

# Trees in cool climate cities may increase atmospheric carbon by altering building energy use

Tedward Erker<sup>\*</sup>, Philip A. Townsend

June 23, 2019

1

---

2

## 3 **Abstract**

4 Urban trees are a critical part of the "green infrastructure" intended to make our growing  
5 cities more sustainable in an era of climate change. The potential for urban trees to modify  
6 microclimates and thereby reduce building energy use and the associated carbon emissions  
7 is a commonly cited ecosystem service used to justify million tree planting campaigns across  
8 the US. However, what we know of this ecosystem service comes primarily from unvalidated  
9 simulation studies.

10 Using the first dataset of actual heating and cooling energy use combined with tree cover  
11 data, we show that that contrary to the predictions of the most commonly used simulations,  
12 trees in a cool climate city increase carbon emissions from residential building energy use.  
13 This is driven primarily by near east ( $< 20\text{m}$  from building) tree cover. Further analysis  
14 of urban areas in the US shows that this is likely the case in cool climates throughout the  
15 country, encompassing approximately 39% of the US population and 62% of its area (56%,

16 excluding Alaska). Our work adds geographic nuance to the understanding of how urban  
17 shade trees affect the carbon budget, and it could have major implications for tree planting  
18 programs in cool climates.

## 19 Introduction

20 Two global trends of the 21st century, climate change and increasing urbanization, have  
21 deepened our need to make cities more sustainable. Urban trees are often championed as  
22 a means to that end. Several large cities in the U.S. have recently committed to large  
23 tree planting programs (see Million Trees New York City and Million Trees Los Angeles).  
24 Spending hundreds of millions of dollars, these cities hope that the environmental benefits,  
25 particularly the reduction in building energy use and the associated carbon (**C**) emissions  
26 from power plants, will outweigh the cost (Young, 2011).

27 A single urban tree has a much stronger impact on the carbon cycle than a non-urban  
28 counterpart because an urban tree induces or reduces more C emitting human behaviors than  
29 a rural one does. Both trees sequester C from the atmosphere, but the urban tree requires  
30 more management (planting, watering, pruning, removal, chipping) and, by modifying the  
31 microclimate, it can alter building energy use and the associated C emissions (**ACE**) from  
32 power plants.

33 Trees primarily alter microclimates by 1) shading, 2) reducing wind speed, and 3) cool-  
34 ing via transpiration. With the exception of transpirative cooling, which is mostly active  
35 in summer, these effects can both increase or decrease ACE. Shading to the west of build-  
36 ings greatly reduces summer cooling loads, but shading to the south of buildings, even by  
37 deciduous trees, may increase winter heating loads (Heisler, 1986). Reduced wind speeds  
38 have complex effects. They: 1) decrease convective heat loss, which is beneficial for winter  
39 heating but detrimental for summer cooling, 2) decrease air infiltration which decreases both  
40 heating and cooling energy use, and 3) decrease natural ventilation, increasing the need for  
41 mechanical cooling (Huang et al., 1990). The strength of the effect of a tree on ACE attenu-  
42 ates with distance to a building. Trees far from a house have little affect on ACE via shading  
43 and wind reduction, but they likely affect ACE via evapotranspiration and the associated  
44 reduction in temperature Ziter et al. (2019).

45 Whether the net effect of trees is to increase or decrease ACE depends on the balance of

beneficial and detrimental effects on heating and cooling energy use. This is largely mediated by the location of tree cover, the prevailing climate (e.g. number of heating- and cooling-degree days), building characteristics (orientation, insulation, size and surface area, etc.), occupant behavior and the C content of a kWh, which varies depending on the fuel mix in the electrical grid.

Our current understanding of how trees affect building energy use and ACE suggests that there are contexts in which trees may increase ACE. But despite this potentially detrimental effect of trees, it is often not mentioned in the literature. In an extensive review of the effect of the urban forest on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Weissert et al. (2014) did not consider that trees could increase ACE. In a paper critical of many ecosystem services provided by trees, Pataki et al. (2011) nevertheless state that trees reduce energy use and ACE. Our work here builds on past simulation studies and uses empirical energy use data from a city to demonstrate that trees may actually increase ACE in cool climate cities.

## Previous research

Decades worth of research primarily by two research groups, the US Forest Service (USFS) and the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab Heat Island Group (LBNL), have reported that, on average, trees reduce C emissions. In 2002, Akbari published a paper summarizing their group's findings: "Shade trees reduce building energy use and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from power plants". In 1999, McPherson and Simpson wrote a technical report that was the basis of the iTree software, which has been used by thousands of communities around the U.S. to estimate ACE avoided. Their methodology was recently applied to estimate the effects of trees on ACE for the entire conterminous US (Nowak et al., 2017). Despite the number of publications on the topic, the length of time we have been researching the matter, and the many large cities with massive tree planting initiatives, our uncertainty about the effects of trees on building energy use is actually quite high (Pataki et al., 2006; McPherson and

71 Simpson, 1999). The effect of trees on nearby building energy use is difficult and expensive  
72 to measure directly and complex to model.

