

Jacksonville Tree Commission

Wednesday March 18th, 2026,

9:30 AM

**Ed Ball Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room 5
and Zoom Webinar**

Commissioners: Curtis Hart, Chair
Susan Fraser
Raul Arias
Nina Sickler
William Burke, Vice Chair
Alden Howell

Advisors: Jonathan Colburn
Laura Hartung
Marites Lucero
Justin Gearhart

Staff: Joe Rainey

AGENDA

Order of Agenda is Subject to Change

- 1. Call to Order** - Chair
- 2. Roll Call and Verification of Quorum** – Chair
- 3. Submittal of Speaker’s Cards** – Chair
 - a) A raised hand icon will be acknowledged by the Chair.
 - b) For those attending in person, paper speakers’ cards will be available.
- 4. Public Comment:**
- 5. Action Items:**
 - a) Approval of Minutes: February 18, 2026 Meeting
 - b) Financial Report for Ordinance Tree Fund (15304), Charter Tree Fund (15305) and BJP (Attachment D) – Marites Lucero
 - c) Fund Status of 630-CITY, Remove & Replace and Level 2 Programs (Attachment E) – Justin Gearhart
 - d) Level 3 Project Proposal: NONE

e) Level 2 Project Proposal: NONE

f) Status of Level 2 Tree Projects (Attachment F) – Justin Gearhart

6. Reports:

g) Parks Department Project Update – Kathleen McGovern/Jill Enz

h) Tree Species for approval – Justin Gearhart

i) UFMP Update/Jacksonville's Urban Forest Management Plan Presentation –Dr. Jennifer Hinton

j) Task Force Update: Update

7. New Business:

8. Old Business:

Parks department new positions funded by Tree Commission Withdrawn by Parks.

9. Adjournment – Next meeting April 15th, 2026, 9:30am-11:30am as a Hybrid/Webinar meeting in Ed Ball Building, 10th Floor, Public Works Office, conference room 5.

Jacksonville Tree Commission

Minutes

Wednesday February 18th 2026, 10:01 AM- 11:06 AM

Via Zoom Platform & In Person

*Recording of Meeting can be obtained by sending requests to
Joe Rainey [jrainey@coj.net]

For approval January 21st, 2026

Commissioners:

Curtis L. Hart, Chair (Council Appointee; 2021-0033-A)
William Burke Vice Chair (Mayor Appointee; 2023-0695-A)
Susan Fraser (Council Appointee; 2022-0063-A)
Vacant (Mayor Appointee; 2023-0696-A)
Alden Howell (Council Appointee; 2024-0388-A)
Raul Arias, Council Liaison
Nina Sickler, Director of Public Works

Advisors:

Justin Gearhart - City Arborist
Shannon MacGillis - Office of General Counsel
Marites Lucero - Accounting
Jonathan Colburn - Urban Forestry Manager

Staff: Joe Rainey

1. Call to Order

Conducted by Chair

2. Roll Call and Verification of Quorum

Conducted by Curtis L. Hart, Chair,

Commissioners present:

Curtis L. Hart
William Burke
Nina Sickler
Susan Fraser
Alden Howell

Quorum present (4, in person): No

50 Call for Public Speakers (online & card):"Pqpg

a. Action Items:

4. Prior Meeting Minutes.

Issue: Approval of Minutes: January 21st, 2026 Meeting

Motion: Approve

Moved by: Nina Sickler

Second: William Burke

Vote: Approved unanimous

Out of Order Item: Daryl Joseph Request for two arborist positions funded by tree commission.

Discussion: How would funds be allocated in relation to current staff and budget? Will the funded positions negatively impact current Parks funding? Request is for position and does not include equipment. Memorandum from Parks Dept. defining how the positions would benefit the Tree Fund to include a metric of progress and goals. Details need to be provided By Parks before Tree Commission approval and submission to City Council. Chair has requested the information be provided to Commissioners with time to review prior to next meeting.

5. Financial Report for Ordinance Tree Fund (15304), Charter Tree Fund (15305) and BJP (Attachment D) - Marites Lucero

1. Combined Revenues for Fiscal YTD are \$2.93M compared to \$2.78M Feb-25. An increase of \$149.1K year-on-year.
2. Combined Expenses for Fiscal YTD are \$1.66M compared to \$1.69M on Feb-25. A decrease of \$33.7K year-on-year.
3. Combined Revenues for Feb-26 were \$392.6K compared to \$631K for Feb-25, a decrease of \$238.4K. Meanwhile, expenses were \$220.6K and \$546.6K on Feb-26 and Feb-25, respectively.
4. The combined Ordinance and Charter Unappropriated/Unallocated was \$28.7 million as of Feb-26.
5. For BJP Total unallocated funds were \$0 for Feb-26.

Discussion: Addition of Staffing costs on report

6. Fund Status of 630-CITY, Remove & Replace and Level 2 Programs (Attachment E) - Justin Gearhart

Total funds not appropriated at \$35,34M. Remaining in the four pools \$9.42M (R and R 1.78M; 630-City \$1.9M; Level 2 \$1.22M; and Level 3 \$2.1M).

Total obligated funds are \$2.3M as of February, 2026.

1. Level 3 Project Proposals: NONE

8. Level 2 Project Proposals: Discussed out of order

i. Landmark Middle School - Justin Gearhart

Motion: Approve, for \$223,201.01

Moved by: Nina Sickler

Second: William Burke

Vote: approved as presented, unanimous for \$223,201.01

10. UFMP Update, Dr Jennifer Hinton: UFMP is ahead of schedule, Canopy data is coming in and UFMP plans a presentation in April.

11. Taskforce: In progress and coming close to conclusion, Review of Prime AE and Taskforce findings. Schedule of February Meeting.

13. New Business: Presented Out of order

February 2026 Tree Commission Ask

Discussion: Overview of how funds are requested and timing of requests. Decisions regarding funding request at next Council meeting.

14. Old Business: Position(s) funding parameters provided to Parks for this to be seen before Commission next meeting. Specific details as to what parks need to provide to the commission for these positions to be discussed for approval by commission. Documents and details are needed at least a week before next Commission meeting for Commission to review. Recommended for parks to withdraw until a future date. Parks will inform Commission before next meeting.

END OF MEETING 11:01 AM

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT 1

City of Jacksonville
Tree Commission
Financial Highlights
February 28, 2026

1. Combined Revenues for Fiscal YTD are \$2.93M compared to \$2.78M Feb-25. An increase of \$149.1K year-on-year.
2. Combined Expenses for Fiscal YTD are \$1.66M compared to \$1.69M on Feb-25. A decrease of \$33.7K year-on-year.
3. Combined Revenues for Feb-26 were \$392.6K compared to \$631K for Feb-25, a decrease of \$238.4K. Meanwhile, expenses were \$220.6K and \$546.6K on Feb-26 and Feb-25, respectively.
4. The combined Ordinance and Charter Unappropriated/Unallocated was \$28.7 million as of Feb-26.
5. For BJP Total unallocated funds were \$0 for Feb-26.

City of Jacksonville
Tree Commission
Financials Combined
Balance Sheet
February 28, 2026

Cash	40,286,315.19	
<hr/>		
Accounts Payable	(22,384.52)	
Other Adjustments	-	
Net Assets/Position	<u><u>40,263,930.67</u></u>	
Fund Balance		
<hr/>		
Beginning Fund Balance	38,996,436.36	
YTD Gain\Loss	1,267,494.31	
Adjusted Fund Balance	<u><u>40,263,930.67</u></u>	
Available Balance Calculation		
<hr/>		
Cash	40,286,315.19	Bank Funds
Less:		
AP	22,384.52	
Other Adjustments	-	
Funds Available	7,075,793.44	Appropriated Funds by City Council
Encumbrances (Open POs)	4,509,213.26	Appropriated and Allocated
Sub-Total Adjustments	<u><u>11,607,391.22</u></u>	
Unappropriated/Unallocated	<u><u>28,678,923.97</u></u>	Funds 15304 & 15305
BJP Unallocated Funds	<u><u>-</u></u>	Better Jacksonville Plan * Funds Available Moved to County-Wide Tree Prog

* Better Jacksonville funds were appropriated to Activity 378 - County Wide Tree Prog Right of Way Not in Ordinance Fund.

City of Jacksonville
Tree Commission
Financials Combined
Statement of Activity
February 28, 2026

	Actuals			Budget
	28-Feb	YTD	%	
Revenues				
Ordinance appropriation				530,506.00
Tree Mitigation Funds - Article 25	41,256.00	326,730.00	11%	
Investment Pool Earnings	249,879.91	451,362.35	15%	
Contributions From Private Sources	101,444.00	2,150,218.00	73%	
Misc Sales and Charges	-	-		
Contribution-Loss Deductible	-	-		
Transfer from fund balance	-	-		
Total	392,579.91	2,928,310.35	100%	530,506.00
Expenses				
Summarized expenses less HR	201,380.26	1,605,799.90	55%	11,221,185.72
Human Resources	19,206.23	55,016.14	2%	
Total Expenses	220,586.49	1,660,816.04	57%	
Net	191,199.65	1,267,494.31	43%	(10,690,679.72)

* Budget is comprised of current year budget and prior year carry forward.

City of Jacksonville
Tree Commission
Ordinance - 15304 - Tree Protection & Related Expenditures
Balance Sheet
February 28, 2026

<u>Equity in Pooled Cash</u>	28,858,231.99
Accounts Payable	(22,384.52)
Other Adjustments	-
Net Assets/Position	<u>28,835,847.47</u>
<u>Fund Balance</u>	
Beginning Fund Balance	27,871,901.58
YTD Gain\Loss	963,945.89
Adjusted Fund Balance	<u>28,835,847.47</u>
<u>Available Balance Calculation</u>	
Cash	28,858,231.99
Less:	
AP	22,384.52
Other Adjustments	-
Funds Available(Budget)	5,792,771.91
Encumbrances (Open POs)	3,902,067.02
Sub-Total Adjustments	<u>9,717,223.45</u>
Unappropriated/Unallocated	<u>19,141,008.54</u>

City of Jacksonville
Tree Commission
Ordinance - 15304 - Tree Protection & Related Expenditures
Statement of Activity
February 28, 2026

	<u>28-Feb</u>	<u>YTD</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Budget</u>
Revenues				
Ordinance appropriation				530,506.00
Tree Mitigation Funds - Article 25	364.00	14,158.00	1%	
Investment Pool Earnings	180,502.04	325,916.68	13%	
Contributions From Private Sources	101,444.00	2,150,218.00	86%	
Misc Sales and Charges	-	-		
Contribution-Loss Deductible	-	-		
Total Revenue	<u>282,310.04</u>	<u>2,490,292.68</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>530,506.00</u>
Expenses				
Summarized expenses less HR	201,380.26	1,471,330.65	59%	11,221,185.72
Human Resources	19,206.23	55,016.14	2%	
Total Expenses	<u>220,586.49</u>	<u>1,526,346.79</u>	<u>61%</u>	
Net	<u>80,929.78</u>	<u>963,945.89</u>	<u>39%</u>	<u>(10,690,679.72)</u>

City of Jacksonville
Tree Commission
Charter - 15305- Tree Mitigation & Related Expenditures
Balance Sheet
February 28, 2026

<u>Equity in Pooled Cash</u>	11,428,083.20
-------------------------------------	---------------

<u>Accounts Payable</u>	-
<u>Other Adjustments</u>	-
Net Assets/Position	<u><u>11,428,083.20</u></u>

<u>Fund Balance</u>	
Beginning Fund Balance 10/1/25	11,124,534.78
YTD Gain\Loss	303,548.42
Adjusted Fund Balance	<u><u>11,428,083.20</u></u>

Available Balance Calculation	
Cash	11,428,083.20
Less:	
AP	-
Funds Available	1,283,021.53
Encumbrances (Open POs)	607,146.24
Sub-total	<u><u>1,890,167.77</u></u>

<u>Unappropriated/Unallocated</u>	<u><u>9,537,915.43</u></u>
--	-----------------------------------

City of Jacksonville
Tree Commission
Charter - 15305- Tree Mitigation & Related Expenditures
Statement of Activity
February 28, 2026

	Actuals			Budget
	28-Feb	YTD	%	
Revenues				-
Tree Mitigation Funds - Article 25	40,892.00	312,572.00	71%	
Investment Pool Earnings	69,377.87	125,445.67	29%	
	110,269.87	438,017.67	100%	
Expenses				
Trust Fund Authorized Expenditures	-	134,469.25		-
Net	110,269.87	303,548.42	69%	-

Jan-26

Ledger COJ PL - Modified Accrual

Fund 15304 Tree Protection & Related

Account	Description	Beginning Balance (USD)	Debits (USD)	Credits (USD)	Ending Balance (USD)
104001	Equity in Pooled Cash Account	29,009,687.12	397,812.97	67,675.37	29,339,824.72
104201	Cash - JP Accounts Payable	-242,823.00	0.00	509,156.06	-751,979.06
104206	Cash - JP General Deposit	1,111,181.79	2,400,112.94	2,211,396.89	1,299,897.84
104299	Bank Clearing	-619,120.25	2,766,540.44	2,757,970.59	-610,550.40
104998	Zero Invoice Clearing	-2,077.50	0.00	0.00	-2,077.50
104999	Cash Clearing	-416,883.61	0.00	0.00	-416,883.61
201101	Vouchers Payable Account	-852,884.26	3,378,828.48	2,530,175.71	-4,231.49
201105	Vouchers Payable-Contr -YE Only	-112,699.89	94,546.86	0.00	-18,153.03
216101	Accrued Payroll Payable	-2,478.82	2,478.82	0.00	0.00
284101	Fund Balance - Unassigned Account	-27,871,901.58	0.00	0.00	-27,871,901.58
					-963,945.89
					-28,835,847.47
343750	Tree Mitigation Funds - Article 25	0.00	0.00	14,158.00	-14,158.00
361101	Investment Pool Earnings	0.00	0.00	325,916.68	-325,916.68
366020	Contributions From Private Sources	0.00	112.00	2,150,330.00	-2,150,218.00
512010	Permanent and Probationary Salaries	0.00	28,720.44	2,188.65	26,531.79
521020	Medicare Tax	0.00	375.88	27.53	348.35
522011	GEPP DB Unfunded Liability	0.00	4,975.00	0.00	4,975.00
522070	Disability Trust Fund-ER	0.00	86.16	6.57	79.59
522130	GEPP Defined Contribution DC-ER	0.00	3,360.32	256.07	3,104.25
523010	Group Dental Plan	0.00	60.00	0.00	60.00
523030	Group Life Insurance	0.00	30.25	0.00	30.25
523040	Group Hospitalization Insurance	0.00	4,694.00	0.00	4,694.00
524001	City Employees Worker's Compensation	0.00	15,192.91	0.00	15,192.91
545020	General Liability Insurance	0.00	322.91	129.17	193.74
549006	Trust Fund Authorized Expenditures	0.00	1,948,127.83	486,848.42	1,461,279.41
549032	Clothing, Clean, Shoe Transfer Allow	0.00	160.00	0.00	160.00
591910	Interfund - Transfer Out	0.00	9,697.50	0.00	9,697.50
Total for Fund 15304		0.00	11,056,235.71	11,056,235.71	-963,945.89

