



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
FACULTY OF ECONOMIC SCIENCES

WORKING PAPERS

No. 21/2019 (306)

URBAN GREENERY MANAGEMENT PROBLEM

TOMASZ ŻYLICZ

WARSAW 2019



Urban greenery management problem

Tomasz Żylicz

University of Warsaw, Faculty of Economic Sciences
tzylicz@wne.uw.edu.pl

Abstract: I look at the urban greenery management as a principal-agent (PA) problem.

In the case analysed in this paper the city mayor (the higher level) wants to maximize the pollution-mitigation capacity of trees planted, while the greenery manager (the lower level) wants to maximize the municipal budget devoted to planting trees subject to some constraints on the outcome of this activity. While the higher level wants certain services to be delivered in the future actually, the lower level is interested in potential benefits provided by the most attractive tree species, even though they will be delivered only partially and probably not in the long run. As a result, the theoretical "residual claimancy" condition required for so-called incentive compatibility does not hold, and the species composition of trees planted is different from what it would have been if the PA model implemented was incentive compatible.

Keywords: Principal-agent models, urban trees

JEL codes: H49, Q53, Q57, R59

1. Introduction

Economic studies of urban greenery are carried out based on at least two approaches. First of all, they can apply cost benefit analyses in order to assess whether total expenditures on maintaining green areas are justified by their effects in terms of better public health, improved tourist attractiveness, environmental protection, and so on (e.g. Tempesta 2015); they start with a list of benefits (e.g. Braubach *et al.* 2017), monetize them, and compare with the cost of establishing and maintaining such areas. Alternatively, studies can assume that certain objectives with respect to urban greenery are set, and a question emerges whether they are likely to be achieved. The paper adopts this second approach. In particular, we do not check whether planting trees is economically justified; its economic efficiency has been demonstrated both with respect to urban forests (e.g. Dwyer *et al.* 1992), and street trees (e.g. Mullaney *et al.* 2015) many times. Instead, we check whether tree planting activities are organized as effectively as possible.

Managing large cities is a complicated problem. A typical city is managed hierarchically with the top management interested (in principle) in enhancing the welfare of their constituency. At the same time, lower level officers do not have to be preoccupied with the same concerns; they are interested in maximizing their utility subject to some constraints imposed by their bosses. This is a standard hierarchical agency theory model studied by economists under the heading of "principal-agent" (PA) problems. It originated in the 1970s (perhaps even in the 18th century). Many economists link it to the papers of Wilson (1968), Ross (1973), Heckerman (1975), Jensen and Meckling (1976), and – most often – Laffont and Tirole (1988), who made it a part of the standard microeconomics. The model can be kept simple by assuming that there is a two-tier structure with the top management unit – let us call it the mayor – supervising one of its executive branches – let us call it the greenery manager.

This paper aims at illustrating how this theoretical approach can be applied in order to improve the effectiveness of urban greenery management if the top management delegates some of its tasks to lower level units.

A mismatch between the objectives of various units in urban greenery management has been identified in earlier research (e.g. Lindholm 2008). It was also observed while talking to officers responsible for urban greenery in the city of Warsaw. The mayor is interested in having enjoyable and productive green areas, while the greenery manager is interested in being adequately rewarded from the city budget. Moreover, information is asymmetric. The manager knows what specific steps need to be taken in order to improve the performance of the greenery, but the mayor does not have this knowledge.

Using the notation typical for PA models (Mas-Colell *et al.* 1995), one can write that the mayor (principal) wants to maximize

$$B(x)-s(x)$$

where:

$B(x)$ stands for net benefits provided by the greenery,

$s(x)$ stands for the salary of the greenery manager, and

x is the level of effort put into the greenery enhancement/maintenance activities;

while the greenery manager (agent) wants to maximize

$$s(x)-c(x)$$

where:

$c(x)$ stands for the cost of the effort

subject to the usual participation constraint:

$$s(x)-c(x) \geq u^0$$

where:

u^0 is an (unknown to the principal) aspiration level.

