

## Federal Facilities Workgroup Meeting Minutes

**Date:** March 9, 2021

**Time:** 10:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.



Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
<b>Introductions</b> (John Maleri)	10:00-10:10	<p><u><b>Summary of action items</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New member presentation updates (cont'd)</li> <li>• Revisit feasibility of including agricultural land use classes on Federal lands</li> <li>• Request to GIS team to add Federal Lands data updates to schedule</li> </ul> <p><u><b>Comments and Questions</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kevin- Effects of CAST updates to the TMDL, preliminary analysis is showing loads are increasing, but no change in FPGs- creating a bigger gap between progress and FPGs just because of the model, can't compare FY20 to FY19. How does this new analysis change the results? how we address FPGs going forward.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jeff- When we switch from CAST 17 to 19, the entire history is re-run, make sure you make the relevant comparison. Should not compare 17 to scenarios run on 19. Once we switch to a new version of the model, we'll use that as the best measure of history.</li> <li>○ Kevin- If the FPGs in the WIPS remain the same as before but the CAST analysis of progress is different,</li> <li>○ James Martin- None of the state or local planning has changed. It's standard fare. Think of the planning targets as a fixed goal post, but every 2 years the model changes, and that model change may result in you moving farther or closer to that goal. The last iteration, most jurisdictions saw a penalty moved further from the goal post as a result. Will see it again as we incorporate Climate change in the model.</li> <li>○ Kevin- So when the FPGs were established, how are they immovable? What went into making the goals?</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- Varies state by state, but in state planning goals, the main driver was the determination and establishment of the Bay's capacity to assimilate nutrients and meet WQ standards, the TMDL. The "goal post" stays fixed- until we reevaluate the assimilative capacity of the Bay. May change with climate. Our understanding of that goal post, Phase 6 model CAST 2017- it is fixed until 2025 or later.</li> <li>○ Olivia- Offer to help set up scenarios in CAST so they are consistent with each other, number of the planning target doesn't change but assessing the scenarios should be in the model, can sort through questions with Brown and Caldwell.</li> </ul>
<b>Federal Land Use Mapping and Modeling</b> <b>1) Land Use Data Production Update</b> (Peter Claggett) <b>Outcome:</b> <b>2) Federal Facilities Data Layer</b> (Greg, Renee, Andy) <b>Outcome:</b> Preliminary plan for updating Federal Facilities Data layer. <b>3) Planning process to reaffirm policy on land uses excluded from federal BMP reporting</b> (Greg Allen) <b>Outcome:</b> Consensus on decision whether to elevate partnership policy question to WQGIT	10:10- 11:10	<b>Land Use Data Production Update-</b> Peter presented updates to the land cover and land use classes mapping strategy and classification used to inform the TMDL, Improving the techniques and ancillary data informing land use, so we have an improved characterization of land use. Breaking down the herbaceous and mixed open areas further. Federal facilities and public lands are classified as fractional. Back in 2016, offered facility managers chances to edit land use in facility editor too, manually enter the composition of low vegetation lands, do not anticipate using this tool again with the updates or having fractional classes. I don't think we need fed facilities to report their vegetation management, we can map it and do away with fractional classes. The data will be updated in CAST with the difference between 2013 and 2017.  <b>Questions and Comments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• James- How many of the land cover/use classes will be represented on Federal lands in the Land use product? How many of the 16 modeled classes are on federal lands in CAST19? Who many will be on federal lands in CAST21? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could be any or all classes, will be rolled up to the original 13 for CAST reporting. No fractional or unknown.</li> <li>○ James- right now in CAST, several load sources are not simulated on federal lands, like ag BMPs, so is it expected that CAST 21 with new land cover hindcasted and forecasted, be able to simulate agriculture and classes that aren't currently on federal lands?</li> <li>○ Yes, some of these facilities will. Will be another opportunity to adapt and improve the process when we map again in 2021 with new imagery</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Olivia- What you're proposing is a huge change that should be evaluated through the WQGIT because it will increase the loads on all fed facilities. In the past, excluded ag areas previously. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Peter- we have the flexibility of how the 60 classes are rolled up into 13. If the desire is for consistency, if it was decided that you don't want to use that information and just consider it mixed open, we can roll it up to that.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Jeff- In Jan 2017, WQGIT agreed to not explicitly represent ag, but agreed to consider issues such as accountability, setting goals and targets, and working towards a better spatial representation of federal ag lands. Being able to better identify federal ag lands is the tip of the iceberg- getting there but there's a lot we need to determine to model it. Fear that the reality is that it won't be accurate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Greg- we could get a reasonably accurate record of BMPs and historical change of BMPs on properties. Although it's a small load, it's important for equity and every bit of progress to account for the benefit of the fed agencies and jurisdictions. Improved land use data and BMP record, what else do we need to be able to harvest these important BMPs and load reductions? What are the other pieces that are missing?</li> <li>○ Jeff- The divisions are Ag, crop and pasture from land cover. No one knows what crops or animals are on those lands but felt strongly the BMPs are tracked and reported as non-federal lands. Ag workgroup would have to reverse this decision.