

Federal Facilities Workgroup Minutes

Date: April 10, 2018

Time: 10:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

Call-in: 202-991-0477

Code: 283-2221

Adobe Connect Link: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/FFWG/>

Meeting Webpage: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/federal_facilities_workgroup_conference_call_april_2018



Members in Attendance

Greg Allen, EPA, <i>Coordinator</i>	Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC	Mike Khamayzer, Army	Nick Robinson, USGS
Matthew Breitenother, USACE	James Davis-Martin, VDEQ, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Lena Kofas, GSA	Greg Sandi, MDE
Joel Campbell, USGS	Liz Dawson, FWS	Rachelle Knight, Navy	Peter Van Dyke, NASA
Chester Carroll, USDA	Sarah Diebel, DoD, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Gina Noel, GSA	Katherine Wares, CRC, <i>Staffer</i>
Russell Clark, GSA	Jim Edward, EPA	Elisa Ortiz, Army	Aaron Waters, DC DOEE
Luke Cole, DC DOEE	Alana Hartman, WV	Andre Remington, NASA	

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
Introductions (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel and Greg Allen)	10:00-10:10	Summary of Action Items from March Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss the list of specific expectations for federal agencies and a federal agency timeline for WIP development at a future meeting. In Progress Sarah and Russ will work on a first draft of the new member training PowerPoint. Members will assist by sending any helpful information such as a map of facilities and fact sheets. In Progress Chairs of FFWG will engage with chairs of FOD to determine how FOD can engage facilities and emphasize this as a priority in their agencies (Meet with Sally Claggett). In Progress Need EPA and states to provide updated POC information for Training Presentation. In Progress Greg will work with the modelling team (Matt Johnson) to help with modeling and planning tools information. Sarah will email states about information for them to provide regarding their approaches to federal targets and local area planning goals Complete. States

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<p>will send response back by March 28th (Received Maryland and West Virginia)</p> <p>In Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email sent by Sarah on March 14th. Categories for states to explain: overall schedule, methodology, opportunities for training/collaboration/partnering at the state or local level, POCs (other than those on the FFWG; for example, representatives who may be leading a stormwater committee), deliverables and deadlines for federal agencies, and FFT distribution. <p>Announcements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DC will be sending a doodle poll to federal partners for CAST training sometime in May. The training will focus on how to use CAST for BMP and WIP planning and how to utilize DC's stormwater database. Sarah offered an agenda item to help them with planning the training.
<p>Federal Facility Target Goals and Protocol Methodology (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen)</p> <p>Start working on how to translate planning goals to usable federal facility targets. There will be a discussion on how to update the old protocol to synchronize with local planning goal process. Discussion with members on how to improve it</p>	<p>10:10-11:15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Meeting Materials</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protocol <u>Meeting Notes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greg Allen ran through the old protocol document to begin discussion on next steps for updating it. The old protocol has a section on jurisdiction and federal agencies responsibilities in setting pollutant reductions. The updated version will focus more on 2025 goals than 2017 midpoint assessment, and will describe both BayFAST (facility scale) and CAST (basin scale) and how to use these two planning tools. The spatial scale and land use section of the old protocol should be improved and updated with more information on agricultural land use and load reductions. We will need to update and correct baseline definition and latest approaches for the next version of the protocol. There is an issue that WIP III planning is based on 2025 projections, but 2025 projections don't account for changes to federal facility lands, so we'll have to figure out how to deal with any changes to federal land. It was suggested that this section should address the difference between 2010 and 2025 baseline conditions so there is no confusion. A graphic may be helpful.

