

Jacksonville Tree Commission

Thursday, June 28th, 2018 – 12:00 PM

117 West Duval Street, Third Floor, Conference Room C

Commissioners: John Crescimbeni, Chair
Curtis Hart, Vice Chair
Chris Flagg
Aaron Glick
John Pappas
Rhodes Robinson

Advisors: Sondra Fetner
Richard Leon
Kathleen McGovern
Joel Provenza

Staff: Cindy Chism

AGENDA

Order of Agenda is Subject to Change

A. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

1. Roll Call
2. Submittal of Speaker's Cards
3. Approval of minutes from June 14, 2018 meeting
4. Fund balance and encumbrance report for 15(F) and 15(N)
 - a. Better Jacksonville Plan funds
5. Status of Pending Tree Projects

B. New Business

1. Tree Planting Suggestion Form Revisions (Tier I Application) – CM Crescimbeni, Sondra Fetner
2. Continuation of Not-For-Profit Application Process – Sondra Fetner
3. North Main Street project – Aaron Glick
4. PUD Meetings – CM Crescimbeni, Sondra Fetner

C. Public Comment

D. Adjournment

Jacksonville Tree Commission
Meeting Minutes June 28, 2018
Approved July 12, 2018

Commissioners Present: John Crescimbeni, Chair
Curtis Hart, Vice Chair
Chris Flagg
Aaron Glick
John Pappas
Rhodes Robinson

Staff: Cindy Chism

Public: Tracey Arpen, Greenscape
John November, Public Trust
Anna Dooley, Greenscape
Teresa Eichner, COJ Budget
Courtney Hilson, Greenscape

Advisors: Sondra Fetner, OGC
Richard Leon, Urban Forest Manager
Kathleen McGovern, City Arborist
Joel Provenza, Accounting

A. Meeting was called to Order by Chair at 12:02 PM.

1. All present introduced themselves.
2. Submittal of Speaker's Cards.
3. Motion made by Mr. Hart, seconded by Mr. Flagg, to approve minutes from the meeting of June 14, 2018. None opposed.
4. Fund balance and encumbrance report for 15(F) and 15(N) (Attachment A)
 - a. Better Jacksonville Plan funds – Mr. Pappas asked if these funds were going to be listed on the Tree Mitigation webpage. Ms. Eichner reported she is still trying to determine if 10-set plans had been reviewed to know where the funds came from so we know which sub-fund, charter, or ordinance to deposit them into. However, if any of these funds are spent, they are still subject to ordinance code.
5. Status of Pending Tree Projects (Attachment B) – changes are in green.

B. New Business

1. Tree Planting Suggestion Form Revisions (Tier I Application) – CM Crescimbeni, Sondra Fetner
 - a. Work on this continues.
2. Continuation of Not-For-Profit Application Process (Attachment C) – Sondra Fetner
 - a. Project Evaluation (Attachment D) – This is the form the Tree Commission will use to evaluate the applications and projects. Once this aspect is completed, the application, instructions and forms can be updated and a vote can be taken on the whole process. The factors listed on the evaluation are in matrix format so each Commissioner can

enter his grade. Sections 1 and 2 are true/false, and sections 3 and 4 are ranked 0 through 5 with 5 indicating strongly agree.

- b. Mr. Robinson asked about 1.c.; if unacceptable trees are proposed, the applicant would then get a 0. Ms. Fetner agreed. The list of acceptable trees is a policy decision for the Tree Commission to make sure applicants are only using specific trees. Mr. Leon recommended using a list of preferable trees and trees that are not allowed. CM Crescimbeni asked if the application has 80% acceptable trees and 20% unacceptable, would the applicant get any points? Mr. Robinson stated that if the application has unacceptable trees, the application should be denied. Mr. Leon responded that the application would be submitted to he and Ms. McGovern first and they could work with the applicant to select acceptable trees. Ms. Fetner suggested there be a list of preferable trees and a list of unacceptable trees. If the application contained unacceptable or prohibited trees, it would not be approved by Mr. Leon or Ms. McGovern. Mr. Hart stated he didn't believe unacceptable trees should be on the application. CM Crescimbeni said there needs to be a master list of acceptable trees; possibly ranked from premium to less than desirable. **Mr. Leon was tasked with expanding the current Approved Tree list (Attachment E) to include which are non-shade trees, which are Florida Friendly, which are allowed in parks and which are only for City right-of-way plantings, irrigation requirements, and site development.** Ms. Fetner asked if it was the Tree Commission's desire to remove 1.c and make it a prerequisite for application, like a minimum requirement.
- c. Mr. November asked how the applicants would know if a tree is Florida Friendly. Ms. Fetner said it would be notated on the acceptable tree list Mr. Leon is generating. Mr. Leon said "Florida Fancy" or "Florida #1" standards refer to structure, while "Florida Friendly" is categorized by climate. Ms. Fetner said a link to the website (which lists Florida Friendly trees) is on the application. CM Crescimbeni asked how the applicant would indicate they would plant "Florida #1" or "Florida Fancy". Mr. Robinson stated this is a requirement for the application, which would be picked up in the initial review. Mr. Robinson and Mr. Flagg added that normally there is a tree schedule with all the specifications on each tree which would be included in the application. CM Crescimbeni suggested including that specific information on the application.
- d. Mr. Leon reminded the Tree Commissioners that the Tier II Application is for groups that have experience in completing this type of work. Mr. Robinson asked if there was a place on the application for the applicant to explain their proposed use of the tree funds with specificity. Mr. Pappas said a schedule of values should be developed in which the applicant would fill in the type of tree with the category boxes next to it.
- e. Ms. Fetner said the application will be either a packet or a booklet, but these evaluation factors will be available to the applicant and it will be in their best interest to create their application in response to these factors. The intent was for the tree planting plan to be completed by using the jaxdigstrees tool, which can specify the grade of tree. Mr. Pappas' recommendation was standardizing some type of basic application and checking boxes for the grade of trees to expedite the application process. **CM**

Crescimbeni will schedule a workshop to generate a tree list and a standardized application. Mr. Arpen asked about the current tree list which is titled Approved Trees for City Right-Of-Way Landscaping. Is there an expanded list for parks and areas not Rights of Way? Mr. Leon suggested there be an expanded list for parks as well.

- f. Ms. Fetner brought to the Tree Commission's attention 2.c. Irrigation costs; how strong should the points for irrigation be; if it's not needed or is insufficient, a decision was never reached. CM Crescimbeni said since there is a one- or two-year warranty that should include irrigation. Ms. Fetner suggested re-wording this factor to specify that irrigation requirements do not exceed two years, which was the intent at the time of writing.
- g. Ms. Dooley asked if site preparation was included in the overall expense and if there will be some type of spending cap. Site preparation may include old tree stumps which need to be removed, soil remediation, and removal of lime rock. Mr. Arpen asked what the ratio is of the site preparation to what you are going to plant. Mr. Hart asked if the Tree Commission should pay for site preparation. CM Crescimbeni asked if the ordinance code and the charter amendment addressed spending funds on site preparation. Ms. Fetner agreed that it is addressed as long as it is directly related to the planting of the trees. Susan Grandin has approved that work to be paid for from the Tree Fund because it is directly related to planting trees. CM Crescimbeni pointed out that the Tree Commission needs to be careful so they do not end up doing re-development work using tree mitigation funds. Perhaps site preparation costs should be restricted to some percentage of the total cost of the project. Mr. Flagg pointed out that site preparation will affect the health of the tree.
- h. CM Crescimbeni asked how much concrete could be removed. Ms. Fetner responded that the issue has never really come up. CM Crescimbeni then asked what are Ms. Grandin's comments related to irrigation. Ms. Fetner replied that Ms. Grandin said "for purposes of determining what amount of funds could be utilized for the site preparation, design fees, incidental landscaping, and maintenance activities, such as irrigation, adding nutrients, pruning, and pest control, a proportional calculation should be made. For example: If the trees are planted as part of a street median tree planting and landscaping project that includes 10 shade trees spaced 30 feet apart with under-planting of shrubs or groundcover, the entire landscape design, site preparation, cost of materials and installation could be appropriate for consideration as a proportion of the tree planting. However, if the trees are just part of a larger landscape project such as within a park or school site, the mature drip line of the trees could be utilized for determining what percentage of the area is designed." Ms. Fetner continued, if the project is an overall tree planting project, those types of costs can be included, but if it is a portion of a larger landscape project, then it is the mature drip line which determines what percentage of the area should have the Tree Fund dollars. This is really going to be a case-by-case basis but after a few evaluations are completed the Tree Commission will have a better sense and may then make a rule.

