Urban and Community Forestry In Oregon:

Results of the 2004 City Survey

Oregon Department of Forestry
Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program

November, 2004

Urban and Community Forestry in Oregon: Results of the 2004 City Survey

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Oregon Department of Forestry Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program (hereinafter cited as ODF U&CF) helps Oregonians improve their quality of life by promoting community stewardship and investment in our urban forests. In 2004, ODF conducted a survey of Oregon cities to assess the status of local urban forestry programs and to provide future program direction. The survey was a follow-up to similar surveys conducted in 1992 and 1994. Of the 240 incorporated cities surveyed, 123 completed the 2004 survey for a response rate of 51%. The population for these cities is 1.9 million, or 80% of the 2.4 million people living within the boundaries of Oregon cities.

In the 2004 survey, 37% of the respondents reported that they had a tree planting or tree care program in their city. Nearly 1.5 million people or 63% of Oregon's incorporated population lives in a city with a tree planting and care program. Over 62% of cities reported that they have a municipal tree ordinance, 38% have tree advisory committees (38%), and 9% have community forest management plans. Cities reported aggregate expenditures of $7.8 million on urban forestry activities during 2003, an increase over the $1.2 million reported by communities in the 1992 survey.

Hazard trees (73%), root conflicts or problems (51%), and tree preservation or protection (46%) were the top three ranked urban forestry concerns reported by cities. Local elected official's interest, community participation, and citizen demand were the three factors most likely to influence the creation or expansion of a local urban forestry program. Community pride, attractiveness, image (82%), enhancing community appeal to new residents, businesses, shoppers (71%), and shade (44%) were reported as the primary benefits to managing trees in cities. Hazardous trees (57%) the financial cost of maintaining trees (54%) and tree/utility conflicts (54%) were the most commonly cited negative aspects of trees in cities. The high response received by hazard trees on several questions may be a reflection of the January 2004 ice and snow storms.

Of the 63% of the cities reporting in 2004 that they did not have a tree planting and care program, 51% reported that their city needed one. Nearly 52% of respondents reported that they had received assistance from an ODF U&CF staff member. Cities that have received assistance are statistically more likely to have a local program, are more likely to say they need a program if they don't already have one, and are more likely to have ordinances, inventories, and tree advisory committees.

When compared with the 1992 responses, the 2004 data reveals the impact of ODF's three full time equivalent staff. As a result of ODF's efforts, there have been significant increases in the number of cities with urban forestry programs and with program components such as inventories and ordinances, and an increase in the amount of local investment in the health of urban forests. The 2004 City Survey provides insights into local urban forestry programs, the needs of municipalities, and potential ODF program delivery methods and strategies. ODF has clearly stimulated local investment in urban forestry. It is evident that ODF has achieved some significant accomplishments in this improving the health of our urban forests, and also has a clearer picture of the challenges before the agency as a result of conducting this survey.

Introduction

The mission of the Oregon Department of Forestry Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program (hereinafter cited as ODF U&CF) is to help Oregonians improve their quality of life by promoting community investment in our urban forests. ODF provides technical, financial, and educational assistance to help Oregon cities capitalize on the economic, environmental, and social benefits that trees provide. In partnership with the USDA Forest Service, ODF has a small staff of urban foresters working directly with communities providing a wide array of urban forestry advice and services.

Since the U&CF program was established in 1991, over 5000 technical, financial, and educational assistance interactions have been provided to Oregon's 240 cities and over 200 non-profit organizations, community groups, schools and colleges, and other public agencies. The program has also managed over $1.7 million dollars in 400 cost-share project grants to cities and community groups, which has leveraged a local match of more than $3.4 million dollars.

As part of an on-going effort to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and innovation of the ODF U&CF program delivery, periodic planning activities including program reviews and assessments take place. This document reports the findings of one such planning effort, a 2004 survey of Oregon cities that was undertaken to obtain data, opinions, and perceptions from elected officials or city staff responsible for urban forestry decision-making. The purposes of conducting this survey included assessing the status of local urban forestry programs, helping ODF determine the most appropriate delivery systems for providing urban forestry services, and helping provide future program direction.

