Takoma Park City Council Meeting – October 23, 2019
Agenda Item 5

Work Session
Discussion of Ongoing Council Review and Potential Changes to the Tree Ordinance, Tree Canopy Goal, and Outreach Efforts

Recommended Council Action
Discuss a second set of tree policy issues, including: definition of hazardous trees; tree removal approval process; tree ratings and replanting requirements; and tree canopy goals. The first work session was held October 16, and a third will be held during the October 30 City Council meeting.

Context with Key Issues
The FY19 and FY20 City Council Priorities include goals to review the City's Tree Ordinance policies and procedures, consider tree canopy goals for the City, and explore ways of improving community outreach and education on tree related matters. The Council began this process with a work session on October 24, 2018, to establish a strategy for moving the effort forward.

Then, in the spring the City hosted a public workshop on results of a citywide tree canopy assessment by the University of Vermont. The Council sought and received comments and suggestions from many residents through the online Tree Ordinance Survey (with over 500 responses), detailed feedback from several groups of residents and individuals, public and written comments at Council meetings, and neighborhood meetings.

At a June 19, 2019, work session, the City's Urban Forest Manager and Public Works Director provided an overview of the current Tree Ordinance process, formally presented the tree canopy assessment, and shared the results of the Tree Ordinance survey. A July 22, 2019, work session with the Tree Commission and several members of the Committee on the Environment produced numerous recommendations for modifications.

In a work session on September 11, 2019, the Council conducted an in depth review of a detailed "starter list" of suggestions for action on tree policies. The contents of the starter list were derived from a wide range of sources, including the resident survey results, remarks presented to the Council during public comment periods, resident emails, community meetings, input from relevant City staff, data on tree permit applications, recommendations from members of the Committee on the Environment and the Tree Commission, and other information. The starter list was a first attempt to group the feedback from these many sources into a logical format that would enable a productive Council discussion. It included issues for possible modification of the City Ordinance and grouped policies into thematic areas.

At the September 11, 2019 work session the Council discussed items on the starter list with the aim of identifying the key issues that require a more focused review, as opposed to more minor suggested technical changes. The three work sessions in October will be devoted to in-depth discussions of those key starter list issues. The following is a tentative list of the broad topics for each of the October work sessions:

Prepared by: Councilmembers Dyballa, Kostiuk, and Kovar
Approved by: Suzanne Ludlow, City Manager
Posted 2019-10-18

October 16, Work Session #1
General Discussion
Clearer and Faster Process and Information
Tree Impact Assessment
Tree Protection Plan
Appeals

October 23, Work Session #2
Removal of Trees and Hazardous Trees
Goals of the Ordinance
Tree Canopy Goal
Tree Rating Chart
Replanting Requirements

October 30, Work Session #3
Pre-planting Programs & Incentives
Fees & Funding
Urban Forest Manager Role, Education & Outreach
Wrap-up on hazardous trees

Other issues

Neither the starter list nor the broad agendas for the three October work sessions are meant to be exhaustive. The Council is still in the discussion phase of this process. It's anticipated that the Committee on the Environment and the Tree Commission will submit recommendations regarding tree canopy goals and resident outreach and education this month. Residents will be able to continue their participation in the process by speaking during the City Council public comment periods, sending emails to the City Clerk (which are shared with all Councilmembers), and contacting the Mayor or Councilmembers directly.

After completion of the three October sessions, the Council will announce next steps, including potential time tables for developing legislative language and a tentative voting schedule. At this time, there is another work session scheduled tentatively for November 13 to discuss potential draft language for the Tree Ordinance amendments with the City Attorney. A work session in early January is also anticipated. Materials from the previous Council meetings on these topics are available through the links below.