- i. Mr. Pappas suggested a cost-benefit analysis should be a part of the evaluation. If the project will require \$50,000 to plant 5 trees compared to \$50,000 on another project which will plant 50 trees, that needs to be considered. Mr. Flagg agreed it should be a case-by-case basis. Ms. Fetner added that it would make sense to the site preparation cost ratio along with irrigation, and types of trees being planted. Mr. Robinson asked how site preparation is currently handled with the Countywide Tree Planting contract. Mr. Leon said there are many various line items for site preparation in the contract. However, there are no line items for concrete removal. CM Crescimbeni added that the only way to address this is to select a percentage of the total cost. Ms. Fetner pointed out that sometimes the site preparation costs far exceed the costs of the actual tree; the percentage is a moving target depending on the trees you plant. Mr. Glick recommended the Tree Commission cap the percentage at 35% - 50% of the total project; anymore indicates redevelopment.
 - j. Mr. Arpen referred to Judge Watson's comments regarding appropriate use of tree fund money; "payment into the fund is used solely for planting trees which are mitigation for trees which have been removed." Spending the funds on things which cannot be considered tree mitigation (like removing concrete or asphalt) is not mitigation and clearer guidelines should be written.
 - k. CM Crescimbeni added that perhaps the ordinance code needs to be made more specific. Mr. Pappas agreed, the whole purpose is to plant trees. CM Crescimbeni suggested restricting the site preparation to any hard surface removal that will only be paid for up to the future drip line of the mature tree
 - l. CM Crescimbeni said in the current Countywide Planting Contract there are no line items for removal of impervious surfaces. Perhaps we should continue that way and not fund any projects which require the removal of impervious surfaces or at least not fund that portion of the project. Mr. Leon agreed. Mr. Flagg pointed out the City has a tree ordinance which has been extended to 5 x 10 square foot hardscape removal. CM Crescimbeni suggested the Tree Commission use the City standards as the cap for size of hardscape removal. **Ms. Fetner will draft a factor for site preparation.**
 - m. Mr. Arpen questioned 4.b. "distinct and unique." Perhaps just providing a benefit to the neighborhood, not necessarily distinct and unique, which was suggested by Mr. November. **Ms. Fetner will change the factor to read "a unique benefit...."**
 - n. Ms. Fetner said as the evaluation stands, the values of each section are as listed: total points for Design - 45 points, Cost – 25 points, Maintenance and Review - 20 points, and Public Benefit - 25 points. **Ms. Fetner will finalize the Evaluation and it will be ready for review at the next meeting.**
3. North Main Street project – Aaron Glick
 - a. Mr. Joe Anderson, JEA, met with the Springfield Merchants Association and demonstrated acceptable methods to prune trees.
 4. PUD Meetings – CM Crescimbeni, Sondra Fetner

- a. Nothing new to report.

C. Public Comment

- Mr. John November, Public Trust. 1) It is important to decide how this application is going to be published either through the City's ITD or Plan-It Geo. There needs to be discussion, perhaps a subcommittee. 2) There are no funds for the Urban Forestry Division for small scale tree planting or removing dead trees throughout the City. Perhaps the allocation of some mitigation funds could be discussed.
- Mr. Hart asked about tree stump removal. Mr. Leon said they grind the stumps. There would have to be soil replaced to be able to plant right away. Most stumps are removed using in-house crews. One crew can remove two to three stumps per day. CM Crescimbeni asked about a permit for tree removal at Lonnie Miller Park. Mr. Leon answered that Lewis Tree; the City contractor removed those trees for the Parks Department under Mowing and Landscape's contract. Ms. Fetner added Lonnie Miller is an ash remediation site controlled by the EPA. The EPA preempts the City and any other department from requiring a permit. Outside of the ash remediation boundary, there will be tree mitigation, but within that boundary of the main portion of Lonnie Miller Park, there are no permits and no mitigation. All trees which would otherwise meet the definition of a protected tree could be removed because they are on top of an ash incinerator site which the City is required to clean up. CM Crescimbeni was told the trees were being removed to make an amphitheater. Mr. Pappas added that the trees which are being removed for the amphitheater will be mitigated as the amphitheater is not on the ash area, they should have had a permit. **Mr. Pappas will find out what happened and provide a summary.** Ms. Fetner said this is a specific situation at Lonnie Miller Park. There was a tree survey completed for outside where the amphitheater is but a permit is still not required because the whole site is considered part of the EPA site. The ash remediation is being done and tree mitigation will be done in some parts as well. **Ms. Fetner will send CM Crescimbeni an email detailing this project.**
- Mr. Tracey Arpen, Greenscape – Wax Myrtles should not be on the list of acceptable trees. Their life expectancy is short and they blow over easily. The landscape ordinance lists them as a nuisance or invasive species not because they are but because they didn't want them planted. Also, Oleanders shouldn't be listed because they are a shrub, not a tree. There are two tree planting processes now but there should still be a third; a volunteer driven, with smaller trees and not necessarily a guarantee for two years or have irrigation.

D. Action Items

Mr. Leon was tasked with expanding the current Approved Tree list (Attachment E) to include which are non-shade trees, which are Florida Friendly, which are allowed in parks and which are only for City right-of-way plantings, irrigation requirements, and site development.

CM Crescimbeni will schedule a workshop to generate a tree list and a standardized Application

Ms. Fetner will draft a factor for site preparation in the Project Evaluation, Section 2. Cost Review. Ms. Fetner will change factor 4.b to “a unique benefit....”

Ms. Fetner will finalize the Project Evaluation and it will be ready for review at the next meeting

Mr. Pappas will provide a summary regarding the tree removal at Lonnie Miller. Ms. Fetner will send CM Crescimbeni an email detailing ash mitigation and tree mitigation at Lonnie Miller.

E. Meeting adjourned at 1:35.

INDEX CODE	Index Code Titles	BUDGET	Actual	Encumbrance	Unencumbered Budget Balance	Reserves	Unencumbered Balance net of Reserves
Subfund 15F Revenue							
PWOD15FFTP	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENSES	29,420,122	40,890,823	1,380	11,470,700	-	11,470,700
JXSF15FPW	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	7,535,414	8,565,311	5,995	1,029,897	-	1,029,897
JXSF15F	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	-	8,580	22,057	8,580	-	8,580
TRIN15FR31R	TRF TO 15F TREE PROTECTION FR 31F	392	392	22,370	-	-	-
	CONVERSION AND NONCASH REVENUE ENTRIES		338,836	117,423	338,836	-	338,836
	Total Subfund 15F Revenue	36,955,929	49,803,942	124,216	12,848,013	-	12,848,013

* Subfund 15F Expenditures

PWOD15FARATP	SANDALWOOD TREE REPLACEMENT PROJECT	13,796	12,416	1,380	-	-	-
PWOD15FHSAS	FORREST STREET ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING	587,850	581,856	5,995	-	-	-
PWOD15FNMS	NORTH MAIN STREET LANDSCAPING	62,057	40,000	22,057	-	-	-
PWOD15FBDAS	BROWN'S DUMP ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING	364,730	342,361	22,370	-	-	-
PWOD15FFCAS	5TH & CLEVELAND ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING	494,215	376,792	117,423	-	-	-
PWOD15FDCS	DUVAL COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD PROPERTY	125,000	784	124,216	-	-	-
PWOD15FHRDA	TREE PLANTING - HARTS RD. AT DUNN AVE	23,718	23,718	-	-	-	-
PWOD15FDTP	DOWNTOWN TREE PLANTING	38,822	26,314	12,508	-	-	-
PWOD15FZLAE	ZOO LANDSCAPING-ASIAN EXHIBIT	1,824,408	689,345	1,135,063	-	-	-
PWOD15FMSW	MINDANAO FR ALOHA DR TO WITCHHAVEN ST	9,710	9,710	-	-	-	-
PWOD15FHBCL	INTERSEC.BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING	100,000	65,231	15,483	19,286	-	19,286
PWOD15FRROW	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-RIGHT OF WAY	4,679,980	4,613,147	36,078	30,756	-	30,756
PWML15F	TREE MAINTENANCE	1,761,795	1,545,797	201,121	14,877	-	14,877
PWOD15FATPP	AVONDALE TREE PLANTING PLAN	31,233	-	31,233	-	-	-
PWOD15FKSCP	KING ST. PLANTING COLLEGE TO PARK	85,366	-	85,366	-	-	-
PWOD15FHMM	HAMMOND BLVD PROJECT	175,761	-	-	175,761	-	175,761
PWOD15FVPP	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-PRESERVATION PARKS	1,000,000	485,146	-	514,854	-	514,854
PWOD15FVAP	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-ACTIVE PARKS	1,151,965	619,420	-	532,545	-	532,545
PWOD15FOSABP	OLD ST. AUG AT BARTRAM PARK	18,364	-	18,364	-	-	-
PWOD15FLAVC	LENOX AVE PLANTING VERNIA TO CASSAT	26,436	-	26,436	-	-	-
PWOD15FTP	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENSES	3,548,513	2,097,444	-	1,451,069	1,449,105	1,964
JXSF15FPW	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	2,000,635	-	-	2,000,635	2,000,635	-
JXSF15F	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	2,365,741	-	-	2,365,741	2,365,741	-
	Subfund 15F Expenditures	20,490,094	11,529,479	1,855,090	7,105,524	5,815,481	1,290,043

