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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODS

Introduction

According to Boone and Modarres, “Only from the window of an airplane does it become apparent that U.S. cities are often heavily forested” (2006, 160). Their abundance notwithstanding, people tend not to associate trees with urban landscapes, and yet they play a vital role in the average urbanite’s everyday life. Trees provide ecological services critical to sustaining the integrity of urban ecosystems and the overall well-being of communities. Increasingly, maintaining a healthy tree canopy is considered a vital issue in managing urban environments.

In addition to providing critical ecosystem services such as filtering air, reducing storm water flow, and mitigating the urban heat island effect, trees offer a variety of economic and social benefits to urban dwellers (Nowak and Dwyer, 2007). With respect to economic benefits, strategically planted trees can reduce energy costs, increase real estate sales and property values, enhance commercial business landscapes, and raise a community’s tax base (Anderson and Cordell, 1988; Nowak and Dwyer, 2007). Evidence suggests that trees offer a wide range of social benefits as well, including enhancing urban landscape aesthetics and amenities, encouraging physical activities, creating social network space, and reducing crime (Platt et al., 1994; Nowak and Dwyer, 2007; Boone et al., 2009).

As important as urban trees are to the health and well-being of city residents, planting new trees does not guarantee the survival, let alone the expansion, of the tree canopy. Urban communities face several challenges when it comes to maintaining
vegetation. These obstacles include inconsistent maintenance, an ecologically challenging urban environment, inexperienced volunteers, poorly designed urban infrastructure, vandalism, and shrinking municipal budgets (Spirn, 1984). The average lifespan of urban trees is usually shortened by factors such as lack of water, overexposure to sunlight, limited room for root systems, poor soil conditions, and diseases like Dutch Elm (Spirn, 1984; Galvin, 1999).

Two cities that are working to overcome such obstacles are Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, Maryland (Casey Trees, 2008; Merse et al., 2008). Traditionally, state and local governments or parks and recreation departments have been responsible for maintaining street trees and urban public parks. In the case of D.C. and Baltimore, the D.C. Urban Forestry Administration and the Baltimore City Recreation and Parks Department Forestry Division are charged with the responsibility of maintaining street trees (Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department, 2010; District Department of Transportation, 2010). However, beginning in the 1980s, drastic budget cuts severely limited provision of forestry services (Wolch, 1990; Perkins, 2009). Governance theory examines how civil sector proponents, nonprofit organizations, and volunteer groups, have attempted to fill the gap left by government agency deficits by taking on the responsibility of providing these services and assisting municipal authorities in achieving urban tree canopy goals (Wolch, 1990; Perkins, 2009).

This research uses governance theory to investigate the role two nonprofit organizations, Casey Trees in Washington, D.C. and the Parks and People Foundation in Baltimore, play in urban community forestry management. Particular emphasis is placed
on how these organizations operate at the neighborhood level to improve urban forest conditions through local revitalization. These nonprofits exemplify how civil sector proponents are playing an increasingly larger role in urban community forestry management and how they fit into the larger governance structure of D.C. and Baltimore (city, state and federal government, private and nonprofit organizations, neighborhood associations, and citizen groups) to enhance the urban tree canopy.

**Data and Methods**

*Research Questions*

The following four questions guided this research. The first question examines the role the two nonprofit environmental organizations play in urban community forestry management in Baltimore, Maryland and Washington, D.C. The next three questions focus more specifically on the structure and function of these nonprofits. In particular, I focused my research on two neighborhoods: Petworth in Washington, D.C. and Franklin Square in Baltimore (Figures 1 and 2). This research was funded by the USDA Forest Service (Policies, Planning, and Investments in Open Space Preservation and Conservation in Urban Areas grant, GL0014459) and the National Science Foundation (A Longitudinal Analysis of the Social Dynamics of Environmental Equity in Baltimore grant, GQ0014326) and contributes to the goals of the Long-term Ecological Research-Baltimore Ecosystem Study and the ULTRA-Ex D.C. Project.

1. What is the role of Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation in urban community forestry management in Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, Maryland?
2. How do Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation partner with city, state, and federal government entities, other NGOs, and citizen groups to promote urban community forestry?

3. How are Casey Trees’ and the Parks and People Foundation’s internal management and funding structured to promote urban community forestry?

4. How have Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation changed urban forest conditions in the Petworth and Franklin Square neighborhoods through revitalization?

Methods

I adopted a constructivist perspective to answer the above questions. This approach was chosen to allow local meanings to be socially produced through participants’ responses (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). A “case study” approach was used to focus on how these two nonprofits operate at the neighborhood level in Petworth and Franklin Square (Creswell, 1998). These two neighborhoods were selected as study sites for three main reasons. First, Parks and People and Casey Trees have been involved in urban community forestry revitalization in these communities for several years. Second, by almost any measure, they are urban community forestry and neighborhood revitalization success stories (Casey Trees, 2011; Parks and People Foundation, 2003). Third, neighborhood level data were available for Franklin Square and Petworth at the Pratt Library and the Maryland and D.C. Historical Societies. Understanding how these nonprofits function at the neighborhood level is essential if their success is to be replicated elsewhere.
Figure 1: Petworth, Washington, D.C.
Figure 2: Franklin Square, Baltimore.

Data

Fifteen semi-structured interviews were conducted, including twelve personal interviews and four recorded over the telephone (Fontana and Frey, 2000; Hay, 2005). Interview participants included seven staff members affiliated with Casey Trees and
Parks and People, three volunteers, four government agency officials, and one nonprofit partner from the Baltimore Water Alliance. The government participants are current employees of the following agencies: USDA Forest Service, Urban Forestry Administration, District Department of the Environment, and the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department. Initial interview participants were identified through purposeful sampling with the assistance of representatives from Casey Trees, Parks and People, and the USDA Forest Service (Appendix A). The remaining participants were selected through snowball sampling after initial consultation with Casey Trees and Parks and People representatives (Creswell, 1998). Interviewing a diverse range of actors allowed me to tease out the wide variety of players involved in urban community forestry management in D.C. and Baltimore. Additionally, participants provided a variety of perspectives on the role Casey Trees and Parks and People play in urban community forestry. Interviewing nonprofit and government forestry officials provided new perspectives on not only the nonprofits’ role in urban forestry but the government’s continuous role in management. These ideas allowed me to further address where these two NGOs fall in the larger governance structure (Creswell, 1998).

In addition to semi-structured interviews, supplemental data were acquired by collecting archival documents. Archival data included newspaper clippings, news and magazine articles, government documents, forestry reports, neighborhood association documents, personal notebooks, photos, press releases, and forest history books. Archival data were obtained from the Historical Society of the District of Columbia, the Maryland Historical Society, and the Pratt Library in Baltimore. Organizational documents were
also collected from nonprofit and government agency staff members. These documents included organization charts, magazine articles, brochures, program and management reports, flyers, excel work sheets, and PowerPoint presentations. Additional reports were downloaded from nonprofit and government agency websites. Using a variety of research methods and multiple sources allowed me to probe more deeply into the role Casey Trees and Parks and People play in urban community forestry management.

The first phase of data collection ran from June through July, 2010. During that time archival documents and contemporary reports were collected. In phase one, the first twelve personal interviews were conducted in D.C. and Baltimore. During phase two, the remaining four telephone interviews were conducted in August through October. Interviews ranged from half an hour to two hours in length. At the end of October, I visited D.C. and Baltimore one more time to collect additional archival data and take personal photos. To guide the interview process, protocols took the form of a question schedule (Appendix B), using open-ended questions to permit flexibility in participants’ responses (Fontana and Frey, 2000; Hay, 2005). Interview questions varied slightly depending on the position participants held in relation to Casey Trees, Parks and People, or government agencies. Interviewees were asked to describe their relationship to the two case study organizations, explain their personal role and affiliated organization’s role in urban community forestry, identify their position in the organizational structure, and provide perspective on how these nonprofits fit into the larger governance structure. Participants were also asked to discuss their involvement in neighborhood revitalization, partnerships, funding, forestry promotion, and community forestry challenges and
success stories. Additional questions were posed during interviews through probing to encourage participants to elaborate on their responses (Fontana and Frey, 2000; Hay, 2005).

Once permissions were secured, interviews were tape recorded. In addition, fieldnotes were taken on an interview protocol. Written permission was obtained from interviewees at the beginning of each interview through the signing of an Ohio University Consent Form (Appendix C). Throughout the summer of 2010, fieldnotes reflecting on interview and archival data collected, were recorded in the form of memos. Memoing allowed me to reflect back on my fieldwork experience and piece stories together (Emerson et al., 1995; Birks et al., 2008). The use of multiple methods, data sources, and reflective memoing ensured a greater degree of rigor in my research results (Baxter and Eyles, 1997).

Data Analysis

The first step to data analysis involved producing fifteen transcripts. Digital Voice Editor Software was used to transcribe interviews. This software converted interview recordings to MP3 files and allowed the recordings to be played back at an appropriate speed. Transcripts were produced word for word from September through December, 2010 (Hay, 2005). During the transcription phase, memoing was occasionally utilized to contextualize the interview data. (Emerson et al., 1995; Birks et al., 2008). Interview transcripts were then reviewed for key quotes to include in various outlined thesis chapters. Next, quotes were highlighted and noted in parentheses with their associated
chapter. Prior to coding, interview protocol notes were reviewed for additional material to contextualize participants’ responses and to ensure accuracy of recorded data.

After transcript production I conducted hypothesis coding to extract relevant data. This form of coding categorized blurbs from transcripts into thirteen codes based on both my research questions and interview schedules (Table 1). Hypothesis coding was selected for this analysis for a number of reasons. First, it allows you to extract larger portions of transcript data, maintaining the original context of an interviewee’s response. In developing case studies of Petworth and Franklin Square, maintaining the context of responses regarding Casey Trees’ and Parks and People’s neighborhood revitalization efforts was key to unraveling their success stories. Second, hypothesis coding encourages researchers to only select data relevant to their research questions. Finally, it saves time by requiring only one phase of coding versus several when engaging in an open coding process (Hay, 2005; Saldana, 2009).

The coding phase began in October 2010 and continued into the month of January. Due to the nature of this study and its focus on two nonprofits, coding analysis was separated into two documents: one for data associated with Casey Trees and one for Parks and People. The coding process was performed in Microsoft Word by copying and pasting transcript data into the associated word document under the appropriate code. Once the coding process was complete the two coding documents were reviewed as needed for particular data relevant to each thesis chapter.
This table shows the 13 hypothesis codes used to analyze interview transcripts for this research. Source: Author, 2011.

In addition to coding, document analysis was performed on the archival data I collected. The most relevant documents were selected for this form of analysis. These documents included magazine articles, newspaper clippings, program and forestry reports, and nonprofit brochures. Documents were reviewed in detail for key information relating to my research questions, case study areas, Casey Trees, Parks and People, and forestry stakeholder partners. During this phase, detailed notes were taken on relevant content and divided up into separate documents, one each to record D.C. and Baltimore data. The content of these notes was further categorized into five topics: government forestry management data for each city, Casey Trees, Parks and People, Franklin Square, and Petworth. Notes were reviewed as needed when writing up my results (Gillian, 2001; Hay, 2005).
Conclusion

Chapters 2-7 are organized as follows: Literature Review, History of Casey Trees and Parks and People, Case Study Neighborhoods, Partnerships and Funding, Governance Theory Applied to Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, and Summary. Chapter 2 explores the literature pertaining to urban community forestry. This chapter is divided up into three main parts: governance theory and the expanding role of NGOs, history of urban community forestry management, and the history of community forestry in D.C. and Baltimore. Chapter 3 examines the historical development of Casey Trees’ and Parks and People’s community forestry programs. Additionally, it identifies the existing management structure of these two groups’ greening programs. Chapter 4 focuses on two case study neighborhoods, Petworth and Franklin Square. This chapter covers four main areas: the involvement of Casey Trees and Parks and People in urban community forestry in the case study neighborhoods, history of demographics and development in each community, perceptions of change in forest conditions in these neighborhoods, and reasons why these two groups were successful in Petworth and Franklin Square. Chapter 5 is divided up into two sections, partnerships and funding. This chapter identifies Casey Trees’ and Parks and People’s partnerships with four key groups: state and federal governments, city governments, nonprofits, and local citizens. Part two discusses community forestry funding obtained by these organizations. Chapter 6 examines governance theory and its applicability to urban forestry in D.C and Baltimore. This theory is addressed by exploring the history of federal, state, and city government’s role in urban forestry management in D.C. and Baltimore. Additionally, this chapter explains
the place nonprofits hold in these cities’ governance structure. Lastly, the pros and cons of NGO involvement are identified. To conclude Chapter 7 provides a brief summary of this thesis.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter establishes the context for this research and explores the history of urban community forestry management. First, I examine governance theory and its evolution to situate the expanding role of nonprofit organizations in the civil sector. Over time, these organizations have taken on a greater share of social service provision. I then proceed to discuss how governance theory applies to the management of urban environmental amenities. A brief history of urban community forestry and the emergence of NGOs in the United States, Washington, D.C., and Baltimore follows. The history of community forestry in D.C. and Baltimore is interwoven with that of Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation.

Governance Theory and the Expanding Role of Nonprofit NGOs

The notion of the “shadow state” was first proposed by Jennifer Wolch in 1990 to explore changes in government structure and power in the civil sector since the 1960s. She developed the “shadow state” thesis to account for the shortfall in social service provision created by the budget cuts of the 1980s. At the time, states nationwide drastically reduced support for social services (Wolch, 1990). The decrease in public service funding can be traced to lost tax revenue caused by out-migration and disinvestment (Pincetl, 2003). Budget cuts were imposed to reduce the amount of support for social welfare programs. This trend lead state and municipal governments to transfer responsibility for service delivery to local communities and their allies (NGOs, charitable
organizations, and citizen groups), increasing the role of the volunteer sector in social

Scholars have expanded on the “shadow state” thesis, recognizing that both public
and private organizations have plugged the hole in service delivery (Pincetl, 2003;
McCarthy, 2006; Perkins, 2010). These organizations, private corporations, and local
nonprofit NGOs, have increasingly taken on the role of distributing, funding, and
managing social services. However, as nonprofits increasingly play a role in service
delivery competition for limited funds intensifies between public agencies and volunteer
sector proponents. With regard to private corporations, scholars have argued that
neoliberal market strategies are being applied to local service delivery, ignoring local
priorities and allowing global politics to guide community-level service provision
(Pincetl, 2003; McCarthy, 2006; Perkins, 2010). Henderson (2002) points out that local
nonprofits have also been influenced by neoliberal management strategies.

Scholars have also acknowledged a positive side to decentralization of the civil
sector, noting that this trend has allowed local social service management to set its own
agenda and increase community participation (Wolch, 1999; Pincetl, 2003; Elwood,
2004; Trudeau, 2008). However, others argue that many local nonprofits manage social
services based on state-set agendas due to strict funding mandates. Evidence suggests that
NGOs make decisions regarding the level of citizen participation involved in service
delivery based on state priorities (Pincetl, 2003; Elwood, 2004). The influence of
corporations and neoliberal policies has further encouraged the uneven distribution of
social services (Pincetl, 2003; Trudeau, 2008; Perkins, 2010).
Many scholars have expanded on this idea of inequitable distribution of public services by focusing on urban environmental amenities (Perkins et al., 2004; Wolch, 2005; Heynen et al., 2006b; Boone et al., 2009). For example, Boone et al. (2009) and Wolch (2005) have examined the inequitable distribution of urban parks in Baltimore, Maryland and Los Angeles, California. Due to a long history of white elites controlling local government commissions and the Department of Parks and Recreation, many expansive parks designed by the Olmsted Brothers landscaping architecture firm are located in suburban areas of Baltimore. Wolch (2005) expanded on this idea by pointing out how park funding in Los Angeles typically flows to wealthier suburban neighborhoods, often at the expense of the inner city. Poorer urban neighborhoods dominated by minority members such as African Americans and Latinos typically lack urban parklands. In Baltimore, a large number of small parks are distributed throughout the inner city but are poorly maintained compared to their suburban counterparts (Wolch, 2005; Boone et al., 2009).

Scholars have also studied the uneven distribution of urban forests. Similar to parks, there tends to be less tree cover in minority neighborhoods. These poorer neighborhoods are typically dominated by renters who are less likely to have the financial means or time to plant and maintain trees (Perkins et al., 2004; Heynen et al., 2006b). Some researchers attribute the inequitable distribution of urban environmental amenities to neoliberal policies (Perkins et al., 2004; Wolch, 2005; Heynen et al., 2006b; Boone et al., 2009). Negative consequences notwithstanding, Elwood (2004) points out that nonprofit organizations may be better equipped to serve poorer urban areas. Additionally,
Perkins et al. (2004) argue that if reforestation efforts are planned well, incorporating social, economic, and political dynamics, especially housing tenure, then NGOs possess the potential to address the inequitable distribution of urban forests.

The neoliberal approach to managing public services has both fueled and demolished environmental nonprofit organizations’ efforts. Economic growth coalitions (groups of individuals, private organizations, and agencies that promote economic growth) have been known to encourage NGOs and local citizen groups to invest in profit-generating community projects. Nonprofits and residents have focused their efforts on revitalizing lots on public land, but without official ownership of these properties growth coalitions in many cases have trumped their efforts entirely. In many cities the pursuit of economic profit outweighs the interests of grassroots organizations (Henderson, 2002; Smith and Kurtz, 2003; Perkins, 2010). Two examples that illustrate this phenomena are the community gardens in New York and Garden Park in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. In 1999, 114 community gardens in New York were put up for local auction. Administrative policy makers argued that New York suffered from a shortage of housing and vacant community garden lots were needed to increase the local housing stock. Garden activists at various political scales fought the plan and, in the end, were able to place some of the community gardens into a local land trust (Smith and Kurtz, 2003). In the case of Garden Park in Milwaukee, volunteer efforts were thwarted by local city growth coalitions. Garden Park was originally a vacant lot revitalized by citizens with the organizational assistance of local NGOs. Residents were awarded a grant from the Wisconsin Natural Resources Department to remediate the soil and plant native species. However, the
Milwaukee Redevelopment Authority recently claimed the parkland for future redevelopment (Perkins, 2010).

These trends have lead scholars to conclude that the separation of state government from the civil sector will continue to strengthen the role of nonprofit NGOs, allowing them to fill a niche in social service provision and work towards meeting local needs. Others have presented counter arguments to decentralizing the civil sector. Perkins (2010) argues that the increasing role of nonprofits has resulted in the exploitation of local volunteer labor to conduct routine maintenance and provide public services. In effect, NGOs rely heavily on residents to provide public services for themselves. Many of them live in poor urban areas and have neither the time nor money to invest in such projects (Perkins, 2010). Salamon (1997) presents a different side to the argument. He argues that nonprofit organizations can’t survive without state government assistance. According to Salamon (1997), the state serves as an essential political partner by providing capital to NGOs. Additionally, Salamon (1997) views these political partnerships as a means to increase welfare programs. However, Henderson (2002) suggests local nonprofit organizations can strengthen their role in service delivery by increasing accountability to stakeholders, collaborating with multiple funding partners, and engaging in more transparent participatory decision making.

