



2003 Annual Report

A Definition of Urban Forestry

The Art, Science and Technology of Managing Trees, Forests and Natural Systems in and around Urban Areas for the Health and Well-being of Communities.

Introduction

The National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council was created by Congress in 1990 to advise the Secretary of Agriculture on matters relating to the protection, planting, and care of trees and forests in our nation's cities and communities.

The specific purposes of the Council are to:

Develop a national urban and community forestry action plan.

Evaluate the implementation of that plan.

Submit recommendations with respect to, and develop criteria for, an urban and community forestry challenge cost-share grant program.

The Council is composed of 15 members appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to represent all levels of government, citizen action groups, industry and trade associations, and nonprofit organizations related to urban and community forestry.

A Vision for the Future

The National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council seeks to generate the necessary support and the essential abilities to ensure safe, sustainable, and healthy trees and ecosystems within American communities of all sizes.

As a result of its activities and the enhancement of the nation's urban and community forests, the Council strives to:

Improve the quality of life for all citizens where they live and work;

Use trees and vegetation to enhance community pride and identity;

Create a better understanding of our biological, psychological and cultural connections to the ecological systems that sustain our lives;

Cultivate appreciation for the social, economic, environmental and aesthetic value of trees and community forests;

Foster self-sustaining municipal forestry programs and volunteer-based organizations;

Encourage the coordination and development of multicultural professional training and educational programs related to urban forestry;

Stimulate additional urban forestry funding from traditional and nontraditional sources. Support expanded research and assure widespread distribution of findings;

Promote partnerships that include the private sector and that lead to the creation of new jobs and contribute to healthier economies.

Letter from the Chair

Since 1970, the science and practice of urban forestry has gained credibility as researchers have learned about all the benefits of city trees - for a healthier environment, increased property values, a real sense of community, and to soften the harsh urban lines of our buildings and streets. The USDA Forest Service had the foresight to include urban forestry in their Cooperative Forestry programs legislation 25 years ago. It was first funded as a national program at a minimal level. In 1990, with the inclusion of urban forestry in the Farm Bill, funding for the national program jumped 10-fold. Since then, funding has been appropriated by Congress every year for the national urban forestry program. It's a resource well worth the investment and Congress recognizes that. Conservative calculations of the value of urban tree cover for reducing storm water problems and improving air quality is over \$400 billion.

It is hard to imagine any resource more valuable than the land where we live and the natural resources it holds. The health of trees and forests is an indicator of the quality of the land and ecological systems where we live. Using images captured by Landsat satellites over the last dozen years we can see a picture of how the land is changing. These images show urban areas expanding by about 20 percent while tree cover declines by about 30 percent in naturally tree covered parts of the country. We cannot continue to lose 10 percent more trees than we gain in concrete and pavement.

It is time to turn this trend around. The urban forest is an ecological resource with an economic value. If we invest in the resource wisely, it can yield big pay-offs. While American cities have huge budgets, the small amount of urban forestry dollars can be leveraged into tremendous values. The big bonus is cleaner air and water in urban areas, where over 80 percent of Americans live. Trees have recently been recognized as assets by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which regulates environmental health, and the Government Accounting Standards Board, the nonprofit that sets the accounting practices for state and local governments. This means that city trees, or green infrastructure, have values like roads and utilities, the 'gray' infrastructure traditionally counted as assets.

We can no longer afford to expand urban uses of the land without carefully fitting the built infrastructure with the natural systems or green infrastructure. The quality of the air and water in metropolitan America has become such a serious problem that cities are at a critical point in their development. Most large cities are on the verge of crossing the line drawn by the EPA to mark the outer limits of air and water quality. Once cities cross over the line they achieve non-attainment status and are subject to heavy fines. More to the point of their bottom line, these cities are no longer eligible for federal funding for items like highway construction.

The good news is that investing in the natural benefits of a green infrastructure can go a long way in making the air and water in metropolitan America better. Trees sequester carbon dioxide and remove pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, ozone, and particulate matter from the air. Trees and soil reduce storm water runoff by slowing water flow and increasing the amount of rain soaked into the ground. We can make considerable improvements in the quality of the air and water in metropolitan America if we increase the tree cover in our cities.

The National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council and the USDA agencies are working to protect and expand the green infrastructure in American cities. They welcome the support and involvement of individuals and partnering organizations across the country. Working together we can invest in our urban forests for the benefit of all Americans.

Deborah Gangloff, Chair

A Statement of Principles

Through the collective experience of members of the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council and with the input of the nation's experts from a wide range of disciplines, a body of principles has emerged to provide guidance for developing future urban and community forestry policy.

