



URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes
September 15, 2022
9:30 – 11:30am
Online Meeting

Commission Members present:	Chair Vivek Shandas, Adrienne Feldstein, Ivory Iheanacho, Roberta Jortner, Bruce Nelson, Daniel Newberry, Leah Plack, Megan Van de Mark
Commission Members absent:	Anjeanette Brown, Melissa McMillan
Urban Forestry staff present:	Jenn Cairo, Brian Landoe, Angie DiSalvo, Clare Carney, Ashley Reese
City staff present:	Director Adena Long, Director Dawn Uchiyama, Chenoa Philabaum, Sarah Huggins

Public Comments

1. Albert Kaufman asked if there were any new updates regarding the Friends of Trees' contract. Albert noted that given the recent heat experienced in Portland, he is concerned that the city is missing an opportunity to plant more trees. Albert thinks that re-establishing the Friends of Trees' contract is imperative and hopes that is something the Commission will discuss. He would like the topic of tree planting added to a future agenda.
 - a. Vivek thanked Albert for the public comment and explained that a large part of the meeting agenda was for a joint tree planting update by Director Long of Bureau of Parks and Recreation and Director Uchiyama of Bureau of Environmental Services.

Minutes Approval

July minutes were sent to Commissioners for review.

1. Bruce moved to accept the minutes with the technical edit he proposed to the July minutes. He explained the edit removed the incorrect reference to fringe and olive trees belonging to Genus *Fraxinus*; those species are not in the same genus but rather the same Family.
 - a. Adrienne seconded the motion.
 - b. (3) Yeas. (0) Nays. (0) Abstentions.
 - c. The motion passed and the July minutes were approved with the technical edit Bruce proposed.

Forestry Report – Jenn Cairo, City Forester

1. The City's seasonal Dutch Elm Disease (DED) Management Program continues and this summer's activities with DED are wrapping up, and it is anticipated that a report of this season's program will be presented at an upcoming Urban Forestry Commission meeting. DED is a lethal disease caused by a fungus that spreads among elm trees and has resulted in dramatic tree loss across the United States. The City's DED Management Program involves:
 - a. Inventorying and monitoring elm trees in the city for symptoms of DED. Trees that show symptoms of the disease are tested for the presence of the fungus.
 - b. Infected trees are removed to limit the further spread of the disease.
 - c. A report of these monitoring activities is prepared and posted to the Urban Forestry website.
2. Emerald Ash Borer (EAB), an insect that kills ash trees and has caused vast forest loss in the eastern and midwestern United States, had not been detected in the west until its detection in Oregon in June. Jenn referred the Commissioners to recent editions of *Tree Bark* and the Urban Forestry website for more details, such as, how to identify and report suspected detections of EAB. Jenn shared the following updates:
 - a. Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) is coordinating the Oregon's management response to EAB. City of Portland Urban Forestry staff are partners with ODF on the recently formed State Management Coordination Task Force.
 - b. ODF is identifying further funding sources for response activities to EAB and Jenn will share more information on this as it develops.

