

## Federal Facilities Workgroup July Minutes

Date: July 14, 2020

Time: 10:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

Webinar: <https://zoom.us/j/998725498?pwd=OTVldWREeWNXMHJCMTHT09VaVh1UT09>

Conference line: 1-929-205-6099

Meeting ID: 998-725-498

Password: FFWG



Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
<b>Introductions</b> (John Maleri and Shawn Norton)	10:00-10:10	<u><b>Summary of Action Items from last meeting:</b></u>
<b>Brown and Caldwell Update</b> (Greg Allen) Review scope of work and provide overview of kick-off meeting and initial actions	10:10- 10:40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephanie Hanes and Stephanie MacDuron from Brown and Caldwell reviewed the tasks under the federal progress evaluation project, with the goal of understanding the barriers to the submission process, ensuring fair and accurate results coming out of the 2019 CAST scenario. Requesting feedback on the accuracy of submitted data from federal agencies to assess the situation for calculating federal agency planning goals. First task is a comparison of BMPs in the model, versus what the agencies know they have in the ground, as a starting point to help diagnose issues.</li> <li><u>Scope of work</u></li> <li><b>James- VA has issues with data, data was submitted to CAST without fed agency designation. Would you modify the process to use the data out of the VA warehouse, or go straight from CAST?</b> Stephanie explained they do BMP crediting reports that are more detailed, including checking where BMPs are. The initial step is the BMP record as the agencies understand them, and how they end up in CAST, through the jurisdictions. <b>Greg added that we may need to work with state reps since they submit the feds data.</b></li> <li><b>Dana- Are you going to capture data on other facilities not participating in MD? There is a DHS facility nearby that has BMPs.</b> Had a DHS rep in the past but they left. FOD could help find a DHS rep.</li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
<p><b>Harvested Forest Reporting and Tracking</b> (Olivia Devereux, Sally Claggett)</p> <p>Re-evaluating federal land use to allow timber harvest, other potential land use BMPs to include in federal lands reporting.</p>	10:40- 11:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Harvested Forest BMP Reporting</a></li> <li>• Sally presented on the issue of achieving load reductions for National Forests as USFS is the largest federal landholder in the watersheds. Harvested forest is not currently an eligible land use for federal lands and can't calculate load reductions from timber harvesting BMPs without harvested forest land, and potential solutions and workarounds for the issue. This would also be an opportunity to highlight the work the states are doing with tracking harvested forest and BMP applications on those forests. Also consider revisiting other currently ineligible federal land uses, ag and construction.</li> <li>• <b>Why can't federal lands get credit for harvested forest BMPs?</b> Olivia explained there was no knowledge of BMPs on ag, active construction, or harvested forest land, so they were not applied to the federal facilities. Need a historical record of the land use in order to look at the change. Some things like timber harvest or ag were excluded because of small loads, but it's important to record the reduced load for crediting.</li> <li>• <b>Dana- Is there a feeling of the aggregate impact of harvested forest not being tracked, and the impact it could have if it was tracked?</b> Yes, the states have good tracking and reporting of forest harvest since it's a valuable resource, but we need that in CAST as well. <b>Post-harvest, how long does it take for the forest to recover? Would you then plan on a prorated load reduction rate?</b> When a forest is disturbed through regular timber harvest it goes through 3 years in the model at the heavier loading rate and then it reverts to natural lands and lower loading rates.</li> <li>• <b>James- How did load reductions get to be so high when there's such a small number of treatable acres? They seem to come from stream bed and bank reductions from the model.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Olivia said those reflect any BMP that goes on any load source, from CAST 17 which did not parse out fed/non-fed but CAST 19 does.</li> <li>○ Sally added that forest lands are not created equal. A lot of national forest is secondary growth, and could be contributing excess sediment into the stream, there is still incision, from historic land use and disturbance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Greg commented managed forested lands and ag are not simple issues, BMPs aren't being credited. Add this to workplan, assemble a team to investigate the historical record, specifically forest harvesting and agriculture.</li> <li>• <b>Kevin DuBois- If a federal agency wants to get credit for BMPs applied to agricultural or forest land, we will also be assigned a load for that land as well?</b></li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes, but it's important because moving in this direction is fair, accurate, and equitable, right now the load is not equally distributed on federal lands. The load is already in the model but attributed to non-federal entities.</li> <li>○ Kevin added that DoD does not get credit for shoreline BMPs in MD, because planning goals are established at edge of stream, or for efforts to reduce wastewater loading, so equity and parity is an issue.