Evergreen Communities Inventory Project
Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting 10:00 A.M. TO 3:00 P.M. – March 17, 2009

Puget Sound Energy, 6905 S. 228th St., Kent, WA

Members Present: Linden Mead, Sharon London, Ara Erickson, Mark Mead, Sarah Griffith, Tina Melton, Terry Flatley, Scott Maco, Ginny Lohr, Garth Davis, David Kuhn, Dan DeWald, Micki McNaughton, Brian Gilles, (Monika Moskal called in), and Galen Wright

Members Absent: Kevin McFarland, Darrel Johnston, and Christy Osborn,

Guests: Vicki Lee, Nicki Eisfeldt, Jim Freed, and Margaret Barrette

Visitors: Vance Julien - UW

Meeting began at 10:10 a.m.

Action Items:
- **Linden will call Barbara at the USFS regarding the RPA report, and ask for the link**
- **Linden will update and e-mail the Data Matrix to Committee for further feedback.**
- **Committee will forward experiences they have had with volunteers, positive or negative when collecting data, and e-mail them to Linden**
- **Nicki will work with Linden to come up with data field standard**

Meeting Handouts:
- Agenda
- Data Collection Methods
- Overview of Remote Sensing Costs (2 handouts)
- Draft Data Matrix
- Recommendations - Draft
- Inventory Goals
- Booklet on "Best Management Practices (Tree Inventories)
- Tree City USA Bulletin 23 "Placing a Value on Trees"
- Tree City USA Bulletin 28 "How to Conduct a Street Tree Inventory"
- TreeLink, fall issue
- Carbon Protocols

Meeting Objectives
- Receive update on CTED process and DNR's progress
- Review information on remote sensing and canopy assessment
- Review DNR's draft recommendations for Inventory Project

Welcome, Agenda, and Introductions
Margaret welcomed everyone. Introductions were made around the room. She then went over the logistics of the building, the agenda, and meeting objectives.

1 Linden advised that Monika would be calling into the meeting to discuss and answer any questions on her
2 handout on "The Overview Remote Sensing Costs." She also highlighted some of the points from the last
3 meeting:
4 • A canopy assessment is vital to the statewide analysis of the urban forest
5 • The need to address the goals of the Bill, including inventory designed for local tree resource
6   management, that will mesh with CTED's management plan and ordinance development.
7
8 Topics for this meeting include data collection. The goal is to determine a mandatory data set for
9 community inventories. The uniform data set will one that is linked into a statewide data set. Additional
10 tiers of data account for local management needs. Committee members will be asked to "vote" on data
11 attributes during the lunch break.
12
13 Draft implementation recommendations will be reviewed during the second half of the meeting
14
15 **Remote Sensing and Canopy Analysis Options – Monika Moskal**
16 Monika did a quick overview of her handouts, and then opened it up for questions. She informed the
17 Committee that she would be back in the Seattle area after next week, and would be open to more
18 questions and phone calls.
19
20 Linden pointed out that Monika mentioned field validation is crucial to remote sensing. One of the
21 implementation recommendations includes utilizing the US Forest Service's I-Tree Suite for analysis in
22 conjunction with remote sensing.
23
24 Scott gave background information on the functionality of the i-Tree analysis tools. The models were
25 developed by researchers across the country to be useable and functional at all levels of urban forest
26 management. Scott passed around the recently published report by the US Forest Service, analyzing
27 Urban and Community Forests of New England. The report is based on National Land Cover Data and
28 used Landsat imagery. The report is available on the USFS Northern Research Station website. The USFS
29 is in the process of analyzing and reporting canopy data for all 50 states. All state reports are expected to
30 be completed and published by the end of 2009.
31
32 Linden stated that the report is integral to the goals of the ECA project.
33
34 **Recommendations – Draft**
35 Linden went over the draft with the Committee. She asked the Committee to look over the
36 recommendations in the draft to make sure she was on the right track.
37
38 There followed a discussion on the carbon market and it's applicability to urban and community forestry
39 programs. The committee agreed that a standard recommendation in the report should be to meet the
40 Evergreen Communities recognition standards being developed by CTED.
41
42 Additionally, out of the five recommendations that were listed under carbon, the Committee endorsed the
43 recommendations that communities:
44 • Plan to develop a baseline of information that includes documentation of existing urban forestry
45   resources (inventory, canopy assessment) within potential program boundaries

