



SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Weston Brinkley (Position #3 – University), Chair
Julia Michalak (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist), Vice-chair
Elby Jones (Position #2 – Urban Ecologist - ISA) • **Stuart Niven** (Position #5 – Arborist – ISA)
Michael Walton (Position #6 – Landscape Architect – ISA) • **Joshua Morris** (Position #7 – NGO)
David Moehring (Position # 8 – Development) • **Blake Voorhees** (Position # 9 – Realtor)
Jessica Hernandez (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

Meeting notes

December 1, 2021, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Via Webex call
(206) 207-1700
Meeting number: 2482 077 3166
Meeting password: 1234

In-person meeting are not being held at this time due to the pandemic. Meeting participation is limited to access by joining the meeting through a computer or telephone conference line.

Attending

Commissioners

Weston Brinkley - Chair
Julia Michalak - Vice Chair
David Moehring
Josh Morris
Elby Jones
Michael Walton
Jessica Hernandez
Shari Selch

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE

Guests

Toby Thaler

Public

Steve Zemke
Tina Cohen
John Small
Michael Oxman

Absent- Excused

Blake Voorhees
Stuart Niven
Jessica Jones

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 and offered a land acknowledgement.

Public comment:

Steve Zemke – regarding the tree protection updates briefing, why isn't the UFC's draft tree protection ordinance being considered also? There are issues in that that don't seem to be in what's being considered now. He suggests a one-month public comment period once the draft comes out. He does appreciate what is being done, but wish it was more public.

John Small, former Commissioner in the Urban Ecologist position – the Commission grappled with these issues back when he was on it; he appreciates the ongoing work. He is struck by the regulatory approach that is being taken with the protection updates, rather than incentives. Regulations cause negative affects on people, where incentivizing has much more direct effects. Are any incentives being considered? Vast majority of large trees can easily be considered hazard trees just due to nature of their growth habit and high risk that larger trees present to structures and human safety. He urges the UFC to help SDCI understand that groves need management to keep them healthy, which may include thinning.

Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:

Patti provided updates regarding investigating in-person options for meetings. She was able to confirm that technology set up in the OSE conference rooms are sufficient to allow for screen use and audio and visual functions while recording the meeting in Webex. The challenge currently remains security access to floors within the Seattle Municipal Tower. Both staff and public are limited in what floors can be accessed easily. Patti will further investigate how to get access for staff and the public to the floor(s) necessary for in-person meeting options.

Patti also provided updates on recruitment for UFC positions.

- The application period for positions 4 and 6 closed on November 16th. We did not receive many applications, but have at least one for each position. Patti will work with Weston and potentially the new Chair to schedule interviews.
- Get Engaged position – we are still waiting for word from the liaison at the YMCA about the process for moving the candidate forward.
- Position 2 – recruitment for this position should be posted this week. Positions 2, 4 and 6 are all Mayor-appointed positions; it will likely be January before we can start moving our candidate selections through the appointment process.

Approval of November 3 and 10 meeting notes

ACTION: A motion to approve the November 3 meeting notes as written was made, seconded, and approved.

ACTION: A motion to approve the November 10 meeting notes as written was made, seconded, and approved.

Chair and Vice-Chair Nominations

Patti reported on the nominations received for these positions, and the results of which Commissioners are interested in and able to serve in them. There were six nominees for Vice-Chair, of which three were interested in serving. There were five nominees for Chair, of which none considered themselves to have the capacity to serve. Patti introduced the concept of potentially having two Co-Chairs share leadership duties for the Commission, in case Commissioners are interested in considering such a model.

The Vice-Chair nominees each took a few minutes to speak on their interest in serving. They were also asked to discuss their contribution to our community outreach draft efforts. Weston and Julia each provided input on duties and time commitments of the Chair and Vice-Chair roles

The Commission will conduct the election for the Vice-Chair position next week, and also consider the leadership model, if there is a desire for a potential shift in it. Meanwhile, Patti will revisit with the nominees how they are feeling about taking on the Chair and/or Vice-Chair roles given this discussion today.

Tree Protection Updates Work

Patti started off the briefing with providing a holistic urban forest framework strategy citywide. She also reviewed the recommendations of the UFC in recent years, and briefly described how those are incorporated into the strategies being explored.

Chanda Emery then covered the strategies being explored. She reviewed the list of 8 strategies outlined in Resolution 31902, explaining that the five strategies currently being explored combine some of those strategies together. The first strategy discussed is to develop a tree service provider registration along with a service provider and homeowner self-reporting system. This strategy will ensure that those implementing tree service work are trained and certified. This will fill in the gaps where currently trees are being taken down inappropriately. She pointed out that the UFC has been supportive of and recommended this previously, and other cities are currently implementing. The reporting system would be a tool that links to the current tree tracking system. The city of Kirkland currently is using a reporting system and staff has consulted with their staff in researching this option. Weston suggested that this strategy could be a place to use incentives in order to increase effectiveness.

