Street Tree Planning and Management: Guiding Principles

Eric Wiseman Mason Patterson Sarah Gugercin

Dept. of Forest Resources & Environmental Conservation Virginia Tech

Street Trees in Virginia



August 15th 2012





What We Have, What We Want,
 & How We Get There

- Urban forestry paradigm
- Street tree management model
- Principles of structure
- Principles of function & value
- Take-home messages

August 15th 2012



- Urban forestry paradigm
- Street tree management model
- Principles of structure
- Principles of function & value
- Take-home messages

August 15th 2012











- Urban forestry paradigm
- Street tree management model
- Principles of structure
- Principles of function & value
- Take-home messages

August 15th 2012



STREET TREE MANAGEMENT MODEL



- Urban forestry paradigm
- Street tree management model
- Principles of structure
- Principles of function & value
- Take-home messages

August 15th 2012



- Street Tree Abundance Stocking
- Full Stocking
 1 tree every 50' (Wray & Prestemon 1983)
 45' | 35' | 25' (Various municipalities)
 - Typical Stocking

46% (Ball et al. 2007)

38% (McPherson and Rowntree 1989)

9–66% (McPherson et al. 2005)

- Optimum Stocking (Miller 1997)
 - Biological capacity
 - Economic capacity
 - Social capacity



- Street Tree Abundance Stocking
- Available Planting Spaces
 - Remotely-sensed or field-surveyed
 - As part of a tree inventory
 - Strip/cut-out size; utilities; setbacks





• Street Tree Composition – Size Distribution





⁽Soares et al. 2011)

• Street Tree Composition – Stature Distribution



(US Forest Service 2004)

W	hat Larc	ΞE	Trees Mean
些	More shade		more energy savings
	Cleaner air		better health and fewer hospital visits
	More stormwat management	er =	lower costs for stormwater controls
	More shaded streets	=	longer time between resurfacing

vww.fs.fed.us/psw/programs/uesd/uep/products

• Street Tree Composition – Stature Distribution



• Street Tree Composition – Taxonomic Diversity



"A community forestry goal of a 10% limit on a single species could give a false indication of



stability.... (t)here is probably little concern about the diversity of families used as street trees, but not enough concern on the reliance on a limited number of genera...a 10% limitation on genera may be our best measure of stability." (Ball et al. 2007)

- Street Tree Composition Taxonomic Diversity
 What is holding us back?
 - Ecology (site suitability: soil, space, pests, stress)
 Social norms (citizens want fast-growing, colorful trees)
 Design and management norms (symmetry and uniformity)
 Nursery production (nurseries produce what consumers demand)

Arboriculture & Urban Forestry 2011. 37(6): 259-264

Survey of Wholesale Production Nurseries Indicates Need for More Education on the Importance of Plant Species Diversity

Nicole R. Polakowski, Virginia I. Lohr, and Teresa Cerny-Koenig

Abstract. Recent pest outbreaks, such as emerald ash borer and Asian longhorned beetle, have renewed concerns about the lack of genetic and species diversity in landscapes across the United States. However, the level of understanding of these issues by people in the green industry is not known. A survey on the knowledge of plant species diversity issues was distributed to Washington, U.S., wholesale nurseries. Respondents indicated a general awareness of the issue, but they had insufficient understanding of why the lack of species diversity is a problem. Respondents who had learned about plant species diversity in educational settings beyond high school were more likely than others to understand the issues. These results indicate the need for increased, in-depth education on why plant species diversity among landscape plants is important. Key Words. Biodiversity; Genetic Diversity; Nurseries; Overplanting.

 Street Tree Composition – Taxonomic Diversity What is holding us back?

• Ecology (site suitability: soil, space, pests, stress)
• Social norms (citizens want fast-growing, colorful trees)
• Design and management norms (symmetry and uniformity)
• Nursery production (nurseries produce what consumers demand)

What do we do about it?

o Educate (share results of assessments; websites; social media)

- o Incentivize (tree replacement request preference for diverse spp.)
- Subsidize (rebate or discount on diverse spp. sales)
- Regulate (approved/prohibited spp. in policy or ordinance)

- Urban forestry paradigm
- Street tree management model
- Principles of structure
- Principles of function & value
- Take-home messages

August 15th 2012



PRINCIPLES OF POPULATION FUNCTION

• Urban heat island and energy conservation



Providence, R.I.



Developed Land

Vegetation Cover

PRINCIPLES OF POPULATION FUNCTION

• Urban heat island and energy conservation



1.4.12	Mature	Sunlight Penetration		
A) 1	Height	Summer	Winter	
Koelreuteria bipinnata	30 ft	6%	66%	
Celtis australis	40 ft	9%	56%	
Pistacia chinensis	50 ft	11%	30%	
Eucalpytus melliodora	50 ft	11%	11%	

Thayer/Zanetto/Maeda

LANDSCAPE JOURNAL, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1983

PRINCIPLES OF POPULATION FUNCTION

VOCs and ozone-forming potential

Characteristics and Effects of Ozone Chemical formula: O₂ $VOC + NOx + sunlight \rightarrow ozone$ Metastable form of oxygen Levels typically found in various locations: 35 to 40 parts per billion (ppb): clean atmosphere, such as found at mid-ocean 100 to 120 ppb: Central California (summer) 100 to 140 ppb: Los Angeles, California (summer) anrcatalog.ucdavis.edu/pdf/8484.pd 400+ ppb: Mexico City (summer) Human health effects: 100 ppb: eye irritation 200 ppb: coughing © Reduction in pulmonary function and physical performance • Damaging to some materials (e.g., rubber)

