



Federal Facilities Workgroup Meeting Minutes

April 14, 2026
10:00-11:30 AM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: To inform the FFWG of practice adjustments for urban nutrient management, discuss the 2025 Annual Progress timeline and communications, and to brainstorm topics and ideal meeting frequency for FFWG meetings in 2026.

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The FFWG approved the August 2025 meeting minutes.

Action: The FFWG is currently holding off on the process of confirming new leadership for the Workgroup until Chesapeake Bay Program governance and structure recommendations have been finalized. However, if you are interested in the chair role, please contact Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) and Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).

Action: David Wood, CSN, provided an update on the Urban Nutrient Management BMPs resulting from the Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel Recommendations. If you have questions on the practice adjustments for Urban Nutrient Management, please reach out to David Wood (David@chesapeakestormwater.org) or view the following [webinar](#) for more information. Please note reporting templates have not yet been updated to accept these Phase 7 practices. However, those interested in reporting these practices in advance of the Phase 7 release are encouraged to reach out to jurisdictional leads to ensure reporting templates are adequately set up to allow for this reporting.

Action: Auston Smith, EPA, will continue to keep the federal agencies informed and engaged ahead of the release of the 2025 annual Progress scenario, anticipated in late summer 2026.

Action: Caroline Kleis, CRC, will compile, summarize, and post/distribute Mentimeter responses related to meeting frequency and topics of interest. The workgroup will pursue suggested topics including, but not limited to, the purchase of nutrient credits, a FFWG 101 overview, and additional topics as instructed by the Clean Water Goal Team/ Water Quality Goal Implementation Team at subsequent meetings.

Action: Workgroup members voiced an interest in maintaining the current bi-monthly meeting frequency or considering a shift to quarterly meetings. Auston Smith and Caroline Kleis, FFWG Staff, will keep the FFWG informed of any potential changes to meeting frequency as governance and structure recommendations are finalized.

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome, Introductions, Announcements

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, provided the FFWG with the following announcements:

- Approval of the August 2025 Meeting Minutes
 - Auston recapped the last meeting (August 2025). In particular, Auston reminded the group that they approved the Federal Facilities Data Layer and finalized the discussion on tracking and crediting of federal land use BMP types that were unassigned in CAST. Auston asked for the approval of the minutes from the August 2025 meeting, and no adjustments or objections were voiced by the group.
- Governance Framework, Management Board, and PSC Updates
 - Auston noted that the Workgroup is awaiting further insight from the Clean Water Goal Team (CWGT) and the Management Board/PSC on potential Workgroup or Goal Team restructuring. In the meantime, the FFWG will discuss both the Progress timeline and future meeting topics later in this meeting, in advance of future direction from the CWGT on how this Workgroup will function moving forward.
- Call for Chair and Vice Chair
 - The process for confirming new leadership for the FFWG has been put on hold while we await aforementioned PSC/MB and CWGT recommendations on structure. However, those interested in filling the Chair or Vice Chair role of the workgroup are encouraged to reach out to Auston and Caroline.

Decisions:

1. The FFWG approved the August 2025 meeting minutes.

Actions:

1. The FFWG is currently holding off on the process of confirming new leadership for the Workgroup until Chesapeake Bay Program governance and structure recommendations have been finalized. However, if you are interested in the chair role, please contact Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) and Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov).

Discussion Notes:

Kevin Du Bois: I just wanted to express my appreciation to the Federal Facilities Workgroup and the team behind the scenes, particularly with the validation of the boundaries for federal installations. I think that, although onerous, it needed to be done, and I appreciate the corrections for the record for Phase 7. So, again, I just wanted to share my appreciation for the work being done.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Kevin. It certainly was a group effort to get there but, yes, two major updates that really do improve the model that we will be using through 2040 at the very minimum. So, we really appreciate everyone's work there.

II. Federal Facilities Reporting Template for Urban Nutrient Management

Lead: David Wood, CSN

David Wood, CSN, informed the group of associated practice adjustments resulting from the finalized Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel Report, ahead of future progress years and noted potential future updates to the reporting templates that may be necessary. In particular, David noted that Phase 6 UNM BMPs are still available for reporting until the Phase 6 Model is sunset. The new BMPs (BMP #1: Urban Nutrient Management Plan With a Soil Test, BMP#2: Urban Nutrient Management Plan Without a Soil Test, and BMP#3: Non-Fertilized Turfgrass)

will also be made available as “planning BMPs” in Phase 6 CAST and included as draft in the appendix for use in planning scenarios. For annual progress reporting, the Phase 6 UNM BMPs (Low, Medium and High Risk) will map directly to the UNM Plan without a Soil Test Practice. Once the Phase 7 model is officially adopted, states will no longer be able to report the Phase 6 practices. Federal reporting templates in CAST are not yet updated with these changes, because they do not take effect until Phase 7. However, agencies were encouraged to begin documenting the following: Name, contact information and locator data for the owner, and landscape manager/responsible entity; system for maintaining signed commitment by the owner/property manager that they intend to adhere to the following clipping management practices.

