



Meeting Minutes

Chesapeake Bay Program Forestry Workgroup (FWG) May Conference Call

May 4th, 2016, 9 AM – 10:30 AM

Meeting Participants:

Julie Mawhorter (USFS), Mid-Atlantic Urban and Community Forestry Coordinator
Tuana Phillips (Chesapeake Research Consortium)
Jeremy Hanson (VA Tech)
Neely Law (Center for Watershed Protection)
Marian Honezcy (MD DNR)
Barbara White (VA DOF)
Matt Poirot (VA DOF)
Judy Okay (VA DOF)
Frank Rodgers (Cacapon Institute)
Tanner Haid (Cacapon Institute)
Nicole Hernandez (Aberdeen Proving Ground)
Tracey Coulter (PA BOF)
Derrick McDonald (PA BOF)
Nancy Falxa Sonti (USFS)
Lauren Townley (NY State DEC)
Anne Hairston-Strang (MD DNR)
Jeff Sweeney (EPA)
Greg Evans (VA DOF)
Ari Daniels (Center for Watershed Protection)
Renee Reber (CBF, PA Office)
Matt Keefer (PA BOF),

9:10 Tree Canopy Expert Panel Release and Timeline – Jeremy Hanson

- The [Urban Tree Canopy Expert Panel Report \(draft\)](#) is now available for review/comment
- Please note the timeline is subject to change based on the volume and substance of comments received during the comment period or workgroup meetings. The schedule may also change based on the schedule of the Forestry or Watershed Technical Workgroups. The intention is to receive WQGIT approval by the end of August. Links to each call on the CBP calendar are provided when available (click on the date).
 - Wed. May 4: Forestry Workgroup (FWG). Introductory briefing to FWG for panel's methods/recommendations.
 - **Fri. May 20: Webinar presenting detailed overview of report and recommendations, open to anyone. Anyone that expects to review/comment on the report is strongly encouraged to participate. The webinar will be recorded.**
 - Wed. June 1: FWG Follow-up briefing/discussion if needed, but unable to seek approval as comments will still be coming in.

- Thurs. June 2: Possible briefing to Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)
- Thu. June 9: Initial 30-day comment period closes. Comments on the report should be submitted to Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu) by close of business.
- Wed. July 6: Currently scheduled FWG. May be rescheduled for late June (TBD) or late July (TBD) to seek FWG approval of the report at that time.
- Thurs. July 7: WTWG conference call. Earliest potential date to seek WTWG approval, depending on status and timing of FWG approval.
- Tues. July 19: Briefing to Urban Stormwater Workgroup.
- Thurs. August 4: WTWG conference call. Seek WTWG approval if earlier approval is not possible given the schedules of the workgroups.
- Mon. August 8 or Mon. August 22: Potential dates for seeking WQGIT approval, depending on FWG and WTWG approval status and schedule. Always the caveat that the schedule could change depending on reviews and workgroup schedules themselves

9:15 Tree Canopy Expert Panel Methods and Decision Points – Neely Law

Neely provided an in-depth review of Expert Panel’s methods to credit the number of new trees planted. She explained how the Panel used i-Tree Forecast to estimate the average annual canopy area and growth for every tree planted. Her presentation also addressed the Expert Panel’s recommendations to improve BMP verification, their recommendations for future research, and other pertinent items in the report.

For more information, please see Neely’s presentation at [this link](#).

Other notes:

- The Panel wanted to explore a method that could credit a single tree given the growing conditions and species, i.e. make sure that “every tree counts.”
- Canopy cover calculations took into account the tree species (growth rate, height at maturity), DBH, light exposure, and dieback.
- The calculations explicitly accounted for mortality.
- Scenarios were modeled based on the following: 4 climate areas + 1 Baywide average, 1 inch DBH at planting, tree in good condition at planting, 20 tree species, 2.5% and 5% mortality, and crown light exposure.
- There were 10,000 simulations per cohort and 40 cohorts per climate region.
- The annual BMP acreage credit was based on 10 years of projected growth after planting.
- The Panel also considered the TMDL timeline in their research and methods.

Recommendations:

The Panel provided recommendations on four items:

- Decision rule for tree canopy as a BMP and as a land use (slide 24)
 - Trees planted for BMP credit in 2016 and onward will continue to be tracked as a BMP through 2025
- Lifespan of annual BMP credit (slide 25)
 - Based on the time period until it is mapped as a land use based on high resolution imagery.
 - This BMP would not be eligible for renewal.
- Information for reporting and tracking BMP (slide 26)
 - Default broadleaf tree is used as the representative tree
 - Baywide climate of 166 frost-free days (FFD)
- Metric for translating trees planted to urban tree canopy acreage (slide 28)

- Annual BMP acreage credit based on 10 years of projected growth after planting.
- The credit for the default broadleaf tree for the Bay-wide climate is 144 square feet for every tree planted (300 trees per acre).
- Neely also provided recommendations on future research and needs, including a recommendation to have a future panel to look at management and conservation of tree canopy leading to natural expansion.

10:00 Questions/Discussion

- Comment: The table on slide 23 could use some more labeling and clarification.
 - This is table 10 in the report.
- This same formula will not be used for forest buffers (that is a separate BMP) so this will not affect that credit.
- Note that as the Expert Panel was doing this work, we wanted to move away from tree per acre although that is the metric. Instead we wanted to look at tree canopy acreage so we looked at canopy size. Tree planting is just one element of that overall management approach.
 - That said, we might want to think about what to call this BMP. Currently it is called the urban tree canopy BMP, but there has been discussion in the past of calling it urban tree planting BMP instead.
- Does this analysis account for canopy that is overlapping?
 Answer: You can look at table 9 in the report to look at the analysis for the individual tree species. The output of Forecast is not projecting optimal growth, and we are accounting for mortality based on the original number of trees planted. But no, it does not directly account for this. This is a good question and the sort of question I would want to follow up on.
 Also, look at Appendix E to compare broadleaf large with other tree species. We included all of this output in the Appendices.

As a reminder, the comment period to provide feedback on the report ends on June 9th.

The next FWG meeting will be on June 1st.