Affects plants starting at approximately 60 ppb

	BVOC	BVOC	A
Sec	Emissions 1	¢/traa	
Species	(lb)	(\$)	3/1100
Sugar maple	-1,221.6	-7,647	3.91
Willow oak	-16,092.5	-100,739	-15.31
Common crapemyrtle	0.0	0	0.42
Red maple	-812.5	-5,086	2.63
Pin oak	-16,684.3	-104,444	-20.78
Japanese zelkova	-4,417.0	-27,651	-4.19
Winged elm	0.0	0	4.85
Green ash	-3,459.2	-21,655	-9.82
Callery pear	0.0	0	2.69
Hedge maple	-3.8	-24	2.37
American sycamore	-3,026.6	-18,946	-10.24
Ginkgo	-13.3	-83	4.00
Loblolly pine	-2,241.4	-14,031	-6.75
Chinese pistache	-2.4	-15	1.98
Sweetgum	-904.1	-5,660	-4.41
American elm	-4,042.5	-25,306	-21.48
Littleleaf linden	-6.1	-38	3.97
London planetree	-1,170.9	-7,330	-7.48
Norway maple	-517.6	-3,240	-3.07
Silver maple	-78.2	-490	3.94
Kwanzan cherry	0.0	0	1.45
OTHER STREET TREES	-3,509.3	-21,968	0.09
Citywide total	-58,203.4	-364,353	-3.18

PRINCIPLES OF POPULATION VALUE

• Understanding street tree benefits and costs

Benefits	Total (\$) Standard Error	\$/tree Standard Error	\$/capita Standard Error
Energy	359,409 (±13,985)	11.70 (±0.46)	5.60 (±0.22)
CO2	35,171 (±1,369)	1.14 (±0.04)	0.55 (±0.02)
Air Quality	349,758 (±13,609)	11.39 (±0.44)	5.45 (±0.21)
Stormwater	29,161 (±1,135)	0.95 (±0.04)	0.45 (±0.02)
Aesthetic/Other	2,964,686 (±115,359)	96.51 (±3.76)	46.16(±1.80)
Total Benefits	3,738,185 (±145,457)	121.69 (±4.73)	58.21 (±2.26)
Costs			
Planting	36,000	1.17	0.56
Contract Pruning	281,500	9.16	4.38
Pest Management	32,250	1.05	0.50
Irrigation	9,000	0.29	0.14
Removal	31,500	1.03	0.49
Administration	78,750	2.56	1.23
Inspection/Service	22,500	0.73	0.35
Infrastructure Repairs	25,000	0.81	0.39
Litter Clean-up	21,000	0.68	0.33
Liability/Claims	22,500	0.73	0.35
Other Costs	0	0.00	0.00
Total Costs	560,000	18.23	8.72
Net Benefits	3,178,185 (±145,457)	103.46 (±4.73)	49.49(±2.26)
Benefit-cost ratio	6.68 (±0.26)		

PRINCIPLES OF POPULATION VALUE

Understanding street tree benefits and costs

	Energy	Air quality	CO ₂	Stormwater	Aesthetics	Total
Hackberry	118.30	19.82	7.05	8.23	27.69	181.09
Camphor	54.29	7.62	2.85	6.71	11.29	82.75
Modesto ash	97.83	52.61	7.67	11.19	5.67	174.96
Ginkgo	51.51	2.79	5.43	3.27	35.18	98.18
Sweetgum	79.88	10.16	6.29	5.24	31.38	132.95
Southern magnolia	79.44	2.42	2.81	2.79	6.15	93.61
Pistache	65.31	10.27	2.82	3.34	11.03	92.76
Plane	136.76	25.76	4.80	7.59	11.33	186.24
Pear	34.00	2.98	1.95	1.47	14.19	54.59
Zelkova	89.25	8.26	4.69	3.37	18.47	124.05

	Prune	Remove	Plant	Root-related	Storm/liability	IPM/other	Total
Hackberry	29.30	1.43	0.01	0.88	0.76	0.29	32.67
Camphor	8.34	1.78	1.05	0.14	_	0.09	11.40
Modesto ash	45.22	0.83	0.01	1.43	0.37	0.93	48.80
Ginkgo	6.56	3.42	2.18	0.75	0.24	0.14	13.28
Sweetgum	49.70	0.90	0.03	2.14	0.62	0.92	54.31
Southern magnolia	17.38	1.13	0.03	0.95	0.70	0.19	20.38
Pistache	25.06	1.54	0.39	0.44	0.19	0.16	27.78
Plane	6.14	0.59	0.51	0.27	0.02	0.13	7.66
Pear	18.55	1.27	0.20	0.53	0.26	0.12	20.94
Zelkova	16.01	2.60	0.78	1.09	0.42	0.24	21.14

McPherson: A Benefit-Cost Analysis of Ten Street Tree Species Journal of Arboriculture 29(1): January 2003

- Urban forestry paradigm
- Street tree management model
- Principles of structure
- Principles of function & value
- Take-home messages

August 15th 2012



TAKE-HOME MESSAGES

- The urban forestry paradigm conceptualizes the interelationships of structure, function, value, & management
- Street tree management is cyclical and is based on resource assessment
- Optimizing structure of street tree populations helps ensure resiliency, stability, and functionality
- High-value street trees are those that provide maximum benefit at minimal cost



