

SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Weston Brinkley (Position #3 – University), Chair • Joanna Nelson de Flores (Position #7 – NGO), Vice-Chair
Steve Zemke (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist) • Sandra Whiting (Position #2 – Urban Ecologist)
Sarah Rehder (Position #4 – Hydrologist) • Stuart Niven (Position #5 – Arborist – ISA)
Michael Walton (Position #6 – Landscape Architect – ISA) • Andrew Zellers (Position #8 – Development)
Craig Johnson (Position #9 – Economist) • Bonnie Lei (Position #10 – Get Engaged)
Megan Herzog (Position #10 – Get Engaged) • Whit Bouton (Position #11 – Environmental Justice)
Jessica Jones (Position #12 – Public Health) • Shari Selch (Position #13 – Community/Neighborhood)

The Urban Forestry Commission was established to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the City of Seattle

September 5, 2018

Meeting Notes

Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 2750 (27th floor)
700 5th Avenue, Seattle

Attending

Commissioners

Weston Brinkley – chair
Joanna Nelson de Flores – vice-chair
Whit Bouton
Jessica Jones
Stuart Niven
Sarah Rehder
Michael Walton
Andrew Zellers
Steve Zemke

Absent- Excused

Craig Johnson
Bonnie Lei
Shari Selch
Sandra Whiting

Staff

Sandra Pinto de Bader - OSE
Jana Dilley – SPU Trees for Seattle
Jon Jainga - SPR
Michael Sanchez – SPU T4S

Guests

Andrea Mojzak - Forterra

Public

Drew Foster
Sally Deneen

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details, listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocs.htm>

Call to order

Weston called the meeting to order

Public comment

None

Adoption of August 1, 8 and 31 meeting notes

Moved to next meeting.

Debrief of the public hearing at the PLUZ committee

Steve and Weston were there. Steve gave an update and mentioned that the process is being slowed down. There is still momentum and there was a lot of support during public comment at today's public hearing. The process will continue, and the UFC needs to remain engaged providing input.

There are a number of community groups that already voted to appeal the DNS. They feel the consequences and impacts of the ordinance haven't been properly assessed.

Weston would like the UFC to begin working on budget recommendations for the ordinance to send to Council before the budget process.

- Mayor Burgess EO talked about tree removal tracking – Incorporate tree actions tracking in Accela. Maybe hire a person to oversee this piece and implement it?
- Recommend hiring another arborist to support SDCI
- Implement 25.11.090 to replace exceptional trees and protect trees on SF zones
- Budget for enforcement officers
- Monitoring and evaluation component of the ordinance

Steve and Jessica will work on it. Sandra will dig out past budget recommendations and send to the group.

Forterra – Andrea Mojzak

Andrea Mojzak works at Forterra. She has been working in urban forestry in Seattle for the past 10 years. Forterra is a 501c3 non-profit working in conservation with a mission to secure places urban and wild to for people to enjoy. They used to be a land trust (they would purchase property and place it on conservation). They preserved 4,000 acres in Kitsap to use as a community park.

They have been moving to also have an urban focus. They preserved land for a park in Bothell. Last year they purchased land in Tukwila to build affordable housing and will have a cultural market. They are working to preserve culture. They purchase the conservation easement of a large property that was slated for development to keep it as a working farm. They are currently working with City of Everett on the development of the Everett Station - looking at building green stormwater infrastructure and plant trees before development takes off.

Green City Partnerships

In 2003, the then Cascade Land Conservancy, held the Cascade Dialogues to find out what people wanted for the region in terms of conservation. Began working with City of Seattle on the Green Seattle Partnership (GSP) to restore 2,500 acres of forested parklands. CLC started fund-raising efforts and raised \$3M dollars to begin addressing conservation needs. The GSP has a long-term plan to restore all 2,500 acres of forested parklands in Seattle and because we are in an urban environment, the effort will need ongoing stewardship and maintenance into the future. The program has 1,500 acres in restoration.