Scholars have begun to apply governance theory to the management of environmental urban amenities (Pincetl, 2003; Perkins et al., 2004; McCarthy, 2006; Perkins 2009, 2010). Pincetl (2003) examined the role local NGOs in Los Angeles played in planning and managing urban parks, arguing that they operate in a similar fashion to
the traditional local government structure. She argues that nonprofits can become effective partners in planning and park provision by operating in two ways, distributing public services and obtaining new funding sources. In the case of Los Angeles, NGOs like the California Planning Conservation League were effective in obtaining new funding sources by placing Proposition K on the ballot to increase state funding for park planning. This strategy was instrumental in the sense that it provided a new approach to funding urban amenities while bypassing state legislation (Pincetl, 2003).

Perkins (2010) recently used governance theory to examine park revitalization projects in Milwaukee, Wisconsin where local NGOs provided organizational and educational assistance to citizens groups. He provides the example of Kilbourn Park, adopted by the local nonprofit, the Children’s Outing Association (COA). The City of Milwaukee and private developers insisted the COA take responsibility for maintaining the park when they adopted it and in exchange the City paid for 20 million dollars of initial repairs. Perkins (2009) also examined the role of nonprofits in Milwaukee, especially in the management of environmental amenities like parks, street trees, and community gardens. He maintains that the involvement of these NGOs has increased the role of unpaid laborers in maintaining Milwaukee’s urban amenities (Perkins, 2009). Additionally, Perkins et al. (2004) point out how private NGOs, such as Greening Milwaukee, have focused their reforestation efforts on private property due to their Adopt-a-Tree program’s participation being dominated by homeowners. This has further increased the uneven distribution of urban forests in Milwaukee (Perkins et al., 2004).
In a 2006 study McCarthy used a neoliberal approach to study community forestry in Canada and the United States. He argues that in the U.S. community forestry agreements are viewed as a threat to current forestry management practices and to the national forests. Critics argue these agreements increase corporate access to protected forests, further degrading the environment. However, British Columbia (B.C.) effectively incorporated a community forestry approach to managing national forests (McCarthy, 2006). McCarthy (2006) argues that B.C. has effectively adopted community forestry for four primary reasons: 1) it operates under the colonial model, 2) industrial forest tenures already existed, 3) their government doesn’t have the equivalent of U.S. environmental acts to follow (EPA, ESA), and 4) the timber industry didn’t want to suffer from additional media criticism. McCarthy (2006) has demonstrated how a slight difference in governance can lead to very different outcomes and responses to neoliberal forest management. These few examples have provided an introduction to governance theory as it applies to the management of urban environmental amenities. However, further research is needed to understand the role local environmental NGOs play in urban community forestry and how they fill the state and municipal government gap in providing environmental amenities through neighborhood revitalization.

**History of Urban Community Forestry and the Emergence of Environmental NGOs**

Founded by J. Sterling Morton in 1872, Arbor Day was the first large-scale organized effort to plant trees in American cities. Morton partnered with local schools to promote tree planting and encourage civic virtue through stewardship practices (Cohen, 2004). Over time, national environmental NGOs, such as the National Arbor Day
Foundation founded in 1971, emerged in part out of concern for the future of America’s urban forests. An offshoot of the National Arbor Day Foundation, Tree City USA was established in 1976 to encourage cities to create a forestry department, approve a tree ordinance, encourage community participation in tree planting, celebrate National Arbor Day, and contribute funds to community forestry programs (Cohen, 2004). Funding for these programs is typically distributed by the USDA Forest Service Cooperative Forestry Program which allocates funds to state and private forestry division cooperatives that distribute funds to local governments, city foresters, and national and local environmental nonprofits. Such funding opportunities have encouraged NGOs to partner with federal, state, and local governments in forestry management (Cohen, 2004; McCarthy, 2006).

Two instrumental acts that directly influence urban community forestry management are the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act. During the Progressive Era (ca. 1890-1920), federal and state agencies were central to the management of natural resources. Scholars have criticized this top-down science-based approach because it favored management by experts over public democracy (Baker and Kusel, 2003; McCarthy, 2006; Fleeger and Becker, 2008). The National Environmental Policy Act was passed in 1969 to provide a new framework for resource management. It required policy makers to collaborate and incorporate public participation in resource management. Several scholars have criticized NEPA for failing to completely reform traditional science-based forestry management (Baker and Kusel, 2003; Fleeger and Becker, 2008). However, others such as James Lewis, a historian from the USDA Forest Service, has addressed the positive impacts of NEPA in terms of
increasing citizen participation in forestry management and mandating minority hires to diversify the USDA Forest Service workforce (Lewis, ND).

Criticism of NEPA is based on three common arguments. First, resource planning is dominated by federal, state, and other public agencies. Second, local participation in forestry management is dominated by the actions of national interest groups. Finally, acceptable participatory public knowledge must still be based on scientific evidence (Baker and Kusel, 2003; Hays, 2007; McCarthy, 2006; Fleeger and Becker, 2008). Scholars such as Becker and Fleeger (2008) have expanded on this criticism by focusing on the legislation’s failure to define public collaboration and the form (meetings, forums, etc.) public participation should take. The traditional NEPA model of resource management only encourages public participation during required public comment sessions (Fleeger and Becker, 2008). By the 1980s, community-based forestry emerged as a grassroots challenge to the traditional science-based model.

In 1978 the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act (CFAA) was passed. This act served as a catalyst for expanding the urban community forestry movement. Cohen (2004) points to several positive effects of the CFAA, such as expanding cooperative forestry programs through increased federal and state government financial and technical support. Cooperative forestry programs provide such support for local level tree planting activities. The expansion of cooperative forestry programs has also provided an opportunity to build partnerships between local nonprofits and national NGOs such as American Forests (Cohen, 2004). The role of local environmental nonprofits has been further strengthened by the establishment of the Urban and Community Forestry Program...
(U&CFP). This program recognizes the decline of urban forests and the connection between healthy forests and improved livelihoods (Baker and Kusel, 2003; Kusel and Adler, 2003; Cohen, 2004). The program provides technical advice and funding to municipalities to distribute to local community forestry implementers such as nonprofit NGOs. Cohen (2004) identifies another positive outcome of the U&CFP, the establishment of the National Urban & Community Forestry Advisory Council. The Council encourages expanding the role of environmental nonprofits by providing grants to organizations that promote urban forestry and by stimulating the network of community forestry partnerships (Cohen, 2004).

Counter arguments of the Urban and Community Forestry Program highlight criticisms based on five main arguments (Aslan Group, 2004). First, program staff have failed to account for annual funding and its distribution at the national, state, and local level. Second, critics argue that more urban community forestry programs need to focus on developing partnerships with underserved communities. Third, the U&CFP needs to be more directly integrated into regional cooperative programs, to strengthen communication among partners. Fourth, state and grassroots organizations such as local NGOs need to communicate with Congress and government leaders to strengthen program leadership. Lastly, self-sufficiency of state and local programs should be encouraged to reduce reliance on federal funding (Aslan Group, 2004). These criticisms reflect the ongoing challenges local nonprofit organizations face in urban community forestry.
Other scholars have addressed the flaws of past forestry management by suggesting strategies for improvement. Dwyer, Nowak, and Noble (2003) argue that urban forestry management could be improved if the following strategies were adopted: 1) broaden forest stewardship to include city-wide efforts, 2) encourage biodiversity of forests, 3) employ a multi-disciplinary management approach, 4) consider different management strategies for different areas, 5) meet the community’s needs, 6) consider how human activities change urban forest structure to meet functional needs, and 7) coordinate management to reduce impacts of urban activities on forests. Scholars stress the importance of understanding participants’ motives and residents’ perceptions of trees, which can vary based on cultural background, to improve urban forestry management (Austin, 2002; Zhang, 2007). The bottom line is that biological, economic, social, and political community needs must be addressed to effectively manage urban forests.

**Urban Community Forestry in Washington, D.C. & Baltimore, Maryland**

Landscaping efforts in Washington, D.C., including tree planting and the establishment of the city’s park system, dates back to at least 1791 when Charles Pierre L’Enfant unveiled his historic plan for the city, later revised by Andrew Elliot. The design of the city’s system of parks and open space was influenced by European landscaping traditions. Design elements included features such as promenades, natural waterways, retained open space, and tree corridors, especially around national monuments and government buildings (Capitol Space, 2009). In the 19th century several parks were established in the District. In the early 1900s, the city embraced the City Beautiful Movement by increasing the number of roadside trees planted. Street-tree
planting and roadside beautification continued well into the 1920s in an effort to attract tourists (Capitol Space, 2009). By the 1970s, however, the District of Columbia’s urban tree canopy was in decline. Indeed, disease, increased development, and a decrease in planting led to a 64% decline in the urban tree canopy between 1950 and 1970. In 2001 a local resident, Betty Brown Casey, astonished by the loss of trees, donated funds to establish a nonprofit organization called Casey Trees to support the D.C. Government’s efforts at reforestation. Today, Casey Trees’ mission is to restore, enhance, and protect D.C.’s tree canopy (Casey Trees, 2011).

The first large-scale tree planting efforts in Baltimore were sponsored by wealthy merchants like William Patterson and citizen groups such as the Women’s Civic League (Merse et al., 2008; Buckley, 2010). Building on this modest foundation, the Municipal Art Society hired the Olmsted Brothers landscape architecture firm to design the city’s extensive park system (Kusel and Adler, 2003). Tree maintenance originally fell under the purview of the Department of Recreation and Parks. Lack of adequate funding resulted in poorly maintained, often neglected trees (Merse et al., 2008; Buckley, 2010). In 1984, mayor William Donald Schaefer promoted the establishment of the Parks and People Foundation to assist the Recreation and Parks Department in managing the city’s park system. Parks and People partners with watershed associations (e.g. Gwynns Falls, Jones Falls, and Herring Run) nonprofits, private organizations, local citizen groups, and the city to promote their mission of improving the urban ecosystem and connecting people to nature. They argue this reduces social problems and improves community health (Kusel and Adler, 2003).
Conclusion

This chapter explored the use of governance theory as a mechanism for explaining the role of local environmental nonprofit organizations such as Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation in urban community forestry management. It has examined both positive and negative aspects of the increasing role of NGOs in the volunteer sector due to the recent shift of social service provision from state and local government control to the volunteer sector. The history of urban community forestry in the United States was recounted to demonstrate how the role of NGOs increased as local communities embraced community level management over the traditional top-down science-based model. Additionally, scholars have provided strategies for improving urban forestry and strengthening the management role of NGOs.

In the context of D.C. and Baltimore, local nonprofits like Casey Trees and Parks and People have bridged the gap left behind by municipal authorities by providing educational outreach, organizational and technical assistance, and encouraging public participation. The effectiveness of these organizations is critical if these two cities are to meet the biological, economic, and social needs of communities, and to sustain successful community forestry programs. Already, these organizations have increased the diversity of stakeholders involved in forestry management. In Washington, D.C. and Baltimore the multitude of stakeholders includes, but is not limited to, various scales of government (Federal, state, and municipal), local and regional environmental nonprofits, private corporations, and neighborhood associations (Kusel and Adler, 2003; Casey Trees, 2011). The complex web of stakeholders involved in urban community forestry is not well
understood. Neither is the manner in which they partner with local NGOs like Casey Trees and Parks and People. Further research is needed to uncover how environmental nonprofit organizations operate to promote urban community forestry, and affect urban forest conditions through neighborhood revitalization.
CHAPTER 3: HISTORY OF CASEY TREES AND PARKS AND PEOPLE

Introduction

This chapter examines the history of Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation, focusing especially on their role in urban forestry management. I begin with a discussion of their community forestry programs. Historically, these programs emerged and evolved at different times. The scale at which both organizations operate also differs, with Parks and People working at the watershed scale and Casey Trees serving the District at the city level. The role of these two groups in forestry management has changed with time in response to various structural and financial dynamics. The chapter concludes with an examination of each group’s organizational structure and current urban community forestry programs.

History of Casey Trees

Over the course of the 20th century, Dutch Elm Disease, residential and commercial development, and insufficient maintenance contributed to a decline in D.C.’s tree population. In 1999, appalled by the high tree mortality rate, a local resident, Mrs. Betty Brown Casey, donated $50,000,000 to the Garden Club of America to create a nonprofit organization (Casey Trees) that would assist the D.C. government in restoring the urban tree canopy. Casey Trees (2011) was established in 2001 with the mission of “restoring, enhancing, and protecting the tree canopy of the Nation’s Capital.” As the organization developed a number of milestones were achieved (Fehr, 1999; Casey Trees, 2011).
In 2001, the organization partnered with the city’s Urban Forestry Administration (UFA) and lobbied to pass the D.C. Urban Forest Preservation Act. This act prohibits D.C. residents from cutting down a tree 55 inches in circumference or greater without a permit. Permits are only granted to those who can plant additional saplings, pay into the city Tree Fund, or prove to authorities that the tree poses a safety hazard (Casey Trees, 2002, 2011). By 2002, Casey Trees had conducted a city-wide tree survey to assess the state of D.C.’s tree canopy and collected coverage data for all the street trees in the District. This project engaged several volunteers across the city. Later in 2002, using a Geographic Information System, tree canopy data were analyzed to produce a city-wide map of tree cover. Casey Trees created an interactive online map that displays trees the organization has planted within the city. This interactive database is updated continuously to show new plantings (Casey Trees, 2011).

Toward the end of 2002, the organization experienced growth through an increase of staff positions and urban community forestry programs. The primary focus of Casey Trees remained on tree planting, education, forestry research, and planning and design (Galvin, 2008). In 2002, the organization launched its first education program to teach school children about the benefits and biological importance of trees. However, it wasn’t until 2003 that Casey Trees actually unveiled its Tree Planting Program. Then, in 2003, several more education programs were introduced including the Citizen Forester Program, the D.C. Schoolyard Greening Consortium, and the Elm Restoration Program (Galvin, 2010b; Casey Trees, 2011). Additionally, Casey Trees introduced a Green Roof Project to demonstrate sustainable living possibilities to local residents, businesses, and
developers (Becker, 2004). By 2003, technical assistance and training for tree maintenance were being incorporated into the education and tree planting programs. In 2004 additional education programs were inaugurated to reach out to school kids such as the Green Tech Program (terminated in 2008 due to infrastructure limitations at schools) and the Summer High School Program, which hired interns to assist primarily in the Education and Tree Planting departments (Galvin, 2008, 2010b; Casey Trees, 2011).

In 2005, Casey Trees conducted another inventory, only this time it was a tree survey focused on schoolyard plantings in the District. This was a significant year for the Tree Planting Program due to changes the organization made to its planting strategy. Casey Trees acknowledged that “carpet bombing” the District with trees based on aerial photography was ineffective so instead the group began to solicit requests for tree planting. Any group of residents or organization can apply to have trees planted by Casey Trees (Galvin, 2010c; Casey Trees, 2011). To further promote sustainable tree planting in the city the organization formed a Blue Ribbon Panel to engage with constituents to discuss efforts to “green” neighborhoods and business districts. In 2006, Casey Trees partnered with the Urban Forestry Administration and the Downtown Business Improvement District to educate managers and property owners about tree care and its importance to maintaining a healthy tree canopy. Around the same time, Casey Trees terminated its Green Roof Project, worried it would undermine the nonprofit’s mission. While Casey Trees had become a nonprofit leader in tree planting in the city, it left green roof initiatives up to D.C. Greenworks, a nonprofit that specializes in green roofs in the District (Buscaino, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Casey Trees, 2011).
In 2007, Casey Trees issued the Tree Homeowners Initiative to promote tree planting on private property. The initiative involved the adoption of new programs such as the Tree Rebate and River Smart Homes Program in partnership with the District Department of the Environment (DDOE). These programs not only promote planting on private property but more efficient stormwater management through landscaping. Additionally, Treescape Design workshops are offered to educate property owners about the importance of trees in reducing runoff (Galvin, 2010c; Hill, 2010; Casey Trees, 2011). Casey Trees also developed a Green Build-Out Model to quantify the stormwater benefits of trees and green roofs in D.C. In 2008, the organization continued to promote innovative ways to assess the benefits of trees by issuing Tree Benefits and Carbon Offset Calculators. Meanwhile, the Planning and Design department continued to make strides in green design by developing a design for a tree box with adequate soil volume and space for root systems. In 2008, Casey Trees began to further assess the conditions of trees they plant by conducting an ongoing tree mortality study. Later that year, Mrs. Casey awarded a second gift to the nonprofit creating Casey Trees Farm in Virginia, which will serve as a tree nursery to support the organization’s D.C. planting efforts (Buscaino, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Casey Trees, 2011).

In 2009, Communications Director Jared Powell was hired to develop a new Communications Plan. The plan included redesigning the website based on input from a focus group, creating plans to include other forms of media, and creating new outreach initiatives to raise awareness about the importance of trees (Galvin, 2010a). By 2009, Casey Trees was pursuing two new initiatives, the Urban Tree Canopy goal and the Tree
Report Card. The city received a “B” grade. The canopy goal was proposed to Mayor Adrian Fenty by Casey Trees and the DDOE and promoted through additional community forestry leaders such as the Urban Forestry Administration. District government agencies (UFA, DDOE) and local nonprofits like Casey Trees are currently working towards increasing the city’s tree canopy from 28% to 40% by 2035. To achieve this ambitious goal Casey Trees continues to pursue public and private partnerships with local stakeholders (Lear, 2010; Casey Trees, 2011).

**History of Parks and People**

In 1984, the Parks and People Foundation was created by Mayor William Donald Schaefer to support Baltimore’s recreation and park system. This nonprofit was originally established as an arm of the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department (BRPD) to directly assist the department in providing recreational opportunities, new programs, and innovative funding sources. The organization’s primary objective was to improve quality of life in Baltimore neighborhoods by engaging in restoration projects and motivating local youth. The plan was for Parks and People to achieve this goal through public and private partnerships (Parks and People, 2011).

In the late 1980s, Parks and People began its involvement in urban forestry when it embraced the Revitalizing Baltimore (R.B.) Program. Developed by Recreation and Parks Director Bob Jones and Yale professor Bill Burch the goal of this program was to promote local forestry projects. In 1989, the Urban Resources Initiative was developed under the umbrella of Revitalizing Baltimore to serve as a cooperative between the Yale School of Forestry and the city Forestry Division. Parks and People took on the role of
coordinating the initiative by overseeing an internship program developed for Yale forestry students. This program provided students with hands-on experience by assisting the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department Forestry Division (Burch and Grove, 1993; Kusel and Adler, 2003). Initially, interns focused on street tree planting and creating community gardens on vacant lots. Over time the Urban Resources Initiative became a research and development arm of the Recreation and Parks Department. This initiative is still funded through Parks and People programs such as Green Career Ladder, which provides green job skills, and the Gwynns Falls Feasibility Study. In 1993, Revitalizing Baltimore was designated as a congressional special project receiving $500,000 from the USDA Forest Service. As coordinator of this project, Parks and People developed new partnerships with other nonprofits to encourage participation in the Revitalizing Baltimore Project (Kusel and Adler, 2003; Parks and People, 2011).