Council Priority

Environmentally Sustainable Community, Engaged, Responsive & Service-oriented Government

Environmental Considerations

The Tree Ordinance establishes the protection and preservation of trees as a fundamental goal in the City. As noted in the Takoma Park Tree Canopy Assessment, "Trees provide many benefits to communities, such as improving water quality, reducing stormwater runoff, lowering summer temperatures, reducing energy use in buildings, removing air pollution, enhancing property values, improving human health, providing wildlife habitat, and aesthetic benefits." In light of the ongoing concerns about climate change -- which the Council recognized formally through its adoption of a resolution declaring a climate emergency -- taking thoughtful action to develop tree canopy goals and ensuring that the tree ordinance functions well take on added importance. Additionally, challenges such as the current die-off affecting many oaks in the City -- which is having a negative effect on older trees that contribute significantly to carbon sequestration (among other benefits) -- underline the need to ensure that we have in place policies that can give our trees the necessary resilience to cope with changing weather patterns, harmful pests, and other threats.

Fiscal Considerations
Fiscal considerations will be examined as the Tree Ordinance and the other tree-related matters being studied are discussed. The FY20 Budget for the Urban Forest Division is $267,330, including staff, consultant services, tree purchases and services. Substantial changes to the ordinance administration or requirements may require a change in the funding level in order to be accomplished. The cost of tree maintenance for an individual property owner is ongoing and similar to any other ongoing home maintenance expense. Energy savings and increased property values may offset or exceed these costs. The costs of complying with the Tree Ordinance can be substantial when a construction project is proposed, when a property owner wishes to remove a tree that is not dead or imminently hazardous, or when trees suddenly decline. The City's tree emergency fund is available for residents with financial need who must remove hazardous trees. The extent to which that fund is sufficient will be part of this review.

Racial Equity Considerations
Tree canopy is not spread equally across the City of Takoma Park and the costs and benefits of tree canopy vary by location and type of property, which can have a race equity component. In addition, heavier tree canopy coverage in residential areas has generally been found in areas with a higher percentage of single family homes as opposed to multi-family residences. 75% of the respondents to the Tree Ordinance Survey were residents of Wards 1, 2, and 3. These three wards are majority white and have fewer multifamily properties than do Wards 4, 5, and 6.

Attachments and Links
- Tree Ordinance Review and Canopy Goal Project Page
- Tree Permit Page
- Agenda June 19, 2019, meeting agenda with links to various materials (Agenda Item 7)
- Agenda for the July 22, 2019, meeting agenda
- Agenda September 11, 2019, meeting agenda with links to various materials (Agenda Item 4)
- Agenda October 16, 2019, materials for Work Session #1 (Agenda Item 10)
- Framework for Establishing Tree Canopy Goal(s) – Takoma Park Tree Commission, October 15, 2019 (attached)
- Recommendations to the City Council for Revisions to the Tree Ordinance – Takoma Park Tree Commission, July 22, 2019 (attached)
- Committee on the Environment Proposed Urban Forest Goals, October 18, 2019 (attached)

Framework for Establishing Tree Canopy Goal(s)
Takoma Park Tree Commission
October 15, 2019

1: Setting a Numeric Goal

Establish a long-term set of objectives 20-25 years with assessments every 5 years

A. Action items tied to metrics that can be tracked incrementally over a long period of time
B. Maintaining status quo may be a reasonable and dare say aspirational goal
C. Establish a common framework for desired ecosystem services delivery
D. Given the wide disparities in current cover, creative goal assessments may be more meaningful, i.e., number of trees planted, jurisdictional percentage increases, etc.

2. Encourage community ownership of goal

A. Incentives for landowners and residents in contributing to achieving goal (i.e tree literacy for residents, resources available for those who have contributed with yard/planting trees on property, options for reducing maintenance costs, neighborhood incentive grants, etc.)
B. Consider environmental justice/social equity in development of goals
C. Support education and outreach
D. Determine a plan of consultation that is inclusive but also recognizes the expertise/responsibility of public works to maintain and execute strategy
E. Engage in activities that are fiscally feasible.

