



Federal Facilities Workgroup Meeting Minutes

June 9, 2026
10:00AM-12:00PM

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

Purpose: To inform the FFWG of relevant announcements and to discuss next steps for the FFWG under the proposed Clean Water Goal Team Workgroup structure.

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Decision: The Federal Facilities Workgroup approved the [April 2026 meeting minutes](#).

Action: Caroline Kleis, FFWG Staffer, will contact Federal Facilities Workgroup voting members via email and request their preference on the following options by June 17th:

- Option 1: Integration of the functions of the Federal Facilities Workgroup into the Watershed Technical Workgroup.
- Option 2: Federal Facilities Workgroup and Watershed Technical Workgroup remain separate workgroups under the Clean Water Goal Team.

Post Meeting Note: Preferences have been recorded and posted to the [June calendar page](#). The majority of members indicated their preference for Option #1 (integration of the functions of the Federal Facilities Workgroup (FFWG) into the Watershed Technical Workgroup), and one vote was received for Option #2. This feedback was shared with the Clean Water Goal Team (CWGT) at their June 22-23rd meeting. The CWGT subsequently voted to incorporate the functions of the FFWG into the Watershed Technical Workgroup.

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome, Introductions, Announcements

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, walked the group through the following announcements:

- Approval of the [April 2026 Meeting Minutes](#)
 - The Federal Facilities Workgroup approved the [April 2026 meeting minutes](#).
- Jurisdictional Follow-Up Regarding BMP Credit Report Analysis
 - Auston Smith, EPA, noted that DoW would be conducting outreach to some partners about reported federal data. Outreach is ongoing.

Decisions:

1. The Federal Facilities Workgroup approved the [April 2026 meeting minutes](#).

Discussion Notes:

Auston Smith: Angela, was there anything additional that Kevin or others at DoW wanted to say about the report that you produced with Brown and Caldwell, which you're doing some outreach on?

Angela Jones: I discussed that with him briefly, but not at this time. I think he is mainly focusing on the goals and the topics for both groups.

II. The Future Role of the FFWG in CWGT Structure

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA & Caroline Kleis, CRC

Auston Smith, EPA, and Caroline Kleis, CRC, recapped the discussions held at the April and May CWGT meetings and the subsequent CWGT decision via email on the proposed workgroup structure under the CWGT. It was noted that at the May Clean Water Goal Team meeting, some FFWG members shared concerns about removing the FFWG Workgroup from the proposed structure and integrating the functions into the WTWG. The FFWG box was ultimately added back on to the structure strawman, with a request for additional discussion to take place amongst FFWG members at this June 9th meeting. As such, the following topics were addressed in the presentation and subsequent discussion, and time was made for participants to discuss paths forward for the FFWG.

- Overview of the Clean Water Goal Team and Clean Water Goal Team's Proposed Structure
- Exploring Potential Integration of the FFWG's Functions into the Watershed Technical Workgroup
- Potential Concerns
- Desired Monthly Meeting Schedule
- Discussion on Federal Facilities Workgroup Leadership
- Next Steps for Workgroup

Actions:

1. Caroline Kleis, FFWG Staffer, will contact Federal Facilities Workgroup voting members via email and request their preference on the following options by June 17th:
 - Option 1: Integration of the functions of the Federal Facilities Workgroup into the Watershed Technical Workgroup.
 - Option 2: Federal Facilities Workgroup and Watershed Technical Workgroup remain separate workgroups under the Clean Water Goal Team.

Post Meeting Note: Preferences have been recorded and posted to the [June calendar page](#). The majority of members indicated their preference for Option #1 (integration of the functions of the Federal Facilities Workgroup into the Watershed Technical Workgroup), and one vote was received for Option #2. This feedback was shared with the Clean Water Goal Team at their June 22-23rd meeting. The CWGT subsequently voted to incorporate the functions of the FFWG into the Watershed Technical Workgroup.

Discussion Notes:

Angela Jones: I think the main point is continuing to be able to have a voice. Even if it is decided to merge the two, [we want to make sure there is] adequate time during the meeting structure for federal facilities to have those discussions. So, I think that is the main concern- not wanting to

lose the voice or it being lost in some of the other issues that may not concern Federal Facilities. So, just allowing that space for federal partners to come together and have those discussions is the main thing for me and Kevin.