Good research, information, communication and the exchange of technological knowledge are keys to strengthening urban forestry programs and empowering communities and urban forestry professionals.

A holistic view of urban forestry reveals a continuum of urban and community forestry issues and concerns, from inner city gardening programs to wildfire and pest problems in the urban/rural interface. Similarly, concern for urban trees cannot be separated from concerns about air quality, storm water runoff, wildlife habitat and other aspects of the urban ecosystem.

Providing information to people about the importance of urban and community forestry programs is a necessary first step in along-term strategy to develop and maintain safe, healthy urban and community forests.

As part of a long-term plan for meeting public needs and building healthy urban and community forestry programs nationwide, it is important to assess and address the perceptions, values and needs of our nation's growing multicultural population with respect to urban vegetation and its management.

The development of multilingual educational materials will be important for reaching new and often under-served populations. Urban ecosystems damaged by construction, storms or invasive species will require special attention, tools and techniques. Planning for species diversity and the use of indigenous species where appropriate are among the ways to prevent recurrence of past problems.

Understanding and practicing good urban forestry can benefit many small communities struggling to retain businesses or attract businesses back to newly revitalized downtowns. Healthy urban forests give communities a more livable image and can assist in improving the economic strength of individual malls, shopping areas or entire cities.

Recommendations to the Secretary

To the Honorable Ann Veneman:

Your National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council, which provides guidance and direction to the USDA agencies involved in urban forestry, has built wide-ranging support for the urban forests of this nation.

The Council defines urban and community forestry as the art, science and technology of managing trees, forests and natural systems in and around urban areas for the health and well-being of communities. The value of our nation's urban forests has been estimated at more than \$400 billion. Urban Forests provide the environmental foundation to our urban areas and when managed properly can enhance the economic and social well-being for residents and businesses alike. In addition, urban forests are living classrooms that offer an accessible and powerful tool for educating our youth about the environment, the values and benefits of trees and forests, and making people aware of the opportunities that exist for natural resource career development and jobs.

The Council's Action Plan identifies research and program areas of the urban forestry movement that need investment and prioritized those areas. The Council's Challenge Cost-Share program annually offers grants through its competitive process to fund those areas of high need. To date, through the Challenge Cost-Share Grant Program, the Council has recommended 124 projects in 33 states and the District of Columbia for \$9,609,113 in Federal Financial Assistance grants to leverage \$14,700,026 of nonfederal matching funds for a total investment of \$24,309,139.

Madam Secretary, your National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council appreciates the excellent work of the USDA agencies to improve the health of our urban forests. The Council challenges you to engage the wealth of other federal agencies at the Cabinet level (especially USDA agencies, DOT, HUD, and EPA) and serve as the advocate for increased support and involvement in urban and community forestry.

Specifically, we respectfully request that you:

Increase the urban and community forestry budget to \$50 million to meet the program needs in fiscal year 2005.

Encourage and work cooperatively with the States to leverage local investment in urban forests at the local level. Promote strong funding for the urban and community forestry program.

Encourage the involvement of minority and underserved communities in the development of urban and community forestry programs, and focus on workforce diversity to train and educate those interested in urban and community forestry.

Support urban forestry research and activities that improve and monitor the health of the urban forest.

Support the development of an identifiable and sustainable technology transfer process for urban forestry research.

Promote the unique values of the urban forest and city trees as buffers against terrorism.

We thank you for your continued support for urban and community forestry and the recognition of the urban forest as a valuable national resource.

The Challenge Cost-Share Grant Program

An important way the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council can fulfill its vision and make a positive impact on community forests nationwide, both now and in the future, is through its annual Challenge Cost-Share Grant Program. Each October, a request for pre-proposals is distributed nationwide. Pre-proposals are then evaluated by the Council to ensure that they meet the specified criteria and demonstrate merit relative to the other proposals. Selected applicants are then invited to submit full proposals for final judging in this competitive program. In all cases, project funding must be matched on at least a 50-50 basis from non-federal sources, and the project must have national scope, application, and distribution of its findings. Projects that will have only a local impact (i.e. local tree-planting projects) do not qualify under this program. Grant categories are established annually and are used to meet the Council's goals.

The categories for the 2003 Challenge Cost-Share Grant Program included:

Urban and Community Forestry for and with Minority and Underserved Populations
Goal: To improve the involvement of minority and underserved populations in the development and delivery of urban and community forestry programs, and improve public and private services to minority and underserved populations.

Urban and Community Forestry Projects that Promote Livable Communities
Goal: To advance the emerging field of green infrastructure and sustainable development principles and methods as related to healthy urban and community forestry. To expand smart growth community designs, plans, and applications, and to incorporate urban and community forestry best management practices and applications. To communicate to policy makers, engineers, architects, and elected officials the linkage of sustainable urban and community forestry to pressing community issues: energy, water, air, homeland security, public health, and jobs.

