

**JOINT FEDERAL OFFICE DIRECTORS /
FEDERAL FACILITIES WORK GROUP MEETING**

MEETING SUMMARY

September 15, 2020

1:00 – 3:00 PM

Introduction and Meeting Welcome

- Sally Claggett (FS, Chair, FOD) welcomed the attendees and provided overview of the Federal Office Directors (FOD). FOD is group of federal agency leads within the partnership that meet monthly, execute EO, TMDL, Chesapeake Watershed Agreement. Mostly programmatic focus. Learn from each other and our respective agencies about their actions for the bay. This meeting is partnership between FOD and FFWG and hope we can learn from each other. Hope that continue dialogue as we improve reporting and interaction as federal agencies within the bay program.
- Shawn Norton (NPS, Co-Chair, FFWG) expressed thanks organizing the meeting. He is looking forward to understanding the context and meeting key players across the states and federal agencies. Looking forward to immersing himself and getting to know everyone involved.
- John Maleri (DC, Co-Chair, FFWG) welcomed the group and shared info about FFWG. FFWG is a workgroup under WQ GIT 3 comprised of federal facilities and jurisdictional partners. Discuss different reporting requirements and how jurisdictions and agencies can foster greater understanding and partnership. Pleasure to connect today and focus on upcoming progress submissions.

Background: Federal Agency Role in TMDL Implementation

- Sally Claggett (FS) provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting. It is important to remember that this isn't just an EPA exercise and we all have a role; one reason we are having this meeting to talk about our roles and learn from each other. Why it's important that everyone participate, otherwise we don't have a full complement of what is going on federal lands, have an accurate reporting and know where there are gaps.
- Wendy O'Sullivan (NPS) shared the cross-GIT nature of federal collaboration. This is a chance to bring about other opportunities for collaboration in addition to water quality, for example actions under the public access goal. This agenda focused on data, TMDL and WIPs but in the future we can look across GIT goals with federal facility partners.
- Greg Allen (EPA) provided context on behalf of Jim.
 - EPA would like to emphasize importance of federal agency involvement in reducing nitrogen, phosphorous and sediment from federal facilities. The Chesapeake Bay Program is facing federal challenges and our ability to demonstrate that federal agencies are doing their fair share is very important. We have a broad range of legal and other requirements that mandate that we make these reductions including the Clean Water Act, CB EO, Chesapeake Watershed Agreement, and TMDL that has federal facilities section.
 - This is a great opportunity to demonstrate that we have done our part across the board, because it is required and is also the right thing to do.
 - Today we will be talking about the system we built over last 10 years – that was designed to help federal agencies understand our fair share what need reduction are and ensure BMPs are reported and credited to the TMDL effort.

- We will hear today about gaps in planning and reporting. We need federal agencies and jurisdictions help our workgroup focus on the details and using the work that is going on now with Brown and Coldwell focus on gaps and help get them filled. Both sides of the equation have gaps, jurisdiction and federal. Ultimately, we want federal facility BMP report to be accurate enough so that we can publish agency specific targets in meeting WIP planning goals.
- John Maleri (DC) noted that is a two-way street for gaps that we need to fill. Fortunate to have contract work with Brown and Coldwell and stress the importance of partnership. Need coordination from both federal agencies as well as jurisdictions.
- Jim Edward (EPA) noted that Sally eluded to joint meeting a couple of years ago with EPA Regional Administrator, DoD and NPS. At that time, we had just made a commitment in EPA expectations in Phase III WIPS for federal facilities to step up reporting of progress and work together with jurisdictions. Committed to report annually on progress we are making and make that info publicly available.

Overview of Data Accounting Process

- Greg Allen provided remarks of encouragement and commendation for members of FOD and FFWG.
- Greg noted that we started out about 10 years ago coordinating federal response to TMDL. Vision was to build a complete the system that would allow us to show that fed agencies were doing their fair share in reductions. System would identify where are federal properties located, who owns them, and what land uses are. From that info, we can estimate current loads of N, P and S. If understand goals fed goals are, we can then see amount of reduction needed and plan for BMPs that will meet that reduction goal. We planned scenarios and set out install BMPs by 2025. Along the way each year we report progress of BMPs installed and eventually Phase 6 model will give us outputs which will be agency specific about progress toward goals.
- What we have come to realize, while that this is a reasonable vision to have. The participation by some federal agencies has been inconsistent. Some of data flows through jurisdiction data tracking and reporting is not working. Those are a few examples of where that system in place, but we have some things to improve on.
- The work that Brown and Coldwell is doing is intended to help us see how well things are going and to see where gaps are that need to be addressed. Ultimately the goal is that the Phase 6 model gives us progress data that is accurate. We have to know that the front-end info is accurate so that we have confidence in the model results.
- Brown and Coldwell tasks are set up to help us understand this process better and what improvements are needed.

