

Urban Stormwater Workgroup
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 16th, 2025
10:00 – 11:40 AM
Meeting Materials

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The USWG approved the [July 2025 USWG Meeting Minutes](#)

Action: The Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel is finalizing their report and recommendations to be presented to the USWG at the October 21st meeting. Approval will be sought by email following the meeting by October 24th. If you have any questions or comments from the initial recommendations presented, please contact David Wood (david@chesapeakestormwater.org).

Action: USWG did not approve the MS4 Data Layer during the meeting. Rebecca Ransom will provide an updated data layer to members aiming for approval via email by November 1, 2025 to be used for model development. If you have any comments on the current draft data layer, please email Rebecca (rransom@usgs.gov) ASAP.

Action: Additional MS4 data may be included for a second-round update of the MS4 Data Layer for Phase 7, recognizing expected data from Virginia. Any data must be received by January 23rd, 2026 in order to be used in calibrating the Phase 7 watershed model. If no new data is received, the layer approved on Nov 1, will be used.

Action: If you have any questions about the Vulnerability Assessment Guidance tool, please reach out to Michelle Miro (mmiro@rand.org). The toolkit is expected to be released in mid-November 2025.

Minutes

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

- The “Beyond Bean Counting” Goal Implementation Team Funding Project is picking back up. Interviews with states and stakeholders were conducted through the summer about BMP tracking and reporting. A report of their findings and recommendations will be brought to USWG in a couple months.
- The UNM Expert Panel report approval process has been extended to November.

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

10:15 Urban Nutrient Management Panel Update

David Wood, CSN

David updated the group on the UNM Expert Panel process, providing a history of the original report, the development of the new panel, and the literature review undertaken by the panel. David shared the anticipated recommendations from the expert panel report (subject to change) and the tentative timeline for next steps towards approval of the recommendations. The panel is not recommending a change to the fertilizer application methodology that the USWG approved in 2023. The panel is proposing to replace the high/low/blended rates with 3-4 BMPs, which are outlined on the [slides](#).

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet, NVRC asked for clarification on the slightly higher percent reduction for non-fertilizer turfgrass, noting that many localities do not apply fertilizer. David responded it was a small difference of likely 7% N and 6% P reduction for non-fertilizer turf grass versus a 6% N and 4.5% P reduction for UNM Plans BMP.
- Cassie Davis, NYS DEC thanked the panel for including the no soil test UNM Plans BMP to support the work they have done towards homeowner pledges. Cassie shared [NYS DEC's pledge card example](#), which the Upper Susquehanna Coalition and Tetra Tech helped them develop.
- KC Filippino, HRPDC asked about the standardization or flexibility for states to develop their own pledges. David responded the panel is likely suggesting some flexibility to allow states to develop their own, but they must meet minimum criteria for core best practices.

Action: The Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel is finalizing their report and recommendations to be presented to the USWG at the October 21st meeting. Approval will be sought by email following the meeting by October 24th. If you have any questions or comments from the initial recommendations presented, please contact David Wood (david@chesapeakestormwater.org).

10:45 MS4 Data Layer Review

Rebecca Ransom, USGS

Rebecca presented an update on the MS4 data layer for the Phase 7 model, sharing a [map viewer](#) with the current draft data layer. She went through each jurisdiction's boundary updates, highlighting what data was provided, key changes to the boundaries, and total MS4 acres. She acknowledged a few updates were still expected for Martinsburg, WV and many of the boundaries in Virginia. Rebecca did not go into detail on updates to the CSS data layer, though information is included on the [slides](#) and the layer is being reviewed and approved by the WWTWG.

Discussion:

- Olivia Devereux asked whether CSS or MS4 is prioritized in areas where they overlap. Rebecca clarified CSS would be prioritized.
- There were questions from multiple workgroup members, including Marty Hurd, KC Filippino, Dave Montali and Norm Goulet, about clarification to the timeline for when this data layer is needed by the modeling team and how new data can be incorporated.
 - Rebecca shared that there is a deadline of January 23, 2026 for any new data to be included in the final version of this data layer for model calibration.
 - KC asked why the MS4 layer was needed for model calibration. Olivia clarified that land uses are needed for a proper calibration in order for it to be as close to final with the right inputs for partnership review. MS4 boundaries are needed to develop land uses, since land uses are classified as MS4 or non-regulated and so BMPs submitted by jurisdictions need to be credited properly depending on where they are located.
 - Auston Smith, EPA noted that “first” and “second” calibrations were being discussed and clarified that any changes after the January 23 deadline are for fatal flaws or mistakes only. If/when a second calibration occurs, it would not be an open period for new data to be included unless it was correcting a fatal flaw.
- Norm Goulet, USWG Chair recommended a stop to approving the MS4 layer right now, requesting that Rebecca make updates to the data layer and send by email for workgroup members to review for a final time and confirm their approval by email.
- Marty Hurd asked for clarification on whether something is needed now for a placeholder layer. Norm confirmed that the process ahead will be two phases. First, the USWG will approve a preliminary layer by email. Then, by January 23, the layer will be updated with any new data from Virginia. VA DEQ is collecting data from localities, hoping to get that data ASAP to be QA/QCed and sent to CBP.
 - David Taylor, VADEQ shared that VADEQ has received data from many localities so far and some have needed to be sent back for fixing. He noted this is the first permit cycle where everyone was required to submit shapefiles. If a locality has something separate that hasn’t gone through DEQ, then they could potentially submit it directly to CBP, but DEQ can’t verify the validity of this. This can be discussed as we get closer to the Jan 23 deadline.
 - David also noted that many nontraditional permittees are not included on the map. Marty Hurd acknowledged Fairfax County has similar challenges of extracting other permittees like cities with separate permits and colleges from their MS4 area. They know where those other permits are, but it is not the county’s responsibility or place to submit boundaries for these other regulated entities.
- Olivia clarified that federal facility areas are mapped separately in the model. David Taylor noted that for Virginia federal facilities that are MS4 are still required to submit their service areas and outfall data to VADEQ.
- There were also clarifying questions and discussion related to CSS boundaries.
 - Dave Montali noted that changes to Martinsburg’s CSS boundary will not significantly impact the total area.
 - Cassie Davis asked what the relationship is between the CSS layer in the model and the CSS reporting in CAST. Olivia responded that reporting in CAST is of any elimination of CSOs that occurred from the previous year. Olivia suggested reaching out to Jess Rigelman and Megan Thyng, who are the CBPO point source experts, for further questions on this.
 - Cassie noted NY may need to look back again at the former hectares for CSS to see how the boundaries were initially determined, if what we are creating now is a new baseline of active hectares for reporting any more reduction from.

