



Meeting Minutes

Chesapeake Bay Forestry Workgroup (FWG) November Meeting

November 2nd, 2016 10:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.

Meeting Participants

Rebecca Hanmer, *FWG Chair*
Sally Claggett (USFS), *FWG Coordinator*
Katherine Wares (Chesapeake Research Consortium)
Julie Mawhorter (USFS)
Nick DiPasquale (EPA)
Anne Hairston-Strang (MD DNR)
Marian Honecny (MD DNR)
Greg Evans (VA DOF)
Judy Okay (VA DOF)
Laura Johnson (VA DOF)
Mike Santucci (VA DOF)
Herb Peddicord (WV DOF)
Frank Rodgers (WV Cacapon Institute)
Tanner Haid (WV Cacapon Institute)
Derrick McDonald (PA DEP)
Matt Keefer (PA DCNR)
Mark Hockley (PA DCNR)
Craig Highfield (ACB)
Jenny McGarvey (ACB)
Karen Cladis (ACB)
Luke Cole (DC DOEE)
Earl Bradley (Sierra Club)

10:00 Welcome and introductions

Rebecca Hanmer welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed participants.

10:10 Update from Water Quality GIT

Rebecca Hanmer gave an overview of the October WQGIT meeting. At the WQGIT meeting, it was discussed whether to use 2025 or current year for planning. Nick DiPasquale explained that developers will not be relieved of their additional loads by using 2025 projections. With the new 1-meter imagery, CBP will be able to do tracking for states. The 1-meter imagery will be available at the end of the year and webinars regarding the imagery will be available soon. Coupled with LIDAR, buffers will be more visible and it will help to track BMP implementation. Sally commented that it is projected to take at least 2 years until a high resolution stream layer will be finished and until streams are accurately mapped, buffer work using cannot happen. Nick said that the PSC made the commitment to redo high

resolution imagery every 2-3 years and that the costs of next iteration will be less. The RFP still needs to be developed.

The FWG was asked by the WQGIT to define E3 (Everything, Everywhere, Everyone) for forestry practices. The E3 Scenario is an estimate of applying management actions to the fullest possible extent. Sally reviewed and shared her draft of the E3 document. She asked the FWG to review the document and send her comments and edits within a week. The Urban Stormwater Workgroup presented no net loss, but the goal is to add 2,400 acres in urban forest. Sally asked the group if the goal should be higher in the E3. Sally proposed doing all bufferable stream miles for agriculture. For forest scenarios, Sally proposed no net loss of forests and 100% timber harvest BMP implementation.

Questions and Comments

- Judy Okay commented that according to tax maps, many farms are divided into lots for development, so although they are farms now, it's likely they will be developed accordingly.
- Rebecca commented that the grass buffer BMP is, appropriately, not represented in E3. Only riparian forest buffers are in E3.
- Rebecca posed the question whether there is level of ag-tree planting that would not reduce farm production and what is the maximum amount of land that can be taken out farm production (e.g., silvipasture).
- Greg asked if there is room to expand the definition of forest buffer.
- Nick suggested providing differential credit for size and location for buffers in the future.

ACTION: FWG to review the E3 document and send Sally edits by next Wednesday.

10:30 Healthy Watersheds Forest/TMDL Project Progress Report

Greg Evans gave an overview of the Healthy Watersheds Forest/TMDL project that demonstrates the value of retaining forestland in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. The Rappahannock River Basin in Virginia was selected as the project study area because it mirrors most of the attributes of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. In Phase I of the project, sediment and nutrient loads were modelled with forest retention actions versus with no action. To do this, they used EPA's TMDL model and land use scenarios provided by the George Washington Regional Commission localities. A major finding from Phase I is that there would be \$125 million in possible future offset savings if the region retained forest instead of developed. Phase II of the project uses findings from Phase I to negotiate with local official to implement land use policies and decisions that retain forestland and create a toolbox with guidelines, incentives, and land use policy changes. Phase I of this project in Virginia was completed last year and Virginia team members have been working on Phase II and discussing tool box elements with localities this year.

Rappahannock River Basin community wants the ability to use intra-basin credit trading due to effects from land use value taxation (in forested parts of the state, there is less money for schools).

The project has expanded to Pennsylvania and the Yellow Breeches Watershed study area. Pennsylvania team members are reviewing the methodologies used in Virginia and have begun working on Phase I and modeling efforts. The benefits of this Virginia-Pennsylvania partnership is to compare and consider diverse solutions and enhanced applicability for other states that want to retain forestland. Around June 2017, the team will make recommendations to EPA based on their findings. Learn more about this project [here](#).