The second strategy is to expand the definition of exceptional trees by lowering the upper threshold from 30" down to 24" and adding tree groves and heritage trees. The species with smaller size thresholds will be retained. This strategy is also looking at potential removal of invasive tree species.

The third strategy would create a new category of "significant trees" to be regulated and protected. This would create a new code requirement that plan reviewers would need to consider ways to protect this new category of trees, especially when there is utility and site access involved.

The fourth strategy would create a voluntary payment-in-lieu program when tree replacement is required. There was much support for this option during the community outreach processes. This could support planting in currently under-planted areas and could also support City tree planting programs that could use additional funding. The amounts collected would be based on national standards and adjusted for costs in Seattle, and the amounts will aim to balance making the program an option people will want to use with the potential for it to be over-used, leading to more trees being removed.

The last strategy encompasses several pieces aimed at improving customer service, simplify processes and strengthening tree regulations and enforcement. The tree service provider registration is expected to increase quality of tree work and reporting, adding to data collected. Hazard tree documentation will also be strengthened, and penalties for illegal tree removal will be greatly increased.

Chanda covered the timing of next steps for this work. The goal is to produce a draft proposal in some format (draft ordinance or proposal report or other) this month for environmental review. She invited the UFC to participate, starting with providing any recommendations and information now and then getting together with staff. She also noted that they are in the early stages of preparing this proposal, there will be more work on it and opportunities to participate.

Questions from Commissioners included what form of product is expected to be produced this month, will there be a permit process included as mentioned in the Resolution, and how many times is the tree ordinance expected to be updated.

Presentation debrief:

David offered to draft a recommendation letter. Weston called for Commissioners to send any input they have on the proposals to Patti and copy David so that it can be included in the recommendation letter.

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>

Public comment:

Michael Oxman clarified his comment from the November 3 meeting regarding the number of staff needed to implement proposed changes. He would like SDCI to address the 22,500 number indicated in the chat during that meeting.

Toby Thaler expressed appreciation for Chanda's presentation, and he looks forward to helping with this work as it proceeds.

Tina Cohen appreciated the strategies presented; SDCI should consider incentives for tree retention (e.g. utility forgiveness). The strategies proposed put much responsibility on the homeowner removals rather than developer removals. She noted, regarding the arborist registration process, that there could be conflicts of interest if there is not separation of TRAQ arborists from the evaluating arborist (those doing the evaluation of trees being those who will be contracted to do removal work).

Steve Zemke suggested that Commissioners not involved in the previous recommendations look closely at them, as the Commission looks to verify what is included in the new proposals. The Friends of Seattle's Urban Forest website has many links to tree ordinances in the region and across the country; these are good resources for seeing what is working elsewhere and what hasn't worked. Also, TreePAC will be releasing next week the second portfolio of questions asked of the public regarding trees.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Meeting Chat:

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:31 PM

I also want to ask them to speak on their contribution to our community outreach draft efforts:

<https://padlet.com/jessica1267/v6zzsm5a9m6qcbiw>

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:40 PM

Thank you everyone!

from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 3:51 PM

Regarding public comment received today, Commissioners may be interested in the Nov 2020 City Council resolution 31902 available online at:

from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 3:51 PM

<https://seattle.legistar.com/ViewReport.ashx?M=R&N=Text&GID=393&ID=3667453&GUID=8D207CD2-96FC-4B02-94AB-7832F169796D&Title=Legislation+Text>

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:53 PM

Her audio cut off

from Tina Cohen to everyone: 3:53 PM

no audio

from John Small to everyone: 3:53 PM

Hi Micheal,, I'm having a bit of deja vu

from Weston to everyone: 3:54 PM

<https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/UrbanForestryCommission/Resources/OutlineandDraftUFCTreeProtectionRegs070219FullDocCorrected.pdf> is the full UFC recommendations referenced as well

from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 3:55 PM

...and regarding public comment from the perspective of Pos 8 'Developer' role, existing Code incentives may be found in the Seattle Municipal Code in a few places... including design departures within section SMC 23.41.012. It might be advisable to see how many times these incentives are being accepted in lieu of existing large and Exceptional Tree removal. Thank you John and Steve for your public comments!

from Weston to everyone: 3:57 PM

One of the other incentive programs currently - <https://www.seattle.gov/utilities/your-services/accounts-and-payments/rates/drainage>

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:00 PM

This meeting is being broadcast live on Facebook.

