

Jacksonville Tree Commission WORKSHOP

Wednesday January 12, 2022 – 9:30 AM

**Ed Ball Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room 5
and Zoom**

Commissioners: Chris Flagg, Chair
Curtis Hart, Vice Chair
Ron Salem
John Pappas
Mike Robinson
Rhodes Robinson
Susan Fraser

Advisors: Susan Grandin
Richard Leon
Kathleen McGovern
Jose Regueiro

Staff: Cindy Chism

AGENDA

Order of Agenda is Subject to Change

- 1. Call to Order - Chair**
- 2. Roll Call – Cindy Chism**
- 3. Urban Forestry Funding –**
 - a)** this topic was brought up by Ricky regarding who can bring a potential project to the Commission.
 - b)** should a new program be added? OR
 - c)** should the Tree Commission and staff together come up with a priority list of potential projects as is set out as a Duty of the Commission in Sec. 94.106(c) and (d), Ordinance Code.
- 4. Potential increase of the percentage from the Tree Fund that can go toward tree maintenance**
 - a)** what is the definition of “maintenance;”
 - b)** how is maintenance connected to extending the life of the trees; and
 - c)** what data shows that an increase is needed
- 5. Adjournment –** the next Tree Commission meeting is scheduled for February 16th, 2022 at 9:30am and will be a Hybrid/Zoom meeting in Ed Ball Building, 10th Floor, Public Works Office, conference room 5.

Jacksonville Tree Commission Workshop
Wednesday, January 12, 2022 – 9:30 AM
Approved February 16, 2022
Via Zoom Platform & In Person

Commissioners Present:	Chris Flagg, Chair Curtis Hart, Vice Chair Mike Robinson Rhodes Robinson Susan Fraser John Pappas CM Ron Salem	Staff:	Cindy Chism
Advisors:	Susan Grandin, OGC Jose Regueiro, Finance Richard Leon, Urban Forestry Kathleen McGovern, City Arborist	Public:	Mike Zaffaroni, Liberty Landscape Kelly O’Leary, Liberty Landscape Fred Pope, COJ Todd Little, COJ Dalton Smith, COJ John November, Public Trust Lisa Grubba, Greenscape Tracey Arpen, Greenscape/Scenic Jax Brooks Andrews, Resiliency Committee

1. Call to Order – Chair

2. Roll Call– Cindy Chism

3. Urban Forestry Funding –

- a) This topic was brought up by Ricky regarding who can bring a potential project to the Commission. Mr. Leon clarified the topic; Staff has no process to enable planting trees where we have identified a need. 630-CITY and the Remove and Replace programs are not appropriate. The Level 2 program would require someone from the community to suggest the project. Staff has no way to initiate a tree planting. If there were a Countywide Tree Planting budget so Staff could plant trees as needed, which a) are not part of the 630-CITY program and b) are not a Level 2 project.
- i. Mr. Pappas asked if Mr. Leon had a threshold of how many trees, unlimited or for specific area. Mr. Leon replied, not a specific area, countywide. For instance, a million dollars in an account to be used in planting trees throughout the county, areas where Staff have determined trees are needed. Without turning the request into a Level 2 project which must have a community member request it, go to Tree Commission, and then MBRC.
 - ii. Mr. Pappas asked how large would the planting projects be? Mr. Leon replied the size and or limits could be discussed and determined.
 - iii. CM Salem suggested a maximum dollar amount or number of trees as well as the district council member at least be aware or be the sponsor of these projects. Mr. Leon pointed out that the Councilmember and their ECA are alerted for each Level 2, we could do the same for this.
 - iv. Mr. M. Robinson asked about the previous Countywide Tree Planting Program and why was it not continued? Mr. Leon responded that was a program ended before I was employed by the City.
 - v. Mr. Hart added the Tree Commission exists to properly spend the Tree Mitigation funds. If creating a streamlined program to plant trees, ok. However, dumping money in an account

