

**Urban Stormwater Workgroup Meeting**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2024**  
**10:00 AM - 11:30 AM**  
[Meeting Materials](#)

**Summary of Actions and Decisions**

**Decision:** The USWG confirmed a new slate of at-large and local government members for a two-year term. This included Greg Hoffman, CWP, Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering, and Rebecca Winer-Skonovd, Biohabitats as at-large members, and Jeff Colella, WVSA, Monique Dykman, Londonderry Township, and Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville as local government representatives. Additionally, the USWG confirmed KC Filippino, HRPDC as the new Vice Chair of the USWG.

**Action:** USWG will take the list of areas in the Phase 7 model for USWG to examine and schedule each on the agenda one at a time and go from there. In the meantime, David Wood will begin diving into the sensitivity literature with Joseph Delesantro.

---

**Minutes**

**10:00 Welcome and Review of November Meeting Minutes.**

Norm Goulet, Chair.

The review of the November Minutes was postponed until the next meeting.

**10:05 Announcements and Updates**

- Updates on Stream Restoration P3 and Coagulants Report
  - The Coagulants Report Technical Appendix was approved by the WTWG at their January Meeting. Stream Restoration Protocol 3 Memo should be on the website shortly.
- Updates from Beyond 2025 Listening Sessions
  - There were no updates. This is a standing agenda item.
- NFWF Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction (INSR) Grant [program](#) is open until February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2024.

**10:15 USWG Membership Elections**

Since November, the USWG has been soliciting nominations for its at-large and local government membership positions. Sushanth Gupta, USWG Staffer gave an overview of new signatory voting members from jurisdictions, including Andrea Krug from DC. Nominees introduced themselves and were confirmed.

**Decision:** The USWG confirmed a new slate of at-large and local government members for a two-year term. This included Greg Hoffman, CWP, Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering, and Rebecca Winer-Skonovd, Biohabitats as at-large members, and Jeff Colella, WVSA, Monique

Dykman, Londonderry Township, and Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville as local government representatives. Additionally, the USWG confirmed KC Filippino, HRPDC as the new Vice Chair of the USWG.

## **10:25 Setting the Stage for the USWG's Role in the Phase 7 Model Development.**

Gary Shenk, USGS

Over the next two years, the Partnership will be working to develop a draft of the Phase 7 modeling tools. Throughout this process, the USWG will play a critical role in providing local data, feedback, and review of these tools. Gary provided a detailed overview of the Phase 7 Model development components, process and timelines followed by discussion on how the WQGIT and USWG can provide input in three key areas: Land Uses, Inputs, and Sensitivities.

### **Discussion:**

- KC Filippino asked for clarification on the distinction of having an average load of turfgrass but then also applied fertilizer on top of it even if fertilizer isn't applied, noting this is a longstanding debate in the workgroup.
  - Gary responded that the average load is the average load is the amount of nitrogen, e.g. leaving the land whereas the average input refers to the amount of nitrogen applied to land as fertilizer, in the example shown. How this is treated in CAST is up for debate in the model development process, he is just showing how it works now.
- Greg Hoffman asked whether there were limits on the "leakiness factor."
  - Gary confirmed the land to water factors are developed from a statistical model and are constrained to be between 0.5 and 2 i.e. it can become half the average or double the average.
- There was discussion about urban nutrient management and fertilizer application.
  - Camille Liebnitzky asked how CAST knows which areas receive more fertilizer in an urban environment.
  - Jeff Sweeney responded that each jurisdiction has a rate related to fertilizer sales data. The workgroup could explore having a land use that doesn't receive any fertilizer, but there is no data currently from jurisdictions that report that.
  - Norm Goulet mentioned USWG will be looking at the UNM Expert Panel report to see how those areas not getting fertilizer can be credited.
  - Marty Hurd mentioned some jurisdictions can differentiate between areas with a mow only strategy vs. areas with UNM plans. That should be considered.
  - Marty added the intent to incorporate more local monitoring data may help. Gary mentioned there was a [STAC workshop and report](#) about local monitoring.
  - Norm mentioned a major change from Phase 5 to 6 was how concentration in soil for fertilizer differ between ag and urban sector fertilizer. Ag has developed good estimates, but we have yet to develop good numbers for the urban side.
  - Dave Montali raised a question about whether the phosphorus ban in some states greatest an equal playing field across all the other states, what the recommended application is, the effect of soil and uptake, etc.