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:01 PM

Question (Bc I might forget it): For the community outreach component, are there other indicators aside from race (reference: BIPOC) that determine which communities are outreach to? Examples: socioeconomic class, home-ownership, gender, etc. Given the % of BIPOC residents in Seattle is low. Thank you.

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:01 PM

outreached*

from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:05 PM

David: will comment on slide 4 relative to Seattle Municipal Codes that are key during the development process.

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 4:07 PM

Jessica - yes, Community Liaisons we worked with through Department of Neighborhoods included seniors, disabled and unhoused communities as well.

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:07 PM

Thank you!

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:10 PM

Many of smaller exceptional trees are native trees like dogwoods

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:15 PM

Please add an 'Environmentally Critical Area' category called 'Tree Zone', similar to a 'Riparian Zone' or 'Steep Slope'.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:17 PM

The tree appraisal pricing standard currently in use is a Pacific Northwest standard.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:19 PM

Look at requiring tree care providers to file information with city for private homeowners rather than homeowners to insure more complete and accurate information. That is the idea behind permits to have arborists get them.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:21 PM

The 'per inch' unit price is contradictory to the standard that is individually derived by the expertise of the consultant doing the appraisal. Things are just NOT that simple, which is why the Seattle Municipal Code requires Arborist Reports to be written only by ISA Certified Arborists.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:23 PM

Johnson's draft eliminated many protections like limiting trees removed by homeowners. Look at UFC modifications of Johnson's draft by UFC see UFC draft!!

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 4:24 PM

Here is the link to the SDCI webpage with the community feedback:

<https://www.seattle.gov/sdci/codes/changes-to-code/tree-protection>

from Weston to everyone: 4:24 PM

Thanks, Patti!

from John Small to everyone: 4:27 PM

The incentives noted above have an economic value <0.001% the value of developing the small grove on my single family lot. (Based on paying drainage fees for 30 years, recent sales of a lot on the same street and under current zoning)

from Tina Cohen to everyone: 4:27 PM

Regarding hazard tree documentation: the evaluation needs to be done by an independent TRAQ arborist who is NOT associated with a tree removal service. The evaluation must be then reviewed by a city arborist. Otherwise this process is ripe for abuse!

from John Small to everyone: 4:27 PM

my point is the city lacks meaningful incentives which would better achieve the urban forestry goals than restricting removals

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:29 PM

Please require Exceptional Tree Removal Permits to only be issued if a replacement tree is planted.

from Tina Cohen to everyone: 4:30 PM

I agree with John Small. Incentives to save trees during development are needed. I don't think homeowners are causing the loss of canopy as much as development.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:32 PM

Number of Replacement trees or in lieu fees need to increase with size of tree removed. Many other cities do this. Current ordinance does not take into account size of tree removed.

from John Small to everyone: 4:33 PM

Tina, almost every tree over 50' tall in single family zoning is going to have potential to damage a home. Based on the ISA criteria that risk alone is very difficult to overcome and in my experience most TRAQ qualified arborists will have significant concerns over these trees. It is incorrect to believe that healthy trees are not hazardous under the ISA criteria

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:34 PM

Exceptional Trees removed on the basis of excessive risk are currently NOT required to be replaced with a specimen that is capable to attain the size of the tree being removed.

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:34 PM

I have a question or more like a statement: This is the first time when the department to which we drafted a letter follows through some of the recommendations we made

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:35 PM

Example: inviting us as a stakeholder- what motivated them to follow through? Patti?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:35 PM

I am stating this since i drafted that letter so I remember it!

from John Small to everyone: 4:35 PM

@Steve Zemke, I agree but that needs to be balanced by the need trees have for space. Planting trees 10' OC only works with dwarf species. Those trees have many times less ecological function than large conifers

from Tina Cohen to everyone: 4:36 PM

John, I'm a TRAQ arborist and I disagree with your statement. Feel free to continue this post meeting, tina@tinacohen.com

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:41 PM

John Small - tree replacement should be placed on some measure of replacement of canopy volume lost within a set period of time like 20 - 25 years. One "tree that at maturity equals tree lost means 80 years for an 80 year old tree.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:42 PM

Please ask city arborists to re-take the self assessment tests that had such egregious error rates, as described in the 2016 Tree Research Regulations Report.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:43 PM

Any in lieu fees need to increase on yearly basis based on inflation like what Portland does.

from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:44 PM

Commissioners, codes I am thinking about as the biggest impacts to exceptional and significant tree loss: (1) SMC 23.24.040 (2) SMC 23.41.012 (3) SMC 25.11.070(2) and the Modifying the Single-Family tree retention and replacement to levels prior to 2019

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:44 PM

Please describe the anticipated job duties of the Chief Arborist position, which was just approved by City Council starting in 2022.

from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:46 PM

Thank you Chanda and Patti! Encouraging !