3. Focus on a set of strategic goals that have concrete action steps

A. Implement easily
B. Build on data and information about the community forest
C. Are informed by the assessment recommendation to prioritize planting on private property
D. Are informed by a mutually agreed upon set of ecosystem services.
E. Consider what is ecologically possible, has fiscal potential, and is socially preferable.
F. Align well with County, State, and Regional plans
G. Consider regional precedents (for example Greenbelt and College Park) and recommendations offered by regional bodies such as MWCOG.
H. Only plan for those activities that can be reasonably funded
I. Incorporate resources that are available inside and outside Takoma Park, MD and advocate for inclusion of TKPK where needed (Tree Montgomery, Chesapeake Bay programs, Stormwater/clean water act resources, other non-profit, state and federal programs)

Ground truthing -The Necessary Conundrum

Takoma Park has undertaken three canopy analyses that involved collection and analysis of data through top-down flyover methods. These analyses provide valuable insight into the overall relationship of the tree canopy to the City over time. There are several pieces of information that cannot be determined from these studies that are essential in understanding the state of our canopy to determine the strategy in moving forward with plans for growth. These include the general state of health and age of individual trees, the distribution of species, the presence of invasive trees.

All parties agree that more information is necessary but determining how to collect it has proved a difficult challenge, as each option provides a different set of data. Options are as follows:

1. Inventory of City owned trees: An inventory is a detailed count of all trees on public property including right of way trees. This method will assist the City in developing a planting plan for public areas of the city. The establishment of such an inventory is currently mandated in the tree ordinance along with its continued maintenance. Current cost estimates for such an inventory runs about $48,000. This method does not garner any insight into the state of the canopy located on private property, which is the primary planting opportunity to increase the canopy in the long term.

2. Survey of trees on and/or to include private property: This option entails a random sampling of plots across the city, securing permission to enter private property, and assessing trees individually. From the random sample the remaining state of the forest is inferred. Because of the number of variables in determining the nature of the survey taken it is difficult to estimate costs. A ballpark at today's rate at 150 plots is $75,000. Critical to the cost effectiveness of this option will be a commitment to community collection of the permissions. This seems to be a reasonable way to keep the cost approachable. In the Tree Commission recommendations for changes to the ordinance, this option was offered to be included in the five-year increments currently in place for the flyover data so that a complete data set is generated on a periodic basis.

3. Inventory of trees on private property: Because Takoma Park is small, and the amount of plantable land slightly more than ½ the acreage of the City, it may be more cost effective to conduct a complete inventory of private property. This option would not produce any useable data on public property.

4. Continue to provide no ground truthing information: This option means that any goal and concurrent incentives will be based on incomplete information which weakens the purposefulness of the exercise. Given no additional funding, this is the likely outcome, but is not recommended by the Tree Commission.

Recommendations to the Council of the City of Takoma Park for revisions to Municipal Code Title 12: Trees and Vegetation

July 22, 2019

12.04.010 Add definition of Ecosystem Services

Add definition of Invasive Species

12.04.080 Clarify responsibility to the City Manager's management of city property. Articulate the requirement to the process outlined in permitting structure, which is a requirement in the determination of replacement trees.

Some but not all Commissioners request that the City articulate its commitment to the appeal process for interested community members.

12.08.070 Review for sufficiency of process; determine if application of law is consistent with lawn maintenance provisions

12.12.010 See sample in Appendix A. General philosophy to be amended to reflect a desire to increase canopy through dynamic management. Reflect stewardship as a community responsibility for the good of a public benefit.

12.12.30 5% limitation is too restrictive. Recommend increasing to 10% Consider if "significant" can be better defined.

Modify fee to $25 for tree impact assessment applications.

Tree impact assessment is required for approval of a tree removal permit filed for purposes of development indicated in section 12.12.40

12.12.40 Incorporate Tree Waiver into Removal permit requirements. Cost average application fee at $40.

12.12.80 Commissioners arrived at several different determinations on rights of appeals. Questions have been raised regarding the right of appeal on removal for declining health of a tree held on private property. This can be addressed by removal of right to appeal in this instance, or alternatively delimited by adjacency or if the appellant's property is potentially affected.

Change undesirable to invasive

Allow UFM the discretion in requiring an independent arborist evaluation for complex plans pursuant to section 12.04.110.