73 Direct measures of the effect of trees on building energy use are rare, focused on cooling  
74 energy use, and limited in their ability to be extrapolated. To our knowledge, there are the  
75 only 5 studies that test the effect of trees on measured building energy use data (Akbari  
76 et al., 1997; Donovan and Butry, 2009; DeWalle et al., 1983; Parker, 1983; McPherson et al.,  
77 1989). Only two of these studies were of actual houses (not mobile homes nor models) and  
78 both are from Sacramento, CA and did not measure heating energy use (Akbari et al., 1997;  
79 Donovan and Butry, 2009). Only one of the studies was from a cool, heating dominated  
80 climate (typical of much of the US) and it studied a single mobile home in a forest (DeWalle  
81 et al., 1983).

82 Given the challenges inherent in collecting direct measurements, simulation studies are  
83 useful attempts to extend our understanding of how trees affect building energy use and  
84 ACE. But these simulations necessarily contain simplifications and generalizations which are  
85 sometimes unrealistic or untestable due to lack of data.

86 The work from LBNL assumes: millions more trees are planted in an urban area (ex-  
87 tremely ambitious); trees are planted to the west and south of buildings (ideal placement for  
88 reducing cooling loads); and winter tree canopy transmissivity is 0.9 (0.7 is more realistic,  
89 Heisler, 1986). In later work, microclimate wind effects are ignored (Akbari and Konopacki,  
90 2005), and in earlier work, they use a three parameter equation fit to four data points to  
91 estimate how wind speed is reduced by canopy cover (Heisler, 1990; Huang et al., 1990). Fi-  
92 nally, the LBNL work uses potential evapotranspiration to predict cooling, and their model  
93 uses parameters derived from crops. Given these assumptions, the authors note that their  
94 work provides an upper boundary for the indirect effect of trees (Akbari and Konopacki,  
95 2005; Huang et al., 1987).

96 USFS studies assume: lookup tables for the effect of tree shade on building energy use  
97 are reliable (even though they may deviate from more detailed simulations by up to 10%,

98 Simpson, 2002); wind reduction only affects heating use in the winter, even though we know  
99 cooling use is also affected, and they also use an overfit summertime leaf-on equation from  
100 Heisler (1990). Evergreen trees are modeled as if they are windbreaks for rural farmhouses  
101 in winter, even in suburban neighborhoods where other buildings and trees already block  
102 significant winds; and estimated evapotranspirative cooling is optimistically high, higher  
103 even than the self declared upper limit of Huang et al. (1987) (McPherson and Simpson,  
104 1999).

105 The consequence of these assumptions is that simulations may overestimate the energy  
106 reducing power of trees. What little validation we have has confirmed the general effects  
107 of trees on energy use that we expect in hot climates, but also highlight the imprecision  
108 of simulations as well as occasional discrepancies from empirical observations. Simulations  
109 of Akbari et al. (1997) were off by 2-fold, though trees were about twice as beneficial as  
110 predicted for the two houses studied. Donovan and Butry (2009) found trees to the north  
111 actually increasing electricity use, unlike the predictions of McPherson and Simpson (1999).

112 Despite providing estimates for the effects of trees on building energy use and ACE for  
113 anywhere in the country (Akbari and Konopacki, 2005) and the entire country (Nowak et al.,  
114 2017), we still have no empirical validation of the effect of urban trees in a cool climate. More  
115 than 3 out of every 4 people in the U.S. live in places with more heating degree days than  
116 cooling degree days, and Americans use much more energy for heating than for cooling (U.S.  
117 Department of Energy, 2009). To properly assess simulations of the role of urban trees  
118 in the C budget, comprehensive analyses are needed to test the relationship between tree  
119 location and energy usage (both heating and cooling). Our work in Madison, WI was the  
120 first to begin address this need. In 2016, we downloaded average annual energy use data  
121 for approximately 32 thousand single family residential homes and built a regression model  
122 between the amount of tree cover near each house and the C produced from electricity and  
123 natural gas use, controlling for other factors such as building characteristics.



Figure 1: Simulated shadows of trees on a house at the latitude of Madison, WI. In the summer, trees to the west of buildings provide the most effective shade since solar angles are lower and cooling demand highest in the afternoon. In winter, even deciduous trees can significantly reduce solar gain.

# Results

## Effect of trees on building associated C emissions

Trees increased C emissions associated with residential building energy use (**ACE**) in Madison, WI. This effect was the result of a trade-off between their electricity (cooling) saving and gas (heating) penalty. We estimated that 100m<sup>2</sup> of tree cover within 20m of a house increased ACE from gas use by 0.77% (95% CI: 0.68%, 0.85%), and decreased ACE from electricity use by 0.21% (95% CI: 0.34%, 0.080%). Our model for net ACE estimated that 100m<sup>2</sup> of tree cover increased ACE by 0.17% (95% CI: .09%, .27%).

