

# Federal Facilities WIP Coordination and Review of Reduction Targets

Chesapeake Bay Program  
Management Board Meeting  
September 11, 2014

# Federal Facilities – Look Back

- 2013 Federal Assessment and EO progress report documented many constructive activities
- 2013 Progress Reporting limited; few agencies with some formatting and delivery issues
- Agencies working to complete BMP inventories and opportunity assessments and aligning budgets
- Strongest resource opportunities occur when there is a permit or regulatory requirement

# **Examples of BMPs implemented on federal land during 2013 that were reported to the jurisdictions and credited for progress toward achieving reduction targets**

**District of Columbia** - 12 acres of urban lands treated by stormwater BMPs reported by four different federal agencies.

**Delaware** – No federally managed land in the jurisdiction's portion of the watershed

**Maryland** - 355 acres of federal implementation completed by several agencies.

**New York** - stormwater BMP from the Horseheads Armory facility which is managed by the US Army.

**Pennsylvania** – no BMPs reported by the jurisdiction

**Virginia** - 8 acres of stormwater BMPs as well as street sweeping from NASA Langley Research Center, and 558 acres of forest harvesting practices on National Forest Service lands.

**West Virginia** - 5 acres of tree planting on the US Fish and Wildlife Service's National Conservation Training Center

# Summary of Agencies and Data Submittal for 2013

BMP Progress	Two-Year Milestones	EISA 438
Smithsonian, NPS, NASA-Langley, FWS, Army, NIST, GSA	NPS, DoD (programmatic EO), NASA-Langley, GSA	FWS, NASA, GSA, Army, NPS

# Example of Fields Included in the Progress Reporting Spreadsheet (Md)

Field Name	Description
CONTACT_ENTITY*	Entity reporting BMPs
FACILITY_NAME*	Facility where BMPs are located
CONTACT_NAME*	Contact Name
CONTACT_TITLE	Contact title, job title (director of xyz)
ADDRESS	Contact address
CITY	Contact city
ZIP	Contact zip code
PHONE*	Contact phone number 10 digits, no dashes (numbers only)
EMAIL*	Contact email address
BMP_ID*	Unique table ID number
STRU_ID*	Structural identifier
STRU_NAME*	Name of Structure
STRU_TYPE*	BMP Structure Type (BMP, Non-structural BMP, ESD Practice or Water Quality Improvement Project)
BMP_TYPE*	Type of BMP structure (Use MDE BMP codes)
MD_NORTH*	Maryland grid coordinate (NAD 83 meters) Northing
MD_EAST*	Maryland grid coordinate (NAD 83 meters) Easting
ADDRESS	Structure address
CITY	Structure city
ZIP	Structure zip
ON_OFF_SITE	On or off-site structure
CON_PURPOSE*	New development (NEWD), redevelopment (REDE), New restoration project (NRP) or restoration of existing facility (REF)
PRIOR_BMP	Use if new BMP is a conversion retrofit of previous BMP
LINEAR_FT	Linear feet of a stream restoration project
POUNDS_COLLECTED	Pounds of Trash Collected
IMP_ACRES*	Equivalent impervious acres treated
URBAN_ACRES*	Total Urban acres treated (Use this cell for pervious and impervious acres)
RAINFALL	The amount of rainfall this practice is designed to capture (needed for water quality performance standards only)
BUILT_DATE*	Construction Completion Date
REPORTING_DATE*	Date BMP Initially entered into database
REPORTING_YEAR	State Fiscal Reporting year
BMP_STATUS	BMP status (pass/fail)
INSP_DATE	Most recent inspection date
MAIN_DATE	Last date maintenance was performed
REINSP_STATUS	Re-inspection status (pass/fail)
REINSP_DATE	Re-inspection date if needed

# Federal Facilities – Look Ahead

- New BayFAST tool for BMP planning at the facility scale
  - [www.BayFAST.org](http://www.BayFAST.org)
- 2014 Data Call Letter to be issued by EPA R3 Regional Administrator plus follow-up memo from EPA CBPO Director with jurisdiction-specific spreadsheets on how federal facilities should report BMP implementation (progress) data
- Coordination forums
  - DC Stormwater MOU
  - Md/DoD Partnership
  - Va two-year 14/15 milestone for coordination

