

Urban Forestry Commission
February 22, 2018
Meeting Summary

Attendance

Nora Palmatier, Chair
John Vihstadt, Board Liaison
John Carey
Patricia Norland
Caroline Haynes
Steve Campbell
David Howell
Brian Keene
Evelio Rubiella
Paul Campanella
Phil Klingelhofer
Kathleen McSweeney

State and County Staff

Kurt Louis, DPR
Brian Keightley, DPR
Vincent Verweij, DPR
Adam Lipera, DPR

Guests

James Hurysz
Margie Bell
Natasha Atkins
Karen Kumm Morris
Suzanne Sundburg
Angela Dickey
Mary Glass
Janice Hull
Vicky Arroyo
Jo Allen
Bernard Berne
Melanie LaForce
Audrey Clement
Jen Holt
Bill Roos

Guests, Commissioners and Staff – Introductions and Sign-in

Public Comment

1. Jim Hurysz – Fairlington resident: Abingdon elementary school concern – toured the site, and stated that mature trees supposed to be preserved were not – APS appeared to have removed more trees than they originally planned. Also, concerned with tree removal along Interstate 395.
2. Natasha Atkins – Aurora Highlands: feels like County is glossing over the fact that half of the civic associations in Arlington lost tree canopy since 2011. Ms. Atkins asked what the canopy goals are, how the county will address the aging forest, and how replacement trees are monitored. Additionally, Ms. Atkins asked about funding for pruning.
3. Suzanne Sundberg: Feels that Tree Canopy study is not accurate. Ms. Sundberg handed out a document outlining her concerns.
4. Mary Glass – Tree Action Group wanted to highlight:
 - a. Psychological benefits that trees provide for the community.
 - b. The need for a faster process for the urban forestry master plan
 - c. The loss of tree canopy 4020 25th St N.
5. Vicky Arroyo is concerned that the loss of trees is changing the neighborhood in a negative manner. Land disturbance should be minimized. Prioritizing preservation vs tree replacements.
6. Bernie Berne: Noted a concern with the Red Cross development site at Trenton St. and Arlington Blvd and the loss of 2% of trees in that neighborhood since last survey. Also concerned about County removing historical plaque for historical tree. Wants sign replaced for historical purposes.

7. Audrey Clement – Westover resident, asked: County impervious space increased over last 5 years, so how can tree canopy have increased? Questions the numbers in the Tree Canopy study. Concerned about losing properties/building in Westover and losing trees because of that new construction. A six-foot diameter tree cut down, in one recent project.
8. Melanie Laforce – Tuckahoe: Wants to save large canopy trees in neighborhood – shade saves energy. Likes aesthetically pleasing aspect that trees provide. Need to find ways to save mature trees.

Mr. John Vihstadt – Board Member and Liaison to UFC

The board member spoke about the following:

1. Liaison to UFC and NVCT.
2. Spoke on FY19 budget.
3. Four Mile Run Valley – competing interests; arts, business, parks communities. Want to keep majority of businesses in tact along Four Mile Run Valley. What should be done with several County owned buildings in that area, how to work with the Signature Theatre, the old warehouses, what to repurpose to create an arts district, and what areas to repurpose area to green space were all issues discussed as competing interests.
4. ADU – Accessory Dwelling Unit – Mr. Vihstadt worked on this issue, to provide appropriate housing, and noted the UFC's guidance helped provide some restrictions on setbacks.
5. POPS – latest draft of POPS document – discussed level of service, UFMP & NRMP, casual use space.
6. Tree Canopy study: Mr. Vihstadt had started reviewing the document, and suggested to have another public session focused solely on Tree Canopy study.
7. Reed School: working to minimize negative impact.

