Urban Stormwater Workgroup
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, July 15th, 2025
10:00 – 11:00 AM
[Meeting Materials](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The USWG approved the [May USWG Meeting Minutes](#)

Action: If you have any questions about the Phase 7 timeline, please reach out to Jeremy, Norm, and Petra. You can view slides from previous presentations of the Phase 7 timeline to [WQGIT](#), [MB](#), and [Modeling WG](#). A draft list of WQGIT decisions to be completed before Sept 30th is linked [here,](#) which the WQGIT will be refining at their [July 28th meeting](#).

Action: The approach to reconcile reported and mapped construction acres will be decided at the [WTWG](#) August meeting. If you have not provided any feedback on construction to your representatives on WTWG, please do so.

Action: If you have any data or contacts to share with Rebecca as she is updating the MS4 and CSS layer for the Phase 7 model, please email her (rransom@usgs.gov).

10:00   **Welcome and Review of March Meeting Minutes.**
Norm Goulet, USWG Chair

Decision: The USWG approved the [May USWG Meeting Minutes.](#)

10:05   **Announcements and Updates**
David Wood, USWG Coordinator, CSN

- Urban Nutrient Management Panel Update
  - The panel met on July 9th to discuss the literature review CSN completed over May-June looking at new research since the 2013 Expert Panel and laid out a framework for moving forward. They got agreement on what the group wants to explore over the next couple weeks, so will begin to draft language and work with people on the CAST and modeling team to see what is possible from a feasibility standpoint.
  - The panel will meet again in early August to review the first draft, and again in early September to have something to share with the USWG in our September meeting.
- "Beyond Bean Counting" Goal Implementation Team Funding Project
  - They have conducted interviews with people from USWG, WTWG and others working on tracking and reporting from different states. Thank you to everyone who participated in that.

o They will hold a steering committee meeting this afternoon, so will have more to report on what has been learned from those interviews soon.

10:15   Phase 7 Model Timeline and Decisions Update
Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator, CRC

Jeremy gave a brief update from the WQGIT on the Phase 7 development timeline, highlighting that there has been a requested extension to the timeline to accommodate some agriculture inputs needing more time and the modeling team needing more time for development given significantly decreased capacity. All decisions relevant to USWG will still need to be done by the existing Sept 30th, 2025 deadline since they need to feed into the Phase 7 development workflow. The proposed timeline extension would push the review of the model to start in 2027 instead of 2026. Norm Goulet also noted that this timeline extension will impact future deadlines, including allocations which were previously set for 2028.

Jeremy recapped the key decisions that will still be needed by the USWG including Urban Nutrient Management and MS4 areas. USWG members may also be interested in wastewater sector decisions being discussed at WWTWG. Norm noted that there has been a push at the WQGIT to not review every single decision that is being made at the workgroup level. If there are some issues that still remain unresolved at a workgroup level then we will filter it up to the GIT, but primarily it's just going to be announcements to the GIT membership. So, if there is something that you need to bring to attention within your management, make sure you do so.

Discussion:
Norm Goulet: [The timeline extension] is probably going to create some problems when it comes to timing in MS4 permits, but it's really beyond everybody's control at this point. If you are anticipating some issues, it probably would be good to also filter that through your management within your organization so everybody's aware of that.
Kevin Du Bois: I don't normally deal with MS4 permits too much, but you mentioned how the decisions and/or the revision of the timeline could maybe impact MS4 permits. Can you help me understand that a little bit better?
Norm: That's going to vary from state to state. For instance, for Virginia's permits, there's a ChesBay section within our MS4 permits that are based off of the allocations that the MS4s have to achieve. So, we're dealing with the timing issue as to when the next permit is going to be negotiated and released versus when the next timing of the allocations is coming up.
Kevin: So, are you saying that they might issue the MS4 permit allocations and then based on new information in Phase 7 that allocation could change so that there would be an adjustment to the MS4 permit?
Norm: No, more than likely there won't be an adjustment to the permit, because that's too cumbersome. More than likely, the MS4 permit will just reflect older information and we're constantly in a game of catch up. But again, that varies from state to state and not every state

has some kind of allocation within their permits with respect to the ChesBay Program. I actually don't know what's in the Fed's permits, so I couldn't even speak to that.

KC Filippino: The permit thing might just be a VA thing, because of the timing and that we use such an old model, and that we're supposedly achieving 100% in our last permit cycle, so what do we do next?

