

PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland



Street Tree Inventory Report Kenton Neighborhood November 2011

Street Tree Inventory Report: Kenton Neighborhood

November 2011

Compiled by:

Angie DiSalvo, Danielle Fuchs, Zach Gustafson, and Isaac Sandlin Portland Parks & Recreation Urban Forestry 503-823-4489 angie.disalvo@portlandoregon.gov http://portlandonline.com/parks/treeinventory

Kenton Tree Inventory Organizers

Stacey Halpern, Julia Harakay, and Angela Moos

Tree Inventory Volunteers

Bruce Abe, Susan Abe, Dale Baer, Willa Bauman, Ian Bonham, Emily Burkett, Sam Claude, Ronna Craig, David Dearth, Christine DeSmet, Cari Ebbert, Tim Ernst, Danielle Fuchs, Fiona Gladstone, Stacey Halpern, Julia Harakay, Laurilyn Hepler, Kitt Jennings, Steven Joiner, Bill Kownacki, Mark LaPine, Natasha Lipai, Erin Martin, Kari McFarlan, Judy Mikowski, Angela Moos, Matthew O'Connor, John Page, Gloria Pittel, David Taylor, and Linda Wiener

Consulting Arborist Rick Faber

GIS Technical Support Josh Darling, Portland Parks & Recreation

Technical Advisor Rob Crouch, Portland Parks & Recreation

Financial Support Portland Parks & Recreation and East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District

Portland Parks & Recreation 1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1302 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 823-PLAY www.PortlandParks.org



Commissioner Nick Fish Director Mike Abbaté

Table of Contents

Project Overview
Neighborhood Characteristics 2
Tree Distribution.3Tree type distribution3Species diversity.3Functional tree type and mature tree size distribution5
Tree Size Distribution5Tree size (relative tree age)5
Tree Condition
Stocking Level
Replacement Values
Environmental and Aesthetic Benefits
Recommendations 11
References
Appendices.15A: Methods15B: Street trees of Kenton by tree type.17C: Street trees of Kenton by size (map)20D: Small street trees (trees <3" DBH) (map)
G: Available street tree planting spaces (map) 24 H: Priority street tree planting spaces (map) 25



Volunteers guided by Portland Parks & Recreation Urban Forestry staff collected data on all 2,946 street trees within Kenton neighborhood to compile the neighborhood's first complete street tree inventory. Data is being used to inform the creation of a Neighborhood Stewardship Plan to guide volunteers in caring for their community's trees.

Project Overview

Project Overview

This report provides results of a street tree inventory conducted in the Kenton neighborhood in 2011, along with Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R) Urban Forestry staff recommendations to improve the condition of the urban forest.

Street trees were inventoried in Kenton in summer 2011 by trained volunteers and PP&R Urban Forestry staff. Over the course of three monthly workshops, 32 volunteers contributed 212 hours collecting data on 2,946 trees. Street trees at every tax lot in the neighborhood were inventoried; data collected included tree type (species or genus), condition, size (diameter at breast height), planting strip width, and presence of overhead high voltage lines. Data was supplemented with available planting space data collected by the Bureau of Environmental Services in 2010 and 2011.

Volunteers experienced and trained in tree identification acted as team leaders, and data was collected in pairs on paper forms. Questions regarding species or site identification were answered by certified arborists and PP&R staff during data collection. Staff conducted spot checks on data to verify accuracy. Data was later digitized and entered by staff into an ArcGIS geodatabase.

Residents of the Kenton Neighborhood and the Kenton Neighborhood Association were essential to organizing workshops, recruiting volunteers, and promoting the project within the community. A special note of thanks is due to inventory organizers Stacey Halpern, Julia Harakay, and Angela Moos for their tireless dedication to the project.

Funding for this project was provided by PP&R Urban Forestry and an East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District Partners in Conservation grant.

If you would like to get involved with Kenton's urban forest, contact the Kenton Neighborhood Association by visiting <u>http://historickenton.com</u> or contacting PP&R Urban Forestry.

Data from the inventory is available to the public in spreadsheet or ArcGIS format by contacting PP&R Urban Forestry.