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:47 PM

How does the MHA law to reduce size of RSL lots to a miniscule 1,700 Sq Ft contribute to achieving canopy goals ?

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:49 PM

Thank you, Chanda!

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:50 PM

Chanda - Thanks for update today with more details today..

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:52 PM

The follow up is quick

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:52 PM

We had less than 50% answers

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:52 PM

or engagement on the community outreach so please complete it if you have not!

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:53 PM

<https://padlet.com/jessica1267/v6zzsm5a9m6qcbiw>

Public input: (see next page and posted notes):

From: Mary Manous <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 4:53 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: End the delay! Adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Patti Bakker,

As recent record temperatures have demonstrated, the climate crisis is real. Trees are a buffer to help reduce extreme temperature impacts in urban areas.

Please adopt, with the amendments recommended by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020 (Designation of Exceptional and Significant Trees, Tree Protection, Retention, and Tree Removal during land division, including tree service provider requirements).

Seattle must move forward now, without the delay urged by some, in adopting this updated Director's Rule with the amendments proposed below. This process of increasing protection for our urban forest was first proposed by the Seattle City Council 12 years ago and is long overdue.

The following updates as proposed in the draft Director's Rule are great steps forward:

- Reducing the upper threshold on exceptional trees to 24 inches in diameter at standard height (DSH) from 30 inches
- Designating trees 6 inches DSH and larger as protected trees, starting in the platting and short platting process
- Requiring Tree Care Providers to register with the City as the Seattle Dept. of Transportation already requires
- Continuing protection of tree groves as exceptional trees, even if a tree is removed from the grove
- Making clear that all exceptional trees removed during development must be replaced per SMC

25.11.090

- Tightening tree removal requirements for exceptional trees as hazard trees

The following changes to the draft Director's Rule are needed:

- Change Subject Title to remove words "land division" and replace with "Development"
- PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND. add "SMC 23 requires that all trees 6 inches DSH and larger must be indicated on all site plans throughout the platting and sub-platting process, and that projects must be designed to maximize the retention of existing trees. This requirement continues throughout any subsequent development on all lots in all zones in the city."
- SECTION 1. Reduce the number of trees and sizes required to be a tree grove. Kirkland, Woodinville, and Duvall all define a tree grove as "a group of 3 or more significant trees with overlapping or touching crowns." Include street trees in groves.
- Add "Significant trees may become exceptional as they grow in size. They are future replacements in the urban forest for exceptional trees when they die. Development projects must be designed to maximize the retention of both exceptional and significant trees to maintain a diversity of tree species and ages."
- Add "All replacement trees regardless of size are protected trees and can't be removed."
- SECTION 2. Change the heading to "TREE PROTECTION". Remove references to "Exceptional Trees" only and change to "Trees". e.g., change "Exceptional Tree Protection Areas" to "Tree Protection Areas".
- SECTION 4. Add "The Director shall have the authority to allow replacement trees on both public and private property to meet the goals and objectives of race and social justice under Seattle's Equity and Environment Initiative."
- Under SMC 25.11.090 the Director has the authority to require "one or more trees" to be planted as replacement trees for removed exceptional trees during development. The number of trees required should increase with the size of the tree removed, with a goal to achieve equivalent canopy area and volume in 25 years. Any in-lieu fee must also rise as the size of the removed tree increases. The city can not wait 80 years to replace an 80-year-old western red cedar tree and expect to maintain its canopy goals as large exceptional trees are removed during development.
- SECTION 5. SEPA requirements under SMC 25.05.675 N are for protecting special habitats and need to be considered at the beginning of the development process. The language of this SEPA code section should be included in the Director's Rule to be certain that the code is complied with.
- SECTION 6. SDCI should adopt SDOT's registration process and requirements to assist Tree Care Providers in complying with city code and regulations. Reduce the number of citations that will remove a Tree Care Provider from being registered with the city to no more than 2 per year. Require annual registration same as Seattle business licenses require. Require that Tree Care Provider companies have a WA State contractor's license to ensure they have workers' compensation. Require they have a certificate of insurance that lists the city as an additional insured so the city cannot be sued. Require that all jobs either have a certified arborist on the work site or that they have visited the site and officially sign off on the specific work being done.

Thank you for protecting our urban forest.

Mary Manous
mmanous@me.com
10523 13th Ave NW
Seattle, Washington 98177

From: Robert Meyer <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 9:45 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: End the delay! Adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Patti Bakker,

As recent record temperatures have demonstrated, the climate crisis is real. Trees are a buffer to help reduce extreme temperature impacts in urban areas.

