



SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Weston Brinkley (Position #3 – University), Chair • **Sarah Rehder** (Position #4 – Hydrologist), Vice-chair
Julia Michalak (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist) • **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) • **Blake Voorhees** (Position #9 – Realtor)
Elena Arakaki (Position #10 – Get Engaged)
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

May 5, 2021, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Via Webex call
(206) 207-1700
Meeting number: 146 442 5508
Meeting password: 1234

In-person meetings 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
Sarah Rehder - Vice-Chair
Elena Arakaki
Jessica Jones
David Moehring
Josh Morris
Shari Selch
Blake Voorhees
Michael Walton

Staff

Sandra Pinto Urrutia - OSE

Public

Tristan Fields
Jo Ann Herbert – Vashon resident
Michael Oxman
Steve Zemke

Absent- Excused

Julia Michalak
Elby Jones
Stuart Niven

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 did the land acknowledgement.

Public comment:

Jo Ann Herbert: She is a retired Nurse and has been living for the past 26 years in Vashon Island. She has seen a lot of concerning things about tree cutting. She has been working with King County on an issue along the highway. She was driving by the site of a stand of Norwegian Maples when she saw a truck with no sign on it. There were five people (one in a bucket truck) there and she approached them to ask what company they worked with and why were they cutting trees. They didn't identify themselves and told her to call King County. She believes community members deserve a response. She suggested to King County to have a local arborist assess the health of the trees. The company doing tree work should have the paperwork showing what they are doing.

Steve Zemke: He sent comments on SDCI's data collection to SDCI staff and he has not received a response. He wants to know if SDCI is still capturing information from the site plans. He believes the developer should do this, not City staff. He also wanted to give the UFC a heads up on an issue. CM Pedersen put in a proviso in last year's budget and the UFC should check the status. Also, the UFC should get started with the response to Council's Urban Forestry program SLI and make recommendations on how to handle trees in Seattle. There is a conflict of interest with SDCI.

Michael Oxman: Would like to urge the City of Seattle to implement a tree removal permit and two weeks posting notice.

Chair report:

Weston mentioned that this section at the beginning of the month would be the right place for coordinator and committee reports.

Sandra shared several items as part of the UFC Coordinator report:

- Position 11 recruitment: Applications for the UFC Environmental Justice position closed 4/29. Sandra is now managing the interview process.
- OSE recruitment: OSE will be hiring a temporary "out-of-class" position to provide seamless transition into the Urban Forestry Policy Advisor/UFC Coordinator role as Sandra retires. This is an internal opportunity for City of Seattle staff to have the opportunity to serve in this role for six months as OSE plans for the permanent position hiring expected to begin later this year.
- Annual UFC and Urban Forest Inter-departmental Team meeting: This year's meeting will take place in June 2 and will be a follow up to last year's Equity and Urban Forestry training.

Administrative committee:

- They would like to spend more time documenting the debriefing process after presentations and working on producing an outline of key points and course of action: recommendation, thank you letter, etc. Getting more clarity about the UFC position and opinion prior to writing drafts. It would be good to run draft letters by the Administrative committee prior to sharing them with the full group. This would allow for removal of the heavy letter editing lift out of meeting and allow for more robust discussion on policy.
- Commissioners were welcoming of this idea.

Adoption of April 7 and April 14 meeting notes

Commissioners reviewed and adopted the April meeting notes.

ACTION: A motion to approve the April 7 meeting notes as written was made, seconded, and approved.

ACTION: A motion to approve the April 14 meeting notes as amended was made, seconded, and approved.

Welcome letter to OSE new leadership

Josh walked the group through the draft letter he wrote. The Commission discussed and offered comments and input.

ACTION: A motion to approve the letter amended was made, seconded, and approved.

Thank you letter to SDOT on Permavoid presentation

Michael walked the group through the draft letter he wrote. Commissioners discussed the letter and offered ideas for amendments.

ACTION: A motion to approve the letter as amended was made, seconded, and approved.

SDCI tree tracking sheet discussion

David led the initial discussion and will be producing a first draft letter of recommendation to SDCI for discussion at next week's meeting.