Not until 1993 did Parks and People officially establish an Urban Community Forestry Program. It began with the donation of $100,000 from a Harford County resident, Mary Catwaler. Catwaler was interested in extensive city-wide tree planting. Based on the recommendation of the city arborist, Mrs. Catwaler donated directly to the Parks and People Foundation to ensure a lower tree mortality rate due to the organization’s experience in community organizing. Early community forestry projects were conducted in East Baltimore neighborhoods such as Canton where the landscape was dominated by concrete and asphalt. Prior to the establishment of the Urban and Community Forestry Program, this nonprofit’s planting efforts were limited to vacant lot restoration (Carrera, 2010; Hager, 2010).
In 1994, the USDA Forest Service requested that Parks and People administer Revitalizing Baltimore as a national model. Growing interest in urban ecosystem management was the impetus behind this notion of viewing urban community forestry from an ecological perspective. During the developing stages of the national model Parks and People assisted in the establishment of other nonprofits such as the Community Development Corporation and the city’s three main watershed associations: Herring Run (established in 1993 but joined R.B. in 1996), Gwynns Falls (1994), and Jones Falls (1997). The organization assisted these new nonprofits by providing funding and offering advice regarding watershed and forest restoration. Revitalizing Baltimore efforts were organized around these three inner city watersheds. Greater emphasis on watershed restoration projects was placed on the Gwynns Falls Watershed due to its direct connection to the Chesapeake Bay. Urban forestry projects that reduce inner city runoff are vital to the health of the Bay (Kusel and Adler, 2003; Carrera, 2010; Pelton, 2010).

In the mid to late 1990s, Parks and People continued to expand its efforts to improve life in Baltimore neighborhoods by establishing two new programs: Kids Grow (1994) and Super Camp (1997), now known as Super Kids Camp. Kids Grow was designed as an environmental education program for elementary students to enhance their knowledge of natural ecosystems. Community forestry projects were incorporated into the program to provide hands-on learning and encourage local Baltimore schools to integrate environmental education into their curriculum (Kusel and Adler, 2003; Cocke, 2010). Super Kids Camp, on the other hand, was developed in response to the 1997 literacy crisis. Here, Parks and People works closely with elementary students to improve
literacy while providing a more exciting learning environment (Carrera, 2010; Parks and People, 2011). Later, in 1997, the National Science Foundation designated Baltimore as a Long-Term Ecological Research site (LTER), creating the Baltimore Ecosystem Study and increasing scholarly focus on urban ecosystems. Parks and People’s community forestry programs were integrated into the BES model. This integration was encouraged to ensure the scientific community, agencies, and other organizations’ research was complementary (Grimm et al., 2000; Cadenasso et al., 2006).

By 1999, the Revitalizing Baltimore Steering Committee had created a Community Grants Program to direct funds to groups such as Parks and People and the three inner city watershed associations that conducted restoration projects to improve conditions of the urban environment. Funds are then allocated from the nonprofits to local citizen groups working on watershed restoration. Many of these projects include neighborhood cleanup of trash and planting trees along riverbanks or streets to reduce air and water pollution. By the early 2000s, Parks and People was promoting homeowner stewardship and requiring residents to care for the trees the organization planted for the first five years. Citizen involvement oftentimes increases community cohesion, reducing social problems in the city (Kusel and Adler, 2003; Parks and People, 2011).

By 2002, the Revitalizing Baltimore Steering Committee was discussing a new cooperative called the U.S. Baltimore Urban Watershed Forestry Research Demonstration Cooperative. The cooperative encouraged the collaboration of citizens, community organizations, natural resource managers, and federal, state, and private researchers. As part of this cooperative BES leaders and Parks and People created the
Watershed 263 (W263) demonstration project, a partnership between the Baltimore Public Works Department and the USDA Forest Service to monitor water quality and revitalize communities. This demonstration project provides educational opportunities and promotes economic development by enhancing inner city neighborhoods (Kusel and Adler, 2003; Parks and People, 2006, 2011). The success of this project has lead other cities including Boston, Washington, D.C., New York City, Pittsburgh, and New Haven to incorporate similar stormwater models. Many of Parks and People’s current community forestry projects are centered on W263 (a subwatershed of Gwynns Falls) which is now an independent nonprofit (separated from BRPD after 2003) pursuing an expanding agenda (Kusel and Adler, 2003; Cadenasso et al., 2006; Parks and People, 2006).

Role of Casey Trees and Parks and People in Urban Community Forestry

Casey Trees’ Role

Casey Trees’ (2011) primary role in urban community forestry management is their mission to “restore, enhance, and protect the tree canopy of our nation’s capital.” All efforts of the organization are in sync with this main goal, or as Executive Director, Mark Buscaino, would say, “we use it as our cue and guide and it’s served us exceptionally well.” This nonprofit seeks to increase the tree canopy and help the city achieve its goal of 40% coverage. To achieve that goal Casey Trees holds community planting events, develops partnerships with local citizens to ensure proper maintenance of trees, and raises awareness of the importance of protecting existing trees in the city (Buscaino, 2010; Casey Trees, 2011). The organization engages in many other activities
aside from tree planting. Educational outreach is promoted through summer internships, workshops, presentations, planting events, tree walks (tree identification tours), the Lead Citizen Forester Program, and through forest ecology classes (Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010). According to Buscaino, “every person from the board to the field staff and just in terms of the breadth of the organization [are] all responsible for outreach” (Buscaino, 2010).

Casey Trees’ role is not just about planting and educating people about trees. Additionally, the organization plays a role in mobilizing people around trees, communication, design, planning, and geographical analysis. Casey Trees serves as an advocate and broker for tree issues. According to Deputy Director, Mike Galvin, staff members view the organization as “kind of a broker and translator to take those messages and package them in ways that the average citizens can understand” (Galvin, 2010c). Thus the organization has the ability to communicate scientific information concerning the importance of urban vegetation. In addition to disseminating information from the scientific community to the public and raising awareness about trees, Education Director Sue Erhardt argues that the organization serves as “a think tank for all urban and community forestry groups and [is] able to be that because [it has] an endowment and secure funding and the biggest limit is our imagination” (Erhardt, 2010).

_Parks and People’s Role_

The Parks and People Foundation (2011) pursues a much broader mission of “supporting a wide range of recreational and educational opportunities; creating and sustaining beautiful and lively parks; and promoting a healthy natural environment for
Baltimore.” As demonstrated by its mission and history, the Foundation has goals in addition to urban community forestry. However, promoting community forestry is a key part of the organization’s Great Parks, Clean Streams and Green Communities Division (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010). This group’s role in urban forestry management is framed in the larger context of neighborhood revitalization. The breadth of the organization’s forestry projects has been described by President and CEO, Jackie Carrera, as having “everything to do with the economic future of the city, the economic health of the city, the community health, and the public health” (Carrera, 2010). Revitalization is achieved by providing a number of services such as hands-on learning experience in green jobs for local youth and college students (interns serving as community organizers), environmental education programs for elementary students, and providing technical assistance for community greening grants to local citizen groups (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010).

Additionally, Parks and People seeks to restore natural ecosystem functions by increasing the tree canopy through planting trees, reducing the amount of asphalt surface and runoff, and by promoting environmental stewardship in the city. To promote community involvement in these activities the organization serves as a catalyst for planting and caring for trees by creating a demand for urban greening. However, one thing that sets them apart from other nonprofit organizations is the time they devote to monitoring and evaluating the effects of community forestry projects. Measurable change is assessed through water quality testing (Carrera, 2010; Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010).
Change in Role

Over time the urban community forestry mission of these two groups has shifted. Initially, Casey Trees expanded to include a focus on green roof demonstration projects. However, as the organization defined itself and became a nonprofit leader in community forestry in the District, it no longer viewed green roofs as a primary focus. Staff members and the Board of Directors emphasized the importance of adhering to the organization’s original mission statement. Recently this group completed a green roof demonstration project at its new headquarters in the Brookland neighborhood of Washington, D.C.; however, it is one of many projects. Casey Trees continues to increase the level of community involvement in tree planting events and tree maintenance on private and public property (Buscaino, 2010; Galvin, 2010c).

In the case of Parks and People, the organization’s role in urban community forestry has shifted more frequently. Community forestry efforts began with the restoration of vacant lots and expanded to include city-wide forestry projects conducted at a neighborhood scale. The Revitalizing Baltimore Project increased the group’s role in community forestry management. As Revitalizing Baltimore funds declined Parks and People continued to expand its forestry efforts by establishing the Watershed 263 Project. The scope of the organization’s forestry projects has shifted in response to the availability of funds, including grants and donations. One could argue that nonprofits have a tendency to isolate themselves from their missions in order to survive; however, having the ability to adapt and change has its advantages (Carrera, 2010; Hager, 2010). President of Parks and People, Jackie Carrera, addresses these advantages: “Our role has
shifted over time and where we have the flexibility as a nonprofit and a pretty entrepreneurial nonprofit to shift our role and go where we’re needed and when we’re needed” (Carrera, 2010). Taking on new grant opportunities allows the organization to reinvent itself and provide a broader scope of community forestry services to neighborhoods most in need of those services.

Today urban community forestry work is woven into a variety of programs at Casey Trees and Parks and People. In the case of Casey Trees, all programs have some focus related to forestry but each department hits on a different aspect in the field (Figure 3). The Community Tree Planting Program serves as the main program to conduct ground work for tree planting and organizing volunteers. The Education Program assists in raising awareness and providing hands-on learning experience to promote involvement in the organization’s programs and initiatives. The Planning and Design Program seeks to develop innovative stormwater management and development designs that harness the benefits of trees. The Geographic Resources branch performs analysis on tree data using Geographic Information Systems, quantifying ecosystem services to send out a clearer message about the value of trees. The Communications Program ties it all together by addressing how the importance of each department’s work can be best communicated to the general public and, in turn, increase participation in urban community forestry projects (Buscaino, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Herwig, 2010).

In the case of Parks and People, community forestry programs and projects fall under the Community Greening Department within the Great Parks, Clean Streams and Green Communities Division (Figure 4). These community greening programs include
Vacant Lots where city lots are restored through planting efforts, Schoolyard Greening, Street Trees, and the Public Housing Initiative, which promotes the participation of lower income residents in community greening projects. Other programs have goals in community forestry such as the Green Career Ladder, which provides youth with green job skills, the Community Grants Program, which assists in the delivery of greening grants to local groups, and the Greening for Water Quality Program, which is connected to the W263 Project. Additionally, the Community Greening Resource Network promotes community greening programs by increasing communication and partnerships among local greening groups, and by creating tool banks that serve as sites for accessible equipment to all network members (Carrera, 2010; Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010; Parks and People, 2011).

**Conclusion**

Since their inception, both Parks and People and Casey Trees have shifted their roles in urban community forestry management. Parks and People changed gears frequently to broaden its scope of work. Casey Trees initially focused on green roof projects. However, this was later determined to be unrepresentative of their original mission statement. Although their missions vary, these two groups carry out similar community forestry work such as providing green job opportunities, planting on a variety of landscapes, and motivating people to care for trees and respect nature in their neighborhoods. However, a variety of factors set these two organizations apart. First, Parks and People emphasizes community capacity building while Casey Trees mobilizes volunteers. Second, Casey Trees relies more on GIS-based technology. Third, projects
are conducted at different scales. Finally, Casey Trees has an endowment while Parks and People must constantly raise funds (Buscaino, 2010; Carrera, 2010; Cocke, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010; Smiley, 2010).

Figure 3: Casey Trees Organization Chart.
This chart demonstrates the structure in which Casey Trees’ community forestry programs are carried out and which staff members are responsible for administering them. Different aspects of urban forestry are woven into each department. Source: Casey Trees, 2010.
Figure 4: Organization Chart of the Parks and People Foundation. This chart demonstrates the structure of Parks and People’s community forestry projects and who is responsible for administering them under the Great Parks, Clean Steam and Green Communities Division. Within this Division several programs incorporates different aspects of urban greening. Source: Parks and People, 2010.
CHAPTER 4: NEIGHBORHOOD CASE STUDIES

Introduction

This chapter examines community forestry efforts in two neighborhoods: Petworth in northwest Washington, DC and Franklin Square in west Baltimore. These neighborhoods have been identified by Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation as successful urban community forestry projects. The approach these two groups took to measure success and introduce urban community forestry to Petworth and Franklin Square demonstrate how these organizations operate on the ground. This chapter examines the reasons behind their success and how these nonprofits promote positive change at a local scale.

History of Petworth and Franklin Square

Demographics

Historically, Petworth and Franklin Square developed at very different rates. Since the 1800s Petworth has experienced a full cycle of gentrification. Franklin Square’s development on the other hand, occurred later and at a slower pace (Fehr, 1992). Once rated “the most desirable place to live in Baltimore” today Franklin Square is struggling (Hayward and Belfoure, 1999, 63). Demographically, from the mid-1800s to the 1960s Franklin Square was home to wealthy white merchants and politicians including governors, mayors, and congressmen. Similar to many inner city neighborhoods in Baltimore, Franklin Square was negatively impacted by white flight after WWII when a large part of the wealthy population relocated to the suburbs (Roderick, 1993; Hayward and Belfoure, 1999). However, this wasn’t the only reason for the neighborhood’s
population decline. Massive development projects such as the 1-70 corridor bordering the north end of Franklin Square (Mulberry and Franklin St.) displaced thousands of residents between 1974 and 1978 (Schneidereith & Sons, 1976; Roderick, 1993). Today, Franklin Square’s population is approximately 2,000 people. Roughly 96% of the population is now African American. It has undergone a transformation from a wealthy neighborhood with well-maintained green space to a lower income area characterized by an 18.4% unemployment rate and relatively poor access to parks and trees (Keen, 1979; Hayward and Belfoure, 1999; American Community Survey, 2009). Many residents deal with poor housing conditions and vacant boarded up houses are not uncommon. With a median household income of $24,231 a year, local residents are hard pressed to find money for housing improvements. These residents are making less than half the national average household income of $51,425 annually, leaving a large portion of Franklin Square’s population in poverty (Keen, 1979; American Community Survey, 2009). Many young teens have resorted to drug dealing for income, leading to increased crime rates (Simon and Burns, 1997).

Petworth also experienced a decline in population. From 1990 to 2000 the neighborhood’s growth was -8%. Part of this decline can be attributed to white flight. However, the recent construction of a new metro station displaced residents, especially near Grant Circle and caused housing values in the immediate vicinity to depreciate (Fehr, 1992; American Community Survey, 2006-08). As of 2008 the population was approximately 57,000 and predominately African American (around 75%), although young middle class white professionals have begun to move into the neighborhood.
In 1999 the opening of the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro Station caused housing values to skyrocket from $100,000 to $200,000 in the early 1990s to approximately $400,000 in 2001 (Fehr, 1992; Karklis, 2008). Until the 1950s, Petworth was a predominately white neighborhood with immigrants from Europe and Asia occupying many row houses in the area. After WWII African Americans relocated to Petworth where housing was affordable. Starting in the 1980s, Central American immigrants moved into vacant row houses throughout the neighborhood. Today the population is aging and poor African American and Latino residents are moving in search of more affordable housing.

Development

Franklin Square was originally named after the town square (Franklin Square Park), one of Baltimore’s oldest public squares. Prior to the establishment of the square the only parks that existed in the neighborhood were privately owned, such as Garrett Park, managed by a home-owners association until 1901 (Roderick, 1993). In 1839 two and a half acres of land including Franklin Square Park and the bordering blocks of row houses were purchased by James Canby, a successful Delaware businessman. By 1845, Canby had donated the land to the City of Baltimore with the stipulation that the city maintain it as a public square. After receiving this donation the city planted a variety of lindens, maples, poplars, and cedars in the park (Evening Sun, 1960; Schart, 1971; Hayward and Belfoure, 1999). By 1850 the neighborhood was described as “a showcase of Baltimore” and by the 1880s it became the home of wealthy politicians such as Governor Bradford (Keen, 1979, 1). Stone congregational churches were built around the
square to serve new residents. In the late 1880s to early 1900s additional health care and educational facilities were established such as Coppin Normal School (1888-Coppin State College) and the Maryland Medical College (1901-purchased by Bradford) known as Franklin Square Hospital (Evening Sun, 1960; Live Baltimore Center, 2010). By 1890, the introduction of the electric trolley boosted development further, particularly beyond Fulton Avenue. In 1904 luxurious three-story Italianate row houses built by Jeremiah Blanch began to line the public square. Development of these brick houses with their intricate iron work railings, staircases, and balconies continued through the 1950s. The presence of Franklin Square Park continued to attract new residents and fueled real estate success (Figures 5 and 6) (NRHP, 1982; Roderick, 1993).

Figure 5: Franklin Square Houses on Carey Street. This figure shows Italianate row houses adjacent to Franklin Square Park during the time of real estate success in the area. Source: MD Department, Pratt Library, 1936.
Franklin Square remained a white wealthy neighborhood up until World War II. By the 1970s the neighborhood had transformed into a lower income area occupied predominately by African Americans. In the 1970s and 1980s the neighborhood continued to witness the deterioration of housing conditions. Even the town square began to lose its beauty. According to Keen (1979, 1) “the square’s once carefully tended shrubbery and flowers are no more, though remnants of big trees remain.” In 1979, efforts to restore and stimulate the local economy included renovating row houses on Waverly Terrace, a project funded by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Figure 7). As of 2009, Franklin Square was still experiencing a high vacancy rate and poor living conditions (American Community Survey, 2005-09).

In the case of Petworth, early settlers were mainly wealthy white people establishing large estates such as the James White Estate, the largest in the District. However, in 1803 James passed away and his land was purchased by the Tayloe family,
extending their property from Rock Creek Church Road to Piney Branch Park. In the early 1800s several governors and mayors established large estates along Georgia Avenue and Rock Creek Church Road (Proctor, 1944, 1946). By 1810, Old 7th Street, now known as Georgia Avenue, was built, facilitating further growth in Petworth. It wasn’t until the mid-1800s that Petworth was incorporated and split away from the neighborhood of Brightwood. By the 1850s wealthy residents such as John Cammack, the pioneer gardener, began to beautify the neighborhood by building greenhouses along 14th, E, and R streets. Later in the 1880s large estate holders such as B. H. Warner and Myron Parker engaged in urban greening projects. These estate holders purchased and subdivided the Tayloe heirs’ land providing attractive features such as sidewalks and canopy trees to prospective buyers (Proctor, 1944; Mayors, 1981).

Figure 7: Waverly Terrace Town Houses. These photos show what the Waverly Terrace row houses looked like before and after the 1979 renovations took place in Franklin Square. Source: News America, 1979.

Post-Civil War the neighborhood experienced a large wave of Irish, German, and Jewish immigration, although the neighborhood’s local economy remained rooted in the
housing and medical services provided to soldiers. The Old Soldiers Home, built in 1851 along Rock Creek Church Road, and the Walter Reed Army Medical Center (established in 1909) shaped the historic landscape of Petworth. Additionally, in the 1880s, a street car line built along Georgia Avenue stimulated economic growth in Petworth (Mayor, 1981; Ogilvie, 2000). Throughout the early part of the 20th century and into the 1920s two-story row houses with white picket fences sprung up in Petworth. Many of these properties were enhanced by flower or vegetable gardens. During the 1950s the city sought to revitalize the area along Georgia Avenue by adding large hemlock trees to the streetscape (Figure 8) (MacGill, 1995; Proctor, 1946).

By the 1960s crime in Petworth had increased substantially and the area was no longer home to wealthy estate holders or a destination for immigrants (Fehr, 1992; Karklis, 2008). Population decline in Petworth did not occur simply as a result of white flight. In the 1970s and 1980s ward 4 experienced a decline in population due to a drop in
military housing and a reduction in operations at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Despite the loss of veteran housing Georgia Avenue continued to prosper through the 1980s making way for a variety of services, including fast food joints, barber shops, gas stations, and financial, medical and real estate services (Mayors, 1981). In recent years Petworth has experienced a turn around with the opening of the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro Station in 1999.