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was suggested that information on the feedback loop to ensure federal agencies are reporting and submitting data accurately is added to the reporting section of the old protocol. ○ The section on verification is still important and should stay in the new version. ○ The section on future improvements related to Midpoint Assessment TMDL will be updated with the 2 improvements Sarah outlined and will focus more on so more on future improvements and recommendations in general and not related to the Midpoint Assessment. ○ Appendix A on methodology will need to be updated. We will need to speak with Jeff Sweeny about agricultural land use and 2009 baselines. The EPA default methodology was on regulated and nonregulated developed land. DC, PA, NY, and WV used the default approach. Maryland used its own method focused on regulated urban stormwater and mirrored its MS4 program. Virginia also used its own method and assigned targets on all land uses, and on both regulated and nonregulated lands. ○ The workgroup decided we need a document on how to translate between local area planning goals to federal facility targets. This document would establish overall principles and could be written as a group. There is a section on EPA Expectation document where this linkage could be made as well. The Local Area Planning Goals Action Team has a document on local area planning goals information and it lists federal facility as a scale. Information is need from jurisdictions on (1) local planning goals and how they will be interpreted at different scales and (2) what they want from federal facilities for the WIPs. Jim Edwards asked jurisdictions their timeline for local planning goals. Virginia will have draft planning targets at the end of May, so should have local planning goals in June. A discussion on the translation could occur after local planning goals have been created, but other sections of the protocol could be updated in the mean time so we're ready once the local planning goals are set. DC has been working with Olivia Devereux to generate data that can be used for draft planning targets. Jim Edwards is going to suggest setting a date for these to the Management Board at the April 12 meeting. ○ ACTION: Find and obtain the Local Area Planning Goals Action Team's document. ○ ACTION: Need jurisdictions to provide information on local planning goal implementation.

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The workgroup decided we need an action team to focus on updating the protocol document. The action team should be ready in July to start working on it. ○ ACTION: Katherine will send out a request to members on who wants to participate in the protocol action team. At the next meeting, show the Local Area Planning Goals Action Team's document, get an update on jurisdiction local planning goal implementation, and determine who is on the Protocol Update Action Team. ○ Previously, the targets were posted on BayFAST but an interface that integrates the targets to be used while making scenarios and to see if scenario meet targets would be more helpful. The challenges is that there are variations in targets so they might have to be integrated differently in CAST. We need to know what the approaches will be before speaking talk to Olivia. Mention the idea of integrating targets into CAST to Olivia Devereux.
<p>EPA Expectations for Federal Facilities in Supporting Jurisdictions' Phase 3 WIPs (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen)</p> <p>Discussion what states want from federal facilities and how to compile and incorporate it in to the WIPs</p>	<p>11:15-11:55</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Meeting Notes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The EPA expectations document is in the process of being updating. The Expectation, Protocol, and new member PPT documents should all be modified to say the same thing and as simply as possible in order to be efficient. ○ Sarah said she'd like a data request for additional planned implementation out to 2025 from EPA or individual jurisdictions along with the BMP progress and milestone data request. The implementation could be due January 2019, not long after the progress and milestones. ○ James Davis Martin provided a list of WIP needs from federal agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verify record of BMP implementation through 2017 ▪ Determine anticipated growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sarah is going to come up with language on this to show to the workgroup. ▪ Develop a plan of implementation for 2018-2025 that achieves planning goals, maximizes co-benefits, and accounts for growth ▪ Consider opportunities to maximize co-benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This item could be changed to "Examples of where BMPs are selected and implemented to achieve co-benefits" or could be added to the item below or above as seen. ▪ Describe existing programs/policies/strategies that will drive bmp implementation and achieve co-benefits

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify any gaps ▪ Describe planned programs/policies/strategies to close gaps ▪ Develop schedule for implementation of new programs/policies/strategies ○ This list could be added to the expectations document with more description, options, and requirements under each item. Greg Allen posed options of how to assemble federal facility information and where it can be compiled for jurisdictions. There was an option in the last expectations document for a facility implementation plan or it could be put on CAST. Members should provide thoughts about what would fit under each of these and what steps in the process should be included in WIP III submission from federal to jurisdictions. The workgroup could look at WIP 2 documents and guide as a reference. ○ ACTION: At the next meeting, determine where assembled federal facility information for jurisdiction WIPs will go. ○ ACTION: Find WIP II documents and guide.
DOD Data Collection Template (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel) Review last year's DOD template to discuss scaling up report efficiency and see if the FFWG agrees on a unify approach.	11:55-12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Meeting Materials</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DOD Reporting Template
Update, Wrap-up, Next Meeting (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Looking Ahead</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DC CAST Training planning ○ Discussion on updating federal targets protocol ○ In April, the FFWG will talk about federal facilities target goals. Then, a face to face will be held in May or after planning targets have been finalized. ○ Midpoint Assessment Schedule Work session ○ Standardized template (DOD data collection template) ○ BMP crediting and gap analysis ○ Review jurisdiction systems for electronic reporting MS4 and nonMS4 BMPs ○ Verification ○ Other natural resource outcomes/co-benefits being added to WIPs • <u>Next Meeting:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Next meeting will be Tuesday May 8th, 10a.m. – 12p.m.