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:

Jo Ann: statement of Seattle's value of trees. Encourage them to use a tree tracking sheet. UFC an educate the public on the importance of trees.

Michael Oxman: Council's LUN Committee had originally put in place a proviso to keep funding from SDCI until they deliver a tree ordinance.

Steve Zemke: gentrification can be any improvement: a new school, putting a sidewalk... tree planting is the same. Consider the value to people's health as well. Yes, it's a concern but we are trying to improve the health of the community. For many years Seattle has been attempting to update tree regulations. Other communities have done it. Tree tracking is just one piece of the effort. UFC needs to urge City Council to take action.

Adjourn: Weston adjourned the meeting.

Content of the meeting's chat:

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:56 PM

Concern with gentrification - is upgrading a school for instance gentrification or a benefit to community living in area. Trees are the same- providing health benefit to living in a community. Should we not do it because it is possible gentrification?

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:08 PM

City needs to track trees being replaced also, not just trees lost. Exceptional trees and trees over 24" DBH need to be replaced under SMC 25.11.090 are supposed to be repaced.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:12 PM

Need to ask what process city is using to get developers to tally tree loss and replacement like Portland Oregon is doing.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:17 PM

Should recommend developers need to get permits to remove any trees and posting of permit applications on site and on line so community knows what is happening.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:26 PM

Should ask for as much information as helps understand what is happening. Basically is a tree inventory. UFC has asked in past to also include photos of trees on site.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:27 PM

require quarterly reporting of tree loss and replacemnt as city departments are now required to do.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:33 PM

Responding to david - tree loss and replacementtracking is meant to be ongoing as sandra said other city departments are already required to do.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:39 PM

Urge people check what Portland is doing on tree tracking - Portland is miles ahead of Seattle in collecting tree data and using it to guide what happens during development.

See Create a Tree Inventory and Tree Plan

Here is Their28 page guide on using Excell for their Tree Code requirements. Tree Code - Excell Tool - user Manual

Survey points for example include survey point number, Northing (y axis), Easting (x Axis), elevation, data collect code, deciduous or evergreen, common species name, log number, DBH, canopy radius, RPZ radius, notes. see e-mail I sent as link is not being transferred

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:42 PM

<https://www.portland.gov/trees/trees-development/capital-improvement-projects/create-tree-inventory-and-tree-plan>

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:43 PM

<https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2020/cip-tree-inventory-user-manual.pdf>

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:48 PM

<https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2020-08/tree-removal-replanting-permit-application.pdf>

Portland now requires permits for trees removed outside development footprint.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:50 PM

<https://www.portland.gov/trees/treepermits/do-i-need-tree-permit/tree-requirements-building-permits>

from Michael Oxman (privately): 4:55 PM

Simple tree inventory <https://shop.arborday.org/23-how-to-conduct-a-street-tree-inventory>

Public input: (see next page and posted notes)

From: dmoehring@consultant.com <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Sent: Sunday, March 14, 2021 11:18 AM

To: PRC <PRC@seattle.gov>

Cc: Treepac <Treepac@groups.outlook.com>; Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; FIREPDR <FIREPDR@seattle.gov>

Subject: Arborist assessment of remaining trees with stumps and groves

CAUTION: External Email

Seattle PRC,

Northeastern Seattle's clear-cutting of properties continues unchecked. Seattle needs strengthened enforcement of tree protection requirements within SMC 23.24, SMC 25.11, and other Seattle Municipal Codes.

Please note the collage of images from this Cedar Park area property at 3532 NE 134TH ST from the SDCI EDMS. Given the images of large trees and tree stumps, provide and carefully review an arborist assessment of tree groves and exceptional trees. The evidence of trees removed may also be found from the 2017 site plan. How are trees being removed on a previous permit application? There does not appear to be permits issued to remove the trees.

The existing 11,618 sq. ft property (within a SF-7200 zone) is being proposed to be subdivided into two long narrow lots with SDCI project #3037750-LU so that related permits may include new buildings that will result in additional tree removal.

