Assessing Urban Tree Cover in the City of Atlanta: Phase 2 (Detecting Canopy Change 2008-2014)

Prepared by:

Center for Spatial Planning Analytics and Visualization (formerly known as the Center for Geographic Information Systems or CGIS)

760 Spring St

Atlanta, GA 30332-0695

Office: 404-894-0127

Georgia Institute of Technology

Investigators:

Anthony Giarrusso, Associate Director (CSPAV), tonyg@gatech.edu

Sponsor: **City of Atlanta**

Project Team:

Principal Investigator:
Anthony J. Giarrusso, Associate Director, Senior Research Scientist
Center for Spatial Planning Analytics and Visualization (
Georgia Institute of Technology
760 Spring Street, Suite 230
Atlanta, GA 30308
Office: 404-894-0127
tonyg@gatech.edu

Graduate Research Assistant
Jeremy Nichols
Center for Spatial Planning Analytics and Visualization
Georgia Institute of Technology
760 Spring Street, Suite 230
Atlanta, GA 30308

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the City of Atlanta. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The project team would like to acknowledge and thank the following individuals for their assistance on this project.

Kathryn A. Evans, Senior Administrative Analyst, Tree Conservation Commission, Department of Planning and Development, Arborist Division

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 3
List of Tables 5
List of Figures 5
Executive Summary 8
1. Introduction 13
1.1 Benefits of Urban Trees 13
1.2 History of the Project 13
1.3 Research Objectives 14
1.4 Report Organization 14
2. Project Methodology 15
2.1 Establishing the Workflow 15
2.2 Imagery Capture and Preparation 15
2.4 Imagery Classification and Post Processing 15
2.5 Accuracy Assessment 17
2.6 Calculating Tree and Land Cover Statistics 18
2.7 Calculating Change between 2008-2014: Tree and Land Cover Statistics 18
3. Data Analysis and Findings for 2014 19
3.1 City-wide Tree and Land Cover Totals 19
3.2 Other Geographies 22
3.3 Watersheds 23
3.3 Sub-Watersheds 24
3.4 Parks 26
3.5 Zoning 28
3.6 Neighborhood Planning Units (NPU) 31
3.7 Council Districts 33
3.8 Neighborhoods 34
4. Change Analysis – Comparing 2008 and 2014 Data 37
4.1 Change Analysis Explained 37
4.2 City-Wide Change 38
4.3 Areas Losing UTC 40
4.4 Areas Gaining UTC 43
4.5 Canopy Change – Selected Geographies 45
4.5 Canopy Change Highlights – Selected Geographies 46
5. Discussion 60
5.1 Discussion of Results 60

5.2 Policy Recommendations 67
5.3 Conclusion 67
6. Appendix 1 - Land Cover Maps by Selected Geographies 69
6.1 Neighborhood Planning Units 70
6.2 Neighborhoods 71
6.3 City Council Districts 6.4 Watersheds 72
6.5 Small Watersheds 6.6 Parks 74
6.7 Zoning 76
6.8 City Grid – (6 acre cells) 77
7. Appendix 2 - Land Cover Graphs by Selected Geographies 78
7.1 Neighborhood Planning Units 79
7.2 Neighborhoods 80
7.3 City Council Districts 81
7.4 Watersheds 82
7.5 Small Watersheds 83
7.8 Parks 84
7.9 Zoning 85
8. Appendix 3 – Summary Land Cover Tables by Selected Geographies 86
8.1 Neighborhood Planning Units 87
8.2 Neighborhoods 88
8.3 City Council Districts 96
8.4 Watersheds 97
8.5 Small Watersheds 98
8.6 Parks > .5 Acres in Size (Sorted by Size - Largest First) 107
8.7 Zoning 114
9. Appendix 4 – Land Cover Change Maps by Selected Geographies 120
9.1 Neighborhood Planning Units 9.2 Neighborhoods 121
9.3 City Council Districts 123
9.5 Small Watersheds 125
9.7 City Grid – (6 acre cells): 127
10. Appendix 5 – Land Cover Change Tables by Selected Geographies 128
10.1. Neighborhood Planning Units 128
10.2. Neighborhoods 129
10.3. City Council Districts 140
10.4. Watersheds 141
10.5. Small Watersheds 141
10.6 Parks > .5 Acres in Size 156

11. Appendix 6 – Land Cover Change Graphs by Selected Geographies 163
11.1 Neighborhood Planning Units 164
11.2 Neighborhoods 165
11.3 City Council Districts 167
11.4 Watersheds 168
11.5 Small Watersheds 169
11.6 Parks 171
..... 171

List of Tables

Table 1. Classification Accuracy Assessment Report 17
Table 2: 2014 City-wide Land Cover Statistics 20
Table 3. Tree Cover by Watershed 24
Table 4: Land Cover Summary Statistics by Zoning Category 30
Table 5. Percent Tree Cover by NPU 31
Table 6: Tree Cover Statistics by NPU 31
Table 7: Tree Cover by Council District 33
Table 8. Land Cover Change by Watershed 2008-2014 46
Table 9. Land Cover Statistics for the Twelve Small Watersheds Showing the Most Change in Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014 48
Table 10. Land Cover Change for the Twelve Small Watersheds Showing the Most Gain in Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014 49
Table 11. Land Cover Change Statistics for Parks with > 2.5 Acres of Loss 2008-2014 52
Table 12. Land Cover Change Statistics for Parks with >=2.5 Acres of Canopy Growth 2008-2014 52
Table 13. 2008-2014 Land Cover Change by Council District 54
Table 14. Top 12 Neighborhoods Gaining Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014 56
Table 15. Top Twelve Neighborhoods Losing Percent Tree Cover 2008 - 2014 57
Table 16. Percent Tree Cover Change by NPU 2008-2014 ---* 2008 Data Not Available for NPU Q 58
Table 17. Potential Estimated Canopy Loss Caused by Single-Family Redevelopments 61
Table 18. Available Potential Planting Land (2014) 63
Table 19. Residential Zoning Regulations 65
Table 20. Residential Zoning Area and Canopy Stats 65
Table 21. Lot Coverage Build-Out Scenarios by Residential Zoning Category 66
Table 22. Modified Lot Coverage Build-Out Scenarios by Residential Category 66

List of Figures

Figure 1. Champion Ash at Tanyard Creek 8
Figure 2 Urban Tree Canopy Distribution 9
Figure 3 Atlanta Skyline from Westview Cemetery 8
Figure 4. Canopy Cover by Zoning category 9

Figure 5. Acres of Landcover by Zoning Category 12
Figure 6. Birds Eye View of Single Family Rredevelopment in NW 11
Figure 7. Tree Growth in Freedom Park 11
Figure 8. Birds eye view of pipe farm over time 12
Figure 9. Pipe Farm with Roads and Curbs 14
Figure 10: Recoding Unsupervised Land Cover Classification Results 16
Figure 11: 2014 City of Atlanta Land Cover 19
Figure 12: City of Atlanta - Tree, Non-Tree Vegetation, Non-Vegetation 20
Figure 13: City-wide Tree Cover Grid 21
Figure 14. Percent Tree Cover by Watershed 23
Figure 15. Land Cover Distribution by Watershed 23
Figure 16. Sub-Watershed Boundaries 24
Figure 17: Percent Tree Cover by Sub-Watershed 25
Figure 18. Percent Tree Cover by Park 26
Figure 19. Land Cover Distribution for Parks > 50 Acres 27
Figure 20: Aggregated Zoning Categories 28
Figure 21. Land Cover Distribution by Zoning Category 28
Figure 22: Land Cover Area in Acres by Aggregated Zoning Category 29
Figure 23: Percent Tree Cover by NPU 31
Figure 24. Land Cover Distribution by NPU 32
Figure 25. Percent Tree Cover by City Council District 33
Figure 26: Land Cover Distribution by City Council District 34
Figure 27. Percent Tree Cover by Neighborhood 34
Figure 28. Land Cover Distribution for Top 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods 35
Figure 29. Top 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods 35
Figure 30. Land Cover Distribution (Percent and Acres) for the Bottom 12 Tree-Covered Neighborhoods 36
Figure 31: Bottom 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods 36
Figure 32. Satellite Imagery Coverage 37
Figure 33.Tree Cover Change in Acres by Grid Cell 38
Figure 34. Site Inspections 39
Figure 35. Secondary Growth on Abandoned Sites 39
Figure 36. Loss of 50% or More of Canopy (> 3 acres) 40
Figure 37. Single Family Development and Redevelopment Sites 40
Figure 38. New Development Permits (2012-2017) 41
Figure 39. Lot Build-Out Scenarios 41
Figure 40. Canopy Loss from New Developments 42
Figure 41. New Development Permits (2012-2017) 43
Figure 42. Non-Native Street Trees Planted in New Development 43
Figure 43. City's Largest and Oldest Pipe Farm (Google Earth View) 44
Figure 44. Pipe Farms 44
Figure 45. Percent Change in Tree Cover Across Selected Geographies 45
Figure 46. Percent and Acreage (Black) Tree Cover Change by Watershed 2008-2014 46
Figure 47. Change in Percent Tree Cover by Watershed 2008-2014 47
Figure 48. Change in Percent Tree Cover by Small Watershed 2008-2014 48

Figure 49. Twelve Small Watersheds with Most Loss of Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014 49
Figure 50. Twelve Watersheds Showing Most Gain in Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014 50
Figure 51. Acres of Canopy Change by Park 2008-2014 51
Figure 52. Canopy Growth in Piedmont and Freedom Parks 53
Figure 53. Percent Tree Cover Change 2008-2014 by Council District 54
Figure 54. Change in Percent Tree Cover by Council District 55
Figure 55. Top 12 Neighborhoods Gaining Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014 56
Figure 56. Top Twelve Neighborhoods Losing Percent Tree Cover 2008 - 2014 57
Figure 57. Percent Tree Cover Change by NPU (Change in Acres in Black) 2008-2014 58
Figure 58. Change in Percent Tree Cover by NPU 2008-2014 59
Figure 59. Stalled Developments Showing Canopy Gain 61
Figure 60. Original Growth behind New Growth on a Pipe Farm 62
Figure 61. Land Cover Distribution by Neighborhood Planning Unit 79
Figure 62. Bottom 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods 80
Figure 63. Top 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods 80
Figure 64. Land Cover Distribution by City Council District 81
Figure 65. Land Cover Distribution by Watershed 82
Figure 66. Land Cover Distribution by Small Watershed 83
Figure 67. Land Cover Distribution for Parks > 50 Acres 84
Figure 68. Land Cover Distribution by Zoning Category 85
Figure 69. Land Cover Area in Acres by Zoning Category 85
Figure 70. Percent Change in Tree Canopy by NPU 164
Figure 71. Bottom Ten Neighborhoods (Canopy Acres Lost 2008-2014) 165
Figure 72. Top Ten Neighborhoods (Canopy Acres Gained 2008-2014) 166
Figure 73. Percent Tree Cover Change by Council District (2008-2014) 167
Figure 74. Percent Tree Cover Change by Watershed (2008-2014) 168
Figure 75. Top Twelve Small Watersheds Showing Gain in Percent Tree Canopy (2008-2014) 169
Figure 76. Bottom 12 Small Watersheds Losing Percent Tree Cover (2008-2014) 170
Figure 77. Parks Gaining Over 2.5 Acres of Tree Canopy (2008-2014) 171
Figure 78. Parks Losing More Than 2.5 Acres of Tree Canopy (2008-2014) 171

Executive Summary – Urban Tree Canopy in the City of Atlanta

Tree canopy is defined as the layer of leaves, branches, and stems of trees that cover the ground when viewed from above. Canopy coverage is affected by local geography and climate, as well as land use patterns and development densities. Studying urban tree canopy coverage helps cities better understand and manage their forest resources and maximize benefits associated with a healthy urban forest.

Figure 1. Champion Ash at Tanyard Creek

In the Piedmont region where Atlanta is situated, the predominant ecosystem is made up of deciduous forest. Left to natural processes, close to 100% of the land would be covered by forests. Other ecological regions such as those characterized by desert, prairie, meadow, evergreen forest, bodies of water, and other features have canopy coverage that reflect those geographies. In urban settings, development patterns and land use have the greatest impact on the natural landscape. Unlike most major cities, especially older industrialized cities, Atlanta retains large portions of its native forest landscape that include areas with old growth character, mature trees, and diverse native plant communities. These urban forests are found in parks, nature preserves, residential yards, and other private properties. Urban trees and forests offer important benefits such as cleaner air and water, life-sustaining habitat for wildlife, and enhanced physical, mental, and spiritual health for residents. The exceptional quality of Atlanta's forest land provides further incentive for its careful study and management.



Figure 2 Urban Tree Canopy Distribution

Atlanta's Department of City Planning completed the first ever city-wide analysis of tree canopy utilizing 2008 satellite imagery. This baseline analysis revealed that Atlanta's overall tree canopy coverage was 47.9% and that canopy coverage within the city varied tremendously, from less than 10% downtown and along transportation corridors to over 90% in nature preserves and along stream corridors. Over the last two years, through a contract with Georgia Tech's Center for Spatial Planning Analytics and Visualization, the City completed a second tree canopy analysis utilizing 2014 satellite imagery. The research team estimates that in October 2014, the overall tree canopy coverage was approximately 47.1% (40,740 acres), which is not a statistically significant change from the baseline. The remainder of the city's land cover was non-tree vegetation such as grass, shrubs, and other plants (22.9%/19,758 acres) and non-vegetation such as buildings, streets, and pavement (30.0%/25,921 acres). Accurate

comparisons of *overall* canopy change from 2008 to 2014 are difficult because the City annexed over 2,000 acres and changed its boundaries during this period. A close evaluation of areas *within* the city of Atlanta that showed significant canopy gain and loss, however, provided a greater understanding of patterns, trends, and underlying causes of the changes in the quantity and quality of tree canopy.

Canopy Distribution Across the City

Figure 3. View of Atlanta Skyline from Westview Cemetery

While Atlanta enjoys some of the highest quantity of overall tree canopy coverage within the city limits of a major US city, the canopy coverage varies widely across the city's 243 neighborhoods. Densely developed and urbanized areas such as Downtown (1,256 acres), Atlantic Station (163 acres), and Lenox (152 acres) had less than 8% canopy coverage. A dozen single-family residential neighborhoods outside the city's core had canopy coverage of 70% or greater. The highest canopy coverage was in the Boulder Park (78%) and Butner-Tell (77%) neighborhoods of southwest Atlanta.

Park land makes up approximately 4.5% land in the city and contains approximately 5% of the city's tree canopy. The average tree canopy coverage on park land (48%) does not differ much from the city's overall tree canopy coverage of 47.1%, reflecting the varied uses of Atlanta's parks, ranging from open lawn to nature preserves. Among parks over 50 acres in size, canopy coverage ranges from a low of 18% at Lakewood to a high of 89% at Cascade Springs Nature Preserve.

Tree cover is very important to water quality and is a strong predictor of watershed health. Atlanta contains 311 small-area watersheds (area of land that drains into a common body of water). Average tree canopy cover for the city's small-area watersheds is 47.4%. Several watersheds feeding into Peachtree Creek and the South River have less than 10% canopy cover. Ten of the 20 small-area watersheds with the highest tree canopy coverage (over 70%) are along Utoy Creek.

Canopy Distribution by Land Use

Tree Canopy Coverage by Zoning		
Zoning Category	**Canopy Coverage within Zoning Area**	**Contribution to Overall Tree Canopy**
Single-Family Residential	58%	76%
Multi-Family Residential	40%	8%
Industrial	26%	6%
Commercial	23%	2%
Other	NA	8%

Figure 4. Canopy Cover by Zoning Category

Canopy coverage is strongly related to zoning and land use. The largest land use in Atlanta is single-family, with residential neighborhoods making up 61% (52,933 acres) of the city's land area. The next largest zoning designations are industrial (11% of total land area), residential multi-family (9% of total land area), and special public interest (6% of total land area). Figure 4 shows the canopy coverage and contribution of several zoning categories.

Sorting data by designated zoning category is the best way to analyze land use, but it is important to note that some zoning categories (e.g. mixed use and special public interest) allow

several uses. In addition, underlying zoning may not reflect current land use such as in the case of land that is underdeveloped or vacant. This may explain the relatively high canopy coverage on residential multi-family land (40%), industrial land (26%), and commercial land (23%), all of which typically leave little space for trees when fully developed in accordance with zoning requirements

Canopy Facts - Selected Geographies

- Thirteen neighborhoods have more than 70% canopy coverage, with Boulder Park having the highest coverage at 78%.
- More densely developed neighborhoods, such as Atlantic Station, Downtown, and Castlebery Hill have less than 8% tree canopy coverage.
- 58% of all land with single-family residential zoning is tree-covered.
- 40% of all land with multi-family residential zoning is tree covered.
- Among parks of over 50 acres in size, tree canopy coverage ranges from a low of 18% at Lakewood to a high of 89% at Cascade Springs Nature Preserve and Herbert Greene Greenway.
- The 311 small-area watersheds that lie within the city have an average tree canopy coverage of 47.4%. Several of the watersheds feeding into Peachtree Creek and South River have less than 10% canopy coverage. Ten of the 20 small-area watersheds with over 70% canopy are along Utoy Creek.



Figure 5. Acres of Landcover by Zoning Category

Urban Tree Canopy Change 2008-2014

A primary objective of the second canopy study was to quantify the canopy change between 2008 and 2014 at multiple geographic levels across the city, starting with the city as a whole, down to 6-acre grid cells. At the city-scale, interpretation of overall change was complicated because the City annexed approximately 2000 acres of land during this time and changed its boundaries, making it difficult to measure *overall canopy change* precisely. The total *acreage* of the City's urban tree canopy (UTC) was higher in 2014 (40,740 acres) than it was in 2008 (40,524 acres). However, since the City grew in size, the observed *percentage* of tree canopy for the city as a whole was lower with 47.1% in 2014 vs. 47.9% in 2008.

The 6-acre grid cell analysis yielded more information about the change over time. Researchers observed tree canopy loss greater than one acre in 413 cells and tree canopy gain greater than one acre in 298 cells. The project team then visually inspected over 750 sites using the satellite photos from both years and subsequently visited 150 locations to verify site conditions. This detailed validation provided added confidence and revealed important trends. Most notable, the site visits revealed that numerous (575) cells detected on the imagery as "canopy gain" were previously sites with scrubby vegetation and invasive plant growth. Specifically, many (>75) areas detected on the imagery as "canopy gain" were previously disturbed or graded sites. Some sites with regrowth of scrubby vegetation, misclassified as canopy. Other locations were covered with small volunteer pines or invasive trees on sites still under development or on sites that had been abandoned before development projects were completed

.



Figure 2. Birds eye view of single-family redevelopment in NW Atlanta

Areas Losing UTC: There were at least fifteen sites, 10 acres in size or more in size, where the change results indicated noticeable (>50%) or complete loss of tree canopy. Most of these sites had been cleared for new development. Since there are very few large, undeveloped parcels left in Atlanta, this is not unexpected. It is unexpected, however, that the greatest observed losses of UTC in the city resulted from redevelopment of single-family homes. Overall, the density of development, specifically the number of single-family residential units, didn't appear to change much between 2008 and 2014 in the areas visited, but the size of single-family homes increased substantially. Through site visits and inspection of the satellite imagery, the project team identified over 100 properties where single-family homes were demolished and rebuilt or renovated at a much larger size and larger building footprint than the original home, resulting in a loss of tree cover (150 acres total) and an increase in impervious surface area (75 acres). While these numbers seem inconsequential, these sites are only a small sample of the city and represent a total number of sites potentially up to 10 to 20 times higher. The trend seems to be increasing based on field observations during 2017 site visits where the team observed significant tree loss on sites under redevelopment that had been initiated since the 2014 assessment. The tree loss occurred in compliance with current zoning and tree ordinance regulations, therefore the potential for more substantial UTC loss is high. Because the majority of the city's tree canopy is on single-family residential lots, this trend may be the most significant threat to the city's tree canopy.

Areas Gaining UTC: On a positive note, the project team also identified areas showing an increase in canopy coverage between 2008 and 2014. Several locations showing canopy increase were the result of the rapid growth of trees planted in new subdivisions or on individual properties around 2008. Sites that were cleared prior to 2008 and had almost no tree cover at that time show up to 25% canopy coverage in 2014. While this growth is positive, it should be noted that many of these quick growing trees are non-native or ornamental species (Bradford pear, Chinese elm, crape myrtle, etc.) and do not provide the same ecological benefits as other types of native trees such as oaks, hickories, tulip poplars, and mixed hardwoods that covered many of these sites prior to clearing for development.

Figure 7. Tree Growth in Freedom Park

Unfortunately, many sites showing growth in UTC were unfinished or semi-finished subdivisions (i.e., land cleared, with roads and sewers constructed but no buildings), which are often referred to as "pipe farms." Of the 32 pipe farms identified, most of which are located in the southeast and southwest corners of the city, 15 are greater than 25 acres in size. The largest, which was cleared in 2004, is roughly 80 acres in size. All these sites are now overgrown with secondary growth, typically small, quick growing pines trees or quick growing invasive tree species that grow in disturbed soils. Some of these sites show close to 100% growth in UTC since 2008. However, the site visits revealed that the new growth often consisted of poor quality trees and, most likely, represented temporary growth since the sites were stalled developments that will eventually be cleared again and developed. Based on extensive site visits and review of satellite imagery, the project team estimates that this "false" growth represents approximately 900 acres or 2.3% of the city's UTC.

Figure 8. Pipe Farm Regrowth Over Time

Recommendations for Consideration

The canopy change analysis provides documented, science-based data that can be used to inform decision-making related to urban trees and urban forest management in Atlanta. Information about canopy change between 2008 and 2014 provides a tool to help the City evaluate and quantify how the interaction of policy, land use, and the free market affect urban canopy in Atlanta over time.

Figure 9. Pipe Farm with Roads and Curbs

Recommendations for consideration and discussion:

- Permanently protect the few remaining large tracts of undisturbed forests.
- Develop measures to prevent clearing of large sites that will not be completed (e.g. "pipe farms").
- Evaluate lot coverage maximums, grading and construction practices, and other factors that influence the impact to trees and tree canopy, especially during development and redevelopment in single-family zoning areas.
- Evaluate open space requirements for multi-family and other developments.
- Identify tools to incentivize "true density" housing development (more housing units with smaller building footprints), less site disturbance, and less trees loss, and to avoid "false density" development (larger building footprints but fewer units of housing).
- Promote planting of native species and align replanting requirements with the species of trees that are removed.

1. Introduction

1.1 Benefits of Urban Trees

Trees provide numerous well-documented environmental and ecological benefits. In urban areas, trees prevent or reduce flooding, erosion, and the “heat island effect” (which causes higher temperatures in cities than surrounding areas) by lowering temperatures and decreasing energy demands. Trees clean particulates and other pollutants from the air, provide critical habitat for native wildlife, enhance privacy, provide shade and beauty, and increase quality of life for residents. Studies demonstrate that the presence of trees in an urban environment also provides human health and social benefits such as quicker recovery time from illness and reduced crime rates.

All trees, and especially trees adjacent to rivers and waterways (riparian trees), play an important role in filtering runoff and sediment from slopes and in slowing floodwaters, both of which are necessary for maintaining water quality and a healthy ecosystem. Shade provided by riparian trees also helps moderate water temperature, which is critical to aquatic life. Forested areas in proximity to surface water also provide important habitat for birds and a variety of wildlife.

Riparian trees are particularly significant in Atlanta since the city developed at the intersection of ten stream drainage basins. Headwaters for several creeks in the Chattahoochee River and Ocmulgee River Basins originate within a fifteen-block radius of the downtown Five Points intersection. Tree cover therefore has a critical impact on water quality in Atlanta and downstream.

Watershed protection is especially important in Atlanta, where surface water provides ninety-eight percent of the region’s drinking water. Healthy watersheds are also important for providing recreational opportunity for residents and habitat for aquatic and other wildlife. Non-point source pollution (caused by storm water runoff which transports oil and pollutants from impervious surfaces and particles associated with soil erosion) is one of the leading causes of water quality problems for surface water, even more than the point source pollution released by permitted industrial facilities. As the land in a watershed is deforested for development, and other natural areas are converted to impervious surfaces such as streets, sidewalks, and parking lots, storm water that would normally soak into the ground becomes runoff. Because land, and the water that runs over and through it, are interconnected, a watershed approach to managing water quality is important for maintaining and restoring healthy ecosystems.

1.2 History of the Project

The City obtained high resolution, multi-spectral satellite imagery in October 2008 and contracted Georgia Tech researchers from the Center for Geographic Information Systems (CGIS) and the Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development (CQGRD) to quantify existing tree cover within the City of Atlanta, establish an accurate baseline tree canopy estimate, and develop methodologies and procedures for future studies. The project team determined that 47.9% of the city was covered by trees in 2008, making it one of the most tree-covered cities in the nation. However, the distribution of tree canopy cover in the city was uneven, with the majority of tree cover in single-family neighborhoods, far from the almost treeless city center.

In 2014, the City again contracted with Georgia Tech to perform a second urban tree canopy study, the results of which are presented in this report.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objective of the second urban tree canopy study was to update the 2008 canopy numbers and determine change in tree canopy from 2008 to 2014, which could be used to help the City understand the pattern of tree loss and gain over time, and how to better manage this change through policy development and planning.

This report and associated data provide a comprehensive, updated calculation of 2014 tree cover and tree cover changes from 2008 to 2014 within Atlanta's city limits. The information will assist the City in making science-based policy decisions regarding Atlanta's forest cover. The new data provided by this research enables the City to accurately identify areas of tree loss and gain and to target efforts to minimize loss and maximize gain so that the city's trees will continue to provide the greatest benefits to water and air quality, and habitat protection, and support an enhanced quality of life for city residents.

1.4 Report Organization

This report describes the project objectives, methods, results, and recommendations, and is organized as follows. Section 1 summarizes the project's history, goals and objectives; Section 2 provides a detailed explanation of the project research methodology; Section 3 presents city-wide and sub-city research findings in detail; Section 4 discusses change in canopy between 2008 and 2014; Section 5 presents conclusions, discusses possible policy implications of the research, and provides recommendations for further tree cover classification studies in the City of Atlanta; and Section 6 lists report references. Finally, the Appendices contain full page maps and complete summary data tables with findings across all geographies.

Figure 4. Atlanta's Canopy

2. Project Methodology

2.1 Establishing the Workflow

Since the primary goal of this research is to quantify tree cover, the final methodology consists of a land cover classification process that differentiates the city into three distinct land cover classes (tree, non-tree vegetation and non-vegetation) using a combination of well-established “unsupervised” and “supervised” imagery classification techniques, followed by an accuracy assessment of the classification techniques.

Unsupervised classification is computer driven and automatically segregates image pixels into groups of similar spectral signatures. Supervised classification is a manual intervention in which the user creates training sets (spectral signatures) for known classes and applies them to the entire image.

The finalized imagery classification process is described in further detail below.

2.2 Imagery Capture and Preparation

Imagery Capture

After review of the available imagery options, Digital Globe Inc.’s WorldView2 satellite imagery was selected as the best option, primarily due to its high spectral resolution. The satellite imagery was captured by the WorldView2 satellite on two separate dates in September and October 2014 when the tree canopy was full. The imagery contained 5% cloud cover, primarily comprised of one large cloud over the NE border of Atlanta and DeKalb County. This extremely detailed 11-bit, 6-foot, pan-sharpened, 8-banded data (Red, Green, Blue and Near IR) served as the basis for all subsequent analyses.

Imagery Preparation

Initially, the project team intended to mosaic all imagery into one seamless image for the city prior to classification. However, after several iterative analyses, it became clear that a city-wide mosaic would compromise the integrity and quality of the individual images, primarily due to substantial spectral variation across images for specific classes. Therefore, each image was classified separately to ensure the best, most unadulterated results.

2.4 Imagery Classification and Post Processing

Unsupervised Classification

The research team established the following land cover classes:

- **Tree Canopy:** the layer of leaves, branches and stems of trees that cover the ground when viewed from above.
- **Non-Tree Vegetation**: primarily lawn, grass, and low-lying vegetation such as shrubs, kudzu, and other plants.
- **Non-Vegetation**: pavement, buildings, impervious surfaces, and bare soil.
- **Shadow or Dark Areas**: shadows created by buildings and trees, certain dark pavements and buildings, and water bodies.

Researchers performed an unsupervised classification on each image using the Iterative Self-Organizing Data Analysis Technique (ISODATA) clustering tool in ERDAS IMAGINE 2015. The ISODATA clustering method uses the minimum spectral distance formula to form clusters or groups of pixels with similar spectral characteristics. The software user chooses the number of clusters or classes for output. The process begins with either arbitrary cluster means or the means of an existing spectral signature set, and each time the clustering repeats, the means of these clusters are shifted. The new cluster means are used for the next iteration. The ISODATA method repeats the clustering of the image until either a maximum number of iterations has been performed or a maximum percentage of unchanged pixels have been reached between two iterations.

In this study, a maximum of ten ISODATA iterations with 100 classes per output were run using arbitrarily generated cluster means derived from image statistic files and a convergence threshold of 0.95. The convergence threshold is the maximum percentage of pixels whose cluster assignments can go unchanged between iterations. By selecting a convergence threshold of 0.95, the user specifies when 95% or more of the pixels remain in the same cluster between one iteration and the next, the utility should stop processing. In other words, as soon as 5% or fewer of the pixels change clusters between iterations, the utility stops processing.



Figure 5: Recoding Unsupervised Land Cover Classification Results

The resulting classification layers each contained 100 classes (Figure 10), which were then manually regrouped into one of the four defined cover classes. Special care was taken to ensure seamless class transition between images.

Shadow

One of the drawbacks of using satellite or aerial imagery alone for land cover classification is the difficulty caused by shadow. Since ISODATA classification is essentially image differentiations based on color, the areas without color (light), or in shadow, tend to remain unclassified or are lumped together with other dark areas of an image (e.g., certain pavement, and water bodies). Initially, almost 12% of the study area was classified as shadow/dark features. The majority of these areas were located downtown and consisted primarily of building and tree shadows, dark pavement and buildings, and some water bodies. To address this issue, the project team extracted and reclassified only the shadow/dark areas of each image into 250 classes and performed two iterations of the 250 class reclassifications. These reclassifications of shadow were combined with results from a Normalized Difference Vegetation Index

(NDVI) for each image. By combining these two techniques, the project team was able to reclassify the shadow/dark areas into one of the other three classes with confidence.

Post Processing

Once the shadow/dark areas were reclassified and the land cover classification was complete, the individual images were merged into one seamless image of the study area. Project team members visually inspected the composite image for any large, noticeable classification errors or omissions and made necessary updates through manual reclassification (i.e., user draws a polygon on the image and manually assigns a land cover class). Often with very high-resolution data, land cover class results can be mixed, where small pixel clusters of one class are embedded in another class (i.e., mistakenly classified), causing a grainy or "salt and pepper" classification effect. To remove the granularity and smooth out the classes, a series of 7-pixel x 7-pixel neighborhood filters were run on the composite image. This helped reallocate stray pixels or small clusters of pixels into their appropriate classes.

2.5 Accuracy Assessment

Upon completion of the land cover classification, the project team conducted an accuracy assessment to validate the results. The accuracy assessment entailed comparison of the classification results with reference data on a category by category basis utilizing a stratified random sample of 250 points for the three classes (tree cover, non-tree vegetation, and non-vegetation) which resulted in a +/- 5% mean accuracy rate. The reference data consisted of Google Earth imagery from July 2014 and a limited number of site visits (< 25) for ground verification.

Table 1. illustrates the results of the accuracy assessment, including overall and individual class accuracies and Kappa statistics. The Kappa coefficient expresses the proportionate reduction in error generated by a classification process compared with the error of a completely random classification. For example, a value of 0.82 implies that the classification process is avoiding 82 percent of the errors that a completely random classification generates. K >0.80 represents strong agreement and good accuracy. 0.40-0.80 is the middle range, and <0.40 is poor.

Class Name	Class Totals	Number Correct	Producers Accuracy	Users Accuracy
Tree	133	123	92.48%	92.48%
Non-Tree Vegetation	50	40	97.56%	80.00%
Non-Vegetation	73	72	87.80%	98.63%
Overall Classification Accuracy =		**91.80%**		
Overall Kappa Statistics = 86.50%				

Table 1. Classification Accuracy Assessment Report

The positive results of the accuracy assessment are likely due to several factors, including but not limited to excellent data quality; the classifiers' knowledge of the local area, both on the ground and as an image interpreter; and the low number of distinct land classes identified.

2.6 Calculating Tree and Land Cover Statistics

Tree canopy cover and other land cover percentages and areas were calculated city-wide and for the following geographic areas within the City of Atlanta:

- City-wide
- City-wide grid (500 ft. x 500 ft. grid cells; approx. 6 acres)
- Parks
- Watersheds
- Sub-watersheds
- Zoning categories
- Neighborhoods
- Neighborhood Planning Units (NPU)
- City Council Districts

These calculations were accomplished using ESRI's ArcGIS Desktop 10.5 to perform standard vector GIS overlay operations and/or raster zonal functions between the land cover data derived through the imagery classification process and geospatial data layers obtained publicly or from the City. The majority of land cover statistics were generated using ArcGIS 10.5 Zonal Statistics tool, which summarizes the values of a raster (in this case, land cover) within the zones of another dataset and reports the results in a data table. The results are then multiplied by the pixel dimensions to obtain the land cover area per zone. For example:

Sq. Ft. of Tree Cover per Zone = Pixel Dimensions (6.56 ft * 6.56 ft) * Sum of Tree Pixels in Zone

Results and subsequent interpretations of these calculations are presented in the following section.

2.7 Calculating Change between 2008-2014: Tree and Land Cover Statistics

Theoretically, calculating change in canopy area and percentages between 2008 and 2014 should be a simple equation. However, the City of Atlanta annexed over 2,000 acres of land between 2008 and 2014. Additionally, the City updated most, if not all, of their GIS layers (zoning, neighborhoods, council districts, etc.) resulting in boundary changes between 2008 and 2014. So, to assure that change over time was accurately calculated, the project team aggregated both 2008 and 2014 land cover data to the 2014 geographies before calculating change. Therefore, land cover percentages reported in the 2008 study for almost all areas other than the city-as-a-whole will differ from those reported herein.

A detailed discussion of canopy change is presented in Section 4.

