



Urban Stormwater Workgroup

Tuesday, October 21st, 2025
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Urban Stormwater Workgroup. The USWG discussed the recommendations from the Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel Report, a post-construction stormwater management BMP proposal from PA, and feedback on the revised CBP structure strawman.

Summary of Actions and Decisions

- **Decision:** The USWG approved the [September USWG Meeting Minutes](#).
- **Action:** Please continue to share approval or requested changes to your jurisdiction's boundary in the MS4 Data Layer to Petra (Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov) and Rebecca (rrandom@usgs.gov) by Friday October 31, if possible, for incorporation into a new draft of the preliminary layer by USGS upon their return to work. The deadline of Jan 23rd, 2026 for new data for the final version to be used in Phase 7 calibration still stands for now. USWG members will be notified if the timeline changes.
- **Action:** USWG voting members are asked to review the Urban Nutrient Management Panel Report and provide your vote via email to Petra (Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov) by **EOD Wednesday, November 12th**. If you have any questions, please contact David (david@chesapeakestormwater.org). Materials will also be shared with WTWG and WQGIT for their review ahead of approval at their November meetings.
- **Action:** USWG leadership will follow up with CBP about the timeline for when the UNM BMP could be incorporated into the model and for use as a planning BMP in CAST.
- **Action:** PA DEP will make updates based on feedback to their presentation and proposal for a Post-Construction Stormwater Management BMP to be put up for a vote at a subsequent USWG meeting. PA DEP may begin work to prepare a white paper, as would potentially be required for approval of this BMP. If you have any questions or further comment, please contact Tyler Trostle, PA DEP (tytrostle@pa.gov).
- **Action:** USWG leadership will follow up with CBP to clarify when PA DEP's proposed Post-Construction Stormwater Management BMP could be implemented, if approved by the workgroup.
- **Action:** USWG leadership will contact jurisdictions to find out where they stand with tracking, reporting, verifying, and maintaining BMPs in unregulated areas to determine a path forward for addressing this issue as a workgroup.
- **Action:** If you have any further comments on CBP Structure, please reach out to USWG leadership. We will continue to follow up with the group as CBP structure, particularly workgroup structure, is discussed further.

Minutes

I. Welcome and Announcements

Lead: Norm Goulet, USWG Chair

Norm welcomed meeting participants, gave an overview of today's meeting, and noted the absence of many federal partners due to the lapse in appropriations.

Decisions:

1. The USWG approved the [September USWG Meeting Minutes](#).

II. Announcements and Updates

Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator

David shared updates on the MS4 data layer for Phase 7, noting the absence of the USGS GIS team may lead to some delays but for now the schedule is moving forward as planned. Norm shared that he and KC Filippino met with VA DEQ and VDOT to get on the same page for Virginia's MS4, with the goal to take whatever data is available by Jan 23rd given the issues with the current Phase 6 boundary. Cecelia Lane, DOEE noted DC is also working on an updated MS4 boundary.

David also shared updates on the "Beyond Bean Counting" Goal Implementation Funding Project, who is working on their draft report and plan to present their recommendations at the December 2025 USWG meeting for feedback for a final report in January 2026.

Actions:

1. Please continue to share approval or requested changes to your jurisdiction's boundary in the MS4 Data Layer to Petra (Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov) and Rebecca (rrandom@usgs.gov) by Friday October 31, if possible, for incorporation into a new draft of the preliminary layer by USGS upon their return to work. The deadline of Jan 23rd, 2026 for new data for the final version to be used in Phase 7 calibration still stands for now. USWG members will be notified if the timeline changes.

III. Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel Recommendations

Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator

David Wood, CSN gave an [overview](#) of the recommendations from the Urban Nutrient Management (UNM) Panel Report, noting these are consensus recommendations pending one official vote from a federal panel member. David shared background on the original 2013 Panel Report, the charge for this panel, an overview of the literature review findings, details on the three suggested BMPs, record keeping guidance, tweaks to the fertilizer application rate methodology, and next steps for approval of the Panel Report. The three BMP recommendations are an UNM Plan with a soil test, an UNM Plan without a soil test, and non-fertilized turfgrass acres. A [recording](#) of the presentation is available and the full [UNM Panel Report](#) is posted.