Neighborhood Characteristics

Kenton neighborhood is located in north Portland (Figure 1). The western boundary (traveling from north to south, respectively) follows N. Portland Road, N. Columbia Boulevard and N. Chautauqua Boulevard; the north boundary is Hayden Island; Interstate 5 is the eastern boundary; and N. Lombard Street is the southern boundary.

Figure 1: Location of Kenton neighborhood in Portland



Neighborhood landmarks include the Historic Downtown Kenton business district on North Denver Avenue, the Portland International Raceway, and the Portland Metropolitan Expo Center. The historic site of Vanport City, a public housing project built to provide homes for World War II shipbuilders, and later destroyed by a 1948 flood, is also located within the current boundaries of the Kenton neighborhood. Key neighborhood tree assets include the Moore Island City Park, Kenton City Park, Delta Park West, the Columbia Slough riparian area, and the Vanport Wetlands Wildlife Habitat. Kenton is located in the Columbia Slough watershed.

According to 2000 Census data (Table 1), 66% of homes in Kenton are owner-occupied. The median income is near \$39,000/year, with 15% percent of residents living below the poverty level. Compared to city-wide averages, Kenton has a lower median income, higher perentage of homeowners occupying properties, and more residents living below the poverty level.

Table	1: N	eight	orhood	and	citvy	vide	demo	oraphics
Labic	T. TA	cigin	Joi noou	anu	cityv	viuc	ucino	graphics

Demographics (2000 Census)	Kenton	Portland
Area	2,193 acres	89,651 acres
Population	6,934	527,750
Density	3 persons/acre	6 persons/acre
Demographics	61% white; 39% non-white	72% white; 28% non-white
% of properties occupied by homeowners	66%	56%
Median income	\$38,505	\$43,958
% below poverty level	15%	11%

Tree Distribution

TREE TYPE DISTRIBUTION

Kenton's public rights-of-way host a diverse array of tree types (trees identified to the species or genus level). The street tree population consists of 2,946 trees of 92 types. Fifteen tree types comprise nearly 67% of the resource, leaving the remaining types to represent less than 2% of the resource each (Table 2). Norway maples are the most common tree type, representing 8.2% of all street trees. Plum, cherry, and pear represent close to 7% of the resource each.

Common	Species	Number	% of	Mean
Name		of Trees	Total Trees	DBH
maple, Norway	Acer platanoides	242	8.2%	10.9
plum	Prunus spp.	197	6.7%	9.9
cherry	Prunus spp.	194	6.6%	10.7
pear	Pyrus spp.	194	6.6%	10.9
maple, other	Acer spp.	192	6.5%	7.2
ash	Fraxinus spp.	171	5.8%	8.8
maple, red	Acer rubrum	135	4.6%	8.8
dogwood	Cornus spp.	121	4.1%	4.7
crabapple	Malus spp.	98	3.3%	4.0
linden	<i>Tilia</i> spp.	86	2.9%	10.4
birch	<i>Betula</i> spp.	75	2.5%	14.3
hawthorn	Crataegus spp.	73	2.5%	7.9
maple, paperbark	Acer griseum	66	2.2%	4.7
locust honey	Gleditsia triacanthos	60	2.0%	3.8
maple, Japanese	Acer palmatum	60	2.0%	3.1

Table 2: Distribution of the 15 most abundant street tree types in Kenton

Thirty-six tree families are represented in the neighborhood, and the fifteen most abundant families comprise 92.4% of the resource. Rosaceae (rose) and Aceraceae (maple) are the most commonly found and represent 32.0% and 25.5% of trees, respectively (Table 3). Other important families include Oleaceae (olive) with 6.1%, Fabaceae (legume) with 4.7%, Betulaceae (birch) with 4.5%, and Magnoliaceae (magnolia) with 3.0%

SPECIES DIVERSITY

A general rule of thumb for urban forest species diversity is the 10-20-30 rule (Santamour 1990). No species should represent more than 10% of the total, no genus should represent more than 20% of the total, and no family should represent more than 30% of the total. Kenton's tree distribution meets the species diversity guideline for individual species, but not for genus or family. The maple genus (*Acer*) is overrepresented at 25.5% of the resource and the rose family (Rosaceae) is overrepresented at 32.0% of all trees.