- and letting Staff just go plant trees is not a process. We have a process, if a quicker process is needed, design a different one, but it must go through the Commission.
- vi. Ms. Fraser pointed out what Mr. Leon is proposing is a piece of a larger puzzle; planting trees hither and yon is lost in the weeds. There is no impact, or priority, it's too random. The larger issue is does the Tree Commission want to deal with the recommendations from the Resiliency Report and set priorities. Perhaps every quarter Staff recommends to the Tree Commission a list of plantings for which the Tree Commission either approves or disproves. There could also be larger recommendations, i.e., increasing the overall tree canopy, which could assist in directing funds overall.
 - vii. Mr. Tracey Arpen added that the Tree Commission needs to be more involved other than just setting up a pot of money for tree plantings. The areas where there may be the greatest need may not necessarily be the areas where you can spot an easy to install 5 or 10 trees. There needs to be priorities set which would emphasize the underserved parts of town, the heat islands, areas which are more difficult to plant in perhaps would be a better use of the funds. With the large amount of funds we have, it is a chance to do something transformational for parts of town that really need transforming, overcoming decades of neglect. The funds need to remain in the hands of the Tree Commission for oversight and setting priorities.
 - viii. Mr. Leon responded there is a 630-CITY tree planting program which has planted about 4000 trees, each one of the trees was not brought before the Tree Commission for approval. There is also the Remove/Replace program which has planted about 600 trees, so just under 5,000 trees have been planted which the Tree Commission is aware of but did not give specific approval. There are guidelines for how the trees may be planted and who has approval before anything may be done. 4600 trees have been planted through approved Tree Commission programs for which the Tree Commission can take credit for. There is oversight and reports are made to the Commission on the status of these programs. The idea is to streamline a process to make it easier to plant trees.
 - ix. Mr. November added why not create a process where some limit of trees, perhaps 10-20 trees, some dollar amount, and each month the location is brought before the Commission for approval. That would achieve the oversight desired. Mr. Leon continued, there is no way for Staff to plant trees on any median without make it a Level 2 project which takes 3 months and uses a lot of time and Staff for 10 trees. Mr. Hart responded those are the rules. Create another process which takes less time, and the Commission will evaluate it.
 - x. Mr. R. Rhodes clarified It appears the Commission would like to know before something gets done and a dollar threshold. An answer may be an inventory, i.e., there are 10 projects we'd like to do, give us approval, when we have time and money they will get done. Mr. M. Robinson agreed and pointed out it sounds like what Mr. November suggested. Have the projects presented at, for instance, the January meeting and then the projects go forward for February. Mr. Leon added funds for Level 2 projects are already appropriated and sit in an account earmarked Level 2. Once the projects are approved by the Commission, we use those funds. Perhaps funds could be appropriated to an account for countywide tree planting. Then at Tree Commission meetings the projects could be presented for approval. Mr. November continued if there were funds already available, the Commission could then give their approval for the project.
 - xi. Ms. Fraser pointed out Mr. R. Robinson had a good point in that we need to ensure that the tree planting projects are spread across all the council districts. There should be a database

- which lists all the projects and what districts they are/have been in. Plan out the year, i.e., this year the priority will be for a specific purpose. A larger picture than just a list every month. Mr. M. Robinson suggested using the canopy map on Plan-it GEO. Mr. Flagg continued that was suggested earlier, to generate a bigger picture plan.
- xii. Mr. Pope pointed out, what we are talking about are major and minor projects. Mr. Leon is looking for funding for small projects, but Ms. Fraser was discussing a list of major projects to prioritize and complete throughout the year.
 - xiii. Mr. Arpen agreed with Mr. November in having an expedited process with the funding already appropriated and in place but still require some sort of sign-off by the Tree Commission before the projects can start.
 - xiv. Ms. Fraser said priorities were established in the Resiliency Report, some of which we may want to consider. On page 75 they set data sources; the existing tree canopy, heat index, flood hazards, poverty redline and economically distressed areas. If we can get all that data, then Mr. Leon's proposed program can fall into that. So it's not a random sighting but fits into these larger priorities for the City and the Commission.
 - xv. Mr. November clarified; it sounds like there is a consensus. If Mr. Leon came back with a proposal for how it would work that achieves his goals, he would have the opportunity to get trees in the ground in an expedited manner.
 - xvi. Mr. Leon agreed but also pointed out it is minor and major projects. On a smaller scale it will take a lot of the Commission's time to prioritize the very small projects (20 trees or less). If these small projects are not prioritized but just brought before the Commission for approval and the larger projects prioritized that could be viable.
 - xvii. Mr. Flagg said the question has always been should the Tree Commission be advocating for these priority areas instead of being more reactive. Our discussion was how do we position ourselves to be more aggressive in advocacy. The consensus so far is we need a big plan but we also need Staff to be able to insert their observations in priority areas as well but worked into a larger master plan which would be brought to the District Representatives for their input. This is parallel to our narrative from last year about being more proactive. How do we put these processes in place to have funding available, have the options available, and have a plan identified so we can move forward?
 - xviii. Mr. Leon agreed bringing a list to Tree Commission for a consent agenda item would work for the smaller projects.
- b)** should a new program be added? OR
 - c)** should the Tree Commission and staff together come up with a priority list of potential projects as is set out as a Duty of the Commission in Sec. 94.106(c) and (d), Ordinance Code. Mr. Flagg suggested this may be a good vehicle to outline opportunities where deficiencies exist and to bring to local district representatives would help bolster what the Commission is about.
- i. Ms. Grandin referred to the spreadsheet which lists the purpose of the Tree Commission as well as the duties (Attachment A). One of them is to formulate a large plan for the planting of trees and health of the City's tree canopy. We have the ability to execute a plan through the Ordinance, and the data and analysis Ms. Fraser mentioned is in Plan-It Geo. There are 2 issues here, Mr. Leon's issue is separate from the big picture. If Mr. Leon could generate a plan, how many trees, what the criteria is, i.e., it must be spread throughout the districts or answer some need from Plan-it GEO, that would be what the Tree Commission would vote on. Then we could get an appropriation through City Council. The other issue is separate.