Feb-26

Ledger

Fund

Account	Description	Beginning Balance (USD)	Debits (USD)	Credits (USD)	Ending Balance (USD)
104001	Equity in Pooled Cash	8,989,236.76	145,250.67	0.00	9,134,487.43
104201	Cash - JP Accounts Payable	-2,295.00	0.00	0.00	-2,295.00
104206	Cash - JP General Deposit	2,335,281.65	321,402.00	343,484.27	2,313,199.38
104299	Bank Clearing	-41,398.95	323,679.27	299,588.93	-17,308.61
201101	Vouchers Payable Account	-156,289.68	290,758.93	134,469.25	0.00
284101	Fund Balance - Unassigned	-11,124,534.78	0.00	0.00	-11,124,534.78
					-303,548.42
					-11,428,083.20
343750	Tree Mitigation Funds - Article	0.00	0.00	312,572.00	-312,572.00
361101	Investment Pool Earnings	0.00	0.00	125,445.67	-125,445.67
549006	Trust Fund Authorized	0.00	134,469.25	0.00	134,469.25
Total for		0.00	1,215,560.12	1,215,560.12	-303,548.42

End of Report

Review Budgetary Control Balances

Done

Control Budget COJ Detail Budget

Saved Search

Search

Amount Type Year to date
 * Budget Period Feb-26
 Funds Available All amounts
 Currency USD

* Fund 15304
 * Center All Center Values
 * Account 500000
 * Project All Project Values

* Activity All Activity Values
 * Interfund All Interfund Values
 * Future All Future Values

Search Reset Save

Budget Balances

View Detach Wrap Transfer Budget 0

Fund	Center	Account	Project	Activity	Interfund	Future	Year to Date Period	Initial Budget	Budget Adjustments	Total Budget	Commitments	Obligations	Expenditures	Funds Available Amount
15304	154006	523030	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	370.00	175.44	545.44	0.00	0.00	30.25	515.19
15304	154006	523040	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	34,209.00	-10,120.26	24,088.74	0.00	0.00	4,694.00	19,394.74
15304	154006	524001	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	8,651.00	0.00	8,651.00	0.00	0.00	15,192.91	-6,541.91
15304	154006	545020	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	775.00	0.00	775.00	0.00	0.00	193.74	581.26
15304	154006	549006	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	479,517.00	837.16	480,354.16	0.00	64,421.05	336,123.30	79,809.81
15304	154006	549032	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	140.00	-240.00	-100.00	0.00	0.00	160.00	-260.00
15304	154006	549518	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	1,072.00	0.00	1,072.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,072.00
15304	154006	549519	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	182.00	0.00	182.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	182.00
15304	154006	549521	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	7,596.00	0.00	7,596.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,596.00
15304	154007	549006	000000	00000000	00000	0000000	Feb-26	0.00	2,033,796.02	2,033,796.02	0.00	158,627.84	0.00	1,875,168.18
15304	191040	591910	000000	00000000	56201	0000000	Feb-26	19,395.00	0.00	19,395.00	0.00	0.00	9,697.50	9,697.50
15304	193034	522011	000000	00002063	00000	0000000	Feb-26	11,940.00	0.00	11,940.00	0.00	0.00	4,975.00	6,965.00
Total								801,037.00	10,420,148.72	11,221,185.72	0.00	3,902,067.02	1,526,346.79	5,792,771.91

	<u>2/28/2026</u>	<u>1/31/2026</u>	<u>MoM Variance</u>
Total Budget	11,221,185.72	11,221,185.72	-
Encumbrance	3,902,067.02	3,780,822.43	121,244.59
Available Funds	5,792,771.91	6,081,337.99	(288,566.08)

Review Budgetary Control Balances

Done

* Control Budget ▼

Saved Search ▼

▶ Search

Budget Balances

View ▼ Detach Wrap Transfer Budget ▼ 0

Fund	Center	Account	Project	Activity	Interfund	Future	Year to Date Period	Initial Budget	Budget Adjustments	Total Budget	Commitments	Obligations	Expenditures	Funds Available Amount
15305	151004	549006	000000	00000378	00000	0000000	Feb-26	0.00	841,300.04	841,300.04	0.00	314,443.91	344.33	526,511.80
15305	151004	549006	000000	00001315	00000	0000000	Feb-26	0.00	1,183,336.98	1,183,336.98	0.00	292,702.33	134,124.92	756,509.73
Total								0.00	2,024,637.02	2,024,637.02	0.00	607,146.24	134,469.25	1,283,021.53

	<u>2/28/2026</u>	<u>1/31/2026</u>	<u>MoM Variance</u>
Total Budget	2,024,637.02	2,024,637.02	-
Encumbrance	607,146.24	452,769.40	154,376.84
Available Funds	1,283,021.53	1,437,398.37	(154,376.84)



TREE MITIGATION CITY OF JACKSONVILLE



TREE REMOVAL PERMIT INFORMATION

Click here to search detailed information on Site Clearing and Tree Removal Permits. In reviewing tree removal information on a specific permit, for "B" permits click on the Spec 2 tab; for "L" permits click on the Tree Mitigation tab.



TREE FUND CITY PLANTING PROJECTS

Click here to search detailed information about City Tree Fund Planting Projects.



AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION

15F (Ordinance): \$19,159,161.57
15N (Charter): \$9,537,915.43
Total: \$28,697,077.00



FILE AN ISSUE

Click here to report site clearing or tree removal without a permit, or to request tree maintenance on public property. In the CARE System, select "Tree Remove or Landscape Violation" from the dropdown.

Disclaimer: The AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION information shown on this page is updated nightly from the City's financial records, but does not include any pending appropriations, or other financial transactions of the funds which have not been completed.



If you experience difficulty viewing or accessing the documents provided on this site, or navigating this application's table features, using any assistive technology please contact the Disabled Services Division at 904-630-4940 or 904-630-4933 (TTY) to request an accommodation.

© 2026 - Official City of Jacksonville and Duval County Government Website, All Rights Reserved.

Version: 1.0.0.6



Search



6:21 AM
3/2/2026

AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION (a)		
15304 (15F)	Ordinance	\$ 19,258,897.57
15305 (15N)	Charter	\$ 9,609,995.43
		<u>\$ 28,868,893.00</u>

THE BIG 4

<u>Title</u>	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>Funds Available</u>
Level 2 Tree Planting Program - Fund 15304 (d)	\$ 1,924,033.74	\$ 95,549.33
Level 2 Tree Planting Program - Fund 15305 (d)	\$ 292,702.33	\$ 756,509.73
Level 3 Tree Planting Program - Fund 15304 (d)	\$ 1,069,090.15	\$ 2,099,402.39
Remove/Replace - Fund 15304 (e)	\$ 681,721.76	\$ 1,259,443.98
Remove/Replace - Fund 35101 (e)	\$ 178,812.96	\$ -
Remove/Replace - Fund 15305 (e)	\$ 314,443.91	\$ 526,511.80
630-CITY Tree Planting Program - Fund 15304 (e)	\$ 158,627.84	\$ 1,875,168.18

FY25 Revenues:	15304 (15F)	15305 (15N)
October	\$ 478,603.00	\$ 89,080.00
November	\$ 574,360.12	\$ 71,839.60
December	\$ 496,845.39	\$ 114,108.17
January	\$ 257,231.09	\$ 66,201.11
February	\$ 559,517.00	\$ 71,469.06
March	\$ 900,099.82	\$ 103,254.18
April	\$ 1,115,970.47	\$ 167,494.98
May	\$ 489,592.53	\$ 76,069.17
June	\$ 480,233.11	\$ 266,136.46
July	\$ 473,481.59	\$ 83,349.17
August	\$ 839,835.79	\$ 72,043.56
September	\$ 516,942.24	\$ 103,668.60

FY26 Revenues:	15304 (15F)	15305 (15N)
October	\$ 1,114,898.00	\$ 82,065.00
November	\$ 283,238.54	\$ 54,409.29
December	\$ 586,718.10	\$ 39,299.51
January	\$ 316,511.80	\$ 187,424.89
February	\$ 286,156.24	\$ 144,178.98

FY25 Expenses:	15304 (15F)	15305 (15N)
October	\$ 30,938.21	\$ -
November	\$ 279,657.16	\$ 98,945.17
December	\$ 357,285.21	\$ -
January	\$ 283,809.67	\$ 5,509.26
February	\$ 684,299.22	\$ -
March	\$ 183,691.45	\$ 82,900.00
April	\$ 399,875.13	\$ 31,166.37
May	\$ 239,722.55	\$ 34,609.68
June	\$ (22,222.33)	\$ 88,908.03
July	\$ 110,611.53	\$ 59,329.59
August	\$ 716,570.54	\$ 34,870.55
September	\$ 1,021,839.29	\$ 156,634.01

FY26 Expenses:	15304 (15F)	15305 (15N)
October	\$ 314,691.73	\$ 99,587.20
November	\$ 111,256.14	\$ 344.33
December	\$ 464,211.72	\$ 32,306.19
January	\$ 484,198.36	\$ 2,231.53
February	\$ 257,880.73	\$ -

	15304 (15F)	15305 (15N)
Funds Available (b)	\$ 583,648.26	\$ 1,283,021.53
Obligations (c)	\$ 3,897,894.54	\$ 607,146.24

- (a) jaxtreemitigation.coj.net
- (b) total appropriated, but unobligated, funds
- (c) purchase order(s) have been issued for these funds
- (d) Tree Commission may make recommendations for these appropriations
- (e) Public Works utilizes these appropriations

Prepared 3/9/26 LD

The City of Jacksonville has two separate laws that provide protection for certain trees and require mitigation for damage or removal of certain trees caused by the process of land development. Mitigation is required either through planting or replanting of a calculated amount of mitigation trees or through making a specified payment into the Tree Protection and Related Expenses Trust Fund codified by Sec. 111.760, Ordinance Code. These laws are Article 25 of the Charter of the City of Jacksonville and Chapter 656, Part 12, Subparts A & B of the Ordinance Code. Each provision has specific criteria for what is characterized as a "protected tree" and thus would require replacing through the development process of a site, or if a replacement is not made, how the "mitigation fee" is calculated for removal of trees without replacement. The mitigation fee that is paid by developers who are unable to replace the trees destroyed during construction, as required by both provisions, is placed in the Tree Protection and Related Expenses Trust Fund. Moreover, funds received from application of the Charter are held in Fund 15305 and funds received from application of the Ordinance Code are held in the Fund 15304.

Jacksonville Tree Commission

Available Funds Summary (as of March, 2026)

	Feb-26	Mar-26
15F Ordinance Funds Available for Council Appropriation (a)	\$18,876,851.53	\$19,159,161.57
Allocated for Remove and Replace to Public Works (b)	\$1,785,955.78	\$1,785,955.78
Allocated for 630-City to Public Works (c)	\$1,923,487.16	\$1,875,168.18
Available for Level 2 Allocation by Tree Commission (d)	\$1,227,381.36	\$852,059.06
Available for Level 3 Allocation by Tree Commission (e)	\$2,099,402.39	\$2,099,402.39
Total Allocated to PW for 630-City and Remove & Replace (b) + (c)	\$3,709,442.94	\$3,661,123.96
Total Available for Allocation by Tree Commission (d) + (e)	\$3,326,783.75	\$2,951,461.45
15N Charter Funds Available for Council Appropriation (f)	\$9,427,645.56	\$9,537,915.43
BJP Tree Mitigation Dollars available for Council Appropriation (g)	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Avail for Appropriation by Council (a) + (f) + (g)	\$28,304,497.09	\$28,697,077.00
Total Avail for Allocation by Tree Commission (d) + (e)	\$3,326,783.75	\$2,951,461.45
Total Funds Not Obligated	\$35,340,723.78	\$35,309,662.41

Encumbered Funds Summary (as of March, 2026)

	Feb-26	Mar-26
<i>Obligated Level 2 Proj Funds</i>	\$1,325,763.48	\$2,097,696.02
<i>Obligated Level 3 Proj Funds</i>	\$1,069,090.15	\$1,069,090.15

Total Funds Obligated	\$2,394,853.63	\$3,166,786.17
------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------

