com/engineering

Assistant City Engineer
Michael R. Dailey, P.E.

Principal Engineer 2
Gregory T. Fries, P.E.

Principal Engineer 1
Christina M. Bachmann, P.E.
Eric L. Dundee, P.E.
John S. Fahrney, P.E.
Christopher J. Petykowski, P.E.

Facilities & Sustainability
Jeanne E. Hoffman, Manager

Operations Manager
Kathleen M. Cryan

Mapping Section Manager
Eric T. Pederson, P.S.

Financial Manager
Steven B. Danner-Rivers

TO: WDOT, District 1—Wendy Braun
WDNR—Eric Rortvedt, Kim McCutcheon (South Central Region)
University of Wisconsin—Marisa Trapp, Matt Collins, Jenny Seifert, Eric Booth
Dane County Land Conservation—Kevin Connors, Jeremy Balousek
Dane County Office of Lakes and Watersheds—Sue Jones
Dane County Capital Area Regional Planning Commission—Mike Kakuska
MMSD—Dave Taylor, Kathy Lake
City of Fitchburg—Cory Horton, Rick Eilertson, Felipe Avila
City of Madison—Rob Phillips, Mike Dailey, Greg Fries, Lauren Striegl, Phil Gaebler
City of Middleton—Rich Weihert, Gary Huth
City of Monona—Daniel Stephany, Shannon Haydin
City of Stoughton—Rodney Scheel
City of Sun Prairie—Daryl Severson, Tom Veith
City of Verona—Ron Rieder, Martin Cieslik
Town of Blooming Grove—Mike Wolf, Tony Reigstad
Town of Burke—Brenda Ayers
Town of Madison—Renee Schwass
Town of Middleton—David Shaw
Town of Westport—Tom Wilson
Town of Windsor—Kevin Richardson
Village of Cottage Grove — Matt Giese
Village of DeForest—Deane Baker
Village of Maple Bluff—Tom Schroeder
Village of McFarland—Allan Coville, Jim Hessling, Eric Rindfleisch
Village of Shorewood Hills—Karl Frantz
Village of Waunakee—Kevin Even
AECOM—Theran Jacobson, Carla Fischer (Verona, Burke)
Brown and Caldwell—Mike Wegner
Clean Lakes Alliance—James Tye, Paul Dearlove
Mead & Hunt, Inc.—Anne Anderson, Tim Astfalk, Levi Ney (Blooming Grove)
MSA Professional Services, Inc. – Eric Thompson, Erik Sorenson, Amber Converse
Nahn & Associates—Chuck Nahn (Town of Madison, Maple Bluff)
Strand Associates, Inc.—Jon Lindert (UW-Madison, Westport, Waunakee)
Town & Country Engineering, Inc.—Brian Berquist, John Jenkins (Shorewood Hills, McFarland)
Vierbicher Associates, Inc.—Sarah Church, Neil Pfaff (Monona, Town of Middleton, DeForest)

RE: Madison Area Municipal Storm Water Partnership Meeting Agenda

DATE: May 7, 2015

TIME: 2:00 PM

LOCATION: 1600 Emil St – Training Room

MINUTES

1. Yahara 2070 (Seifert, Booth – UW)

Jenny Seifert and Eric Booth from the UW presented on the Yahara 2070 initiative, a 5-year, National Science Foundation (NSF)-funded project. The primary question asked by the project is how changes in land use, climate and human demand impact the benefits derived from nature (ecosystem services) for future generations in the Yahara watershed. The project's researchers quantified "future generations" by selecting a date (2070) to simulate. To address the uncertainty in future conditions (land use, climate and human demand), four scenarios were developed, each with a different primary

factor of change. These scenarios are as follows:
Abandonment and renewal (no change)
Nested watersheds (government/policy change)
Accelerated innovation (technological progress)
Connected communities (shifting values)

All scenarios are meant to challenge the models developed as part of the project, and to engage the public in thinking long-term about the watershed. Ultimately, researchers hope to develop a "5th scenario," or the desired future, with community members and leaders and to backcast to develop actions that the community can take now to get there. More information on the goals of Yahara 2070, as well as a summary of modeling approaches and assumptions, is included as an attachment to these minutes.

