

Chesapeake Bay Program
Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
Meeting Minutes

Thursday, October 2nd, 2024
10:00 AM to 11:00 AM

[Meeting Materials](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: The WTWG approved the August and September Meeting Minutes.

Action: WTWG Members with feedback on the Phase 7 timeline should send feedback to Auston (smith.auston@epa.gov).

Action: WTWG Members with feedback for Peter should reach out to Peter and Auston (claggettp@chesapeakebay.net and smith.auston@epa.gov). WTWG Leadership will plan on having a presentation from Peter and others at next months meeting.

Action: WTWG Members with interest in a potential taskforce should reach out to Peter and Auston (claggettp@chesapeakebay.net and smith.auston@epa.gov). WTWG Leadership will work with Peter, Sarah, and others to come up with meeting time and then send that out to those who expressed interest.

Action: Lorenzo and Katie will get back to WTWG Leadership with an update on efficiency rates.

Action: Jess will work with Auston to reach out to partners to clarify whether they use a one or three year approach when reporting.

Meeting Minutes

10:00 **Introductions and Announcements** – Auston Smith, EPA (10 min).

- *Please put your name and affiliation in the chat box for attendance purposes. Thank you!*
- **Decision requested:** Approval of August & September Meeting Minutes.

Decision: The WTWG approved the August and September Meeting Minutes.

- Phase 7 Timeline Update – Auston Smith, EPA

Action: WTWG Members with feedback on the Phase 7 timeline should send feedback to Auston (smith.auston@epa.gov).

- Peter Claggett, USGS mentioned that the Land Data Team is about to publish the 2021/2022 High Res LULC back to 2013 which will inform the Phase 7 model. Peter mentioned that there might be similarities between the Land Data Team's reconciliation of reported versus mapped construction acres and the forthcoming reconciliation of reported versus mapped Timber Harvest acres (which was discussed at the end of the call).

Action: WTWG Members with feedback for Peter should reach out to Peter and Auston (claggettp@chesapeakebay.net and smith.auston@epa.gov). WTWG Leadership will plan on having a presentation from Peter and others at next months meeting.

Action: WTWG Members with interest in a potential taskforce should reach out to Peter and Auston (claggettp@chesapeakebay.net and smith.auston@epa.gov). WTWG Leadership will work with Peter,

Sarah, and others to come up with meeting time and then send that out to those who expressed interest.

Discussion:

Norm Goulet: It would be appropriate here. We're mainly dealing with a problem with reconciling permitting data, versus what's happening on the land use. A lot of these are staged in various phases so we end up with the difference between permitting and what Peter's saying. It comes down to how its going to be tracked versus reported.

Dave Montali (in chat): I'll participate in the subteam regarding construction.

Norm Goulet (in chat): Sign me up as well.

Tyler Trostle: We in PA would also like to participate in this discussion.

10:10 Progress Schedule Update – Auston Smith, EPA (10 min)

Auston Smith, EPA provided an update on the Progress Schedule including items coming up over the next quarter. This included items coming up and currently under review, and the timeline for the team getting back to jurisdictions with questions.

10:20 Forest Harvesting Practices BMP Update and Changes to Reporting – Lorenzo Cinalli, USFS and Jessica Rigelman, J7 LLC (35 min)

Katie Brownson, USFS gave an overview of the Timber Harvest Task Force and where it had arrived at with its recommendations for improving the modeling of forest harvest data. Lorenzo Cinalli, USFS re-introduced a project from the Forestry Workgroup (FWG) looking at changing the efficiency rate and the credit duration of the Forest Harvesting Practices BMP which was first presented at the WTWG's September Meeting. Lorenzo asked for feedback from the group to help move this item forward. Jess Rigelman, J7, provided information on the consequences in the model of changes to reporting for this practice.

ACTION requested: WTWG Members should review the Timber Harvest Water Quality Review document and be prepared to offer feedback.

Discussion:

Dave Montali: On earlier slides you said the base condition for harvested forest is seven times that for true forest for nitrogen. Do we have a number for phosphorus? What's the average base loading rate relative to forest?

Lorenzo Cinalli: I just talked about Phosphorus to not spend too much time on it.

Dave Montali: So, Phosphorus is 3 times the amount. When you combine these with the efficiencies, I'm worried that harvested forest with the BMPs may load less than forest. If we said 90% reduction from 7x forest, that means 0.7x forest on average condition.

Katie Brownson: That's something to consider. We wouldn't want the BMP to make the harvested load less than forest. We should double check the math on that.

[Auston Smith](#): I was looking at the Timber Harvest Water Quality Review you sent around. To focus on sediment really fast, you have four or five studies that have percentages outlined, but you also highlight the width in the Maine studies where the reductions were quantified using words, and you've provided those quotes. I see that your average efficiency is about 85% but when I tried to recreate that number myself, it was just using the percentages applied and removing the other examples that have words as a reduction. How was that decided and when I see no measurable difference I'd consider that a higher than 90% efficiency. I see these two examples as possibly correlating to a higher efficiency than proposed.