Organizations’ Involvement

Urban Community Forestry Projects

Today local nonprofit organizations such as Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation have taken on the challenge of revitalizing neighborhoods in DC and Baltimore by promoting urban community forestry. Focused on the neighborhood scale these groups have sought to improve urban forest conditions and the health of communities in places like Petworth and Franklin Square. Their success notwithstanding, it is important to recognize the different approach each organization has taken to promote local revitalization (Cocke, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010; Smiley, 2010).

In the case of Casey Trees, the group’s mission is not just to grow trees but to build community capacity and educate residents about the benefits of trees, in hopes that neighbors will learn to respect urban green space. According to Education Director, Sue Erhardt, “We don’t only grow trees we grow people. Because we want to raise that next generation of appreciating trees and green space” (Erhardt, 2010). This idea is related to the Broken Window Thesis where if one person cares for trees in the neighborhood, then
other residents begin to catch on and engage in community greening (Wilson and Keilling, 1982). According to Volunteer Coordinator Carol Herwig, Casey Trees’ approach to urban forestry management has been deemed a success because it has generated interest among residents (Herwig, 2010). Motivated residents in turn have exhibited a new respect for the urban forest and a willingness to care for it (Herwig, 2010).

Although both organizations work at the neighborhood scale, Parks and People’s approach tends to be broader in scope. It goes beyond improving physical conditions or community cohesion. The following quote by Senior Director, Guy Hager, addresses this broader mission of Parks and People’s urban community forestry projects: “We’re looking to comprehensively revitalize a neighborhood or a community, both in terms of quality of life and other economic means” (Hager, 2010). One could argue that both nonprofits offer the potential to improve quality of life and health through tree planting. However, Parks and People’s strategy is broader in terms of the variety of projects and programs they provide and their goal of directly improving health of urban ecosystems, framed within the context of watershed restoration (Goldman, 2008; Hager, 2010).

For several years, Casey Trees and Parks and People have been committed to promoting urban community forestry activities in Petworth and Franklin Square (Table 2; Figure 16). Casey Trees’ Volunteer Coordinator, Carol Herwig, has been a resident of Petworth for twenty-five years, and originally encouraged the organization’s involvement in the neighborhood during her early days as a volunteer. Beginning in 2001, she initiated the planting of day lilies at St. Paul’s Church in Rock Creek Park (Herwig, 2010). Similar
projects have been initiated in Petworth almost every season since then (Furr, 2010). By 2005 the organization had branched out, organizing other activities such as the Cherry Blossom Festival held at Grant Circle. During the festival, Casey Trees distributed flower pots to residents to beautify the area. As demonstrated by Herwig, the festival proved to be a great success and the following spring, in 2006, Casey Trees partnered with the Petworth Library to host it (Herwig, 2010). However, organization staff and volunteers continue to revisit and improve conditions at Grant Circle where the original Cherry Blossom Festival was held (Erhardt, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

In 2007 Casey Trees began to beautify the neighborhood’s triangle parks. The District of Columbia has hundreds of small triangle parks and traffic circles thanks to Pierre L’Enfant’s unique city plan. Until recently, many of the triangle parks had issues with trash, shrubs, and drugs (Table 2). In fall 2007 Casey Trees volunteers planted 20 trees at Taylor Street, Sheppard, and Upshur Park. Later that spring the organization moved on to two triangle parks at Georgia Avenue, Upshur, and 7th and Taylor (Figure 9) (Furr, 2010; Herwig, 2010). The parks were in desperate need of restoration. The organization provided and planted twenty-five trees, cleared shrubs, and installed new benches, making the park a more inviting place. Several community members took notice of Casey Trees’ work and began to utilize the parks more frequently. According to Herwig, one positive result was a reduction in drug activity (Herwig, 2010). Casey Trees continues to revisit these sites and make improvements as needed. In 2007 this group began to reach out to school children by organizing an educational planting event at Clark Elementary School, giving students a chance to interact with and appreciate nature
Students, teachers, and Casey Trees’ staff collaborated in greening the schoolyard with twelve new trees (Erhardt, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

Table 2: Casey Trees’ Forestry Projects in Petworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Trees Planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2007</td>
<td>First Planting Day Lilies</td>
<td>St. Paul’s at Rock Creek Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>Cherry Blossom Festival (Flower Pots)</td>
<td>Grant Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>Cherry Blossom Festival</td>
<td>Petworth Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Triangle Park Planting</td>
<td>Taylor St.-Shepherd/Upshur</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Triangle Park Plantings, cleared shrubs</td>
<td>Georgia Ave-Upshur &amp; 7th and Taylor</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Smaller Triangle Planting (Ornamental)</td>
<td>Rock Creek Church Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Smaller Triangle Planting</td>
<td>Georgia, Kansas &amp; Varnum Streets</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>Clark Elementary School</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Flower and Tree Planting</td>
<td>St. Paul’s at Rock Creek Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Rose Garden, Tree Planting (hillside erosion control)</td>
<td>Rock Creek Cemetery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>Georgia Ave-Upshur &amp; 7th and Taylor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Restoring the Elms</td>
<td>Kansas Ave</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tree Planting (River Birch, Bold Sycamore-stormwater control)</td>
<td>Rock Creek Cemetery</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Planted New Oak Trees</td>
<td>Rock Creek Cemetery</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tree Planting - replaced missing trees</td>
<td>Sherman Circle</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tree and Perennial Plantings</td>
<td>16th Ave, Metro Station-Grant Circle (Median Strip)</td>
<td>long run-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>River Smart Homes (Birches, Circus Berries for private residences-stormwater control)</td>
<td>Petworth Neighborhood</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personal interviews, 2010.
Figure 9: Georgia Avenue, Upshur, 7th and Taylor Park. This figure shows one of the triangle parks in Petworth where Casey Trees hosted a planting event. Source: Photo by Author, July 2010.

Figure 10: Clark Elementary School. This figure shows an elementary school where Casey Trees worked with students and teachers to plant trees. Source: Photo by Author, July 2010.

Since 2007 the organization has reconnected with the church community at St. Paul’s and organized several plantings. Starting in 2009 Casey Trees focused attention on Rock Creek Cemetery, establishing rose gardens and planting trees on hillsides to reduce erosion. Later, in 2010, organization volunteers returned to Rock Creek Cemetery to
plant eighteen trees, primarily River Birches (*Betula*) and Bald Cypress (*Taxodium*) for stormwater management. Additionally, large oaks (*Quercus*) were planted near the cemetery entrance. Other recent projects include planting hybrid elms (*Ulmus*) and replacing missing trees on Sherman Circle (Figure 11) (Erhardt, 2010; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010). The most extensive project Casey Trees is currently working on is the New Hampshire Avenue median strip planting (Figure 12). The organization was contracted by the city to plant approximately sixty trees surrounded by bulbs along an entire block extending from the Georgia Avenue-Petworth Metro Station to Grant Circle. Over sixty volunteers were involved in this extensive project (Todd, 2010; Herwig, 2010). Recently, Casey Trees has also been successful promoting programs such as River Smart Homes in Petworth. This program provides free trees and design tips to residents to better manage stormwater runoff in the city (Herwig, 2010; Hill, 2010).

Although, both organizations have broadened their horizons by extending urban community forestry projects to a variety of landscapes (schoolyards, parks, gardens, medians, traffic circles) Parks and People has engaged in several projects beyond tree planting related to watershed restoration (Table 3; Figure 17). Much of the group’s work in Franklin Square is framed within the context of a watershed and urban forest restoration plan centered on Watershed 263. This plan was developed by Baltimore Ecosystem Study scientists in cooperation with Parks and People to restore waterways and forested areas within an urban watershed, providing an opportunity to demonstrate measurable improvements at a micro scale. Watershed 263 is a 930-acre subwatershed of the Gwynns Falls watershed in west Baltimore. This plan was designed to foster
community participation and stewardship through community greening and water restoration projects. Franklin Square became one of the first sites to test the new Watershed 263 plan (Stack and Hager, 2006; Hager, 2010).

Figure 11: Sherman Circle.
This figure shows one of the traffic circles where Casey Trees hosted a community planting in partnership with the National Park Service. Source: Photo by Author, July 2010.
In 2004 Parks and People began its involvement in Franklin Square with a schoolyard greening and asphalt removal project at the local elementary school. According to Senior Director Guy Hager, it has been one of the organization’s biggest success stories (Hager, 2010). Parks and People worked with students, teachers, and the principal to redesign and transform the schoolyard into an outdoor classroom. Together these volunteers worked to create a new garden and an outdoor reading circle, and to plant trees such as dogwoods (*Cornus*) along the edge of the schoolyard (Figure 13). Over an acre of asphalt was removed from the school grounds (Goldman, 2008; Hardcastle, 2009; Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010).
Table 3: Parks and People Watershed 263 Forestry Projects in Franklin Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2006</td>
<td>Asphalt removal &amp; greening</td>
<td>Franklin Square EMS - 215 Stricker Street</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Alley removal and Bio-Swale</td>
<td>Bruce St. &amp; Fulton Ave.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Tree planting (2 large Dogwoods)</td>
<td>Bruce Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Bioretention</td>
<td>Baltimore St. &amp; Frederick Ave.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>N. Mount &amp; Lexington Sts.</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Curb Extension</td>
<td>W. Fayette &amp; N. Mount St.</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Catch Basin Insert</td>
<td>Bruce at Baltimore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Inlet modification</td>
<td>Fulton at Lexington NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Filterra</td>
<td>Farmount &amp; Fulton Ave.</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Catch Basin Insert</td>
<td>Lexington at Mount (SV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Sand Filter</td>
<td>Alley between Fayette and Fairmount at Addison</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Bio-Swale</td>
<td>N. Mount &amp; Baltimore Sts.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Street Tree Planting; create new tree pits</td>
<td>Franklin Square - Subshed O</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td>Lexington Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td>Kids Grow</td>
<td>Franklin Square</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td>Project Blue</td>
<td>Franklin Square</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


![Franklin Square Elementary School](Image)  
Figure 13: Franklin Square Elementary School.  
This figure shows Franklin Square Elementary where Parks and People worked with students and teachers to green the schoolyard. Source: Photo by Author, July 2010.

The organization’s efforts at the school continued well into 2006, when the elementary school adopted an environmental education program. As a result, in
2005 Franklin Square Elementary School became a community host for two Parks and People environmental education programs: Kids Grow and Project Blue. These programs have continued to gain interest within the community. Kids Grow is an after school environmental education program where elementary students engage in greening activities, learning about topics such as habitats, watersheds, gardening, nutrition, and natural cycles. Project Blue targets middle school students and teaches valuable lessons about urban ecosystem and watershed management. To promote these concepts Parks and People personnel work with students to provide hands-on experience in field investigations (Cocke, 2010; Hardcastle and McDaniels, 2010).

In 2008 Parks and People began to invest time in other Watershed 263 urban community forestry projects such as clearing out the Bruce Street Alley and planting two new large dogwoods. Nearby residents have taken on the responsibility of watering trees (Goldman, 2008). During the period 2004-2010 Parks and People has also been involved in a variety of other watershed restoration greening projects (Table 3). Many of these projects, such as curb extensions, inlet modifications, catch basin inserts, and bio-swale and bioretention measures, have been put in place to more effectively manage stormwater runoff and provide a means to filter pollutants and improve water quality (Figures 14 and 15). Parks and People has also continued to participate in landscaping such as the community plantings on Lexington Street (Start and Hager, 2009; Hager, 2010; Smiley, 2010).
Figure 14: Curb Extension at Mount and Fayette Streets. This figure shows an example of a curb extension installed by Parks and People to reduce stormwater runoff. Source: Photo by Author, October 2010.

Figure 15: Inlet Modification at NW Lexington and Fulton Streets. This figure shows an example of an inlet modification installed by Parks and People to control stormwater and monitor water quality. Source: Photo by Author, October 2010.
Figure 16: Casey Trees Community Forestry Projects in Petworth.
Figure 17: Parks and People Community Forestry Projects in Franklin Square.

**Partnerships and Funding**

Casey Trees and Parks and People have engaged in a variety of partnerships to promote urban community forestry in Petworth and Franklin Square. In the case of Petworth, Casey Trees has developed partnerships with local residents, churches,
developers, neighborhood associations, elementary schools, libraries, the National Park Service (NPS), the D.C. Department of the Environment, and the DC Urban Forestry Administration (Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Kelso, 2010). In past years schoolyard plantings at Clark and Bernard Elementary Schools, Casey Trees established a relationship with school principals and students to promote forestry projects. In the case of the National Park Service partnership, NPS granted the organization permission to plant on Park Service property and provided assistance with plantings during community events at Grant and Sherman Circles (Erhardt, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

Casey Trees has also worked diligently to form partnerships with local churches. For example, long-time partner St. Paul’s Church assists by watering the trees that volunteers plant in the vicinity of the church. The First Baptist and Petworth Methodist Churches have also assisted Casey Trees by watering and providing meeting space to organize community planting events (Herwig, 2010). Casey Trees has formed partnerships with other stakeholders such as the Urban Forestry Administration, development corporations (Petworth Neighborhood Development Corporation) and local residents to ensure that the trees, shrubs, and flowers that are planted are watered, mulched, and cared for. Government agencies such as the District Department of the Environment have provided funding and worked closely with Casey Trees to promote the River Smart Homes Program, which many Petworth residents have taken advantage of recently. The majority of Casey Trees’ community planting projects in Petworth were funded by the organization’s endowment. Additional funding providers included the
Given the broader scope of the Parks and People Foundation’s community forestry work in Franklin Square, a greater variety of stakeholders has partnered and assisted the organization. However, both organizations have invested time partnering with federal, state, and municipal authorities. In Franklin Square, primary Watershed 263 partners include the Baltimore City Department of Public Works, Recreation and Parks Department, the Baltimore Ecosystem Study, and the USDA Forest Service. Parks and People has had multiple partners provide financial assistance for Watershed 263 projects. These stakeholders include the USDA Forest Service, Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Maryland Forest Service, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Baltimore City Department of Public Works, Baltimore Planning Department, Chesapeake Bay Trust, Rauch Foundation, and the Campbell Foundation for the Environment. Major funders of Franklin Square community greening projects have been the USDA Forest Service and the Chesapeake Bay Trust (Start and Hager, 2009; Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010).

The Parks and People Foundation has developed additional partnerships with the Franklin Square Community Association, the Bon Secours Foundation of Maryland, and the Maryland Port Administration. The latter has been a major player in Parks and People’s success at Franklin Square Elementary assisting with the removal of 1.39 acres of asphalt on the school grounds. This partnership allows developers to make community
forestry contributions to meet city stormwater mitigation requirements. As a result of these partnerships in 2009 the elementary school was one of the first to be named a Maryland Green School by the Maryland Association for Environmental and Outdoor Education (Hardcastle, 2009; Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010).

Organizations’ Change in Neighborhood Forest Conditions and Reasons for Success

Perceptions of Change in Urban Forest Conditions

According to Casey Trees staff and volunteers, their urban community forestry efforts have changed Petworth’s forest conditions through physical, educational, and community involvement (Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010). Physically, the organization has planted approximately 300 trees in the neighborhood, transforming bare city lands into attractive urban green spaces. The following quote by Jeff Furr, Casey Trees’ Lead Citizen Forester, speaks to this idea of the organization’s planting projects making a difference in the attractiveness of Petworth: “The visual change would probably be the number one. Where Casey Trees has planted there’s a visual distinction” (Furr, 2010). Petworth has seen a transformation over the past decade from an area with a declining tree canopy to a greener more inviting place. Visually, this transformation is starting to manifest itself as young trees and flower beds begin to mature. This is a stark contrast to conditions twenty years ago when open space in Petworth was often devoid of vegetation and filled with trash (Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010).

Today, with the assistance of organizations like Casey Trees to encourage residents’ involvement in plantings, the community’s urban forest conditions have
improved. Residents such as staff member Carol Herwig, have noticed a positive change in Petworth in terms of the number of people engaging in community greening activities. “Now there are blocks and blocks where people have greened, you know my neighbors on both sides have decided to landscape and plant some flowers” (Herwig, 2010).
According to two interviewees, the effect of Casey Trees’ efforts in Petworth are not just visual; they’re encouraging new interest in community forestry and greening projects (Furr, 2010; Herwig, 2010). These active community members have taken on the responsibility to care for trees and flowers for two years after a Casey Trees planting event (Furr, 2010; Herwig, 2010). These partnerships help to ensure a higher survival rate for new plantings, while encouraging interested residents to take advantage of planting opportunities on their private property (Galvin, 2010c; Herwig, 2010). According to Lead Citizen Forester Kevin Kelso, growing Petworth’s tree canopy has raised community pride and respect for the neighborhood’s urban forest (Kelso, 2010).

Changes to Franklin Square’s urban forest have been similar to the effects seen in Petworth. Prior to the organization’s involvement the neighborhood experienced minor vegetation cover (Cocke, 2010; Smiley, 2010). Residents have noticed the visual impact Parks and People’s community greening projects have had on the neighborhood. According to volunteer Ashanti Smiley, “It looks really good around here. I think it’s helped the community out and made it look more attractive” (Smiley, 2010). According to Hager, many of these projects were request driven and allowed Parks and People to engage more community members and local youth in urban greening projects, promoting further respect for urban green space (Hager, 2010).
**Reasons for Success in Petworth and Franklin Square**

The success of Casey Trees in Petworth and the Parks and People Foundation in Franklin Square can be attributed to a number of factors. First and foremost has been the ability of each organization to adapt and change. Originally, Casey Trees initiated planting projects based solely on aerial photography, identifying areas in D.C. where vegetation was lacking. Today their Community Tree Planting Program is entirely request driven. In other words, Casey Trees goes where the partnerships are (Galvin, 2010c). Parks and People initially focused on widget counting (counting numbers of trees and volunteer hours), placing emphasis on the sheer numbers of trees planted. Today, the organization’s efforts are based on a community capacity building model, where the most important factor in urban community forestry projects is the people. This form of urban greening requires a critical mass of community members and volunteers. In Senior Director Guy Hager’s words: “The key to that model’s success is stewardship from volunteers” (Hager, 2010).

However, it’s not just about having volunteers. It is about finding active community members who can mobilize and motivate residents to participate in community forestry projects to help clean up their neighborhoods. In the case of Parks and People’s successful partnership with the Franklin Square Elementary School, local activists are teachers, principals, and managers who are fully committed to greening both the school and neighborhood (Cocke, 2010). In Petworth the catalyst was Casey Trees’ Volunteer Coordinator, Carol Herwig. Deputy Director Mike Galvin emphasized the importance of having local activists and their ability to promote further success in
neighborhoods like Petworth: “In most cases there is a person who is kind of the spark plug. That local champion who really will rally and keep people on task. Carol is like the spark plug times ten” (Galvin, 2010c).