- The Tree Commission could decide, for instance, this urban corridor needs trees, this Park needs shade, big conceptual ideas. The Ordinance also asks for an estimate on cost.
- ii. Mr. Leon said urban forestry is not just massive, large scale tree plantings. A lot of people looking from the outside think that's how it is, there's this large heat island over here and there's tree canopy inequity over here so let's do massive broad scale plantings. That's not urban forestry. Urban forestry is immensely complex with so many different stakeholders, it doesn't allow for massive scale. The property owner may not want a tree in the ROW in front of their home, or the obscure maintenance agreement signed in 1980 which is ours to maintain there is so much involved. Smaller scale tree plantings shouldn't be discounted. It is a complex City that we live in with diverse stakeholders in all forms of the word. Keep your eye on the target, but don't miss the low hanging fruit.
 - iii. Mr. Arpen pointed out that in the older parts of town there isn't room for large tree planting projects. There is not a lot of public space, there is not a large park. The solution for those areas may be the 630-CITY program. It would be helpful for the Commission to be updated on the progress of this program, such as what parts of town are requesting the trees, what outreach has been done to make the program more visible to the needier parts of town. Even though the plantings are only ones and twos, that may be the best option for some parts of town.
 - iv. Mr. Leon added perhaps agriculture extension agents or some of the non-profit groups could be the liaisons for these areas for larger plantings to put that piece of the puzzle together. Also, the Level 3 program could be utilized. Instead of the non-profit coming to the Commission with a project, what if the Commission said we would like to do a Level 3 planting project in this identified heat island area, does anyone want to submit a project.
 - v. Ms. Grandin said there appear to be 2 programs; the bigger picture program does not appear to be Staff driven. Mr. Leon was focused on a small-scale program. These should be separated, take one up at a time. The small scale project should be voted on one way or another and get it off the table and then talk about the bigger picture. Mr. Flagg asked if there were some collaborative thinking related to Mr. Leon's smaller projects, could they be injected into a larger plan?
 - vi. CM Salem said he would sponsor an Ordinance which would create a program described by Mr. Leon which would require a separate fund such as what we have for the other 3. Within that Ordinance all specifications desired could be listed, i.e., Council notification, approval, what ever the Commission would like. The disadvantage would be now there is a fourth fund that requires City Council approval to be replenished however, that seems like the best way to go.
 - vii. Mr. November said he had concerns about overburdening Staff. It seems right that there is good work to be done in terms of prioritizing and I worry about overburdening the Tree Commission as well. It seems there may be some Staff members and some Tree Commission members that want to spend extra time doing prioritization and large-scale thinking, but if this issue is going to be discussed at the monthly meetings, the agendas are already full. Perhaps a subcommittee could be created to work on this and report to the Commission quarterly.
 - viii. Ms. Fraser asked if there was a map of all the plantings in the last 5 years, how many, what district, etc. Mr. Leon answered, yes, we have that data from every program that we have, Remove/Replace, 630-CITY, Level 2 Projects are all logged onto the map on Plan-it GEO with