The Seattle Fire Department needs to review the required emergency access to the lot and splitting it into two lots. The dead-end street is about 275 feet in length, exceeding the maximum 150-foot length without a fire truck turnaround.

Moreover, the resulting lot sizes with one being just 5,479 sq. ft. is too small at 76% of the minimum 7,200 sq ft lot size. Please verify surveys, especially including the provisions for emergency vehicle turnaround at the end of a dead-end street. The survey is missing adjacent property bordering trees and structures.

Thank you for allowing these comments to PRC@seattle.gov.

David Moehring
TreePAC board member

Neighbors that SDCI should contact:

CLINEY, DANIEL	3512 NE 134TH ST
WILLING, KENT	3505 NE 134TH ST
EGAN, ELIZABETH ANNE	3519 NE 134TH ST
DEARDORFF, PIPER D	3518 NE 134TH ST
CLARK, PEGGY+SHEMET MELISSA	13241 37TH AVE NE
CLARK, PEGGY ANN	13247 37TH AVE NE
GALLAWAY, DOROTHYK	13235 37TH AVE NE
SCHOEN, JASON+LAUREN	13227 37TH AVE NE
BRADY-SHERWOOD, Carolyn	13223 37TH AVE NE
DOHERTY, TRACY	13217 37TH AVE NE
ATKINS, VANCE	13211 37TH AVE NE
LOMER, G BRUCE & ANNE	13215 37TH AVE NE
BURKE, BRIAN+AIMEE FULLERTON	13214 37TH AVE NE
STRAUSZ, DAVID III+HILARY AT	3605 NE 135TH ST
MOUNCE, STEVEN S	3641 NE 135TH ST
BOYD, KEEGAN	3601 NE 135TH ST
PENN, AMANDA	3526 NE 134TH ST
YAN, RAN	13230 35TH AVE NE

From: Stuart Niven <panorarbor@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:38 PM

To: David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Cc: PRC <PRC@seattle.gov>; Treepac <Treepac@groups.outlook.com>; Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; FIREPDR <FIREPDR@seattle.gov>

Subject: Re: Arborist assessment of remaining trees with stumps and groves

CAUTION: External Email

Thank you David, I second your comments.

Thank you and kind regards,

Stuart Niven, BA (Hons)

PanorArborist

www.panorarbor.com

[ISA Certified Arborist PN-7245A & Tree Risk Assessment Qualification \(TRAQ\)](#)

[Arborist on Seattle Audubon Society Conservation Committee](#)

[Arborist on Seattle's Urban Forestry Commission](#)

[Board Member of TreePAC](#)

[WA Lic# PANORL*852P1](#) (Click to link to WA L&I's Verify a Contractor Page)

From: Judith Starbuck <judithstarbuck@msn.com>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 3:43 PM

To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>

Subject: Please Strengthen Seattle's Tree Ordinance

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

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.

Judith Starbuck

judithstarbuck@msn.com

1126 GRAND AVE

SEATTLE, Washington 98122

From: dmoehring@consultant.com <dmoehring@consultant.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 11:58 AM
To: PRC <PRC@seattle.gov>
Cc: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; sdot_la@seattle.gov
Subject: Duwamish Tree grove clearing for 3 new houses and opening of street

CAUTION: External Email

Thank you for allowing public comment.

The limited tree canopy within the Duwamish valley at 1211 to 1219 S TRENTON ST is proposed to be thinned even further, resulting in greater disparity and loss of equitable environment compared to other parts of Seattle:

Project: 3033333-LU

Area: West Seattle

Notice Date: 3/18/2021

Project Description

Land use application to allow a 2-story single family dwelling unit. Parking for 2 vehicles proposed.
Comments may be submitted through: 03/31/2021

And

Application for project 3037675-LU

(Click for complete notice information)

Address: 1211 S TRENTON ST Project: 3037675-LU

Area: West Seattle

Notice Date: 3/18/2021

Project Description

Land use application to allow a 2-story single family dwelling unit. Parking for 2 vehicles proposed.
Comments may be submitted through: 03/31/2021

And

Application for project 3037676-LU

(Click for complete notice information)

Address: 1215 S TRENTON ST Project: 3037676-LU

Area: West Seattle

Notice Date: 3/18/2021

Project Description

Land use application to allow a 2-story single family dwelling unit. Parking for 2 vehicles proposed.
Comments may be submitted through: 03/31/2021

How will this project account for tree canopy replacement per provisions of the code?

