Minutes
Chesapeake Bay Forestry Workgroup (FWG)

November 1, 2017 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM

Fish Shack – Chesapeake Bay Program
410 Severn Avenue
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Members in Attendance
Rebecca Hanmer, *Chair*
Sally Claggett (USFS), *Coordinator*
Katherine Wares (CRC), *Staffer*
Anne Hairston-Strang (MD DNR)
Dakota Durcho (MD DNR)
Matt Keefer (PA DCNR)
Teddi Stark (PA DCNR)
Judy Okay (VA DOF)
Greg Evans (VA DOF)
Luke Cole (DC DOEE)
Herb Peddicord (WV DOF)
Craig Highfield (ACB)
Emily Trentacoste (EPA)
Laura Free (EPA)
Matt Johnston (UMD)
Hannah Boom (UMD)
Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting)
Marcia Fox (DE DNREC)
Lauren Townley (NYDEC)
Peter Hoagland (PA NRCS)
Barry Frantz (NRCS)
Julie Mawhorter (USFS)
Ryan Davis (ACB)
Jenny McGarvey (ACB)
Kathy Boomer (TNC)
Jennifer Miller Herzog (Land Trust Alliance)
Jeremy Hanson (VA Tech)
Earl Bradley

10:00 Welcome and Introductions **Rebecca Hanmer, Chair**

10:10 2016 and 2017 RFB Progress Data **Katherine Wares**
While preparing riparian forest buffer miles data for the 2016-2017 Bay Barometer, inconsistencies between BayTAS data and reported data to Sally Claggett was found. Katherine asked members why they think there might be differences. Pennsylvania has discrepancies due to the Penn State survey.

Maryland DNR only reports non CREP acres to Sally, but MDA reports CREP acres to MDE who then submits data into NEIEN which is why the numbers are different. To reduce double reporting, members were asked which set of data they think is best to use or which is more accurate for reporting or calculating miles planted. Members said NEIEN is probably more accurate. Since NEIEN and the model report acres, width will be needed from the states to calculate miles. States said they should be able to report average width to Sally/CBP. Sally suggested that the workgroup work on a uniform riparian forest buffer data form for the field.
DECISION: The official reporting system will be used, and states will send Sally and Katherine average width so they can calculate miles planted for the Forest Buffer Indicator and Bay Barometer. Katherine, Sally, and Laura Free will send guidance moving forward to the workgroup.

10:40 Priority Watershed Analysis **Emily Trentacoste**

A vast amount of new information and science has become available since the last phase of WIP development. Emily showed an example of how all of this information can be integrated to understand drivers of water quality in a particular watershed and focus restoration efforts moving forward geographically, by sector, and by practice. In the Swatara Creek watershed, a USGS monitoring station was used to analyze nitrogen trends, drivers, and management. Satellite land use imagery was looked at to understand where nitrogen is coming from and where it is predicted to come from based on groundwater, changes in developed land, and changes in nitrogen load and removal. Efforts were focused geographically based on vulnerable geology and differences in county loads and practices. Practices to focus were determined based on what management practices have been used and their nitrogen removal efficiency. This info can be layered to determine where to focus and then what practices to use.

11:00 Top 10 Cost Effective BMPs **Matt Johnston**

Matt Johnson showed the most cost effective best management practices in Pennsylvania to reduce 1lb of nitrogen to the Bay. Buffers and Wetland restoration are always in the top most cost effective. Since buffers are cost-effective practice, we need to know how many acres are available, where buffers be planted, how much will it cost, and what the investment is. He used York County, PA as an example for this analysis. There is about 65,000 acres of bufferable area in York. About 21,000 acres of those are unbuffered. Matt showed there would be 1.4 million lbs of nitrogen removal for York County if they buffered all possible areas. The modelling team can provide information on what areas are not buffered and what is bufferable throughout the Bay watershed. The high resolution land use analysis is also available everywhere with request to Lindsey Gordon. Sally also has condensed excel spreadsheets on bufferable data. Chesapeake Conservancy did a buffer gap analysis with their new stream network, they didn't publish it due to over estimates and they are working to fix it.

11:20 Update on State WIP Planning Efforts **State Leads**

Maryland: The WIP process is led by MDE. They have done some local government outreach and there are regular bay policy coordination meetings; DNR partners sometimes participate. MDA is the lead for setting agricultural BMP goals like forest buffers. In Phase II of the WIPs, the forest buffer goal was low. MDE is responsible for urban BMP goals; in Phase II, the urban buffer goal was high. There will be an opportunity for DNR partners to comment, but with current staffing feedback will be difficult.
Sally said determining how costs were figured out should be a priority.

West Virginia: The Chesapeake Bay Tributary team is directing the WIP process, and Herb and Frank are involved. Effectiveness of the Potomac has been reduced which may cause West Virginia to deliver a

lower load. They will have urban forest planting in this phase of the WIPs. Timber harvest inspections will continue. There's are new CREP addendum.
Sally said that buffers verification should be added to the Forestry WIP Guidance.

Delaware: DNREC and other Delaware organizations meet quarterly with EPA for Phase III WIPs. Previously, there were high unattainable goals for riparian forest buffers; they are working with focus groups to develop better goals. DNREC received WIP funding through EPA so Tetra Tech and the University of Delaware will help the state make action plans. They'll also be holding CAST workshops to talk about 2025 goals. Timelines of their process are on the Delaware WIP webpage.

Pennsylvania: The state is far behind in implementing phase I and II. DEP has set up a committee and they have weekly WIP meetings. The Buffer Advisory Committee is participating. There will be a Buffer summit in early spring 2018.
ACTION: Katherine will scan Pennsylvania's WIP summary paper and send it to states that aren't at the meeting in person.

District of Columbia: 85% of DC's nitrogen load is from Blue Plains Wastewater Treatment facility. They are using local planning and MS4 targets for WIP planning, and are working with Olivia in CAST. They are planning to have 40% canopy **by some year**. Currently, they have about 39% tree canopy and have been planting about 10,000 trees/year the past few years.

New York: NYDEC has a buffer task force meeting in December to talk about WIP development. They received money from NFWF for plantings, and they are focusing on urban forestry practices moving forward.

Virginia: VADOF has a greater role due to the Healthy Watersheds Forest Retention project. They are focusing on local area planning goals and are either (1) going to divide them by source sector or (2) have a more matrix effort and combine source sectors and do local commission. From the DOF perspective, option 2 is better. Greg Evans also gave an update on the Healthy Watersheds Forest Retention project; John Griffon will be joining the team and the project timeline has been extended to 18months.

1:00 Water Quality GIT and WIP Updates **Sally Claggett and Julie Mawhorter**
There will be a two PSC meeting December 19-20 to reach consensus on a series of midpoint assessment issues: climate change, Conowingo, accounting for growth, and planning targets. For the December FWG meeting we will go over 2025 Land Projections with USGS and verification. For the Forestry WIP guide, Sally and Julie have incorporated comments and are updating data tables in the document. A final draft version will be shown at the next meeting as well.
ACTION: Members should submitted any additional comments on the WIP Guide to Sally.

1:50 CAST Practicum **Olivia Devereux**

3:30 Adjourn