Tree Canopy Study – Vincent Verweij, DPR

1. Questions from Commissioners about Tree Canopy study
2. Questions were provided by the general public, in paper form, which will be used to create a Frequently Asked Questions section on the urban tree canopy page.
3. It was noted that the study report will not be altered, but the Urban Forest Master Plan (UFMP) will address many questions and concerns.
4. Vincent Verweij worked down the questions, and answered, where appropriate:
 - a. Nora: To me it is too complicated to keep explaining the figures with DOD and without. I propose we only use the Exclude airport and DOD, so say 41%. Since any efforts we undertake to increase canopy will not affect DOD or Airport, let's not even mention them. Vincent: In the future, this will likely be the approach, but for the sake of comparison, it was appropriate to keep this.
 - b. Kit: Agree it is confusing. We can focus our discussion on data excluding DOD/Airport and explain that clearly. At the same time, good to avoid being seen "cherry-picking" terms of comparison. Including DOD/Airport is the only data set available for 2008; the 2017 report states that, including those, "UTC percentage is 38%." In the spirit of openness and transparency, not sure we can or should ignore that finding. (DOD and Airport are not the only area county does not control, given NPS.) Also, can we also clarify how school land – typically counted as part of "parkland" acreage - is counted in this 2017 study? Vincent: that distinction was not made, but we could make that part of future analyses.
 - c. Nora: The report is pretty much what I was expecting. I'd hypothesized that increased plantings on public property such as parks had occurred and the greatest loss was in

residential areas. Interesting to compare those receiving Tree Canopy Funds since 2009 : Aurora Highlands which has received 170 Tree Canopy Fund trees this time increased by 15%, Penrose that received 175 trees increased 11%, Rock Spring has received 22 trees and decreased 4%. So how does UFC and ACE use this study to get more groups to apply for their free trees?
Vincent: for the UFC to discuss

- d. Nora: Davey Report Page 11 - by Census Blocks. Can this map be printed in the extra large format, or a way to enlarge it on my computer screen, so it can be further analyzed? I think this detail provides better data to determine where land exists to plant trees. It gives Virginia Square as having pockets of 45% coverage and yet overall is only 23%. Any civic association with a park in its boundaries will have the same – Bluemont has Lacey Woods, Junction and Bonair so is 43%, but on the census block map most residential area is close to 15%. Is there a way to put the Civic Association boundaries onto this Census Block map?

Vincent: This map will be produced.

- e. Nora: Davey Report p. 13 & 14 Table 5. by Zoning, The Residential is where there is the greatest change to increase canopy, and the largest acreage is R-6 which has also lost the highest percentage (-10) since 2008. The R zoning is where By Right development is most likely to occur and site plans not involved so motivational education is most needed, and where Tree Canopy Fund applies. This is what I was expecting to see in the study. Are there any surprises to UF staff?

Vincent: The biggest surprise was the overall increase, but when digging deeper into the data, this was corroborated with tree growth and retention

- f. Brian Keene: Using the data in this report, and data from the county on the location of building permits, we should be able to run some statistical analysis to see if there is any correlation between permits for by-rights development and changes in canopy coverage. Similarly, with data from the Tree Stewards, it may be possible to see if there are correlations between outreach efforts and changes in canopy.

Vincent: This may be appropriate for future analysis

- g. Brian: The zoning data on p 13 gets hard to follow. Would be good to rank order the zoning types by their potential opportunity for expanding the canopy or preventing further loss.

Vincent: This may be appropriate for future analysis

- h. John: Some initial thoughts. As Kit has pointed out, the underlying methodology for the 2011 report does not seem to be described in any of the online resources (i. e. , whether the data come from the National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery and thus are comparable to the 2008 and 2016 data, and whether the same software was used).

As a result, it's hard to know conclusively whether the published figures (43% canopy cover in 2008, 40% in 2010-11, and 41% in 2016) represent meaningful on-the-ground differences or simply variations in data or methods. Can we pin down, please, whether the data in the 2011 study also come from the NAIP, and if so, in what year the data were collected? (e.g. 2010?)

Vincent: The methodology is partially explained in the draft report for that study. The methodology was compared with the 2008 data, as well, and was deemed to be comparable, despite being slightly different.

John: If indeed all the data and methods are the same, then we do need to acknowledge the margin of error in the studies, I think. As the Davey report points out, the accuracy of the

analysis is between 92.4% and 94.1%. So the apparent increase in tree canopy from the 2011 report to the new one (from 40% to 41%) is close to the margin of error, and thus may sound bigger than it really is. As a result, personally, I'd be more comfortable saying that the new report shows no decrease in tree canopy since 2011, instead of trying to claim an increase. Vincent: Noted. We will not be changing the report, and it stands as is, and it is a tool for planning. The areas with significant decrease will be used for targeted efforts in tree canopy retention and improvement.