Communicating the Value of Urban and Community Forestry
Goal: To increase the public's understanding of the value of the urban and community forest, and responsibility for its health.

Creative and Innovative Urban and Community Forestry Research and Technology Development
Goal: To improve our understanding of many components and interactions within the urban forest.

Securing a Copy of the Challenge Cost-Share Request for Pre-Proposals

A copy of the Request for Pre-Proposals may be downloaded from the Council's home page.

Contact Suzanne M. del Villar, executive assistant, if you would like to be added to the Council's mailing list.

Highlights of two projects supported by the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council

Quality of Life at the Urban Fringe: Density and Nature in Residential Subdivisions
Forests at the urban fringe are being lost at an alarming rate as urban centers continue to encroach upon surrounding open space. Conventional residential developments meet the "American dream" of a big house on a large lot by converting nearly every square foot of the development parcel into houses, yards, wide streets, sidewalks, and driveways. The result is a uniform and relatively low housing density across the landscape with little or no preservation of natural areas. Costs of this low-density development are clear - loss of forest lands, fragmented wildlife habitat, and reduced water quality - to name a few. One solution to these problems is alternative patterns of development: going by names such as cluster housing and conservation subdivisions, these development approaches preserve large areas of open space by increasing housing density on portions of the parcel. These alternative approaches arguably help preserve environmental quality, but how do they affect the people who live there? A recently completed NUCFAC project, Social and Psychological Impacts of Residential Development Patterns at the Urban-Forest Fringe, sought some answers.

Several studies, conducted at both the University of Washington and the University of Michigan, explored the perceptions, satisfactions, and preferences of homeowners towards their neighborhoods and surrounding space.

Some of the specific questions addressed were:

- Is "open space" important to residents? If so, which aspects are the most important?
- How do density levels and amount of nearby nature affect residents' satisfaction with their neighborhood?
- What trade-offs between density and nature are people willing to make?

Lessons Learned

The importance of nature. The availability of nature plays a significant role in residents' satisfaction with their communities.

The view from the home. Nature views (particularly of forested areas) are highly prized by residents of both conventional and open space subdivisions. But nature views are not simply a matter of preference: views of nature from the home significantly increased overall neighborhood satisfaction and feeling of community while decreasing perceived problems with higher density.

Making trade-offs. Many residents are willing to make trade-offs that can reduce further fragmentation of natural areas.

What's in a name? Residents of conventional large lot subdivisions tend to describe their communities using terms associated with "open landscapes," while open space conservation subdivisions are described by residents in terms related to trees, woods, and other natural areas. In both types of subdivisions, residents gave scenes of "open" grassy areas low preference ratings while forested scenes were highly preferred. Given these results, the term "open space" as it is currently used by many experts (including landscape planners, developers, foresters, and academics) may

not be appropriate. The term often does not reflect the natural features that have been preserved nor is it indicative of the natural settings residents prefer.

Implications for Planning and Design. Results of this project provide insight into how residential development can be accommodated in ways that help preserve forests while providing individuals with satisfying places to live.

Specific recommendations include:

Increase efforts to preserve trees and natural features in residential developments.

Pay particular attention to nature views. Nature views are particularly important to residents. Strategic positioning of housing clusters around natural areas and thoughtful orientation of dwellings on the lot are key considerations for planners and designers in maximizing nature views.

Encourage collaboration opportunities and information exchange among foresters, planning professionals, and the public in residential development decisions. On the one hand, people are often not aware of the trade-offs involved in their decisions about where to live. At the same time, planners and developers may make incorrect assumptions about the perceptions and preferences of the public. Adding to the confusion is the different understandings of terms such as "open space." Given these potential problems, experts, the public, and ultimately the environment stand to benefit from increased collaboration and communication.

For more information about this project, please contact:

Dr. Anne R. Kearney, College of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-2100, Phone: (206) 685-7140; Fax: (206) 685-0790; E-mail: akearney@u.washington.edu

Greening -Green Jobs - Strong Communities Project
D.C. Greenworks' mission is to help solve urban environmental and economic problems by fostering local environmental expertise and community stewardship. DCG works in partnership with community groups, public agencies, businesses, and non-profit organizations to develop community-based environmental programs that address the environmental, social and economic issues facing urban Washington. D.C. Greenworks is the Washington, D.C. subsidiary of Community Resources, an urban, environmental non-profit with programs in Baltimore and Washington, D.C.

This project had three goals:

Goal 1: Improve neighborhood environments through community-based urban forestry on public, private and community spaces.

