

**Water Quality Goal Implementation Team  
Federal Facilities Workgroup  
Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** February 11th, 2025

**Time:** 10 am – 12 noon

[Meeting Materials](#)



**Chesapeake Bay Program**

*Science. Restoration. Partnership.*

Agenda Item (Discussion Lead) and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
<b>I. Welcome, Introductions, Announcements</b> – (Greg Allen, US EPA CBPO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>For roll call purposes, please enter your name &amp; affiliation into the chat. Call-in participants are requested to identify themselves verbally</li></ul>	10:00 – 10:10	
<b>II. Follow-up on Updating the Federal Boundaries Data Layer for Phase 7</b> – (Greg Allen, US EPA CBPO)  Overview of instructions, progress and questions from federal agencies. Thanks to USFWS, DoD, ARS/USDA, NASA Langley, and NPS NCR for getting started!	10:10 – 10:40	<p>Greg reviewed the <a href="#">Action Paper: Updating the Federal Boundaries Data Layer</a> that was sent to the FFWG on January 23rd, requesting feedback by February 28th to help update the Chesapeake Bay Program.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Kevin Du Bois expressed the map viewer is hard to use and tedious, and anticipates it will take longer to rectify the changes needed because of all the disaggregated parcels.</p> <p>Greg Allen mentioned that the timeline might be able to be extended, but was originally set to try and meet the deadline for Phase 7 of the Watershed Model.</p>

	<p>Alicia Ritzenthaler referred in the chat to John Wolf's presentation and mentioned the zipped files on slide 3 that includes all the layers if anyone would prefer to open on the ArcGis desktop, which she mentions would probably make it a lot easier to intersect with agency GIS data if you have access to that.</p> <p>Marilyn referred to another option listed in the action paper for agency coordinators without the respective GIS data to send this request to the respective agency GIS contacts that have access to this data.</p> <p>Kevin mentioned it's difficult because there is not just one person, there are many different offices that would need to be contacted.</p> <p>Greg mentioned for those that have more questions and concerns, John Wolf and the CBPO GIS team leading this request offered to schedule agency-specific meetings.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> For those that would like to schedule an agency specific call with the CBPO GIS team, please email FFWG staffer (<a href="mailto:myang@chesapeakebay.net">myang@chesapeakebay.net</a>) to schedule a meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Greg states we will check-in on this request at the next meeting.</p>
--	--

<p><b>III. Review of the Tracking and Crediting Federal Land Uses Unassigned in CAST Issue</b> – (Greg Allen, US EPA CBPO and Peter Claggett, USGS)</p> <p>Review of the current draft decision paper, which describes possible options for crediting federal BMPs on certain federal lands.</p>	<p>10:40 – 11:30</p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Greg and Peter walked through a previous version of the Issue Paper: Tracking and Crediting Federal Land Uses Unassigned In CAST (<a href="#">updated version as of 4/8</a>) and discussed the possible options for each land use/BMP type to gauge feedback from the FFWG.</p> <p>Kevin stated this discussion would need to move up the agency chain of command and that a recommendation could not be made at the workgroup level. He asked why this wasn't done in the past and why we are being asked to address it now.</p> <p>Olivia Devereux responded saying generation of land cover data and the ability of the modeling team to incorporate data into large data management systems have changed. With more advanced technology, tools, and better data management, the team now has more capabilities to perform calculations and make decisions that were not possible a decade ago.</p> <p>Greg added that WIP 3 brought this issue back to our attention because some of those WIPs were written with expectations that required we track these things. Additionally, the Phase 7 model is bringing it back for review. The key question now is whether what we're tracking and crediting is accurate, and if it's not, whether it's the right time to make changes.</p> <p>Kevin said it would be helpful to have the justification for pushing this issue clearly defined in</p>
--	--------------------------	---

	<p>the paper, so that when they bring it up the chain of command there's an explanation.</p> <p>Katie Brownson mentioned these changes will require more substantial reporting and will likely not receive support from USFS especially with current funding and staffing constraints. Is there an option for agencies who are doing the BMPs to report rather than report everything?</p> <p>Ande Remington in the chat mentioned NASA already reports this construction data to VA DEQ with our annual BMP warehouse submittal.</p> <p>Olivia responded in the chat to Ande saying what happens with your reporting is that they report it as state land, not federal. They may do the same with your erosion and sediment control on construction land. This is why NASA doesn't get "credit" for the BMPs. Hence, this discussion today and at the last 3 or so meetings.</p> <p>Kevin stated he did not support the proposed options and wanted the methodology for each option to be further worked out and explained prior to making any decisions. In addition, he emphasized the need to have there be agreement at the WTQG and WQGIT in order to move any recommendations forward.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Greg will continue to work on updating the issue paper of options in coordination with the CBPO GIS team, Auston, Marilyn, Katie, and Olivia.</p>
--	---

		Then, he will send a revised copy to the FFWG for further review.
<p><b>IV. Featured Success Story - Land Conservation and Restoration at Naval Weapon Station Yorktown (VA) Providing Multiple Benefits for Installation Resilience and Chesapeake Bay Agreement Goals and Outcomes</b> – (Kevin Du Bois, DoD)</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois will showcase a DoD conservation and restoration project that meets both military installation resilience objectives and provides multiple co-benefits for key 2014 Watershed Agreement goals and outcomes for the restoration of wetlands, oysters and fish habitat; protects submerged aquatic vegetation habitat; improves water quality and supports state WIP goals; and enhances carbon sequestration to offset the effects of future climate changes. The project sits within the newly designated Virginia Security Corridor Sentinel Landscape and is a harbinger for upcoming Army, Air Force, and Navy projects with multiple benefits and opportunities for state and federal collaboration.</p>	11:30 – 11:55	<p>Kevin Du Bois gave an overview of land conservation and restoration projects at Naval Weapon Station Yorktown (VA). The project involved creating rock sills, breakwaters, and marsh restoration to address erosion and improve habitat. Preliminary results show successful oyster colonization and habitat growth. The project is part of a larger shoreline management plan, with future efforts to continue restoring the area and enhancing coastal resilience. The full presentation slides are available to review here: <a href="#">Presentation Slides</a></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Greg asked about how they were able to get the funding from other partners and how the partnership was formed.</p> <p>Kevin said it was a natural coalition of people affected by erosion of that spit.</p> <p>Liz Dawson asked which oyster reef substrate shape worked best.</p> <p>Kevin said the project is still early on and they haven't yet completed the monitoring and how their shapes break the wave activity, and he assumes they won't know for a couple of years.</p> <p>Following the meeting, Kevin shared a <a href="#">link</a> to an additional presentation that further addresses the question about monitoring the various oyster reef substrates.</p>

<b>V. Wrap-up and Conclude</b> <b>Next Meeting:</b> <i>April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025 (10:00am-12:00pm)</i>	11:55 – 12:00	
--	------------------	--