



**URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION**

Meeting Minutes  
January 19, 2023  
9:30am – 11:30am  
Online Meeting

**Commission Members present:** Chair Vivek Shandas, Adrienne Feldstein, Daniel Newberry, Megan Van de Mark, Melinda McMillan, Bruce Nelson, Leah Plack, Roberta Jortner

**Commission Members absent:** Anjeanette Brown, Ivory Iheanacho

**Urban Forestry staff present:** Jenn Cairo (City Forester), Brian Landoe (Analyst III), Ashley Reese (Administrative Specialist II), Nik Desai (Botanic Specialist II)

**City staff present:** Claudio Campuzano (PP&R Finance, Property, and Technology Manager)

**Public Comments**

1. Marita Ingalsbe, a member of SW Neighborhoods Park Committee, Friends of Gabriel Park, and Hayhurst Neighborhood Association, raised concern about invasive ivy impacting trees in SW Portland, especially along major roadways such as Capitol Highway, Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway, Scholls Ferry Road, and Terwilliger Boulevard. Marita asked the Commissioners for guidance about what might be done to inhibit and mitigate the effects of the ivy in SW Portland. Marita inquired about potential grants or incentive programs.
  - a. Daniel explained that because the ivy is so pervasive in natural areas, eradication is no longer a practical goal. He suggested organizing work parties to prioritize specific areas and target ivy removal.
  - b. Bruce noted that if the roads adjacent to the natural areas are major roadways, they might be the responsibility of the State to maintain, which would present more challenges than if they are City streets.
    - i. Jenn noted access to a rail line property would require permission by the rail company. She also noted that major roads in the City are often owned by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and in effect managed by the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT). Jenn suggested that continuing to raise these concerns to those entities might incentivize interest or action in the activity.
  - c. Megan suggested Marita’s organization(s) consider seeking small grants for outreach-based approaches that engage private property owners about ivy removal. She encouraged Marita to reach out to the West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District and Backyard Habitat, as both organizations engage private property owners in different ways to remove ivy. Megan put the following link in the meeting chat:  
[https://backyardhabitats.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/SmallGrantsforBackyardHabitats\\_2019.pdf](https://backyardhabitats.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/SmallGrantsforBackyardHabitats_2019.pdf)
    - i. Jenn added that Urban Forestry also has a small grant program that might be utilized by [Neighbor Tree Teams](#) to engage neighborhood residents. Additionally, Jenn mentioned that PP&R has a volunteer program to remove ivy from Parks’ properties: [No Ivy League | Portland.gov](#). PP&R prioritizes certain Parks as candidates for ivy removal work based on their ecological value and PP&R’s capacity for removing the ivy in those areas.

**Minutes Approval**

1. November minutes were emailed to the Commissioners for review.
2. Roberta moved to adopt the minutes with her included note and with Bruce’s edits. Adrienne seconded the motion.
  - a. (8) Yeas; (0) Abstentions; (0) Nays.
3. The November minutes were approved with the suggested edits.

**Forestry Report – Jenn Cairo (City Forester)**

1. Jenn reminded the Commissioners that Brian sent an email invitation for Commissioners to participate in a no-cost PP&R training entitled “Foundation to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.” The training centers equity and anti-racism; Jenn noted that Commissioners are asked to participate in at least one anti-racism training each year and this would be an opportunity to fulfill this commitment. Commissioners should contact Brian if interested.

**Urban Forestry Commission**

1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 1302, Portland, Oregon 97204

Phone 503-823-TREE (8733) | Fax 503-823-4493

*Sustaining a healthy park and recreation system to make Portland a great place to live, work and play.*

