
Chesapeake Bay Program

Local Leadership Workgroup - Tree Canopy Outcome

The Region 9 Chesapeake Bay Coordinator (CB Coordinator) was recently appointed Chair to the Local Leadership Workgroup for the Chesapeake Bay Program. The Workgroup’s purpose is to “continually increase the knowledge and capacity of local officials on issues related to water resources and in the implementation of economic and policy incentives that will support local conservation actions.” But which **ISSUES** do we educate on?

This report will use Tree Canopy, another Chesapeake Bay Agreement Outcome, as an example of how the LLWG can focus its efforts on increasing knowledge and capacity. By linking our “curriculum” to other desired CB Agreement Goals and Outcomes, the LLWG has guidance on which issues to focus on and ultimately helps further other goals and outcomes within the Program.

Findings:

Tree Canopy 101:

Course Description

This course is designed to provide a better understanding to local government officials of the value of trees within rural, urban, and suburban landscapes.

Learning Outcomes

The outcomes associated with this curriculum will better enable the Tree Canopy Workgroup Outcome to accomplish their goal of increasing tree canopy by 2,400 acres by the year 2020. To achieve this, the Local Leadership Workgroup will develop and delivery content within the following subject areas:

1. **Funding and partnership**

Purpose: Tree plantings cost money and require labor and coordination. LLWG should recommend and endorse effective and easy funding sources and partnerships.

- **Partnerships:** Find examples across the watershed of successful programs:
 - See West Virginia’s Cacapon Institute - CTREE and “Your BMP”
 - Information shared at the Urban Tree Canopy Workshop
 - Montgomery County
 - Volunteers

- **Funding:**
 - Green Infrastructure USDA Revolving Loan Fund
 - NFWF

- FEMA Funding
- Division of Forestry's Grants
- Tree City Funding Requirements (Spend \$2 per capita on trees)
- Stormwater Fees
- Municipal General Fund
- Examples: Mark Gulick, Jennifer. 2016. "Funding Your Urban Forest Program: A Guide for New and Seasoned City Foresters." Society of Municipal Arborists. Available: <https://www.urban-forestry.com/assets/documents/funding-your-uf-program-jenny-gulick.pdf>

2. **Policy and Ordinances**

Purpose: To provide the needed regulatory examples and resources to increase tree canopy.

In 2011, the Eastern Panhandle Planning and Development Council (Region 9) conducted research on their community's existing stormwater management and erosion and sediment (E & S) control ordinances and requirements within their three county region. It was determined that there was a lack of local regulatory oversight during the land development process. Seeing this, Region 9 developed a model stormwater and E & S ordinance template for local municipalities to voluntarily review, modify, and consider for adoption. This template was complemented by technical assistance provider who worked with these communities during the review and adoption process.

The ability value of this technical assistance and model template was proved when 75% of the communities in region used the document for ordinance revision consideration resulting in a 50% adoption rate of the higher standards.

Applying this demonstrated technique across the watershed can increase tree canopy and achieve community priorities. It is recommended for LLWG to locate several existing tree related

Possible Examples:

- [https://pittsboronc.gov/vertical/sites/%7B512CE168-4684-4855-9CD9-7D209FE775E3%7D/uploads/Tree Protection Ordinance Recommendations 072215\(1\).pdf](https://pittsboronc.gov/vertical/sites/%7B512CE168-4684-4855-9CD9-7D209FE775E3%7D/uploads/Tree%20Protection%20Ordinance%20Recommendations%20072215(1).pdf)
 - Tree Canopy and Forest Retention Ordinance Requirements
 - Trees Virginia
 - ChesapeakeTrees .net
 - Vibrant Cities

3. **Technical Capacity**

Purpose: Train public works departments, assist workforce development of 'green collar'

jobs, and locate supply chains (plant or tree nurseries). Specific examples could include:

- Right Tree Right Place. Overhead lines, underground utilities and sidewalks
- Tree Specie Diversity
- Internships and Apprenticeships (see Branching In Native Nursery - NFWF)
- Maintenance issues and training.
 - Pruning
 - Old/Dying Tree Removal and waste options (BioChar, mulch)
 - Other

4. Outreach and Education

Purpose:

1. Assist communities better understand the co-benefits of tree canopy within their community, which includes but not limited to:
 - Flash Flood Reduction
 - Stormwater Management Programs
 - Air Quality
 - Quality of Life
 - Energy Savings. Increase relevance of Tree Canopy with Stormwater Managers.
2. Cost Effectiveness of Tree Canopy for meeting local TMDL responsibilities
 - The Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay recently released findings from the Urban Tree Canopy Forum. Below is an excerpt of the findings:
 - “Given the many benefits that trees provide, it is not surprising that communities have discovered urban forests to be a wise investment of public dollars, providing positive returns-on-investment (ROI). One recent study analyzed municipal investments in urban tree canopy and found a return to the community of \$1.37 to \$3.09 for every dollar spent. For all these reasons, communities should view urban forests not as a cost to themselves but rather as a smart investment strategy that produces real economic returns.”
 - Mark McPherson, G., et al. 2005. “Municipal Forest Benefits and Costs in five US Cities.” Journal of Forestry. Available: https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/mcpherson/psw_2005_mcpherson003.pdf
 - Mark The Kestrel Design Group, Inc. “Investment vs. Returns for Healthy Urban Trees: Lifecycle Cost Analysis.” Deeproot. Available: <https://www.deeproot.com/silvapdfs/resources/articles/LifecycleCostAnalysis.pdf>
 - Mark USDA Forest Service Center for Urban Forest Research. 2004. “The Large Tree Argument: The Case of Large-Stature Trees vs. Small-Stature Trees.” Available:

https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/cufr_511_large_tree_argument.pdf

Summary:

While many funding opportunities are available and local governments are eligible, there still exists a lack of “hand-holding” technical assistance providers for local governments to lean upon to better understand policies and programs that can increase tree canopy over the long term.

Workgroup Needs:

The LLWG requests \$_____ to hire one (1) regional technical assistance provider to work in WV, MD, VA, and PA around Interstate 81 corridor. Martinsburg is central to these states as all four are within 40 miles and can be served by one provider.