The ODF U&CF Program has been the subject of two previous surveys. In 1992, Arboreal Enterprises and the University of Oregon conducted a baseline survey that determined the state of local urban forestry programs in Oregon cities, and assessed city opinions about tree issues. The resulting publication: *Urban and Community Forestry In Oregon: An Assessment With Recommendations For Initiating Action*, was the first of its kind in the state, and guided program efforts for several years. In 1994, Lynnae Sutton, a student in the Geography Department at Portland State University, conducted a survey that asked some of the same questions as the 1992 survey, as well as additional new questions. For the 2004 survey, the ODF U&CF program developed used selected questions from the two previous surveys combined with additional new questions. Wherever the questions are directly replicable, data from one or both of the 1992 and 1994 surveys is compared with the 2004 results in this report.

Methodology

The survey was designed to collect demographic information about each of Oregon's 240 incorporated cities, to gather data about each city's urban forestry program components, and to determine each city's future plans and needs related to urban forestry assistance. The survey was designed to be broad in scope, with minimal instructions or definitions provided.

Thirty-one survey questions were developed to collect the desired information, organized around key themes of interest to the ODF U&CF staff. Some questions used an open ended response, others involved a defined list of choices, and others used a five or seven point rating scale measuring the strength of agreement towards a set of options or statements. An Internet survey site (www.surveymonkey.com) was used as the data collection mechanism.

The survey population was identified by developing a list of email addresses for a known key contact in each sampled city. For cities that have an existing established working relationship with the ODF U&CF program, the key contact was a city forester, city planner, parks manager, public works director, or other official known to be the primary decision maker within that city's urban forestry program. For cities without an existing relationship with the ODF U&CF program, a key contact was chosen by ODF staff from a list of city officials found on the League of Oregon Cities website. Email addresses were obtained for all but three of the 240 possible respondents. Those three cities were later mailed a printed version of the survey instrument.

After the key contact email list was finalized and the survey was written, the key contacts received an email requesting that they complete the on-line survey, and providing a hyperlink directly to the survey instrument. Each key contact was given the option to pass the survey request along to another city staff or elected official if they believed that they were not the most appropriate respondent for their city. Two follow-up emails were later sent in a successful effort to increase the response rate.

Survey Respondents

From a land perspective, Oregon can be considered a rural state, but from a population perspective, its population distribution is actually 79% urban and 21% rural. Although Oregon is the 9th largest US state in land area, it ranks 28th in population. Oregon has a population of 3.4 million people, 2.4 million (or 68%) of whom live in Oregon's 240 incorporated cities. The population distribution for Oregon cities ranges from less than a dozen to over 500,000 people. Demographically, 169 (70%) of Oregon cities can be designated as small cities with a population of 5,000 people or fewer, 55 cities (23%) are medium cities with populations ranging from 5,000 to 25,000 people, and 16 (7%) are large cities with more than 25,000 residents.

Of Oregon's 240 incorporated cities, 123 completed the 2004 survey that forms the basis of this report, for an overall response rate of 51%. The response rate for small cities was 41%, for medium cities it was 71%, and for large cities it was 94%. The total reported population for responding cities was 1,938,522, meaning that the responding cities encompass 80% of the total number of people living within the boundaries of Oregon cities.   Response rates for the 2004 survey were comparable to the previous surveys. Table 1 lists the response detail for the 2004 survey as compared with the 1992 survey. The 1994 survey, which was not as comprehensive as the other two, had a slightly lower rate, with 102 or 43% responding, along similar size distributions.

Table 1: Oregon City Populations and Survey Response Rates, 2004 and 1992				
	2004 Survey # and % of Cities Responding	2004 City Size Distribution	1992 Survey # and % of Cities Responding	1992 City Size Distribution
Small Cities (less than 5,000 pop.)	69 (43%)	169 (70%)	113 (62%)	183 (76%)
Medium Cities (5,000 – 25,000 pop.)	39 (71%)	55 (23%)	30 (67%)	45 (18%)
Large Cities (over 25,000 pop.)	15 (94%)	16 (7%)	8 (67%)	12 (5%)
Totals	123 (51%)	240 (100%)	151 (63%)	240 (100%)

Table 1 also reveals the urbanization of Oregon between these two survey intervals. The number of small cities has declined, while medium and large cities have increased in number. The state population has also increased during the interval between the two surveys, from 2.8 million in 1990 to the present 3.4 million. Most of that increase has been net migration to medium and large cities.