</li> <li>○ Olivia- FFWG concern years ago were that the lands were leased, feds don't know how the lease is managing it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rick- At USDA-ARS, this will have an impact as we have thousands of acres for various agricultural (crop and livestock). Would classifying these as ag rather than Mixed Open be beneficial for us or would it negatively impact us?</li> <li>• Renee- I do know the Chesapeake Conservation Partnership and NPS do NOT feel the historic battlefields should be AG. They are generally managed in a mixed open sustainable way.</li> <li>• James- so if something isn't land cover derived data, is it conceivable we collect that data on harvested forest, construction, disturbed acres from federal agencies? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Olivia- Agencies decided against this initially because it was too variable over time</li> <li>○ Katie- Still in the process of evaluating whether it's worth including harvested forest</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kevin- Leased ag lands are usually off base, not managed in the confines of the installation. We don't track the BMPs implemented on those lands, the farmers may provide it to the county ag districts. Renegotiating long-term leases not worth the effort and cost, repercussions could lead to farmers backing out or encroachment problems.</li> <li>• Kevin- Send text from 2017 WQGIT decision? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jeff- FFWG and AgWG, and the WQGIT ultimately made the decision with the caveat to continue to look into this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• James- decisions related to how federal lands are simulated in the model, that's different than how lands are managed. We've heard plenty of good explanations for why it's too complicated to do so. In VA, our FP targets include expectations for fed agencies to account for loads coming from septics, harvested forest, and ag, just like they expect from local govts.</li> <li>• Kevin- We don't own the "land" but own certain interests on how the land is managed. We can't tell the farmer what to do. Uses, management, is specified in long term lease agreements. Would not get support for renegotiation.</li> <li>• Peter- Getting out of the ag discussion, the data that's currently in CAST 2013 is modeled urbanization/ag. No changes in fed facilities, the way we model urbanization is independent of those changes. Currently in CAST the land uses should be static from 2013-2025. You'll see a change outside of ag- like an increase in impervious, turf, and that will affect loads. Those changes will show up in the CAST 21 data, no matter what the model decision.</li> <li>• James- important change, understanding the growth and land use change from 2013-2017, and we'll have the data for 21/22. Did not think we included federally leased lands, or federal development right holdings.</li> <li>• Renee- My understanding, ownership trumps everything, so if the agency or department, regardless of who uses it, it is still assigned to feds. For purposes beyond TMDL modeling and other outcomes, there's a lot of interest in those DoD lands managed for those purposes. Work with Kevin as we update the dataset. Clarify that the leased lands are managed for reasons other than DoD, are still important for Bay program.</li> <li>• Greg- Keep discussion going, first few steps. Decision to revisit the feasibility, to decide whether it's worth it or not, and based on that decision will decide on revisiting FPGs.</li> <li>• Olivia- Peter-how can you change federal agency total acres unless it happens for 1985 to 2013? I thought we were not updating the entire history this time.</li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ That's another question for the WQGIT. Renee will be updating the mapping of federal lands. Whether those changes are incorporated into CAST is a FFWG and WQGIT decision.</li> <li>• Data from 14 counties to review, April/May, peter will send when ready to review.</li> <li>• "REPI Lands" is a misnomer. REPI is a DoD program that provides funding in partnership with non-federal entities to purchase land to limit encroachments to military operations. I think it would be site/project specific on who owns the land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Federal Facilities Data Layer-</b> The fed facilities dataset was created from the protected lands database and then added to in 2013. The process for updating would take what we already have and work with those agencies without protected lands for refining updating essentially put out a data call. Likely a lot of updates and refinements, approximately 3-6 months, looking for contacts with GIS leads, parcel boundaries. Work on getting a timeline to build into the CBP land data team.</p> <p><b>Comments and Questions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• James- Needed update. Here in VA there's a new NP holding, need to add new acquisitions.</li> <li>• Renee- Would make a map viewer for agencies to view parcels, not the facility editor tool, but a simpler one.</li> <li>• Andy- Example of a current viewer, <a href="https://gis.chesapeakebay.net/fedfacs/">https://gis.chesapeakebay.net/fedfacs/</a></li> </ul>
<b>Federal Facilities New Member Training Slides</b>	11:10- 11:55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">FFWG Training Presentation</a></li> <li>• John, Shawn, and Greg led breakout groups each reviewing a specific set of slides from the new member training presentation, noting areas that need improvements or updates.</li> <li>• John- Recommend recording a video of leadership presenting the training, an effort to simplify the information and make it more accessible.</li> <li>• Shawn- Opportunity to brand and show continuity in the slides, a more uniform style, incorporate graphics as well as editorial updates.</li> <li>• Greg- Keep, change, improve. Resequencing suggested, need more time. Pick up and complete at the next meeting.</li> </ul>

Agenda Item, (Discussion Lead), and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
<b>Update, Wrap-up, Next Meeting</b>	11:55- 12:00	<b><u>Looking Ahead:</u></b>  <b><u>Next Meeting: May 11, 2021</u></b>

**Attendees:**

Greg Allen, EPA, Coordinator  
 John Maleri, DC DOEE Co-Chair  
 Shawn Norton, NPS, Co-Chair  
 Nora Jackson, CRC, Staffer  
 Mike McMahon, MDE  
 Rick Kumpon, ARS  
 Kevin DuBois, DoD  
 Katie Brownson, USFS  
 Liz Dawson, USFWS  
 Sarat Calamur, NASA  
 Ande Remington, NASA

Renee Thompson, USGS  
 Peter Claggett, USG  
 Andy May, ACE  
 Andy Fitch, USGS  
 Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting  
 Pauline Adams, USFS  
 Cassandra Davis, NYDEC  
 Ted Tesler, PA DEP  
 Evan Miles, DoD  
 James Martin, VA DEQ  
 Alana Hartman, WV