Since 2017

15F Remove and Replace

15304 Ordinance Funds Available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$19,159,161.57

Appropriated	Date	Project	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status
\$300,000.00	Nov-18					
\$2,000,000.00	Nov-19					
\$2,000,000.00	Apr-21					
\$4,000,000.00	Dec-22					
\$2,100,000.00	May-25					
		Baymeadows R&R	\$169,819.05	12/21/2023	\$8,940.96	Open
		Old Saint Augustine R&R	\$55,877.46	2/14/2024	\$2,793.87	Open
		Round 22	\$27,425.81	3/6/2024	\$2,742.58	Open
		Fort Caroline R&R	\$185,252.23	3/28/2024	\$9,262.62	Open
		2024-03	\$90,400.00	5/2/2024	\$9,040.00	Open
		Greenland Road R&R	\$101,044.45	5/8/2024	\$5,052.23	Open
		Parks Remove and Replace (FY 25 Replacements)	\$100,000.00	4/4/2025	\$27,524.00	Open
		Remove and Replace Old Saint Augustine @ I-95	\$42,341.33	4/9/2025	\$6,351.20	Open
		Remove and Replace GolfAir JSEB Office	\$4,414.50	4/9/2025	\$662.17	Open
		University and Merrill Remove and Replace	\$7,163.92	4/18/2025	\$1,074.58	Open
		2025-04	\$65,400.00	8/6/2025	\$13,080.00	Open
		FDOT Roads N R+R	\$69,027.10	8/1/2025	\$13,805.42	Open
		Baymeadows R&R Round 2	\$25,947.68	8/8/2025	\$5,189.52	Open
		R&R FY 2026 Round 2	\$56,899.02	10/23/2025	\$56,899.02	Open
		R&R FY 2026 Round 3	\$95,972.70	10/23/2025	\$95,972.70	Open
		PWML R&R Removals FY 2026	\$200,000.00	10/31/2025	\$137,852.22	Open
		FY 2026 Parks Remove and Replace (Replacements)	\$200,000.00	11/6/2025	\$121,577.00	Open
		R&R FY 2026 Round 5	\$56,214.45	12/12/2025	\$56,214.45	Open
		R&R FY 2026 Round 7	\$68,517.21	1/29/2026	\$68,517.21	Open
\$10,400,000.00	Total	Total	\$8,802,619.14	Total	\$642,551.75	
				Available for 15F Remove and Replace Allocation	\$1,259,443.98	

Definitions of Terms

- Available for Appropriation-** Requires City Council Approval
- Allocated-** Already been approved by City Council/Tree Commission and MBRC approved funds
- Obligation-** Funds have been assigned to a project and a purchase order has been issued
- Green fill** indicates amount available in pool of money
- Orange fill** indicated total money for column

Since 2017

15N Remove and Replace

15305 Charter Funds Available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$9,537,915.43

Appropriate	Date	Project	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status
\$1,000,000.00	Jun-24					
		Gator Bowl R&R	\$6,886.58	10/28/2024	\$688.66	Open
		R&R 2025-01	\$82,900.00	4/11/2025	\$16,580.00	Open
		R&R 2025-02	\$69,200.00	5/5/2025	\$13,840.00	Open
		R&R FY 2026 Round 1	\$122,391.58	10/23/2025	\$122,391.58	Open
		R&R FY 2026 Round 4	\$67,476.77	12/2/2025	\$67,476.77	Open
		R&R FY 2026 Round 6	\$93,466.90	1/29/2026	\$93,466.90	Open
\$1,000,000.00	Total	Total	\$473,488.20	Total	\$314,443.91	
				Available for 15N Remove and Replace Allocation	\$526,511.80	

Definitions of Terms

Available for Appropriation- Requires City Council Approval

Allocated- Already been approved by City Council/Tree Commission and MBRC approved funds

Obligation- Funds have been assigned to a project and a purchase order has been issued

Green fill indicates amount available in pool of money

Orange Fill indicated total money for column

Since 2017

BJP Remove and Replace

Better Jacksonville Plan- Tree Mitigation Dollars available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$0

Appropriated	Date	Project	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status
\$1,717,826.00	Jun-24					
		Courthouse R&R	\$2,295.54	8/9/2024	115.28	Open
		Main Street R&R	\$369,995.86	8/9/2024	\$36,999.59	Open
		Shindler and Rampart R&R	\$74,564.42	11/15/2024	\$7,456.44	Open
		Monument and Cobblestone R&R	\$173,283.67	1/9/2025	\$17,328.37	Open
		Southeast Regional Library	\$57,231.54	1/17/2025	\$5,723.15	Open
		Hodges Blvd R&R	\$112,120.86	2/11/2025	\$21,493.09	Open
		1st St R&R	\$102,509.54	2/27/2025	\$15,376.43	Open
		City Hall Remove and Replace	\$91,366.60	2/28/2025	\$14,897.79	Open
		Parks Remove and Replace (Removals) FY 2026	\$101,445.01	12/5/2025	\$47,781.78	Open
\$1,717,826.00	Total	Total	\$1,717,826.00	Total	\$167,171.92	
				Available for BJP Remove and Replace Allocation	\$0.00	

Definitions of Terms

Available for Appropriation- Requires City Council Approval

Allocated- Already been approved by City Council/Tree Commission and MBRC approved funds

Obligation- Funds have been assigned to a project and a purchase order has been issued

Green fill indicates amount available in pool of money

Orange Fill indicated total money for column

Since 2017

630-City

15304 Ordinance Funds Available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$19,159,161.57

Appropriated	Date	Project	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status
\$200,000.00	Nov-18					
\$1,600,000.00	Aug-19					
\$2,000,000.00	Jan-25					
\$2,000,000.00	Jan-20					
\$2,000,000.00	Dec-22					
		630-City Round 25	\$101,800.00	6/12/2025	\$20,360.00	Open
		630-City Round 26	\$89,948.86	10/23/2025	\$89,948.86	Open
		630-City Round 27				
\$7,800,000.00	Total	Total	\$4,549,441.48	Total	\$110,308.86	
				Available for 630-City Allocation	\$1,875,168.18	

Definitions of Terms

Available for Appropriation- Requires City Council Approval

Allocated- Already been approved by City Council/Tree Commission and MBRC approved funds

Obligation- Funds have been assigned to a project and a purchase order has been issued

Green fill indicates amount available in pool of money

Orange Fill indicated total money for column

Since 2017

15F Level 2

15304 Ordinance Funds Available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$19,159,161.57

Appropriated	Date	Project	Allocation	Date	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status
\$1,000,000.00	Feb-19							
\$2,000,000.00	Jan-20							
\$2,000,000.00	Jan-21							
\$2,000,000.00	Aug-21							
\$8,000,000.00	Jun-22							
		GoldStar Phase 2	\$2,300,000.00	12/21/2022	\$1,143,500.00	7/14/2023	\$59,075.00	Open
		Gator Bowl	\$41,185.00	7/19/2023	\$41,185.00	8/10/2023	\$2,059.25	Open
		Hodges Blvd	\$137,667.34	10/18/2023	\$137,667.34	12/14/2023	\$6,833.36	Open
		Lift Ev'ry Voice and Sing Park	\$223,335.00	11/15/2023	\$223,335.00	1/10/2024	\$44,667.00	Open
		McGirts Creek Preserve Restoration (Planting)	\$182,750.00	1/17/2024	\$182,750.00	4/2/2024	\$182,750.00	Open
		McGirts Creek Preserve Restoration (Consulting)	\$82,250.00	1/17/2024	\$82,250.00	8/23/2024	\$54,166.64	Open
		Alden Road	\$76,282.56	6/28/2024	\$76,282.56	7/11/2024	\$11,442.38	Open
		JTA Bus Stops Phase 1	\$34,533.86	7/17/2024	\$34,533.86	9/10/2024	\$3,453.39	Open
		State Street Plan	\$298,769.36	9/18/2024	\$298,769.36	10/31/2024	\$83,571.86	Open
		Gonzales Park	\$106,397.74	11/20/2024	\$106,397.74	12/16/2024	\$10,639.77	Open
		Murray Hill	\$33,119.53	11/20/2024	\$33,119.53	12/13/2024	\$3,311.95	Open
		Merrill Road	\$7,998.33	11/20/2024	\$7,998.33	12/13/2024	\$799.83	Open
		Walter Anderson Park	\$10,700.00	11/20/2024	\$10,700.00	1/13/2025	\$4,280.00	Open
		Touchton Road Park	\$85,400.00	11/20/2024	\$85,400.00	1/13/2025	\$17,080.00	Open
		Julington Durbin Preserve	\$52,950.00	11/20/2024	\$52,950.00	1/13/2025	\$18,160.00	Open
		Greenland Park	\$86,475.00	11/20/2024	\$86,475.00	1/13/2025	\$17,295.00	Open
		Glynlea Park	\$81,000.00	11/20/2024	\$81,000.00	1/13/2025	\$16,200.00	Open
		Genovar Park	\$56,900.00	11/20/2024	\$56,900.00	1/13/2025	\$22,760.00	Open
		Black Hammock Island Park	\$94,150.00	11/20/2024	\$94,150.00	1/13/2025	\$18,830.00	Open
		Backridge Park	\$51,575.00	11/20/2024	\$51,575.00	1/13/2025	\$10,315.00	Open
		Atlantic Blvd	\$45,379.20	12/18/2024	\$45,379.20	1/31/2025	\$4,537.92	Open
		Palmetto Leaves Park	\$152,650.00	12/18/2024	\$152,650.00	2/11/2025	\$30,530.00	Open
		Five Points	\$35,226.79	2/19/2025	\$28,605.04	4/4/2025	\$5,721.01	Open
		Jacksonville Zoo Level 2	\$52,255.97	2/19/2025	\$52,255.97	4/4/2025	\$21,174.60	Open
		Pearl St	\$38,872.69	3/19/2025	\$38,872.69	4/23/2025	\$7,817.43	Open
		Neptune Beach Phase 1	\$46,970.28	3/19/2025	\$46,970.28	4/23/2025	\$8,157.96	Open
		Windy Hills Park	\$55,205.00	3/19/2025	\$55,205.00	5/7/2025	\$55,205.00	Open
		Terrace Park	\$30,620.00	3/19/2025	\$30,620.00	5/7/2025	\$12,248.00	Open
		Riverview Park	\$49,475.00	3/19/2025	\$49,475.00	5/7/2025	\$19,790.00	Open
		Oceanway Park	\$51,000.00	3/19/2025	\$51,000.00	5/7/2025	\$11,400.00	Open
		District 10 Parks	\$135,915.00	3/19/2025	\$135,915.00	5/7/2025	\$52,206.00	Open
		Beaver Dam Road	\$56,329.02	4/30/2025	\$56,329.02	5/30/2025	\$18,187.74	Open
		Glorianne Drive	\$11,036.25	4/30/2025	\$11,036.25	5/30/2025	\$1,655.43	Open
		ACPS Dog Park	\$14,560.00	5/21/2025	\$14,560.00	6/25/2025	\$11,020.00	Open
		Riverfront Park	\$58,437.50	5/21/2025	\$58,437.50	6/26/2025	\$21,192.50	Open
		Beachwood Blvd	\$26,928.45	5/21/2025	\$26,928.45	7/10/2025	\$12,113.39	Open
		Panda Street and Cougar Road	\$6,003.72	7/16/2025	\$6,003.72	8/18/2025	\$3,315.02	Open
		Edgewood Ave	\$27,570.25	7/16/2025	\$27,570.25	8/18/2025	\$9,438.05	Open
		Oreilly Drive West	\$24,279.75	6/16/2025	\$24,279.75	8/18/2025	\$10,912.64	Open
		Neptune Beach Phase 2	\$24,368.04	7/16/2025	\$9,535.32	8/18/2025	\$4,131.97	Open
		South Shores and Guilford Road	\$5,297.40	6/16/2025	\$5,297.40	8/18/2025	\$4,855.95	Open
		Gator Bowl and Bay Street	\$25,019.41	9/17/2025	\$25,019.41	10/23/2025	\$8,505.54	Open
		SPAR	\$271,865.25	8/20/2025	\$271,865.25	10/31/2025	\$271,865.25	Open
		Dames Point Park	\$39,300.00	9/17/2025	\$39,300.00	11/14/2025	\$15,720.00	Open

15F Level 2

15304 Ordinance Funds Available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$19,159,161.57

Appropriated	Date	Project	Allocation	Date	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status
		Marjenhoff Park	\$34,830.00	9/17/2025	\$34,830.00	11/14/2025	\$11,628.00	Open
		Resilient Ribault	\$161,235.00	9/17/2025	\$161,235.00	11/17/2025	\$63,894.00	Open
		Central Bark Dog Park	\$99,660.00	12/15/2025	\$99,660.00	1/22/2026	\$99,660.00	Open
		Camp Milton	\$210,454.00	12/15/2026	\$210,454.00	1/30/2026	\$210,454.00	Open
		Collins Lake Dr	\$48,034.50	12/15/2026	\$48,034.52	2/4/2026	\$48,034.52	Open
		Sandawood High	\$80,545.37	1/21/2026	\$80,545.37	2/13/2026	\$80,545.37	Open
		Justina Road	\$20,532.21	1/21/2026	\$20,532.21	2/12/2026	\$20,532.21	Open
		King St and Beaver	\$30,642.24	1/21/2026	\$30,642.24	2/12/2026	\$30,642.24	Open
		Herbert Bayer Park	\$28,000.00	1/21/2026	\$28,000.00	2/17/2026	\$28,000.00	Open
		Boone Park South	\$29,725.00	1/21/2026	\$29,725.00	2/17/2026	\$29,725.00	Open
\$15,000,000.00	Total		\$16,704,440.31	Total	\$14,311,386.07	Total	\$1,832,547.57	
						Available for 15F Level 2 Allocation	\$95,549.33	

Definitions of Terms

Available for Appropriation- Requires City Council Approval

Allocated- Already been approved by City Council/Tree Commission and MBRC approved funds

Encumbered- Funds have been assigned to a project and a purchase order has been issued

Green fill Indicates amount available in pool of money

Orange Fill indicated total money for column

Since 2017

15N Level 2

15305 Charter Funds Available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$9,537,915.43

Appropriated	Date	Project	Allocation	Date	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status
\$1,500,000.00	Jun-24							
		Gate Parkway	\$123,681.46	7/17/2024	\$123,681.46	10/24/2024	\$12,368.15	Open
		Amelia View Phase 3	\$42,644.07	2/19/2025	\$42,644.07	4/4/2025	\$6,694.59	Open
		Warrington Park	\$75,250.00	5/21/2025	\$75,250.00	6/27/2025	\$35,700.00	Open
		Atlantic Blvd San Marco	\$8,542.75	10/15/2025	\$8,542.75	11/13/2025	\$8,542.75	Open
		Alexandria Oaks Park	\$64,000.00	6/18/2025	\$64,000.00	1/9/2026	\$64,000.00	Open
		Sandalwood High	\$70,595.64	1/21/2026	\$70,595.64	2/13/2026	\$70,595.64	Open
		Justina Road	\$52,558.68	1/21/2026	\$52,558.68	2/12/2026	\$52,558.68	Open
		King St and Beaver	\$14,688.64	1/21/2026	\$14,688.64	2/12/2026	\$14,688.64	Open
\$1,500,000.00	Total	Total	\$726,956.39	Total	\$726,956.39	Total	\$265,148.45	
						Available for 15N Level 2 Allocation	\$756,509.73	

