

**Agenda**  
**Village of Glen Ellyn**  
**Regular Village Board Workshop**  
**Monday, June 21, 2010**  
**7:00 p.m.**  
**Galligan Board Room**  
**Glen Ellyn Civic Center**

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comments?
3. Review of Agenda for June 28 Regular Village Board Meeting
4. Potential Tree Replacement Cost Share Program – Joe Caracci  
(See attachment – pages 2 – 21)
5. Manor Woods/Additional Village Property Discussion – President Pfefferman
6. Other items?
7. Adjournment



**To:** Steve Jones, Village Manager  
**From:** Joe Caracci, Public Works Director  
**Date:** June 14, 2010  
**Re:** Tree Replacement Program Recommendations

### **Background**

The Village's comprehensive Forestry Management Program includes tasks like tree removals, tree pruning, fertilization, and tree replacements. Over the past few years, we have seen our forestry program funding reduced due to these difficult economic times. One program that has felt the brunt of the cut-backs has been the reforestation program. The Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) infestation has not helped our cause as reduced funding earmarked for our reforestation program has been redirected toward our EAB Program. We have not planted new trees since spring of 2009.

In light of these reductions, we have evaluated possible changes to how our replacement program functions. Our current replacement program is fully funded by the Village. Although we would love to plant one tree for every tree removed, this is not a realistic goal due to space limitations and surrounding obstacles. On average we are replacing approximately 80% of our parkway tree inventory.

We have looked into different funding options for our replacement program (Village funded, 50/50 cost share, and 100% resident funded). We have also considered a possible donation program for implementation. We have come up with some alternatives that we would like to present to the Village Board with hopes of receiving direction on how to proceed.

### **Issues**

The Village's current program is underfunded. Due to the deferment of the Fall '09 and Spring '10 plantings, we started this fiscal year with 250 trees awaiting planting – with a price tag of approximately \$75,000. With the confirmation of EAB in Glen Ellyn, we expect our annual replacement program to include approximately 280 trees per year (200 normal replacements and 80 EAB replacements). In order to financially support these anticipated annual plantings, \$84,000 must be funded annually. Our current budget only provides \$60,000. Obviously, you can see the pickle we have created for ourselves.

How do we resolve of this problem? First I think we need to identify what our objectives will be. In order to truly work out a program that best meets our goals and objectives, I needed to make some assumptions.

1. The Village would like to enhance our urban forest through a significant reforestation program.
2. The Village would like to financially support this effort through a combination of tax-supported dollars and voluntary donations.
3. The Village would ultimately like to replace a removed tree within one year. However, the Village is willing to extend this replacement temporarily for up to two years.

If these assumption are acceptable to the Village Board, please be prepared to offer modifications at our June 21 Village board Meeting.

We have evaluated three options that use combinations of replacement programs.

Attached to this memo are:

- Three supplemental memos describing different Tree Replacement Programs available. Each of the memos includes a description of the program as well as some pros and cons.
- One supplemental memo describing a Conservancy / Donation program and process.
- Three supplemental memos examining three options for moving forward with our reforestation program.
  - Option 1 involves the Village continuing to fully fund the reforestation of village removed trees while providing a cost share program for residents looking to fill available spaces in the parkway.
  - Option 2 is a modification of Option 1 without a catch up program.
  - Option 3 utilizes a cost share program for reforestation within the Village.

When evaluating these options, we tried to balance budgetary commitments, desire to continue to enhance our urban forest with as many tree plantings as possible, and fairness to our residents.

It is our recommendation to initiate Option 1 concurrently with the Conservancy / Donation Program. We are open to any of the catch up plan identified, but feel we must commit to one. We feel that option 1 allows us the best mechanism to achieve our goals – unfortunately funding plays a significant role in this option.

Unfortunately, we struggled to develop a plan that has less financial impact while still providing a fair and equitable opportunity for all Village residents. Option 2 extends the replacement timing past what we feel is fair and appropriate. Option 3 does not enhance our forest and creates an excessive amount of open spaces with limited likelihood of ever being filled.

## **Action Requested**

We are looking for Village Board direction on the following items:

1. Are the assumptions made consistent with the Board's desires?
2. Does the Board concur with our recommended option?
  - a. If so, is there a desired catch-up plan?
3. Does the Board have any other options or recommendations?