The magnitude and direction of the effect depended on tree location relative to the building. Figure 2 shows the percent change in the ACE from 100m<sup>2</sup> of tree cover. Trees reduced ACE from electricity for all near regions except the east. Trees increased ACE from gas for all regions, especially in the near south and east. For net ACE, tree cover in the near east was the most important, having the only estimate with a 95% CI that excluded 0.




Figure 2: The percent effect of 100m<sup>2</sup> tree cover in different locations on C emissions from residential building energy use. n = 25095, bars indicate standard errors.



## 137 Effect of existing tree cover on a typical house

138 The median house in our sample was responsible for 1084 and 954 kg C annual emissions  
 139 due to electricity use and gas use, respectively. Multiplying the median tree cover in each  
 140 region (see table 1) by its coefficient we estimated the effects of typical tree cover on a typical  
 141 house in Madison: electricity C emissions were reduced by 33.8 kg C / yr (95% CI: 14.7,  
 142 52.7), but gas C emissions were increased by 102.3 kg C / year (95% CI: 92.9, 111.8). Our  
 143 combined model estimated the net effect of existing tree cover is to increase C emissions by  
 144 about 62 kg C/year (95% CI: 38.7, 85.3) for a typical house. This is 2.5% of the median  
 145 house's annual ACE.

Table 1: Summary statistics for amount of tree cover ( $\text{m}^2$ ) in each region around houses in Madison, WI.

| Region     | min | mean | median | max  |
|------------|-----|------|--------|------|
| near west  | 0   | 193  | 179    | 742  |
| near south | 0   | 372  | 363    | 1443 |
| near north | 0   | 357  | 345    | 1197 |
| near east  | 0   | 193  | 179    | 764  |
| far west   | 0   | 974  | 960    | 2640 |
| far south  | 0   | 1676 | 1653   | 4376 |
| far north  | 0   | 1673 | 1661   | 4602 |
| far east   | 0   | 967  | 955    | 2677 |

146 While tree cover in far regions had smaller per unit area effects than in near regions,  
 147 there was more tree cover in farther regions, so when median tree cover was multiplied by  
 148 the smaller coefficients some of the farther regions had larger typical effects than near ones  
 149 (figure 3). Typical tree cover in the far east and far west regions had a greater estimated  
 150 effect than cover in the near north and near west.




Figure 3: Effect of typical tree cover on a typical building's C emissions.

## Comparing C emissions from energy use due to trees to C stored and sequestered.

For comparison, consider a green ash tree with a crown area of 100m<sup>2</sup>. This tree would store approximately 1360 kg C in above ground biomass and it could sequester around 34 kg C / year. That same tree in the near east region of a typical house in Madison was estimated to increase C emissions by 9.8 kg C/yr (95% CI: 6.7, 12.9). In the near west the estimated effect was 1.0 kg C/yr (95% CI: -2.1, 4.1). The the transfer of carbon from atmosphere to the biosphere is an order of magnitude larger than the transfer from the lithosphere to atmosphere.

## Discussion

### Interpreting Tree Effects

In the cool climate city of Madison, with 7283 HDD and 597 CDD and a electricity emission factor of 0.206 kg C / kwh, the effect of trees on ACE was clear: trees increased ACE from gas use more than they decreased ACE from electricity use, resulting in a net increase in ACE.

In simulation studies, if shade were the only effect on ACE (winter wind speed reduction was not included) trees in cool climate cities would cause an increase in ACE. Since we found an increase in ACE with increased tree cover

This result suggests that shading was the most important process and that whatever gas savings trees may have provided in winter by reducing wind speeds was swamped by the penalty in reduced solar radiation.

By separating tree cover into different locations, it appeared that for the most regions, the beneficial effects of trees on electricity ACE *mostly* canceled out the detrimental effects of trees on gas ACE, with the exception of the near east. This suggests that trees to the

175 east may have been responsible for most of the net increase in ACE. Eastern trees did not  
176 provide electricity savings since houses require less cooling in the morning hours, but still  
177 caused an increased gas use in winter. This agrees with Donovan and Butry (2009) who also  
178 found trees to the east had no effect on electricity use.

179 As expected, trees to the near south had a strong effect on electricity savings, but they  
180 also had a stronger gas penalty. Trees in the near west and near north had the weakest gas  
181 penalty, which may have been due to the savings they provided by reducing wind speed.  
182 Somewhat surprising was the weakness of the estimated electricity savings of trees in the  
183 near west, which all simulations have predicted has the strongest effect.

184 Trees to the north and gas use..... doesn't make much sense, and could be wrong.  
185 But consider that over buildings is included, so there is some shading. it's north of the  
186 building's centroid. transpiration possible effect? there are leaves on trees for part of the  
187 heating season and there are some evergreen trees that can transpire for much of year.