3. Data Analysis and Findings for 2014

3.1 City-wide Tree and Land Cover Totals



Figure 6: 2014 City of Atlanta Land Cover

Figure 11 depicts City-wide results of the land cover classification, with green representing tree canopy, yellow representing non-tree vegetation, and red representing non-vegetation.

	Square Miles	Total Acres	Percentage Land Area
Tree Cover	64	40,740	47.1%
Non-Tree Vegetation	31	19,758	22.9%
Non-Vegetation	41	25,921	30.0%
2014 City Area - Excludes Airport	135	86,419	
2008 City Area - Excludes Airport	132	84,648	

Table 2: 2014 City-wide Land Cover Statistics

Table 2 shows that almost half of the city (47.1% or 40,740 acres) is tree-covered while 22.9% of the land cover is non-tree vegetation (e.g., grass, shrubs, ground covers, etc.), and 30.0% is non-vegetation.

As seen in Figures 11 and 12, trees dominate the landscape of the city at 47.9% canopy cover. The majority of tree cover is concentrated on the city's periphery, especially in the north and southwest, while downtown and the surrounding neighborhoods have very low tree cover. Active industrial facilities, road and rail corridors, and areas of extensive commercial development also lack significant tree cover.

Non-tree vegetation represents 22.9% of the city land area (approximately 19,758 acres) and is distributed throughout the city (center graphic in Figure 12). Non-tree vegetation includes grass, shrubs, and other vegetation. Major concentrations of non-tree vegetation can be found in municipal parks with large fields, golf courses, cemeteries and capped landfills. The distribution of large vegetated areas without trees is evenly spread across the city. A significant number of smaller vegetated areas without trees are also scattered across the city. These areas are underestimated to some extent since trees can shade other vegetated and non-vegetated surfaces.

The red areas in Figure 12 represent the 30.0% of the city that is covered by non-vegetation such as buildings, large waterbodies, pavement, bare earth, and other impervious surfaces. Non-vegetated land is concentrated in the densest business districts and transportation corridors, as well as industrial areas

Figure 7: City of Atlanta - Tree, Non-Tree Vegetation, Non-Vegetation

(e.g., large rail yards). These non-vegetated areas, estimated to be approximately 25,921 acres, have limited tree planting potential. These areas may also be underestimated since some are shaded by trees.

Figure 13 illustrates tree cover aggregated to a city-wide grid comprised of 500 ft. x 500 ft. (approximately 6-acre) cells. This aggregated grid helps illustrate the density of tree cover across the city, not simply total cover area. Areas in red, orange, or yellow have less tree cover than the city average. Tan represents areas just above or below the city tree cover average of 47.1%. Areas in green have higher than average tree cover percentages and represent the most densely tree-covered areas in the city. Many of these densely forested areas are residential neighborhoods along the city's primary stream tributaries (Peachtree, Nancy, Utoy, and Proctor Creeks). The mid-range or average tree cover grid cells (tan) include residential neighborhoods scattered between some of the stream corridors, with a majority of these areas running along an east-west mid-city band. The least densely forested areas are at the center of the city, radiating out along highways, industrial corridors, and rail yards, and around commercial districts including Downtown, Midtown, Buckhead, and Lenox.



Figure 8: City-wide Tree Cover Grid

3.2 Other Geographies

In addition to city-wide statistics, the project team calculated the amount and percentage of tree and other land cover for the following geographies across the city: Watersheds, Sub-Watersheds, Neighborhoods, NPUs, Council Districts, Parks, and Zoning. Several different graphic and tabular summaries were produced for each geography, the majority of which are founds as appendices at the end of this document.

1. **Maps -** Maps depicting percent tree cover for each city geography are found in **Section 6** - **Appendix 1**. For each map, layer symbology (colors and numeric class breaks) have been standardized and are presented as a progression of tree cover values in increments of ten, starting with low values in red, progressing to tan in the middle and ending with high values in dark green.

2. **Land Cover Distribution Charts -** Bar charts showing land cover area in acres and as a percentage for the specified geography are found in **Section 7 - Appendix 2**.

3. **Table of city-wide comparisons** - Land cover summary statistics tables show land cover percentages for each geographic areas (NPUs, neighborhoods, parks, zoning, etc.) as they compare to the ***city as a whole*** (% City Land), to the ***geographic area itself*** (% Geography), and to ***each land cover class*** (% Cover Type), with cover types represented by acronyms (Tree cover = UTC, Non-Tree Vegetation = NTV, Non-Vegetation = NV).

   - **"% City Land" -** The percentage of the ***city's total area*** that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation for a specific geographic area. For example, a "% City Land" value of 4% in the "Tree Cover" grouping for a specific geography means that four percent of the city's total area is comprised of tree cover found in that geography alone.

   - **"% Geography"** - The percentage ***within a specified geography*** (NPU, Council District, etc.) that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation. For example, a "% Geography" value of 16% in the "Non-Tree Vegetation" group for a specified geography means that sixteen percent of that geographic area is comprised of non-tree vegetation.

   - **"% Cover Type" -** The percentage ***of the city's total land cover type that is contributed by a particular geographic area***. For example, a "% UTC" value of 8% in the "Non-Tree Vegetation Cover" grouping for a specific geography means that eight percent of the city's total non-tree vegetation area is comprised of non-tree vegetation found in that geographic area alone.

   The summary table format was adapted from data tables in the 2011 City of Philadelphia's Urban Tree Canopy Report by the US Forest Service, the University of Vermont, and the City of Philadelphia. City-wide comparison tables for each geography are in **Section 8 - Appendix 3.**

Brief summaries of each geography are found in the next sections.

3.3 Watersheds

Watersheds or drainage basins are generally described as the area of land where surface water converges at a single point, usually the lowest elevation and the exit of the basin, where the water from the area joins another larger water body. Subsequently, these naturally imposed boundaries do not align with human-defined limits such as city boundaries. As a result, the City of Atlanta contains *portions* of fourteen basins that are approximately the same size as the United States Geologic Survey's (USGS) Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC 12) category (Figure 14). HUC 12s, usually categorized as sub-watersheds, range in size from 10,000–40,000 acres, and are normally too large for small scale planning purposes. Consequently, the City Department of Watershed recently delineated watershed boundaries using high-resolution elevation data and customized hydrologic models which are more detailed than the USGS HUC 12 category. Therefore, for this report, USGS HUC 12 basins will be referred to as Watersheds while City-derived watershed areas will be referred to as Sub-Watersheds.



Figure 9. Percent Tree Cover by Watershed

Figure 15 shows the land cover distribution of Atlanta's HUC 12 watersheds ordered from greatest to least percent canopy.



Figure 10. Land Cover Distribution by Watershed

WATERSHED	Area (Acres)	Tree Canopy (Acres)	Tree Canopy (Percent)
Long Island Creek	2,383	1,510	63%
Utoy Creek	15,491	9,104	59%
Bakers Ferry	433	250	58%
Nancy Creek	8,034	4,532	56%
Camp Creek	3,912	2,169	56%
Doolittle Creek	464	254	55%
Sandy Creek	3,595	1,930	54%
Shoal Creek	74	37	51%
South River	11,876	5,233	44%
Sugar Creek	2,583	1,096	42%
Proctor Creek	12,097	4,873	40%
Peachtree Creek	19,582	7,568	39%
Intrenchment Creek	4,863	1,665	34%
Mud Creek	79	12	16%

Table 3. Tree Cover by Watershed

Table 3. shows the tree cover area and percentages by watershed. The watersheds' percent tree canopy ranges from 63% for Long Island Creek to 16% for Mud Creek, with most watersheds having tree canopy cover between 40% and 60%. Utoy Creek and Peachtree Creek are the largest watersheds but have very low tree cover (20%). The smallest watersheds are Bakers Ferry, Shoal Creek, and Mud Creek.

Generally, the watersheds with the most tree cover are in the north (e.g., Long Island Creek and Nancy Creek) and west (e.g., Utoy Creek). Those with the least tree cover include downtown, Proctor Creek, and areas that are heavily urbanized (e.g., Intrenchment Creek). This corresponds with findings from the neighborhood-level and zoning-area analyses -- the most tree-covered watersheds are comprised primarily of large lot, single-family residences, and the least tree-covered watersheds are downtown (e.g., Intrenchment Creek) and along industrial and commercial corridors (e.g., Proctor Creek). The tree cover percentages in two of the three largest watersheds, Proctor and Peachtree Creek, are quite low and cause for concern. Greater tree cover within a watershed, especially in close proximity to streams, filters and slows down storm water runoff, reducing water pollution, stream bank erosion, and stream sedimentation, all important factors contributing to water quality.



Figure 11. Sub-Watershed Boundaries

3.3 Sub-Watersheds

As described above, the City of Atlanta watershed department created drainage basins or sub-watershed boundaries more detailed than the HUC12 USGS-delineated boundaries. Each Atlanta HUC 12 watershed is composed of nested sub-watersheds as illustrated in Figure 16. There are 310 sub-watersheds ranging in size between .25 and 1,000 acres and averaging 276 acres.

Figure 17 shows percent tree cover by sub-watershed. Due to the large number of sub-watersheds, tables showing the land cover area and distribution for the sub-watersheds are not shown in the body of the report but can be found in Section 8 - Appendix 3.



Figure 12: Percent Tree Cover by Sub-Watershed

The collective sub-watershed figures and tables reveal many interesting findings. Only two of the 20 or so sub-watersheds bordering the Chattahoochee River have below city-average tree cover. Many sub-watersheds have above city-average tree cover, including Bakers Ferry and South River with the highest tree cover at 87% and 82%. Almost all of the top 20 most tree-covered sub-watersheds are found in the Utoy Creek sub-watershed. This tree cover, in proximity to the Chattahoochee River, provides valuable ecological services important to maintaining Atlanta's water quality; however, based on water quality research (2003, 2005, Goetz et. al.), the high percentages of non-vegetated areas in most of Atlanta's sub-watersheds preclude "excellent" or "high" water quality ratings. None of the City of Atlanta's streams would receive a rating of excellent (which requires less than 6% impervious area in the sub-watershed). In addition, only a few sub-watersheds along the South River and Utoy Creek are close to meeting the limits for "good" water quality, which is associated with less than 10% impervious area (See Section 8 - Appendix 3).

While these metrics and guidelines may or may not accurately predict the health of individual streams and sub-watersheds in Atlanta, the relationship between the amount of impervious surface and tree cover in any given watershed undoubtedly affects the volume and speed of stormwater runoff, the extent of erosion, the deposition of sediment, and subsequently the water quality and environmental health of surface water and the natural system.

3.4 Parks

According to data downloaded from the City of Atlanta GIS website in late 2017, there are 366 parks in the City of Atlanta, totaling approximately 3,915 acres (4.5% of the city's land area). These parks contain 2,138 acres of tree-covered land (5% of the city's tree canopy). Some parks, including nature preserves and newly acquired watershed properties, have almost 100% tree cover. Other parks, especially those downtown and those designed for specific uses such as golf courses or athletic fields, have very little tree cover. Overall, the average tree cover in parks is slightly above the average tree cover for the city as a whole. Figure 18 shows tree cover in Atlanta parks. In general, the percentage of tree cover within these parks increases with distance from the city center.



Figure 13. Percent Tree Cover by Park

The City of Atlanta has 21 parks greater than 50 acres in size. Among these parks, the greatest number of acres of tree cover is estimated for Southside Park (153 acres), Cascade Springs Nature Preserve (107 acres), Chastain Park (96 acres), and Atlanta Memorial (77 acres). The highest percentage of tree cover (>=80%) is estimated for Swann Preserve (40/50 acres; 80%), Cascade Springs (107/120 acres; 89%), and Herbert Greene (53/62 acres; 85%) (Figure 26). Among these large parks, the lowest percent of tree cover is estimated for Lakewood (22/120 acres; 18%), Browns Mill (38/166 acres; 23%); Maddox (18/55 acres; 33%); Piedmont (65/193 acres; 35%); and Candler (19/51 acres; 37%).



Figure 14. Land Cover Distribution for Parks > 50 Acres

As expected, tree cover is generally highest in nature preserves and parks with minimal facilities like Swann Preserve (80%), Cascade Springs (89%), and Herbert Greene (86%). Tree cover is lowest in large parks having specific uses. These large parks, with the exception of Maddox Park (33%) and Freedom Park (39%), each have primary uses that likely limit the potential for future tree planting. These uses include golf in Candler Park, John A. White Park, Chastain Park and Browns Mill Park, and the amphitheater in Lakewood. Parks are utilized for many purposes including activities that require large open areas as well as the preservation of forested areas and natural landscapes. Both Freedom Park and Maddox Park, however, seem to have adequate space for multiple purposes including potential additional tree planting, with 56 and 17 open acres respectively (Figure 19). Freedom Park, which was designed primarily as a series of connected trails surrounded by semi-open fields or lightly forested areas, may represent one of the largest potential planting areas on parkland, particularly some of the larger open areas around North Avenue, Freedom Parkway, and the Carter Center. The 56 vegetated acres without trees represents 44% of Freedom Park's total area.

Land cover statistics and summaries for the many parks smaller than 50 acres in the City of Atlanta are not presented in the body of this report. A complete list of all parks and their associated land cover statistics can be found in Section 8 - Appendix 3.

3.5 Zoning



Figure 15: Aggregated Zoning Categories

The research team examined tree canopy cover for each zoning category to establish a baseline measure for tree cover for each zone. While the City utilizes many zoning subcategories, the project team aggregated zoning categories with similar land uses (e.g., C-1, C-2, and C-3 are all grouped under C-Commercial).

Figure 20 illustrates the distribution of zoning categories across the city. Figure 21 illustrates the relative distribution of land cover within each zoning category, presented from highest to lowest canopy cover. Figure 22 shows the overall land area in acres for each aggregated zoning group.

As was the case in the previous study, the majority of Atlanta is zoned residential, with single-family residential as the largest zoning category (52,933 acres; 61% of the city's land area). The second largest zoning category is industrial, which constitutes a much smaller land area (9,818 acres; 11% of the city's land area). The third largest is multi-family residential (7,868 acres; 9% of the city's land area).



Figure 16. Land Cover Distribution by Zoning Category

In addition to being the largest zoning category by far, residential property has more tree cover than any other zoning categories. (e.g., 58% of single-family residential land is tree-covered and 45% of areas zoned for planned housing development are tree-covered, compared with commercially zoned land where 23% is tree-covered). Only single-family residential zoning has a tree cover percentage (58%) above the city average of 47.1%. The lowest concentration of tree cover is in the areas zoned neighborhood commercial (23%), Quality of Life-Mixed Use (21%), and special public interest (17%). Special public interest (SPI) zoning is difficult to characterize because it includes various land uses ranging from commercial to residential. SPI zoning in the city applies to commercial areas such as the Central Core, Buckhead Commercial Core, Buckhead/Lenox Station, Lindbergh Transit Station, Midtown, Piedmont Avenue, Buckhead Peachtree Corridor, Greenbriar, Memorial Drive/Oakland Cemetery, and Lindbergh Transit Station, as well as residential areas such as Candler Park, Poncey-Highland, Home Park, Mechanicsville, and Historic West End/Adair Park.

While tree cover makes up only 26% of the 9,818 acres with industrial zoning, this represents 2,515 acres of tree cover (and over 6% of the city's total tree cover). Under the zoning code, there are no limits on the amount of impervious lot coverage on many properties with industrial zoning. These data may suggest a significant amount of underdeveloped or vacant acreage that is zoned for industrial use, and therefore may represent areas with potentially signifcant loss of tree canopy if the acreage is developed in compliance with current regulations.



Figure 17: Land Cover Area in Acres by Aggregated Zoning Category

Table 4 Shows land cover summary statistics by zoning category.

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
Historic-Cultural	1%	34%	1%	0%	27%	1%	0%	39%	1%
QOL Mixed Use	2%	21%	1%	0%	20%	2%	1%	59%	4%
Office Institutional	2%	34%	1%	0%	23%	2%	1%	44%	3%
Planned Development	3%	45%	3%	1%	24%	3%	1%	31%	3%
Commercial	4%	23%	2%	1%	19%	4%	3%	58%	9%
Special Public Interest	6%	17%	2%	1%	17%	4%	4%	66%	13%
Residential Multi-Family	9%	40%	8%	2%	26%	10%	3%	34%	10%
Industrial	11%	26%	6%	2%	21%	10%	6%	54%	20%
Residential Single-Family	61%	58%	76%	14%	24%	63%	11%	18%	37%

Table 4: Land Cover Summary Statistics by Zoning Category

Interpreting the table:

- **"% City"** The percentage of the city's total area that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation in the specified zoning category. For example, a "% City" value of 61% for Single-Family Residential under the "Tree Cover" grouping means that 61% of the city's total land area is comprised of tree cover found solely on land zoned single-family residential.

- **"% Zone"** The percentage within the zoning category that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation. For example, a "% Zoning" value of 58% for Single-Family Residential under the "Tree Cover" grouping means that 58% of land zoned single-family residential is tree-covered.

- **"% Cover Type (UTC, NTV, NV)"** The percentage of a cover type's total area that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation in a specific zoning category. For example, a "% UTC" value of 76% for Single-Family Residential under the "Tree Cover" grouping means that 76% of the city's total tree canopy area is comprised of tree cover found on land zoned single-family residential.

Significant findings in Table 4:

- Most of the tree cover (76%) in the city is found on single-family residential land.
- The second greatest concentration of the city's tree cover is found on land zoned for multi-family residential use (8%) and industrial (6%).
- The lowest tree cover percentages are in the Special Public Interest (SPI) zoning areas (17%) and Quality of Life Mixed Use (21%)

- High potential for planting trees is found on single-family residential land where 24% of land cover is non-tree vegetation (63% of all non-tree vegetation, such as lawns, is located on single-family residenial land).
- Industrial and multi-family residential land have the next greatest potential for planting, each with non-tree vegetative cover percentages near 10%.

The policy and planning implications of zoning specifications on Atlanta's urban tree canopy are significant and will be discussed in more depth later in this report.

3.6 Neighborhood Planning Units (NPU)

There are 26 Neighborhood Planning Units (NPUs) in the City of Atlanta.



Figure 18: Percent Tree Cover by NPU

NPU	Area (Acres)	Tree	Tree Cover (Percent)
A	7,317	4,555	62%
P	6,008	3,692	62%
I	6,137	3,651	60%
H	4,088	2,421	59%
Q	1,069	607	57%
C	3,874	2,186	56%
R	3,448	1,876	54%
J	2,840	1,476	52%
Z	6,704	3,386	51%
S	2,486	1,252	50%
G	3,598	1,654	46%
B	6,516	2,978	46%
W	3,398	1,522	45%
F	3,042	1,330	44%
O	2,487	1,056	43%
X	2,566	1,073	42%
N	2,204	878	40%
K	1,528	587	38%
T	1,751	588	34%
Y	2,106	696	33%
D	4,150	1,270	31%
E	3,780	1,019	27%
L	846	209	25%
V	2,027	475	23%
M	2,422	288	12%

Table 5. Percent Tree Cover by NPU

Figure 23 shows the percent tree cover by NPU for the City of Atlanta. Table 5 shows the acreage and percent tree cover by NPU. Figure 24 shows the percent land cover

distribution by NPU in bar chart form, with total acres for each land cover type labeled in black font on the associated land cover bar. Chart is in order of highest to lowest percentage of tree cover.



Figure 19. Land Cover Distribution by NPU

As expected, the centrally located NPUs have significantly lower tree cover percentages than NPUs outside of downtown. The majority of NPUs with above city average tree cover percentages contain large stream corridors that run through residential neighborhoods and drain into the Chattahoochee River.

The NPUs vary significantly in size and composition. NPU A is largest (7,317 acres) and has the highest percentage of tree cover (62%) in the city. By contrast, NPU L is the smallest NPU and has the lowest total tree canopy area (209 acres), but it has only the third lowest percentage of tree canopy (25%) among the NPUs. NPU M in downtown has the lowest percentage of tree cover (12%) and the second lowest amount of tree-covered acreage (288 acres).

3.7 Council Districts



Figure 20. Percent Tree Cover by City Council District

District	Area (Acres)	Tree	Tree Cover (Percent)
2	2,795	749	27%
3	4,805	1,513	31%
4	4,017	1,401	35%
1	6,404	2,526	39%
5	4,946	1,919	39%
6	5,053	2,054	41%
9	11,413	4,912	43%
12	9,899	4,355	44%
7	5,069	2,336	46%
8	12,108	7,130	59%
10	8,803	5,154	59%
11	11,307	6,678	61%

Table 7: Tree Cover by Council District

Figure 25 and Table 7 illustrate tree cover across the City of Atlanta Council District boundaries. Tree cover percentages by City Council District range from a high of 66% canopy cover in District 8 to a low of 13% canopy cover in District 2. The council districts with the lowest tree cover percentages are concentrated in the center and eastern parts of the city.

District 8 is the largest district and has both the highest percentage and total acreage of tree cover, while District 2 is the smallest district and has the both the least acreage and lowest percentage of tree cover across all districts (see number of acres printed in black on bars in Figure 26). Over 60% of land cover in District 2 is non-vegetation, which includes pavement, buildings, and other impervious surfaces with low potential for planting trees (Figure 26). Several districts have a high percentage of non-tree vegetation, which indicates potential tree planting areas. District 1, for example, has a high percentage of land with tree planting potential (non-tree vegetation), and Districts 3, 4, 5, and 6 have slightly lower percentages. District 2 has the largest amount of non-vegetated land area, indicating low potential for tree planting. Finding suitable areas to plant trees in this downtown District would be challenging without converting impervious area to pervious areas or utilizing innovative measures such as use of structural soils under pavement to enhance growing space for shade trees.



Figure 21: Land Cover Distribution by City Council District



Figure 22. Percent Tree Cover by Neighborhood

3.8 Neighborhoods

The City of Atlanta neighborhood GIS data layer contains 244 neighborhoods, ranging in size from sixteen acres (Harvel Homes) to over 1,900 acres (Paces), with an average size of 330 acres. Many areas in the city are undesignated as neighborhoods (shown in black on Figure 27).

Figure 28 shows land cover distribution for the dozen most tree-covered neighborhoods. The total acreage (2,155) of these twelve neighborhoods is similar to the total acreage (2,817) of the twelve least tree-covered neighborhoods seen in Figure 29. The difference in tree cover between these areas is dramatic -- each of the top twelve neighborhoods have more than 70% tree canopy and each of the twelve least tree-covered areas have less than 17% tree canopy.

The highest tree cover for any single neighborhood is in Boulder Park, which has



Figure 23. Land Cover Distribution for Top 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods



Figure 24. Top 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods

tree canopy of 78% of its 386 acres. The largest neighborhood in the top twelve most tree-covered is Audobon Forest, which has tree canopy on 73% of its 497 acres. Overall, the top twelve neighborhoods average 72 percent tree cover, 17% non-vegetative cover, and just under 11% non-tree vegetative cover. Non-vegetative cover is an approximate measure of impervious surface, but likely is an underestimate since many buildings and paved areas are shaded by canopy. Similarly, some portions of non-tree vegetation, such as lawns, shrubs and smaller plants, are covered by tree canopy.

Among the twelve least tree-covered neighborhoods (Figure 33), the average tree cover is 9.5%. Downtown is by far the largest neighborhood with low tree cover. Less than seven percent of its 1,256 acres have tree canopy.

Other neighborhoods among the dozen least tree-covered in Atlanta include Castleberry



Figure 25. Land Cover Distribution (Percent and Acres) for the Bottom 12 Tree-Covered Neighborhoods



Figure 26: Bottom 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods

Hill (adjacent to downtown), Oakland, Marietta Street Artery, Capitol Gateway, Sweet Auburn, Buckhead Village and Summerhill.

Based solely on the amount of non-vegetated land in these areas (Figure 30), there is potential for tree planting [e.g., 92 acres (27%) in Summerhill; 49 acres (45%) in the Villages at Carver; and 146 acres (11%) in Downtown]. These potential planting spaces, however, may have already been developed or planted with small trees. Additional investigation is needed to determine whether these non-vegetated areas represent viable planting areas.

4. Change Analysis – Comparing 2008 and 2014 Data

4.1 Change Analysis Explained

A primary objective of the second canopy study was to quantify the UTC change between 2008-2014 at multiple geographic levels across the city, starting with the city as a whole and going down to 6-acre grid cells. Theoretically, calculating change in canopy area and percentages between 2008-2014 should be a simple equation. However, as stated previously, the city of Atlanta annexed over 2,000 acres of land between 2008-2014. Additionally, the city updated most, if not all of their GIS layers (zoning, neighborhoods, council districts, etc.). So, to assure that change over time was accurately calculated at smaller geographies, the project team aggregated both 2008 and 2014 land cover data to the 2014 geographies before calculating change. Therefore, land cover percentages originally reported in 2008 for various geographies may differ from those reported herein. Furthermore, due to the annexation of acreage between 2008 and 2014, the 2008 satellite imagery did not cover the entire 2014 city limits. Subsequently, canopy change could not be calculated for areas not covered by the 2008 satellite imagery (See "No Satellite Imagery (2008) in Figure 32).



Figure 27. Satellite Imagery Coverage

Canopy change at the city scale and smaller geographies is discussed below. See Appendix 4 for canopy change maps, Appendix 5 for canopy change tables, and Appendix 6 for canopy change charts and graphs.

4.2 City-Wide Change

At the city scale, the measured change in total coverage between 2008 and 2014 (47.9% to 47.1%) was not statistically significant[i]. At the 6-acre grid cell scale, however, there were many areas (403 grid cells) where the data indicated tree loss of greater than one acre. There were also areas (133 grid cells) where the results indicated UTC gain of more than one acre (Figure 33).



Figure 28.Tree Cover Change in Acres by Grid Cell

To better understand these findings, the project team visually inspected over 800 sites using the satellite photos from both time periods and subsequently visited 158 sites in person to verify site conditions (Figure 34). This detailed verification and validation of the change analysis results provided added confidence and allowed the project team to refine and increase the validity of the results. It also revealed many trends across the city that would likely have been under-reported or missed completely without this verification. Most notable,

[i] Statistical significance is + or – 5% as described in Section 2.5.



Figure 29. Site Inspections

the site visits revealed greater loss of tree canopy across the city than the numbers show. In particular, many (>75) areas detected on the imagery as “canopy gain” or areas with one or more acres of tree growth were actually disturbed sites covered by rapidly growing, low quality trees or a monocuculture of pines. On many of these previously cleared sites, scrubby vegetation and small invasive plants were misclassified in the imagery analyses as areas showing tree canopy growth. Other sites were covered with small volunteer pines or invasive trees that had grown on disturbed sites which were either still under development or had been abandoned during the development process (Figure 35).

Figure 30. Secondary Growth on Abandoned Sites

4.3 Areas Losing UTC

There were at least fifteen sites across the city where the change results indicated noticeable (> 50%) or complete loss of urban tree canopy (Figure 35). Most of these sites had been cleared and graded for new development. Since there are very few large, undeveloped parcels left in Atlanta, this small number of completely cleared parcels is not unexpected. And given the canopy change time period spans a majority of the economic downturn (2008-2012), a lack of large developments is not startling. What is unexpected, however, is that the greatest observed loss of canopy in the city, at least in raw numbers, resulted from new or redevelopment of single-family houses.

Overall, the density of development, specifically the number of single-family residential units didn't appear to change much between 2008-2014, but the size and footprint size of single-family homes increased substantially. Through site visits and inspection of the satellite imagery, the project team identified over 100 properties (Figure 36) where single-family homes were newly built, demolished and rebuilt, or renovated with a much larger size and building footprint than the original home, resulting in a loss of tree cover (~155 acres total) and an increase in impervious surface area (75 acres). While these numbers may seem inconsequential, they are only a small sample of the city and represent a number potentially as much as 10 to 20 times higher. More alarming is the fact that the trend is increasing as permit activity for new developments has steadily increased since 2014 (Figure 38). The increase in permits more than doubled between 2012 (301) and 2017 (677) and was highest in 2016 (at 695).



Figure 31. Loss of 50% or More of Canopy (> 3 acres)



Figure 32. Single Family Development and Redevelopment Sites



Figure 33. New Development Permits (2012-2017)

During every project site visit, the project team observed significant tree loss on single-family lots under redevelopment, all of which had been started after the 2014 UTC assessment. Since the majority of the city's tree canopy is found on single-family residential lots, this trend of larger footprints on individual lots and small-scale single-family lot redevelopments may be the biggest threat to the city's urban tree canopy. Even though this tree loss occurred legally and in accordance with current zoning and tree ordinance regulations, the potential for more substantial and permanent UTC loss is high. For example, if 50% of all single–family lots were redeveloped and built out to their maximum lot coverage, the city would lose roughly 7,400 acres or 18% of its tree canopy (Figure 39).

% Single-Family Lots Built Out to Max Lot Coverage	100%	50%	25%	10%
Estimated Acres Lost	14,887	7,443	3,722	1,489
Estimated % UTC Lost	37%	18%	9%	4%

Figure 34. Lot Build-Out Scenarios



Figure 35. Canopy Loss from New Developments

In addition, there are no lot coverage limits for multi-family and industrial zones and if all of these areas were fully developed in accordance with current code requirements, canopy loss could be nearly 100 percent in these areas, resulting in 6,500 acres or 16% overall loss of canopy in the city. Several site visits to industrial, commercial and industrial sites revealed almost complete clear-cut of trees (Figure 40). While many of these sites plant street trees or shade trees as part of the new development, the quality and quantity of tree loss is almost irreplaceable and adds to the continued reconfiguration of Atlanta's urban forest.

4.4 Areas Gaining UTC

On a positive note, the project team also identified areas showing an increase in canopy coverage between 2008-2014. Several locations showing growth in canopy were the result of the rapid growth of trees planted in parks, new subdivisions and on individual properties around 2008 (Figure 41). Sites that were cleared prior to 2008 and had almost no tree cover at that time show up to 25% growth in canopy coverage in 2014. While this growth is positive, it should also be noted that many of these quick growing trees are non-native or ornamental (such as crape myrtles, Chinese elms, and cyptomeria) and do not provide the same ecological benefits as native trees such as oaks, beeches, hickories, elms, and other trees that likely covered many of these sites prior to clearing for development (Figure 42).

Figure 36. New Development Permits (2012-2017)

Unfortunately, many sites showing growth in UTC were unfinished or semi-finished subdivisions (i.e., land cleared, roads and sewer constructed but no buildings), which are often referred to as “pipe farms”. Of the 32 identified pipe farms (Figure 43), most of which are in the southeast and southwest corners of the city, fifteen are greater than 25 acres in size, and the largest, which was cleared in 2004, is roughly 80 acres in size (Figure 44). All of these sites are now overgrown, typically with small, tightly spaced volunteer pines, or quick growing invasive trees (Figure 43). Some of these sites show in the imagery as close to 100% growth in UTC since 2008. However, the site visits revealed that they were often populated with poor quality trees and, most likely, represented temporary growth since the sites are stalled developments that will eventually be cleared again when the development plans are implemented. Based on extensive site visits and review of the satellite imagery, the project team estimates that this “false” growth represents ~ 900 acres or 2.3% of the city’s canopy.

Figure 37. Non-Native Street Trees Planted in New Development



Figure 39. Pipe Farms

Figure 38. City's Largest and Oldest Pipe Farm (Google Earth View)

4.5 Canopy Change – Selected Geographies

Figure 45 below shows the percent change in tree cover between 2008-2014 for selected geographies within the city. Individual tree cover change maps and table and charts showing acres of canopy change by selected geographies are found in Section 9 - Appendix 4, Section 10 – Appendix 5, and Section 6 - Appendix 6.



Figure 40. Percent Change in Tree Cover Across Selected Geographies

The majority of canopy loss and gain shown in the maps below is similar, if not identical, to trends seen across the city as a whole. The northern part of the city is the only area to experience statistically significant loss (> 5% loss) while areas showing statistically significant gains (> 5% gain) are primarily south, east and west of the downtown area. As discussed above, the causes for canopy loss in the northern parts of the city are primarily due to redevelopment of single-family homes and new residential, commercial and institutional (schools, fire departments, etc.) developments. Tree cover gain to the west, east and south of downtown is likely attributed to growth observed in subdivisions built circa 2008, false growth as discussed above, and possibly some underestimates of 2008 tree canopy.

4.5 Canopy Change Highlights – Selected Geographies

The following figures and tables show some of the 2008-2014 canopy change highlights across selected geographies. See Appendix xx and xx for a comprehensive look at change maps, tables, and graphs for selected geographies.

4.5.1 Watershed Canopy Change

Table 8 shows land cover change by watershed sorted by most canopy loss to least canopy loss from 2008-2014. Figure 46 is a bar chart showing percent tree cover change by watershed from 2008-2014. Figure 47 is a map showing change in percent tree canopy by watersheds between 2008-2014.



Figure 41. Percent and Acreage (Black) Tree Cover Change by Watershed 2008-2014

Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Nancy Creek	8,034	(625)	(7.8)	268	3	378	5
Peachtree Creek	19,582	(540)	(2.8)	559	3	10	0
Long Island Creek	2,383	(163)	(6.8)	84	4	143	6
Mud Creek	79	0	0.3	1	1	(1)	(1)
Doolittle Creek	464	6	1.4	(10)	(2)	17	4
Shoal Creek	74	7	9.4	1	1	5	7
Bakers Ferry	433	14	3.3	(8)	(2)	9	2
Sandy Creek	3,595	39	1.1	(68)	(2)	49	1
Sugar Creek	2,583	39	1.5	(14)	(1)	(7)	(0)
Utoy Creek	15,491	50	0.3	43	0	371	2
Camp Creek	3,912	57	1.5	(41)	(1)	82	2
Proctor Creek	12,097	157	1.3	103	1	(219)	(2)
South River	11,876	249	2.1	(28)	(0)	(192)	(2)

Table 8. Land Cover Change by Watershed 2008-2014



Figure 42. Change in Percent Tree Cover by Watershed 2008-2014

.