Goal 2: Enhance economic opportunities for residents through green-job training and placement.

Goal 3: Strengthen the culture of stewardship and the community's capacity in these neighborhoods through shared learning, participatory project development, and community-based greening.

D.C. Greenworks partnered with the University of the District of Columbia Cooperative Extension Department (UDC), the Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Department of Employment Services to create and implement an 8-week, hands-on landscape training and Master Gardener's certification program. Upon completion of the program, 24 trainees received their National Master Gardener Certification from UDC and were hired by the District of Columbia Department of Park and Recreation to restore and maintain 100 of DC's small pocket parks and green spaces.

In 2002 DC Greenworks, a green service microenterprise, was launched to help funnel subcontracts for green work to local providers. DCG works in the area known as Low Impact Development (LID), which focuses on the integration of sustainable practices in landscape and building design, including greenroof technology, rain gardens, constructed wetlands, storm water management and pervious surfaces.

The Earth Conservation Corps and Community Resources/DC Greenworks partnered to transform a desolate, industrial part of Southeast, Washington, D.C. into a lovely greenspace. This project has become the first major local demonstration of cutting edge urban forestry, Low Impact Development, and pollution prevention technologies in D.C. The Matthew Henson Park includes a greenroof, several rain gardens and a restored riparian and forest habitat. CR/DCG was among the team of professionals who designed the park and also led the education and training of the Eagle Corps members themselves, who did most of the physical labor in building the park.

For more information, please contact: DC Greenworks, 2451 18th Street, NW 2nd floor, Washington, DC 20009, 202-518-6195, info@dcgreenworks.org, www.dcgreenworks.org.

Challenge Cost-Share Program Recipients

The following list includes the projects selected by the National Urban and Community Forestry Council for funding under the Challenge Cost-Share Program.

California

Going Green. Compass Rose Media. Contact: Ann Palermo at (831) 457-3533.

Hometown Forest Youth Education Package. Tree Musketeers. Contact: Gail Church at (310) 322-0263.

A Model for Urban Forest Sustainability. HortScience, Inc. Contact: James R. Clark at (925) 484-0211.

T.R.E.E.S. - Transagency Resources for Environmental and Economic Sustainability. TreePeople. Contact: Andy Lipkis at (818) 753-4600.

The Impact of Trees on the Sale and Leasing of Business Property in San Jose. Our City Forest. Contact: Rhonda Berry at (408) 998-7337.

50 Careers With Trees. Tree Foundation of Kern, Inc. Contact: Dana Adams at (661) 325-6650.

Feasibility Study for "Is the Urban Forest A Natural Resource Public Utility?" Bailey O. Hudson Horticultural Consulting. Contact: Bailey O. Hudson at (805) 349-0081.

Guidelines for Developing and Evaluating Tree Ordinances on the Web. Phytosphere Research. Contact: Tedmund J. Swiecki at (707) 452-8735.

National Assessment of Current Urban and Community Forestry Programs. HortScience, Inc. Contact: James Clark at (925) 484-0211.

Colorado

Colorado Habitat Tree. Cheyenne Mountain Zoo. Contact: Frogard Ryan at (719) 633-9925, ext. 116.

Delaware

Roadside Ecosystem Study. Delaware Center for Horticulture. Contact: Gary Schwetz at (302) 658-6262.

Getting the Word Out: Graphic Campaign to Communicate Tree-Planting Principles. University of Delaware. Contact: Susan Barton at (302) 831-1375.

District of Columbia

Urban Trees and Municipal Value: Communicating What a Park System is Worth to a City. Trust for Public Land. Contact: Peter Harnik at (202) 543-7552.

Communicating the Economic and Ecological Values of Urban and Community Forests to Local Government Officials. International City/County Management Association. Contact: Andrew Seth at (202) 962-3622.

Building Effective Partnerships for City Trees. American Forests. Contact: Karen Fedor at (202) 955-4500, ext. 224.

Economic Benefits and Costs of the Urban Forest in Low Income and Non-Low Income Communities. American Forests. Contact: Cheryl Kollin at (202) 955-4500, ext. 221.

Urban Ecological Analysis: Expanding the Economic Costs/Benefits Model to Include Air, Water, and Energy. American Forests. Contact: Cheryl Kollin at (202) 955-4500, ext. 221.

Common Knowledge: Turning Local Gems into National Treasures. American Forests. Contact: Karen Fedor at (202) 955-4500, ext. 224.

Regional Urban & Community Forestry Train-the-Trainer Sessions for Youth Corps Staff. National Association of Service & Conservation Corps. Contact: Andrew O. Moore at (202) 737-6272 ext. 107.