188 More here a la reviewer 3

## 189 **Comparing to past work**

190 Our findings agreed with some though not all of the past simulation studies, and the modeling  
191 of wind is the main cause of discrepancies. Thayer Jr and Maeda (1985) modeled the shading  
192 effects of south trees on building energy use and reported that trees increased emissions in  
193 cities with more heating degree days than cooling degree days. McPherson et al. (1988)  
194 investigated the shading and wind effects on building energy use in 4 cities, one of which  
195 was Madison, WI. Converting their results into C, trees in Madison caused a small increase  
196 in emissions, though their method for modeling wind was later criticized and abandoned  
197 (Simpson and McPherson, 1998). Akbari and Konopacki (2005) developed a method to  
198 predict the effect of a tree planting program and increasing roof albedo for any city in  
199 the U.S. Figure 4 illustrates an application of their method to every census tract in the  
200 conterminous US for pre-1980s houses using updated energy emission factors. Clearly climate

201 largely drives the relationship between ACE and trees at large scales, but there is significant  
 202 regional variation due to differences in electricity C emission factors. For example, despite  
 203 its cool climate, trees in Chicago reduce ACE because the electricity reduction benefit is  
 204 larger with more C per kwh.

205 while  
 206 across the rust

207 About 40% of the US population live in areas where the Akbari and Konopacki (2005)  
 208 model predicts that trees increase C emissions. While their methods were limited as men-  
 209 tioned above, and they modeled theoretical, not existing, tree cover, their work suggests that  
 210 many large cities especially in New England, the Northwest, the Mountains and the Upper  
 211 Midwest would need to carefully consider the C implications of large tree planting programs.

212 the 2002 paper "Shade trees reduce building energy use and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from power  
 213 plants"

214 this is on average  
 215 it seems the nuance is known that it could exist

216 Our empirical findings disagree with those simulation studies that model the relationship  
 217 between tree cover and wind speed following Heisler (1990) and McPherson and Simpson  
 218 (1999). When the beneficial effects of wind are excluded for models of several cool climate  
 219 cities: Toronto (Akbari and Taha, 1992), Chicago (Jo and McPherson, 2001), Minneapolis,  
 220 Sacramento, and Washington (Huang et al., 1990), trees either have no effect or increase  
 221 energy use and ACE, which agrees with our general findings. The iTree model which uses  
 222 the methods of McPherson and Simpson (1999) predicts that the shading effects of a large  
 223 deciduous tree in the Northern Tier, North Central, Mountains, Pacific Northwest, and  
 224 California Coast regions increases ACE of a 1950-1980 vintage house by 0.136 to 9.52 kg,  
 225 depending on the region. This is comparable to our results. However, the wind effect in the  
 226 iTree model of that same tree on the same house decreases heating ACE by 1.23 to 66.14 kg  
 227 depending on the region and existing canopy: an order of magnitude greater savings for gas




Figure 4: Each census tract in the conterminous US shaded by magnitude of building C emissions effect of trees planted to west and south of a pre-1980's home and increasing roof albedo. Differences in regional emission factors (C/kWh) cause deviations from climate trend. New England has especially high ACE for the climate because their electricity is cleaner (low C/kWh). About 40% of Americans live in places where trees increase ACE. Model based on Akbari and Konopacki (2005).

228 ACE from wind reduction than the penalty from shading. Given that our model coefficients  
229 show that trees increases ACE, it suggests that shading is a more important process than  
230 wind speed reduction. In other words, our results agree with the shading but not wind  
231 reduction effects proposed by others, and therefore may suggest that shading is being more  
232 accurately modeled than wind in existing simulations. McPherson and Simpson (1999) note  
233 that the uncertainty in their methods was high, and, given our contradictory findings, it is  
234 clear that more data and improved models are needed to better parameterize the complex  
235 and uncertain relationship between tree cover, wind, and building energy use.

## 236 **Considering the larger C cycle**

237 The effect on ACE of a tree with a 100 m<sup>2</sup> canopy area is an order of magnitude smaller  
238 than that tree's C sequestration. However, it is important to make the distinction between  
239 different pools of C. Discounting increased ACE as irrelevant because C sequestration more  
240 than compensates, fails to recognize that ACE is an input of fossilized C while sequestration is  
241 a temporary transfer of C from the atmosphere to biosphere. In the short term, sequestration  
242 may assist in climate change mitigation, but unless forested land is permanently expanded  
243 or wood products are forever prevented from decay, in the long run (hundreds of years)  
244 sequestration by trees can never offset fossil C emissions. Indeed this same conclusion was  
245 made for fossilized C emissions due to tree management (Nowak et al., 2002). The avoided  
246 ACE from trees had been estimated to more than offset these management emissions in  
247 a life-cycle analysis of the Million Trees Los Angeles program (McPherson and Kendall,  
248 2014). However, our results suggest that for cool climate communities, shade trees actually  
249 increase ACE and, especially when combined with the C emissions from management, are  
250 atmospheric C sources in the long term.