portlandoregon.gov/trees | Commissioner Carmen Rubio | Director Adena Long



2. City Commissioner Dan Ryan's portfolio now includes PP&R, the Office of Equity and Human Rights, Civic Life, and the City's Art Portfolio. Jenn asked the Commissioners if they could attend the February 16th meeting in person at the Portland Building, and if so, Commissioner Ryan would be invited to attend.
  - a. Some Commissioners indicated that they might be able to attend the upcoming meeting in person. Adrienne will be out of town but might be able to join the meeting virtually.
3. The initial stages of the Portland Clean Energy Fund (PCEF) Equitable Tree Canopy Initiative continue, which involves collaboration with staff from both Urban Forestry (UF) and the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS). A structure for UFC participation in that initiative will likely comprise PCEF staff attendance at UFC meetings to provide updates, answer questions, and hear advice from Commissioners. The timeline for the Equitable Canopy Initiative has not yet been established but is an anticipated agenda item in the next few months. Commission members are also invited to participate as an observer in the two remaining Equitable Canopy Roundtables occurring in January. The Roundtables inform the development of goals, outcomes, eligibility criteria, and funding levels for the Equitable Canopy Initiatives.
4. In the next few months, the Commission agenda will include updates about Streets PDX (PBOT's Street Design Master Planning Process), and a Trees in the Curb Zone Pilot Project, which is a partnership between UF and PBOT to design and develop locations to plant large-form trees in the curb zone (area in a complete street that's adjacent to the curb). The pilot is funded in part by a Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) grant.
5. The Portland Water Bureau (PWB) has recently implemented an administrative rule prohibiting tree planting within ten feet of large transmission pipes under complete streets (which are paved roads with curbs and sidewalks). The policy eliminated current, otherwise viable street tree planting spaces and also prohibits the replanting of large-form trees when trees currently planted in such locations are removed. The PWB Chief Engineer and her staff committed to working with UF on a case-by-case basis to incorporate trees into sites when a ten-foot separation can't be achieved. PWB and UF are drafting a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to memorialize that commitment and the escalation path to achieve it. The UF Permitting and Regulation team have begun working case-by-case with the Engineer; in each case reviewed, appropriately-sized trees have been planted.
6. The appointment of new Urban Forestry Commissioners proceeds according to the timeline, and City Council is expected to review the appointments in February.
7. Urban Forestry continues to hire for new positions, including Botanic Specialists, a Tree Maintenance Operations Supervisor, and a Tree Technician (Development Service Technician II). Additionally, upcoming recruitments will include Tree Inspector and several seasonal positions for tree planting, tree care in Parks', and the Street Tree Inventory Project. Job postings and descriptions can be found at this link: <https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/portlandor?keywords=urban%20forestry%20>
8. Adrienne asked Jenn if there was data about PWB's ten-foot-rule and the quantity of trees removed as a result. Adrienne also asked about any science that informed the policy and if conflicts between trees and pipes were species-dependent.
  - a. Jenn clarified that the rule does not apply to or authorize removal of existing trees but prohibits future planting within ten feet of large water transmission pipes. She explained that many large-form, mature trees currently planted within ten feet of these pipes would eventually be removed (due to age or failure) and the rule would prohibit replanting efforts in these areas. Jenn acknowledged the Water Bureau's concern that the large transmission pipes involved supply the city's drink water, and PWB goals are to mitigate any interruptions to water service. She noted, however, that from an arboricultural science perspective, there are no conflicts between trees and transmission pipes due to the feet of compacted soil and concrete between the pipe and the roots. Generally, tree roots do not disrupt those spaces because there is no oxygen and water for them to live. Jenn also noted that other cities do not have such an administrative rule. UF staff continue to demonstrate that there is little issue between roots and pipes in most situations in the city.
9. Bruce asked if Jenn knew the main point of contact at Commissioner Ryan's Office for Parks and/or Urban Forestry.
  - a. Jenn noted that there is usually one staff member in each office that receives requests for information but does not know that information yet. She suggested asking Commissioner Ryan that question when he attends a future UFC meeting.

#### **PP&R FY24 Budget Proposals** - Claudio Campuzano (PP&R Finance, Property, and Technology Manager)

Claudio Campuzano presented the UFC an overview of the Parks' and Citywide Budget processes, reviewed the PP&R base budget, and discussed the Director's and Mayor's Guidance that informed proposals of PP&R's FY24 requested budget. Slides to the presentation are available here: [FY 23-24 Urban Forestry Presentation 1-19-2023](#).