Urban Forestry Commission

1120 SW 5th 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



3. The recently passed Federal Inflation Reduction Act contains 1.5 billion dollars for urban and community forestry, as a means to address the climate and tree equity crisis. Urban Forestry, Portland Parks and Recreation, and the City's Intergovernmental Affairs are tracking the funding as it moves forward and planning its implementation.
4. An outcome of the recently adopted Pedestrian Design Guide Update is that Urban Forestry and Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) will jointly pilot a program to plant street trees in the 'curb zones,' which historically have been reserved for street parking. The pilot proposal was recently awarded a Percent for Green grant from the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES). The pilot is still in its early development.
5. Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) staff are planning to report to the UFC in the December meeting about the City's Climate Action Plan. BPS will include the UFC's comments at City Council on that topic.
6. Urban Forestry Commissioners received a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between BES and Parks and Recreation via email, and the MOU is also on the City's website. This UFC meeting [October 2022 meeting] includes information presented by BES and Parks Directors about the City's tree planting activities and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Portland Parks and Recreation and BES. Goals of the MOU are to eliminate the programmatic overlap between the two Bureaus, improve efficiency and outcomes of the Citywide Tree Planting Strategy.
7. This UFC meeting will also include an update on the works of the PP&R Sustainable Futures Ballot Initiative Task Force. The group aims to identify longer-term, sustainable sources of the Bureau's operational and capital funding needs.
 - a. An objective of this work is to identify resources for City-funded street tree maintenance.
 - b. Daniel has been representing UFC as a member of the Task Force. Thank you to Daniel for his time and energy.
 - c. Next month's agenda is planned to include a more comprehensive agenda item for an update on this task force.
8. Jenn asked if the Commissioner's had any questions about the Forestry Report.
 - a. There were several questions about the proposed pilot program to plant street trees in the curb zones.
 - i. Daniel questioned which entities would be responsible for maintaining new street trees in the curb zones. Jenn explained that the program is still in its developmental stages and this outcome has not been determined. The City's current policy is that the adjacent property owner is responsible for maintaining street trees.
 - ii. Bruce asked for clarification regarding the definition of 'curb' planting and if that planting would take place on unimproved sidewalks. Jenn suggested the Commission review the [Pedestrian Design Guide Update](#) (link), in which PBOT defines the curb zone. The curb zone is where cars are typically parked, and in which some of those spaces this pilot program aims to plant trees.
 - iii. Adrienne asked about the size of the pilot and what the measures of success on the project would be. Jenn explained that at this stage, scope and metrics had not yet been determined – that funding typically determines a program's size. However, she acknowledged that defining such metrics are essential to evaluating the successes or challenges of a pilot program and that work is planned.
 - iv. Vivek asked Jenn if Urban Forestry could gauge what a successful pilot program could lead to in terms of increases in the number of street tree planting spaces in the city. Jenn responded that such information was not yet available.
 - v. Vivek noted that Roberta asked in the chat how much money the grant awarded. Jenn confirmed the grant was for \$500,000.
 - vi. Vivek asked if Angie [DiSalvo]'s [planting] team would lead the initiatives on this program. Jenn explained that it does not yet involve the planting team, and that due to the policy standards it encompasses, Tree Regulation staff are engaged. Jenn is currently leading Urban Forestry's aspects of the project.
 - vii. Vivek asked of there are other places that have piloted comparable projects. Jenn confirmed that she personally observed the practice in Europe. She clarified that PBOT staff are responsible for researching these types of projects in other places and that this information is not available yet.
 - b. Adrienne also asked to hear more about the potential outlook of EAB's infestation, and what areas might be most affected. Jenn did not have more information to share on this topic but will report to the UFC when more information becomes available.

Walk-on Items – Vivek Shandas

Vivek asked the Commissioners if they had any thoughts to share, future agenda items to request, or any comments to relay from their interactions with community.

1. Roberta commented that she would like more information and communication with BPS and Bureau of Development Services (BDS) about monitoring the implementation of new codes in multi-dwelling zones and former single-dwelling zones, passed with the Residential Infill Project (RIP), as it pertains to trees. She suggested that communication from the UFC might initiate monitoring efforts, if trees and tree preservation in RIP's implementation are not tracked at present.

- a. Vivek asked Roberta if her request was specifically for data, speculative impacts, and understanding the implications for other code changes. Roberta confirmed this interpretation, and further explained the significance for BDS to perform these analyses, especially as it pertains to tracking changes in canopy and priority neighborhoods.
 - i. Jenn agreed that policy should be informed by outcomes and noted that Urban Forestry staff will look into this request and report back to the UFC.
 - ii. Vivek recalled the Better Housing by Design presentations to the UFC in recent years and noted that BPS staff conducted evaluations and projections of heat indices as density increases in certain multi-dwelling residential zones.
2. Bruce expects to have his report on the street tree survey he is conducting on major North-South streets in East Portland by the end of the month. The document will include an environmental history of East Portland and recommendations for tree planting opportunities. Bruce will seek outreach to advocate for proposed changes on 82nd Ave, 102nd Ave, 122nd Ave, 148th Ave, and 162nd Ave.
 - a. Vivek will work with Jenn and Brian to see if there is available agenda time for Bruce to present this information to the other Commissioners.