Gary Huth asked how the model takes into account different land management practices, particularly agricultural practices. Eric explained that the model has several different management options built in and that, to predict future management, historical practice information was extrapolated out in ways that accounted for the different scenario themes. Chuck Nahn asked if the model takes into account increasingly extreme weather events; Eric confirmed that it does. Rick Eilertson asked what the Yahara 2070 group would like communities to do with the information presented. Jenny responded that researchers hope that leaders will facilitate discussions within their communities about long-term changes in the Yahara watershed, and use the project to inform management. Eric and Jenny both mentioned that they would be available to present on the project to community members and leaders. Eric, responding to a question by Chuck Nahn, stated that the end result of the project will be a picture of water quality in the future based on different conditions and choices made in the Yahara watershed.

2. Update on Yahara WINS and Chloride Reduction Initiatives (Lake – MMSD)

Kathy Lake discussed chloride reduction outreach efforts. Kathy and Dave Taylor stated that MMSD is starting to see increased chlorides in wastewater, and that treating water for chlorides could cost approximately \$400 million to \$2.3 billion. Therefore, outreach and salt use reduction is a much cheaper way to handle the problem. An MMSD-led team has developed five (5) different handouts (attached to these minutes) describing the importance of reducing salt use; each handout targets a different audience. Additionally, a website regarding salt use, wisaltwise.com, is operational. Rick Eilertson asked about the status of water softener outreach for chloride reduction. Kathy said that she is working on this and should have information by Summer 2015.

Dave discussed the future of Yahara WINS and adaptive management. The pilot project, Yahara WINS, is scheduled to end in 2015. In April 2015, the subcommittee on adaptive management (within the MMSD commission) voted to recommend full-scale adaptive management to the MMSD commission, and he expects MMSD to move forward with the program on the subcommittee's recommendation. Dave's cost model shows that, as expected, adaptive management is the most economical way to meet MMSD's TMDL requirements. He said that 2016 will be a transition year for the project (from the pilot-scale WINS to full-scale adaptive management) and requested that all partners in WINS budget as for WINS in 2016. Budgets should be expanded for the full-scale effort in 2017. He also requested that all partners be open to having him present over the next year to their organizations about the full-scale adaptive management project. He also stated that, over the next year, an inter-governmental agreement (IGA) will be drafted by Paul Kent and refined to cover adaptive management.

Gary asked what happens after the end of adaptive management. Dave replied that the District and DNR have a memorandum of understanding that identifies how compliance will be determined during and at the end of adaptive management. He also indicated that best management practices have different shelf or practice lives and this will have to be taken into account in adaptive management. For example, contracts for harvestable buffers cover a 5-10 year period, which is shorter than the 20 year adaptive management period. Chuck asked whether MMSD has gauged the interest of farmers outside of the WINS area in such a program. Dave answered that MMSD has done outreach outside of the WINS boundaries and has started to build up capacity for the full-scale program. Gary asked what the budget increase would be from pilot-scale to full-scale adaptive management (i.e. from 2016 to 2017). Dave replied that cost would be covered under the IGA and discussed by partners over the next year, but that, based on his cost model, it is likely that costs will be less than originally predicted.

He also mentioned that the IGA would cover 20 years, but would provide “off-ramps” for municipal partners, and that it would take into account stormwater management practices implemented by municipalities within their own borders.

3. Group Permit Reissuance Status/Summary of Finalized WDNR Stormwater Guidance Documents (Rortvedt – WDNR)

Eric Rortvedt said that he has not worked much on the reissuance of the group permit, but that he intends to make progress on it within a few weeks. He does not expect any major differences from the new General Permit, just continued momentum on pollutants of concern and the TMDL goals. One issue that he hoped to address with the new permit is rules governing internally drained areas, which aren't covered in the General Permits. Rick asked what the timeframe of the new permit will be, as the old permit expired in June 2014. Eric said that the new permit will be in effect for 5 years from the date of issuance (not 5 years from the expiration date of the old permit).

