EPA Assessing the Benefits of Urban Forestry in Mojave Desert Communities SwESP

Authors: Angela M. Hammond¹ and Nita Tallent-Halsell²

LOGO Affiliation: ¹USEPA ORD NERL ESD Student Services Contractor Immediate Office, ²USEPA ORD NERL ESD Landscape Ecology Branch



Objective:

As the climate and environment change due to human activity, an understanding of the existing natural resources becomes paramount. Urban forests of Mojave Desert communities have the potential to reduce air pollution, heat island effects, and energy consumption. Analyses of urban forestry benefits have been primarily conducted in temperate areas. The objective is to investigate the transferability of cost/benefit analysis to arid regions, utilizing the i-Tree model.

Study Area:

Clark County is located at the southernmost tip of Nevada and includes the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson.

For this initial software trial, municipal tree inventory data, from three electoral districts of the city of Las Vegas were analyzed.



Methodology:

i-Tree is a free, peer-reviewed software suite developed by the USDA forest service. The i-Tree model can provide information on species distribution and the monetary benefits of an urban forest in the categories of energy, storm water, air quality, carbon dioxide, carbon stored, and aesthetic value. All important contributors to climate.

The module required: STRATUM climate zones tree species, and diameter breast height (DBH).



To demonstrate the functionality of i-Tree in desert landscapes, sample data was obtained from the City of Las Vegas Planning and Development department and analyzed using i-Tree Streets. The local population, land area, street and sidewalk width averages, municipal budget and planting cost data were estimated from census, map, and general budget information.

Acknowledgements:

i-Tree, http://www.itreetools.org City of Las Vegas Planning and Development

- Dept., Dave Cornoyer
- **City of Las Vegas Interactive Map**
- Daniel Heggem, U.S. EPA
- Leah Hare, Student Contractor U.S. EPA
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Results:

The most abundant species of the sample data set is the *Washingtonia robusta* (Mexican Fan Palm). In regards to air quality it has a negative net benefit due to high biogenic volatile organic compound (BVOC) emissions. The recently added/planted species, *Fraxinus oxycarpa* (Caucasian Ash), has a relatively low net benefit. The longer established *Washingtonia filifera* (California Palm), has a moderate net benefit.

Results indicate that i-Tree analysis is applicable in arid regions if irrigation costs and benefit prices are accurately estimated. Species distribution also needs to be taken into account, as some trees are better suited for a desert environment than others.

The objective of the USEPA's Southwest Ecosystem Services Program, SwESP, is to develop and implement methods, models, and tools to map and assess the condition of Southwestern ecosystems. i-Tree is a valuable first step in understanding the value of Mojave Desert urban forests. Future studies will focus on the utilization of additional i-Tree modules to further understand the relationship between southwest urban forestry, air quality, and climate.

