Forestry Workgroup Meeting Minutes

April 2nd, 2025 | 9:00 am - 11:00 am

Meeting Materials

Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Meeting Attendees

Alanna Crowley, MD DNR
Alexis Dickerson, Potomac Conservancy
Anne Hairston-Strang, MD DNR
Bay Hanson, USFS
Caitlin Verdu, VA DOF
Cassie Davis, NYS DEC
Celine Colbert, PA DCNR
Chris Miller, DE FS
Craig Highfield, ACB
Emily Heller, EPA CBPO
Erica Carlsson, DC DOEE
George Doumit, DE DNREC
Heidi Bonnaffon, MWCOG
Helen Golimowski, Devereux Consulting
Jeff Lerner, EPA
Jenna Talbot, DE DNREC
Judy Okay, J&J Consulting
Julie Mawhorter, USFS
Kalaia London PA DCNR

Kesha Braunskill, USFS
Lorenzo Cinalli, USFS
Lucas Bolno, The Nature Conservancy
Mark Dubin, UME
Matt Keefer, PA BOF
Marilyn Yang, CRC
Meghan Noe Fellows, DE Center for the Inland Bays
Ned Brockmeyer, PA DCNR
Nicole Angelo, NY FPAC-FSA
Orsi Lazar PA DCNR
Ranier Luca, Upper Susquehanna Coalition
Richard Turcotte, USFS
Rob Schnabel, CBF
Robbie Coville, PA DCNR
Robert Corletta, DC DDOT
Ruth Cassilly, UME
Sarah McDonald, USGS
Susan Minnemeyer, Nature Plus

9:00 (5 min)	**Welcome and Introductions** – *Anne Hairston Strang (MD FS, FWG Chair)* For roll call purposes, please enter your name & affiliation in the chat box. Call-in participants are requested to identify themselves verbally.
9:05 (5 min)	**Announcements** – *Katie Brownson (USFS, FWG Coordinator)* • Upcoming USFS Watershed Forestry Webinar on April 17th 12-1: "Linking Working Forests and Water Quality". Register Here • New Trees 101 Video • NFWF now accepting applications for Small Watersheds Grants and Chesapeake Wild Grants (applications due in May) • Changes to Upcoming FWG Meetings: ○ May 7th FWG meeting rescheduled to May 14th

	○ Scoping a possible June 11th field trip (hopefully in PA!) in place of the June FWG meeting ● The WVU Arboriculture & Urban Forestry lab is seeking a Master's student for a research project focused on utility vegetation management. Applications are due May 15, 2025. For more information, please email Dr. Greg Dahle (gregory.dahle@mail.wvu.edu) Erica Carlson (in chat): DC DOEE also has a new tree video! https://youtu.be/PYsWJI_U5Ws?si=v-kQ_D6fwv8vACT- Katie Brownson: Welcomed Lorenzo and Kesha back!

9:10
(5 min)
	Forestry Workgroup Membership Review and Call for At-Large Members – *Katie Brownson (USFS, FWG Coordinator) and Marilyn Yang (CRC, FWG Staffer)*
	
	Katie and Marilyn provided a summary of the current voting members and asked for jurisdictional representatives to review and update their membership as needed. In addition, they reviewed the at-large members whose terms are ending and put out a call for up to three at-large member nominations.
	
	Current signatory members (4/2025):
	● Virginia
	  ○ Caitlin Verdu, VDOF
	● West Virginia
	  ○ Jeremy McGill, WV DOF
	● Washington D.C.
	  ○ Robert Corletta, DDOT
	     Erica Carlsson, DC DOEE
	● Delaware
	  ○ Taryn Davidson, DDA
	  ○ Catie Soriano, DNREC
	● Maryland
	  ○ Anne Hair-Strang, MDNR
	  ○ Alanna Crowley, MDNR
	● Pennsylvania
	  ○ Matt Keefer, PA DCNR
	● New York
	  ○ Cassie Davis, NY DEC
	  ○ Lauren Townley, NY DEC
	● Federal government
	  ○ Julie Mawhorter, USFS
	  ○ Katie Brownson, USFS
	● Chesapeake Bay Commission
	  ○ Vacant
	At-large members with terms expiring 2026 (4/2025):
	● Lydia Brinkley, Upper Susquehanna Coalition
	● Craig Highfield, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
	● Alexis Dickerson, Potomac Conservancy