Exploring Ecological Linkages Between Urban and Rural Communities. American Forests. Contact: Gerald J. Gray at (202) 955-4500, ext. 217.

GreenWorks! Works. American Forest Foundation. Contact: Caroline Austin at (202) 463-2472.

Mobilizing the Web for Urban and Community Forestry Education. American Forest Foundation. Contact: Eric Steiner at (202) 463-5170.

Florida

Restoring the Urban Forest Ecosystem. University of Florida. Contact: Mary L. Duryea at (352) 392-1784.

Hawaii

National Assessment of Minority and Underserved Populations' Experiences in Urban and Community Forestry. NatureTalks. Contact: Colleen Carroll at (808) 742-9339.

Illinois

Coping with Poverty and the Value of Nature in Urban Public Housing. University of Illinois. Contact: William C. Sullivan at (217) 244-5156.

Growing Hope: Children, Trees, and Urban Public Housing. University of Illinois. Contact: Frances E. Kuo at (217) 244-0393.

Impacts of Development on Perched/Seasonal Water Table Fluctuations and its Effects on Urban Woodlands. Village of Riverwoods. Contact: William Kaplan at (847) 945-3990.

Urban Forestry for the 21st Century: Trees, Vitality and Longevity in Older Americans. University of Illinois. Contact: William C. Sullivan at (217) 244-5156.

National Urban and Community Forestry Research and Technology Transfer Assessment. ISA Research Trust. Contact: John Geissal at (217) 355-9411, ext. 53.

Reducing Urban Crime. A Multi-City Assessment of the Benefits of Urban Forests. University of Illinois. Contact: William C. Sullivan at (217) 244-5156.

The Healing Power of the Urban Forest: Impacts on ADHD. University of Illinois. Contact: Frances E. Kuo at (217) 244-0393.

Conveying the Power of Trees. A National Outreach Effort. University of Illinois. Contact: William Kruidenier at (217) 244-2831.

Mycorrhizal Responses to Anthropogenic Nitrogen Enrichment in Urban and Rural Woodlands. Chicago Botanic Garden. Contact: Louise Egerton-Warburton at (847) 835-6915.

Iowa

Trees and Traditions of the Native Americans. T.R.E.E.S. Forever. Contact: Shannon Ramsay at (319) 373-0650.

Identifying Environmental Constraints Affecting Tree Survival and Growth in Rural, Suburban, and Urban Public Settings. Iowa State University. Contact: Jan Thompson at (515) 294-0024.

Urban Trees to Household Furniture. Resource Conservation & Development for Northeast Iowa, Inc. Contact: Teresa Steffens at (319) 864-7112.

Kansas

Project Kansas Urban Green. Natural Tree Source, Inc. Contact: Duane Dyer at (316) 788-7581.

Kentucky

Watershed Analysis and Issue Characterization for Education and Outreach. Northern Kentucky Area Planning Commission. Contact: Larisa Hughes at (859) 331-8980.

Teen's Forestry Organization for Russell Community Enhancement: T-FORCE. Louisville Central Community Center. Contact: Sam Watkins at (502) 589-8821.

Computer Animated Stormwater Runoff Model. Sanitation District No. 1 of Northern Kentucky. Contact: John Lyons at (859) 578-6770

Louisiana

The Forest Where We Live (1995). Louisiana Public Broadcasting. Contact: Tika Laudun at (504) 767-4262.

The Forest Where We Live (1997). Louisiana Public Broadcasting. Contact: Ayan Rubin at (225) 767-5660.

Quantifying the Relative Ability of Tree Species in Intercepting and Removing Particle Pollution. Southern University and A&M College. Contact: Kamran K. Abdollahi at (225) 771-6291.

Trees2K. Shreveport Green. Contact: Donna Curtis at (318) 219-1888.

National Urban and Community Forestry Minority Outreach and Education Conference. Southern University and A&M College. Contact: Zhu Hua Ning at (225) 771-3286.

Maine

Cost Effective Sidewalk Planting Site Re-habilitation. City of Bath, Maine. Contact: Thomas C. Hoerth at (207) 443-8345.

Promote Holistic Effective Management of Forested Parcels. Maine Department of Conservation. Contact: Kevin Doran at (207)287-4988.

Maryland

Reducing the Barriers to Urban and Community Forestry: A Policy Approach. Parks & People Foundation. Contact: Amanda Cunningham at (410) 448-5663.

Valuing Urban Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs). Community Resources, Inc. Contact: Mike McConnell at (410) 448-4900.

Using Community-Based Urban Forestry to Create New Jobs for Lower-Income Urban Residents: A National Demonstration Project in Washington, D.C. Community Resources, Inc. Contact: Mike McConnell at (410) 448-4900.