PP&R-BES Tree Planting MOU - PP&R Director Adena Long, BES Director Dawn Uchiyama, BES Community Partnerships Manager Chenoa Philabaum, City Forester Jenn Cairo, and Urban Forestry Planting Manager Angie DiSalvo

Directors Dawn Uchiyama (BES) and Adena Long (PP&R) and BES and Urban Forestry staff presented information about the recently signed MOU between BES and PP&R.

1. Director Uchiyama acknowledged the history between BES and PP&R and the significant need for the work on behalf of the City to preserve and expand the City's tree canopy. She referenced the widespread and fatal impacts of climate change in Portland, in part due to the inequitable distribution of tree canopy in the city, in which the most severe impacts are experienced by people living in low canopy neighborhoods. She noted that a disproportionate number of community members in low canopy areas are also low income and/or Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC). Director Uchiyama expressed her immense gratitude and excitement to work together with Director Long and PP&R to improve the tree planting services the City provides to its residents, and to ensure that these services are delivered in a manner responsive to each community's needs. Director Uchiyama reiterated her passion and commitment to this work.
2. Chenoa Philabaum (BES Community Partnerships Division Manager) echoed Director Uchiyama's gratitude and excitement. Chenoa has been working for the City for 18 months; as BES' Community Partnerships Division Manager, she oversees the teams at the Bureau that deliver programs to people and to community organizations. This division delivers financial investments, collaborative stewardship, environmental education, and green infrastructure facilities. Chenoa provided context to the history of tree planting strategy between BES and PP&R. She explained that the late Commissioner Nick Fish oversaw both BES and PP&R, and in 2019 asked the Bureaus to collaborate on recommendations for a tree planting strategy. This collaboration aimed to improve the planting outcomes in the city and define roles and responsibilities for each Bureau. The exploratory process began with an internal conversation between Bureau Directors, field staff from both Bureaus, and third party consultants. This conversation yielded several outcomes, including an MOU for natural planting areas. The process also informed a second conversation with a broader collection of stakeholders, hosted by Dr. Vivek Shandas and Dr. Jennifer Allen from Portland State University. Chenoa shared the outcome statements these stakeholders established and to which the City committed:

"Improve outcome for BIPOC Portlanders and low-income, low-canopy neighborhoods; align City tree planting programs to integrate outreach, engagement, policy, planning, planting stewardship efforts, and tree life cycle management; invest new resources in engagement to ensure pre-planting activities match needs and values of the community, make it seamless for community partners to work with the City by clarifying Bureau roles and responsibilities, business processes, funding, etc.; set goals with community, involvement measuring and reporting progress"

Chenoa noted that although Marveita Redding retired in September after 30 years working with the City, her contributions to centering these statements fostered the conversation surrounding the MOU.

3. Angie DiSalvo, Manager of Urban Forestry's Science, Outreach, and Planting programs, presented the details in the MOU.
 - a. The MOU recognizes the roles and responsibilities of the two Bureaus and clearly defines them. This establishes clear priorities for each Bureau as it relates to tree-planting, in order to eliminate programmatic overlap and improve outcomes.
 - i. BES will prioritize planting private trees on commercial, industrial, and multi-family properties.
 - ii. Parks will plant trees along streets, city-wide at schools, and on residential properties.
 - b. The MOU sets shared planting standards and outcomes, which will be pursued through respective programming.
 - i. Priorities of these shared standards include: tree planting that maximizes canopy growth by use of large form evergreen trees and native species, and resilience to climate change, pests, and pathogens.

