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Abstract.—The Urban Forest Effects (UFORE) computer model was developed to help managers and researchers quantify urban forest structure and functions. The model quantifies species composition and diversity, diameter distribution, tree density and health, leaf area, leaf biomass, and other structural characteristics; hourly volatile organic compound emissions (emissions that contribute to ozone formation) throughout a year; total carbon stored and net carbon sequestered annually; and hourly pollution removal by the urban forest and associated percent improvement in air quality throughout a year.

Few people know how many and what kind of trees are found in urban areas, or how these trees affect a city’s environment and the health and well-being of its inhabitants. Measuring the urban forest is one of the first steps toward understanding this resource and developing appropriate management plans. Understanding and quantifying the impact of urban trees is an important prerequisite to managing city vegetation for optimal beneficial effects.

The Urban Forest Effects (UFORE) computer model was developed to help managers and researchers quantify urban forest structure and its functions. Written in SAS, the program incorporates vegetation data and local hourly meteorological and pollution-concentration measurements to quantify city-specific vegetation structure and functions. The model currently has four modules: (1) UFORE-A: Anatomy of the Urban Forest, which quantifies urban forest structure (e.g., species composition, tree density, tree health, leaf area, leaf biomass); (2) UFORE-B: Biogenic Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Emissions, which quantifies hourly urban forest VOC emissions (emissions that contribute to ozone formation); (3) UFORE-C: Carbon Storage and Sequestration, which calculates total carbon stored and net carbon sequestered annually by urban trees; and (4) UFORE-D: Dry Deposition of Air Pollution, which quantifies hourly pollution removal by the urban forest and associated percent improvement in air quality. Pollution removal is calculated for ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter less than 10 microns. UFORE methods can be applied to areas of any size and to non-urban areas. Model results have been cross-checked and verified against test data sets and field measurements.

DATA REQUIREMENTS

Four types of data are needed to run all four UFORE modules: field, tree cover, meteorological, and pollution concentration data. Field data are collected within randomly located 0.04-ha plots throughout the study area, stratified by land-use type. Within each plot, data are collected on land use, ground and tree cover, shrub characteristics, and building features, as well as on individual-tree attributes of species, stem diameter at breast height (1.37 m), tree height, height to base of live crown, crown width, percent crown dieback, and distance and direction from buildings (to be used in a module under development: UFORE-E: Energy Effects on Buildings). Although tree cover measurements are made in the field, tree cover attributes often are also measured by sampling aerial photographs (Nowak et al. 1996).

Running the UFORE-B and D modules requires digital hourly meteorological data from the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) (U.S. Department of Commerce 1970). UFORE-D also requires hourly pollution-concentration data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS database).

UFORE-A: ANATOMY OF THE URBAN FOREST

UFORE-A uses field data to quantify forest structure of an entire urban area, individual land uses, and/or of individual tree species. It quantifies total or means as well as standard errors (Cochran 1977) of number of trees, species composition, tree density, dbh and condition-class distribution, leaf area, and leaf biomass. This module also calculates species richness, Shannon-Wiener diversity index values, population distribution by region of origin (e.g., percent native species), and ground-cover type distribution. The proportions of leaf area and live tree population in various susceptibility classes to gypsy moth feeding (Liebhold et al. 1995) also are calculated to reveal an urban forest’s susceptibility to gypsy moth defoliation.
Leaf area and leaf biomass of individual trees are calculated using regression equations for deciduous urban trees (Nowak 1996). For deciduous trees whose size is beyond the appropriate input range for the regression equation (typically less than 10 percent of the population), leaf area is estimated using extrapolations of calculated leaf-area indices (LAI) for similar trees. For trees that are too large, average LAI is calculated by the regression equation for the maximum allowable tree size based on the appropriate height-width ratio and shading coefficient class of the tree. This calculated LAI is applied to the ground area covered by the crown of the specific tree to calculate its leaf area. For trees with height-to-width ratios that are too large or too small, tree height or width is scaled downward or upward to allow the crown to reach the maximum (2) or minimum (0.5) height-to-width ratio; the appropriate LAI for the maximum or minimum ratio is used to determine total leaf area. Leaf area is then scaled proportionally to obtain the original crown volume.

