



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Attendees

Sally Claggett, USFS

Brenda Sieglitz, CBF

Patty Webb, DE DNREC

Emma deGarbolewski

Frank Rodgers, Cacapon Inst,
WV

Ashley Traut, GBWC

Rebecca Hanmer, Chair

Jackie Pickford, CRC

Peter Claggett, USGS

Anne Hairston-Strang, MD

Craig Highfield, ACB

Sarah McDonald

Paul Emmart, MDE

John Young, USGS

Gloria Van Duyne, NY

Andrea Nieves

Eric Greenfield, USDA Forest
Service

Cassie Davis, NY DEC

Rachel Felver, CBP

Terry Lasher, VDOF

Kalaia Tripeaux, PA

Teddi Stark, PA

Jason Swartz

Matt Poirot, VA

Karl Berger, MWCOC

Forestry Workgroup Meeting Minutes

August 3, 2021

9:00am-11:00am

Meeting Materials: [link](#)

Welcome and Introductions, *Rebecca Hanmer, Chair*

Planting the Future, *Ashley Traut, Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition*

The Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition is leading the Planting the Future initiative, a 3-year effort funded by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation with the goal of tripling the rate of tree planting throughout Central Maryland. Key to this effort, the Coalition is looking to help partners come together to share best practices, tackle systemic hurdles and strategically increase capacity.

- **Contact Info:** Ashley Traut (atraut@baltimorewilderness.org)
- **Rebecca Hanmer:** How is your success so far?
 - **Ashley Traut:** It's still early on, but interest is high. We've had great attendance at our tree summits, and have consistent, strong attendance at our monthly workgroup meetings.
- **Anne Hairston-Strang:** How do we coordinate the workforce development with career ladders? We're looking to get 13 contractual positions and want to reflect the diversity of MD in that. How do we make those connections and recruit people from the programs we have now?
 - **Ashley Traut:** Workforce development is still in early stages, but we're having great conversations. From NOAA down to DNR - there are lots of partners looking at workforce development. We want to have a robust ladder. It's challenging but I think it's doable if we work together to identify the key hurdles. DNR has been good at calling in folks. We've been trying to engage MCC and Conservation Corps and bring them back into Baltimore.
- **Sally Claggett:** Have you been able to utilize the high-res data in any way?
 - **Ashley Traut:** We're still early in our mapping process. Originally we didn't have the one meter dataset available yet, but our plan is to later update the data when we have it. We still need to meet with local governments and input their data.

- **Eric Greenfield:** iTree is a really great tool that might be worth taking a look at. There are tons of resources there (www.itreetools.org). Might be worth to include for environmental justice/equity considerations. Also I love the Conservation Corps idea.
 - **Ashley Traut:** One of the challenges is that there are just so many valuable programs out there. We haven't looked into iTree yet, but I'd love some guidance from you on that.
 - **Sally Claggett (in chat):** Data iTree Landscape is also going to be part of our county fact sheet data.
 - **Brenda Sieglitz:** We also started using iTree, doing public health modeling, historical data looking at tree loss from disease, patterns over time, etc. and ways we might want to reforest some areas. We've been trying to connect with some public health sectors using that data. I'm not the one using the data but I can put you in contact with those folks.

GIT Funding Updates, Sally Claggett, USFS

Sally reviewed the FY21 GIT Funding Program manual, facilitated a discussion and recorded ideas on developing Table 1s and RFPs for the hazard mitigation and funding and policy roundtable projects selected during the July FWG meeting.

- **Sally Claggett:** If you are interested in the nitty gritty details, there is a training session on how we submit these ideas on August 16th. Let me or Jackie Pickford (pickford.jacqueline@epa.gov) know if you are interested in attending and we will give you the information.
- **Ashley Traut:** Are you looking for partners or assistance for this?
 - **Sally Claggett:** Yes we are. Craig is also working with Harper County to do some tree acreage planting there and see about purchasing those credits. We've had some conversations in Anne Arundel County as well. The GIT funding is for anywhere in the watershed but it needs to be tightly wedded to our work plan for those outcomes. It is funding designed to address barriers. Anything that can be contracted out is fair game.
- **Action:** Reach out to Sally Claggett (sally.claggett@usda.gov) if you are interested in attending the GIT Funding Meeting on Monday, August 16th.

