

*Feedback Specific to the Forestry Workgroup
From the Verification Panel*

- Address concern about the percentage of forestry operations that are evaluated independently to verify accuracy of data.
- For expanded tree canopy, how do you determine if it's expanded given trees grow slowly? Through remote sensing or through planting data?
- How do you verify that buffers still function, e.g. reasonably uniform flow through buffer rather than channelized flow?
- On page 10 of Appendix J, confused what the four principles bullets are referring to.
- There is much more detail on the agriculture section of the protocol compared to the urban section.
- The first four practices are covered in Urban Stormwater Workgroup or Agriculture Workgroup's protocols—please confirm this is the case, as just want to make sure they are addressed in those protocols.
- Because of dependence on USDA cost share programs for supporting riparian forest buffers, page 13, really need the agriculture community to advise the Forestry Workgroup on the timing of inspections.
- On page 14, the section is marked "optional" when it really should not be considered optional.
- What counts as a professional program on page 7, Appendix J?
- What/who are these local partners and what is required to be defined as a local partner? Is there some level of expected training or professional certification required?
- Who is responsible for the gathering the data that would be used for this verification?
- For urban forest canopy, the Forestry and Urban Stormwater Workgroups need to make sure we are not double counting with urban stormwater verification protocol.
- Who is responsible for reporting the urban forestry practices in urban environments?
- Is verification every 5 years really enough?
- Unclear how data records would be obtained for what is done on private lands (non-cost shared practices).
- Need address concerns about the low frequency and adequacy (staffing) of inspections on private lands.
- Page 14, part 2: enhance appeal for monitoring. Is monitoring after planting 10 years later for determining functionality really being carried out? This section raises more questions than answers.
- If there is a loss of the urban tree canopy, then there is no credit given for those five years and any previous credit is lost (page 11, Appendix J). What is the reasoning behind that approach? Why take away any incentive for maintaining urban tree canopy. Seems a little extreme.
- Recommend the Workgroup consider clarifying the protocol text about removal of credit given specific situations.
- Why not include the agriculture and stormwater-forestry related BMPs in the agriculture or stormwater verification protocols. Could become a double counting issue.
- Was not clear what the actual forest harvesting BMPs were. Recommend adding a more complete list of these practices in the protocol description.