Eric then discussed new stormwater-related guidances published by the WDNR. He provided a handout, attached to these minutes, showing many of the new and updated guidances. However, Greg Fries pointed out that the handout is just a partial list, and that MAMSWaP members should sign up for WDNR email updates for notification of all new guidances. Eric said that a new guidance regarding the timing of wetland delineations should be coming out soon (in May 2015). The WDNR is trying to standardize wetland delineation procedure and put the onus on permit applicants to obtain the delineations. He said that if an applicant notices an indicator of wetlands at the site (i.e. hydric soils), the applicant must get a wetland delineation and submit it with the NOI to the WDNR. He said that transition to this new procedure for wetland delineation will be rapid.

Gary asked how thorough wetland delineations will need to be. Eric responded that they will need to be thorough and completed by an assured delineator; if they are not, they will need to be reviewed by the central office for concurrence. Greg pointed out that there are very few assured wetland delineators in Wisconsin, and suggested that developers and municipalities ask their preferred delineators to become assured delineators. He reminded MAMSWaP members that this could significantly affect the timeline for projects. Eric stated that wetland delineations are good for five (5) years. Chuck asked whether, if a map showed now hydric soils at a site, it could be assumed that there were no wetlands at the site. Eric said that this is likely true, but that it would likely be better to get the delineation upfront for borderline cases.

Eric briefly discussed archaeology requirements. He mentioned that access to the archaeological database for the state costs about \$1,500 per year. Felipe Avila mentioned that public access to the archaeological database is available at the Wisconsin Historical Society, and that the database is constantly being updated to account for new discoveries.

4. Adaptive Management Modeling Guidance (Fries – City of Madison)

Eric Rortvedt and Greg Fries are working together to develop the correct loads for adaptive management. However, this has been a challenge, as the TMDL uses percent reductions and adaptive management requires the use of pounds. Greg and Eric are still working out issues with the calculation approach and hope to have a method developed very soon. Greg mentioned that, as municipalities need estimated loads no later than May 2016 to start adaptive management in 2017, they are aware that the method must be agreed upon sooner than later. Dave Taylor said that these discussions are being done in the interest of fairness; MMSD wants to ensure that each partner is paying for what it needs, taking into account changes in land area and practices in place in each municipality.

Greg described some of the challenges in developing a method for load calculation for adaptive management. He said that the TMDL includes several errors, including geographic errors, errors in the area of each municipality in each reachshed, and errors in soil types. His goal is to recalculate the erroneous numbers to determine the correct loading in each reachshed, then fairly distribute the loading between municipalities. One problem is the issue of precision – acceptable error in loading numbers varies between municipalities (i.e. Madison vs. Windsor). While the TMDL measures reductions from “baseline” (assumed to be 40% reduction), Greg and Eric are trying to simplify matters by calculation reduction from no controls (0% reduction). Eric has developed a memorandum outlining how to calculate back to no controls (found at <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/stormwater/documents/MS4TMDLImpGuidance.pdf>). Greg and Eric hoped to

resolve all issues by August 2015 and present the new calculation method at the August 2015 meeting of MAMSWaP.

Greg emphasized that this modeling is not the same as the cost modeling being done by Dave Taylor, and will not provide municipalities with an estimated cost per pound under adaptive management. Dave said that he hopes to provide cost per pound estimates soon, as the cost model nears completion.

Gary asked if greater needs will receive preference under full-scale adaptive management. Dave stated that the program will not be competitive. Any municipality that buys in will be able to purchase its full load.

5. Information and Education Update (Balousek – Dane County)

Jeremy Balousek provided an update on Dane County's information and education efforts. The update is attached to these meeting minutes. He also reminded MAMSWaP members that the County is updating its ordinances to comply with new precipitation depths and distributions developed by the NRCS, as well as adding control for the 100-year peak flow as a requirement. Additionally, the County is implementing a new erosion control spreadsheet for consistency with the WDNR's rules. The new spreadsheet will be available for use in the next month. These items were discussed in detail at the February 2015 MAMSWaP meeting; those minutes can be consulted for further information.