For all conifer trees, average LAI per height-to-width class for deciduous trees with a shading coefficient of 0.91 is applied to the tree's ground area to calculate leaf area. The 0.91 shading coefficient class is believed to be the best class to represent conifers because conifer forest LAI typically is about 1.5 times greater than deciduous forest stands (Barbour et al. 1980). The average shading coefficient for deciduous trees is 0.83 (Nowak 1996); 1.5 times the 0.83 class LAI is equivalent to the 0.91 class LAI.

Tree leaf biomass is calculated by converting leaf-area estimates using species-specific measurements from the literature (see Nowak 1994a) of g leaf dry weight per m² of leaf area. Shrub leaf biomass is calculated as the product of the crown volume occupied by leaves (m³) as measured in the field and measured leaf biomass factors (g m⁻³) for individual species (e.g., Nowak 1991, Winer et al. 1983). Shrub leaf area is calculated by converting leaf biomass to leaf area based on measured species conversion ratios (m² g⁻¹). If there are no leaf biomass-to-area conversion factors or leaf biomass factors for an individual species, genera or hardwood/softwood averages are used. Estimates of leaf area and leaf biomass are adjusted downward based on percent crown dieback (tree condition).

Table 1.—Estimates of number of trees and tree density (trees ha⁻¹) for cities analyzed with the UFORE model. Estimates of percent tree cover are based on satellite images or sampling of aerial photographs. Data from Oakland, CA (Nowak, 1991) and Chicago, IL (Nowak, 1994a) were not analyzed with UFORE (SE = standard error).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of trees</th>
<th>Tree density</th>
<th>Tree cover (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>9.420,000</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>5.220,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>4.130,000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>2.600,000</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>2.110,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>1.590,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>1.180,000</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

na = not analyzed; base data for Atlanta from American Forests; base data for Baltimore from Grove (1996).
The amount of emissions depends on tree species, leaf biomass, air temperature, and other environmental factors. UFORE-B estimates the hourly emission of isoprene, monoterpenes, and other volatile organic compounds (OVOC's) by species for each land use and for the entire city. Species leaf biomass (from UFORE-A) is multiplied by genera-specific emission factors (e.g., Benjamin et al. 1996, Geron et al. 1994) to produce emission levels standardized to 30°C and PAR flux of 1000 μmol m⁻² s⁻¹ (full sunlight). If genera-specific information is not available, median emission values for the family or order are used. Standardized emissions are converted to actual emissions based on light and temperature correction factors (Geron et al. 1994) and local meteorological data.

**Urban Forest Influence on VOC Emissions**

The species composition and leaf biomass of urban trees directly affect VOC emissions. Model results of planting of additional low VOC-emitting genera have been shown to decrease ozone concentrations in the Los Angeles Basin (Taha 1996). Shifting from high VOC-emitting genera may be another strategy to help improve air quality. High-emitting genera (emissions >35 μg g⁻¹ leaf weight) include Liquidambar spp., Quercus spp., Platanus spp., Populus spp., Rhamnus spp., and Salix spp. The proportion of total tree leaf biomass in high-emitting genera was highest in New York (44.3 percent; 35,500 t leaf biomass in high-emitting genera), followed by Atlanta (29.7 percent; 27,900 t), Chicago (29.4 percent; 11,200 t), Baltimore (25.4 percent; 7,300 t); Boston (22.1 percent; 3,400 t), and Philadelphia (21.0 percent; 6,300 t). The three most dominant trees in New York (London planetree, northern red oak, and sweetgum) are high emitters and make up 35 percent of the city's total leaf biomass.