	At-large members with terms expiring this spring 2025/positions up for re-election or new nominations (4/2025): ● Frank Rodgers, Cacapon Institute ● Rob Schnabel, Chesapeake Bay Foundation ● Susan Minnemeyer, Nature Plus ACTION: If any current at-large members wish to be re-nominated, or if a FWG participant would like to nominate themselves or someone else, please indicate your interest via email to Katie Brownson (Katherine.Brownson@usda.gov) and Marilyn Yang (myang@chesapeakebay.net) **by COB May 6th**

9:15 (10 min)	[**Update on 2024 Land Use/Land Cover (LULC) Data and Communications Products**](#) – *Sarah McDonald (USGS) and Katie Brownson (USFS, FWG Coordinator)*
	
	Sarah and Katie provided an update and a preview on the forthcoming 2024 edition of the LULC data and updates to the State of Chesapeake Forests Storymap and new municipal fact sheets.
	
	Summary of the [presentation](#):
	Data sources:
	● NAIP (National Agricultural Imagery Program) 1-meter aerial imagery used across all dates
	● LIDAR is key to mapping tree canopy and identifying changes
	● A detailed jurisdiction-by-date table will be included in the user guide, listing data inputs used in each location
	● Data organized by three time periods:
	  2013–14, 2017–18, 2021–22
	
	"Tree Canopy" Trends:
	● Watershed-level data shows consistent trends:
	  ○ Slight decline from 63% to 62% tree canopy cover over time
	  ○ 25 million acres in 2021–22
	  ○ Variability may exist due to differences in LIDAR availability by county and years
	
	"Forested" Extent Trends:
	● Represents large forest patches and areas regrowing into forest
	● Higher overall percentages than tree canopy:
	  ○ 67% in early dates, dropping slightly to 66% in 2021–22
	  ○ 27 million acres in 2021–22
	● For comparison:
	  ○ Tree canopy in 2021–22: 25 million acres
	  ○ Forested extent in 2021–22: 27 million acres
	
	"Forest" Trends:
	● 2021–22 data shows:
	  ○ 24.5 million acres
	  ○ 60% of the watershed

- Indicates that about 6% of the watershed was mapped as harvested or in transition (not yet full forest)

Change with development impacts:
- Net change from forest/tree canopy to developed classes (2013–14 to 2021–22):
    - 100,000-acre reduction
    - Consistent across tree canopy, forested extent, and forest only metrics
    - Equals about 0.25% loss across the watershed
- Important distinction:
    - Some forest-to-development transitions still retain tree canopy
        - E.g., trees in yards or over impervious surfaces
        - These are no longer counted as "forest" but still included in some tree canopy classes

Accuracy assessment of the data:
- 2021–22 land cover overall accuracy: 95%
- Tree canopy accuracy: 95% or above, evaluated in a couple of different ways
    Tree canopy change is more complicated:
    - Generally more accurate at detecting losses than gains
    - Tied to LIDAR limitations (it's easier to detect a removed tree than to recognize a new tree that hasn't grown tall enough yet)
- For more information, refer to the detailed presentation given at the March 2025 Land Use Workgroup

Communications products:
- The LULC data is dense and can be easily misinterpreted, especially when it comes to understanding landscape transitions, so clear communication is essential to help users interpret the data accurately.
- To support this, they're working on a set of communications products to release along with the data:
    - New municipal-scale fact sheets, similar to the county-scale fact sheets
    - Effort to update the county fact sheets is also underway although the timing is uncertain whether it will be released at the same time
    - Light update to the State of the Chesapeake Forest Story Map

Discussion:

Matt Keefer: This is just a comment, but the caution is around how and when we present the data. At the watershed scale, as Sarah showed, it doesn't look like much change. But if we're trying to elevate forest conservation and tree canopy protection, especially beyond 2025, we need to make sure the messaging reflects that in places like riparian areas, there are real losses, and restoration isn't keeping up.