I'd also be very curious about what Vincent, Nora, and other experts think about the 2008-2010 (or 2011) data that seem to show a big decline in tree canopy cover (from 43% to 40%) in just two years. Does that feel right, given what was happening on the ground at the time? Vincent: We are using the data from the report. Anecdotal data can be very misleading

More important, though, I do see real value in the specific trends identified in the new tree canopy report. It looks like the County deserves kudos for the canopy increase on parkland (Figure 11, page 17). Too bad that parks are just a small percentage of the total land area, because we are clearly losing the tree canopy battle in most residential areas (Figure 6, p.7) and especially in neighborhoods that are seeing large numbers of tear-downs and in-fill development, such as Lyon Park, Rock Spring, Yorktown, etc. (Figure 8, page 10).

Vincent: Noted

- i. These data reinforce what we already know—that in-fill residential development is one of the largest threats to Arlington's tree canopy, and that we need to continue to try to find new solutions.

Vincent: Noted

- j. Kit: It would be useful to have an explanation for the discrepancy in percentage of impervious surface in the 2017 report (38% including DOD/Airport, 37% excluding) and on the county's web site (42%). The explanation will be helpful in itself, as well as any bearing it might have on margin for error in other data. Thank you.

Vincent: The impervious cover does not count impervious cover underneath trees, which accounts for the difference.

- k. Evelio: Early in the report, it indicates an increase in UTC of 165 acres for the County since 2011 (a 2.7% increase) however, a later table in the report (and one of the PP slides) indicates only a 1% increase overall for the County during the same period. Did I misread something?

Vincent: This relates to the difference between percentage point and percentage, and the area used.

- l. Evelio: There is a factoid early in the report indicating less road repair associated with increased tree canopy (p. 1). Can you elaborate on the reasons for why this is? I think this is a benefit most people don't associate with increased UTC.

Vincent: Asphalt evaporates, and shaded asphalt can improve road longevity through shade.

- m. Evelio: Is it correct that the most/max area (based on assessment of "preferred plantable area") that could be converted to UTC is an additional 17%--for a total of 55% UTC overall for the County? (based on current UTC (38%) plus 17% preferred plantable area).

Vincent: That is correct, though it must be noted that much of that is on private property.

- n. Evelio: is it correct that all one family dwelling districts (Table 5) showed overall declines in UTC from 2011-2016?

Vincent: That appears to be correct

- o. Evelio: The Rosslyn and Nat'l Airport tree cover show substantial increases over the course of the various assessments. If correct, to what is this attributable? I'm curious since the narrative in the report also indicates that these are watersheds with low overall tree cover—is/has the County making some kind of concerted effort to address the low tree cover in these watersheds?

Vincent: Growth is likely the major component here, though some planting has occurred in the Rosslyn watershed.

- p. Steve: There is a footnote to the 2011 Civic Association Map (U of VT and Casey Trees) that says the Arlington TCC study excludes "all FEDERAL properties and the airport", which unlike 2008 and 2016, would imply more than only DOD. Therefore- does the 2011 TCC study exclude the GW Parkway, Iwo Jima/Netherlands Carillon Parks? The way the map is drawn seems to support this. If so, this would influence the 40% overall number.

Vincent: This will be fixed.

- q. Steve: If the 2011 Civic Association Map can have a table that lists approx. 70 civic associations, why can't table 3 of the 2017 study (page 8) do the same?

Vincent: This will be part of a future map. The contractor did not dedicate space for these tables to be complete.

Arlington citizens love to study the TCC map wherever it is displayed. They like looking for their civic association, whether at farmer's market Tree Steward tables, civic association annual meetings, other programs/ events, etc.

Also it is very important to mention ALL the CAs with poor canopy in the text on this page- in addition to Crystal City/Pentagon City and RAFOM are North Rosslyn, Courthouse-Clarendon, and Foxcroft. Each has 17% or lower TCC.

Vincent: Noted

- r. Steve: In the Introduction (page 1/ first paragraph) should 'health' be added as a benefit?

Vincent: The report stands as is, and will not be changed. This may be appropriate for the UFMP.

- s. Same paragraph, last sentence, I think it would be more important to mention how trees reduce the Urban Heat Island effect, rather than road maintenance savings (or mention both). In fact, UHI causes damage to road surfaces, but UHI is the more important issue.

