

Workgroup Meeting 2: Agenda

Urban Forest Project Protocol

Workgroup Conference Call

July 16, 2013

10:00 am – 12:00 pm (pst)

10:00 am

Introductions

10:15 am

Recap of quantification meeting held on June 17, 2013

10:30

Discussion of tasks, timeline, and team assignments (see below)

11:30

Identify follow up dates and times for team conference calls:

Team	July 17 – July 19	July 31 – Aug 2	Aug 21 - 23	Sept 4- 6	Sept 18 - 20	Drafts of key concepts needed by October 1
Policy Team I						
Policy Team II						
Quantification Team						

11:50

Other miscellaneous business

12:00

Adjourn

Task List and Timeline

A timeline is provided below to inform the Urban Forest Workgroup activities. The current workload has been divided into three categories for separate teams to address, develop recommendations, and report back to the general workgroup. Please see the matrix below to determine the issues to be addressed by each team. Workgroup members have been assigned to specific teams and some preliminary tasks have been identified that need to be addressed.

		June, 2013	July, 2013	August, 2013	September, 2013	October, 2013	November, 2013	December, 2013	January, 2014	February, 2014	March, 2014	April, 2014
Teams	Milestones		Workgroup meeting scheduled for July 16		9/31 – Key concepts needed for first draft	10-3 –In person workgroup meeting			1/15 Complete draft for public comment	Public Comment Meeting		4/30 Complete Final Draft
Policy Team I	Eligibility											
	Safeguards											
	Boundary Definition											
	Start Date Criteria											
Policy Team II	Additionality											
	Permanence											
	Baseline											
Quantification Team	Quantification											
Deferred	Reporting and Monitoring											
	Verification											
	Drafting											
	Response to Comments											

Policy I

Recommended Team: Cindy Blain, Denise Farrell, Russell Hansen, Tom Hayes, Jeremy Williams, Mark McPherson

1. **Eligibility.** Expanding eligibility to include all trees within a governance entity and not just the trees owned by governance entity. Items to be developed and presented to workgroup for consideration are:
 - a. Identify potential ownership classes (municipal, private individual, corporation, districts, utility, etc.).
 - i. How is ownership determined in the field?
 - b. Draft process to adopt varying ownership classes of trees for inclusion in a project by a governing body, such as a municipality.
 - c. Define process to identify conceptual required framework for benefit-sharing decision making. A framework for benefit sharing is needed since carbon in trees owned by entities other than the governing body may be managed by the governing body.

2. **Safeguards.** Environment Safeguards. Species diversity and use of native species—how should this be addressed in the context of an urban forest project (risk reduction, environmental co-benefits, etc.)? Rationale for inclusion or omission of environmental safeguards needs to be thought through and documented.
 - a. May include provisions for diversity of non-native trees, requirements for safety concerns
3. **Boundary Definition.** Define the urban boundary. This is intended to encompass trees that may have been excluded in the existing protocol, including parks, urban fringe, riparian corridors, etc. It may be desirable to consider how wall to wall urban forest coverage might be developed.
4. **Start date criteria** – What constitutes substantial evidence that project activity has been initiated with intent to increase carbon stores?

Policy Team II

Recommended Team: Misha Sarkovich, Robert Hrubes, Michelle Passero, Nancy Hughes, Walter Passmore, Doug Wickizer

1. **Additionality** Issues:
 - a. Develop a process to identify the suite of regulations, ordinances, mitigation, etc. that exist within a governance entity (municipality).
 - b. Draft recommendations to address the suite of regulations, ordinances, mitigation, etc. that must be considered as a legal encumbrance.
 - c. Consider a different interpretation of a performance standard (instead of tree sites) for maintaining existing urban forest. The performance standard will likely need to be developed based on trends in each of the standardized urban classes (see quantification section).
 - i. Develop rules for project baselines.
2. **Permanence** issues. 100-year permanence will likely remain in updated protocol. Need to address mechanisms to ensure permanence.
 - a. What entity is responsible for reversals with aggregated projects?
 - b. Develop criteria for buffer mechanism for unavoidable reversals:
 - i. What are the risks?
 - ii. How will risks be calibrated?

Quantification

Recommended Team: Francisco Escobedo, Greg McPherson, Brett Milligan, UC Davis Researcher, Andy Trotter

Outside Experts: Will vary, but likely to include David Saah, Jarlath Oneil-Dunne, Sean Fu, and John Dogoty

Quantification team met June 14 in Davis. Par Key thoughts discussed included a desire to develop a ‘wall to wall ‘accounting of forest carbon within urban boundaries. Tasks identified to address include:

1. Develop a standardized process to stratify urban forests into classes. This will include urban centers, dense neighborhoods, suburbs, parks, undeveloped areas, etc.
2. Develop requirements for outcomes of remotely sensed data (minimum standards) for identifying urban canopy cover. Approach could be flexible with minimum standards to allow for use of more resolute data, such as lidar, where possible. Alternative acceptable tools for remote sensing might include Google Maps.

3. Develop requirements for sampling methodologies. Minimum requirements must include ability to quantify:
 - a. Total urban biomass
 - b. Carbon inventories by defined classes of ownership, such as municipality, utility, homeowners, etc. This will be needed to ensure proper agreements are in place when carbon is aggregated for project purposes.
 - c. Carbon inventories by legal status. This is needed to assist in quantifying additional carbon stores rather than carbon stores required by law.
4. Identify appropriate biomass equations for the suite of urban forest trees.
5. Investigate the importance of accounting for other carbon sinks, sources, and reservoirs associated with urban forests. This will include consideration of wood products, non-biological emissions, etc. associated with urban forest projects.
6. Identify an approach to updating urban forest carbon inventory estimates.

Workgroup Activity Deferred until Later

Verification

- Develop sampling guidelines for verification. Sequential sampling tools used for forest projects likely to be useful for urban forests.
- Develop guidelines for verifying other aspects of protocol requirements.
- Seek other ways to standardize verification for efficient verification.

Reporting and Monitoring

- Whether/how to report and verify GHG cobenefits from energy conservation.
- Development of standardized reporting tools (spreadsheets).
- Develop scheduling of reporting/monitoring requirements.