* Includes accounts with encumbrances and budget balances

Unencumbered Budget Balance
Revenues
Expenditures
Unencumbered Balance net of Reserves

Subfund 15F Available to Appropriate (Budget less Actual less Encumbrance less Unencumbered Budget balance) 18,663,494

#REF! BUDGET BALANCE REVIEW

INDEX CODE	Index Code Titles	BUDGET	Actual	Encumbrance	Unencumbered Budget Balance	Reserves	Unencumbered Balance net of Reserves
PWOD15NTM	Subfund 15N Revenue	173,306	4,138,806	-	3,965,500	-	-
	TREE MITIGATION & RELATED EXPENSES	173,306	4,138,806	-	3,965,500	-	-
	Total Subfund 15N Revenue						
PWOD15NARTS	*Subfund 15N Expenditures						
PWOD15NBDDTP	AVONDALE/RIVERSIDE TREE SURVEY	39,999	39,999	-	-	-	-
JXSF15N	BAKERSFIELD DRIVE-TREE PLANTING	8,306	7,475	831	-	-	-
	TREE MITIGATION & RELATED EXPENSE	1	-	-	1	1	-
	Subfund 15N Expenditures	48,306	47,474	831	1	1	-
	* Includes accounts with encumbrances and budget balances						
	Subfund 15N Available to Appropriate (Budget less Actual less Encumbrance less Unencumbered Budget balance)						3,965,501
PWC/P351MIT	Better Jacksonville Plan						
	TREE MITIGATION PROJECT	1,717,826	-	-	1,717,826	-	1,717,826
	Better Jacksonville Plan (for Tree Mitigation) Available to Appropriate (Budget less Actual less Encumbrance less Unencumbered Budget balance)						1,717,826
	Total 15F and 15N Funds						22,628,996
	Better Jacksonville Plan - TREE MITIGATION PROJECT						1,717,826
	Grand Total						24,346,822



TREE REMOVAL PERMIT INFORMATION

Click here to search detailed information on Site Clearing and Tree Removal Permits. In reviewing tree removal information on a specific permit, for 'B' permits click on the Spec 2 tab; for 'L' permits click on the Tree Mitigation tab.



TREE FUND CITY PLANTING PROJECTS

Click here to search detailed information about City Tree Fund Planting Projects.



AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION

15F (Ordinance)	\$18,663,494.17
15N (Charter)	\$3,965,501.45
Total:	\$22,628,995.62



FILE AN ISSUE

Click here to report site clearing or tree removal without a permit, or to request tree maintenance on public property. In the CARE System, select "Tree Remove or Landscape Violation" from the dropdown.

Disclaimer: The AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION information shown on this page is updated nightly from the City's financial records, but does not include any pending appropriations, or other financial transactions of the funds which have not been completed.



If you experience difficulty viewing or accessing the documents provided on this site, or navigating this application's table features, using any assistive technology please contact the Disabled Services Division at 904-630-4940 or 904-630-4933 (TTY) to request an accommodation.

© 2018 - Official City of Jacksonville and Duval County Government Website. All Rights Reserved.

Version: 1.2.0.6

#REF! 6/28/2018

Year	Encumbrance Number	Enc. Sfx	Sub - fund	Vendor Number	Vendor Suffix	Vendor Name	Encumbrance Balance	Index Code	Index Code Title
2018	CTPW07000014	01	15F	591319010	01	JACKSONVILLE ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY	1135063.14	PWOD15FZLAE	ZOO LANDSCAPING-ASIAN EXHIBIT
2018	CTPW16000066	02	15F	592283261	03	GREENSCAPE OF JACKSONVILLE INC	124215.6	PWOD15FDSC	DUVAL COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD PROPERTY
2018	PO3019740001	04	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	36077.5	PWOD15FROW	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-RIGHT OF WAY
2018	PO3019740003	02	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	5994.5	PWOD15FFSAS	FORREST STREET ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING
2018	PO3019740004	02	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	22369.5	PWOD15FBDAS	BROWN'S DUMP ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING
2018	PO3019740005	02	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	117423	PWOD15FFCAS	5TH & CLEVELAND ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING
2018	PO7A02942003	02	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	1379.55	PWOD15FARATP	SANDALWOOD TREE REPLACEMENT PROJECT
2018	PO7A02942004	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	4205	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942006	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	22057	PWOD15FNMS	NORTH MAIN STREET LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942007	01	15N	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	830.58	PWOD15NBDTP	BAKERSFIELD DRIVE-TREE PLANTING
2018	PO7A02942008	02	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	519.5	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942010	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	1076.4	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942012	03	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	1022.64	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942015	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	8659.61	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942017	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	12508.02	PWOD15FDTP	DOWNTOWN TREE PLANTING
2018	PO7A02942018	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	18364.21	PWOD15FOSABP	OLD ST.AUG AT BARTRAM PARK
2018	PO7A02942019	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	85366.23	PWOD15FKSCP	KING ST. PLANTING COLLEGE TO PARK
2018	PO7A02942021	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	31232.6	PWOD15FATPP	AVONDALE TREE PLANTING PLAN
2018	PO8A01798005	01	15F	161004851	05	LEWIS TREE SERVICE, INC.	201120.57	PWML15F	TREE MAINTENANCE
2018	REQ235138	01	15F				26435.84	PWOD15FLAVC	LENOX AVE.PLANTING VERNA TO CASSAT
							<u>1,855,920.99</u>		

4

CITY OF JACKSONVILLE TREE PLANTING PROJECTS - ACTIVE

See jaxtreeemintigation.coi.net - Tree Fund City Projects for links to legislation and planting details