Actions:

1. USWG voting members are asked to review the Urban Nutrient Management Panel Report and provide your vote via email to Petra (Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov) by **EOD Wednesday, November 12th**. If you have any questions, please contact David (david@chesapeakestormwater.org). Materials will also be shared with WTWG and WQGIT for their review ahead of approval at their November meetings.
2. USWG leadership will follow up with CBP about the timeline for when the UNM BMP could be incorporated into the model and for use as a planning BMP in CAST.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet asked what local governments need to submit for record of Non-fertilized Turfgrass Acres. David answered they need a record of where those acres, a point of contact for who is managing the property, the number of acres in the no-mow condition. This would be reported on an annual basis.
- Fernando Pasquel, Arcadis asked for recommendations on how to work with manufacturers of fertilizer products on reductions and better labeling/education. David answered that legislation has been effective at reducing phosphorus content in fertilizer, whoever it is hard to require and enforce big companies to improve labeling. The panel recommends a focus of future research on human and behavior change components.
- Norm asked why there hasn't been such a precipitous drop in fertilizer. David responded there has been about a 60-70% drop in phosphorus since the legislation took effect in Md, Va, NY and DC, which is very closely in line with the 2013 panel's projections. Hard to know why it hasn't phased out entirely. It is used in specialty products and applied in recent development conditions for new turf.
- KC Filippino, HRPDC asked for clarification on the timeline for including in CAST for Phase 7. David confirmed yes, it would be a wholesale change from the current UNM BMPs in Phase 6 CAST once Phase 7 is adopted. Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator added that the exact timing for when Phase 7 would be adopted is to be determined, but likely 2030. Bo Williams, EPA added that the model will be ready for target development in 2028 but likely not for use in Progress until 2030.
- KC asked if it was possible to include the practices as planning BMPs in CAST before then. Jeremy responded this should be technically easy to do but it would have to be confirmed with the CAST team. Norm said they would ask CBP about this.

IV. Post-Construction Stormwater Management BMP Proposal

Lead: Jamie Eberl, Tyler Trostle and Scott Heidel, PADEP

Jamie, Tyler and Scott [presented](#) a proposal from PADEP to leverage retrofit stormwater treatment BMPs to support a statewide, conservative estimation of previously unaccounted-for post-construction stormwater management (PCSM) measures in non-regulated areas from 2013 to 2024 Progress Years. There is no reporting or tracking of these BMPs, but there are regulatory requirements through NPDES permits for them to be put in place and maintained. PADEP is working to develop a tracking system, but as an alternative reporting approach in the short-term they propose to use back-cast data to determine new impervious acres since 2013, apply a 10% margin of safety and 90% compliance rate to determine acres treated by PCSM BMPs, use a 2 yr/24 hr storm to calculate runoff generated by these acres, and use the Retrofit Stormwater Treatment BMP in CAST to report acre-feet of volume and impervious area treated. Tyler ran through the method applied in CAST with a blanket reduction and shared initial estimated load reductions/outcomes.

Actions:

1. PA DEP will make updates based on feedback to their presentation and proposal for a Post-Construction Stormwater Management BMP to be put up for a vote at a subsequent USWG meeting. PA DEP may begin work to prepare a white paper, as would potentially be required for approval of this BMP. If you have any questions or further comment, please contact Tyler Trostle, PA DEP (tytrostle@pa.gov).
2. USWG leadership will follow up with CBP to clarify when PA DEP's proposed Post-Construction Stormwater Management BMP could be implemented, if approved by the workgroup.