Sarah McDonald: Yes, I appreciate that comment.

Katie Brownson: That's a great point. The actual numbers are pretty big, but when shown as a percent of land area, it can seem like not much is changing, partly because the watershed is so large. So it may help to highlight the raw numbers more clearly.Thanks again to Sarah for joining us. We're looking forward to the official data release and will be sharing it with the workgroup, along with the communications products, once everything is ready. Stay tuned for more soon.

	Sarah McDonald: If anyone has specific questions about the data or ideas for how you'd like to see it summarized or rolled up, now's a great time to reach out. Feel free to email me at smcdonald@chesapeakebay.net.
9:25 (15 min)	**Update on Beyond 2025** – *Katie Brownson (USFS, FWG Coordinator)* To set the stage for the following agenda items, Katie provided an overview of the broader Beyond 2025 effort, including recent Management Board decisions on the disposition of the outcomes in the revised Watershed Agreement. She also highlighted the FWG's related outcomes: Healthy Watersheds (slide 10), Land Use Options Evaluation (slide 11), and Protected Lands (slide 12). Katie then concluded by sharing that the recommendation to update the Forestry Workgroup outcomes—Tree Canopy and Forest Buffers—was approved by the Management Board, but they requested the FWG to consider the following: • 3/27/25 MB Meeting Update: The MB approved moving forward with recommending to the PSC to "Update" the FWG outcomes. However, they have directed the FWG to consider how to broaden and better highlight opportunities for forest conservation and restoration, in addition to considering whether consolidation or reclassification under a single outcome makes sense, with the inclusion of distinct tree canopy and forest buffer targets. This discussion will be revisited during the April 10th MB meeting. **Discussion**: Rob Schnabel: On the protected lands component, what do we need in the plan to actually shift the trend to net gains? I'm thinking about new goals and how this ties to permanent protection of riparian buffers. Curious how those overlap and if you can elaborate. Katherine Brownson: We'll see more as we dig into the two outcomes' language. We already include language around working toward net gains. Within the forestry outcomes, the frame should be broader (conservation, stewardship, and management) both maintaining what's on the landscape and increasing it. The protected lands piece is a narrower subcomponent focused on permanent protection. That's likely where sub-goals for forests and riparian forests would sit. That part would land under the permanent land protection outcome. Then we can handle broader conservation beyond permanent protection. Rob Schnabel: Permanent protection can also help leverage new buffers, the way those protection programs work. It'll be important to communicate back and forth to hopefully generate more acres. Katherine Brownson: Agreed. Historically we haven't collaborated with the Protected Lands outcome as much as we could. If the agreement gets reorganized, operating under a shared goal framework could make that collaboration easier. Rob Schnabel: Since they're also working on ag preservation: could permanent ag easement programs be used to require or prioritize forest buffers by adjusting standards or ranking? Do we need to provide anything to push that?

	Katherine Brownson: That likely comes in during the management strategy phase, but it's a good point to flag for future discussions.
9:40 (20 min)	**Beyond 2025: Finalizing the Draft Updated Tree Canopy Outcome Language** – *Julie Mawhorter (USFS)*

Julie led a discussion to review options for updating the Tree Canopy Outcome language and numeric targets.

Potential revised outcome language:
- TREE CANOPY OUTCOME: Conserve and expand community tree canopy to maximize air quality, water quality and public health benefits throughout the watershed. Working toward a net gain in canopy, plant and maintain ## new acres of community trees by 2035. […with a focus on low canopy areas?]