Effect of Nitrogen Fertilizer on Insect Pest Populations, Their Damage, and Tree Growth of Selected Landscape Trees. University of Maryland Cooperative Extension. Contact: Chuck Schuster at (301) 590-2807.

Massachusetts

Public Service Announcement: Trees Are My Friends! Eagle Eye Institute, Inc. Contact: Anthony Sanchez at (617) 666-5222.

Learn About Forests™ Eagle Eye Institute, Inc. Contact Anthony Sanchez at (617) 666-5222.

Michigan

A Study of the Effect of Vegetation on Micro Climates and Residential Energy Use in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Arbor Resources Group. Contact: Geoffrey McD. Lewis at (734) 665-6665.

TLC - The Landscape Consultation. Urban Options, Inc. Contact: LeRoy Harvey at (517) 337-0422.

Creating an Edible Urban Forest in Detroit. Michigan Integrated Food & Farming Systems. Contact: Tom Guthrie at (517) 432-0712.

Model Community Forestry Internship Program. The Greening of Detroit. Contact: Rebecca Salminen Witt at (313) 237-8733.

Minnesota

Southeast Asian Initiative for Urban and Community Forestry. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources in partnership with Tree Trust. Contact: Josee Cung at (651) 297-4745.

Re-Designing Neighborhood Parks and Town Squares. University of Minnesota. Contact: Ann Forsyth at (612) 624-3509.

The Economics of Tree Preservation in Developing Urban Areas. University of Minnesota. Contact: Gary R. Johnson at (612) 625-3765.

Montana

Native American Urban/Community Forestry Technical and Cultural Transfer Project. Natural Path Forestry Consultants, Inc. Contact: Kelly Chalfant at (406) 721-3263.

Nebraska

Tree Planting and Care Public Information Packet for Utilities. The National Arbor Day Foundation. Contact: Mary Yager at (402) 474-5655, ext. 206.

Tree City USA Bulletin Translation Editions. The National Arbor Day Foundation. Contact: Mary Yager at (402) 474-5655, ext. 206.

Tree City USA Bulletins. The National Arbor Day Foundation. Contact: Mary Yager at (402) 474-5655, ext. 206.

Sustainable Urban and Community Forestry Program Guidebook. The National Arbor Day Foundation. Contact: Mary Yager at (402) 474-5655, ext. 206.

Web Site Enhancement for arborday.org. The National Arbor Day Foundation. Contact: Mary Yager at (402) 474-5655, ext. 206.

New Hampshire

Benefits of Large Trees Relative to Maintenance Costs to Private Tree Owners. National Arborist Association. Contact: Martin Novom at (603) 673-3311.

New Jersey

Greening the Garden State: Trees New Jersey Community Forestry Materials. Trees New Jersey. Contact: Jan Bisco Werner at (609) 298-2999.

The Influence of Trees on the Appraised Value of Urban Land. University of New Jersey - Rutgers. Contact: Steven Strom at (732) 932-8488.

The Green Infrastructure Guide: Planning for a Healthy Urban and Community Forest Ecosystem. MSM Regional Council. Contact: Ann Brady at (609) 452-1717.

New York

Young Citizen Pruners for Today & Tomorrow. New York City Street Tree Consortium. Contact: Barbara Eber-Schmid at (212) 227-1887.

The Economic Impact of Urban Forests in Commercial Districts. A Greater New York/New Jersey Area Study. Trees New York. Contact: Barbara Eber-Schmid at (212) 227-1887.

Tree Heritage Program. Cornell Cooperative Extension of Jefferson County. Contact: Ralph E. Mitchell at (315) 788-8450, ext. 231.

The National Art and Design Street Tree Competition. City University of New York. Contact: Caitlin G. Cahill at (212) 254-9501.

Bike Rack "cum" Tree Guard: Protecting Our Street Trees. Trees New York. Contact: Barbara Eber-Schmid at (212) 227-1887.

Holding Water and Creating Forested Parks in East New York: Cleaning the Waters of Jamaica Bay. The Gaia Institute. Contact: Paul S. Mankiewicz at (718) 885-1906.

Dissemination of an Approach to Integrate Urban Tree Planting into State and Federal Air Quality Improvement Programs. Davey Resource Group. Contact: Christopher Luley at (585) 394-9460.

Integrating a High-Powered Urban Forest Benefits Model in a User-Friendly, Public Domain Program. Davey Resource Group. Contact: Christopher Luley at (585) 394-9460.

North Carolina

World-Wide Publication of the Cumulative Proceedings of the Metropolitan Tree Improvement Alliance (METRIA). North Carolina State University. Contact: Thomas G. Ranney at (828) 684-3562.