- c. To remain transparent, the MOU sets the expectation that both of the Bureaus are going to publicly report or report to each other the number, location, and species of trees planted.
 - i. As program managers, Chenoa and Angie will continue to meet monthly to collaborate. They will conduct a joint communication to promote tree planting opportunities from the perspective of the City. The respective teams will also discuss a shared RFP for some planting contractors, given the overlap that exists with those contractors. Both Bureaus should utilize the same standards, requirements, fee table; this will be explored this year. Additionally, the teams will work together to identify how each program are better able to foster community building and workforce development opportunities.
 - d. The MOU is set for two years; after this period the Bureaus will be better able to assess, review, and revise the terms and conditions.
4. Director Adena Long thanked Angie, Chenoa, and the UFC. She noted that great progress has been made, but that there was a lot of work still to be done. She noted that the two programs planted 4,600 trees in the last planting season, and that an estimated 5,000 trees are planned in the upcoming season. She added that BES and Parks continue to plant thousands of trees in natural areas. Director Long reiterated that these trees and future trees will be planted in accordance with industry best practices and will also fulfill the City's established and defined goals.
 5. Director Long announced that Commissioner Carmen Rubio would be announcing proposed changes to strengthen the Portland Clean Energy Fund, which anticipates an approximate 40 million dollar investment to grow and maintain the city's urban forest. The MOU between BES and Parks will provide a framework to implement new resources.
 6. Vivek suggested the Commissioners respond and comment to the discussion.
 - a. Adrienne congratulated BES and Parks for the exciting work. Adrienne asked if there could be a joint report annually on impact, noting that it could improve the public outlook and that City Council would likely be interested in the report. She also asked if the applications for development would change.
 - i. Angie responded to the reporting question that BES and Parks do report citywide on tree planting outcomes each year. The Bureaus will continue to compile that information into a publicly-available report annually. Angie noted that the question about applications for development were likely outside of the scope of the conversation because the tree planting activities referenced in the MOU are specifically volunteer tree planting activities. She clarified that preservation is another component of tree canopy but it would not be impacted by this MOU.
 - ii. Jenn added that the Tree Code (Title 11) defines tree planting activities when they pertain to development situations.
 - b. Bruce would like to see financial information annually regarding the money spent on tree planting programs. He noted the importance to taxpayers to understand how the funds are being used. Ideally, Bruce would like to see the funding that's been spent in the last 10 years for tree planting activities. He asked what the source of the funding is.
 - i. Jenn reminded the Commissioners that annually Urban Forestry reports each year to City Council in a written report how trust funds are used and for which purposes; these reports are on the Urban Forestry website. The Tree Planting and Preservation Fund currently composes the bulk of Urban Forestry's voluntary tree planting activities.
 - c. Daniel thanked the staff from both Bureaus for the presentation, and congratulated them for the accomplishment. He noted the importance of a public MOU. Daniel noted that although the MOU has already been signed, it could be helpful to define establishment and maintenance of the trees once they have been planted, because tree planting alone does not ensure the growth of the urban forest. Daniel asked if the City has a policy or is able to comment publicly if future planned tree planting activities would be done with contractors or City employees. Daniel's research has concluded that tree planting and tree care can be up to four times as expensive if done with City employees as opposed to with contractors.
 - i. Angie clarified that currently there is a combination of ways that trees are planted. She explained that there are internal Operations' crews that focus planting efforts in Parks and sometimes with other Bureaus. The bulk of the voluntary tree planting activities coordinated by Urban Forestry is via contract planting, and the program intends to proceed this way. There is a small percentage of tree planting performed by City employees. Finally, a large portion of Parks' tree planting is via volunteer planting in the Yard Tree Giveaway Program. Angie noted that Urban Forestry continues to examine the best ways to involve community members and organizations, and that PCEF funding will allow that work to continue.
 - ii. Jenn appreciated Bruce's comments and added that Urban Forestry uses any and all techniques that are effective, and agreed that funds should be well spent. A City staff component is required to manage, coordinate, and oversee the work that's done – even when done by contractors – to ensure outcomes.