Possible numeric targets:
1. Plant 24,000 acres by 2035 (from 2014 baseline- so, plant 12,660 additional acres from 2024-2035) – continues our average annual planting rate from the last 10 years into the next ten+ years'
2. Plant 35,000 acres by 2035 (from 2014 baseline- so, plant 23,660 additional acres from 2024-2035) – moderately higher planting rate than last 10 year average
3. Plant 50,000 acres by 2035 (from 2014 baseline- so, plant 38,660 additional acres from 2024-2035)- significantly higher planting rate aiming to better offset average net loss rate of 3755 acres/year

Discussion:
Robbie Coville: I like the change in language overall. Adding public health is valuable since there's overlap and growing involvement from that sector. I do want to challenge the shift toward planting goals instead of canopy coverage goals. A canopy focus ensures conservation of mature trees and shows whether plantings reach maturity, while planting numbers alone risk inefficiency if survival is low.

Julie Mawhorter: I agree. We tried not to lose that focus—our language includes conserve, working toward a net gain in canopy, and plant *and maintain*. Those are meant to show it's more than just planting. The issue is that even with 11,000 acres planted, we still saw a net loss of 28,000 acres. That's why we leaned toward planting numbers—they're easier to track.

Katie Brownson (in chat): I think the intent would be to continue tracking net gain/loss, right?

Matt Keefer: Leadership prefers simple numbers, trees or acres planted, because they show quick progress. Net gain or loss is harder to explain. I think we need a planting number, but also language that's more active, pointing to policy and conservation, even if just in supporting text.

Erica Carlsson (in chat): DC's goal: Plant and maintain 10,500 new trees per year in priority areas to achieve 40% tree canopy cover by 2032.

Julie Mawhorter: We could also say "reduce the rate of loss" to make it clearer.

Judy Okay: Focusing only on "low canopy areas" could set us up for failure, since many have limits. I'd suggest more specific wording.

Alexis Dickerson (in chat): Adding the word "plantable" might increase specificity.

Susan Minnemeyer: Goals vary by community, but encouraging them is useful. I like "community forestry" over "urban forestry" to include more places. Planting targets also help since it takes 5–15 years for new trees to show up in canopy data.

Erica Carlsson: In DC, planting goals are aspirational but effective. Space is shrinking, but we still set numbers.

Julie Mawhorter: This outcome tracks canopy in urban and community areas, not the whole watershed. From 2014–2023, 11,340 acres were planted, but we lost 8,900 acres of canopy. We could maintain, moderately increase, or stretch our planting rate to address that.

Erica Carlsson (in chat): Yes, and the reason why it is challenging (tree canopy %) is that it takes time to get canopy to show up in LIDR and other imaging, but I've not been convinced about planting #s because even though they are reported as maintained there is pretty considerable mortality.

Caitlin Verdu (in chat): I've just sent this to Lara Johnson--she had not yet seen it and is on leave today. I will need to regroup with her before offering comments on behalf of VA.

Erica Carlsson: What are the consequences if we don't reach the goal?

Julie Mawhorter: These are voluntary goals. Some are in state WIPs, but states choose which BMPs to use.

Erica Carlsson: Then I'd support a moderately higher planting rate—the middle option.

Matt Keefer: In Pennsylvania, canopy in our WIP has helped build support. We debated being cautious with funding but see value in a stretch goal to show demand. I'd lean toward 35,000 acres by 2035. We should also think about program changes, like planting on private land, even if tracking is harder.

Julie Mawhorter: The question is what actions we'd prioritize to actually reach those goals.

Robert Corletta: Costs are rising and space is limited in DC. Street trees are already at 98% stocking. Planting continues, but preserving and growing existing canopy is key to real gains.

Erica Carlsson (in chat): 100%

Judy Okay (in chat): Setting unattainable goals does have connotations of failure when doing reports that have public access. If you can explain away the whys of not making a

goal then it may be okay, particularly if there is a solution to the issue. I would advocate for the 35,000 by 2035...catchy, not too much of a stretch.

Julie Mawhorter: Thanks everyone for the feedback. I'll follow up. It seems there's support for either maintaining the current rate or a moderate stretch goal.

10:00
(20 min)

Beyond 2025: Finalizing the Draft Updated Forest Buffers Outcome Language – *Katie Brownson (USFS, FWG Coordinator)*

Katie led a discussion to review options for updating the Forest Buffer Outcome language and numeric targets.