Ohio

Effects of Soil Management Practices on Soil Ecology, and Tree Carbon Allocation, Insect Resistance and Stress Tolerance in an Inverted Subsoil Profile. The Ohio State University. Contact: Daniel A. Herms at (330) 202-3506.

Feasibility Study: Making a Revenue Generating Biogenic Utility a Reality. Davey Resource Group. Contact: Elizabeth Buchanan at (800) 828-8312, ext. 17.

Urban Forest Benefit/Cost Identification. Davey Resource Group. Contact: Sandra L. Burns at (330) 673-9511, ext. 349.

Study of Energy Conservation Through Vegetation Management. ACRT, Inc. Contact: Cindy Terry at (800) 622-2562, ext. 234.

Using Benefit/Cost Analysis to Manage an Urban Forest. Davey Resource Group. Contact: R. J. Laverne at (330) 673-5685, ext. 49.

Bottom-Line Benefit Partnership. The Urban Forest and the Development Community: Using Bottom-Line Benefits to Shift the Paradigm. Davey Resource Group. Contact: R. J. Laverne at (330) 673-5685, ext. 49.

Feasibility Study of Urban Forest's Economic Value for USEPA Air Pollution and Carbon Sequestering Emission Reduction Credits and/or Mitigation Trading. ACRT, Inc. Contact: Cindy Terry at (800) 622-2562, ext. 234.

Evaluating Air Quality Effects of Urban Trees: Developing Directionally Sound Programs for Use in State Ozone Attainment Goals. ACRT, Inc. Contact: Cindy Terry at (800) 622-2562, ext. 234.

Trees and Sidewalks - Who Exploits Who? The Ohio State University. Contact: T. Davis Sydnor at (614) 292-3865.

The Influence of Urban Trees on Rental Rates at Commercial Developments: A Pilot Study in Northeast Ohio. Davey Resource Group. Contact: R. J. Laverne at (330) 673-5685, ext. 49.

Catastrophic Loss of Tree Canopy as an Opportunity to Study the Effects of Trees on Energy Use. The Davey Resources Group & the Arbor Resources Group. Contact: R. J. Laverne at (330) 673-5685, ext. 49.

The December 2000 Ice Storm: Loss of Tree Canopy as an Opportunity to Study the Effect of Trees on Energy Use. Davey Resource Group & The Arbor Resources Group. Contact: R. J. Laverne at (330) 673-5685, ext. 49.

Oregon

Comparing the Value of Urban Forests in New Community Development. University of Oregon. Ronald Kellett at (541) 346-3647.

Pennsylvania

Exploring Social-Structural and Social-Psychological Bases of Environmental Concern and Urban Wildlife Values in Ethnic Minority Populations. Pennsylvania State University. Contact: Geoffrey Godbey at (814) 863-8985.

Our Heritage of Community Trees. Pennsylvania Urban and Community Forestry Council. Contact: Henry Gerhold at (814) 865-3281.

South Carolina

Managing Urban Forest Fear/Safety and Vegetation/Privacy: Alternatives to Clearing the Trees. Clemson University. Contact: William Hammitt at (864) 656-0787.

Feasibility of Planting Small, Bare Root Trees in Select Locations as an Alternative to Typical Community Tree Ordinance Planting Requirements. Clemson University. Contact: Donald Ham at (864) 656-2480.

South Dakota

The Influence of Urban Soil Condition and Modification on Transplanted Tree Performance. South Dakota State University. Contact: Peter Schaefer at (605) 688-4732.

A Comparison of the Benefits and Costs of Tree Cover Between Two Prairie Communities. South Dakota State University. Contact: John Ball at (605) 688-4737.

The Influence of Urban Fringe Forest on the Development of Urban Communities. South Dakota State University. Contact: John Ball at (605) 688-4737.

Tennessee

Economic Impacts of the Green Industry in the United States. University of Tennessee in partnership with the University of Florida. Contact: Charles R. Hull at (865) 974-7410.

Growing Healthy Dogwoods: Proper Selection, Care, and Maintenance. University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Contact: Wayne K. Clatterbuck at (865) 974-7346.

Electronic Media Tutorial Programs to Improve Urban Tree Establishment and Management. Tennessee Technological Institute. Contact: Douglas Airhart at (931) 372-3288.

Texas

Demonstrating Community Values of Urban Forests Relative to Their Form and Function. Texas A&M University. Contact: Scott Shafer at (979) 845-5411.

Sustainable Urban Orchard with Urban Produce Marketing Cooperative. TreeFolks, Inc. Contact: Mary McCarthy at (512) 443-5323.

