

## Federal Facilities Workgroup Minutes



**Date:** November 8, 2016

**Time:** 10:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.

**Location:** Conference Call, Room 305A

**Call-in:** 866-299-3188

**Code:** 410-267-5731

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

**Meeting Webpage:** <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23405/>

### Members in Attendance

Greg Allen, EPA, <i>Coordinator</i>	Shannon Easton, GSA	Lisa Quiveors, DHS	Jeff Sweeny, EPA
Joel Campbell, USGS	Andy Fitch, USGS	Kevin Shao, Army	Peter Claggett, USGS
James Davis-Martin, VDEQ, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Dana Jackson, USDA	Renee Thompson, USGS	Russ Clark, GSA
Liz Dawson, FWS	Marian Norris, NPS	Peter Van Dyke, NASA	
Sarah Diebel, DOD, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Elisa Ortiz, DOD	Katherine Wares, CRC, <i>Staffer</i>	

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
<b>Introductions</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel, DOD Navy)	10:00-10:15	<p><b>Summary of Action Items from July Meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ask Renee Thompson whether the new boundary layer can be used to create a revised master list of facilities. <b>In Progress</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Notes and Actions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The most recent version includes all edits so far. Renee Thompson asked whether the FFWG would like the GIS team to make edits as they are submitted or do them periodically in bulk. The FFWG suggested make edits as they are submitted. Dana Jackson indicated that some edits will need to be one on one. Sarah Diebel asked if data from the database could be extracted as a table to be used as a master list of federal facilities. Renee responded that this is possible and that she will work with Katherine Wares to export the data and create a table.</li> <li>Determine when the final layer must be complete for Phase 6</li> <li>Discuss additional features in the tool, such as running reports</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask Lucinda Power to review the WIP III Expectation document more thoroughly at a future FFWG meeting. <b>In Progress (suggest Feb/March 2017)</b></li> <li>• Jeff and Peter will follow-up and provide more information regarding how to designate agricultural land uses. <b>In Progress</b></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Notes and Actions</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Federal facility agricultural land use is currently not designated or recognized in the model. Jeff Sweeny explained the issues that modelers have relate to unknowns associated with whether the federal facility ag land is private or leased, what type of agricultural land use is present, how many acres exist, and how agricultural land use on federal facility lands has changed since 1985. Some FFWG members said there is data regarding these questions, but Jeff responded that he does not know how to obtain that data and information since it is not part of the current mechanism to obtain the information (i.e. Ag Census). Marian Norris asked how to address new agricultural land. FFWG members agreed that federal agricultural lands should not be ignored or left out of the model, and they did not support the idea of using adjacent county agricultural practices as a default for federal facility land use since there are likely no federal facilities with livestock. A suggestion was made to use data from the editor tool as a way to provide input. It was agreed that this topic needed to be discussed further.</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Sarah will coordinate a call with Marian, Jeff, James, Dana, Katherine, Greg, Peter, and Renee to continue discussing federal agricultural land use designation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Report on WQGIT Meeting Decisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BMP Reporting and Tracking</b> (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen and Sarah Diebel) Review current draft of the Track Table. Discussion of the WQGIT's decision to extend data input deadline to December 2016. Discussion of state expectation and federal agency status.</li> <li>• <b>Local Area Planning Goals/Federal Facility Targets</b> (Discussion Lead: James Davis-Martin) Anticipate that the Phase 6 Model will result in need to update federal facility targets. Review issues related to timeline for federal facility WIP III activities</li> </ul>	10:35-12:05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FFWG Reporting Progress Table</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Notes and Actions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The WQGIT decided to extend data submissions to NEIEN and the Phase 6 Model through December 2016. This includes federal facilities' progress and historic BMP data. Time will be needed by the jurisdictions for data entry so it was suggested to have federal agencies properly format and send data to jurisdictions by December 1<sup>st</sup>. New data or all BMP data can be reported, federal representatives need to ensure to clearly articulate what information is being sent to each of the jurisdiction contacts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>considering the timing of availability of revised targets (estimated to occur in 2018).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Reporting Progress Table was posted and reviewed. The table indicated what data jurisdictions have received and submitted into NEIEN. Federal partners continued to have concerns related to status. Jeff Sweeny suggested federal agencies check what data is currently in the NEIEN system in order to determine if their BMP data was entered. To do this, email Jeff Sweeny for access; it includes everything submitted to CBP since October 1<sup>st</sup>. Greg Allen proposed individual conversations with each jurisdiction to complete the table.