**UFORE-C: CARBON STORAGE AND SEQUESTRATION**

Carbon dioxide is a dominant greenhouse gas, and trees, through their growth process, sequester and store carbon (from carbon dioxide) in their tissue. Thus, trees are one potential means to help reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide. To calculate current carbon storage, biomass for each measured tree is calculated using allometric equations from the literature. If there is more than one equation, the mean of the biomass equation results is used. If there is no allometric equation for an individual species with a specific dbh and/or height, the average of results from appropriate equations of the same genera is used. If there are no genera equations, biomass is computed separately for each hardwood and conifer equation, and the average result from the hardwood or conifer group is used. For large trees (>97 cm dbh), volumetric equations from Hahn (1984) and specific gravity of wood are used to estimate biomass.

Biomass equations differ in what portion of tree biomass is calculated and in whether fresh or oven-dry weight is estimated. Equations that predict aboveground biomass are divided by 0.78 to convert to whole-tree biomass, as average belowground biomass of trees is approximately 22 percent of total tree biomass (see Nowak 1994b). Equations that compute fresh-weight biomass are multiplied by species- or genera-specific- conversion factors from the literature to yield dry-weight biomass. Open-grown, maintained trees tend to have less biomass than predicted by forest-derived biomass equations (Nowak 1994b). To adjust for this difference, biomass results for urban trees are multiplied by 0.8. No adjustment is made for trees found in more natural stand conditions (e.g., on vacant lands or in forest preserves). For dead and dying trees, leaf biomass is removed from the estimate of total tree biomass. Total tree and shrub dry-weight biomass is converted to total stored carbon by multiplying by 0.5 (e.g., Chow and Rolfe 1989).

**Urban Tree Growth and Carbon Sequestration**

To estimate the gross amount carbon sequestered annually, average diameter growth from the appropriate genera and diameter class is added to the existing tree diameter (year x) to estimate tree diameter in year x+1. For trees in forest stands, average dbh growth is estimated as 0.38 cm yr⁻¹ (Smith and Shifley 1984); for trees in a park-like structure (e.g., parks, cemeteries, golf courses), average dbh growth is 0.61 cm yr⁻¹ (de Vries 1987); for more open-grown trees, dbh and genera specific growth rates, which average about 0.87 cm yr⁻¹, are used based on Nowak (1994b). Average height growth is calculated with formulas from Fleming (1988) and the specific dbh growth factor used for the tree. Growth rates are adjusted based on tree condition. For trees in excellent to fair condition (0-25 percent crown dieback), growth rates are multiplied by 1 (no adjustment). For trees with greater than 25 percent crown dieback, growth rates are adjusted downward based on percent dieback associated with the condition class. Dead tree growth rates are multiplied by 0. The difference in estimates of carbon storage between year x and year x+1 is the gross amount of carbon sequestered annually.

**Carbon Storage and Sequestration in New York**

Trees in New York City store approximately 1.2 million metric tons of carbon. This carbon, which took years to store, is equivalent to the amount emitted from New York’s population in about 10 days based on average per capita carbon emissions (U.S. Dept. of Energy 1997). New York’s trees sequester an estimated 39,000 t C yr⁻¹.
However, based on estimated mortality and tree removals (given New York's tree-condition distribution), net sequestration is likely negative due to carbon emissions from decomposition of dead and/or removed trees. New York City land uses that contain the most carbon in trees are open space (44 percent of total carbon stored by trees in the city), one- to two-family residential (28 percent), and vacant land (19 percent). Tree species that currently store the most carbon in New York are London planetree (13.6 percent of the total carbon stored), northern red oak (12.8 percent), and pin oak (*Quercus palustris*; 9.7 percent). Through proper planting strategies, urban trees also can reduce atmospheric carbon by reducing energy use in buildings and consequent emission of carbon dioxide from fossil fuel-based power plants. This avoidance of carbon emissions from power plants could be four times greater than direct carbon storage over the life of a mature tree (Nowak 1993).