Actions:

1. David Wood, CSN, provided an update on the Urban Nutrient Management BMPs resulting from the Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel Recommendations. If you have questions on the practice adjustments for Urban Nutrient Management, please reach out to David Wood (David@chesapeakestormwater.org) or view the following [webinar](#) for more information. Please note reporting templates have not yet been updated to accept these Phase 7 practices. However, those interested in reporting these practices in advance of the Phase 7 release are encouraged to reach out to jurisdictional leads to ensure reporting templates are adequately set up to allow for this reporting.

Discussion Notes:

David Wood (in chat): Link to full UNM Webinar:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G34WFGcrHAW>

Caroline Kleis (in chat): Today's meeting materials, including David's slides, are accessible on today's calendar page: <https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/federal-facilities-workgroup-meeting-april-2026>

Caroline Kleis (in chat): The Final UNM report is available here:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/FINAL-UNM-Report_Approved-11.24.25.pdf

Kevin DuBois: Thanks, David. I didn't know these wouldn't be available until after Phase 7 was instituted. So, these are annual BMPs for the non-fertilization BMP, correct?

David Wood: Yes, that's correct.

Kevin Du Bois: How far back in the record after Phase 7 is in effect would we have to go back and record annual BMPs to get those credits, or does that not matter? Once they are done in the current year we would get that amount of credit. To maintain the credit, they would have to be re-reported annually going forward. Is that right? I am just trying to understand mechanically how we would do this.

David Wood: My understanding is that, right now, you can put the Phase 7 BMPs in as planning BMPs. Auston, correct me if I am wrong, do those get turned into active once Phase 7 takes place?

Auston Smith: Yes.

David Wood: So, you would begin entering them now as planning BMPs and then when Phase 7 is active, they become active.

Kevin Du Bois: But my understanding is the reporting templates are not set up to allow us to do that.

David Wood: That is also my understanding as of this moment.

Auston Smtih: For Phase 6 BMPs, no template changes are needed but between now and the finalization of Phase 7 (2029/2030), that would need to be adjusted to capture that and help build out that history.

Kevin Du Bois: Once the template is updated in anticipation of Phase 7, then we would have to submit amendments to the historical data in the template to get credit? Or do we just do it one time?

Auston Smith: If in 2029, hypothetically, you have a lot of your data records built out for this process, I think that you could just submit them all to a single jurisdiction and, if they have the time in their reporting for that year, they can submit that entire history of years. It wouldn't just need to be 2029 Progress or whatever it might be. Am I getting to the point of your question?

Kevin Du Bois: I am a little confused. I see Dylan's got his hand up. Maybe he can help. We could hypothetically go back and amend the historical data that we submit to the state. Since it is an annual BMP, and you have to report it every year, maybe we don't have to go back in time. We just have to do it in 2029 when Phase 7 is in effect and then every year after to show that we're continuing that activity. But I'll cede to Dylan because maybe he can help me.

Dylan Burgevin: Speaking for Maryland, we submit all of our data every single year. If you are reporting an annual BMP for clipping management practices in 2024 that a DoD facility was doing, we're going to include that. But, because it's an annual BMP, you obviously wouldn't get credit for it in Progress '26. So, we will include all of your "backwards reporting BMPs" every single year as long as that's in your data submission. That's not going to get dropped on our end. However, in that individual year, you won't necessarily receive credit for it. Does that make sense?

Cassie Davis (in chat): That's how we submit in NY. We report the entire BMP history record every year to account for updates to previous years.

Kevin Du Bois: Since it is an annual BMP, you get that credit the year you submit it. To continue to get the credit going into the future, you have to say I'm continuing to do that activity, just like with street sweeping. So, maybe you don't have to go backwards and correct the historical data. Maybe, once it is available, you apply for it. Then going forward, you keep saying, hey, we're continuing to do it. Just like street sweeping or any of the other annual BMPs.

Alicia Ritzenthaler: I can chime in on how DC would address that. Kevin, you are correct in that some BMPs only get credit for the one year. If you would like, at least for DC, to start including them now, we can include them and it will just be ignored by CAST until they are considered to be BMPs. We already report BMPs which don't currently get Bay Program credit, and CAST just ignores them. So, if you want them in, we can start including them in whenever. But, in terms of needing to go back and credit it, I think that would only be applicable if you wanted to rerun previous year's models.