Under the standard convexity assumptions adopted in economic modelling, an incentive compatible contract requires that the greenery manager (agent) is the "residual claimant" (Varian 2010: 731), i.e.

$$\partial B/\partial x = \partial c/\partial x.$$

In this paper we discuss whether the residual claimancy condition can be considered realistic in the management process of green areas in Warsaw. Up to the best of our knowledge, there are no studies of urban greenery using PA approach. There are a number of papers which use this analytical framework, but they aim at general land-use problems rather than planting trees in a city (e.g. Hotte *et al.* 2016). Kronenberg (2015) identifies institutional barriers to improving urban greenery other than the PA problems. Lindholm (2008) analyses possibilities to improve greenery managers' performance by designing better contracts, but – again – without referring to the PA framework. Cortinovis and Geneletti (2019) look at ways to improve integration of biological and political considerations in urban planning decisions. They take into account air purification carried out by green areas, but without analysing whether different management levels may have different incentives. Likewise, Robinson *et al.* (2019) admit that many different skills and backgrounds interact in taking natural resource decisions, but they do not make a distinction between various hierarchical levels.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce the basic conceptual model of urban greenery hierarchical management. A review of analyses of benefits provided by urban trees follows. In section 4 we look at specific measures taken by urban greenery managers. This middle part of the paper is based on our studies of how green areas have been managed in Warsaw. The statistical quality of data does not allow for a more comprehensive econometric analysis. Section 5 discusses what incentive incompatibility problems are faced by the urban greenery management. The last one concludes and identifies directions for future research.

2. The problem of urban greenery management

The management structure can be, in fact, more complicated than applied here. Analysing typical urban greenery management structures in a more detailed way is beyond the scope of this paper. A case study referring to the data collected in Warsaw serves as an illustration of problems that may affect the efficiency of management structures elsewhere too.

In Warsaw, the administrative unit which is responsible for the urban greenery does not manage the resources directly. It hires dozens of firms who take care of designated areas and supervises district authorities who are responsible for their smaller jurisdictions. This complicated reporting structure is expected to change, and a more detailed description of the management mechanism could take into account several tiers and perhaps further additions. Here we take a preliminary approach by assuming a simple two-tier structure.

Our model is based on several stylized facts which are derived from analyses of the urban green management in Warsaw. Most importantly, we confirm that there is a discrepancy between what the city mayor declares and what the lower level officials care for. We observe that different tree species provide city inhabitants with different benefits. In particular, we contrast two popular species with very different pollution-absorption capacities: large Common oak (*Quercus robur* spp.) and Red oak (*Quercus rubra* spp.), and small Callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana*). At the same time, these species vary in terms of survival rates (with oak characterised by much lower rates). We also observe that the lower level prefers to be involved in planting trees which provide large benefits, irrespective of their survival statistics; failures are seen as a result of someone's neglect rather than natural phenomena. Finally, we assume that the lower level expects a financial premium for planting the more valuable species that are characterized by poor survival rates.

One of the most controversial aspects of the PA analysis is how to measure the level of effort x . It cannot be the total area of the municipal green, since this is not under the control of

the manager. The area is rather to be decided by the city mayor, and it is easy to measure. Therefore, given the exogenous area, we assume that the manager can use his/her professional knowledge in order to boost the potential net benefits from a specific composition of trees planted and specific processes applied in order to provide high ecosystem services.

3. Benefits from urban greenery

There are many alternative approaches to analyse benefits from biological resources. So-called *Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services* (CICES 2015) – the most widely used in the European Union – lists 47 such services. Sixteen of them refer to provision of materials (and energy), twenty – to regulation of natural processes, and eleven – to societal functions (including recreation). In order to keep the analysis as simple as possible, we take into account only three "regulatory services". In the original list they were identified as:

- Bio-remediation by micro-organisms, plants, algae, and animals
- Bio-chemical detoxification / decomposition / mineralisation etc.
- Filtration / sequestration / storage / accumulation by ecosystems

While some crops can be harvested for the benefit of the city dwellers, the most typical gains from urban greenery include regulation of natural processes, and recreation. These gains are not necessarily very large in economic terms. A recent study of a major park in southern Warsaw (Zawojńska *et al.* 2016) demonstrated that ecosystem services can lose (in economic terms) with other benefits provided by the urban infrastructure. Besides, one needs to stress that street trees have different roles than parks and other contiguous green areas, and hence each category may require different measurement methods (Giergiczny and Kronenberg 2014).