Please adopt, with the amendments recommended by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020 (Designation of Exceptional and Significant Trees, Tree Protection, Retention, and Tree Removal during land division, including tree service provider requirements).

Seattle must move forward now, without the delay urged by some, in adopting this updated Director's Rule with the amendments proposed below. This process of increasing protection for our urban forest was first proposed by the Seattle City Council 12 years ago and is long overdue.

The following updates as proposed in the draft Director's Rule are great steps forward:

- Reducing the upper threshold on exceptional trees to 24 inches in diameter at standard height (DSH) from 30 inches
- Designating trees 6 inches DSH and larger as protected trees, starting in the platting and short platting process
- Requiring Tree Care Providers to register with the City as the Seattle Dept. of Transportation already requires
- Continuing protection of tree groves as exceptional trees, even if a tree is removed from the grove
- Making clear that all exceptional trees removed during development must be replaced per SMC 25.11.090
- Tightening tree removal requirements for exceptional trees as hazard trees

The following changes to the draft Director's Rule are needed:

- Change Subject Title to remove words "land division" and replace with "Development"
- PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND. add "SMC 23 requires that all trees 6 inches DSH and larger must be indicated on all site plans throughout the platting and sub-platting process, and that projects must be designed to maximize the retention of existing trees. This requirement continues throughout any subsequent development on all lots in all zones in the city."
- SECTION 1. Reduce the number of trees and sizes required to be a tree grove. Kirkland, Woodinville,

and Duvall all define a tree grove as “a group of 3 or more significant trees with overlapping or touching crowns.” Include street trees in groves.

- Add “Significant trees may become exceptional as they grow in size. They are future replacements in the urban forest for exceptional trees when they die. Development projects must be designed to maximize the retention of both exceptional and significant trees to maintain a diversity of tree species and ages.”
- Add “All replacement trees regardless of size are protected trees and can’t be removed.”
- SECTION 2. Change the heading to “TREE PROTECTION”. Remove references to “Exceptional Trees” only and change to “Trees”. e.g., change “Exceptional Tree Protection Areas” to “Tree Protection Areas”.
- SECTION 4. Add “The Director shall have the authority to allow replacement trees on both public and private property to meet the goals and objectives of race and social justice under Seattle’s Equity and Environment Initiative.”
- Under SMC 25.11.090 the Director has the authority to require “one or more trees” to be planted as replacement trees for removed exceptional trees during development. The number of trees required should increase with the size of the tree removed, with a goal to achieve equivalent canopy area and volume in 25 years. Any in-lieu fee must also rise as the size of the removed tree increases. The city can not wait 80 years to replace an 80-year-old western red cedar tree and expect to maintain its canopy goals as large exceptional trees are removed during development.
- SECTION 5. SEPA requirements under SMC 25.05.675 N are for protecting special habitats and need to be considered at the beginning of the development process. The language of this SEPA code section should be included in the Director’s Rule to be certain that the code is complied with.
- SECTION 6. SDCl should adopt SDOT’s registration process and requirements to assist Tree Care Providers in complying with city code and regulations. Reduce the number of citations that will remove a Tree Care Provider from being registered with the city to no more than 2 per year. Require annual registration same as Seattle business licenses require. Require that Tree Care Provider companies have a WA State contractor’s license to ensure they have workers’ compensation. Require they have a certificate of insurance that lists the city as an additional insured so the city cannot be sued. Require that all jobs either have a certified arborist on the work site or that they have visited the site and officially sign off on the specific work being done.

Thank you for protecting our urban forest.

Robert Meyer
meyerrw@mac.com
223 Yesler Way
Seattle, Washington 98104

From: Todd Stoltey <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 10:15 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: End the delay! Adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Patti Bakker,

As recent record temperatures have demonstrated, the climate crisis is real. Trees are a buffer to help reduce extreme temperature impacts in urban areas.

Please adopt, with the amendments recommended by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020 (Designation of Exceptional and Significant Trees, Tree Protection, Retention, and Tree Removal during land division, including tree service provider requirements).

Seattle must move forward now, without the delay urged by some, in adopting this updated Director's Rule with the amendments proposed below. This process of increasing protection for our urban forest was first proposed by the Seattle City Council 12 years ago and is long overdue.

