

Survey of State Funding Trends
ACT Annual Meeting • November 17, 2008
Martha Ozonoff & Ruth Williams, California ReLeaf

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.

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

\$250,000 or below	30.6% (15)
\$250,001 - \$500,000	44.9% (22)
\$500,001 - \$750,000	8.2% (4)
\$750,001 - \$1,000,000	6.1% (3)
over \$1,000,000	10.2% (5)

Has your budget changed in the past five years? (2002 – 2007)

Decreased	62% (31)
Increased	16% (8)
No significant changes	26% (13)

How is the urban and community forestry program funded in your state?

State Department of Forestry	58% (29)
General fund line item in State budget	10% (5)
Federal Forest Service matching funds	70% (35)

Other:

- License plate program.
- Fire Protection funding for wildland urban interface projects (Federal).
- State trust fund managed by State Department of Forestry.
- Some general fund, but not line item. Proposition-based funds (voter initiated).
- Partnering with investor-owned utility.
- Forest health dollars for restoration of urban forest canopy due to emerald ash borer loss.
- 1/8 of one cent sales tax.

Do you feel that your program funding source(s) are stable and long-term?

Yes	12% (6)
No	88% (44)

Can your program survive without Federal Forest Service funds?

Yes	34% (16)
No	66% (31)

In light of the current Federal Forest Service outlook, is your State considering new funding sources to maintain your program?

Yes	76% (38)
No	24% (12)

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

- Fines and fees associated with improper arboricultural practices.
- Increasing State funding.
- Corporate sponsorships, foundation grants, other state and federal sources of grants, carbon market.
- Proposed Conservation Heritage Fund with 3/8 of one percent of sales tax dedicated to conservation, approved for referendum vote in November 2008.
- On a competitive basis, lottery proceeds are available to conservation and urban and community forestry. These funds are available to state agencies and municipal and local governments too.
- Outsourcing program to a nonprofit to raise funds to continue the program.

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

Carbon off-sets	83.3% (15)
Utility taxes	27.8% (5)
State income tax	22.2% (4)
Air Quality Management District assessments	33.3% (6)

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.
- Charge every vehicle owner in the state \$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.
- Our Proposition-based funds are a double-edged sword. The bonds bring money in, but with restrictions and there is 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.
- Wisconsin's entire forestry program, of which urban is a part, is funded through a statewide property tax, currently capped at .17 mil (\$17 per \$100,000 of property valuation) which was enacted in 1923. This has been a stable funding source, though the rate of increase has slowed with the flattening of the housing market.
- The Municipal Tree Restoration Program involves funding from local utility companies for the removal of poor quality trees under power lines and replacement with more suitable species.
- The state's Realty Transfer Tax provides regular funding to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, of which the Bureau of Forestry is a part, but until the present administration, none of that funding has ever been appropriated for urban forestry.

For More Information: Ruth Williams, TREE Davis, ruth@treedavis.org, 530-758-7337
Martha Ozonoff, California ReLeaf, mozonoff@californiareleaf.org, 530-757-7333