CD	Project Title	Project Scope	Project or Ordinance Number	Division/Project Manager	Estimated Cost	Actual Cost	Anticipated Start Date	Actual Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Status
7	Main Street	Tree removal and planting on N. Main St. between 1st St. and 7th St.	2017-0111-E	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Richard Leon/Fred Pope	\$22,057.00						Scheduling
7	Harts Rd & Dunn Ave. Medians and Streetscape in Downtown Jacksonville	5 Date Palms to be planted on two medians on Harts Rd. at the cross street of Dunn Ave. (Phase 1) 8 Date Palms to be planted as replacements in Downtown Jax (4 on Riverside Ave., 2 on Adam St. W, 1 on Forsyth St. W, 1 on Monroe St) (Phase 2) 13 Date Palms total. Includes removal of existing Date Palm stumps in city street planting boxes. Introduced by CM Gaffney. Appropriation from Tree Fund 15F.	2018-0007-E	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Richard Leon/Kathleen McGovern	\$62,540.03	\$62,540.03	Phase 1 4/10/2018 Phase 2 4/25/18	Phase 1 3/23/2018 Phase 2 4/30/18	Phase 1 6/11/18 Phase 2 6/11/18	6/11/2018	Project and Inspection Complete 6/11/18
6	Old St. Augustine Rd Medians	Two median tree plantings on Old St. Augustine Rd. from Bartram Park Blvd to entrance of Palmetto Leaves Park South. (No removals) Introduced by CM Schellenberg. Appropriation from Tree Fund 15F.	2018-0043-E	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Richard Leon/Kathleen McGovern	\$18,364.21		4/20/2018	6/1/2018			In Progress
14	King Street	King St. from College St to Park St., replacement planting on nine medians and sidewalk cut-outs. Introduced by CM Love. Appropriation requested from 15F.	2018-0159-E	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Richard Leon/Kathleen McGovern	\$85,366.23		5/11/2018	5/11/2018			In Progress
4	Patton Rd/Beach Blvd. -Southside	Right of Way Plantings on two adjacent sites at the intersection of Patton Rd. and Beach Blvd. (no removals). Introduced by CM Scott Wilson and through citizen request. Appropriation requested from 15F (\$19,138.05) and 15N (\$18,260.20)	2018-0190	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Dave McDaniel/Kathleen McGovern	\$37,398.25						Introduced 3/27/2018, Deferred pending changes
14	Avondale Neighborhood - Tree Planting Plan	Tree Planting in City ROW on residential streets in Avondale replace dead/storm damaged trees. Introduced by CM Love. Appropriation requested from 15F.	2018-0273-E	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Richard Leon/Kathleen McGovern	\$31,232.60						In Progress
4	Lenox Ave. Tree Planting	Tree Planting in City ROW tree planting (no removals) on Lenox Ave. from Shen Ave to Cassat Ave. Introduced by CM Dennis. Appropriation requested from 15F	2018-0307-E	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Dave McDaniel/Kathleen McGovern	\$26,435.84						Enacted
7	Harts Rd. Medians and Right of Way	Tree Planting in City ROW and medians. Introduced by CM Gaffney	2018-0369	Public Works - Mowing and Landscape Dave McDaniel/Kathleen McGovern	\$31,265.81						Submitted 6/8/18

*Changes highlighted in green

NOT-FOR-PROFIT APPLICATION PROCESS FOR TREE FUND PROJECTS

INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMS

I. Introduction and Process Overview

The Tree Commission is an advisory body that encourages and coordinates the efforts of the various public and private entities that are concerned with the conservation and enhancement of the City's Tree Canopy. The Tree Commission is the subject matter expert on the City's tree canopy and is tasked with making recommendations to the City Council, Mayor's Office, City Staff, and community stakeholders with respect to the planting of trees and the health of the City's tree canopy. Pursuant to Sec. 94.106, *Ordinance Code*, the Tree Commission was charged with coordination of planting projects between public and private entities and to review expenditure proposals and plans for planting projects.

The Tree Protection and Related Expenses Trust Funds, as authorized by Sec. 111.760, *Ordinance Code*, and Sec. 25.04, *City Charter* ("Tree Funds"), are comprised of funds that are required to be expended on the provision and maintenance of trees and incidental landscaping to such trees, within the City's rights-of-way and on other lands owned by the City, its agencies or authorities, and on all other public lands in Duval County. In an effort to improve the City's canopy, the City will collaborate with not-for-profit organizations to achieve this goal through tree planting projects.

Following the review and evaluation of tree planting projects proposed by not-for-profit organizations, and with the input of the District Councilperson and City staff, the Tree Commission will create a Project Priority List of proposed tree planting projects based on the established criteria and guidelines herein. The Project Priority List will be submitted to the Mayor's Office for review and approval at least three times per year. If the Mayor's Office approves a proposed project on the Project Priority List, legislation appropriating Tree Fund moneys for the proposed project will be filed with the City Council, and the City Council shall make the final decision whether or not to appropriate such funds, pursuant to Sec. 111.760, *Ordinance Code*.

Regardless of the Tree Commission's recommendation for approval, approval with conditions, or denial, a proposed project will be included on the Project Priority List to be

presented to the Mayor's Office through the Mayor's Budget Review Committee ("MBRC") process, and, if a proposed project is approved by MBRC, the Office of General Counsel will draft the necessary appropriation legislation and Agreement at the request of the Mayor's Office and file same with City Council who will make the final decision regarding appropriation pursuant to Sec. 111.760, *Ordinance Code*. In the alternative, the Mayor's Office can decide to delay the funding of a proposed project to a later date or decide not to fund a certain project from the Project Priority List. If a proposed project is denied by the Mayor's Office, no further action on it shall be made, unless at the complete discretion of a Councilperson at the request of the Applicant.

If a citizen or organization is interested in suggesting a planting project to be administered by the City, then a streamlined application can be found at the following link: XXXX. The proposed project will be evaluated by the Tree Commission and included in the Project Priority List submitted to the Mayor's Office.

II. Application Process

A. Application Schedule. The Tree Commission will review and create a recommended Project Priority List for the Mayor's Office for project funding three times per year. The Tree Commission's review of projects will follow, if possible, the below schedule. All deadlines end at 5:00 PM on the specified date below. If a date listed below falls on a weekend or a legal holiday, the effective date shall be next business day.

Award Session	Courtesy Application Review Period	Application Deadline	Staff review due	Commission Meeting
1	<u>November 1 through 5 business days prior to Application Deadline</u>	January 2	January 31	2 nd meeting in February
2	March 1 through 5 business days prior to Application Deadline	May 1	May 31	2 nd meeting in June
3	July 1 through 5 business days prior to Application Deadline	September 1	September 30	2 nd meeting in October

B. Complete Application. Applications must be completed by the Application Deadline listed above. More specifically:

1. Applications are deemed complete if all requested and necessary information and documentary proof is provided, as outlined in the document and on the Application.
2. Applicants shall submit applications to the City, by submitting it either electronically or in person to the Mowing & Landscape Maintenance Division, c/o the Urban Forester.
3. A courtesy application review period will take place prior to each Application Deadline to allow applicants to submit applications to Tree Commission staff for review of completeness and to iron out any details missing in the Application. Also, feedback and input from Tree Commission staff may be provided, if time permits.

C. Staff Review. The Tree Commission staff will review and make a recommendation for approval, approval with conditions, or denial in a Staff Report that will be sent to both the Tree Commission, the District Councilperson, and the Applicant.

D. Application Presentation and Public Hearing. All Applications will be presented for review, deliberation, and final recommendation by the Tree Commission at a public hearing during the above scheduled meetings. Special meetings may be held if needed at the discretion of the Tree Commission.

1. Applicants shall have 10 minutes to present their Application to the Tree Commission at the above scheduled meetings and each Commissioner shall have up to 10 minutes per Application for questions.
2. Commissioners shall receive a copy of all Applications and Staff Reports at least 14 days prior to Tree Commission meeting when the Applications will be heard.

E. Project Priority List. Following the Application Presentation(s) and Public Hearing on the Tree Planting Projects, each Commissioner will individually score each Application and the Assistant General Counsel assigned to the Tree Commission will average the total score from each Commissioner for each Application to arrive at a final Score for each Application. The Applications will then be ranked in order of highest average score to the lowest average score. This ranking will be included in the

Tree Commission's Project Priority List to be presented to the Mayor's Office through the MBRC process.

Comment [SF1]: how will scores from different sessions be compared? What if there are 3 applications in session 1 but, only one is funded? Do the remaining 2 remain on the list until funded or do they need to try again in the second session?

F. **Mayor Review.** At the earliest MBRC meeting that the funding request can be filed, Tree Commission staff will submit and present the Project Priority List for review and If the Mayor's Office approves any or all of the projects, the Office of General Counsel will prepare the appropriation bill(s) and agreement(s) as directed by the Mayor's Office. In the alternative, the Mayor's Office can decide to delay the funding of a proposed project to a later date or decide not to fund a certain project from the Project Priority List. If a proposed project is denied by the Mayor's Office, no further action on it shall be made, unless at the complete discretion of a Councilperson at the request of the Applicant.

G. **City Council Review.** The appropriation bill(s) and agreement(s) as directed by the Mayor's Office will be filed with City Council for final decision of approval or denial.

III. Certain Communications Prohibited During Application Evaluation Period.

A. During the Application Evaluation Period, an Applicant shall be prohibited from communicating with Tree Commission Commissioners, Tree Commission staff, and other City employees involved with the Tree Planting Project application process regarding an application submitted by such Applicant. For purposes of this Section, the "Application Evaluation Period" shall mean the period commencing on the day immediately following the Tree Planting Project application deadline listed above and ending on the day that the Tree Commission has submitted its scores at the Public Meeting of Tree Commission. This prohibition shall not apply to the following communications:

1. Communications to the Tree Commission staff regarding matters of process or procedure contained herein or in any related documents;
2. Communications during any publicly noticed meeting under Chapter 286, Florida Statutes, including, but not limited to, Tree Commission meetings and subcommittee meetings; and
3. Communications that are necessary and solely related to the ordinary course of business concerning an Applicant's existing Tree Planting

Project Contract.