12.12.90 In instances where a preliminary approval is granted for development purposes, authorize the Urban Forest Manager to allow for extensions of deadlines without further right of appeal.

12.12.100 See modified formula Appendix B

Consider authorizing the Urban Forest Manager the capacity to reduce replanting requirements to incentivize planting on site. Consider how this would be financed.

Consider expansion of waiver, to potentially include trees evaluated to be in decline with less than 10 years of life. Consider how this would be financed.

Fee Formula should include provision for maintenance for a period of 2 years, with language broad enough to cover deer protection.

Change undesirable to invasive

12.12.105 Repeal Pre-planting credit program

12.12.120 Authorize the City Attorney, in consultation with the Urban Forest Manager and the Tree Commission, the ability to rewrite criteria for consideration permit applications for clarification/simplification.

12.12.140 Recommend including education and outreach in master plan. Retain Annual report. Retain replanting plan and modify inventory to once every five years concurrent with canopy assessment on both private and public lands, to set canopy goals. Establish implementation plan for canopy goals and review/revise on a 5-year cycle.

Ancillary Recommendations:

Consider fiscal modifications created by amendments to replanting requirements, in order to reflect the community stewardship component of the vision statement. To the extent it is determined this is not possible to increase funding base, expand funding of the tree emergency fund to accommodate requests for tree replacements to remove trees within 10 years of life, for residents that demonstrate need.

The Urban Forest Management Office should conduct a top-down evaluation, to include external review of all regulations, including but not limited to invasive tree list, preferred tree list, and permit applications and processes. Such evaluations should be made public and include methodology. This transparency serves to support the quality of evaluation the resident applicants receive from the City.

Ensure the Urban Forest Management Office is adequately resourced in the execution of both strategic and operational functions. Set a threshold for permit volume that, when exceeded triggers contract services, to ensure timely customer service to permit applicants. Continue to consider the incorporation of Green Infrastructure and explore areas of cooperation and cost sharing with the Sustainability Office.

The fee in lieu charge should reflect the actual cost of replacement. This represents an increase in the cost of purchasing the tree, in addition to deer protection and water/maintenance for the first two years post planting.

Concurrent with the annual report, recommend establishment of an annual work session to set goals for the year between the Tree Commission, Urban Forest Manager, City Manager and Council to take place in September of each year, in the spirit of the Green Team meeting. Stepped up enforcement on strategic initiatives and periodic reporting requirements.

Explore both opportunities for increased vendor engagement and vendor enforcement that the law allows.

Explore ways residents may be incentivized to preserve volunteer/small trees based on land preservation.

Authorize the City Attorney, in consultation with the Tree Commission, to correct errors in the code. Change all references to the Arborist to Urban Forest Manager.

Appendix A: 12.12.010 Legislative Findings

The Council of the City of Takoma Park finds that it is in the interest of the citizens of the City to protect, preserve, and enhance the City's urban forest. Stewardship of our urban forest is a community effort. A healthy, biodiverse and demographically balanced urban forest sequesters carbon to help mitigate global warming, reduces energy consumption, mitigates temperature extremes, promotes health through control of air, noise, and visual pollution, supports wildlife, and enhances aesthetics of the cityscape. The City's urban plays an important role in controlling storm water run-off, thereby supporting the biologic and hydrologic integrity of downstream watersheds. Regulation of actions affecting the urban forest provides mutual benefits to City residents and property owners. The purpose of this chapter is to promote a diverse, resilient urban forest of desirable species, and it shall be administered in a manner that seeks to protect and replace such trees at every opportunity. (Ord. 2003-40 (part), 2004)

Appendix B: 12.12.100 Tree evaluation Matrix for determination of replanting requirements