Reported Timber Harvest Model Recommendations, Peter Claggett, USGS

Peter discussed the forest clearing data from the high-res land use change product and the implications for timber harvest in the model. Link to Land Use Change Viewer: <http://cicapps.org/obj1lu/>

- **Anne Hairston-Strang:** Why is there a rule that there is no timber harvest on federal lands?
 - **Sally Claggett:** It has to do with the federal lands workgroup. Basically the fed lands are not showing any agriculture at all. We're working on this rule and it has to do with simplifying the reporting, I'm still getting to the bottom of it myself.
 - **Anne Hairston-Strang:** I've reported the permitted acres by county, but it's not made it into the model.
 - **Peter Claggett:** Yeah, and that's resulted in MD reported data for 2013, but for 2017 we use the 1.5 multiplier, so the trends in harvest are not reflective of reality.
 - **Anne Hairston-Strang:** I just want to know how to get my data to the right place.

- **Peter Claggett:** Jurisdictions have until the end of the month to report their data so we have time to work on that, but I would send it to Olivia Devereux (olivia@devereuxconsulting.com) to make sure it goes to the right place.
 - **Paul Emmart:** I can make sure someone at MDE gets it into the NEIEN system as well.
- **Rebecca Hanmer:** Did you mention WV because the correlation didn't work as well as it did in VA? Or because you haven't looked at the data yet?
 - **Peter Claggett:** Well we only have a small amount of counties for WV. The numbers they've reported as timber harvest doesn't look like what we've been seeing for forest clearing, sometimes they're bigger, sometimes they're smaller.
- **Matt Keefer:** Where we are in PA, we acknowledge our reporting shortfalls when we developed the WIP. We've had some discussions with industry and the private lands reporting is what is challenging because it's all self reported. They're willing but there are issues like formatting, and problems with verification that we have to work through. Thinking about the disparity in the model you showed. We have spatial data for the state lands that shows harvested forest, could you test how that aligns with the model and high res data? Also, on a separate note - I'm still not comfortable with labeling timber harvest as a land use change. I understand why it's classed as mixed open because the loading is different and the canopy hasn't fully formed. But if the intent is to continue to grow trees on the site, we don't view it as a land use change. I'm concerned as to how that change can be communicated.
 - **Peter Claggett:** I agree I think it is a communication issue. We're monitoring change on the landscape so we have dynamic classes. Knowing that all of these changes are happening really depends on our ability to capture succession. For the public release of this data, we're not calling it mixed open, we're going to call it timber harvest or natural succession. We definitely welcome state data, especially if it has an annual timestamp, and we can use that data in our classification to distinguish active harvest and management from something else.
 - **Sally Claggett:** I like your idea Peter for a task force. We can call it the Forest Change Mapping Task Force. Anyone interested in leading or participating in the group, please let me know. We will be addressing the issues that Peter raised.
 - **Rebecca Hanmer:** In the part of VA that I come from there's a huge amount of forest harvesting for the purpose of future development. It looks like natural regeneration for a few years until the development plans mature. How do we deal with that issue in mapping?
 - **Peter Claggett:** When we don't have state data, we look at the land use history from satellite data annually back to the 80s and we look for any history of rotation in the area. We also use 2019 satellite data. If we can take recent data, we can understand better what the purpose of that clearing is, whether it be developed land or crop land, etc. This is why I want the Bay Program to continue to monitor out to 2030, so we can understand what the dynamics are across the region and relate to socioeconomic factors as well.
 - **Rebecca Hanmer:** Proximity to major highways may be a good indicator of temporary change or development. Do you have certain indicators of development potential?
 - **Peter Claggett:** Yes, we currently use context in our classification so we do take things like that into account.