## **Recommendation**

Option 1

## **Attachments**

- Supplemental Attachment – Village Funded Replacement Program
- Supplemental Attachment – 50/50 Cost Share Replacement Program
- Supplemental Attachment – Resident Funded Replacement Program
- Supplemental Attachment – Conservancy / Donation Program
- Supplemental Attachment – Option 1 – Village funded removal / Cost share available space (with catch-up plan)
- Supplemental Attachment – Option 2 – Village funded removal / Cost share available space (without catch-up plan)
- Supplemental Attachment – Option 3 – Cost share program for all reforestation

**Supplemental Agenda Information  
Village of Glen Ellyn**

Agenda Item Supplemented by Commentary

- X Pros & Cons
  - Strategic Action Goal
  - Downtown Strategic Plan Goal
- X Budget Impact/Return on Investment
  - Process Improvement
  - Green Initiative
  - Communication Initiative
  - Safety/Liability/Risk Assessment
  - Comparable Community Info
- X Other

**Comments: Village Funded Replacement Program**

Description

The Village currently operates under a 100% Village funded tree replacement program. Each year the Village budgets for replacements as funds allow. Below is a table of funding and expenses for the last five years.

	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
Original Budget	\$41,300	\$60,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$60,000
Expenses	\$30,749	\$39,299	\$66,747	\$73,579	\$0
Quantity Planted	140	224	278		0*

\*During the FY10 budget season, the \$60,000 of budget funds were redirected and used for the removal of 45 ash trees that were exhibiting signs and symptoms of Emerald Ash Borer.

The current program attempts to plant trees wherever an available space is identified. An available space can be created because of a Village parkway tree removal, a private tree removal that creates room for a new parkway tree, or a space left empty at the request of a homeowner who did not want a tree planted. Currently, we estimate (and this has not been field verified) that we have approximately 350 available spaces. Of these 350 spaces, 250 spaces are the result of a Village initiated parkway tree removal.

The Village typically performs two separate plantings per year – one in the spring and one in the fall. Different species are planted in each season as some species thrive better based on the season. Our purchases are made through the Suburban Tree Consortium which handles the administration of the planting bid and invoicing. We are able to select from a variety of nurseries within an 85 mile radius of Chicagoland which enhances our ability to locate the trees we desire. Orders are typically placed by January 1 for an April spring planting and July 1 for an October fall planting.

Trees species are selected by our Forestry Team based on size of the available space (small, medium or large), surrounding species, and surrounding conditions (utility lines, etc.). Residents are welcome to call Public Works if they desire to discuss alternative species, but final decisions are always made by Public Works. Residents may also request larger trees be planted at an additional cost to the resident. It should be noted that larger trees require more care for them to thrive. Residents who request larger trees be planted should accept responsibility for additional care necessary to ensure the successful growth of the tree.

This program has worked well for the Village for a number of years. Our recent economic struggles and the onset of EAB have slowed our replacement program over the last two years.

#### Pros / Cons

##### Pros

- No cost to the residents
- Program already established
- Provides a more likely chance that the available spaces will be filled – puts control of the parkway restoration in the Villages hands

##### Cons

- Economy has slowed the replacement program due to funding
- Funding limits the number of trees that can be planted
- Higher mortality rate (residents take less “ownership” of tree maintenance)

#### Budget Impact / Return on Investment

The Village would fund 100% of the tree replacements. With a 100% funded program, we would be establishing a limit of how many trees can be planted in any given year based on the available funding. Our funding has varied from \$40,000 to \$100,000 which has yielded between 140 and 280 tree replacements annually.

**Supplemental Agenda Information  
Village of Glen Ellyn**

Agenda Item Supplemented by Commentary

- X Pros & Cons
  - Strategic Action Goal
  - Downtown Strategic Plan Goal
- X Budget Impact/Return on Investment
  - Process Improvement
  - Green Initiative
  - Communication Initiative
  - Safety/Liability/Risk Assessment
  - Comparable Community Info
- X Other

**Comments:                      50/50 Cost Share Replacement Program**

Description

Years ago, the Village had a 50/50 Cost Share Tree Replacement Program. The Forestry Team members who would be involved in a cost share program are familiar with this type of program and any transition could be handled with limited impact on our Team.

The cost share program would operate as follows:

1. Resident calls Public Works with a request for a parkway tree
2. Public Works inspects the property paying particular attention to space limitations, surrounding tree species, and surrounding obstacles.
3. Public Works informs resident that either no space is available or space is available. If space is available, three to five choices of trees would be provided with a Village recommended tree identified. Residents always have the opportunity to discuss alternative species with our Team.
4. Resident then acknowledges their desire to participate in Cost Share Program, identifies their payment preference (submit a direct payment or authorize charge on utility bill – we are researching possibility of payment plan option), and indicates their top two tree species priorities from the list.
5. Once payment is received, Public Works will schedule for next available planting season.