CRITERION	VALUE		RATING
	5 or 4	3 or 2	1
Target	No Target or within 2X Height	Target within 1X height/ or within dripline with target zone rarely occupied	Target within dripline/target zone is frequently occupied
Site Factor	Optimal no site changes favorable soil conditions	Grade change/compacted soil/soil saturation	Limited soil volume/severely compacted/planting box restriction/history of failures in close proximity evident
Trunk/Root Collar	Sound and solid/ root collar in tact	Sections of bark missing/root damage	Extensive bark loss and hollow/ evidence of fungal bodies/ root cuts and/or significant root damage clearly evident
Structure/Crown Health	Normal foliage and full and balanced crown	1 Major/structural limbs dead or dying/ normal to sparse foliage/ presence of vines	2 or more major limbs dead/ significant structural deadwood/sparse necrotic or chlorotic foliage in crown/ vine inundation
Insects/Diseases	Normal pest presence	Past or current pest activity not significantly inhibiting vitality	Active activity or infestation negatively impacting tree health
Life Expectancy	Over 30 years	10 to 30 years	Less than 10 years
			Total Rating

D. Using the above scale, trees are to be replaced according to the following formula, with the actual number of replacement trees required rounded up to the next whole number:

Total Rating of Tree to Be Removed	Percentage of Basal Area to Be Replaced contingent on increasing the tree replacement costs expecting fewer trees to be replaced	
	Invasive Species Removed per § 12.12.080(B)(1) Encourage removal of undesirables as agreed to by the group	All Other Trees
6 to 15	.25%	1%
16 to 24	.5%	3%
25 to 30	1.5%	5%

Takoma Park Urban Forest[1] Goals

(Proposed by the Committee on the Environment for community discussion)

PROPOSED VISION STATEMENT:

The Takoma Park City Council recognizes the wide range of ecological, social, and economic benefits that a healthy urban forest provides its residents[2]. Among these is the vital role that our forest has in promoting the City's resilience to climate change, and the role that native tree species have in supporting local and regional biodiversity of plants and wildlife – a major benefit, given the current global biodiversity extinction crisis.

In response to both the current climate emergency and the global biodiversity extinction crisis; and with the objective of equitably expanding to all Takoma Park residents the benefits trees provide—the City will prioritize growing and sustaining a healthy urban forest in ways: that provide essential ecosystem services for all residents; that help mitigate climate change; and that enhance the health and diversity of native flora and fauna.

Proposed Goals for Community Discussion:

The CoE proposes the following draft goals to advance the Council's, city staff's, and residents' discussion in designing specific strategies to achieve the vision above:

1. **Expand Resident/Community Participation—**The City will promote greater understanding of the benefits of trees, and resident participation in the development and implementation of goals.

   Strategy/Implementation examples include: (a) the City acquiring assistance of urban-forest NGOs and/or the U.S. Forest Service in developing a Takoma Park website covering the selection, planting, and care/maintenance of trees[3]; and (b) the City facilitating neighborhoods taking advantage of county and state tree-related environmental education and tree planting incentive programs[4] (e.g. Maryland Urban/Community Forestry Committee grants to community groups for planting trees and carrying out education projects.) Other examples of expanded participation are in the goals that follow.

2. **Promote Environmental Justice in Offering Tree Benefits—**The City will maximize the benefits from trees for all, across all racial groups, incomes, housing types, and wards—but do so in a way that responds to the informed preferences of those neighborhoods that are now underserved by trees. For at least the next five years, this would require focusing the bulk of the City's community outreach, education, and spending on the planting and care of trees in the Wards and neighborhoods with the least tree-canopy cover. According to the recent Tree Canopy Assessment, the citywide average for tree-canopy cover was 58 percent in 2018. Ward 2 averaged the highest cover, at 66 per cent. The City should prioritize creating opportunities for residents, businesses, and property owners in the neighborhoods below the citywide average to: (1) learn about the benefits of trees, and (2) help plan whether, where, and how to increase the tree canopy around their homes and businesses. Ward 6, with tree-canopy cover of 44 per cent, and Ward 4, with 52 per cent, are the most obvious areas to be designated with priority status. (Other wards have – 1: 60%, 3: 58%, and 5: 60%.)