4. 5.2 Small Watershed Canopy Change

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Nancy Creek_78	59	-7	-12%	3.65	6.28	3.38	5.81
Long Island Creek_47	175	-7.01	-12%	4.57	7.74	2.49	4.22
Long Island Creek_53	167	-18.34	-10%	9.99	5.7	8.36	4.78
Peachtree Creek_102	358	-17.3	-10%	12.54	7.53	4.75	2.85
Peachtree Creek_129	428	-36.94	-10%	21.74	6.07	15.17	4.24
Long Island Creek_48	194	-18.94	-10%	7.9	4.25	11.1	5.97
Nancy Creek_87	222	-43.61	-10%	15.36	3.59	28.29	6.61
Peachtree Creek_112	37	-22.5	-10%	9.09	4.09	13.39	6.04
Peachtree Creek_92	37	-19.63	-10%	9.88	5.1	9.77	5.04
Peachtree Creek_149	520	-3.75	-10%	1.24	3.35	2.56	6.91
Peachtree Creek_93	135	-51.49	-10%	28.65	5.51	22.79	4.38
Peachtree Creek_120	306	-3.63	-10%	2.82	7.69	0.79	2.15

Table 9. Land Cover Statistics for the Twelve Small Watersheds Showing the Most Change in Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014



Figure 43. Change in Percent Tree Cover by Small Watershed 2008-2014

Figure 48 is a map of change in percent tree cover by small watersheds. Due to the large number of small watersheds in the city, only the twelve top and bottom tree-covered small watersheds will be highlighted in this section. For a detailed table on land cover change for all small watersheds, please see Section 10 – Appendix 5. Table 9 contains land cover change statistics for the twelve small watersheds showing the most change in percent tree cover 2008-2014. Figure 49 shows the location of the twelve small watersheds that had the greatest loss of percent tree cover between 2008-2014. Single-family redevelopment and new single family developments are the primary cause of change in the percent of tree cover in the two small watersheds showing the most change. Most, if not all, of the change observed in the remaining watersheds is due to a variety of new developments and redevelopments, primarily single-family.



Figure 44. Twelve Small Watersheds with Most Loss of Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014

Table 10 contains land cover change statistics for the twelve watersheds showing the most gain in percent tree cover between 2008-2014. Figure 50 shows their location and change in percent tree cover.

The growth observed in these areas varies quite a bit from false, secondary growth (Sandy Creek and Intrenchment) to true growth of canopy (Proctor, Utoy and Intrenchment) to street tree growth and growth from new plantings (South River, Peachtree and Intrenchment).

True canopy growth in this area of the city, however minimal, is positive and significant as it will help offset stormwater runoff and help lower temperatures caused by the urban heat island effect.

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
South River_241	266	25	9%	3	1%	(28)	-11%
Utoy Creek_283	187	16	9%	(6)	-3%	(10)	-5%
Sandy Creek_192	207	18	8%	(17)	-8%	(1)	0%
Proctor Creek_162	280	24	8%	0	0%	(24)	-9%
Proctor Creek_164	633	54	8%	(30)	-5%	(23)	-4%
Intrenchment Creek_40	154	13	8%	(7)	-5%	(6)	-4%
Intrenchment Creek_31	208	17	8%	(9)	-4%	(8)	-4%
Intrenchment Creek_30	184	15	8%	(1)	0%	(14)	-8%
Proctor Creek_188	275	21	8%	14	5%	(36)	-13%
Peachtree Creek_124	218	16	7%	(3)	-1%	(13)	-6%
Intrenchment Creek_43	531	39	7%	(19)	-4%	(20)	-4%
Utoy Creek_314	732	51	7%	(23)	-3%	(28)	-4%

Table 10. Land Cover Change for the Twelve Small Watersheds Showing the Most Gain in Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014



Figure 45. Twelve Watersheds Showing Most Gain in Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014

4.5.3 Park Canopy Change

Due to the large size variation in parks, acres of canopy change, not percent change in canopy, will be shown and discussed below. Furthermore, since there are numerous parks in the city (> 360), ranging greatly in size, only parks greater than ½ acre in size and showing the most and least change in tree cover will be highlighted here. For a detailed table presenting land cover distribution and change for all parks, please see Section 10 - Appendix 5.



Figure 46. Acres of Canopy Change by Park 2008-2014

Figure 51 is a map showing change in acres of tree cover by park. As noted by the map legend, acres of canopy lost or gained between 2008-2014 in the vast majority of parks is not significant. Southside lost roughly 25 acres of tree cover due to work in sewer easements. Swann Preserve lost approximately eight acres due to clearing for a road/path. The majority of loss greater than 2.5 acres appears to be due to maintenance (clearance of secondary growth), infrastructure upgrades (paths, sewer lines), trees lost to storms, and tree removal due to death or declining condition of trees. In a few locations, the loss appears to be overestimated (Chastain and Atlanta Memorial), likely as a result of an underestimate of canopy in 2008 resulting from a shadow on that portion of the satellite image. Table 11 shows the land cover change statistics for the 16 parks exhibiting loss greater than 2.5 acres.

Park	Acres	Acres UTC 2014	% UTC 2014	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Southside Park	211	153	73%	-26	-12%	19	9%	7	3%
Atlanta Memorial Park	193	77	40%	-12	-6%	7	3%	6	3%
Chattahoochee Trail	52	22	43%	-11	-21%	9	18%	2	4%
Chastain Memorial Park	250	96	38%	-11	-4%	-5	-2%	15	6%
North Camp Creek Parkway NP	73	57	78%	-9	-13%	9	12%	0	0%
Swann Preserve	50	40	80%	-8	-15%	6	12%	2	4%
Cascade Springs Nature Preserve	121	107	89%	-6	-5%	6	5%	0	0%
Morningside Nature Preserve	37	25	68%	-6	-15%	4	12%	1	3%
Gun Club Park	42	34	81%	-5	-13%	4	10%	1	3%
Lionel Hampton	49	42	85%	-5	-10%	5	9%	0	0%
South Bend Park	75	46	61%	-4	-6%	3	4%	2	2%
Herbert Greene	61	53	86%	-4	-7%	4	6%	1	1%
Melvin Drive Park	52	40	77%	-3	-7%	3	6%	0	0%
Herbert Taylor Park	26	18	70%	-3	-13%	2	8%	1	5%
Spink-Collins Park	26	22	84%	-3	-12%	3	11%	0	1%
Rockdale Park	63	43	69%	-3	-5%	2	2%	1	2%

Table 11. Land Cover Change Statistics for Parks with > 2.5 Acres of Loss 2008-2014

Table 12 shows land cover change statistics for the seven city parks with >=2.5 acres of canopy growth between 2008-2014. Canopy growth in these parks is primarily due to rapid growth of young trees and or trees planted sometime around 2008 (Figure 52).

Park	Acres	Acres UTC 2014	% UTC 2014	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Freedom Park	125	50	40%	13	10%	-11	-9%	-2	-1%
Grant Park	131	65	50%	9	7%	-10	-8%	1	1%
Maddox Park	55	18	33%	4	7%	-2	-3%	-2	-4%
Piedmont Park	193	65	34%	3	2%	5	3%	-9	-5%
Oakland Cemetery	48	11	22%	3	7%	2	5%	-6	-12%
Browns Mill Golf Course	165	38	23%	3	2%	-6	-4%	3	2%
Candler Park	51	19	37%	3	6%	-4	-8%	1	2%

Table 12. Land Cover Change Statistics for Parks with >=2.5 Acres of Canopy Growth 2008-2014



Figure 47. Canopy Growth in Piedmont and Freedom Parks

4.5.4 Council District Canopy Change

Table 13 shows land cover change by council district, sorted by most loss to least loss of canopy. Figure 53 shows tree cover change between 2007-2014 by council district.

Council District	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
8	12,108	(977)	(8)	450	4	591	5
7	5,069	(341)	(7)	177	3	190	4
9	11,413	(175)	(2)	195	2	50	0
6	5,053	(98)	(2)	138	3	1	0
10	8,803	(46)	(1)	(91)	(1)	203	2
5	4,946	120	2	122	2	(54)	(1)
2	2,795	143	5	(2)	(0)	(141)	(5)
12	9,899	200	2	(44)	(0)	(120)	(1)
3	4,805	205	4	25	1	(230)	(5)
4	4,017	208	5	(23)	(1)	(185)	(5)
11	11,307	267	2	248	8	381	2
1	6,404	308	5	(73)	(1)	(235)	(4)

Table 13. 2008-2014 Land Cover Change by Council District



Figure 48. Percent Tree Cover Change 2008-2014 by Council District



Figure 49. Change in Percent Tree Cover by Council District

4.5.5 Neighborhood Canopy Change

Due to large number of neighborhoods in the City of Atlanta, the twelve neighborhoods showing the most or least change in percent tree cover are highlighted here. Figure 55 shows the locations of the top twelve neighborhoods showing gain in percent tree cover while Table 14 shows their gain statistics. The reasons for gain in these neighborhoods range from growth of street trees planted in subdivisions circa 2008 (Villages at Carver, Cascade Green, Betmar) to growth of existing canopy (Hunter Hills. Washington Park, Ashview, Just Us, Harvel, South Atlanta) to false growth on land cleared circa 2008 (Englewood



Figure 50. Top 12 Neighborhoods Gaining Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Englewood Manor	31	5	18	6	20	(11)	(37)
Washington Park	164	16	10	(4)	(2)	(13)	(8)
Boulevard Heights	140	14	10	(6)	(4)	(8)	(5)
The Villages at Carver	108	11	10	19	17	(29)	(27)
Cascade Green	49	5	10	(4)	(8)	(1)	(2)
Ashview Heights	175	17	10	1	0	(18)	(10)
Betmar LaVilla	72	7	9	(3)	(4)	(4)	(5)
Fort McPherson	515	46	9	(22)	(4)	(19)	(4)
South Atlanta	296	26	9	(8)	(3)	(18)	(6)
Hunter Hills	323	29	9	(20)	(6)	(9)	(3)
Just Us	18	2	9	(1)	(3)	(1)	(5)
Harvel Homes Community	16	1	8	(2)	(12)	1	3

Table 14. Top 12 Neighborhoods Gaining Percent Tree Cover 2008-2014

Manor, Boulevard Heights) to possible under estimates of canopy in 2008 and better capture of street

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Colonial Homes	27	(4)	(15)	(2)	(9)	7	24
Arden/Habersham	115	(15)	(13)	8	7	7	6
Woodfield	46	(6)	(13)	4	10	2	3
Wesley Battle	199	(24)	(12)	14	7	10	5
Peachtree Battle Alliance	459	(54)	(12)	26	6	27	6
Ardmore	84	(10)	(11)	6	7	3	4
Brandon	410	(46)	(11)	25	6	21	5
Collier Hills	151	(17)	(11)	11	7	6	4
Peachtree Heights East	133	(15)	(11)	9	7	6	4
Tuxedo Park	735	(78)	(11)	34	5	44	6
South Tuxedo Park	244	(25)	(10)	9	4	16	7
Brookwood Hills	199	(20)	(10)	12	6	8	4

Table 15. Top Twelve Neighborhoods Losing Percent Tree Cover 2008 - 2014

trees in 2014 (Fort McPherson).

Figure 56 shows the location of the twelve neighborhoods showing the most loss in percent tree cover between 2008-2014. Table 15 shows the associated loss statistics. Almost all of the loss in these areas can be attributed to either new developments or redevelopments, many along Peachtree Street or some of the main thoroughfares. Removal of large overhanging street trees was also observed in a few of these neighborhoods. Most of the neighborhoods showing the most loss in percent tree cover had at least one large, new development in the neighborhood. Some of the tree loss also is likely attributable to tree removal of individual large trees.



Figure 51. Top Twelve Neighborhoods Losing Percent Tree Cover 2008 - 2014

4.5.6 NPU Canopy Change

Figure 57 shows the percent change and change in acres by NPU for 2008-2014. Table 16 shows land



Figure 52. Percent Tree Cover Change by NPU (Change in Acres in Black) 2008-2014

NPU	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
A	7,317	(586)	(8)	246	3	403	6
B	6,516	(448)	(7)	238	4	236	4
C	3,874	(321)	(8)	176	5	146	4
D	4,150	(114)	(3)	82	2	51	1
I	6,137	(83)	(1)	(49)	(1)	148	2
F	3,042	(70)	(2)	93	3	9	0
G	3,598	(60)	(2)	83	2	1	0
R	3,448	(50)	(1)	(16)	(0)	71	2
E	3,780	14	0	91	2	(105)	(3)
O	2,487	27	1	128	5	14	1
P	6,008	29	0	34	1	143	2
Z	6,704	31	0	39	1	(50)	(1)
H	4,088	37	1	(50)	(1)	65	2
J	2,840	38	1	(27)	(1)	(11)	(0)
L	846	54	6	29	3	(83)	(10)
M	2,422	94	4	55	2	(149)	(6)
S	2,486	94	4	(79)	(3)	(9)	(0)
K	1,528	97	6	(22)	(1)	(75)	(5)
X	2,566	98	4	(58)	(2)	(30)	(1)
Y	2,106	98	5	(12)	(1)	(86)	(4)
N	2,204	105	5	(32)	(1)	(54)	(2)
T	1,751	112	6	2	0	(114)	(6)
V	2,027	122	6	24	1	(146)	(7)
W	3,398	178	5	(95)	(3)	(75)	(2)
Q*	1,069	317	30	241	23	151	14

Table 16. Percent Tree Cover Change by NPU 2008-2014 ---* 2008 Data Not Available for NPU O

cover change by Neighborhood Planning Unit, sorted by most loss to least loss of canopy. Figure 58 shows tree cover change by NPU for 2008-2014. The northernmost NPUs experienced the most change in tree canopy, likely a direct result of increased residential development between 2012-2014. The NPUs immediately south and west of downtown experienced the most significant growth, much of which can be attributed to growth of street trees planted in new developments circa 2008.



Figure 53. Change in Percent Tree Cover by NPU 2008-2014

5. Discussion

5.1 Discussion of Results

The canopy study found that in October 2014, 47.1% (40,740 acres) of land within the city limits was shaded by urban tree canopy. The study also showed that 22.9% (19,758 acres) was covered by non-tree vegetation such as grass, shrubs, and other plants while 30.0% (25,386 acres) was covered by non-vegetation such as buildings and paved surfaces. At 47.1%, the overall percentage of tree canopy is the highest among 15 major cities that have evaluated urban tree canopy in recent years, reflecting Atlanta's setting in a Piedmont forest (with almost 100% canopy in its natural state), its large land area, its predominantly residential development patterns, and its favorable climate, as well as its longstanding tree preservation and planting policies. These findings are significant and will enable the City of Atlanta to continue to effectively plan for and manage their urban forest. A few of the more noteworthy findings are further discussed below.

5.1.2 The majority of the city's canopy is found on land zoned single-family residential

As expected, the strong impact of zoning and land use on the distribution of tree canopy in 2014 is very similar to the 2008 study findings. Most of the city's tree canopy grows on single-family residential property (75.6%) on the city's periphery and is heaviest in the northwest, southwest, and southeast The second highest concentration of canopy is on land zoned for multi-family residential use (7.7%) followed by industrial use (6.2%). Commercial (2.1%), Mixed Use (1.1%), Office-Institutional (1.5%) and Special Public Interest (2.2%) are the lowest contributors to the city's tree canopy. Tree cover is lowest downtown, in the areas surrounding downtown, and along commercial and transportation corridors. The distribution of the canopy varies significantly across Atlanta's 244 neighborhoods, with an average tree canopy of ***73***% in the dozen most-canopied neighborhoods, and an average tree canopy of only ***9*** % in the dozen least-canopied neighborhoods.

Ultimately, this means that tree canopy protection in the City of Atlanta is in the hands of its citizens. While the tree ordinance and zoning regulations provide protection to the canopy, unfortunately, these protective measures still allow for substantial removal of trees at the parcel level. Furthermore, if the ongoing trend of developing and redeveloping single-family homes to the maximum allowable lot coverage persists, the city will continue to lose significant canopy on a lot by lot basis. It may not happen all at once, and may not be as noticeable as a lot completely cleared for a new development, but a transformation of the city's canopy is underway and unless it is slowed down, the city's canopy will be considerably altered, diminished, and potentially changed forever.

5.1.3 Despite the Numbers, the Canopy is Changing

The lack of statically significant change in canopy cover between 2008 (47.9%) and 2014 (47.1%) is very misleading. Observations on the ground during site visits revealed some very concerning trends that indicate more loss than what the numbers showed, and more loss to come if the pattern continues. Approximately 2.3% of the observed "gain" was identified as "false growth", indicating that the city's canopy may have declined to as little as 45% during this period.

The majority of canopy loss occurred in the northern part of Atlanta and was due primarily to redevelopment or new development of single-family homes. While these losses can occur at one or two-acre increments, over time, this adds up, and, based on observations during site visits and the patterns of recent building permit activity, much more of this type of development has occurred since 2014 than occurred between 2008-2014. Redevelopment of single-family homes where the new home is built to the maximum allowable lot coverage is the city's newest and most serious threat to its tree canopy. Table 17 shows various estimates of canopy loss caused by single-family redevelopments that are built-out to the

% Single-Family Lots Built Out to Max Lot Coverage	100%	50%	25%	10%
Estimated Acres Lost	14,887	7,443	3,722	1,489
Estimated % UTC Lost	37%	18%	9%	4%

Table 17. Potential Estimated Canopy Loss Caused by Single-Family Redevelopments

Figure 54. Stalled Developments Showing Canopy Gain

Figure 55. Original Growth behind New Growth on a Pipe Farm

maximum allowable lot coverage.

Initial study results indicated substantial canopy growth (> 2 acres within a 6-acre grid cell) at several areas across the city. There were a few areas that appeared to be new, small contiguous forests (< 10 acres), but site visits typically revealed a much different story. Almost every one of the areas showing substantial growth were, in fact, sites previously cleared for development, demolished and/or stalled in development and now covered by secondary growth (fast growing invasive trees or a monoculture of tightly spaced pines). Figure 59 shows a few examples of sites showing canopy "gain". On the left of Figure 59 are the 2008 and 2014 satellite photos of two sites where land was cleared yet development was not completed by 2014. The pictures on the right of Figure 59 were taken during site visits. Notice the similarity in the "new" forest cover at each of the two sites – it is dense, pine-dominated and likely replaced an older, healthy, mixed hardwood forest. At many sites, the demarcation between the old forest (cleared for development) and new growth was evident as pictured in Figure 60. This was a common observation at this type of location.

On a positive note, a handful of sites showing substantial canopy gain were valid. A few of the city's parks experienced notable gains in canopy, some due to plantings installed circa 2008. There were also several subdivisions and individual properties built around 2008 that showed sizeable increase in canopy due to rapid street tree growth. There were many neighborhoods with mature trees and canopy that continued to increase, though not as quickly as areas with younger, faster growing trees. This type of growth is harder to detect in a short period of time.

What does this mean for Atlanta's canopy? When simply looking at the numbers for "gain", we see an estimated increase in canopy. However, at most of these sites, there is no gain in the quality of canopy. Typically, when forested land with healthy, mature canopy is clear cut, depending upon soil conditions, it is quickly replaced by fast growing invasive trees or a monoculture of pines. Furthermore, most of these sites are in a sort of developmental limbo and will likely be cleared again, making any gain, even low-quality gain, short-lived. These false gain sites are degraded sites with graded soil where development has faltered and nature is trying to reclaim the land. Given decades, or centuries to recover, the sites could recover to offer some of the ecosystem services they provided prior to 2008, but

because of the roads, curb-and-gutter, and other infrastructure that was installed, they are unlikely to return to their full natural value. In the meantime, existing forests will continue to be cleared for development without policies to guide development choices. The city needs to better understand how these sites came to be, and how to prevent this type of disruptive development practice from happening in the future. Otherwise, because of sites like these and the trend towards lot build-out on redeveloped single-family homes, the city's high quality forests will diminish into a lower quality version of itself, providing fewer and fewer ecosystem services for Atlanta's residents.

5.1.4 The City's Canopy Goals

Following the first City of Atlanta Urban Tree Canopy Assessment, the city made a goal of obtaining and maintaining at least 50% tree cover across the city. While positive and praiseworthy, the mechanisms for achieving and maintaining this goal are not as straightforward as they might seem. Two things must happen in order to achieve the 50% canopy goal with no net-loss; plant trees and mitigate loss.

A. Plant Trees

If the city is currently covered by 47.1% tree canopy, 2.9% *new* canopy cover must be grown to reach 50%. This equates to roughly 2,500 acres of new tree cover, which could be realized through a continued public and private tree planting efforts.

Land Type	Acres of Non-Tree Vegetation (Land for Tree Planting)
Parks	1,500
Public Schools	300
Other Public Lands	800
Private Land	14,600
Right-of-Way	3,050

Table 18. Available Potential Planting Land (2014)

Assessing the 2014 tree canopy data in conjunction with data obtained from the city's GIS department., the Fulton County Tax Assessor and the Atlanta Public School district, Atlanta contains roughly 2,600 acres of public land (non-tree vegetation) currently available for planting (Table 18). A safe assumption might be that up to 25% (650 acres) of public land currently covered in non-tree vegetation could be planted with canopy trees, which leaves roughly 2,000 acres of new canopy that must be grown and maintained either on private land or in the right-of-way. Fortunately, there is approximately 14,600 acres of privately owned, non-tree vegetated land in the City across 160,000 properties. There is also approximately 3,050 acres of non-tree vegetation acres in the right-of-way. Given adequate incentives and proper planning, 2,000 acres of tree cover could be achieved over time, through private plantings combined with some larger scale planting, particularly along the interstate highways. Alternatively, underutilized public properties covered by impervious surfaces could be converted to planting areas, though this strategy would likely be cost prohibitive.

B. Mitigate Loss

It is imperative that the City evaluate multiple options for mitigating tree loss because tree planting alone is not a quick or viable solution to replace lost canopy. The city is losing tree cover faster than it is gaining

tree cover and, based on observations made during field visits for this project, that trend is likely to continue post 2014 with a substantial increase in magnitude and velocity.

The following are a few possibilities for mitigating tree loss.

- ***Permanently protect existing forests:***

  Using 2015 City of Atlanta tax assessor data in conjunction with the 2014 urban tree canopy data, the project team identified approximately 3,480 vacant properties in the city that contain >= .25 acres of tree cover, totaling 5,700 acres of undisturbed forests, or roughly 14% of the existing canopy. Over 220 of these vacant properties are relatively large, with >=5 acres of canopy cover, totaling roughly 2,600 acres of tree cover or 6% of the existing canopy. The two vacant properties with the most tree canopy are both over 75 acres in size (118 and 77) and contain 80 acres and 57 acres of tree canopy respectively. More importantly, over 75 of the 220 vacant properties with >= 5 acres of tree cover are located within 250 feet of a river, including each river within the city limits. Unfortunately, based on current trends, there is a strong likelihood that many of these properties will be developed and much of this existing canopy will be permanently lost, potentially causing a negative effect to the city's delicate ecosystem.

  The project team also identified 424 occupied, privately owned properties that are >= 10 acres in size and contain 80% or more tree cover, totaling approximately 3,900 acres of tree cover or 10% of the existing canopy cover. Nine of these properties have more than 50 acres of tree cover, with the largest having 116 acres of tree cover. As is the case with vacant land, there are a substantial number of these forested properties along Atlanta's streams. Approximately *136* of these properties are within 250 feet of a stream and therefore likely play a large role in maintaining clean water in Atlanta.

  It is evident that by using the 2014 tree canopy data in conjunction with tax assessor data and other relevant datasets (hydrography, parks, watersheds, etc.), the city is able to easily identify and prioritize large tracts of existing forests for permanent protection, whether that be through outright purchase, conservation easements, or other means of protection.

- **Modify Minimum Lot Coverage for Zoning Categories:**

Maximum lot coverage is generally defined as the percentage of a lot that can be covered by impervious surface (structures). Currently, the city zoning code allows for a wide range of maximum lot coverage across zoning categories, ranging from a high of 100% for Industrial land to a low of 25% for single-family residential land zoned R-1 (2-acre lot minimum). Aside from residential categories, most zoning allows for almost 100% coverage. The allowable maximum lot coverages for residential land vary from 25% to 55% (Table 19).

Summary of Zoning Regulations in R Districts

		R-1	R-2	R-2A	R-2B	R-3	R-3A	R-4	R-4A	R-4B	R-5
MINIMUM SETBACKS	FRONT	60 ft.	60 ft.	60 ft.	50 ft.	50 ft.	50 ft.	35 ft.	30 ft.	20 ft.	30 ft.
	SIDE[a]	25 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.	10 ft.	10 ft.	10 ft.	7 ft.	7 ft.	5 ft.	7 ft.[c]
	REAR	35 ft.	30 ft.	30 ft.	20 ft.	20 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.	15 ft.	5 ft.	7 ft.[c]
LOT REQUIREMENTS	MINIMUM LOT AREA	2 acres	1 acre	30,000 sq.ft.	28,000 sq.ft.	18,000 sq.ft.	13,500 sq.ft.	9,000 sq.ft.	7,500 sq.ft.	2,800 sq.ft.	7,500 sq.ft.
	MINIMUM STREET FRONTAGE[b]	200 ft.	150 ft.	100 ft.	100 ft.	100 ft.	85 ft.	70 ft.	50 ft.	40 ft.	50 ft.[c]
	MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE	25%	35%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%	55%	85%	55%
	MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO	0.25	0.30	0.35	0.40	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.50[d]	0.75[e]	see section 16-07.010
	MINIMUM REQUIRED CAR PARKING SPACES	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	see section 16-07.010

Table 19. Residential Zoning Regulations

Table 20 shows the acres of land, the percentage of the city's total area, and the tree canopy cover area and percentage cover for each major single-family residential zoning category in the city. Table 21 shows the estimated acreage of tree cover loss at different levels of maximum lot coverage build-out for each single-family residential category. The vast majority of residential land is zoned either R-4 (9,000 sq. ft. lots) or R-3 (18,000 sq. ft. lots), and subsequently contain the majority of tree canopy found on residential land at 46% and 27% respectively. If even 25% of R-4 or R-3 lots were built out to maximum lot coverage, the city would lose 7% of its total canopy, or approximately 2,700 acres of tree canopy. Based on observations made during site visits for this study, maximum lot build-out of 25% of all single-family properties is not unlikely. And, if it occurred, it would be almost impossible to recover that lost canopy any time soon, if ever.

Zoning	Acres	% of City Land	Acres UTC	% UTC
R-1	1,533	1.8%	1,063	69%
R-2	3,221	3.7%	2,085	65%
R-2A	865	1.0%	584	68%
R-2B	404	0.5%	255	63%
R-3	13,014	15.1%	8,189	63%
R-3A	325	0.4%	199	61%
R-4	24,643	28.5%	14,046	57%
R-4A	4,659	5.4%	2,526	54%
R-4B	320	0.4%	128	40%
R-5	2,703	3.1%	1,173	43%

Table 20. Residential Zoning Area and Canopy Stats

Ultimately, the data produced in this study and future studies can be used by city planners to evaluate and modify planning policies. For example, as seen in Table 19 below, by lowering the maximum lot

coverage allowance by 10% for each residential zoning category, decision-makers can immediately quantify a policy change's potential effect on urban tree canopy.

Zoning	% Single -Family Lots Built Out to Max Lot Coverage			
	100%	50%	25%	10%
R-1	153	77	38	15
R-2	609	305	152	61
R-2A	189	95	47	19
R-2B	92	46	23	9
R-3	3,135	1,567	784	313
R-3A	86	43	21	9
R-4	7,881	3,941	1,970	788
R-4A	1,669	835	417	167
R-4B	170	85	43	17
R-5	756	378	189	76
Total	**14,741**	**7,370**	**3,685**	**1,474**

Table 21. Lot Coverage Build-Out Scenarios by Residential Zoning Category

As seen in Tables 21 and 22., a change in zoning policy (e.g. lowering max lot coverage from 50% to 40% for R-4) could have a substantial effect on the amount of tree cover lost during lot build-out.

By using the tree canopy data to run scenarios like these allows the city to accurately estimate or quantify changes in tree cover due to planned or potential policy change.

Modified Lot Coverage	Zoning	% Single -Family Lots Built Out to Max Lot Coverage			
		100%	50%	25%	10%
15.0%	R-1	0	0	0	0
25.0%	R-2	287	144	72	29
25.0%	R-2A	103	51	26	10
30.0%	R-2B	52	26	13	5
30.0%	R-3	1,834	917	458	183
35.0%	R-3A	53	27	13	5
40.0%	R-4	5,417	2,708	1,354	542
45.0%	R-4A	1,203	602	301	120
75.0%	R-4B	138	69	35	14
45.0%	R-5	485	243	121	49
	Total	**9,572**	**4,786**	**2,393**	**957**

Table 22. Modified Lot Coverage Build-Out Scenarios by Residential Category

5.2 Policy Recommendations

The canopy change analysis provides documented, science-based data that can be used to inform decision-making related to urban trees and urban forest management in the city. Reviewing tree canopy change between 2008 and 2014, the City can evaluate and quantify how the interaction between policy, decision making, and the free market affect urban tree canopy in the City of Atlanta over time. Subsequent UTC studies will add to this wealth of information and meaningfully inform decision-making for urban tree and urban forest management in the City.

The City can immediately use the findings to:

- Refine policies and set canopy goals to ensure that each area of the city receives the benefits of a healthy canopy and that the overall tree canopy is maintained and increased over time;
- Inform sustainability efforts and policy decisions related to climate, water and air quality, tree preservation, and watershed protection; and
- Educate the public about the value, distribution, and trends that affect tree canopy in Atlanta.

Specific recommendations for consideration:

- Permanently protect some of the few remaining large tracts of undisturbed forests with priorities based on proximity to streams.
- Require that all city-funded tree planting locations are mapped, catalogued, and maintained by the City in database format so the canopy contribution of these trees can be tracked over time.
- Identify policies for reducing tree loss during redevelopment of single-family properties.
- Inform policy decisions related to land development, specifically as it relates to “pipe farms” (partially developed sites).
- Further evaluate tree cover in riparian buffers and current stream buffer policy.
- Evaluate maximum allowable lot coverages, especially residential land.
- Implement conservation measures for new subdivisions.
- Evaluate open space requirements for multi-family and other developments.
- Align replanting requirements with the species of trees that are removed or require replanting of native trees to ensure tree replacements are of similar quality to the removed trees.
- Develop measures to prevent clearing of large sites that will not be completed (such as development bonds).

5.3 Conclusion

The 2014 Urban Tree Canopy Assessment marks the second comprehensive detailed analysis of tree canopy within Atlanta’s city limits. Using findings from this study, the city is well-equipped to build on their ongoing efforts to manage and protect the city’s urban forest The tree canopy analysis and resultant baseline data are valuable city assets that can be utilized in numerous ways by a variety of stakeholders to:

- Continue to measure tree canopy change over time;
- Inform goals and policies for maintaining and increasing tree canopy throughout the city;

- Provide data for establishing a refined Urban Forestry Management plan;
- Offer public information about tree canopy throughout Atlanta on an interactive map; and
- Continue to improve canopy identification techniques for future urban tree canopy studies.

The last two City of Atlanta Urban Tree Canopy Assessments are vital for an accurate understanding of the distribution of the tree canopy throughout the city, how it has changed over time, and how it will continue to change in the future. These studies provide essential information for planning for how to maintain and increase the benefits of the canopy for all Atlantans

6. Appendix 1 - Land Cover Maps by Selected Geographies

6.1 Neighborhood Planning Units



6.2 Neighborhoods



6.3 City Council Districts



6.4 Watersheds



6.5 Small Watersheds



6.6 Parks


Percent Tree Cover (2014)
0% - 10%
11% - 20%
21% - 30%
31% - 40%
41% - 50%
51% - 60%
61% - 70%
71% - 80%
81% - 90%
91% - 100%
N
0
1.5
3 Miles
Esri, HERE, DeLorme, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

6.7 Zoning


Percent Tree Cover (2014)
0% - 10%
11% - 20%
21% - 30%
31% - 40%
41% - 50%
51% - 60%
61% - 70%
71% - 80%
81% - 90%
91% - 100%
N
0 1 2 Miles
Esri, HERE, DeLorme, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

6.8 City Grid – (6 acre cells)



7. Appendix 2 - Land Cover Graphs by Selected Geographies

7.1 Neighborhood Planning Units



Figure 56. Land Cover Distribution by Neighborhood Planning Unit

7.2 Neighborhoods

Due to the large number of neighborhoods, only the top and bottom 12 tree covered neighborhoods are shown below



Figure 57. Bottom 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods



Figure 58. Top 12 Tree Covered Neighborhoods

7.3 City Council Districts



Figure 59. Land Cover Distribution by City Council District

7.4 Watersheds



Figure 60. Land Cover Distribution by Watershed

7.5 Small Watersheds – All small watershed names are not displayed. The graph is for illustrative purposes only.



Figure 61. Land Cover Distribution by Small Watershed

7.8 Parks

Due to the large number of parks, only parks greater than 50 acres in size are shown below.



Figure 62. Land Cover Distribution for Parks > 50 Acres

7.9 Zoning



Figure 63. Land Cover Distribution by Zoning Category



Figure 64. Land Cover Area in Acres by Zoning Category

8. Appendix 3 – Summary Land Cover Tables by Selected Geographies

Interpreting the **Summary Land Cover Tables** - Land cover summary statistics tables show land cover percentages for each geographic areas (NPUs, neighborhoods, parks, zoning, etc.) as they compare to the city as a whole (% City Land), to the geography itself (% Geography), and to each land cover class (% Cover Type), with cover types represented by acronyms (Tree cover = UTC, Non-Tree Vegetation = NTV, Non-Vegetation = NV).

- **"% City Land" -** The percentage of the city's total area that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation for a specific geographic area. For example, a "% City Land" value of 4% in the "Tree Cover" grouping for a specific geography (NPU X, for example) means that 4% of the city's total area is comprised of tree cover found in that geography (NPU X) alone.

- **"% Geographic Unit"** - The percentage of the specified geography's (NPU, Council District, etc.) total area that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation. For example, a "% Geography" value of 16% in the "Non-Tree Vegetation" group for a specified geography (NPU X) means that 16% of that geography's area (NPU X's area) is comprised of non-tree vegetation.

- **"% Cover Type" -** The percentage of a cover type's total area that is covered by trees, non-tree vegetation, or non-vegetation within a specific geographic area. For example, a "% UTC" value of 8% in the "Tree Cover" grouping for a specific geography (NPU X) means that 8% of the city's total tree canopy area is comprised of tree cover found in that geography (NPU X) alone.

