**Overarching Forestry BMP Tracking Issues and Actions** (identified at the December 1, 2011 meeting)

for FWG, 2/1/12

Forestry BMPs on Ag land: Riparian forest buffers and tree planting

* Consider unique identifier for each RFB planting, given past issue with latitude and longitude reporting, and double-counting.
* States will need to review USDA information coming to Bay Program via USGS, to ensure no double counting.
* Determine if NRCS/FSA could report buffer length and width, in addition to acreage.
* Likely that states undercount these BMPs.
* More work is needed to align tracking and reporting systems in some states (e.g., in VA with IFRIS and Ag Cost Share database used by DCR)
* How do we ensure practices are properly designed, installed, and maintained? Figure out what percent of installations are sampled and when in each state.
* Are practices deleted from the model if failed, expired, or removed from the land?

Urban Forestry BMPs: forest buffers and tree planting

* There is a large disparity in tracking and reporting urban tree planting and urban buffers between states, we need to consider how this can be improved.
* Tree planting is grossly under-counted in some states.
* For urban tree planting to be a credible practice we need to ensure that the trees reported amount to a net gain, not replacing mortalities. Also, what additional data should reported such as tree size, type, species, etc.
* Ideal: detailed local BMP record-keeping for urban tree planting is simplified when sent in to the state.
* State oversees local BMP accounting/reporting.
* Need to avoid counting practices for mitigation credit (e.g., Combined Sewer Overflow plantings in DC)
* Need to base urban tree planting on what gets put in the ground, not what is sold. (If the latter is the only metric, is there a way it can be discounted when reporting?)

Forest Harvesting BMP

* Revisit 1% assumption for forest harvesting and clarify how states can submit their own forest harvesting data.
* Identify the list of “significant risk to water quality” harvesting BMPs.
* States vary widely on their assumed BMP implementation rates and their means of figuring it.
* States that 1) track amount of private forest land harvested, 2) have harvesting laws, and 3) enforcement have most reliable implementation.
* Judy Okay did write-up comparing forest harvesting BMP guidelines of MD, PA, and VA.