The following updates as proposed in the draft Director's Rule are great steps forward:

- Reducing the upper threshold on exceptional trees to 24 inches in diameter at standard height (DSH) from 30 inches
- Designating trees 6 inches DSH and larger as protected trees, starting in the platting and short platting process
- Requiring Tree Care Providers to register with the City as the Seattle Dept. of Transportation already requires
- Continuing protection of tree groves as exceptional trees, even if a tree is removed from the grove
- Making clear that all exceptional trees removed during development must be replaced per SMC 25.11.090
- Tightening tree removal requirements for exceptional trees as hazard trees

The following changes to the draft Director's Rule are needed:

- Change Subject Title to remove words "land division" and replace with "Development"
- PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND. add "SMC 23 requires that all trees 6 inches DSH and larger must be indicated on all site plans throughout the platting and sub-platting process, and that projects must be designed to maximize the retention of existing trees. This requirement continues throughout any subsequent development on all lots in all zones in the city."
- SECTION 1. Reduce the number of trees and sizes required to be a tree grove. Kirkland, Woodinville, and Duvall all define a tree grove as "a group of 3 or more significant trees with overlapping or touching crowns." Include street trees in groves.
- Add "Significant trees may become exceptional as they grow in size. They are future replacements in the urban forest for exceptional trees when they die. Development projects must be designed to maximize the retention of both exceptional and significant trees to maintain a diversity of tree species and ages."
- Add "All replacement trees regardless of size are protected trees and can't be removed."
- SECTION 2. Change the heading to "TREE PROTECTION". Remove references to "Exceptional Trees"

only and change to "Trees". e.g., change "Exceptional Tree Protection Areas" to "Tree Protection Areas".

- SECTION 4. Add "The Director shall have the authority to allow replacement trees on both public and private property to meet the goals and objectives of race and social justice under Seattle's Equity and Environment Initiative."
- Under SMC 25.11.090 the Director has the authority to require "one or more trees" to be planted as replacement trees for removed exceptional trees during development. The number of trees required should increase with the size of the tree removed, with a goal to achieve equivalent canopy area and volume in 25 years. Any in-lieu fee must also rise as the size of the removed tree increases. The city can not wait 80 years to replace an 80-year-old western red cedar tree and expect to maintain its canopy goals as large exceptional trees are removed during development.
- SECTION 5. SEPA requirements under SMC 25.05.675 N are for protecting special habitats and need to be considered at the beginning of the development process. The language of this SEPA code section should be included in the Director's Rule to be certain that the code is complied with.
- SECTION 6. SDCI should adopt SDOT's registration process and requirements to assist Tree Care Providers in complying with city code and regulations. Reduce the number of citations that will remove a Tree Care Provider from being registered with the city to no more than 2 per year. Require annual registration same as Seattle business licenses require. Require that Tree Care Provider companies have a WA State contractor's license to ensure they have workers' compensation. Require they have a certificate of insurance that lists the city as an additional insured so the city cannot be sued. Require that all jobs either have a certified arborist on the work site or that they have visited the site and officially sign off on the specific work being done.

Thank you for protecting our urban forest.

Todd Stoltey
tstoltey@gmail.com
4432 Baker Ave NW
Seattle, Washington 98107

From: Trane Levington <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 11:54 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: End the delay! Adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Patti Bakker,

As recent record temperatures have demonstrated, the climate crisis is real. Trees are a buffer to help reduce extreme temperature impacts in urban areas.

Please adopt, with the amendments recommended by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020 (Designation of Exceptional and Significant Trees, Tree Protection, Retention,

and Tree Removal during land division, including tree service provider requirements).

Seattle must move forward now, without the delay urged by some, in adopting this updated Director's Rule with the amendments proposed below. This process of increasing protection for our urban forest was first proposed by the Seattle City Council 12 years ago and is long overdue.

The following updates as proposed in the draft Director's Rule are great steps forward:

- Reducing the upper threshold on exceptional trees to 24 inches in diameter at standard height (DSH) from 30 inches
- Designating trees 6 inches DSH and larger as protected trees, starting in the platting and short platting process
- Requiring Tree Care Providers to register with the City as the Seattle Dept. of Transportation already requires
- Continuing protection of tree groves as exceptional trees, even if a tree is removed from the grove
- Making clear that all exceptional trees removed during development must be replaced per SMC 25.11.090
- Tightening tree removal requirements for exceptional trees as hazard trees

The following changes to the draft Director's Rule are needed:

- Change Subject Title to remove words "land division" and replace with "Development"
- PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND. add "SMC 23 requires that all trees 6 inches DSH and larger must be indicated on all site plans throughout the platting and sub-platting process, and that projects must be designed to maximize the retention of existing trees. This requirement continues throughout any subsequent development on all lots in all zones in the city."
- SECTION 1. Reduce the number of trees and sizes required to be a tree grove. Kirkland, Woodinville, and Duvall all define a tree grove as "a group of 3 or more significant trees with overlapping or touching crowns." Include street trees in groves.
- Add "Significant trees may become exceptional as they grow in size. They are future replacements in the urban forest for exceptional trees when they die. Development projects must be designed to maximize the retention of both exceptional and significant trees to maintain a diversity of tree species and ages."
- Add "All replacement trees regardless of size are protected trees and can't be removed."
- SECTION 2. Change the heading to "TREE PROTECTION". Remove references to "Exceptional Trees" only and change to "Trees". e.g., change "Exceptional Tree Protection Areas" to "Tree Protection Areas".
- SECTION 4. Add "The Director shall have the authority to allow replacement trees on both public and private property to meet the goals and objectives of race and social justice under Seattle's Equity and Environment Initiative."
- Under SMC 25.11.090 the Director has the authority to require "one or more trees" to be planted as replacement trees for removed exceptional trees during development. The number of trees required should increase with the size of the tree removed, with a goal to achieve equivalent canopy area and volume in 25 years. Any in-lieu fee must also rise as the size of the removed tree increases. The city can

not wait 80 years to replace an 80-year-old western red cedar tree and expect to maintain its canopy goals as large exceptional trees are removed during development.

- SECTION 5. SEPA requirements under SMC 25.05.675 N are for protecting special habitats and need to be considered at the beginning of the development process. The language of this SEPA code section should be included in the Director's Rule to be certain that the code is complied with.
- SECTION 6. SDCI should adopt SDOT's registration process and requirements to assist Tree Care Providers in complying with city code and regulations. Reduce the number of citations that will remove a Tree Care Provider from being registered with the city to no more than 2 per year. Require annual registration same as Seattle business licenses require. Require that Tree Care Provider companies have a WA State contractor's license to ensure they have workers' compensation. Require they have a certificate of insurance that lists the city as an additional insured so the city cannot be sued. Require that all jobs either have a certified arborist on the work site or that they have visited the site and officially sign off on the specific work being done.

Thank you for protecting our urban forest.

Trane Levington
tranewaters@gmail.com
620 N 130TH ST Apt 55
Seattle , Washington 98133

From: Betsy Snyder <bjsnyder11@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:58 AM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: End the delay! Adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Patti Bakker,

As recent record temperatures have demonstrated, the climate crisis is real. Trees are a buffer to help reduce extreme temperature impacts in urban areas.

Please adopt, with the amendments recommended by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020 (Designation of Exceptional and Significant Trees, Tree Protection, Retention, and Tree Removal during land division, including tree service provider requirements).

Seattle must move forward now, without the delay urged by some, in adopting this updated Director's Rule with the amendments proposed below. This process of increasing protection for our urban forest was first proposed by the Seattle City Council 12 years ago and is long overdue.

The following updates as proposed in the draft Director's Rule are great steps forward:

- Reducing the upper threshold on exceptional trees to 24 inches in diameter at standard height (DSH) from 30 inches
- Designating trees 6 inches DSH and larger as protected trees, starting in the platting and short platting

process

- Requiring Tree Care Providers to register with the City as the Seattle Dept. of Transportation already requires
- Continuing protection of tree groves as exceptional trees, even if a tree is removed from the grove
- Making clear that all exceptional trees removed during development must be replaced per SMC 25.11.090
- Tightening tree removal requirements for exceptional trees as hazard trees

The following changes to the draft Director's Rule are needed:

- Change Subject Title to remove words "land division" and replace with "Development"
- PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND. add "SMC 23 requires that all trees 6 inches DSH and larger must be indicated on all site plans throughout the platting and sub-platting process, and that projects must be designed to maximize the retention of existing trees. This requirement continues throughout any subsequent development on all lots in all zones in the city."
- SECTION 1. Reduce the number of trees and sizes required to be a tree grove. Kirkland, Woodinville, and Duvall all define a tree grove as "a group of 3 or more significant trees with overlapping or touching crowns." Include street trees in groves.
- Add "Significant trees may become exceptional as they grow in size. They are future replacements in the urban forest for exceptional trees when they die. Development projects must be designed to maximize the retention of both exceptional and significant trees to maintain a diversity of tree species and ages."
- Add "All replacement trees regardless of size are protected trees and can't be removed."
- SECTION 2. Change the heading to "TREE PROTECTION". Remove references to "Exceptional Trees" only and change to "Trees". e.g., change "Exceptional Tree Protection Areas" to "Tree Protection Areas".
- SECTION 4. Add "The Director shall have the authority to allow replacement trees on both public and private property to meet the goals and objectives of race and social justice under Seattle's Equity and Environment Initiative."
- Under SMC 25.11.090 the Director has the authority to require "one or more trees" to be planted as replacement trees for removed exceptional trees during development. The number of trees required should increase with the size of the tree removed, with a goal to achieve equivalent canopy area and volume in 25 years. Any in-lieu fee must also rise as the size of the removed tree increases. The city can not wait 80 years to replace an 80-year-old western red cedar tree and expect to maintain its canopy goals as large exceptional trees are removed during development.
- SECTION 5. SEPA requirements under SMC 25.05.675 N are for protecting special habitats and need to be considered at the beginning of the development process. The language of this SEPA code section should be included in the Director's Rule to be certain that the code is complied with.
- SECTION 6. SDCI should adopt SDOT's registration process and requirements to assist Tree Care Providers in complying with city code and regulations. Reduce the number of citations that will remove a Tree Care Provider from being registered with the city to no more than 2 per year. Require annual

