Assessing Connecticut's Forest Cover at Multiple Spatial Scales

Danica Doroski Urban Forestry Coordinator, CT DEEP i-Tree Academy 2021

Background

The purpose of this project was to use i-Tree Landscape to examine tree canopy cover and ecosystem services at broad and fine scales and to use the results of broad assessments to prioritize urban tree canopy investments at finer scales. To do this, I first examined urban tree cover and associated ecosystem services for all of 169 municipalities in Connecticut. I then zoomed in on one municipality in particular, Waterbury, CT and quantified urban tree cover and ecosystem services for that city only to understand how Waterbury's urban canopy contributes to Connecticut's collective urban canopy. I choose Waterbury because it is the fifth largest city in the state but has relatively fewer resources and investments than other large cities in the state. Using i-Tree Landscape I wanted to identify priority areas with Waterbury that would be good places to increase investment in urban tree cover. Specifically, I was interested in neighborhoods with low canopy cover, high population density, and in environmental justice areas.

Statewide Tree Cover

Connecticut has a high urban tree cover at 61.24%. As expected, rural areas have very high tree cover (up to 81.84%) and more urban areas have much lower tree cover (as low as 16.10%). The state has an estimated 30.09% of potential "plantable" area. Other benefits are outlined below:

															j-	Tree
															Let	edito ign
ocation Int	ormat	ion														
Canopy & Impe	rvious (r	igh Resolution U	PTC)													
				Are				Garward			Impurvice			Harts	the Space	
			acr		* No		9019				80%	* %				
Selec	ion Total			3,277,133	3	100.00		1,825,832	4	62.14	240,999	3 7	77	102	375,7	30.00
		Kalution L/TC) Carbon I	Borage Short T		(artson Gegen	atration ant Tona and			CO ₂ Equivale	ni Olurage Slovet Top	. Der be	CO ₂ Hape	valent Sequ	undtation 1 Tons car a	
Solection Tate	à.	Cartxin L/TC) Cartxin 1 8 4 17,738,349,797	Storage Short T 121.61	lan († 1	C Patrinsant 4 282,254,366	artson Gagan Jist.(3)	uatratian Narit Tiana Anc.v	9480) • 1855 195 (17.	CO ₃ Egymeter 8 8 728,348,797	rt Otorage Shart Ton 361,090,430	• Patie	CO,tupe MC) ● 294,383	vələnt Gəqu Vət.(Rhat	unattastas 1. Tecnu carr. ve 4.	1400 + DEB.041.5
Selection Tota	ê an Remo	Garbon I Garbon I 6 ¢ 17.738,546,767	Shoraya Short T 923,60 killuri 1,700	lae # 18,016.5	o Philippani M 282,254.500	arbor Gegas Yyr.(3)	natratari Karti Taria, esc. v 1	948C) * (855, 195, 1	17	CO ₂ Egymete 8 8 728,348,797	ri Storage Shari Ton 361,090,433	• Parte 6 960,	CO, taµr ₩2) ♦ 294,393	valent Sequ XVI./Rbat	unstration 1.Jacon.car. vi 4.	MED + Dem,OH1.5
Balactikas Tata Iotal Air Poliuti	ê on Ramo	Carbon UTC) Carbon 1 6 9 17.736,346,767 Will (High Rose	Bhoraga Short T 123,8 Iuliun LTC)	las e Molico	C Percinant 4 282,364,300	arton Gegan Avr. 20	adratan sert Terna carc y 1	5482) • (855,153,1	47.	CO ₂ Egymele 8 9 738.348,797	rt Storage Sitort Ton 361,090,430	• Path • 200.	CO,tape M2) ● 294,393	valent Gegi Xirt./Rhat	undtration 1.Topic.com vi 4.	NAC) + Della,OH1 S