- **Action:** Reach out to Sally Claggett (sally.claggett@usda.gov) if you are interested in leading or participating in the Forest Change Mapping Task Force.
- **Terry Lasher (in chat):** Is there a way to link land use changes to known or permitted types of changes? For example: A silvicultural timber harvest in Virginia will be reforested, be naturally seeded by seed tree or will be converted to hardwoods. All of these approaches are documented. If the land use change is the result of a true change and not a zoning change i.e. solar projects, these are documented by application of a “special use permit” or other. It could add validity to the data if there is documentation.
 - **Peter Claggett:** We don’t currently use that for our classification. If your timber harvest polygon data were attributed with intent, we could take that into account in our classification.
 - **Terry Lasher:** It might be too cumbersome to look at it on a location by location basis but we could account for some of those total acres, at least on the silvicultural end.
 - **Peter Claggett:** Ultimately we’re trying to tell a story to the public, saying this is why the landscape is changing, etc. So that would help us do that for sure.
 - **Terry Lasher:** It’s important how we frame that story too. Back to what Matt said about us framing the story, when we say silvicultural timber harvesting, which is a sustainable practice, is a land use change, that has a magnifier to the amount of TN and TP heading to the Bay, it may not be an accurate depiction of the story.
 - **Peter Claggett:** Right, there’s a proposal to completely revamp and rescale how we’re modeling the watershed, and pending Bay Program approval, it will go into effect in 2025. Maybe we can build on this task force in the meantime to address that issue.
 - **Terry Lasher:** Right because the implication is that the TN and TP is coming through sediment leaving the site, but our management and oversight program is telling us that’s not occurring at our sites.
 - **Matt Poirot:** Our sediment loading/ BMP auditing monitoring program shows that we have less than 1% of the sites that we audit within the Bay Watershed that have active sedimentation leaving the site (it’s about 240 sites annually). From a sediment standpoint, it’s just not happening here in VA.
 - **Anne Hairston-Strang:** We need to keep in mind the difference between the base loading rate (no BMPs applied) versus what you get credit for (when BMPs are applied). Maybe we’re just not giving them enough credit. When they were doing the scientific background check, the problem we have is that we can’t find places where we don’t use BMPs to really set a baseline.
- **Terry Lasher (in chat):** Curious why there is a multiplier for harvesting when it is a temporary change, has WQ BMP’s and harvest regs that demonstrate no sedimentation leaving sites.
 - **Anne Hairston-Strang (in chat):** Terry, there is a harvested forest loading to be able to count the benefits of the widely used BMPs. The 1.5% multiplier was for where states could not report harvested acres, so it is not used in VA.

10 Million Trees for Pennsylvania, Brenda Sieglitz, Chesapeake Bay Foundation

The collective strength of our experience, initiative, and ideas is necessary for us to create systemic change in Pennsylvania and plant 10 million trees by 2025. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation supports the current Keystone 10 Million Trees (K10) Partnership strategy that aims to assist agencies, businesses,

organizations and landowners with funding for tree plantings and innovative ideas that lead to increased demand and guarantee supply of native trees. Brenda Sieglitz, partnership senior manager, shared how partners are utilizing the partnership for tree planting projects, what resources are available to partners, and followed with a Q&A on how partners and landowners can collaborate.

- **Frank Rodgers (in chat):** What does 710,000 trees cost? Was the workforce shortable a COVID issue (i.e., short term) or do you anticipate a chronic shortage? Is the Foundation self-assessing or is a 3rd party being engaged to do analysis of different techniques, survival, etc.?
 - **Brenda Sieglitz:** Cumulative trees plus shelters and stakes was around \$2.6M (<https://www.cbf.org/blogs/save-the-bay/2020/09/planting-trees-in-pennsylvania-to-save-the-bay.html>). According to the nurseries, the workforce shortage issue seems to be chronic, particularly with the bare root trees because it's specialized and tends to be in remote areas. But the pandemic definitely made it worse. To your third question - we have several partners looking at that, specifically Chesapeake Conservancy and Clearwater Conservancy. They're working with contractors within their regions to do regular site visits and evaluate accordingly. We have other partners as well. We're looking at a fully biodegradable tree shelter for this upcoming fall, called NexGen.
- **Anne (in chat):** Brenda, as we move into our 5 million trees by 2031 for MD, I'd like to follow up with you on lessons learned (Anne.Hairston-Strang@maryland.gov).
- **Rebecca Hanmer:** Maybe we should think about having an annual consortium meeting to bring together large-scale efforts to share ideas and talk about lessons learned.

Round Robin

Sally Claggett: Proposing to change the September meeting time to Thurs Sep 2nd, from 9-11am. Also, a new group has formed at the Bay Program, called the Outcome Attainability Team. They want to see actions on buffers and wetlands. They've proposed to have a separate forum on each of those outcomes and hash out how we're going to get to our goal. Led by Sean Corsen, NOAA.

WV: A couple of units of our municipalities have become regular tree planters so we're working with them to get them lined up for Tree City USA.

VA: Hiring for watershed program manager. Urban Community and Forestry staff has participated in and funded at least 10 different urban heat island studies across the Commonwealth in July.

MD: Staff transitions. Looking for 5 million additional tree plantings by 2031. Economic adjustment strategy will hopefully be finalized in August. New article on tree configuration and effects on urban heat island effect (posted [here](#)).

Brenda Sieglitz (in chat): And we are hiring if you know of anyone interested in logistics (moving trees): <https://www.cbf.org/about-cbf/jobs-internships/jobs/keystone-10-million-trees-1.html> Please share - thank you!

Meeting Adjourned