Definitions of Terms

Available for Appropriation - Requires City Council Approval

Allocated - Already been approved by City Council/Tree Commission and MBRC approved funds

Encumbered - Funds have been assigned to a project and a purchase order has been issued

Green fill indicates amount available in pool of money

Orange Fill indicated total money for column

Since 2017

Level 3

15304 Ordinance Funds Available for Appropriation: As of 03/01/2026 there is \$19,159,161.57

Appropriated	Date	Project	Allocation	Date	Purchase Order Amount	Date	Remainder	Status	
\$1,000,000.00	May-20								
\$1,000,000.00	Dec-22								
\$2,000,000.00	Jun-24								
		RiversEdge	\$1,211,246.21	3/20/2024	\$1,211,246.21	11/18/2024	\$702,090.15	Open	
		UNF	\$367,000.00	4/16/2025	\$367,000.00	11/6/2025	\$367,000.00	Open	
\$4,000,000.00	Total	Total	\$2,029,035.56	Total	\$2,006,325.76	Total	\$1,069,090.15		
							Available for Level 3 Allocation	\$2,099,402.39	

Definitions of Terms

Available for Appropriation- Requires City Council Approval

Allocated- Already been approved by City Council/Tree Commission and MBRC approved funds

Obligation- Funds have been assigned to a project and a purchase order has been issued

Green fill indicates amount available in pool of money

Orange Fill indicated total money for column

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
CITY OF JACKSONVILLE
117 WEST DUVAL STREET
SUITE 480
JACKSONVILLE, FL 32202



MEMORANDUM

TO: The Jacksonville Tree Commission

FROM: Shannon MacGillis
Assistant General Counsel, Legislative Affairs & Regulatory Department

RE: Legislation introduced at the March 10th City Council Meeting

DATE: March 12, 2026

Please find attached the legislation introduced at the March 10th Council meeting. The bill number(s), short title(s) and committees of reference are as follows:

2026-180 ORD Approp \$4,500,000 from the Tree Protection & Related Expenses Trust Fund (Ordinance) to the Level 2 Tree Planting Prog to Prov Funds for Tree Plantings Administered by the Dept of Public Works on Public Property; Prov for Contd Oversight by the Dept of Public Works (MacGillis) (Introduced by CM Arias) 3/10/26 CO Introduced: NCSPHS, F Public Hearing Pursuant to Ch 166, F.S. & CR 3.601 - 3/24/26

Finance, NCSPHS

The Council public hearing for this bill will be on **Tuesday, March 24, 2026.**

Provided there are no delays:

1. The **NCSPHS** Committee will address this bill on **Monday, April 6, 2026.**
2. The **Finance** Committee will address this bill on **Tuesday, April 7, 2026.**
3. Full Council will address this bill on **Tuesday, April 14, 2026.**

1 Introduced by Council Member Arias:
2
3

4 **ORDINANCE 2026-180**

5 AN ORDINANCE APPROPRIATING \$4,500,000 FROM THE
6 TREE PROTECTION AND RELATED EXPENSES TRUST FUND
7 (ORDINANCE) TO THE LEVEL 2 TREE PLANTING PROGRAM
8 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR TREE PLANTINGS ADMINISTERED
9 BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS ON PUBLIC
10 PROPERTY; PROVIDING FOR CONTINUED OVERSIGHT BY
11 THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS; PROVIDING AN
12 EFFECTIVE DATE.
13

14 **WHEREAS**, the Tree Commission was established by Ordinance
15 2017-635-E, as described in Chapter 94, *Ordinance Code*, which outlines
16 the various duties and responsibilities of the Tree Commission to
17 develop and maintain a healthy tree canopy in the City; and

18 **WHEREAS**, the City currently maintains two Tree Protection and
19 Related Expenses Trust Funds, the first was created pursuant to
20 Section 25.04 of the *Jacksonville City Charter* and the second by
21 ordinance which is codified in Section 111.760, *Ordinance Code*; and

22 **WHEREAS**, while these Funds are subject to differing guidelines
23 and requirements, they both serve the fundamental mission of planting
24 and maintaining trees along the public rights-of-way and on public
25 lands within the City, so as to mitigate for the loss or destruction
26 of protected trees and to replace the tree canopy in the City that
27 has been lost through the process of land development; and

28 **WHEREAS**, the Tree Commission established the Level 2 Program,
29 by Ordinance 2019-89-E, to provide individual citizens,
30 organizations, City departments, and/or Council Members with the
31 opportunity to suggest locations for tree planting projects on public

1 property within Duval County that proposes to use funds from the City
2 of Jacksonville Tree Protection and Related Expenses Trust Fund; and

3 **WHEREAS**, during its meeting on February 18, 2026, the Tree
4 Commission voted unanimously to recommend appropriating Tree
5 Protection and Related Expenses Trust Fund (Ordinance) monies for the
6 continuation and expansion of the Level 2 Tree Planting Program; now
7 therefore

8 **BE IT ORDAINED** by the Council of the City of Jacksonville:

9 **Section 1. Appropriation.** For the 2025-2026 fiscal year,
10 within the City's budget, there are hereby appropriated the sum(s)
11 from the account(s) listed in subsections (a) to the account(s) listed
12 in subsection (b):

13 (The account information is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and
14 incorporated herein by this reference)

15 (a) Appropriated from:

16 See **Exhibit 1** \$4,500,000

17 (b) Appropriated to:

18 See **Exhibit 1** \$4,500,000

19 (c) **Explanation of the appropriation:**

20 The funding above represents a total appropriation of
21 \$4,500,000 from the Tree Protection and Related Expenses
22 Trust Fund (Ordinance) to fund the continuation and
23 expansion of the City's Level 2 Tree Planting Program (the
24 "Level 2 Program").

25 **Section 2. Purpose.** The purpose of the appropriation in
26 Section 1 is to provide funds for the continuation and expansion of
27 the City's Level 2 Program which allows for tree plantings on public
28 rights-of-way and public property by the Department of Public Works.

29 **Section 3. Oversight Department.** The Public Works
30 Department shall continue to oversee and administer the Level 2
31 Program described herein. The trees that are planted, and any that

1 are removed as part of the planting, shall be recorded electronically
2 on Plan-it Geo, or its equivalent, and shall note the species and
3 size of each, as well as the date of planting or removal.

4 **Section 4. Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall become
5 effective upon signature by the Mayor or upon becoming effective
6 without the Mayor's signature.

7
8 Form Approved:

9
10 /s/ Shannon MacGillis

11 Office of General Counsel

12 Legislation Prepared By: Shannon MacGillis

13 GC-#1734479-v5-2026_Level2_Tree_Funds_Appropriation.docx

Completed CITY OF JACKSONVILLE LEVEL 2 TREE PLANTING PROJECTS

ATTACHMENT B

Visit <https://pg-cloud.com/JacksonvilleFL/> for City of Jacksonville Tree Project Maps
 Visit jaxtreemitigation.coj.net - Tree Fund City Projects for links to legislation and planting details

Requesting Entity	Project Scope	Tree Commission Approval Date	Status	Council District	Approp.	Obligated	Contract/Warranty
Executive Director, Tree Hill Nature Center	22 trees requested in Tree Hill amphitheater parking area; site plan complete; no removals required; ready for review pending cost estimate per new countywide tree planting contract.	May-19	Complete	1	\$21,472.80	\$21,472.80	Liberty 3/mos
Sheffield Elementary School PTA President	10 Trees requested to provide shade for existing play area/field at Sheffield Elementary School; site visit complete - pending design and review.	May-19	Complete	2	\$20,414.48	\$20,414.48	Davey -1/yr
San Marco Preservation Society and Greenscape, San Marco Tree Planting	102 Trees requested in city right of ways within District 5, includes removal of damaged/diseased trees; site evaluation scheduled	Jun-19	Complete	5	\$247,749.52	\$247,749.52	Davey -1/yr
Kensington Association HOA Director	54 trees requested within Kensington Lakes city right of ways along Kensington Gardens Blvd. and Kensington Lakes Dr to replace trees lost due to storm damage/disease; may include removals. Planting Plan pending.	Aug-19	Complete	3	\$124,202.62	\$124,202.62	Davey -1/yr
S-Line Biodiversity Corridor Tree Planting	Installation of 25 trees throughout the S-Line Trail Biodiversity Corridor. This will offer additional tree canopy and shade to the trail.	Aug-19	Complete	7	\$30,949.40	\$30,949.40	Liberty 3/mos
City Cemetery - citizen request	18 Trees in right of ways on Ionia St. and Jessie St.	Dec-19	Complete	7	\$41,350.50	\$41,350.50	Liberty 2/yr
Baymeadows East Association Tree Planting	119 Trees in right of ways and medians on Baymeadows East and Fort Family Regional Park	Dec-19	Complete	11	\$284,900.07	\$284,900.07	Davey -1/yr
Cathedral District Tree Planting	50+ trees requested as Cathedral District (CD7) tree planting, may include removal of damaged/diseased trees. City right of way tree plantings within general proximity but not limited to State St to Catherine St. to Main St. to Adams St.; site evaluation scheduled	Jan-20	Complete	7	\$120,371.14	\$120,371.14	Liberty 2/yr
Yates Building - Cultural Council of Greater Jacksonville	8 Trees to be installed around renovated fountain at building entrance	Jan-20	Complete	7	\$38,312.00	\$38,312.00	Liberty 2/yr
Ed Austin Park Tree Planting/Resident request	115 Trees in right of ways around and within Willowbranch Park	Jun-20	Complete	2	\$214,822.00	\$214,822.00	Liberty 2/yr
Neptune Beach/Residential requests - City of Neptune	Trees within residential Right of Ways - 47 trees	Jul-20	Complete	13	\$55,490.00	\$55,490.00	Liberty 3/mos
Nathan Krestul Park - Friends of Krestul Park	Trees within Park - 34 trees	Jul-20	Complete	5	\$63,423.00	\$63,423.00	Liberty 2/yr
Alexandria Oaks Park/SMPS and Bolles School request	Trees within Park - 15 trees	Jul-20	Complete	5	\$28,593.00	\$28,593.00	Liberty 2/yr
Huntington Forest Park/Resident request to CM	Trees along Park Right of Way - Buffer - 15 trees	Jul-20	Complete	5	\$28,026.00	\$28,026.00	Liberty 2/yr
Canopy Place Tree Planting/resident request	Installation of 40 trees in city right of ways and medians to provide additional tree canopy, sound buffer and screening.	Oct-20	Complete	8	\$117,483.97	\$117,483.97	Davey -1/yr
Sunrise Ridge/resident request	Installation of 40 tree in city right of ways to increase tree canopy as well screening and buffer from adjacent highway.	Oct-20	Complete	1	\$107,316.52	\$107,316.52	Davey -1/yr

Completed CITY OF JACKSONVILLE LEVEL 2 TREE PLANTING PROJECTS

ATTACHMENT B

Visit <https://pg-cloud.com/JacksonvilleFL/> for City of Jacksonville Tree Project Maps
 Visit jaxtreemitigation.coj.net - Tree Fund City Projects for links to legislation and planting details

Requesting Entity	Project Scope	Tree Commission Approval Date	Status	Council District	Approp.	Obligated	Contract/Warranty
Jacksonville Beach Golf Park/Jax Beach	Installation of 156 trees in city golf course park to increase tree canopy, create screening, and attract wildlife.	Nov-20	Complete	13	\$147,562.80	\$147,562.80	Liberty 3/mos
Freedom Park/CM & Parks	Trees within newly established park (irrigated) - 38 trees	Dec-20	Complete	2	\$38,548.00	\$38,548.00	Liberty 3/mos
Blue Cypress Park Restoration/Parks	Trees within park - field restoration - 157 trees	Mar-21	Complete	1	\$187,154.40	\$187,154.40	Liberty 1/yr
Atlantic Beach/City of Atlantic Beach Phase 2	Trees within Atlantic Beach residential Right of Ways and Parks - 133 trees	May-21	Complete	13	\$164,404.80	\$164,404.80	Liberty 3/mos
Cobblestone Homeowners Association/residential requests/HOA	Installation of 105 trees in city right of ways and medians to provide additional tree canopy, sound buffer and screening.	Jun-20	Complete	2	\$192,922.00	\$192,922.00	Liberty 2/yr

ACTIVE CITY OF JACKSONVILLE LEVEL 2 TREE PLANTING PROJECTS

ATTACHMENT F

Visit <https://pg-cloud.com/JacksonvilleFL/> for City of Jacksonville Tree Project Maps

Visit jaxtreemitigation.coj.net - Tree Fund City Projects for links to legislation and planting details