Residents may also request larger trees be planted at an additional cost to the resident. It should be noted that larger trees require more care for them to thrive. Residents who request larger trees be planted should accept responsibility for additional care necessary to ensure the successful growth of the tree. The intent of the program would be to cost share the standard 2" to 2.5" tree that the Village typically plants. Additional costs for larger trees should be the responsibility of the resident.

### Pros / Cons

#### Pros

- Ability to plant more trees with same level of funding
- Ability to plant same number of trees at half the funding
- Creates more "ownership" from the residents if they are participating in cost share

#### Cons

- Provides a less likely chance that the available spaces will be filled as it will require resident cost participation that may be difficult in tough economic times
- If the Village averages 280 tree planting per year under a 100% Village funded program, we would expect only approximately 50-75 participants in a cost share program
- More labor intensive for Village personnel (species selections, communication with residents, payment management, etc.)

### Budget Impact / Return on Investment

The Village would fund 50% of the tree replacements. With a 50% funded program, we would be establishing a limit of how many trees can be planted in any given year based on the available funding. Our funding has varied from \$40,000 to \$100,000 which has yielded between 140 and 280 tree replacements. We could decide to keep this funding level consistent and double the number of trees to be planted or reduce the funding and in return reduce the number of trees to be planted. We would expect reduction in the number of plantings and an increase in the number of available spaces each.

**Supplemental Agenda Information  
Village of Glen Ellyn**

Agenda Item Supplemented by Commentary

- X Pros & Cons
  - Strategic Action Goal
  - Downtown Strategic Plan Goal
- X Budget Impact/Return on Investment
  - Process Improvement
  - Green Initiative
  - Communication Initiative
  - Safety/Liability/Risk Assessment
  - Comparable Community Info
- X Other

**Comments:**

**Resident Funded Replacement Program**

Description

A 100% resident funded program would operate in the same manner as a 50/50 Cost Share Program, only resident assumes the full cost of the tree planting. The Village would still require that all planting be performed by the Village (or its contractor) and that the Village select (tag) the trees at one of our STC nurseries.

The cost share program would operate as follows:

1. Resident calls Public Works with a request for a parkway tree.
2. Public Works inspect the property paying particular attention to space limitations, surrounding tree species, and surrounding obstacles.
3. Public Works informs resident that either no space is available or space is available. If space is available, three to five choices of trees would be provided with a Village recommended tree identified. Resident always has the opportunity to discuss alternative species with our Team.
4. Resident then acknowledges their desire to participate in Resident Funded Replacement Program, identifies their payment preference (submit a direct payment or authorize charge on utility bill – we are researching possibility of payment plan option), and indicates their top two tree species priorities from the list.

5. Once payment is received, Public Works will schedule for next available planting season.

Residents may also request larger trees be planted at an additional cost to the resident. It should be noted that larger trees require more care for them to thrive. Residents who request larger trees be planted should accept responsibility for additional care necessary to ensure the successful growth of the tree. The intent of the program would be to cost share the standard 2" to 2.5" tree that the Village typically plants. Additional costs for larger trees should be the responsibility of the resident.

It is very important to Public Works that we maintain control over the planting and species selection as part of this program. Once the trees are planted they become our responsibility to maintain. It is in our best interest that we tag the trees so that we can use our professional experience in selecting only the highest quality of trees that are free of disease. Allowing a resident to purchase or choose a tree removes that confidence in our forest and introduces new potentially serious unknowns to our program.

#### Pros / Cons

##### Pros

- No cost to the Village
- Creates more "ownership" from the residents if they are paying for the tree

##### Cons

- Provides a less likely chance that the available spaces will be filled as it will require resident cost participation that may be difficult in tough economic times
- More labor intensive for Village personnel (species selections, communication with residents, payment management, etc.)
- If the Village averages 250 tree planting per year under a 100% Village funded program, we would expect approximately 20-25 participants in a 100% resident funded program

#### Budget Impact / Return on Investment

The Village would fund 0% of the tree replacements. We would eliminate the funding from the budget. We would expect a large reduction in the number of plantings and an increase in the number of available spaces each year.