**UFORE-D: DRY DEPOSITION OF AIR POLLUTION**

This module calculates the hourly dry deposition (i.e., pollution removal during nonprecipitation periods) of ozone (O$_3$), sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), and carbon monoxide (CO), and daily deposition of particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM10) to tree canopies throughout the year. Pollutant flux (F) is calculated as the product of the deposition velocity ($V_d$) and the pollutant concentration (C):

$$F = V_d \times C$$

Deposition velocity is calculated as the inverse of the sum of the aerodynamic ($R_a$), quasi-laminar boundary layer ($R_b$), and canopy ($R_c$) resistances (Baldocchi *et al.* 1987):

$$V_d = \frac{1}{R_a + R_b + R_c}$$

Specific procedures used to calculate $R_a$ and $R_c$ are given in Nowak *et al.* (1997). In-leaf, hourly tree-canopy resistances for O$_3$, SO$_2$, and NO$_2$ are calculated based on a hybrid of big-leaf and multi-layer canopy deposition models (Baldocchi *et al.* 1987, Baldocchi 1988). Hourly inputs to calculate canopy resistance are photosynthetic active radiation (PAR; µE m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), air temperature ($K^o$), windspeed (m s$^{-1}$), $u_*$ (m s$^{-1}$), carbon dioxide concentration (set to 360 ppm), and absolute humidity (kg m$^{-3}$). Air temperature, windspeed, $u_*$, and absolute humidity are measured directly or calculated from measured hourly meteorological data. Total solar radiation is calculated based on the National Renewable Energy Laboratory Meteorological/Statistical Solar Radiation Model (METSTAT) with inputs from the NCDC data set (Maxwell 1994). PAR is calculated as 46 percent of total solar radiation input (Monteith and Unsworth 1990).

Because the removal of carbon monoxide and particulate matter by vegetation is not directly related to transpiration, $R_c$ for CO was set to a constant for in-leaf season (50,000 s m$^{-2}$) and leaf-off season (1,000,000 s m$^{-2}$) based on data from Bidwell and Fraser (1972). For particles, the deposition velocity (based on average $V_d$ from the literature) was set at 0.0064 m s$^{-1}$ for the in-leaf season and 0.0014 m s$^{-1}$ for the leaf-off season, both of which incorporate a 50 percent resuspension rate of particles back to the atmosphere (Zinke 1967).

The model uses an urban tree LAI of 6, bark area index of 1.7, and a distribution of 90 percent deciduous and 10 percent coniferous leaf surface area (Nowak 1994a, Whittaker and Woodwell 1967). Local leaf-on and leaf-off dates are input into the model so that deciduous-tree transpiration and related pollution deposition are limited to the in-leaf period, and seasonal variation in removal can be illustrated for each pollutant. To limit deposition estimates to periods of dry deposition, deposition velocities were set to zero during periods of precipitation.

Hourly pollution-concentration data for gaseous pollutants (ppm) and average daily concentrations of PM10 (µg m$^{-3}$) are obtained from local EPA monitors. Hourly ppm values are converted to µg m$^{-3}$ based on measured atmospheric temperature and pressure (Seinfeld 1986). Missing hourly meteorological or pollution-concentration data are estimated using the monthly average for the specific hour. In a few locations, an entire month of pollution-concentration data may be missing and are estimated based on interpolations from existing data. For example, ozone concentrations may not be measured during winter months and existing O$_3$ concentration data are extrapolated to missing months based on the average national O$_3$ concentration monthly pattern.

Average hourly pollutant flux (g m$^{-2}$ of tree-canopy coverage) among the pollutant monitor sites is multiplied by city tree-canopy coverage (m$^2$) to estimate total hourly pollutant removal by trees across the city. Bounds of total tree removal of O$_3$, NO$_2$, SO$_2$, and PM10 are estimated using the typical range of published in-leaf dry deposition velocities (Lovett 1994). Monetary value of pollution removal by trees is estimated using the median externality values for the United States for each pollutant. The externality values are: NO$_2$ = $6,750 t^{-1}$, PM10 = $4,500 t^{-1}$, SO$_2$ = $1,650 t^{-1}$, and CO = $950 t^{-1}$ (Murray *et al.* 1994). Externality values for O$_3$ were set to equal the value for NO$_2$.