</li> <li>○ It was suggested to rethink the process by which federal agencies report their data in the future as there tends to be significant gaps between data submitted and what is input into NEIEN.</li> <li>○ Katherine Wares and Greg Allen should be cc'd on emails between jurisdictions and federal agencies.</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Greg and Katherine will set up meetings with each jurisdiction to review the FFWG Reporting Progress Table.</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Jeff Sweeney to provide presentation to the federal partners on Beta 4 version of federal BMP reporting and identify if changes between Beta 4 and Beta 3 are present.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b><u>Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PowerPoint slides from WQGIT meeting (phase 6 model)</li> <li>○ Midpoint Assessment schedule document</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b><u>Notes and Actions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ James Davis-Martin explained that the WQGIT's taskforce proposed to give jurisdictions flexibility for determining local planning area targets for Phase III WIPs and decided to rename the targets "goals". Recommendations from the LATTf will be included in EPA's Phase III WIP Expectations. Phase III WIPs are to be developed between December 2017 and August 2018. The group discussed the timeline challenge associated with revised federal facility targets and when draft/final Phase III WIPs were due to EPA. With those challenges, the group discussed using the current federal facilities targets as part of the Phase III WIP planning support versus waiting until revised targets with only 3 months to provide scenarios. Members recognized that federal facility targets would be revised once details of the model are finalized. Greg explained that based on preliminary information, additional effort will be necessary for nutrient and sediment reduction 2025 goals to be met. Sarah asked the group if a schedule and timeline</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<p>of reporting expectations and availability of tools would be helpful; the group decided it would.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kevin Shao commented that goals need to be equitable. The group agreed that while the scale at which a federal facility target and local area target may be different (i.e. size, ownership, etc.), the methodologies to determine reductions must be consistent and equitable between the two. James Davis-Martin indicated that he would raise this comment to the WQGIT on the importance of equity and consistency.</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Sarah will create a timeline for federal facility WIP III activities</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> James Davis-Martin / Sarah Diebel will communicate to the LATTF and WQGIT the group's discussion surrounding equitability in methodologies when determining local area planning goals.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Update on Inputs to Federal Facility Editor Tool</b> (Discussion Lead: Andy Fitch) Review of activity with regard to using the editor tool and grouping the inputs by agency.</p>	<p>12:05- 12:25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b><u>Notes and Actions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Andy Fitch presented stats from the federal facilities editor tool. About 10% of facilities provided their land use percent data.</li> <li>○ The group discussed getting a table of comments received and list of edits needed for the tool.</li> <li>○ The group was asked to provide concurrence on methodology established by the LUWG for default percentages of low vegetation land use classes. Peter Claggett described that initially the default land use settings used for herbaceous land cover for agencies that did not enter information was 65 turf/35 mixed open—regardless of the size of the facility. Most recently, the LUWG agreed on 70% turf and 30% mixed open for parcels less than 10acres and 100% mixed open for parcels larger than 10acres. The LUWG requested the FFWG's input on this default setting. FFWG members did not agree that plots greater than 10acres should have a 100% mixed open land used and suggested that factors other than size be used to create the defaults. Peter said that he would take the group's comments and suggestions back to Land Use workgroup. James Davis-Martin suggested this be raised to the WQGIT for agreement and decision. UPDATE: On 14 NOV, the WQGIT was asked to approve updated defaults for federal facilities. Sarah is coordinating with Peter and Andy to determine path forward and identify what the FFWG feels is the best decision for the good.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sarah asked members to consider joining the Land Use Workgroup and other workgroups and representing FFWG; Marian said she would consider this.</li> <li>○ The editor tool will be open through Thanksgiving.</li> </ul>
<b>Update, Wrap-up, Next Meeting</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel, DOD Navy)	12:25-12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Looking Ahead</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Discussion of items to be included on next month's agenda. Request for ideas.</li> <li>○ 4<sup>th</sup> Model Calibration (Jeff Sweeney)</li> <li>○ Data Visualization Tools</li> <li>○ Phase III WIP Expectations</li> <li>○ Trash TMDL and how it will affect federal facilities with MS4 permits, if the workgroup is ready to take on issues beyond the nutrient and sediment TMDL</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Next Meeting:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Next meeting will be Tuesday December 13<sup>th</sup>, 10a.m. – 12p.m.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>