## 251 **Trees relative to other factors that affect ACE and the ACE effect** 252 **of trees relative to other ecosystem services/disservices.**

253 Considering all of the factors that determine building energy use and ACE, trees play a  
254 very minor role, which we estimated to be about 2.5% of the ACE of a median house. As  
255 buildings become better built and insulated the effect of trees on ACE will decrease. Far  
256 greater ACE savings are possible with improved construction and savvy occupant behavior.  
257 However, the effect of trees on energy use and ACE is one of the most often cited ecosystem  
258 services of trees (Roy et al., 2012), and evidence that ACE is increased by trees highlights  
259 the large uncertainty in software used by thousands of communities to justify urban forest  
260 costs.

261 Still, effects on ACE are just one of the ecosystem effects that trees have in cities. Trees  
262 may also improve air quality, reduce stormwater runoff, reduce noise, and provide wildlife  
263 habitat. The aesthetic value of trees is often far greater than the value of the ecosystem  
264 services or disservices provided (McPherson et al., 2005). Even after publishing that trees  
265 reduced ACE on average, Akbari (2002) noted that this benefit alone may not justify the  
266 cost of tree planting. Our opposing results have a similar caveat: even after finding the  
267 detrimental impacts of trees on ACE in cool climates, management decisions need to consider  
268 these results as just one of the many benefits and costs of trees. Our results suggest that  
269 trees planted on all but the near east side of a house are net neutral in terms of ACE, so  
270 that the other benefits of tree planting, such as aesthetics, could be accomplished in cool  
271 climates through careful selection of planting locations.

## 272 **Future work**

273 Using actual energy use data from over 25,000 houses, we provide a much needed complement  
274 to simulation models of tree effects on ACE in cool climates. However, there is need for  
275 continuing work to address remaining shortcomings. The observational nature of our data is



strengthened by the size of the dataset, but ultimately causal inference depends on our physical knowledge of how trees alter building energy use. Not all coefficients in our model agree with our existing physical understanding of how trees affect building energy use. For example, it is surprising that trees to the near west have such a weak effect on electricity use and that trees to the north increase gas use. While the overall association between greater tree cover and greater ACE in Madison is clear from our work, how that relationship changes with distance and direction is less clear. Our work is an important complement to simulation studies and highlights the need for more experimental studies especially in cool climate cities.

Our data on tree cover was also limited by a lack of information about tree height, which means we could not address how adjusting the size of trees planted in an urban area affects ACE. Incorporating lidar could provide more accurate estimates of tree shading and wind reduction. Furthermore, the scale of the effects that our study could detect is much smaller than the city-wide effects many simulation studies address. Ultimately, this work is a sample of one year from one city with the accompanying limitations. The warm December during the sampling period may mean the effect of trees is even more detrimental than we report, but more years are needed to say. The location of Madison near the boundary that Akbari and Konopacki (2005) identified between trees being a sink and a source is useful, but more cities are needed to empirically determine this boundary.

Our work reveals a blind spot in urban forest ecosystem studies. In an extensive review of the effect of the urban forest on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Weissert et al. (2014) did not consider that trees could increase ACE. In a paper critical of many ecosystem services provided by trees, Pataki et al. (2011) nevertheless state that trees reduce energy use and ACE. While this may be true in most of the US, and the potential ACE reduction is larger than the potential ACE increase, it ignores geographical nuance (Akbari and Konopacki, 2005). In many ways it is not surprising, given the climatic diversity across the country, that the effects of trees on ACE might also vary and that our prescriptions for how to plant trees to minimize ACE could be different between Los Angeles and New York City. However our study is only the

303 first study to use both gas and electric energy use observations, and the first study of its  
304 kind in a cool climate. Much more work with observed energy use is needed to identify the  
305 border between atmospheric C sink and source. Planners and designers should

## 306 **Conclusion**

307 Using observed energy use data, we have shown that trees near residential houses in Madison,  
308 WI increase energy use and associated C emissions and near east tree cover has the strongest  
309 net effect. Extending past simulation studies, we show that this is likely the case for a large  
310 area of the US. The magnitude and direction of the effect is dependent on tree location  
311 relative to buildings, climate, building characteristics, occupant behavior, and the C content  
312 of electricity. Disagreements between our results and past work may be due to how wind  
313 effects are modeled and much more work is needed to better understand this process. We add  
314 critical geographic nuance to research that could have major implications for tree planting  
315 programs in cool climates.

316 Add that I don't necessarily invalidate other studies (a la reviewer 3)

## 317 **Methods**

### 318 **Building Energy Use**

319 In April 2016, we obtained the annual energy use summary table (April 2015 - April 2016)  
320 from Madison Gas and Electric's publicly available website for approximately 32 thousand  
321 single family residential houses in Madison, WI. This included average monthly gas and  
322 electricity use. This period exhibited a much warmer than average December (about 6° C)  
323 and had low snowfall. We removed from our sample outliers that used fewer than 120 therms  
324 (which is less than the 0.5% quantile) or fewer than 240 kWh (which is less than the 0.05%  
325 quantile) annually. We included only buildings that used natural gas for heating and had

central air conditioning. Our final sample size used to build models was 25095.