**Supplemental Agenda Information  
Village of Glen Ellyn**

Agenda Item Supplemented by Commentary

- X Pros & Cons
  - Strategic Action Goal
  - Downtown Strategic Plan Goal
- X Budget Impact/Return on Investment
  - Process Improvement
  - Green Initiative
  - Communication Initiative
  - Safety/Liability/Risk Assessment
  - Comparable Community Info
- X Other

**Comments:                      Conservancy / Donation Program**

Description

In the past, the Village maintained a Conservancy Fund within the Forestry budget that was meant to help encourage and sustain beautification of Glen Ellyn's landscape. The fund supplemented money donated to plant trees as gifts or memorials, develop and maintain flower beds, support natural area revitalization, as well as other improvement opportunities. This fund was eliminated from the budget in FY07. I have been told that many residents and businesses have asked how they can replace their own trees or contribute to filling available spaces. As requests come in to provide opportunities for residents to donate to our urban forest, we have looked into the possibility of revitalizing a fund of this nature.

Our plan would be to implement a mechanism that would allow either one-time or recurring donations to the Village that would help fund our tree replacement program. Residents could donate through direct payment (check or cash) or establish charges to their monthly water bills. Our current billing system is setup to easily allow one time charges or recurring charges – similar to Fire Company donations.

We could advertise this program on our Village website, e-blast, and water bills. Interested parties could download an application from the Village website and return either with direct contributions or authorization to charge their water bill accounts in a denomination of their choice.

We would also allow residents to donate the full cost of a tree planting at a location of their choice (on village property) – as long as the space requested is accommodating to a new tree placement. This donation would run according to the guidelines established in the “Resident Funded Replacement Program.”

If the program is initiated and is successful, it can lead to other opportunities with respect to donations for Manor Woods, Northern Gateway, Parkway benches, etc. Establishing a system for something that can be easily monitored and show results will be important in expanding donation programs in the future. The fact that we can provide relatively quick results from the donations is important in establishing a program. We will be looking into ways to address the other opportunities above as we proceed. It is important to be able to provide return on investment in a reasonable amount of time for residents in order to keep them in a donating position.

#### Pros / Cons

##### Pros

- Provides an opportunity for financial donations to the tree replacement program
- Provides a mechanism for donations to be automatic and recurring for residents
- May lead to other donation programs in the future

##### Cons

- Requires some additional tasks for both Public Works and Finance personnel

#### Budget Impact / Return on Investment

Any donations would bolster our tree replacement program. Results of donations to the tree replacement fund can easily be accounted for. When a resident donates \$500, we can show them 1 to 2 trees planted with their money that otherwise may not have been planted.

## Supplemental Agenda Information Village of Glen Ellyn

### Agenda Item Supplemented by Commentary

- X Pros & Cons
  - Strategic Action Goal
  - Downtown Strategic Plan Goal
- X Budget Impact/Return on Investment
  - Process Improvement
  - Green Initiative
  - Communication Initiative
  - Safety/Liability/Risk Assessment
  - Comparable Community Info
- X Other

### **Comments: Option 1 – Village funded removal / Cost share available space (with catch-up plan)**

The Village averages approximately 250 tree removals and 200 replacements per year. The introduction of EAB in Glen Ellyn has added an estimated 100 ash tree removals and 80 ash tree replacements per year. These actions total an average of 280 tree replacements per year. The average cost to replace a tree is approximately \$300. This results in an annual budget commitment of \$84,000.

Our current status of available planting spaces in our Village parkways is approximately 350. Of these 350 spaces, 100 are the result of a Village tree removal. The remaining 250 spaces are open spaces that exist in our parkways. In order to fund the replacement of these 250 Village generated spaces, \$75,000 is necessary.

Our current budget includes \$60,500 for tree replacements - \$43,000 for our replacement program and \$17,500 for our EAB Program. This provides for the replacement of 200 trees.

When evaluating options, we tried to balance budgetary commitments, desire to continue to enhance our urban forest with as many tree plantings as possible, and fairness to our residents.

Option 1 recommends that the Village continue on our current path of fully funding tree replacements for those trees that we remove when space is available. Further, it is our recommendation to initiate a 50/50 Cost Share Program for those who you desire to plant a tree in one of our otherwise open spaces. This recommendation would not penalize residents who lose trees due to health, hazard, or disease. It also allows those who desire trees in their

vacant parkway to help fund the replacement – in return providing a sense of ownership that will assist the Village with watering and care.

In order for this option to work, significant financial commitment is needed. Our current budget does not allow for an immediate “catch up” for deferring our last two planting seasons. The tables below summarize the level of financial commitment needed to get back on track within 2, 3, and 4 years.

