



Urban Stormwater Workgroup

Tuesday, October 20th, 2026
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. Main topics included updates on the CBLCM approval, Clean Streets = Cleaner Water Initiative and CSN's soil health work and overviews of model review expectations and workgroup workplan development.

Summary of Actions and Decisions

- Decision: USWG approved the September USWG/LUWG Joint Meeting [minutes](#).
- Action: If you have initial information on local/regional BMP cost data for design, installation, capital costs, operation & maintenance, and opportunity costs, please share them with Eugenia Hart (Eugenia.Hart@tetrattech.com). Please also share any priority BMPs that you feel should be at the top of the list for new cost and/or efficiency data. USWG will hear a full briefing on the BMP cost analysis in December.
- Decision: ***Via email prior to meeting:*** USWG approved the final forecast of utility scale solar for the "Business as Usual" scenario for Phase 7. A vote tracker is [posted](#).
- Action: Please reach out to Seth (seth.brown@nationalstormwateralliance.org), Greg (greg@urbanquarriesus.com), David (dheigl@alamo-group.com) and Andrew (asheerin@fathomsolutions.dev) if you have any questions or want further information on the Clean Streets = Cleaner Water Initiative or their specific work presented.
- Action: Invitations to the December 4th urban soil health workshop are going out next week, which will include all USWG members. Please RSVP if you can attend or share an alternate who may be able to attend in your place.
- Action: Please review the [posted draft](#) of potential USWG Workplan activities and share feedback by **Tuesday, November 10th** to David Wood (david@chesapeakestormwater.org). We need to submit a list to CWGT by the end of November. With feedback from CWGT and continued workgroup feedback, David will build out this list into the more detailed template for USWG review and support in December.

Minutes

I. Welcome and Announcements

Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator

David welcomed meeting participants and gave an overview of the meeting agenda. David shared the below announcements:

- CWGT held a two-day, hybrid meeting September 28-29th with multiple key discussions and decisions, including the approval of the proposed urban sector E3 scenario. See the [calendar page](#) for more details.
- The WTWG is leading the process of updating the BMP Expert Panel protocols. USWG Leadership provided some comments on an initial draft shared ahead of the October WTWG meeting and there will continue to be opportunities to weigh in.
- Tetra Tech is providing assistance to the Chesapeake Bay Program to update BMP cost profile data for the full suite of CBP-approved BMPs as well as conduct a literature review to determine if new or updated pollutant removal efficiency information is available. This work will provide a dataset update to help provide more region-specific cost estimates for BMP implementation and new pollutant removal efficiency studies to potentially incorporate into the CAST model where available.
- A new [CCLC Green Infrastructure Maintenance Guide](#) is out. CSN held a [webinar](#) on this as well.

Decisions:

1. USWG approved the September USWG/LUWG Joint Meeting [minutes](#).

Actions:

1. If you have initial information on local/regional BMP cost data for design, installation, capital costs, operation & maintenance, and opportunity costs, please share them with Eugenia Hart (Eugenia.Hart@tetrattech.com). Please also share any priority BMPs that you feel should be at the top of the list for new cost and/or efficiency data. USWG will hear a full briefing on the BMP cost analysis in December.

Discussion:

- Cecilia Lane (in chat): Do you have a template for data submission?
 - Eugenia responded there is no data template right now. They are just looking for sources, so you can just send that for now.
 - Cecilia added that this is great, but there are always caveats and things that need to be standardized. She noted having this info by December would be difficult.
 - Eugenia offered to talk with Cecilia more and noted the overall timeline is tight.
- Olivia Martin shared that she was involved in this last time when RTI did it. The big lift was the property costs and land opportunity costs, especially in urban/suburban areas.
- Kevin DuBois (in chat): Eugenia, I would recommend you reach out to Jim Cahoon at Bay Environmental about wetland restoration costs. He's a qualified contractor working in the field. Also, [BayLand Consultants & Designers, Inc.](#) is another contractor working in MD.
- Ginny Snead (in chat): I would recommend also talking to ACEC and other engineering associations for data if you haven't already.
- Additional Announcements
 - KC Filippino shared there is a review going around for another GI document from WEF Stormwater Community: [Reviewers Needed for Green Infrastructure Implementation \(2nd Edition\) | Stormwater Community](#). Note, this is for WEF and/or VWEA members only, so the link may be password protected for you.
 - Cecilia Lane (in chat): Thought this was a neat municipal program, especially the touchpoint it creates with the public '[Your City Could Be Better': Why Salt Lakers are Adopting Storm Drains — Presented By City Cast DC](#)'.