Kevin Du Bois: When we run the CAST analysis for Progress, it doesn't do us any good to go backwards. We would just do it in that Progress year, say 2029 when Phase 7 is in effect, and then that full credit for that annual practice would show us our Progress. Then, going forward, we would just continue to submit it. I was trying to do a quick calculation, but I didn't have enough time while David was speaking. For us, it's maybe 70,000 acres of non-fertilized turf. So, for DoD, it's a big chunk.

Dylan Burgevin: I know that in terms of reporting, we have those templates and those will be updated for Phase 7. However, because this is not a BMP that fits with our standard urban MS4 reporting, which is how we process a lot of things, Maryland is looking at developing a survey that would capture both homeowner as well as federal/county reporting for this. So, I'd say, Kevin, or any other facilities who are interested in reporting this, definitely just reach out to me. I don't want to speak for other states or jurisdictions, but maybe reach out to them as well, just to make sure that we include you all in the process as we are looking to develop this because there is a sort of institutional shift or change that has to happen.

Alicia Ritzenthaler: That's a good point. I don't think our template will change for DC as a jurisdiction, but we will need to add the BMP to the template. So, I am not 100% sure if we have it in our template yet or not. So, I guess that might be the only asterisk with reporting them

immediately. This next year, we'd have to confirm that it's in our template. But we will certainly get it added for Phase 7.

Auston Smith: Great question, Kevin. Thank you, Dylan and Alicia, for your insight on how it's done in your neck of the woods. Any other follow-up questions or comments for David?

Dylan Burgevin: David, I just wanted to clarify one thing. I know BMP 1, 2, and 3 can get a little bit confusing. So, just to clarify, if you have an urban nutrient management plan drafted, you are reporting that as either 1 or 2, you also need to maintain those clipping management practices, correct? So, the first two BMPs are kind of inclusive of that third BMP. Is that correct?

David Wood: That's correct. The non-fertilized turf has an additional kind of criteria around that coverage condition, the 15% bare spot threshold that's in there as well. But you are right in terms of the turf length and leaving the clippings. Those are also part of the best practices for the nutrient management plans.

Auston Smith: Thanks a lot, everyone, for your forward-thinking thoughts. This is really helpful. I really appreciate the overview, David.

III. Progress Communications Surrounding 2025 Annual Progress Release

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, gave a short overview of the anticipated 2025 Annual Progress release timeline and associated deadlines, notably the April 1st deadline for BMP submissions and a status update on the finalization of the Progress scenario. Time was made for the group to discuss necessary late spring/early summer communications surrounding the Progress release.

Actions:

1. Auston Smith, EPA, will continue to keep the federal agencies informed and engaged ahead of the release of the 2025 annual Progress scenario, anticipated in late summer 2026.

Discussion Notes:

Kevin Du Bois: If I heard you correctly, the official Progress release won't happen until late July or early August. Do you have a sense of where that stacks up with releases in the past? The reason why I ask is we do an internal assessment of Progress, and we always compare our CAST scenarios to the partnership, and there's always a difference. We try to understand the reasons for those differences. Some of it is because the Army Corps of Engineers BMPs/loads get looped into ours. So, we try to understand all that. A release not until July or August really throws off our whole production schedule that we've had for a decade on understanding our progress. Is that normal for the release to be that late in the year? I know that one of the things that holds it up is a lot of the agricultural BMPs. Of course, that does not apply to us. So, is there a way to get a non-official, earlier release, not including the agricultural BMPs, so that we can sort of stay on our production timeline for our internal Progress reporting?

Auston Smith: To your first question, no. In the past few years, we have typically tried to put out Progress scenario by April or May. This being a target year, additional communication steps needed to be put in place, along with the extension that the entire partnership kind of went through regarding the April 1st deadline being moved back as opposed to it being early February. So, in addition to the two-month Progress timeline extension, and it being a target year, it is probably going to be late July/August. However, maybe there will be a couple of small tweaks to the partnership data in the coming weeks. But, before late July/April, I will be sending out another note to Progress Buddies highlighting that we had a change, it should or should not affect X, Y, or Z. Please just re-download the data. At that point, Kevin, I think that you should feel comfortable pursuing DoW analysis to keep on track with your timeline. When would be the latest that would still be relevant to you all?

Kevin Du Bois: I would have to look at our timeline. But, I know that we have people looking at those biweekly updates to see what is changing. I guess I don't know about this "Progress Buddies" group. I hope we are on that. If not, please add us.

Auston Smith: You and a few of your other colleagues at DoW are on that email. I can confirm that.

IV. Future Meeting Topics and Frequency

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

The group was asked to provide their input on potential topics for the FFWG to explore at future FFWG meetings in 2026 and preferred meeting frequency. Feedback was solicited through a Mentimeter activity and group discussion. Note that while we captured group feedback on meeting frequency and topics of interest for 2026, we may receive additional direction from the CWGT or MB/PSC that further shape the agendas moving forward.