Potential revised outcome language:
- FOREST BUFFER OUTCOME: Restore and conserve forest buffers to maximize benefits for water quality, habitat and people throughout the watershed. Working towards having **75%** of riparian areas forested throughout the watershed, plant and maintain **7500** acres per year of riparian forest buffer and reduce the loss of existing forest buffers to achieve at least **71%** of riparian areas forested by 2035.

Possible numeric targets:
1. No net loss of forest buffers
    - Maintain current 70% buffer coverage through 2035
    - Plant 5587 acres/yr to keep pace with losses
    - Pros: On par with average recent high planting rates
    - Cons: Wouldn't put us on track to reach 75% forested
2. 1% gain in riparian forest by 2035 (71% forested)
    - Plant 3712 acres/year (assuming no net loss)
    - Plant 9298 acres/year (to compensate for average loss rates)
    - Plant 6505 acres/year (to compensate for 50% of average loss rates)
    - Pros: Would put us on a trajectory to achieve a net gain in forest cover (assuming loss can be reduced) while maintaining realistic planting rates
    - Cons: Reaching 75% forested will take a long time
3. 2% gain in riparian forest by 2035 (72% forested)
    - Plant 7,289 acres/year (assuming no net loss)
    - Plant 12,876 acres/year (to compensate for average loss rates)
    - Pros: Would put us on track to achieve 75% forested by 2035
    - Cons: Planting rates needed to compensate for losses are unrealistic

Discussion:
Cassie Davis (in chat): Quick update: NY currently has a statewide 25 million tree goal by 2033 and NYS DEC is continuing to develop a statewide reforestation plan. There is a new dashboard for tracking trees planted:
https://dec.ny.gov/nature/forests-trees/climate-change/25-million-trees

Judy Okay (in chat): 70% cover is indicated as a healthy watershed. I would suggest you might go with:" Maintain a 70% cover for healthy watersheds and strive for a 5% increase in cover to assure high quality watersheds.

Caitlin Verdu: I put this in the chat, but I'm curious if we've looked at the land use/land cover data to see how many acres are really available for planting. In Virginia this comes up a lot—we're running out of places for buffers. That's why I like the change from miles to acres. I also like keeping the percentage. I don't have a big issue with the numbers, but if we had that data quickly, it would be useful to test against the targets.

Katherine Brownson: That's a great point. I don't think we'll have that data before draft numbers, but The Conservancy is doing a plantable space analysis for the State of Chesapeake Forest story map. We'll eventually overlay that with the riparian forest layer, just not in the next few weeks.

Caitlin Verdu: Maybe once we set the goal, when I think any of these are pretty reasonable, we can look at it again and plan for the future. That sounds good.

Rob Schnabel (in chat): Remind me Buffer width that would count towards this?

Anne Hairston-Strang (in chat): 35 to 300 ft

Judy Okay: You might consider saying maintain 70% cover and strive to increase by 5%, then use the 7,500 acres. Research shows 70% riparian cover supports a healthy watershed. If meeting goals is difficult, this may be a better setup.

Katherine Brownson: I'd hope maintaining 70% would be implied, since we say "plant and maintain" and "working toward net gain."

Judy Okay: I think you go back and forth with your losses—that's the problem.

Katherine Brownson: Right. I tried to find more recent science behind the 70% goal, but it was hard.

Judy Okay: I think it's been updated, I'll check.

Katherine Brownson: Please send anything you find. The Chesapeake Healthy Watersheds Assessment links riparian cover to stream health scores, which justifies a 75% goal for improving stream health.

Judy Okay: There's also fisheries and forest research with percentages—I'll share.

Katherine Brownson: Okay, thanks.

Matt Keefer: Thanks, Katie, for keeping us focused and representing us at the management board. This is really important. On the numbers—they're big and will be a stretch no matter what. I'm concerned about sustaining the pace, so stretching further is a little concerning. That said, buffers are gaining traction. DEP, PSC, and others are recognizing the importance of canopy and buffers, so we've made progress. My question is whether the 70% to 75% goal accounts for improvements from other practices—like cover crops or nutrient management—that also reduce loads.