Requesting Entity	Project Scope	Tree Commission Approval Date	Councill District	Status	Allocated Amount	Contract/Warranty
Gold Star Family Memorial Highway Phase 2	Trees within retention ponds and right of way. 1218 trees	Dec-22	8	Installation Complete	\$2,300,000.00	To Bid 2/yr
GatorBowl	Trees in Median. 8 trees	Jul-23	7	Installation Complete	\$41,185.00	Liberty/2yr
McGirts Creek Restoration Level 2	In Preserve (12,000 saplings)	Jan-24	9	Scheduling	\$182,750.00	Greenway/no warranty
Alden Road	41 Trees along ROW	May-24	4	Installation Complete	\$76,282.56	Liberty 2/yr
Gate Parkway	49 Trees in median and ROW	Jul-24	4	Installation Complete	\$123,681.46	Liberty 2/yr
JTA Bus Stops Phase 1	11 trees in ROW	Jul-24	Various	Installation Complete	\$34,533.86	Liberty 2/yr
Merrill Road	4 trees in median	Nov-24	1	Installation Complete	\$7,998.33	Liberty 2/yr
Murray Hill	14 trees in ROW	Nov-24	7	Installation Complete	\$33,119.53	Liberty 2/yr
Gonzales Park	within park boundaries 50 trees	Nov-24	13	Installation Complete	\$106,397.74	Liberty 2/yr
Glynlea Park	within park boundaries 64 trees	Nov-24	4	Installation Complete	\$81,000.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Julington Durbin Preserve	within park boundaries 41 trees	Nov-24	6	Installation Complete	\$52,950.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Backridge Park	within park boundaries 34 trees	Nov-24	4	Installation Complete	\$51,575.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Walter Anderson Park	within park boundaries 7 trees	Nov-24	6	Installation Complete	\$10,700.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Genovar Park	within park boundaries 42 trees	Nov-24	11	Installation Complete	\$56,900.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Greenland Park	within park boundaries 59 trees	Nov-24	11	Installation Complete	\$86,475.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Touhton Rd Park	within park boundaries 63 trees	Nov-24	4	Installation Complete	\$85,400.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Black Island Hammock Park	within park boundaries 60 trees	Nov-24	2	Installation Complete	\$94,150.00	Greenway/ 1yr
Palmetto Leaves	within park boundaries 103 trees	Dec-24	6	Installation Complete	\$152,650.00	Greenway/1yr
Atlantic Blvd	Median 20 trees	Dec-24	13	Installation Complete	\$45,379.20	Liberty 2/yr
Jacksonville Zoo Level 2	On public property on Zoo grounds 64 trees	Feb-25	2	Installation Complete	\$141,164.00	Liberty 2/yr
Amelica View Phase 3	on City Right of way's in neighborhood 22 trees	Feb-25	2	Installation Complete	\$44,630.60	Liberty 2/yr
Five Points Level 2	On City Right of way 15 trees	Feb-25	7	Installation Complete	\$35,226.79	Liberty 2/yr
Neptune Beach Phase 1	on public right of way and park- 21 trees	Mar-25	13	Installation Complete	\$54,386.41	Liberty/2yr
Pearl Street Level 2	on city right of way- 21 trees	Mar-25	10	Installation Complete	\$52,119.19	Liberty/2yr
District 10 Parks	within park boundaries-91 trees	Mar-25	10	Ongoing	\$135,915.00	Greenway/1yr
Windy Hills Park	within Park boundaries- 36 trees	Mar-25	4	Ongoing	\$55,205.00	Greenway/1yr
Oceanway Park	within Park boundaries- 37 trees	Mar-25	8	Installation Complete	\$51,000.00	Greenway/1yr
Terrace Park	within Park boundaries- 22 trees	Mar-25	9	Installation Complete	\$30,620.00	Greenway/1yr
Riverview Park	withing Park boundaries- 38 trees	Mar-25	2	Ongoing	\$49,475.00	Greenway/1yr
Beaver Dam Road Pond	on city right of way- 50 trees	Apr-25	13	Installation Complete	\$90,938.70	Liberty/2yr
Glorianne Dr	on city right of way- 5 trees	Apr-25	5	Installation Complete	\$11,036.25	Liberty/2yr
Beachwood Blvd	on city Right of way- 31 Trees	May-25	4	Installation Complete	\$60,566.94	Liberty/2yr
Warrington Park	within park boundaries- 67 trees	May-25	1	Installation Complete	\$90,300.00	Greenway/1yr
Riverfront Park	within park boundaries and ROW- 46 trees	May-25	5	Installation Complete	\$58,437.50	Greenway/1yr
ACPS Dog Park	within park boundaries- 24 trees	May-25	7	Installation Complete	\$34,410.00	Greenway/1yr
South Shores Level 2	on city property and ROW- 12 trees	Jun-25	5	Installation Complete	\$24,279.75	Liberty/2yr
Oreily Drive W Level 2	on city ROW- 26 trees	Jun-25	9	Installation Complete	\$54,563.22	Liberty/2yr
Neptune Beach Phase 2	in Cleary Park- 19 trees	Jul-25	13	Installation Complete	\$35,492.58	Liberty/2yr
Edgewood Ave Level 2	in City Right of Way-9 trees	Jul-25	7	Installation Complete	\$27,570.25	Liberty/2yr
Panda St and Cougar Rd Level 2	in City Right of way- 9 trees	Jul-25	12	Installation Complete	\$16,775.10	Liberty 2/yr
Alexandria Oaks Park	Within Parks Boundaries- 1 tree	Jul-25	5	Ongoing	\$75,000.00	Liberty

ACTIVE CITY OF JACKSONVILLE LEVEL 2 TREE PLANTING PROJECTS

ATTACHMENT F

Visit <https://pg-cloud.com/JacksonvilleFL/> for City of Jacksonville Tree Project Maps

Visit jaxtreemitigation.coj.net - Tree Fund City Projects for links to legislation and planting details

Requesting Entity	Project Scope	Tree Commission Approval Date	Councill District	Status	Allocated Amount	Contract/Warranty
SPAR 2025 Level 2	in City Right of Way- 279 trees	Aug-25	7	Ongoing	\$279,629.37	Liberty 2/yr
Gator Bowl and Bay Street Level 2	in City Right of Way- 25 trees	Sep-25	7	Installation Complete	\$31,186.99	Liberty 2/yr
Marjenhoff Park	Within Parks Boundaries- 35 trees	Sep-25	5	Installation Complete	\$34,830.00	Greenway/1yr
Resilient Ribault	Within Parks Boundaries- 146 trees	Sep-25	10	Ongoing	\$161,235.00	Greenway/1yr
Dames Point Park	Within Parks Boundaries- 31 trees	Sep-25	2	Installation Complete	\$39,300.00	Greenway/1yr
Atlantic Blvd San Marco	In medians- 6 trees	Oct-25	5	Ongoing	\$8,542.75	Liberty 2/yr
Central Bark Dog Park	within park boundaries- 85 trees	Nov-26	5	Ongoing	\$99,660.00	Greenway/1yr
Camp Milton	within park boundaries-250 trees	Nov-26	12	Ongoing	\$210,454.00	Greenway/1yr
Collins Lake Dr	ROW- 27 trees	Dec-25	14	Ongoing	\$48,034.52	Liberty 2/yr
Justina Road	ROW- 45 trees	Jan-26	1	Ongoing	\$80,400.79	Liberty 2/yr
King St and Beaver	ROW- 28 trees	Jan-26	9	Ongoing	\$49,863.97	Liberty 2/yr
Sandlewood High School	In ROW and School Boundaries- 111 trees	Jan-26	4	Ongoing	\$151,141.01	Liberty 2/yr
Boone Park	Within Park Boundaries-20 trees	Jan-26	7	Ongoing	\$29,725.00	Greenway/1yr
Herbert Bayer Park	Within Park Boundaries- 24 trees	Jan-26	7	Ongoing	\$28,000.00	Greenway/1yr

Potential Trees to add to Approved Species List

[Taxodium ascendens](#) – Pond Cypress

Native: Yes

USDA Zones: 5A through 9B

Height: 50-60 ft

Spread: 10-15ft

Growth Rate: Fast

Light requirement: full sun to partial shade

Soil tolerances: clay; sand; loam; slightly alkaline; acidic; wet to well-drained

Drought tolerance: high

Aerosol salt tolerance: Moderate

Availability: Moderate

Ecosystem services: Attracts birds; not showy; fruit/leaves not a litter problem; resinous

Pest Resistance: Resistant to pests/disease

Uses: sidewalk cutout (tree pit); tree lawn 3–4 feet wide; tree lawn 4-6 feet wide; tree lawn > 6 ft wide; street without sidewalk; specimen; reclamation; parking lot island < 100 sq ft; parking lot island 100–200 sq ft; parking lot island > 200 sq f

Other considerations: ridged bark provide much landscape interest during the winter. The trunk grows unusually thick toward the base, even on young trees. This is thought to provide support for the tree in its wet habitat. The small seeds are used by some birds and squirrels



Standards, Procedures and Policies of the Tree Commission for Planting in an Urban Environment

Scope and Purpose

1. Definition of Urban Planting Environment
2. Applicability of Standards and Procedures
3. Suitable Planting Environment Definition
4. Responsibility for Determination of Suitable Planting Environment
5. Other Urban Impacts on Tree Planting

Suitable Planting Environment is Provided at Each Tree Planting Location

1. Sufficient area is provided to accommodate mature trunk, flare and surface roots.
2. Sufficient Soil Quantity (volume) is provided to support the tree mass (spread) proposed.
3. A classification of Not Compacted is achieved within the Required Soil Volume at each planting location.
 - A. Existing Conditions Project
 - i. 630-CITY and Remove & Replace Programs not within a Public ROW Median
 - ii. Remove & Replace Programs within a Public Right of Way Median
 - iii. Level 2 Project without associated development/construction
 - iv. Level 3 Project without associated development/construction
 - B. Proposed Development Project.
 - i. Identify Unsuitable Planting Environments
 - ii. Mitigate Unsuitable Planting Environments
 - a. Required Soil Volumes located within an SPA
 - b. Required Soil Volumes located outside an SPA
 - iii. Concept Plan Review
 - a. Submittal Requirement
 - b. Approval of the Concept Plan
 - c. Staff Report
 - d. Compliance Inspections

Urban Impacts on Tree Planting are Addressed

1. Vertical and Overhead Obstructions are Recognized in Tree Selection.
2. Soil Quality within the Required Soil Volume
3. Short and Long Term Maintenance is Provided
4. Canopy Goals are Considered

Attachments

Exhibit A.	Charge Memo dated November 20, 2025
Table 1.	Minimum Open Space Cut Out Requirements
Table 2.	Required Soil Volume
Table 3.	Standards for Establishing Classification of NOT COMPACTED
Table 4	Soil Replacement Approved to Mitigate COMPACTED Soil in ROW Median
Exhibit B.	LDPM, Volume 4. Section 601, Effective January 2025
Exhibit C.	Soil Profile Rebuilding Standards

Standards, Procedures and Policies of the Tree Commission for Planting in an Urban Environment

Scope and Purpose

The Chair of the Tree Commission established the Task Force on Jacksonville Urban Tree Planting Best Practices for the purpose stated in the Amended Charge Memorandum dated November 20, 2024 (*Exhibit A*).

1. *Definition of Urban Planting Environment*

The Task Force is empowered to review and provide recommendations on initiatives and strategies related to the planting of trees on urban public land in the City for the purpose of maximizing the long term health and vitality of trees planted with Tree Mitigation Funds on urban public land pursuant to the Tree Commission Programs. As defined by the Charge Memorandum, the term “urban” refers to *planting or replanting trees anywhere in the geographic City of Jacksonville that is constrained, horizontally or vertically, or both by, including but not limited to, development (such as buildings, utilities, etc.), grey infrastructure, hardscape, concrete, asphalt, pavement or brick, etc. above or below ground (“Urban Planting Environment”)*

The Task Force has recommended the following standards, procedures and policies to the Tree Commission, and at its DATE meeting, the Tree Commission has determined that trees planted with Tree Mitigation Funds in an Urban Planting Environment pursuant to the Tree Commission Programs listed below shall be subject to the standards, procedures and policies herein to achieve a Suitable Tree Planting Environment for each proposed tree planting location.

- 630- CITY
- Remove and Replace
- Level 2
- Level 3

Each Application shall establish a Suitable Planting Environment (SPE) for each tree planting location as prescribed herein to mitigate each otherwise Unsuitable Planting Environment to be eligible for funding from the Tree Mitigation Funds unless the Tree Commission approves an alternative mitigation strategy to achieve a Suitable Planting Environment. Recognizing the additional impacts posed by the larger urban environment on tree planting, Applications shall also mitigate or eliminate Urban Impacts to Tree Planting determined to impact proposed tree planting locations. Evidence of establishment of an (SPE) for each tree planting location and a summary of any alternative standards proposed for Tree Commission approval shall be documented in the Staff Report for the Application to be considered by the Tree Commission when Tree Commission approval is required and shall be documented in Program records when Tree Commission approval is not required under the Procedures of the Tree Commission.

The establishment of these standards and procedures is intended to inform project applicants and designers of the ~~minimum~~ requirements determined to be applicable to tree planting in an Urban Planting Environment to achieve a healthy and sustainable tree canopy within the City. The

*Standards, Policies and Procedures
of the Tree Commission*

For Planting in an Urban Environment (FINAL draft) 1

*November 3, 2025
Revised March 12, 2026*

standards and procedures address Existing Conditions Projects in a manner that recognizes the conditions likely to be encountered when planting trees in existing Urban Planting Environments and provide guidance to direct applicants to alternative planting locations and tree selections when the ~~minimum~~ standards cannot be met. The standards and procedures for New Construction Projects are intended to challenge applicants and project designers to apply the ~~minimum~~ standards applicable to this category of project in initial design decisions in a manner that avoids and minimizes the need for supporting infrastructure such as soil replacement, structure support for surface improvements and compaction mitigation to address Urban Planting Environments within the project. Consideration of New Construction projects by the Tree Commission include an assessment of the extent to which the need for supporting infrastructure is minimized or eliminated; based on site conditions and design decisions represented in the Application, Applicants may be required to pay for the supporting infrastructure necessary to achieve Suitable Planting Environments within the project.

The Tree Commission is committed to a partnership with all Applicants to meet its goal to maximize the future health and vitality of any tree planted under its programs; in support of the Tree Commission’s duty to provide the best outcome for the future tree canopy of the City, project review and approval is intended to be an interactive collaboration in pursuit of this goal.

2. Applicability of Standards and Procedures

These standards shall apply to all locations within a project determined to be Unsuitable Urban Planting Locations. These procedures and standards established by the Tree Commission are those required to provide a Suitable Planting Environment at the time of tree planting. Subject to approval by the Tree Commission, an Applicant may propose alternative standards that provide an equal or superior tree planting environment than that created by application of the established standards or address unique site conditions. Approval of alternative standards by the Tree Commission shall be required under the Schematic and Conceptual Plan procedures established herein.

For the purposes of these Standards, Procedures and Policies, the term “Application” shall include:

- projects prepared by staff or an Applicant other than staff for Tree Commission approval (Level 2 and Level 3 Programs); and,
- projects managed by staff under the 630-City and Remove & Replace Programs that do not require Tree Commission approval.