Family	Family	Tree Types Included	Number of	% of
Scientific Name	Common Name	in the Family	Trees	Total Trees
Rosaceae	rose	apple, cherry, crabapple, dogwood, hawthorn, mountain ash, peach, pear, plum, serviceberry	944	32.0%
Aceraceae	maple	boxelder, maple	750	25.5%
Oleaceae	olive	ash, Chinese fringe tree, lilac tree, olive	179	6.1%
Fabaceae	legume	amur maackia, black locust, golden chain tree, Kentucky coffeetree, honey locust, mimosa tree, pagoda tree, redbud, yellow wood	138	4.7%
Betulaceae	birch	alder, birch, hazelnut, hophornbeam, hornbeam	133	4.5%
Magnoliaceae	magnolia	magnolia, tulip poplar	88	3.0%
Malvaceae	mallow	linden	86	2.9%
Fagaceae	beech	beech, chestnut, oak	70	2.4%
Ulmaceae	elm	elm, zelkova	62	2.1%
Sapindaceae	soapberry	golden rain tree, horsechestnut	59	2.0%
Pinaceae	pine	cedar, douglas-fir, fir, hemlock, larch, pine, spruce	58	2.0%
Styracaceae	styrax	snowbell	55	1.9%
Juglandaceae	walnut	walnut	35	1.2%
Cupressaceae	cypress	arborvitae, cryptomeria, cypress, giant sequioa, juniper, western redcedar	33	1.1%
Altingiaceae	sweetgum	sweetgum	31	1.1%

Table 3: Distribution of the 15 most abundant tree families in Kenton

FUNCTIONAL TREE TYPE AND MATURE TREE SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Broadleaf deciduous trees dominate the landscape, accounting for 95.7% of all street trees (Table 4). Broadleaf evergreen trees comprise 1.3% and coniferous evergreen trees comprise 3.0% of the total. Tree size designation (small, medium, and large) is determined by the mature size of the tree. Mediumsized trees account for 46.0% of the resource and small-sized trees account for 32.3%, while large trees account for 21.6%.

Functional				
Tree Type	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Broadleaf deciduous	31.6%	44.4%	19.6%	95.7%
Broadleaf evergreen	0.1%	1.3%	0%	1.3%
Coniferous evergreen	0.6%	0.3%	2.0%	3.0%
Palm evergreen	0.1%	0%	0%	0.1%
Total	32.3%	46.0%	21.6%	100.0%

Table 4: Distribution of trees by functional tree type and mature tree size

Tree Size Distribution

TREE SIZE (RELATIVE TREE AGE)

The relative ages of trees may be approximated using size measured by diameter at breast height (DBH). Generally, trees increase in size with age, along with the value of the tree and the magnitude of the benefits that the tree provides. Trees were categorized into diameter classes to show the proportion of trees at various stages of maturity (Figure 2). Note that an uneven-aged population is desirable for managing tree maintenance costs over time. Age diversity ensures that canopy coverage and community complexity are not reduced with mortality.

Kenton's streets host a wide range of tree sizes from the youngest half-inch sapling to the largest, a 65" DBH cottonwood (*Populus* spp.). Over half of all trees are less than 6" DBH, and only 5.3% are larger than 24" DBH (Figure 2). Tree size distribution is heavily skewed towards smaller (younger) trees.



Figure 2: Relative tree age (tree size by diameter class)

Tree size distributions are similar regardless of whether or not planting strips are located under high voltage power lines (Figure 3). Divided into functional size classes, Kenton's small and medium form trees dominate nearly all diameter classes under 30" DBH (Figure 4).





Figure 4: Relative tree age (tree size by diameter class) of trees by functional size class



Tree Condition

Tree condition was assessed by assigning trees to one of four categories: good, fair, poor, and dead. These general ratings reflect whether or not a tree is likely to continue contributing to the urban forest (good and fair trees) or whether the tree is at or near the end of its life (poor and dead trees). 46.7% of trees rated good, 43.4% rated fair, 8.9% poor, and 1.0% are dead (Table 5).

Table 5: Trees by condition class

Condition	% of
	Total Trees
Good	46.7%
Fair	43.4%
Poor	8.9%
Dead	1.0%

Of the most commonly found tree types, the healthiest trees were paperbark maple, linden, Japanese maple, dogwood, and red maple, of which at least 95% of trees rated good or fair (Table 6). In poorest condition were hawthorn, cherry, birch, and Norway maple, of which at least 13% of trees rated poor.