Erica Carlsson (in chat): For conservation and maintenance I still wish we could call out invasives. Forest buffers are notoriously damaged by vines. This even includes natives.

Cassie Davis (in chat): There is a narrow buffer BMP in CAST for 10 to 35ft are those included?

Katherine Brownson: Stream health scores respond to many different stressors and improvements across the landscape. The relationship is broad strokes—watersheds with more riparian forest cover generally have better stream health. Other actions also matter, but if we look only at riparian forests, 75% cover is the level we think is needed to support good stream health.

Matt Keefer: And just for perspective—looking at that 234,000 acres, Pennsylvania's WIP called for 85,000 acres. Then there's another 15,000 or so in the Conowingo WIP. So theoretically a significant portion of that is already committed. I'm not sure how we'll get there, but some of those numbers are already planned for. Maybe that makes it a little less intimidating. But it puts the burden on Pennsylvania for sure.

Katherine Brownson: Yeah. And I don't know if 75% is too big. I picked it because it's a nice round number, right between "good" and "excellent." It's big, but if we're thinking about what we want to get to eventually, it seems like something we could stand behind.

Matt Keefer: I'd be interested in how the management board and PSC react if we set 75% for 2050. Even as a long-term target, it signals a sustained program with attention to maintenance, not just rushing tubes into the ground.

Katherine Brownson: Right. Maybe something like 72% or 73% by 2050 would be more realistic, but my instinct is to start big and let them talk us down, rather than starting low and being pushed lower. I'm open to what the workgroup thinks.

Rob Schnabel: In general, increasing percent cover should improve water quality. But there are case studies—like Reston, or one Virginia town—that had good buffers but poor stormwater management, so water quality was still bad. Given that anything from 35 to 300 feet counts, should we emphasize headwater streams? Buffers there give the biggest benefit for baseflow and water quantity.

Katherine Brownson: An interesting thought. My instinct is not to be that specific in the outcome language, but to include it in the management strategy. The general language is about maximizing benefits for water quality, habitat, and people. The natural follow-up would be to highlight headwaters. But if we say we're focusing on rural headwaters, then communities may ask, "What about us?" That's the risk of being too prescriptive in the outcome language.

Rob Schnabel: I could see it—you're downstream and it floods, so you make buffers wider there, but you're not addressing water quantity issues upstream. I get not being prescriptive, but even a one-liner about the importance of headwater buffers could help.

	Anne Hairston-Strang: I think that belongs in the strategy. The goal should stay simple and inclusive. Buffers should target effective areas, but we also need coverage across the landscape. Rob Schnabel: Okay, as long as it's clear that "effective areas" means different things to different people. Anne Hairston-Strang: Yes, and that's where statewide strategy documents will come in. Rob Schnabel: Okay. We've got our state hydrologist, so I have faith in Maryland. Katherine Brownson: Thanks, everyone, for the input. Unless blocking concerns arise, we'll move forward assuming separate outcomes and keep the numeric targets I shared. Reach out afterward if you have concerns. With our last 14 minutes, we'll shift to the final agenda item—whether to consolidate our two outcomes. Even if consolidated, we would still want numeric targets rolled into that outcome. Anne Hairston-Strang: Katie, Cassie had a question in the chat: there's a narrow buffer BMP in CAST for 10–35 feet. Are those included? Katherine Brownson: In planting counts, no. For forest cover after growth, yes. For BMP tracking, only 35 feet or greater counts as riparian forest buffer.
10:20 (20 min)	**Beyond 2025: Considering Options for a Consolidated "Forests and Trees" Outcome** – *Katie Brownson (USFS, FWG Coordinator)* Katie led a discussion focused on responding to the Management Board's request to consider what a consolidated "Forests and Trees" Outcome could look like. **Pros of consolidating:** ● Allows broader consideration of all forests and trees in the watershed, beyond riparian areas and communities ● Fills the gap left when the earlier Watershed Health outcome shifted to decision support ● Enables a single consolidated Management Strategy and Workplan ● Could support additional outputs or indicators on forest/TC trends, stewardship, agroforestry, etc. **Cons of consolidating:** ● Separate outcomes keep a stronger focus on two distinct priority areas ● Recognizes differences in communities, landscapes, and people engaged in each ● Consolidation would significantly broaden the Forestry Workgroup's scope ● Capacity may be limited for developing new outputs/indicators **Potential Language for a "Healthy Forests and Trees" Outcome**: ● Conserve and restore healthy forests and tree cover to maximize benefits for water quality, habitat and people throughout the watershed, with a particular focus on riparian areas and communities. ● Working toward a net gain in canopy, plant and maintain ## new acres of community trees by 2035.