The term “Applicant” shall include the City when applications are prepared by City staff and any other party seeking approval of a project by the Tree Commission. Compliance with the applicable Standards, Procedures and Policies for projects not subject to Tree Commission approval shall be documented in the Program records of the City.

3. Suitable Planting Environment Definition

A Suitable Planting Environment is defined as a proposed tree planting location in which, at the time of planting:

- 1) sufficient area is provided to accommodate mature trunk volume, flare and surface roots (Table 1. OSCO Requirements) ; and,
- 2) sufficient Soil Quantity (volume) is provided to support the tree mass (spread) proposed (Table 2. Required Soil Volumes); and,
- 3) a classification of Not Compacted is achieved within the Required Soil Volume at each tree planting location (Table 3. Suitable Planting Environment Standards).

Within each project an Unsuitable Planting Location is assumed to exist for a particular tree planting location if, at the time of tree planting, without changes to the conditions that will exist at the time of tree planting, a Suitable Planting Environment would not be provided in that location. The determination of suitability is location specific; a project may include both tree planting locations that are determined to be Urban Planting Locations and locations that are not.

4. Responsibility for Determination of Suitable Planting Environment.

Determination that a Suitable Tree Planting Environment exists for each tree planting location shall be determined by the entity listed or their designee. When approval by the Tree Commission is otherwise required for the project funding, the ~~determining~~ entity listed shall make a report recommendation to the Tree Commission as to compliance with the applicable Standards, Procedures and Policies to achieve the provision of Suitable Planting Environment(s) within the project. The Tree Commission shall consider the staff ~~report recommendation~~ and public comment in its review of the application. If compliance with the Standards cannot be achieved, approval of an alternative standard or variance to the adopted standard may be considered by the Tree Commission. The Tree Commission shall be solely responsible for approving alternative standards after consideration of the Staff Report, the application, the Applicant and public comment.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Entity</u>
630-CITY	City Arborist
Remove and Replace	City Arborist
Level 2	City Arborist recommendation; Tree Commission approval
Level 3	City Arborist recommendation; Tree Commission approval

5. Other Urban Impacts on Tree Planting

In addition to a suitable tree planting environment, the surrounding urban environment can pose other challenges to the long term health and vitality of planted trees (Urban Impacts).

- a. vertical obstructions may limit the desired tree canopy and impose additional maintenance requirements (Urban Impacts Section 1); and,
- b. imported soils can include contaminants or may be of such a quality that tree health is not supported (Urban Impact Section 2); and,
- c. maintenance beyond initial warranty periods may be required to address the stress the urban environment places on the tree (Urban Impacts Section 3); and,
- d. constrained planting areas can affect the ultimate canopy spread and growth rate of a tree located in such an environment, reducing the shade benefit of the tree selected such that a fast growing tree species may achieve shade goals more effectively (Urban Impacts Section 4).

In addition to a recommendation as to the compliance with applicable standards to provide a Suitable Planting Environment at each planting location, each project application shall identify the presence or absence of each Urban Impact on the tree planting locations within the project limits and confirm compliance with the applicable standards established in Urban Impacts Sections 1-3. When a project goal established by the Tree Commission includes the timely provisions of shade, the Tree Commission may require utilization of the tree species recommended in Urban Impacts Section 4. ~~When a project goal of the tree planting location is to quickly provide shade, utilization of the tree species recommended in Urban Impacts Section 4 is encouraged.~~

Suitable Planting Environment is Provided at Each Tree Planting Location

The Application shall demonstrate that for each planting area:

1. Sufficient area is provided to accommodate mature trunk, flare and surface roots.

To provide sufficient area to accommodate mature trunk, its flare and surface roots, an open space without surface improvements shall be provided around the trunk of the tree; this area, when located within an area of surface improvement, shall be provided in the form of a cut out within the surface improvement.

The Tree Commission's Approved Tree List classifies each Approved Tree as small, medium or large (Tree Size). **Table 1.** identifies the minimum Open Space / Cut Out (OSCO) required for each tree planting location based on the Tree Size.

The specified Minimum Open Space / Cut Out (OSCO) based on the Tree Size of the proposed tree to be planted shall be provided for each tree location.

For an Existing Conditions Project, if the standards in Table 1 cannot be met, the Tree Commission may approve the following alternative standard:

The reduction of one dimension of the required OSCO Requirement is permitted provided the area of the applicable OSCO is not reduced and the minimum distance of the trunk to an impervious surface is maintained.

Tree Grates may be utilized to maintain the minimum OSCO opening dimensions. If installed within an OSCO, tree grates must have an opening (symmetrical around the truck) that is a minimum of 12" from the trunk at the time of planting and the long term maintenance agreement with the City must provide for annual tree grate inspection and modification or replacement as required to maintain an opening that is a minimum of 6 inches from the trunk, measured at the time of inspection.

Tree Grates specified in an Existing Conditions Project for installation within an OSCO in order to provide the minimum sidewalk width for the adjacent sidewalk as defined in Section 654, Ordinance Code and the LDPM Volume 2. Design Standards (*Exhibit A*) shall be eligible for funding from the Tree Mitigation Funds.

2. Sufficient Soil Quantity (volume) is provided to support the tree mass (spread) proposed.

The Tree Commission's Approved Tree List classifies each Approved Tree as small, medium or large (Tree Size). Based on this classification, the planting area for each proposed tree shall meet the standards in **Table 2.**

Table 2. identifies the Required Soil Volume (RSV) for each tree planting location. The area claimed as Required Soil Volume is calculated as the total depth x width x height minus the area of utilities or other encroachments (measured as the volume within the Required Soil Volume).

Unless otherwise approved by the Tree Commission, each Required Soil Volume must be provided within land controlled by the project's Maintenance Entity.

In the absence of hydric soils or vegetative indicators of a higher water table, the application of a depth of ≤ 3 feet to the calculation of the RSV is assumed to provide adequate drainage to obtain root growth in the soil. The application of a depth of > 3 feet to the calculation of the RSV requires additional testing to confirm the depth of the water table is lower than the depth applied in the calculation. Test results that indicate a water table at or above 3 feet will require the calculation of the RSV for those locations to utilize a depth above the identified water table.

New Construction project designs are encouraged to combine, and for Existing Conditions Projects, to relocate as practical, proposed tree planting locations so as to combine Required Soil Volumes in a manner that reduces the need for subsurface infrastructure to provide an UNCOMPACTED planting environment and maximizes the OSCO available to the planted trees. As an incentive, combined planting areas are eligible for a 25% reduction in the Required Soil Volume otherwise required for an individual tree, provided however that the minimum distance to an impervious surface established for the tree trunk cannot be reduced.

The Tree Commission may grant a reduction in ~~variance reducing~~ the Required Soil Volume applicable to a planting location based on the Tree Size of the tree proposed (Proposed Tree Size) to be planted provided:

- i. Relocation of the planting area or combination of Required Soil Volumes does not provide the Required Soil Volume applicable to the Proposed Tree Size; and
- ii. Reduction of the Proposed Tree Size, substituting a small or medium tree for proposed large tree or a small tree for proposed medium tree, does not provide the Required Soil Volume applicable to the substituted tree size.

3. *A classification of Not Compacted is achieved within the Required Soil Volume at each planting location.*

A Suitable Planting Environment requires the classification of NOT COMPACTED within each Required Soil Volume. Together, **Table 3.** and the sections below identify the standards and procedures for the determination of "NOT COMPACTED" by Project Type.

Applications that include a planting location classified as "COMPACTED" shall meet the standards established in Table 3 to establish a Suitable Planting Environment within the Required Soil Volume.

A. Existing Conditions Project. Defined as a project authorized under the 630-CITY and Remove & Replace Programs, a proposed Level 2 Project without associated development/construction, including Level 2 Projects within an existing Public Right of Way and a proposed Level 3 Project without associated development/construction.

- i. **630-CITY and Remove & Replace Programs not within a Public Right of Way Median**

Staff shall inspect the proposed tree planting locations and identify, based on the Tree Size of the proposed tree to be planted, the Required Soil Volume associated with each. Each RSV shall be classified as “COMPACTED”, “NOT COMPACTED” or “POTENTIALLY COMPACTED”. Each RSV must ultimately be classified as “COMPACTED” or “NOT COMPACTED”. Staff may rely on history of the site, health of adjacent tree plantings, on-site testing results (penetrometer) or order a bulk density test (BDT) to make a final determination of “COMPACTED” or “NOT COMPACTED” for each RSV. If a BDT is performed, a Bulk Density Score of 109 lb /cubic foot or above shall be classified as COMPACTED. Compacted of 85% or greater shall be classified as COMPACTED.

For Remove & Replace Plantings located within an existing Public Right of Way outside the median, staff shall apply the following assumption for a determination of COMPACTED or NOT COMPACTED. This assumption may be rebutted by staff based on health of adjacent tree plantings, on-site testing or BDT:

Planting locations located between the travel lane(s) and the right of way that are 8 feet in width or greater (exclusive of surface improvements including sidewalks) are assumed “NOT COMPACTED”; width less than 8 feet are assumed to be “COMPACTED”.

If an RSV is classified as “COMPACTED” and tree planting is desired, the Staff shall submit a mitigation plan and cost estimate to establish a Suitable Planting Environment to the Tree Commission for approval.

ii. **Remove & Replace Programs within a Public Right of Way Median**

Staff shall inspect the proposed tree planting locations and identify, based on the Tree Size of the proposed tree to be planted, the Required Soil Volume associated with each. The Required Soil Volume for planting in an existing public right of way median is identified in Table 4. Each RSV shall be classified as “COMPACTED”, “NOT COMPACTED” or “POTENTIALLY COMPACTED”. Each RSV must ultimately be classified as “COMPACTED” or “NOT COMPACTED”. Staff may rely on history of the site, health of adjacent tree plantings, on-site testing results (penetrometer) or order a bulk density test (BDT) to make a final determination of “COMPACTED” or “NOT COMPACTED” for each RSV. If a BDT is performed, a Bulk Density Score of 109 lb /cubic foot or above shall be classified as COMPACTED. Compacted of 85% or greater shall be classified as COMPACTED.

For Remove & Replace Plantings located within an existing Public Right of Way median, staff shall apply the following assumption for a determination of COMPACTED or NOT COMPACTED. This assumption may be rebutted by staff based on health of adjacent tree plantings, on-site testing or BDT:

Required Soil Volume located within an existing median 12 feet in width or less (measured BOC to BOC) are assumed to be “COMPACTED”.

If an RSV is classified as “COMPACTED” and tree planting in that location is desired, mitigation in the form of Soil Replacement shall be authorized, up to the Volume to be

Replaced and Cost identified in **Table 4** for the Tree Size to be planted without additional review and approval by the Tree Commission. Mitigation in excess of the Cost identified in Table 4 for the Tree Size to be planted shall require approval by the Tree Commission.

iii. **Level 2 Project without associated development/construction.**

Staff shall inspect the proposed tree planting locations and identify the Required Soil Volume associated with each. Each RSV shall be classified as “COMPACTED”, “NOT COMPACTED” or “POTENTIALLY COMPACTED”. Each RSV must ultimately be classified as “COMPACTED” or “NOT COMPACTED”. Staff may rely on history of the site, health of adjacent tree plantings, on-site testing results (penetrometer) or order a bulk density test (BDT) to make a final determination of “COMPACTED” or “NOT COMPACTED” for each RSV. If a BDT is performed, a Bulk Density Score of 109 lb /cubic foot or above shall be classified as COMPACTED. Compacted of 85% or greater shall be classified as COMPACTED.

Staff shall apply the assigned classifications for each RSV in its development of the Level 2 project application. The Planting Plan and Cost Estimate shall be based on the classification assigned each planting location and include mitigation measures required to establish a Suitable Planting Environment in each.

For Level 2 Projects located within an existing Public Right of Way without associated development/construction, staff shall apply the following assumptions for a determination of COMPACTED or NOT COMPACTED. These assumptions may be rebutted by staff based on health of adjacent tree plantings, on-site testing or BDT.

- a. Required Soil Volume located within an existing median 12 feet in width or less (measured BOC to BOC) are assumed to be “COMPACTED”.
- b. Planting locations located between the travel lane(s) and the right of way that are 8 feet in width or greater (exclusive of surface improvements including sidewalks) are assumed “NOT COMPACTED”; width less than 8 feet are assumed to be “COMPACTED”.

- iv. **Level 3 Project without associated development/construction.** The Applicant shall prepare and submit a Schematic Planting Plan prior to the Project Scoping Meeting. The Schematic Planting plan shall, at a minimum, identify proposed planting locations, proposed Tree Size for each planting location and the OSCO and RSV proposed for each proposed planting location. Each proposed planting location shall be numbered and a tabular summary provided that identifies the extent to which each proposed planting location meets the applicable standards established herein. Upon receipt of a Level 3 Project Scope Submittal, staff shall perform an initial site visit prior to the Project Scope Review Meeting to identify /confirm the Required Soil Volume associated with each potential planting area as “COMPACTED”, “NOT COMPACTED” or “POTENTIALLY COMPACTED” under existing site conditions. Staff may rely on health of adjacent tree plantings, history of the site, on-site testing results (penetrometer) or order a bulk density test (BDT) to make a final determination of “COMPACTED” or “NOT COMPACTED” for each proposed planting location. If a BDT is performed, a Bulk Density Score of 109

lb /cubic foot or above shall be classified as COMPACTED. Compacted of 85% or greater shall be classified as COMPACTED.

Staff shall provide its classification for each planting location to the Applicant. The Applicant shall apply the classifications in its development of the Conceptual Level 3 project application. The Level 3 Conceptual Planting Plan and Cost Estimate shall be based on the assigned classification and include mitigation measures required to establish a Suitable Planting Environment.