Bill Keeling (in chat): If FFWG is merged into the WTWG would that mean a new voting member of the WTWG?

Lee McDonnell (in chat): Not sure that anything for the structure of the WTWG would need to change. This would be an opportunity for the topics that are discussed at the current FFWG would to be discussed at the WTWG.

Auston Smith: I think that is a question we would need to answer, Bill. I don't know that necessarily the structure would need to change, but maybe if it's a Federal Facilities topic and there isn't consensus, it goes to the FMC. If it is a Watershed Technical Workgroup related item, it really needs to be elevated on the Clean Water Goal Team side. Caroline, the Chairs, and I of the Watershed Technical Workgroup would just kind of iron out what is a fed-specific topic on each agenda versus what is specific to the Watershed Technical Workgroup. So, overall we are trying to save Federal Agencies time by not asking you to participate in 12 meetings a year.

Bill Keeling (in chat): Federal MS4s in VA are required to report BMP data by COB October 1 each year.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Bill, for the correction on October 1st each year. I need to correct that in my presentation. So maybe the quarterly schedule could shift. This is very straw man. I thought that those might be four months that we could cherry pick. The Federal Facilities Workgroup did specify quarterly meetings, so maybe that's not every three months. Maybe there's a two-month gap and then a four-month gap. It's whatever makes sense. Maybe if it can be a regular schedule, that will help relieve any confusion on this proposed integration. But thank you, Bill. I appreciate that.

Tyler Trostle (in chat): I'd like to comment on behalf of PA, with support from two WTWG at large members, that we support the integration of the FFWG into the WTWG. This possible restructuring would dovetail nicely within the WTWG.

Alicia Ritzenthaler (In chat): DC also supports integrating the FFWG with the WTWG.

Angela Jones: Just so I am understanding, the proposed restructuring would involve the four quarterly meetings. Would they only be specific to federal agencies for those four or would they be half or a portion of the meeting? What is the timeframe for those quarterly meetings? Would it be entirely Federal Facility [related] or would there be allotted time for federal facilities within the regular Watershed Technical workgroup meeting?

Auston Smith: Good distinction. The idea would be that say, come August, that's a Federal Facilities major meeting. So, we have X, Y, Z agenda topics specific to federal agencies. However, let's say I noted something should change about the NEIEN Appendix, which is something that the Watershed Technical Workgroup (without the insight of the Federal Facilities) would typically approve. Maybe we wanted that voted on in August. In this hypothetical situation, I would place that Watershed Technical Workgroup specific item at the very end of the agenda. So, anything that the Federal Facilities Workgroup wanted and needed to focus on that month would have priority. Then we could have the necessary Watershed Technical Workgroup specific items and give federal agencies a chance to jump off if it is no longer relevant. So, generally that would be the way it could be done. If there were so many topics from the Federal Agency perspective that we couldn't get to the Watershed Technical Workgroup piece that needed to be voted on, I think we could be amenable to an email vote. But, this would require a little bit of flexibility. Generally, each of those four months would prioritize Federal Facilities items. If there's anything absolutely necessary from the Watershed Technical angle, we can save it until the end.

Angela Jones: Ok. Then you all would still be co-chairs, or would you all be looking for a federal partner to also assist with those meetings as a co-chair?

Auston Smith: That is a good question. Lee, I might turn to you here. We have a new chair and co-chair for the Watershed Technical Workgroup. Were an integration to be hypothetically agreed upon, would we want to adjust our chair/co-chair structure to be different for the quarterly Federal Facilities conversations? I think that would need to be ironed out. But, I think that's something that could be ironed out once we make this decision one way or another.

Angela Jones: To go along with Bill's question, as far as the voting, would that change the voting structure also if it were to be combined? I am assuming the name of the group would stay the same.

Auston Smith: Right. I think the name of the group would just stay Watershed Technical Workgroup, but Federal Facilities would know that every quarter it is focusing on federal facilities. Lee, is there anything I maybe missed?

Lee McDonnell: I don't think anything would need to change with the structure of the Watershed Technical Workgroup, but it would certainly be welcome if someone from one of the Federal agencies as a data reporter would like to help formulate agendas, topics, etc. At this point, they've been looking for a chair/co-chair for a long time, and no one has volunteered. So, if somebody wanted to volunteer to assist with that agenda setting, that would be great.

