



## Urban Stormwater Workgroup

Tuesday, December 16th, 2025  
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. USWG members approved an adjustment to the Compacted Pervious Land Use class and decided to vote via email after the meeting on the mapping of developed BMPs to Load Sources. USWG also heard updates on the Phase 7 model development timeline, a presentation of the Beyond Bean Counting draft report, and an update from PADEP on tracking PCSM BMPs.

### Summary of Actions and Decisions

- **Decision:** The USWG approved the October meeting minutes.
- **Action:** At-large members should email Petra ([Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov](mailto:Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov)) to confirm they are interested and able to continue serving in their position through June 2026 until CBP structure and governance changes are solidified.
- **Action:** The deadline for additional data to be included in the final MS4 Data Layer for Phase 7 is **Friday Jan 23rd, 2026**. Please send data and comments to Rebecca Ransom ([rransom@usgs.gov](mailto:rransom@usgs.gov)) and Petra ([Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov](mailto:Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov)) if you have not already done so. If no new data is received for your jurisdiction, the current draft layer in [this map viewer](#) will be used.
- **Decision:** The USWG approved (pending a couple missing votes) the division of Compacted Pervious into regulated (within MS4s) and non-regulated compacted pervious for the Phase 7 Load Sources.
- **Decision Requested:** Voting members should review the provided [materials](#) and send your consensus vote (1-5 scale) to approve the mapping of developed sector BMP eligibility on Phase 7 Load Sources as shown in [this matrix](#) to Petra ([Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov](mailto:Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov)) by **Monday Dec 29th**. If you have any questions or comments for changes to the BMP eligibility, please send them ASAP to David ([david@chesapeakestormwater.org](mailto:david@chesapeakestormwater.org)) and Jess ([jrigelman@j7llc.com](mailto:jrigelman@j7llc.com)) as well.
- **Action:** Please provide feedback and comments on the [Beyond Bean Counting draft report](#) to Norm, David and Petra by **Thursday Jan 8th, 2026**.
- **Action:** USWG will discuss and explore how remote sensing and other innovative practices could be used to track BMPs, especially in non-regulated areas, for a watershed-wide approach.

### Minutes

#### I. Welcome and Announcements

*Lead: Norm Goulet, USWG Chair*

Norm welcomed meeting participants and gave an overview of today's meeting. Members approved the October 2025 meeting minutes.

**Decisions:**

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

**II. Announcements and Updates**

*Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator*

David shared that the Urban Nutrient Management BMP Panel Report was approved by the WQGIT and the final version has been [posted](#). CSN will likely be writing a factsheet and hosting a webinar in 2026 to help communicate these recommendations from the report. David also reminded members that the deadline for new data to be submitted for inclusion in the final version of the Phase 7 MS4 Layer is still Friday, Jan 23rd, 2026. Rebecca Ransom is working on updates and answers to those who submitted comments on the MS4 layer during the shutdown. Norm shared that given the upcoming changes to the CBP structure and governance, we are planning to extend current at-large members' terms through June 2026 until these changes are solidified.

**Actions:**

1. The deadline for additional data to be included in the final MS4 Data Layer for Phase 7 is Friday Jan 23rd, 2026. Please send data and comments to Rebecca Ransom ([rransom@usgs.gov](mailto:rransom@usgs.gov)) and Petra ([Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov](mailto:Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov)) if you have not already done so. If no new data is received for your jurisdiction, the current draft layer in [this map viewer](#) will be used.
2. At-large members should email Petra ([Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov](mailto:Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov)) to confirm they are interested and able to continue serving in their position through June 2026 until CBP structure and governance changes are solidified.

**III. Phase 7 Timeline Update**

*Lead: Bo Williams, EPA CBPO*

Bo provided an [update](#) on the Phase 7 timeline, given recent furloughs and other changes that have slightly modified the schedule. In particular, Bo noted that the December 31st, 2026 deadline has not changed. March is the review period for the Phase 7 Land Use, about which an email will be sent soon to LUWG members. April 1st is when the CAST Team and Jess Rigelman need to finalize the CAST land use. Bo noted that CalCAST is still expected to be fully completed and Joseph Delesantro has taken this work over.