8.1 Neighborhood Planning Units

NPU	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City Land	% NPU	% UTC	% City Land	% NPU	% NTV	% City Land	% NPU	% NV
A	5%	62%	11%	2%	19%	7%	2%	18%	5%
P	4%	61%	9%	1%	20%	6%	1%	18%	4%
I	4%	59%	9%	2%	22%	7%	1%	18%	4%
H	3%	59%	6%	1%	21%	4%	1%	20%	3%
Q	1%	57%	1%	0%	23%	1%	0%	21%	1%
C	3%	56%	5%	1%	21%	4%	1%	22%	3%
R	2%	54%	5%	1%	21%	4%	1%	25%	3%
J	2%	52%	4%	1%	27%	4%	1%	21%	2%
Z	4%	51%	8%	2%	24%	8%	2%	25%	7%
S	1%	50%	3%	1%	28%	4%	1%	22%	2%
G	2%	46%	4%	1%	25%	5%	1%	29%	4%
B	3%	46%	7%	1%	19%	6%	3%	36%	9%
W	2%	45%	4%	1%	26%	5%	1%	29%	4%
F	2%	44%	3%	1%	23%	4%	1%	33%	4%
O	1%	42%	3%	1%	30%	4%	1%	28%	3%
X	1%	42%	3%	1%	24%	3%	1%	34%	3%
N	1%	40%	2%	1%	25%	3%	1%	35%	3%
K	1%	38%	1%	0%	26%	2%	1%	36%	2%
T	1%	34%	1%	1%	26%	2%	1%	40%	3%
Y	1%	33%	2%	1%	31%	3%	1%	36%	3%
D	1%	31%	3%	1%	22%	5%	2%	48%	8%
E	1%	27%	3%	1%	21%	4%	2%	52%	8%
L	0%	25%	1%	0%	29%	1%	0%	46%	2%
V	1%	23%	1%	1%	27%	3%	1%	50%	4%
M	0%	12%	1%	0%	17%	2%	2%	71%	7%



8.2 Neighborhoods

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
Boulder Park	0.4%	78.0%	0.8%	0.1%	15.6%	0.3%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%
Butner/Tell	0.1%	77.2%	0.3%	0.0%	16.6%	0.1%	0.0%	6.2%	0.0%
Audobon Forest	0.5%	73.7%	1.0%	0.1%	17.3%	0.5%	0.1%	9.0%	0.2%
Oakcliff	0.1%	72.8%	0.1%	0.0%	17.2%	0.1%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%
Bakers Ferry	0.1%	72.4%	0.3%	0.0%	19.3%	0.2%	0.0%	8.3%	0.1%
Swallow Circle/Baywood	0.2%	71.9%	0.4%	0.0%	19.6%	0.2%	0.0%	8.5%	0.1%
Ridgewood Heights	0.1%	71.0%	0.3%	0.0%	15.9%	0.1%	0.0%	13.1%	0.1%

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
Fairway Acres	0.1%	70.5%	0.2%	0.0%	16.8%	0.1%	0.0%	12.6%	0.1%
Elmco Estates	0.1%	70.4%	0.2%	0.0%	16.9%	0.1%	0.0%	12.7%	0.1%
Pleasant Hill	0.2%	70.3%	0.5%	0.0%	15.1%	0.2%	0.0%	14.6%	0.1%
Fernleaf	0.0%	70.2%	0.1%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.0%
Niskey Lake	0.2%	70.1%	0.5%	0.0%	14.6%	0.2%	0.1%	15.2%	0.2%
Fairburn Road/Wisteria Lane	0.1%	70.0%	0.2%	0.0%	20.7%	0.1%	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%
Mt. Paran Parkway	0.1%	69.2%	0.2%	0.0%	14.1%	0.1%	0.0%	16.8%	0.1%
Cascade Heights	0.6%	69.2%	1.2%	0.1%	18.2%	0.7%	0.1%	12.6%	0.3%
Ben Hill Forest	0.1%	69.0%	0.2%	0.0%	20.1%	0.1%	0.0%	10.9%	0.0%
Laurens Valley	0.1%	68.7%	0.2%	0.0%	19.6%	0.1%	0.0%	11.5%	0.1%
Fairburn	0.1%	68.6%	0.2%	0.0%	19.5%	0.1%	0.0%	11.9%	0.1%
Old Fairburn Village	0.0%	68.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.2%	0.0%	0.0%	15.7%	0.0%
Beecher Hills	0.2%	68.3%	0.5%	0.1%	21.3%	0.3%	0.0%	10.4%	0.1%
Whitewater Creek	0.2%	68.3%	0.4%	0.0%	15.0%	0.2%	0.0%	16.6%	0.2%
Fairburn Tell	0.1%	67.9%	0.3%	0.0%	21.2%	0.2%	0.0%	10.5%	0.1%
Castlewood	0.2%	67.2%	0.4%	0.0%	17.6%	0.2%	0.0%	15.2%	0.1%
Ben Hill Terrace	0.2%	67.1%	0.4%	0.0%	19.0%	0.2%	0.0%	13.9%	0.1%
Mellwood	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	20.7%	0.0%	0.0%	12.6%	0.0%
Orchard Knob	0.2%	66.7%	0.5%	0.1%	21.0%	0.3%	0.0%	12.3%	0.1%
Audobon Forest West	0.1%	66.2%	0.2%	0.0%	19.9%	0.1%	0.0%	14.0%	0.1%
Almond Park	0.3%	66.1%	0.6%	0.1%	23.1%	0.4%	0.0%	10.7%	0.1%
Brandon	0.3%	66.0%	0.7%	0.1%	17.8%	0.4%	0.1%	16.1%	0.3%
Ivan Hill	0.1%	65.0%	0.1%	0.0%	22.6%	0.1%	0.0%	12.4%	0.0%
Wilson Mill Meadows	0.2%	64.9%	0.4%	0.1%	16.9%	0.2%	0.1%	18.2%	0.2%
Tuxedo Park	0.6%	64.3%	1.2%	0.2%	19.1%	0.8%	0.2%	16.6%	0.5%
Mt. Paran/Northside	1.1%	64.1%	2.3%	0.3%	19.5%	1.4%	0.3%	16.4%	0.9%
Arden/Habersham	0.1%	63.8%	0.2%	0.0%	20.2%	0.1%	0.0%	16.0%	0.1%
Bankhead/Bolton	0.4%	63.3%	0.9%	0.1%	18.0%	0.5%	0.1%	18.7%	0.4%
Paces	1.5%	63.2%	3.2%	0.4%	17.0%	1.8%	0.5%	19.8%	1.6%
Carey Park	0.3%	63.1%	0.6%	0.1%	22.2%	0.4%	0.1%	14.3%	0.2%
Wesley Battle	0.2%	63.1%	0.3%	0.1%	20.7%	0.2%	0.0%	15.8%	0.1%
Ben Hill	0.5%	63.0%	1.1%	0.2%	21.3%	0.8%	0.1%	15.7%	0.4%
Collier Hills	0.1%	62.9%	0.3%	0.0%	21.9%	0.2%	0.0%	15.2%	0.1%
Westwood Terrace	0.1%	62.9%	0.2%	0.0%	23.6%	0.2%	0.0%	13.4%	0.1%
Fairburn Mays	0.3%	62.9%	0.7%	0.1%	15.7%	0.3%	0.1%	21.4%	0.3%
Memorial Park	0.1%	62.9%	0.2%	0.0%	20.7%	0.1%	0.0%	16.4%	0.1%
Arlington Estates	0.2%	62.8%	0.4%	0.1%	19.6%	0.2%	0.0%	17.6%	0.2%

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
Kings Forest	0.3%	62.7%	0.7%	0.1%	19.0%	0.4%	0.1%	18.2%	0.3%
Mt. Gilead Woods	0.0%	62.7%	0.1%	0.0%	19.9%	0.0%	0.0%	17.4%	0.0%
Bush Mountain	0.0%	62.5%	0.1%	0.0%	23.7%	0.1%	0.0%	13.8%	0.0%
Peachtree Battle Alliance	0.4%	62.4%	0.8%	0.1%	22.0%	0.5%	0.1%	15.5%	0.3%
Monroe Heights	0.2%	62.4%	0.4%	0.1%	18.2%	0.2%	0.1%	19.4%	0.2%
Southwest	1.0%	62.3%	2.1%	0.3%	18.6%	1.3%	0.3%	19.1%	1.0%
Kingswood	0.3%	62.1%	0.7%	0.1%	22.0%	0.5%	0.1%	15.9%	0.3%
Venetian Hills	0.5%	62.1%	1.0%	0.2%	22.2%	0.7%	0.1%	15.7%	0.4%
Wyngate	0.1%	62.1%	0.3%	0.0%	18.1%	0.2%	0.0%	19.9%	0.2%
Hanover West	0.1%	62.0%	0.2%	0.0%	21.0%	0.1%	0.0%	17.0%	0.1%
West Manor	0.1%	62.0%	0.3%	0.0%	21.0%	0.2%	0.0%	17.1%	0.1%
Wildwood (NPU-H)	0.1%	61.9%	0.3%	0.0%	17.5%	0.2%	0.0%	20.5%	0.1%
Peyton Forest	0.2%	61.8%	0.5%	0.1%	20.3%	0.3%	0.1%	17.9%	0.2%
Collier Hills North	0.1%	61.6%	0.1%	0.0%	24.1%	0.1%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
Rue Royal	0.0%	61.5%	0.0%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.9%	0.0%
South River Gardens	1.3%	60.4%	2.9%	0.5%	21.6%	2.1%	0.4%	18.0%	1.3%
Springlake	0.1%	60.3%	0.2%	0.0%	19.8%	0.2%	0.0%	19.8%	0.1%
Margaret Mitchell	0.4%	60.2%	0.9%	0.1%	19.9%	0.6%	0.1%	19.9%	0.4%
Heritage Valley	0.2%	59.9%	0.4%	0.1%	21.1%	0.3%	0.1%	19.0%	0.2%
Argonne Forest	0.1%	59.7%	0.3%	0.0%	20.6%	0.2%	0.0%	19.6%	0.1%
Tampa Park	0.0%	59.3%	0.0%	0.0%	20.6%	0.0%	0.0%	20.1%	0.0%
Greenbriar Village	0.0%	59.2%	0.1%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.8%	0.0%
Collier Heights	0.9%	59.2%	1.9%	0.3%	20.8%	1.4%	0.3%	19.9%	1.0%
Huntington	0.0%	59.1%	0.1%	0.0%	22.6%	0.0%	0.0%	18.3%	0.0%
Wildwood Forest	0.0%	59.1%	0.1%	0.0%	21.9%	0.1%	0.0%	19.0%	0.1%
Randall Mill	0.2%	59.0%	0.3%	0.0%	16.9%	0.2%	0.1%	24.0%	0.2%
Ridgecrest Forest	0.1%	59.0%	0.1%	0.0%	22.4%	0.1%	0.0%	18.5%	0.1%
West Paces Ferry/Northside	0.3%	58.9%	0.7%	0.1%	18.5%	0.4%	0.1%	22.6%	0.4%
Woodfield	0.0%	58.7%	0.1%	0.0%	22.7%	0.1%	0.0%	18.5%	0.0%
West Lake	0.1%	58.6%	0.3%	0.1%	22.7%	0.2%	0.0%	18.8%	0.1%
Baker Hills	0.1%	58.2%	0.3%	0.1%	23.9%	0.2%	0.0%	18.0%	0.1%
Rosedale Heights	0.1%	58.1%	0.3%	0.1%	23.9%	0.3%	0.0%	18.0%	0.1%
Chalet Woods	0.1%	58.0%	0.1%	0.0%	23.2%	0.1%	0.0%	18.8%	0.1%
Lakewood	0.2%	57.9%	0.5%	0.1%	27.5%	0.5%	0.1%	14.6%	0.2%
Niskey Cove	0.0%	57.7%	0.1%	0.0%	20.2%	0.1%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%
Grove Park	0.8%	57.5%	1.6%	0.3%	24.0%	1.4%	0.2%	18.4%	0.8%
Westminster/Milmar	0.1%	57.0%	0.1%	0.0%	18.0%	0.1%	0.0%	25.1%	0.1%

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
Magnum Manor	0.1%	56.6%	0.2%	0.0%	23.1%	0.2%	0.0%	20.3%	0.1%
East Ardley Road	0.0%	56.4%	0.1%	0.0%	23.3%	0.1%	0.0%	20.3%	0.1%
Bolton Hills	0.0%	56.4%	0.1%	0.0%	23.1%	0.1%	0.0%	20.5%	0.0%
Ben Hill Acres	0.1%	56.3%	0.1%	0.0%	18.8%	0.1%	0.0%	24.9%	0.1%
Chastain Park	0.7%	56.2%	1.6%	0.3%	26.3%	1.5%	0.2%	17.5%	0.8%
Horseshoe Community	0.0%	56.1%	0.1%	0.0%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	20.6%	0.0%
Adams Park	0.4%	55.7%	0.9%	0.2%	29.4%	1.0%	0.1%	14.9%	0.4%
Cascade Avenue/Road	0.5%	55.5%	1.0%	0.2%	29.0%	1.1%	0.1%	15.5%	0.4%
Carroll Heights	0.2%	55.3%	0.4%	0.1%	25.1%	0.4%	0.1%	19.6%	0.2%
Lake Claire	0.2%	55.3%	0.5%	0.1%	22.3%	0.4%	0.1%	22.5%	0.3%
Pomona Park	0.0%	54.9%	0.1%	0.0%	25.6%	0.1%	0.0%	19.4%	0.0%
Brookhaven	0.4%	54.8%	0.9%	0.2%	24.0%	0.8%	0.2%	21.2%	0.5%
Peachtree Heights East	0.1%	54.7%	0.2%	0.0%	20.5%	0.1%	0.0%	24.9%	0.1%
Midwest Cascade	0.4%	54.6%	0.9%	0.2%	22.8%	0.7%	0.2%	22.6%	0.5%
Peachtree Heights West	0.4%	54.3%	0.8%	0.1%	19.1%	0.6%	0.2%	26.5%	0.6%
English Park	0.1%	54.3%	0.2%	0.0%	20.0%	0.1%	0.0%	25.6%	0.1%
Ben Hill Pines	0.0%	53.8%	0.1%	0.0%	23.9%	0.1%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%
Polar Rock	0.2%	53.3%	0.4%	0.1%	26.8%	0.4%	0.1%	19.9%	0.2%
Woodland Hills	0.1%	53.2%	0.1%	0.0%	23.7%	0.1%	0.0%	23.1%	0.1%
Green Acres Valley	0.0%	53.0%	0.1%	0.0%	24.6%	0.1%	0.0%	22.4%	0.0%
Briar Glen	0.0%	52.9%	0.1%	0.0%	24.1%	0.1%	0.0%	23.1%	0.1%
Green Forest Acres	0.1%	52.7%	0.1%	0.0%	24.7%	0.1%	0.0%	22.6%	0.1%
Dixie Hills	0.3%	52.6%	0.6%	0.1%	25.7%	0.7%	0.1%	21.7%	0.4%
South Oakes at Cascade	0.0%	52.6%	0.0%	0.0%	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	29.0%	0.0%
Fairburn Heights	0.2%	52.6%	0.5%	0.1%	24.0%	0.5%	0.1%	23.5%	0.3%
Hunter Hills	0.2%	52.3%	0.4%	0.1%	24.1%	0.4%	0.1%	23.6%	0.3%
Wisteria Gardens	0.1%	52.3%	0.2%	0.0%	25.6%	0.2%	0.0%	22.1%	0.1%
East Chastain Park	0.2%	52.2%	0.5%	0.1%	17.7%	0.3%	0.1%	30.1%	0.4%
Wildwood (NPU-C)	0.2%	51.8%	0.3%	0.0%	16.6%	0.2%	0.1%	31.6%	0.3%
Lake Estates	0.0%	51.4%	0.1%	0.0%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	29.8%	0.1%
Old Gordon	0.0%	51.3%	0.1%	0.0%	19.0%	0.1%	0.0%	29.6%	0.1%
Meadowbrook Forest	0.0%	51.1%	0.1%	0.0%	27.2%	0.1%	0.0%	21.7%	0.1%
Westover Plantation	0.0%	51.0%	0.1%	0.0%	20.3%	0.1%	0.0%	28.7%	0.1%
Morningside/Lenox Park	0.9%	50.9%	1.9%	0.4%	24.2%	1.9%	0.4%	24.9%	1.5%
Druid Hills	0.2%	50.7%	0.5%	0.1%	27.4%	0.5%	0.1%	21.8%	0.3%
Peachtree Hills	0.2%	50.7%	0.4%	0.1%	20.0%	0.4%	0.1%	29.3%	0.4%
Sherwood Forest	0.1%	50.7%	0.2%	0.0%	24.1%	0.2%	0.0%	25.2%	0.1%

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
Brentwood	0.0%	50.6%	0.1%	0.0%	31.3%	0.1%	0.0%	18.1%	0.0%
Capitol View Manor	0.1%	50.6%	0.2%	0.0%	25.8%	0.2%	0.0%	23.7%	0.1%
Custer/McDonough/Guice	0.2%	50.5%	0.4%	0.1%	29.1%	0.5%	0.1%	20.4%	0.2%
Ormewood Park	0.3%	50.0%	0.7%	0.2%	24.2%	0.7%	0.2%	25.9%	0.5%
East Atlanta	0.6%	49.9%	1.2%	0.3%	24.4%	1.2%	0.3%	25.7%	1.0%
North Buckhead	1.0%	49.5%	2.2%	0.4%	17.2%	1.6%	0.7%	33.2%	2.3%
Westview	0.2%	49.0%	0.5%	0.1%	24.3%	0.5%	0.1%	26.8%	0.4%
Florida Heights	0.1%	49.0%	0.3%	0.1%	24.7%	0.3%	0.1%	26.3%	0.3%
Cross Creek	0.1%	48.7%	0.2%	0.1%	24.4%	0.2%	0.1%	26.9%	0.2%
Center Hill	0.4%	48.6%	0.9%	0.3%	30.2%	1.1%	0.2%	21.3%	0.6%
Deerwood	0.1%	48.5%	0.2%	0.0%	30.6%	0.2%	0.0%	20.9%	0.1%
Adamsville	0.3%	48.4%	0.7%	0.2%	23.9%	0.8%	0.2%	27.6%	0.7%
Just Us	0.0%	48.2%	0.0%	0.0%	26.2%	0.0%	0.0%	25.5%	0.0%
Garden Hills	0.3%	48.0%	0.6%	0.1%	21.9%	0.6%	0.2%	30.0%	0.6%
Riverside	0.3%	48.0%	0.6%	0.1%	23.9%	0.6%	0.2%	28.1%	0.6%
Channing Valley	0.0%	48.0%	0.1%	0.0%	22.9%	0.1%	0.0%	29.1%	0.1%
Pine Hills	0.4%	48.0%	0.9%	0.2%	17.4%	0.7%	0.3%	34.6%	1.0%
Brookwood Hills	0.1%	47.9%	0.3%	0.1%	21.3%	0.2%	0.1%	30.8%	0.2%
Hammond Park	0.2%	47.7%	0.5%	0.1%	22.5%	0.5%	0.1%	29.8%	0.5%
Peachtree Park	0.2%	47.7%	0.4%	0.1%	19.8%	0.3%	0.1%	32.5%	0.4%
Benteen Park	0.1%	47.5%	0.2%	0.1%	31.0%	0.3%	0.0%	21.6%	0.2%
Ardmore	0.0%	47.4%	0.1%	0.0%	20.5%	0.1%	0.0%	32.0%	0.1%
East Lake	0.5%	47.2%	1.0%	0.3%	32.6%	1.4%	0.2%	20.2%	0.6%
Westhaven	0.1%	47.1%	0.2%	0.0%	19.2%	0.2%	0.1%	33.7%	0.2%
Oakland City	0.4%	46.8%	0.8%	0.2%	22.8%	0.8%	0.2%	30.3%	0.8%
Harvel Homes Community	0.0%	46.5%	0.0%	0.0%	23.7%	0.0%	0.0%	29.9%	0.0%
Kirkwood	0.6%	46.5%	1.2%	0.3%	27.0%	1.4%	0.3%	26.5%	1.0%
Mozley Park	0.2%	46.0%	0.3%	0.1%	27.8%	0.4%	0.1%	26.2%	0.3%
Browns Mill Park	0.4%	45.7%	0.8%	0.3%	36.5%	1.3%	0.1%	17.8%	0.5%
Greenbriar	0.5%	45.7%	1.0%	0.2%	17.2%	0.8%	0.4%	37.2%	1.2%
Boulevard Heights	0.1%	45.5%	0.2%	0.1%	30.1%	0.2%	0.0%	24.5%	0.1%
Thomasville Heights	0.2%	45.3%	0.5%	0.2%	33.2%	0.7%	0.1%	21.4%	0.4%
Englewood Manor	0.0%	45.2%	0.0%	0.0%	50.3%	0.1%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%
Rockdale	0.2%	44.8%	0.4%	0.1%	28.6%	0.6%	0.1%	26.5%	0.4%
Perkerson	0.3%	44.7%	0.7%	0.2%	21.1%	0.7%	0.3%	34.2%	0.8%
Glenrose Heights	0.5%	44.6%	1.1%	0.2%	19.8%	1.0%	0.4%	35.6%	1.3%
Harland Terrace	0.2%	44.5%	0.3%	0.1%	16.7%	0.3%	0.1%	38.8%	0.5%

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
Carver Hills	0.1%	44.5%	0.2%	0.1%	27.8%	0.3%	0.1%	27.7%	0.2%
Ansley Park	0.2%	44.3%	0.5%	0.1%	31.0%	0.7%	0.1%	24.8%	0.4%
Virginia Highland	0.4%	44.2%	0.8%	0.2%	23.5%	0.9%	0.3%	32.3%	0.9%
South Tuxedo Park	0.1%	44.1%	0.3%	0.1%	17.9%	0.2%	0.1%	38.0%	0.4%
Candler Park	0.2%	44.0%	0.5%	0.1%	28.2%	0.6%	0.1%	27.7%	0.5%
Mays	0.1%	44.0%	0.3%	0.1%	25.9%	0.4%	0.1%	30.1%	0.3%
Campbellton Road	0.2%	43.2%	0.5%	0.1%	20.5%	0.5%	0.2%	36.3%	0.6%
Washington Park	0.1%	43.2%	0.2%	0.1%	27.6%	0.2%	0.1%	29.2%	0.2%
Capitol View	0.2%	43.1%	0.4%	0.1%	26.2%	0.5%	0.1%	30.6%	0.5%
Ridgedale Park	0.1%	42.8%	0.1%	0.0%	20.9%	0.1%	0.1%	36.2%	0.2%
Scotts Crossing	0.2%	42.6%	0.3%	0.1%	22.1%	0.4%	0.1%	35.2%	0.4%
Sandlewood Estates	0.0%	42.3%	0.1%	0.0%	23.5%	0.1%	0.0%	34.2%	0.1%
Lincoln Homes	0.1%	42.3%	0.2%	0.0%	18.9%	0.2%	0.1%	38.8%	0.3%
Penelope Neighbors	0.1%	41.8%	0.1%	0.0%	27.7%	0.2%	0.0%	30.5%	0.2%
Whittier Mill Village	0.1%	41.5%	0.2%	0.1%	22.5%	0.2%	0.1%	36.0%	0.3%
Norwood Manor	0.2%	41.3%	0.4%	0.1%	29.2%	0.5%	0.1%	29.6%	0.4%
Edmund Park	0.0%	41.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%	0.0%	0.0%	37.4%	0.0%
Chattahoochee	0.1%	40.9%	0.2%	0.1%	22.6%	0.3%	0.1%	36.5%	0.3%
Atkins Park	0.0%	40.4%	0.0%	0.0%	24.5%	0.0%	0.0%	34.8%	0.0%
Rebel Valley Forest	0.1%	39.7%	0.1%	0.0%	19.9%	0.1%	0.1%	40.4%	0.2%
Lakewood Heights	0.4%	39.3%	0.9%	0.3%	26.5%	1.3%	0.4%	34.1%	1.2%
Regency Trace	0.0%	39.3%	0.1%	0.0%	30.2%	0.1%	0.0%	30.5%	0.1%
Grant Park	0.5%	38.1%	1.1%	0.4%	26.5%	1.6%	0.5%	35.3%	1.6%
Leila Valley	0.1%	37.5%	0.3%	0.1%	27.2%	0.5%	0.1%	35.3%	0.5%
Lindridge/Martin Manor	0.2%	37.5%	0.4%	0.1%	20.6%	0.5%	0.2%	41.8%	0.8%
Joyland	0.0%	37.2%	0.1%	0.0%	32.5%	0.2%	0.0%	30.3%	0.1%
Ashview Heights	0.1%	36.8%	0.2%	0.1%	32.5%	0.3%	0.1%	30.7%	0.2%
Inman Park	0.2%	36.6%	0.4%	0.1%	25.6%	0.5%	0.2%	37.7%	0.6%
Sylvan Hills	0.5%	36.3%	1.0%	0.3%	24.9%	1.4%	0.5%	38.8%	1.7%
Brookview Heights	0.2%	36.2%	0.3%	0.2%	37.1%	0.7%	0.1%	26.7%	0.4%
Blair Villa/Poole Creek	0.4%	35.4%	0.8%	0.2%	18.6%	0.9%	0.5%	45.9%	1.6%
West Highlands	0.2%	35.3%	0.5%	0.2%	33.4%	0.9%	0.2%	31.2%	0.6%
Edgewood	0.2%	34.8%	0.5%	0.2%	26.8%	0.8%	0.3%	38.4%	0.9%
Poncey-Highland	0.1%	34.8%	0.2%	0.1%	25.0%	0.3%	0.1%	40.1%	0.4%
Bolton	0.4%	34.4%	0.9%	0.3%	25.2%	1.3%	0.5%	40.4%	1.6%
Fort Valley	0.0%	34.2%	0.0%	0.0%	24.9%	0.0%	0.0%	40.9%	0.0%
Bankhead	0.2%	33.6%	0.4%	0.1%	28.4%	0.6%	0.2%	38.0%	0.6%

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
South Atlanta	0.1%	33.6%	0.3%	0.1%	30.5%	0.5%	0.1%	35.8%	0.4%
High Point	0.0%	33.5%	0.1%	0.0%	27.7%	0.1%	0.0%	38.8%	0.1%
Cascade Green	0.0%	33.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.0%	0.1%	0.0%	33.8%	0.1%
West End	0.3%	33.1%	0.6%	0.2%	23.3%	0.9%	0.4%	43.6%	1.2%
Fort McPherson	0.2%	32.8%	0.4%	0.3%	40.1%	1.1%	0.2%	27.1%	0.6%
Atlanta Industrial Park	0.2%	32.1%	0.4%	0.1%	15.7%	0.4%	0.3%	52.1%	0.9%
Piedmont Heights	0.1%	32.0%	0.3%	0.1%	20.3%	0.3%	0.2%	47.7%	0.6%
Buckhead Forest	0.1%	32.0%	0.2%	0.0%	16.7%	0.2%	0.1%	51.2%	0.4%
Underwood Hills	0.3%	31.6%	0.6%	0.2%	17.0%	0.7%	0.5%	51.4%	1.5%
State Facility	0.0%	30.7%	0.1%	0.0%	31.2%	0.2%	0.1%	38.1%	0.2%
Loring Heights	0.1%	30.7%	0.2%	0.1%	21.2%	0.3%	0.2%	48.1%	0.5%
Peoplestown	0.1%	30.3%	0.3%	0.1%	29.6%	0.5%	0.2%	40.1%	0.6%
Ashley Courts	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.9%	0.1%	0.0%	44.1%	0.1%
Buckhead Heights	0.0%	29.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%	0.1%	0.0%	48.6%	0.1%
Princeton Lakes	0.2%	29.2%	0.4%	0.2%	28.9%	0.7%	0.2%	41.9%	0.8%
Adair Park	0.1%	28.1%	0.2%	0.1%	24.1%	0.4%	0.2%	47.7%	0.6%
Pittsburgh	0.2%	27.8%	0.4%	0.2%	25.1%	0.7%	0.3%	47.1%	1.0%
Betmar LaVilla	0.0%	27.4%	0.1%	0.0%	34.7%	0.1%	0.0%	37.9%	0.1%
Brookwood	0.0%	27.3%	0.1%	0.0%	15.3%	0.1%	0.1%	57.4%	0.2%
Amal Heights	0.0%	26.1%	0.0%	0.0%	38.0%	0.1%	0.0%	35.8%	0.1%
Vine City	0.1%	26.0%	0.2%	0.1%	31.4%	0.6%	0.2%	42.5%	0.6%
Chosewood Park	0.2%	25.5%	0.4%	0.2%	35.0%	1.0%	0.3%	39.4%	0.8%
Reynoldstown	0.1%	25.0%	0.3%	0.1%	20.9%	0.4%	0.3%	54.1%	0.9%
The Villages at East Lake	0.1%	25.0%	0.1%	0.1%	42.8%	0.4%	0.1%	32.2%	0.2%
English Avenue	0.2%	23.9%	0.3%	0.2%	27.6%	0.8%	0.3%	48.5%	1.0%
Harris Chiles	0.0%	23.0%	0.1%	0.0%	37.1%	0.2%	0.0%	39.8%	0.1%
Knight Park/Howell Station	0.1%	22.8%	0.2%	0.1%	21.6%	0.4%	0.2%	55.6%	0.8%
Hills Park	0.3%	22.7%	0.6%	0.2%	20.0%	1.1%	0.7%	57.3%	2.2%
Cabbagetown	0.0%	22.2%	0.1%	0.0%	19.9%	0.1%	0.1%	57.9%	0.3%
Colonial Homes	0.0%	21.7%	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	0.0%	0.0%	60.5%	0.1%
Midtown	0.3%	21.6%	0.6%	0.2%	16.6%	0.9%	0.8%	61.8%	2.6%
Old Fourth Ward	0.2%	21.6%	0.4%	0.2%	24.4%	1.0%	0.5%	54.0%	1.7%
Blandtown	0.1%	21.6%	0.3%	0.1%	22.5%	0.6%	0.3%	55.9%	1.1%
Home Park	0.1%	20.5%	0.2%	0.1%	19.5%	0.5%	0.3%	59.9%	1.1%
Berkeley Park	0.1%	20.0%	0.2%	0.1%	23.3%	0.4%	0.2%	56.7%	0.7%
Atlanta University Center	0.1%	19.4%	0.2%	0.1%	27.6%	0.5%	0.2%	53.1%	0.7%
Bankhead Courts	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69.1%	0.2%	0.0%	11.9%	0.0%

Neighborhood	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Hood	% UTC	% City	% Hood	% NTV	% City	% Hood	% NV
Mechanicsville	0.1%	18.2%	0.2%	0.2%	26.8%	0.7%	0.3%	55.0%	1.0%
Georgia Tech	0.1%	17.9%	0.2%	0.1%	23.5%	0.5%	0.3%	58.5%	0.9%
Lindbergh/Morosgo	0.1%	17.3%	0.2%	0.1%	17.0%	0.4%	0.3%	65.7%	1.0%
Summerhill	0.1%	17.0%	0.2%	0.1%	26.8%	0.5%	0.2%	56.2%	0.8%
The Villages at Carver	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%	0.1%	45.0%	0.3%	0.1%	39.8%	0.2%
The Villages at Castleberry Hill	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	37.8%	0.1%	0.0%	47.1%	0.1%
Buckhead Village	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.1%	0.1%	79.5%	0.4%
Sweet Auburn	0.0%	9.9%	0.1%	0.1%	23.6%	0.3%	0.2%	66.5%	0.5%
Capitol Gateway	0.0%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.9%	0.2%	0.1%	57.6%	0.2%
Marietta Street Artery	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	0.1%	0.1%	76.3%	0.3%
Castleberry Hill	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	0.2%	0.2%	73.3%	0.5%
Downtown	0.1%	6.8%	0.2%	0.2%	11.6%	0.8%	1.3%	81.6%	4.2%
Lenox	0.0%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	0.1%	0.2%	85.8%	0.5%
Oakland	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%	72.5%	0.1%
Atlantic Station	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.1%	0.2%	81.0%	0.5%

8.3 City Council Districts

Council	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% District	% UTC	% City	% District	% NTV	% City	% District	% NV
11	7.7%	59.1%	16.4%	2.7%	20.8%	11.9%	2.6%	20.1%	8.8%
8	8.2%	58.9%	17.5%	2.8%	19.8%	12.1%	3.0%	21.3%	10.0%
10	6.0%	58.5%	12.7%	2.3%	22.3%	9.9%	1.9%	19.2%	6.5%
7	2.7%	46.1%	5.7%	1.1%	18.6%	4.8%	2.1%	35.3%	6.9%
12	5.0%	44.0%	10.7%	2.7%	23.9%	12.0%	3.4%	29.9%	11.4%
9	5.7%	43.0%	12.1%	3.1%	23.3%	13.5%	4.4%	33.7%	14.8%
6	2.4%	40.6%	5.0%	1.4%	23.8%	6.1%	2.1%	35.5%	6.9%
1	2.9%	39.4%	6.2%	2.1%	28.6%	9.3%	2.4%	32.0%	7.9%
5	2.2%	38.8%	4.7%	1.5%	26.1%	6.5%	2.0%	35.1%	6.7%
4	1.6%	34.9%	3.4%	1.1%	23.8%	4.8%	1.9%	41.3%	6.4%
3	1.7%	31.5%	3.7%	1.4%	24.8%	6.0%	2.4%	43.7%	8.1%
2	0.9%	26.8%	1.8%	0.7%	21.5%	3.0%	1.7%	51.7%	5.6%



8.4 Watersheds

Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Mud Creek	0.0%	15.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.5%	0.1%	0.1%	62.7%	0.2%
Intrenchment Creek	1.9%	34.2%	4.1%	1.5%	26.8%	6.7%	2.2%	39.0%	7.4%
Peachtree Creek	8.9%	38.6%	18.8%	4.9%	21.2%	21.4%	9.2%	40.1%	30.5%
Proctor Creek	5.7%	40.3%	12.1%	3.6%	25.4%	15.8%	4.9%	34.3%	16.1%
Sugar Creek	1.3%	42.4%	2.7%	0.8%	26.7%	3.5%	0.9%	30.9%	3.1%
South River	6.1%	44.1%	13.0%	3.5%	25.0%	15.2%	4.3%	31.0%	14.3%
Shoal Creek	0.0%	50.5%	0.1%	0.0%	23.0%	0.1%	0.0%	26.5%	0.1%
Sandy Creek	2.3%	53.7%	4.8%	0.9%	21.6%	4.0%	1.0%	24.7%	3.5%
Doolittle Creek	0.3%	54.9%	0.6%	0.1%	26.0%	0.6%	0.1%	19.2%	0.3%
Camp Creek	2.5%	55.5%	5.4%	0.9%	20.6%	4.1%	1.1%	24.0%	3.6%
Nancy Creek	5.3%	56.4%	11.3%	1.9%	19.8%	8.2%	2.2%	23.8%	7.4%
Bakers Ferry	0.3%	57.9%	0.6%	0.1%	22.3%	0.5%	0.1%	19.9%	0.3%
Utoy Creek	10.7%	58.8%	22.6%	4.0%	22.3%	17.7%	3.4%	19.0%	11.4%
Long Island Creek	1.8%	63.4%	3.8%	0.5%	16.8%	2.1%	0.6%	19.8%	1.8%