KC Filippino: Another thing that's come up, especially as we have conversations with the LUWG, we've been making decisions at a rapid pace that I don't think all of us are super comfortable with, but they need the decisions now so that they can have a baseline for Phase 7. Like, they need land use to go into Phase 7, they need inputs to go into Phase 7, so they can actually start doing that. From what I hear, that Year of Review will be even more important because that's an opportunity to say, 'well, we agreed with the methods, but now we're seeing what happened because of this method' and/or 'it doesn't make sense because this method wasn't right or our assumptions were off'. So, some folks are saying you're still going to have another crack at the apple. But, I don't know - sometimes you get caught in the Year of Review 'well it's already in there and it's too hard to change'. So, there's a little bit of a game that we have to play of wanting to do our best right now to make the right decisions right now. But, hopefully if there is something that is way off or really egregious, it will be addressed in that Year of Review. That's what I'm falling back on because LUWG is really pushing to make some decisions that, like I said, I'm not really comfortable with right now, but kind of have to do it. And same with the segmentation issue before the WQGIT - super not comfortable with it either, but they need the layers and the input and the numbers to put into the model. So, that's my only caveat to all of this. The Year of Review will be important and I know STAC is starting to coalesce about what they want to do during that year of review too.

Jeremy: Yes, STAC will be doing their own peer review/technical review at the request of the partnership and we'll be, as we did the last time around, scoping out the specific questions and agreeing to that list of the questions that STAC will be addressing in their review. But we also will have the partnership reviewing the results along the way. We still need to have the discussions about what that partnership review really looks like. In the past, I think it was more of a 'fatal flaw' focus more on errors or mistakes or catching things that just seem incorrect. But, I remember back when we were going through all the CAST-21 and CAST-23 stuff, we spent a lot of time discussing illogical results or anomalies or things that just maybe didn't make sense and whether there was a scientific basis for making changes then or to maybe revert back to old methods on certain issues. I think we still have to figure out if that is the focus or are we still fatal flaw focused in the partnership review. That's the questions I'm asking and hoping we can, as a partnership, scope out as well.

Norm: Yes, it has primarily been fatal flaw in past. But the definition of fatal flaw can vary from person to person. I know we had some issues the last go around with fertilizer. We hopefully have resolved that issue at least on the urban side. You know, when West Virginia brought it forward and said 'it just doesn't make any sense,' we hopped on it and came up with a compromise. But there are other inputs that some of us considered a fatal flaw, for instance, when a gigantic population of layers was not included. That got pushed off and it still has not been resolved. That, to me, is a fatal flaw and that needs to be addressed. I guess what I'm trying to convey to everyone here is that that Year of Review is going to be very important, and as the USWG, we need to be looking at our sector here to make sure what's coming out of Phase 7 does make sense and ask how it compares to Phase 6. But not only that - is there inequities between the USWG and some other sector? In the past, we've done a surface review.

I think this time around, we probably need to do a little deeper of a dive than what we've done in the past.

Olivia: Coming out of Phase 6, there was a list of comments made and responses to those comments. It occurred to me that while that was for Phase 6, and things have changed, it might be useful to just get an idea of what the tone of those comments were and the types of things that are raised and the types of responses that the Bay Program provided in response. I think it could be good to pull that back out for informational purposes, since a lot of people are new to this process.

Norm: That's actually a good point, Olivia. It would be good to pull that document out and then do a checklist as to whether or not those particular issues have been resolved with Phase 7.

Jeremy: We can track that down.

KC (in chat): There were a lot of comments that said, 'we can do that in phase 7', so that's a good place to start.

Norm: KC brought up a good point in that there were a lot of comments that said 'we can do that in Phase 7'. Well, Phase 7 is here so we need to see whether or not it was actually taken care of.

Olivia: I know everybody has their own priority and things that are important to them. For me, the one that kind of bugged me was that sediment on stream bed and bank was not estimated correctly according to the rules that were developed. So, I will be checking that one to make sure that we get sediment right. With a lot of work with MDE, we determined that there was an error in the model. It was after the whole model had been approved and finalized, but it was just clearly a math error. That definitely needs to be fixed and so I'll be looking for that one, but I know there were dozens of things on the list.

KC (in chat): https://cast-content.chesapeakebay.net/documents/P6ModelDocumentation%2F13%20Reviews.pdf

Jeremy: One more thing, as you pointed out Norm, is that pushing back the development timeline and the Year of Review also has that ripple effect on other things and we're working on a simple communication piece or Gantt chart of sorts to help communicate that a little bit. It's in the works, but I'm sure people are already thinking they would want something like that, so we are anticipating that and have already started working on that so we can have a little more guided or informed discussions about, 'if this is when these things are happening, when do we need the sector work groups to update their E3 scenarios,' or things like that.

Norm: Quite frankly, the Gantt charts you guys have been putting out for this lately have really stunk. They've been very difficult to understand and they have not been very explicit whatsoever. So, my comment to you is when you start planning these new Gantt charts that you make them explicit and easy to understand at a glance. That's the whole idea of a Gantt chart.

Jeremy: Yeah, that's part of the difficulty with the overarching Phase 7 development was there was too much to wrangle into one feasible or reasonable Gantt chart. So, the list you'll be seeing this week is much more simplified - just the decisional items that are relevant from now through September.

