**Participants:** Chris Peiffer, Craig Highfield, Gary Speiran, Judy Okay, Anna Stuart Burnett, Sally Claggett, Herb Petticord, David Wise, Josh Zimmerman, Sloane Crawford, Eric Sprague, Tracey Coulter, Tanner Haid, Derrick McDonald, Ellen Roane, Barry Isaacs, Donna Murphy, Tom Ward

* FWG looked at protocols in March.
* There must be scientific accounting for each principle.
* Sally needs a group of volunteers to continue to work on the verification protocols. This needs to be done in June.

**Forestry BMP Verification – Principles and Protocols**

1. Urban forestry program (municipal, partnership)
	1. Programmatic part: to ensure maintenance, replanting
	2. Looking for reporting to come up on a county basis, but can use finer tree assessment if available
	3. Why would you discount a group where people are trained as tree stewards?
	4. Need a good definition of “the partner”
	5. Try to integrate with CARS database that is used for state urban and community forestry reporting to USFS. Does it allow a way to look at net gain in tree cover for a jurisdiction? Not really.
	6. We are getting good at documenting tree planting activities at the local level, but want to do better in tracking survival of these activities in out years.
	7. Need to track losses as much as tree plantings (or almost as much).
	8. Need to make sure programs are in place to ensure no net loss of forest
	9. Will sample jurisdictions every few years
	10. For example, states could use federal funds (EPA or USFS) to monitor a certain number of local jurisdictions a year (e.g., 2-3 or 10% of those reporting).
		1. If federal funds are expected to be used, should be discussed at the Management Board
		2. Guesstimate: would take ½ day for one person using iTree to sample whether a community was losing forests or not. Need to check with statistician/Dave Nowak on how many sample points would be needed.
		3. Need to establish a baseline for the communities first, this can be a challenge for those communities without canopy assessments but iTree and/or Land Image Analyst tool could help with both.
	11. States are doing good if they are holding the line, can they be expected to have a net gain?
	12. MD has the Forest Conservation Act, no other Bay state has a protective state-wide law. Some communities have ordinances that protect tree canopy
2. Will be tracking urban buffers better since Phase II WIPs. Need a separate discussion for that. Will have a call with a few key people next week (Ellen, Barbara, Dave, Donna, Frank, Anne) to determine next steps.
3. Ag Riparian Forest Buffers
	1. Need to create a baseline
	2. Land Image Analyst tool (now in Beta), is designed to monitor existing buffers and change in buffers
	3. Check for projects being double counted at state forestry office.
	4. USDA Forestry Team will discuss buffers counted toward the Executive Order goal. Sally will discuss these protocols with them - especially the need to track width (could they add a data field?) and monitoring.
	5. Effectiveness protocol: is the buffer functioning effectively/ surviving
	6. Need to review a percentage of buffers every 5 years, focus on plantings coming up for reenrollment
	7. Look for buffers that are hydrologically connected. Is this possible?
	8. From Tom Ward: be wary of overstocked buffers not functioning fully:
		1. 60-80ft2 / acre of basal area recommended to ensure vertical diversity in buffers (this is about 60% open canopy - which is desirable)
		2. Or could simply check for canopy openness.
		3. 70% survivorship required for payment; 60% canopy required for reenrollment
4. Forest Harvesting BMP Principle
	1. How do you determine the difference between tree harvesting and development?
	2. Sally will keep moving the document forward, no further discussion needed.
5. Announcements
	1. No July Forestry Workgroup meeting. Will have August 1st conf call.
	2. Get all the USFS grants to states signed by the end of June.
	3. Meeting face to face September 5th.