- a Council district overlay. Ms. Fraser asked if that could be provided at the next meeting. Mr. Leon agreed. Ms. Fraser continued, step one; this Committee as a whole, should look at the data from the Resiliency Report on maps, and decide what the priorities are; planting in the flood plane for instance. Then that is prioritized. Step two; what kind of project(s) might fulfil those priorities. This would help to find successful proposals instead of depending on Staff to suggest them.
- ix. Mr. R. Robinson commended Mr. Leon for his initiative in helping the Commission get more trees in the ground. The idea is sound, and we need to find a solution for small projects. Bifurcate that from the big picture; the big picture and the way this Commission works it will take months to finalize. However, a solution for the small projects is more doable, once the number of trees is determined, and then the big picture program could catch up and they could come back together. The programs are two separate things but related. Mr. Leon continued in terms of the big picture, all these programs really do play a part, the Level 3s play a good role in this if the Tree Commission identifies these places of concern especially as it relates to the Resiliency outline. The Level 3s entail a lot of administrative work to plant trees in underserved communities, you need a lot of buy in which would be a great role for a Level 3 particularly on the administration side.
- x. Mr. Flagg pointed out there was a well-done graphic which was presented to the City Council which showed most of our plantings were in deficient zones. Mr. Leon continued; the data can be broken down but it's not exactly apples to apples. Some districts are more rural, and some more urban.
- xi. Ms. Grandin added, the Ordinance also authorizes the Tree Commission to educate the public. Part of the big picture program may be working with community groups. Begin with CPACs, Homeowners Associations or Neighborhood Associations, the City Planning Department has a list of all the Neighborhood Associations. From experience, the neighborhood will get excited about any improvement, but they want to be involved from the beginning. Typically, when the City does something on this scale a Facilitator is hired. The Tree Fund will not pay for a Facilitator but is there anyone on Staff that could do it or if a Commissioner knows anyone who would like to volunteer to facilitate this. It seems like we need someone, not a Commissioner, to assist in generating the priorities. Ms. Fraser asked if the Regional Planning Council could do it, they were active in the Resiliency Committee and are heavy on data and mapping. Mr. November suggested if anyone knows someone who would be a good Commissioner but doesn't want to commit to monthly meetings, someone who knows about trees and planting projects as well as strategic planning perhaps that may be someone to approach to volunteer. Mr. Pope pointed out there is a large staff in the Planning Department, perhaps one of them could facilitate.
- xii. Mr. Hart said having a facilitator is very good process. There is some local talent who I might be able to find some money to pay. They don't have to know anything about trees, just what our goals are and they'll try to get us there. We could spend half a day and get somewhere. The School Board uses a lot of facilitators and have a great facility off Spring Park. Ms. Grandin will write a narrative of what we expect the facilitator to do and maybe we could find someone. Using a facilitator is a great idea.

- xiii. Mr. Arpen added under the current Level 3 Project system it is expected for a non-profit to do all of the facilitation, groundwork, and outreach meetings upfront before getting to the Stage 1 meeting with Staff, none of which is reimbursable. There are not many non-profits in town which can afford that type of expense in time and money to get to the point of coming up with even a preliminary plan to take to Staff. So as much as non-profits might like to be involved in the Level 3 process that's too much of a burden to expect them to undertake.
- xiv. Mr. Leon will put together the Small-Scale Plantings criteria; Ms. Grandin will determine a scope of expectations and goals for a facilitator relating to the Big Picture Program. Mr. Flag asked if this would be another workshop or done at a Tree Commission meeting. Ms. Grandin suggested another workshop. Perhaps Mr. Leon could bring his Small Scale Planting program to the next Tree Commission meeting for a vote. For the facilitator, Ms. Grandin and Mr. Hart will have further discussions. Mr. November suggested a private donation perhaps for the facilitator. Ms. Fraser added if we are focused on the Resiliency Committees goals, perhaps they would contribute.

4. Potential increase of the percentage from the Tree Fund that can go toward tree maintenance

- a) what is the definition of "maintenance;"
- b) how is maintenance connected to extending the life of the trees; and
- c) what data shows that an increase is needed
 - i. Mr. Leon said this came out of the fact that we are planting trees at a higher rate than ever, and all the trees are going to require maintenance, then the topic turned to what is the definition of maintenance and whether the type of maintenance we are doing is in the best interest of the tree. My argument was a tree in a natural area does not require the same amount of maintenance as a tree in an urban area. So, we need to separate natural areas from our urban areas. Natural areas require little to no maintenance, urban settings require maintenance due to infrastructure, risk, and public safety. Page 263 of the Urban Forestry Planning and Management of Urban Green Spaces by Robert Miller says, "Of all municipal tree management activities, tree pruning is the most essential for long term tree safety and survival." Our argument is that we are planting more trees, so we need to increase our budget for maintaining those trees.
 - ii. Ms. Fraser asked for the definition of maintenance which Public Works uses. Mr. Leon replied maintenance is any work done to the tree even injecting a fungicide. Ms. Fraser refined, how is the money spent that you want the increase for. Mr. Leon replied, the budget is separated into hazard tree removal and maintenance. Maintenance is pruning. We don't charge any removals under our tree trimming budget. Though pruning is all we use the maintenance budget for currently an argument could be made for anything which prolonged the life of the tree. Ms. Fraser asked if Mr. Leon was asking for the definition of maintenance to be expanded.
 - iii. Mr. Arpen pointed out that not all pruning necessarily extends the life of the tree. If you are pruning because the limb is too low on the sidewalk and someone may hit their head, that is a safety concern, but it is not extending the life of the tree. The only way we could include maintenance in the tree mitigation scheme was for the maintenance to be the functional equivalent of planting a new tree by extending the life of the trees that are there. Where is the evidence that the type of maintenance specifically being done in the

City of Jacksonville by Public Works is extending the life of a tree? Just to say pruning it is extending the life of a tree would not cut it in court.