II. Solar Land Use Forecast Decision

Lead: Peter Clagget, USGS; David Wood, USWG Coordinator

David provided a brief recap that USWG held a vote by email following the joint meeting with LUWG in September on approving the utility scale solar forecast for the “Business as Usual” scenario for Phase 7. There were a couple concerns raised through that vote, which are documented in the vote tracker, and a couple small changes made, which Peter shared updates on.

Peter shared an [update](#) that the acre numbers for solar demand for 2025 – what we “burn in” – were slightly changed (column K in red text). Column A, which is mapped solar in the 2021/22 land use, has been updated to more accurately reflect the footprint that exists today, including solar impervious and solar pervious. If solar overlaps that full footprint, then that doesn't result in any new conversion. Column A.1 was updated to show just what was mapped within the Chesapeake Bay counties, which had previously had everything within the state. As a result, the solar demand in Column K, which is A.1 minus A, was reduced for all jurisdictions (except DC which stayed the same). Peter also shared a brief update on an adjustment to WV’s solar demand percentage with the inclusion of a solar field in Jackson County that reduced the proportion of solar megawatts in the Bay watershed from 87% to 61%.

Materials: [Map Viewer \(with latest FAQ Doc\)](#), [USWG & LUWG Vote Tracker](#)

Decisions:

1. ***Via email prior to meeting:*** USWG approved the final forecast of utility scale solar for the “Business as Usual” scenario for Phase 7. A vote tracker is [posted](#).

Discussion:

- Marty Hurd asked why solar was pulled out on its own for the land use forecast and if there was an FAQ on that rationale.
 - Peter responded that solar was included as a separate part because it has such a significant number of acres, which is on par with the rest of all urban development. The FAQ document does include more detail on how we are mapping solar.
- Ginny Snead shared that she had previously had concerns, but Peter talked with her ahead of the meeting. Ginny appreciated that the numbers came down a little in the update, as she was concerned that there was an overestimation in the approach originally. So much is unknown about how much solar is actually coming our way. It's really hard to predict it. She was reassured that these numbers will be revisited at some point in the future.
- Petra Baldwin walked through the vote tracker documenting votes received by email and David confirmed no one wanted to change their vote given the information presented today.

III. Clean Streets = Cleaner Water Initiative

Lead: Seth Brown, National Municipal Stormwater Alliance; Greg McPartlin, Urban Quarries; David Heigl, Schwarze Industries; Andrew Sheerin, Fathom Solutions

As a follow-up from their initial presentation in March 2026, this presentation provided background information on the Clean Streets = Cleaner Waters (CS=CW) Initiative led by the National Municipal Stormwater Alliance (NMSA). They provided an update on this initiative, key findings and considerations from the Phase I Report Out and anticipated future activities.

In addition, David Heigl shared a case study in Washington County, MD for a real-world applications of sweeping programs to gain stormwater credit in the context of Chesapeake Bay

requirements. Andrew Sheerin also shared information on SWPT (Stormwater Pollution Tracker), which is a decision-support software to help municipal sweeping programs optimize their sweeping operations.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. Please reach out to Seth (seth.brown@nationalstormwateralliance.org), Greg (greg@urbanquarriesus.com), David (dheigl@alamo-group.com) and Andrew (asheerin@fathomsolutions.dev) if you have any questions or want further information on the Clean Streets = Cleaner Water Initiative or their specific work presented.

