



Standards Oversight Council (SOC)

Developing effective technical standards that protect Wisconsin's natural resources

131 W. Wilson St., Suite #601, Madison, Wisconsin 53703
(608) 441-2677 || Fax (608) 441-2676 || socwisconsin.org

1010 Proprietary Filtration Devices Standard Team

MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, August 1, 2018 ▲ 9:00am – 3:00pm ▲

DNR Service Center, 3911 Fish Hatchery Road, *Gathering Waters* Conference Room, Fitchburg, WI

Welcome & Introductions (Kate, Team)

Each team member introduces themselves and their experience related to storm water.

SOC Process, Team Responsibilities (Kate, Eric, Mary Anne)

Goal: Establish understanding of SOC process & member expectations

Review of the SOC process. **See PDF file of Kate's presentation slides.**

Group Agreements and Decision-Making (Kate)

Goal: Allow group to develop a common understanding of how we'll operate as a group and have an opportunity to further define member expectations.

Team agreements:

- Arrive on-time, ready to participate
- Stay on topic, on agenda
- Use tool for commenting—flip name card on its side when you'd like to speak
- Respect the decision making process
- Commit to formal team decisions – only revise if new info or reviewer input
- ID next meetings topics at end of the current meeting
- Respect other members' ideas – do not interrupt
- Complete assignments on time
- Use personal devices only if needed, be respectful
- Avoid side conversations
- Kate/Eric – send agenda and readings 1 week prior to next meeting

8 of 11 members in agreement for decision-making

When voting, we may use thumbs up-thumbs down; red-yellow-green indicator cards; must-have vs can't have issues. Kate and Eric will assess better techniques to use for different types of decisions.

In-person attendance preferred. We can set up webinar if needed.

Substitutes allowed, but generally discouraged. Subs will not be able to vote in decision making

Current Resources, Goals & Sideboards (Eric, Mary Anne)

Goal: Provide an overview of the current process of reviewing filtration devices to determine whether to allow them to be used, including the objective of this new standard, how it will be used and by whom, and why it is being created. Define mission & set sideboards.

Technical standards are guidance and are not enforceable by the state unless supported by administrative code or statute. However, some local agencies have adopted state technical standards as locally enforceable standards. Standard creation does not change state enforceable requirements.

Projects receiving DNR grants would require standard to be applied.

A technical standard may call for monitoring/evaluation of a device to establish its performance.

However, DNR storm water performance standards are by design and site-by-site compliance is based on implementation of an accepted design (e.g. technical standard).

Removal of impaired waters from impaired waters list is based on monitoring of waterbody.

Sideboards - standard is not:

1. Bioretention for Infiltration (Std 1004)
2. Proprietary Storm Water Sedimentation Devices (Std 1006) – though a good starting point/framework to potentially use for this standard.
3. Techniques vs proprietary devices (e.g. iron for P reduction, sand filters)
4. To approve devices or provide list of devices

Standard Goals and Key Issues:

Goal: Gather input from team on criteria or themes expected to be important and/or challenging.

Goals for the standard generally include Design factors, Filter process, Testing protocol, O&M

1. What is a *Proprietary Filtration Device*? Define clearly
2. Guidance and not regulatory
3. Considerations section of the standard – to be used when lack of consensus or date for things to consider rather than criteria
4. Maintain consistency in comparing devices – results based, not product list
5. Develop process to assess products – not an approval process.
6. General thoughts below:
 - a. What proprietary filters are available?
 - b. Consider different types of processes that filters can have (ie sedimentation). What are the common design factors for all filters?
 - c. Ensure product defines acceptable design rates.
 - d. Consider NURP particle size for TSS (source area consideration?); not in NR 151 but DNR uses in practice

- e. If other pollutants are considered, separate pathways for each pollutant so proprietary systems aren't at a sizing disadvantage vs other BMPs.
Additional pollutants besides TSS for purposes of quantifying BMP reduction or performance.
Narrow pollutants to those for TMDLs.
Evaluate to meet performance standard of 80% TSS reduction (40% reconstructions); also evaluate with TMDLs which may change to 90% or a different pollutant of concern (P, bacteria) –
 - f. Must determine treatment and bypass rates based on long term continuous simulation model. Ensure possibility of various models.
 - g. Maintain flexibility to determine performance for enhancing (ex. filtration).
 - h. Define what is included in the "Device" (e.g., pre-filter, bypass).
 - i. Consider using effluent concentrations. Who tests discharge?
 - j. Who determines device is appropriate? – user provides data, DNR (or local official?) confirms documentation complete (may also include SW permit from DNR when >1 acre).
7. Standard should mirror the way bioretention is viewed – designed in the state. Maintain equivalency with non-proprietary BMPs.
 8. Consider how consultants can use data for site design (i.e., how to best size/model results).
 9. Testing protocol should be flexible. What testing protocols are available? How does the standard address testing done as part of an approved process (NJCAT)? Will there be 3rd party validation of test data (NJCAT)?
 10. Testing systems vs. parts – applicability of test to site. Evaluate field test vs lab test.
 11. Develop standard that accounts for how devices actually perform (i.e., site-specific) appropriate design for expected flow and loading rates.
 12. Strive to write a standard that keys into national trends (STEPP). Look to other states' [like WA Dept. of Ecology (WDOE) TAPE and NJ Dept. of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) NJCAT] protocols as appropriate for understanding what exists and use for starting points.
 13. Feasibility and usability – make sure completed standard is equivalent value for all devices and able to be used in practice
 14. Maintain consistency in protocol and scaling/sizing
 15. Do we address industrial storm water?
 16. What is reasonable O&M? Establish maintenance requirements - O&M important for these devices (what's required, frequency (# years or flow based), difficulty, responsibility).
 17. Maintain inclusiveness in the process – in addition to the breadth of this team and your network, the SOC process also has Initial Review, which is select, invited reviewers, and Broad Review process, which is open to public and announced by DNR's GovDelivery and SOC's listserv.

Development of Stormwater Treatment Methods (Bob Pitt)

Goal: Provide background on proprietary filtration devices and associated research.

See PDF file of Bob's presentation slides.

Team Timeline and Meetings (Eric, Kate)

Goal: Set timeline for drafting, reviewing, and completing the standard. Establish meeting frequency, future dates & location.

TIMELINE OF A TYPICAL STANDARD = about 13 months

Our target schedule:

Aug 2018 – May 2019: Monthly team meetings
End of May 2019: Release for Initial Review (2 wks)
June & July 2019: Address Initial Review comments
End of July 2019: Release for Broad Review (3 wks)
Sept & Oct 2019: Address Broad Review comments
Oct. 2019: Accept final team comments via email
Nov 2019: Submit final document to DNR

Next meetings:

Sept. 12
Oct. 10
Nov. 28
Jan. 9
2nd Wed. thereafter, possibly through 2019

Meetings continue to be held at Fitchburg DNR for next 5-6 months; Milwaukee in perhaps March or April? Adrienne can coordinate for meeting location in Milwaukee, TBD

[Note: after meeting adjourned, we found out Fitchburg DNR not available on 9/12 so that meeting is moved to Dane County UW-Extension office]

Plan of Action (Kate, Eric)

Goal: Review Action Items and agenda items for next meeting.

Sept. 12 - Next meeting

Agenda: review and discuss existing research to identify applicability for our standard and what's lacking

Eric – draft definition for review and critique

Bob – send Kate links to device/monitoring research to share with the team

Kate – disseminate research, prepare survey to rank major issues for future meeting priorities, reiterate calendar for next meetings, draft notes for team review

All – review all information sent out, respond to survey, consider other research to share on existing devices, design, and testing