- Dave mentioned that WV is working with Jess Rigelman to see how they can change the history of their CSS area, since they have realized the boundary previously used was of the whole city and that was not correct to begin with.

Action: USWG did not approve the MS4 Data Layer during the meeting. Rebecca Ransom will provide an updated data layer to members aiming for approval via email by November 1, 2025 to be used for model development. If you have any comments on the current draft data layer, please email Rebecca (rransom@usgs.gov) ASAP.

Action: Additional MS4 data may be included for a second-round update of the MS4 Data Layer for Phase 7, recognizing expected data from Virginia. Any data must be received by January 23rd, 2026 in order to be used in calibrating the Phase 7 watershed model. If no new data is received, the layer approved on Nov 1, will be used.

11:15 Draft Vulnerability Assessment Framework

Michelle Miro, RAND

Michelle provided an [overview](#) of the Climate Resilient Stormwater Support project and the main tasks of the project, the first of which is developing a Vulnerability Assessment Guidance tool. Michelle outlined their process in developing the tool through literature review, stakeholder interviews, and a pilot test with a stormwater agency. She highlighted key features of the tool, including making it right-sized, actionable, and integrated. They plan to release the toolkit in mid-November as a document with step-by-step guidance, flow charts and worksheets, as well as a technical memorandum describing findings from the lit review and interviews.

Discussion:

- Norm Goulet, NVRC asked for an update on the [IDF curves](#). Michelle shared that MARISA is developing an update to the IDF curve tool with new data from CMIP 6 (the current version released in 2021 utilized data from CMIP 5). They are currently undergoing internal peer-review on the output, then will be working to share the tool. They will present it to the USWG once it is released.
- Norm reminded the workgroup that Atlas 15 Vol 1 is going to be released. Vol 2 was originally put on the shelf, but NOAA may have reversed this and will be working on Vol 2, but they have not specified a timeline. Norm thanked MARISA for their work to update these numbers for new climate data and how Atlas 15 Vol 1 will figure into this.

Action: If you have any questions about the Vulnerability Assessment Guidance tool, please reach out to Michelle Miro (mmiro@rand.org). The toolkit is expected to be released in mid-November 2025.

11:40 Adjourn

Participants

Norm Goulet, NVRC (USWG Chair)
KC Filippino, (USWG Vice-Chair)
David Wood, CSN (USWG Coordinator)
Petra Baldwin, CRC (USWG Staffer)
Michelle Miro, RAND
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech
Kevin Du Bois, DoD CBP
Jamie Eberl, PA DEP
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting/CBPO
Helen Smith, Devereux Consulting/CBPO
Jeff Colella, WVSA
Rebecca Ransom, USGS
Allie Wagner, NVRC
Samuel Canfield, WVDEP
Alison Santoro, MD DNR
Holly Walker, DNREC
Brock Reggi, VA DEQ
Heather Gewandter, City of Rockville
David Taylor, VA DEQ
Scott Crafton, VDOT
Michelle Fuels, VDOT
Cassie Davis, NYS DEC
Auston Smith, EPA/CBPO
Marel King, CBC
Greg Hoffman, CWP

Andrea Krug, DC DOEE
Camille Liebnitzky, City of Alexandria
Nathan Forand, Baltimore Co., MD
Martin Hurd, Fairfax Co., VA
Ginny Snead, AMT Engineering
Mary Simmons, AMT Engineering
Kristen Parsons, ACB
Amanda Obosnenko, Nature Conservancy
Bailey Robertory, MD DNR
Ho-Ching Fong, Montgomery Co. DEP
Rebecca Winer-Skonovd, Biohabitats
Joe Parfitt, VDOT
Caitlin Bolton, MWCOG
Devon Kosisky, MDE
Michele Berry, CSN
Cecelia Lane, DC DOEE
Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Angela Jones, DoD CBP
Mark Symborski, Montgomery Co. Planning
Derick Winn, VA DEQ
Ellen Egen, Aqua Law
Aaron Fisher, Ernest Maier Inc.
Brenda Morgan

Acronym List

BMP: Best Management Practice
CAST: Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool
CMIP: Coupled Model Intercomparison Project
CSS: Combined Sewer System
IDF: Intensity Duration Frequency
MARISA: Mid-Atlantic Regional Integrated
Sciences and Assessments

MS4: Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
UNM: Urban Nutrient Management
USGS: U.S. Geological Survey
USWG: Urban Stormwater Workgroup
WWTWG: Wastewater Treatment Workgroup