**Discussion:**

- Norm reminded members that the January 23rd deadline for the MS4 Data Layer is important to keep on time with to coordinate with the rest of Phase 7 development. Norm also highlighted that WQGIT is planning a longer hybrid meeting in April where many Phase 7 development discussions will occur and urged USWG members to communicate up their jurisdictions' chain anything relevant to those conversations.

**IV. Compacted Pervious Land Use**

*Lead: David Wood, USWG Coordinator*

David outlined the [proposal](#) to divide the Phase 7 Land Use Class of Compacted Pervious into regulated (within MS4s) and non-regulated compacted pervious. It was previously one part of the "Mixed Open" class which was in the Natural sector in Phase 6. The Compacted Pervious component of mixed open is now considered in the Developed sector and therefore it is proposed to be divided into 3 CAST Load Sources: CSS, MS4, and Non-Regulated, similar to how all other classes in the developed sector are treated in Phase 7. This division was mistakenly omitted in the

original decision. USWG voting members approved the proposal, pending a couple missing votes from absent members.

**Decisions:**

1. The USWG approved (pending a couple missing votes) the division of Compacted Pervious into regulated (within MS4s) and non-regulated compacted pervious for the Phase 7 Load Sources.

**V. Mapping BMPs on Land Uses for Phase 7**

*Lead: Jess Rigelman, J7 Consulting/CBPO*

Jess presented how Phase 7 Load Sources have been mapped to BMPs and Load Source Groups, highlighting developed sector BMPs and changes that have occurred from Phase 6. Jess walked through the current [draft mapping matrix](#). Jess also noted that a discussion on the eligibility of agriculture BMPs on solar land uses will occur at the next AgWG meeting.

**Decision Requested:**

1. Voting members should review the provided materials and send your consensus vote (1-5 scale) to approve the mapping of developed sector BMP eligibility on Phase 7 Load Sources as shown in this matrix to Petra (Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov) by Monday Dec 29th. If you have any questions or comments for changes to the BMP eligibility, please send them ASAP to David (david@chesapeakestormwater.org) and Jess (jrigelman@j7llc.com) as well.

**Discussion:**

- KC Filippino, HRPDC confirmed whether USWG members are able to request changes and edits. Jess confirmed yes, they are seeking USWG input and USWG's recommendations will go to the WTWG who will be finalizing the mapping.
- KC shared that she had a few questions on some mapping including why Tree Planting doesn't map to Tree Canopy Over Impervious. Jess responded that Tree Planning is a Land Use Change BMP so the BMP is applied to a different land use and then becomes Tree Canopy Over Impervious.
- Cecilia Lane, DC DOEE asked (in chat) how splitting out compacted pervious from mixed open will impact loading rates from the new compacted pervious Land Use category. Jess clarified that it's not really split, rather Mixed Open had more Land Use classes within it that went away elsewhere, and referred people to Peter Claggett and Sarah McDonald for further questions about Land Use.
- Cecilia asked why compacted pervious is not mapped to anything besides Abandoned Mine Reclamation. Jess clarified it is because it is newly considered in the developed sector for Phase 7, so the initial draft had just left those BMPs formerly eligible on Mixed Open. It is open to USWG to suggest additional BMPs to be eligible if appropriate.
- Norm mentioned a discussion from a previous WTWG meeting about feed space allocations and the consideration of how land is delineated between one class to another. For feed space, part of the method is that when they run out of land from the Ag sector, they're taking it from the MS4 layer. Thus, Norm reminded members the importance of having an accurate MS4 layer in the model – it is not just an overlay.
- KC raised a question about whether it is worth figuring out what additional BMPs could be eligible on Compacted Pervious, given that the load rate for it is much lower than other developed load sources so the difference wouldn't be very large. KC suggested she would be okay with leaving Compacted Pervious as it is.