- d. Ivory thanked the team for the presentation and echoed Daniel's statements supporting the transparency of the respective and joint tree planting activities of each Bureau.
- e. Leah also agreed with Daniel, reiterating the importance of defining the establishment and maintenance outcomes of trees after they are planted, including the financial aspect of tree care.
- f. Megan noted that this MOU marked a significant change to the City's approach to tree planting; especially BES' approach to tree planting. She noted that historically BES had a residential tree planting program and that now Urban Forestry is responsible for facilitating voluntary tree planting activities on residential properties. She asked for clarification of this understanding.
 - i. Jenn explained that the MOU is actually intended to be fairly broad in definition in how it performs tree planting activities. She clarified that currently, most of the programs – like those referenced by Megan – are funded by the Tree Planting and Preservation Fund. As funding opportunities for Urban Forestry grow, so will Urban Forestry be able to expand the breadth and type of tree planting programs it offers. Urban Forestry continues to prioritize outcomes, examine what the efficacy of its programs, and the most efficient means to meet the stated goals of the City's climate equity needs.
- g. Megan also believes that a resilient urban forest necessitates options; that different options for tree planting are required since different means work more or less successfully for different people. Megan would continue to appreciate clarity moving forward and noted that historically, the context has not always been made clear.
 - i. Jenn agreed with Megan and stated Urban Forestry's intentions to build in many different directions. Jenn also clarified that the goal to reduce redundancy is less about the type of planting, but about defining the roles between the two groups. Jenn explained that prior to 2016, there were no funds available to Urban Forestry for tree planting. Tree planting resources were established by the Tree Planting and Preservation Fund.
- h. Roberta reaffirmed the appreciation for the work that's been done to foster collaboration and clarity between the two Bureaus. Roberta was surprised that standards and outcomes for establishment, health, maintenance, and longevity of the trees were not included in the MOU. Roberta would like to better understand the investment strategy of planting trees on private property and what the long term plan is for asset management. Roberta noted that the UFC continues to get questions from residents that believe there should be a lot more trees planted than there is currently. Roberta suggested developing a strategy to relay to the public how the City intends to build capacity, especially when PCEF funds are distributed. She commented that the development of a strategy could ensure the funds are distributed in an efficient and expeditious way that responds to the urgency of the climate crisis.
 - i. Director Long agreed with Roberta that tree establishment and ongoing maintenance is paramount to grow and maintain the urban forest. She clarified that the MOU defines the relationship between Urban Forestry and BES Community Partnerships and is less about the operationalization of the work. Director Long noted that Parks would work closely with BPS and PCEF to ensure transparency and community engagement.
- i. Adrienne observed that the majority of Urban Forestry's tree planting budget is due to mitigation fees, and asked if BES' funding was from the same source of funding. She would like to know what the long-term outlook is for this source of funding, and if there are other cities that fund tree planting activities from other sources.
 - i. Vivek noted that this information will be reported to the UFC at a future meeting.
- j. Vivek noted the palpable excitement of the meeting due to the MOU. Vivek hopes that momentum could continue to build with planned substantive amendments to Title 11 and an update to the Urban Forestry Management Plan. Vivek asked if there was anything that might inhibit the likelihood of these deeper, value-based conversations as the update to the Urban Forestry Management Plan is considered. Vivek thanked the Directors of BES and Parks for their presentation to the UFC and looks forward to details of the operationalization of the work.

Bill Naito Award Selection - Clare Carney, Outreach and Stewardship Coordinator

Clare Carney, Urban Forestry's Outreach and Stewardship Coordinator, explained that the Bill Naito Awards are given to nominees for both a volunteer individual and a volunteer organization that exemplify tree stewardship and volunteer urban forest management. Clare explained that paid work is not considered to be eligible for this award. The UFC votes on which nominees will receive the award and awards are presented on Arbor Day, planned for October 29th, 2022. Commissioners received a packet with information about each nominee.