IV. Requirements to Apply- Qualifications and Proof:

A. Be a 501(c) not-for-profit organization

1. Attach a copy of the organization's IRS determination letter

B. Registered with the State of Florida and have been in existence for at least one (1) year

1. Attach a status good standing certificate issued by the Florida Division of Corporations evidencing that the Applicant is in good standing and has been in existence for one (1) year prior to the Tree Fund Project application deadline. The certificate must be dated within 60 days of the application deadline and list the requesting agency as a Florida non-profit corporation (requested from Florida Division of Corporations here: <http://dos.myflorida.com/sunbiz/manage-business/certification/certificate-status-efile/>) ; and
2. Attach proof of active registration with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs evidencing that the Applicant is allowed to solicit contributions. (requested from the Department here: <https://www.freshfromflorida.com/Business-Services/Solicitation-of-Contributions>)

C. Currently operating in Duval County

1. Attach a copy of Detail by Entity Name from Sunbiz.org
Go to this link: <http://search.sunbiz.org/Inquiry/CorporationSearch/ByName>
2. Provide evidence of current operation in Duval County by submitting at least one of the following:
 - A list of notable projects or work conducted in Duval County
 - A copy of media publicity identifying work conducted in Duval County (i.e. news article or blog post)

Comment [SF2]: this is covered in the affidavit, FYI

D. Have authority to act on behalf of the Applicant

1. Attach Corporate Resolution Certification (form provided in this packet)

E. Have authorization by the owner or operator of the public property in which the

planting project is planned

1. Contact the Real Estate Division (904)255-8700 to determine the owner or operator of the public property.
2. Attach the Authorization to Plant Trees (form provided in this packet)
 - If City Right-of-Way, must obtain a Right of Way Permit from the Development Services Division of the Planning and Development Department (website: <http://www.coj.net/departments/planning-and-development/development-services-division/right-of-way-permitting.aspx>) in addition to the form
 - If City Park, must obtain authorization from the Parks & Recreation Department
 - If School Board property, must obtain authorization from the Assistant Superintendent.

F. Solicited at least 5 bids and responses from contractors, subcontractors, and major suppliers

1. Please list all contractors, major subcontractors (watering, fertilizing, planting) and suppliers (nursery, farms) and their bid proposals/ price quotes.
2. Attach copies of all solicitations and proposals as listed below:
 - If Applicant hires a contractor to perform the substantially all of project, the Application must include the solicitation for bids from at least five (5) contractors along with the responses.
 - If Applicant is acting as a contractor but is hiring a subcontractor for watering, planting, fertilizing or other major task, the Application must include the solicitation for bids from at least five (5) of the applicable type with the responses.
 - If trees or other materials and supplies are going to be purchased by the Applicant directly from a supplier (i.e. nursery), the Application must include the solicitation for pricing quotes from at least five (5) suppliers with the responses.

G. Affirmance that Applicant is in compliance with the terms of all existing City agreements, to which it is a part and in compliance with all federal, state, local laws, rules, regulations and ordinances, as the same may exist from time to time, applicable to it.

1. Attach an executed Tree Fund Project Affidavit (form provided in this packet)

V. Application:

A. Qualifications- Applicant must meet all qualifications and submit the required documents in Paragraph A of the Application.

B. General Information- Applicant must provide General Information in Paragraph B of the Application. Either answer in the spaces provided or use a separate sheet.

C. Project Design & Narrative- This is the part of the Application where the Applicant describes the Project in Narrative Form. The list of items in Paragraph C of the Application are information that is required to be included in the Narrative. Please feel free to get creative in your Application and provide more information than requested.

VI. Application Review- This is the portion of the Application that identifies how the Tree Commission will evaluate and score the Application for the submittal of a recommended priority list to the Mayor's Office. Each application will be scored on a scale of **0 to 140 points**. Assuming multiple applications will be received during each Award Session, these applications will be ranked in order of highest score and included on a recommended Project Priority List to the Mayor's Office for the award of tree funds for the respective projects. The evaluation of the Application will be based on the criteria set forth below and will receive a score out of a total of **140 possible points**.

The Tree Commission staff will review each Application and provide a report and recommendation for approval or disapproval based on the Application and exhibits. This report shall include a Maintenance and Impacts Analysis of the Project. The Staff Report will not include a score for each Application.

When evaluating each application, the Tree Commission shall utilize the information contained in the Application, including the exhibits, Staff Report and all information obtained during the Applicant's presentation for scoring. Each Commissioner will individually score each Application and the Assistant General Counsel assigned to the Tree Commission will average the

total score from each Commissioner for each Application to arrive at a final Score for each Application.

A.

1. Design Review

- a. The species of trees are appropriately located
- b. The number and placement of trees are appropriately located
- c. Trees are from the list of acceptable trees are being planted
- d. The overall use of non-shade trees is acceptable
- e. Less than 25% of the total species of trees being planted are palms
- f. The planting will not interfere with utilities or sight line requirements
- g. Only "Florida Friendly" tree species are being planted (see <https://ff.ifas.ufl.edu/plants>)
- h. Only Florida Fancy or Florida #1 grade specimens are being planted
<https://www.freshfromflorida.com/Divisions-Offices/Plant-Industry/Business-Services/Florida-Grades-and-Standards-for-Nursery-Plants-2015>
- i. The project does not include incidental landscaping

2. Cost Review

- a. Project costs are equal to or less than the City's Continuous Contract
 - 1) Tree Commission staff will provide this information. If the contractor responsible for the City's Continuous Contract cannot do the Project, then this requirement is not applicable
- b. The administrative costs for the Project accurately reflect the amount of administrative services necessary and being performed.
- c. The irrigation costs are only for 1 to 2 years
- d. The cost of the species of trees selected do not outweigh the benefit of the trees

3. Maintenance and Impacts Review

- a. Minimum maintenance required after first year, considering the time and money required for fertilizing, pruning, and any other required maintenance

- b. Minimum adverse impacts on infrastructure
 - c. Positive Impacts to storm water and ground water
 - d. Positive impacts to City's TMDL BMAP
4. **Public Benefit Review**
- a. The species of trees being planted are beneficial to the City's tree canopy
 - b. The Project provides a distinct and unique benefit to the neighborhood, Council District, or City
 - c. The Project serves high visibility areas
 - d. The Project engages the Community through volunteers or education or other public engagement
 - e. The Project is aesthetically pleasing and/or combats blight in blighted areas
 - f. The Applicant or Contractor, has experience related to planting trees\
5. **Plan-It Geo Objective Criteria Review (will be conducted by staff)**
- a. Staff will utilize the Plan-It Geo Web Tool to evaluate the location of the proposed planting project.
 - b. The location will be evaluated based on the Census Block ranking (1- 488) developed by Plan-It Geo for the five (5) categories listed below:
 - 1) Urban Tree Canopy Percentage
 - 2) Stormwater Benefits
 - 3) Urban Heat Island
 - 4) Socio-Economic Benefits
 - 5) Overall-equally weighted criteria
 - c. A maximum of 4 points per category is possible. If a project is on the border of two or more Census Blocks, than the average of the census blocks will be applied to determine a score (e.g. located on the 50th and 300th census blocks, then 175th census block will be applied so that it will receive 3 points). The ranking and corresponding points are as follows:
 - 1) 1st-25th percentile (1-122)- 4 points;
 - 2) 26th- 50th percentile (123-244)- 3 points;
 - 3) 51st-100th percentile (245-366) 2 points
 - 4) 76th-100th (367-488) percentile- 1 point

NOT-FOR-PROFIT APPLICATION PROCESS FOR TREE FUND PROJECTS

Project Evaluation

Evaluation Criteria and review of Project Narrative and Design: The evaluation of the Project shall be based on the criteria set forth below and will receive a score out of 140 points. The Tree Commission staff will evaluate each Project, provide a report and recommendation for approval or disapproval of the Project. This report shall include an Impacts Analysis of the Project. When evaluating each Project, the Tree Commission shall utilize the information contained in the Application, including the exhibits, Staff Report and all information obtained during the Applicant's presentation for scoring. Each Commissioner will individually score each Project and the Assistant General Counsel assigned to the Tree Commission will average the total score from each Commissioner for each Project to arrive at a final Score.