registration same as Seattle business licenses require. Require that Tree Care Provider companies have a WA State contractor's license to ensure they have workers' compensation. Require they have a certificate of insurance that lists the city as an additional insured so the city cannot be sued. Require that all jobs either have a certified arborist on the work site or that they have visited the site and officially sign off on the specific work being done.

Thank you for protecting our urban forest.

Betsy Snyder
bjsnyder11@comcast.net
4211 SW College St
Seattle, Washington 98116

From: Betsy Snyder <bjsnyder11@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 7:59 AM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please Protect Seattle's Trees

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Patti Bakker,

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the City Council has repeatedly asked SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its recent Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

If SDCI cannot respond in a timely manner, please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. As the City Auditor proposed in 2009, transfer tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment. SDCI has a conflict of interest in tree oversight – their priority mission has been to help developers build, not protect trees. Years of inaction on effective oversight and protection of trees by SDCI demands that a separate entity like OSE take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban forest comprise a vital green infrastructure. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents.

Seattle's rapid growth and an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed and not replaced. It is urgent to act now to stop this continued loss of trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity as trees are replaced.

Please update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance as recommended in the latest draft by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission.

Here are the key provisions that need to be in the updated tree ordinance:

1. Expand the existing Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program, including 2-week public notice and posting on-site, as used by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) – to cover all Significant Trees (6" and larger diameter at breast height (DBH)) on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require the replacement of all Significant Trees removed with trees that in 25 years will reach equivalent canopy volume – either on site or pay a replacement fee into a City Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund. Allow the Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants and set up easements.
3. Retain current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24" DBH, protect tree groves and prohibit Significant Trees being removed on undeveloped lots.
4. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-Exceptional Trees in 3 years per lot outside development
5. Establish one citywide database for applying for Tree Removal and Replacement Permits and to track changes in the tree canopy.
6. Post online all permit requests and permit approvals for public viewing.
7. Expand SDOT's existing tree service provider's registration and certification to register all Tree Service Providers (arborists) working on trees in Seattle.
8. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Betsy Snyder
bjnyder11@comcast.net
4211 SW College St
Seattle, Washington 98116

From: Timothy Humes <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 11:42 AM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please Update Seattle's Tree Ordinance

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Patti Bakker,

"Tree Protection Staff: As we await a new, stronger tree protection ordinance, I am proposing to hire two additional arborists in the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspection to immediately enhance the City's ability to enforce the tree code and review permit applications to ensure compliance with tree protections. While the bigger changes we need will come with a new ordinance, we can start by adequately enforcing the laws we currently have."

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the City Council has repeatedly asked SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its recent Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

If SDCI cannot respond in a timely manner, please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. As the City Auditor proposed in 2009, transfer tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment. SDCI has a conflict of interest in tree oversight – their priority mission has been to help developers build, not protect trees. Years of inaction on effective oversight and protection of trees by SDCI demands that a separate entity like OSE take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban forest comprise a vital green infrastructure. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents.

Seattle's rapid growth and an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed and not replaced. It is urgent to act now to stop this continued loss of trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity as trees are replaced.

Please update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance as recommended in the latest draft by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission.

Here are the key provisions that need to be in the updated tree ordinance:

1. Expand the existing Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program, including 2-week public notice and posting on-site, as used by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) – to cover all Significant Trees (6" and larger diameter at breast height (DBH)) on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require the replacement of all Significant Trees removed with trees that in 25 years will reach equivalent canopy volume – either on site or pay a replacement fee into a City Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund. Allow the Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants and set up easements.
3. Retain current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24" DBH, protect tree groves and prohibit Significant Trees being removed on undeveloped lots.
4. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-Exceptional Trees in 3 years per lot outside development
5. Establish one citywide database for applying for Tree Removal and Replacement Permits and to track changes in the tree canopy.

6. Post online all permit requests and permit approvals for public viewing.
7. Expand SDOT's existing tree service provider's registration and certification to register all Tree Service Providers (arborists) working on trees in Seattle.
8. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Timothy Humes

britdanhuj@aol.com

5105 1st Ave NW

Seattle, Washington 98107