

USWG-Approved Phase 7 E3 Scenario for the Developed Sector - August 2026

BMP	LU	Treatment Assumption
Retrofits	Developed	RR Retrofits sized to treat 1.5 in IA for all urban land uses
New Development	Developed	All new development has RR BMPs sized for 2.0 inch IA
Street Cleaning	Roads, TC over Roads	100% Roads swept using SCP-1
UNM Plans	Turf, TC over turf, Solar pervious	100% of turf, TC over turf, and solar pervious have UNM Plans BMP; For Turf and TC over Turf - 50% Implement UNM W/ a Soil Test (BMP #1), and 50% Implement Non-Fertilized Turf (BMP#3). For Solar Pervious, 100% covered by BMP #3.
Gray Infrastructure and Storm Drain Cleanouts	Developed	5% of Urban N and P load removed due to both credits
Stream Restoration	Stream Bed and Bank	Stream bed and bank loads will be reduced by 50% for 15% of stream network, dispersed evenly across each modeled hydrologic segment in the CB watershed
ESC	Construction	100% of all construction sites are treated to ESC Level 3 and have UNM plan (BMP #1)
Riparian Buffers on Urban	Pervious Developed	30% of turf grass acres (MS4, CSS, Non-Regulated) within the 35 ft riparian area are buffered as forest for each modeled hydrologic segment in the Chesapeake Bay watershed
Tree Canopy Expansion and Forest Planting on Urban	Pervious Developed	20% of turf grass and compacted pervious acres (MS4, CSS, Non-Regulated) will be converted to Tree Canopy over Turfgrass (TCTG) using the Urban Tree Canopy Expansion BMP, and an additional 20% of turf grass and compacted pervious acres will be converted to Forest using the Urban Forest Planting BMP.
Impervious Cover Removal	Roads, Buildings and Other,	1% of total impervious cover (Roads, Buildings and Other, and TC over Impervious) will be converted to Turfgrass per the ICR

	TC over Impervious	BMP.
Shoreline Management	Shoreline	70% of unprotected shoreline linear feet will be managed by the Living Shoreline BMP and receive the default rate for non-conforming practices
Abandoned Mine Reclamation	Compacted Pervious	AMR will be applied to 2% of compacted pervious acres

Notes:

- No proposed Conservation Landscaping implementation because efficiency removal (39% TN and 25% TP) is lower than proposed E3 conditions for Retrofits and New Development and would apply to the same acres.
- Continuous Monitoring and Adaptive Control (CMAC), Coagulant Enhanced Treatment (CET) and Floating Treatment Wetlands (FTWs) are all retrofits to ponds, which are ST practices. As such, none of these strategies represent an increase in pollutant removal over the proposed E3 scenario which is based on RR implementation on 100% of urban lands. CET comes close for TP removal, but at a significant expense to TN.
- For splitting implementation of Retrofits and New Development, practices implemented prior to 2016 will be applied as the Retrofit standard for E3, which practices implemented after 2016 will be applied as the New Development standard. This is consistent with the P6 split, and has not been changed.
- For UNM, 75% of residents from surveys cited in UNM report say they fertilize at least once a year. This scenario assumes there is an uptick in residents who chose not to fertilize, and the remainder use a soil test to develop a targeted UNM plan.
- SR - Protocol 1 is based on measured bank erosion rates, which are then reduced by 50% post-restoration in the absence of post-restoration monitoring. We have stream bed and bank loads, so if we assume the same magnitude of implementation as Phase 6 (15%), this approach should square the Protocol 1 approach within the model parameters of E3.
- Tree Canopy Outcome is 45,000 acres of canopy by 2040 across all sectors, and 202,000 acres of new forests across all sectors. There was ~1.7 million acres of turf grass in 21/22, so under this E3, 347,908 acres of turf would go to TCTG and 347,908 acres would go to Forest for a total conversion of nearly 695,815 acres.
- There was 53,948 acres of turf in the 35 ft buffer zone for 21/22, so 30% would represent a conversion of 16,184 acres to forest
- The VIMS shoreline management model was used, which estimates that 82.5% of shoreline ft would be suitable for living shoreline. Recommended Living Shoreline" includes any shoreline in the [VA Shoreline Management Model version 5.1](#) with a general category of "Living Shoreline" (includes the "Non-Structural Living Shoreline," "Non-Structural Living Shoreline," and "Plant Marsh with Sill" recommendations) and any shoreline in the [MD Shoreline Stabilization Model](#) with a recommendation of "Living Shoreline." This was adjusted downward to 70% following USWG member feedback and

based on data from VIMS on shoreline erosion rates in Virginia which found that 80% of shorelines measured were eroding at a rate of >0 ft per year, but only 30% were eroding at a rate of >1 ft per year.

- For AMR, this is based on comparing P7 LU data with active permits in WV, which found approximately 10% of extractive lands were abandoned mine lands (AML). Because only 15% of compacted pervious acres are extractive, that leads to a conservative estimate of 2% AMR.