Survey Findings

State of Municipal Urban Forestry Programs

A portion of the survey was designed to collect information about what common municipal urban forestry program elements were present in the responding community. Respondents were initially asked a question about whether or not they had a tree planting and tree care program in their city, and about the specific program components present. The term "tree planting and care program" was used to replicate the language in previous surveys, rather than the term "urban forestry", due to the fact that Oregon has a large percentage of smaller communities that may not relate to the term "urban" in this context.

In the 2004 survey, 37% of the respondents reported that they had a tree planting or tree care program in their city. This figure is an increase over the 1992 survey, which found 26% of respondents had such a program. In 2004, approximately 1.5 million people or 63% of Oregon's incorporated population lives in a city with a tree program.

Although only 37% of 2004 respondents reported the presence of a "program", 62% reported that they had a municipal tree ordinance or other codes related to trees, one of the foundational components to having a program. The discrepancy between these two figures may reflect an uncertainty about what actually constituted a "program" for the purposes of this survey. The higher percentage of cities with ordinances suggests that the percentage of cities with programs may actually be higher. The percentage of cities with ordinances has steadily increased (Table 2) with each survey.

Table 2: Cities With Tree Ordinances or Codes			
	2004	1994	1992
Percentage of Cities Responding "Yes"	62%	52%	46%

The 2004 survey asked a follow-up question of cities that had ordinances to determine the most common clauses or situations covered by the ordinance. Table 3 summarizes the clauses most commonly found in local ordinances and codes:

Table 3: Clauses Appearing In Municipal Ordinances or Codes	
Clause	Response %
Regulates which tree species may or may not be planted as street trees	68
Defines who is responsible for public tree maintenance	68
Regulates removal of dead or diseased trees	61
Prohibits the topping of public trees	43
Recognizes established standards for proper tree care	40
Regulates tree removal on private land being developed	39
Regulates tree removal on private residential property	32
Establishes a heritage tree program	19
Regulates forest practices in lieu of the state forest practice act	14

Although most cities reported having a tree ordinance, fewer cities have tree advisory committees (38%) or community forest management plans (9%), two other common urban forestry program components. The 38% of cities with tree advisory committees constitute an increase from the 27% reporting in the 1994 survey.

Tree inventories, another element of municipal programs, have been completed by 56% of the respondents. The data reveals a small increase over the 1994 survey. Cities were also asked to report the types of inventories they had completed. Table 4 lists the findings for the tree inventory questions from the 2004 and 1994 surveys.

Table 4: Cities With Tree Inventories and Types of Inventories		
Tree Inventory	2004	1994
Cities that have an inventory	56%	46%
Street trees	28%	27%
Park trees	24%	26%
Forestlands	8%	3%
Historic trees	16%	9%
Other	13%	5%

Survey respondents were also asked about the financial scope of their tree planting and care efforts. The 123 respondents reported aggregate expenditures of $7.8 million on urban forestry activities during 2003. This figure is a considerable increase over the $1.2 million reported by communities in the 1992 survey. The 2004 total includes estimates from all cities, even those that reported that they did not have a tree planting or tree care program. Some cities reported zero expenditures. For cities that did report some expenditures, Table 5 lists the following percentages as reported for each program component from the current survey and as compared to the 1992 survey:

Table 5: Comparison of Tree Program Expenditures		
Municipal Urban Forestry Program Component	2004 Average Percent of Expenditures	1992 Average Percent of Expenditures
Maintenance (Pruning, fertilization, staking, etc)	39%	33%
Planting	22%	25%
Removal	22%	8%
Administration	9%	26%
Pest Control	4%	4%
Education	3%	4%

Respondents were asked about the role of volunteers in their urban forestry efforts. According to the 2004 survey results, citizens in the responding cities also donated a total of 10,728 volunteer hours during 2003. These hours included time spent in advisory roles, coordinating projects, and actually planting trees or conducting other urban forestry projects. At the nationally recognized valuation rate of $17.19 for volunteer hours, this figure equates to $184,414 worth of service to the improvement of local urban forests and programs.