Soloction Tota Iotal Air Polluti	ê on Ramo	Kalution UTC) Certson 1 8 4 17.736,346,767 XVIII (High Rose	Blongya Short T 1633,91 Kallan L/TC) Thurddy	lan Ø : 12,015.5 Desurgency	G Factoreal C Bac point Sol Boogstant	artson Began Byr.(2) Awatu Seepinatory	altatan seti Tera secu 1 Aathra	900) • (855, 163, 1	17. School	CO3 Egymele 8 8 738,548,797 Heapital Admissions,	rt Otorage Shart Ton 361,090,430 Hong tal Advatationa,	Pratin 6 200, Acuin	CO ₃ Equa M2) 0 IS+C,300 Chronic	valent Gegi Bitt./Bhat Acute	Laper Rospiratory	Lower Ranginati
Selection Tota Iotal Air Polluti	n on Remo	Earteen I Carteen I 6 • 17.736.346,767 Will (High None) Nige Jamesch	Storage Short T 123,50 Adam L.T.C) HeadD Incidence	laz e 12.015.5 Emergency Rosen Viete e	G FYECTOSEALL 0 282,254,366 Reception Administration	Analo Sempler Analo Sempler Symplecon Sympleco	albahan Iarli Taruk sec y 1 Aathree Eascerbeilen 8	slaci + .655, 153, 1 Mortality	f 17. Schaol Lois Days 4	CO3 Egymele 8 8 728,348,787 Hospital Admissions, Respiratory	tt Bitmage Shart Ton 361,000,433 Hospital Administras, Gardiovencular	 Pating Pating	CO, Equi M2 • 294,393 Chronic Bronzhilia	Acute Branchille Branchille	Lipper Ronginstory Symptoms	BBD + DBB.0415 LONNE Ranginat Sympton
Solociton Tota local Air Poliuti Batection Totat:	e on Remo Ryr Mulle2,20	Cartson I Cartson I 1 0 17.736.346,767 Will (High Hono Dign Hono Dign 200.0001 0 100.0003303.4	Bhoraga Short T 1923,Bi Bullan L/TC) Hacidanca B Discidanca B 21,JTD	lae e LL.016.5 Rosen Yistte e 12.67	C Partiysart 0 282,354,300 Roopflart Administers 8 26,20	Anulo Anulo Respiratory Symplects Symplects	atratan art Tana ser y 1 Aathrea Executation 8 7,908,17	Mortality 12.52	fr. School Loos Days 4 0,361,27	CO3 Egynvelw 8 0 728.348.797 Hexapted Administry 0.689	tt Storage Stort Ton 361/300,433 Hong-tai Advatations, Cardiovoncular 8 0.00	 Brg.jg 202,5 Acuits Myccardial Interction# 3.02 	CO, Egar 194, 303 SH, 303 Chronic Branchilla 9 2.02	Acute Acute Acute Acute Acute Acute	Uaper Respirators Syrrotors 44.00	BBD + DBB.041.5 LOWER Raspirate Sympton Sa
Balection Tota Iotal Air Poliuti Belection Totat Hydrology Qua	a on Remo For Helder, 20 nility (High	Carton LTC) Carton I 8 4 17.738.346.767 Will (High Reed Hely: Jamenda 9 00.109.053.073.4 Reedution LTC	Boraya Short S 103,6 Kellen LTC) Headlin Headlin 21,750	lae e III,006.5 Emergency Rosen Viatta e 12.67	(First Lynaut) 282 254 306 Reception Administeres 8 26.20	Autor Segue Jyr.20 Autor Sempiratory Byropican Byropican Byropican Byropican	Asthyna Esacarbollon B 7,006.17	1992) 9 1855 1851 1 Murtailly 9 12,52	17. Schaol Lois Days 4 1.381.22	CO ₂ Egynale 8 0 738,548,797 Mespilal Admissions, Respiratory 9 0,60	tt Otorage Short Ton 361,000,430 Hong tal Advatations, Cardiovoscular 6 0.00	Acuta Acuta Myccardial Infarction# 3.08	CO ₃ figur sec. 303 Chrossic Brenzbilin 9 2.02	Acute Bearchille 443	Lager vi G Upper Rospiratory Syrrptoms 4 44.00	BBED & DEB,OH1.5 Lower r Raspiral Sympto P 1 Se