David Moehring

Board member

TreePAC



Sent using the mobile mail app

From: Stuart Niven <panorarbor@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 6:41 AM

To: David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Cc: PRC <PRC@seattle.gov>; Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; sdot_la@seattle.gov

Subject: Re: Duwamish Tree grove clearing for 3 new houses and opening of street

CAUTION: External Email

Thank you David, I second your question about this project.

Thank you and kind regards,

Stuart Niven, BA (Hons)

PanorArborist

www.panorarbor.com

[ISA Certified Arborist PN-7245A & Tree Risk Assessment Qualification \(TRAQ\)](#)

[Arborist on Seattle Audubon Society Conservation Committee](#)

[Arborist on Seattle's Urban Forestry Commission](#)

[Board Member of TreePAC](#)

[WA Lic# PANORL*852P1](#) (Click to link to WA L&I's Verify a Contractor Page)

From: Margaret Staeheli <mpegrose@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 9:32 PM
To: Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>
Cc: noah.an@seattl.gov; Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>
Subject: Tree Code

CAUTION: External Email

City Council members:

I want to once again express my deep disappointment and frustration at the circular process city council continues to follow regarding trees in Seattle.

I volunteered my time on the Urban Forestry Commission - at a time when both my family and my business required considerable attention. Thus the Commission volunteer was my "free time" more than 12 years have passed -. I am volunteering outside of city process now because very little happened.

Then- remember 2020- a newly elected with CM Strauss had a hearing- over a year and half ago- I attended and spoke- at that time you and other CM's said you would finally direct city staff to get the code updated. COVID 19 is no excuse. The work and framework had been done. You just needed to direct city staff. You said you would move forward but you went sideways or what I feel is backwards.

Now I hear you are hiring a consultant to review Seattle resident attitudes toward trees - really - why suddenly go backwards. Please explain- if it is pressure from the development community then just say it- I can accept that fact- I can no longer accept the council spin. The reality is creative, dynamic cities have housing and trees. Figure out how to use the space in our land. Be honest and transparent with your reasoning.

Please take two half days and "drive" around the whole city- look at the trees on new housing - where they are placed- what species. Understand street trees are fine, park trees are fine but the SDOT trees will not create canopy in our neighborhoods

I encourage you to move on adopt the UFC code recommendations.

Peg Staeheli
West Seattle
Sent from my iPhone

From: heidi calyxsite.com <heidi@calyxsite.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2021 8:21 AM

To: Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>

Cc: NoahAn@Seattle.gov; Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>

Subject: Comments in support of adopting a tree ordinance-

Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email

March 24, 2021

Dear Councilman Strauss and Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee:

The Council--- driven by existing conditions across Seattle, our current rate of cutting 3,000-4,000 trees a year, profligate use of fraudulent hazard tree determinations, fire smoke, high heat island index, and the diminishing of, and continued assault on, communities of color—all speak to your incumbent responsibility to adopt a tree ordinance.

Two years ago, we passed Resolution 31902. While there has been some good progress, we seem to be stuck resolutely in a continuous loop of studying an issue to death. While you are conducting your community outreach between March and June, please use existing community groups which are already involved in green infrastructure, tree protection and gentrification issues as well as climate. Climate alone should drive your decision to adopt a tree ordinance.

<https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/environment/amid-climate-crisis-a-proposal-to-save-washington-state-forests-for-carbon-storage-not-logging/>

We had not had an updated ordinance in over 12 years which is clearly unacceptable.

A City audit and two Tree Regulations Reports later, the City still seems unable to adopt an ordinance. Perhaps it's because the developer community sits at the Council and Mayor's doors on an ongoing basis? It's strains credulity to come up with any other set of excuses since you have a stellar UFC and expertise at your disposal as well as every conceivable basis for taking action.