Vincent: See previous answer

- t. Third paragraph, should mention also be made of increased disease in trees and deer browse as challenges?

Vincent: See previous answer

- u. Steve: Shouldn't the Surface Temperature Analysis on page 22 mention that TCC reduces UHI's damaging effects? Effects such as- 1) higher temperatures resulting from UHI worsen air quality by increasing pollutant levels (ozone, e.g.); 2) UHI increases peak energy demand;

3) it harms water quality in streams/ivers, including significantly raising the temperature of stormwater runoff; 4) it contributes to climate/global warming. The UHI effect is an important issue for the County.

Vincent: See previous answer

- v. Steve: The 19% 2008-2016 increase shown for downtown Rosslyn does give a misleading impression. It is not at all what it seems, because it is based on only 1.5 acres of TCC growing to 1.74 acres, an increase of only one-quarter acre of canopy over 8 years.

Vincent: Noted. This is a good example of the difference between percentage and percentage point

- w. Steve: Shouldn't the study mention the new County planting specifications re: adequate soil volume for trees (as well as the use of quality soil media)? Both very important to increasing tree canopy!

Vincent: The study stands as is. This may be appropriate for the UFMP

- x. Steve: Just to be sure, is Arlington Cemetery considered a DOD property in these studies, and as such is excluded from the TCC calculations?

Vincent: That is correct

- y. That being the case, I would suggest that Arlington Cemetery should be specifically mentioned, along with DOD and the airport, since many people may not be aware the cemetery is part of DOD.

Vincent: The study stands as is. This may be appropriate for the UFMP.

Notable Trees – Adam Lipera, DPR

The following notable trees were reviewed, and a determination of award follows:

1. *Aesculus hippocastanum*, European horse chestnut, 2550 N. Greenbrier St. 22207 - yes - Certificate
2. *Thuja occidentalis*, Eastern Arborvitae, 4418 4th St. S. 22204 - yes - Certificate
3. *Catalpa Spp.*, Catalpa, 983 20th St. S. 22202 yes – Certificate & plaque
4. *Gleditsia triacanthos*, Honeylocust, 3620 27th St. S. 22206 - yes – Certificate (public tree)
5. *Quercus Falcata*, S. Red Oak, 807 N. Fill-more. 22207 - yes – Certificate
6. *Quercus velutina*, Black Oak, 1318 N. Harrison St. 22205 - yes – Certificate & plaque
7. *Quercus velutina*, Black Oak, 1906 N. Hollister St. 22207 - yes – Certificate
8. *Quercus phellos*, Willow Oak, 4418 4th St. S. 22204 - yes – Certificate
9. *Quercus phellos*, Willow Oak, 929 N. Potomac St. 22205 - yes – Certificate & plaque
10. *Quercus phellos*, Willow Oak, 522 26th St. S. 22202 - yes – Certificate (public tree)
11. *Liriodendron tulipifera*, Tulip Tree, 5005 27th St N. 22207 - yes – Certificate
12. *Liriodendron tulipifera*, Tulip Tree, Rock Springs Park, near Little Falls Rd and Edison St. 22207 - yes – Certificate (public tree)

13. *Quercus palustris*, Pin Oak, 2433 Quantico St. 22207 - yes – Certificate & plaque
14. *Carya glabra*, Pignut Hickory, 1604 S. Lynn St. 22202 - yes – Certificate
15. *Carya glabra*, Pig-nut hickory, 2700 8th St. S. 22204 - no – no owner consent
16. *Acer rubrum*, Red Maple, 6012 27th Rd. N. 22207 - yes – Certificate
17. *Acer rubrum*, Red Maple, 2101 Powhatan St. N. 22205 - yes – Certificate
18. *Acer saccharum*, Sugar Maple, 2515 N. Potomac St. 22207 - yes – Certificate
19. *Pinus taeda*, Loblolly Pine, 801 22nd St S. 22202 - yes – Certificate
20. *Pinus rigida*, Pitch Pine, 1224 N. Dinwiddie St. 22205 - yes – Certificate & plaque
21. *Ilex opaca*, American Holly, 4534 19th St. N. 22207 - yes – Certificate & plaque
22. *Metasequoia glyptostroboides*, Dawn Redwood, 4822 15th St. N. 22205 - yes – Certificate
23. *Metasequoia glyptostroboides*, Dawn Redwood, 2357 S. Ode St. 22202 - yes – Certificate
24. *Metasequoia glyptostroboides*, Dawn Redwood, Little Falls traffic island - yes – Certificate (public tree)
25. *Magnolia grandiflora*, Southern Magnolia, 4301 8th St. S. 22204 - yes – Certificate
26. *Magnolia grandiflora*, Southern Magnolia, 3440 Roberts Lane 22207 - yes – Certificate
27. *Quercus alba*, White Oak, 4518 Old Glebe Rd. 22207 - yes – Certificate
28. *Quercus alba*, White Oak, 5244 11th St. S. 22204 - no
29. *Platanus x acerifolia*, London Planetree, 1560 Wilson Blvd. 22209 - no
30. *Quercus stellata*, Post Oak, 5201 15th St. N. 22205 - yes – Certificate
31. *Acer saccharinum*, Silver Maple, 6000 27th Rd. N. 22207 - yes – Certificate & plaque
32. *Quercus phellos*, Willow oak, 2411 N Monroe St. 22207 - yes – Certificate & plaque

