

Survey of State Funding Trends
ACT Annual Meeting • November 13, 2007
Martha Ozonoff & Ruth Williams, California ReLeaf

Purpose of Grant - In 2006, California ReLeaf was awarded a grant from the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council (NUCFAC) to contact all of the State Urban Forestry Coordinators to inquire about how their programs are funded, with the ultimate goal of identifying a handful of permanent, long-term funding sources.

Survey Results

Respondents:

- | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. Alabama | 7. WY State Forestry | 13. Louisiana |
| 2. Kentucky | 8. Michigan | 14. Texas |
| 3. Missouri | 9. Iowa | 15. AZ |
| 4. Indiana | 10. Washington | 16. Utah |
| 5. West Virginia | 11. Florida | 17. New York |
| 6. Nebraska | 12. SC | 18. California |

What is the current size of your state's urban and community forestry program budget?

\$250,000 or below	16.67% (3 respondents)
\$250,001 - \$500,000	50.00% (9 respondents)
\$500,001 - \$750,000	11.11% (2 respondents)
\$750,001 – \$1,000,000	11.11% (2 respondents)
over \$1,000,000	11.11% (2 respondents)

Has your budget changed in the past five years?

Decreased	50.00% (9 respondents)
Increased	22.22% (4 respondents)
No significant changes	33.33% (6 respondents)

And if it has changed significantly, by how much?

- Increased with funds from our Conservation Commission - to address major tree damage/loss as a result of recent ice storm (resulted from a Federal Disaster declaration)
- approximate decrease of \$60,000
- The Core program funding hasn't changed significantly, but due to Emerald Ash Borer, we have received additional funding from USFS to deal with related replanting, education and management issues.
- It fluctuates with Fed. Funds. Highest = \$376,000 in 2003; lowest = 193,100 in 2006
- This fiscal year is almost double last year.

How is your urban and community forestry program funded in your state? (check all that apply)

State Department of Forestry	55.56% (10 respondents)
State Department of Transportation	5.56% (1 respondents)
State Parks Department	0.00% (0 responses)
General fund line item in State budget	16.67% (3 respondents)
Federal Forest Service matching funds	77.78% (14 respondents)

Other:

- Alabama Cooperative Extension System
- Missouri Department of Conservation - 1/8 of one cent sales tax which is a constitutional amendment
- grant dollars from foundations, corporations, and utilities for pass-through for tree planting grants.
- Corporations and Utility Companies
- Partnering with Investor Owned Utility
- Some General Fund, but not line item. Proposition based funds (voter initiated)

Has this changed in the past five years?

Yes	33.33% (6 respondents)
No	66.67% (12 respondents)

If you answered "yes" to question #4 above, how was your program previously funded?

- 2008 is the first year that the State has funded the urban and community forestry program.
- The level of support from the State Environmental Protection Fund varies with the success of lobbyists.
- Previously by Funds from the Forest Resources Improvement Fund. Revenue generated by demonstration of proper harvesting methods and resource management.

Do you feel that your program funding source(s) are stable and long-term (i.e., sustainable and permanent)?

Yes 11.11% (2 respondents)
 No 88.89% (16 respondents)

Can your program survive without Federal Forest Service funds?

Yes 27.78% (5 respondents)
 No 72.22% (13 respondents)

In light of the current Federal Forest Service outlook (e.g., perennial funding cuts, with less passed-through to the States), is your State considering new funding sources to maintain your program?

Yes 72.22% (13 respondents)
 No 27.78% (5 respondents)

If you answered "yes" to question #8 above, please share your ideas.

- My state should be seeking state funding.
- Looking to partner more on the delivery of key programs.
- We are considering seeking state funding, but it looks bleak.
- More State funds, private corporation funding, other federal agencies
- Looking for new partners including investor owned utilities and NGO's.
- We are pursuing state legislation
- State General Funds
- Look into partnerships with DOT and other non-traditional entities (e.g., corporations)
- Our main goal is to demonstrate the viability of U&CF to the legislature to gain a line item General Fund.

Regardless of your Program's reliance on Forest Service Funds, have you considered the following funding sources

Carbon off-sets 83.33% (5 respondents)
 Utility taxes 33.33% (2 respondents)
 State income tax 16.67% (1 respondent)
 Air Quality Management District assessments 16.67% (1 respondent)

Other:

- I believe that all of these suggestions require authority beyond the scope of my program.

Please share with us any other ideas and/or experience with more-permanent, sustainable funding sources.

- Our funding is stable and dedicated through a constitutional amendment which directs 1/8th of one cent sales tax to support the management of fish, forest, and wildlife in Missouri. The funding generated by this amendment cannot be diverted for other state priorities. Passed in 1976 this amendment does not sunset
- I see no reason why every vehicle owner in the state could not pay \$1.00 per vehicle, with those funds going to the state program for community tree planting initiatives. After all, the majority of our pollution is vehicular. And, a fee like this paid through the BMV would not hurt very badly.
- Shift S&PF out of the USFS to EPA or NRCS for a federal funding source. Corporate support is also an excellent funding opportunity.
- Our Proposition based funds are a double edged sword. They bring money in, but with restrictions and they have little available for administering the grants (5%). It makes it look like a lot of money, but it has big strings and a big debt burden attached. Long-term it can be worse than not being funded.

Discussion & Conclusions