8.5 Small Watersheds



Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Bakers Ferry_1	0.0%	48.4%	0.0%	0.0%	25.5%	0.0%	0.0%	26.1%	0.0%
Bakers Ferry_2	0.2%	66.2%	0.5%	0.1%	21.3%	0.3%	0.0%	12.5%	0.1%
Bakers Ferry_3	0.1%	41.9%	0.1%	0.0%	24.2%	0.2%	0.1%	34.0%	0.2%
Bakers Ferry_4	0.0%	87.4%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%
Bakers Ferry_5	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	30.6%	0.0%	0.0%	63.1%	0.0%
Camp Creek_6	0.7%	70.7%	1.4%	0.2%	16.5%	0.7%	0.1%	12.9%	0.4%
Camp Creek_7	0.1%	44.0%	0.3%	0.1%	30.5%	0.4%	0.1%	25.5%	0.3%
Camp Creek_8	0.3%	56.6%	0.5%	0.1%	25.7%	0.5%	0.1%	17.7%	0.3%
Camp Creek_9	0.1%	46.0%	0.2%	0.0%	16.9%	0.1%	0.1%	37.0%	0.2%
Camp Creek_10	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	0.1%	0.0%	71.5%	0.1%
Camp Creek_11	0.2%	33.8%	0.3%	0.1%	26.5%	0.5%	0.2%	39.7%	0.6%
Camp Creek_12	0.3%	67.7%	0.5%	0.1%	21.1%	0.3%	0.0%	11.3%	0.1%
Camp Creek_13	0.0%	39.7%	0.0%	0.0%	31.5%	0.0%	0.0%	28.7%	0.0%
Camp Creek_14	0.0%	74.8%	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%
Camp Creek_15	0.1%	56.4%	0.2%	0.0%	16.4%	0.1%	0.0%	27.2%	0.1%
Camp Creek_16	0.2%	54.8%	0.4%	0.1%	18.4%	0.2%	0.1%	26.8%	0.3%
Camp Creek_17	0.0%	63.1%	0.0%	0.0%	19.8%	0.0%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%
Camp Creek_18	0.0%	47.3%	0.1%	0.0%	21.8%	0.1%	0.0%	30.8%	0.1%
Camp Creek_19	0.2%	61.5%	0.4%	0.1%	22.5%	0.3%	0.0%	16.0%	0.2%
Camp Creek_20	0.0%	21.7%	0.1%	0.0%	11.3%	0.1%	0.1%	67.0%	0.4%
Camp Creek_21	0.2%	53.1%	0.4%	0.1%	17.3%	0.2%	0.1%	29.6%	0.3%
Camp Creek_22	0.1%	79.5%	0.1%	0.0%	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%
Camp Creek_23	0.2%	60.6%	0.5%	0.1%	20.4%	0.3%	0.1%	19.0%	0.2%
Doolittle Creek_24	0.1%	52.3%	0.1%	0.0%	24.6%	0.1%	0.0%	23.1%	0.1%
Doolittle Creek_25	0.2%	55.7%	0.5%	0.1%	26.4%	0.5%	0.1%	17.9%	0.2%
Intrenchment Creek_30	0.1%	29.1%	0.1%	0.1%	34.4%	0.3%	0.1%	36.5%	0.3%
Intrenchment Creek_31	0.1%	34.7%	0.2%	0.1%	25.3%	0.3%	0.1%	40.0%	0.3%
Intrenchment Creek_32	0.1%	31.0%	0.1%	0.1%	45.6%	0.3%	0.0%	23.5%	0.1%
Intrenchment Creek_33	0.1%	25.3%	0.3%	0.2%	30.0%	0.7%	0.2%	44.7%	0.8%
Intrenchment Creek_34	0.1%	18.7%	0.2%	0.1%	23.1%	0.4%	0.2%	58.2%	0.8%
Intrenchment Creek_35	0.2%	48.3%	0.4%	0.1%	26.2%	0.4%	0.1%	25.4%	0.3%
Intrenchment Creek_36	0.1%	53.6%	0.2%	0.1%	23.7%	0.2%	0.0%	22.7%	0.2%
Intrenchment Creek_37	0.2%	48.6%	0.3%	0.1%	22.3%	0.3%	0.1%	29.1%	0.3%
Intrenchment Creek_38	0.1%	53.1%	0.3%	0.1%	27.0%	0.3%	0.0%	20.0%	0.2%
Intrenchment Creek_39	0.1%	40.7%	0.2%	0.1%	34.1%	0.4%	0.1%	25.2%	0.2%
Intrenchment Creek_40	0.1%	48.1%	0.2%	0.1%	32.9%	0.3%	0.0%	19.0%	0.1%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Intrenchment Creek_41	0.0%	51.9%	0.0%	0.0%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.5%	0.0%
Intrenchment Creek_42	0.1%	11.6%	0.1%	0.1%	20.8%	0.6%	0.4%	67.6%	1.4%
Intrenchment Creek_43	0.3%	44.6%	0.6%	0.2%	26.9%	0.7%	0.2%	28.5%	0.6%
Intrenchment Creek_44	0.2%	44.5%	0.5%	0.2%	30.3%	0.7%	0.1%	25.2%	0.4%
Intrenchment Creek_45	0.0%	52.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.6%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	0.0%
Intrenchment Creek_46	0.2%	22.4%	0.4%	0.2%	22.1%	0.8%	0.4%	55.3%	1.4%
Long Island Creek_47	0.1%	76.5%	0.1%	0.0%	14.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%
Long Island Creek_48	0.1%	63.5%	0.3%	0.0%	15.5%	0.2%	0.0%	21.0%	0.2%
Long Island Creek_49	0.1%	61.3%	0.3%	0.0%	21.0%	0.2%	0.0%	17.7%	0.1%
Long Island Creek_50	0.1%	67.8%	0.1%	0.0%	11.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.0%	0.1%
Long Island Creek_51	0.1%	59.3%	0.3%	0.0%	12.6%	0.1%	0.1%	28.1%	0.2%
Long Island Creek_52	0.2%	63.2%	0.5%	0.1%	16.5%	0.3%	0.1%	20.3%	0.3%
Long Island Creek_53	0.1%	65.2%	0.3%	0.0%	21.8%	0.2%	0.0%	12.9%	0.1%
Long Island Creek_54	0.0%	61.0%	0.1%	0.0%	13.1%	0.0%	0.0%	25.9%	0.0%
Long Island Creek_55	0.3%	73.5%	0.6%	0.1%	14.4%	0.2%	0.0%	12.0%	0.2%
Long Island Creek_56	0.1%	45.3%	0.3%	0.1%	20.8%	0.3%	0.1%	34.0%	0.3%
Long Island Creek_57	0.0%	59.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.8%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	0.0%
Long Island Creek_58	0.0%	55.3%	0.0%	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.5%	0.0%
Long Island Creek_59	0.0%	75.7%	0.0%	0.0%	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%
Long Island Creek_60	0.4%	64.7%	0.9%	0.1%	17.2%	0.5%	0.1%	18.1%	0.4%
Mud Creek_61	0.0%	15.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.5%	0.1%	0.1%	62.7%	0.2%
Nancy Creek_62	0.1%	49.7%	0.3%	0.1%	30.2%	0.3%	0.1%	20.1%	0.2%
Nancy Creek_63	0.2%	65.4%	0.4%	0.1%	19.2%	0.2%	0.0%	15.4%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_64	0.3%	57.6%	0.7%	0.1%	19.0%	0.5%	0.1%	23.4%	0.4%
Nancy Creek_65	0.1%	65.6%	0.2%	0.0%	19.9%	0.1%	0.0%	14.6%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_66	0.3%	63.0%	0.7%	0.1%	20.9%	0.5%	0.1%	16.1%	0.3%
Nancy Creek_67	0.2%	62.4%	0.4%	0.1%	24.9%	0.3%	0.0%	12.8%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_68	0.1%	62.3%	0.3%	0.0%	20.2%	0.2%	0.0%	17.5%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_69	0.1%	67.5%	0.2%	0.0%	17.1%	0.1%	0.0%	15.4%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_70	0.3%	50.0%	0.5%	0.1%	18.3%	0.4%	0.2%	31.6%	0.5%
Nancy Creek_71	0.3%	63.1%	0.6%	0.1%	21.4%	0.4%	0.1%	15.4%	0.2%
Nancy Creek_72	0.2%	51.7%	0.5%	0.1%	29.5%	0.6%	0.1%	18.8%	0.3%
Nancy Creek_73	0.0%	59.7%	0.1%	0.0%	20.9%	0.0%	0.0%	19.5%	0.0%
Nancy Creek_74	0.1%	61.1%	0.3%	0.0%	15.9%	0.2%	0.1%	23.1%	0.2%
Nancy Creek_75	0.2%	49.2%	0.5%	0.1%	18.2%	0.4%	0.1%	32.6%	0.5%
Nancy Creek_76	0.0%	52.5%	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	0.0%	33.9%	0.0%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Nancy Creek_77	0.0%	57.0%	0.1%	0.0%	14.5%	0.1%	0.0%	28.5%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_78	0.0%	46.4%	0.1%	0.0%	32.2%	0.1%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%
Nancy Creek_79	0.3%	55.8%	0.6%	0.1%	20.8%	0.5%	0.1%	23.3%	0.4%
Nancy Creek_80	0.1%	49.5%	0.2%	0.1%	27.6%	0.2%	0.0%	22.9%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_81	0.1%	55.8%	0.3%	0.1%	22.5%	0.3%	0.1%	21.6%	0.2%
Nancy Creek_82	0.1%	63.3%	0.3%	0.0%	18.7%	0.2%	0.0%	18.0%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_83	0.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	58.5%	0.1%	0.0%	31.0%	0.0%
Nancy Creek_84	0.4%	56.4%	0.7%	0.1%	18.1%	0.5%	0.2%	25.5%	0.5%
Nancy Creek_85	0.1%	20.9%	0.1%	0.0%	11.4%	0.1%	0.2%	67.7%	0.7%
Nancy Creek_86	0.0%	59.1%	0.1%	0.0%	16.0%	0.1%	0.0%	24.8%	0.1%
Nancy Creek_87	0.3%	61.0%	0.6%	0.1%	18.6%	0.4%	0.1%	20.4%	0.3%
Nancy Creek_88	0.5%	66.5%	1.0%	0.1%	15.6%	0.5%	0.1%	17.9%	0.4%
Nancy Creek_89	0.7%	53.5%	1.5%	0.2%	18.1%	1.0%	0.4%	28.4%	1.2%
Peachtree Creek_90	0.1%	20.2%	0.2%	0.1%	20.1%	0.4%	0.3%	59.7%	0.9%
Peachtree Creek_91	0.3%	53.1%	0.6%	0.1%	21.5%	0.5%	0.1%	25.4%	0.5%
Peachtree Creek_92	0.1%	58.9%	0.3%	0.0%	20.6%	0.2%	0.0%	20.5%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_93	0.4%	60.4%	0.8%	0.1%	18.9%	0.5%	0.1%	20.7%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_94	0.0%	12.8%	0.1%	0.0%	16.6%	0.2%	0.2%	70.6%	0.6%
Peachtree Creek_95	0.1%	51.6%	0.3%	0.1%	29.3%	0.3%	0.0%	19.1%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_96	0.2%	63.9%	0.3%	0.0%	17.5%	0.2%	0.0%	18.7%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_97	0.0%	24.8%	0.1%	0.0%	15.5%	0.1%	0.1%	59.8%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_98	0.1%	42.5%	0.2%	0.0%	20.4%	0.2%	0.1%	37.1%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_99	0.1%	31.6%	0.3%	0.1%	21.7%	0.4%	0.2%	46.8%	0.7%
Peachtree Creek_100	0.1%	28.7%	0.1%	0.0%	23.8%	0.2%	0.1%	47.5%	0.3%
Peachtree Creek_101	0.2%	53.7%	0.3%	0.1%	22.7%	0.3%	0.1%	23.6%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_102	0.1%	53.6%	0.2%	0.0%	22.4%	0.2%	0.0%	23.9%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_103	0.1%	17.0%	0.2%	0.1%	23.9%	0.4%	0.3%	59.1%	0.8%
Peachtree Creek_104	0.0%	9.7%	0.1%	0.1%	19.5%	0.4%	0.3%	70.8%	1.0%
Peachtree Creek_105	0.1%	37.5%	0.3%	0.1%	21.6%	0.3%	0.1%	40.9%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_106	0.1%	59.2%	0.3%	0.1%	26.6%	0.3%	0.0%	14.2%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_107	0.2%	43.4%	0.4%	0.1%	20.7%	0.4%	0.2%	35.9%	0.5%
Peachtree Creek_108	0.1%	40.3%	0.3%	0.1%	30.6%	0.5%	0.1%	29.2%	0.3%
Peachtree Creek_109	0.1%	36.2%	0.2%	0.1%	18.4%	0.2%	0.1%	45.4%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_110	0.1%	55.1%	0.2%	0.0%	24.5%	0.2%	0.0%	20.4%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_111	0.1%	44.7%	0.2%	0.0%	29.3%	0.2%	0.0%	26.0%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_112	0.1%	53.3%	0.3%	0.1%	21.0%	0.2%	0.1%	25.7%	0.2%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Peachtree Creek_113	0.3%	61.5%	0.5%	0.1%	18.5%	0.3%	0.1%	20.0%	0.3%
Peachtree Creek_114	0.1%	20.4%	0.2%	0.1%	22.3%	0.5%	0.3%	57.3%	0.9%
Peachtree Creek_115	0.2%	44.7%	0.4%	0.1%	18.9%	0.4%	0.2%	36.4%	0.5%
Peachtree Creek_116	0.2%	33.4%	0.4%	0.1%	25.2%	0.6%	0.2%	41.3%	0.8%
Peachtree Creek_117	0.1%	23.5%	0.2%	0.1%	17.1%	0.4%	0.3%	59.4%	1.0%
Peachtree Creek_118	0.1%	50.2%	0.2%	0.0%	25.8%	0.2%	0.0%	24.0%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_119	0.2%	58.6%	0.4%	0.1%	22.6%	0.3%	0.1%	18.8%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_120	0.0%	51.7%	0.0%	0.0%	23.6%	0.0%	0.0%	24.7%	0.0%
Peachtree Creek_121	0.0%	38.6%	0.0%	0.0%	48.1%	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%
Peachtree Creek_122	0.0%	51.2%	0.1%	0.0%	26.5%	0.1%	0.0%	22.3%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_123	0.1%	33.0%	0.1%	0.0%	18.4%	0.1%	0.1%	48.7%	0.3%
Peachtree Creek_124	0.1%	26.9%	0.1%	0.1%	27.0%	0.3%	0.1%	46.1%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_125	0.1%	48.5%	0.3%	0.1%	21.0%	0.3%	0.1%	30.5%	0.3%
Peachtree Creek_126	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	84.7%	0.0%
Peachtree Creek_127	0.3%	22.1%	0.5%	0.2%	19.4%	1.0%	0.7%	58.5%	2.2%
Peachtree Creek_128	0.0%	18.1%	0.1%	0.0%	15.9%	0.2%	0.2%	66.0%	0.6%
Peachtree Creek_129	0.2%	42.6%	0.4%	0.1%	19.3%	0.4%	0.2%	38.0%	0.5%
Peachtree Creek_130	0.0%	12.4%	0.1%	0.1%	21.0%	0.4%	0.3%	66.7%	0.9%
Peachtree Creek_131	0.0%	16.3%	0.1%	0.0%	18.0%	0.2%	0.2%	65.7%	0.5%
Peachtree Creek_132	0.1%	28.9%	0.2%	0.1%	27.1%	0.4%	0.1%	44.0%	0.5%
Peachtree Creek_133	0.2%	42.6%	0.4%	0.1%	24.1%	0.4%	0.1%	33.3%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_134	0.1%	43.8%	0.2%	0.0%	21.6%	0.2%	0.1%	34.6%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_135	0.1%	16.6%	0.1%	0.1%	18.2%	0.3%	0.2%	65.2%	0.8%
Peachtree Creek_136	0.1%	56.2%	0.3%	0.1%	25.1%	0.3%	0.0%	18.7%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_137	0.1%	22.4%	0.1%	0.1%	18.8%	0.3%	0.2%	58.8%	0.6%
Peachtree Creek_138	0.2%	63.7%	0.5%	0.1%	20.0%	0.3%	0.1%	16.4%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_139	0.0%	7.8%	0.1%	0.0%	14.1%	0.2%	0.3%	78.1%	0.8%
Peachtree Creek_140	0.1%	39.9%	0.3%	0.1%	27.8%	0.4%	0.1%	32.3%	0.3%
Peachtree Creek_141	0.3%	47.6%	0.6%	0.1%	19.2%	0.5%	0.2%	33.2%	0.7%
Peachtree Creek_142	0.1%	35.3%	0.2%	0.1%	33.6%	0.4%	0.1%	31.1%	0.3%
Peachtree Creek_143	0.2%	51.6%	0.5%	0.1%	15.5%	0.3%	0.1%	32.8%	0.5%
Peachtree Creek_144	0.1%	30.0%	0.3%	0.1%	19.5%	0.4%	0.2%	50.5%	0.8%
Peachtree Creek_145	0.1%	33.5%	0.2%	0.1%	19.8%	0.2%	0.1%	46.7%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_146	0.2%	38.5%	0.5%	0.1%	15.8%	0.4%	0.3%	45.7%	0.9%
Peachtree Creek_147	0.2%	50.1%	0.5%	0.1%	24.1%	0.5%	0.1%	25.8%	0.4%
Peachtree Creek_148	0.1%	36.5%	0.2%	0.1%	32.4%	0.3%	0.1%	31.1%	0.3%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Peachtree Creek_149	0.0%	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%	18.3%	0.0%	0.0%	47.4%	0.1%
Peachtree Creek_150	0.2%	55.9%	0.4%	0.1%	21.9%	0.3%	0.1%	22.2%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_151	0.3%	44.7%	0.6%	0.2%	28.1%	0.8%	0.2%	27.1%	0.6%
Peachtree Creek_152	0.2%	27.3%	0.4%	0.1%	20.2%	0.6%	0.4%	52.5%	1.2%
Peachtree Creek_153	0.0%	11.5%	0.1%	0.0%	15.2%	0.2%	0.2%	73.3%	0.6%
Peachtree Creek_154	0.1%	54.7%	0.3%	0.0%	18.7%	0.2%	0.1%	26.5%	0.2%
Peachtree Creek_155	0.6%	62.9%	1.3%	0.2%	18.4%	0.8%	0.2%	18.7%	0.6%
Proctor Creek_156	0.3%	42.6%	0.5%	0.2%	31.5%	0.8%	0.2%	25.9%	0.5%
Proctor Creek_157	0.3%	58.2%	0.6%	0.1%	19.2%	0.4%	0.1%	22.5%	0.4%
Proctor Creek_158	0.1%	38.2%	0.2%	0.1%	19.2%	0.2%	0.1%	42.6%	0.4%
Proctor Creek_159	0.5%	47.9%	1.0%	0.3%	33.5%	1.5%	0.2%	18.6%	0.6%
Proctor Creek_160	0.3%	43.7%	0.6%	0.2%	30.8%	0.9%	0.2%	25.5%	0.6%
Proctor Creek_161	0.0%	5.9%	0.1%	0.1%	13.5%	0.2%	0.3%	80.6%	1.1%
Proctor Creek_162	0.1%	39.2%	0.3%	0.1%	28.7%	0.4%	0.1%	32.2%	0.4%
Proctor Creek_163	0.2%	52.5%	0.3%	0.1%	23.1%	0.3%	0.1%	24.4%	0.2%
Proctor Creek_164	0.3%	45.8%	0.7%	0.2%	27.1%	0.9%	0.2%	27.1%	0.7%
Proctor Creek_165	0.2%	43.7%	0.5%	0.2%	29.7%	0.7%	0.1%	26.6%	0.5%
Proctor Creek_166	0.0%	11.4%	0.1%	0.1%	18.4%	0.3%	0.2%	70.2%	0.8%
Proctor Creek_167	0.2%	35.0%	0.4%	0.1%	18.4%	0.5%	0.3%	46.5%	0.9%
Proctor Creek_168	0.5%	55.5%	1.1%	0.2%	24.5%	1.0%	0.2%	20.0%	0.6%
Proctor Creek_169	0.0%	15.2%	0.1%	0.0%	11.9%	0.1%	0.2%	72.9%	0.7%
Proctor Creek_170	0.1%	48.8%	0.2%	0.1%	32.6%	0.3%	0.0%	18.6%	0.1%
Proctor Creek_171	0.1%	27.8%	0.2%	0.0%	16.2%	0.2%	0.2%	56.0%	0.5%
Proctor Creek_172	0.3%	57.0%	0.6%	0.1%	21.8%	0.5%	0.1%	21.2%	0.4%
Proctor Creek_173	0.1%	57.9%	0.2%	0.0%	22.7%	0.1%	0.0%	19.4%	0.1%
Proctor Creek_174	0.0%	27.7%	0.1%	0.0%	18.0%	0.1%	0.1%	54.3%	0.3%
Proctor Creek_175	0.1%	45.3%	0.3%	0.1%	26.0%	0.3%	0.1%	28.7%	0.3%
Proctor Creek_176	0.1%	43.6%	0.3%	0.1%	24.0%	0.3%	0.1%	32.4%	0.3%
Proctor Creek_177	0.2%	60.6%	0.4%	0.1%	25.2%	0.3%	0.0%	14.1%	0.1%
Proctor Creek_178	0.0%	24.6%	0.1%	0.1%	36.8%	0.3%	0.1%	38.6%	0.2%
Proctor Creek_179	0.3%	61.1%	0.6%	0.1%	21.5%	0.5%	0.1%	17.5%	0.3%
Proctor Creek_180	0.1%	37.7%	0.3%	0.1%	34.0%	0.6%	0.1%	28.3%	0.4%
Proctor Creek_181	0.2%	52.6%	0.4%	0.1%	30.0%	0.5%	0.1%	17.4%	0.2%
Proctor Creek_182	0.3%	35.4%	0.5%	0.1%	19.0%	0.6%	0.3%	45.6%	1.1%
Proctor Creek_183	0.1%	20.2%	0.2%	0.1%	30.4%	0.6%	0.2%	49.5%	0.8%
Proctor Creek_184	0.1%	18.1%	0.1%	0.1%	29.6%	0.4%	0.2%	52.3%	0.6%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Proctor Creek_185	0.2%	31.6%	0.4%	0.2%	26.9%	0.7%	0.2%	41.5%	0.8%
Proctor Creek_186	0.0%	51.4%	0.0%	0.0%	23.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	0.0%
Proctor Creek_187	0.1%	30.4%	0.2%	0.1%	26.1%	0.4%	0.1%	43.5%	0.5%
Proctor Creek_188	0.1%	24.0%	0.2%	0.1%	28.3%	0.4%	0.2%	47.8%	0.5%
Proctor Creek_189	0.1%	32.2%	0.1%	0.1%	26.9%	0.3%	0.1%	40.8%	0.3%
Sandy Creek_190	0.1%	50.3%	0.3%	0.1%	25.5%	0.3%	0.1%	24.2%	0.2%
Sandy Creek_191	0.4%	47.7%	0.8%	0.2%	23.7%	0.8%	0.2%	28.6%	0.7%
Sandy Creek_192	0.2%	70.3%	0.4%	0.0%	16.2%	0.2%	0.0%	13.4%	0.1%
Sandy Creek_193	0.2%	62.3%	0.5%	0.1%	21.7%	0.3%	0.1%	16.1%	0.2%
Sandy Creek_194	0.3%	55.8%	0.6%	0.1%	24.5%	0.6%	0.1%	19.7%	0.3%
Sandy Creek_195	0.3%	52.8%	0.6%	0.1%	22.2%	0.5%	0.1%	24.9%	0.4%
Sandy Creek_196	0.1%	59.6%	0.3%	0.0%	19.8%	0.2%	0.1%	20.6%	0.2%
Sandy Creek_197	0.2%	46.6%	0.4%	0.1%	20.8%	0.4%	0.1%	32.6%	0.4%
Sandy Creek_198	0.1%	37.3%	0.2%	0.0%	16.2%	0.2%	0.1%	46.5%	0.4%
Sandy Creek_199	0.2%	59.3%	0.5%	0.1%	20.3%	0.3%	0.1%	20.4%	0.3%
Sandy Creek_200	0.2%	55.7%	0.3%	0.1%	18.8%	0.2%	0.1%	25.5%	0.2%
Shoal Creek_201	0.0%	53.5%	0.1%	0.0%	20.1%	0.1%	0.0%	26.4%	0.1%
Shoal Creek_202	0.0%	40.4%	0.0%	0.0%	31.7%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%	0.0%
Shoal Creek_203	0.0%	46.6%	0.0%	0.0%	28.2%	0.0%	0.0%	25.1%	0.0%
South River_204	0.0%	26.5%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%	54.4%	0.0%
South River_205	0.2%	46.5%	0.5%	0.1%	29.0%	0.7%	0.1%	24.5%	0.4%
South River_206	0.0%	53.6%	0.1%	0.0%	21.1%	0.1%	0.0%	25.3%	0.1%
South River_207	0.2%	63.5%	0.5%	0.1%	22.1%	0.4%	0.1%	14.3%	0.2%
South River_208	0.0%	49.6%	0.1%	0.0%	21.9%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%
South River_209	0.0%	64.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	21.8%	0.0%
South River_210	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	88.7%	0.0%
South River_211	0.1%	46.4%	0.2%	0.0%	21.1%	0.2%	0.1%	32.5%	0.3%
South River_212	0.2%	41.1%	0.3%	0.1%	20.9%	0.4%	0.1%	37.9%	0.5%
South River_213	0.2%	69.4%	0.4%	0.0%	17.4%	0.2%	0.0%	13.2%	0.1%
South River_214	0.1%	54.8%	0.2%	0.0%	22.9%	0.2%	0.0%	22.4%	0.1%
South River_215	0.3%	47.5%	0.6%	0.1%	24.7%	0.7%	0.2%	27.8%	0.6%
South River_216	0.1%	39.0%	0.3%	0.1%	17.3%	0.3%	0.1%	43.7%	0.5%
South River_217	0.3%	43.1%	0.6%	0.2%	25.5%	0.7%	0.2%	31.4%	0.7%
South River_218	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.5%	0.0%	0.0%	70.3%	0.1%
South River_219	0.1%	42.1%	0.2%	0.0%	24.4%	0.2%	0.1%	33.5%	0.2%
South River_220	0.2%	64.1%	0.4%	0.1%	24.2%	0.3%	0.0%	11.7%	0.1%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
South River_221	0.3%	32.1%	0.6%	0.3%	31.6%	1.2%	0.3%	36.3%	1.0%
South River_222	0.0%	65.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.8%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%	0.0%
South River_223	0.1%	55.2%	0.2%	0.0%	24.7%	0.2%	0.0%	20.1%	0.1%
South River_224	0.2%	34.8%	0.3%	0.1%	23.4%	0.5%	0.2%	41.8%	0.6%
South River_225	0.1%	48.6%	0.2%	0.1%	27.7%	0.2%	0.0%	23.7%	0.1%
South River_226	0.2%	24.8%	0.5%	0.2%	23.6%	0.9%	0.5%	51.6%	1.5%
South River_227	0.2%	38.5%	0.3%	0.1%	19.4%	0.3%	0.2%	42.1%	0.6%
South River_228	0.1%	58.2%	0.3%	0.1%	22.6%	0.2%	0.0%	19.2%	0.1%
South River_229	0.0%	29.9%	0.0%	0.0%	22.3%	0.0%	0.0%	47.9%	0.1%
South River_230	0.1%	44.8%	0.3%	0.1%	19.3%	0.3%	0.1%	35.9%	0.4%
South River_231	0.1%	81.8%	0.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.1%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%
South River_232	0.1%	56.8%	0.3%	0.1%	30.3%	0.3%	0.0%	12.9%	0.1%
South River_233	0.1%	33.2%	0.1%	0.0%	28.4%	0.2%	0.1%	38.4%	0.2%
South River_234	0.2%	50.7%	0.5%	0.1%	22.8%	0.4%	0.1%	26.5%	0.4%
South River_235	0.1%	39.8%	0.2%	0.1%	29.8%	0.3%	0.1%	30.4%	0.2%
South River_236	0.0%	43.2%	0.0%	0.0%	10.2%	0.0%	0.0%	46.6%	0.0%
South River_237	0.1%	65.6%	0.2%	0.0%	20.6%	0.2%	0.0%	13.8%	0.1%
South River_238	0.3%	68.3%	0.6%	0.1%	20.9%	0.4%	0.0%	10.8%	0.2%
South River_239	0.1%	30.7%	0.2%	0.0%	16.7%	0.2%	0.1%	52.7%	0.5%
South River_240	0.2%	29.1%	0.4%	0.2%	28.9%	0.8%	0.3%	41.9%	0.8%
South River_241	0.1%	30.5%	0.2%	0.1%	37.1%	0.5%	0.1%	32.4%	0.3%
South River_242	0.3%	41.9%	0.5%	0.3%	43.0%	1.2%	0.1%	15.1%	0.3%
South River_243	0.4%	63.2%	0.8%	0.1%	22.4%	0.6%	0.1%	14.5%	0.3%
South River_244	0.4%	57.3%	0.8%	0.2%	25.8%	0.8%	0.1%	16.8%	0.4%
South River_245	0.2%	28.2%	0.4%	0.2%	27.1%	0.7%	0.3%	44.7%	0.9%
South River_246	0.0%	10.9%	0.0%	0.0%	15.7%	0.1%	0.1%	73.5%	0.4%
South River_247	0.2%	35.8%	0.4%	0.1%	18.0%	0.4%	0.2%	46.2%	0.7%
Sugar Creek_248	0.1%	49.2%	0.2%	0.1%	26.9%	0.2%	0.0%	23.9%	0.2%
Sugar Creek_249	0.2%	45.6%	0.4%	0.1%	27.7%	0.5%	0.1%	26.7%	0.4%
Sugar Creek_250	0.1%	51.4%	0.3%	0.1%	25.8%	0.3%	0.1%	22.7%	0.2%
Sugar Creek_251	0.1%	34.1%	0.3%	0.1%	29.7%	0.5%	0.2%	36.1%	0.5%
Sugar Creek_252	0.0%	29.8%	0.0%	0.0%	23.6%	0.0%	0.0%	46.6%	0.0%
Sugar Creek_253	0.0%	50.5%	0.0%	0.0%	29.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.5%	0.0%
Sugar Creek_254	0.1%	31.7%	0.3%	0.1%	21.3%	0.4%	0.2%	46.9%	0.6%
Sugar Creek_255	0.1%	35.4%	0.3%	0.1%	32.3%	0.5%	0.1%	32.3%	0.4%
Sugar Creek_256	0.2%	51.9%	0.4%	0.1%	25.5%	0.4%	0.1%	22.6%	0.3%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Sugar Creek_257	0.1%	43.3%	0.2%	0.1%	25.9%	0.3%	0.1%	30.9%	0.3%
Sugar Creek_258	0.1%	44.9%	0.3%	0.1%	23.9%	0.3%	0.1%	31.2%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_259	0.2%	55.9%	0.4%	0.1%	17.0%	0.3%	0.1%	27.1%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_260	0.0%	65.1%	0.0%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%	0.0%	13.2%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_261	0.2%	61.8%	0.5%	0.1%	20.0%	0.3%	0.1%	18.2%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_262	0.2%	55.2%	0.4%	0.1%	21.4%	0.3%	0.1%	23.4%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_263	0.6%	73.4%	1.2%	0.1%	15.2%	0.5%	0.1%	11.4%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_264	0.3%	76.6%	0.6%	0.1%	15.5%	0.3%	0.0%	7.9%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_265	0.1%	45.1%	0.1%	0.0%	22.8%	0.1%	0.0%	32.2%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_266	0.1%	53.7%	0.2%	0.0%	24.2%	0.1%	0.0%	22.2%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_267	0.1%	55.8%	0.2%	0.1%	36.1%	0.2%	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_268	0.6%	63.0%	1.3%	0.2%	18.9%	0.8%	0.2%	18.2%	0.6%
Utoy Creek_269	0.4%	67.2%	0.7%	0.1%	18.5%	0.4%	0.1%	14.3%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_270	0.4%	59.0%	0.9%	0.2%	22.8%	0.7%	0.1%	18.2%	0.4%
Utoy Creek_271	0.2%	54.3%	0.4%	0.1%	31.4%	0.5%	0.0%	14.3%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_272	0.5%	73.1%	1.1%	0.1%	18.5%	0.6%	0.1%	8.4%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_273	0.2%	40.8%	0.4%	0.2%	38.1%	0.8%	0.1%	21.1%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_274	0.1%	36.7%	0.3%	0.2%	41.5%	0.7%	0.1%	21.8%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_275	0.4%	64.3%	0.8%	0.1%	18.8%	0.5%	0.1%	16.9%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_276	0.3%	56.7%	0.7%	0.1%	18.6%	0.5%	0.1%	24.8%	0.5%
Utoy Creek_277	0.3%	61.2%	0.6%	0.1%	21.0%	0.4%	0.1%	17.8%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_278	0.0%	67.9%	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_279	0.0%	66.2%	0.0%	0.0%	18.9%	0.0%	0.0%	14.7%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_280	0.1%	63.1%	0.2%	0.0%	19.4%	0.1%	0.0%	17.5%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_281	0.1%	58.5%	0.2%	0.0%	20.2%	0.1%	0.0%	21.2%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_282	0.2%	43.9%	0.4%	0.1%	24.1%	0.4%	0.1%	32.0%	0.4%
Utoy Creek_283	0.1%	27.4%	0.1%	0.1%	33.1%	0.3%	0.1%	39.4%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_284	0.0%	74.8%	0.0%	0.0%	18.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_285	0.3%	69.2%	0.6%	0.1%	18.5%	0.3%	0.0%	12.3%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_286	0.3%	54.2%	0.5%	0.1%	22.1%	0.5%	0.1%	23.8%	0.4%
Utoy Creek_287	0.2%	59.4%	0.5%	0.1%	23.3%	0.4%	0.1%	17.3%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_288	0.0%	31.5%	0.1%	0.0%	27.6%	0.1%	0.0%	40.8%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_289	0.1%	78.9%	0.2%	0.0%	16.1%	0.1%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_290	0.1%	58.9%	0.3%	0.0%	16.8%	0.2%	0.1%	24.3%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_291	0.2%	57.1%	0.4%	0.1%	19.0%	0.3%	0.1%	23.9%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_292	0.2%	69.2%	0.4%	0.0%	19.3%	0.2%	0.0%	11.5%	0.1%