- Liz Beinberg (in chat) asked whether the Bay Program tried to require more ‘granular’ N application data (reporting requirement) from industry to improve fertilizer distribution knowledge, thus modeling? And program focus areas.
  - David Wood (in chat) shared that they had some data from Scotts from 2013 when the original UNM panel was developed. He wasn’t able to get anything new when looking last year.
- Peter Claggett (in chat) clarified that Suspended Succession land uses are Barren, low vegetation, and scrub-shrub lands where the regrowth of woody vegetation is actively suppressed such as road and utility rights-of-way and landfills. These lands are assumed to be unfertilized.
- Cecelia Lane (in chat) mentioned that the [IDDE Expert Panel](#) looked at the wastewater exfiltration issue. It warrants a closer look, though.
- Norm asked about plans to further enhance the septic aspect, since some research out of Fairfax County was showing septic contributions to the base flow higher than projections. Gary said he was not aware of efforts on this. It was discussed that septic has often not been clearly in the purview of WWTWG or USWG, but it will hopefully be looked at by the reconvened WWTWG. Dave Montali mentioned WWTWG had been the one to administer BMP panels on septic.
- KC Filippino asked for clarification on whether the priority of consistency over accuracy in the model would continue for Phase 7.
  - Gary responded that with Phase 7, we get to reset everything, so things before 2020 will still need to be estimated but we can use the most accurate data for 2020 going forward. We will just need to figure out a way to get them on the same level to compare and make trends.
  - KC mentioned Land Use as an example where new data would want to be incorporated, not just looking at land use change. Gary responded that is the perfect example of this.
  - KC asked for clarification on how “inaccurate” data can be dealt with. Gary responded there needs to be something to cover all space and time, so trends need to be estimated as best as possible. It’s a case by case basis.
  - Dave Montali added that the backcasting from the new land use data will help replace older, inaccurate land use data back to 1985.
- Norm Goulet asked Gary what he thought was the most important need from the USWG.
  - Gary responded the sensitivities and inputs (e.g. how to deal with phosphorus, exfiltration, new types of inputs, etc.) will be the more important. Land uses are okay, relative loading rates can be investigated with CalCAST, and BMPs are in good shape given the large effort in the past 5-15 years ago.
  - Norm mentioned a worry that there is not the monitoring data out there needed for updating the sensitivities. A deep dive into the literature will be needed.
- Alison Sontoro asked for more clarification on the timeline, specifically in relation to the Beyond 2025 process.
  - Gary responded all the decision on inputs and sensitivities will need to be done and documented by the end of 2025. Then, deliver the model and documentation to the partnership for review. In terms of the TMDL, many decisions will be made in 2027-2028.

- Norm concluded that Phase 7 will be a major redo and change. He encouraged people to ask questions and raise concerns now.

**Action:** USWG will take the list of areas in the Phase 7 model for USWG to examine and schedule each on the agenda one at a time and go from there. In the meantime, David Wood will begin diving into the sensitivity literature with Joseph Delesantro.

## 11:25 Wrap Up

David mentioned the February USWG meeting may be canceled, so members should look out for an email about upcoming meeting scheduling.

## Participants

Alison Santoro, MD DNR  
Allie Wagner, NVRC  
Andrea Krug, DC DOEE  
Beth Uhler, CWP  
Brenda Morgan  
Brock Reggi, VA DEQ  
Caitlin Bolton, MWCOG  
Camille Liebnitzky, City of Alexandria  
Carol Wong, CWP  
Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC  
Cecilia Lane, DOEE  
Christina Lyerly, MDE  
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech  
David Wood, CSN  
Derick Winn, VA DEQ  
Elaine Webb, DNREC  
Erica Duncan, VA DEQ  
Eugenia Hart, Tetra Tech  
Gary Shenk, USGS

Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering  
George Doumit, DNREC  
Gopal Bhatt  
Greg Hoffman, CWP  
Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville  
Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting  
Ho-Ching Fong, Montgomery County DEP  
Isabella Bertani, UMCES  
Jamie Eberl, PA DEP  
Jeff Colella, WVSA  
Jeremy Hanson, CRC  
Joe Parfitt, VDOT  
Joseph Delesantro, EPA ORISE  
Jeff Sweeney, EPA  
KC Filippino, HRPDC  
Laura Herrmann, VA DEQ  
Lew Linker, EPA

Liz Feinberg  
Mark Hoffman, CBC  
Martin Hurd, Fairfax County  
Mia Girardi  
Michele Berry, CSN  
Monique Dykman, Londonderry Township  
Normand Goulet, NVRC  
Peter Claggett, USGS  
Priyanka Mohandoss, Brown & Caldwell  
Rebecca Winer-Skonovd, Biohabitats  
Samuel Canfield, WVDEP  
Scott Crafton  
Shannon McKenrick, MDE  
Shawn Hill  
Sophia Grossweiler, MDE  
Sushanth Gupta, CRC  
Ted Brown, Biohabitats