Conclusion

Both organizations have experienced success in these neighborhoods as a result of higher volunteer and neighborhood participation rates, although a variety of other factors have contributed. Additional factors that have led to Casey Trees’ success in Petworth include the sheer number of tree planting events, finding responsible resident caretakers to maintain trees, increased visual attractiveness, and having the necessary financial and technical tools. In Franklin Square, Parks and People’s success is based on the ability to provide a replicable model (Watershed 263) where local improvements are measurable. However, the level of the organizations’ commitment to these neighborhoods has been the impetus for their continued success (Cocke, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010; Smiley, 2010).
CHAPTER 5: PARTNERSHIPS AND FUNDING

Introduction

This chapter explores partnerships and funding of the Parks and People Foundation and Casey Trees. First, I examine a wide range of partnerships. In particular, these partnerships focus on relationships developed with local, state and federal governments, citizen groups, and other nonprofit organizations. Second, I discuss Parks and People’s and Casey Trees’ urban community forestry funding sources. Understanding the importance and complexity of these partnerships and funding opportunities provides insight into how these nonprofits operate on the ground and work towards achieving D.C.’s and Baltimore’s urban tree canopy goals.

Parks and People Foundation Partnerships

City Partnerships

Nonprofits such as Parks and People play a key role in implementing urban forestry work on the ground. Parks and People provides supplemental resources which the city lacks. These include forestry staff, work crew services, and community capacity building. The majority of the Foundation’s interactions with the city have been through partnering with the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department, Department of Public Works, and Housing Authority for Baltimore City (Cocke, 2010; Carrera, 2010; Draddy, 2010; Parks and People, 2006). According to President and CEO Jackie Carrera, Parks and People partners with the Recreation and Parks Department Forestry Division by “trying to figure out how to manage things more efficiently and effectively. [They’re] a part of that thinking process” (Carrera, 2010). Organization and city officials consult
during management and executive meetings to consider how the city’s urban forest and parks can be efficiently managed. Both the current Forestry Division and Parks and People staff recognize the resource they have in collaborative partnerships with one another (Carrera, 2010; Draddy, 2010).

In many cases, the Recreation and Parks Department, through the TreeBaltimore Program, purchases and distributes trees to Parks and People to plant throughout the city and occasionally provides grants to nonprofits working towards achieving Baltimore’s tree canopy goal. In return for providing trees, Parks and People shares planting equipment and provides service crews for city forestry and recreation projects such as the Gwynns Falls Trail. The Gwynns Falls Trail is a fifteen-mile long recreation trail that runs through Baltimore within the Gwynns Falls watershed. Parks and People and the USDA Forest Service collaborated with the Recreation and Parks Department during the planning and development stages of this trail. Today, Parks and People continues to assist the city by providing work crews to maintain brush along this recreational resource (Carrera, 2010; Cocke, 2010). Additionally, this group partners with the Recreation and Parks Department to conduct training sessions for city employees called Grow Workshops. These workshops focus on increasingly critical aspects of park management such as stewardship and fundraising (Cocke, 2010; Draddy, 2010).

According to Community Greening Stewardship Program Manager Abby Cocke, Parks and People “have a really symbiotic relationship on some levels” with the city (Cocke, 2010). Two examples that demonstrate this are the Partnerships for Parks program and Constellation Energy partnership. Partnerships for Parks is a joint program
between the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department and Parks and People where the Department provides funding for Parks and People to assist and distribute funds to local friends of park groups. In this partnership Parks and People works with the city to provide community capacity building training to local groups interested in making improvements to public parks in Baltimore. Additionally, Parks and People visits parks with local volunteer groups and provides the planting tools necessary to get the job done (Cocke, 2010; Draddy, 2010). According to TreeBaltimore Coordinator Anne Draddy, both parties benefit from the arrangement. Improvements are made to the city parks and Parks and People is funded to do what it does best, capacity building (Draddy, 2010).

In 2009 and 2010, the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department received funding from a local utility company, Constellation Energy, to develop partnerships in support of the TreeBaltimore Program (Bayor and Mayor, 2009; Draddy, 2010). Initiated by Anne Draddy, a partnership was formed between the Recreation and Parks Department, Parks and People, the Alliance for Chesapeake Bay, and the city watershed associations to increase tree plantings. These partners share Constellation Energy funds for tree planting and work together to identify target areas for TreeBaltimore efforts (Figure 18). In the case of Parks and People, the city pays the organization’s staff using Constellation Energy funds to perform a variety of tasks including outreach and volunteer recruitment for TreeBaltimore, maintaining street trees planted on public lands, and organizing and hosting community tree plantings. However, in the case of large street tree plantings, both the city and Parks and People assist volunteers with planting. This partnership assists the city by expanding the urban tree canopy, especially on private
property. Meanwhile, Parks and People takes advantage of a valuable funding opportunity (Cocke, 2010; Draddy, 2010).

Figure 18: TreeBaltimore Target Areas. This map shows target areas for TreeBaltimore plantings funded by Constellation Energy. Source: Bayor and Mayor, 2009.
Parks and People also partners with the Housing Authority for Baltimore City and the Department of Public Works. Promoted through the organization’s Public Housing Greening Initiative, Parks and People assists the housing authority by collaborating with public housing communities such as the Perkins Homes in southeast Baltimore on urban greening projects. Since 2007, Parks and People has partnered with residents of this community to plant 53 trees and three new garden beds (Parks and People Foundation, 2008; Carrera, 2010; Cocke, 2010). These projects improve the aesthetic quality of properties and livelihood of community members. In the case of the Department of Public Works, Parks and People’s partnership is centered on the Watershed 263 Project. The Department assisted in the development and installation of eight bio-swales throughout the designated project area (Figure 19). Bio-swales are designed to capture trash and heavy metals before they enter stormwater drains to reduce water pollution downstream. This partnership is key to improving water quality in Baltimore harbor and the Chesapeake Bay (Stack and Hager, 2006; Hager, 2010).

Figure 19: Bio-swale in the Herring Run Watershed in Baltimore. This figure shows a bio-swale at the Herring Run Watershed Center in Baltimore. Source: Ziger and Snead, 2010.
**State and Federal Partnerships**

Although few of Parks and People’s community greening programs are funded directly by the state, the organization has developed partnerships with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) and the office of the State Forester. In partnership with the Recreation and Parks Department, Parks and People collaborates with the state forester on urban forestry efforts. However, according to Jackie Carrera, the organization’s level of engagement in this partnership varies depending on the city’s current focus in urban community forestry (Carrera, 2010). Additionally, this group consults state foresters when participating in forestry projects such as public housing greening (Carrera, 2010). Parks and People’s partnership with the MDNR includes a project called Maryland Civil Justice Corps. This project began as a summer employment program for at risk city kids and now serves the entire state of Maryland. Parks and People staff supervise and train youth on the importance of preserving urban environments. In essence, Parks and People acts as a service provider for the program, offering training, volunteer recruitment, and program evaluation for the state (Hager, 2010).

The most important federal partner in this group has been the USDA Forest Service. Since 1992, the Forest Service has supported Parks and People by providing community forestry funds, leadership in research and strategic planning, and participating in schoolyard greening lectures (Carrera, 2010; Cocke, 2010). The Forest Service Research and Development Department works closely with Parks and People on the Baltimore Ecosystem Study, as well as urban tree canopy assessments. The USDA
Forest Service provided extensive leadership in the development of BES. Additionally, the Research and Development Department assists Parks and People with analytical and informational research needs. In 2001, the Forest Service conducted its first tree canopy assessment for Baltimore city. Today, this federal agency continues to work closely with Parks and People to implement urban canopy goals through prioritizing tree plantings in Baltimore (O’Neil-Dunne, 2009a; Grove, 2010).

Nonprofit Partnerships

According to Senior Director Guy Hager, Parks and People “were involved with either forming and funding or influencing and participating in the creation [of other Baltimore NGOs]” (Hager, 2010). This is true for the city’s three main watershed groups: Gwynns Falls, Herring Run, and Jones Falls. Throughout the 1990s, Parks and People worked closely with these watershed associations, all of which placed a high value on urban community forestry. Over the years as Parks and People’s mission shifted, its work with the watershed associations diminished, although partnerships still develop on a project level or individual basis (Hager, 2010; Pelton, 2010). Due to Parks and People’s involvement in Watershed 263 and BES, the group’s community forestry work has focused extensively on the Gwynns Falls Watershed. Recently, Parks and People partnered with the Gwynns Falls Watershed Association (GFWA-now part of Baltimore Water Alliance) to plan the Gwynns Falls Trail and to coordinate summer tree planting projects by AmeriCorps crews. In the case of the Gwynns Falls Trail, the GFWA provided input on the positioning of the trail to maximize stormwater capture (Pelton, 2010).
Additionally, Parks and People has collaborated with the Baltimore Harbor Watershed Association on Project Watershed 246. Similar to W263, watershed management strategies are used to reduce pollutants flowing into storm drains. These strategies include asphalt removal, tree planting, and community outreach to discourage littering (Pelton, 2010; Parks and People, 2011). These efforts are key to improving water quality in Baltimore harbor (Pelton, 2010).

**Citizen Partnerships**

Citizen partnerships are vital to the success of Parks and People’s capacity building model. According to Community Greening Stewardship Program Manager Abby Cocke, coordination with local citizen groups is conducted “on a case by case basis and there’s lots of different ways they work together. Some of them are more formal and funded, some less formal” (Cocke, 2010). Formal partnerships are typically organized around two community grant programs: Neighborhood Greening and Partnerships for Parks. Any group of local citizens may apply for either grant program. Grants for parks are intended to support citizen group’s efforts to improve Baltimore parks. Neighborhood greening grants apply to all other landscapes where groups are interested in participating in an urban greening project. Annually, Parks and People solicits proposals for community greening projects and offers training workshops to assist local groups through application procedures. Once a committee decides who to award, groups may be granted several hundred dollars. Parks and People continues to collaborate with groups by conducting site visits and advising groups on strategies for implementing greening projects. Throughout the year the organization continues to provide community
organizing and greening workshops and conducts site visits to ensure local citizen groups meet project objectives (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010; Smiley, 2010).

Other formal partnerships develop from coordination with local schools and neighborhood associations. Parks and People has partnered with several elementary and middle schools, such as Franklin Square Elementary, on schoolyard greening projects. These partnerships have been influential in encouraging grade schools to adopt environmental education programs (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010). In terms of neighborhood associations, Parks and People coordinates tree surveys and workshops. In 2007, Parks and People was approached by the Reservoir Hill Improvement Council to conduct a tree survey in their neighborhood. Since then, other associations such as Druid Hill Park have partnered with the organization to conduct tree surveys. Oftentimes, Parks and People will reach out to neighborhood associations to partner on urban greening projects or obtain additional volunteers to facilitate gardening and planting workshops (Cocke, 2010).

Less formal unfunded collaborations with Baltimore residents include volunteer projects, tree give-a-ways, the Community Greening Resource Network, and communications with individual volunteers (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010). A great example of a volunteer project is the women’s shelter on 114 N. Mount Street. For fifteen years, Parks and People has organized volunteers to participate in urban greening projects on this block. On the south end, large Sycamore trees were planted starting fifteen years ago. This past June 2010, 33 volunteers and 25 staff members participated in an asphalt removal project at 114 N. Mount Street. This demonstrates how Parks and People
continues to build on past successes and reconnect with the community (Hager, 2010). Additionally, this group sustains citizen networks such as the Community Greening Resource Network. This network is open to all residents and provides a means of communicating with urban greening members and accessing tool bank sites. At these sites, members are provided with the gardening tools needed to encourage community gardening and schoolyard greening (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010).

**Casey Trees Partnerships**

*City Partnerships*

Similar to Parks and People, Casey Trees views developing partnerships as a key component of their urban forestry work. According to Education Director Sue Erhardt, community forestry “is all about people and so you can’t plant a tree in an urban environment without a relationship with someone else” (Erhardt, 2010). To achieve forestry goals, Casey Trees partners with a wide range of District stakeholders. In terms of city partnerships, this group collaborates with government agencies such as the D.C. Planning Department, District Department of the Environment (DDOE), and Urban Forestry Administration (UFA). Casey Trees assists the Planning Department in establishing sustainability and health indicators and provides advice relating to tree ordinances such as the Pine Tree Ordinance (Buscaino, 2010). In relation to partnerships developed with the DDOE and UFA, community forestry efforts are centered on encouraging plantings on private property, Elm restoration, and providing implementation strategies to achieve the city’s tree canopy goal of 40% by 2035 (Buscaino, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hill, 2010; Lear, 2010).
In 2007, Casey Trees initiated tree plantings for the District Department of the Environment to promote the River Smart Homes Program (RSHP). Established in 2007 by DDOE, this program raises awareness of pollution prevention by implementing stormwater management practices on residential properties. This partnership has been successful as a result of DDOE’s enthusiasm and its non-point source pollution grant requirements for tree planting. DDOE incorporates tree planting into stormwater management on a regular basis but lacks the resources to conduct extensive tree planting. That’s where Casey Trees comes in and assists the agency by carrying out stormwater project implementation through tree planting (Galvin 2010c; Hill, 2010). The District Department of the Environment conducts stormwater audits to assess private property for its potential to implement stormwater management practices through the RSHP. These practices include installing shade trees, rain barrels, and rain gardens (Figure 20), bayscaping, and replacement of impervious pavement with pervious surfaces. Homeowners may be awarded up to $1,200 in subsidies for adopting these measures through the DDOE (Hill, 2010; DDOE, 2011).

As residents request shade trees DDOE directs them to Casey Trees for tree planting. This group consults with interested homeowners to identify suitable locations and tree species for their property. Tree species that Casey Trees plants include a variety of oaks, maples, birches, and evergreen trees (Table 4). Residents may choose to plant different species not offered by Casey Trees and receive a rebate through the organization’s Tree Rebate Program. Return costs vary by tree size (small-large), from $25.00 to $75.00 dollars (Hill, 2010; Casey Trees, 2011a).
In 2008, Casey Trees hosted a tree give-a-way to promote the River Smart Homes Program. The organization compiled a list of people at the event who were interested in adopting one of the five low-impact development practices offered through the RSHP. Clusters of interested people were mapped to identify eight River Smart Home demonstration sites. Casey Trees assisted in the promotion of these sites by providing trees and pick-up locations (Furr, 2010; Kelso, 2010; Hill, 2010). Casey Trees is also assisting DDOE with the development of green streetscape designs as part of the agency’s new River Smart DC program. In 2010, Casey Trees began redesigning streetscapes to capture stormwater runoff in Ward 8 near Oxen Run on Wheeler Terrace. The River Smart DC program, modeled on Parks and People’s Watershed 263 Project, focuses on retrofitting three stormsheds in the Rock Creek watershed. Casey Trees has contracted with DDOE to conduct extensive tree planting for this project. The District Department of the Environment intends to monitor the reduction in stormwater throughout the duration of the program. However, as Peter Hill, Chief of the Watershed
Protection Division Planning and Restoration Branch at DDOE noted, “it takes a lot of trees to see a change in the hydraulic flow” (Hill, 2010).

Table 4: Tree Species Casey Trees Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula nigra</em></td>
<td>River Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cladrastis kentukea</em></td>
<td>Yellowwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nyssa sylvatica</em></td>
<td>Blackgum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liquidambar styraciflua</em></td>
<td>Sweetgum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liriodendron tulipfera</em></td>
<td>Tulip Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Platanus occidentalis</em></td>
<td>Sycamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quercus alba</em></td>
<td>White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quercus bicolor</em></td>
<td>Swamp White Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quercus rubra</em></td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ilex opaca</em></td>
<td>American Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Magnolia grandiflora</em></td>
<td>Southern Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cedrus deodara</em></td>
<td>Deodar Cedar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows species type and common name for trees that Casey Trees will plant as part the River Smart Homes Program. Source: Casey Trees, 2011a.
Since 2003, Casey Trees has partnered with the Urban Forestry Administration to promote the agency’s Elm Restoration Program by planting over 1,750 elm trees throughout the District. The Urban Forestry Administration identifies suitable locations for hybrid elm trees to be planted in public rights-of-way and grants Casey Trees permission to plant street trees in public tree boxes and medians. Hybrid elms immune to Dutch Elm Disease include Jefferson, Valley Forge, Princeton, and New Harmony trees. Prior to 2009, UFA provided technical assistance and shared the cost of watering tubes with the organization to promote proper maintenance of elm trees. Casey Trees employs high school summer crews to water and maintain newly planted elms (Buscaino, 2010; Casey Trees, 2011b; Lear, 2010). This partnership is crucial to the success of the program.

Casey Trees and the Urban Forestry Administration partner on a variety of levels. At the “arborist” level, Casey Trees notifies UFA of any damaged street trees it finds while the UFA contacts them regarding potential opportunities to plant in public parks (Herwig, 2010; Lear, 2010). Additionally, Casey Trees occasionally hires foresters for the Urban Forestry Administration to reduce UFA’s cost of hiring additional staff. In return, Urban Forestry Administration staff members teach classes for Casey Trees’ Lead Citizen Forester program and encourage their staff to participate in weekend volunteer tree plantings (Buscaino, 2010; Herwig, 2010; Lear, 2010). In July 2010, UFA, DDOE, and Casey Trees joined forces again, this time to create an implementation plan to achieve D.C.’s urban tree canopy goal (Hill, 2010). To meet this goal, cooperation is required among a variety of District urban forestry stakeholders.
State and Federal Partnerships

Because of Washington, D.C.’s unique political status, partnerships at the state level do not exist the way they do in Baltimore. However, in the realm of forestry, District government agencies such as DDOE or UFA are often viewed as state entities (Buscaino, 2010). In the case of the Urban Forestry Administration, state foresters such as Monica Lear and John Thomas are housed in UFA. These foresters partner with Casey Trees in additional ways such as participating in the organization’s lecture series (Lear, 2010).

Federal partnerships have developed over the years to promote planting on federal land, the Weed Warrior Program, tree surveys, and USDA Forest Service-sponsored workshops, classroom instruction, canopy assessment, and technical and analytical research support (Buscaino, 2010; Ehardt, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Grove, 2010; Herwig, 2010). When seeking permission to plant on federal land in the District, Casey Trees submits a formal permit and distributes tree planting specifics to federal partnering agencies. In addition, the NPS and Government Services Administration (GSA) manages a great deal of land in the District. By performing landscaping work for GSA, Casey Trees is able to expand its efforts beyond national park land (Buscaino, 2010; Erhardt, 2010).

In 1999, Forest Ecologist Carole Bergmann from the Montgomery County Park System initiated the program known as Weed Warrior. In June 2010, Casey Trees produced its first class of Weed Warrior graduates. In collaboration with the University of the District of Columbia Extension, Casey Trees trains volunteers to remove invasive
species. Once training is complete, Casey Trees volunteers assist the NPS by removing non-native plants from National Park Service land. In August 2010, certified weed warrior volunteers focused their efforts on removing invasive species from Rock Creek Park (Casey Trees, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Jentz, 2010). Another NPS partnership involves examining climate change links to tree survey data. In 2010, Casey Trees began GIS analysis for this project and is working with NPS to address the potential development of outreach initiatives the organization can pursue in relation to climate change. In addition to surveys conducted in 2002, tree survey data for the National Mall were acquired through a partnership with the Smithsonian Institute. National Mall surveys focused on identifying existing elm trees (Galvin, 2010c).