A series of survey questions were designed to obtain the respondents' opinions about their program status. Respondents were asked about their potential to start, expand, or reduce the scope of their tree planting and care efforts (Table 6), a question that was also asked in the previous surveys. Response choices ranged from "Highly Likely" to "Highly Unlikely". A significant data trend for 2004 appears to be a higher level of concern for the potential for municipal programs to be reduced. Several factors may account for this shift in optimism, including the overall state economic picture.

Table 6: Likelihood of City Starting or Expanding, Maintaining, or Reducing Tree Programs			
Highly Likely, Likely, or Somewhat Likely to:	2004	1994	1992
Start or Expand Program	42%	60%	46%
Maintain	58%	43%	58%
Reduce Size or Scope	30%	5%	8%

Respondents to the 2004 survey were asked to rate the positive and negative factors influencing the creation, implementation, or expansion of a tree program in their community using a seven point scale, with 7 being the most positive and 1 being the most negative. The results listed in Table 7 rank the positive factors, and reveal that budget constraints are the only truly negative factor, since it is the only factor that scored on the negative side of the scale (3.5 being neutral).

Table 7: Factors Influencing the Creation, Implementation, or Expansion of a Tree Program	
Factor	Mean Score
Local Elected Official's Interest	5.07
Community Participation	4.84
Citizen Demand	4.70
Public Safety/Risk From Hazard Trees	4.55
Local Political Climate	4.52
Having Qualified Staff to Manage Program	4.31
Availability of Grant Funds	4.28
Availability of Technical Assistance	4.05
Having Adequate Staff to Manage Program	3.93
Budget Constraints	2.84

Issues, Concerns, and Opinions about Urban Forestry

A series of survey questions asked the respondents to provide opinions about various urban forestry issues and concerns. These questions involved selecting and ranking from a list of provided options. Cities were asked to rank their top three tree related issues from a list of 11 choices (Table 8).

Table 8: Tree Related Issues of Most Concern to Cities	
2004	1994
Hazard trees (73%)	Tree preservation or protection (48%)
Root conflicts or problems (51%)	Root conflicts or problems (43%)
Tree preservation or protection (46%)	Hazard trees (42%)

The three top ranked issues were the same in the 2004 and 1994 surveys, though in a different order and with higher percentages. The heightened interest in hazard trees may be a result of the January 2004 snow and ice storm that struck much of Oregon. Many cities reported considerable tree damage from this storm, and having to deal with those situations may have still been fresh in the minds of respondents. Hazard trees are also a factor in municipal risk and liability, which is a continual concern for cities.

In the 2004 survey, a large list of primary benefits and negative aspects of trees was provided, and respondents were requested to check the three most important benefits and the three most negative aspects in their city. The most frequently selected responses (Table 9) are:

Table 9: Most Commonly Selected Positive Benefits And Negative Aspects of Trees	
Primary Benefits	**Primary Negative Aspects**
Community pride, attractiveness, image (82%)	Hazardous trees (57%)
Enhancing community appeal to new residents, businesses, shoppers (71%),	Financial cost of maintaining trees (54%) and tree/utility conflicts (54%) *(Tie)*
Shade (44%)	Tree/sidewalk conflicts (52%)

Interestingly, the top three perceived benefits relate precisely to the three pillars of most sustainability models (economic, environmental, and social benefits). Again, the topic of hazard tree rises to the forefront of the negative aspects.

Regarding the public trees (park trees, street trees, downtown streetscapes, etc), found in their city, respondents were asked how important it was for their city to realize a specific outcome from a list of nine (9) possible urban forestry program outcomes on a scale of not important at all to very important. The ranked order of the results are:

Table 10: Perceived Importance of Tree Related Outcomes		
2004 Rank	**Value**	**1992 Rank**
1	Improve Community Appearance	2
2	Decrease Hazards From Trees	9
3	Promote Business Development	1
4	Control Soil Erosion	6
5	Provide Shade	8

As with in the previous responses (Table 8), the issue of hazard trees is given a high priority position in 2004 compared with 1992. In this context, "decreasing hazards from trees" may be both a policy and an operational goal.

