

Kingsbury Urban Forest Summary



The Chicago Region Trees Initiative (CRTI) goal is that, by 2050, the Chicago Region will support and host

a healthier urban forest, comprised of a diversity of tree species and ages, appropriately distributed across land use types in the region. The forest will provide the region improved environmental, economic, and social benefits. In order to achieve that goal CRTI works with a wide variety of people who work with and manage trees. This document is intended to help municipalities understand their urban forest, and identify strategies that they can use to make it better.

The *urban forest* is comprised of all of the trees in an urban setting, regardless of who owns or manages them. It is made up of street trees, forested natural areas and even the trees in resident's back yards. These trees are all included in the urban forest, because they all provide benefits that municipalities depend on. They improve air and water quality, reduce flooding and the urban heat island effect, and reduce energy use by shading buildings. Trees provide habitat for wildlife and improve residents' quality of life by reducing crime rates, increasing property value and boosting social cohesion in neighborhoods.

The magnitude of benefits that trees provide correlates with the size, structure and location of their canopy. Understanding the extent of tree canopy is critical for urban planning. Canopy maps can be used to quantify the benefits that their trees provide, identify where new plantings would have the greatest impact and to develop priorities and strategies for expanding the canopy.



Fig. 1: Comparison of satellite image and land cover map. Seven types of gray and green infrastructure are in the land cover map.

The Chicago Region Trees Initiative, USDA Forest Service, American Forests, and the University of Vermont mapped land cover across the seven-county Chicago Region. This project not only identifies tree canopy, but also other green infrastructure including vegetation under 10 feet tall, bare soil and water; and gray infrastructure including buildings, roads and rail and other paved surfaces like sidewalks and parking lots (Fig. 1). Here after, these seven layers will be referred to as *land cover types*.

Kingsbury Urban Forest Summary





Fig 2: LaPorte County's current land cover (A), including 20% canopy cover. An additional 75% of the county is suitable for planting (B). Kingsbury currently has 15% canopy cover (C), and 82% of the land cover could potentially be converted to canopy (D).

Overall, 20% of LaPorte County is covered by tree canopy (Fig. 2). There is a lot of room for growth across the county. We can identify spaces where trees could potentially be planted by adding together the vegetation, bare soil and other paved surface land cover types, as these land cover types could be converted to canopy with minimal effort. In all, these land cover types make up 75% of the county's area, meaning that canopy cover could potentially be raised to 95% if all of these surfaces were converted to trees. It is important to note, that while these surfaces could theoretically be covered with canopy, it is not necessarily preferable. Agricultural fields and baseball diamonds are included as "plantable space," but few would agree that these are ideal sites to expand the forest canopy.

These land cover data can also describe canopy at the municipal scale. Kingsbury currently has 6% canopy cover, and could potentially increase their canopy to 96% (Fig. 2).


Kingsbury Urban Forest Summary



Canopy cover is not distributed evenly across the region, nor within municipalities. To better understand how land cover patterns vary, we can compare them across land use types, like residential, commercial or industrial properties. In Kingsbury, the highest percentage of canopy is found in residential and vacant properties (Fig. 3). Agriculture and commercial properties have the lowest canopy cover. See Table 1 at the end of this report for more details.

Fig 3: Variations in land cover across land use types.

Kingsbury Urban Forest Summary



By combining vegetation, bare soil and other paved surface categories we can identify which land use types have the most room for growth. In Kingsbury, the highest proportions of plantable space are found in agriculture and commercial properties (Fig. 4).

Fig 4: Current canopy and possible planting space across land use types.

Kingsbury Urban Forest Summary




Fig 5: The majority of land is agriculture land use.

While commercial properties have an abundance of plantable spaces, they make up a relatively small area in Kingsbury (Fig. 5). The majority of land is the agricultural land use type.

Kingsbury Urban Forest Summary




Fig 6: Agriculture has the greatest potential for increasing the canopy, followed by low density residential properties.

Residential and agricultural properties have the most area that could possibly be converted to canopy (Fig. 6). Targeting these areas could have the greatest impact in expanding the canopy. However, each of these land use types will require different strategies to increase canopy. Residential property owners could be encouraged to plant more trees through tree giveaways, ordinances that encourage tree preservation, or stormwater tax breaks for properties that have more tree canopy. Trees on agricultural properties can help preserve soil and prevent run off, and can be encouraged through conservation reserve programs (CRP).

Table 1: Summary of land cover across land use types.

	Tree canopy		Vegetation		Bare soil		Water		Buildings		Roads and rail		Other paved	
	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent
Agriculture	41.4	9.5%	386.2	88.3%	0.0	0.0%	1.0	0.2%	1.6	0.4%	1.4	0.3%	5.8	1.3%
Commercial	4.7	13.9%	10.5	30.9%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	3.7	10.9%	0.1	0.2%	14.9	44.1%
Low Density Res	35.2	27.4%	75.3	58.6%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	9.3	7.2%	0.1	0.1%	8.7	6.8%
Medium Density Res	0.8	35.5%	0.1	6.8%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.4%	1.1	51.3%	0.1	6.0%
Vacant	13.4	35.1%	18.2	47.7%	0.0	0.0%	0.2	0.4%	1.4	3.6%	2.7	7.2%	2.3	6.0%
Total abundance	95.4	14.9%	490.3	76.6%	0.0	0.0%	1.1	0.2%	16.0	2.5%	5.4	0.8%	31.8	5.0%