Species Distribution Re

Relative Age Distribution



Annual Air Quality Benefits

| | | eposi | tion (Ib |) | Total | 22225 | Avoid | ed (lb) | | Total | BVOC | BVOC | Total | Total | % of Total | Avg. |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|----------|------|-------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------|--------|------------|---------|
| Species | O 3 | NO 2 | PM 10 | SO 2 | Depos. (\$) | NO 2 | PM 10 | VOC | SO 2 | Avoided. (\$) | Emissions (lb) | Emissions (\$) | (lb) | (\$) | Trees | \$/tree |
| Mexican fan palm | 90.6 | 49.4 | 85.3 | 10.0 | 1,229 | 58.3 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 49.7 | 1,033 | -617.3 | -2,469 | -270.4 | -207 | 27.3 | -0.10 |
| Velvet ash | 33.7 | 13.0 | 32.3 | 2.7 | 423 | 67.8 | 3.5 | 0.6 | 57.9 | 1,203 | 0.0 | 0 | 211.4 | 1,626 | 9.0 | 2.41 |
| Afghan pine | 118.7 | 64.7 | 115.6 | 13.1 | 1,632 | 103.0 | 5.3 | 0.9 | 88.2 | 1,832 | -100.4 | -402 | 409.1 | 3,063 | 7.8 | 5.23 |
| Date palm | 72.2 | 39.4 | 67.4 | 7.9 | 975 | 32.1 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 27.2 | 566 | -444.8 | -1,779 | -196.7 | -238 | 6.9 | -0.46 |
| California palm | 7.3 | 4.0 | 6.8 | 0.8 | 99 | 80.6 | 4.1 | 0.7 | 68.7 | 1,428 | -128.4 | -514 | 44.6 | 1,013 | 5.5 | 2.46 |
| Mediterranean fan palm | 6.0 | 3.2 | 5.9 | 0.7 | 82 | 6.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 5.1 | 107 | -63.3 | -253 | -36.0 | -64 | 4.2 | -0.20 |
| Argentine mesquite | 27.3 | 13.1 | 27.9 | 2.7 | 372 | 42.1 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 35.9 | 747 | -40.6 | -162 | 111.1 | 957 | 3.6 | 3.57 |
| White mulberry | 71.7 | 19.6 | 47.6 | 4.4 | 719 | 65.7 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 56.1 | 1,166 | -109.6 | -438 | 159.4 | 1,447 | 3.0 | 6.35 |
| Caucasian ash | 6.1 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 0.5 | 77 | 13.3 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 11.3 | 236 | 0.0 | 0 | 40.4 | 313 | 2.9 | 1.45 |
| Canary Island date palm | 133.1 | 72.6 | 124.4 | 14.6 | 1,799 | 69.3 | 3.5 | 0.6 | 59.2 | 1,230 | -757.2 | -3,029 | -279.8 | 0 | 2.8 | 0.00 |
| Siberian elm | 213.8 | 82.7 | 164.0 | 17.1 | 2,439 | 112.1 | 5.7 | 1.0 | 96.2 | 1,997 | 0.0 | 0 | 692.7 | 4,436 | 2.2 | 26.72 |
| Live oak | 5.1 | 2.8 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 79 | 12.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 10.6 | 220 | -170.0 | -680 | -131.3 | -381 | 2.1 | -2.44 |
| Shoestring acacia | 15.6 | 7.5 | 14.2 | 1.6 | 202 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 11.8 | 246 | -33.2 | -133 | 32.2 | 315 | 2.0 | 2.09 |
| African sumac | 2.5 | 1.3 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 39 | 6.8 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 5.8 | 120 | 0.0 | 0 | 20.3 | 159 | 1.8 | 1.16 |
| Olive | 12.2 | 6.6 | 12.5 | 1.3 | 171 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 11.9 | 247 | -6.0 | -24 | 53.4 | 395 | 1.7 | 3.06 |
| Aleppo pine | 38.0 | 20.7 | 39.0 | 4.2 | 534 | 41.4 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 35.5 | 738 | -68.3 | -273 | 113.0 | 999 | 1.5 | 9.17 |
| Chinese pistache | 4.6 | 1.8 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 57 | 9.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 7.9 | 164 | -55.1 | -220 | -26.3 | 1 | 1.4 | 0.01 |
| Locust | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 14 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 60 | -10.4 | -42 | -1.4 | 32 | 1.3 | 0.34 |
| Paloverde | 9.8 | 4.7 | 10.1 | 1.0 | 133 | 15.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 12.9 | 267 | -21.0 | -84 | 33.4 | 317 | 1.2 | 3.41 |
| Cherry plum | 3.9 | 1.9 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 52 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 86 | -10.7 | -43 | 8.4 | 94 | 1.0 | 1.21 |
| Other street trees | 67.2 | 31.8 | 63.0 | 6.6 | 877 | 71.4 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 61.1 | 1,269 | -211.7 | -847 | 93.7 | 1,299 | 10.7 | 1.62 |
| Citywide total | 940.3 | 443.8 | 840.9 | 90.8 | 12,007 | 842.5 | 43.0 | 7.6 | 719.9 | 14,961 | -2,847.9 | -11,391 | 1,080.9 | 15,576 | 100.0 | 2.08 |

Total Annual Benefits

| | The One OTA Dise One One One One One One One One OTA Dise One One | color case of a faller of a data faller of a caller of a faller of a data of a data of a data of a | |
|------------------------|---|--|-----------|
| Benefits | Total (\$) | \$/tree | \$/capita |
| Energy | 56,725 | 7.57 | 0.20 |
| CO2 | 5,108 | 0.68 | 0.02 |
| Air Quality | 13,651 | 1.82 | 0.05 |
| Stormwater | 13,459 | 1.80 | 0.05 |
| Aesthetic/Other | 160,180 | 21.37 | 0.56 |
| Total Benefits | 249,123 | 33.24 | 0.88 |
| Costs | | | |
| Planning | 20,000 | 2.67 | 0.07 |
| Contract Pruning | 22,000 | 2.94 | 0.08 |
| Pest Management | 10,500 | 1.40 | 0.04 |
| Irrigation | 32,000 | 4.27 | 0.11 |
| Removal | 40,000 | 5.37 | 0.14 |
| Administration | 28,000 | 3.74 | 0.10 |
| Inspection/Service | 8,000 | 1.07 | 0.03 |
| Infrastructure Repairs | 13,000 | 1.73 | 0.05 |
| Litter Clean-Up | 26,000 | 3.47 | 0.09 |
| Liability/Claims | 10,000 | 1.33 | 0.04 |
| Other Costs | 1,000 | 0.13 | 0.00 |
| Total Costs | 210,500 | 28.09 | 0.74 |
| Net Benetits | 38,623 | 5.15 | 0.14 |
| Benefit-cost ratio | 1.18 | | |