Meeting Minutes

Chesapeake Bay Forestry Workgroup (FWG)
May Conference Call

May 3, 2017 9:00 A.M. – 10:30 A.M.

Meeting Participants

Sally Claggett (USFS), FWG Coordinator
Katherine Wares (Chesapeake Research Consortium)
Julie Mawhorter (USFS)
Marian Norris (NPS)
John Wolf (USGS)
Steve LeDuc (EPA)
Nancy Sonti (US FS)
Kesha Braunskill (DE FS)
Anne Hairston-Strang (MD DNR)
Dakota Durcho (MD DNR)
Marian Honeczy (MD DNR)
Lauren Townley (NYSDEC)
Matt Keefer (PA DCNR)
Todd Brajkovich (PA DCNR)
Greg Evans (VA DOF)
Barbara White (VA DOF)
Lara Johnson (VA DOF)
Judy Okay (VA DOF)
Tanner Haid (Cacapon Institute)
Frank Rogers (Cacapon Institute)
Craig Highfield (Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay)
Jenny McGarvey (Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay)
Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting)
Kathy Boomer (TNC)
Pauline Adams (USFS)
Rob Feldt (MD DNR)

9:00 Welcome and Introductions
Sally welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed participants.

9:10 Model Review Tools
Olivia Devereux ran through several websites and resources that are available and can be helpful for Phase III WIP planning. These websites and tools use the new Phase 6 Model data. Olivia navigated to the Chesapeake Bay Midpoint Assessment Progress tracking page, https://mpa.chesapeakebay.net/ and went to the Phase 6 Model Development page. Graphs and maps of the Phase 6 Model inputs can be found on the Graphical Interface page. Olivia assumed that

Nutrient Applications category would be the most helpful to the FWG and went to the Nutrients Application page. The page opens up to the Introduction and has several tabs at the top. The Land Use Sector tab shows total acres of agriculture, developed, and natural and change over time. The Land Use tab shows acres of agriculture, developed, and natural land uses. You can choose different agencies, states, state basins, county, and load sources to view as well. This information is based on the CBP GIS team and reports. An excel file, "Phase 6 Source Data April" with information regarding load sources can be found on the CAST and BayFAST transition to Phase 6 page. CAST is running the Phase 6 Model.

Members can view more information and reports at http://cast-beta.chesapeakebay.net/. Creating a login allows users to run and save scenarios. Olivia ran through how to create scenarios. She said users should click official BMPS (official BMPs are approved by CBP, whereas planning BMPs are suggested but not approved), choose a geographic area, and the base conditions. Then, you can click edit and go in and add BMPs. Then, you can run the scenario and view the results to see load reductions. Olivia said if members wanted view the effects of forest buffers, they can create one scenario with buffers and one without buffers and compare the two scenarios.

John Wolf presented two web mapping tools that show outputs of the Phase 6 model. The first was the Watershed Model Scenario Comparisons which can be viewed at http://gistest.chesapeakebay.net/comparescenarios/. The mapping application includes nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment data with differing levels of progress/action. There are two viewers in the application so you can choose and compare two different maps. There is also the CBP Watershed Model Segmentation Viewer where you can view all GIS data related to the TMDL. The link can be found here. He told members to let him know if there is anything that the FWG would like to include in these maps.

Comments and Questions
- Sally asked if the amount of bufferable streams will be incorporated into this tool soon so users are only be able to select the maximum amount of bufferable area in scenarios. Olivia said that it would be.
- Anne asked whether states should use MAST or CAST. Olivia said MAST will be no longer be up to date after the Phase 6 model is done so CAST might be better to use.
- Anne asked how much information is needed to set up a scenario. Olivia replied that you don't really need to know any information, but that knowing what BMPs are of interested or which ones are being implemented on the ground is useful.
- Sally asked where the cost data is from. Olivia said it was determined through public and private costs for the lifespan of the practice using information from a variety of sources. Capital, operation, maintenance, and opportunity costs are all components of the costs. Users can edit the default costs if they have better information or judgement.
- Frank Rogers reiterated that there are workshops on the Phase 6 Model in June and July. Katherine sent an email on May 2nd about the webinars.
- Sally suggested having a workshop day where members could run scenarios and have John and Olivia available as resources. Olivia said that they will be having some trainings and webinar, but that she could have a FWG session at a local computer center or facility with capacity for everyone. Many members expressed interest in having a workshop.

10:10 WIP III Planning

Sally presented several excel spreadsheets with forest buffer data. The spreadsheets show the percent of natural, impervious, and herbaceous land cover for 10meter and 30meter buffers at the county level. A key for natural, impervious, and herbaceous land cover are on the second tab of the Hi-

Res Buffer Data document. The spreadsheets also include pie charts representing the amount of bufferable area at 10m and 30m by state. Sally explained that this data is similar to E3 and shows the opportunity for buffer plantings. She also pointed out that the 30meter data (wider buffers) are not only the target width, but may be necessary to reach WIP targets. Sally asked for suggestions on how best to present this data.

Comments and Questions
- Anne said she would like more information on what the data is based on or where it came from. Matt asked if the data came from the Chesapeake Conservancy water network. Sally said it is based on CBP's calculated water network. Matt said that the Chesapeake Conservancy's water network might over estimate streams which needs to be considered during outreach efforts and that we should decide on which water network to use in order to have consistency across the watershed. (**New information**: After the FWG meeting, Sally confirmed with Peter Claggett that CBP provided the same calculated water network to the Chesapeake Conservancy to use in their buffer analyses. It's called the Synthetic Stream Network and uses a 60-acre drainage and maps streams based on 10m DEM. CBP has commissioned the Chesapeake Conservancy to investigate further improvements to the Stream Network layer to be worked out over the next year or so.)
- Anne commented that based on the factors that affect plantings, she estimates that 50-70% of the bufferable area identified is practical for riparian forest buffers.
- Kathy Boomer said that she preferred a term other than 'herbaceous' since that too can be natural. She would like more information on how it was decided. She also discussed how it is important to keep the effects of climate change on streams considered.

10:30 Round Robin
- DC has gone public with their request for applications for a tree planting grant within the District that focuses on planting on large parcels. They expect the grant to be awarded in the coming months for planting to begin this fall.
- Maryland: Anne is putting together a NFWF grant on buffer outreach and adoption and maintenance issues for improved future management.
- Pennsylvania: Matt is assembling a NFWF proposal on buffers marketing and outreach products and strategies. The products will be used in a pilot area and with the idea that they would go watershed-wide. The next PA Buffer Advisory Committee meeting is June 1st, and meetings for the rest of the year have been planned. The committee is expanding and members from the FWG are invited to join and participate. Katherine will send more information to the workgroup.
- Virginia: Greg said that legislation was passed in VA that created a workgroup to look at how to address water quality issues in stormwater areas. The workgroup will be looking at findings from the Forestland Retention project as part of their analysis. The workgroup will be meeting in July.
- Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay is submitting a NFWF grant for planting buffers in Augusta County, VA.

10:40 Adjourned