Common	Species	% of Total Trees (Number of Trees)			
Name		Good	Fair	Poor	
maple, Norway	Acer platanoides	41.7% (101)	44.6% (108)	13.6% (33)	
plum	Prunus spp.	49.2% (97)	40.6% (80)	10.2% (20)	
cherry	Prunus spp.	36.6% (71)	47.4% (92)	16.0% (31)	
pear	<i>Pyrus</i> spp.	35.1% (68)	59.8% (116)	5.2% (10)	
maple, other	Acer spp.	46.9% (90)	44.8% (86)	8.3% (16)	
ash	Fraxinus spp.	45.6% (78)	47.4% (81)	7.0% (12)	
maple, red	Acer rubrum	37.0% (50)	58.5% (79)	4.4% (6)	
dogwood	Cornus spp.	48.8% (59)	47.9% (58)	3.3% (4)	
crabapple	Malus spp.	50.0% (49)	39.8% (39)	10.2% (10)	
linden	<i>Tilia</i> spp.	55.8% (48)	41.9% (36)	2.3% (2)	
birch	<i>Betula</i> spp.	37.3% (28)	48.0% (36)	14.7% (11)	
hawthorn	Crataegus spp.	30.1% (22)	53.4% (39)	16.4% (12)	
maple, paperbark	Acer griseum	42.4% (28)	56.1% (37)	1.5% (1)	
locust honey	Gleditsia triacanthos	35.0% (21)	58.3% (35)	6.7% (4)	
maple, Japanese	Acer palmatum	60.0% (36)	36.7% (22)	3.3% (2)	

Table 6: Condition class percentages and numbers of trees for the 15 most abundant tree types

Stocking Level

STOCKING LEVEL

Street tree stocking level reflects the percentage of planting spaces that are currently occupied by trees. Kenton's stocking level for residential areas is 59% (Table 7). Stocking level data in Table 7 was provided by the Bureau of Environmental Services and excludes commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential sites.

Planting Strip	Available	Existing	Total	Stocking
Code and Description	Planting Spaces	Trees	Spaces	Level
A 2.5-3' with or without wires	451	256	707	36%
B 3-4' with or without wires	302	256	558	46%
C 4-6' without wires	300	386	686	56%
D 4-6' with wires	170	308	478	64%
E 6-8.5' without wires	140	305	445	69%
F >6' with wires	192	549	741	74%
G >8.5' without wires	237	480	717	67%
Totals	1,792	2,540	4,332	59%

Table 7: Street tree stocking level data for single-family residential lots

Planting space availability is subject to a number of guidelines, including width of the planting strip, presence/absence of high voltage power lines, and distance from conflicts (property lines, stop signs, etc). In single-family residential lots, 1,792 empty spaces have been identified for tree planting in residential areas in Kenton. Planting spaces are categorized into planting strip categories based upon width and overhead wire presence. Higher stocking levels are generally found in larger planting strips, and planting strips larger than six feet in width without overhead wires are at least 67% stocked.

RIGHT TREE IN THE RIGHT PLACE

Tree placement is vital for maximizing the benefits trees provide and minimizing avoidable costs. The right tree in the right place will experience fewer obstacles to reaching maturity and is easier to maintain.

Large planting strips without high voltage power lines provide the best opportunity for expanding canopy and maximizng benefits from trees. A small-growing tree in a large planting strip represents a missed opportunity, as it will not live as long or grow as large as a larger-growing tree. In 6-8.5' wide planting strips without wires, 54% of trees are undersized for the strip (Table 8). In planting strips 8.5' or greater without wires, 57% of trees are undersized for the strip.