2 Year Catch Up Plan							
Fiscal Year End Date	FY10 04/30/10	FY11 04/30/11	FY12 04/30/12	FY13 04/30/13	FY14 04/30/14	FY15 04/30/15	FY16 04/30/16
Trees to Plant	250	250	330	165	0	0	0
Plantings Generated	0	280	280	280	280	280	280
Total Trees	250	530	610	445	280	280	280
Trees Funded (\$)	0 (\$)	200 (\$60,500)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)
Supplement (\$)	0 (\$)	0 (\$)	165 (\$49,500)	165 (\$49,500)	0 (\$)	0 (\$)	0 (\$)
Trees Left to Plant	250	330	165	0	0	0	0
Funding Commitment	\$0	\$60,500	\$133,500	\$133,500	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000

3 Year Catch Up Plan							
Fiscal Year End Date	FY10 04/30/10	FY11 04/30/11	FY12 04/30/12	FY13 04/30/13	FY14 04/30/14	FY15 04/30/15	FY16 04/30/16
Trees to Plant	250	250	330	165	0	0	0
Plantings Generated	0	280	280	280	280	280	280
Total Trees	250	530	610	445	280	280	280
Trees Funded (\$)	0 (\$)	200 (\$60,500)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)
Supplement (\$)	0 (\$)	0 (\$)	110 (\$33,000)	110 (\$33,000)	110 (\$33,000)	0 (\$)	0 (\$)
Trees Left to Plant	250	330	220	110	0	0	0
Funding Commitment	\$0	\$60,500	\$117,000	\$117,000	\$117,000	\$84,000	\$84,000

4 Year Catch Up Plan							
Fiscal Year End Date	FY10 04/30/10	FY11 04/30/11	FY12 04/30/12	FY13 04/30/13	FY14 04/30/14	FY15 04/30/15	FY16 04/30/16
Trees to Plant	250	250	330	165	0	0	0
Plantings Generated	0	280	280	280	280	280	280
Total Trees	250	530	610	445	280	280	280
Trees Funded (\$)	0 (\$)	200 (\$60,500)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)
Supplement (\$)	0 (\$)	0 (\$)	82 (\$24,600)	82 (\$24,600)	83 (\$24,900)	83 (\$24,900)	0 (\$)
Trees Left to Plant	250	330	248	166	83	0	0
Funding Commitment	\$0	\$60,500	\$108,600	\$108,600	\$108,900	\$108,900	\$84,000

One of the issues that these plans introduce is that replacement trees for Village removals may not occur for up to two years after the removal takes place. A tree removed in July 2010 may not be replaced until spring of 2012. Our thought is that if a resident does not want to wait that long, they could participate in a 100% Resident Funded Replacement Program. The resident would pay the full cost of the replacement and we would plant the tree on the very next planting program. Otherwise the resident would wait on a first removed – first replaced program.

It is our estimation that participation in the available space program will be minimal and most likely include approximately 25 trees per year. This would result in a Village commitment of approximately \$4,000 per year. We are hopeful that the donation program will generate enough funding to support the available space cost share program.

#### Pros / Cons

##### Pros

- No cost to the residents for Village generated removals
- Residents are not penalized for death, disease, or hazard removal of a tree in the parkway
- Program already established
- Provides the best likelihood that the available spaces will be filled

- Cost share program is funded through voluntary donations

#### Cons

- Significant financial commitment from Village Board
- Could be a management nightmare coordinating tree replacement program over many years

#### Budget Impact / Return on Investment

Depending on the catch up plan, the financial commitment is quite significant. For the past five years, tree replacement funding averaged approximately \$72,000. With the EAB infestation upon, one would expect our financial commitment to the forestry program to increase.

**Supplemental Agenda Information  
Village of Glen Ellyn**

Agenda Item Supplemented by Commentary

- X Pros & Cons
  - Strategic Action Goal
  - Downtown Strategic Plan Goal
- X Budget Impact/Return on Investment
  - Process Improvement
  - Green Initiative
  - Communication Initiative
  - Safety/Liability/Risk Assessment
  - Comparable Community Info
- X Other

**Comments: Option 2 – Village funded removal / Cost share available space (no catch up plan)**

This option is identical to Option 1 except there would be no catch up plan initiated. The following table shows the five year commitment plan.