You must do what SDCI- the center of an obvious conflict of interest (construction department the head of tree regulations? Dur),--cannot and will not do. Please do what you know is right.

And please don't say you support communities of color, underserved communities while letting these patterns of destruction run unabated. Do something and do the right thing. This is an easy fix if you use your common sense, research and your own moral compass to do what needs to be done. Pass the ordinance.

Please share this note with the rest of your Committee and please put in the public records for the UFC. Thank you for taking action today to adopt the ordinance.

All the best,
Heidi Siegelbaum.

Heidi Siegelbaum
Heidi@calyxsite.com

(206) 784-4265

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/HeidiSiegelbaum>

From: Ruth Alice Williams <ruthalice@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2021 1:18 PM

To: Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; Juarez, Debora <Debora.Juarez@seattle.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <Teresa.Mosqueda@seattle.gov>; Pedersen, Alex <Alex.Pedersen@seattle.gov>; Gonzalez, Lorena <Lorena.Gonzalez@seattle.gov>; Lewis, Andrew <Andrew.Lewis@seattle.gov>

Cc: An, Noah <Noah.An@seattle.gov>; Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; Emery, Chanda <Chanda.Emery@Seattle.gov>

Subject: Tree Protection Planning and Parking Requirements North of 85th Street

CAUTION: External Email

Dear City Council Land Use and Neighborhoods committee members:

Tree Protection:

I am very pleased to see that there has been progress in enforcing the regulations we have in place and in improving documentation of the existing tree canopy. And now we are presented with a detailed plan and schedule for crafting the tree protection ordinance we've awaited so long. Please don't allow this to go through the public process and then evaporate as all the earlier ones have done. Seattle needs our trees protected now, not by-and-by when they are already gone.

To cite just one example of the damage being done now, not far from my home there are plans for an eight-story, 345,300 sq. ft., multi-family project at 10631 8th Avenue NE (3035925-LU). The applicants propose to remove 29 mature trees, including, seven giant sequoias, and completely mitigate the loss by planting seven vine maples.

We need to keep the ‘Emerald City’ green and healthy by valuing our trees enough to protect them and to work for no net loss of canopy and ecoservices.

Cars:

The Transit Oriented Development Overlay for Northgate allows the construction of multi-family projects with minimal or no parking. This is going on in neighborhoods where there are few sidewalks. (The City never saw fit to fund them north of 85th Street.)

This policy is causing growing congestion in the public rights-of-way and creating hazards for pedestrians. ‘Getting people out of their cars’ is not the same thing as discouraging car ownership, and SEPA reviews are often too lax to catch these problems.

We all anticipate the convenience of the coming Sound Transit train stations and the improvements in our bus services, but over night they aren’t going to cause most or even many of Seattle’s 81% who own cars to stop owning and housing them. Besides, we would do well to note that in New York City only 45% own cars, but even so, the streets are jammed, and parking costs are steep.

At the same time, we need to remember that the gig economy largely runs on the backs of poor people with cars.

The problems are complex, and with the increased density we hope for, we need to become drastically more creative and proactive in coping with private transportation. But in the meantime, please beef up those SEPA reviews.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,
Ruth Williams
1219 NE 107th St.
Seattle, 98125

From: heidi calyxsite.com <heidi@calyxsite.com>

Sent: Sunday, March 28, 2021 11:51 AM

To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>; Stuart Niven <panorarbor@gmail.com>

Subject: Concerns about company's advice on which trees to keep during construction

CAUTION: External Email

<https://www.washingtontreeexperts.net/protect-trees-construction/>

For your next UFC meeting (if you have room), please discuss how the City of Seattle addresses false or misleading information regarding tree care and removal. While the ISA material below may be accurate, to put this on a consumer oriented web site is misleading. “Trees that can blow over easily?” Really- this seems pretty complex.