Discussion:

- Kevin DuBois (in chat): The DoW is the largest federal owner of developed land in the watershed and has many MS4 permitted installations. Defense communities (adjacent municipalities) should look to Inter Governmental Support Agreements to share sweeping costs associated with equipment, maintenance, staff, etc. to make street sweeping more affordable.
 - KC Filippino (in chat): Let's pilot this in Hampton Roads!
- KC Filippino asked if there would be a report from Phase I.
 - Seth responded that they have an internal report for those initially invested, but they plan to develop a public-facing document. One thing for Phase II is establishing the community of practice.
 - Greg added that the original 6 are interested in moving forward, but 5 other manufacturers are interested in it as well, so they are excited to expand.
- Cecilia Lane (in chat): How do we sign up to find out more about the Community of Practice?
 - Seth responded that they will reach out to David Wood with more information as this moves forward and it will be shared with the workgroup.
 - David Wood added that the draft list of activities for the USWG workplan includes tracking and following up with this effort to find opportunities to improve how we implement and credit street sweeping practices in the watershed.
 - Seth emphasizes that their work is about more than just crediting, but a much broader approach to all topics related to street sweeping.

IV. Soil Health Update

Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator

David shared an update on the work that Chesapeake Stormwater Network (CSN) has been doing related to soil health, which stemmed out of interest raised at USWG to explore soil health and soil restoration practices to improve urban and suburban soils. CSN was able to put some funding and work towards this as a “mini version of a STAC state of the science workshop,” since the proposed STAC Workshop did not get funded. A steering committee was formed in March, and they are conducting a literature review, have a planned workshop for December and will put together a memo of recommendations for the USWG. David shared objectives and proposed deliverables and gave an overview of the literature review (draft completed by end of November) and the agenda for the upcoming Workshop (December 4th at the Reservoir Center in DC).

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. Invitations to the December 4th urban soil health workshop are going out next week, which will include all USWG members. Please RSVP if you can attend or share an alternate who may be able to attend in your place.

Discussion:

- Kevin DuBois (in chat): I think we also need to build awareness that turf grass is the largest fertilized crop in the watershed.
- Kevin DuBois (in chat): I think that your proposed deliverables, esp the strategies for protection and restoration of urban/suburban soils, should be designed for its use by landscapers to sell "conservation" contracts to property owners as an alternative to the standard fertilize, spray, irrigate strategies.
 - Kevin elaborated verbally that it would be great as a part of the report following the workshop to start the conversation on how a landscaper could develop a conservation contract to sell to a landowner to improve soil health for its multiple benefits.
- Eric Hughes (in chat): Great leadership from the developed sector in this space! Soil health is a priority of the Ag Advisory Committee and Agriculture Workgroup, too, and we're very interested in working with you to ensure we don't approach this in a silo. We're expecting a STAC/AAC soil health workshop early next year. Maybe ag folks could be involved in this workshop (to listen and learn) and folks from the USWG team could similarly be plugged into the ag-leaning SH workshop?

V. Model Review Expectations

Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator

David shared a high-level [update](#) on the Phase 7 review expectations for the USWG, noting that some of the specifics are still being determined across the CWGT and the timeline is in flux. The overall partnership review timeline involves a prep period and review period "sprints" with a pause in between for the modeling team to make changes based on the feedback received. There will be more direction for how the review will work and a specific process for submitting and aggregating comments. The main goal for our workgroup review is to 1) Ensure the collective partnership-based decisions have been fully carried out (i.e. omissions review) and 2) Evaluate model calibration inputs and outputs specific to their respective land uses (i.e. evaluate unintended outcomes or consequences) or larger source categories. USWG has a few specific sections and aspects to review outlined on slide 20.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet highlighted that this is a work in progress. He also noted there is an input visualization tool that we are sharing feedback on already. This is a priority and the workgroup will need to spend some time on model review.
 - Auston Smith (in chat): Thanks David, nothing to add here except to echo Norm on that this is an evolving process.
- Kevin DuBois: For DoW, one of the most important aspects of Phase 7 updates is the separation of USACE lands from DoW lands for more accurate accounting. How will we be able to test that?
 - Auston Smith responded that he doesn't think there are any federal agency breakouts on the review tool. However, in speaking with the modeling team, it has been assured that that breakout has been accomplished. Once we're into that

later review, we can more easily dive into that and review it together.