For more details on the conversation, including the Q&A portion of the presentation, please listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocs.htm>

Seattle Parks and Recreation Views policy – Jon Jainga

Jon is the natural resource manager with Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR). SPR is working on incorporating best management practices for their policies including the view policy. They are starting a task force to update SPR's view policy. The task force will meet in 9/12, 9/26, 10/10 and 10/24. He will deliver a full briefing to the UFC on 10/10.

UFMP update listening session

Jana Dille is working on the engagement piece of the UFMP update.

The UFMP guides the City's management of all our urban trees: along streets, in parks, on private property, and near power infrastructure.

Hopes for the new plan:

- Data driven approach
 - o Canopy cover – 2016
 - o Street tree inventory
- Emphasis on equity
- Impacts of climate change
- Measurable actions/accountability
- Robust public engagement

Focus on Equity

The City is committed to:

- Dedicating most resources to engaging historically under-represented communities
- Seeking input prior to drafting goals or actions
- Valuing feedback equitably
- Transparency

Equity & Environment Initiative communities

The people we will focus on:

- People of color
- Low income populations
- Linguistically isolated households
- Foreign-born populations
- Native populations

There will be two phases of public engagement

Phase I

- Inclusive Engagement
 - o Public input prior to plan drafting
 - o Engaging EEI communities through SPU's Community Connections and Department of Neighborhoods' Community Liaisons
 - o Online comment input form
- Key Stakeholder listening sessions
 - o Tree advocates
 - o City implementation partners
 - o Government agencies
 - o Private arborist companies
- City Boards and Commissions
 - o Urban Forestry Commission
 - Listening session – September 5
 - Key strategic conversations
 - o Environmental Justice Committee
 - o Pedestrian Advisory Board
 - o Planning Commission
- Urban Forestry Management Team
- Interdepartmental Team

We will be hiring an urban forestry consultant to do an initial assessment and a technical review.

The UFMP update team will consider the information and input provided by inclusive engagement, key stakeholders, and the initial assessment and begin development the content of the plan.

Phase II will take place once we have a draft plan and we will send it out for public comment.

UFC comments:

- Developers and contractors as a stakeholder group. Sandra will create a listening session for Developers and Contractors.
- Clarify that we are increasing outreach to historically underrepresented communities. Include the link to public health.

Listening session content:

The City is using the following values as we work to update the UFMP. The values below are meant to help guide the development of the new UFMP. How would you add to/strengthen these values?

- Ecosystem and human health: maximizing the mental health and human well-being, air quality, water quality storm water runoff reduction, carbon sequestration, recreation, wildlife habitat, beauty, and other benefits of trees.
- Commitment to equity: including diverse perspectives and equitable distribution of urban forestry resources and program.
- Community stewardship: engaging the Seattle community, including residents and businesses, in appreciating and caring for the urban forest.
- Tree health, human safety, and property protection: keeping the urban forest healthy using best management practices with a focus on public and crew safety.
- Good governance: working in conjunction with other City and community goals such as transportation, utility provision and housing.

Comments:

- Use best available science to use data to deliver UF services.
- Equity piece: include inclusion, and the benefits of the UF being equitably distributed among different populations in Seattle.
- Consider putting health as a section of the plan (or maybe consider making it the framework?)
- Planning for Seattle of the future
- Emphasis to make sure UF is viewed from all the things that forest and natural areas.... Native vs. non-native trees, as they support bird and insect species. Non-native trees are not providing habitat value. Look at pollinators.
- Bring in the understory elements of the urban forest.
- Climate change connection and how to manage UF.
- Diversity of tree species.

b. Priority issues to the UFC

- Put explanatory section to help average home owner to understand the economic benefits of the UF. Put dollar amount to benefits of trees.
- Education component in general. The UFC is opening its door to hear from the community so that's a two-way conversation.
- To preserve trees through our changing city what would give the person in the field enough of a pause for them to protect trees?
- Education and outreach. Providing a \$ value to tree protection. Trees are important and how to convey.
- Trees vs. forests – it's not just a tree, we have big and small trees, native and non-native, groups of trees.
- The hierarchy of benefits created by trees. Spatial equity aspects of tree removal mitigation
- Tree regulations