Responses from the Mentimeter activity were read aloud to the group by Auston Smith, EPA, and a list of responses has been compiled and summarized by key theme, accessible [here](#).

Actions:

1. Caroline Kleis, CRC, will compile, summarize, and post/distribute Mentimeter responses related to meeting frequency and topics of interest. The workgroup will pursue suggested topics including, but not limited to, the purchase of nutrient credits, a FFWG 101 overview, and additional topics as instructed by the Clean Water Goal Team/ Water Quality Goal Implementation Team at subsequent meetings.
2. Workgroup members voiced an interest in maintaining the current bi-monthly meeting frequency or considering a shift to quarterly meetings. Auston Smith and Caroline Kleis, FFWG Staff, will keep the FFWG informed of any potential changes to meeting frequency as governance and structure recommendations are finalized.

Discussion Notes:

Meeting Frequency

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): I would rather keep the bi-monthly drumbeat so that it's on the calendar and then cancel if we have to.

Kevin Du Bois (in chat): In the new structure and governance, there's precious little interaction/forum for state/fed interaction.

Kaylyn Gootman (in chat): I could see that point changing my vote from quarterly to bi-monthly.

Meeting Topics of Interest

Auston Smith: Updating the reporting template for the purchase of nutrient credits- I know that we talked about this in August, though it wasn't a decisional item. Kevin, if I can call on you, I know that this was a topic brought forward by DoW. Maybe in 2023, you all passed legislation to begin to track them and now have that process in place for next year's Progress. I know that we had some questions, but I think that that would be a great topic for us to have a more formal back and forth on, maybe at the next workgroup meeting. Is there anything you wanted to clarify on that point?

Kevin Du Bois: The last time we talked about it, I think there was some concern from the jurisdiction side about expending the effort to update the reporting templates without firm assurance that the DoD actually has that authority. But, I am here to report today that the Navy has received that authority. So, they're going to be looking forward to purchasing credits in this

calendar year for sure. I am not sure about the federal year or whether it would be before or after October 1st. So, I would imagine by the 2027 calendar year in our data submissions we would be wanting to submit the purchase of nutrient credits. The authorization is for the entire DoW, but my expectation is once the Navy does it and the word gets out, then the other services are going to jump right into it.

Auston Smith: One question we had in August was working with jurisdictional partners to account for whatever practice it was that gave that credit to ensure there was no duplication or double counting. So, as that work also needs to be discussed, I think this is a good forum for that.

Kevin Du Bois: You are talking about the seller submitting for credit and then the buyer?

Auston Smith: Right. But, absolutely, that's a great topic.

Additional Mentimeter responses were read aloud to the group.

Cassie Davis (in chat): We have a good starting point for FFWG 101 from 2018:

<https://www.chesapeakebay.net/projects/ffwg-new-member-training-presentation>

Kevin Du Bois: With the work going into Phase 7 updates and the year of review, then potentially the new WIPs that will come after the Phase 7 model is developed and there are new federal planning targets, I just think there's going to be a lot for this group to talk about. Again, this will be a very valuable forum for state and federal interaction as all of those things are cranking through the system. Once that all gets established by 2030, then maybe the meeting schedule can be revisited and maybe it's not as critical. But, there's just going to be a lot of moving parts for the next four or five years. So, that's why I was arguing for a more frequent time frame. I'm not even sure we can anticipate all the issues that are going to arise through all these changes to the structure and governance, the Watershed Agreement, Phase 7, and all that stuff.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Kevin. Certainly a lot that we are waiting on, but that point is well taken about a lot more needing to be done in the coming years and then "foot off the gas", so to speak, more in 2030. Not on implementation, but on these planning efforts that we are all going through. So, thank you. Caroline and I will be working to get a summary of these responses and the minutes out to you all in the next couple of weeks. So, thank you for helping us populate that.

Dylan Burgevin (in chat): I have to hop off for another meeting. If anyone has questions on UNM reporting in Maryland please reach out: dylan.burgevin1@maryland.gov

V. Wrap-Up

Lead: Caroline Kleis, CRC

VI. Adjourn

Next Meeting: June 9, 2026

Attendees:

Auston Smith, EPA

Caroline Kleis, CRC

Liz Dawson, FWS

David Wood, CSN

Kattie Iwanski, NASA

Ande Remington, NASA

Lindsey Davis, USDA ARS

Arianna Johns, VA DEQ

Mike McMahon, MDE

Rachel Chang, NOAA

Alicia Ritzenthaler, DOEE

Samuel Canfield, WVDEP

Dylan Burgevin, MDE

Katie Brownson, USFS

Kevin Du Bois, DoW

Cassie Davis, NY DEC

Kaylyn Gootman, EPA

Andy Oetman, GSA