Auston Smith: Thanks, Angela. Does that sound ok generally?

Angela Jones: Yes. I probably will defer to Kevin, so we will probably respond by the 22nd date via email because I am not a voting member. So, we will defer to vote.

Auston Smith: Of course. Let me also correct myself. We would need it by the 22nd. In our email out to membership, we will request by COB on the 21st so we can send a note to the Clean Water Goal Team ahead of time. Thanks.

Angela Jones: Ok, the 21st. Gotcha. I will make a note and let him know.

Auston Smith: Thank you. We will send an update to the Workgroup as well after this call. I also saw New York and DC's comments/reactions in the chat kind of supporting what Pennsylvania put forward. Any other questions, comments, next steps, or other considerations from the group? Generally, we will be trying to reach out to you if we haven't heard from you on this call or in the chat directly with your indication of a vote. We will be reaching out and trying to get that by COB on the 21st. If you are not comfortable putting your thoughts forward now, we will be reaching out so we can get that in the next two weeks.

Angela Jones: If we decided to say that we wanted to keep them separate, would we also have to have a co chair/chair identified at that time in order to support that?

Auston Smith: Yes, I think so. If you have a dissenting opinion but you don't necessarily want to step forward for a chair or co-chair, we'd still want to hear from you. But, it would be great to have an immediate suggestion as well.

Angela Jones: Ok, gotcha. That makes sense. I will definitely talk with Kevin, and I understand that would be a stipulation if we did vote to keep it separate and also that there are still some other details to iron out if it is the restructuring. Thank you.

Auston Smith: Thank you, Angela!

Bill Keeling (in chat): Have a concern about Federal topics superseding WTWG topics considering p7 development issues.

Auston Smith: Bill, considering Phase 7 development issues, I will try and play this out hypothetically. Say this integration were to happen in the next three or four months (September/October). The Watershed Technical Workgroup will have some Phase 7 review items or pre-review, like getting people ready and other items that we would want to discuss. Your concern would be about putting that at the end of the agenda after Federal Facilities Workgroup items because it wouldn't get the time that it needs. We, the WTWG leadership team, would just need to be planning ahead. There hasn't been a month that I can remember where a Federal Facilities Workgroup meeting agenda was so robust that items couldn't be discussed from a Watershed Technical Workgroup lens at the end. I think if time ran out, we could be flexible on this one. I fully recognize that Phase 7 is a major priority and that timeline is of the utmost

importance. So, I think I would just be working with leadership to ensure that if it is a burning urgent Phase 7 topic that must be decided upon and it needs 45 minutes of discussion, I think we just need to be communicating that as ahead of time as we can. Hypothetically if this ends up on one of the meetings that the Federal Facilities Workgroup is participating in, I think we would just need to be coordinating more heavily up front to ensure that no one feels like their topic is getting cut off and modelers for Phase 7 aren't getting their items pushed back further. So, I recognize that concern, Bill. That would need to be something that we are flexible on in different months as we see those items come up. It was raised by another jurisdiction as well. So, I think this group has been flexible and efficient enough in this past year to show that we can make whatever decisions are needed each month on Phase 7. I am hoping that a lot of the major decisions are behind us and it's more review in the next 6-9 months. As a conflict arises, we'd be working to ensure that everything was spoken to and it had the right amount of time.

Angela Jones: To piggyback on what Bill was saying, that was one of the discussions Kevin and I had- not taking away from those topics. Also, the Phase 7 WIP is a concern for Federal Facilities as far as wanting to establish equitable and agreed upon methodologies that are a concern for the federal family as well. So, I agree with what he's saying. That could be a joint topic that affects both of us and, like you said Auston, it may take some additional coordination if it does fall on one of those quarterly meetings where Federal Facilities are supposed to have cognizance over more of the meeting. But, that was a concern for us too- not taking away from the Watershed Technical Workgroup time as well.

Bill Keeling (in chat): You were not around for CAST 19 to CAST 23.