In this paper we emphasize benefits of bio-remediation. Specifically, various tree species turn out to absorb air contaminants to a different degree. In addition, they can provide

other ecosystem-regulatory benefits, including mitigation of the surface runoff, but – again for simplicity – we do not analyse them here. Neither do we look at other diverse benefits – such as e.g. mitigating heat island effect – analysed in urban tree planting scenarios (Bodnaruk *et al.* 2017) – or amenities that might be relevant for greenery management decisions too.

There are numerous empirical analyses on how much a given tree can absorb (or otherwise "avoid") of NO₂, SO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, VOC, and O₃. The results suggest that – up to 100 years – the remediation benefit is roughly proportional to the age of the tree (McPherson *et al.* 2007). Apart from what can be found in some parks or forests, a typical tree is less than 100 years old and consequently it remediates a fraction of the maximum expected of the oldest conceivable one. Therefore the remediation benefit is simply a percent of what can be absorbed by a 100 years old tree, and various trees of the same age provide – proportionally – the same benefits as the mature ones that belong to the same species. Table 1 lists these maximum absorption benefits for four categories – coniferous trees (1) and three types of deciduous trees: small (2), medium (3), and large (4).

Table 1. Annual absorption for a 100 year old tree [in g]

	Coniferous	Deciduous		
		Small	Medium	Large
NO ₂	177	93	239	544
SO ₂	23	11	28	65
PM _{2.5}	14	8	22	48
O ₃	307	160	410	933

Source: Calculations based on McPherson *et al.* (2007), and Szkop (2019)

As seen from the table, the physical remediation capacity of trees can vary quite a lot. The capacity depends mainly on the surface of leaves, and the numbers are based on empirical research carried out in northern United States mainly. Of course, American species

composition is not the same as in Warsaw, but the table informs about the order of magnitude of what can be expected of certain tree types.

Removal of toxic substances implies health and other environmental benefits. Ideally site-specific empirical studies would be needed in order to estimate these benefits. Lacking the opportunity to rely on such studies, we had to apply a benefit transfer approach. To this end, the results of a number of European research programmes were used. They are summarized in standard coefficients adopted by the ExternE project. They are differentiated for various pollutants. It is also acknowledged that economic impacts depend on whether the pollution affects densely or sparsely populated areas. Estimates adequate for urban environments were applied in Table 2. Specifically, we used the rates 10.65 € per each kg of NO₂ absorbed, 9.47 for SO₂, and 2.07 for PM_{2.5}. The ExternE data base does not include O₃.

Table 2. Annual benefits provided by a 100 year old tree [in €]

	Coniferous	Deciduous		
		Small	Medium	Large
NO _x	1.89	0.99	2.55	5.79
SO ₂	0.22	0.10	0.27	0.62
PM _{2.5}	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.99

Source: Calculations based on Table 1 and results of the ExternE project [http://www.externe.info/externe_d7/?q=node/2]; please note that the project calculates monetary benefits for NO_x rather than NO₂, thus numbers in the table should be regarded as rough estimates.

Table 2 demonstrates that annual monetized benefits from the absorption of acidifying substances – such as nitrogen and sulphur oxides – dominate the total. They can be more than 6 € per old large deciduous tree. For coniferous species they are a fraction of that. Let us emphasize once again, that these numbers have to be treated with great caution. The absorption capacity depends on a number of circumstances (Jin *et al.* 2014), it is a subject to empirical research, and it cannot be easily transferred. Besides, as the sulphur pollution is largely under control, nitrogen contamination – linked to the growing car traffic – emerges as

one of the most important air pollution problems in cities. Table 2 suggests that small trees provide roughly four times lower benefits linked to nitrogen abatement than large ones.