Planting Strip Code and Description	Tree species planted are large enough for strip	Tree species planted are too small for strip
E 6-8.5' without wires	46% (96)	54% (111)
G >8.5' without wires	43% (294)	57% (391)

Table 8: Percentage and number of adequately sized trees growing in large planting strips without wires

Replacement Values

Replacement values for street trees in Kenton were calculated using iTree Streets, an urban forest analysis software suite developed by the USDA Forest Service. A replacement value is an estimate of the full cost of replacing a tree in its current condition, should it be removed for some reason. Species ratings, replacement costs, and basic prices were obtained for each species from regional appraisal guides. The replacement cost of Kenton's tree population is valued at \$7,488,187. The most valuable size classes of trees are those between 12" DBH and 18" DBH (Figure 5). Replacement values are the highest for Norway maple (\$797,348), horsechestnut (\$732,517), and pear (\$590,014).



Figure 5: Replacement values of trees by diameter class (inches)

Environmental and Aesthetic Benefits

Using iTree Streets, Kenton's street tree population was assessed to quantify the dollar value of annual environmental services and aesthetic benefits provided by trees: energy conservation, air quality improvement, carbon dioxide reduction, stormwater control, and property value increase. The model relies on tree size and species, as well as current pricing for electricity rates, median home resale value, regional stormwater interception costs, and costs of tree maintenance.

Kenton's street trees provide over \$231,000 annually in environmental and aesthetic benefits, as calculated by iTree Streets (Table 9). Annual benefits are valued by category at approximately \$11,000 in energy savings, \$2,000 in carbon sequestration, \$3,500 in air quality improvement, \$44,000 in storm water management, and \$171,000 in aesthetic and other benefits. Each tree provides an average of \$79 worth of benefits annually.

Table 9: Valuation of the environmental and aesthetic benefits provided annually by Kenton's trees

Benefits	Total (\$)	\$ / Tree
Energy savings	\$10,925	\$3.71
Carbon sequestration	\$2,129	\$0.72
Air quality improvement	\$3,450	\$1.17
Stormwater processing	\$44,058	\$14.96
Aesthetics	\$171,049	\$58.06
Total benefits	\$231,611	\$78.62

Of the most common tree types, Norway maple, pear, linden, and red maple provide the highest annual per tree benefits, at least \$102 per tree (Table 10). Crabapple, dogwood, and honey locust trees provide the least amount of benefits at half or less of the average per tree.

Table 10: Average annual environmental	and aesthetic benefits provided by	Kenton's most abundant
street tree types		

Tree Type	Energy	CO2	Air	Storm	Aesthetic/	Total (\$)
			Quality	water	Other	per tree
ash	\$3.21	\$0.65	\$1.24	\$14.92	\$70.96	\$90.97
birch	\$5.89	\$0.45	\$1.94	\$25.20	\$55.07	\$88.56
cherry	\$3.26	\$1.72	\$1.16	\$9.66	\$45.43	\$61.23
crabapple	\$0.85	\$0.29	\$0.28	\$2.04	\$13.94	\$17.40
dogwood	\$0.92	\$0.34	\$0.31	\$2.27	\$15.18	\$19.02
hawthorn	\$2.23	\$0.96	\$0.78	\$5.99	\$31.24	\$41.19
honeylocust	\$0.94	\$0.22	\$0.29	\$3.20	\$27.13	\$31.77
linden	\$4.59	\$0.88	\$1.46	\$16.95	\$80.82	\$104.71
maple, Japanese	\$1.23	\$0.23	\$0.37	\$4.88	\$63.48	\$70.19
maple, Norway	\$6.08	\$0.97	\$2.02	\$26.84	\$94.90	\$130.80
maple, other	\$4.02	\$0.47	\$1.27	\$13.97	\$70.17	\$89.90
maple, paperbark	\$2.01	\$0.37	\$0.61	\$8.21	\$77.45	\$88.65
maple, red	\$4.93	\$0.54	\$1.57	\$17.21	\$78.47	\$102.71
pear	\$5.36	\$0.70	\$1.22	\$21.01	\$80.15	\$108.44
plum	\$2.80	\$1.29	\$0.98	\$7.77	\$40.41	\$53.25

Recommendations

Based on street tree inventory data presented in this report, PP&R Urban Forestry staff make the following recommendations for Kenton neighborhood.