1. Individual nominees this year are Ginger Edwards, Casey Clapp, and Gregg Everhart. The Commission discussed the individual nominees.
 - a. (5) Commissioners voted for Ginger Edwards, (0) Commissioners voted for Casey Clapp, and (3) Commissioners voted for Gregg Everhart.
 - b. Ginger Edwards will receive the Bill Naito Award during the 2022 Arbor Day Celebration.
2. Organization nominees this year are Mount Tabor Park Weed Warriors, the No Ivy League, and Trees for Life Oregon. The Commission discussed the nominees for a volunteer organization.
 - a. (1) Commissioner abstained from voting. (2) Commissioners voted for Mount Tabor Park Weed Warriors. (3) Commissioners voted for the No Ivy League. (2) Commissioners voted for Trees for Life Oregon.
 - b. The No Ivy League will receive the Bill Naito Award during the 2022 Arbor Day Celebration.

PP&R Sustainable Future Update - Sarah Huggins, Sustainable Future Program Manager

Sarah Huggins, PP&R's Sustainable Future Program Manager, provided the UFC with updates to the Sustainable Future Project, which pursues additional funding options to sustain and fulfill service level needs without reducing critical park services.'

1. Director Long is committed to providing City Council and Portland voters to continue funding and increasing current service levels. In November 2020, voters approved a 5-year Parks Levy that allowed the Bureau to avoid devastating service cuts. As a temporary funding solution, the Levy did not solve the Bureau's financial needs for ongoing funding sources. Sustainable Futures considered several ballot initiatives. Service levels are the Bureau's sets goals for meeting the PP&R-related needs of the community. These objectives are informed by listening and learning, identifying and reflecting a community's needs, and to support anti-racism work by illustrating disparities in service systems.
 - a. Operating service levels include: maintenance of trees, natural areas, parks, and the types of programs provided by the Bureau.
 - i. Specific examples of operational service levels are: how many acres are treated annually for removal of invasive species, how often park trees receive proactive maintenance as opposed to just addressing emergencies, and how frequently each park is visited for maintenance like trash pick-up, restroom cleaning, or general park maintenance.
 - b. Capital service levels include: the quantity of tree canopy, where tree canopy exists and which communities can access it, and the number of parks and natural areas the Bureau maintains. Considerations for these service levels include planning for the growth and maintenance of Portland's tree canopy, which provides critical clean air, reduces storm water runoff, reduces heat impacts, and increases the livability and resilience of the Portland community.
 - i. Examples of capital service levels specify what goals exist for Portland's tree canopy and by what means those goals are set, considering if the services of tree canopy are equitably distributed, what types of parks and recreation experiences are accessible to Portland residents when demographics are considered, and in what conditions should Parks' assets maintain, including trees.
2. Parks and recreation activities are not presently funded at a sustainable level to fulfill service level objectives. Without additional resources, the deliverability of PP&R services Portlanders value will decline.
3. PP&R has a history of using tax measures to support the services it provides to Portland. In the last 120 years, voters approved several operating levies and capital bonds.
4. Sustainable Futures enabled a task force in 2019, which invited members of the Trust Republic Land and learned that in the last 25 years, local governments that create funding using the budget process provide substantially less funding than those that create dedicated funding via additional ballot measures. Since 1996, 76% of all Parks and Recreation measures nationally passed at the ballot.
5. In November of 2019, City Council held a Sustainable Futures work session to review financial and service level forecasts. The Bureau received support to pursue additional funding, and encouraged the Bureau to pursue additional funding alternatives, including income taxes, a temporary levy, the formation of a special district with pursuit of a change in State Statue to allow City Council be the governing body of a Parks District, Capital Bonds' measures, and food and beverage taxes.
 - a. COVID-19 impacted the Bureau's ability to pursue these options, and the Bureau received immediate operating funding gaps.
6. The Bureau polled a bond that would address capital maintenance needs and temporary levy to address operational needs. City maintenance of street trees was polled, but did not receive support; including street tree maintenance in a prospective levy package correlated to a drop in overall support below 50%. Highest polling support was for a temporary levy to address operational needs; this operating levy including tree planting and proactive maintenance of park trees.