The Level 3 Conceptual Planting Plan and Cost Estimate shall be approved, approved with conditions/modification or denied by the Tree Commission. A Level 3 Concept Plan approved by the Tree Commission with conditions/modification shall be revised by the Applicant to incorporate the conditions/modifications; the revised Concept Plan shall be reviewed by staff and re-approved by the Tree Commission as the Project Planting Plan; a Level 3 Concept Plan approved by the Tree Commission without conditions/modification shall, upon approval, be the Project Planting Plan. shall become the approved project plan.

B. Proposed Development Project. Defined as tree planting proposed in conjunction with any development/construction. When determined to be applicable to any Tree Commission Program other than a Level 3 Project, the Application shall be subject to the Level 3 Application requirements.

Within a Proposed Development Project, the Tree Commission seeks to limit the creation of Unsuitable Planting Environments through partnership with the project Applicant. A successful urban planting design balances the project goals with the impacts created by an urban environment on the health and long term viability of the desired urban tree canopy. A vibrant urban tree canopy can be best achieved by mitigating the constraints the urban environment places on trees through informed design decisions and management of construction practices. The standards established below represent the ~~minimum~~ requirements for mitigation of an Unsuitable Planting Environment.

i. **Identify Unsuitable Planting Environments**

To increase the quality of urban tree planting within a Proposed Development Project, an Applicant must first demonstrate that the design avoids the creation of Unsuitable Planting Environments to the maximum extent possible.

The initial Project Scope meeting with Staff shall identify proposed planting locations and tree species proposed for each location. The plan shall apply the Suitable Planting Environment standards for a Proposed Development Project to each proposed planting location and summarize in table form the mitigation required by these standards and policies to provide a Suitable Planting Environment at each planting location.

ii. **Mitigate Unsuitable Planting Environments**

In determining the mitigation required for a planting location, each planting location located within the limits of construction shall be classified as COMPACTED.

The Applicant shall demonstrate that the Proposed Development Plan employs the following design strategies to limit designation of COMPACTED to a Required Soil Volume:

a. Required Soil Volumes located within an SPA. In addition to the proposed planting plan, the Level 3 Project Scope submittal shall include a plan depicting the limits of construction within the Proposed Development Project (Limits of Construction Plan). Limits of construction include areas for storage of equipment, laydown of materials or supplies, limits of work, construction access, construction parking and all areas that are or will be impervious. Areas within the project limits that have been previously developed or disturbed shall be included in the area identified as the limits of construction. Areas that are outside the limits of construction shall be delineated on the Limits of Construction Plan and protected as Soil Preservation Areas (SPAs).

b. Required Soil Volumes located outside an SPA. If Tree Mitigation Funding is requested for the installation of a Surface Support System (silvacell, etc.), Staff will work with the Applicant and Public Agency in the development of the Conceptual Plan to meet the project goals, maximize the investment in future tree canopy and minimize the need for Surface Support System investment from the Tree Mitigation Fund. To effectuate coordination, the following design review is required to minimize planting locations within a Compacted Planting Environment that requires an SSS:

- i. Tree locations have been evaluated to minimize or eliminate the need for installation of an SSS. *Staff may recommend the relocation of trees to reduce ~~achieve minimum~~ the need for an SSS.*
- ii. Tree sizes (small, medium or large) have been evaluated to minimize the need for installation of an SSS. *Staff may recommend changes to tree size to reduce the volume of SSS.*
- iii. Paved areas have been located so as to minimize the need for installation of an SSS. *Staff may recommend reduction or relocation of proposed paved areas to reduce the area of SSS.*

An Applicant may decline to accept the recommendations of Staff and seek approval by the Tree Commission. The Staff Report will document its recommendations and the consistency of the Project Planting Plan for which the Applicant seeks approval in its report to the Tree Commission. Tree Commission approval may assign costs associated with mitigation of a Compacted Planting Environment to the Applicant.

iii. **Concept Plan Review and Approval by Tree Commission**

a. Submittal Requirements. To facilitate the design review, in addition to the required Level 3 Application materials, the Application shall include, with the Conceptual Planting Plan, a Compacted Environment Assessment Plan that overlays the location of each RSV on the Limits of Construction Plan. Each Required Soil Volume located within the Limits of Construction shall be classified as COMPACTED; Required Soil Volume(s) located outside the Limits of Construction, within an SPA, shall be classified as UNCOMPACTED unless site history or on site testing supports a finding of COMPACTED. Planting areas outside the Limits of Construction may be classified as COMPACTED if the creation of an

Unsuitable Planting Environment is anticipated to be created by future development activities/ factors. The Staff shall work with the Applicant to minimize the extent of COMPACTED classification(s) within the project limits. The Applicant shall incorporate Staff recommendations to the maximum extent possible into the Conceptual Plan to be considered by the Tree Commission.

The Application for Concept Plan approval to the Tree Commission shall include a Rough Estimate of Improvements based on the Compacted Environment Assessment Plan (CEAP). Based on the CEAP, the Concept Plan shall reflect mitigation required to provide a Suitable Planting Environment for each Required Soil Volume. The Rough Estimate of Improvements shall include the cost associated with the provision of mitigation proposed to achieve Suitable Planting Environments. For each mitigated planting location, the extent to which the mitigation is requested to be funded by Tree Mitigation Funds shall be described. If all or a portion of the mitigation required to achieve Suitable Planting Environments will be funded from a source other than the Tree Mitigation Fund, such cost share shall be described and other funding source(s) identified.

b. Approval of the Concept Plan. Tree Commission approval is required prior to submittal of the Project Planting Plan to the Tree Commission. Project Planting Plans must clearly identify the limits of construction and SPAs consistent with the limits depicted on the Schematic and Concept Plans. SPAs depicted on the Project Planting Plan shall be maintained by the Applicant as UNCOMPACTED throughout construction and final acceptance utilizing protection from all encroachment in the same manner as required for tree protection areas in Section 656.1207, Ordinance Code. Location of fencing shall be depicted on approved plans and maintained by the Applicant /Public Agency as depicted through final acceptance.

c. Staff Report. The Staff Report to the Tree Commission for the Concept Plan Approval for a Level 3 Project shall identify actions taken to reduce the creation of Unsuitable Planting Environments and the need for Pavement Support Systems within the Level 3 Project.

d. Compliance Inspections. In addition to inspections related to tree installation, to ensure compliance with SPA protection requirements, Tree Commission Staff may perform inspections at any time after approval of a Level 3 project by the Tree Commission and enforce the maintenance of SPA protective fencing through final acceptance. If a CEI is retained for the project, inspections shall be assigned to the CEI professional retained for the project. Failure to maintain required fencing and encroachments within the SPA shall cause the project to be subject to additional review by the Tree Commission.

Urban Impacts on Tree Planting are Addressed

1. Vertical and Overhead Obstructions are Recognized in Tree Selection.

Within the urban environment, vertical obstructions can limit the extent (spread) of the tree canopy in one or more directions. Vertical obstructions are typically adjacent buildings and traffic clearance requirements but also may include lighting provided to illuminate a road surface or pedestrian path. Failure to recognize these obstructions when selecting a tree species for a particular location can limit the natural mature spread of the tree species and require additional inspection, maintenance and pruning.

A. Vertical Clearance to Adjacent Structures. When selecting a tree species for an urban location, the following standards apply to vertical clearance to adjacent structures. Additional limitations in tree selection may be applied by Staff to recognize overhead and other vertical obstructions applicable to the planting location. Maintenance of Illumination for Sidewalks is specifically addressed in B. below.

The following distance requirements shall apply when *the planting location is* adjacent to a vertical structure of two stories or greater (measured to the center of the trunk of the tree):

- i. **Large Trees.** Minimum of 12 feet from the vertical constraint (building façade) unless the Tree Commission approves a Proactive Maintenance Plan (PMP) prepared by Staff that, at a minimum, specifies the frequency of maintenance projected to be required to address conflicts with the vertical constraint. The PMP will identify the maintenance entity and funding source. If maintenance is provided by other than the City, an enforceable PMP shall be executed by the maintenance entity.
- ii. **Small and Medium Trees.** The minimum sidewalk width for downtown sidewalks must be maintained and the required OSCO for the Tree Size provided.

B. Maintenance of Illumination for Sidewalks. Level 2 and Level 3 Project plans shall clearly identify the location and height of light sources within the project boundaries that illuminate a public sidewalk or public street (pole lights, wall lights, street lights, etc.) and depict the extent of the illumination on the ground surface that would be present without the proposed tree planting. Tree Planting Locations that, based on the mature canopy of the tree to be planted (height and width), will impact/ reduce the extent of illumination on the ground surface, shall submit a PMP prepared by Staff for Tree Commission approval that, at a minimum, specifies the frequency of maintenance projected to be required to address conflicts with the provision of ground illumination for public sidewalks and streets. The PMP will identify the maintenance entity and funding source. If maintenance is provided by other than the City, an enforceable PMP shall be executed by the maintenance entity.

2. Soil Quality within the Required Soil Volume is of sufficient quality to support tree growth and long term tree health.

A. Proposed Soil Replacement meets the adopted specifications for Soil Replacement. See **Exhibit B.** Land Development Procedures Manual, Volume 4. Specifications Section 601.

LANDSCAPING (Effective January 2025)

B. If required, Proposed Soil Profile Rebuilding and specifications are consistent with adopted standards. See **Exhibit C.** Soil Profile Rebuilding Standards.

C. If imported soil/topsoil is proposed, soil analysis for imported soil/topsoil within each Required Soil Volume meets the adopted specifications for Soil Replacement in **Exhibit B.**

D. Site History will be reviewed by Staff utilizing the City’s GIS Ash Site and Brownfields Site Inventory. Based on historic site use, Staff may require additional soil testing or environmental assessment to address potential contamination that would adversely affect tree health.

3. Short and Long Term Maintenance is Provided.

The long-term health and viability of a tree planted in an urban environment requires both short-term and long-term maintenance. All tree planting funded from Tree Mitigation Funds are supported with short term maintenance for a period of one or two years under the applicable contract warranty period; without additional proactive maintenance, tree planting in urban environments have reduced long-term health, early decline/death and reduced contribution to the tree canopy. To maximize the long term health and vitality of tree planting in the City, additional long term maintenance is required beyond the short term maintenance period; within an urban environment this includes regular inspections and scheduled pruning and may include implementation of an integrated pest management plan.

The Tree Commission may include in its approval of an Urban Planting Project a requirement for an enforceable post warranty period maintenance plan that addresses long-term maintenance, including but not limited to regular inspections, scheduled pruning and as required, an integrated pest management plan. If tree grates are installed, the long term maintenance plan shall provide for tree grate replacement or modification at the Maintenance Entity’s or Public Agency’s expense.

4. Canopy Goals are Considered.

When a goal of the tree planting installation is to quickly provide shade / cooling environment through the use of tree canopy to address existing or future urban conditions that affect human health and comfort, the following trees are recommended. Locations include but are not limited to transit stops, adjacent to sidewalks, parking areas, civic locations such as plazas and other urban gathering spaces.

Medium Trees		Growth Rate
Althena Elm	<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> “Emer I’	moderate
Bosque Elm	<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> ‘ Bosque’	moderate
Drake Elm	<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> ‘ Drake ’	moderate
River Birch	<i>Betula nigra</i>	rapid
Large Trees		
Allee Elm	<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> “Emer II’	moderate
Red Maple	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	moderate

Shumard Oak	<i>Quercus shumardii</i>	rapid
Sycamore	<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	rapid
Tulip Poplar	<i>Liriodendrum tulipifera</i>	rapid

Source: Tree Commission Approved Tree List, June 2025

Urban Planting Standards

Minimum Planting Area is Provided for each Proposed Tree

Table 1

October 29, 2025 Task Force

- Sufficient area is provided to accommodate mature trunk, flare and surface roots.

		Minimum Open Space Cut Out (OSCO)Requirements ²		
		Proposed Development Project	Existing Conditions Project incl Existing ROW (other than median)	Existing Right of Way Median
Tree Size ¹	min. distance from trunk to impervious surface (656.1211)			
Small Tree	2 feet	6' x 6' / 36 SF area	6' x 6' / 36 SF area	6' x 6' / 36 SF area
Medium Tree	3 feet	8' x 8' / 64 SF area	8' x 8' / 64 SF area	8' x 8' / 64 SF area
Large Tree				
Other Than Live Oak	4 feet	10' x 10' / 100 SF area	8' x 8' / 64 SF area	10' x 10' / 100 SF area
Live Oak	6 feet	12' x 12' / 144 SF area	12' x 12' / 144 SF area	12' x 12' / 144 SF area

¹ As classified by the Tree Commission Approved Planting List

² Reduction of one dimension of the OSCO dimension shall be permitted provided the area of the OSCO is not reduced and the minimum distance from the trunk to impervious surface is maintained.

Urban Planting Standards

Minimum Planting Area / Required Soil Volume is Provided for each Proposed Tree

Table 2

July 15, 2025 Task Force

- Provide sufficient soil quantity to support the tree mass proposed.

Required Soil Volume (depth x height x width) ³				
	Permitted Depth ¹	Proposed Development Project ²	Existing Conditions Project incl Existing ROW (other than median)	Existing Right of Way Median
Small Tree	2' - 3'	300 CF	300 CF	300 CF
Medium Tree	2.5' - 4'	800 CF	600 CF	600 CF
Large Tree				
Other Than Live Oak	3' - 4'	1,000 CF	750 CF	750 CF
Live Oak	3' - 4'	1,000 CF	1,000 CF	1,000 CF

¹ Calculations based on depth over 3 feet requires water table depth confirmation

² Required Soil Volume may be reduced by up to 25% if planting area is shared between multiple trees.

³ Aspect ratio of area claimed as Required Soil Volume shall not exceed 4:1; no dimension of the RSV shall be less than the applicable OSCO smallest dimension in Table 1 (as may be reduced by shared RSV, without add'l reduction).

Urban Planting Standards

Suitable Planting Environment is Provided

Table 3

October 29, 2025 Task Force

- A classification of NOT Compacted is Achieved within the Required Soil Volume

The Required Soil Volume is provided without encroachment by surface improvements.

Test Required Soil Volume for compaction if site history indicates. If Required Soil Volume is:

NOT COMPACTED

Meet the standards of LDPM Section 601

COMPACTED

Mitigate compacted environment with Soil Replacement. Soil Profile Rebuilding may be appropriate.