3. USWG leadership will contact jurisdictions to find out where they stand with tracking, reporting, verifying, and maintaining BMPs in unregulated areas to determine a path forward for addressing this issue as a workgroup.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet asked if PA has plans to put together a database to track the permits and BMPs. Jamie Eberl responded that they would like to but have not been able to yet given resources. Norm noted the need for equity across jurisdictions, with most jurisdictions have some tracking system, but recognized the issue of nonregulated areas exists for other states too.
- Norm asked if they would consider a pilot project to verify these numbers in a small area. Scott Heidel responded that it comes down to resources, again. They could potentially see about doing one, though.
- Norm asked if there were requirements for maintenance in the permits. Jamie responded it is required under the permit and an O&M Plan. It is in the municipality's ordinance to be able to enforce implementation of the O&M Plan either by requiring the property owner to maintain the BMP or have the municipality maintain it and charge the property owner for it.
- Cassie Davis, NYS DEC shared interest in seeing how this compares to NY's reporting. They mine the Notice of Intent database for construction stormwater permits, but they don't permit below 1 acre so they are missing all those voluntary BMPs especially since much of NY is not an MS4. Jamie responded they are looking at the bigger issue right now of large developments with permits, but that issue surely exists in PA too.
- Samuel Canfield, WVDEP asked whether dry detention ponds rather than stormwater treatment were considered for representing the period. Jamie answered they are trying to do the most conservative estimate in each step. For dry detention ponds it would be hard to figure out the drainage area to them. It was a better fit for stormwater treatment since they have the volume managed and the new impervious acres from the regulation.
- Dave Montali asked how they plan to get acres for the years after 2024, since they plan to use back-cast for 2013-2024. Tyler responded they plan to use the base conditions in the land use, which would incur a lag by a year. There is some information on disturbed acres in the permit, but it is not accurate. Cassie shared that in NY they have to use the limited "disturbed area" because they don't have a "total area treated".
- Cecelia Lane, DC DOEE raised a few questions on the age limitations and need for visual inspection, referencing the BMP Verification requirements, and proposed a temporary credit that lapses after 3 years without visual inspection.
 - Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville agreed that without inspection for continued function the credit should sunset and asked what their timeline is for a tracking process, how temporary this method would be, and what is their high-level vision for a long-term process.
 - Tyler responded that they envision this as a temporary solution until a reporting and tracking system and more permanent solution is developed.
 - Cecelia responded that DC also has O&M Plans and requirements but have come across BMPs that exist and have never been maintained so are not functioning at all. So, Cecelia suggested a conservative basis to also set up an incentive to build a visual inspection component.
 - Cecelia shared the BMP verification required for continued credit include visual inspection to verify still exists, functioning as designed (no bypass, no blown out downstream, etc.), and receiving sufficient maintenance. Cecelia suggested these

would need to be met to receive a portion of the credit, with a quick review of the BMPs existence and then a backlog could be worked through as resources allow.

- Jamie asked about the process and personnel of verification and inspection for BMPs in non-regulated areas in other jurisdictions.
 - Cecelia responded that DC is all regulated, but they have a large inspection team and prioritization. There is regulatory leverage for private BMPs coming with (re)development, but the public BMPs can be lacking sometime in verification. Sometimes they lose credit in a given year if they cannot verify all.
 - Elaine Webb, DCREC shared that DE has a statewide stormwater requirement and much is outside MS4. The local agencies that review and approve stormwater plans also have the responsibility to do maintenance review, sometimes employing contractors. They report to DNREC statewide biannually.
 - Samuel Canfield shared that much of WV is unregulated, knowledge of new BMPs comes from termination of permits, though they are voluntary. Samuel is the one who does reverification of BMPs. Jamie responded they do have a permitting system for Chapter 102 permits and delegate reviews to conservation planning districts, but it is hard to get them access to the PADEP system.
 - Heather Gewandter shared that within Maryland, areas like Rockville, are a delegated authority to review their own stormwater and show BMPs are maintained every 3 years, regardless of if it's in an MS4 or not.
- KC Filippino shared that PA's issue has brought forward the bigger issue of dealing with unregulated developed lands and BMPs. This should probably be a long-term effort of the USWG to help figure out the best ways to track, report, maintain, and verify these BMPs. Multiple people expressed support for this.
 - Norm agreed this seems to be an outstanding issue for others, including VA. USWG will look into discussing this soon and plan to reach out to all jurisdictions to see where everyone land on this.
 - KC asked for clarification on whether PA's specific proposal would be a decisional item in the future as well, even if we are discussing the broader issue as a workgroup.
 - Scott Heidel shared they would like to put it up for a vote, hoping to be used for Progress.
 - Norm suggested PADEP incorporate comments from the workgroup to amend their proposal when they bring it back for a vote.
- Ginny Snead, AMT noted this is connected to the Beyond Bean Counting project and research being done. David Wood elaborated that the interviews for the project included themes around streamlining tracking of voluntary BMP reporting, so this adds to the need to address this issue. The report should have some starting recommendations.
- Norm noted that given the timeline as discussed for other BMPs, this would likely not go into effect until the Phase 7 model is adopted.
 - KC asked for clarification on when PADEP would be requesting implementation of this.
 - Tyler Trostle responded they were aiming for use in 2026 Progress. Norm responded he wasn't sure that would be possible, given understanding of similar items to be added to the model.
- KC suggested PA could put together a white paper that outlines the proposal, methodology, hopefully a sunset date, and plans to move forward with tracking mechanisms.
 - Norm responded that PA could get started on that, but to get any kind of BMP approved it usually needs to go through an Expert Panel process. If it is building