- a. The recent end to fiscal year 21-22 concluded the first year of the 5-year Parks' Levy. The year focused on developing procedures, programs, and partnerships to ensure a successful delivery of Levy-funded services for the community.
 - i. The first Parks' Levy annual report will be completed this fall after its review by the Parks Levy Oversight Committee is complete.
7. This year, Director Long convened a limited duration Ballot Initiative Task Force to inform the next steps to a more sustainable future that included a variety of perspectives, including members of the Parks' Board, the Parks' Community Foundation, community partners, and local businesses.
 - a. Daniel represented the Urban Forestry Commission by serving on the task force.
8. The task force involved three meetings.
 - a. The first meeting focused on establishing service levels and identifying service level inequities, the Bureau's funding position, and the types of funding gaps the Bureau prospects to close.
 - b. The second garnered input about the criteria needed for various potential funding options.
 - c. The third meeting called for input on next steps, given the members understanding of funding needs and options.
9. The Ballot Initiative Task Force identified three major existing service categories and also explored the resources required to add a new service of taking on street tree maintenance.
 - a. Operations service levels considered overall deliverance of equitable PP&R programs, services, and routine daily maintenance of parks, natural areas, trees, and other facilities. Capital maintenance considerations included how to fund the maintenance and replacement of existing facilities to prevent asset failures. Capital growth considerations explored how to continue to expand the capacity of the park system to meet the needs of Portland residents as the City grows.
10. The Sustainable Future Project aims to identify a sustained annual funding level for the entire Bureau, which at today's service levels amounts to approximately 235 million dollars annually (255 million dollars if the City added the new service of providing street tree maintenance).
 - a. Fiscal Year 26-27 would be the last year PP&R would receive Park Levy revenues. Currently, the Parks' Levy is providing approximately one third of the Bureau's operating funding needs. The Parks' Levy supports urban tree canopy by increasing tree planting in priority neighborhoods, establishing a system for proactive park tree maintenance and approving 12 new positions for that work.
 - b. Capital maintenance is currently allocated 5 million dollars from the General Fund, but estimates that it needs approximately 55 million dollars more annually to achieve an best industry practice level and to prevent asset closures.
 - i. This number is calculated with the principal of reinvesting 3% annually on the replacement value of existing built infrastructure. The number also assumes that revenues will continue to rise, with just over 30 million dollars annually in support.
 - ii. Capital maintenance exhibits the largest need for identify funding gaps.
 - c. Urban Forestry staff worked with a consultant to estimate that Citywide maintenance of street trees would require approximately 20 million dollars annually of additional funding.
11. The Sustainable Future team grouped potential funding of high revenue sources (so defined as grossing more than 15 million dollars annually) into three general categories:
 - a. Fees and other sources
 - i. Fees are generally collected in exchange for a conferred service, like an activity, class, permit application fee, or development impact fees. Fees are intended to recoup the cost incurred while services are provided.
 - ii. These might be able to fund some more specific services, such as instituting a park utility fee to fund targeted services – perhaps street tree maintenance.
 - b. Property taxes
 - i. Taxes which are generally levied more broadly for the purpose of raising revenues for more general public services.
 - ii. This might be achieved via General Obligation Bonds, which could pay for capital costs but would not meet operating needs
 - c. Other types of specific taxes
 - i. Such as art taxes, business-income taxes, a transient lodging tax, amusement tax, sweetened beverage tax
 - ii. Tax proposals can either be regressive or progressive.
12. Director Long and Commissioner Rubio will be considering these options and expect to provide an update to stakeholders and impacted Boards and Commissions (including the UFC) in October.
13. Vivek thanked Sarah for her update and asked for a copy of the presentation to allow Commissioners the opportunity to deliberate and process.

14. Daniel asked if he could provide his comments to the rest of Commissioners in advance of the October meeting.
 - a. Brian and Jenn approved this request; Jenn reminded the Commissioners that sharing such information is acceptable but that discussion must happen in a public forum.
15. Roberta recalled that a presentation to City Council in the last five years estimated that a replacement value of street tree maintenance was approximately 2.5 billion dollars, and that if the City applied the framework of investing annually to replace 3% of maintained assets to street trees, it would approximate to 60 million dollars a year. A 20 million dollar annual tax incurred to maintain street trees would fall within that 3% replacement value.

Meeting adjourned.