Since 2007, the USDA Forest Service Research and Development Department has assisted Casey Trees in various ways. The department provides informational, technical and analytical services to address the organization’s needs (Grove, 2010). In 2009, for example the Forest Service assisted Casey Trees by conducting an urban tree canopy assessment (O’Neil-Dunne, 2009b). Since the assessment, the Forest Service has worked with this group to identify canopy goal implementation strategies. In addition to research support, the USDA Forest Service participates in the Lead Citizen Forester program and is actively involved in Casey Trees’ lecture series (Grove, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

Nonprofit Partnerships

Casey Trees partners with a variety of other environmental nonprofits serving the District such as the D.C. Environmental Network, International Society for Arboriculture, Municipal Society of Arborists (MSA), Water and Sewer Authority, D.C. Greenworks,
Metropolitan Branch Trail, and Friends of Rock Creek Park. The organization interacts with the D.C. Environmental Network to address green city regulatory issues. These two groups have come together to build critical mass among NGOs to protest forestry program budget cuts. Casey Trees staff attend hearings and meetings hosted by the D.C. Environmental Network to provide feedback and support for green issues (Galvin, 2010c; Herwig, 2010).

Regarding the International Society of Arborists, Deputy Director Mike Galvin assists the board and local chapter (MSA) and serves as a municipal forester. Casey Trees staff supports both the national and local chapter by presenting at the Annual Meeting for the International Society of Arboriculture and Municipal Society of Arborists (Galvin, 2010c). In the case of the Water and Sewer Authority, Casey Trees partnered in the development of the Green Build-out Model to assess stormwater benefits of urban vegetation in D.C. Additionally, this group collaborates with other nonprofits to plant trees along trails for the Metropolitan Branch Trail group and forms coalitions to expand partnerships among friends of Rock Creek Park (Busciano, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

Citizen Partnerships

Casey Trees works closely with local citizens from a variety of communities. According to Volunteer Lead Citizen Forester Jeff Furr: “I have been to very poor blighted neighborhoods and I’ve done plantings where we’re adding trees to completely green canopy neighborhoods that are ridiculously wealthy” (Furr, 2010). This group has developed citizen partnerships with neighborhood associations, local businesses, elementary schools, high school students, universities, Lead Citizen Foresters (LCF), and
other volunteer planting groups. Two examples that demonstrate partnerships with neighborhood associations are Trees for Georgetown and the Michigan Park Citizens Association (MPCA) (Buscaino, 2010; Furr, 2010).

In 1987, the Citizens Association of Georgetown (CAG) launched the Trees for Georgetown Program to supplement the District’s tree-planting efforts. In 2007, Trees for Georgetown developed into a partnership between Casey Trees, the Urban Forestry Administration, Earth Conservation Corps, and the Citizens Association of Georgetown. These three forestry players assisted the CAG by planting elms in Georgetown, along Q, 32nd, and 28th Streets. That same year the CAG approached Casey Trees to carry out a tree survey in Georgetown to promote the Trees for Georgetown program (Buscaino, 2010; Citizens Association of Georgetown, 2007). In the case of the Michigan Park Citizens Association, Casey Trees helped residents restore two triangles near Michigan Park. The MPCA is made up of residents living adjacent to Michigan Park near Brookland, D.C. These residents obtained money from the D.C. government to spruce up two triangle parks abutting their homes. Prior to this partnership these parks were in poor condition, infested with weeds and containing dead and dying trees. Casey Trees volunteers conducted repeated plantings to enhance the Michigan Park triangles. The most recent tree planting event occurred in spring 2010 (Furr, 2010).

In terms of local businesses, Casey Trees has established partnerships with downtown Business Improvement Districts (BID) and local operations such as Tudor Place. Free forestry training is offered to BID staff through the Education Department. Sue Erhardt, Education Director, trains BID staff on the basic biology of trees and proper
maintenance (e.g. mulching, pruning, and watering). Typically, BID members are recovering addicts or high school dropouts. This partnership offers BID staff temporary fulltime employment through educational tree training (Erhardt, 2010). Tudor place, on the other hand, is a local Museum in Georgetown, which has worked with Casey Trees to solve its stormwater problems. Similar to Rock Creek Church Cemetery, Volunteer Coordinator Carol Herwig assisted this business to envision a landscape design that would capture stormwater runoff and reduce hillside erosion. To achieve this goal, Casey Trees volunteers planted trees on hillsides in Tudor Place’s historic garden (Herwig, 2010).

Over 2,000 volunteers assist the Casey Trees Tree Planting Department annually by offering their services at community tree planting events. Approximately 500-600 volunteers are enrolled in forestry classes offered through the Education Department (Erhardt, 2010). Casey Trees works closely with District students of various levels. The organization collaborates with students, teachers, and principals at elementary schools to coordinate schoolyard greening events. Staff members consult with school participants to envision a landscape design and develop a maintenance plan to implement after tree plantings have occurred. In many cases, Lead Citizen Foresters are assigned to work with elementary school groups and to assist Herwig with site surveys. This group has engaged private, public, and charter elementary schools such as Horseman’s School, and Murch, Clark, and Barnard Elementaries (Figure 21) in NW, D.C. (Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Kelso, 2010; Herwig, 2010).
In addition to elementary students, Casey Trees works with high school and college students through its summer High School Program as well as volunteer tree planting events. Each summer high school students are employed through the High School Program to serve on a tree maintenance crew. This program provides teens with an opportunity to obtain training and valuable work experience in green jobs. College students, on the other hand, make up 25% of the organization’s volunteers (Erhardt, 2010). Individual students and environmental groups from campuses across the District such as American University, Georgetown, and George Washington participate in community tree planting events. In many cases, participation in tree planting meets community service hours required for students to graduate. In the past, environmental college groups applied through Casey Trees to conduct community tree planting events on campus (Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Herwig, 2010). As with any volunteer group, engagement with applicants follows a set procedure. Erhardt and Herwig review tree
planting applications and assign a Lead Citizen Forester to work with a volunteer group and consult with neighborhood project organizers. Citizen Foresters assist volunteer groups by identifying suitable species and sites. On planting day LCFs guide volunteers to ensure proper planting procedures are followed. Follow-up contact with volunteer groups is typically under-taken to ensure trees are cared for (Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Herwig, 2010; Kelso, 2010). Citizen partnerships and volunteers play a vital role in implementing Casey Trees’ planting goals. According to Erhardt, “it takes a community to achieve these tree canopy goals. It’s not just the nonprofit or the City, it really takes a village to come together and make it happen” (Erhardt, 2010).

**Funding**

*Parks and People*

Over time Parks and People has secured a variety of funding sources through new partnerships and grants (Table 5). Long-term urban community forestry funding providers have been the USDA Forest Service and Chesapeake Bay Trust (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010). Since 1992, the Forest Service has funded the organization through urban forestry grants. From 1996 to 1999 the agency provided millions of dollars to fund projects related to the Baltimore Ecosystem Study. Once BES funds began to taper off the USDA Forest Service began funding W263 to support Parks and People’s greening work in west Baltimore (Carrera, 2010; Grove, 2010). In 2010, the Forest Service issued stimulus funds to this group. These funds support and pay for work crews who conduct tree and trail maintenance. Without USDA Forest Service support, the organization’s ability to hire work crews would be limited (Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010).
Table 5: Parks and People Sources of Community Greening Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Provider</th>
<th>Funding Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>BES research and forestry work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Forest Service</td>
<td>BES, W263, community forestry work and work crews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Forest Service, Stimulus Funds</td>
<td>BES, W263, community forestry work and work crews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Enhance and remodel historic site for new headquarters and for efforts relating to the Gwynns Falls Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development (CBG)</td>
<td>Community organizing, neighborhood greening and city park enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Sector Foundation</td>
<td>Survey and plant trees for neighborhood associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Energy</td>
<td>Pay staff to maintain street trees planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Bay Trust</td>
<td>Public Housing Greening Initiative and urban forestry work for CBT Urban Greening Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Armor</td>
<td>Urban community forestry and education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart in Maryland</td>
<td>General expenses for urban greening work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Catwaler</td>
<td>Donation for extensive tree planting in east Baltimore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table identifies major sources of funding for urban community forestry work conducted by the Parks and People Foundation. Source: Personal and telephone interviews, 2010.

Several years ago the Chesapeake Bay Trust awarded an urban forestry grant to Parks and People to promote its Urban Greening Initiative. Parks and People utilizes this grant to green Baltimore neighborhoods and implement its Public Housing Greening Initiative. Other funding sources dating back to 1995 are Community Block Grants (CBG). These grants are issued by the federal government under the Department of Housing and Urban Development to support economic growth and promote healthy
communities. Community Block Grants fund the majority of Parks and People’s community organizing efforts. Since 1995, CBGs have been utilized by the organization’s Motivating Youth Division and were extended in 2008 to fund urban greening work. CBG funds used for neighborhood greening are focused primarily on the Public Housing Greening Initiative (Carrera, 2010; Cocke, 2010; Hager, 2010; Pelton, 2010).

Additional community forestry funding providers include but are not limited to the National Science Foundation, Department of Transportation, Gold Sector Foundation, private corporate sponsors, and private donations. The National Science Foundation assists Parks and People in funding forestry work and research related to the Baltimore Ecosystem Study. Department of Transportation funds have been utilized to maintain the Gwynns Falls Trail as well as remodel and enhance the organization’s new headquarters in Druid Hill Park (Carrera, 2010). Gold Sector Foundation funds have contributed to planting and surveying trees for neighborhood associations such as the Druid Hill Park Neighborhood Association and Reservoir Hill Improvement Council (Cocke, 2010). Additionally, private corporate sponsors, including Constellation Energy, Wal-Mart, and Under Armor, have contributed urban greening funds to the organization. As mentioned earlier, Constellation Energy funds are distributed to Parks and People from the city’s Recreation and Parks Department for tree planting and maintenance. Under Armor funds were distributed to Parks and People for both education and community forestry programs. In 2010, Wal-Mart granted $75,000 to the organization for general expenses related to urban greening. However, private donations from wealthy residents like Mary
Catwaler have also assisted the organization in pursuing community forestry goals (Carrera, 2010; Draddy, 2010; Hager, 2010).

*Casey Trees*

Although Casey Trees has only been in existence for ten years, this group has developed a variety of new partnerships. In some cases these partnerships provide additional funding opportunities such as collaborating with District government agencies, neighborhood associations, and private sponsors (Table 6). The majority of community forestry funding comes from the Casey Trees Endowment Fund (Buscaino, 2010, Erhardt, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Herwig, 2010). The original gift granted by Mrs. Casey in 2001 was $50,000,000. However, as Erhardt explains, “you never touch the principle you’re just working off the interest” (Erhardt, 2010). In other words, annual operation funds from the endowment are extracted from the interest earned on the organization’s investments (Buscaino, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Galvin, 2010c).

Government agency support has assisted a variety of programs and projects. In the case of the District Department of Transportation (DDOT), funding support allowed for the installation of green design products at Casey Trees’ new headquarters in Brookland. These include a bioretention pond, a rain garden, and solar panels (Galvin, 2010c). Housed within DDOT, the Urban Forestry Administration has also provided funding over the years. From 2001-2009, UFA distributed approximately $2,300 in USDA Forest Service funds to Casey Trees to support its urban community forestry efforts in the District. In addition to providing general community forestry funding, in the
past UFA has funded the group’s Summer Internship Program (2008) and summer crew
(Lear and Thomas, 2008; Buscaino, 2010; Lear, 2010).

Table 6: Casey Trees Sources of Community Forestry Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Provider</th>
<th>Funding Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Casey, Casey Trees Endowment Fund</td>
<td>Organization establishment and operation to restore D.C.’s urban tree canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Solar panels, bioretention and rain garden at new headquarters demonstration site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forestry Administration</td>
<td>Summer internship program, tree planting, general community forestry work in D.C. and to fund the summer crew at one point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Department of the Environment, Stimulus Funds</td>
<td>Create programs to increase the tree canopy, implement stormwater management programs and for green design at their new headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington Office of Sustainability</td>
<td>Promote sustainability through tree programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Neighborhood Commissions</td>
<td>Support tree planting events in D.C. neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEX Environmental</td>
<td>Sponsored an arborist tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington Law Center</td>
<td>General support for the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerald Lynch</td>
<td>Support neighborhood tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petworth Neighborhood Development Corporation</td>
<td>Support neighborhood tree planting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table identifies funding sources for Casey Trees’ urban community forestry work. Source: Personal interviews, 2010.

In terms of outside sources, the District Department of the Environment has provided the greatest amount of funding to Casey Trees. Most other grants received are
small. DDOE funds support the creation of new initiatives and programs that increase the District’s tree canopy such as the Tree Rebate program, tree planting on private property to reduce runoff, and low impact development or green design. The District Department of the Environment granted Casey Trees $50,000 for low impact development projects such as their new headquarters demonstration project and $150,000 to plant trees for the River Smart Homes Program. Additionally, DDOE forwarded $500,000 in stimulus funds to implement tree planting for stormwater management programs such as River Smart Homes and River Smart Schools, as well as planting efforts on private residential property in the District. Large portions of funding forwarded from DDOE come from EPA or CBT non-point source pollution grants requiring the implementation of tree planting to meet Clean Water Act standards (Galvin, 2010c; Hill, 2010).

Over the past decade several private sponsors have granted additional monies to Casey Trees. In some instances universities such as George Washington University have provided not only volunteers but a grant to promote sustainability initiatives. This grant was received from the school’s Office of Sustainability (Erhardt, 2010). Other sponsors include neighborhood associations and private corporate organizations such as Jerald Lynch, GW Law Center, and APEX Environmental. Both Advisory Neighborhood Commissions and development corporations like the Petworth Neighborhood Development Corporation or Jerald Lynch occasionally contribute funds to neighborhood tree planting events hosted by Casey Trees. In past years APEX Environmental has contributed funds to sponsor an arborist tree planting event. GW Law Center funds, on
the other hand, contributed to general operational services to support Casey Trees’ efforts in providing amenities that benefit the general public (Busciano, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

**Conclusion**

Since their establishment, the Parks and People Foundation and Casey Trees have engaged in a variety of partnerships. Both organizations have developed partnerships with city and federal government agencies, neighborhood associations, local volunteers, and private sponsors. In the process of developing new partnerships these groups have opened the door to a variety of outside funding sources that promote their urban community forestry programs and assist the city in achieving canopy goals. Although both organizations receive funding from outside sources such as government agencies, neighborhood associations and private sponsors, Parks and People operates on a budget based more on grants and funds raised each year. Casey Trees, on the other hand, obtains the majority of its funding from the organization’s Endowment Fund. Operational funds, however, are only extracted from the interest gained off of Casey Trees’ investments. These organizations’ partnerships and collaborations with urban community forestry stakeholders are crucial to achieving urban tree canopy goals and more efficient forestry management.
CHAPTER 6: GOVERNANCE THEORY APPLIED TO WASHINGTON, D.C. AND BALTIMORE

Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the role that federal and state governments play in urban community forestry management in Washington, D.C. and Baltimore. Next, I discuss the role of city government in urban forestry. Since the early 1900s, public agencies have been involved in urban forestry management (Merse et al., 2008; Draddy, 2010; Kelly, 2010; Lear, 2010). I then discuss Casey Trees’ and Parks and People’s place in the larger D.C. and Baltimore governance structure. Finally, I examine how governance theory applies to community forestry in these two settings. The chapter concludes with a brief examination of avenues for future research, especially as it pertains to property rights and landownership in urban community forestry management.

Federal and State Government’s Role in Urban Community Forestry

When it comes to urban forestry, federal government agencies such as the USDA Forest Service play similar roles in D.C. and Baltimore. However, federal agencies such as the National Park Service, are far more influential in D.C., owning and controlling up to 40% of District land. Another complicating factor is that management of federally-owned public space in D.C. must also meet the approval of Congress. Meanwhile, only 10% of public right-of-way land is controlled by public agencies (Grove, 2010; Lear, 2010). In the case of Baltimore, public land is managed at the city level by the Recreation and Parks Department (Draddy, 2010).
In both Baltimore and D.C., the Forest Service plays a role in community forestry through the Urban and Community Forestry Program (UCFP) and the Research and Development Department (RDD). The Urban and Community Forestry Program provides technical support and grants to private, state, county, and city landowners. These landowners include state, county, and local public agencies involved in urban forestry. The Research and Development Department provides research tools and funding to city government agencies and local nonprofits. By virtue of its involvement with BES, Baltimore city receives greater financial support from the USDA Forest Service than most cities. Parks and People, for example, receives long-term support from the Forest Service to conduct research in areas such as Watershed 263 in west Baltimore. Because Casey Trees is privately endowed the Forest Service provides research as opposed to financial support. In addition to assisting with financial support, the RDD conducts urban tree canopy assessments and monitors and evaluates pilot forestry projects for local community groups and cities. Canopy assessments conducted at the parcel level for D.C. and Baltimore have guided city agencies’ and nonprofits’ decisions on planting implementation. Currently, the Forest Service provides monitoring assistance to Parks and People for W263 (Grove, 2010).

At the state level, Maryland plays a role in urban community forestry management through the State and Private Forestry Division. The Division provides funding to cities such as Baltimore for forestry implementation projects. City governments and local groups including nonprofits such as Casey Trees and Parks and People typically work through state foresters when they need community forestry
assistance and funding. (Grove, 2010; Lear, 2010). In terms of serving Baltimore, the Maryland Department of Natural Resources promotes urban community forestry through sponsoring programs such as the Maryland Green School Program. This program encourages students and teachers to engage in recycling and urban greening projects to meet Green School designation requirements. Such engagement raises people’s awareness about how actions taken on their property affect what goes into Baltimore Harbor and the Chesapeake Bay. It promotes the connection of local community forestry projects to the quality of water in Baltimore city and the Chesapeake Bay region (Pelton, 2010).

**City Government’s Role in Urban Community Forestry**

*Role of D.C. City Government*

Since the early 1900s, city government agencies have been involved in urban forestry management in D.C. For the majority of the 20\(^{th}\) century, Clifford Lanham, Superintendent of the Trees and Parking Department, served as a key authority figure in promoting D.C.’s tree canopy (Kelly, 2010). Later in the 1900s, the District Department of Public Works took on the role of landscaping and tree planting. However, the landscaping and tree planting division split, shifting the role of tree planting to the District Department of Transportation. In 1999, in response to D.C.’s declining tree canopy, the District Department of Transportation, under the title of the Urban Forestry Administration, increased its efforts and continued to play a major role in improving community forestry management (Kelly, 2010; Lear, 2010).
Today, UFA is D.C.’s leading public agency in urban forestry management. According to Associate Deputy Director Monica Lear, UFA is “charged to take care of street trees” (Lear, 2010). This agency fulfills its responsibility by planting and conducting tree maintenance in the public rights-of-way. Maintenance requests are undertaken through an emergency response system. UFA works hard year round to keep public streets accessible and free of hazardous trees. Additionally, UFA participates in tree maintenance and inventories of public parks when partnering with organizations such as the District Real Estate Group. As part of the agency’s duties UFA works diligently on urban tree policy and health issues. Currently, the Administration is working to create an urban forestry policy that sufficiently addresses the existing 40% tree canopy goal. UFA envisions a tree policy in which all city forestry stakeholders work towards a common goal. This policy would propose individual canopy goals for particular classifications of land such as public streets, parks, schools, and private and federal land (Lear, 2010).