Questions and Comments

- Judy Okay asked if the \$125 million findings in Phase I could be broken out per acre. Greg responded that the finding is an absolute number.
- Judy also commented that linking forestry with fisheries could be a good strategy especially in the Rappahannock River. Nick DiPasquale suggested linking forest retention and source water protection as a strategy. It was also suggested that in developing WIP III strategies, states will need to communicate with localities so linking this to state WIP planning could be another strategy. Greg replied that when talking with localities, the timber benefits have seemed to be a good motivator.
- Anne commented that there needs to be a reasonable assurance approach; forest retentions should be incorporated as a good practice to assure that a jurisdiction will reach their WQ goals.
- Rebecca commented that there is a hidden number in the TMDL – watershed attenuation – loads are commonly discussed but underneath that is the assumption that the landscape will attenuate loads. She pointed out that if we reduce the amount of forests, we reduce the attenuation capacity; with this in mind, we could credit forest land use in the model (see Draft Attenuation Credit paper).

Greg commented that he does not think the model takes forests at risk into account

Nick said if jurisdictions have been benefiting from Conowingo, then they understand attenuation factors and could take BMPs into account

- Rebecca suggested coupling this presentation with a presentation on the Forest Conservation Act to remind the group how the MD law has been incorporated into the model. Anne said the FCA was designed to reduce, not eliminate, forest loss and wondered how CBP is treating the forest conservation BMP in Phase 6 of the model.
- Sally asked whether the Rappahannock project used Phase 6 of the model to estimate cost savings. Greg replied that yes, 1-meter resolution imagery was used so that it would be similar to what will be used in Phase 6 of the CBP model.
- Laura Johnson commented that it will be interesting to see how the lower, middle, and upper portions of the Rappahannock River Basin will differ due to their different views and approaches to urbanization
- Sally mentioned that TMDL goals will be scaled-down to the local level in Phase III and that forest retention could help local jurisdictions meet these goals. Nick replied that while there would be local goals, they would not be enforceable.
- Rebecca asked Greg if there was anything the FWG could do to assist with this project. Greg replied that this presentation presented preliminary findings and that they are working on a more final report in the coming months. He said that the FWG could help by suggesting and thinking about intra-basin crediting, informing other GITs and workgroups about the project, and thinking about how this project could be applied in your area.

11:20 TetraTech BMP Scoring

Sally provided a draft version of scores for Forestry BMPs and their effect on each management strategy and explained her scoring method. She asked the FWG to review the scores she gave and provide comments and edits. The final scores are due to TetraTech November 17th.

Questions and Comments

- Several members expressed concern about the scoring system and the numbering scale.

- Members asked for details regarding the purpose of the project and who was the lead on it. Sally responded that this is one of the WQGITs 'GIT funded' projects.

ACTION: FWG review the BMP scoring table ("Scoring Sheet" tab) and send Sally comments by next Wednesday.

11:45 Unveiling of Draft RFB Website

Sally Claggett and Jenny McGarvey introduced the Riparian Forest Buffer website to the FWG. Both websites have a live, RSS feed from the Chesapeake Network; Jenny asked the FWG to join the Chesapeake Network's buffer group and tree canopy group in order to participate in conversations on the websites, ask questions, and upload material. During the session, FWG members provided suggestions for additions or edits to certain pages on the website. Jenny and Sally asked the FWG to review the site and provide further comments and suggests of user groups within two weeks. To preview the website, go to <http://chesapeakeforestbuffers.net/>

1:00 Unveiling of Draft Tree Canopy Website

Julie Mawhorter and Jenny McGarvey introduced the Tree Canopy website to the FWG. This website will also include a newsletter. During the session, FWG members provided suggestions for additions or edits to certain pages on the website. Jenny and Julie asked the FWG to review the site and provide further comments and suggests of user groups within two weeks. To preview the website, go to <http://chesapeaketrees.net/>

Questions and Comments

- Rebecca suggested finding user groups and having them review the websites.
- Nick suggested having the CBP web team review the websites.

ACTION: FWG, review the two websites and give comments back to Sally, Julie, and Jenny within the next two weeks.

ACTION: Jenny will send instructions on how to join the Chesapeake Network groups.