1. Design Review (TOTAL OF 50 POSSIBLE POINTS)

This part of the Project Evaluation evaluates the design of the Project.

Factor: Allocate 5 points if the statement is TRUE and 0 points if the statement is FALSE.	POINTS
(1.a) The species of trees are appropriately located Comments/questions/justifications	
(1.b) The number and placement of trees are appropriately located Comments/questions/justifications	
(1.c) Trees are from the list of Acceptable Trees are being planted Comments/questions/justifications	

<p>(1.d) The overall use of non-shade trees is acceptable Comments/questions/justifications</p>	
<p>(1.e) Less than 25% of the total species of trees being planted are palms Comments/questions/justifications</p>	
<p>(1.f) The planting will not interfere with utilities or sight line requirements Comments/questions/justifications</p>	
<p>(1.g) Only "Florida Friendly" tree species are being planted Comments/questions/justifications</p>	
<p>(1.h) Only Florida Fancy or Florida #1 grade specimens are being planted Comments/questions/justifications</p>	
<p>(1.i) The project does not include incidental landscaping Comments/questions/justifications</p>	
<p>(1.j) The planting is started and completed outside of the period of May 15 and September 15. Comments/questions/justifications</p>	
	TOTAL POINTS

2. Cost Review (TOTAL OF 20 POINTS POSSIBLE)

This part of the Project Evaluation evaluates the present and future costs of the Project.

Allocate <u>5</u> points if the statement is <u>TRUE</u> and <u>0</u> points if the statement is <u>FALSE</u>	POINTS
(2.a) Project costs are equal to or less than the City's Continuous Contract Comments/questions/justifications	
(2.b) The administrative costs for the Project accurately reflect the amount of administrative services necessary and being performed Comments/questions/justifications	
(2.c) The irrigation costs are only for 1 to 2 years Comments/questions/justifications	
(2.d) The cost of the species of trees selected do not outweigh the benefit of the trees Comments/questions/justifications	
TOTAL POINTS	

Comment [SF1]: Strength of Irrigation? What if they don't need it? Or what if they do and the irrigation plan isn't sufficient

3. Maintenance and Impacts Review (TOTAL OF 20 POSSIBLE POINTS)

This part of the Project Evaluation evaluates the required maintenance and potential impacts of the Project.

Points	0	1	2	3	4	5
Means	Incomplete	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Points						
Allocate <u>0-5</u> points based on the scoring criteria, above.						
(3.a) Minimum maintenance required after first year, considering the time and money required for fertilizing, pruning, and any other required maintenance Comments/questions/justifications						
(3.b) Minimum adverse impacts on infrastructure Comments/questions/justifications						
(3.c) Positive Impacts to storm water and ground water Comments/questions/justifications						
(3.d) Positive impacts to City's TMDL BMAP Comments/questions/justifications						
						TOTAL POINTS

4. Public Benefit Review (TOTAL OF 30 POSSIBLE POINTS):

This part of the Project Evaluation evaluates the Public Benefit of the Project.

Points	0	1	2	3	4	5
Meaning	Incomplete	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Allocate 0-5 points based on the scoring criteria, above.						
(4.a) The species of trees being planted are beneficial to the City's tree canopy						
Comments/Questions/Justification						
(4.b) The Project provides a distinct and unique benefit to the neighborhood, Council District, or City						
Comments/Questions/Justification						
(4.c) The Project serves high visibility areas						
Comments/Questions/Justification						
(4.d) The Project engages the Community through volunteers or education or other public engagement						
Comments/Questions/Justification						

	(4.e) The Project is aesthetically pleasing and/or combats blight in blighted areas Comments/Questions/Justification	
	(4.f) The Applicant or Contractor, has experience related to planting trees Comments/Questions/Justification	
	TOTAL POINTS	

Comment [SF2]: Remove and make this a requirement

5. Plan-it Geo/Lax Digs Trees Webtool Review (TOTAL 20 POINTS POSSIBLE)

This part of the Project Evaluation objectively scores the Project solely based on the location of the Project in relation to the Plan-It Geo/Lax Digs Trees Webtool. Points will be allocated based on the Census Block Ranking for the factors listed in 5.a – 5.e , below. If a project is on the border of two or more census blocks, than the average of the census blocks will be applied to determine a score (e.g. located on the 50th and 300th census blocks, then 175th census block will be applied so that it will receive 3 points).

Allocate 0-4 points based on the Census Block Percentile Score: out of 488 Census Blocks:	Census Block	Points
1 st -25 th percentile (1-122)- <u>4</u> points;		
26 th - 50 th percentile (123-244)- <u>3</u> points;		
51 st -100 th percentile (245-366) <u>2</u> points		
76 th -100 th (367-488) percentile- <u>1</u> point		
(5.a) Low Urban Tree Canopy Percentage		
(5.b) Storm water Benefits with low Urban Tree Canopy		
(5.c) Urban Heat Islands with low Urban Tree Canopy		
(5.d) Socio-Economic Priority Area with low Urban Tree Canopy Percentage		
(5.e) Total Plan-It Geo Score for all Criteria		

