Water Quality Goal Implementation Team Federal Facilities Workgroup Meeting Agenda

Date: June 4, 2024 **Time:** 10am -12pm

Materials



Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Agenda Item (Discussion Lead) and	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
Desired Outcome	
Welcome, Introductions,	
Announcements (Greg Allen, USEPA	
CBPO)	
Modeled Load Reduction Indicator Release (Auston Smith, USEPA CBPO) Auston will be providing a high-level overview of the 2023 MLRI to inform the FFWG.	Auston reviewed the MLR Indicator and was able to show data related to load reductions with Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Sediment.
	There is room for positivity, even if the outlook is still off course. We are closer to meeting our goals, but there is still room for improvement. We have achieved the 2025 planning target for sediment. Nitrogen and phosphorus have some areas for improvement.
	Regulatory mandates related to sediment have played a big role in the reduction. Ag BMPs have also played a big role. Most of the reductions occurred in development and ag, but we do not know the exact practices that are leading to the most reduction.
	Discussion Questions about effective and ineffective BMPs were asked. Auston noted that a follow-up action should be identifying those for the group.
	Greg noted that we can't parse out the fed lands with this indicator, but this indicator shows that we have made good progress overall. This is an outstanding achievement to celebrate.

	ACTION: Look into what BMPs are the least effective. What BMPs should we NOT be focusing on as they are not as effective?
2024 Data Call and NEIEN Appendix	Jess showed the 2024 appendix and compared it to last year's to highlight the changes. The
Changes (Jessica Rigelman, J7 LLC and	changes include credit duration, name changes, whether or not they are tidal, and new
Greg Allen, USEPA CBPO) Jessica will be providing information on	BMPs/new records. The 2023 appendix is available via the CAST website.
the new NEIEN Appendix and what that means for reporting. The 2024 Data Call will also be discussed.	If members have questions, email Jessica (jrigelman@j7llc.com). For edits or additions, we should talk with the Watershed Technical workgroup to make the changes.
	Discussion
	Questions on how the spreadsheet can be most beneficial were asked. Jess noted that members can search for a BMP name to find the BMP of interest. If the name of something you do is not on this as that name, working with the WTWG could help get those names onto the list. The appendix is supposed to be helpful for look-up and naming.
	Olivia demonstrated how to use the appendix to better name your BMPs to ensure they make it into CAST. This appendix is the list of the current Bay Program BMP names.
	A question about Bay Program BMPs was asked: Where is there a copy of the current list of Bay Program BMP names?
	The list of accepted names for annual reporting is in column A of the Appendix, at the link above. The list of all the CAST BMPs is there in column E and also at this link: https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Home/SourceData
	All error reports for NEIEN/CAST annual progress from the prior year are on CAST here:
	https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Home/TMDLTrackingReports
	Jurisdictions noted that errors occur more with expectation dates than with BMP names. They can work with the feds to ensure the right dates are included.
Highlighting GSA Stream Restoration	Russ talked about the stream restoration project on the White Oak Campus. Background,
Projects (Russell Clark, GSA; Andie	partners, and the work that happened were shared with the group. There are more restoration
Oetman, GSA)	projects that will occur in the future. To view the presentation, use this link:

Sharing approaches, results and lessons	https://d18lev1ok5leia.cloudfront.net/chesapeakebay/documents/EPA-FFWG-Presentation-
learned from stream restoration projects	Whats-In-The-Water.pdf
in the watershed.	
	Discussion
	Questions about the flora and fauna around the restored stream were asked. The project
	aimed to avoid cutting down trees. After the project was done, life returned to stream, but the
	specific Russ was unsure about.
	The project's origins were questioned. Russ noted that it was born out of a partnership with
	the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and National Capital Parks and
	Planning, among other partners.
	This project is not complete. Other sections of the streams need to be completed. IRA funding
	is involved with this project.
Non-Creditable BMPs of Interest (Auston	Auston showed the ecosystem benefits browser to highlight the BMPs that have ecosystem
Smith and Greg Allen)	benefits. The Habitat Tracker was brought up as a tool to help with tracking how BMPs can
Examples of BMPs that have outcome	support other outcomes. How do we highlight that other outcomes are supported by the
cross benefits. Members would be asked	implementation of specific BMPs? There has been an ongoing effort to look at BMPs and their
about BMPs they would like to hear more	cross-functional support mechanisms.
about beyond water quality. Finding	
connections among water quality and	Greg asked the group what BMPs and projects have a cross-outcome benefit and what we
other outcomes will be an emphasis of	should discuss within this group.
this discussion.	
	Some answers included:
	sediment reduction
	Some additional, but not exhaustive, outcome supported (in white oak example): tree canopy,
	fish habitat, and possibly wetlands too, depending on hydric presence in banks!
	Other outcomes are Community stewardship, tree canopy, toxic contaminants, healthy
	watersheds, forage fish, stream health, brook trout,
	Environmental Justice.
Wrap-up and Conclude	
Next meeting: August 13 ^{th,} 10:00-12:00	
Other 2024 meeting dates: October 8 ^{th,} 10:00-12:00	
December 10 th , 10:00-12:00	
10.00 12.00	1