SUFC Research Committee
Monday, May 13, 2013

<u>Participating</u>: Faith Campbell/TNC; Rich Dolesh/Nat'l Rec & Parks Assoc; Alec Giffen & Ann Gosline/Clean Air Task Force; Gerry Gray; Jen Hinrichs/SUFC; Michael Leff/USFS & Davey; Scott Maco/Davey.

The goal of today's call was for workgroup members to review our internal survey results on the proposed 10 urban forestry research areas. We discussed importance rankings and other feedback on each of the 10 items in order to move toward refined descriptions and overall prioritization. (See original list embedded in final page of this document.)

- Michael presented and workgroup discussed SurveyMonkey findings and summary notes (attached).

- All agreed we need to clarify descriptions of each of the 10 research areas to better indicate scope and intent for each one.
    - Michael: Suggested we take another pass at prioritization of the 10 items once we have adjusted the descriptive language for each. Would be interesting to see if there's a greater convergence of importance rankings once we have a better common understanding of what is intended by each item.
    - Discussed whether the 10 research items should be prioritized 1-10 or all considered equally important. Consensus seemed to be that we should at least have them loosely prioritized while at the same time emphasizing that <u>all</u> 10 are high priorities.
    - Considered collapsing or expanding the 10 priority items, but agreed that we should probably keep as is – 10 separate items, though certainly overlapping and interconnecting in many ways.

- Discussed whether the intent of these 10 research priorities concerned only <u>research</u> needs, or also guidance on how to <u>apply</u> the research for benefit of various urban forest settings.
    - Noted that "Science delivery" (aka tech transfer) itself is what enables research application, and in that sense is essential for implementation of all other priority items – <u>and</u> it is also a specific research topic that needs to be addressed in its own right.
    - Alec: Certainly we care about the science of each item – but our focus should be on how to bridge that gap from research to implementation. Key is how to apply the science on the ground.
    - Scott: Noted interconnection between "Science delivery" (tech transfer) and "Standards."

- Rich: When presenting these priorities, we should address question – How will these items serve the "triple bottom line" (environmental, economic, social)? We should consider and indicate who is ultimately going to benefit from these priorities. This needs to be part of our message (depending on audiences).

- Scott: These research recommendations go well beyond what is expected of or from USFS. These are priorities that bring us all together as a coalition.
  - Gerry: Agreed, we should look beyond USFS agenda. And consider how these research priorities connect with SUFC policy and advocacy groups.

- Gerry: Was volunteered to craft overall "framing" statement to capture intent and scope of these 10 priority items, for our shared reference and guidance.

Next Steps:

1. Scott will start process of revising/enhancing tags and descriptions for all 10 items in preparation for next week's meeting.
2. Workgroup members will then review the revised/enhanced list and suggest additional changes, until we have general satisfaction with scope and descriptions of each item.
3. At that point, we may repeat our individual prioritization rankings to see how that shakes out.
4. Meanwhile, Gerry will craft that overall framing statement.
5. **Next meeting: Thursday, May 23, at 12:00 Eastern.**

(Notes submitted by Michael Leff)

1. **Ecosystem services**
    a. Health of an ecosystem and the benefits it provides
    b. Environmental Economics

2. **Human health**
    a. Ranging from asthma and skin cancer rates to monitored stress levels - loss of productivity (school, work)

3. **Community health**
    a. Economic well-being (business vitality, jobs etc.)

4. **Threats**
    a. Pest, climate adaption/change

5. **Optimizing urban tree plantings** (metric and tree canopy goals – how to maximize urban forest benefits)
    a. Green infrastructure
    b. Forecasting

6. **Inventorying urban tree canopies**
    a. Monitoring
    b. GIS/mapping, FIA+
    c. Doing more and doing it better - both at landscape and individual parcel level

7. **Science delivery**
    a. Tech transfer and making it accessible

8. **Forest products**
    a. Protocols for wood utilization

9. **Ecosystem Services Markets & Banking**

10. **Standards**
    a. Tied to Vibrant Cities Standards initiative (Rec. #12) & existing sustainability standards (STAR, Envision+)
        i. Elements of sustainability - what it means to be a sustainable community (resource base, knowledge, management now and into the future)