Utah

TreeLink in 12 Languages. Tree Utah. Contact: Pepper Provenzano at (801) 359-1933.

The TreeLink Project. Tree Utah. Contact: Pepper Provenzano at (801) 359-1933.

TreeLink: An "Expanding Canopy" of Urban and Community Forestry Knowledge. Tree Utah. Contact: Pepper Provenzano at (801) 359-1933.

Virginia

Tree Maintenance - Wire Basket Manipulation and Tree Stabilization. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Contact: Bonnie Appleton at (757) 363-3906.

Making Tree Roots Visible. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Contact: Bonnie Appleton at (757) 363-3906.

Tree Conservation and Sustainable Landscaping for Habitat for Humanity Homes. National Wildlife Federation. Contact: David Mizejewski at (703) 438-6499.

Arborist Training Program. Norfolk Botanical Garden. Contact: Mark K. Scott at (757) 441-5830, ext. 350.

The Street/Utility Easement Conflict. Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University. Contact: Bonnie Appleton at (757) 363-3906.

Washington

Public Knowledge of Urban Forest Benefits & Values in Commercial & Retail Environments. University of Washington. Contact: Kathleen Wolf at (206) 616-5758.

A City Among the Trees. City of Seattle Urban Forest Coalition and Office of Management and Budget. Contact: Liz Ellis at (206) 684-5008.

The View from the Road: Costs and Benefits of Roadside Urban Forests for Business Districts. University of Washington. Contact: Kathleen L. Wolf at (206) 616-5758.

Examining Ethnic Differences and Shifts in Urban Forestry Attitudes through Group Design of Scale Models. UTMS. Contact: J. Alan Wagar at (206) 546-8251.

A Multicultural Survey of the Influences of Childhood Environmental Experiences on Adult Sensitivities to Urban and Community Forestry. Washington State University. Contact: Virginia I. Lohr at (509) 335-3101.

Social and Psychological Impacts of Residential Development Patterns at the Urban-Forest Fringe. University of Washington. Contact: Anne Kearney at (206) 685-7140.

Nature's Assets: Public Perceptions of the Community Forest of Business Districts in Small Towns. University of Washington. Contact: Kathleen Wolf at (206) 616-5758.

Healing Nature: The Psychological, Social, and Spiritual Effects of Nature in the Hospice Care Environment. University of Washington. Contact: Daniel Winterbottom at (206) 616-1876.

Safety, Trees and Urban Transportation: A National Study of the Roadside Urban Forest and Accident Rates. University of Washington. Contact: Kathleen Wolf at (206) 616-5758.

West Virginia

Urban Forest Tree Growth and Global Climate Change: Sugar Maple as an Indicator Species. West Virginia University. Contact: Jonathan Cumming at (304) 293-5201, ext. 31508.

Wisconsin

Nitrogen Relationships of Ornamental Trees in Urban Settings: A First Look. University of Wisconsin. Contact: Robert Miller at (715) 346-4189.

The Impact of Forests on Elderly People in Long-Term Settings: A Multicultural Perspective. University of Wisconsin. Contact Uriel Cohen at (414) 229-6481.

2004 Meetings of the Council

February 26-28, 2004 in Washington, DC

June 24-26, 2004 in Detroit, Michigan

October 14-16, 2004 in New York, New York

For further information, contact;

Suzanne M. del Villar

Executive Assistant to the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council

USDA Forest Service

P.O. Box 1003

Sugarloaf, CA 92386-1003

Phone: (909) 585-9268

Fax: (909) 585-9527

E-mail: sdelvillar@fs.fed.us

Council Members

Deborah Gangloff, Chair, American Forests, Washington, D.C.

Brenda Allen, Auburn University, Tuskegee, Alabama

John Ball, South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota

Ann Bates, Idaho Nursery & Landscape Association, Idaho Falls, Idaho

Larry Biles, USDA Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Washington, D.C.

Bill Brash, Assunpink Environmental Institute, Hamilton Square, New Jersey

Dan DeWald, Bellevue Parks, Bellevue, Washington

Joel Holtrop, USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

Elizabeth Kinch, Derby Community Foundation, Derby, Kansas

Steven G. Scott, Tennessee Department of Agriculture, Division of Forestry, Nashville, Tennessee

Ray Tretheway, Sacramento Tree Foundation/Alliance for Community Trees,
Sacramento, California

Teresa Trueman-Madriaga, Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife, Kapolei, Hawaii
Kelli Tuttle, Bluestem Forest Consulting, Inc., Argonne, Wisconsin

Joseph Wilson, Greening Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Donna Yowell, Association of State Flood Plain Managers, Madison, Mississippi