Olivia: I'll speak to the Gantt charts. It has been hard for all of us staff to figure out how to do it. If we have a super detailed one, then it's way too much information and not easy to digest. If we have a modified version with just some broad general topics, then people want to know where the details are. If you have any examples or suggestions, I'm sure that we would all be willing to use those, but I think we're struggling here to provide what it is people want. I hear

you when you say they stink, but what wouldn't stink with the complexity of this? Can you help us out here?

Norm: You can have multiple versions. You can have a less complex version and then you can have a more detailed version if people want to get into them. But, as they've been coming out right now, they've been very difficult to understand. The overlaps without some kind of time reference, where it just says 'we're extending it by 9 months,' but it doesn't give you what the actual days are on one of the axes. So, they've just been very difficult to understand and I know I'm not the only person that has that on their minds. It's been a general comment from a lot of the people outside of the organization.

KC: It's more like who the audience is. Since I'm in workgroups and the GIT, I just want something specific for decision making and then to see the future of how that impacts those future items and when they're going to happen. That, to me, in a Gantt chart would be useful depending on the audience it's going to, and I know that means you have to make multiple, but we need them for the workgroups and the GIT.

Jeremy: Yeah, I think we've gotten to the point where we just realized it's easier to start from scratch. And so that's what we're doing to get you something more useful in the coming weeks and days.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): Everything, Everywhere, by Everyone
https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/attach_f._sweeney_uswg_e3_051716.pdf

Action: If you have any questions about the Phase 7 timeline, please reach out to Jeremy, Norm, and Petra. You can view slides from previous presentations of the Phase 7 timeline to WQGIT, MB, and Modeling WG. A draft list of WQGIT decisions to be completed before Sept 30th is linked here, which the WQGIT will be refining at their July 28th meeting.

Action: The approach to reconcile reported and mapped construction acres will be decided at the WTWG August meeting. If you have not provided any feedback on construction to your representatives on WTWG, please do so.

10:45   MS4 and CSS Data Update
Rebecca Ransom, USGS

Rebecca has joined this project, picking up work from Fred Irani. She gave a brief update on the MS4 and CSS data input layer for the Phase 7 model, sharing a map of the baseline review. She went through updates received from each jurisdiction on any changes to MS4 and CSS areas. Workgroup members on the call shared updated contacts and data with Rebecca to fill in information she had not collected yet. Norm noted that federal permits will also need to be looked at.

Action: If you have any data or contacts to share with Rebecca as she is updating the MS4 and CSS layer for the Phase 7 model, please email her (rransom@usgs.gov   ).

11:00   Adjourn

Participants

Norm Goulet, NVRC (USWG Chair)
KC Filippino, (USWG Vice-Chair)
David Wood, CSN (USWG Coordinator)
Petra Baldwin, CRC (USWG Staffer)
Camille Liebnitzky, City of Alexandria
Ho-Ching Fong, Montgomery Co. DEP
Greg Hoffman, CWP
Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP
Jamie Eberl, PA DEP
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting/CBPO
Rebecca Ransom, USGS
Samuel Canfield, WVDEP
Brock Reggi, VA DEQ
Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville
Auston Smith, EPA/CBPO
Maggie Woodward, CBC
Fernando Pasqual, Arcadis
Monique Dykman, Londonderry TWP
Bonnie Arvay, DE DNREC
Krista Romita Grocholski, RAND
Sophia Grossweiler, MDE
Andrea Krug, DC DOEE
Carol Wong, CWP
Nathan Forand, Baltimore Co., MD

Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering
Martin Hurd, Fairfax Co., VA
Amanda Obosnenko, Nature Conservancy
Bailey Robertory, MD DNR
Gillian Adkins, MDE
Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting/CBPO
Tyler Monteith, VA DEQ
Joe Parfitt, VDOT
Caitlin Bolton, MWCOG
Jeremy Hanson, CRC
Devon Kosisky, MDE
Erica Duncan, VA DEQ
Michele Berry, CSN
Cecelia Lane, DC DOEE
Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Paola Soto
Matt de la Houssaye, BTS Bioenergy
Angela Jones, DoD CBP
Derick Winn, VA DEQ
Katherine Dyer, MWCOG
Matthew Meyers, Fairfax Co., VA
Ellen Egen, Aqua Law

Acronym List

CAST: Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool
CSS: Combined Sewer System
E3: Everything, Everywhere, by Everyone
STAC: Science and Technical Advisory Committee
LUWG: Land Use Workgroup
MB: Management Board

MS4: Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
UNM: Urban Nutrient Management
USWG: Urban Stormwater Workgroup
WQGIT: Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
WTWG: Watershed Technical Workgroup
WWTWG: Wastewater Treatment Workgroup