The Forestry Work Group discussed the Mid-Point Assessment at its September and October meetings. This list of suggested changes to the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (CBW) model resulted and will be discussed by the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team --along with many others --at its October meeting.

1. **Account for true forest and riparian/floodplain forests** by making separate layers in the land cover model.  The CBW model currently has one land cover that combines forests with other land types that do not fit in either urban or agriculture. The true forest land cover is important as a “natural background” – i.e., no pollution is attributed. The difference to water quality and habitat is significant when compared to a non-forested (e.g., “open”) land use. Types of forest that differentially treat WQ (e.g., species, age) may also be delineated, TBD. A similar situation exists with riparian and floodplain forests – they are uniquely beneficial to watershed functioning.
   1. **Report air deposition loadings**— more clearly communicate the additional loading from air that is being processed by land cover acreage in efforts to demonstrate how natural land cover is already reducing pollution from this source. For example, an acre of forest may be receiving 14 lbs of TN from air, but is able to process all but 4 lbs which becomes the pollutant loading of that acre of forest—the forest reduced 10 lb of TN naturally.There is no way to further improve upon forest loads—except to plant more forests.
   2. As a land cover, **existing riparian/floodplain forests** could receive a similar or lower loading than true forests and/or become a BMP because of the ability of the forested floodplains and streams to continually process TN and prevent sedimentation. The value of this land cover would be made more obvious by taking this step. The re-connection of forests to their floodplain would also become a BMP (per Delaware).
2. **Use projected future land cover data for WIPs** and other planning processes. This makes more sense since the future land cover is what each jurisdiction will be managing. It will also make more obvious the benefits of preventing conversion of forest lands.
3. **Refine the amount of forest land assumed to be harvested** (or disturbed) in any given year.  Some states have regulatory programs around forest harvesting and can document acres of forests harvested and BMPs applied on those acres for any given year. Jurisdictions that are unable to report acres of forest harvest, would refine a percent of forest land harvested annually in that jurisdiction. Currently, 1% of “forest” land cover in the CBW model is assumed to be harvested annually.