PLANTING

- Kenton's street tree stocking level is 59% and 1,792 spaces have been identified for planting street trees.
- Planting opportunities should be prioritized to plant large-form trees in large planting strips (>6') without overhead wires. In these planting strips, 377 spaces have been identified for planting.
- Planting in the smallest planting strips is not a priority, as they are more difficult to manage and provide very little return on investment. However, all plantings help contribute to a neighborhood "tree ethic" and encourage others to plant.
- Plantings should continue to include a diverse array of species, genera, and families, particularly those outside of the other than maple (*Acer*) and in the rose (Rosaceae) family.
- Take advantage of existing planting programs, such as low cost trees through Friends of Trees. These plantings are currently subsidized by the City for the next few years; afterwards cost and availability may change.

YOUNG TREE ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE

- With 50% of trees being 6" DBH or less, special attention should be paid to properly water and establish young trees. Small trees represent the future generation of street trees, and early care and training will pay off in future benefits.
- Young trees should be structurally pruned to promote proper form as street trees. This includes removing low limbs for pedestrian and traffic clearance and removing codominate leaders. This is critical in the first ten years after planting.
- Educate property owners on how to properly care for trees (pruning, watering, and root barriers) in order to reduce and delay future problems and conflicts with infrastructure.

MATURE TREE MAINTENANCE

- With 5.3% of trees being larger than 24" DBH, special care should be taken to maintain and care for larger trees. Trees provide the most benefits as they reach maturity, and without early maintenance, tree care is the most expensive for large trees. Increasing the level of maintenance of large, old trees will maximize the ecosystem services provided by these high value members of the urban forest.
- Seek funding or assistance for low-income property owners to care for mature trees.

- Retain existing large trees in fair and good condition. Benefits and time are lost when older trees are removed and replaced with smaller tree species.
- Promote the importance and benefits of large-form species and mature trees within the community.
- Nominate trees for Portland's Heritage Tree program to promote interest in trees and appreciation for mature and diverse specimens. Kenton currently has only one tree in the Heritage Tree program.

REMOVALS

- Encourage removal and replacement of dead trees and trees in poor condition.
- Encourage replacement of underperforming species, including undersized trees in large rights-ofway, with higher functioning, appropriately sized trees.

References

City of Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement and US Census Bureau. 2000. 2000 Portland Neighborhood Demographic Data. http://www.portlandonline.com/oni/index.cfm?c=28387

Portland Parks & Recreation. 2007. Portland's Urban Forest Canopy: Assessment and Public Tree Evaluation. http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=171829

Santamour, Frank S., Jr. 1990. Trees for Urban Planting: Diversity, Uniformity, and Common Sense. *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of Metropolitan Tree Improvement Alliance (METRIA)* 7:57-65.

US Forest Service. iTree Streets (version 3.1). http://www.itreetools.org

Appendices

Appendix A: Methods

Street trees were inventoried in summer 2011 by trained volunteers and PP&R Urban Forestry staff. Street trees at every tax lot in the neighborhood were inventoried, except in industrial areas, which were excluded. Street trees are located in the public right-of-way, typically between the sidewalk and curb.

Data collected included tree type (species or genus), condition, size (diameter at breast height), planting strip width, and presence of overhead high voltage lines.

<u>Tree type</u>: trees were identified to the genus or species. Six maple species were identified to the species level, and these are bigleaf (*Acer macrophyllum*) Japanese (*A. palmatum*), Norway (*A. platanoides*), paperbark (*A. griseum*), red (*A. rubrum*) and silver (*A. saccharinum*) maple. All other maple species were identified as "maple, other." Tree types of dead trees are listed as "unknown" as identification was difficult.

<u>Tree condition</u>: trees were rated as either good, fair, poor, or dead. These general ratings reflect whether or not a tree is likely to continue contributing to the urban forest (good and fair trees) or whether the tree is at or near the end of its life (poor and dead trees). The following guidelines were used.

Good: tree is healthy and vigorous with no apparent problems. Bark is undamaged, trunk is sound and solid, and crown is full.

Fair: Tree is in average condition. Tree many need some pruning and have some dead branches. Damage to bark is minimal and there is no decay on trunk. Other problems are minimal.

Poor: tree is in a general state of decline as indicated by the presence of cavities, conks, decay, and many dead branches.

Dead: Tree is dead or close to dying.

<u>Tree size</u>: Diameter at breast height (4.5' above ground) was measured with a diameter tape. Measurements of trees with branches, forks, or swelling at 4.5' were taken lower on the tree. Trees with multiple stems close to ground level were measured individually, and PP&R staff made final diameter calculations in the office.

