

## Federal Facilities Workgroup Minutes

**Date:** August 14, 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\\_august\\_2018](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/federal_facilities_workgroup_conference_call_august_2018)



### Members in Attendance

Pauline Adams, USDA FS	Luke Cole, DC DOEE	Kevin Dubois, DOD	Ted Tesler, PA DEP
Greg Allen, EPA, <i>Coordinator</i>	Morgan Corey, CRC	Kelly Gable, EPA	Aaron Waters, DC DOEE
Matthew Breitenother, USACE	Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC	Alana Hartman, WV	Jeff White, MDE
Patrick Campbell, NPS	Liz Dawson, FWS	Dana Jackson, USDA	
Heather Cisar, USACE	Olivia Devereux	Robin Jazxhi, USAR	
Russell Clark, GSA	Sarah Diebel, DoD, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Jeff Sweeney, EPA	

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
<b>Introductions</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel)	10:00-10:05	<p><b>Summary of Action Items from July Meeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sarah and Russ will work on a final draft of the new member training PowerPoint. <b>In Progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sarah and Russ will finalize and send it out to the workgroup</li> </ul> </li> <li>Chairs of FFWG will engage with chair of FOD, Sally Claggett, to determine how FOD can engage facilities and emphasize this as a priority in their agencies. <b>Complete</b></li> <li>Greg will work with the modelling team (Matt Johnson) to help with modeling and planning tools information. <b>In Progress</b></li> <li>Determine where assembled federal facility information for jurisdiction WIPs will go. <b>In Progress (below)</b></li> <li>The Protocol Update Action Team will set up a call before the next FFWG to start updating the document. <b>Complete</b></li> </ul>

