

**FINAL REPORT**  
**FOREST SERVICE GRANT NO. 01-DG-11244225-290**

Period covered by this report: August 8, 2001 through August 8, 2002

**Issued to:** Davey Resource Group

**Address:** 6050 Hicks Road, Naples, NY 14512

**Congressional District Number:** 27

**Project Name:** Dissemination of an Approach to Integrate Urban Tree Planting into State and Federal Air Quality Improvement Programs

**Contact Person/Principal Investigator:**

**Name:** Christopher Luley

**Mailing Address:** Same as above

**Phone Number:** (585) 394-9460

**Fax Number:** (585) 394-8193

**E-Mail Address:** [cjluley@davey.com](mailto:cjluley@davey.com)

**Your Organization's internet home page address:**

**Date of Award:** August 8, 2001

**Grant Modifications:** N/A

**Date of Expiration:** August 8, 2002

**Funding: Federal Share:** \$13,050 plus **Grantee Share:** \$13,050 = **Total Project:** \$26,100

---

**FS Grant Manager:** Phil Rodbell

**Address:** USDA Forest Service - NA, 11 Campus Blvd, Suite 200, Newtown Square, PA 19073

**Phone Number:** (610) 557-4133 **Fax Number:** (610) 557-4136 **E-mail:** prodbell@fs.fed.us

---

Please provide an abstract on your project and its results. This abstract will be posted on the NUCFAC internet site. (approximately 200 words or less).

Two previous National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council grants prepared the groundwork for this project that developed the materials and disseminated our approach on how to integrate urban tree planting and management into a viable strategy to reduce air pollution. The objectives of this project were to create a contact database of governmental air quality management officials, state urban forestry coordinators, and grassroots-type urban forestry activists, develop a color tri-fold brochure on urban forest management and air quality improvement and to disseminate the brochure to all states in the US. The database contained over 400 contacts. Each contact received by mail the brochure. A follow-up phone and email contact was conducted in States with federal ozone non-attainment status to ensure that all parties received and understood the brochure. This contact also allowed us to discuss our efforts and approach with the individuals that could influence the process in each state. We found that a simple mailing of a brochure, even to a targeted audience, was ineffective in raising awareness. The follow-up calling and contact process was invaluable in disseminating our message, and was well received once the contact was made.

**Project objectives:**

The objectives of this project were to:

1. Create a contact database of governmental air quality management officials, state urban forestry coordinators, and grassroots-type urban forestry activists,
2. Develop a color tri-fold brochure on urban forest management and air quality improvement,
3. Disseminate the brochure to all states in the US via mail and
4. Conduct a follow-up phone and email contact process to determine if the brochure was received and read and if the message was understood.

**Objectives met successfully:**

All the objectives defined above were successfully completed.

**Objectives not met:**

None.

**List the major research or policy findings of your project?**

This project was defined as technology transfer and outreach and did not involve any research per se.

**If not apparent in the above, or if your project did not involve research, how did the project increase the knowledge we have about urban forestry? How did (will) the public benefit?**

The project was intended as a technology transfer/outreach effort and was directed at increasing the knowledge of the importance and impact of urban trees on air quality. It was also intended to inform state urban forestry coordinators, state air quality management officials, and grassroots urban forestry organizations on the importance of integrating urban forest management into each state's air quality regulatory efforts. Our efforts in New York State to include urban forest management into the State Implementation Plan (SIP) to reduce ozone has the potential to be applied in many other states. Our goal with this project was to inform individuals in each state on how to start the process so it could be widely considered as a means to enhance air quality and urban forest management.

Successful application of urban forest management as a tool to improve air quality within a regulatory environment could mean substantial increases in funding for urban forest management, improved air quality for the public as urban forest management increased, and increased environmental quality provided by additional urban tree planting and management. Importantly, these benefits would be available to all people living in and around the larger cities that have air quality issues, because poor air quality (especially ozone or smog) is an environmental problem that is dispersed over large areas. Improved air quality that results from preserving and increasing tree cover would be a benefit available to all of society.

The project also allowed us to discuss directly the message that we had with key contact individuals in each state. Once contact was made, it was evident that most State Forestry Coordinators had a high level of interest in the message. State Air Quality individuals were typically interested but were more skeptical, but were in all cases willing to listen and consider the merits of the message. We contacted fewer individuals from grassroots organizations because the likelihood of them being involved is less due to the technical nature of the process. Their role would be much more important in the latter stages of the integration process.

**What recommendations might you make for community foresters or others who might benefit from your project?**

It was clear that the follow-up contact, either by email (with a written response indicating contact) or phone call was essential and should be included in any project that intends on reaching a targeted audience with a specific message. Very few of the individuals contacted had remembered seeing the brochure in its initial mailing. It is apparent in this information-rich age that simple mailings, no matter how effective the material and how focused on a target group with a high potential interest in the information, is an ineffective means of communicating a message. Fortunately for this project, the follow-up calling allowed us to send the message again and to make personal contact with the audience. Follow-up calling, however, is extremely time consuming and usually requires a minimum of three calls (total by both parties) to make a contact.

**Attach copies of reports, publications, or videos. If your work has been published (journals, popular press, etc.), provide where they have been published or reported and how copies can be obtained.**

We sent previously copies of the final report including the brochure and contact database to all NUCFAC members.

**How were your results disseminated to the public?**

The results were disseminated via a direct mailing to our contact database, emailing, and phone calling to follow up on all the brochures that were sent out.

**List the active partners (key individuals or organizations) involved in the project:**

Dave Nowak, Ph.D.  
USDA Forest Service  
NE Research Station  
5 Moon Library  
SUNY E SF  
Syracuse, NY 13210  
(315) 448-3212

Gopal Sistla  
New York State DEC  
Bureau of Air Quality  
625 Broadway  
Albany, NY 12233-3259  
518 402 – 8394

Jerry Bond  
Davey Resource Group  
3904 Willowdale Ln  
Geneva, NY 14456-9267  
(315) 585-9145

**Photo or Illustration: If possible, please provide a photo or illustration for our use that summarizes or represents the project. Indicate how this illustration should be credited.**

These were included in the final report submitted previously.

**If a no-cost time extension was granted for this project, why was it needed?**

A no-cost time extension was requested to cover the additional time needed to complete the follow up phone calling and contact. This process took considerably longer than expected, due to the difficulty in reaching people by phone.

**How would you evaluate the grant process? What changes, if any, would you recommend?**

The grant process works well. One recommendation would be at the start of the grant to provide the grantee a timeline of required reports including start and end dates on the grant and deadlines.

**Comments considered of importance but not covered above:**

We have been working on this effort for over 10 years and much of this time has been unsupported. Therefore we appreciate NUCFAC's support of this continuing effort to integrate the use of urban forest management into air quality improvement.

The contacts made at the state level through this grant have been valuable as our efforts are now being taken up and considered in MID, CT, NJ, PA and DC. This will be an ongoing project that could have huge benefits to urban forest management and the environment if we are successful in getting states to bring urban forest management into a regulatory environment individually and to collectively consider how the urban forest can be used to enhance the environment regionally.

**This report was prepared by:**

**Name:** Christopher J. Luley, Ph.D.  
**Title:** Project Manager  
**Phone Number:** (585) 394-9460  
**Date:** July 14, 2003