Although not exclusively their mission, other D.C. government agencies such as the District Department of the Environment and Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (ODMPED) integrate urban forestry components into their planning projects (Busciano, 2010; Hill, 2010). According to Peter Hill Chief of the Watershed Protection Division at DDOE, tree planting is “a component of all of [their] projects” (Hill, 2010). Forestry is incorporated into stormwater management, environmental audits, stream restoration and environmental outreach. In terms of outreach, the agency works with schools to provide direction for adopting environmental education curriculums. The District Department of the Environment also plays a key role
in bringing forestry implementers together by contracting work out and providing grant opportunities to nonprofits. DDOE keeps implementers in check to assure they are working to meet city-wide initiatives such as the urban tree canopy goal. Similar to many nonprofits DDOE doesn’t own land and works closely with public agencies such as the National Park Service to receive buy-in for environmental projects. This encourages the agency to play a facilitator role in engaging D.C. forestry groups (Hill, 2010). The D.C. Office of Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development, on the other hand, interacts with agencies such as DDOE to promote planting through green initiatives and existing zoning. Additionally, the ODMPED incorporates planting into neighborhood revitalization projects. Recent projects include developing a public park in LeDroit Park, the Anacostia Riverwalk Project, Diamond Teague Park, Washington Canal Park, Marvin Gaye Park, and the East Hill Waterfront Redevelopment Project. Each project incorporated urban forestry components through tree planting, gardening, or recreational trail development (Busciano, 2010; ODMPED, 2011).

**Role of Baltimore City Government**

Since the establishment of Druid Hill Park in 1860, the Recreation and Parks Department has been charged with the responsibility of maintaining and planting street trees in Baltimore. At that time, the department lacked adequate funding and personnel to carry out tree maintenance beyond public park boundaries. In the early 1900s, in response to the department’s struggle to maintain street trees, the Women’s Civic League along with neighborhood associations, pushed for the establishment of a Forestry Commission to oversee tree maintenance along city streets. In 1912, Baltimore passed an ordinance
establishing a city Forestry Division to conduct street tree maintenance activities. However, by the 1920s the Division’s budget and staff had dwindled to the point that the city’s tree cover had diminished considerably. In the 1950s, the Forestry Division took on new initiatives to improve urban forestry management such as conducting a tree census to prioritize tree planting efforts (Merse et al., 2008; Buckley, 2010).

By the mid-1960s, the Forestry Division was in better financial shape and tree planting efforts expanded and accelerated. However, by the 1980s, the Division’s budget and personnel were slashed again (Merse et al., 2008; Buckley, 2010; Draddy, 2010). In 1997, forestry services shifted to the Department of Public Works. When tree planting services returned to the Forestry Division three years later, expertise and equipment were lost. Since 2000, urban community forestry services have remained the responsibility of the Recreation and Parks Department Forestry Division. In 2006, in response to Baltimore’s declining tree canopy, city officials established an Urban Tree Canopy goal, proposing to double the city’s canopy over the next 30 years. Prior to the creation of the TreeBaltimore Program in 2009, the Forestry Division focused exclusively on public space. Today, TreeBaltimore partners with public and private land owners to achieve the canopy goal (Draddy, 2010).

Currently, the Recreation and Parks Department plays a variety of roles in urban community forestry management. TreeBaltimore provides free trees for public lands and private residents interested in planting on their property. The Department deals with street tree planting and removal requests through a 311 calling system to ensure residents’ needs are met. Although the Department is legally responsible for tree
maintenance on public lands, residents have recently taken part in caring for trees by signing a consent form agreeing to water trees abutting their property. This contract alleviates part of the city’s financial burden to maintain street trees. In addition to its primary role of tree care, the Recreation and Parks Department operates a community forestry office through TreeBaltimore promoting educational outreach by facilitating volunteer planting projects and stewardship workshops to train neighborhood associations in the latest landscaping techniques. As a leader in urban forestry, the Recreation and Parks Department acts as a key facilitator to bring nonprofits and the city together to participate in forestry projects and identify unified funding to support the tree canopy goal (Draddy, 2010). According to TreeBaltimore Coordinator Anne Draddy, “the city can bring certain resources to the mix” (Daddy, 2010). City resources such as free trees, mulch, and political connections support nonprofit forestry implementers.

**Constraints of City Government’s Role**

While city government agencies in D.C. and Baltimore continue to figure prominently in urban community forestry it’s important to recognize the constraints under which they function. Public agencies such as UFA, DDOE, and the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department essentially work for the mayor and must keep their agendas in line with the mayor’s priorities. Common constraints include tight forestry budgets, lack of personnel, and aging equipment (Draddy, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Grove, 2010; Hager, 2010; Hill, 2010). In recent years, budget constraints have become far more pressing in Baltimore. According to Draddy “as of July 1, 2010 Baltimore Forestry’s budget [was] decimated” (Draddy, 2010). This new budget shifted the responsibility of
tree requests to the TreeBaltimore Program. In terms of personnel, oftentimes it makes more financial sense for government agencies to contract out forestry implementation work to nonprofits such as Casey Trees and Parks and People. Utilizing the assistance of these organizations reduces the number of full-time staff and equipment needed in UFA, DDOE, and the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department. Additionally, city governments’ ability to marshal public opinion is limited by their duty to serve and please the mayor. As a result, city government agencies are less apt to publically disagree with forestry budgets or polices (Busciano, 2010; Draddy, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Grove, 2010; Hill, 2010).

Oftentimes, constraints create tension between city government officials and nonprofits. In D.C. and Baltimore such tension stems from a variety of factors. First, government agencies serve as regulators of environmental services but have limited influence over the actions of nonprofits except when entering into direct partnerships with NGOs. This has driven a wedge between city government officials and their nonprofit counterparts. However, this wedge can be surmounted through cooperative partnerships and keeping each other informed about community forestry plans and intentions (Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010). Second, both D.C. and Baltimore city forestry agencies have aspirations to pursue further involvement in project implementation, tree maintenance, and community outreach but are constrained by city budgets, limited personnel, and daily procedures. Limited municipal forestry funding, especially in Baltimore, has forced city agencies to seek out additional grant opportunities in competition with local nonprofits and community groups. City governments also control
a very small percentage of city land (Draddy, 2010; Hill, 2010; Pelton, 2010; Lear, 2010). Third, tensions are created as a result of nonprofits’ refusal to take on legal responsibility for tree maintenance. Even in partnership, UFA and the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department are still charged with the legal responsibility for street trees within city limits (Grove, 2010). These constraints may be overcome by continuing to develop well-defined partnerships among city government and nonprofits. These two parties can best achieve urban community forestry goals when developing partnerships that build off of each other’s strengths (Galvin, 2010c; Grove, 2010; Hill, 2010).

**Casey Trees’ and Parks and People’s Placement in the City Governance Structure**

Casey Trees and Parks and People are voluntary associations that serve on behalf of city residents and government. These nonprofits have developed a relationship with city government through engaging in partnerships with public agencies and securing forestry funds. Their efforts benefit D.C. and Baltimore in a variety of ways. According to TreeBaltimore Coordinator Anne Draddy, nonprofits are “valuable because they have funding and neighborhood contacts. They complement what we do in terms of the community forestry piece” (Draddy, 2010). As successful community organizers Casey Trees and Parks and People have developed long-term relationships with D.C. and Baltimore neighborhoods. These relationships increase political connections and community forestry support which city government agencies can take advantage of through partnerships with these organizations (Draddy, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Hager, 2010; Hill, 2010; Herwig, 2010).
In terms of funding, as local government forestry budgets run dry nonprofit services can assist the city in continuing urban forestry practices. Casey Trees and Parks and People achieve this by utilizing in-house skills, labor, and equipment to implement community forestry projects and tree maintenance. In the case of Baltimore, Parks and People mobilizes work crews to water street trees for the city and share crew services with partnering nonprofits such as the Baltimore Water Alliance (BWA) (Cocke, 2010; Draddy, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hill, 2010; Pelton, 2010). According to the Program Director of the Gwynns Falls Watershed Association, Scott Pelton, completing street tree requests “given the budget constraints, it’s a really long process” (Pelton, 2010).

According to Senior Director Guy Hager, nonprofit organizations in Baltimore such as Parks and People and the BWA “truncate the time involved to go from request to fulfillment” (Hager, 2010). However, in addition to utilizing paid summer work crews for tree maintenance, these organizations encourage active volunteer citizens to take part in providing maintenance services by watering trees in their neighborhood (Cocke, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Furr, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010; Herwig).

Casey Trees and Parks and People further assist city officials by promoting similar urban community forestry goals. According to Education Director Sue Erhardt, these groups serve as a “tremendous benefit to the City because you have twenty other people walking up every morning trying to figure out how do we get to a 40% tree canopy” (Erhardt, 2010). Oftentimes, it is difficult for public agencies to raise support for urban forestry initiatives because people have a negative perception of government (Galvin, 2010c; Grove, 2010). These nonprofits elevate community forestry issues to the
next level, casting tree planting in a positive light. Increased community support places D.C. and Baltimore one step closer to achieving their urban tree canopy goals. Support is gained not only by advocating for canopy goals, but by lobbying for new urban forestry polices and improved budgets (Busciano, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Hill, 2010). Building community capacity around forestry issues as Peter Hill with DDOE explains “advances our mission” (Hill, 2010).

However, there is a difference in advocacy between these two groups. Casey Trees tends to advocate more for tree policy while Parks and People focuses on assisting the city in the regulation of urban green space and achieving Baltimore’s sustainability plan. In a way, Parks and People’s mission predates the group’s creation. As Guy Hager likes to point out, the goal of Parks and People is to complete the Olmsted Brothers Plan, connecting urban green space with the vision of “one park.” As advocates, these organizations serve as watch dogs, holding residents and governments accountable for proper tree care and support for urban community forestry management. Although Casey Trees and Parks and People’s place in the governance structure is deeply embedded in the city matrix, partnerships with state and federal government agencies expand their reach beyond city limits (Galvin, 2010c; Grove, 2010; Hager, 2010; Hill, 2010).

**Governance Theory**

While governance theory offers a lens through which to examine the emerging role of environmental nonprofits, it is difficult to capture urban community forestry management in all its complexity. Casey Trees and Parks and People are just two of many urban forestry players. Traditional governance theory identifies a void in state and
local community forestry management, dating back to the 1980s. However, this is not the case in D.C. and Baltimore. Since the early 1900s, both cities have been deeply involved in urban community forestry management. While both cities have experienced financial peaks and valleys, both have served as leaders in urban forestry (Draddy, 2010; Grove, 2010; Lear, 2010). However, during times of financial difficulty, D.C. and Baltimore city governments have not always been able to efficiently manage the urban tree canopy (Merse et al., 2008; Buckley, 2010; Kelly, 2010). During financial downturns local nonprofits such as Casey Trees and Parks and People have assisted city government in achieving community forestry goals by providing tree maintenance crews, forestry personnel, and community organizing services. Although, these two groups have supplemented city tree maintenance through promoting citizen participation, certain concerns can arise from employing a request-driven urban forestry model. These obstacles include low income neighborhoods lacking neighborhood associations and well-organized active citizens, the time it takes to build community capacity, and inequitable distribution of urban trees (Buckley, 2010).

State agencies on the other hand, have been less involved with “on-the-ground” urban forestry work. City government and nonprofit organizations serve as the primary leaders in community forestry implementation in D.C. and Baltimore. Still, state agencies continue to provide cities with project funding, technical assistance, and, in the case of Baltimore, urban greening program promotion through initiatives such as Maryland Green Schools (Draddy, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Grove, 2010; Pelton, 2010).
Urban Forestry Issues Excluded from Governance Theory and Future Research

One factor excluded from the framework of this theory is landownership and, by extension, property rights. Landownership plays a major role in urban forestry and must be addressed at the implementation level. According to Morgan Grove, Research Forester with the USDA Forest Service, “if cities want to achieve an urban tree canopy goal they cannot achieve that goal through street trees. Urban and community forestry is going to have to become an all-lands agenda in order to achieve the sustainability goals that cities are articulating” (Grove, 2010). These issues of landownership can be best addressed by increasing local community forestry partnerships among federal, state, city, and private landowners.

With regard to property rights, issues relating to urban community forestry typically revolve around how environmental public health and safety or species protection regulations limit private individuals’ land-use rights. Regulatory restrictions on development or land use are viewed by property rights advocates as anti-free market regimes that limit economic prosperity. Activists over the years have taken this argument so far as to claim that environmental regulations constitute a “taking” of private property under the 5th Amendment. As a result, some states such as Tennessee have created legislation to require public government agencies to perform a Taking Impact Assessment. However, environmental agencies argue that they have a right to regulate natural resource use to protect the health and safety of the general public and to meet federal regulations. Private property owners must realize their rights only extend to what’s presumed as an acceptable use of land (Hanna, 1995; Jacobs, 1998).
Urban community forestry management is most effective when it respects the rights of property-owners. In the case of Washington, D.C. forestry management is challenged by the District’s complex ownership patterns. Property rights arguments can result from the District’s restrictions on land use enforced through tree policies such as UFA’s Special Tree Permit, the Female Gingko Tree Policy, and municipal regulations. These policies require permits and meeting specified criteria to remove trees on public and private land (Clark et al, 1997; Bryant, 2006; Short, 2006, 2007; UFA, 2011). In the case of Baltimore, urban forestry is challenged by state, city, and private landownership patterns. Urban forestry can be affected by state, community, private, and open access property regimes. Differences in property rights create fragmentation of the urban forest and a more complex management structure. To efficiently manage Baltimore’s urban forest, further data are required to identify forest land owners and their practices (Grove et al., 2006; Cadenasso et al., 2006). In D.C. and Baltimore, community forestry management can be improved by addressing public and private property rights concerns from the outset; increasing cooperation among NGOs, city, and federal government agencies, and private property owners; and revising property rights regimes to address ecological and societal goals (Clark et al, 1997; Bryant, 2006; Short, 2006, 2007; Pincetl, 2010).

**Conclusion**

This chapter addressed governance theory and its applicability to urban community forestry management in D.C. and Baltimore. After examining the role that federal, state, and city governments play in urban forestry it is clear that traditional
notions of local government voids do not entirely represent these cases. As these two cities have faced budget cuts local governments have relied increasingly on assistance from outside sources to promote urban forestry, however, city agencies have remained key players in community forestry management. A state void exists on some levels in terms of groundwork conducted to implement forestry projects. Both city government and local nonprofits play a role in community forestry implementation. However, this theory excludes several other factors such as the role of additional urban forestry management stakeholders, property rights, and landownership issues. Further research is needed to understand the complexity of landownership patterns and property rights debates in D.C. and Baltimore, and provide strategies for incorporating those concerns into urban community forestry management.
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY

This research used a case study approach to address the role of two nonprofits, Casey Trees in Washington, D.C. and the Parks and People Foundation in Baltimore, in urban community forestry management. These two nonprofits have emerged in recent years to assist the D.C. and Baltimore governments in providing key environmental amenities and services such as tree planting. Governance Theory was used to contextualize the rising role of NGOs in urban greening and community forestry management. My research questions addressed four key points: 1) the role of these groups in urban forestry; 2) the partnerships they developed to promote forestry; 3) the funding and management structure of these nonprofits; and 4) perceptions of change in urban forest conditions in two case study neighborhoods. I conducted research in the Petworth section of D.C. and at Franklin Square in Baltimore to explore how Casey Trees and Parks and People operate at a local scale to promote community forestry. These neighborhoods were selected because they represented successful urban forestry projects carried out by Casey Trees and Parks and People.

Although both organizations have seen their role in urban community forestry shift over the years, the scale at which they operate remains different. For the most part, Casey Trees works at the broader city-wide scale while Parks and People focuses on projects at the watershed scale. Initially, Casey Trees included green roof demonstration projects as part of its mission. Later, this focus was dropped as Casey Trees (2011) concentrated its efforts on “restoring, enhancing and protecting the tree canopy of the Nation’s Capital.” Parks and People, on the other hand, broadened its scope from vacant
lot restoration to citywide forestry and watershed restoration projects. Over time, the scope of projects changed in response to funding availability. Broadening the scope of projects allowed Parks and People to expand its community forestry program and assist more neighborhoods in Baltimore (Busciano, 2010; Carrera, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010).

Both groups are involved in a number of community related activities. In addition to community organizing and educational outreach, they offer technical assistance, encourage residents to care for vegetation, implement projects that enhance the urban tree canopy, advocate for urban greening policies and budgets, and provide green job skills to local youth. Although their roles are similar, certain differences set these organizations apart. Parks and People tends to focus primarily on capacity building and approaches educational outreach from an urban ecosystem perspective. Meanwhile, Casey Trees participates in community organizing but assesses projects through a technologically advanced GIS approach (Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010).

To promote urban community forestry these groups partner with numerous stakeholders including city, state, and federal government agencies, schools, neighborhood associations, other nonprofits, and private sponsors. Partnerships with key stakeholders are crucial to achieving urban tree canopy goals. Two great examples of partnerships are the River Smart Homes Program and the Partnerships for Parks program. River Smart Homes is a stormwater management program established by the District Department of the Environment. Since 2007, Casey Trees has partnered with DDOE by fulfilling the planting component of this program. Tree planting is just one of the many
implementation practices this program offers. In the case of Parks and People, the Partnerships for Parks program was developed with the Baltimore Recreation and Parks Department Forestry Division. In this case the city provides funding assistance to Parks and People to assist local greening groups to improve public parks. Both volunteer recruitment and technical assistance is provided to urban greening groups. In the eyes of city officials and these nonprofits, collaborative partnerships such as River Smart Homes and Partnerships for Parks improve community forestry management in D.C. and Baltimore (Cocke, 2010; Draddy, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hill, 2010).

In partnership with key stakeholders Casey Trees and Parks and People seek outside funding opportunities to support their community forestry efforts. Outside funding providers range from private sponsors to government agencies. The majority of Casey Trees’ urban forestry funding is provided through the Casey Trees Endowment Fund. However, in recent years the organization has partnered with the District Department of the Environment, District Department of Transportation, George Washington University, neighborhood associations, and private sponsors such as APEX Environmental. To a much greater extent, Parks and People must solicit funds from public agencies and private donors. Major long-term funding providers for the organization’s urban greening efforts include the USDA Forest Service and the Chesapeake Bay Trust. As concrete funding assistance allows Casey Trees to chart its own course, Parks and People has to be more adaptive to changes in funding situations on an annual basis (Busciano, 2010; Carrera, 2010; Galvin, 2010c; Hager, 2010).
Since their establishment partnerships and funding providers have allowed these nonprofits to expand their urban forestry programs. Community forestry work is woven into all five main departments at Casey Trees. Each Department focuses on a different aspect of urban forestry. However, the Community Tree Planting Program provides on-the-ground work through community planting efforts. The Education Department raises awareness and provides hands-on learning experiences to local youth. Other departments such as Planning and Design and Geographic Resources focus more on the technical design and analysis side of urban forestry while Communications uses multi-media to spread the word to the general public regarding Casey Trees’ forestry projects. In the case of Parks and People, urban forestry projects fall under their Community Greening Department, and more specifically in the Great Parks, Clean Streams and Green Communities Division. Urban greening programs include Vacant Lots restoration, Schoolyard Greening, Street Trees, and the Public Housing Initiative (Cocke, 2010; Erhardt, 2010; Galvin, 2010; Hager, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

Focusing on these two groups’ community forestry efforts at the neighborhood level reveal the physical and social impact their efforts have had “on the ground.” Thanks to the work of Casey Trees and Parks and People both Petworth and Franklin Square have experienced improvements to their urban tree canopy. Improvement of the urban canopy demonstrated an increase in the visual appeal of these neighborhoods. Community forestry projects, programs and events have generated a sense of pride and respect for nature in these communities. Such respect leads to lower tree mortality rates as a result of residents caring more for vegetation in their neighborhood. There are
several reasons why these programs have succeeded. Both groups identified local activists and dedicated people to care for trees, enlisted neighborhood stewards to participate, and used request driven planting models. Two additional factors that contributed to Casey Trees’ success in Petworth were the sheer number of trees the organization planted and having the financial means to complete projects. Parks and People gauges its success in Franklin Square according to changes in stormwater runoff related to the Watershed 263 Project. Not only can change be measured, but the model can be applied elsewhere (Cocke, 2010; Furr, 2010; Hager, 2010; Herwig, 2010).