1. The overview of the Budget Process:
  - a. The PP&R Director's Guidance was issued in July, informed by PP&R Finance's May/June forecast and priorities identified in Listening and Learning sessions and the Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland initiative. The Guidance directed each Division within PP&R to identify areas of potential investment, which were proposed in October.
  - b. Typically, City Council holds a series of work sessions to discuss and review Bureau submissions (particularly issues that span Bureaus).
  - c. In early May, the Mayor is expected to issue a proposed Citywide budget. The City Council will vote and/or amend the proposed budget in May and the budget will be formally adopted in June for the start date of July 1<sup>st</sup> FY24.

*Audio recordings of Urban Forestry Commission meetings are available upon request.*

2. Currently PP&R is a multi-funded Bureau, operated with eight primary funds that compose an approximate \$211.4 million adopted budget. PP&R funds and allocations for FY22-23 included:
  - a. The General Fund, accounting for approximately 44.79% or \$94.7 million of PP&R's current funding.
  - b. The Capital Improvement Fund, which accounts for approximately \$49.8 million of revenue. This fund is composed of System Development Charges (SDCs), debt proceeds for Portland projects, and a loan repayment from the City's Grants Fund. This fund advances the Capital Improvement Program.
  - c. The Parks Local Option Levy, which accounts for \$46.2 million of PP&R's current budget.
3. Roberta asked if the maintenance of PP&R facilities fell into the Capital category or the staff General Fund category. She also asked if the revenues in the Tree Funds (such as mitigation fees) were categorized as miscellaneous or as licenses and permits, as part of development fees.
  - a. Claudio explained that Brian Landoe would be better able to clarify the revenue categorization of the Tree Funds. Regarding the maintenance of existing facilities, Claudio noted that facilities are currently maintained through budgeted allocations for operating costs. He explained that there is not currently a significant source of capital to maintain facilities; in fact, there exists a half-billion dollar deferred major maintenance gap. He added that although not covered in today's presentation, the Sustainable Future Project aims to balance delivery and expectations of services with the cost of performing those services.
4. Claudio discussed the Director's Guidance released in July by Director Long for FY23-24. Director Long's Guidance to Division Managers acknowledged that many new positions are still in recruitment, new facilities for staff are still being built, and new standard operating procedures are still being developed. Key priorities emerged in the Guidance; these acknowledge limiting factors in future revenue forecasts, prioritize stability, reduce costs as a barrier to access programs, and fund the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) of new and existing assets.
  - a. After the Parks' Levy was passed, a joint memo between PP&R and the CBO agreed that O&M of new assets would be funded by the Parks' Levy rather than the General Fund Discretionary (from which O&M had historically been funded), and with the understanding that a successor resource for the Parks' Levy would be established.
  - b. Similarly, the Guidance called for workspace improvements and new facilities, acknowledging that the unprecedented influx of new staff has significantly increased facility needs. Existing facilities need improvements to make them safer, more secure, equitable, and accessible to all staff.
    - i. Director Long directed exploration of converting funds currently allocated to ongoing major maintenance into resources for near-term critical work to improve these spaces.
  - c. The Director asked for evaluations regarding one-time funded items in the current FY22-23 budget, such as if they should constitute ongoing programming, and how those levels of service could be achieved.
  - d. The Guidance acknowledged that increased operational changes also increased pressure on Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) throughout the Bureau, potentially creating capacity issues as SMEs are called into project management.
  - e. Due to a continued projection of ongoing construction inflation, the Guidance advised that forecasted SDC funding address cost increases prior to its allocation to future projects.
  - f. Potential realignments of previously allocated Levy funding will be considered as an option to better deliver service and meet priorities.
  - g. Currently, the Bureau receives approximately \$4.7 million annually for recapitalization of assets, in addition to approximately \$1 million for ADA transition plan work. The Mayor's Guidance this year directed the Bureau against including any General Fund requests. PP&R will discuss the annual budget note request of an additional \$500,000 of General Funds for ongoing major maintenance at a later date.
  - h. The Director asked Divisions to identify areas of anticipated challenges for meeting Levy commitments and encouraged Divisions to anticipate the resource needs to address them.
5. Bruce asked if there was any increase in money allocated for major maintenance in the last five years and if it was accurate to say that the major maintenance fund is growing faster than it's being spent by PP&R.
  - a. Claudio explained that heading into this fiscal year, City Council included a budget note that directed the CBO to add \$1 million to PP&R's major maintenance budget, because they could not accommodate the annual \$500,000 request in FY21-22. Claudio noted approximately \$1.3 million increase in allocations for ongoing major maintenance in the past few years.
6. Claudio noted that there were no significant changes to the program expected at the base budget. He explained that collective bargaining and inflationary increases could impact the Levy forecast and constrain the ability to deliver promised Levy services.
7. Jenn explained that Urban Forestry's annual budget (including planned use of UF Trust Funds) is approximately \$13 million. She presented Urban Forestry's additional budget requests for this budget process, which includes:
  - a. A request to allocate funds for the update to the UFMP, in order to hire consultants to research and develop the plan with public input and community engagement.