</li> <li>● Managed forest timber harvest, ag, construction, septic, and shoreline management are all areas without an accurately assigned load, or the ability to report BMPs, some sort of issue. We need a team to look at this and identify to level of work and effort it would take to make some fixes. Sally will help outline some next steps, include Jeff and Vanessa, assemble a small team.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Progress Reporting</b> (John Maleri) Review process and deadlines for annual progress submissions and discuss the barriers for completing submissions.</p>	11:00- 11:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 5 agencies submitted milestone reports, and we will continue to accept them after the deadline.</li> <li>● EPA progress evaluation, share when complete</li> <li>● October 1, 2020 deadline to report BMP implementation to jurisdictions.</li> <li>● BC to develop tracking table for 2020 progress to share at next meeting, showing which agencies have submitted or are planning to submit before October 1.</li> <li>● Data call templates – What do fed agencies need for submission this year, should a letter of request come from EPA to agencies? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dana commented that it's always good to have a letter to demonstrate the need to move resources around, but it could also be from the state.</li> <li>○ Shawn commented that maybe a reminder should come from the federal office as well.</li> <li>○ John said that DC sends the agencies a reminder, do other jurisdictions plan on doing that? Traditionally DC is the only one that has directly reached to feds.</li> <li>○ Alana will try using the D.C. template in WV, John to share.</li> <li>○ Greg asked what DC uses, since Brown and Caldwell are developing templates? Specific requirements in the district to match up with their database. It includes the reporting form, was sent to DoD and BC already.</li> <li>○ DoD is preparing jurisdiction specific templates and will send those out when completed. They will incorporate all the changes to the data requirements for each jurisdiction.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>James added that the BC work is also an opportunity to update older practices, maintenance dates, and be thinking about verification.</li> <li>Kevin- BC provides more detailed credit reports, showing the analysis, that's how DoD knows where individual installation issues might be.</li> <li>Kevin will be asking about public access in next data call, if DoD land supports CBP public access goals. A lot of locations are only available to government employees/security clearance.</li> <li>Sally suggested bringing this up at a joint meeting between the Federal Office Directors and the FFWG this fall.</li> <li>Use the joint meeting to look at the other outcomes like stewardship, zero down on facility management, as opposed to top down, more broad initiatives. Aim for early September, before Oct 1 deadline, outside of regular meeting time. <b>Action item: Joint meeting with FOD in September.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Federal Lands Data Update</b> (John Maleri) Discussion on the process for updating CBPO's GIS data layer with more recent federal lands shapefiles.	11:30- 11:40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Draft workplan</u></li> <li>Making sure we have an accurate data layer of federal lands, agencies within each jurisdiction. USGS developed the facility editor tool, where the data layer was accessible to the fed facilities. <b>Action item: Follow up with Renee and Andy on the tool/process for the update.</b></li> <li>James commented there are agencies without representatives on this group, and this effort doesn't help understand the unknowns, like VA hospitals for example. Additionally, wondering if there's not some other process, an effort to look at existing data sets? <b>Action item: Reach out to FOD about involving other agencies and federal land inventory updates.</b></li> </ul>
<b>Round Robin: Federal Agency and Jurisdiction Updates</b>	11:40-11:50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dana- Maglev train planned between DC and Baltimore is looking to take 250 acres of BARC property for a train repair yard- would be the first time giving up land to a private entity. It would remove historical planting locations, and NASA has concerns about light pollution. Plans will be coming out later this summer fall, share with group.</li> <li>James- Developing a state lands data layer and state lands load estimates, like the federal or local planning goals, to make a state land specific WIP.</li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
Update, Wrap-up, Next Meeting	11:50- 12:00	<p><u>Looking Ahead:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workplan development, mission and vision statement</li> <li>• Joint FOD and FFWG meeting</li> <li>• Forest and ag BMP crediting</li> </ul> <p><u>Next Meeting: September 15, 1-3pm</u></p>

**Attendees:**

Greg Allen, EPA, Coordinator  
John Maleri, DC-DOEE, Co-Chair  
Shawn Norton, NPS, Co-Chair  
Nora Jackson, CRC, Staffer  
Kevin Du Bois, DoD  
Liz Dawson, DOI-FWS  
Pauline Adams, USFS  
Ted Tesler, PA-DEP  
Timothy Tolley, USFS

Sally Claggett, USFS  
Cathy Broad, USDA  
Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting  
Stephanie Hanes, Brown and Caldwell  
Stephanie MacDurmon, Brown and Caldwell  
Alana Hartman, WV DEP  
Elisa Ortiz, DoD  
James Martin, VA DEQ  
Dana Jackson, USDA