## **Carbon Emissions**

We converted energy use to C emissions using emission factors published by the US EPA's Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database, eGRID (Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database, 2016). 100% of the carbon in natural gas is oxidized to CO<sub>2</sub> when burned for heating. The carbon coefficient for natural gas is 1.446 kg C / therm (United State Environmental Protection Agency, 2017). For electricity, Madison, WI is a part of the Midwest Reliability Organization East (MROE) region of the North American electric grid. The estimated carbon coefficient for power generated in this region is 0.2063698 kg C/kWh (Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database, 2016). We had originally used emission factor for MROE from 2012 (.1567988 kg C / kWh) and by switching to the updated and higher 2016 emission factor (0.2063698 kg C/kWh), the overall detrimental effects of trees on ACE was diminished from about 3.4% to 2.5%.

## **Building Characteristics**

Energy use is strongly determined by building characteristics. For every address in the city, the City of Madison releases the assessor's property information, which includes information on building age, size, materials, type of heating and cooling, as well as which schools serve the address. We removed any houses that had bad or missing data. Many of the covariates, such as size and price, were strongly correlated. Given that our primary interest was how tree cover affected building energy use, not how building characteristics affect building energy use, we reduced the dimensionality of building characteristics using principal components analysis. This reduced the number of building covariates from 20 (Lot area, length of water frontage, year built, number of stories, number of bedrooms, number of bathrooms (full and half), number of fireplaces, living area on each floor, finished attic area, finished basement area, total basement area, crawl space area, year roof was replaced, number of stalls in each

garage, land value, improvement value) to 5 orthogonal vectors, accounting for 55% of the variance.

## **Tree Canopy**

For tree cover we used a 1m resolution landcover map derived from 2013 National Agriculture Inventory Program (NAIP) visible and near-infrared digital aerial imagery with an accuracy of 85% (Erker et al., 2018). Using building footprints from the Dane county, for each house for which we had energy use data, we divided the space around it into 8 regions defined by 2 buffers around the house of distance 20 m and 60m and 4 rays from the building's centroid. Tree cover closer than 20m was considered near, tree cover farther than 20m and closer than 60m was considered far. These buffers were subdivided into north, west, south, and east regions by rays of angles 57, 123, 237, 303 degrees from north. These angles are within 1 degree of the azimuth angle of sunrise and sunset at the two solstices. This defines the south region as the region that is exposed to direct sunlight year-round, and the north region as the region that is never exposed to direct sunlight (this relationship is approximate and complicated by individual building geometry). Within each of the eight regions we summed the area covered by trees, and then use the tree cover in each region as predictors in our models.

We tested buffers of different widths (every 3m from 3m to 60m), but found because of the observational nature of our data that we needed to aggregate regions to remove multicollinearity that caused unstable coefficient estimates. Using a distance of 18, 21, or 24 m instead of 20m to separate "near" from "far" cover only slightly changed coefficient estimates. By fitting a model with all tree cover close to a house aggregated into one variable and then a model with the tree cover separated into 8 variables defined by distance and direction we tested the overall association of ACE with tree cover and then tested for specific associations by distance and direction.

## 376 Building Cover

377 Nearby buildings likely also affect the energy use of a building. To test this hypothesis  
378 we calculated the area of buildings in each of the eight regions around every building and  
379 included these as covariates in our modeling. We used building footprints from Dane County  
380 which consists of structures the size of a single car garage or larger. The horizontal accuracy  
381 is +/- 6.6 feet for well-defined points, at a ninety percent confidence level.

## 382 Modeling

383 We fit linear models where the response was log transformed annual ACE for gas use, for  
384 electricity use, or for gas and electricity combined (net). Because a separate model was  
385 built to explain net C emissions, coefficient estimates for the net model were not precisely  
386 the sum of the coefficients from the electricity and gas models. ACE was log transformed  
387 to meet assumptions of normality and diagnostic plots were assessed to check other model  
388 assumptions and potential sensitivity to influential observations. Our first models aggregated  
389 all tree cover near buildings into one variable, and subsequent models separated tree cover  
390 based on direction and distance into eight variables. In addition to tree cover, variables in  
391 our model were: 5 principal components of building characteristics, building cover in each of  
392 the 8 regions, and a random effect for elementary school which might capture neighborhood  
393 characteristics such as culture. We used AIC as a variable selection criterion and in our final  
394 models only used the first 5 building characteristics principal components and we dropped all  
395 the building cover covariates. Estimates for the coefficients of tree cover were not sensitive  
396 to the inclusion or removal of these covariates, but model fit improved. Although some tree  
397 cover covariates increased AIC, we kept all tree cover covariates in the model because we  
398 wanted estimates of their effects, however uncertain they might be. We also fit models We  
399 fit models using the R package lme4 (Bates et al., 2015).