Small Watershed	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Wshed	% UTC	% City	% Wshed	% NTV	% City	% Wshed	% NV
Utoy Creek_293	0.1%	63.8%	0.3%	0.0%	21.2%	0.2%	0.0%	15.0%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_294	0.0%	70.9%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_295	0.1%	47.6%	0.2%	0.1%	39.5%	0.3%	0.0%	12.9%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_296	0.2%	64.2%	0.4%	0.1%	23.5%	0.3%	0.0%	12.3%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_297	0.3%	56.0%	0.7%	0.2%	32.1%	0.9%	0.1%	11.9%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_298	0.4%	55.1%	0.9%	0.2%	22.1%	0.8%	0.2%	22.8%	0.6%
Utoy Creek_299	0.2%	77.6%	0.4%	0.0%	15.3%	0.1%	0.0%	7.1%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_300	0.1%	69.4%	0.3%	0.0%	19.0%	0.2%	0.0%	11.6%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_301	0.2%	60.1%	0.5%	0.1%	21.4%	0.4%	0.1%	18.5%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_302	0.2%	77.1%	0.4%	0.0%	16.8%	0.2%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_303	0.0%	45.5%	0.1%	0.0%	17.8%	0.1%	0.0%	36.7%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_304	0.1%	55.8%	0.3%	0.1%	22.6%	0.3%	0.1%	21.6%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_305	0.0%	31.7%	0.1%	0.0%	21.2%	0.1%	0.1%	47.1%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_306	0.2%	58.6%	0.4%	0.1%	22.6%	0.3%	0.1%	18.8%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_307	0.2%	51.2%	0.4%	0.1%	23.6%	0.3%	0.1%	25.3%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_308	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	51.2%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	0.0%
Utoy Creek_309	0.0%	46.2%	0.1%	0.0%	25.2%	0.1%	0.0%	28.6%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_310	0.2%	67.5%	0.5%	0.1%	17.0%	0.3%	0.1%	15.5%	0.2%
Utoy Creek_311	0.2%	76.3%	0.4%	0.0%	16.1%	0.2%	0.0%	7.6%	0.1%
Utoy Creek_312	0.3%	57.6%	0.6%	0.1%	25.1%	0.5%	0.1%	17.3%	0.3%
Utoy Creek_313	0.2%	61.2%	0.4%	0.1%	22.6%	0.3%	0.0%	16.1%	0.1%

8.6 Parks > .5 Acres in Size (Sorted by Size - Largest First)

Park	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Park	% UTC	% City	% Park	% NTV	% City	% Park	% NV
Chastain Memorial Park	0.1%	38.3%	0.2%	0.1%	47.1%	8.6%	0.0%	14.6%	0.3%
Southside Park	0.2%	72.6%	0.4%	0.1%	21.4%	3.3%	0.0%	6.0%	0.3%
Piedmont Park	0.1%	33.5%	0.2%	0.1%	47.1%	6.7%	0.0%	19.4%	0.3%
Atlanta Memorial Park	0.1%	39.8%	0.2%	0.1%	47.1%	6.6%	0.0%	10.5%	0.2%
Browns Mill Golf Course	0.0%	23.0%	0.1%	0.1%	68.7%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.6%
Adams Park	0.1%	37.4%	0.1%	0.1%	53.1%	6.2%	0.0%	9.5%	0.8%
Grant Park	0.1%	50.2%	0.2%	0.0%	29.6%	2.8%	0.0%	20.2%	0.3%
Freedom Park	0.1%	39.9%	0.1%	0.1%	44.6%	4.1%	0.0%	15.2%	0.5%

Park	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Park	% UTC	% City	% Park	% NTV	% City	% Park	% NV
Cascade Springs Nature Preserve	0.1%	88.6%	0.3%	0.0%	10.2%	0.9%	0.0%	1.2%	0.2%
Lakewood Fairgrounds & HiFi Buys Amphitheater	0.0%	18.4%	0.1%	0.0%	28.4%	2.5%	0.1%	53.3%	0.2%
John A. White Park	0.1%	45.9%	0.1%	0.1%	43.4%	3.5%	0.0%	10.7%	0.3%
South Bend Park	0.1%	61.0%	0.1%	0.0%	31.0%	1.7%	0.0%	8.0%	0.6%
North Camp Creek Parkway NP	0.1%	77.7%	0.1%	0.0%	21.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%
Rockdale Park	0.0%	68.7%	0.1%	0.0%	27.3%	1.3%	0.0%	4.0%	0.1%
Herbert Greene	0.1%	86.3%	0.1%	0.0%	12.6%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%	1.3%
Anderson Park	0.0%	63.7%	0.1%	0.0%	22.1%	0.9%	0.0%	14.3%	0.1%
Maddox Park	0.0%	33.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.6%	1.2%	0.0%	36.4%	1.0%
Melvin Drive Park	0.0%	76.9%	0.1%	0.0%	17.4%	0.7%	0.0%	5.6%	0.1%
Chattahoochee Trail	0.0%	43.0%	0.1%	0.0%	44.3%	1.7%	0.0%	12.7%	0.5%
Candler Park	0.0%	37.3%	0.0%	0.0%	54.7%	2.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.3%
Swann Preserve	0.0%	79.8%	0.1%	0.0%	15.9%	0.6%	0.0%	4.3%	0.3%
Lionel Hampton	0.0%	85.1%	0.1%	0.0%	14.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
Perkerson Park	0.0%	59.0%	0.1%	0.0%	30.2%	1.1%	0.0%	10.7%	0.1%
Oakland Cemetery	0.0%	22.4%	0.0%	0.0%	54.5%	1.9%	0.0%	23.1%	0.2%
Center Hill Park	0.0%	59.6%	0.1%	0.0%	30.0%	1.0%	0.0%	10.3%	0.1%
Gun Club Park	0.0%	80.7%	0.1%	0.0%	15.6%	0.5%	0.0%	3.8%	0.1%
Morningside Nature Preserve	0.0%	68.0%	0.1%	0.0%	23.2%	0.6%	0.0%	8.7%	0.5%
Wilson Mill Park	0.0%	63.7%	0.1%	0.0%	28.9%	0.8%	0.0%	7.4%	0.2%
Mozley Park	0.0%	43.2%	0.0%	0.0%	41.0%	0.9%	0.0%	15.7%	0.3%
Spink-Collins Park	0.0%	83.6%	0.1%	0.0%	13.8%	0.3%	0.0%	2.7%	0.1%
Herbert Taylor Park	0.0%	70.3%	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	0.4%	0.0%	7.9%	0.3%
Falling Water	0.0%	73.9%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	0.3%	0.0%	8.5%	0.1%
Harwell Heights Park	0.0%	73.2%	0.0%	0.0%	18.3%	0.3%	0.0%	8.4%	0.0%
Frankie Allen Park	0.0%	45.6%	0.0%	0.0%	34.3%	0.6%	0.0%	20.0%	0.1%
Ben Hill Park	0.0%	46.2%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	0.3%	0.0%	34.4%	0.1%
Outdoor Activity Center	0.0%	78.8%	0.0%	0.0%	15.9%	0.3%	0.0%	5.3%	0.2%
Boulevard Crossing	0.0%	19.9%	0.0%	0.0%	73.2%	1.2%	0.0%	6.8%	0.3%
Whittier Mills Park	0.0%	61.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.3%	0.6%	0.0%	3.7%	0.1%
Washington Park	0.0%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	39.3%	0.6%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%
Rosel Fann Park	0.0%	54.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	0.3%	0.0%	20.0%	0.4%
Historic Fourth Ward Park	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	54.6%	0.7%	0.0%	38.4%	0.1%
Central Park	0.0%	30.3%	0.0%	0.0%	56.4%	0.7%	0.0%	13.5%	0.2%
Grove Park	0.0%	40.1%	0.0%	0.0%	44.9%	0.6%	0.0%	14.9%	0.1%
Deerwood Park	0.0%	63.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.0%	0.4%	0.0%	7.7%	0.1%

Park	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Park	% UTC	% City	% Park	% NTV	% City	% Park	% NV
Thomasville Park	0.0%	51.4%	0.0%	0.0%	31.7%	0.4%	0.0%	16.9%	0.1%
Chosewood Park	0.0%	69.8%	0.0%	0.0%	23.6%	0.3%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%
Collier Park	0.0%	70.6%	0.0%	0.0%	22.5%	0.3%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%
Coventry Station CE	0.0%	86.8%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%
Tanyard Creek Park	0.0%	61.8%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	0.4%	0.0%	4.3%	0.1%
Fort Peachtree Landings	0.0%	61.1%	0.0%	0.0%	32.2%	0.3%	0.0%	6.6%	0.3%
Mims Park	0.0%	28.2%	0.0%	0.0%	59.6%	0.6%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%
Rev. James Orange Park at Oakland City	0.0%	48.4%	0.0%	0.0%	39.7%	0.4%	0.0%	12.0%	0.1%
Blue Heron Nature Preserve	0.0%	48.9%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.2%	0.0%	6.7%	0.4%
Isabel Gates Webster Park	0.0%	72.1%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%	0.2%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%
Pittman Park	0.0%	29.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.8%	0.5%	0.0%	23.1%	0.2%
Rosa L. Burney Park	0.0%	22.7%	0.0%	0.0%	49.3%	0.5%	0.0%	27.9%	0.0%
Harper Park	0.0%	56.4%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	0.3%	0.0%	10.0%	0.1%
Coan Park	0.0%	28.7%	0.0%	0.0%	53.0%	0.5%	0.0%	18.5%	0.6%
Emma Millican Park	0.0%	75.2%	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	0.2%	0.0%	7.0%	0.1%
Brownwood Park	0.0%	74.3%	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	0.2%	0.0%	7.6%	0.1%
Shady Valley Park	0.0%	64.8%	0.0%	0.0%	22.7%	0.2%	0.0%	12.5%	0.1%
Mountain Way Commons	0.0%	57.3%	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%	0.1%	0.0%	29.6%	0.1%
South Atlanta Park	0.0%	38.8%	0.0%	0.0%	43.5%	0.4%	0.0%	17.8%	0.0%
Alexander Park	0.0%	85.4%	0.0%	0.0%	11.9%	0.1%	0.0%	3.4%	0.5%
Adamsville Recrecreation Center	0.0%	19.4%	0.0%	0.0%	21.7%	0.2%	0.0%	58.7%	0.1%
Stone Hogan Park	0.0%	88.5%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.1%	0.0%	3.9%	0.1%
Westside Park	0.0%	31.2%	0.0%	0.0%	22.3%	0.2%	0.0%	46.0%	0.0%
Avery Park-Gilbert House	0.0%	79.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.2%	0.1%	0.0%	4.3%	0.3%
Adair Park II	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%	64.0%	0.5%	0.0%	22.4%	0.3%
A.D. Williams Park	0.0%	58.4%	0.0%	0.0%	29.2%	0.2%	0.0%	12.6%	0.1%
West Manor Park	0.0%	57.2%	0.0%	0.0%	26.6%	0.2%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%
East Lake Park	0.0%	35.8%	0.0%	0.0%	52.5%	0.4%	0.0%	11.8%	0.2%
Campbellton Road Park	0.0%	79.9%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%	0.1%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%
Benteen Park	0.0%	47.6%	0.0%	0.0%	42.6%	0.3%	0.0%	10.2%	0.3%
Empire Park	0.0%	52.8%	0.0%	0.0%	41.2%	0.3%	0.0%	5.8%	0.1%
Winn Park	0.0%	68.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.9%	0.2%	0.0%	5.1%	0.1%
Arthur Langford Jr Park	0.0%	39.7%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	0.3%	0.0%	23.3%	0.1%
Underwood Hills Park	0.0%	65.2%	0.0%	0.0%	26.3%	0.2%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%
English Park	0.0%	52.3%	0.0%	0.0%	31.5%	0.2%	0.0%	16.3%	0.1%
Barbara A. McCoy Park	0.0%	72.8%	0.0%	0.0%	22.4%	0.1%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%

Park	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Park	% UTC	% City	% Park	% NTV	% City	% Park	% NV
D.H. Stanton Park	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	64.3%	0.4%	0.0%	19.9%	0.1%
Sibley Park	0.0%	80.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.2%	0.1%	0.0%	3.2%	0.1%
Cumberlander	0.0%	84.5%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
Lenox-Wildwood Park	0.0%	81.2%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.1%	0.0%	4.4%	0.2%
Daniel Johnson Nature Preserve	0.0%	81.9%	0.0%	0.0%	14.5%	0.1%	0.0%	3.3%	0.3%
Peachtree Hills Park	0.0%	36.7%	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%	0.3%	0.0%	16.4%	0.1%
Phoenix II Park	0.0%	24.2%	0.0%	0.0%	56.1%	0.3%	0.0%	20.1%	0.0%
Beaverbrook Park	0.0%	78.9%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	0.1%	0.0%	5.9%	0.1%
Greenbriar	0.0%	78.5%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	0.1%	0.0%	2.6%	0.2%
Bessie Branham Park	0.0%	25.2%	0.0%	0.0%	46.2%	0.2%	0.0%	29.2%	0.0%
Walker Park	0.0%	27.8%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	0.3%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%
West End Park	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%	0.0%	48.3%	0.2%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%
Kirkwood Urban Forest	0.0%	72.9%	0.0%	0.0%	22.7%	0.1%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%
J. Allen Couch Park	0.0%	31.2%	0.0%	0.0%	61.8%	0.3%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%
Emma Lane	0.0%	74.6%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%	0.1%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%
Adair Park I	0.0%	36.2%	0.0%	0.0%	54.2%	0.2%	0.0%	9.3%	0.1%
Orme Park	0.0%	75.5%	0.0%	0.0%	20.6%	0.1%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%
Tanyard Creek Urban Forest	0.0%	75.5%	0.0%	0.0%	17.7%	0.1%	0.0%	6.2%	0.0%
Ansley Park	0.0%	77.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16.4%	0.1%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%
Dean Rusk Park	0.0%	26.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.8%	0.2%	0.0%	25.7%	0.1%
Riverside	0.0%	81.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	0.1%	0.0%	2.6%	0.1%
Renaissance Park	0.0%	61.1%	0.0%	0.0%	32.6%	0.1%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%
Selena S. Butler Park	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%	0.0%	54.2%	0.2%	0.0%	33.6%	0.0%
Tullwater Park	0.0%	73.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.7%	0.1%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%
Cleveland Avenue Park	0.0%	52.1%	0.0%	0.0%	31.1%	0.1%	0.0%	17.1%	0.1%
Springlake Park	0.0%	83.6%	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%	0.1%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%
Springdale Park	0.0%	40.6%	0.0%	0.0%	54.1%	0.2%	0.0%	5.3%	0.1%
M.L.K. Center	0.0%	10.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.8%	0.1%	0.0%	60.4%	0.1%
Beecher Park	0.0%	72.5%	0.0%	0.0%	18.7%	0.1%	0.0%	8.7%	0.0%
Howard Park	0.0%	67.7%	0.0%	0.0%	26.4%	0.1%	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%
Lake Claire Park	0.0%	64.8%	0.0%	0.0%	28.5%	0.1%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
McClatchey Park	0.0%	62.4%	0.0%	0.0%	27.4%	0.1%	0.0%	10.3%	0.1%
Drake Park	0.0%	92.2%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.1%
Morningside Recreation Center	0.0%	35.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.1%	0.0%	47.8%	0.1%
Four Corners Park	0.0%	27.2%	0.0%	0.0%	57.6%	0.2%	0.0%	15.5%	0.0%
Bass Recreation Center	0.0%	20.3%	0.0%	0.0%	66.5%	0.2%	0.0%	12.6%	0.1%
Little Nancy Creek Park	0.0%	77.9%	0.0%	0.0%	16.8%	0.1%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%

Park	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Park	% UTC	% City	% Park	% NTV	% City	% Park	% NV
Memorial Drive Greenway	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	59.3%	0.2%	0.0%	29.2%	0.0%
Rawson-Washington Park	0.0%	21.7%	0.0%	0.0%	43.6%	0.1%	0.0%	34.8%	0.1%
Shirley Place Park	0.0%	57.9%	0.0%	0.0%	32.5%	0.1%	0.0%	9.4%	0.1%
Edwin Place Park	0.0%	80.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.2%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%
Cleopas R. Johnson Park	0.0%	29.6%	0.0%	0.0%	49.2%	0.2%	0.0%	21.1%	0.2%
Springvale Park	0.0%	61.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.8%	0.1%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%
John C. Burdine Center	0.0%	43.1%	0.0%	0.0%	26.5%	0.1%	0.0%	30.2%	0.0%
Peachtree Battle Parkway	0.0%	68.6%	0.0%	0.0%	21.1%	0.1%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%
Shadyside Park	0.0%	68.3%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	0.1%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%
Enota Place Park	0.0%	75.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%
Phoenix III Park	0.0%	58.9%	0.0%	0.0%	35.9%	0.1%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%
Cabbagetown Park	0.0%	25.4%	0.0%	0.0%	56.2%	0.2%	0.0%	18.4%	0.0%
Spring Valley Park	0.0%	80.5%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.1%
Virgilee Park	0.0%	37.8%	0.0%	0.0%	54.7%	0.1%	0.0%	7.6%	0.2%
Oak Grove Park	0.0%	45.0%	0.0%	0.0%	39.2%	0.1%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%
Garden Hills Park	0.0%	58.1%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.1%	0.0%	17.0%	0.0%
Lang-Carson Park	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	39.5%	0.1%	0.0%	33.1%	0.0%
Robert W. Woodruff Park	0.0%	32.4%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%	0.1%	0.0%	40.5%	0.1%
Chattahoochee Park	0.0%	47.4%	0.0%	0.0%	39.2%	0.1%	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%
Mayson Ravine	0.0%	90.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%
John Howell Memorial Park	0.0%	61.7%	0.0%	0.0%	25.8%	0.1%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%
Georgia Hill Center	0.0%	33.6%	0.0%	0.0%	30.4%	0.1%	0.0%	35.8%	0.1%
Dale Creek Park	0.0%	90.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.1%
Haynes Manor Park	0.0%	71.3%	0.0%	0.0%	23.6%	0.1%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%
Tucson Trail Park	0.0%	77.1%	0.0%	0.0%	17.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%
Mayson Park	0.0%	84.2%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
Gilliam Park	0.0%	60.3%	0.0%	0.0%	29.5%	0.1%	0.0%	9.4%	0.0%
Knight Park	0.0%	72.2%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%
Rose Circle Park	0.0%	38.1%	0.0%	0.0%	44.7%	0.1%	0.0%	17.5%	0.0%
Sidney Marcus Park	0.0%	69.8%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	0.1%	0.0%	4.0%	0.1%
Mantissa Road	0.0%	81.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%
Proctor Village Park	0.0%	35.1%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%
Goldsboro Park	0.0%	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	30.3%	0.1%	0.0%	25.9%	0.0%
J.F. Kennedy Park	0.0%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	78.0%	0.1%	0.0%	13.2%	0.0%
Ella Mae Wade Brayboy Memorial Park	0.0%	39.4%	0.0%	0.0%	46.4%	0.1%	0.0%	14.0%	0.0%
3162 Lenox Rd	0.0%	84.9%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%

Park	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Park	% UTC	% City	% Park	% NTV	% City	% Park	% NV
17th Street Park	0.0%	75.2%	0.0%	0.0%	19.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%
Lillian Cooper Shepherd Park	0.0%	57.7%	0.0%	0.0%	27.2%	0.0%	0.0%	14.7%	0.0%
Sunnybrook Park	0.0%	81.4%	0.0%	0.0%	15.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%
Lanier Boulevard Parkway	0.0%	50.6%	0.0%	0.0%	27.4%	0.0%	0.0%	22.4%	0.0%
Howell Park	0.0%	47.3%	0.0%	0.0%	37.4%	0.1%	0.0%	15.1%	0.0%
Vermont Road Park	0.0%	86.5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%
Yonah Park	0.0%	75.5%	0.0%	0.0%	17.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%
Iverson Park	0.0%	52.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.7%	0.1%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%
Loring Heights Park	0.0%	53.5%	0.0%	0.0%	26.3%	0.0%	0.0%	20.1%	0.0%
Hurt Park	0.0%	29.6%	0.0%	0.0%	35.2%	0.0%	0.0%	35.2%	0.1%
Gordon-White Park	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	61.2%	0.1%	0.0%	34.4%	0.0%
Whetstone Creek Park	0.0%	76.1%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%
Home Park	0.0%	35.7%	0.0%	0.0%	32.2%	0.0%	0.0%	32.5%	0.0%
Ardmore Park	0.0%	72.3%	0.0%	0.0%	20.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	0.1%
Wildwood Gardens Park	0.0%	81.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	0.0%
Vine City Park	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	70.8%	0.1%	0.0%	23.2%	0.0%
Adamsville Park (Old)	0.0%	43.9%	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	34.8%	0.0%
Sara J. Gonzalez Park	0.0%	68.7%	0.0%	0.0%	24.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%
John Wesley Dobbs Park	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.1%	0.0%	0.0%	59.4%	0.0%
Rebel Valley Playlot	0.0%	61.9%	0.0%	0.0%	32.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%
Eubanks (The Prado) Park	0.0%	71.9%	0.0%	0.0%	24.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
Dellwood Park	0.0%	53.9%	0.0%	0.0%	30.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	0.0%
Ormond-Grant Park	0.0%	58.5%	0.0%	0.0%	34.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%
Boone and West Lake	0.0%	57.9%	0.0%	0.0%	37.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%
Ellsworth Park	0.0%	65.4%	0.0%	0.0%	27.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%
Matilda Place Park	0.0%	73.3%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%
Lindsay Street Park	0.0%	23.2%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	0.0%	56.7%	0.0%
Benjamin E. Mays St. Park	0.0%	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	73.9%	0.0%
West Wesley Park	0.0%	76.2%	0.0%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%
Gertrude Place	0.0%	64.2%	0.0%	0.0%	27.9%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%	0.0%
Macon Drive Park	0.0%	70.8%	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%
Charles L. Harper Memorial Park	0.0%	28.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.5%	0.0%	0.0%	40.8%	0.0%
Windsor Street Park	0.0%	35.1%	0.0%	0.0%	49.4%	0.0%	0.0%	15.9%	0.0%
Oak Knoll I Park	0.0%	78.7%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%
South Evelyn Place Park	0.0%	50.6%	0.0%	0.0%	35.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.8%	0.0%
Loridans	0.0%	46.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	50.8%	0.0%
Benoit	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	49.2%	0.0%	0.0%	47.9%	0.0%

Park	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Park	% UTC	% City	% Park	% NTV	% City	% Park	% NV
Green Leaf Circle	0.0%	16.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.3%	0.1%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%
Sunken Garden Park	0.0%	65.8%	0.0%	0.0%	24.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%
North Evelyn Place Park	0.0%	47.3%	0.0%	0.0%	46.4%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%
Ashby Circle Playlot	0.0%	60.2%	0.0%	0.0%	30.7%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%
Watkins Park	0.0%	81.6%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.0%
Arlington Circle Beauty Spot	0.0%	83.2%	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%
J.D. Sims Recreation Center	0.0%	29.4%	0.0%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	35.3%	0.0%
Inman Park Trolley Barn	0.0%	50.1%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	31.9%	0.0%
Esther Peachey Lefever	0.0%	29.7%	0.0%	0.0%	35.8%	0.0%	0.0%	34.9%	0.0%
Parkway-Merritts Park	0.0%	50.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.9%	0.0%	0.0%	20.8%	0.0%
Verbena Street Playlot	0.0%	23.4%	0.0%	0.0%	68.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%
Heritage (Founder's) Park	0.0%	30.2%	0.0%	0.0%	46.2%	0.0%	0.0%	22.9%	0.0%
Old Ivy Road Park	0.0%	74.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%
Jacci Fuller Woodland Garden Park	0.0%	76.5%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%
Oakview II Park	0.0%	44.1%	0.0%	0.0%	24.2%	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	0.0%
Elinor Place Park	0.0%	69.2%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%
Parkway-Wabash Park	0.0%	38.4%	0.0%	0.0%	35.6%	0.0%	0.0%	25.6%	0.0%
Channing Valley Park	0.0%	67.8%	0.0%	0.0%	30.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%
Hardy Ivy Park	0.0%	42.5%	0.0%	0.0%	25.9%	0.0%	0.0%	33.2%	0.0%
Summerhill Triangle	0.0%	46.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	18.9%	0.0%
Oak Knoll II Park	0.0%	78.4%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	0.0%
Harold Avenue Place	0.0%	79.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%
Charlie Loudermilk Park	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	96.3%	0.0%
Arlington Circle Playlot	0.0%	81.5%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%
Sylvan Circle Playlot	0.0%	36.9%	0.0%	0.0%	61.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%

8.7 Zoning

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
Historic-Cultural	1%	34%	1%	0%	27%	1%	0%	39%	1%
QOL Mixed Use	2%	21%	1%	0%	20%	2%	1%	59%	4%
Office Institutional	2%	34%	1%	0%	23%	2%	1%	44%	3%
Planned Development	3%	45%	3%	1%	24%	3%	1%	31%	3%
Commercial	4%	23%	2%	1%	19%	4%	3%	58%	9%
Special Public Interest	6%	17%	2%	1%	17%	4%	4%	66%	13%
Residential Multi-Family	9%	40%	8%	2%	26%	10%	3%	34%	10%
Industrial	11%	26%	6%	2%	21%	10%	6%	54%	20%
Residential Single-Family	61%	58%	76%	14%	24%	63%	11%	18%	37%

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
C-1	0.8%	23%	0.8%	0.7%	19%	1.4%	2.0%	55%	3.1%
C-1-C	0.5%	35%	0.5%	0.3%	22%	0.7%	0.6%	43%	1.0%
C-2	0.4%	23%	0.4%	0.3%	18%	0.6%	1.0%	59%	1.5%
C-2-C	0.1%	24%	0.1%	0.1%	21%	0.1%	0.2%	55%	0.3%
C-3	0.1%	12%	0.1%	0.1%	13%	0.2%	0.5%	75%	0.7%
C-3-C	0.1%	14%	0.1%	0.1%	18%	0.2%	0.3%	68%	0.5%
C-4	0.1%	22%	0.1%	0.1%	24%	0.1%	0.1%	54%	0.2%
C-4-C	0.0%	4%	0.0%	0.0%	12%	0.1%	0.3%	85%	0.5%
C-5	0.0%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	1%	0.0%	0.0%	99%	0.0%
C-5-C	0.0%	13%	0.0%	0.0%	33%	0.0%	0.0%	54%	0.0%
FCR-3	0.9%	55%	0.9%	0.4%	23%	0.7%	0.4%	23%	0.6%
HC-20A SA1	0.0%	5%	0.0%	0.0%	11%	0.0%	0.0%	83%	0.0%
HC-20A SA2	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	26%	0.0%	0.0%	52%	0.0%
HC-20A SA3	0.1%	37%	0.1%	0.0%	28%	0.1%	0.1%	35%	0.1%
HC-20A SA4	0.0%	26%	0.0%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	54%	0.0%
HC-20A SA4-C	0.0%	11%	0.0%	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	64%	0.0%
HC-20A SA5	0.0%	3%	0.0%	0.0%	11%	0.0%	0.1%	86%	0.1%
HC-20B	0.4%	52%	0.4%	0.2%	28%	0.5%	0.2%	20%	0.2%

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
HC-20C SA1	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	24%	0.0%	0.0%	52%	0.0%
HC-20C SA2	0.0%	25%	0.0%	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	52%	0.1%
HC-20C SA3	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	61%	0.1%
HC-20C SA3-C	0.0%	32%	0.0%	0.0%	32%	0.0%	0.0%	34%	0.0%
HC-20C SA4	0.0%	6%	0.0%	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.1%	82%	0.2%
HC-20D	0.0%	38%	0.0%	0.0%	38%	0.0%	0.0%	23%	0.0%
HC-20E	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.1%	53%	0.1%	0.0%	25%	0.0%
HC-20N SA1	0.0%	8%	0.0%	0.0%	21%	0.1%	0.1%	71%	0.1%
HC-20N SA2	0.0%	5%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	78%	0.0%
I-1	2.2%	23%	2.2%	2.1%	22%	4.3%	5.3%	55%	8.4%
I-1-C	0.8%	43%	0.8%	0.4%	22%	0.8%	0.6%	35%	1.0%
I-2	3.1%	25%	3.1%	2.4%	20%	5.0%	6.7%	55%	####
I-2-C	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.1%	16%	0.1%	0.2%	68%	0.4%
LW	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.0%	65%	0.1%
LW-C	0.0%	26%	0.0%	0.0%	24%	0.0%	0.0%	50%	0.0%
MR-2	0.2%	60%	0.2%	0.1%	25%	0.2%	0.0%	15%	0.1%
MR-2-C	0.1%	48%	0.1%	0.1%	26%	0.2%	0.1%	26%	0.1%
MR-3	0.1%	42%	0.1%	0.1%	22%	0.1%	0.1%	36%	0.1%
MR-3-C	0.2%	38%	0.2%	0.1%	25%	0.3%	0.2%	37%	0.3%
MR-3A-C	0.0%	53%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.0%	27%	0.0%
MR-4-C	0.0%	43%	0.0%	0.0%	32%	0.0%	0.0%	26%	0.0%
MR-4A	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	25%	0.1%	0.1%	53%	0.1%
MR-4A-C	0.3%	34%	0.3%	0.2%	25%	0.4%	0.3%	40%	0.5%
MR-4B	0.1%	65%	0.1%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%
MR-4B-C	0.0%	44%	0.0%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	35%	0.0%
MR-5A	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	69%	0.0%
MR-5A-C	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.0%	38%	0.0%	0.0%	43%	0.0%
MR4-B-C	0.0%	68%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.0%	12%	0.0%
MRC-1	0.1%	33%	0.1%	0.1%	22%	0.2%	0.2%	46%	0.3%
MRC-1-C	0.2%	25%	0.2%	0.2%	22%	0.3%	0.4%	53%	0.6%
MRC-2	0.2%	46%	0.2%	0.1%	28%	0.2%	0.1%	27%	0.1%
MRC-2-C	0.2%	21%	0.2%	0.2%	16%	0.3%	0.6%	63%	0.9%
MRC-3	0.0%	9%	0.0%	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.0%	74%	0.0%
MRC-3-C	0.2%	12%	0.2%	0.3%	19%	0.6%	1.0%	69%	1.6%
NC-1	0.0%	13%	0.0%	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	64%	0.1%
NC-10 SA1	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	7%	0.0%	0.0%	76%	0.0%
NC-10 SA2	0.0%	50%	0.0%	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	27%	0.0%

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
NC-11	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.0%	66%	0.0%
NC-12 SA1	0.0%	8%	0.0%	0.0%	10%	0.0%	0.0%	82%	0.0%
NC-12 SA2	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.0%	57%	0.0%
NC-13	0.0%	27%	0.0%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	52%	0.0%
NC-14	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	61%	0.0%
NC-2	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.1%	0.1%	64%	0.1%
NC-3	0.0%	29%	0.0%	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	49%	0.0%
NC-4	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.0%	66%	0.1%
NC-5	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.1%	61%	0.1%
NC-5-C	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	29%	0.0%	0.0%	54%	0.0%
NC-6	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%	0.0%	67%	0.1%
NC-7	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	56%	0.0%
NC-7-C	0.0%	43%	0.0%	0.0%	41%	0.0%	0.0%	13%	0.0%
NC-8	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.0%	65%	0.0%
NC-9	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	56%	0.0%
O-I	1.2%	32%	1.2%	0.9%	24%	1.8%	1.7%	44%	2.6%
O-I-C	0.3%	44%	0.3%	0.1%	16%	0.2%	0.3%	40%	0.4%
PD-H	2.2%	54%	2.2%	0.9%	22%	1.8%	1.0%	24%	1.5%
PD-H1	0.1%	64%	0.1%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%
PD-H2	0.0%	51%	0.0%	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	31%	0.0%
PD-MU	0.9%	34%	0.9%	0.7%	26%	1.5%	1.1%	41%	1.8%
PD-OC	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%	0.1%	57%	0.1%
PDH	0.0%	48%	0.0%	0.0%	46%	0.1%	0.0%	6%	0.0%
R-1	2.6%	69%	2.6%	0.6%	16%	1.2%	0.6%	15%	0.9%
R-2	5.1%	65%	5.1%	1.5%	19%	3.1%	1.3%	16%	2.0%
R-2A	1.4%	68%	1.4%	0.4%	19%	0.8%	0.3%	13%	0.4%
R-2A-C	0.0%	60%	0.0%	0.0%	36%	0.0%	0.0%	4%	0.0%
R-2B	0.6%	63%	0.6%	0.2%	20%	0.4%	0.2%	17%	0.3%
R-3	20.1%	63%	20.1%	6.8%	21%	13.9%	5.1%	16%	8.0%
R-3-C	0.0%	44%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	39%	0.0%
R-3A	0.5%	61%	0.5%	0.2%	20%	0.3%	0.1%	19%	0.2%
R-4	34.5%	57%	34.5%	15.1%	25%	31.1%	10.9%	18%	####
R-4-C	0.1%	56%	0.1%	0.0%	20%	0.1%	0.0%	24%	0.1%
R-4A	6.2%	54%	6.2%	3.0%	27%	6.3%	2.2%	19%	3.4%
R-4A-C	0.0%	41%	0.0%	0.0%	27%	0.0%	0.0%	32%	0.0%
R-4B	0.3%	40%	0.3%	0.2%	28%	0.5%	0.2%	32%	0.4%
R-4B-C	0.1%	33%	0.1%	0.1%	36%	0.2%	0.1%	31%	0.2%