Of the 63% of the cities reporting in 2004 that they did not have a tree planting and care program, 51% reported that their city needed one. This figure reveals a continuing demand for making technical urban forestry services available to cities. This question was asked in the 1992 survey as well. Of the 74% of cities that reported they had no program in 1992, 51% also responded that their city needed one.

Of these cities without programs, 32% reported that it was somewhat likely, likely, or highly likely that they would start such a program within the next two years. Respondents without tree programs were asked to rank a list of 10 factors influencing the creation of such a program (Table 11):

Table 11: Factors Influencing the Creation of New Programs	
Factor	**Response**
Local elected official's interest	52%
Community participation	49%
Citizen demand	45%
Public safety/risk from hazard trees	39%
Local political climate	33%

The political nature of the respondents' opinions here cannot be over-emphasized. Urban forestry efforts must not be limited to city operations staff; elected officials must also be educated in order for local efforts to succeed. The 1992 survey asked a similar, though not precisely replicable question about the factors influencing program creation or expansion. The primary factors reported then were Community involvement (75%), Citizen demand (69%), and Grant funds (65%).

Cities were also asked if they are aware of the Tree City USA program. This national recognition program is awarded to cities with urban forestry programs, and is one tangible measure of program success. In order to become a Tree City USA, cities must have an ordinance, a tree board or other authority, an expenditure of $2 per capita on trees, and an Arbor Day observance and proclamation. Oregon had 37 Tree City USA communities during 2003, up from 19 in 1992. The Tree City USA program has very high name recognition, with 72% of 2004 respondents having heard of the program. This response is consistent with the previous surveys, both of which found recognition in excess of 70%. In 2004, respondents were asked follow-up questions about the Tree City USA program. Cities were asked about what they thought were the top three main benefits of the Tree City USA program (Table 12):

Table 12: Top Three Benefits of Being A Tree City USA	
Benefit	**Response**
Positive community image or pride	93%
A sign the city cares about the environment	66%
Makes city attractive for new residents or businesses	62%

Although Tree City USA name recognition is very high, only 42% of the cities reported that they had an official Arbor Day or Arbor Week observance. Cities that had not already received Tree City USA status were asked a follow-up question about the barriers to becoming a Tree City USA (Table 13):

Table 13: Barriers to Becoming A Tree City USA	
Barrier	**Response**
Lack of knowledgeable staff or volunteers to care for trees	40%
Can't meet the $2 per capita requirement	39%
Don't know about the program	35%
No support among city leaders	25%
No support among city residents	25%

The responses to this question reveal that while Tree City has high name recognition, many city representatives don't know much about the program.

Urban and Community Forestry Assistance

The Oregon Department of Forestry is the primary source of urban forestry technical advice and services for Oregon cities. The 2004 survey respondents were asked a series of questions about receiving urban forestry assistance. Nearly 52% of respondents reported that they had received assistance from an ODF U&CF staff member. The respondents who had previously received assistance were asked a follow-up question regarding the frequency of assistance received (Table 14):

Table 14: Frequency of ODF U&CF Assistance Received	
Response	**Frequency of Assistance**
48%	More than once a year
18%	Once a year
7%	Every other year
27%	A couple of times in the last decade

The respondents who did receive assistance were also asked to indicate what types of assistance they had received from a list of commonly requested services (Table 15):

Table 15: Types of ODF U&CF Assistance Received
83% reported receiving a program newsletter or other printed materials
72% reported receiving advice via telephone or electronic mail
62% reported receiving an on-site technical assistance visit
55% reported that they had visited the ODF website to access urban forestry info
53% reported that they had sent city staff to an ODF educational workshop
47% reported receiving a grant
25% reported sending city staff to the annual state urban forestry conference

Respondents were asked to rank the priority they would give to the different forms of assistance they could receive in the future from the Oregon Dept. of Forestry. All of the 2004 respondents were asked this question, including cities that had not previously used ODF services. This question was also asked in the previous surveys, although in those instances the assistance types were not broken out in the same manner. Nevertheless, by combining some categories, the results were as follows (Table 16):

Table 16: Ranked Types of ODF U&CF Assistance Requested by Cities			
	2004	**1994**	**1992**
Cost-share grants	1	1	1
On-site technical assistance visits	2	2	3
Technical assistance via phone or email	3	2	3
Printed materials (brochures, newsletters)	4	4	2
Instructional workshops	5	3	4
Statewide or regional conferences	6	3	5

Cities in the 2004 survey were also asked if they had an ISA Certified Arborist on staff, or had the ability to contract with one, and 45% responded that they did.