Current Status of Federal Data, Gaps and Tools

- Stephanie Hanses and Stephanie MacDurmon from Brown and Caldwell provided presentation on current status of federal data, gaps and tools.
- They highlighted the four Brown and Caldwell tasks.
 1. 2019 partnership progress scenario
 2. Calculate federal planning goals
 3. Compare WIP 3 final scenario
 4. Present results. Provide summary memo of work and hosting webinar with everyone to evaluate results of findings.

Step 1-

- Shared table that displayed the status of federal data submissions (red green table) in the 2019 scenario. There are some states that are missing info as well as some limitations to data that we have been received.
- Using this information, submitted request to federal agencies. Request went out from Vanessa, in order to understand from each agency, was it accurate, if possible, to provide record as their BMPs.
- Shared update on progress by agency (slide).

Step 2-

- Calculate fed agency planning goals – we reviewed approved Phase 3 WIPs to determine:
 - 1. Whether a numeric goal was identified.
 - 2. Whether WIP included sufficient info
 - 3. Assess if FPG and local area planning goals methods were equitable.
- Reviewed FPG status for each jurisdiction (slide).
- Purpose was to assess what already done in phase 3 WIPs and begin to determine what the path forward could be. Will put questions out to jurisdictions to help resolve questions.
- We have a few outstanding requests for feedback. Would like to get the initial assessment of 2019 progress results by end of this week.

ACTION: Is this accurate reflection of data set? If not, what is extent are we missing info? As available we would like BMP records, progress and historical by Oct 1 to align with providing 2020 progress to jurisdictions. The second request to the jurisdictions, we have some questions to help clarify federal planning goals calculation methods. You should be receiving that in your inbox soon. We are working through questions revisions and would like to see responses by the end of the month to help understand status of FPG.

Final step

- Consolidate feedback from federal agencies and look at gaps across the record and where sources come from based on data from agencies and output from model. Look at federal planning goals to calculate numerical planning goals. Comparing those with WIP 3 final scenario results. Summary as a memo.

Questions / Discussion

- Clarification on color on first graph.
- Sally Claggett - Question on West Virginia NA. No federal planning goals. Is that reason no BMPs reported for WVA?
 - Based on BMP input deck, no BMPs assigned to federal agencies.
 - Decision in WV to group BMPs that way? Not having discuss with WV. A few issues, could be just that reporting template does not associated BMPs with fed agencies. Could correct in future years to get that separation.
 - In VA – some issues getting set right. We know there are some problems with their data set. In some cases, we do need to do a little more digging to understand why.
- Sally Claggett - Can you give us an example of in MD of fed planning goal methodology?
 - Stephanie - with MD the main issue we ran into, this evaluation was focused on the calculation methods, so definitely understand other pieces involved re equity. In MD main issue, the WIP

doesn't explicitly say what fed facilities are expected load reductions expected to achieve numerically. Creates larger issue across the board, to figure out how to develop numeric goal. That is why orange.