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
R-5	2.9%	43%	2.9%	2.0%	30%	4.0%	1.8%	27%	2.8%
R-5-C	0.2%	43%	0.2%	0.1%	28%	0.3%	0.1%	29%	0.2%
R-LC	0.1%	41%	0.1%	0.0%	22%	0.1%	0.1%	37%	0.1%
R-LC-C	0.1%	45%	0.1%	0.0%	20%	0.1%	0.1%	35%	0.1%
RG-1	0.1%	41%	0.1%	0.1%	33%	0.2%	0.1%	26%	0.1%
RG-1-C	0.0%	42%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	30%	0.0%
RG-2	1.9%	43%	1.9%	1.1%	25%	2.3%	1.4%	32%	2.2%
RG-2-C	0.7%	51%	0.7%	0.3%	20%	0.5%	0.4%	29%	0.6%
RG-3	3.0%	39%	3.0%	2.1%	28%	4.4%	2.5%	33%	3.9%
RG-3-C	0.5%	34%	0.5%	0.4%	24%	0.8%	0.6%	40%	1.0%
RG-4	0.2%	25%	0.2%	0.2%	25%	0.4%	0.4%	50%	0.6%
RG-4-C	0.1%	25%	0.1%	0.1%	17%	0.1%	0.2%	58%	0.4%
RG-5	0.1%	25%	0.1%	0.0%	24%	0.1%	0.1%	51%	0.2%
RG-5-C	0.0%	40%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.0%	42%	0.0%
SPI-1 SA1	0.1%	6%	0.1%	0.2%	9%	0.4%	1.7%	85%	2.6%
SPI-1 SA2	0.0%	7%	0.0%	0.0%	10%	0.0%	0.1%	83%	0.2%
SPI-1 SA3	0.0%	10%	0.0%	0.0%	13%	0.0%	0.1%	77%	0.1%
SPI-1 SA4	0.0%	25%	0.0%	0.0%	18%	0.1%	0.1%	57%	0.2%
SPI-1 SA5	0.0%	9%	0.0%	0.0%	22%	0.1%	0.1%	70%	0.2%
SPI-1 SA6	0.0%	4%	0.0%	0.0%	7%	0.0%	0.1%	88%	0.1%
SPI-1 SA7	0.0%	5%	0.0%	0.0%	5%	0.0%	0.1%	90%	0.1%
SPI-11 SA1	0.0%	5%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	79%	0.1%
SPI-11 SA10	0.0%	41%	0.0%	0.0%	24%	0.0%	0.0%	35%	0.0%
SPI-11 SA11	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	42%	0.0%	0.0%	42%	0.0%
SPI-11 SA12	0.0%	13%	0.0%	0.0%	32%	0.1%	0.1%	55%	0.1%
SPI-11 SA2	0.0%	13%	0.0%	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	64%	0.0%
SPI-11 SA3	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.1%	0.1%	51%	0.1%
SPI-11 SA4	0.0%	37%	0.0%	0.0%	34%	0.0%	0.0%	29%	0.0%
SPI-11 SA5	0.0%	45%	0.0%	0.0%	26%	0.0%	0.0%	30%	0.0%
SPI-11 SA6	0.1%	45%	0.1%	0.1%	25%	0.2%	0.1%	30%	0.1%
SPI-11 SA7	0.1%	32%	0.1%	0.1%	34%	0.2%	0.1%	34%	0.2%
SPI-11 SA8	0.1%	28%	0.1%	0.1%	31%	0.1%	0.1%	42%	0.1%
SPI-11 SA9	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	45%	0.0%
SPI-12 SA1	0.1%	9%	0.1%	0.1%	9%	0.2%	0.7%	81%	1.1%
SPI-12 SA2	0.0%	27%	0.0%	0.0%	20%	0.1%	0.1%	53%	0.1%
SPI-12 SA3	0.0%	13%	0.0%	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	65%	0.0%
SPI-15 SA1	0.0%	9%	0.0%	0.0%	8%	0.0%	0.1%	83%	0.1%

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
SPI-15 SA2	0.0%	7%	0.0%	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.0%	81%	0.1%
SPI-15 SA3	0.0%	9%	0.0%	0.0%	13%	0.1%	0.2%	78%	0.3%
SPI-15 SA4	0.0%	29%	0.0%	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	50%	0.0%
SPI-15 SA5	0.0%	34%	0.0%	0.0%	26%	0.0%	0.0%	39%	0.0%
SPI-15 SA6	0.0%	37%	0.0%	0.0%	24%	0.0%	0.0%	39%	0.0%
SPI-15 SA7	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	63%	0.0%
SPI-15 SA8	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.1%	69%	0.1%
SPI-16 SA1	0.2%	12%	0.2%	0.2%	13%	0.4%	1.0%	75%	1.6%
SPI-16 SA1C	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	43%	0.0%	0.0%	36%	0.0%
SPI-16 SA2	0.0%	27%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	57%	0.0%
SPI-16 SA2 JSTA	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%	0.0%	64%	0.0%
SPI-16 SA3	0.0%	17%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%	0.0%	68%	0.1%
SPI-17 SA1	0.0%	32%	0.0%	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	46%	0.0%
SPI-17 SA2	0.0%	20%	0.0%	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.0%	66%	0.0%
SPI-17 SA3	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.0%	72%	0.0%
SPI-17 SA4	0.0%	31%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.0%	0.0%	50%	0.1%
SPI-18 SA1	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.1%	0.1%	56%	0.1%
SPI-18 SA10	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.1%	33%	0.1%	0.1%	54%	0.2%
SPI-18 SA2	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.0%	24%	0.1%	0.1%	64%	0.1%
SPI-18 SA3	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	64%	0.1%
SPI-18 SA4	0.0%	21%	0.0%	0.0%	32%	0.1%	0.1%	46%	0.1%
SPI-18 SA5	0.1%	33%	0.1%	0.0%	29%	0.1%	0.1%	38%	0.1%
SPI-18 SA6	0.0%	36%	0.0%	0.0%	29%	0.1%	0.0%	35%	0.0%
SPI-18 SA7	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.0%	31%	0.0%	0.0%	57%	0.1%
SPI-18 SA8	0.0%	8%	0.0%	0.0%	11%	0.0%	0.1%	81%	0.2%
SPI-18 SA9	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	59%	0.0%
SPI-20 SA1	0.1%	20%	0.1%	0.0%	13%	0.1%	0.2%	67%	0.4%
SPI-20 SA2	0.1%	27%	0.1%	0.0%	14%	0.1%	0.2%	59%	0.2%
SPI-20 SA3	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	64%	0.1%
SPI-20 SA4	0.1%	44%	0.1%	0.0%	14%	0.0%	0.1%	42%	0.1%
SPI-20 SA5	0.2%	57%	0.2%	0.1%	17%	0.1%	0.1%	26%	0.2%
SPI-20 SA6	0.0%	68%	0.0%	0.0%	25%	0.0%	0.0%	7%	0.0%
SPI-21 SA1	0.0%	2%	0.0%	0.0%	5%	0.0%	0.0%	93%	0.1%
SPI-21 SA10	0.0%	3%	0.0%	0.0%	10%	0.0%	0.1%	87%	0.1%
SPI-21 SA2	0.0%	10%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%	0.1%	75%	0.2%
SPI-21 SA3	0.0%	10%	0.0%	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.0%	78%	0.1%
SPI-21 SA4	0.0%	10%	0.0%	0.0%	13%	0.0%	0.0%	77%	0.0%

Zoning	Tree Cover			Non-Tree Vegetation			Non-Vegetation		
	% City	% Zone	% UTC	% City	% Zone	% NTV	% City	% Zone	% NV
SPI-21 SA5	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	58%	0.1%
SPI-21 SA6	0.0%	22%	0.0%	0.0%	39%	0.0%	0.0%	39%	0.0%
SPI-21 SA7	0.0%	46%	0.0%	0.0%	37%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.0%
SPI-21 SA8	0.0%	23%	0.0%	0.0%	30%	0.1%	0.1%	47%	0.1%
SPI-21 SA9	0.0%	7%	0.0%	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.1%	77%	0.1%
SPI-22 SA1	0.0%	5%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	67%	0.0%
SPI-22 SA2	0.0%	4%	0.0%	0.0%	46%	0.1%	0.0%	51%	0.0%
SPI-22 SA3	0.0%	8%	0.0%	0.0%	32%	0.1%	0.1%	60%	0.1%
SPI-22 SA4	0.0%	12%	0.0%	0.0%	19%	0.1%	0.1%	69%	0.2%
SPI-22 TSA	0.0%	11%	0.0%	0.0%	16%	0.0%	0.0%	74%	0.1%
SPI-5 SA1	0.0%	45%	0.0%	0.0%	43%	0.1%	0.0%	12%	0.0%
SPI-5 SA2	0.0%	39%	0.0%	0.0%	30%	0.0%	0.0%	31%	0.0%
SPI-5 SA3	0.0%	47%	0.0%	0.0%	25%	0.0%	0.0%	28%	0.0%
SPI-6 SA1	0.0%	51%	0.0%	0.0%	41%	0.0%	0.0%	8%	0.0%
SPI-6 SA2	0.0%	43%	0.0%	0.0%	44%	0.0%	0.0%	13%	0.0%
SPI-6 SA3	0.0%	38%	0.0%	0.0%	37%	0.0%	0.0%	24%	0.0%
SPI-6 SA4	0.0%	25%	0.0%	0.0%	51%	0.0%	0.0%	26%	0.0%
SPI-7 SA1	0.0%	32%	0.0%	0.0%	51%	0.1%	0.0%	16%	0.0%
SPI-7 SA2A	0.0%	56%	0.0%	0.0%	18%	0.0%	0.0%	26%	0.0%
SPI-7 SA2B	0.0%	37%	0.0%	0.0%	15%	0.0%	0.0%	46%	0.0%
SPI-7 SA2C	0.0%	41%	0.0%	0.0%	27%	0.0%	0.0%	32%	0.0%
SPI-7 SA3	0.0%	28%	0.0%	0.0%	24%	0.0%	0.0%	49%	0.0%
SPI-9 SA1	0.0%	8%	0.0%	0.0%	8%	0.1%	0.3%	84%	0.4%
SPI-9 SA2	0.0%	15%	0.0%	0.0%	13%	0.1%	0.2%	72%	0.3%
SPI-9 SA3	0.0%	20%	0.0%	0.0%	17%	0.1%	0.1%	63%	0.2%
SPI-9 SA4	0.0%	11%	0.0%	0.0%	11%	0.0%	0.1%	78%	0.1%

9. Appendix 4 – Land Cover Change Maps by Selected Geographies

9.1 Neighborhood Planning Units



9.2 Neighborhoods



9.3 City Council Districts



9.4 Watersheds



9.5 Small Watersheds



9.6. Parks (Note that canopy change is measured in total acres gained or lost, not percent change)



9.7 City Grid – (6 acre cells):

Canopy change shown at total acres lost or gained



10. Appendix 5 – Land Cover Change Tables by Selected Geographies

Interpreting the **Land Cover Change Tables**

* = Incomplete or No Data for 2008

All tables sorted by acres of UTC change (most lost to least lost)

Change by zoning categories was not calculated due to significant changes in zoning boundaries and categories between 2008-2014.

10.1. Neighborhood Planning Units

NPU	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
A	7,317	(586)	(8)	246	3	403	6
B	6,516	(448)	(7)	238	4	236	4
C	3,874	(321)	(8)	176	5	146	4
D	4,150	(114)	(3)	82	2	51	1
I	6,137	(83)	(1)	(49)	(1)	148	2
F	3,042	(70)	(2)	93	3	9	0
G	3,598	(60)	(2)	83	2	1	0
R	3,448	(50)	(1)	(16)	(0)	71	2
E	3,780	14	0	91	2	(105)	(3)
O	2,487	27	1	128	5	14	1
P	6,008	29	0	34	1	143	2
Z	6,704	31	0	39	1	(50)	(1)
H	4,088	37	1	(50)	(1)	65	2
J	2,840	38	1	(27)	(1)	(11)	(0)
L	846	54	6	29	3	(83)	(10)
M	2,422	94	4	55	2	(149)	(6)
S	2,486	94	4	(79)	(3)	(9)	(0)
K	1,528	97	6	(22)	(1)	(75)	(5)
X	2,566	98	4	(58)	(2)	(30)	(1)
Y	2,106	98	5	(12)	(1)	(86)	(4)
N	2,204	105	5	(32)	(1)	(54)	(2)
T	1,751	112	6	2	0	(114)	(6)
V	2,027	122	6	24	1	(146)	(7)
W	3,398	178	5	(95)	(3)	(75)	(2)

NPU	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Q*	1,069	317	30	241	23	151	14

10.2. Neighborhoods

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Paces*	1,936	(164)	(8)	90	5	112	6
Mt. Paran/Northside	1,371	(117)	(9)	38	3	79	6
North Buckhead	1,707	(116)	(7)	55	3	72	4
Tuxedo Park	735	(78)	(11)	34	5	44	6
Chastain Park	1,074	(77)	(7)	20	2	58	5
South River Gardens	1,805	(65)	(4)	96	5	(24)	(1)
Pine Hills	718	(60)	(8)	16	2	51	7
Peachtree Battle Alliance	459	(54)	(12)	26	6	27	6
Brookhaven	641	(49)	(8)	28	4	30	5
Peachtree Heights West	580	(48)	(8)	28	5	20	4
Morningside/Lenox Park *	1,446	(47)	(3)	51	4	9	1
Brandon	410	(46)	(11)	25	6	21	5
Riverside	500	(44)	(9)	7	1	43	9
Garden Hills	482	(42)	(9)	20	4	22	5
Margaret Mitchell	541	(39)	(7)	18	3	21	4
Bolton	964	(35)	(4)	16	2	24	3
Underwood Hills	718	(35)	(5)	27	4	8	1

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
West Paces Ferry/Northside	428	(32)	(8)	14	3	19	4
Peachtree Park	311	(31)	(10)	22	7	9	3
Kingswood	401	(30)	(8)	13	3	17	4
Lindridge/Martin Manor	451	(30)	(7)	26	6	3	1
Piedmont Heights	311	(28)	(9)	12	4	16	5
Southwest	1,262	(27)	(2)	6	0	21	2
Peachtree Hills	331	(27)	(8)	14	4	13	4
East Chastain Park	349	(25)	(7)	13	4	12	3
South Tuxedo Park	244	(25)	(10)	9	4	16	7
Audobon Forest	498	(24)	(5)	12	2	13	3
Wesley Battle	199	(24)	(12)	14	7	10	5
Pleasant Hill	253	(24)	(9)	8	3	16	6
Beecher Hills	285	(23)	(8)	10	3	13	5
Adams Park	629	(22)	(4)	(2)	(0)	24	4
Whitewater Creek	241	(21)	(9)	6	2	18	7
Brookwood Hills	199	(20)	(10)	12	6	8	4
Cascade Heights	660	(18)	(3)	1	0	18	3
Boulder Park	386	(18)	(5)	17	4	4	1
Castlewood	208	(17)	(8)	9	4	9	4
Wyngate	187	(17)	(9)	6	3	11	6
Collier Hills	151	(17)	(11)	11	7	6	4
Arden/Habersham	115	(15)	(13)	8	7	7	6

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Rockdale	359	(15)	(4)	20	6	(6)	(2)
Peachtree Heights East	133	(15)	(11)	9	7	6	4
Kirkwood	966	(14)	(1)	6	1	9	1
Wildwood (NPU-C)	236	(14)	(6)	8	3	7	3
Argonne Forest	173	(14)	(8)	5	3	9	5
Almond Park	337	(13)	(4)	11	3	3	1
Hills Park	969	(13)	(1)	18	2	(5)	(0)
Carey Park	334	(12)	(4)	7	2	5	2
Ridgewood Heights	137	(12)	(9)	6	4	6	4
Carver Hills	207	(11)	(5)	2	1	10	5
Swallow Circle/Baywood	200	(11)	(5)	4	2	6	3
Springlake	152	(11)	(7)	8	5	3	2
Randall Mill	218	(10)	(5)	4	2	6	3
Peyton Forest	287	(10)	(4)	(5)	(2)	15	5
Blair Villa/Poole Creek	848	(10)	(1)	14	2	(4)	(0)
Ardmore	84	(10)	(11)	6	7	3	4
Kings Forest	419	(8)	(2)	(6)	(1)	13	3
West Highlands	507	(8)	(1)	16	3	(9)	(2)
Westminster/Milmar	90	(8)	(8)	3	3	5	6
Butner/Tell	144	(8)	(5)	3	2	5	3
Hanover West	100	(7)	(7)	6	6	1	1
Sherwood Forest	134	(7)	(5)	6	5	1	0

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Memorial Park	93	(7)	(7)	5	6	1	1
Cross Creek	179	(7)	(4)	6	4	0	0
Ben Hill Forest	96	(6)	(7)	3	3	3	4
Laurens Valley	125	(6)	(5)	1	1	5	4
Audobon Forest West	133	(6)	(5)	(0)	(0)	6	5
Ridgedale Park	116	(6)	(5)	4	3	3	2
Collier Hills North	71	(6)	(9)	4	6	2	3
Mt. Paran Parkway	91	(6)	(7)	0	0	6	6
Woodfield	46	(6)	(13)	4	10	2	3
Campbellton Road	433	(6)	(1)	5	1	6	1
Heritage Valley	243	(6)	(2)	(7)	(3)	13	5
Channing Valley	73	(5)	(7)	4	5	1	2
Brookwood	101	(5)	(5)	0	0	5	5
Fernleaf	55	(5)	(9)	3	5	2	3
Fairburn Mays	402	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	6	1
Atlanta Industrial Park	421	(4)	(1)	(0)	(0)	11	3
Colonial Homes	27	(4)	(15)	(2)	(9)	7	24
Magnum Manor	150	(4)	(3)	(4)	(3)	9	6
Westover Plantation	51	(4)	(8)	4	7	0	0
Ben Hill Terrace	212	(4)	(2)	(2)	(1)	5	3
West Manor	172	(4)	(2)	(4)	(2)	8	4
Elmco Estates	133	(4)	(3)	(1)	(1)	5	4

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Ben Hill Acres	94	(4)	(4)	(1)	(1)	4	5
Lincoln Homes	167	(4)	(2)	(2)	(1)	6	4
Ansley Park	389	(4)	(1)	6	1	(2)	(1)
Lindbergh/Morosgo	384	(3)	(1)	10	3	(6)	(2)
Ivan Hill	65	(3)	(5)	1	2	2	3
Buckhead Forest	200	(3)	(2)	7	3	(4)	(2)
Oakcliff	67	(3)	(4)	2	2	1	1
Bolton Hills	47	(2)	(5)	(1)	(2)	3	7
Fairburn Tell	176	(2)	(1)	1	1	2	1
Green Forest Acres	101	(2)	(2)	(4)	(4)	6	6
Loring Heights	276	(2)	(1)	1	0	1	0
Horseshoe Community	34	(2)	(5)	8	23	2	5
Adamsville	584	(2)	(0)	(19)	(3)	21	4
Brentwood	46	(2)	(3)	(2)	(4)	3	7
English Park	109	(1)	(1)	(3)	(3)	5	4
Mt. Gilead Woods	36	(1)	(4)	(2)	(5)	3	9
Chalet Woods	77	(1)	(2)	(2)	(3)	4	5
Green Acres Valley	49	(1)	(2)	(2)	(5)	4	9
Wisteria Gardens	111	(1)	(1)	(4)	(3)	5	4
Meadowbrook Forest	71	(1)	(2)	(2)	(3)	3	4
Lake Claire *	316	(1)	(0)	1	0	11	4
Old Gordon	79	(1)	(1)	2	2	(1)	(1)

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Wildwood Forest	67	(1)	(1)	(2)	(3)	5	7
Briar Glen	67	(1)	(1)	(2)	(3)	3	4
Scotts Crossing	311	(1)	(0)	8	2	(7)	(2)
Dixie Hills	468	(1)	(0)	(9)	(2)	9	2
Rue Royal	22	(1)	(3)	(1)	(5)	2	8
Mellwood	23	(1)	(2)	(0)	(2)	1	4
Westwood Terrace	141	(0)	(0)	(3)	(2)	3	2
Tampa Park	17	(0)	(2)	(1)	(6)	1	8
Buckhead Village	127	(0)	(0)	1	1	(1)	(1)
Lakewood	343	(0)	(0)	(6)	(2)	6	2
Ridgecrest Forest	74	0	0	(4)	(5)	4	5
Fairburn Road/Wisteria Lane	83	0	0	(2)	(3)	2	3
Lake Estates	42	0	1	(3)	(7)	3	6
Rosedale Heights	200	0	0	(1)	(0)	1	0
Berkeley Park	300	0	0	6	2	(6)	(2)
Fairburn	115	0	0	(3)	(2)	2	2
Baker Hills	183	0	0	(6)	(3)	6	3
East Ardley Road	66	0	1	(4)	(5)	3	5
Brookview Heights	345	0	0	21	6	(22)	(6)
Deerwood	118	0	0	(7)	(6)	7	6
Old Fairburn Village	21	1	3	(1)	(3)	1	3
Fairway Acres	124	1	0	(2)	(2)	3	2

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Carroll Heights	271	1	0	(7)	(3)	9	3
Ben Hill Pines	45	1	1	(3)	(7)	3	6
Oakland	34	1	2	5	14	(6)	(16)
Wilson Mill Meadows	242	1	0	(10)	(4)	9	4
Pomona Park	47	1	1	(2)	(5)	2	4
Cascade Avenue/Road	673	1	0	(9)	(1)	8	1
Lenox	152	1	1	3	2	(4)	(2)
South Oakes at Cascade	22	1	5	4	18	(1)	(6)
Fort Valley	23	1	6	(1)	(2)	(0)	(2)
Harvel Homes Community	16	1	8	(2)	(12)	1	3
Polar Rock	300	1	0	(6)	(2)	5	2
Buckhead Heights	44	1	3	2	4	(3)	(7)
Just Us	18	2	9	(1)	(3)	(1)	(5)
Westhaven	152	2	1	(3)	(2)	1	1
Atkins Park	35	2	6	(1)	(4)	(1)	(3)
Venetian Hills	616	2	0	(20)	(3)	17	3
Niskey Cove	53	2	5	(4)	(7)	2	4
Niskey Lake	270	2	1	3	1	5	2
Amal Heights	36	3	7	(4)	(11)	1	4
Marietta Street Artery	108	3	2	5	5	(8)	(7)
Ashley Courts	36	3	8	0	1	(2)	(7)
Capitol Gateway	84	3	4	7	8	(10)	(11)

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Bush Mountain	50	3	7	(3)	(5)	(1)	(1)
Monroe Heights	249	3	1	(1)	(0)	(3)	(1)
The Villages at Castleberry Hill	57	3	6	7	13	(11)	(19)
The Villages at East Lake	187	4	2	32	17	4	2
High Point	65	4	6	(2)	(3)	(2)	(3)
Bankhead Courts	49	4	8	18	36	(21)	(44)
Atlantic Station	163	4	2	10	6	(14)	(8)
Whittier Mill Village	203	5	2	(13)	(6)	16	8
State Facility	117	5	4	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Joyland	86	5	5	(4)	(4)	(1)	(1)
Cascade Green	49	5	10	(4)	(8)	(1)	(2)
Castleberry Hill	181	5	3	8	4	(13)	(7)
Englewood Manor	31	5	18	6	20	(11)	(37)
Woodland Hills	95	5	6	(5)	(5)	(1)	(1)
Bakers Ferry	161	6	4	7	5	1	0
Harland Terrace	295	6	2	(2)	(1)	(4)	(1)
Rebel Valley Forest	112	6	5	(2)	(2)	(4)	(3)
West Lake	185	6	3	(8)	(4)	2	1
Harris Chiles	89	6	7	9	10	(15)	(17)
Penelope Neighbors	126	6	5	(7)	(6)	1	1
Florida Heights	247	6	3	(11)	(5)	5	2
Betmar LaVilla	72	7	9	(3)	(4)	(4)	(5)

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Greenbriar Village *	40	7	17	(3)	(7)	0	0
Benteen Park	181	7	4	(2)	(1)	(5)	(3)
Edmund Park *	19	7	37	4	20	7	36
Perkerson	608	7	1	2	0	(5)	(1)
Wildwood (NPU-H)	179	7	4	(12)	(6)	4	2
Leila Valley	315	7	2	(5)	(1)	(3)	(1)
Norwood Manor	332	8	2	(2)	(1)	(6)	(2)
Sweet Auburn	202	8	4	12	6	(20)	(10)
Greenbriar	823	8	1	(20)	(2)	12	1
Fairburn Heights	357	8	2	(17)	(5)	9	3
Chattahoochee	208	8	4	5	3	5	2
Cabbagetown	112	9	8	(2)	(1)	(7)	(6)
Sandlewood Estates *	57	9	16	(3)	(5)	0	0
Blandtown	495	9	2	21	4	(30)	(6)
Ben Hill *	685	9	1	(2)	(0)	11	2
Center Hill	704	9	1	(14)	(2)	5	1
Georgia Tech	359	10	3	3	1	(13)	(4)
Capitol View Manor	147	10	7	(5)	(4)	(5)	(3)
Druid Hills	343	11	3	(7)	(2)	7	2
The Villages at Carver	108	11	10	19	17	(29)	(27)
Home Park	448	11	2	9	2	(20)	(5)
Custer/McDonough/Guice	289	12	4	(6)	(2)	(7)	(2)

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Collier Heights	1,247	13	1	(38)	(3)	25	2
Arlington Estates	216	14	6	(10)	(5)	3	1
Mays	253	14	5	(13)	(5)	(1)	(0)
Boulevard Heights	140	14	10	(6)	(4)	(8)	(5)
Orchard Knob	294	14	5	(11)	(4)	(3)	(1)
Lakewood Heights	883	14	2	(11)	(1)	(3)	(0)
Grove Park	1,078	14	1	(17)	(2)	2	0
Mozley Park	277	15	5	(11)	(4)	(5)	(2)
Bankhead/Bolton	549	15	3	(7)	(1)	4	1
Adair Park	289	16	5	(0)	(0)	(15)	(5)
Knight Park/Howell Station	349	16	5	10	3	(27)	(8)
Washington Park	164	16	10	(4)	(2)	(13)	(8)
Ashview Heights	175	17	10	1	0	(18)	(10)
Poncey-Highland	241	18	8	(5)	(2)	(13)	(5)
Edgewood	554	19	3	(5)	(1)	(13)	(2)
Princeton Lakes *	477	19	4	7	1	9	2
Westview	401	19	5	(16)	(4)	(3)	(1)
East Lake	780	19	2	95	12	14	2
Hammond Park	390	20	5	(13)	(3)	(6)	(2)
Bankhead	416	21	5	1	0	(22)	(5)
Candler Park	417	21	5	(18)	(4)	(4)	(1)
Atlanta University Center	332	22	7	12	4	(34)	(10)

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Huntington *	37	22	59	8	23	7	18
Summerhill	345	22	6	(0)	(0)	(22)	(6)
Glenrose Heights	892	23	3	(16)	(2)	7	1
Reynoldstown	395	24	6	3	1	(26)	(7)
Vine City	327	24	7	7	2	(31)	(9)
Mechanicsville	458	24	5	14	3	(38)	(8)
Chosewood Park	530	24	5	(5)	(1)	(19)	(4)
Inman Park	384	25	6	(3)	(1)	(21)	(6)
Peoplestown	340	25	7	(1)	(0)	(24)	(7)
South Atlanta	296	26	9	(8)	(3)	(18)	(6)
Capitol View	369	27	7	(11)	(3)	(16)	(4)
Regency Trace *	68	27	39	20	30	21	30
Browns Mill Park	656	27	4	(18)	(3)	(9)	(1)
Virginia Highland	670	28	4	(3)	(0)	(24)	(4)
Hunter Hills	323	29	9	(20)	(6)	(9)	(3)
English Avenue	519	30	6	22	4	(52)	(10)
Thomasville Heights	407	30	7	(8)	(2)	(22)	(6)
Pittsburgh	512	33	6	5	1	(38)	(7)
East Atlanta	924	33	4	(32)	(3)	5	1
Sylvan Hills	1,053	34	3	(32)	(3)	2	0
Ormewood Park	506	35	7	(21)	(4)	(14)	(3)
Downtown	1,256	40	3	29	2	(69)	(6)
Old Fourth Ward	783	41	5	6	1	(46)	(6)

Neighborhood	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Oakland City	631	41	6	(26)	(4)	(15)	(2)
Midtown	1,048	41	4	20	2	(61)	(6)
West End	681	43	6	(11)	(2)	(32)	(5)
Fort McPherson	515	46	9	(22)	(4)	(19)	(4)
Grant Park	1,108	66	6	(26)	(2)	(39)	(4)
Midwest Cascade *	596	110	19	136	23	70	12

10.3. City Council Districts

Council District	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
8	12,108	(977)	(8)	450	4	591	5
7	5,069	(341)	(7)	177	3	190	4
9	11,413	(175)	(2)	195	2	50	0
6	5,053	(98)	(2)	138	3	1	0
10	8,803	(46)	(1)	(91)	(1)	203	2
5	4,946	120	2	122	2	(54)	(1)
2	2,795	143	5	(2)	(0)	(141)	(5)
12	9,899	200	2	(44)	(0)	(120)	(1)
3	4,805	205	4	25	1	(230)	(5)

4	4,017	208	5	(23)	(1)	(185)	(5)
11	11,307	267	2	248	8	381	2
1	6,404	308	5	(73)	(1)	(235)	(4)

10.4. Watersheds

Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Nancy Creek	8,034	(625)	(7.8)	268	3	378	5
Peachtree Creek	19,582	(540)	(2.8)	559	3	10	0
Long Island Creek	2,383	(163)	(6.8)	84	4	143	6
Mud Creek	79	0	0.3	1	1	(1)	(1)
Doolittle Creek	464	6	1.4	(10)	(2)	17	4
Shoal Creek	74	7	9.4	1	1	5	7
Bakers Ferry	433	14	3.3	(8)	(2)	9	2
Sandy Creek	3,595	39	1.1	(68)	(2)	49	1
Sugar Creek	2,583	39	1.5	(14)	(1)	(7)	(0)
Utoy Creek	15,491	50	0.3	43	0	371	2
Camp Creek	3,912	57	1.5	(41)	(1)	82	2
Proctor Creek	12,097	157	1.3	103	1	(219)	(2)
South River	11,876	249	2.1	(28)	(0)	(192)	(2)
Intrenchment Creek	4,863	296	6.1	(35)	(1)	(260)	(5)

10.5. Small Watersheds

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Nancy Creek_89	1,104	(98)	(9)	43	4	55	5
Peachtree Creek_155	842	(75)	(9)	38	5	37	4
Nancy Creek_88	602	(54)	(9)	24	4	30	5

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Peachtree Creek_93	520	(51)	(10)	29	6	23	4
Nancy Creek_87	428	(44)	(10)	15	4	28	7
Nancy Creek_64	491	(42)	(9)	20	4	22	5
Long Island Creek_60	541	(40)	(7)	7	1	34	6
Peachtree Creek_91	476	(40)	(8)	25	5	15	3
Nancy Creek_84	532	(38)	(7)	16	3	23	4
Peachtree Creek_129	358	(37)	(10)	22	6	15	4
Nancy Creek_75	384	(37)	(10)	16	4	21	5
Utoy Creek_272	607	(36)	(6)	18	3	18	3
Peachtree Creek_146	521	(35)	(7)	25	5	11	2
Peachtree Creek_143	374	(35)	(9)	0	0	35	9
Nancy Creek_66	436	(35)	(8)	11	3	23	5
Proctor Creek_167	502	(34)	(7)	17	3	18	4
Nancy Creek_79	425	(33)	(8)	14	3	21	5
Peachtree Creek_141	539	(33)	(6)	22	4	11	2
Long Island Creek_55	335	(32)	(10)	16	5	17	5
Nancy Creek_70	441	(32)	(7)	15	3	17	4
Peachtree Creek_113	351	(32)	(9)	14	4	17	5
Nancy Creek_71	368	(32)	(9)	16	4	16	4
Peachtree Creek_138	328	(29)	(9)	19	6	11	3
Peachtree Creek_108	306	(29)	(10)	14	5	15	5
Peachtree Creek_107	369	(29)	(8)	20	5	9	2

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Proctor Creek_180	330	(26)	(8)	19	6	18	5
Proctor Creek_159	879	(26)	(3)	29	3	(4)	(0)
Nancy Creek_72	364	(25)	(7)	6	2	19	5
Long Island Creek_52	328	(24)	(7)	5	2	22	7
Peachtree Creek_115	388	(24)	(6)	16	4	8	2
Peachtree Creek_112	222	(22)	(10)	9	4	13	6
Peachtree Creek_144	417	(22)	(5)	20	5	2	1
Nancy Creek_63	244	(22)	(9)	8	3	14	6
Proctor Creek_163	252	(21)	(8)	13	5	8	3
Nancy Creek_67	254	(21)	(8)	11	4	10	4
Utoy Creek_263	663	(20)	(3)	12	2	20	3
Peachtree Creek_137	260	(20)	(8)	12	5	8	3
Peachtree Creek_92	194	(20)	(10)	10	5	10	5
Long Island Creek_56	241	(19)	(8)	12	5	8	3
Peachtree Creek_96	201	(19)	(9)	8	4	11	6
Peachtree Creek_95	199	(19)	(9)	9	5	10	5
Peachtree Creek_125	248	(19)	(8)	12	5	6	3
Peachtree Creek_106	202	(19)	(9)	13	7	5	3
Long Island Creek_53	175	(18)	(10)	10	6	8	5
Nancy Creek_82	196	(18)	(9)	6	3	13	6
South River_213	218	(18)	(8)	18	8	(0)	(0)
Peachtree Creek_102	167	(17)	(10)	13	8	5	3