APPROVED TREES FOR CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY LANDSCAPING CITY OF JACKSONVILLE

Tree	H/ Spd	¹ Plan Canopy Diameter	² Foliage	³ Light Required	⁴ Soil Drainage	⁵ Drought Tolerance	⁶ Growth Rate	Soil Tolerance (pH)
SMALL TREES								
American Hornbeam <i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	30-35'/ 25/30'	20'	DECID	FS/PS	WD	HIGH	SLOW	(4.2-7.6)
Eastern Redbud <i>Cercis canadensis</i>	15-30'/ 15-25'	20'	DECID	FS, PSH	WD	HIGH	RAPID	(4.2-7.6)
Crape Myrtle <i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> var. <i>Natchez, Muskogee, or Tuskegee</i>), Standard or Multi-trunk	15-20'/ 15-25'	18'	DECID	FS	WD	HIGH	MOD	(5.0-7.5)
Fringe Tree <i>Chionanthus virginicus</i>	12-20'/ 10-15'	10'	DECID	FS, PSH, SH	WD	MOD	SLOW	(6.0-6.5)
Little Gem Magnolia <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i> 'Little Gem'	25-35'/ 8-10'	15'	E'GRN	FS, PSH, SH	AW, WD	MOD	SLOW	(4.5-5.0) tolerant to 7.5
Yaupon Holly <i>Ilex vomitoria</i>	15-25'/ 15-20'	15'	E'GRN	FS, PSH, SH	AW, WD	HIGH	SLOW	(4.5- 8.2)
Wax-Leaf Ligustrum <i>Ligustrum japonicum</i>	8-12'/ 15-25'	12'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	WD	MOD	MOD	(5.5-7.5)
⁹ Wax Myrtle <i>Myrica cerifera</i>	15-25'/ 20-25'	20'	E'GRN	FS, PSH, SH	W, WD	HIGH	RAPID	(5.5 -7.0) tolerant to 8.2
Walters Viburnum <i>Viburnum obovatum</i>	8-25'/ 6-12'	10'	SEMI-E'GRN	FS, SH	W, OW	HIGH	MOD	(5.0-7.5)
MEDIUM TREES								
Athena Elm <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> 'Emer I'	45'/ 50'	30'	DECID	FS	OW, WD	MOD	MOD	(4.8-7.5)
¹² Drake Elm <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> 'Drake'	35-40'/ 35-50'	30'	DECID	FS, PSH	OW, WD	MOD	MOD	(4.8-7.5)
Dahoon Holly <i>Ilex cassine</i>	20-30'/ 8-12'	15'	E/GRN	FS, PSH	W, OW	MOD	SLOW	(3.5-6.5)
Eagleston Holly <i>Ilex attenuata</i> 'Eagleston'	30-45'/ 15-25'	20'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	WD	MOD	MOD	(4.0-6.0) tolerant to 7.5
East Palatka Holly <i>Ilex attenuata</i> 'East Palatka'	30-45'/ 15-25'	20'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	WD	MOD	MOD	(4.0-6.0) tolerant to 7.5
Southern Red Cedar <i>Juniperus silocillois</i>	30-40'/ 20-30'	20'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	WD	HIGH	SLOW	(5.5-7.5) tolerant to 8.0
⁸ River Birch <i>Betula nigra</i>	40-50'/ 25-35'	20'	DECID	FS, PSH	W, OW	LOW	RAPID	(4.0-6.5) tolerant to <4.0
Winged Elm <i>Ulmus alata</i>	40-50'/ 30-40'	30'	DECID	FS, PSH	OW, WD	LOW	MOD	(5.0-7.0) tolerant to 8.0
¹⁰ LARGE TREES								
Allee Elm <i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> 'Emer II'	75'/ 60'	30'	DECID	FS	OW, WD	MOD	MOD	(4.8-7.5)
Bald Cypress <i>Taxodium distichum</i>	60-80'/ 25-30'	25'	DECID	FS, PSH	W, OW, WD	MOD	RAPID	(4.0 to 6.0), tolerant to 7.5
Blackgum <i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	75'/ 25-30'	30'	DECID	FS, PSH, SH	W, OW, WD	HIGH	SLOW	(6.0-7.0)
¹¹ Live Oak <i>Quercus virginiana</i>	60-80'/ 60-120'	50'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	OW, WD	HIGH	MOD	(4.5-6.5) tolerant to 8.0
Overcup Oak <i>Quercus lyrata</i>	35-50'/ 30-50'	35'	DECID	FS, PSH	W, OW, WD	LOW	MOD	(4.5-6.0)
Nuttall Oak <i>Quercus nuttallii</i>	60-80'/ 35-50'	35'	DECID	FS	OW, WD	LOW	MOD	(4.5-5.5)
⁸ Red Maple <i>Acer rubrum</i>	60-75'/ 25-35'	30'	DECID	PSH	W, OW	LOW	MOD	(5.4-7.1)
Slash Pine <i>Pinus elliotii</i>	60-80'/ 30-40'	20'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	OW, WD	HIGH	RAPID	(4.5-7.0)
Long Leaf Pine <i>Pinus palustris</i>	60-80'/ 30-40'	20'	E'GRN	FS	WD	HIGH	MOD	(4.5-7.0)
Southern Magnolia <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	30-100'/ 20-40'	30'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	OW, WD	MOD	MOD	(5.5-6.5) tolerant to 7.5
Sweetgum <i>Liquidambar straciflua</i>	60-75'/ 35-50'	30'	DECID	FS, PSH	W, OW	LOW	MOD	(4.5-7.0) tolerant to 7.5
Sycamore <i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	75-90'/ 50-70'	30'	DECID	FS	W, OW, WD	MOD	RAPID	(4.9-6.5), tolerant up to 8.0
Tulip Poplar <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	80-100'/ 30-50'	30'	DECID	FS, PSH	OW, WD	MOD	RAPID	(4.5-6.5) tolerant up to 7.5
⁹ Weeping Willow <i>Salix babylonica</i> or <i>alba</i>	45-70'/4 5-70'	30'	DECID	FS, PSH	OW, WD	MOD	RAPID	(4.5-7.5)

APPROVED TREES FOR CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY LANDSCAPING CITY OF JACKSONVILLE

Tree	Ht/ Spd	¹ Plan Canopy Diameter	² Foliage	³ Light Required	⁴ Soil Drainage	⁵ Drought Tolerance	⁶ Growth Rate	Soil Tolerance (pH)
PALMS								
Washington Palm <i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	60-100'/ 10-15'	12'	E'GRN	FS, PSH	OW, WD	HIGH	RAPID	(5.5-7.5) tolerant up to 8.0
Cabbage Palm <i>Sabal palmetto</i>	40-50'/ 10-12'	10'	E'GRN	FS	OW, WD	HIGH	MOD	(6.0-6.8) tolerant up to 8.0
Ribbon Palm <i>Livistona decipiens</i>	30-50'/ 18-25'	15'	E'GRN	FS	WD	HIGH	MOD	(5.5-7.5)

LEGEND

Yaupon Holly <i>Ilex vomitoria</i>	If planting area is likely contaminated with limerock or if the soil pH is tested above 7.5, then concentrate on trees <u>shown in gray</u> that are tolerant of alkaline soils.
---------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

¹ Draw each tree symbol on the landscape plan to the diameter shown above to match the normal mature (20 year) canopy of each tree species. Do not overlap tree canopies of different species (ie, do not show the canopy circle of a sun loving crape myrtle overlapping the mature canopy circle of a live oak). However, tree canopy circles of the same species can overlap to create tree clusters or to create a solid, closely spaced row of trees. Also, new understory trees can be shown under existing shade trees if existing trees have high branching.

² Foliage: DECID = Deciduous, E'GRN = Evergreen

³ Light Requirement: FS = Full Sun, PSH = Partial Shade (2-5 hrs. of sun or filtered sun), SH = Full Shade (<2 hrs. sun)

⁴ Soil Drainage: W=Always Wet (soil saturated for more than several days during growing season), OW=occasionally Wet (Soil saturated for several days during several days of growing season), WD=Well Drained

⁵ Drought Tolerance: HIGH=High (no watering required once well established), MOD= Moderate (occasional watering required during dry periods in growing season), LOW= Low (frequent watering required during dry periods of growing season)

⁶ Growth Rate: SLOW=Slow (<1ft/ yr.), MOD=Moderate (1-2 ft/ yr.), FAST=Fast (>2ft/ yr.)

⁷ Use Live Oak cultivars (Q. v. 'SDLN' ('Cathedral' Live Oak) or Q. v. 'QVTIA' ('Highrise' Live Oak)) in medians when a single row of oaks with uniform spacing is desired. Use 'Highrise' Oak where oaks are near overhead power lines. Use common live oak for informal groupings.

⁸ Limit use of River Birch, Red Maple, and Weeping Willow to clusters around retention ponds and in areas of R.O.W. undisturbed by construction. Do not use in medians or within 20' of pavement. These trees don't do well in alkaline conditions generally found near pavement. Because River Birch and Willows have a short life span, use these tree sparingly. Generally, cluster with longer lived tree types.

⁹ Use Wax Myrtle only in mass planting for visual screening and transition into natural areas. Use Oleander only in mass planting for visual screening and color accents.

¹⁰ Provide 6'-8' minimum between Large Trees and pavement, curbs and other structures.

¹¹ Trees not on the above approved list may be considered for approval by the Mowing and Landscape Maintenance Division. Contact Fred Pope, PLA (pope@coj.net or 904.255.4305) to obtain written approval.

¹² Because of weeping nature of Drake Elm, limit use to medians 30' wide or greater, measured from the edge of travel lane (i.e. two 1.5' curb & gutter & 27' grassed median) and where the tree can be set back 15' from the travel lane, if planted on the side of the street.

PROHIBITED TREES

Common Name <i>Botanical Name</i>	Reasons
Bradford Pear <i>Pyrus calleryana 'Bradford'</i>	Poor branching, short life
Laurel Oak <i>Quercus laurifolia</i>	Poor branching, weak wood
Camphor Tree <i>Cinnamomum camphora</i>	Category I Invasive Plant by FLEPPC
Tallow Tree <i>Sapium sebiferum</i>	Category I Invasive Plant by FLEPPC
Cherry Laurel <i>Prunus caroliniana</i>	Short lived, messy litter, multiple seedlings
Loblolly Pine <i>Pinus taeda</i>	Preferred host of Southern Pine Beetle
Dogwood <i>Cornus florida</i>	High mortality from anthracnose disease & borers

