



Urban Stormwater Workgroup

Tuesday, February 17th, 2026
10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

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

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Urban Stormwater Workgroup. Main topics included a presentation and discussion on E3 (Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere) Scenario Development and a presentation and discussion on funding and technical assistance through EPA for stormwater projects

Summary of Actions and Decisions

- **Decision:** The USWG approved the December meeting minutes.
- **Action:** USWG leadership will put together a draft initial scenario that addresses new BMPs to share and discuss with USWG at an upcoming (likely April) meeting,
- **Action:** Please reach out to USWG leadership and Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) with any questions about E3 Scenario development and whether there is interest or need for additional office hours on this topic.
- **Action:** David will follow-up with Tyler Trostle, PADEP about their question on receiving baseline credit in Phase 7 for PA's urban Fertilizer Law.
- **Action:** If you want to share more challenges and needs for funding and technical assistance, you can send them to USWG leadership and Travis Ostrom (Ostrom.Travis@epa.gov) or [submit them through this survey](#). The survey will remain open to field continued comments.

Minutes

I. Welcome and Announcements

Lead: KC Filippino, USWG Vice-Chair

KC welcomed meeting participants and gave an overview of today's meeting. David shared various announcements:

- The mapping of BMPs to Load Sources for Phase 7 was approved by USWG via email.
- The Beyond Bean Counting Report has been finalized by AMT. Thank you to everyone who gave feedback after the draft report was presented at the Dec 2025 USWG meeting.
- The [Vulnerability Guidance Document](#) has been published by RAND and they will present it to USWG at an upcoming meeting. CSN is working on a companion snapshot factsheet, which will be released soon.
- Land Use Time Series Data Review Office Hours – [Tuesday, March 3rd at 1-3pm](#). Sarah McDonald, USGS will also be presenting at the March USWG meeting to talk specifically about developed sector land use in Phase 7, but the office hours will be a chance to provide input.

- Local Government Leadership Workgroup – [Thursday, March 5th at 9:30-11:30am](#). The Theme is Building Local Resilience - Innovative Approaches to Managing Stormwater, Mitigating Flooding, and Reducing Pollution.
- CSN is hosting a [Winter Webinar Series](#) on upcoming Tuesdays at 12pm.
 - Updating Urban Fertilizer Management – [February 24](#)
 - Creative Funding Models for Watershed Management – [March 3](#)
 - Assessing the Effectiveness of Green Stormwater Infrastructure – [March 10](#)
 - Assessing and Managing Stormwater Impacts of Solar Installations in Virginia and Central Pennsylvania – [March 19](#)

Decisions:

1. The USWG approved the [December 2025 USWG Meeting Minutes](#).

II. E3 Scenario Development Introduction

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA CBPO

Auston gave an [overview](#) of what scenarios are needed for setting planning targets, including No Action and Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere (aka “E3”) Scenarios. Auston outlined what each scenario is and how they help determine the appropriate context for “controllable loads”. Auston shared considerations for developing E3 scenarios for Phase 7 and highlighted the main decisions and tasks that the USWG will need to work on in the coming 6-8 months. This includes considerations for inputs, determining a base year, and reviewing Phase III WIPs ahead of the next step for developing new planning targets and guiding frameworks.

David gave [background](#) on the development of E3 Scenarios for Phase 6, and highlighted decisions made for inputs and BMPs. USWG will need to determine what should be kept the same and what needs to be revised. David also noted the addition of [new BMPs](#) since the last effort, which USWG will need to establish how to handle.

Materials: [Auston’s Presentation](#), [Phase 6 Reference Materials](#), [New BMP List for Consideration](#)

Actions:

1. USWG leadership will put together a draft initial scenario that addresses new BMPs to share and discuss with USWG at an upcoming (likely April) meeting,
2. Please reach out to USWG leadership and Auston with any questions about E3 Scenario development and whether there is interest or need for additional office hours on this topic.
3. David will follow-up with Tyler Trostle, PADEP about their question on receiving baseline credit in Phase 7 for PA’s urban Fertilizer Law.

Discussion:

- KC Filippino, HRPDC asked if E3 takes into account growth and future scenarios.
 - Auston responded that E3 is only based on the base year. Future considerations are reflected in the separate forecast done by the Land Use team. The E3 scenario can be applied to other years in the future to help make decisions, but the E3 scenario on the base year is that upper bound threshold for controllable loads.
- KC asked what implications from land use changes in Phase 7 may exist on constraints for E3 on where BMPs are applicable. Will the Phase 7 Land Use need to be finalized before we can apply this?
 - David responded that usually broad-scale percentages are used for land use types in E3 Scenarios, so it wouldn’t have to be that detailed to the point of identifying the number of acres of a certain land use.

- Jamie Eberl, PADEP asked for clarification on the stream restoration default rate. She noted that the default rate is much easier to use, especially since PA regulates on a smaller scale, but it is only allowed to be used for planning purposes.
 - David responded that this was addressed in the Expert Panel report. It has implications for E3 Scenarios since the previous Phase 6 scenario had the default rate because it was still allowed to be used back then. Since the default rate is no longer used in practice, USWG will need to come up with some other approach for Phase 7 E3.
 - KC noted the first step for all of this will be to go through the list and see what's feasible since it has changed.
 - Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting noted that while the default rate is for planning purposes only, when states do report, a lot of them have their own defaults they use based on their state regulations for the amount treated.
- KC asked at what level/group the base year decision will be made.
 - Auston responded the WQGIT will decide with consideration from source sector workgroups, and ultimately it will need to be approved by the PSC.
- David noted that a proposal draft scenario from Phase 6 from USWG members included lower inches per impervious acre treated for retrofits and new development to better align with regulations. However, that was ultimately overridden by the WQGIT, because there was a higher achievable level, even if it's more theoretical. Distinguishing between what is a physical restraint (e.g. some practices cannot happen on coastal plain) vs. what is just not considered feasible given resources will be important for USWG to remember as we develop the E3 Scenario for Phase 7.
- Tyler Trostle, PADEP (in chat): Side question from PA for this group: PA has enacted its urban Fertilizer Law. Do we or will we in Phase 7 get a baseline credit for this Fertilizer Law? I recall discussion months ago but follow up confirmation would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