VI. Workgroup Workplan Development

Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator

David shared background on how the workgroup workplan relates to other CBP guiding documents, shared key points of what should go into the workplan, and the timeline for development over the next few months. David outlined which Management Approaches (MAs) our brainstorming should focus on, noting that multiple MAs involve all RENPS workgroups and we do not need to draft them ourselves. There are also 3 goal-level MAs, which we can weigh in on if we want. Many of those are in our scope of expanding technical assistance, workforce development and collaboration. David walked through the draft list of workplan activities and asked for any initial reactions.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Draft Workplan Activities List](#)

Actions:

1. Please review the [posted draft](#) of potential USWG Workplan activities and share feedback by **Tuesday, November 10th** to David Wood (david@chesapeakestormwater.org). We need to submit a list to CWGT by the end of November. With feedback from CWGT and continued workgroup feedback, David will build out this list into the more detailed template for USWG review and support in December.

Discussion:

- Cecilia Lane (in chat): Do these work plans give USWG the flexibility to pivot as needed, i.e., should we stumble upon some new innovative tech that cleans stormwater?
 - Norm Goulet responded that that was something he is concerned about as well. We have included some broad activities about innovative practices to allow us to include work that we might not be thinking about right now. We tend to be more reactive than proactive, so we want to be able to continue to address emerging concerns and opportunities.
- Kevin DuBois (in chat): Thank you for giving us a launchpad!

VII. Wrap-Up

Lead: Petra Baldwin, USWG Staffer

VIII. Adjourn

Next Meeting: [Tuesday, December 15th at 10am - 12pm](#)

Attendees:

Norm Goulet, NVRC (USWG Chair)
KC Filippino, HRPDC (USWG Vice-Chair)
David Wood, CSN (USWG Coordinator)
Petra Baldwin, CRC (USWG Staffer)
Bonnie Arvay, DNREC
Cecilia Lane, DC DOEE
Andrea Krug, DC DOEE

Eric Hughes, EPA CBPO
Kevin DuBois, DoW
Angela Jones, DoW
Peter Claggett, USGS
Jackie Pickford, USGS
Rebecca Ransom, USGS
Aaron Porter, USGS

Gillian Adkins, MDE
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Cass Klingaman, NYSDEC
Jamie Eberl, PADEP
Owen Dingman, VADEQ
Scott Settle, WVDEP
Auston Smith, EPA CBPO
Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering
Camille Liebnitzky, City of Alexandria
Heather Gewandter, Rockville, MD
Sydney Hall, DNREC
Shannon McKenrick, MDE
Devon Kosisky, MDE
Ari Engelberg, MD DNR
Joe Parfitt, VDOT
Scott Crafton, VDOT
Brock Reggi, VADEQ
Garrett Stewart, VADEQ
Callie Sams, WVDEP
Anna Killius, CBC
Megan Beever, CBC

Andy Oetman, GSA
Michele Berry, CSN
Martin Hurd, Fairfax Co., VA
Matthew Meyers, Fairfax Co., VA
Amandla Hill, Alexandria, VA
Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Katherine Dyer, MWCOG
Ho-Ching Fong, MoCo Planning
Carol Wong, CWP
Eugenia Hart, TetraTech
Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting
Seth Brown, NMSA
Greg McPartlin, Urban Quarries
David Heigl, Alamo Group
Andrew Sheerin, Fathom Solutions
Aaron Fisher, Ernest Meier Inc.
Steven Calvillo, TYMCO
Charles Hegberg, RES
Brenda Morgan