- on an existing panel, a white paper has been used in the past but it answers the same set of questions.
 - Scott Heidel mentioned the use of an Expert Panel Establishment Group (EPEG) for the recently approved agroforestry BMP practices, wondering if something similar could be used here. Norm confirmed something like that has been done for stormwater BMPs too, however many of those still took about a year.
- Cecelia shared a question in the chat on whether they have good data on regulated BMPs, i.e., how many/% require correctional maintenance. Maybe that can be used to justify a broad approach for taking credit for the unregulated BMPs and target the rest for inspection.

V. CBP Organizational Structure Discussion

Lead: Norm Goulet, USWG Chair

Norm provided background on the [initial structure strawman](#) that was discussed at the Management Board Fall Retreat and Oct 9 meeting for the Chesapeake Bay Program to implement alongside the adoption of the revised *Watershed Agreement*. Norm shared some initial reactions and concerns about the potential loss of source sector workgroups and highlighted the importance of the USWG for BMP development/verification/implementation, local expertise, and supporting the Reducing Excess Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Sediment outcome success as outline in a [memo](#). A [Support Notes](#) document was also developed by USWG leadership outlining the work USWG has done since 2017 and before.

Actions:

1. If you have any further comments on CBP Structure, please reach out to USWG leadership. We will continue to follow up with the group as CBP structure, particularly workgroup structure, is discussed further.

Discussion:

- KC Filippino shared that there have been remarks since the initial strawman presentation that missing components in the graphic do not necessarily indicate their absence, but the idea of this conversation is to ensure more discussion occurs at the GIT and workgroup level and ensure things don't get left off by default.
- Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator, shared that a similar discussion is on the agenda for the October 27th WQGIT meeting as well.
- Cassie Davis shared that, with the perspective from the MB, it was not the intent to leave source sector workgroups off. Cassie agreed they need to be represented and shared appreciation for the document USWG put together showing the vast contributions.
- Adrienne Kotula, CBC agreed with Cassie and shared that her understanding is it will be up to Goal Teams to propose what their workgroups should look like. The initial strawman just had a 1 outcome to 1 workgroup ratio as a starting point.
- Cecelia Lane added that DC is sharing feedback on the structure and reiterated what others said about the need for source sector workgroups to provide technical expertise and a local implementation point of view on how to build programs, track and report BMPs, etc.
- KC noted another major part was to not limit membership on groups to signatories/jurisdictional representatives only, recognizing the importance of at-large membership.

VI. Wrap-Up

Lead: Caroline Kleis, WQGIT Co-Staffer

VII. Adjourn

Next Meeting: [Tuesday, November 18th, 2025](#)

Attendees:

Norm Goulet, NVRC (USWG Chair)
KC Filippino, (USWG Vice-Chair)
David Wood, CSN (USWG Coordinator)
Caroline Kleis, CRC (WQGIT Co-Staffer)
Petra Baldwin, CRC (USWG Staffer)
Jeff Colella, WVSA
Ho-Ching Fong, Montgomery Co. DEP
Bruce Naylor, PA DEP
Michelle Ashworth, AquaLaw
Elaine Webb, DNREC
Shannon McKenrick, MDE
Scott Heidel, PA DEP
Jamie Eberl, PA DEP
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Natahnee Miller, PA DEP
Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering
Mary Simmons, AMT Engineering
Jeremy Hanson, CRC
Gillian Adkins, MDE

Maggie Woodward, CBC
Adrienne Kotula, CBC
Bo Williams, EPA
Fernando Pasquel, Arcadis
Sydney Hall, DNREC
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Samuel Canfield, WVDEP
Brock Reggi, VA DEQ
Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville
David Taylor, VA DEQ
Cassie Davis, NYS DEC
Greg Hoffman, CWP
Martin Hurd, Fairfax Co., VA
Matthew Meyers, Fairfax Co., VA
Bailey Robertory, MD DNR
Rebecca Winer-Skonovd, Biohabitats
Cecelia Lane, DC DOEE