- Norm noted for the future that “developed” is considered one class essentially, whether it is urban developed or ag developed. Norm shared desire to look at trying to separate develop between the ag sector and the urban sector for the next time this is updated.
- Marty Hurd, Fairfax Co. DPWES asked about the difference between the developed land use group and the impervious land use group. Jess clarified that developed is all of developed, so it includes both impervious and pervious land.
  - KC added that there can be confusing using different terminology between [land use classes](#) presented in other places and load sources used here. Is it possible to match the terms so there is more consistency? Jess responded that the terms in the mapping are the CAST terms. In the long term, we can definitely try to standardize the terminology we use.
  - Cassie Davis, NYSDEC asked (in chat) whether it is because BMP Reporting is not that specific. KC added that if the BMP reporting isn't even that specific, it should be at the highest level of BMP reporting. Jess responded that there are differences between all the systems – CAST, Land Use, the Dynamic Watershed Model, and NEIEN. They all have different aggregations and names, so that can be something that we can move forward with trying to reconcile as best we can.
- Cecilia asked for clarification on the difference between compacted pervious and turf. Her question was answered through the land use aggregation [presentation](#) from LUWG, which KC shared in the chat.
- Norm proposed to conclude this decision via email.
  - Kevin Dubois, DoD shared support for this, asking for more time to review the materials before voting.
  - Norm proposed a deadline of December 29th to receive votes by email.

## VI. Beyond Bean Counting Draft Report

*Lead: Ginny Snead, AMT*

Ginny presented the draft report from the Beyond Bean Counting Project, which was initiated by the USWG under the GIT-funding process to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of BMP tracking and reporting processes across the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Ginny provided an overview of the project’s purpose, scope and workplan, including a QAPP review, interviews with jurisdictions and CBPO staff, and a GAP analysis. Finally, Ginny gave a brief overview of some of the recommendations outlined in the report. The report will be finalized in January 2026, and Ginny requested feedback from USWG members.

### **Actions:**

1. Please provide feedback and comments on the [Beyond Bean Counting draft report](#) to Norm, David and Petra by Thursday Jan 8th, 2026.

### **Discussion:**

- Norm Goulet asked what was meant by the recommendation on “Clarify CAST Limitations”. Ginny responded that they heard in interviews people trying to use CAST for more than its intended purposed as a planning tool, which can lead to frustration. So, the intent is to clarify what the use and abilities of CAST are to lessen that.
- Norm noted that NEIEN is planning to be phased out. Ginny responded that the timeline of the project was prior to some of the changes being made at CBP later in the year, but the recommendations can still prove useful for supporting those changes.
  - Cassie Davis, NYSDEC noted (in chat) that NY submitted XMLs through CAST and it was very easy this year, which is a huge improvement.

- KC Filippino noted that the Steering Committee struggled with determining what recommendations were doable within the USWG vs. what needed cross-work with other workgroups or GITs. They were not categorized in that way, though, so she encouraged people to examine the recommendations to see what USWG can prioritize and start work on in 2026.
- Kevin DuBois, DoD raised that in regards to tracking co-benefits, the CAST website has some resources on this.
  - Multiple people shared links and resources on this in the chat, including:
    - Cassie: <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Documentation/Optimization>
    - Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting: CAST also has a report that includes the soil carbon sequestration for BMPs. Data source was Comet Planner, so mostly agriculture.
    - Olivia: <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/ecohealth/index>
  - Ginny responded that multiple people shared that this could be done better. DC has a permit that requires them to track co-benefits. Others may be doing it, but not reporting. Others might not be doing much because they are not required to or incentivized to do so.
  - Kevin added that putting this in their Milestones commitments can be another way to express work being done beyond nutrient reporting.
  - Norm added that this is a big conversation around Beyond 2025 to grapple with TMDL-related work and other work happening on the habitat side of CBP.
  - Kevin noted the need for help with communications to jurisdictions that may be meeting 2025 goals to keep implementing work while new targets are set. We can encourage people in those jurisdictions to think about co-benefits through this period, in addition to keeping up with maintenance.
    - Norm noted conversations about messaging around 2025 Progress are occurring at the WQGIT.
- Natahnee Miller, PADEP thanked AMT and the Steering Committee for their work on the report and asked for clarification on the deadline for feedback.
  - Norm, KC, David and Ginny proposed January 8 to allow time around the holidays for USWG to review and enough time after for AMT to implement changes before the final report is due.