- Where the tree is matters. For a tree to be successful it needs good and plenty of soil, water, good policy and stewarding community.
- Dollars allocated for education and outreach/engagement. Good opportunity during tree regs.
- Get to aspirational goal. Not just 30%. Finding out what a good goal is. What's keeping us from that goal.
- Why are we going to 2037 to get to 30%? Adjust canopy cover goals.
- Is the goal no net loss and show growth?
- Is there a one number or single sentence rallying goal that is the new 30% (the proxy that people understand?)
- Helpful to have a goal even if it's not perfect. maybe have a section with reflection on the goals and identifying the challenges with the goals and how they can be improved.
- City should change gears to the aspirational goal. There will be challenges such as climate change and density.
- Does the UFMP account for what happens to the goal if the city annexes White Center.
- Canopy volume – tracking instead of area.
- Use of snags

Public comment

Drew – works at the botanical gardens. Do new proposed regs deal with heritage trees. Good opportunity to protect them. Do new regs include snags. Equity – good discussion. He thinks a lot about tree care costing a lot of money. How do we include equity into that? CC likes where we are going thinking on volume and structural metrics. Methodology changes drastically and it's just a snapshot in time.

New Business

None

Adjourn

Public input

From: Constance Sidles <constancesidles@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 4:58 PM

To: Durkan, Jenny <Jenny.Durkan@seattle.gov>

Cc: Herbold, Lisa <Lisa.Herbold@seattle.gov>; O'Brien, Mike <Mike.O'Brien@seattle.gov>; Gonzalez, Lorena <Lorena.Gonzalez@seattle.gov>; Juarez, Debora <Debora.Juarez@seattle.gov>; Sawant, Kshama <Kshama.Sawant@seattle.gov>; Burgess, Tim <Tim.Burgess@Seattle.gov>; Bagshaw, Sally <Sally.Bagshaw@seattle.gov>; Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>; Aldrich, Newell <Newell.Aldrich2@seattle.gov>; Rawlins, Jesse <Jesse.Rawlins@seattle.gov>; Grove, Kiersten <Kiersten.Grove@Seattle.gov>; Pinto de Bader, Sandra <Sandra.Pinto_de_Bader@Seattle.gov>; Johnson, Rob <Rob.Johnson@seattle.gov>

Subject: Tree Protection Ordinance proposal

Dear Honorable Mayor and members of the City Council,

As I read the proposed alterations to the City's Tree Protection Ordinance, current protection for heritage trees and tree groves is to be replaced by mitigation, meaning little trees will be planted when big trees are cut down.

The dictionary defines "mitigation" as: lessening the force or intensity of something unpleasant, such as pain, grief, or extreme circumstances.

You might take comfort in the notion that planting saplings that will take 20 to 40 years or more to grow to the size of heritage trees is a great way to preserve our canopy while lessening the ill effects of logging off our largest trees and groves. I do not share your sense of comfort.

While we wait decades for little trees to grow to replace the canopy we have lost, we will suffer more: More pollution as fewer leaves clean less air; more heat waves as smaller trees provide less shade; more urban stress as we lose urban bird populations and the wild nature they embody.

For the sake of few to no restrictions on development, you are trading away our present health and quality of life and making every citizen wait half a lifetime or more to recover. I am 69 years old. I will never see these trees again, or hear the rustle of their leaves, or watch a woodpecker drill a new nesthole in a wide trunk. This in no way meets the definition of mitigation.

Do you seriously think this ordinance will make life better for us? Surely there are better ways to build housing for all of us who need it in such a way that we can all enjoy a higher quality of life and health. We need our big trees and green groves. Please take this ordinance back to the drawing board and give us *both* development and a green environment. Portland has done this effectively. Seattle can, too.