Solection Tota local Air Poliuti Belection Total Hydrology Gua	a on Remo Syr Hauszyzo faity (High Tourapier	Carton LTC) Carton 1 8 4 17.728.346.767 Will (High Hoad Brigg James da 9 100,003,073,4 Resolution LTC willion (MCL 000100	Borrege Short T VE3,6 Aden LTC) Necidence S 21,750 1 ms. of Gallen	iae 8 III.016.5 Desergency Rosen Yisto 8 12.67	C Prociosadi 282 264 366 Recepital Administres 26.00 Radobal M	Anala Stradiu Renalizatory Rympiona 10,725.03	Asthra Asthra Castertalion 8 7,000.17	Naci 4 Ass. 163. 1 Murtailly 12.62 Callered	f 17. School Loss Days 4 0.381.27 1. (past)	CO, Egymole 1 0 728,549,797 Heepful Anniakons, Respiratory 0 0.00 Available 5	nt Disrage Short Ton 361,000,430 Hong-tai Administran, Gardiovennular 9 0.50 honoff (900, Millino	 Bracks Shacks Acasts Mysocardial Interction# 3.08 	CO, Bager and P SHC 200 Chronic Branchillin P 2.02 mil/st (senet)	Acute Branchilla 443 Acute	Lastration 1. Total: Bar yi d d Upper Rospiratory Syreptons 44.00 a4.00	GAD + DEB.0415 LOWER Ranginat Sympton Sympton Samuel Samuel
Selection Tela Total Air Poliuti Selection Totat Hydrology Qua	an Remo Star HE.202.00 Nitty (High Therapido	Carbon I Carbon I 17.738.346.767 Will Orign Read Balac Jamasha Balac Jamasha Data San Carbon	Borrege Short 1 103,6 kellun 1.TC) HoodBh HoodBh 21,750 1 ms. of Gallen	las 8 III.016.5 Desergency Rosan Yisto 8 12.67	C Partissatt 0 282,354,566 Rospitat Administers 26,50 Raintat 6 8	Arton Gegan Jyc.23 Arath Sexplotery Sympleces Byropics NJ, 785.05	ativitan ant Tana ancy 1 Asthra Gascerbellon 8 7,000,17 MD (Willoco a	stac) • .655,155,1 Mortality • 12.63 (Galleess)	f 17. School Loss Days 4 3.381.27 6. (pss/d)	CO, Egynole 1 9 728,546,797 Heepful Antiasions, Respiratory 0 0.00 Accided f 0	nt Dearrage Short Ton 361,000,433 Heeg hal Administran, Gardiovencular 0,50 0,50 haveff (MG, Maline	6 Sigging 6 2002 Myccardial Inferction 2.00 ma.nt.Galler	CO, figer SE() 0 Pres 300 Chrossie Brensbillin 0 2.52 ni)(st.(penel)	Acute Acute Acute Acute Acute Acute Acute Acute Acute S	Landbacker 1 Jock Ler yr G Nager Mager Syrrytons 4 44.00 44.00 44.00	SM2) DEB,OH15 Lowe (Raspind Sympton) 5 (Lynnti) 9

Waterbury Tree Cover

Waterbury ranks 155 out of 169 for urban tree cover (1 being the highest tree cover 169 being the lowest). In Waterbury 38.10% of the land area is forested and 27.91% is potentially plantable. Canopy cover, however, varies significantly depending on neighborhood. For example, the Bucks Hill Neighborhood has 67.88% canopy cover whereas the Central Business District has only 2.81%. Knowing that there are disparities in urban tree cover depending on neighborhood, I next wanted to highlight which neighborhoods would be good to target for urban forestry investments. To do this I created a custom scenario ranking tree stocking level at 30% importance, tree cover per capita at 30%, population below poverty line at 20%, and minority population density at 20%. This analysis highlighted the



Figure 1. Priority planting/regeneration locations by census block within the city of Waterbury, CT. Areas are prioritized based on tree stocking level, tree cover, population below poverty line, and minority population density.

Hillside, Crownbrook, Willow Plaza and Central Business District as priority neighborhoods for future urban forestry investment (fig. 1).