Impact of the ODF U&CF Program

To assess the effects of cities having an established working relationship with the ODF U&CF program, respondents were sorted by this factor with regard to their responses on other questions. Table 17 reflects this impact with data where responses significantly diverged based on the factor of having received ODF assistance:

Table 17: Reponses Based on Whether a City Received ODF Assistance	
Cities that have received ODF assistance	**Cities that reported they had not received ODF assistance**
67% said they had a tree planting and care program	**12%** said they had a tree planting and care program
81% that said they didn't have a program said they needed one	**35%** that said they didn't have a program said they needed one
81% have a tree ordinance or codes	**57%** have a tree ordinance or codes
63% have a tree advisory body	**16%** have a tree advisory body
63% had an ISA Certified Arborist on staff or could contract with one	**30%** had an ISA Certified Arborist on staff or could contract with one
89% are aware of the Tree City USA program	**56%** are aware of the Tree City USA program
61% observe Arbor Day or Arbor Week	**24%** observe Arbor Day or Arbor Week

The demarcation between cities that reported receiving ODF assistance and those that haven't is significant. This is, in part, a measure of the program's effectiveness in reaching cities with the message of proper urban forest management. The cities that have received ODF assistance are clearly doing a better job of managing their urban forest resources than cities that haven't received ODF assistance.

The success of the ODF U&CF efforts can also be gauged by comparing selected data from the 2004 survey with the 1992 survey. Since the 1992 survey was designed to provide an assessment of urban forestry needs for a new program, its data constitutes a baseline from which the success of the program can be measured. Several of the questions in the 2004 survey that were replicated from the 1992 survey provide an opportunity to examine how urban forestry activities or opinions have changed in the state, and to gauge the impact of ODF urban forestry program efforts. Additionally, the number of cities achieving the Tree City USA award between the two years provides another measure of success. Table 18 summarizes these observations:

Table 18: Measurement of ODF U&CF Program Impact, 1992-2004			
Indicator	**2004**	**1992**	**% change**
Cities with tree planting and care programs	37%	26%	+ 9%
Cities with tree ordinances or codes	62%	46%	+14%
Cities with tree inventories	56%	46%	+10%
Cities receiving Tree City USA award	15%	8%	+7%
Total local U&CF expenditures	$7.8 million	$1.2 million*	+550%

(* not adjusted for inflation)

A final measure of ODF's U&CF program impact is in its technical and financial assistance accomplishments as recorded in its annual performance measures. However, in this context, those accomplishments are more appropriately viewed as inputs into local program achievement (outcomes). The survey results are evidence that the investments of state technical, educational, and financial assistance have paid valuable dividends at the local level in improving the health of urban forests and the quality of community life.

Conclusions

As the primary clients for the ODF U&CF program, cities can provide a valuable feedback mechanism to program efficiency and effectiveness. Resource data from city agencies and opinions of city decision-makers are useful information elements in planning future program direction at the state level. The results of this 2004 City Survey have some significant implications for ODF's U&CF program in terms of the appropriate strategic program emphasis and delivery. Some conclusions that can be drawn about the ODF U&CF program as a result of this survey include:

- An intensified emphasis on reaching local elected decision-makers is warranted. ODF has an extensive network of people who impact the operational details of urban forestry, but a less extensive one of policy makers.

- Hazard tree management should remain a strong program focus, both from an operational and a policy perspective.

- The current balance of providing technical, financial, and educational assistance is congruent with what the cities need and expect.

- Financial assistance in the form of matching grants remains popular, and additional grant opportunities would be met with increased demand.

- Training and education courses for municipal employees, such as through the Community Tree Management Institute should continue to be emphasized.