# What Does the TMDL say About Targets?

- **Jurisdictions** are expected to further **distribute LA and WLA** allocations among local level target areas such as counties. These more local targets also could **include federal facilities**.
- Include federal agency actions, programs, policies, and resources necessary to achieve **federal facility-specific load reduction targets in jurisdictions' Phase II WIPs**
- Federal facility-specific target loads are expected to be included in the jurisdictions' Phase II WIPs in 2011 **via one of two approaches**:
  - (a) jurisdictions could establish **explicit load reduction expectations** for federal facilities as part of the Phase II WIP process; or
  - (b) on the basis of **broad load reduction goals** established by the jurisdiction, individual federal facilities/installations could develop Federal Facility Implementation Plans (FFIPs)

Note:

- In either case, **states and District decide what loading reduction goals to propose for federal facilities** in its WIP. (p. 25 EO Strategy)

# Approaches to Federal Targets From Jurisdiction Phase II WIPs

Note: In general, targets were established at the same level of reduction as established for non-federal land owners

- De
  - **24%** for nitrogen, **20%** for phosphorus, and cap (**0%**) sediment
- DC
  - **Reduce by the same percentage as the District requires of itself in the MS4 and “Other” areas**
  - Loadings **calculated** for Federal agencies in the CSO drainage area based **on agency-specific acreage**

# Approaches to Federal Targets From Jurisdiction Phase II WIPs

- Md
  - **MS4 Phase II target** is nutrient and sediment reduction by **treating 20% of existing developed acres**
  - Reduction estimated on the basis of **average reduction efficiency of 25% for total nitrogen**. This strategy **will also apply to federal lands**.
  - **Retrofits** on a schedule **similar to that required of local governments**.
  - **Final target strategy informed by and developed using local and federal load reduction scenarios**
  - **Broad levels of effort for implementation on federal lands** to meet aggregate reduction targets and **more detailed planning targets were provided to federal agencies**
  - **Identified individual planning targets for a number of the largest federal facilities** in Maryland that are Phase II MS4s

# Approaches to Federal Targets From Jurisdiction Phase II WIPs

- NY – None specified
- Pa
  - Identifies federal small **MS4s** and requirement for **management plans**
  - Discusses **county planning targets** and suggested federal facilities should use those targets (when developed)
- Va
  - **Reduce 9% of nitrogen, 16% of phosphorus, and 20% of sediment** loads from **impervious** regulated acres
  - **Reduce 6 percent of nitrogen, 7.25 percent of phosphorus and 8.75 percent sediment** loads from **pervious** regulated acreage
- WV
  - Developed lands sector – strategy is to **keep** loads from this sector **equal to those in the 2010NA scenario**

# Federal Facility Targets

## Brainstorming Other Possible Approaches

### **Near Term (thru 2017):**

- (1) Facility Level Targets: Jurisdictions (working with fed agencies) identify major federal facilities and lands for targeted load reductions (% or lbs. to be determined). Federal facilities use BayFAST to determine BMPs that would achieve targets.
- (2) Agency Aggregate Targets: EPA and agencies calculate federal land acreage by agency and work with jurisdictions to set load reduction targets on an agency-by-agency basis (% or lbs. to be determined) within each jurisdiction.

# Federal Facility Targets

## Brainstorming Other Possible Approaches

### **Long Term (2018-2025):**

- (1) Federal lands identified as a separate land use in Phase 6 model. Jurisdictions identify specific load reduction targets (by % or lbs.) in Phase III WIPs.
- (2) BayFAST 2.0 enables federal facilities to calculate needed load reductions based on actual land use and to directly report BMP implementation progress to jurisdictions for use in their input decks.

# Questions Related to Federal Facility Targets

- Are the WIP II targets not optimal and is a new approach needed? More specific or explicit targets?
- For best traction, who should set the targets? EPA, federal agencies, jurisdictions, jointly?
- What should improved federal target be based on?
  - How close does it have to be to model results?
- What can we do now (prior to 2017)?
- What will change in the Phase III WIP process and the Phase 6 WSM that could impact this issue?
- What are the resource implications and on whom?