It is my understanding the revisions to the ordinance will be presented at the Planning, Land Use and Zoning Committee meeting tomorrow morning at City Hall. I respectfully request that this comment letter be included as part of the public record relating to that discussion. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Constance Sidles
4532 48th Avenue NE
Seattle WA 98105
206-522-7513

From: McAleer <billandlin@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 7:48 AM

To: Durkan, Jenny <Jenny.Durkan@seattle.gov>

Cc: Herbold, Lisa <Lisa.Herbold@seattle.gov>; O'Brien, Mike <Mike.O'Brien@seattle.gov>; Gonzalez, Lorena <Lorena.Gonzalez@seattle.gov>; Juarez, Debora <Debora.Juarez@seattle.gov>; Sawant, Kshama <Kshama.Sawant@seattle.gov>; Burgess, Tim <Tim.Burgess@Seattle.gov>; Bagshaw, Sally <Sally.Bagshaw@seattle.gov>; Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>; Aldrich, Newell <Newell.Aldrich2@seattle.gov>; Rawlins, Jesse <Jesse.Rawlins@seattle.gov>; Grove, Kiersten <Kiersten.Grove@Seattle.gov>; Pinto de Bader, Sandra <Sandra.Pinto_de_Bader@Seattle.gov>; Johnson, Rob <Rob.Johnson@seattle.gov>; McConaghy, Eric <Eric.McConaghy@seattle.gov>; Morris, Geri <Geri.Morris@seattle.gov>

Subject: Re: Tree Protection Ordinance proposal-needs more protection for significant heritage trees

Dear Honorable Mayor and members of the City Council,

As a long term resident and steward of numerous heritage trees, we have concerns about the newest draft for consideration by City Council which strips protection for such city treasures.

Please see our attached comments in detail and we ask that the new tree ordinance be vetted with more rigor to prevent to destruction of these 50+ year old trees and that the new policies protect and grow the City's tree canopy.

The goal is to enhance what we have, and not set off "tree wars" among neighbors who want better views at the expense of the quality of life and habitat of both humans and wildlife in our dense urban environment.

Sincerely,
Colleen and Bill McAleer
3137 West Laurelhurst DR NE
Seattle 98105

September 04, 2018

The Honorable Mayor Jenny Durkan
Seattle City Council Members
City of Seattle
PO Box 34025
Seattle, Washington 98124-4025
Re: Seattle Tree Protection Ordinance changes in SMC 25.11

Dear Seattle City Council Members:

The Laurelhurst Community Club (LCC) urges **you to not to support the newest version (7) of Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance, SMC 25.11** which has been labeled a "Determination of Non-Significance" under SEPA from pre-existing codes. This new version of the tree preservation code, is now called "Trees for All", but it does not at all preserve the Seattle tree canopy, and heritage trees and groves. This new version is an attempt to weaken the existing ordinance with a false promise to add trees all over the city at the expense of felling mature existing ones. This new version of SMC 25.11 actually streamlines the process for mature and existing tree's destruction, and removes their protection outright which formerly was based upon their species, size and cultural significance.

From its inception, the intrinsic goal of the city's tree protection ordinances is to retain and preserve the shrinking tree canopy, which is vital for the health and quality of life for urban life. As Seattle expands its residential population, and its workforce, its municipal codes must also support its quality of life by at least retaining, if not expand its green tree canopy

Laurelhurst Community Club has concerns in the v.7 of the new proposal including:

1. Allows unlimited number of trees to be removed per year, formerly 3 per year.
2. Removes protection for Seattle's heritage and largest trees-irreplaceable.
3. Permits the removal of trees over 6" diameter on undeveloped lots
4. Adds cumbersome methods to calculate canopy, not providing for shared coverage
5. Removes the protection for tree groves
6. Relies on the use of LIDAR to exclusively calculate tree canopy which is not accurate.