<u>Planting strip width</u>: Planting strip width was measured from the inside of the curb to the sidewalk.

High voltage wires: Only high voltage wires were recorded.

Inventory data was supplemented with available planting space data collected by the Bureau of Environmental Services in 2010 and 2011. BES canvassing staff recorded the number of trees present and available spaces for trees by taxlot in single-family residential areas. This data was used to calculate stocking level.

Volunteer neighborhood coordinators recruited volunteers to conduct street tree inventories during three Saturday work days. Volunteers interested in being inventory "team leaders" attended a 3.5 hour training to learn to identify tree species and site conditions, and how to collect and record data.

During work days, team leaders were paired with novice volunteers to collect data in a three to four block area. Groups were given a clipboard containing a map, data entry sheets, tree type abbreviations, and a list of trees planted by Friends of Trees in the neighborhood. Volunteers wore safety vests and carried a diameter tape, tree identification book, and bags for collecting samples.

In addition to PP&R staff, one or more volunteer "arborists-on-call" was available on inventory work days to assist volunteers with questions. Accuracy was stressed as highly important, and volunteers utilized the arborist-on-call to verify species identification as questions arose. Data was collected on paper maps and forms, and later digitized in ArcGIS by PP&R staff.

Accuracy of volunteer-collected data was checked by PP&R staff and corrections made as necessary. Remaining areas not completed during inventory work days were inventoried by volunteer team leaders and PP&R staff. In Kenton, 70% of the inventory was collected by volunteers and 30% by PP&R staff. Spot-checks of the final data set found species identifications to be 95% accurate.

Common	Scientific	Number	% of	Mean
Name	Name	of Trees	Total Trees	DBH
alder	Alnus spp.	1	0.0%	2.1
American sycamore	Platanus occidentalis	5	0.2%	5.3
apple	Malus domestica	38	1.3%	7.6
arborvitae	Thuja arborvitae	11	0.4%	3.2
ash	Fraxinus spp.	171	5.8%	8.8
beech	Fagus spp.	8	0.3%	2.3
birch	Betula spp.	75	2.5%	14.3
black locust	Robinia pseudoacacia	21	0.7%	13.6
boxelder	Acer negundo	14	0.5%	14.4
camellia	<i>Camellia</i> spp.	1	0.0%	13.7
cascara	Rhamnus purshiana	12	0.4%	2.0
catalpa	<i>Catalpa</i> spp.	5	0.2%	5.5
cedar	Cedrus spp.	10	0.3%	10.9
cherry	Prunus spp.	194	6.6%	10.7
chestnut	Castanea spp.	3	0.1%	29.3
Chinese fringe tree	Chionanthus retusus	2	0.1%	1.2
crabapple	Malus spp.	98	3.3%	4.0
crape myrtle	Lagerstroemia indica	9	0.3%	3.7
cryptomeria	Cryptomeria spp.	1	0.0%	29.0
cypress	Chamaecyparis spp.	9	0.3%	5.2
dogwood	Cornus spp.	121	4.1%	4.7
douglas-fir	Pseudotsuga menziesii	12	0.4%	19.5
elm	<i>Ulmus</i> spp.	32	1.1%	14.5
empress tree	Paulownia tomentosa	1	0.0%	4.4
eucalyptus	<i>Eucalyptus</i> spp.	1	0.0%	0.0
fig	Ficus spp.	5	0.2%	3.9
fir	Abies spp.	3	0.1%	8.6
franklinia	Franklinia alatamaha	1	0.0%	1.6
giant sequoia	Sequoiadendron giganteum	1	0.0%	15.9
ginkgo	Ginkgo biloba	17	0.6%	2.2
glorybower	Clerodendron spp.	17	0.6%	6.0
golden chain tree	Laburnum anagyroides	9	0.3%	4.1
golden rain tree	Koelreuteria paniculata	18	0.6%	3.9
hawthorn	Crataegus spp.	73	2.5%	7.9
hazelnut	Corylus spp.	2	0.1%	5.2
hemlock	<i>Tsuga</i> spp.	1	0.0%	19.3
holly	<i>Ilex</i> spp.	7	0.2%	8.2
honey locust	Gleditsia triacanthos	60	2.0%	3.8
hophornbeam	Ostrya spp.	3	0.1%	2.4
hornbeam	Carpinus spp.	52	1.8%	11.3