This year plaque will only be ordered for private owners who commit to displaying the plaque on their property. Public trees will not receive plaques due cost and loss to vandalism and theft.

Approval of January Minutes

Minutes approved unanimously

Letter to Board about Red Cross site unanimously approved.

Staff Reports - (provided in advance by email unless otherwise noted)

Kurt Louis, Parks and Natural Resources Division Chief, spoke in person about the FY19 proposed managers budget, which proposes a 7.5% cut. Slightly over 1 million dollars was cut from PNR, which was met through reductions in the vehicle fleet and the elimination of the snow blower program.

Vincent Verweij

General:

1. Staff is continuing to look at the data from the Tree canopy report, and will work on analyses in the future.
2. Our Open Data Portal now contains some tree information. This was spurred by some requests by residents on data on tree removal on public and private land. Please see the link here: <https://data.arlingtonva.us/datasets/179271/trees-planted-and-removed-and-tree-canopy/>
3. Vincent Verweij is meeting with managers and staff across the division and department, to work on collaboration with urban forestry.

Site plans:

1. Finalizing construction: 2311 Wilson Blvd, Key and Nash, 400 Army Navy Dr, 672 Flats. Ballston Quarter is getting close to starting on its tree pits, which will be some of the first stormwater tree pits in the county.
2. Under review:
 1. Kirkwood and Washington Blvd (YMCA Site). New submission, as part of the Kirkwood GLUP study. This component of the project will have on-site tree canopy, and significant street tree improvements
 2. Red Cross. The most contentious, regarding tree canopy. The applicant is still going in front of the PC, HALRB, and eventually, County Board, with their proposal.
 3. 11th and Vermont. Minor tree impact. Staff is working to improve the soil volumes of on-site trees.

DES:

1. Adam Lipera is taking on the majority of DES projects, and will be reporting on the larger projects (such as Washington Bike Blvd, Clark St, etc.)

Parks:

1. Long Bridge Park is continuing to look for spaces for tree replacement in and outside of the park, to accommodate the aquatic facility
2. Staff is working with the design team on Lubber Run park, to minimize impact, and improve survival of proposed plantings.
3. The Glencarlyn Park shelter is under design for reconstruction. This will not impact the old growth forest, but some trees will need to be removed and replaced. Final numbers are not available yet.
4. Benjamin Banneker Park is starting design of the preparation for improvement of the dog park parking lot, trails, and playgrounds.
5. Nellie Custis Park is finalizing design. Some tree impact exists in this project, but it's primarily Bradford pears, and some smaller trees. All trees will be replaced, and a large elm will have its root zone improved.
6. Reeves Farmhouse will be renovated, and a path will be added in the area for better access to Bluemont Park. Very little tree impact.

Schools:

1. Stratford School is getting closer to finalizing permits for construction.
2. Reed school options are being considered by staff and the public. DPR has provided comments on preferred options. The needs of forestry and recreation seem to align with this particular project, as forestry had similar preferences to other staff.