LCC also supports the positive additions to v.7 draft of the Tree Ordinance including:

1. Requiring permits for trees greater than 6 inch in diameter
2. Requiring replacement if canopy falls below Urban Forestry Management Plan
3. Require tree care providers to sign a statement of recognition of tree policies
4. Increases penalty for illegal tree removal
5. Requiring 2 day, or 2 week public pre-posting for tree removal

In answer to the environmental impacts which could result with the changes in the current tree canopy, the City of Seattle issued a Determination of Non-Significance under SEPA, instead of conducting a thorough EIS to vet **all of the consequences of such changes**. All one has to do is look to the disaster in OSo mudslide, in 2014 and the loss of 43 people and 49 homes due to numerous factors, including loss of trees when it was developed, when the local city government failed to look hard at future potential impacts.

As a public policy, the new v.7 version of the tree ordinance allows mature tree removals in one location, by allowing tree planting in another location or pay into a "tree offset fund". Trees are NOT like housing units, and to reach maturity may take 20-30 years to be a meaningful replacement, and cannot be inhabited right away. This proposed ordinance will also create another administrative burden for the city. How will valuations be assessed for mature trees? Are there variations based on rarer species? Who will monitor how much and if the developers can place money in the tree to wipe out mature trees by the arduous calculations? Which agency will tell the tree cutters where they can plant trees in "other locations"? Who will say "yes" to the alternate locations? These policies will be a nightmare, and expensive to administer. And, the proposal is based on LIDAR methodology which falls short of measuring trees exclusively, rather than vegetation.

The delicate Seattle ecosystem will be negatively impacted by the proposed changes. Allowing the immediate removal of mature trees will displace the urban bird population habitat, and historic nesting locations for migratory birds. The City of Seattle, with the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife, signed on to be an Urban Bird Treaty City on May 5, 2017, to preserve and enhance bird habitat. The lack of protection for existing mature trees violates that commitment of the treaty. An eagle's perch in the neighborhood's 85 foot tall Coastal Redwood , cannot be replaced with 10 foot tall skinny, starter tree because eagles need tall heights to see their prey, and for the protection of their nests.

Laurelhurst Community Club requests that the City Council stop considering this version of the Tree Ordinance (v.7), and require and EIS for further evaluation. More time and rigor is needed to develop a truly balanced tree protection code that will enhance the treasured species that Seattle has, and, to enable the tree canopy to spread further to all areas of the city by offering tree preservation of existing trees, and tangible programs for more trees to be planted in all areas of the City to enhance the health and quality of life for all of its human and other inhabitants.

Sincerely,



Colleen McAleer, Vice President
3137 West Laurelhurst Drive NE
Seattle, Washington 98105
206-525-0219



Jeannie Hale, President
3425 West Laurelhurst Drive NE
Seattle, Washington 98105
206-525-5135

From: urbanmagnolia@pacificwest.com <urbanmagnolia@pacificwest.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 8:50 AM

To: Emery, Chanda <Chanda.Emery@Seattle.gov>; Johnson, Rob <Rob.Johnson@seattle.gov>; An, Noah <Noah.An@seattle.gov>; McConaghy, Eric <Eric.McConaghy@seattle.gov>

Cc: Ben Broesamle <bbroesamle@gmail.com>; Stephanie Ballard (MacKeen <stephaniebridget@gmail.com>; Carol Burton <ctburton7@gmail.com>; Bruce Carter <brucedcarter@hotmail.com>; DeForest, Stephen E. <sdeforest@foxrothschild.com>; Stephen DeForest <stephenedeforest@gmail.com>; Jessica M. Gallegos <jessica_m_gallegos@yahoo.com>; Alison Grevstad <alisongrevstad@earthlink.net>; Lynn Hogan <lynnkathrynhogan@gmail.com>; Mary Hoverson <maryhoverson@comcast.net>; David Kaplan <davidkaplan@pipeline.com>; Aubrey Mandus <aubreymandus@gmail.com>; Richard Piacentini <richardp@belmarprop.com>; Cindy Pierce <pierce7771@comcast.net>; Bill Stafford <>wantagh@comcast.net>; Libby Stevenson <baileyfinch@comcast.net>; Charlene D. Strong <charlenedstrong@gmail.com>; Tom Tanner <tjtanner@comcast.net>; Janis Traven <janistraven@comcast.net>; montgomery5022@gmail.com; Durkan, Jenny <Jenny.Durkan@seattle.gov>; O'Brien, Mike <Mike.O'Brien@seattle.gov>; Pinto de Bader, Sandra <Sandra.Pinto_de_Bader@Seattle.gov>; Joe3 Veyera <qamagnews@nwlink.com>; Bagshaw, Sally <Sally.Bagshaw@seattle.gov>; Herbold, Lisa <Lisa.Herbold@seattle.gov>; Gonzalez, Lorena <Lorena.Gonzalez@seattle.gov>