- iv. Mr. November added when someone pays into the tree fund, they are impacting our canopy. Activities that we do to better our canopy would fit into the definition of what could be expected by that developer when we are talking about maintaining our canopy long term. A healthy 50-year-old Sugar Maple will sequester 120 times the amount of carbon of a 10-year-old tree. Consequently, a tree planted in 2020 will have little or no impact on the canopy until 2040 or 2050. So, it is imperative that we take care of our existing canopy. My recommendation is, if we are going to expand the maintenance percentage from 25% to something like 40% it must be specifically used for something called preventative pruning, i.e., these funds shall be used exclusively for a preventative pruning program that is designed to maintain a structurally sound trunk and branch architecture to sustain the health of our tree canopy long-term. The fund needs to be very strictly managed and it appears Mr. McDaniel is willing to have the contract be specific and have the funds be directed only to that activity. If the percentage increases, the amount of funds from the general budget must also increase. Our canopy is not being maintained appropriately; Savannah has 15 Arborist which prune their trees. We need to do better as a City when it comes to spending money.
- v. Mr. Arpen agreed that what Mr. November suggested is defensible in court. When you talk about removing cross branches which are rubbing, that type of thing, the problem is getting a grasp of how much of the tree maintenance time and money is spent on that type of pruning which is defensible in court versus what I call the nuisance pruning where a limb is hanging to low over a sidewalk or a park. Mr. Flagg added most of the pruning he sees is destructive to the life of the tree which is due to the bad pruning habits. There will have to be some level of pruning criteria which will have to coincide with this increase in dollars as well. Good pruning is an art form.
- vi. Ms. Grandin asked if the increase in the Public Works budget would have to come before or the same time as any percentage increase in the tree fund money, if you set a number, e.g., if the Public Works tree maintenance budget increased \$500,000 then the percentage from the tree fund would increase 1 percentage point. Does Mr. Arpen think this would hold up? Mr. Arpen replied it's not how much of a percentage it is, the bottom-line question is how you are spending the money. There's no cap if you can convince the court the type of maintenance you are doing makes the tree live longer. Ms. Grandin added, so essentially, we should be doing that with the 25% we currently receive. Mr. Arpen agreed.
- vii. Mr. Pappas said as we look at defining what maintenance is and what these funds could be used for on that maintenance term, would it not be appropriate if there are low hanging limbs which are impacting vehicles, if those vehicles strike those limbs doesn't that cause challenges to the tree? Wouldn't that fall into extending the life of the tree? Mr. Arpen replied, I would defer to an arborist, but I would assume that you could make a case for that. However, the impediment to pedestrians on a sidewalk, and all sidewalks are adjacent to streets so in some cases the limb may not extend over the street. Mr. Flagg added, sounds like right tree, right place too.

- viii. Mr. M. Robinson asked Mr. Leon are the maintenance funds being used currently for preventive pruning? Pritchard road was recently done by a contractor also POW/MIA Blvd, is that done as a preventative measure? Mr. Leon responded that in our current contract, the general foreman must be a certified arborist. We have a set of standards, the ANSI A-300 standard in our hazard tree contract which the tree pruning falls under. Remember we are trying to prolong the life of a tree in a man-made environment. So, all of those constraints, pedestrians, school buses, power lines those are all environmental constraints that a tree doesn't have in a natural environment. Anything we do will prolong the life of the tree because we are trying to get this tree to live in a place it's not naturally meant to live in.
- ix. Ms. Fraser asked Mr. Leon for a professionally supported opinion, something someone could take to court that says all our pruning is eligible. You tell us what resources you have and rely on and if people in the legal profession agree, then you're good if not then we know where the boundaries are. Help us understand in writing, with references, what bring you to your conclusion. Mr. R. Robinson added, we want to help you make the case so you can do what you want to do.
- x. Mr. November asked where the funds come from, is there any chance of an increase in the overall maintenance budget? Mr. Pappas responded, reasons must be provided for the increase, quantify the numbers with the needs. Currently whatever we do allocate from the general fund, 25% comes from the tree fund. Perhaps the percentage does need to be adjusted but what the funds are used for must defined. Defining the level of service and being able to quantify that goes a long way in getting an increase. Mr. November asked if perhaps Lewis Tree could tell us how much of the canopy could we cover if we could get X more dollars? Mr. Leon responded that would be very difficult. Currently the contract for tree trimming is set at an hourly rate. To determine an absolute of what we need and what they can accomplish, we need to know how fast they can trim, how many miles of road we need to trim, the size of the road, what cycle, if they are high traffic or low. A major urban forestry consultant would really be necessary to get us all this information. Trying to calculate how much linear trimming we could get done on an hourly rate would be very difficult.
- xi. Mr. Arpen added, the issue is not if the maintenance costs are reasonable or not the question is, using the tree funds, is it mitigating for the impact of the trees removed.
- xii. Mr. November continued, the "back of the envelope" calculation is that a contractor is going to say he'll need 10 times what is available for the whole city. Mr. Pappas pointed out that we must define what exactly we would get for the additional funds.
- xiii. Mr. Hart pointed out that it's possible for someone to decide they only want the funds to be spent on what has been planted by the mitigation funds. What is being discussed is taking care of the entire canopy. Ultimately what we all want is accountability on where these funds are going though it has improved considerably. Mr. November added, planting trees is not the only way to benefit the canopy, there are lots of ways to benefit the canopy. The loss of canopy and the loss of trees can be outweighed by maintaining our canopy long term. Mr. Hart continued, as a developer if I'm developing a piece of