[Lorenzo Cinalli](#): You're right that the average is only looking at the six studies that had exact amounts and that we didn't include the two that said no impact. We wanted a conservative number which felt like if the calculated rate was 85% and the two studies that say almost 100%, rather than lowering 85% to be conservative we figured 85% is conservative. Compared to looking at nitrogen and phosphorus where all of the studies implied 100% and then we cut that down to 90% or 85%. So again, keeping a conservative estimate. This is also what the original study did, they had higher numbers but cut them down to be conservative.

[Jess Rigelman](#): I wanted to pose a few questions to the group here, since you're the ones that report harvested forest acres to me and then report your harvested practices as BMPs to NEIEN. Those acres that you are currently reporting for both harvested forest and the BMPs, do they represent only the current years harvested forest permitted acres, or were you under the understanding that you should report based on the last three cumulative years? The reason I ask is I know many of you report the harvested forest and then your BMP is 90% of those acres because of whatever policies in place that have to be implementing those practices. If we were to change the credit duration of your current reported BMP to three years, that would create a lot of excess. The real ask here is for those like Bill and Sam in WV and the person in MD who report harvested forest acres to me for land use, do those represent only one years' worth of permitted or are you on the back end doing that three year calculation and submitting a three year total to me?

[Dave Montali \(in chat\)](#): WV only one year

[Jess Rigelman](#): I would like to follow up with VA and MD. If any of the states are reporting a three year total for both the BMP and harvested forest acres, we're going to have to fix the reporting in NEIEN to represent only one years' worth of data. That was a concern I raised with Katie and Lorenzo, and I will work with Auston to follow up with the states on that.

[Katie Brownson](#): I talked with the person from VA Department of Forestry who reports the harvest numbers, and he said what comes out of CAST aligns with what he's reporting annually, so he'd be surprised if there was a back end calculation that was resulting in a three year running total of acres. That was the same indication I got from MD as well. IT would be good to confirm because we don't want to throw a wrench in reporting systems, but what we're proposing is just for the reported duration for the harvested forest land use to align with the duration of the BMP so we wouldn't have the excess issue or harvested forest acres that should have BMPs applied that aren't.

[Jess Rigelman](#): I totally agree. I thought some of the states did understand this three year rule and were reporting it that way for Phase 6. We'll follow up and take it from there. If they are

only reporting the one year, they will have to update the harvested forest acres they report to me and not the BMP reporting which would be built into the whole land use calculation you sent me earlier. I have a question for Katie and Lorenzo; the 1.1% or 1.5% default rate, would that be the default applied to harvested acres for the last three years or just the one year?

Katie Brownson: I think it would be over the three year period, so it would compound. The 1.1% is an estimate of the annual harvest rate of true forest. We wouldn't base that off of the harvestable forest footprint. The FIA data is based on the total amount of forest as defined by FIA which aligns closely with how we define forest. We think 1.1% is getting harvested annually.

Jess Rigelman: If that state doesn't report harvested forest as part of the land use process, then I would apply 1.1%?

Katie Brownson: Exactly.

Action: Lorenzo and Katie will get back to WTWG Leadership with an update on efficiency rates.

Action: Jess will work with Auston to reach out to partners to clarify whether they use a one or three year approach when reporting.

Next Meeting: [Thursday, November 7th, 2024](#), from 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM.

Participants

Alicia Ritzenthaler, DC DOEE
Ashley Hullinger, PA DEP
Auston Smith, EPA
Bailey Robertory, UMCES
Caitlin Bolton, MWCOG
Chris Brosch, DDA
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech WV
Dylan Burgevin, MDE
Emily Dekar, USC
Eugenia Hart, Tetra Tech
Fernando Pasquel, Arcadis
Jackie Pickford, USGS
Jeff Sweeney, EPA
Jessica Rigelman, J7

John Lancaster, PA DEP
Joshua Glace, Larson Design Group
Katie Brownson, USFS
Kevin Mclean, VA DEQ
Lorenzo Cinalli, USFS
Lori Brown, DE DNREC
Mark Dubin, UMD
Matthew Kofroth, LCCD
Normand Goulet, NVRC
Peter Claggett, USGS
Samuel Canfield, WV DEP
Scott Heidel, PA DEP
Sushanth Gupta, CRC
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP

Acronym List

BMP: Best Management Practice
CAST: Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool
CBP: Chesapeake Bay Program
CRC: Chesapeake Research Consortium
DDA: Delaware Department of Agriculture
DNREC: [DE] Department of Natural Resources and
Environmental Control
DOEE: [DC] Department of Energy and the

Environment
DEP: [PA or WV] Department of Environmental
Protection
DEQ: [VA] Department of Environmental Quality
EPA: [US] Environmental Protection Agency
FIA: Forest Inventory and Analysis
GIT: Goal Implementation Team
LCCD: Lancaster County Conservation District

LULC: Land Use Land Cover
MDE: Maryland Department of the Environment
MWCOG: Metropolitan Washington Council of
Governments
NEIEN: National Environmental Information
Exchange Network
NVRG: Northern Virginia Regional Commission
UMCES: University of Maryland Center for
Environmental Science
UMD: University of Maryland
USC: Upper Susquehanna Coalition
USFS: United States Forest Service
USGS: United States Geological Survey
WTWG: Watershed Technical Workgroup