4. Planting trees as an air protection instrument in Warsaw

The mayor of Warsaw has a detailed list of urban trees with information on their age, size and sanitary condition. The list is too much detailed to be of practical significance for this level of management. Nevertheless it is a valuable source of information on urban greenery. In addition, the mayor has information on which tree species provide maximum air quality benefits.

Top species recommended for remediation of acidifying substances

Red maple (*Acer rubrum*)

Horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*)

Yellow birch (*Betula alleghaniensis*)

Deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*)

Northern hackberry (*Celtis occidentalis*)

American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*)

White ash (*Fraxinus americana*)

Ginkgo (*Ginkgo biloba*)

Kentucky coffeetree (*Gymnocladus dioica*)

Black walnut (*Juglans nigra*)

Tulip tree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*)

Cucumber tree (*Magnolia acuminata*)

Norway spruce (*Picea abies*)

Eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*)

London planetree (*Platanus hybrida*)

Eastern cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*)

American basswood (*Tilia americana*)

Eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*)

American elm (*Ulmus americana*)

Japanese zelkova (*Zelkova serrata*)

Source: Nowak (2000), and Nowak, and Heisler (2010)

All these species can be found in Warsaw, but only few of them are planted routinely. The local administration of urban greenery is expected to plant trees that are well adapted to local climatic conditions and – more recently – that were found to be allergic-friendly. Their list includes:

Sycamore maple (*Acer pseudoplatanus*)

Common lime (*Tilia × europaea*)

Japanese cherry (*Prunus serrulata*)

Callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana*)

London plane (*Platanus × acerifolia*)

Black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*)

European ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*)

Common hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*)

Common oak (*Quercus robur*)

Source: ZOM (2017)

5. Tree planting strategies in Warsaw

The benefits provided by living trees cannot be questioned. The problem, however, is that not every tree planted survives. The Warsaw experience is quite vast, as thousands of trees are planted every year. Many of them survive, but some do not. There are several reasons why a tree does not survive. First, it is not a native species and unless an unprecedented (and costly)

care is applied, the tree is doomed to die soon as a result of harsh climatic conditions, pest infestation or other causes. Second, it could have been planted in an inappropriate way, e.g. without a reasonable space left for the canopy or root system. Third, it could have been inappropriately maintained, e.g. insufficiently watered. Fourth, it could have been exposed to environmental contaminants such as chlorides (often used as de-icing agents by some real estate owners) (Nowocin 2017).

Urban greenery managers tend to perceive urban trees as real capital rather than living objects thus expecting that once planted, they will provide a steady flow of benefits. Natural survival rates are perceived as close to 100%. Whereas in fact they can be much lower. Low survival rates of urban trees have been studied widely (e.g. Sæbø *et al.* 2003, Nowak *et al.* 2004, Roman and Scatena 2011) and linked to a number of threats the trees are exposed to. Climate change has added a new important stressing factor (Fontaine and Larson 2016).

Specifically for Warsaw, several econometric models were estimated in order to check the relationship between the number of trees (of a given species) planted and their mortality rates, as well as benefits provided by absorbing air pollutants (Szkop and Żylicz 2018). Despite numerous attempts, it proved impossible to find statistically significant relationships linking these numbers with mortality rates. The latter were estimated based on a large inventory of 162,500 trees registered in Warsaw. Planting trees seems to be totally unrelated to their mortality rates which range from almost zero (0.77% for *Pyrus calleryana* spp.), to over 4% (4.13% for *Quercus rubra* spp.). In contrast, potential benefits – as represented by pollutants absorbed by a living tree – did prove correlated with numbers of trees planted (Szkop 2019). Based on a somewhat smaller inventory of 2,111 street trees of 36 species planted between 2014 and 2016, this correlation turned out to be 58%. This allowed to claim that urban greenery managers ignore mortality rates, and prefer to plant species known for their large potential to absorb air pollutants.