Adam Lipera:

Operations

1. Continuing to review 311's, Web Submissions, and customer calls pertaining to County trees. Urban Forestry is receiving approximately 20-25 submissions per week. All requests/tasks are being worked through our new work order system, Cartegraph.
2. 2 dead oak street trees around CHP were removed by our contractor, and several others were pruned.
3. 9 stumps at 600 Army Navy Drive have been ground by our contractor.
4. Stumps in Rosslyn from the recent tree removals, per the BID, will be ground by our contractor by Spring.
5. Stumps in front of the Harris Teeter along N Glebe Rd have been ground by our contractor.
6. Urban Forestry, with coordination with Natural Resources and the area Park Manager, are re-distributing the pile of wood left by several trees that were cut down/fell at Lacey Woods from a 2017 Summer storm. The wood from these felled trees is being used to block off several unapproved mountain bike trails and to line several trails throughout the park. *This project was started in January, but has not been finished due to weather conditions.*

DES

1. Washington Blvd Bike Trail – The contractor (Fort Myer Construction) is currently installing tree protection fencing (halfway done as of 2/22/2018) and will notify Urban Forestry once complete for an inspection.
2. Clark Street Bridge – Walked the site with DES and the contractor (Neuber Environmental) to go over tree protection fencing placement before bridge demo begins. Tree protection fencing will be going up within the next week or two.
3. Columbia Pike – Conducted the pre-construction meeting with the contractor (Fort Myer Construction). Work has not yet started, but will soon. Tree protection and E&S Controls will be going up one segment at a time.
4. 15th St N + Clarendon Blvd (Pork chop) – Conducted the pre-construction meeting with the contractor (Ardent). Once controls are in place, Urban Forestry will be contacted for an inspection.
5. NC Project: S Courthouse Rd – Pre-construction meeting was held with the contractor (Ardent) and neighboring apartment/condo property managers. Tree protection and E&S Controls will be installed next week with an Urban Forestry inspection to follow.

Site Plans

1. Attending/inspecting/reviewing on average 20 total preconstruction meetings, certificate of occupancy final inspections, and site plan reviews per week for single family home projects

Commission Member Reports (provided in advance by email unless otherwise noted)

Chairs Report – Nora Palmatier

2019 Budget will be provided to County Board on Feb. 22 at 4pm, I'll watch the work session on line before our meeting to see if any details concerning Urban Forestry are given, but expect we will have to wait until the entire proposed budget is on the web site to see any funding gain or loss. The Parks and Recreation Commission is receiving a briefing at their meeting Feb. 27, 7 pm in Azalea Room at Courthouse Plaza. Unfortunately, the Parks budget work session is March 14, before UFC will have an opportunity to discuss the budget. The Chair attends the work session and is given an opportunity to speak for only a few minutes, staff is present and they answer Board questions. The Board doesn't adopt the budget until April so we will discuss in March and send a letter.

Natural Resources Joint Advisory Group – Caroline Haynes

Karen Baragona, Natural Resources Unit intern, presented on her research on meadow management, especially focusing on issues unique to Arlington. Meadow management was a topic not covered in the current Natural Resources Management Plan, but likely will be included in the update.

Park and Recreation Commission – Caroline Haynes

Meets next week, jointly with the Sports Commission.

Planning activities

Reed School – No update.

Four Mile Run WG – input provided by Caroline Haynes. The key item of interest for UFC from the February 20 County Board Work Session on 4MRV (a double header on Tuesday!), is that there is still disagreement on the concept plan for Jennie Dean Park, especially as safety concerns of the location of the adult softball field were raised at the last minute by the adult softball league. The working group will convene a committee to see if an alternate plan can be developed. Planning Commissioner Elizabeth Gearin (alternate on 4MRVWG) will be chairing the committee. The current staff proposal allows for protecting a number of mature trees, planting additional trees and opportunities for riparian restoration. Moving the diamond fields will likely have additional tree impacts.

Red Cross Site – Evelio provided draft letter on behalf of UFC.

Arlington hospital (John Carey) – No update.


Housing Conservation Districts (Sherry Frear) – FYSA, little to report WRT the first meeting of the HCD Advisory Group. Initiative intro, personal intros, discussion of infill options (which will impact trees) and possible financial incentives, e.g., TDRs. No surprises: Developer members want to develop, preservation members want to preserve, housing advocates want to house. Next meeting is Weds 28 FEB 2:20-5 PM (not ideal for me, as I'll have to take leave to attend, but I can make it).