Option 2 Plan (no catch up plan)							
Fiscal Year	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
End Date	04/30/10	04/30/11	04/30/12	04/30/13	04/30/14	04/30/15	04/30/16
Trees to Plant	250	250	330	330	330	330	330
Plantings Generated	0	280	280	280	280	280	280
Total Trees	250	530	610	610	610	610	610
Trees Funded (\$)	0 (\$)	200 (\$60,500)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)	280 (\$84,000)
Trees Left to Plant	250	330	330	330	330	330	330
Funding Commitment	\$0	\$60,500	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000	\$84,000

Trees would be replaced on a first removed - first replaced criteria. This program would extend the timeframe after tree removal, but still offers the possibility for residents to fully fund a replacement if they are not willing to wait that long.

## Pros / Cons

### Pros

- No cost to the residents for Village generated removals
- Residents are not penalized for death, disease, or hazard removal of a tree in the parkway
- Program already established
- Provides the best likelihood that the available spaces will be filled
- Cost share program is funded through voluntary donations

### Cons

- Significant financial commitment from Village Board
- Residents may have to wait multiple years for a replacement tree
- Could be a management nightmare coordinating tree replacement program over many years

### Budget Impact / Return on Investment

Budget commitment would be consistent from year to year. In a good year we could bump up the program to help reduce the outstanding available spaces.

**Supplemental Agenda Information  
Village of Glen Ellyn**

*Agenda Item Supplemented by Commentary*

- X Pros & Cons
  - Strategic Action Goal
  - Downtown Strategic Plan Goal
- X Budget Impact/Return on Investment
  - Process Improvement
  - Green Initiative
  - Communication Initiative
  - Safety/Liability/Risk Assessment
  - Comparable Community Info
- X Other

**Comments: Option3 –Cost share available program for all replacements**

The Village averages approximately 250 tree removals and 200 replacements per year. The introduction of EAB in Glen Ellyn has added an estimated 100 ash tree removals and 80 ash tree replacements per year. These actions total an average of 280 tree replacements per year. The average cost to replace a tree is approximately \$300.

Our current status of available planting spaces in our Village parkways is approximately 350. Of these 350 spaces, 250 are the result of a Village tree removal. The remaining 100 spaces are open spaces that exist in our parkways.

Our current budget includes \$60,500 for tree replacements - \$43,000 for our normal replacement program and \$17,500 for our EAB Program.

Option 2 recommends that the Village cease our fully funded replacement program and initiate a 50/50 Cost Share Program. The program would still require funding as we move forward, however the level of funding will depend on the participation of our Village residents. It is safe to say that we would not expect every resident with an available space to participate in a cost share program. Our optimistic estimation is that only one-fourth (25%) of our residents would participate.

In order for this option to work, financial commitment is still needed. The table below summarizes the level of financial commitment needed to change our program over the next five years. The summary is based on Village participation of \$150 per tree and a replacement of 70 trees per year.

Cost Share Plan						
Fiscal Year End Date	FY11 04/30/11	FY12 04/30/12	FY13 04/30/13	FY14 04/30/14	FY15 04/30/15	FY16 04/30/16
Trees to Plant	250	460	670	880	1,090	1,300
New Plantings	280	280	280	280	280	280
Total Trees	530	313	950	1,160	1,370	1,580
Trees Funded (\$)	70 (\$11,000)	70 (\$11,000)	70 (\$11,000)	70 (\$11,000)	70 (\$11,000)	70 (\$11,000)
Unplanted Trees	460	670	880	1,090	1,300	1,510
Funding Commitment	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$11,000

The obvious issue that this program generates is that we increase the number of available planting spaces significantly over the years. We could exceed 1,000 available spaces in our parkway in 4 years.

This analysis was based on participation experienced when the Village last performed a cost share program for parkway tree replacement.

The Village Board could revert back to a fully funded program if and when funding became available.

It is our estimation that participation in the available space program will be minimal and most likely include approximately 25 trees per year. This would result in a Village commitment of approximately \$4,000 per year. We are hopeful that the donation program will generate enough funding to support the available space cost share program.

#### Pros / Cons

##### Pros

- Reduces the financial burden on the Village
- Creates more “ownership” from the residents if they are participating in cost share
- Available space program is supplemented through voluntary donations

##### Cons

- Provides a less likely chance that the available spaces will be filled as it will require resident cost participation that may be difficult in tough economic times
- Generates open spaces in our parkways

- Could be a management nightmare coordinating tree replacement program over many years

#### Budget Impact / Return on Investment

This option would help reduce the financial burden on future budgets as it would drastically reduce the commitment to our reforestation program.