- Also, in PA, DEP and EPA are taking second look at calculation method that was used in Phase 3 WIPs. Therefore a larger issue.
- These are things that distinguished orange from yellow.
- James Martin (VA) My question is on next steps slide. It sounds like intent is to construct new fed planning goals and compare them with input decks or WIP BMP implantation scenarios with federal lands. Most federal agencies did not provide specific BMP inputs that we used in default in Phase 2 inputs that were in place for federal lands. Question is, if recreate fed planning goals and end up lower than what fed planned for in jurisdiction WIPs, whose responsibility is it to close gap and how?
 - Greg Allen— Wherever there is methodology in WIP that we understand and is equitable, we don't want to recreate those goals. We stand by and ready to calculate any jurisdiction federal planning goals where there is not a specific method that we understand equitable. We can do that in places where there is not a WIP 3 procedure and federal planning goal. I don't think we will supersede something jurisdictions have already that is working for everyone.
 - James Davis – not working for anyone.
 - Greg Allen - In VA, we are very close to it works. In PA could use the default method may work. We need to talk with them more. DC very close to having own method and understood and working. We are close on a few of these. I don't think we intend to supersede something in WIP 3 as long as it works.
- Greg Allen would like to go back to slide 4 to point out a few things. Red – green chart demonstrates how this is a two-way challenge still. Emphasis there may be problems on the jurisdiction side but start with WV.
 - There are BMPs in fed facilities in WV. We would like to be able to reflect that. Something has happened that has kept any of that info from coming from WV into NEIN and making way through to CAST and the model.
 - Similar to VA, there are issues with regard to data warehouse in VA that we need to understand better, and tag BMPs that are federal to fill in what we are sure what is not correct in the analysis.
 - There may be other states that have systemic issues. We need to work from state side at least VA and WV and also work from federal perspective, and those are questions that went out to federal agencies.
 - What do you feds think about this record? If not, what is level of effort needed to make it correct.
 - This is upstream node. Everything downstream relies on this part of record being accurate.
 - Asking FOD and FFWG members to think about how make resources available to get this right, because anything we say about progress won't be accurate unless this is accurate.
 - Understand where breakdown is happening to make this right and turn to green.
 - Maybe we need yellow – some record but still trying to determine if correct. But trying to get to green with a number, so that all of our model outputs are accurate.
 - Whatever FOD can do to help make this happen is much appreciated.
- John Maleri - Can you share timeline when expect do that planning goal development and when see it?

- Stephanie – we will be wrapping up progress eval in October and then planning goals and comparison is in October. Goal is to get draft memo early mid-November.
- Initial goal info webinar December, but the goals and discussion available early at net FFWG meeting in November.
- Goal have separate webinar to share end results and incorporate final feedback in the final memo.
- Sally Claggett - When go back to slide with the check marks – defining the different categories along the top. We have touched on equity, but there may be some confusion about what is meant by those categories, including what makes it reproducible.
 - Stephanie - can we reproduce based on what is provided in Phase 3 WIP.
 - Sally – find out what federal facility was that was reporting certain progress and then could and map that?
 - Stephanie – varies a little by jurisdiction, reproduce map but also knowing what the assumptions are.
 - Sally - Does that explain equity assessment?
 - Stephanie - Being able to understand method and assumptions are key in assessing if expectations for federal agencies are greater, less or equal to area.

Questions/Discussion

- Sally Claggett – We would like to figure out what needs you have as federal facilities to fill gaps in reporting, what FOD can do to help.
- Speaking from FS perspective, sometimes it helps to elevate the issue to some level because everyone is overworked, oftentimes you are in own federal agency bubble and maybe supervisor doesn't see the value in participating in this effort.
- Sometimes FOD can help elevate importance and have that discussion.
- Kevin DuBois (DoD) put in the chat, what do others annual data call look like?
- Like to hear more about that because other feds could learn from what you are doing there with DoD.
- This is open discussion time. Ideas or suggestions for reporting the data, and how we are getting structure, what EPA, Brown and Caldwell or FOD can do to help. Thoughts or suggestions are welcome.
- Kevin DuBois respond to info that DoD CBP puts out data call every year.
 - Two mini data calls. (1) to collect BMP data and (2) to collect info to show how complying with the Executive Order.
 - When questions come up about public access and goals for program or public access, we use data calls to get additional info from installations on how meeting those goals and outcomes.
 - One of other meetings discussed access goals and asked whether DoD facilities were included in those tabulations. Use data calls to ask those kinds of questions.
 - We also distribute to FFWG the credit reports that Brown and Caldwell to provide to DoD. They are very good at identifying reasons why BMPs not credited. Either don't make it through NEIN or not in model and identify work installations need to correct or improve data submissions and identify breakdowns at jurisdiction level.
 - Info reports very invaluable to resolve issues.

Greg Allen – Kevin was describing what Brown and Coldwell has done for DoD.

- That is some of what we did in task B. They are only giving us the formats and giving us gaps. Cannot work directly with federal facility data managers to get data.
- Doing same crediting analysis in task B.