Tree Stewards – Steve Campbell

Below please find the 2017 Tree Steward Annual Report.

Also, Tree Steward groups continue their pruning of County and APS trees, and their invasive plant removal projects through the winter.

Visit this group at <https://groups.google.com/group/TreeStewardsArlAlexVa>.

 <p>TreeStewards ARLINGTON · ALEXANDRIA www.TreeStewards.org</p>	<p>The Mission</p> <p>The Tree Stewards of Arlington and Alexandria take the lead within our communities to enhance a sustainable urban forest through volunteer activities and public education program.</p> <p>Our Goals are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase public awareness of the intrinsic value and beauty of trees • Learn and understand the needs of the community's public and private trees • Help care for each community's urban forest and increase the canopy cover • Educate other residents about urban forestry and the care of trees • Involve additional community members as volunteers in caring for trees
<p style="text-align: center;">2017 Annual Report</p> <p style="text-align: center;">56 Tree Stewards reported over 4200 Volunteer Hours of Service worth \$99,330</p> <p style="text-align: center;">We educated over 2550 people and cared for more than 3700 trees</p>	
<p>Tree Plantings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed materials and worked with residents of the North Ridge Civic Association to select, purchase, plant, and care for 139 canopy trees, gaining the attention of the mayor and sparking plans to replicate this success across Alexandria. • With a TD Bank grant, planted a food forest of fruit and nut trees at Four Mile Run Park • Planted trees at Fort Ward Park (Alex.) and Bluemont Park (Arl.), in Falls Church, at houses of worship, condo associations, etc. <p>Education and Outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided tree care information to residents at public events including Farmers Markets at Arlington Courthouse, the spring and fall Native Plant sales in Park Fairfax, and others. • Assisted and advocated for Arlington County's Notable, Champion, and Specimen Tree programs • Coordinated the successful distribution of hundreds of trees to Arlington and Alexandria residents along with assistance in picking trees and providing care information. • Helped homeowners select the right trees to request from the Arlington Tree Canopy Fund. • Assisted Columbia Gardens Cemetery with a project to attain Arboretum status by identifying all the tree species currently on the grounds. 	<p>Pruning and Invasive Plant Removal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In coordination with Arlington County, surveyed, organized, pruned, and removed invasive plants throughout the County park system, as well as Arlington Public Schools and Community Centers. • Removed ivy and other invasive plants from Alexandria parks. • With the National Park Service, removed invasive plants from Rosslyn Circle in preparation for future plantings. <p>The Tree Canopy Fund Survey enlisted TreeStewards to fan out across Arlington and locate trees planted in previous years through the Tree Canopy Fund, providing a wealth of data on the impact of the program. From 2009, 81% of TCF trees are still thriving!</p> <p>The Elm Nursery of the National Parks Service and the Arlington Native Plant Nursery had TreeSteward volunteers weekly.</p> <p>Special thanks to our supporting partners who make our volunteer work possible: Trees Virginia, Arlington County Urban Forestry and Landscaping, Alexandria City Arborist, National Parks Service, Virginia Department of Forestry, Casey Trees, and Virginia Cooperative Extension.</p>

Like us on Facebook to watch our events throughout 2018!

Tree Canopy Fund – Nora Palmatier

The trees will start being planted in early March! So now it's time to think about what species to offer for FALL 2018 planting and more outreach to the areas that lost canopy. I've observed that having even one dedicated volunteer in a neighborhood seems to work best -- but how to recruit that one spark plug!

Northern Virginia Urban Forest Roundtable – Nora Palmatier

March 15, topic is on assessing tree survival cost effectively. Info at www.TreesVirginia.org

Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Commission – Phil Klingelhofer

No update.

Public Spaces Master Plan – Caroline Haynes

Attached is a summary of my notes of the February 20 County Board Work Session on POPS, along with the staff [presentation](#).

Highlights of POPS February 20, 2018 County Board Work Session

Benchmark cities:

- Result of extended discussions with Advisory Group
- Alexandria, VA, Bellvue, WA and Berkley, CA also used as benchmark cities for CPHD and Economic Development planning; similar in association with nearby major cities, similar demographics, etc.
- St. Paul, MN, looking for reach city (ranked above Arlington in TPL ratings) most relevant to Arlington
- Not looking to find exact matches, but rather similar cities and aspirational cities

Level of Service (LOS):

Staff stressed that this is a planning tool to assist with both needs and access analysis.