The [ISA outlines the following criteria](#) for groups of trees considered within an Excellent Stand Protection Zone, or a zone of trees that is healthy and should be protected:

- Healthy soil
- Prevalent wildlife
- Ecological function
- Natural forest succession and regeneration

Criteria for groups of trees that may be considered in Poor Stand Protection Zone, or a zone of trees that is unhealthy and may be a hazard to the community include:

- **Trees that can blow over easily**
- Sparse forest areas
- Poor soil and erosion
- Prevalent weeds and invasive species

Heidi Siegelbaum

Heidi@calyxsite.com

(206) 784-4265

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/HeidiSiegelbaum>

From: Chris Covert-Bowlds <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Sunday, March 28, 2021 2:29 PM

To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>

Subject: Please adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

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.

Chris Covert-Bowlds
c.covertbowlds@gmail.com
523 N 84th St
Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Patricia Murphy <murphy.patricia@live.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 28, 2021 10:33 PM
To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

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.

Patricia Murphy

murphy.patricia@live.com

8835 Burke Ave N

Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Sophie Newland <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 10:15 AM
To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please Strengthen Seattle's Tree Ordinance

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

I have a personal story about why the Seattle Tree Ordinance is essential to equitable retention of Seattle's mature trees - and why it is not yet fully sufficient to help tree owners without excess resources to defend mature trees against threats from wealthier Seattle neighbors demanding more sunshine and less needles in their backyards.

We are being legally threatened by our two wealthier neighbors if we do not remove two of the three mature Western Cedar Trees from our yard because they don't like the needle debris in the Fall, although sunshine issues are also mentioned. These neighbors and their lawyer have no problem bending the truth and manufacturing issues to support their threatening letters and predicting great legal costs to us if they don't get their way. Today they rejected our proposal provided by a ISA certified arborist to remove only one of the three cedar trees (two trunked, diameter at 4.5 feet = 15" and 21") and prune for maintenance the remaining two trees (diameters at 4.5 feet = 45" and 21"). I am not sure what we will do; but thankfully we are unable to consider their repeated threatening requests that we top the upper 50 feet of the 75 foot tall Exceptional Tree (45" diameter) protected by the existing Seattle Tree Ordinance.

Ideally Seattle would lower the diameter threshold to protect smaller, but still significant trees, for example the cedar tree in our yard with a 21" diameter at 4.5 feet, but in any case this is a real-world example about why the Seattle Tree Protection Ordinance is essential to equity - it helps less wealthy property owners defend mature trees against neighbors with abundant resources and unscrupulous lawyers.

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.

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.

Sophie Newland

sophvannew@yahoo.com

3632 41st Ave W

Seattle, Washington 98199

From: Sophie Newland <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 10:20 AM
To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

I have a personal story about why the Seattle Tree Ordinance is essential to equitable retention of Seattle's mature trees - and why it is not yet fully sufficient to help tree owners without excess resources to defend mature trees against threats from wealthier Seattle neighbors demanding more sunshine and less needles in their backyards.

We are being legally threatened by our two wealthier neighbors if we do not remove two of the three mature Western Cedar Trees from our yard because they don't like the needle debris in the Fall, although sunshine issues are also mentioned. These neighbors and their lawyer have no problem bending the truth and manufacturing issues to support their threatening letters and predicting great legal costs to us if they don't get their way. Today they rejected our proposal provided by a ISA certified arborist to remove only one of the three cedar trees (two trunked, diameter at 4.5 feet = 15" and 21") and prune for maintenance the remaining two trees (diameters at 4.5 feet = 45" and 22"). I am not sure what we will do; but thankfully we are unable to consider their repeated threatening requests that we top the upper 50 feet of the 75 foot tall Exceptional Tree (45" diameter) protected by the existing Seattle Tree Ordinance.

Ideally Seattle would lower the diameter threshold to protect smaller, but still significant trees, for example the cedar tree with a 22" diameter, but in any case this is a real-world example about why the Seattle Tree Protection Ordinance is essential to equity - it helps less wealthy property owners defend mature trees against neighbors with abundant resources and unscrupulous lawyers.

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

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.