FLEPPC = Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council

INDEX CODE	Index Code Titles	BUDGET	Actual	Encumbrance	Unencumbered Budget Balance	Reserves	Unencumbered Balance net of Reserves
Subfund 15F Revenue							
PWOD15FTP	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENSES	29,420,122	40,890,823		11,470,700		11,470,700
JXSF15FPW	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	7,535,414	8,565,311		1,029,897		1,029,897
JXSF15F	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	-	8,580		8,580		8,580
TRIN15FFR31R	TRF TO 15F TREE PROTECTION FR 31F	392	392		-		-
	CONVERSION AND NONCASH REVENUE ENTRIES		338,836		338,836		338,836
Total Subfund 15F Revenue		36,955,929	49,803,942	-	12,848,013		12,848,013
* Subfund 15F Expenditures							
PWOD15FARATP	SANDALWOOD TREE REPLACEMENT PROJECT	13,796	12,416	1,380	-	-	-
PWOD15FFSAS	FORREST STREET ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING	587,850	581,856	5,995	-	-	-
PWOD15FNMS	NORTH MAIN STREET LANDSCAPING	62,057	40,000	22,057	-	-	-
PWOD15FBDAS	BROWN'S DUMP ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING	364,730	342,361	22,370	-	-	-
PWOD15FFCAS	5TH & CLEVELAND ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING	494,215	376,792	117,423	-	-	-
PWOD15FDCS	DUVAL COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD PROPERTY	125,000	784	124,216	-	-	-
PWOD15FHRDA	TREE PLANTING - HARTS RD. AT DUNN AVE	23,718	23,718	-	-	-	-
PWOD15FDTP	DOWNTOWN TREE PLANTING	38,822	26,314	12,508	-	-	-
PWOD15FZLAE	ZOO LANDSCAPING-ASIAN EXHIBIT	1,824,408	689,345	1,135,063	-	-	-
PWOD15FMSW	MINDANAO FR ALOHA DR TO WITCHHAVEN ST	9,710	9,710	-	-	-	-
PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING	100,000	65,231	15,483	19,286	-	19,286
PWOD15FROW	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-RIGHT OF WAY	4,679,980	4,613,147	36,078	30,756	-	30,756
PWML15F	TREE MAINTENANCE	1,761,795	1,545,797	201,121	14,877	-	14,877
PWOD15FATPP	AVONDALE TREE PLANTING PLAN	31,233	-	31,233	-	-	-
PWOD15FKSCP	KING ST. PLANTING COLLEGE TO PARK	85,366	-	85,366	-	-	-
PWOD15FHAMM	HAMMOND BLVD PROJECT	175,761	-	-	175,761	-	175,761
PWOD15FVPP	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-PRESERVATION PARKS	1,000,000	485,146	-	514,854	-	514,854
PWOD15FVAP	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-ACTIVE PARKS	1,151,965	619,420	-	532,545	-	532,545
PWOD15FOSABP	OLD ST.AUG AT BARTRAM PARK	18,364	-	18,364	-	-	-
PWOD15FLAVC	LENOX AVE.PLANTING VERNA TO CASSAT	26,436	-	26,436	-	-	-
PWOD15FTP	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENSES	3,548,513	2,097,444	-	1,451,069	1,449,105	1,964
JXSF15FPW	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	2,000,635	-	-	2,000,635	2,000,635	-
JXSF15F	TREE PROTECTION & RELATED EXPENDITURES	2,365,741	-	-	2,365,741	2,365,741	-
Subfund 15F Expenditures		20,490,094	11,529,479	1,855,090	7,105,524	5,815,481	1,290,043
* Includes accounts with encumbrances and budget balances							
Unencumbered Budget Balance							
Revenues							12,848,013
Expenditures							7,105,524
Unencumbered Balance net of Reserves							(1,290,043)
Subfund 15F Available to Appropriate (Budget less Actual less Encumbrance less Unencumbered Budget balance)							18,663,494

INDEX CODE	Index Code Titles	BUDGET	Actual	Encumbrance	Unencumbered Budget Balance	Reserves	Unencumbered Balance net of Reserves
Subfund 15N Revenue							
PWOD15NTM	TREE MITIGATION & RELATED EXPENSES	173,306	4,138,806	-	3,965,500	-	-
	Total Subfund 15N Revenue	173,306	4,138,806	-	3,965,500	-	-
*Subfund 15N Expenditures							
PWOD15NARTS	AVONDALE/RIVERSIDE TREE SURVEY	39,999	39,999	-	-	-	-
PWOD15NBDTP	BAKERSFIELD DRIVE-TREE PLANTING	8,306	7,475	831	-	-	-
JXSF15N	TREE MITIGATION & RELATED EXPENSE	1	-	-	1	1	-
	Subfund 15N Expenditures	48,306	47,474	831	1	1	-
* Includes accounts with encumbrances and budget balances							
Subfund 15N Available to Appropriate (Budget less Actual less Encumbrance less Unencumbered Budget balance)							3,965,501
Better Jacksonville Plan							
PWCP351MIT	TREE MITIGATION PROJECT	1,717,826	-	-	1,717,826	-	1,717,826
Better Jacksonville Plan (for Tree Mitigation) Available to Appropriate (Budget less Actual less Encumbrance less Unencumbered Budget balance)							1,717,826
Total 15F and 15N Funds							22,628,996
Better Jacksonville Plan - TREE MITIGATION PROJECT							1,717,826
Grand Total							24,346,822

#REF! 6/28/2018

Year	Encumbrance Number	Enc. Sfx	Sub - fund	Vendor Number	Vendor Suffix	Vendor Name	Encumbrance Balance	Index Code	Index Code Title
2018	CTPW07000014	01	15F	591319010	01	JACKSONVILLE ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY	1135063.14	PWOD15FZLAE	ZOO LANDSCAPING-ASIAN EXHIBIT
2018	CTPW16000066	02	15F	592283261	03	GREENSCAPE OF JACKSONVILLE INC	124215.6	PWOD15FDCS	DUVAL COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD PROPERTY
2018	PO3019740001	04	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	36077.5	PWOD15FROW	COUNTY-WIDE TREE PROG-RIGHT OF WAY
2018	PO3019740003	02	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	5994.5	PWOD15FFSAS	FORREST STREET ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING
2018	PO3019740004	02	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	22369.5	PWOD15FBDAS	BROWN'S DUMP ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING
2018	PO3019740005	02	15F	340176110	07	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	117423	PWOD15FFCAS	5TH & CLEVELAND ASH SITE TREE/PLANTING
2018	PO7A02942003	02	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	1379.55	PWOD15FARATP	SANDALWOOD TREE REPLACEMENT PROJECT
2018	PO7A02942004	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	4205	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942006	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	22057	PWOD15FNMS	NORTH MAIN STREET LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942007	01	15N	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	830.58	PWOD15NBFTP	BAKERSFIELD DRIVE-TREE PLANTING
2018	PO7A02942008	02	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	519.5	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942010	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	1076.4	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942012	03	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	1022.64	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942015	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	8659.61	PWOD15FIBCL	INTERSEC,BRIDGE,MISC 09/10 LANDSCAPING
2018	PO7A02942017	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	12508.02	PWOD15FDTP	DOWNTOWN TREE PLANTING
2018	PO7A02942018	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	18364.21	PWOD15FOSABP	OLD ST.AUG AT BARTRAM PARK
2018	PO7A02942019	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	85366.23	PWOD15FKSCP	KING ST. PLANTING COLLEGE TO PARK
2018	PO7A02942021	01	15F	340176110	06	THE DAVEY TREE EXPERT COMPANY	31232.6	PWOD15FATPP	AVONDALE TREE PLANTING PLAN
2018	PO8A01798005	01	15F	161004851	05	LEWIS TREE SERVICE, INC.	201120.57	PWML15F	TREE MAINTENANCE
2018	REQ235138	01	15F				26435.84	PWOD15FLAVC	LENOX AVE.PLANTING VERNA TO CASSAT

1,855,920.99



TREE REMOVAL PERMIT INFORMATION

Click here to search detailed information on Site Clearing and Tree Removal Permits. In reviewing tree removal information on a specific permit, for "B" permits click on the Spec 2 tab; for "L" permits click on the Tree Mitigation tab.



TREE FUND CITY PLANTING PROJECTS

Click here to search detailed information about City Tree Fund Planting Projects.



AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION

15F (Ordinance): \$18,663,494.17
 15N (Charter): \$3,965,501.45
Total: \$22,628,995.62



FILE AN ISSUE

Click here to report site clearing or tree removal without a permit, or to request tree maintenance on public property. In the CARE System, select "Tree Remove or Landscape Violation" from the dropdown.

Disclaimer: The AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION information shown on this page is updated nightly from the City's financial records, but does not include any pending appropriations, or other financial transactions of the funds which have not been completed.



If you experience difficulty viewing or accessing the documents provided on this site, or navigating this application's table features, using any assistive technology please contact the Disabled Services Division at 904-630-4940 or 904-630-4933 (TTY) to request an accommodation.

© 2018 - Official City of Jacksonville and Duval County Government Website, All Rights Reserved.

Version: 1.0.0.6