Strategy/Implementation Examples: The Council could direct that a certain, high proportion of City Urban Forest funding be set aside to meet the needs of Wards 6 and 4, including for outreach, education, and securing community input as to where residents in those areas desire trees to be planted, on both City and private property. While input is being sought, the Council could also reserve a high proportion of the City's tree-planting budget for planting on City property to respond quickly to resident demand in underserved Wards and neighborhoods. The City could also prioritize securing new funding (see last goal) for tree planting and care on private property, as desired by residents, in those Wards.

3. **Create a Prioritized City Tree Planting Plan and Map—**the City will develop and make public an on-line available map that assists in the planning and implementation of actions for achieving the city's urban forest goals. (e.g. identifying locations and actions for achieving environmental justice, addressing storm water runoff, tracking decline in tree health, planning planting programs, etc.).

   Strategy/Implementation Examples: The City will create, maintain, and make publicly available a professional inventory of government "owned" trees—those found in street right of ways, parks, schools, and city-owned property to assist the Urban Forest Manager with planning, planting, maintenance, and assessment. Professionally supervised public participation could be a cost-effective way of accumulating and updating the data and for expanding the inventory to trees on private property. Public participation is also an effective means for conducting outreach, and promoting engagement and awareness. City will utilize an inventory system for recording and maintaining data for both public and private property. Encouraging professional arborists to record data as part of their services could increase over time the quantity and quality of data for private property in the City.

4. **Establish a Species Planting List**— The City will develop, publish, and update a tree and shrub species list that will among other priorities promote the forest's ecological health and the conservation of biodiversity. The city will select from this list in the plantings on city property and the promoting of planting on private property.

   Strategy/Implementation Examples: Species-attributes such as: availability, transplant success, cost, resilience to urban environmental conditions, and climate change adaptability will be considered. In addition, a determining priority will be the capacity for delivering ecosystem services addressing global climate change and the biodiversity/habitat-degradation crises. The public will receive incentives to follow the list. (See[5] table of 86-species under development for City consideration.)

5. **Stewardship of Existing Urban Forest and Planted Trees—**The City will make a priority the maintenance and conservation of established and as well as recently planted trees on city land and will provide outreach and educational materials to the public in the proper care of trees on private land. This is in recognition of the fact that tree conservation and proper care is key to the maintenance and expansion of the City's forest.

   Strategy/Implementation Examples: This goal will be achieved through both City staff and resident/community participation. The City will update a strong and flexible tree ordinance for existing trees, and will identify, implement, and monitor best practices for installation, watering, pruning, utility work, and early detection and response to pests and disease. The public (neighborhood groups and interested residents) will be educated and supported by the staff in doing monitoring for best practices and in particular assisting in watering during the first few years after planting. The information gained for public trees can be transferred to stewardship on private land.

5

6. **<u>Community Asset and Community Funding/Support</u>** – Because the trees in the city are a "community good"—even those on private property— the Council will establish an incentive fund for the planting and maintenance of trees on private property.

   <u>Strategy/Implementation Examples:</u> The funds could be drawn from: a new "tree fund" (possibly analogues to the stormwater fund), generally city revenue, and usage fees. The city could make funds available on a matching or "in-kind" basis, (e.g., matching funds, labor) from property owners, businesses; and neighborhood, civic, church, and school groups. These funds could be complemented by state and county urban forest incentive funds[4]. Additional funds for staff (particularly support for the urban forester) and for consultants are needed

The CoE recommends that implementation should begin for those goals, or their elements, for which there is agreement, and the path to proceed is clear. "Perfection should not be the enemy of the good." A complete plan and implementation package is not needed before starting on obvious items.