1:45 Rollout of Websites Discussion

With the goal to make the websites live by the end of the year, Sally asked the FWG to brainstorm ideas on how to get the website out to the targeted audiences and ensure that it has good usability. She proposed having the websites available for preview before it is officially launched, sending blast emails to announce the website, and advertising through Chesapeake network as possible ideas. For the riparian forest buffer website, the target audience is practitioners working with buffers. For the tree canopy website, there will be a newsletter component so getting the word out about its subscription is also important. Members offered suggestions such as talking with the CBP's communications team, advertising the sites at trainings, contacting state leads and having them send it to their teams and organization, having news organizations such as the Bay Journal advertising the sites in their newsletters, and contacting conservation districts, choose clean water coalition, FSA and NRCS.

Questions and Comments

- Craig commented that these websites belong to the FWG and that members should take ownership of the sites when spreading the word to partners.

- Jenny clarified that the purpose of these sites are not to replace the state information or other resource but to provide links to these many resources in one place.
- Greg suggested not to preview the websites and commented that it would be better for people to see the finished product.

2:15 Goal to Incite Tree Planting in the Watershed

Craig Highfield reviewed the Chesapeake Tree Challenge session at the Chesapeake Watershed Forum which introduced the idea of increasing local watershed group engagement and tree planting efforts. For this challenge, a watershed wide goal for amount of trees planted by 2025 would be set, partners would make a public pledge to plant a certain number, and progress would be recorded and tracked. The objectives are to encourage people and communities to plant more trees, provide a means to map and track tree plantings, and celebrate tree planting achievements in a very visible way. Input from the session at the Forum gave insight to challenges organizations face and what resources and support organizations need to help them increase tree plantings and maintain existing trees. This project is still in the idea-collecting phase and Craig asked the FWG for input on how the challenge could work. Learn more information from this session and about this project [here](#).

Questions and Comments

- Greg commented that it is important to educate and train people on how to plant trees correctly and that to make these efforts count, there needs be a way for the states to use this information.
- Rebecca suggested having a tree planting training at next year's Chesapeake Watershed Forum.
- Rebecca commented that there is the urban tree planting goal and two related BMPs so states will want to take credit for these plantings in their WIPs.
- Rebecca suggested reviewing the BMPs to determine if participants in the challenge can meet the goals/requirements. If so, the plantings could be done at the local level and states could check in on efforts and maintenance and receive credits.
- Judy commented if an organization is not enrolled in certain programs than they won't report back to the state and the efforts will not be recognized; NEIEN should account for volunteer projects or there should be a different tracking tool.
- Marion mentioned the Marylanders plant trees website, Jenny mentioned the smart tool, and Julie mentioned Pennsylvania's tree planting map tool which could all be considered as tracking mechanisms.
- Nick commented that the residential BMP is a combination of BMPs and there's a calculator associated with them and organizations could send amounts to the county and county could sent it to the state.
- Herb commented that at the end of the day, the goal needs to be to plant trees.
- Rebecca asked what the next steps for this project are. Craig responded that they are going to go through more from the session at the forum, try to involve key partners, and eventually try and find funding for the project.

2:45 Round Robin

- Rebecca: The Chesapeake Stormwater Network is having a webinar on November 17 webinar on urban tree canopy and forest planting. It will discuss the urban tree canopy and urban forest planting BMPs and how local jurisdictions can use them receive credits. The webinar is free and open to anyone.

- Maryland: The Annapolis City Council approved a local Forest Conservation Act. The ordinance can be found online. Two groups from Harford Allegheny Counties received awards for tree planting. Maryland DNR will be working with them to replicate their work.
- Pennsylvania: The CREP forester positions were recently posted. Several CREP projects have been funded; projects and more grant opportunities will be announced later in the year.
- West Virginia: They are trying to reconnect with reenrollments. There will be a couple CREP plantings later in the year. Due to budget issues, DOF will be losing more forestry positions, but a new CREP forester was hired in the state. They are still regulating timber BMPs but only in the CB portion of the watershed.
- Virginia: They are interviewing for a replacement CREP forester position. Virginia for Trees for Clean Water RFP will be out soon. They are developing urban wood utilization programs and will have a forum; the first workshop was very successful.
- Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay: The Smith Island training this year went great. They are looking into a different location – possibly Port Isobel or Karen Noonan Center-- for next year's trip.
- Sally/USFS: PWP Info Exchange will be on December 6th and the Baltimore Washington Partners for Forest Stewardship annual conference is November 15th in Laurel MD. John Griffen was hired as the lead for Chesapeake conservation partnership federal efforts.

3:00 Adjourned