Existing ROW Median

Assess for compaction; see Section 3. A. ii. and Table 4.

The Required Soil Volume includes existing or proposed surface improvements.

Existing Conditions Project

Assume Required Soil Volume is Compacted. Apply Existing Project standards. Mitigate compacted environment within Required Soil Volume with Soil Replacement.

Proposed Development Project

Design the surface improvements to limit compaction within Required Soil Volumes. Group tree planting areas, combine Required Soil Volumes, utilize tree grates, raised planters and locate trees strategically to maximize area of OSCO (bump outs, planting within adjacent parallel parking) and minimize requirement for support of surface improvements.

When compaction within the Required Soil Volume is not avoided, mitigate compacted environment created through Soil Replacement and as required, structural support of surface improvements.

After approval of Conceptual Plan that minimizes the requirement for structural support for necessary surface improvements, where required install minimum support necessary for surface improvement integrity to create and maintain an uncompacted environment within the Required Soil Volume.

Protect Required Soil Volume from compaction during construction activities.

Urban Planting Standards

Suitable Planting Environment is Provided

Table 4

October 29, 2025

- A classification of NOT Compacted is Achieved within the Required Soil Volume

*Soil Replacement Approved to Mitigate Compacted Environment
in an Existing Median under Remove & Replace*

Tree Size ¹	Minimum OSCO ²	RSV Depth	Soil Replacement Volume		FY 2025/26 Cost (\$200 / CY)
			(OSCO x RSV Depth)		
Small	6' x 6'	3'	108 CF	4 CY	\$800
Medium	8' x 8'	3'	192 CF	7 CY	\$1,400
Large	10' x 10'	3'	300 CF	11 CY	\$2,200

¹ As classified by the Tree Commission Approved Planting List

² Table 1

Land Development Procedures Manual

Volume 4. Specifications *Effective January 2025*

Section 601. LANDSCAPING

2.3 TOPSOIL

A. Fine sand or loamy fine sand indigenous to the area suitable for plant growth that is free of weeds, roots, stumps, rocks larger than ½” diameter, organic muck, hard pan, toxic substances detrimental to plant growth, and construction debris such as limerock, concrete, and asphalt pieces. Deliver in a normally moist condition, neither muddy nor wet. Soil used for topsoil shall meet the following criteria measured in accordance with the appropriate AASHTO and ASTM standard:

1. USDA Texture: Fine Sand, Loamy Fine Sand
2. AASHTO Classification: A-3
3. pH 5.0-7.5
4. Deleterious Material 0-2% maximum by mass (rocks, roots, sod)
5. Organic Matter Content 1-10% by mass
6. Sand Content 80-96% by mass
7. Silt & Clay Content 3-10% by mass

B. Submit a one-quart sample of the topsoil to the Engineer before beginning planting and obtain approval. If requested by the Engineer, submit a soil test report from a commercial soil testing laboratory to verify compliance with the above criteria.

2.4 EXISTING SOIL

Use existing soil in plant pits if the soil complies with the standard for topsoil, unless the soil is contaminated with limerock, clay, brush, weeds, roots, stumps, stones larger than 1 1/2 inches in any dimension, litter and other extraneous or toxic matter harmful to plant growth. Remove contaminated soil and replace with acceptable stockpiled existing soil or new topsoil.

2.6 SOIL CONDITIONER

Provide 100% organic soil conditioner, free of limerock, clay, brush, weeds, roots, stumps, gravel, litter and other extraneous or toxic matter harmful to plant growth. Soil conditioner shall be one of the following:

A. Pine Bark Fines. 100% pine bark fines screened from other pine bark products in accordance with standards of the Mulch & Soil Council (Web: www.mulchandsoilcouncil.org) with a maximum of 15% pine wood content and at least 90% of particle size 1/4” or less.

B. Compost: A commercially blended and ground mixture of yard waste, tree trimmings, manure, and other biodegradable materials composted at a temperature and for the time necessary for the biological decomposition of the material, which significantly reduces the viability of pathogens and weed seeds, stabilizes carbon, produces high fungal material to benefit plant growth. Compost shall meet the following US Compost Council STA/MECC criteria.

Stability:	≤ 2 mg CO ₂ -C per G OM per day
Maturity:	90-100% seed emergence and vigor
Moisture Content:	35-60% wet weight Organic Matter Content 35-60% dry
weight Particle Size:	3/8"-1/2" screen size to pass through
pH:	6.0-7.5
Soluble Salts:	Max. 5 dS/m (mmhos/cm) dry weight basis
Physical Contaminants:	$\leq 0.5\%$ dry weight basis
Chemical Contaminants:	meet or exceed US EPA Class A standard, 40CFR §503.13 Tables 1 and 3
Biological Contaminants:	meet or exceed US EPA Class A standard 40CFR § 503.32(a)

Exhibit C. Soil Profile Rebuilding Standards

Source:



This project was made possible in part by a grant from the Tree Research and Education Endowment Fund.

Additional support was provided by the Institute for Critical Technology and Applied Research.

<https://sres.frec.vt.edu/>

Soil Profile Rebuilding Specification by Susan Day et al. is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 United States License.



Both specifications are licensed under a Creative Commons license to allow the user full use of the specification in your business. However the specification itself may NOT be sold or distributed for commercial purposes. You may use the specification as is, or adapt it for your use. The term "Soil Profile Rebuilding" may only be applied if the specification is used as is. Research documentation only applies to the specification as written and references to Soil Profile Rebuilding or the documented outcomes cannot be used unless it refers to the specification as written. If you have suggestions for improving the specification, or alternate forms for different regions, we welcome your thoughts. It is our aim to facilitate the use of this specification as much as possible while preserving the integrity of the term "Soil Profile Rebuilding." Please contact us.

Soil Profile Rebuilding

Specification for Restoration of Graded and Compacted Soils that will be Vegetated

CSI Div 2

CSICode-02910-Plant Preparation-Soil Preparation

CONTENTS

1. PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION

2. PROCEDURE

3. DEFINITIONS

4. SUBMITTALS

REFERENCES & PERMISSIONS

1. PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION

1.1 Purpose

Soil Profile Rebuilding is an appropriate soil restoration technique for sites where topsoil has been completely or partially removed and subsoil layers have been compacted (graded and/or trafficked by equipment). It may also be used with some modifications if topsoil is present. This is not an appropriate technique in sites with surface compaction only (6 inches or less), although this situation is rare on construction sites. This technique is not appropriate within the root zones of trees that are to be protected. Soil Profile Rebuilding can improve physical and biological characteristics of soil to allow for revegetation. Soil chemical problems, soil contamination from heavy metals, pathogens, or excessive debris or gravel shall be addressed separately.

1.2 Description of Procedure

The procedure includes a subsoiling procedure, addition of organic matter in the form of compost, replacement or addition of topsoil, and subsequent planting with woody plants. The soil preparation portion of Soil Profile Rebuilding puts the components in place for restoration to characteristics similar to undisturbed soils, however, the complete restoration process requires root activity and occurs over many years. This technique may be appropriate for restoration of disturbed soils as defined by SITES™.

1.3 Expected Outcomes

Soil Profile Rebuilding may improve vegetation establishment, increase tree growth rates, increase soil permeability, enhance formation of aggregates in the subsoil, and enhance long-term soil carbon storage.

2. PROCEDURE

2.1 Location

Profile Rebuilding shall occur on all soil areas that are to be vegetated that have been disturbed by trafficking or grading during construction or prior to construction. Soil areas that are not to be treated should be protected by permanent fencing during the construction period and all access to these areas prohibited. A soil map delineating protected areas and areas to be treated shall be approved by the owner, arborist, or landscape architect before grading or construction begins.

2.2 Sequencing

Profile Rebuilding shall occur after site disturbance is complete, including all vehicle and equipment trafficking, but before replacement of topsoil. Once profile rebuilding is complete, all traffic and equipment or materials storage on treated areas is prohibited with the exception of foot traffic for the purposes of planting or mulching.

If topsoil is already present and is 4 inches or greater in depth, use the “modifications for pre-existing topsoil.”

2.3 Remove foreign materials

Remove all foreign materials resulting from construction operations, including oil drippings, stone, gravel, and other construction materials from the existing soil surface.

2.4 Application of Compost

Spread mature, stable compost (see Section 3. Definitions for definition of compost) to a 4 inch depth over compacted subsoil.

2.5 Subsoiling

Subsoiling may be performed when soil is neither wet nor dry. If a shovel cannot be forced into the soil, it is too dry. If the surface is sticky or muddy, it is too wet. Use a backhoe rearbucket or similar equipment with a tined bucket to break up the compacted soil and incorporate the compost. Work backwards away from excavated soils so that treated soil is not trafficked by the equipment. Insert the bucket through the compost layer and into the subsoil to a depth of 24 inches and raise a bucket of soil at least 24 inches above the soil surface. Tip the bucket and allow soil to fall. Repeat this procedure until no clumps of compacted soil larger than 12 inches in diameter remain. The tines of the bucket can be used to break apart larger clumps if necessary. 50% of the soil shall be in clumps 6 inches or smaller. No clumps shall be greater than 18” in diameter. The subsoiling is not intended to homogenize the compost and soil, but rather loosen the soil to a 24-inch depth and create veins of compost down to that depth as well. To ensure that subsoiling reached the appropriate depth, a push tube soil sampler shall be used to verify compost is present at 24 inch depth.

2.6 Replacement of topsoil

2.6.1 Standard procedure

Stockpiled topsoil, or additional topsoil if none is available from the site, shall be returned to the site to a 4 inch minimum depth (see *Section 3.3 Definitions* for definition of topsoil). If soil was severely disturbed (see definitions), a 6-8 inch minimum shall be replaced.

2.6.2 Modification if significant topsoil is already present before Profile Rebuilding is initiated

Case 1:

At least four inches of topsoil is present on the site after construction activities are completed AND soil **is not** severely disturbed (see *Section 3.3 Definitions* for description of severely disturbed).

Case 2:

Less than 4 inches of topsoil is present on site after construction activities were completed but before Profile Rebuilding is initiated, OR soil is severely disturbed (see *Section 3.3 Definitions* for description of severely disturbed).

For Case 1: A minimum of 3 inches additional topsoil shall be placed over the subsoiled layer before tilling.

For Case 2: Follow *Section 2.6.1 Standard procedure*, as if no topsoil had been present.

2.7 Tilling

Rototill topsoil to a depth of 6-8 inches when soil is neither dry nor very moist. Rototilling depth should cross the interface with the subsoiled layer by a minimum of 1 inch and can be verified with a random sampling with a push tube soil sampler.

2.8 Planting

Plant the site with woody plants, trees or shrubs, at a density that insure a minimum of 50% of the site will be occupied with roots within 10 years. Planting of at least one large stature tree (e.g., one that will mature at approximately 60-70 feet in height) or 20 medium stature shrubs per 5,000 sq. ft. shall be considered to achieve this.

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1 Topsoil

Soil can be considered topsoil if it originates from an A horizon of a natural soil or is a mineral soil with 3% or greater organic matter content and a NRCS textural class similar to pre-development A horizon soils for the site or as specified by the owner, arborist, or landscape architect. Blended soils shall not be used unless specified by the owner, arborist, or landscape architect. In addition topsoil shall:

1. Be friable and well drained

2. have a pH between 5.2 and 7.5 (a narrower range may be specified for particular plant material)
3. have an organic matter content not less than 3%
4. have low salinity as indicated by an electrical conductivity of less than 4.0 mmhos/cm
5. be free of debris, stones, gravel, trash, large sticks, heavy metals, and other deleterious contaminants, (if screening is used to remove debris, screen size must be ¾ inch or larger).
6. have a nutrient profile such that it is able to support plant growth
7. be free of noxious weed seeds

3.2 Compost

Compost feedstock shall be leaves, yardwaste, or foodwaste. Biosolid-based composts shall not be used. A compost sample with analysis shall be submitted for approval to the client before application.

Stability refers to the rate of biological breakdown, measured by carbon dioxide release. Maturity refers to completeness of the aerobic composting process and suitability (lack of plant toxicity) as a plant growth media, often measured by ammonia release and by plant growth tests. Compost manufacturers that subscribe to the US Composting Council's testing program may document stability as compost testing 7 or below in accordance with TMECC 05.08-B, "Carbon Dioxide Evolution Rate". Maturity (suitability for plant growth) may be documented as compost testing greater than 80% in accordance with TMECC 05.05-A, "Germination and Vigor". Compost is considered mature and stable if it tests at 6.0 or higher on the Solvita Compost Maturity Index Rating, which is a combination of Carbon Dioxide and Ammonia Maturity Tests (test information and equipment available at www.solvita.com).

Compost shall also:

1. Free of weed seeds
2. Free of heavy metals or other deleterious contaminants
3. Have an EC of less than 4.0 mmhos/cm

3.3 Severely Disturbed Soil

Soil shall be considered *severely disturbed* if grade was lowered more than 14 inches OR soil was compacted in lifts regardless of the final grade.

4. SUBMITTALS

4.1 Soil Map

A soil map indicating soil areas to be protected and those to be restored via Soil Profile Rebuilding shall be submitted by the contractor for approval by the owner, arborist, or landscape architect before construction begins.

4.2 Compost

A compost sample with analysis certifying it is stable, mature, from acceptable feedstocks and free of contaminants and weed seeds shall be submitted for approval to the landscape architect or owner before compost is applied to the soil.

4.3 Topsoil

A topsoil sample with analysis from a certified testing laboratory and verification of source shall be submitted for approval to the landscape architect or owner before application. Separate documentation is required for each 100 cubic yards of topsoil unless otherwise approved by the landscape architect or owner.

REFERENCES & PERMISSIONS

Use of this specification has been documented to increase tree canopy and soil carbon stores compared with typical practices. See www.urbanforestry.frec.vt.edu/SRES for more information.

Soil Profile Rebuilding Specification by Susan Day et al. is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 United States License. It may be used freely as is, or modified. However use of the term “Soil Profile Rebuilding” should only be used when soil restoration is performed as described in this specification. See www.urbanforestry.frec.vt.edu/SRES/specification.html for full details.