Sophie Newland

sophvannew@yahoo.com

3632 41st Ave W

Seattle, Washington 98199

From: Siegelbaum, Heidi <heidi.siegelbaum@wsu.edu>

Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 10:31 AM

To: Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; Emery, Chanda <Chanda.Emery@Seattle.gov>; David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Subject: Public Tools for citizens- geared to land use planning- May 13th Opportunity for the city

Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email

ADVERTISEMENT

[Learn how to give constituents the tools and confidence to manage their development and planning goals](#)

Join us on May 13 alongside panelists from two leading local governments — LA County and City of Marco Island. Get best practices for adopting virtual citizen self-service, training your customers, and transforming your organization's relationship with citizens and developers from one of regulation to collaboration.

Heidi Siegelbaum
Stormwater Strategic Initiative Lead

Washington Stormwater Center at Washington State University

Heidi.Siegelbaum@wsu.edu

(253) 445-4502
Home office: (206) 784-4265

<https://wastormwatercenter.org>

<https://pugetsoundestuary.wa.gov>

From: Judith Leshner <jack2729rabbit@earthlink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 10:17 PM

To: council@seattle.gov; Lewis, Andrew <Andrew.Lewis@seattle.gov>

Cc: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>; Emery, Chanda <Chanda.Emery@Seattle.gov>; Torgelson, Nathan <Nathan.Torgelson@seattle.gov>; Friends of Seattle's Urban Forest <steve@friends.urbanforests.org>; TreeAmbassador <TreeAmbassador@seattle.gov>

Subject: Take Action on Updating Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

CAUTION: External Email

Good Day:

Monday morning, May 3, I heard a chainsaw nearby so I walked a block to find workers from Seattle Tree Care taking down a small birch tree and noticed that a big red oak was also slightly limbed and asked if they were taking that tree down, too. Yes. The owner wants it down. I asked about a permit and they assured me that they had a permit and were knowledgeable about Seattle's Tree Ordinance. Here again was a beautiful, healthy and valuable tree being cut down.

Why are you members of the City Council so reluctant to act to adopt the painstaking work done by so many people to update the current tree ordinance? This lost healthy tree will no longer provide shade or clean our air and water. And, this needless destruction will continue to occur throughout our city until you people recognize how truly costly this is to all of us.

Seattle Tree Care used Director's Rule 16-2008 showing the list of trees with red and pin oaks at 2 feet 6 inches. This is outdated. They sent me a picture showing the tape measure on the tree. If you had updated the Tree Protection Ordinance, this tree would still be standing.

Attached are some pictures to help you see the loss. Please finish this work. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Judith Leshner
2568 10th Ave W
Seattle, WA 98119
jack2729rabbit@earthlink.net





From: Janet Way <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Friday, May 7, 2021 7:59 AM
To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

It is way past time to pass this Tree Ordinance!

Save existing trees Seattle! This summer the Heat Island Effect will again become obvious!

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.

Janet Way

janetway@yahoo.com

940 NE 147th St
Shoreline , Washington 98155

From: Patricia Murphy <murphy.patricia@live.com>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 8:18 PM
To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

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.

Patricia Murphy

murphy.patricia@live.com

8835 Burke Ave N

Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Patricia Murphy <murphy.patricia@live.com>

Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 8:22 PM

To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>

Subject: Please Strengthen Seattle's Tree Ordinance

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

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.

Patricia Murphy

murphy.patricia@live.com

8835 Burke Ave N

Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Jon Michael Willson <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 9:53 PM

To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>

Subject: Please Update Seattle's Tree Ordinance

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

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.

Jon Michael Willson

debrouillard777@hotmail.com

1358 West Armour Street

Seattle, Washington 98119

From: Jon Michael Willson <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 9:57 PM
To: Pinto Urrutia, Sandra <Sandra.PintoUrrutia@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please adopt, with amendments, SDCI's Director's Rule 13-2020

CAUTION: External Email

Sandra Pinto de Bader,

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.

Jon Michael Willson

debrouillard777@hotmail.com

1358 West Armour Street

Seattle, Washington 98119