Let us assume that there are two tree species which provide benefits of b_1 and b_2 per tree, respectively, with $b_1 < b_2$. Therefore total benefits read $\beta = b_1n_1 + b_2n_2$, where n_1 and n_2 , are the number of trees of the first and the second species, respectively. If x is the fraction of trees of the second (i.e. more "valuable") species ($x=n_2/N$), and N is the total number of trees, then the formula reads:

$$\beta = b_1(1-x)N + b_2xN,$$

and

$$\partial\beta/\partial x = N(b_2 - b_1) > 0.$$

From the social welfare point of view, however, as only living trees provide benefits, a more appropriate formula for the total benefits reads:

$$B = b_1(1-x)N\theta_1 + b_2xN\theta_2,$$

Where θ_1 , θ_2 are survival rates of the first and second species, respectively. If one assumes that the survival rate of the first species is 1, then the formula reduces to:

$$B = b_1(1-x)N + b_2xN\theta_2.$$

It is then easy to calculate that

$$\partial B/\partial x = N(\theta_2 b_2 - b_1).$$

The cost of planting a tree is likely to be higher in the case of the more "valuable" species: $c_1 < c_2$. Thus the raw cost of tree planting activity is $c_1(1-x)N + c_2xN$, where x and N denote the same variables as before. However, tree planting agents know that the second species is more risky to be planted and hence they request a mark-up proportional to the share of the more risky trees, say, $1+x$. Consequently the cost formula reads:

$$c = c_1(1-x)N + c_2xN(1+x).$$

The derivative reads:

$$\partial c/\partial x = N(2c_2x + c_2 - c_1).$$

In other words, $\partial c/\partial x$ increases when the share of the more valuable species increases.

One needs now to check these findings against the data observed in Warsaw. $\theta_2 b_2 - b_1$ is certainly lower than $b_2 - b_1$, but its sign is not obvious immediately. Trying to estimate these expressions, we can take two typical species: Red oak (a large tree) and Callery pear (a small tree). The annual survival rate for the more "valuable" species, Red oak, is 96%, while the survival rate for the less "valuable", Callery pear, is virtually 100%. These numbers indicate that for the two typical species, over 10 years (perhaps an upper limit of what greenery managers can realistically contemplate), $\theta_2 b_2 - b_1 > 0$, since θ_2 can be assumed to be 0.5 (0.96^{10} is approximately 0.5) and as long as $b_2 > b_1/0.5$ which is obviously satisfied for the case of Red oak and Callery pear (see Table 2 for large and small species, respectively).

The results are based on benefits, survival rates and cost functions collected by relevant authorities. The data inform about the knowledge these authorities rely on, which is not necessarily based on the entire statistical material characterising urban trees properly. The attempt of these analyses is not to discover an optimum composition of urban greenery, but rather to explain why certain tree species can be found in the city more frequently than others.




Figure 1. Preferences with respect to tree species composition

The main conclusion from these observations (Figure 1) is that species composition likely to be chosen by greenery managers (ξ_0) is different from what would be preferred by the mayor (x_0). If urban greenery managers do not take into account low survival rates of the most (theoretically) valuable tree species, then these species are likely to be overrepresented in urban tree planting schedules.

Alternative quantifications of B and β require additional analyses. In our calculations we assumed that managers look at annual absorption benefits. Actually the decision making process can be more complex. For instance, they can look at cumulative benefits over some time horizon, say, 10 years. Additionally, they can discount the future with a positive discount rate. It is easy to see, however, that proportion of benefits provided by two species to be compared is exactly the same irrespective of whether annual outcome is taken into account or the cumulative effect, and irrespective of the discount rate applied. It simply depends on the proportion of b_1 and b_2 .

Survival rates are a different story. If annual survival rates are different but constant over time they make expected annual benefits lower than theoretical ones. Yet it may turn out that they vary over time and, say, are different for the first three years than for the next three years. In this case, proportion of benefits obtained by planting alternative species may depend on the time horizon adopted.