property with 40% canopy, then my goal on that property should be, at a certain point in time, maybe 20 years from now, that it be back to 40%.

- xiv. Ms. Grandin said the funds which come in through the Charter must be spent on the trees planted by the mitigation fund monies. The Ordinance Code funds are not as restricted. Most likely the 25% which is going into the Public Works Tree Maintenance budget is all coming out of the Ordinance Code pot of money. Mr. Pope suggested there be two pots of money, 1 for the trees planted using the mitigation funds and 1 for maintaining well established trees, both from mitigation funds. Mr. M. Robinson pointed out there are already two pots of money, the Charter requires its funds only to be used on trees planted using mitigation funds and the Ordinance may be used for maintenance of any trees.
- xv. Mr. Flagg said this is a very broad topic. How do we define the potential increase of the percentage? How are we going to circle back round and make a recommendation on what's the level of increase? Mr. Hart suggest it be part of the facilitation process. Ms. Fraser said we need to understand what maintenance is first. Mr. Arpen suggested if there is an increase in percentage, it should be taken out of the Ordinance funds to alleviate the requirement for the funds only to be spent on mitigation trees.
- xvi. Mr. Pope said he believes there are 2 issues; 1) where the money goes, how much goes to mitigation trees and other trees; 2) the total amount of maintenance is a separate issue.
- xvii. Mr. Leon said we could look at how many trees we have. We did a street tree study that extrapolated data based on a 3-year 6% random sampling, there is 439,684 street trees in the City excluding FDOT roads. In addition, to what level do we maintain the trees, 'Disneyworld' or functional. We could also look at the number of trees we've planted in comparison to the total amount of trees and try to get a hard number from there. We took different data samples for every tree which fell within our inventory parameters, size, species, and maintenance requirements. 19.77% trees required pruning at the time the inventory was taken. We could compare that with how many trees we are planting and what percent of those planted trees are a part of that percentage. Ms. Fraser pointed out to present to people which are going to authorize extra money what benefit it buys: \$10 more gets another 30 minutes more tree trimming, then the hourly rate for the contractor is 2 trees per hour, so for every half million dollars more you allocate you get another so many trees addressed which would cover the deficiency. Mr. Pappas agreed that was a good way to quantify what the improvements could be but to get to a standard of what you want is critical. **Mr. Leon will finalize these data points for the next Tree Commission meeting.**

- 5. Adjournment** – the next Tree Commission meeting is scheduled for February 16th, 2022 at 9:30am and will be a Hybrid/Zoom meeting in Ed Ball Building, 10th Floor, Public Works Office, conference room 5.

CHAPTER 94 TREE COMMISSION

	RED	YELLOW	GREEN	NOTES
PURPOSE (Sec. 94.105)				
To study and make 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.				
To formulate an overall plan for the planting of trees and the health of the City's tree canopy and thereafter to annually review the plan and report recommendations to the Mayor's Office.				
To act as a motivating and coordinating body to encourage joint public and private participation in the planting of trees and the health of the City's tree canopy.				
To review and make recommendations, if necessary, to the Council concerning the City's tree protection and landscape regulations.				

CHAPTER 94 TREE COMMISSION

DUTIES (Sec. 94.106)	RED	YELLOW	GREEN	NOTES
<p>To act as a coordinator for programs, projects, and activities related to planting projects and the health of the tree canopy between all public and private entities;</p>				
<p>To review expenditure proposals and plans for planting projects;</p>				
<p>To prioritize, with the input of District Council members, proposed planning projects based on established criteria for recommendation to the Council, and, when requested, the Commission may also make recommendations on other proposed tree planting projects;</p>				
<p>To formulate a recommended priority project list, including an estimated implementation cost for each item, for tree planting and canopy maintenance, and to thereafter annually review the priority project list and report recommendations to the Mayor's Office;</p>				
<p>To help coordinate the maintenance of an inventory of the urban tree canopy with an emphasis on historic trees, exceptional specimen trees and other unique environmentally significant trees within the City;</p>				

CHAPTER 94 TREE COMMISSION

	RED	YELLOW	GREEN	NOTES
To assist in the establishment of educational and outreach programs to encourage proper management and maintenance of trees on private property in the City;				
To conduct research studies, collect and analyze data and prepare maps, charts, and plans for the accomplishment of its purposes;				
To identify issues relative to the health and protection of public trees and recommend solutions to problems identified;				
To recommend to and help develop opportunities for the City's grant writing office for grants and solicitation of donations to support the City's tree canopy;				
To perform an annual audit of funded projects, the status of the inventory, and tree permits submitted to the City to be included in an annual report to the Mayor's Office and City Council; and				
To develop and maintain a tree canopy and existing tree inventory.				