- A large percentage of Oregon cities, mostly smaller ones, don't have urban forestry programs and still need to be convinced of the benefits of managing their urban forest. The fact that over half the cities without programs believe they need a program shows continued demand for basic technical services.

- Cities that have received ODF assistance have achieved more accomplishments and are doing a better job managing their urban forest than those that haven't received assistance.

- Based on a comparison between 1992 and 2004, there is a direct correlation between receiving ODF U&CF assistance and an improvement in the quality of local urban forest management over this time period. This is a direct measure of the effectiveness of ODF's program.

- Data from these types of surveys provides valuable planning insights. Future surveys should be conducted at more regular intervals, perhaps every 4 years. The use of electronic data collection via Internet survey instruments was efficient and cost-effective, and should be considered again for future surveys.

The 1992 survey publication: *Urban and Community Forestry In Oregon: An Assessment With Recommendations For Initiating Action* reached a conclusion that still is germane today: "The challenge faced by the Oregon Department of Forestry is to motivate communities to action". It is clear from the results of this survey that this goal has been addressed, and significant progress has been made towards is implementation. ODF has clearly stimulated local investment in urban forestry.

The 2004 City Survey provides a wealth of insights into local urban forestry programs, the needs of municipalities, and potential ODF program delivery methods and strategies. It is evident that ODF has achieved some significant accomplishments in this improving the health of our urban forests, and also has a clearer picture of the challenges before the agency as a result of conducting this survey.

Appendix: 2004 City Survey Questions

==

2004 State Urban and Community Forestry Program Survey

The Oregon Department of Forestry is conducting a survey of all 240 Oregon cities to gather information that will be used to help us improve our delivery of urban forestry services. You received this email because you are listed in our records as the primary point of contact between our program and your city. If you do not believe that you are the most appropriate city staff member to complete this survey, please forward this email on to an individual on your city staff (or knowledgeable elected official) who can respond. It is important that we get responses from as many cities as possible.

The data collection method for this information is an on-line survey. You can go to the following address to complete the survey.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=70600584843

There are 31 questions ranging from statistical information about your city such as information about your tree care budget or ordinance, and opinion questions such as what type of urban and community forestry services you value most. It may be helpful for you to have written information about your city nearby while you are completing the survey, such as budget or statistical data

Your participation in this survey is critical for ODF to develop technical, financial, and educational efforts that can help you deal with tree issues in your city. Even if your city doesn't have an active tree planting and care program, please respond so we can include your information.

If you have questions about this survey, please don't hesitate to contact me by phone or email at the contact information listed below.

Please go on-line and complete the survey by September 7, 2004. Thank you.

Paul Ries
U&CF Program Manager
Oregon Dept. of Forestry

==

1. What is the name of your city?

2. What is the population of your city?

3. What is the title of the person responsible for tree issues in your city?

4. Does your city have a tree planting or care program? Yes or No. If No, answer question 5.

    5. If your city does not have such a program, does it need one? Yes or No

6. Within the next two years, how likely or unlikely is it that your city will: (6 point scale of unlikely to likely)

        Start or expand a tree planting and care program
        Maintain an existing program at the same level
        Reduce the size or budget of the program

7. How much will each of the following factors impact the creation, implementation, or expansion of a tree planting or care program in your city within the next two years: (6 point scale of negative to positive)

Budget constraints
Availability of technical assistance
Availability of grant funds
Citizen demand
Community participation
Local elected official's interest
Having qualified staff to manage program
Having adequate staff to manage program
Local political climate
Public safety/risk from hazard trees

8. Of the following tree related issues, which three are the most important concerns to your city? Please mark the top three.