Stephanie -

- We are doing limited version of that. We are looking at first step, agency info provided to jurisdictions, and what is the end result with what is coming out of model. Looking at every step of the process.
- Getting to understand if data reported in jurisdictions and if data is coming out the other side.
- Sally Claggett- All agencies in a different place. If jurisdiction doesn't know why data isn't showing up in those tables, maybe if there are multiple in a jurisdiction. Does it make sense that team up with jurisdiction rep?
- If you are fed fac doesn't know why data isn't showing up in the table, does make sense that you can team up with jurisdiction rep?
 - From WV, Liz Dawson FWS. Pretty common. I didn't even realize it was an issue until this this year. Helpful to work with Alana. Didn't know situation existed.
 - Mike Owens (National Forest) We are trying to catch up with process for several years, we believed giving info asked, but learn more about detail behind it. Not sure what next step is to fix the problem. Want to express interest in learning more about this and trying to get us square with that needs to happen.

Sally Claggett - Ask other federal facility managers would it be helpful for FOD to intercede either with jurisdiction rep or supervisors? Do you think that would be step in the right direction?

- Shawn Norton (NPS) We are working, brought on contractor to help identify gaps and aggregate the data so not sure if that is needed for us.
- Liz Dawson (FWS)– feel awkward to be in situation, not sure why occurred. I am not the only one in this situation. No thoughts yet on how to resolve. Any support from directors is always helpful.
- Sally Claggett- Is anyone from FOD planning something? FS will be meeting and understand more about gaps and data, those meeting will be more commonplace. We will continue to get better.
- If anyone is not sure how to get through this year, now is the time to speak up. Want to make sure people understand what is needed and how to get it entered.

Successful Federal / Jurisdiction Partnership Highlights

- Kevin DuBois - Even though have issues to resolve, we have found that our counterparts at jurisdiction side have been willing to resolve issues to make sure BMPs that can be counted are counted. Grateful for cooperation with jurisdictions. Appreciative cooperative spirit for jurisdictions and DoD.
- John Maleri – echo from jurisdiction al side. Your preparation with work with BC around your tracking is incredibly helpful.
- Greg Allen summarized next steps
 - Every year for las 10 years we have had an Oct 1 annual progress due date. This year we were hopeful this date would include refreshing whole historical BMP record so that the fed agencies

- they have a record is accurate record so we can see what comes out of CAST what is not making it through.
- As soon as possible to get that record refreshed, includes verified BMPs reporting as on the ground.
 - And from judication perspective not sure what right approach is, not sure if FFWG is the place to have jurisdiction specific discussions about what we are seeing here.
 - Somebody could arrange jurisdiction specific meetings to get at systemic issues. That could FFWG or FOD to help get discussion in individual jurisdictions.
 - The federal facilities are refreshing BMP record, we have the jurisdiction – help understand back up an fix systemic problems. And that is what we are trying to do as quickly as possible.
 - Today – resent the FFWG the link to use get to BMP reporting template. Federal resources in CAST that include reporting template.
 - Also sent the list of jurisdiction contacts for submitting data.
 - **By Oct 1 have complete BMP record across all agencies.** Keep working on it as fast as possible, we can't get good info about of model until get input right.
- Sally Claggett – question about getting revisions and correct past years, even if weren't reporting for past years, you can still do that?
 - Greg - Yes, Any verified BMP for the 2020 progress run.
 - Any verified BMP from prior years, do best we can to submit. 2009 baseline year.
 - Things are moving in the right direction. I would encourage FOD to reach out to federal facility managers and see if there is anything we can do to get reporting get in on time and include judication rep.
 - Junctions should be the one could reach out to the FFWG and get find out who people are.
 - FOD can work directly with federal facilities within jurisdictions to see if need or concern.
 - Sally asked about the FFWG letter? Not mandate letter written by bay program sent out yet. We have gotten out Instructions have been sent to FFWG. Process hasn't changed this year.

Meeting Attendees:

Jurisdictions

John Maleri, DC
 Mike McMahon, MDE
 Ted Tesler, PA DEP
 James Martin, VA DEQ
 Cassandra Davis, NY
 Alana Hartman, WV DEP

Federal Agencies

Sally Claggett, FS (Chair FOD)
 Mike Owens, FS
 Timothy Tolley, FS
 Pauline Adams, FS
 Wendy O'Sullivan, NPS
 Shawn Norton, NPS
 Greg Allen, EPA
 Kelly Gable, EPA

Jim Edward, EPA
Amy Handen, EPA
Kevin DuBois, DoD
Bob Williams, DoD
Elisa Ortiz Army DoD
Evan Miles, DoD
JasonRinker, USACE
Jennifer Melton, NOAA
Katie Chiang, US Dept Ag
Liz Dawson FWS
Sarat Calamur NASA