Endnotes

1. "Forest" is a more inclusive term than "canopy," (i.e., top-down coverage), for including goals we are trying to achieve—health, diversity of species, age structure, and other ecosystem services

2. "Benefits of the Urban Forest We Want to Promote"—list presented by the City Council at 9/11/2019 Work Session

- ► Sequesters carbon to enhance resilience and mitigate climate change
- ► Reduces energy consumption
- ► Mitigates temperature extremes
- ► Promotes health through control of air, noise, and visual pollution
- ► Supports wildlife
- ► Enhances aesthetics of the city
- ► Improves property values
- ► Improves quality of life
- ► Controls stormwater runoff
- ► Supports the biologic and hydrologic integrity of watersheds, including Long Branch, Takoma Branch, Sligo Creek, and the Chesapeake Bay

3. Example of public outreach and education website:
https://caseytrees.org/resources/?search=&resource_category=how-tos

4. Montgomery County Tree-Planting Programs

Additional funding options available to Takoma Park include the following County and State incentive and grant programs for promoting the planting of urban forests.

Program	TP Qualifies	Process	Notes/Comments
Tree Montgomery	Yes	*Simple on-line application but long waiting list*	*Program staff plants 10-foot tall shade trees on public and private property for free-- target are areas affected by development, and places with little tree canopy or a real need for shade. Program* does not plant street trees.
Street Tree Programs	?		*If you want the County to replace a street tree or plant a new one, submit a request online, or contact the Division of Highway Services by calling MC 311. Many cities have street tree planting programs (e.g., Cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg). Contact municipalities them directly for more information.*

Shades of Green	No		*Shades of Green, a program of the Montgomery County Planning Department, provides free trees and planting for qualifying property owners in urban areas of the County.*
Marylanders Plant Trees	Yes	Download $25 coupon	*Sponsored by the Maryland Forest Service-download a coupon to receive $25 off a native tree at participating nurseries across the State. On residential properties, the Maryland coupon can be combined with the* Leaves for Neighborhoods *coupon for additional savings.*
Leaves for Neighborhood	Yes	Download $40 coupon	*Download a coupon to receive $40 off the purchase of a native tree with a retail value of at least $75 at participating nurseries. This coupon may be combined with the* Marylanders Plant Trees *coupon for additional savings.*
Backyard Buffers	Yes	Contact Montgomery County Coordinator: James Eierdam 301-854-6060 james.eierdam@maryland.gov	*Property owners with a stream or other waterway on, or adjacent to, their property can receive a free "buffer in a bag". Each bag includes 20 to 30 native tree and shrub seedlings, each approximately 1 to 2 feet in height, and well adapted to streamside conditions.*
Tree-Mendous Maryland	Yes		*Helps volunteers restore tree cover on public land and community open space, including parks, street trees, and schools. Trees are provided at low prices. Technical assistance to plant and maintain the trees is also available.*
Maryland Urban and Community Forestry Committee (MUCFC) Grants program	Yes	Submit proposal— in-kind effort and matching-funds considered in awarding grants	*Provides funds (max $1,500/grant) to community groups to plant trees and carry out education projects. Projects must be on public lands. Proposal due to Grants Chair, with forestry board member original signature, by 4:30 p.m. on February, June or September 15 technical assistance available through* TREE-Mendous Maryland*. Matching funds and/or in-kind support.*
Rain-Scapes Rewards Rebates	No		

5. The table below contains candidate species and cultivars being evaluated for inclusion in a Takoma Park list of trees and shrubs from which the City will select for both its planting and for promoting planting on private property. With further development, some species will be removed and others added; and for each species included specific information such as ecological value, height, crown spread, required growing conditions, and suitable landscape use (e.g. parking lots, utility strips, open field) will be provided.

Candidate Native Tree/Shrub Species—86 Species, 46 Genera, and 28 Families Represented