Hazard trees
Tree preservation or protection
Heritage or Historic trees
Timber harvesting
Topped trees
Vandalism
Root conflicts or problems
Insects and disease problems
Stormwater/Water quality
Lack of tree cover

9. What are the primary benefits of trees in your city? Check up to three items.

Air quality improvement
Increased property values
Stormwater runoff control
Shade
Community pride, attractiveness, image
Enhancing community appeal to new residents, businesses, or shoppers
Stormwater runoff or water quality
Traffic calming
Enhance recreation areas
Other _____

10. What are the primary negative aspects of trees in your city? Check up to three items.

Debris removal after storms
Tree disposal
Financial cost of maintaining trees (e.g. infrastructure damage, repairing vandalism)
Tree/sign conflicts
Tree/sidewalk conflicts
Solar access problems
Hazardous trees
Tree/utility conflicts
Other _____

11. Regarding the public trees in your city, how important is it for your city to: ("rating" question, on a scale of 1-6, from not important to important)

> Increase Community Infrastructure Value
> Decrease Hazards from Trees
> Improve Community Appearance
> Improve Efficiency of Staff Effort
> Decrease Broken Curbs and Sidewalks
> Provide Shade
> Promote Business Development
> Create Habitat for Wildlife
> Control Soil Erosion

12. Do you have a municipal tree ordinance or other community ordinances and codes related to trees? Yes or No.

   13. If yes, please check which clauses appear in your ordinance or codes:

> Regulates which tree species may or may not be planted as street trees
> Defines who is responsible for public tree maintenance
> Regulates tree removal on private land being developed
> Regulates tree removal on private residential property
> Establishes a heritage tree program
> Regulates removal of dead or diseased trees
> Recognizes established standards for proper tree care
> Regulates forest practices in lieu of the state forest practice act'
> Prohibits the topping of public trees

14. Does your city have an officially recognized citizen tree advisory body, like a tree board, planning commission, or parks committee that advises the city on tree issues? Yes No

   15. If yes, what is the title/name of this body: _____

16. Has your city conducted an inventory of any of the following? Check all that apply.

> Forested lands within the city UGB
> Park trees
> Street trees
> Trees on private land
> Significant or Historic Trees

17. Does your city have a Community Forest Management Plan? Yes No

18. Do you have an ISA Certified Arborist on your city staff or have the ability to contract with a local ISA Certified Arborist?

19. How much you would estimate your city spent, in tax revenues, fees, donations, etc on tree planting and care in 2003? Total _____

   20. Please estimate what percentage of that total was spent in each of the following tree related categories during 2003:

> Planting
> Maintenance (Pruning, fertilization, staking, etc)
> Pest Control
> Removal

Education
Administration

21. Approximately how many hours were volunteered by citizens or community organization member for tree planting, care, or education in your city during 2003? _____

22. Is tree topping a problem in your community? Yes No

23. Has your city used the services of the Oregon Department of Forestry's Urban and Community Assistance Program staff? Yes, No.

24. If yes, how often?

More than once a year
Once a year
Every other year
A couple of times in the last decade

25. If yes, what types of assistance have you received? Check all that apply

Received an on-site technical assistance visit
Received advice via telephone or email
Received a grant
City staff attended an educational workshop
City staff attended the state urban forestry conference
Received their newsletter or other printed materials
Visited the ODF website to access urban forestry information

26. From lowest to highest, please rank the priority you would give to the different forms of assistance you could receive in the future from the Oregon Department of Forestry:

Cost-share Grants
Technical advice via phone or email
On-site technical assistance visits to your city
Instructional workshops
Statewide or regional conferences
Printed materials (newsletters, brochures)
Urban forestry tours (nurseries, other cities' programs, etc)
Other, please specify _____

27. Are you aware of the Tree City USA program? Yes No

28. What do you think are the main benefits of the Tree City Program? Check the top three benefits.

Positive Community Image or Pride
Recognition for hard work
Makes city more attractive for new residents or businesses
Flag, street signs, Arbor Day observance
It's a sign the city cares about the environment
Encourages planning for tree management
Other _____

29. If your city has been awarded Tree City USA status this year, please skip this question. What are the barriers to your city becoming a Tree City? Check all that apply.

Don't know about the program

Can't see the benefits of it
Can't meet the $2 per capita requirement
No support for program among city leaders
No support for program among city residents
Don't have the time to complete the paperwork
Lack knowledgeable city staff or volunteers to care for trees
Other _____

30. Does your city have an official Arbor Day or Arbor Week observance?

31. Are there any comments you would like to make? This space is available for your questions, comments, or concerns. Please indicate if you would like a response from an ODF staff member.

Thank you again for taking the time to complete this survey.