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Peachtree Creek_145	244	(17)	(7)	6	3	11	4
Peachtree Creek_142	234	(17)	(7)	5	2	12	5
Long Island Creek_49	182	(17)	(9)	11	6	6	3
Peachtree Creek_117	415	(17)	(4)	14	3	3	1
Peachtree Creek_140	268	(17)	(6)	7	3	9	4
Peachtree Creek_109	245	(16)	(7)	13	5	3	1
Nancy Creek_68	196	(16)	(8)	6	3	10	5
Utoy Creek_312	384	(16)	(4)	(2)	(1)	18	5
Utoy Creek_264	328	(16)	(5)	10	3	6	2
Nancy Creek_80	164	(15)	(9)	10	6	6	3
Nancy Creek_81	223	(15)	(7)	8	3	8	3
Nancy Creek_74	206	(15)	(7)	6	3	9	4
South River_230	275	(15)	(5)	17	6	(3)	(1)
Utoy Creek_275	507	(14)	(3)	(1)	(0)	15	3
Peachtree Creek_136	215	(14)	(6)	12	5	2	1
South River_205	439	(14)	(3)	18	4	(5)	(1)
Utoy Creek_269	448	(14)	(3)	(2)	(0)	16	3
Nancy Creek_62	214	(13)	(6)	1	0	12	6
Peachtree Creek_111	135	(13)	(10)	9	7	4	3
Peachtree Creek_154	204	(13)	(6)	5	3	8	4
Long Island Creek_48	196	(13)	(7)	9	5	14	7
South River_238	361	(12)	(3)	7	2	5	1

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Utoy Creek_292	216	(12)	(6)	4	2	8	4
South River_231	135	(11)	(8)	8	6	3	2
Camp Creek_6	816	(11)	(1)	(5)	(1)	16	2
Utoy Creek_302	211	(11)	(5)	17	8	3	1
Utoy Creek_285	344	(10)	(3)	1	0	9	3
Nancy Creek_65	140	(10)	(7)	1	1	9	6
Utoy Creek_311	207	(9)	(5)	6	3	4	2
Peachtree Creek_134	170	(9)	(5)	6	4	3	2
Proctor Creek_179	428	(9)	(2)	4	1	5	1
Utoy Creek_287	337	(8)	(3)	(4)	(1)	13	4
Utoy Creek_299	191	(8)	(4)	3	2	5	3
Peachtree Creek_119	300	(8)	(3)	10	3	2	1
Peachtree Creek_135	321	(8)	(2)	12	4	(5)	(1)
Proctor Creek_171	250	(8)	(3)	(10)	(4)	18	7
Utoy Creek_276	490	(8)	(2)	(0)	(0)	8	2
Utoy Creek_289	84	(7)	(9)	7	9	1	2
Sugar Creek_256	328	(7)	(2)	2	0	10	3
Proctor Creek_177	246	(7)	(3)	6	2	1	1
Utoy Creek_300	180	(7)	(4)	3	2	4	2
Proctor Creek_158	226	(7)	(3)	1	1	6	3
Utoy Creek_296	269	(7)	(3)	(2)	(1)	9	3
Camp Creek_8	387	(7)	(2)	(10)	(2)	17	4

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Utoy Creek_310	296	(7)	(2)	6	2	3	1
Peachtree Creek_105	271	(7)	(3)	10	4	(3)	(1)
Utoy Creek_293	197	(7)	(4)	0	0	6	3
South River_246	141	(7)	(5)	6	4	1	0
Nancy Creek_78	59	(7)	(11)	4	7	3	6
Utoy Creek_259	295	(6)	(2)	(2)	(1)	8	3
Peachtree Creek_97	170	(6)	(4)	5	3	1	1
South River_239	234	(6)	(3)	4	2	9	4
Proctor Creek_178	145	(5)	(4)	(1)	(1)	7	5
Sugar Creek_249	347	(5)	(1)	4	1	2	1
Utoy Creek_286	401	(5)	(1)	(9)	(2)	13	3
Utoy Creek_267	130	(5)	(4)	5	4	0	0
Utoy Creek_313	235	(5)	(2)	(3)	(1)	8	3
Long Island Creek_47	64	(4)	(7)	5	8	4	6
Utoy Creek_297	522	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	9	2
Nancy Creek_69	95	(4)	(4)	4	4	5	5
Utoy Creek_295	172	(4)	(2)	0	0	4	2
Proctor Creek_157	404	(4)	(1)	(6)	(1)	9	2
Peachtree Creek_149	37	(4)	(10)	1	3	3	7
Peachtree Creek_120	37	(4)	(10)	3	8	1	2
South River_237	152	(4)	(2)	3	2	1	1
Peachtree Creek_123	150	(4)	(2)	6	4	(3)	(2)

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Proctor Creek_170	175	(4)	(2)	7	4	(3)	(2)
South River_220	238	(4)	(1)	(3)	(1)	6	3
Nancy Creek_86	70	(3)	(5)	3	5	1	2
Peachtree Creek_90	375	(3)	(1)	18	5	(15)	(4)
Utoy Creek_304	218	(3)	(1)	2	1	10	5
Utoy Creek_291	273	(3)	(1)	(5)	(2)	8	3
Utoy Creek_281*	105	(3)	(3)	21	20	6	6
Utoy Creek_261	311	(3)	(1)	(3)	(1)	6	2
Peachtree Creek_150	265	(2)	(1)	(0)	(0)	8	3
Peachtree Creek_152	608	(2)	(0)	7	1	(5)	(1)
Sandy Creek_194	454	(2)	(0)	(1)	(0)	5	1
Utoy Creek_280*	135	(2)	(2)	26	19	5	4
Sandy Creek_198	205	(2)	(1)	4	2	3	1
Utoy Creek_262	268	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	4	1
Nancy Creek_85	252	(2)	(1)	2	1	(0)	(0)
Utoy Creek_294	23	(2)	(7)	1	6	0	2
South River_233	140	(2)	(1)	(0)	(0)	2	1
Utoy Creek_284*	16	(2)	(9)	2	13	0	3
Sandy Creek_191	636	(1)	(0)	(13)	(2)	15	2
Utoy Creek_282	345	(1)	(0)	(7)	(2)	8	2
Utoy Creek_305	107	(1)	(1)	2	2	4	4
Utoy Creek_265	99	(1)	(1)	3	3	(2)	(2)

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Long Island Creek_59	12	(1)	(6)	0	3	1	6
Camp Creek_15	108	(1)	(1)	1	1	(0)	(0)
South River_204	19	(1)	(4)	1	6	(1)	(3)
Sugar Creek_255	295	(1)	(0)	6	2	4	2
Peachtree Creek_118	150	(1)	(0)	4	3	(3)	(2)
Long Island Creek_58	19	(1)	(3)	1	4	3	13
Sandy Creek_193	309	(0)	(0)	(6)	(2)	6	2
Peachtree Creek_110	161	(0)	(0)	(3)	(2)	5	3
South River_218	25	(0)	(1)	2	6	1	5
Nancy Creek_73	42	(0)	(1)	0	0	1	2
Long Island Creek_54	36	(0)	(1)	1	3	4	10
Utoy Creek_260	3	(0)	(7)	0	8	0	1
Long Island Creek_57	0	(0)	(21)	0	11	0	11
Utoy Creek_308	0	0	6	0	51	(0)	(6)
Bakers Ferry_5	3	0	1	0	8	(0)	(8)
Peachtree Creek_126	4	0	1	0	7	(0)	(7)
Camp Creek_9	156	0	0	(9)	(6)	9	6
Peachtree Creek_133	342	0	0	4	1	(4)	(1)
South River_210	9	0	2	0	1	(0)	(3)
South River_209	8	0	2	(0)	(4)	0	2
South River_222	14	0	1	(1)	(4)	0	3
Nancy Creek_76	14	0	1	1	6	(0)	(3)

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Proctor Creek_173	126	0	0	(1)	(1)	1	1
Mud Creek_61	79	0	0	1	1	(1)	(1)
Sugar Creek_252	5	0	5	0	6	0	7
South River_236	12	0	3	0	2	(1)	(5)
Intrenchment Creek_41	14	0	3	(0)	(3)	0	0
Utoy Creek_301	327	0	0	(9)	(3)	9	3
Camp Creek_20	136	0	0	(3)	(2)	2	2
Utoy Creek_298	673	0	0	(20)	(3)	21	3
Bakers Ferry_4	1	0	84	0	12	0	2
Intrenchment Creek_45	11	0	5	(0)	(1)	0	1
South River_228	192	0	0	4	2	(5)	(3)
Camp Creek_14	1	1	75	0	16	0	6
Sugar Creek_253	25	1	2	(1)	(3)	1	3
Utoy Creek_278	3	1	22	(0)	(6)	(0)	(2)
Proctor Creek_156	502	1	0	18	4	(19)	(4)
Sandy Creek_200	234	1	0	(3)	(1)	2	1
Long Island Creek_51	179	1	0	4	2	12	7
South River_214	154	1	0	2	1	(3)	(2)
Proctor Creek_174	144	1	1	0	0	(1)	(1)
Bakers Ferry_1	5	1	15	0	2	0	9
Camp Creek_19	249	1	0	(1)	(0)	2	1
Nancy Creek_83	18	1	5	0	1	0	2

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Peachtree Creek_98	151	1	1	3	2	1	0
South River_244	586	1	0	(11)	(2)	10	2
South River_229	29	1	4	1	2	(2)	(6)
Camp Creek_12	318	1	0	5	1	2	1
Shoal Creek_203	7	1	18	1	12	1	13
Proctor Creek_165	437	1	0	27	6	(28)	(6)
Peachtree Creek_122	65	1	2	(1)	(1)	2	2
Peachtree Creek_121	12	2	12	(0)	(3)	1	6
Doolittle Creek_25	349	2	0	(9)	(3)	14	4
Camp Creek_16	260	2	1	(5)	(2)	4	1
Camp Creek_13	4	2	37	1	16	0	8
Sandy Creek_190	235	2	1	17	7	(15)	(6)
Sugar Creek_250	232	2	1	(7)	(3)	6	2
Utoy Creek_288	97	2	2	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
South River_216	284	2	1	3	1	(5)	(2)
Proctor Creek_169	238	2	1	1	0	(3)	(1)
South River_227	337	2	1	5	1	(7)	(2)
South River_208	43	2	5	(0)	(0)	1	3
Utoy Creek_266	113	2	2	(3)	(3)	2	2
Sandy Creek_197	343	2	1	(8)	(2)	5	2
Peachtree Creek_131	200	3	1	7	4	(10)	(5)
Shoal Creek_202	14	3	20	2	13	3	19

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Proctor Creek_186	11	3	25	1	9	2	16
Sandy Creek_199	323	3	1	(11)	(3)	8	2
Shoal Creek_201	53	3	6	(2)	(3)	2	3
Intrenchment Creek_32	149	3	2	12	8	(14)	(10)
Utoy Creek_303	89	3	3	(1)	(2)	1	1
South River_247	396	3	1	1	0	(4)	(1)
Camp Creek_7	274	3	1	3	1	(6)	(2)
Sugar Creek_248	176	3	2	(3)	(2)	2	1
Proctor Creek_172	438	3	1	(12)	(3)	9	2
South River_211	200	4	2	(3)	(1)	(1)	(0)
South River_206	56	4	6	(2)	(4)	4	7
Nancy Creek_77	71	4	6	2	3	4	5
Camp Creek_10	53	5	9	8	14	23	44
Utoy Creek_306	246	5	2	(7)	(3)	2	1
Camp Creek_22	60	5	8	1	2	(1)	(1)
Doolittle Creek_24	115	5	4	(1)	(1)	2	2
Sandy Creek_196	212	5	2	(13)	(6)	8	4
Utoy Creek_268	849	5	1	(32)	(4)	26	3
Bakers Ferry_3	137	5	4	(10)	(7)	5	4
Camp Creek_21	277	5	2	(2)	(1)	(3)	(1)
Utoy Creek_271	281	5	2	(10)	(4)	5	2
Proctor Creek_160	575	6	1	(10)	(2)	4	1

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Peachtree Creek_148	209	6	3	6	3	(11)	(5)
South River_225	155	6	4	(7)	(5)	2	1
Long Island Creek_50	75	6	8	3	4	11	15
Proctor Creek_182	609	6	1	(1)	(0)	(5)	(1)
Sugar Creek_251	357	6	2	(1)	(0)	(5)	(2)
Proctor Creek_161	352	6	2	9	2	(15)	(4)
Peachtree Creek_130	337	7	2	5	2	(12)	(4)
South River_223	127	7	5	(6)	(5)	2	1
Peachtree Creek_101	253	7	3	(6)	(2)	(1)	(0)
Peachtree Creek_128	220	7	3	2	1	(9)	(4)
Intrenchment Creek_36	185	7	4	(10)	(5)	3	1
Utoy Creek_277*	367	7	2	44	12	5	1
Camp Creek_17	12	8	63	2	19	2	17
South River_235	165	8	5	(0)	(0)	(8)	(5)
Bakers Ferry_2	287	8	3	2	1	3	1
South River_207	335	8	2	(10)	(3)	2	1
Camp Creek_23	332	8	3	(16)	(5)	11	3
Peachtree Creek_100	177	8	5	(0)	(0)	(8)	(5)
Proctor Creek_166	304	9	3	13	4	(21)	(7)
Utoy Creek_279*	14	9	66	3	19	2	15
South River_232	222	9	4	18	8	(20)	(9)
South River_219	146	10	7	(6)	(4)	(3)	(2)

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Sugar Creek_257	227	10	4	(5)	(2)	(5)	(2)
South River_240	521	10	2	(8)	(2)	(2)	(0)
Utoy Creek_290	197	10	5	(3)	(2)	(3)	(1)
Peachtree Creek_139	279	10	4	4	2	(15)	(5)
Peachtree Creek_94	206	11	5	4	2	(15)	(7)
Sandy Creek_195	428	11	3	(19)	(4)	8	2
Peachtree Creek_153	221	11	5	11	5	(22)	(10)
South River_243	523	11	2	(11)	(2)	(1)	(0)
Sugar Creek_258	270	12	4	(7)	(3)	(4)	(2)
South River_242	524	12	2	(7)	(1)	(5)	(1)
Peachtree Creek_103	366	12	3	9	2	(21)	(6)
Proctor Creek_181	344	12	3	(9)	(2)	(3)	(1)
Utoy Creek_273	395	13	3	(15)	(4)	2	1
Intrenchment Creek_38	194	13	7	(8)	(4)	(5)	(2)
Proctor Creek_189	187	13	7	1	1	(14)	(7)
Intrenchment Creek_40	154	13	8	(7)	(5)	(6)	(4)
Peachtree Creek_114	407	13	3	18	4	(31)	(8)
Peachtree Creek_104	361	13	4	15	4	(28)	(8)
Proctor Creek_175	230	13	6	(9)	(4)	(4)	(2)
South River_212	333	14	4	(6)	(2)	(8)	(2)
Intrenchment Creek_39	207	14	7	10	5	(25)	(12)
Intrenchment Creek_30	184	15	8	(1)	(0)	(14)	(8)

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Peachtree Creek_147	422	15	4	(3)	(1)	(5)	(1)
Peachtree Creek_99	400	16	4	6	2	(22)	(6)
Proctor Creek_184	294	16	5	20	7	(35)	(12)
Peachtree Creek_124	218	16	7	(3)	(1)	(13)	(6)
Proctor Creek_176	266	16	6	(9)	(3)	16	6
Utoy Creek_309*	54	17	31	14	25	11	21
Intrenchment Creek_31	208	17	8	(9)	(4)	(8)	(4)
Camp Creek_18	83	17	21	3	4	6	7
Peachtree Creek_132	265	18	7	(3)	(1)	(14)	(5)
Camp Creek_11	385	18	5	(13)	(4)	(2)	(1)
Utoy Creek_283	192	19	10	(5)	(3)	(9)	(4)
Sugar Creek_254	321	19	6	(3)	(1)	(16)	(5)
Proctor Creek_187	288	19	7	2	1	(21)	(7)
Intrenchment Creek_34	339	19	6	4	1	(23)	(7)
Proctor Creek_185	480	19	4	9	2	(29)	(6)
Intrenchment Creek_37	285	20	7	(11)	(4)	(9)	(3)
South River_234	381	20	5	(14)	(4)	(5)	(1)
Intrenchment Creek_42	515	20	4	14	3	(34)	(7)
Proctor Creek_188	275	21	8	14	5	(36)	(13)
Sandy Creek_192	216	22	10	(16)	(7)	3	2
Intrenchment Creek_35	330	22	7	(18)	(6)	(4)	(1)
Utoy Creek_274	338	22	7	(17)	(5)	(5)	(1)

Small Watershed	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Change	% NV Change
Proctor Creek_162	280	24	8	0	0	(24)	(9)
South River_217	560	24	4	(15)	(3)	(7)	(1)
Utoy Creek_270	625	25	4	(31)	(5)	6	1
South River_224	381	25	7	(14)	(4)	(11)	(3)
South River_241	266	25	9	3	1	(28)	(11)
Intrenchment Creek_44	454	26	6	(11)	(2)	(15)	(3)
Peachtree Creek_116	468	26	6	(7)	(2)	(19)	(4)
Intrenchment Creek_33	433	27	6	6	1	(33)	(8)
Proctor Creek_183	416	28	7	18	4	(46)	(11)
South River_215	514	28	6	(20)	(4)	(8)	(2)
South River_221	737	29	4	(15)	(2)	(13)	(2)
Peachtree Creek_151	569	32	6	(23)	(4)	(9)	(2)
South River_245	527	32	6	3	1	(35)	(7)
Peachtree Creek_127	973	33	3	9	1	(42)	(4)
Proctor Creek_168	833	36	4	(29)	(4)	(7)	(1)
Intrenchment Creek_43	531	39	7	(19)	(4)	(20)	(4)
Intrenchment Creek_46	670	40	6	12	2	(52)	(8)
South River_226	761	44	6	8	1	(52)	(7)
Utoy Creek_314	732	51	7	(23)	(3)	(28)	(4)
Proctor Creek_164	633	54	8	(30)	(5)	(23)	(4)
Utoy Creek_307*	282	124	44	54	19	61	22

10.6 Parks > .5 Acres in Size

Park	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Southside Park	211	-26	-12%	19	9%	7	3%
Atlanta Memorial Park	193	-12	-6%	7	3%	6	3%
Chattahoochee Trail	52	-11	-21%	9	18%	2	4%
Chastain Memorial Park	250	-11	-4%	-5	-2%	15	6%
North Camp Creek Parkway NP	73	-9	-13%	9	12%	0	0%
Swann Preserve	50	-8	-15%	6	12%	2	4%
Cascade Springs Nature Preserve	121	-6	-5%	6	5%	0	0%
Morningside Nature Preserve	37	-6	-15%	4	12%	1	3%
Gun Club Park	42	-5	-13%	4	10%	1	3%
Lionel Hampton	49	-5	-10%	5	9%	0	0%
South Bend Park	75	-4	-6%	3	4%	2	2%
Herbert Greene	61	-4	-7%	4	6%	1	1%
Melvin Drive Park	52	-3	-7%	3	6%	0	0%
Herbert Taylor Park	26	-3	-13%	2	8%	1	5%
Spink-Collins Park	26	-3	-12%	3	11%	0	1%
Rockdale Park	63	-3	-5%	2	2%	1	2%
Fort Peachtree Landings	15	-2	-14%	2	14%	0	0%
Adams Park	160	-2	-1%	1	0%	1	1%
Anderson Park	56	-2	-3%	-2	-3%	3	6%
Falling Water	26	-1	-5%	1	4%	0	2%
Blue Heron Nature Preserve	21	-1	-6%	1	6%	0	0%
Frankie Allen Park	23	-1	-5%	-1	-2%	2	8%
Avery Park-Gilbert House	11	-1	-12%	1	8%	0	4%
Alexander Park	11	-1	-11%	1	8%	0	3%
Tanyard Creek Park	16	-1	-7%	1	5%	0	2%
Sibley Park	9	-1	-12%	1	10%	0	3%
Beecher Park	5	-1	-20%	1	11%	0	9%
Cumberlander	9	-1	-11%	1	11%	0	0%
Howard Park	5	-1	-18%	1	14%	0	4%
Little Nancy Creek Park	5	-1	-19%	1	15%	0	4%
Beaverbrook Park	7	-1	-12%	1	7%	0	5%
Harwell Heights Park	24	-1	-3%	0	1%	1	3%
Underwood Hills Park	10	-1	-9%	1	8%	0	1%
Benjamin E. Mays St. Park	1	-1	-72%	0	2%	1	69%

Park	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Coventry Station CE	16	-1	-5%	1	5%	0	0%
Shirley Place Park	4	-1	-16%	0	10%	0	5%
Tanyard Creek Urban Forest	6	-1	-11%	1	9%	0	1%
Greenbriar	7	-1	-9%	0	7%	0	2%
Shady Valley Park	11	-1	-5%	-1	-4%	1	10%
Rosel Fann Park	19	-1	-3%	1	3%	0	0%
Springlake Park	5	-1	-11%	0	7%	0	3%
Riverside	6	-1	-9%	0	7%	0	3%
Peachtree Hills Park	8	-1	-7%	0	2%	0	5%
Barbara A. McCoy Park	9	-1	-6%	0	3%	0	3%
Kirkwood Urban Forest	6	-1	-8%	0	4%	0	4%
Loring Heights Park	2	-1	-26%	0	12%	0	14%
Lenox-Wildwood Park	8	0	-6%	0	6%	0	0%
Edwin Place Park	4	0	-11%	0	6%	0	5%
Peachtree Battle Parkway	4	0	-11%	0	3%	0	9%
Spring Valley Park	4	0	-13%	0	10%	0	3%
Haynes Manor Park	3	0	-14%	0	10%	0	4%
Garden Hills Park	3	0	-12%	0	8%	0	5%
Sunnybrook Park	2	0	-17%	0	14%	0	3%
Campbellton Road Park	10	0	-4%	1	6%	0	-2%
Mountain Way Commons	11	0	-3%	1	5%	0	-2%
Mayson Park	3	0	-13%	0	11%	0	2%
Orme Park	6	0	-6%	0	6%	0	-1%
Oak Grove Park	3	0	-10%	0	3%	0	7%
Mantissa Road	3	0	-14%	0	10%	0	4%
17th Street Park	2	0	-13%	0	11%	0	2%
Tullwater Park	5	0	-6%	0	3%	0	3%
Selena S. Butler Park	5	0	-5%	0	9%	0	-3%
Benoit	1	0	-30%	0	-13%	0	43%
Mayson Ravine	3	0	-9%	0	8%	0	1%
Isabel Gates Webster Park	14	0	-2%	0	2%	0	1%
Deerwood Park	17	0	-2%	0	-2%	1	4%
Virgilee Park	3	0	-7%	0	4%	0	3%
Drake Park	5	0	-5%	0	4%	0	1%
Lakewood Fairgrounds & HiFi Buys Amphitheater	120	0	0%	-2	-2%	2	2%

Park	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Ellsworth Park	1	0	-17%	0	17%	0	0%
West Wesley Park	1	0	-18%	0	16%	0	3%
Stone Hogan Park	11	0	-2%	0	1%	0	0%
Gilliam Park	3	0	-7%	0	2%	0	5%
Four Corners Park	5	0	-4%	0	0%	0	4%
Ardmore Park	2	0	-10%	0	6%	0	4%
Loridans	1	0	-16%	0	3%	0	14%
Daniel Johnson Nature Preserve	8	0	-2%	0	-1%	0	3%
Oak Knoll I Park	1	0	-15%	0	6%	0	9%
Old Ivy Road Park	1	0	-22%	0	11%	0	11%
Sara J. Gonzalez Park	1	0	-10%	0	8%	0	2%
Charles L. Harper Memorial Park	1	0	-13%	0	5%	0	8%
Eubanks (The Prado) Park	1	0	-9%	0	6%	0	2%
Parkway-Merritts Park	1	0	-17%	0	7%	0	12%
Charlie Loudermilk Park	1	0	-22%	0	-46%	0	68%
Channing Valley Park	1	0	-19%	0	17%	0	2%
Emma Lane	6	0	-2%	0	7%	0	-5%
Esther Peachey Lefever	1	0	-15%	0	-11%	0	27%
Green Leaf Circle	1	0	-9%	0	7%	0	2%
Matilda Place Park	1	0	-7%	0	2%	0	5%
Hurt Park	2	0	-5%	0	-5%	0	10%
Arlington Circle Beauty Spot	1	0	-10%	0	4%	0	6%
John Howell Memorial Park	3	0	-3%	0	3%	0	0%
Dale Creek Park	3	0	-2%	0	2%	0	1%
Whetstone Creek Park	2	0	-4%	0	1%	0	3%
Jacci Fuller Woodland Garden Park	1	0	-10%	0	6%	0	4%
Arlington Circle Playlot	0	0	-12%	0	13%	0	4%
Vine City Park	1	0	-4%	0	33%	0	-30%
Sylvan Circle Playlot	1	0	-8%	0	15%	0	-7%
Vermont Road Park	2	0	-1%	0	3%	0	-2%
Center Hill Park	44	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sidney Marcus Park	3	0	-1%	0	-2%	0	2%
Harold Avenue Place	1	0	-2%	0	-10%	0	12%
John Wesley Dobbs Park	1	0	0%	0	-6%	0	7%
Summerhill Triangle	1	0	-1%	0	0%	0	2%

Park	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Watkins Park	1	0	1%	0	-5%	0	5%
McClatchey Park	5	0	0%	0	4%	0	-4%
Wildwood Gardens Park	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Yonah Park	2	0	0%	0	-6%	0	6%
Elinor Place Park	1	0	3%	0	-6%	0	3%
Oak Knoll II Park	1	0	3%	0	-8%	0	5%
Parkway-Wabash Park	1	0	3%	0	1%	0	-5%
Sunken Garden Park	1	0	2%	0	-7%	0	4%
Boone and West Lake	1	0	2%	0	11%	0	-14%
Renaissance Park	6	0	0%	0	-5%	0	5%
Rose Circle Park	3	0	1%	0	-5%	0	4%
Ashby Circle Playlot	1	0	5%	0	-6%	0	0%
Lanier Boulevard Parkway	2	0	2%	0	-10%	0	8%
Inman Park Trolley Barn	1	0	7%	0	2%	0	-8%
Georgia Hill Center	3	0	2%	0	0%	0	-2%
Gordon-White Park	2	0	4%	1	29%	-1	-33%
Proctor Village Park	3	0	3%	0	4%	0	-8%
J.D. Sims Recreation Center	1	0	9%	0	9%	0	-17%
Home Park	2	0	5%	0	2%	0	-7%
Hardy Ivy Park	1	0	16%	0	-6%	0	-8%
A.D. Williams Park	10	0	1%	0	4%	-1	-5%
Rebel Valley Playlot	1	0	7%	0	-8%	0	1%
Adamsville Park (Old)	1	0	6%	0	0%	0	-6%
3162 Lenox Rd	2	0	4%	0	-6%	0	2%
Oakview II Park	1	0	18%	0	-31%	0	16%
Chattahoochee Park	3	0	3%	0	-5%	0	2%
Verbena Street Playlot	1	0	16%	0	6%	0	-24%
Gertrude Place	1	0	10%	0	-15%	0	5%
Robert W. Woodruff Park	3	0	4%	0	-10%	0	6%
Emma Millican Park	13	0	1%	-1	-6%	1	5%
Ansley Park	6	0	2%	0	0%	0	-3%
Macon Drive Park	1	0	12%	0	-18%	0	5%
Historic Fourth Ward Park	18	0	1%	5	28%	-5	-28%
Windsor Street Park	1	0	14%	0	-19%	0	6%
Perkerson Park	49	0	0%	-2	-3%	1	3%
J.F. Kennedy Park	2	0	6%	0	1%	0	-6%

Park	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Heritage (Founder's) Park	1	0	23%	0	-18%	0	-5%
South Evelyn Place Park	1	0	16%	0	-25%	0	9%
D.H. Stanton Park	9	0	2%	1	6%	-1	-8%
Ormond-Grant Park	1	0	13%	0	-14%	0	1%
North Evelyn Place Park	1	0	21%	0	-15%	0	-5%
Bessie Branham Park	7	0	3%	0	-5%	0	3%
Memorial Drive Greenway	5	0	5%	2	45%	-2	-50%
Enota Place Park	4	0	5%	0	-12%	0	6%
Howell Park	2	0	10%	0	-10%	0	-1%
Collier Park	16	0	1%	-1	-3%	0	2%
Dellwood Park	1	0	18%	0	-9%	0	-8%
Goldsboro Park	3	0	10%	0	-9%	0	-1%
Iverson Park	2	0	12%	0	-9%	0	-3%
Lake Claire Park	5	0	5%	0	-3%	0	-2%
Lindsay Street Park	1	0	21%	0	0%	0	-22%
West Manor Park	10	0	2%	-1	-6%	0	4%
Tucson Trail Park	3	0	10%	0	-2%	0	-8%
Cleveland Avenue Park	5	0	5%	0	-3%	0	-2%
Westside Park	11	0	3%	0	-1%	0	-2%
Whittier Mills Park	22	0	1%	-1	-3%	0	1%
Harper Park	14	0	2%	0	-3%	0	0%
Springvale Park	4	0	7%	0	-4%	0	-3%
Empire Park	10	0	3%	0	-2%	0	-1%
West End Park	7	0	5%	0	-6%	0	1%
Rawson-Washington Park	4	0	7%	0	-6%	0	-1%
Arthur Langford Jr Park	10	0	3%	-1	-7%	0	3%
Adair Park II	11	0	3%	-1	-11%	1	7%
Bass Recreation Center	5	0	8%	0	-5%	0	-3%
M.L.K. Center	5	0	8%	0	1%	0	-8%
Phoenix III Park	4	0	10%	0	-12%	0	1%
Cleopas R. Johnson Park	4	0	10%	0	-10%	0	1%
Wilson Mill Park	37	0	1%	-1	-3%	1	2%
Ella Mae Wade Brayboy Memorial Park	2	0	17%	0	-15%	0	-2%
Shadyside Park	4	0	10%	0	-7%	0	-3%
Knight Park	3	0	16%	0	-12%	0	-4%

Park	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Lillian Cooper Shepherd Park	2	0	19%	0	-11%	0	-8%
East Lake Park	10	0	4%	-1	-8%	0	4%
Pittman Park	14	0	3%	-1	-5%	0	2%
Rosa L. Burney Park	14	0	3%	-1	-6%	0	3%
Coan Park	13	0	3%	-1	-5%	0	2%
Outdoor Activity Center	22	0	2%	-1	-6%	1	3%
Adair Park I	6	0	8%	0	6%	-1	-14%
J. Allen Couch Park	6	0	8%	0	6%	-1	-14%
Cabbagetown Park	4	1	14%	0	-8%	0	-6%
Mims Park	15	1	4%	0	-2%	0	-2%
Winn Park	10	1	5%	0	-4%	0	-1%
Lang-Carson Park	3	1	16%	0	0%	-1	-16%
Chosewood Park	16	1	3%	-1	-7%	1	3%
Walker Park	7	1	9%	-1	-10%	0	1%
Ben Hill Park	23	1	3%	-2	-11%	2	8%
Boulevard Crossing	22	1	3%	7	34%	-8	-37%
South Atlanta Park	11	1	6%	-1	-9%	0	3%
John C. Burdine Center	4	1	16%	0	-8%	0	-8%
Grove Park	17	1	4%	-1	-5%	0	0%
Morningside Recreation Center	5	1	15%	0	-4%	-1	-12%
Thomasville Park	17	1	5%	-1	-6%	0	2%
Phoenix II Park	7	1	11%	-1	-11%	0	-1%
English Park	9	1	9%	-1	-7%	0	-2%
Adamsville Recrecreation Center	11	1	8%	-1	-5%	0	-4%
Rev. James Orange Park at Oakland City	14	1	6%	-1	-5%	0	-1%
Springdale Park	5	1	19%	-1	-11%	0	-8%
Dean Rusk Park	6	1	18%	0	-4%	-1	-13%
Benteen Park	10	1	12%	-1	-11%	0	0%
Central Park	17	1	7%	-1	-5%	0	-2%
Brownwood Park	13	1	10%	-2	-13%	0	2%
John A. White Park	112	1	1%	-3	-3%	2	1%
Washington Park	20	2	8%	-1	-7%	0	-1%
Mozley Park	31	2	7%	-2	-6%	0	-1%
Candler Park	51	3	6%	-4	-8%	1	2%
Browns Mill Golf Course	165	3	2%	-6	-4%	3	2%

Park	Acres	Acres UTC Change	% UTC Change	Acres NTV Change	% NTV Change	Acres NV Channge	% NV Change
Oakland Cemetery	48	3	7%	2	5%	-6	-12%
Piedmont Park	193	3	2%	5	3%	-9	-5%
Maddox Park	55	4	7%	-2	-3%	-2	-4%
Grant Park	131	9	7%	-10	-8%	1	1%
Freedom Park	125	13	10%	-11	-9%	-2	-1%

11. Appendix 6 – Land Cover Change Graphs by Selected Geographies

11.1 Neighborhood Planning Units (% Tree Cover Change – Acres Change in Parentheses)



Figure 65. Percent Change in Tree Canopy by NPU

11.2 Neighborhoods – Tree Cover Change in Acres – Only Top and Bottom 10 are shown due to large number of neighborhoods in the city





Figure 66. Bottom Ten Neighborhoods (Canopy Acres Lost 2008-2014)





Figure 69. Top Ten Neighborhoods (Canopy Acres Gained 2008-2014)

11.3 City Council Districts - (% Tree Cover Change – Acres Change in Parentheses)



Figure 72. Percent Tree Cover Change by Council District (2008-2014)

Figure 73. Percent Tree Cover Change by Watershed (2008-2014)Figure 74. Percent Tree Cover Change by Council District (2008-2014)

11.4 Watersheds - (% Tree Cover Change – Acres Change in Parentheses)

Figure 75. Percent Tree Cover Change by Watershed (2008-2014)

11.5 Small Watersheds

– Due to the large number of small watersheds, only the twelve top and bottom small watersheds gaining or losing percent tree canopy are shown below.









Figure 81. Bottom 12 Small Watersheds Losing Percent Tree Cover (2008-2014)

Figure 82. Parks Gaining Over 2.5 Acres of Tree Canopy (2008-2014)Figure 83. Bottom 12 Small Watersheds Losing Percent Tree Cover (2008-2014)

11.6 Parks – Due to the large number of parks, only parks with canopy change of greater or less than 2.5 acres are shown below.



Figure 84. Parks Gaining Over 2.5 Acres of Tree Canopy (2008-2014)



Figure 87. Parks Losing More Than 2.5 Acres of Tree Canopy (2008-2014)

Figure 88. Parks Losing More Than 2.5 Acres of Tree Canopy (2008-2014)