LOS based primarily on population and projected population increases; recommended change of LOS projections to 2035 (instead of 2045, population predictions are less reliable the farther out they go)

Process includes analysis of:

- 1) current population/existing inventory
- 2) service levels in benchmark cities (population based)
- 3) national average (PROS analysis population based)
- 4) Arlington statistically valid survey (ranked as high, medium or low based on survey results)
- 5) professional judgment based on wait lists, user data, trend analysis, etc. (different type of data, depending upon amenity, specific to Arlington)

These elements are factored in to projected need, primarily based on projections in population growth.

In some cases (ie., playgrounds) recommended LOS will decrease; others more moderate growth based on projected moderation of growth in demand (ie, diamond fields) relative to demand for other facilities.

APS and any other facilities available to the public included in the LOS inventory.

--CB members suggested including a case study in the plan to illustrate development

of LOS.

--Discussion about field study by DPR to more closely track and allocate fields, and how this plays into demand analysis.

Land Acquisition:

- Streamlined from earlier version.
- Develop objective criteria to determine if parcels are brought before the County Board. (Board ultimately determines whether to purchase or not.)

Grouped into categories

Part I: Alignment with County Adopted Plans (*go directly to CB*)

Part II: Alignment with General PSMP priorities AND at least one from

Part III:

- 1) Natural Resource Purpose
- 2) Recreational/Leisure Purpose (including casual use)
- 3) Historic Resource Purpose

(*Go to CB if meet criteria in both Part II and Part III*)

Listing of potential acquisition mechanisms and sites identified in the 1994 and 2005 PSMPs that have not already been acquired will also be included in the updated plan.

--CB generally supported the “buckets”, prioritization and range of acquisition mechanisms.

--Questions arose about equity and access, especially in underserved areas. How to balance the need in densely populated corridors with opportunities to expand existing parks? CB noted the need to take advantage of range of opportunities (discussion on rooftop gardens); staff emphasized the need for public access.

--Comments about private facilities taking the pressure off of public facilities, even if these are not specifically counted in land acquisition or in LOS.

Synthetic Turf and Lights:

Key difference from earlier draft >>>two issues are separated and potential sites will be run through separate set of criteria; expanded to include environmental review and tree impact.

--CB supported overall direction decoupling lights from synthetic turf fields.

--Discussion about prioritizing conversion of existing lighted fields to synthetic turf (inconclusive on whether this criterion should be given higher priority on checklist)

-- Rather than including specific candle foot recommendation, should include a more generic statement of “minimum for safety, light spillage and glare”; given that this is a policy document this formulation is more adaptable to changing industry standards and improvements

--Inconclusive discussion on whether access to bathrooms should also be given a higher priority than other criteria.

--Inconclusive discussion about neighborhood context; JV stating that some neighborhoods may never be appropriate for lighting; KC and CD noting that no neighborhoods should be excluded from consideration

Natural Resources and Trees:

--General support for updating both the Natural Resources Management Plan and Urban Forest Master Plan simultaneously, as soon as PSMP is completed.

--Noted that preliminary work on both has already begun.

--Elements of both existing plans still in process of implementation.

Casual Use Spaces:

--Recognition that this is a new concept that advisory group (and public) continue to refine both in definition

- Measurement and establishing level of service problematic (also since concept is new, there is no national standard or benchmarking)
 - Recommendation for further study to develop more fully
 - Recognition that DPR is already including casual use space in current planning processes
 - Discussion about a need to balance recreational facilities, casual use areas and natural resource areas
 - General support for moving forward with development of this concept
- Privately Owned Public Spaces:
- Noted PRC and PC interest in developing guidelines for urban open spaces, and that these are still being discussed.

Environment and Energy Conservation Commission - Kimberly Fedinatz

No update..

Virginia Department of Forestry – Jim McGlone

No update.

Arlington Public Schools – Jim Meikle

No update.

Virginia Cooperative Extension – Kirsten Buhls

No update

New Business

Caroline Haynes may draft a letter in response to the budget.

UFC Booth at Arlington Home Show, April 14, 2018

Next Meeting

March 22, 2018, Courthouse Plaza – Room 311