- b. A request to develop a Tree Preservation and Compliance team with the addition of six budgeted positions. Jenn noted that compliance enforcement has been a goal for UF since the adoption of Title 11 in 2015. In order to implement the City's Code and address the volume of code compliance issues, UF requires a defined compliance program, comparable to compliance programs in BDS, PBOT, and BES. Jenn noted that it's estimated an approximately 2000 required mitigation trees annually are not planted because UF currently lacks the capacity to ensure all permit requirements are met in all cases.
  - c. A request for an additional permitting Tree Inspector to meet the volume of tree permit applications, especially for non-development applications.
  - d. A request for three Arborist trainee positions. UF would like to develop a Workforce Development program, giving the City an opportunity to diversify the arboriculture field.
  - e. A request to prioritize and evaluate equity in UF permitting by continuing to develop and expand a pilot program that waives certain permit application fees for low-income residents.
8. Claudio added that UF's total additional budget requests are for approximately \$1.6 million.
9. Daniel noted the request to add new staff positions to better regulate compliance to Title 11. He suggested that upcoming Title 11 amendments consider opportunities to simplify the Code, potentially making it easier to comply at the residential level.
10. Roberta asked if there was any discussion of an analysis or development of a pilot street tree maintenance program considered as part of UF's budget proposal. She noted the inconsistency between allocating funding for O&M of new assets as they are obtained and developed, while street trees – as an existing asset – are not maintained at all.
- a. Jenn explained that street tree maintenance is being considered in other contexts, such as the Sustainable Future Project (in which it is an explicit goal) and PCEF's Equitable Canopy Initiative (in which it is not an explicit goal at this time but is being discussed).
  - b. Megan added that she represents the UFC on PP&R's Budget Advisory Committee and proposes City maintenance of street trees at every opportunity. She noted that it is considered during discussions of Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland, and the Sustainable Future Project. She offered to bring resources from those meetings if Commissioners were interested or to pass along specific asks of the Commission to that Committee.
11. Adrienne asked for further details about PP&R receiving approximately 20% of its funding from fees, and specifically that percentage in the context of the entire budget. She also asked about the revenue of UF's budget and its fees.
- a. Claudio clarified that the largest component of PP&R's "Charge for Services" revenue category (that funds operating and capital maintenance) is built of System Development Charges. SDCs account for approximately \$20 million in revenue in recent years.. Historically and pre-pandemic, the second largest revenue source in this category was due to Recreation fees, accounting for approximately \$14 to \$15 million annually.. Claudio explained that UF's largest sources for revenues are due to permits fees associated with trees in development situations.
    - i. Brian added that of UF's annual \$13 million budget, approximately \$1.5-\$1.6 million come from development fees, and another \$400,000 from non-development fees (largely the \$100 fee charged for non-development permit applications).

**Urban Forest Inventory and Analysis (Urban FIA): My City's Trees - Nik Desai (UF Botanic Specialist II), and Suzanne Owen (U.S. Forest Service Analyst)**

Nik Desai and Suzanne Owen presented information about the Urban Forestry Inventory and Analysis (Urban FIA) program at the Pacific Northwest (PNW) Research Station.