## 400 **Interpreting coefficients**

401 To improve interpretability of coefficients, we back transformed them to the original scale  
402 and expressed the multiplicative effects as a percentage (Gelman and Hill, 2007). We then  
403 multiplied this percent change by the median ACE (a better estimator of the central tendency  
404 because of the right skew in our data) to estimate the typical effect in absolute C terms.  
405 To get typical effects of tree cover, we multiplied median tree cover in each region by its  
406 coefficient estimate and back transformed to the original scale.

## 407 **Estimating C storage and sequestration of a green ash with 100m<sup>2</sup>** 408 **canopy**

409 To estimate C storage and sequestration by a single green ash tree with a canopy cover of  
410 100m<sup>2</sup>, we used allometric equations to estimate that tree's diameter at breast height (DBH)  
411 and mass and then, assuming an annual DBH growth of 0.61 cm, predicted the change in  
412 mass to get C sequestration Nowak and Crane (2002); McPherson et al. (2016).

## 413 **Extending Analyses from Published Literature**

414 To compare our work to past simulation studies we converted results that were in Therms  
415 or kWh to kg C. We did this for Thayer Jr and Maeda (1985), McPherson et al. (1988),  
416 and Huang et al. (1990) using updated emission factors corresponding to each study city's  
417 eGrid subregion (Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database, 2016). To extend  
418 Akbari and Konopacki (2005), we joined climate data (heating and cooling degree days) from  
419 the nearest NOAA weather station to census tract centroids U.S. Census Tract Centroids  
420 (2010); Arguez et al. (2012). It was from this join of climate and census data that we  
421 determined that 77% of the U.S. population lives in places with more heating than cooling  
422 degree days. Then for each census tract we predicted the effect of trees and increasing roof  
423 albedo on the energy use of a pre-1980's building with gas heating following their table that

bins houses according to heating degree-days and using emission factors corresponding to the eGrid subregion containing the census tract centroid. Separating out the indirect effects of trees from the indirect effects of increasing roof albedo was not possible because these were not modeled separately. However, the general trend would be similar, but with a decreased electricity savings and a decreased heating penalty. Akbari and Konopacki (2005) found the effect of tree shade to be stronger than the indirect effects of increased roof albedo and transpirative cooling.

## Code

All of the code and data for these analyses are present on Github (<https://github.com/TedwardErker/energy>). Code is provisional pending review.

## References

- Akbari, H. (2002). Shade trees reduce building energy use and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from power plants. *Environmental Pollution*, 116(nil):S119–S126.
- Akbari, H. and Konopacki, S. (2005). Calculating energy-saving potentials of heat-island reduction strategies. *Energy Policy*, 33(6):721–756.
- Akbari, H., Kurn, D. M., Bretz, S. E., and Hanford, J. W. (1997). Peak power and cooling energy savings of shade trees. *Energy and buildings*, 25(2):139–148.
- Akbari, H. and Taha, H. (1992). The impact of trees and white surfaces on residential heating and cooling energy use in four canadian cities. *Energy*, 17(2):141 – 149.
- Arguez, A., Durre, I., Applequist, S., Vose, R. S., Squires, M. F., Yin, X., Heim, R. R., and Owen, T. W. (2012). Noaa’s 1981-2010 u.s. climate normals: An overview. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(11):1687–1697.

446 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models  
 447 using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1):1–48.

448 DeWalle, D. R., Heisler, G. M., and Jacobs, R. E. (1983). Forest home sites influence heating  
 449 and cooling energy. *Journal of Forestry*, 81(2):84–88.

450 Donovan, G. H. and Butry, D. T. (2009). The value of shade: Estimating the effect of urban  
 451 trees on summertime electricity use. *Energy and Buildings*, 41(6):662–668.

452 Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (2016). Accessed Jul. 24, 2018.

453 Erker, T., Townsend, P. A., Wang, L., Lorentz, L., and Stoltman, A. (2018). A statewide  
 454 urban tree canopy mapping method. *Remote Sensing of Environment (in review)*.

455 Gelman, A. and Hill, J. (2007). *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical*  
 456 *Models*. Analytical Methods for Social Research. Cambridge University Press.

457 Heisler, G. M. (1986). Effects of individual trees on the solar radiation climate of small  
 458 buildings. *Urban Ecology*, 9(3-4):337–359.

459 Heisler, G. M. (1990). Mean wind speed below building height in residential neighborhoods  
 460 with different tree densities. volume 96. Proceedings of the American Society of Heating,  
 461 Refrigeration and Air conditioning Engineers.

462 Huang, Y. J., Akbari, H., and Taha, H. (1990). The wind-shielding and shading effects  
 463 of trees on residential heating and cooling requirements. volume 96. Proceedings of the  
 464 American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Air conditioning Engineers.

465 Huang, Y. J., Akbari, H., Taha, H., and Rosenfeld, A. H. (1987). The potential of vegetation  
 466 in reducing summer cooling loads in residential buildings. *Journal of Climate and Applied*  
 467 *Meteorology*, 26(9):1103–1116.

468 Jo, H.-K. and McPherson, E. (2001). Indirect carbon reduction by residential vegetation and  
 469 planting strategies in chicago, usa. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 61(2):165–177.