6. Conclusions and directions for future research

The main conclusion derived from the model is – to some extent – predictable. The fact that species composition preferred by the lower level is not necessarily what the higher level would like to see is intuitively obvious. What the model can shed more light on are specific management solutions which – when implemented – can reduce the exposure to air contaminants more effectively.

PA models studied in economics suggest that the lower level should be the "residual claimant" of benefits. This is not practical in the context of urban greenery, as it is inconceivable that managers can be reimbursed with any additional benefits their extra effort implies. A mismatch between preferences with respect to tree species known of very high potential absorption capacity and species that are perhaps not that attractive, but less sensitive to harsh urban conditions, can be addressed by establishing more detailed guidelines for the lower level. For the time being, these guidelines reflect potential benefits, and seem to ignore survival rates. However, in order to arrive at more robust conclusions, more empirical research is called for.

First and foremost, more site-specific research on the absorption of air contaminants is necessary. Our conclusions largely base on the benefit transfer method, with policy-site relationships extrapolated from observations collected elsewhere. While the original data are fairly detailed and probably accurate, local climatic, economic, and environmental conditions somewhere else can be different. Second, we need much broader data on the survival of trees. It would be necessary to know to what extent poor survival rates are caused by planting species that are not fit to local conditions, and to what extent they can be controlled (either through regulations on economic activities in the neighbourhood of trees, or through an incentive structure). Likewise, it would be illuminating to see how survival rates depend on the time horizon. Third, it would be interesting to deepen the study of preferences of the higher level and preferences of the lower management level. We assumed that the higher level aims at maximizing the absorption capacity of the (living) trees planted. Yet other benefits provided by the urban green may play a role as well. Perhaps reviews of important policy documents and adequate in-depth surveys of city officials may help to identify more closely incentives relevant for the urban greenery management.

References

- Bodnaruk, E. W., C. N. Kroll, Y. Yang, S. Hirabayashi, D. J. Nowak, T. A. Endreny, 2017. "Where to plant urban trees? A spatially explicit methodology to explore ecosystem service tradeoffs", *Landscape and Urban Planning* 157: 457-467
- Braubach, M., A. Egorov, P. Mudu, T. Wolf, C. Ward Thompson, and M. Martuzzi, 2017. "Effects of Urban Green Space on Environmental Health, Equity and Resilience", in: *Nature-based Solutions to Climate Change Adaptation in Urban Areas. Linkages between Science, Policy and Practice* (ed. by N. Kabisch, H. Korn, J. Stadler, and A. Bonn), Springer, Cham: 187-205
- CICES (Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services), 2015. "Towards a common classification of ecosystem services", <http://cices.eu>
- Cortinovis, C., and Geneletti, 2019, "A framework to explore the effects of urban planning decisions on regulating ecosystem services in cities", *Ecosystem Services* 38
- Dwyer, J. F., E. G. McPherson, H. W. Schroeder, and R. A. Rowntree, 1992, "Assessing the Benefits and Costs of the Urban Forest", *Journal of Arboriculture* 18(5): 227-234
- ExternE (External Costs of Energy) website http://www.externe.info/externe_d7/?q=node/2
- Fontaine, L. C., B. M. H. Larson, 2016. "The right tree at the right place? Exploring urban foresters' perceptions of assisted migration", *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 18: 221-227
- Giergiczny, M. and J. Kronenberg, 2014. "From Valuation to Governance: Using Choice Experiment to Value Street Trees", *Ambio* 43:492-501
- Heckerman, D. G., 1975, "Motivating managers to make investment decisions", *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 2, issue 3: 273-292
- Hotte, N., C. Mahony, and H. Nelson, 2016. "The principal-agent problem and climate change adaptation on public lands", *Global Environmental Change* 36: 163-174
- Jensen, M. C., W. H. Meckling, 1976, "Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure", *Journal of Financial Economics* Volume 3, Issue 4: 305-360
- Jin, S., J. Guo, S. Wheeler, L. Kan, and S. Che, 2014. "Evaluation of impacts of trees on PM2.5 dispersion in urban streets", *Atmospheric Environment* 99: 277-287
- Kronenberg, J., 2015. "Why not to green a city? Institutional barriers to preserving urban ecosystem services", *Ecosystem Services* 12: 218-227
- Laffont, J-J. and J. Tirole, 1988. "The dynamics of incentive contracts", *Econometrica* 56: 1153-1175

