

1 **Evergreen Communities Inventory Project**
2 **Technical Advisory Committee**

3
4 **Meeting 10:00 A.M. TO 3:00 P.M. – April 20, 2009**

5
6 **Renton City Hall, 7th Floor, 1055 S. Grady Way, Renton, WA**

7
8 **Members Present:** Linden Mead, Sarah Griffith, Ara Erickson, Brian Gilles, Christy Osborn, David
9 Kuhn, Galen Wright, Ginny Lohr, Mark Mead, Scott Maco, Terry Flatley, Tina Melton, Kevin
10 McFarland, Dan DeWald, Sharon London, and Monika Moskal

11
12 **Members Absent:** Micki McNaughton, Garth Davis, and Darrel Johnston

13
14 **Guests:** Vicki Lee, Nicki Eisfeldt, and Margaret Barrette

15
16 Meeting began at 10:05 a.m.

17
18 **Action Items:**

- 19 • **Linden will update data set sheet and e-mail back to members**
20 • **Linden will e-mail the Outline to the Committee Members for comment and they will e-mail**
21 **their comments back to her.**
22 • **After today, Committee will e-mail or phone any comments to Linden and all Committee**
23 **members.**

24
25 **Meeting Handouts:**

- 26 • Agenda
27 • March Meeting Minutes
28 • Forest Service Canopy Assessment Summary Sheet
29 • Document Outline
30 • Data Standards Table

31
32 **Meeting Objectives**

- 33 • Review DNR's draft goals and recommendations for Inventory Project
34 • Review draft criteria and implementation report
35 • Review progress of CTED's project

36
37 **Welcome, Agenda, and Introductions**

38 Terry welcomed everyone. He then went over the logistics of the building. Margaret went over the
39 agenda, and meeting objectives. Introductions were made around the room. Margaret explained we would
40 be going through a series of slides that Linden put together, and have a discussion where anything comes
41 up. Feel free to ask questions at any point.

42
43 **PowerPoint Presentation (attached) - Linden**

44 The presentation outline included:

- 45 • Goals (TAC recommendations based on ECA)
46 • Getting There (TAC recommendations)
47 • Remote Sensing and Canopy Analysis
48 • Goals Addressed
49 • Existing Data and Technology

- 1 • Recommendations
- 2 • Tree Inventory
- 3 • Goals Addressed
- 4 • Existing Technology
- 5 • Recommendations
- 6 • Statewide Database
- 7 • Goals Addressed
- 8 • Existing
- 9 • External
- 10 • Business Recommendations
- 11 • Project Prioritization
- 12 • Recommendations
- 13 • Implementation
- 14 • Statewide UCF Assessment
- 15 • County UCF Inventory and Canopy Assessment
- 16 • Statewide Database

17
18 The committee reviewed and discussed recommendations, suggesting the addition of “enhancement of
19 existing resources” as a goal of canopy analysis, in addition to retention, preservation, and expansion of
20 canopy.

21
22 There was a suggestion that renting or leasing spatial information may be a cost effective alternative to
23 purchasing it outright. Smaller communities should consider purchasing consultant services to accomplish
24 an analysis.

25
26 **Local Analysis discussion points:**

27 Canopy analysis should include land classes and subclasses, including impervious surface, and
28 vegetation, to capture a clearer picture of the tree resource and associated benefits.

29 Capturing the capacity for storm water retention and air quality is pertinent to canopy analysis.

30 The committee emphasized the importance of working with jurisdictions to determine information
31 necessary for local management.

32 A standardized request-for-proposal (RFP) template will provide an even playing-field in securing
33 professional urban forestry consultant services. The DNR should develop an RFP that includes a base-line
34 menu of required services and data collection expectations.

35
36 **Tree Inventory discussion points:**

37 If data sets are standardized, communities with existing inventories may need to reformat data to meet
38 proposed data standards.

39 Cities will need to adapt to the standards, if securing grant funding through the DNR and/or before
40 requesting data analysis assistance.

41 Data table should reflect differences in types of inventories; including single trees, grouped trees (open
42 space/natural areas) and i-Tree analysis.

43
44 **Statewide Database discussion points:**

45 The committee discussed the development of a statewide urban and community forest data base,
46 including the associated benefits and challenges of such a large project. It was concluded that, although
47 there is historical significance in capturing urban forest information on a state-wide basis, the cost in time
48 and resources to develop and maintain such a system was prohibitive.

1 In order to accomplish a state-wide inventory that is periodically updated, as outlined in the ECA, the
2 committee recommended that the Urban Forestry Inventory and Analysis (UFIA) protocols, recently
3 developed by the US Forest Service (USFS), be adopted for use in Washington. This will provide ground-
4 based tree attribute data that, when analyzed and paired with USFS canopy coverage reports, provides an
5 accurate assessment of the structure, function and value of the state-wide urban forest resource.
6

7 **CTED Update - Sarah**

8 Due to state funding cuts, the CTED project effectively ends on June 30. CTED subcommittees are
9 focused on providing a final report by June 30. The report will include a model for developing tree
10 inventories and policy. The recognition program will be tabled.

11 CTED urban forestry specialist, Micki McNaughton is currently working half time for DNR, but will
12 become full time after July 1, through the end of the year.
13

14 **DNR Urban Forestry Update - Sarah**

15 2009 Federal funding will remain stable or may increase slightly, which equates to a stable DNR UCF
16 program. It is anticipated that some UCF grants will be available to communities this summer, although they
17 will likely focus on implementation of tree inventories.
18

19 **Data Set Summary (See handout)**

20 Several corrections were suggested and will be reflected in the final product.
21

22 There was a discussion on characterizing protocol for Single Trees vs. Forest Trees. Outcome is outlined
23 below:

24 U-Fore	24 I-Tree
25 <i>Forest Trees</i>	25 <i>Single Trees</i>
26 Plot Size	26 Complete sample
27 Plot Location & ID	27 % sample
28	28 Plot location & ID
29	

30 **What is Next?**

31 **Project Prioritization**

32 The committee reviewed recommendations, as outlined. Rather than limited data collection to pilot
33 counties, the group agreed that a state-wide data collection project, using UFIA protocols, is realistic.
34 Individual cities need a standardized management data set. Data standards should be outlined to read
35 more clearly; separating data required for management from that needed for analysis and including
36 explanations for both.
37

38 **Implementation**

39 Proposed implementation was presented to the group.
40

41 **Timeline for final report**

42 This meeting will be the last time the committee meets. Committee members should expect a final draft of
43 the report to be circulated mid-May. Comments should be forwarded to Linden by June 1, at the latest.
44 The report will be circulated to the Legislature by the end of June.
45

46 Sarah thanked the Committee for all their time and hard work.
47

48 **Public Comment - Margaret**

49 No public comments.
50

51 Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.