	13_1996	13_1997	Change from Prior yr	13_1998	Change from Prior yr
15304 (15F) Revenue	691,718.88	951,787.17	38%	1,049,472.53	10%
Expenses	80,057.50	347,092.76	334%	494,487.10	42%
Fund Balance		1,082,290.86	100%	1,014,975.29	-6%

15305 (15N) Revenue

Expenses

Fund Balance

13_1999	Change from Prior yr	13_2000	Change from Prior yr	13_2001	Change from Prior yr
1,210,651.59	15%	2,565,246.05	112%	5,869,322.79	129%
615,157.18	24%	392,419.88	-36%	230,995.61	-41%
868,169.70	-14%	2,773,066.87	219%	7,339,625.05	165%

13_2002	Change from Prior yr	13_2003	Change from Prior yr	13_2004	Change from Prior yr
4,362,471.40	-26%	9,601,595.30	120%	5,114,569.45	-47%
874,134.52	278%	1,143,905.47	31%	1,990,645.24	74%
9,354,481.43	27%	11,950,157.08	28%	13,636,154.29	14%
15,157.54	-	18,537.00	22%	235,918.40	1173%
0	0				
0	0	18,537.00	0%	254,455.40	1273%

13_2005	Change from Prior yr	13_2006	Change from Prior yr	13_2007	Change from Prior yr
3,944,933.41	-23%	11,613,479.88	194%	3,897,839.70	-66%
1,846,436.64	-7%	1,647,359.28	-11%	2,557,934.91	55%
14,329,231.06	5%	19,958,070.30	39%	19,599,710.16	-2%
138,643.13	-41%	309,548.79	123%	310,227.79	0%
				7,555.80	0%
393,098.53	54%	702,647.32	79%	1,005,319.31	43%

13_2008	Change from Prior yr	13_2009	Change from Prior yr	13_2010	Change from Prior yr
3,394,193.30	-13%	7,604,711.35	124%	6,509,734.61	-14%
2,418,021.74	-5%	4,387,738.27	81%	2,202,454.54	-50%
19,612,036.47	0%	17,046,441.84	-13%	16,431,827.68	-4%
147,595.05	-52%	205,159.77	39%	124,187.92	-39%
32,443.00	329%		100%		
1,120,471.39	11%	1,325,631.16	18%	1,449,819.08	9%

13_2011	Change from Prior yr	13_2012	Change from Prior yr	13_2013	Change from Prior yr
14,697,380.62	126%	1,751,051.67	-88%	770,717.02	-56%
1,588,161.12	-28%	858,915.45	-46%	936,714.66	9%
15,700,509.56	-4%	16,564,785.78	6%	16,371,378.14	-1%
93,342.08	-25%	162,527.72	74%	202,632.98	25%
1,543,161.16	6%	1,705,688.88	11%	1,908,321.86	12%

13_2014	Change from Prior yr	13_2015	Change from Prior yr	13_2016	Change from Prior yr
1,053,079.35	37%	1,388,121.92	32%	2,057,994.62	48%
1,183,169.64	26%	799,216.91	-32%	827,830.84	4%
16,241,287.85	-1%	16,830,192.86	4%	17,968,271.91	7%
182,150.99	-10%	249,217.76	37%	417,243.64	67%
2,090,472.85	10%	2,339,690.61	12%	2,718,226.25	16%

13_2017	Change from Prior yr	13_2018	Change from Prior yr	13_2019	Change from Prior yr
2,479,970.32	21%	2,472,284.19	0%	5,950,915.25	141%
551,599.86	-33%	709,858.39	29%	1,556,562.92	119%
19,896,642.37	11%	21,659,068.17	9%	26,043,420.50	20%
500,529.72	20%	1,110,688.85	122%	770,734.86	-31%
131,644.61	0%	1,661.15	-99%	79,787.39	4703%
3,087,111.36	14%	4,234,847.06	37%	4,925,794.53	16%