Acer saccarinum	Scarlet maple	*G. tricantha* cultivar	'Shademaster'	*Quercus falcata*	Southern Red Oak
Acer negundo	Box elder	*Halesia monticola*	Mountain Silverbell	*Quercus imbricaria*	Shingle Oak
Acer rubrum	Red Maple	*Hamamelis virginiana*	Witch Hazel	*Quercus lyrata*	Overcup Oak
Acer saccarum	Sugar maple	*Ilex decidua*	Possumhaw	*Quercus macrocarpa*	Bur Oak
Aesculus flava	Yellow buckeye	*Ilex opaca*	American Holly	*Quercus marilandica*	Blackjack, jack oak
Alnus serrulata	Smooth, hazel alder	*Juglans nigra*	Black walnut	*Quercus michauxii*	Swamp chestnut oak
Amelanchier arborea	Downy Serviceberry	*Juniperus virginiana*	Eastern Red Cedar	*Quercus montana*	Chestnut oak
Amelanchier canadensis	Shadblow Serviceberry	*Liriodendron tulipifera*	Tuliptree, Tulip Poplar	*Quercus muehlenbergii*	Chinkapin Oak
Amelanchier laevis	Allegheny Serviceberry	*Liquidambar styraciflua*	American Sweetgum	*Quercus nuttalli*	Nuttall Oak
AmelanchierXgrandiflora	Apple Serviceberry	" cultivar	'Cherokee'	*Quercus palustris*	Pin Oak
Asimina triloba	Pawpaw	" cultivar	'Hapdell Happidaze'.	*Quercus phellos*	Willow Oak
Betula lenta	Sweet birch	" cultivar	Low Fruiting	*Quercus rubra*	Northern Red Oak
Betula nigra	River Birch	*Magnolia virginiana*	Sweetbay Magnolia	*Quercus stellata*	Post oak, iron oak
Betula papyrifera	Paper birch	*Malus coronaria*	Sweet crabapple	*Quercus velutina*	Black or yellow bark oak
C. viridis cultivar	'Winter King'	*Morus rubra*	Red mulberry	*Rhus copalluina*	Winged sumac
Carpinus caroliniana	American Hornbeam	*Nyssa sylvatica*	Black Gum, Black Tupelo	*Rhus glabra*	Smooth sumac
Carya cordiformis	Swamp hickory	" cultivar	'Wildfire'	*Rhus typhina*	Staghorn sumac

Carya glabra	Pignut hickory	*Ostrya virginiana*	Eastern hophornbeam	*Robinia pseudoacacia*	Black Locust
Carya ovata	Shagbark Hickory	*Oxydendrum arboreum*	Sourwood	*Salix nigra*	Black, swamp willow
Carya tomentosa	Mockernut hickory	*Pinus echinata*	Southern yellow pine	*Salix sericea*	Silky willow
Castanea pumila	Alleghany chinkapin	*Pinus rigida*	Pitch pine	*Sassafras albidum*	Sassafras
Catalpa speciosa	Northern Catalpa	*Pinus strobus*	Eastern White Pine	*Taxodium distichum*	Common Bald Cypress
Celtis occidentalis	Hackberry	*Pinus virginiana*	Virginia pine	*Tilia americana*	American Linden
Cercis canadensis	Eastern Redbud	*Platanus occidentalis*	Sycamore	" cultivar	'Redmond'
Chionanthus virginicus	White Fringetree	*Populus deltoides*	Eastern cottonwood	*Tsuga canadensis*	Eastern hemlock
Cladrastis kentukea	American Yellowwood	*Populus heterophylla*	Swamp poplar	*Ulmus americana*	American elm
Cornus florida	Flowering Dogwood	*Prunus americana*	American or wild plum	" cultivar	'Jefferson'
" cultivar	'Appalachian Spring'	*Prunus serotina*	Black or wild cherry,	" cultivar	'New Harmony'
Crataegus phaenopyrum	Washington hawthorn	*Prunus virginiana*	Chokecherry	" cultivar	'Valley Forge'
Diospyros virginiana	Common Persimmon	*Quercus alba*	White Oak	*Ulmus rubra*	Red elm
Fagus grandifolia	American Beech	*Quercus bicolor*	Swamp White Oak	*Viburnum prunifolium*	Blackhaw Viburnum
Gleditsia triacanthos	Honey Locust	*Quercus coccinea*	Scarlet Oak		

***Source:** Compiled by Lizz Kleemeier from Casey Trees, US Fish & Wildlife, DC government, Montgomery County, and Montgomery College publications, webpages, and other documentation.