- Lindholst, A. C., 2008. "Improving contract design and management for urban green-space maintenance through action research", *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 7: 77-91
- Mas-Colell, A., M. D. Whinston, and J. R. Green, 1995. *Microeconomic Theory*, Oxford University Press, New York
- McPherson, E.G., J.R. Simpson, P.J. Peper, S.L. Gardner, K.E. Vargas, and Q. Xiao, 2007. *Northeast Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planting*. PSW-GTR-202. USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station
- Mullaney, J., T. Lucke, S. J. Trueman 2015, "A review of benefits and challenges in growing street trees in paved urban environments", *Landscape and Urban Planning* Volume 134, February 2015: 157-166
- Nowak, D. J., 2000. "Tree species selection, design and management to improve air quality", in D.L. Scheu, (ed.), *American Society of Landscape Architects Annual Meeting Proceedings*, Washington, D.C.: 23-27
- Nowak, D. J., and G. M. Heisler, 2010. *Air Quality Effects of Urban Trees and Parks*, National Recreation and Park Association, Ashburn, VA
- Nowak, D., M. Kuroda, and D. E. Crane, 2004. "Tree mortality rates and tree population projections in Baltimore, Maryland, US", *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 2: 139-147
- Nowocin, K., 2017. *Urban Maintenance Authority*, Warsaw (personal communication)
- Robinson, K. F., A. K. Fuller, R. C. Stedman, W. F. Siemer, and D. J. Decker, 2019, "Integration of social and ecological sciences for natural resource decision making: challenges and opportunities", *Environmental Management*, 63: 565-573
- Roman, L. A., F. N. Scatena, 2011. "Street tree survival rates: Meta-analysis of previous studies and application to a field survey in Philadelphia, PA, USA", *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 10: 269-274
- Ross, S. A., 1973, "The Economic Theory of Agency: The Principal's Problem", *American Economic Review* 63(2): 134-139
- Sæbø, A., T. Benedikz, and T. B. Randrup, 2003. "Selection of trees for urban forestry in the Nordic countries", *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 2: 101-114
- Szkop, Z., 2016. "An evaluation of the ecosystem services provided by urban trees: The role of Krasiński Gardens in air quality and human health in Warsaw (Poland)", *Environmental & Socio-economic Studies* 4,4: 41-50
- Szkop, Z., 2019. "Wartość ekonomiczna usług ekosystemowych świadczonych przez drzewa miejskie. Problem optymalnego zarządzania zielenią miejską", unpublished PhD thesis,

- University of Warsaw [Economic value of ecosystem services provided by urban trees. Optimum management of urban greenery]
- Szkop, Z. and T. Zylicz, 2018. "Urban greenery management as an economic problem", paper presented at the World Congress of Environmental and Resource Economists, Gothenburg
- Tempesta, T., 2015. "Benefits and costs of urban parks: a review", *Aestimum* 67: 127-143
- Varian, H. R., 2010. *Intermediate Microeconomics. A modern approach*, W. W. Norton, New York
- Wilson, R., 1968, "On the Theory of Syndicates", *Econometrica* 36: 119-132
- Wrzesień, M., 2017. Environmental Protection Office, Warsaw (personal communication)
- ZOM (Zarząd Oczyszczania Miasta), 2017. "Drzewa i krzewy" (in Polish) <http://zom.waw.pl/zielen-przyuliczna/drzewa-i-krzewy>
- Zawojńska, E., Z. Szkop, M. Czajkowski, and T. Zylicz, 2016. "Economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by the Wilanów Park: A benefit transfer study", *Ekonomia i Środowisko* 4(59): 143-153



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

FACULTY OF ECONOMIC SCIENCES

44/50 DŁUGA ST.

00-241 WARSAW

WWW.WNE.UW.EDU.PL