Auston Smith: Thank you. Bill, I've heard all about that. I was only there at the very end of CAST 23. So, yes, I recognize the partnership can stumble upon problems that supersede any expectation of what might be expected as far as the timeline of correction. So, I fully recognize that. Whatever the group is to decide by the 21st, we will let folks know how this landed so no one feels like they are in limbo. Caroline and I will be reaching out today or tomorrow with a follow up from this meeting and a request for you or your agency/jurisdiction to provide a vote, unless we have it here in the chat, so that we can send a final decision to the Clean Water Goal Team before their in person meeting. The 21st is a Sunday now that I am thinking about it, so maybe the 19th.

Lee McDonnell: Auston, could I ask that you send them in by the 17th? The 19th is also a federal holiday, and we want to give a little time to react before the Clean Water Goal Team meeting on that following Monday the 22nd. Thank you.

Andy Oetman (in chat): GSA also supports integrating the FFWG with the WTWG. Thanks!

Auston Smith: Thank you. Ok, so a little over a week. Hopefully that is amenable for your schedules. We've tried to put this on your radars for as long as possible, but I recognize that it's been kind of a quick turnaround, and we're asking for you to consider a lot in some respects. Thank you, Andy. I see your comment in the chat. Much appreciated.

Angela Jones: If there were a restructuring, when would this occur?

Auston Smith: Hypothetically, if it is agreed upon in June. I would think that we could begin to plan towards August as the first FFWG/WTWG quarterly meeting. That would be what I have in my head. If we needed more time to think about the combination and push that back another month towards November, that's ok. But, that kind of seems like a long gap to me. So, I think we can be flexible with that. I would love to have the FFWG and WTWG meet, as it is agreed upon, in August or September at the latest from now. I wouldn't want us to get too far into Progress and not touch base.

Angela Jones: It was still uncertain if there would be an additional voting member if there was a restructuring. If the two groups merge, will there be a new voting member?

Auston Smith: I don't believe so. We will need to work with our existing at-large membership structure. I know that Kevin is, for example, an at-large member already at the WTWG. So, that could be an immediate next step for combination.

Angela Jones: So, as far as DoW, he is already one for both anyways I believe.

Auston Smith: He is. Correct. He is already an at-large member.

Ande Remington (in chat): NASA also supports the integration. Thanks!

Dylan Burgevin (in chat): Maryland would find it really helpful to have our federal partners in the WTWG. We often discuss matters that are pertinent to both federal facilities and other MS4 reporting partners.

Auston Smith: Maryland would find it helpful to have federal partners in the WTWG, recognizing how many of them are on MS4s. That's really helpful. Then thank you for the vote from NASA as well. We will record that. We are approaching the first hour. Are there any other overarching comments or questions from the group? Does everyone feel clear about what is required from them by the 17th and what the foundational questions are that you can be asking yourself and others in your federal agency to determine the next best steps? We've tried to really ensure everyone's got all of the information they need to make an informed decision. Not seeing any other comments, questions, or hands, maybe we can move to do the wrap up and call the meeting to an end.

Rene Senos (in chat): NPS supports integrating the FFWG with the WTWG. Hoping this integration builds more capacity for the overall CB pollution reduction effort, and provides more resources for the reporting agencies.

III. Wrap-Up

Lead: Caroline Kleis, CRC

IV. Adjourn

Next Meeting: August 11, 2026 from 10:00AM-12:00PM

Attendees:

Auston Smith, EPA

Caroline Kleis, CRC

Karl Wilson, USDA-OPEM

Lindsey Evans, NASA

Bill Keeling, VA DEQ

Tyler Trostle, PA DEP

Jessica Schrader

Angela Jones, DoW

Arianna Johns, VA DEQ

Jason Rinker, USACE

Dylan Burgevin, MDE

Lee McDonnell, EPA

Brittany Long, APG DPW

Katie Brownson, USFS

Bo Williams, EPA

Kaylyn Gootman, EPA

Scott Settle, WVDEP

Christina Lyerly, MDE

Rene Senos, NPS

Lindsey David, USDA ARS

Coral Howe, USGS

Shelly Frie, Jacobs

Alicia Ritzenthaler, DOEE

Cassie Davis, NYSDEC

Andy Oetman, GSA

Danny Filer, NPS

Suzanne Trevena, EPA

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG

Ande Remington, NASA