Subject: Tree Ordinance DNS comment (Magnolia Community Council Executive Committee)

Importance: High

Dear Council-member Johnson,

I am writing on behalf of the Executive Committee of the **Magnolia Community Council** regarding the proposed Tree Protection Code Amendments and Determination of Non-Significance published on August 23, 2018.

The Magnolia Community Council has several key reservations to the proposed revisions without conducting an environmental impact study. The Magnolia Community Council endorses the need for an **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the drafted Tree Protection Code Amendments**. Our concern is that the potential citywide impact on our tree canopy has not been fully evaluated with the proposed ordinance revisions.

Please include this request to retract the 'Determination of Non-Significance' within the public comment records of today's public hearing.

Sincerely,

David Moehring AIA NCARB, Board Member, Magnolia Community Council
Tel: 425-352-5143, urbanmagnolia@pacificwest.com

CC: Mayor Jenny Durkan
Councilmember Sally Bagshaw
Councilmember and PLUZ Committee member Mike O'Brien
Councilmember and PLUZ Committee member Lisa Herbold
Councilmember and PLUZ Committee member Lorena González
Chanda Emery, City of Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections, chanda.emery@seattle.gov



Magnolia Community Council

September 5, 2018

OFFICERS

President
Mary Montgomery

Vice President
Lynn Hogan

Treasurer
Mary Hoverson

Recording Secretary
Aubrey Mandus

Past President
Bruce Carter

TRUSTEES

Stephanie Ballard
Ben Broesamie
Carol Burton
Bruce Carter
Steve DeForest
Jessica Gallegos
Alison Grevestad
David Kaplan
David Moehring
Richard Placentini
Cindy Pierce
Bill Stafford
Libby Stevenson
Charlene Strong
Tom Tanner
Janis Traven

Magnolia
Community
Council

P.O. Box 99564

Seattle, WA
98139-0564

Mayor and City Council of Seattle

City Councilmember Rob Johnson
Planning, Land Use & Zoning Committee
Seattle City Council
P.O. Box 34025
Seattle, WA 98124-4025

RE: City of Seattle proposed regulation changes in the Tree Protection Code
Amendments and Determination of Non-Significance.

Dear Councilmember Johnson,

I am writing on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Magnolia Community Council regarding the proposed Tree Protection Code Amendments and Determination of Non-Significance published on August 23, 2018. The Council has several key reservations to the proposed revisions without conducting an environmental impact study. In particular, the Magnolia Community Council endorses the recommendations of the Urban Forestry Commission and the need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the drafted Tree Protection Code Amendments. Our concern is that the potential citywide impact on our tree canopy has not been fully evaluated with the proposed ordinance revisions, including impacts on air quality, natural habitat, and esthetics.

Thank you,

David Moehring
Board Member,
Magnolia Community Council
Tel: 425-352-5143, urbanmagnolia@pacificwest.com

CC: Mayor Jenny Durkan
Councilmember Sally Bagshaw
Councilmember and PLUZ Committee member Mike O'Brien
Councilmember and PLUZ Committee member Lisa Herbold
Councilmember and PLUZ Committee member Lorena González
Chanda Emery, City of Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections, chanda.emery@seattle.gov

4818-3181-8287.02
64778.00001