III. Stormwater Funding and Technical Assistance Opportunities

Lead: Travis Ostrom, EPA Office of Water

Travis gave a [presentation](#) on funding and financing programs available through EPA – the Clean Water State Revolving Funds (CWSRF), the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) program, and the Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants (OSG) program. These programs have historically been used more for wastewater projects, but there have been recent opportunities and increased ability to use them for green infrastructure projects. Travis gave background on the programs and provided multiple examples of successful projects both inside and beyond the Chesapeake Bay watershed. He also provided information on technical assistance programs through EPA and highlighted a few examples, which cover a wide range of types of assistance from planning/design to asset management and technical/managerial capacity building. Members asked questions and provided input on challenges and technical assistance needs for greater investment in urban stormwater infrastructure.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. If you want to share more challenges and needs for funding and technical assistance, you can send them to USWG leadership and Travis (Ostrom.Travis@epa.gov) or [submit them through this survey](#). The survey will remain open to field continued comments.

Discussion:

- Cecilia Lane, DC DOEE (in chat): DC has been using CWSRF for funding GSI for a long while now as it was part of our original negotiations with EPA. My understanding is that other communities were not allowed to do so until it was negotiated as an option during the IIA (infrastructure act).
 - Travis responded he was not sure about eligibility prior to IIA, but there were definitely significant changes in that period. He clarified it is definitely eligible and allowed now.
- Cecilia (in chat) shared an update from DC on Stormwater Funding and Technical Assistance Opportunities: Feel free to follow-up if there are any outstanding questions.
 - Clean Water State Revolving Funds (CWSRF): yes, DC uses this fund for GSI
 - Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) program: this fund primarily goes to DC Water for the tunnels project and other critical wastewater infrastructure upgrades
 - Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants (OSG) program: can also be used for GSI but primarily goes to grey work at District municipal yards
- Kevin DuBois, DoD (in chat) asked: Is the EPA Water TA available to federal agencies?
 - Travis responded it is not available to federal agencies.
- KC Filippino, HRPDC noted that one barrier for their localities is taking loans and how it will impact their bond rating at the local level. How do you help counter that narrative? Often that is a decision made at council, so public works way not even have it on their radar since they're not allowed to do it.
 - Travis responded that is a big barrier. He can see where that would be a tough conversation. Technical Assistance could help here by bringing in financing experts as a way to start those conversations across different entities in a municipality and with CWSRF staff at EPA.
 - KC noted the importance of having the conversations with the right people with the right information. For example, their finance people are not coming to the USWG, so it's important to bring these questions and opportunities back.
 - Travis responded the technical assistance part can be a great entry point, because it's a small commitment.
- KC asked if OSG is on a rolling basis or open call for applications.
 - Travis responded that it is run through the states so they may have their own process. You should look into your particular state for the cycle.
- Greg Hoffmann, CWP (in chat) asked: How difficult is it to get approved for technical assistance? Are there more applicants than funding available?
 - Travis responded it is not difficult to get approved. Unlike a grant application, it is a quick form (~5 min). There is more availability of assistance than applications, especially in the stormwater sector.
- David noted that another upcoming Local Government Leadership Workgroup meeting on May 21 is on the topic of Strengthening Local Solutions: Communicating Successes and Tailored Technical Assistance, which Travis will be presenting at.

IV. Wrap-Up

Lead: Petra Baldwin,

V. Adjourn

Next Meeting: [Tuesday, March 17th, 2026](#)

Attendees:

KC Filippino, (USWG Vice-Chair)
David Wood, CSN (USWG Coordinator)
Petra Baldwin, CRC (USWG Staffer)
Elaine Webb, DNREC
Bonnie Arvay, DNREC
Cecilia Lane, DC DOEE
Sophia Grossweiler, MDE
Gillian Adkins, MDE
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Scott Heidel, PA DEP
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Owen Dingman, VADEQ
Samuel Canfield, WVDEP
Maggie Woodward, CBC
Auston Smith, EPA
Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville
Greg Hoffmann, CWP
Jeff Colella, WVSA
Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering
Mary Simmons, AMT Engineering
Travis Ostrom, EPA
Rebecca Ransom, USGS
Marina Metes, USGS
Michele Berry, CSN

Jamie Eberl, PADEP
Denise Uzupis, PADEP
Bruce Naylor, PADEP
Sydney Hall, DNREC
Joseph Schell, DNREC
Shannon McKenrick, MDE
Bailey Robertory, MD DNR
Devon Kosisky, MDE
Brock Reggi, VA DEQ
Joe Parfitt, VDOT
Scott Crafton, VDOT
Krista Romita Grocholski, RAND
Kevin DuBois, DoD
Angela Jones, DoD
Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Fernando Pasquel, Arcadis
Eugenia Hart, TetraTech
Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting
Ellen Egen, AquaLaw
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Ho-Ching Fong, MoCo DEP
Martin Hurd, Fairfax Co., VA
Andy Oetman, GSA
Brenda Morgan