Appendix B: Trees of Kenton by tree type

Appendix B continued

Common	Scientific	Number	% of	Mean
Name	Name	of Trees	Total Trees	DBH
horsechestnut	Aesculus spp.	41	1.4%	28.0
juniper	<i>Juniperus</i> spp.	7	0.2%	5.9
katsura	Cercidiphyllum japonicom	22	0.7%	3.8
Kentucky coffeetree	Gymnocladus dioica	4	0.1%	1.8
larch	Larix spp.	4	0.1%	7.7
lilac tree	Syringa reticulata	5	0.2%	7.7
linden	<i>Tilia</i> spp.	86	2.9%	10.4
madrone	Arbutus menziesii	5	0.2%	0.2
magnolia	Magnolia spp.	25	0.8%	1.8
magnolia, southern	Magnolia grandiflora	44	1.5%	3.3
maple, other	Acer spp.	192	6.5%	7.2
maple, bigleaf	Acer macrophyllum	12	0.4%	15.1
maple, japanese	Acer palmatum	60	2.0%	3.1
maple, Norway	Acer platanoides	242	8.2%	10.9
maple, paperbark	Acer griseum	66	2.2%	4.7
maple, red	Acer rubrum	135	4.6%	8.8
maple, silver	Acer saccharinum	29	1.0%	9.7
mimosa tree	Albizia julibrissin	7	0.2%	7.4
mountain ash	Sorbus spp.	20	0.7%	10.4
mulberry	Morus spp.	6	0.2%	10.3
oak	Quercus spp.	59	2.0%	7.0
olive	Olea spp.	1	0.0%	0.0
pagoda tree	Sophora japonica	1	0.0%	1.8
palm	Trachycarpus spp.	2	0.1%	0.0
peach	Prunus persica	1	0.0%	0.7
pear	<i>Pyrus</i> spp.	194	6.6%	10.9
Persian ironwood	Parrotia persica	21	0.7%	5.1
persimmon	Diospyros spp.	3	0.1%	2.8
pine	Pinus spp.	24	0.8%	11.0
plum	Prunus spp.	197	6.7%	9.9
poplar	Populus spp.	2	0.1%	38.8
Prunus, other	Prunus spp.	3	0.1%	3.0
redbud	Cercis canadensis	34	1.2%	4.2
serviceberry	Amelanchier spp.	5	0.2%	3.6
seven son flower	Heptacodium miconioides	5	0.2%	1.2
smoketree	Cotinus spp.	1	0.0%	0.0
snowbell	Styrax spp.	55	1.9%	2.0
sourwood	Oxydendrum arboreum	3	0.1%	1.1
spruce	Picea spp.	4	0.1%	11.6
stewartia	Stewartia pseudocamellia	3	0.1%	1.7

Appendix B continued

Common	Scientific	Number	% of	Mean
Name	Name	of Trees	Total Trees	DBH
sumac	Rhus spp.	3	0.1%	1.0
sweetgum	Liquidambar styraciflua	31	1.1%	15.1
tree of heaven	Ailanthus altissima	7	0.2%	17.1
tulip poplar	Liriodendron tulipifera	19	0.6%	14.8
tupelo	Nyssa sylvatica	14	0.5%	1.6
unknown	unknown	32	1.1%	5.5
walnut	<i>Juglans</i> spp.	35	1.2%	19.4
western redcedar	Thuja plicata	4	0.1%	3.9
willow	Salix spp.	14	0.5%	17.2
witch hazel	Hamamelis spp.	1	0.0%	3.1
yellow wood	Cladrastis lutea	2	0.1%	4.5
zelkova	Zelkova serrata	30	1.0%	3.6
Grand Total		2,946	100%	8.7



Appendix C: Street trees of Kenton by size



Appendix D: Small street trees (trees < 6" DBH)



Appendix E: Large street trees (trees > 24" DBH)



Appendix F: Poor and dead street trees



Appendix G: Available street tree planting spaces



Appendix H: Priority street tree planting spaces