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States will provide updated template for 2018 progress reporting, so Olivia Devereux can update them on CAST and so for CAST and for DOD standardized template. <b>In Progress (need NY)</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Annual Data Call and Template</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Data Call</li> <li>Run through the DOD template to see where EPA can make edits</li> </ul>	10:05-10:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Meeting Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DOD Templates</li> <li><a href="#">State Template Presentation</a></li> </ul> </li> <li><b><u>Meeting Notes</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All state templates for FY18 Reporting are in Phase 6 format. Federal partners will need to update/convert their BMP records for FY2017 Progress BMPs and Historical BMPs into Phase 6 names.</li> <li>DOD released the data call on July 31<sup>st</sup> and are requesting installations respond by August 31<sup>st</sup>, so data review and reconciliation can be conducted in September and then submitted to jurisdictions by October 1.</li> <li>The data requested is the same as previous years. This includes Progress BMPs implemented between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018 (state year 2018), Planned BMPs implemented between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2025, and Historical BMPs implemented prior to July 1, 2017. All reported BMPs must be state or CBP-approved practices.</li> <li>DOD did a BMP Crediting Report for MD, VA, PA, and DC. Fifty-nine BMPs did not get credit due to missing or outdated inspection and maintenance dates. Moving forward it's important to consider inspection and maintenance dates in context with the BMP's credit duration and provide that information. Built a formula that includes type of BMP based on credit duration and linked it to the built data and maintenance data. There is now a required inspection date field in this year's templates. The field will also be outlined in red if an inspection is required before the next year's data call. MS4 permits may require more frequent inspections than the credit duration and what is noted in the template.</li> <li>The BMP Crediting Report found that including additional information would allow certain BMPs to qualify for additional credit under the Stormwater Performance Standard. Certain BMPs include bioretention practices, filtering practices, swales, permeable pavement, wet ponds, infiltration practices, and forest buffers. To get this credit, installations must provide total acres treated, impervious acres treated, and volume treated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is an instruction sheet with step-by-step information on what is needed to complete all the tabs, as well as, helpful links with state cost data. There is also a BMP entry sheet requesting progress and planned BMPs in one section and historical BMPs in another section. Then there is a reference sheet with additional information.</li> <li>○ DOD is stressing installations to include longitude and latitude for the location field.</li> <li>○ DOD is also requesting BMP cost data to demonstrate how much investment is going toward implementation. DOD also stresses ensuring Natural Resources managers provide data for natural BMPs such as stream and shoreline restoration; these BMPs are implemented outside of the environmental compliance branch, but still have nutrient and sediment benefits.</li> <li>○ The facility name, BMP crediting status, and cost information fields may need to be edited or removed.</li> <li>○ Federal agencies think these templates are helpful. If states are okay with the templates, EPA can point to them in the annual data call letter.</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> FFWG staff will edit the template: hide the DOD facility names field, note cost information field is not mandatory (white instead of gold), and delete list of facilities on the reference sheet.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Protocol Action Team Update</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel and Greg Allen)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on the Protocol Action Team</li> <li>• Discussion on questions identified at the Action Team's meeting and answers</li> </ul>	10:45-11:05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Meeting Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2015 Protocol for Setting Targets, Planning BMPs and Reporting Progress for Federal Facilities and Lands</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Meeting Notes</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ At the Protocol Action Team meeting, there was discussion on who would lead this team and their meetings; Jeff Sweeney and Greg Allen will work together as EPA Lead.</li> <li>○ The Protocol Action Team asked EPA CBP to take a first stab at updating the document, specifically information like Phase 5.3.2 and BayFAST. The state representatives on the Protocol Action Team will then add updates to their methodologies for calculating targets in Appendix A. The Protocol Action Team will then do one final review of the document and provide recommendations to the FFWG.</li> <li>○ Jeff Sweeney said EPA will follow up with a default method that states can use; it is different from the previous default method. Jeff Sweeney wanted</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<p>to reassure that the level of effort for targets is the same for the federal facilities as the surrounding state basin. Greg said the question of how federal targets will be used and integrated with the Phase 6 outputs is critical this time. We need to determine how the targets will roll up to the progress assessment and provide federal agencies with a method for rolling up targets to be assessed at the basin level. The protocol should clarify how to complete the progress assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Greg said the taxonomy and terminology needs to be correct. State planning target broken down to local area planning goal; each jurisdiction has a different method for local area planning goals to federal facility targets. A graphic in the document could be used to clarify.</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> The Protocol Action Team will have a couple more meetings to continue working on the Protocol. A graphic could be used to clarify terminology/taxonomy and progress assessment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>FOD Follow Up</b> (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FOD-FFWG Meeting Review</li> <li>• Develop ranking priority matrix of data needs for Phase 3 WIPs. Members will individual rank.</li> <li>• Where do we go from here? Determine where assembled federal facility information for jurisdiction WIPs will go, CAST?</li> </ul>	<p>11:05-11:55</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Meeting Materials</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FOD-FFWG Meeting Minutes</li> <li>○ <a href="#">EPA's Expectation for Federal Lands and Facilities in Supporting Chesapeake Bay Jurisdiction's Phase III WIPs</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Meeting Notes</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There was a combined FOD and FFWG meeting on August 2<sup>nd</sup>. The FOD is the Federal Office Directors and it includes most of the agencies in the watershed. FFWG wanted to work with the FOD on getting the word out through the agencies to help facility managers who are struggling to keep up with BMP and data requirements because this work is important and needs to be managed properly. A follow up from the 8/2/18 meeting was to set up another meeting with federal agency representatives at the PSC or deputy director level. Jim Edwards noted that he would get back with Cosmos during the Regional Managers Meeting about next steps. A fall/November time frame was discussed.</li> <li>○ For Phase II WIPs, the Expectation document had a list of data needs federal agencies were required to compile and provide to jurisdictions, and in the end, there was a variety on how this information was used and incorporated. This time, it is not reasonable to think the entire list will be compiled by the federal agencies, provided to jurisdictions, and included in the Phase III WIPs. The new Expectations document list the data</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
		<p>needs/information thought necessary and says federal agencies are expected to provide them to jurisdictions or make them available to jurisdictions (page 3). One way to make the data/information available to jurisdictions is CAST. The FFWG needs to go through the list to determine which data needs are more critical or less critical to determine which should be put on CAST. Olivia Devereux said there are many options available and current federal agency information could be updated in CAST. Greg began reviewing the list on page 3 of Expectations document to decide if each item is appropriate for CAST or somewhere else. This was recorded in an excel spreadsheet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Complete “Information to Support Phase III WIPs” in the Expectations document</li> <li>○ <b>ACTION:</b> Check with CBP GIS Team on using Editor Tool to make changes to the inventory</li> </ul>
<p><b>Update, Wrap-up, Next Meeting</b> (Discussion Lead: Sarah Diebel)</p>	<p>11:55-12:00</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Looking Ahead</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BMP Crediting Reports and Gaps</li> <li>○ Jurisdiction electronic reporting MS4 and nonMS4 BMPs</li> <li>○ Verification</li> <li>○ Additional capacity on CAST</li> <li>○ Other natural resource outcomes/co-benefits being added to WIPs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b><u>Next Meeting:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Next meeting will be Tuesday September 11<sup>th</sup>, 10a.m. – 12p.m.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>