1. Suzanne explained that part of her responsibilities as an analyst for the program involve data quality checks, report writing, and supporting the program's expansion. The FIA started in the 1930s as a regionally specific timber survey program with four regional units, including the PNW. The program is a long-term monitoring program that utilizes standardized plot designs to consistently monitor the nation's forested areas across all land ownerships. The program seeks to identify trends in forest conditions and track their change(s) over time.
2. Due to the FIA's previous definition of forest land, urban areas were not included in the program prior to 2014 and the expansion of the Farm Bill. The inclusion of urban areas is significant because urban trees (as opposed to the previous and strict definition of forested lands) have a more direct impact on the daily lives of approximately 80% of the population. The PNW Research Station currently maintains two operational cities (Portland and San Diego) with plans to expand to cities in Washington and other cities in California. Commissioners can learn more here: <https://www.fia.fs.usda.gov/program-features/urban/>.
3. The Urban FIA utilizes the same data collection methods across the country, storing the data in a national database. Each plot where condition and tree data are collected is approximately a sixth of an acre in size. Some challenges with collecting data in an Urban FIA include navigating access individual plots when they are owned by several owners.
4. Portland's measurement cycle was accelerated by PP&R crews in 2018; remeasurement began in 2019 by FIA crews.
5. The Urban FIA program prioritize local partnerships (such as Portland UF) that prove critical to technical practice and data collection. The program has three primary components, which include:

*Audio recordings of Urban Forestry Commission meetings are available upon request.*

- a. collection of core FIA measurements which are similar to those used in the traditional FIA, such as land condition variables, species, DBH, height, carbon sequestration estimates, and regional variables like signs/symptoms of relevant insects and diseases;
  - b. collection of urban specific data, such as land use designations, percentage of impervious cover and vegetation cover, and urban specific-damage records; and
  - c. generating i-Tree reports, which add estimates of ecosystem services (like pollution removal and energy savings) and denote approximate monetary value of the urban forest.
6. Suzanne explained the many free tools offered by i-Tree (<https://www.itreetools.org/>). Different tools of i-Tree include: Urban Data Mart, which allows users to download CSV files and provide the most flexible opportunities for analysis and data interpretations of the tools offered. Urban Data Mart requires some coding knowledge to manipulate. My City's Trees has the ability to categorize urban data by several spatial themes, which are selected by each City partner and can produce downloadable reports. Nik explained that in this application, themes function as filters for reviewing conditions and different geographical divisions of the city. In addition to the land and rain cover theme that all cities use, Portland chose the following themes:
- a. zoning (industrial, commercial, residential, and open space), in order to consider how canopy might differ in those areas
  - b. equity-based information, including race and income demographics
  - c. neighborhood coalitions (like North, Northeast, etc.)
  - d. heat island effects maps (utilizing the work of Dr. Vivek Shandas and Jackson Voelkel)
7. Utilizing different themes, the My City's Tree application allows users to toggle and filter data. The application can generate PDF reports that include volumes of useful information. Notable interpretations at the time the datasets were collected include:
- a. The hottest neighborhoods in Portland feature only approximately 5% of the city's canopy. In contrast, 37% of the city's canopy exists in the coolest parts of the city and are primarily composed of Bigleaf Maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), Western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*) and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*).
  - b. As a species, Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) accounts for approximately 44% of the city's carbon sequestration.
  - c. It's estimated that 68% of pollution removal occurs in the least disadvantaged communities, whereas only 3% occurs in the highest disadvantaged communities.
8. Bruce asked how often surveys were collected and if comparative data existed.
- a. Nik explained that Portland collects data annually, with 10% of plots being remeasured. Nik noted that as of yet, no year-to-year analyses existed, but that the program has established a standardized protocol for comparing canopy in cities across the U.S.
  - b. Daniel asked for clarifications about the data suggesting the species of tree sequestering the most carbon: if the measurements were on an individual basis of mature trees and if there was data suggesting a difference in wildland trees versus urban trees.
    - i. Suzanne did not have the answer and suggested that Nik might be the best person to respond, given his familiarity with the local species.
9. Due to time constraints, Suzanne and Nik agreed to respond to the Commissioner's questions via a follow-up email.

**Meeting adjourned.**