To approximate boundary-layer heights in the study area, local daily morning and afternoon mixing heights are obtained and interpolated to produce hourly values using the EPA's PCRAMMIT program (U.S. EPA 1995). Minimum boundary-layer heights are set to 150 m during
the night and 250 m during the day based on estimated minimum boundary-layer heights in cities. Hourly mixing heights (m) are used in conjunction with pollution concentrations (μg m\(^{-2}\)) to calculate the amount of pollution within the mixing layer (μg m\(^{-2}\)). This extrapolation from ground-layer concentration to total pollution within the boundary layer assumes a well-mixed boundary layer, which is common during the daytime (unstable atmosphere) (e.g., Colbeck and Harrison 1985). The amount of pollution in the air is contrasted with the amount of pollution removed by trees to calculate the relative effect of trees in reducing local pollution concentrations:

\[ E = R (R+A) \]

where \( E \) = relative reduction effect (%); \( R \) = amount removed by trees (kg); \( A \) = amount of pollution in the atmosphere (kg).

**Air Pollution Removal by Urban Trees**

In 1994, trees in New York City removed an estimated 1,821 metric tons of air pollution at an estimated value to society of $9.5 million (table 2). Air pollution removal by urban forests in New York was greater than in Atlanta and Baltimore (table 2), but pollution removal per m\(^2\) of canopy cover was fairly similar among these cities (New York: 13.7 g m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\); Baltimore: 12.2 g m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\); Atlanta: 10.6 g m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)). These standardized pollution removal rates differ among cities according to the amount of air pollution, length of in-leaf season, precipitation, and other meteorological variables.

Air quality improvement in New York due to pollution removal by trees during daytime of the in-leaf season averaged 0.47 percent for PM\(_{10}\), 0.45 percent for O\(_3\), 0.43 percent for SO\(_2\), 0.30 percent for NO\(_2\), and 0.02 percent for CO. Air quality improves with increased percent tree cover and decreased boundary-layer heights. In urban areas with 100 percent tree cover (i.e., contiguous forest stands), short-term improvements in air quality (one hour) from pollution removal by trees were as high as 15 percent for O\(_3\), 14 percent for SO\(_2\), 13 percent for PM\(_{10}\), 8 percent for NO\(_2\), and 0.05 percent for CO.

**CONCLUSION**

**Table 2.—Total estimated pollution removal (metric tons) by trees during nonprecipitation periods (dry deposition) and associated monetary value (thousand dollars) for New York (800 km\(^2\)), Atlanta (341 km\(^2\)), and Baltimore (209 km\(^2\)) in 1994.**

Estimates are for ozone (O\(_3\)), particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM\(_{10}\)), nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)), sulfur dioxide (SO\(_2\)), and carbon monoxide (CO). Numbers in parentheses represent expected range of values (no range determined for CO). Monetary value of pollution removal by trees was estimated using the median externality values for United States for each pollutant (Murray et al. 1994). Externality values for O\(_3\) were set to equal the value for NO\(_2\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>New York, NY</th>
<th></th>
<th>Atlanta, GA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Baltimore, MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removal</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Removal</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O(_3)</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>514(^1)</td>
<td>3,471(^1)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(_{10})</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>(101-604)</td>
<td>(684-4,081)</td>
<td>(42-221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO(_2)</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO(_2)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>(72-165)</td>
<td>(483-1,115)</td>
<td>(48-134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,7821</td>
<td>9,465</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Average national O\(_3\) monthly trend data were used to estimate missing data for January, February, and December.

\(^2\) Assumes 50 percent resuspension of particles.
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