13_2020	Change from Prior yr	Year not closed 12_2021	Change from Prior yr	Total from Inception
1,360,733.54	-77%	4,278,107.06	214%	106,642,090.33
2,116,772.33	36%	5,609,689.23	165%	37,967,340.52
26,053,420.50	0%	25,355,594.16	-3%	-
1,485,257.54	93%	1,109,956.00	-25%	7,789,273.49
3,126.58	-96%	3,321.49	6%	259,589.40
4,925,794.53	0%	6,407,925.49	30%	-

From January 2022 Meeting

	13_1996	13_1997	Change from Prior yr	13_1998	Change from Prior yr	13_1999	Change from Prior yr	13_2000	Change from Prior yr	13_2001	Change from Prior yr
15304 (15F) Revenue	691,718.88	951,787.17	38%	1,049,472.53	10%	1,210,651.59	15%	2,565,246.05	112%	5,869,322.79	129%
Expenses	80,057.50	347,092.76	334%	494,487.10	42%	615,157.18	24%	392,419.88	-36%	230,995.61	-41%
Fund Balance		1,082,290.86	100%	1,014,975.29	-6%	868,169.70	-14%	2,773,066.87	219%	7,339,625.05	165%

15305 (15N) Revenue		15305 (15N) Revenue
Expenses		Expenses
Fund Balance		Fund Balance

13_2002	Change from Prior yr	13_2003	Change from Prior yr	13_2004	Change from Prior yr	13_2005	Change from Prior yr	13_2006	Change from Prior yr	13_2007	Change from Prior yr
4,362,471.40	-26%	9,601,595.30	120%	5,114,569.45	-47%	3,944,933.41	-23%	11,613,479.88	194%	3,897,839.70	-66%
874,134.52	278%	1,143,905.47	31%	1,990,645.24	74%	1,846,436.64	-7%	1,647,359.28	-11%	2,557,934.91	55%
9,354,481.43	27%	11,950,157.08	28%	13,636,154.29	14%	14,329,231.06	5%	19,958,070.30	39%	19,599,710.16	-2%
15,157.54	-	18,537.00	22%	235,918.40	1173%	138,643.13	-41%	309,548.79	123%	310,227.79	0%
0	0									7,555.80	0%
0	0	18,537.00	0%	254,455.40	1273%	393,098.53	54%	702,647.32	79%	1,005,319.31	43%

13_2008	Change from Prior yr	13_2009	Change from Prior yr	13_2010	Change from Prior yr	13_2011	Change from Prior yr	13_2012	Change from Prior yr	13_2013	Change from Prior yr
3,394,193.30	-13%	7,604,711.35	124%	6,509,734.61	-14%	14,697,380.62	126%	1,751,051.67	-88%	770,717.02	-56%
2,418,021.74	-5%	4,387,738.27	81%	2,202,454.54	-50%	1,588,161.12	-28%	858,915.45	-46%	936,714.66	9%
19,612,036.47	0%	17,046,441.84	-13%	16,431,827.68	-4%	15,700,509.56	-4%	16,564,785.78	6%	16,371,378.14	-1%
147,595.05	-52%	205,159.77	39%	124,187.92	-39%	93,342.08	-25%	162,527.72	74%	202,632.98	25%
32,443.00	329%		100%								
1,120,471.39	11%	1,325,631.16	18%	1,449,819.08	9%	1,543,161.16	6%	1,705,688.88	11%	1,908,321.86	12%

13_2014	Change from Prior yr	13_2015	Change from Prior yr	13_2016	Change from Prior yr	13_2017	Change from Prior yr	13_2018	Change from Prior yr	13_2019	Change from Prior yr
1,053,079.35	37%	1,388,121.92	32%	2,057,994.62	48%	2,479,970.32	21%	2,472,284.19	0%	5,950,915.25	141%
1,183,169.64	26%	799,216.91	-32%	827,830.84	4%	551,599.86	-33%	709,858.39	29%	1,556,562.92	119%
16,241,287.85	-1%	16,830,192.86	4%	17,968,271.91	7%	19,896,642.37	11%	21,659,068.17	9%	26,043,420.50	20%
182,150.99	-10%	249,217.76	37%	417,243.64	67%	500,529.72	20%	1,110,688.85	122%	770,734.86	-31%
						131,644.61	0%	1,661.15	-99%	79,787.39	4703%
2,090,472.85	10%	2,339,690.61	12%	2,718,226.25	16%	3,087,111.36	14%	4,234,847.06	37%	4,925,794.53	16%

13_2020	Change from Prior yr	Year not closed 12_2021	Change from Prior yr	Total from Inception
1,360,733.54	-77%	4,278,107.06	214%	106,642,090.33
2,116,772.33	36%	5,609,689.23	165%	37,967,340.52
26,053,420.50	0%	25,355,594.16	-3%	-
1,485,257.54	93%	1,109,956.00	-25%	7,789,273.49
3,126.58	-96%	3,321.49	6%	259,589.40
4,925,794.53	0%	6,407,925.49	30%	-