1 • Develop a tracking tool (a dynamic, ongoing inventory) to document performance standards
2   necessary to be eligible for carbon markets
3
4 **Draft Data Matrix**
5 Linden referenced a wall chart that held two columns of data fields, each separated into 4 categories. The
6 first column was a list of suggested mandatory field data attributes which will be used for local inventory
7 projects and meet the requirements of an ECA state-wide inventory.   The second column listed optional
8 data attributes that could be included for inventories at the local level. The committee was tasked with
9 reviewing the chart and recommending revisions. In reviewing the chart, committee members were asked
10 to address the following questions:
11 • Is the mandatory data set sufficient to meet the goals of the ECA?
12 • Are there items from the optional column that should migrate to the mandatory column?
13
14 Committee members were asked to "vote" on data attributes by placing dots next to an attribute on the
15 chart.
16
17 The Committee complied with the task. Margaret then reviewed the chart with them. During the
18 discussion the following things were changed or added:
19 • Include type of inventory along with community information
20 • Height will be categorized by class or range
21 • Provide for location information to account for communities that do not collect data with geo-
22   reference information (GPS or GIS)
23
24 Linden will forward an updated electronic copy of the matrix to the Committee for review and feedback.
25
26 **Review Minutes**
27 Minutes were reviewed from last meeting. No changes were made. No public comments.
28
29 **Data Collection – Workforce**
30 Linden reviewed recommendations. There was discussion about data collection and how that would be
31 accomplished.
32
33 Galen suggested hiring consultants. Though there is little initial community involvement, this will give
34 communities good initial data.
35
36 It was suggested to use volunteers. Questions arose about valid data and the need for training. James
37 Freed, Washington State University, Natural Resources Extension Professor, discussed the suitability of
38 using veteran master gardeners for the project. With additional inventory-specific training, this work
39 force would be a valuable commodity for data collection as well as for connecting the community to the
40 urban forest.
41
42

1 Scott referenced the table on page 6 of the Booklet "Best Management Practices – Tree Inventories"
2 which outlines options for data collection personnel. He suggested the table as being a good starting point
3 for deciding the work force for community inventory project.
4
5 Linden recognized the value of consultants in the data collection process and suggested the
6 recommendations reflect that by referencing them in the final recommendation statement.
7
8 Homework was assigned to the Committee to send Linden information on how they have successfully
9 utilized volunteers to accomplish community projects.
10
11 **CTED – Micki McNaughton**
12 Micki gave a brief update on CTED Evergreen Communities Task Force. The Task Force will finish an
13 interim final report by the end of June including a draft ordinance design matrix that will help
14 communities in developing tree ordinances. The CTED report is being designed to dovetail with the TAC
15 report.. The report will be formatted so it will be web ready. Micki informed the Council in talking to
16 Assistant Director Carol Larkin, it was very clear that any of the work produced by the task force could
17 not provide jurisdiction over trees on private property as it would contradict an already existing WAC.
18 Micki has been attempting to get a touch with Ms. Larkin to inquire about the regulations she is
19 referencing; in order to clarify private property questions brought forth by both the CTED Task Force and
20 the TAC. The next scheduled task force meeting is in two weeks. TAC committee members who would
21 like to review Task Force projects were asked to send an e-mail to Micki.
22
23 **Data Collection Method**
24 Linden discussed the handout listing inventory types.
25
26 It was agreed that data collection should have a very standard protocol; this would make it repeatable and
27 historically applicable.
28
29 It was suggested that DNR could develop recommendations for purchasing data collection software.
30
31 Another suggestion was to build a standard program for communities on a data platform that would
32 integrate with all database formats. (e.g. MS Access can be integrated into ArcGIS) The committee
33 emphasized the need to standardize the list and protocol for data fields, including length of attributes and
34 data abbreviations. Nicki will work with Linden to develop data standards.
35
36 **Round Table – Thoughts from Today's Meeting (All)**
37 **Garth** – Likes the simplicity of what Scott talked about from the local level. Is consensus too much to ask
38 for at the next meeting?
39
40 **Sharon** - Felt we were more focused this time. I-Tree is a very helpful tool.
41
42 **Dan** – NCLD is a methodology for doing a canopy analysis statewide inventory. He also liked Scott's
43 suggestion to do an I-Tree, and Eco Urban Forestry analysis.
44

1   **Brian** – passed

3   **Vance** – Thanked the committee for inviting him to meeting. It sounds like Committee is making
4   progress. He is taking away a lot of good notes which will help him work on his project at University.

6   **Terry** – Likes statewide inventory concept.

8   **Tina** – Thanks for making progress and staying focused.

10 **Sarah, Ginny** – passed.

12 **Ara** – We are making really good progress. She would like to see the players in all of these pieces. Who
13 is going to be responsible for each one of these pieces? This would get us closer to having a statewide
14 inventory. This would give clear direction.

16 **Scott** – Everything we do and recommendations that we make must answer the question, "How is this
17 going to help us better manage Washington State's Urban Forests?" We need to measure the success of
18 the program, and the only way to do that is to capture a canopy baseline and then carry out a statewide
19 assessment.

21 Next meeting will be on April 20, 2009, in Renton. This is the last scheduled meeting. Terry will secure a
22 meeting room. The committee will be provided with RFP templates to review and will have the
23 opportunity to comment on draft report recommendations.

25 Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.