- Working toward having XX% of riparian areas forested throughout the watershed, plant and maintain XX acres of forest buffers and reduce the loss of existing forest buffers to achieve at least XX% of riparian areas forested by 2035.

Discussion:

Caitlin Verdu: I'd prefer to keep the outcomes separate. In Virginia, we have different teams working on each, and I don't see much benefit in combining them other than reducing two outcomes to one.

Katherine Brownson: Okay, thanks Caitlin. Matt?

Matt Keefer: Pennsylvania's different position in the pulse check was meant to elevate forestry work overall and respond to the EC's charge to simplify the agreement. The idea was if we had one forest outcome, it would elevate everything. Our rep's final vote was to reclassify, thinking we'd still have distinct outputs, but I didn't realize that would drop forestry from the agreement, which is a non-starter. Katie made that clear last week at the management board. If this moves forward, I'd want forestry to remain an outcome under Healthy Watersheds. If separate, we'd have two outcomes under that goal. If consolidated, we'd have one "forests and trees" outcome. My concern is if we push too hard to keep them separate, others may argue tree planting is just an output. If combined, could we also include a forest conservation piece that's missing?

Katherine Brownson: If separate, there would still be two outcomes—one for buffers and one for canopy—under the same goal. If consolidated, it would be a "healthy forests and trees" outcome, but the agreement language would still specifically reference community trees and forest buffers. That's been my hard line: it must remain written into the agreement, not just in the management strategy. I don't care if it's called an output or outcome as long as it's in the agreement. And yes, consolidation could give us the opportunity to add conservation.

Susan Minnemeyer (In chat): As long as the two distinct tracts of our work remain in the agreement at the same level of importance then consolidation makes sense to me.

Cassie Davis (in chat): I would prefer to keep them separate as they are now

Anne Hairston-Strang: On outputs versus outcomes, tree planting is an output in some contexts, but for Bay restoration, buffers and forests are fundamental and should be part of an outcome. If combined, the outcome should be elevated to "trees," with a focus on buffers and community canopy, and then have specific goals under that.

Katherine Brownson: We're running short on time. Cassie is saying keep them separate, others are leaning toward consolidation. I'm torn myself—I can see it both ways, and people are leaning both ways. Could we do a quick show of hands on where folks stand?

Anne Hairston-Strang: It may depend on the structure of the agreement. Many like the focus of separate outcomes, but if forestry language can be elevated into the goal itself, the outcomes might stay separate.

	Katherine Brownson: That's a good point. How goals are set makes a big difference. If some of the forestry language gets elevated into goal language, then we might not need a consolidated outcome. Anne Hairston-Strang: Thanks to everyone for engaging. Goals like these are important because they help us communicate needs and explain funding. Katherine Brownson: Sorry we got crunched for time. But if folks do want to follow up afterwards, please feel free to reach out. I'm happy to chat or e-mail. I think I'll take the strategy of bringing some options back to the management board, getting them to react and provide direction, and sharing the input I got today both ways. Anne Hairston-Strang: If needed, we can hold an e-mail vote.
10:40 (20 min)	**Round Robin** *Ran out of time*
11:00	**Adjourn**