

# Federal Facilities Workgroup Meeting Minutes

Date: February 13, 2024

[Meeting Materials](#)



**Chesapeake Bay Program**

*Science. Restoration. Partnership.*

<b>Agenda Item</b> (Discussion Lead) and Desired Outcome	<b>Time</b>	<b>Materials, Notes, and Action Items</b>
<b>Introductions</b> - (Greg Allen, EPA) Post affiliation in the chat and thanks for joining.	10:00 - 10:10	
<b>Membership Discussion</b> (Greg Allen, EPA) Greg will showcase the member list and ask if there are any updates or edits. The Chair and co-Chair positions remain open.	10:10- 10:20	Member list Member list was presented to the group. Some members had corrections to make on the spot. Sophie will be emailing the list out to folks to review to ensure that we have the most up to date list.
<b>Healthy Watersheds and the FFWG</b> (Jeff Lerner, EPA) Jeff will discuss the Healthy Watersheds Outcome and the protection and stewardship activities around federal lands.	10:20- 10:50	<p>Jeff presented on the Beyond 2025 Healthy Watersheds recommendations, the Healthy Watersheds goal team, the nexus of protected lands and federal facilities, and the potential connection of healthy watershed connection and federal facilities.</p> <p>Comments about potential partners occurred (The Nature Conservancy). Request to add the federal facilities layer to the Chesapeake Healthy Watersheds Assessment tool was suggested. Jeff noted that we collect a lot from the feds, and asked what else could we be capturing in terms of the work that the feds are doing and how does that connect with some of the healthy watershed's work? Oliva Devereux noted that conservation approach is crucial and is not captured in the watershed model. There are things that can happen in terms of progress that have nothing to do with the TMDL.</p> <p>Kevin Du Bois noted that REPI lands are not mapped as lands conserve due to the security risks associated with lands protected in connection to military installations. Because they are not getting mapped, they are not getting counted in the total protected lands.</p>

		<p><b>Actions:</b> Support the addition of federal facilities in the Chesapeake Healthy Watersheds Assessment.</p> <p>Explore federal lands and their overlap with vulnerable lands.</p>
<p><b>Federal Facilities Mapping</b> (Peter Claggett, USGS)</p> <p>ACoE and DoD own lands that need to be separated.</p> <p>Updating the federal facility footprint and land use for Phase 7</p>	<p>10:50-11:30-</p>	<p>Materials and/or visualization of the current federal data layer\</p> <p>Reviewed the land use/land change data currently in Phase 6 and the hopes for Phase 7. Peter also talked about federal facility types and the proposed changes for Phase 7 (the Army Corps of Engineers will be getting their own designation).</p> <p>Peter also discussed the updated land use on federal lands and how there is the ability to show what is actually happening on the land (i.e.- specific land uses not just a general class)</p> <p>Questions - What is the decision-making process when it comes to adding to our facility list? (There is no formal process; we can agree to make that change)</p> <p>Do we have other new agency types? ( If there is a case for it, then we move forward with adding more types)</p> <p>It was noted that there is no way to make changes to fed types before Phase 7, as that would take partnership approval to edit the current CAST version. The edits and additions to federal facility types will occur in Phase 7.</p> <p><b>Action-</b> Agencies need to have the opportunity to look at their current footprints within CBP data to ensure that they are accurate. A period of review and edits is something that should occur within 2024.</p> <p>Look into additions to potential federal facility types.</p> <p>A policy decision was made to exclude construction, ag lands, and harvested forest lands from federal agencies, even if they are happening on federal land, due to</p>

		<p>concerns about reporting errors. It was noted that having a conversation about re-attributing those lands to the feds should occur at a future meeting.</p> <p>Take some short solutions for DoD/ACE separation.</p>
<p><b>Open Discussion on Member Priorities (All)</b></p> <p>Updates, concerns, suggestions for future meetings</p>	<p>11:30 – 12:00</p>	

<b>Agenda Item</b> (Discussion Lead) and Desired Outcome	<b>Time</b>	<b>Materials, Notes, and Action Items</b>
<b>Introductions</b> - (Greg Allen, EPA) Post affiliation in the chat and thanks for joining.	10:00 - 10:10	
<b>Membership Discussion</b> (Greg Allen, EPA) Greg will showcase the member list and ask if there are any updates or edits. The Chair and co-Chair positions remain open.	10:10-10:20	<i>Member list</i> Member list was presented to the group. Some members had corrections to make on the spot. Sophie will be emailing the list out to folks to review to ensure that we have the most up to date list.
<b>Healthy Watersheds and the FFWG</b> (Jeff Lerner, EPA) Jeff will discuss the Healthy Watersheds Outcome and the protection and stewardship activities around federal lands.	10:20-10:50	<p>Jeff presented on the Beyond 2025 Healthy Watersheds recommendations, the Healthy Watersheds goal team, the nexus of protected lands and federal facilities, and the potential connection of healthy watershed connection and federal facilities.</p> <p>Comments about potential partners occurred (The Nature Conservancy). Request to add the federal facilities layer to the Chesapeake Healthy Watersheds Assessment tool was suggested. Jeff noted that we collect a lot from the feds, and asked what else could we be capturing in terms of the work that the feds are doing and how does that connect with some of the healthy watershed's work? Oliva Devereux noted that conservation approach is crucial and is not captured in the watershed model. There are things that can happen in terms of progress that have nothing to do with the TMDL.</p> <p>Kevin Du Bois noted that REPI lands are not mapped as lands conserve due to the security risks associated with lands protected in connection to military installations. Because they are not getting mapped, they are not getting counted in the total protected lands.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> Support the addition of federal facilities in the Chesapeake Healthy Watersheds Assessment. Explore federal lands and their overlap with vulnerable lands.</p>
<b>Federal Facilities Mapping</b> (Peter Claggett, USGS) ACoE and DoD own lands that need to be separated.	10:50-11:30-	<p>Materials and/or visualization of the current federal data layer\</p> <p>Reviewed the land use/land change data currently in Phase 6 and the hopes for Phase 7.</p> <p>Peter also talked about federal facility types and the proposed changes for Phase 7 (the Army Corps of Engineers will be getting their own designation).</p>

Updating the federal facility footprint and land use for Phase 7		<p>Peter also discussed the updated land use on federal lands and how there is the ability to show what is actually happening on the land (i.e.- specific land uses not just a general class)</p> <p>Questions - What is the decision-making process when it comes to adding to our facility list? (There is no formal process; we can agree to make that change) Do we have other new agency types? ( If there is a case for it, then we move forward with adding more types)</p> <p>It was noted that there is no way to make changes to fed types before Phase 7, as that would take partnership approval to edit the current CAST version. The edits and additions to federal facility types will occur in Phase 7.</p> <p><b>Action-</b> Agencies need to have the opportunity to look at their current footprints within CBP data to ensure that they are accurate. A period of review and edits is something that should occur within 2024.</p> <p>Look into additions to potential federal facility types.</p> <p>A policy decision was made to exclude construction, ag lands, and harvested forest lands from federal agencies, even if they are happening on federal land, due to concerns about reporting errors. It was noted that having a conversation about re-attributing those lands to the feds should occur at a future meeting.</p> <p>Take some short solutions for DoD/ACE separation.</p>
<b>Open Discussion on Member Priorities (All)</b> Updates, concerns, suggestions for future meetings	11:30 – 12:00	