## **VII. Post-Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM) BMP Proposal Follow-up**

*Lead: Scott Heidel, PADEP*

Scott shared an update after PADEP's proposal at the [October 2025 USWG meeting](#) to leverage retrofit stormwater treatment BMPs to support an estimation of previously unaccounted-for PCSM measures in non-regulated areas. Scott shared that PADEP has decided to pause and pivot to prioritize improving their electronic tracking system and work on a pilot project to track new PCSM BMPs. Recognizing there will still be a significant gap in BMPs outside of MS4 areas, PA would like to explore as a workgroup how remote sensing and machine learning could be used for tracking BMPs. He noted they are hoping for a more centralized and watershed-wide project for this to make it readily usable for everyone.

### **Actions:**

1. USWG will discuss and explore how remote sensing and other innovative practices could be used to track BMPs, especially in non-regulated areas, for a watershed-wide approach.

### **Discussion:**

- Norm noted this will definitely be an effort that breaks ground in a number of areas. He hopes we can make it a workgroup effort to ensure questions and concerns are raised early and everyone can benefit from its potential application.
- Olivia Martin shared she is glad to see remote sensing work is moving forward, seeing PA take the lead, and looking forward to a watershed-wide proposal.
- KC Filippino asked if PADEP had specific BMPs in mind at this point. Scott responded that still needs to be figured out. What it comes down to is figuring out what can be trained for the model to be able to recognize a BMP and extrapolate out from that.
  - Norm added that it will be difficult to identify not just the existence of some BMPs, e.g. dry ponds, but also that they are properly functioning. There will be questions about accountability and maintenance to figure out.

## VIII. Wrap-Up

*Lead: Petra Baldwin,*

## IX. Adjourn

**Next Meeting:** [Tuesday, February 17th](#)

### Attendees:

Norm Goulet, NVRC (USWG Chair)  
 KC Filippino, (USWG Vice-Chair)  
 David Wood, CSN (USWG Coordinator)  
 Petra Baldwin, CRC (USWG Staffer)  
 Elaine Webb, DNREC  
 Bonnie Arvay, DNREC  
 Cecelia Lane, DC DOEE  
 Sophia Grossweiler, MDE  
 Gillian Adkins, MDE  
 Cassie Davis, NYSDEC  
 Scott Heidel, PA DEP  
 Tyler Trostle, PA DEP  
 Rebecca Calderone, VADEQ  
 Jaime Robb, VADEQ  
 Samuel Canfield, WVDEP  
 Maggie Woodward, CBC  
 Auston Smith, EPA  
 Camille Liebnitzky, Alexandria Co., VA  
 Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville  
 Rebecca Winer-Skonovd, Biohabitats  
 Greg Hoffman, CWP  
 Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering  
 Mary Simmons, AMT Engineering  
 Isaac Scruggs, AMT Engineering  
 Jess Rigelman, CBPO Contractor  
 Rebecca Ransom, USGS

Ashley Hullinger, PADEP  
 Natahnee Miller, PADEP  
 Sydney Hall, DNREC  
 Brock Reggi, VA DEQ  
 Bailey Robertory, MD DNR  
 Devon Kosisky, MDE  
 Kevin DuBois, DoD  
 Angela Jones, DoD  
 Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG  
 Jeremy Hanson, CRC  
 Bo Williams, EPA CBPO  
 Michele Berry, CSN  
 Carol Wong, CWP  
 Eugenia Hart, TetraTech  
 Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting  
 Allie Wagner, NVRC  
 Ho-Ching Fong, MoCo DEP  
 Mark Symborski, MoCo Planning  
 Martin Hurd, Fairfax Co., VA  
 Matthew Meyers, Fairfax Co., VA  
 Lisa Ochsenhirt, AquaLaw  
 Nathan Forand, Baltimore Co., MD  
 Amanda Obosnenko, TNC  
 Edwin Edokwe, DC DOT  
 Andy Oetman, GSA  
 Brenda Morgan