470 McPherson, E., Simpson, J. R., and Livingston, M. (1989). Effects of three landscape  
 471 treatments on residential energy and water use in tucson, arizona. *Energy and Buildings*,  
 472 13(2):127–138.

473 McPherson, E. G., Herrington, L. P., and Heisler, G. M. (1988). Impacts of vegetation on  
 474 residential heating and cooling. *Energy and Buildings*, 12(1):41–51.

475 McPherson, E. G. and Kendall, A. (2014). A life cycle carbon dioxide inventory of the  
 476 million trees los angeles program. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*,  
 477 19(9):1653–1665.

478 McPherson, E. G. and Simpson, J. R. (1999). Carbon dioxide reduction through urban  
 479 forestry. *Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-171, USDA For. Serv., Pacific Southwest Research Station*,  
 480 *Albany, CA*.

481 McPherson, E. G., van Doorn, N. S., and Peper, P. J. (2016). Urban tree database and  
 482 allometric equations.

483 McPherson, G., Simpson, J. R., Peper, P. J., Maco, S. E., and Xiao, Q. (2005). Municipal  
 484 forest benefits and costs in five us cities. *Journal of Forestry*, 103(8):411–416.

485 Nowak, D. J., Appleton, N., Ellis, A., and Greenfield, E. (2017). Residential building energy  
 486 conservation and avoided power plant emissions by urban and community trees in the  
 487 united states. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 21:158–165.

488 Nowak, D. J. and Crane, D. E. (2002). Carbon storage and sequestration by urban trees in  
 489 the usa. *Environmental Pollution*, 116(3):381–389.

490 Nowak, D. J., Stevens, J. C., Sisinni, S. M., and Luley, C. J. (2002). Effects of urban tree  
 491 management and species selection on atmospheric carbon dioxide.

492 Parker, J. H. (1983). Landscaping to reduce the energy used in cooling buildings. *Journal*  
 493 *of Forestry*, 81(2):82–105.

494 Pataki, D. E., Alig, R. J., Fung, A. S., Golubiewski, N. E., Kennedy, C. A., McPherson,  
 495 E. G., Nowak, D. J., Pouyat, R. V., and Lankao, P. R. (2006). Urban ecosystems and the  
 496 north american carbon cycle. *Global Change Biology*, 12(11):2092–2102.

497 Pataki, D. E., Carreiro, M. M., Cherrier, J., Grulke, N. E., Jennings, V., Pincetl, S., Pouyat,  
 498 R. V., Whitlow, T. H., and Zipperer, W. C. (2011). Coupling biogeochemical cycles in  
 499 urban environments: Ecosystem services, green solutions, and misconceptions. *Frontiers*  
 500 *in Ecology and the Environment*, 9(1):27–36.

501 Roy, S., Byrne, J., and Pickering, C. (2012). A systematic quantitative review of urban tree  
 502 benefits, costs, and assessment methods across cities in different climatic zones. *Urban*  
 503 *Forestry & Urban Greening*, 11(4):351–363.

504 Simpson, J. and McPherson, E. (1998). Simulation of tree shade impacts on residential  
 505 energy use for space conditioning in sacramento. *Atmospheric Environment*, 32(1):69–74.

506 Simpson, J. R. (2002). Improved estimates of tree-shade effects on residential energy use.  
 507 *Energy and Buildings*, 34(10):1067–1076.

508 Thayer Jr, R. L. and Maeda, B. T. (1985). Measuring street tree impact on solar performance:  
 509 a five-climate computer modeling study. *Journal of arboriculture (USA)*.

510 United State Environmental Protection Agency (2017). Inventory of u.s. greenhouse gas  
 511 emissions and sinks: Annex 2 methodology and data for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from  
 512 fossil fuel combustion. (430-P-17-001).

513 U.S. Census Tract Centroids (2010). Accessed Jul. 24, 2018.

514 U.S. Department of Energy, E. I. A. (2009). Wisconsin household energy report.

515 Weissert, L., Salmond, J., and Schwendenmann, L. (2014). A review of the current progress in  
 516 quantifying the potential of urban forests to mitigate urban co2 emissions. *Urban Climate*,  
 517 8(nil):100–125.

518 Young, R. F. (2011). Planting the living city. *Journal of the American Planning Association*,  
519 77(4):368–381.

520 Ziter, C. D., Pedersen, E. J., Kucharik, C. J., and Turner, M. G. (2019). Scale-dependent  
521 interactions between tree canopy cover and impervious surfaces reduce daytime urban heat  
522 during summer. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(15):7575–7580.

## 523 Acknowledgments

524 Steve Carpenter, Bret Larget and the Fall 2017 Statistical Consulting Class at UW-Madison  
525 for comments on early drafts; Madison Gas and Electric; Chris Kucharik; Jun Zhu; NASA  
526 Fellowship Award NNX15AP02H, Wisconsin DNR Contract 37000-0000002995

527 McPherson and Simpson (1999)

528 Heisler (1990)