Comparing these two neighborhoods sheds light on the different approaches nonprofits take to promote neighborhood revitalization. As Parks and People have employed a variety of stormwater control and planting projects in Franklin Square, they’ve placed a strong emphasis on monitoring water quality and hydraulic flow. Meanwhile, Casey Trees has conducted primarily community planting projects in Petworth focusing on getting trees in the ground and caring for them (Erhardt, 2010; Hager, 2010; Herwig, 2010). Although both organizations have worked diligently to build critical mass around community forestry in these neighborhoods, their different approach to revitalization has yielded varying levels of volunteer involvement and a different distribution of community forestry projects. In the case of Franklin Square, Parks and People’s long-term commitment to the neighborhood has enabled them to build capacity particularly around local elementary schools such as Franklin Square Elementary. However, according to two interviewees, involvement in neighborhood tree planting events outside environmental education programs tends to lack participation.
from residents (Hager, 2010; Smiley, 2010). In the case of Petworth, community participation at Casey Trees’ planting events tends to be higher (Furr, 2010; Herwig, 2010). This may be attributed to two factors; 1) Casey Trees’ Volunteer Coordinator Carol Herwig is a long-time active resident of the community, and 2) as a gentrifying lower to middle class neighborhood Petworth has had greater participation recently from neighborhood associations in community forestry projects (Herwig, 2010). In terms of the distribution of improvements made to these neighborhoods through community forestry, Parks and People’s projects have concentrated primarily in west Franklin Square with the exception of Franklin Elementary School. Meanwhile, Casey Trees’ planting projects have spread further across the neighborhood of Petworth (Casey Trees, 2011; Parks and People, 2011).

Since the early 1900s, city government has played a prominent role in urban forestry management in D.C. and Baltimore. Over the years both city governments have experienced cuts to budgets and staff. These cuts challenge the ability of city government officials to manage forest resources. Nonprofit organizations such as Casey Trees and Parks and People have assisted their respective cities to meet these challenges by providing tree maintenance services, organizing volunteers, securing funding, advocating for increased budgets, and assisting in the implementation of community forestry goals (Draddy, 2010; Hill, 2010; Lear, 2010).

Increased NGO involvement in urban forestry has its negative side too. For example, greater involvement has caused tensions to rise between NGOs and city government. In D.C. and Baltimore this tension stems from competition and a gap in
information flow. Such competition arises as a result of local governments and nonprofits competing for funding, public relations, and accountability opportunities. In the case of funding, local NGOs go after similar grant opportunities as the D.C. and Baltimore governments. Conflicts with forestry funding tend to be more prominent in Baltimore than D.C. as a result of recent budget cuts to the city’s Forestry Division. Additionally, due to Casey Trees’ status as a privately endowed organization, it is less likely to seek out the same funding opportunities as local governments. Parks and People, on the other hand, does occasionally compete for grants with other nonprofits and city government entities. For example, in past years Parks and People, the Recreation and Parks Department, and watershed associations such as the Gwynns Falls Watershed Association have competed for urban greening grants distributed by the Chesapeake Bay Trust (Busciano, 2010; Draddy, 2010; Lear, 2010; Pelton, 2010).

In the case of public relations, competition generates from the notion of accountability. Several urban greening groups are involved in community forestry in D.C. and Baltimore. These groups range from city government entities to local nonprofits and neighborhood associations. No one agency can manage these cities’ urban forests alone. City government agencies compete with local community groups to gain support for their urban forestry programs. Frustration on both sides stems from one group receiving credit for city forestry work over the other. However, regardless of who receives credit, at the end of the day city government still holds the legal responsibility for maintaining street trees. Tension between D.C. and Baltimore city governments and NGOs also stems from this idea of placing the burden of legal responsibility on one party. Outside the public
realm, private residents are responsible for maintaining trees on their land. Traditional NGO models that are request driven have led to success in some areas such as Petworth and Franklin Square; however, not all neighborhoods are set up with the means to absorb tree maintenance responsibilities and costs. Casey Trees and Parks and People may experience problems with this model in other lower income neighborhoods. These problems may include a shortage of dedicated caretakers, limited time and money on the part of residents, and cultural resistance to trees (Draddy, 2010; Furr, 2010; Grove, 2010; Lear, 2010; Lewis, n.d.).

In terms of information flow, a gap exists between city government and local forestry organizations as a result of the lack of collaborative strategic planning. For example, Casey Trees and Parks and People host meetings and partner with D.C. and Baltimore governments in some instances, but neither side is fully informed of the other’s urban forestry efforts. As partnerships between local government entities and NGOs continue to develop within these cities, the flow of community forestry information will increase (Busciano, 2010; Carrera, 2010; Draddy, 2010; Galvin, 2010; Grove, 2010; Hager, 2010; Lear, 2010).

Public-private partnerships are critical to achieving these cities’ urban canopy goals. Without these partnerships community forestry management would suffer. Further research is needed to address additional urban community forestry issues such as property rights, land ownership dynamics, and the role of other stakeholders in urban forestry management.
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APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Parks and People Foundation

Abby Cocke, Community Greening Stewardship Program Manager

Guy Hager, Senior Director of Great Parks, Clean Streams, and Green Communities Division

Jackie Carrera, CEO and President

Ashanti Smiley, Franklin Square Volunteer

Casey Trees

Carol Herwig, Volunteer Coordinator

Jeff Furr, Lead Citizen Forester Volunteer

Kevin Kelso, Lead Citizen Forester Volunteer

Mark Buscaino, Executive Director

Mike Galvin, Deputy Director

Sue Erhardt, Education Director

Forestry Partners/ Government Agencies

Anne Draddy, TreeBaltimore Coordinator, Baltimore Parks and Recreation Department

Monica Lear, Deputy Associate Director/State Forester, D.C. Urban Forestry Administration

Morgan Gove, Research Forester, USDA Forest Service Northern Research Station

Peter Hill, Branch Chief of Watershed Protection Division Planning and Restoration Branch, District Department of the Environment
Scott Pelton, Program Director of the Gwynns Falls Watershed Association/ Baltimore

Water Alliance representative
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Interview Questions for Casey Trees Staff Members

Background Information
1) How long have you been working for Casey Trees?
2) What positions have you held in the time you’ve been employed with Casey Trees?

Organizational Role
1) What is the role of the organization in urban community forestry management?
2) What is your role in the organization?
3) How has your role changed since you’ve been employed with Casey Trees?
4) How has the organization’s role changed over time as it has faced budget cuts?

Organizational Structure
1) Describe the organization’s internal structure.
2) How does your position relate to Casey Trees’ organizational structure?
3) How does the organization fit into the larger government structure?

Partnerships
1) How does the organization partner with the federal, state, and city government?
2) How does the organization partner with other environmental nonprofit NGOs?
3) How does the organization partner with local citizen groups?
4) When has the organization relied more on volunteers over the years?
5) Who did you partner with on community forestry projects in Petworth, D.C.?

Funding
1) What source does the majority of the organization’s urban community forestry funding come from?
2) From what other organizations and local government entities do you learn about funding sources for community forestry management?
3) How has the organization’s major source of funding changed since statewide budget cuts in the 1980s?
4) What was the primary funding source for community forestry projects in Petworth, D.C.?
   How has this funding source influenced the success of these revitalization projects in Petworth?

Neighborhood Revitalization
1) What community forestry revitalization projects has the organization been involved with in Petworth, D.C.?
2) Have you personally been involved in those projects?
   If so, what was your role in those projects?
3) How has the organization’s involvement in revitalization in Petworth affected the neighborhood’s urban forest conditions?

Successes/Challenges
1) What are the organization’s biggest challenges in promoting urban community forestry?
2) What community forestry programs have been successful? Why?
3) Why does the organization view forestry revitalization in Petworth, D.C. as successful?
   How has the organization’s urban community forestry strategies changed to promote success in Petworth?

Interview Questions for the Parks and People Foundation Staff Members

Background Information
1) How long have you been working for the Parks and People Foundation?
2) What positions have you held in the time you’ve been employed with Parks and People?

Organizational Role
1) What is the role of the organization in urban community forestry management?
2) What is your role in the organization?
3) How has your role changed since you’ve been employed with Parks and People?
4) How has the organization’s role changed over time as it has faced budget cuts?

Organizational Structure
1) Describe the organization’s internal structure.
2) How does your position relate to Parks and People’s organizational structure?
3) How does the organization fit into the larger government structure?

Partnerships
1) How does the organization partner with the federal, state, and city government?
2) How does the organization partner with other environmental nonprofit NGOs?
3) How does the organization partner with local citizen groups?
4) When has the organization relied more on volunteers over the years?
5) Who did you partner with on community forestry projects in Franklin Square, Baltimore?

Funding
1) What source does the majority of the organization’s urban community forestry funding come from?
2) From what other organizations and local government entities do you learn about funding sources for community forestry management?
3) How has the organization’s major source of funding changed since statewide budget cuts in the 1980s?
4) What was the primary funding source for community forestry projects in Franklin Square, Baltimore?
   How has this funding source influenced the success of these revitalization projects in Franklin Square?

**Neighborhood Revitalization**
1) What community forestry revitalization projects has the organization been involved with in Franklin Square, Baltimore?
2) Have you personally been involved in those projects?
   If so, what was your role in those projects?
3) How has the organization’s involvement in revitalization in Franklin Square affected the neighborhood’s urban forest conditions?

**Successes/Challenges**
1) What are the organization’s biggest challenges in promoting urban community forestry?
2) What community forestry programs have been successful? Why?
3) Why does the organization view forestry revitalization in Franklin Square, Baltimore as successful?
   How has the organization’s urban community forestry strategies changed to promote success in Franklin Square?

**Interview Questions for Casey Trees Volunteers**

**Background Information**
1) How long have you been volunteering for Casey Trees?
2) How did you originally hear about volunteering for the organization?
3) What motivated you to volunteer?

**Organizational Role**
1) What is the role of the organization in urban community forestry management?
2) What is your role in the organization?
3) How has your role changed over time as the organization has faced budget cuts?

**Organizational Structure**
1) Describe the organization’s internal structure.
2) How does your position relate to Casey Trees’ organizational structure?

**Partnerships**
1) How does the organization partner with volunteers and local citizen groups?
2) When has the organization relied more on volunteers over the years?
Neighborhood Revitalization
  1) What community forestry neighborhood revitalization projects have you been involved in when working with Casey Trees?
  2) What was your role in those projects?
  3) Have you volunteered for neighborhood revitalization forestry projects in Petworth, D.C.?
     If, so how were you involved?
     How has the organization’s involvement in revitalization in Petworth affected the neighborhood’s urban forest conditions?

Successes/Challenges
  1) What are the organization’s biggest challenges in promoting urban community forestry?
  2) What community forestry programs have been successful? Why?
  3) Why does the organization view forestry revitalization in Petworth, D.C. as successful?
     How has the organization’s urban community forestry strategies changed to promote success in Petworth?

Interview Questions for the Parks and People Foundation Volunteers

Background Information
  1) How long have you been volunteering for the Parks and People Foundation?
  2) How did you originally hear about volunteering for the organization?
  3) What motivated you to volunteer?

Organizational Role
  1) What is the role of the organization in urban community forestry management?
  2) What is your role in the organization?
  3) How has your role changed over time as the organization has faced budget cuts?

Organizational Structure
  1) Describe the organization’s internal structure.
  2) How does your position relate to Parks and People’s organizational structure?

Partnerships
  1) How does the organization partner with volunteers and local citizen groups?
  2) When has the organization relied more on volunteers over the years?

Neighborhood Revitalization
  1) What community forestry neighborhood revitalization projects have you been involved in when working with Parks and People?
  2) What was your role in those projects?
  3) Have you volunteered for neighborhood revitalization forestry projects in
Franklin Square, Baltimore?
If, so how were you involved?
How has the organization’s involvement in revitalization in Franklin Square affected the neighborhood’s urban forest conditions?

Successes/Challenges
1) What are the organization’s biggest challenges in promoting urban community forestry?
2) What community forestry programs have been successful? Why?
3) Why does the organization view forestry revitalization in Franklin Square, Baltimore as successful?
   How has the organization’s urban community forestry strategies changed to promote success in Franklin Square?

Interview Questions for City Government Officials in D.C.

Background Information
1) How long have you worked for the city’s government?
2) What positions have you held during your employment with the government?

Government Role
1) What is the government’s current role in urban community forestry management in D.C.?
2) What is your role in the government?
3) Prior to the establishment of Casey Trees what local government entities have been responsible for promoting and managing urban community forestry in D.C.?
4) How has the role of the government in urban forestry management in D.C. changed since the 1980s?

Organizational Structure
1) How does your role relate to the larger government structure?
2) How does Casey Trees’ fit into the larger government structure?

Partnerships
1) How does the city, state, and federal government partner with Casey Trees?
2) Has the government partnered with Casey Trees on community forestry projects in Petworth, D.C.?
   If so, how was it involved?

Funding
1) How has the government assisted Casey Trees in funding forestry programs?
2) How has the amount of community forestry funds provided by the government distributed to Casey Trees changed since the 1980s?
3) Have government entities contributed funding to Casey Trees’ neighborhood
revitalization projects in Petworth, D.C.?

Neighborhood Revitalization
1) What other community forestry neighborhood revitalization projects have the city’s government entities been involved in with Casey Trees?
2) What was the government’s role in those projects?

Interview Questions for City Government Officials in Baltimore

Background Information
1) How long have you worked for the city’s government?
2) What positions have you held during your employment with the government?

Government Role
1) What is the government’s current role in urban community forestry management in Baltimore?
2) What is your role in the government?
3) Prior to the establishment of Parks and People what local government entities have been responsible for promoting and managing urban community forestry in Baltimore?
4) How has the role of the government in urban forestry management in D.C. changed since the 1980s?

Organizational Structure
1) How does your role relate to the larger government structure?
2) How does Casey Trees’ fit into the larger government structure?

Partnerships
1) How does the city, state, and federal government partner with Parks and People?
2) Has the government partnered with Parks and People on community forestry projects in Franklin Square, Baltimore?
   If so, how was it involved?

Funding
1) How has the government assisted Parks and People in funding forestry programs?
2) How has the amount of community forestry funds provided by the government distributed to Parks and People changed since the 1980s?
3) Have government entities contributed funding to Parks and People neighborhood revitalization projects in Franklin Square, Baltimore?

Neighborhood Revitalization
1) What other community forestry neighborhood revitalization projects have the city’s government entities been involved in with Parks and People?
2) What was the government’s role in those projects?

**Interview Questions for Affiliated Forestry Partners of Casey Trees**

**Background Information**
1) How long have you worked for this organization?
2) What positions have you held during your employment with this organization?

**Government Role**
1) What is your organization’s role in urban community forestry management in D.C.?
2) What is your role in the organization?

**Organizational Structure**
1) How does your role relate to the organization’s internal structure?
2) How does your organization’s role relate to Casey Trees’ in the larger government structure?

**Partnerships**
1) How does your organization partner with Casey Trees?
2) How long has your organization been partnering with Casey Trees?
3) Has the organization partnered with Casey Trees on community forestry projects in Petworth, D.C.?
   If so, how was it involved?

**Funding**
1) How has the organization assisted Casey Trees in funding forestry programs?
2) Has the organization contributed funding to Casey Trees’ neighborhood revitalization projects in Petworth, D.C.?

**Neighborhood Revitalization**
1) What other community forestry neighborhood revitalization projects has the organization been involved in with Casey Trees?
2) What was the organization’s role in those projects?

**Interview Questions for Affiliated Forestry Partners of the Parks and People Foundation**

**Background Information**
1) How long have you worked for this organization?
2) What positions have you held during your employment with this organization?

**Government Role**
1) What is your organization’s role in urban community forestry management in Baltimore?
2) What is your role in the organization?

**Organizational Structure**
1) How does your role relate to the organization’s internal structure?
2) How does your organization’s role relate to Parks and People’s in the larger government structure?

**Partnerships**
1) How does your organization partner with Parks and People?
2) How long has your organization been partnering with Parks and People?
3) Has the organization partnered with Parks and People on community forestry projects in Franklin Square, Baltimore?
   If so, how was it involved?

**Funding**
1) How has the organization assisted Parks and People in funding forestry programs?
2) Has the organization contributed funding to Parks and People’s neighborhood revitalization projects in Franklin Square, Baltimore?

**Neighborhood Revitalization**
1) What other community forestry neighborhood revitalization projects has the organization been involved in with Parks and People?
2) What was the organization’s role in those projects?
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Urban Community Forestry in Washington, D. C. and Baltimore, MD: The Role of Nonprofit Organizations

Researcher: Meghan L. Rodier

You are being asked to participate in research. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to sign it. This will allow your participation in this study. You should receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Explanation of Study
The purpose of this research is to apply governance theory to examine how two organizations, Casey Trees in Washington, D.C. and the Parks and People Foundation in Baltimore, Maryland, promote urban community forestry at the neighborhood level. Additionally this research will explore how these organizations’ stewardship practices affect urban forest conditions through neighborhood revitalization in Petworth, D.C. and Franklin Square, Baltimore. To answer my research questions, I would like to conduct interviews with staff members, volunteers and affiliated forestry partners of Casey Trees and the Parks and People Foundation. If you feel uncomfortable or unsure at any point during this interview, you may 1) refuse to answer a certain question 2) ask for the tape recorder to be turned off or 3) ask to end the interview.

Risks and Discomforts
No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

Benefits
Even though there are no immediate benefits for you, your participation is valuable and important. You can help researchers, city governments, and organizations better understand the development of successful urban community forestry programs and the role organizations need to play in order to achieve such success.

Confidentiality and Records
For anyone who wishes, I will provide a pseudonym instead of using actual names. Any information that you may wish to keep confidential will not be made public. While I will NOT release this information to anybody else, it is important for you to know that my advisor will also have access to this data. Any notes and audiotapes will be secured in my residence. Additionally, while every effort will be made to keep your study-related
information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:
  * Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
  * Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;

**Contact Information**
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Meghan Rodier at (603) 831-0621 or mr795209@ohio.edu.

You may also contact my thesis advisor:
Dr. Geoffrey Buckle at (740) 593-9846 or buckleg1@ohio.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University at (740) 597-1267.

By signing below, you are agreeing that:

- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions
- known risks to you have been explained to your satisfaction.
- you understand Ohio University has no policy or plan to pay for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this research protocol
- you are 18 years of age or older
- your participation in this research is given voluntarily
- you may change your mind and stop participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled.

Signature_________________________________________ Date_______

Printed Name_____________________________________
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