

## Federal Facilities Workgroup Minutes

**Date:** December 13, 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/23406/>



### Members in Attendance

Greg Allen, EPA, <i>Coordinator</i>	Liz Dawson, FWS	Dana Jackson, USDA	Renee Thompson, USGS
Matt Breitenother USACE	Sarah Diebel, DOD, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Rachel Knight	Katherine Wares, CRC, <i>Staffer</i>
Catherine Broad, USDA - FS	Andy Fitch, USGS	Marian Norris, NPS	Bob Williams, Navy
Joel Campbell, USGS	Kelly Gable, EPA	Elisa Ortiz, DOD	Adam Wright, DOD
Peter Claggett, USGS	Marty Hurd, DOEE	Jeff Sweeny, EPA	

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 November 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renee has updated federal facilities in the new boundary layer; there are still a few properties that need to be updated. After that, Renee should be able to provide a master list/shapefile of facilities. Renee said she could present how the information is used at the January meeting; this will be added to the next agenda.</li> </ul> </li> <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> <li>Sarah will coordinate a call with Marian, Jeff, James, Dana, Katherine, Greg, Peter, and Renee to continue discussing federal agricultural land use designation. <b>Completed</b></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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 in January</i> <b>In Progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This topic will be considered for the January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting agenda.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Greg and Katherine will set up meetings with each jurisdiction to review the FFWG Reporting Progress Table.</i> <b>Completed</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Greg and Katherine can show the updated table at the next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Sarah will create a timeline for federal facility WIP III activities</i> <b>Completed</b></li> <li>• <i>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.</i> <b>Completed</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If there are questions regarding this topic, contact Sarah or check the Target Taskforce webpage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Agricultural Land Use Designations for Federal Lands</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel, Jeff Sweeney) Review options for federal agriculture land cover.	10:15-11:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Meeting Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Options Discussion</li> <li>○ Comments and Votes on Ag Options</li> <li>○ Options Discussion (VA Comments)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Notes/Actions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There were 3 options provided for designating agricultural land uses on federal properties. Jeff Sweeney explained each option. The first option is to shift federal ag acres to corresponding county values. For this option, federal agencies would not have loads assigned to them even if they have agricultural land, and reported load reductions would be part of the county load reductions. The second option is to maintain federal ag acres within the federal agency type footprint. For this option federal agencies would have to report agricultural BMP data for the past 30 years or a default of no BMPs for the past 30 years. The third option is to shift federal ag acres to turf. This option would maintain the federal facility footprint but loads would not be considered area agricultural loads and agricultural BMPs couldn't be reported.</li> <li>○ Before the meeting, some members sent their votes for which option they thought was best to Sarah Diebel. There were two votes for option 2, two votes for option 1, and three votes for option 3. Marian Norris explained that she picked option 2 because option 3/assigning turf affects land conversion and whether the agency is credited for</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<p>converting agricultural lands. Liz Dawson proposed a fourth option to informally credit formal BMPs on ag land. She explained that this is a difficult decision because federal agencies are trying to meet their targets and want credit for ag land conversion BMPs, so as long as agencies are able to receive credit and reach targets, they should be in agreeance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jeff explained that data for the model is at the county level and has not gone any smaller. James Davis-Martin voted for option 2 and is for maintaining federal ag acres because Virginia has mapped acres of cropland and pasture and are aware of agriculture on federal lands. Peter Claggett commented that there is a way to determine acreage; also that pasture and turf are similar in loading rates, but that assigning herbaceous land cover to turf is less accurate.</li> <li>○ Marian commented that not getting credit for BMPs reduces agency incentive to do any work.</li> <li>○ Bill Williams asked if targets are for all of the federal land or federal land without agriculture. Jeff replied that is the land without agriculture and that targets are for urban stormwater loads only, and that they are unsure how to set ag targets for federal facilities due to limited information. Sarah asked about informally setting a target for fed ag load. Jeff replied that if there is an ag target, the county load would have to be used as the baseline. Liz said that she is not in favor of targets. Greg Allen commented that targets are important to have though. He also noted that there needs to be a method for addressing the small number of federal facilities with ag and load reductions, and determine a way to combine urban and ag targets. Federal progress needs to be shown in order to avoid disincentives. Greg asked Jeff how progress on federal lands for both ag and urban could be calculated outside of the model. Jeff replied that it is probably possible but facilities need to except that baseline is going to be county levels which could be higher than the facilities loads.</li> <li>○ It was decided to drop option 3. Members noted that option 2 might be most accurate but that it has many challenges, and that option 1 is a reasonable option if everyone can accept uncertainty and if ag targets can be made.</li> <li>○ Sarah asked the group if they agree that the options stand as, option 2, option 1, and an extension of option 1 (option1a). The group agreed. Sarah said she would write up option 1a. Jeff and Sarah decided they</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>would reach out to James and other jurisdictions to see if they agree, and then Sarah will take this to the WQGIT. Greg noted an extension of option 1/option 1a could achieve accountability and ability to do ag BMPs while avoiding others concern about effects on the model. Greg asked Jeff if there is a deadline for this. Jeff replied that if option 2 was chosen it would need to be completed in two weeks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Sarah will revise and summarize options for federal ag land uses and note where group stood</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Sarah will present federal ag land uses options at the WQGIT meeting Monday, December 19<sup>th</sup></li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Jeff and Sarah will reach out to James and other jurisdictions for input federal ag land uses before the WQGIT meeting</li> </ul>
<b>Federal Facilities Editor Tool</b> (Discussion Lead: Renee Thompson, Andy Fitch) Discussion of database functionality and federal facilities data layer	11:00-11:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Meeting Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Federal Facility Update</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Notes/Actions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Andy Fitch is working on a tool/way for members to view data visually on a map and in tabular form, and might have a method to present at the next meeting. This tool would be used for viewing information and would be connected to the editor tool. Sarah asked Andy if he would like a list of functions that members are interested in for this tool. Andy replied that he would and Sarah asked members to think of functions and about having information in a tabular or visual format. Members provided feedback.</li> <li>○ Renee showed new categories for grouping model outputs by federal agency in the Phase 6 model. Members discussed the collapsed categories and why certain properties were listed in certain ways. It was decided to keep ARS and USDA separate.</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Sarah asked Renee to reach out to USGS and Joel Campbell to decide whether to incorporate DOI into "Fed Other".</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Review of Federal Facilities WIP III and Revised Targets Timeline</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel)	11:15-11:55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Meeting Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Draft Schedule</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Notes/Actions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This agenda item was not addressed due to time, and was tabled for the next meeting on January 10<sup>th</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Update, Wrap-up, Next Meeting</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel, DOD Navy)	11:55-12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Looking Ahead</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Review of Federal Facilities WIP II and Revised Targets Timeline</li> <li>○ FFWG Reporting Progress Table</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</li> <li>○ Bay Fast</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Next Meeting:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Next meeting will be Tuesday January 10<sup>th</sup>, 10a.m. – 12p.m.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	-------------	---