

## Urban Forestry Commission (UFC)

September 7, 2011

### Meeting Notes

Seattle Municipal Tower Room 2750  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Seattle  
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

*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*

### Attending

#### Commissioners

Matt Mega (MM) – chair  
John Small (JS) – vice chair  
Nancy Bird (NB)  
John Floberg (JF)  
Peg Staeheli (PS)  
Tom Early (TE)

#### **Absent- Excused**

Gordon Bradley (GB)  
John Hushagen (JH)  
Jeff Reibman (JR)

#### Staff

Sandra Pinto de Bader (SPdB) - OSE  
Brennon Staley (BS)

#### Public

Steve Zemke (SZ)  
Max Silver (MS)  
Michael Oxman (MO)

### Call to Order

MM – called the meeting to order

### Public Comment

SZ – sent document with email links on tree ordinances from different cities. Tree wiki information for Philadelphia and San Francisco also included in handout. Thinks we should do this in Seattle. Portland now has a tree ordinance that will begin enforcement in 2013. Have 1:1 replacement policy and a tree planting and preservation fund. Portland is leading the way.

MO – Has been monitoring tree situation with some things going well and others are not going well. The public meeting with SCL and Shoreline resident didn't accept public comment. Six arborists were in attendance. There are 30 arborists in the City and they do not meet. UFC should meet with them. At 83<sup>rd</sup> and Aurora a 32" DBH sweet gum was removed due to a sewer problem. Due to ADA issues they will not replant the site. Need to look at ADA and find some other way to replant. Some trees at intersections are grand fathered and won't be replaced. In the case of Ingraham HS proper tree protection required by permit is not in place.

### Approve August 3 and August 10 meeting notes

**ACTION: A motion was made to approve the August 3 meeting notes as amended. The motion was seconded and carried.**

**ACTION: A motion was made to approve the August 10 meeting notes as written. The motion was seconded and carried. NB and JS abstained.**

**Tree Standards position paper – vote**

JF walked UFC through the revised document. When people search the web for ‘planting in Seattle’ we are not getting what we want. Let’s make it simple and get exactly what we want so that any person can plant a tree and understand the process. Take out the idea that this is regulatory. The information can be use to inform regulation making but it’s not a regulatory document.

PS – what are next steps? Vote and take it to IDT meeting?

MM – Not to this first IDT meeting. We have been holding these position papers and maybe we can have the IDT vet them before sending them to Council and Mayor?

PS – should start getting position papers out to test the waters. Post on the web and let staff know we are looking at this issues.

MM – could be used as next steps at IDT meeting.

BS – from our perspective a comprehensive re-design of website will happen around September of 2012. Once we have new street tree ordinance, new tree regulations, and an updated UFMP then the website can be updated

JF – each piece should be placed in that context come next fall

PS – need to tee up things

NB – You are talking about posting on UFC website. Get the IDT to weigh in and comment and then as the time comes it’s ready

JF – Give the public the opportunity to comment

MM – As soon as we adopt the document it goes on our website for public comment. Drive more traffic to the documents. I think getting the content done is a priority. We also need to have a conversation on how we discuss it. It’s a good idea to bring it to IDT meeting.

JF – IDT doesn’t have a public section for documents maybe we can be the conduit to share information with the public?

MM – that would be the reLeaf website

TE – Can we put the document in Word format for people to provide input tracking changes?

MM – It's better if it's a .pdf and people can comment at meetings. We would adopt the document and post it but not send it.

MM – MM – likes the introduction change. It clarifies things for people. When we are talking about 30 sqft and 300-500 cubic feet of soil...

PS – that's getting into the weeds. Keep it simple and from a layman's perspective. It's a good place to start and send message about space

JF – another important point from last meeting is the need to visualize future potential tree growth

MM – I also like showing references for people to go to find out more

JS – Curious to see what other Commissioners think about the first sentence. Focusing on the 30% number is missing the forest for the trees. We could add something along the lines of "tree standards are necessary to build a healthy urban forest ..." We don't want to hang our hat on a number that could change.

MM, PS – like that

**ACTION: A motion was made to adopt the position paper as amended. The motion was seconded and carried.**

**Finalize UFC messaging document - vote**

MM – we were going to add an FAQ section in the back. We can brainstorm on what questions we could include. Any comments on the document as it is written?

TE – question on where the goal came from? Derived from the bylaws? How did the goal originated

MM – along the way it has been an implicit goal for the UFC. Wanting the UF to be seen as urban infrastructure.

MM – the italicized sections are the most important.

PS – can put in a card to carry around

JF – It's interesting that adding the piece 'green'. Nobody doubts that it's part of the urban green infrastructure. Adding 'green' puts it in a subcategory.

PS – we want the urban forest on the same place as water lines

NB – Likes the idea of taking out 'green'

MM – I'm okay with taking 'green out' but then we'll need to define 'urban infrastructure'

SPdB - that could be one of the FAQs...

NB – is there anything we want to put in the primary objectives around outreach? Understanding public concerns and helping bridge the gap?

MM - we could add that as fourth objective

PS – provide format for dialogue for the community. A bridge implies a gap. But would like to express something in a more positive light

JF – if we are doing outreach it should serve to the overarching goal of advising the Mayor and Council. We can spend all out effort having open meetings on trees. We need to define it so it functions in a meaningful way.

MM – Jeff would argue that we are technical experts. How we take public comment to help us provide advice. We can't make decisions for the public.

PS – public dialogue to assist us in our advice.

NB – I don't know what it takes to get a feed from updates to our website

SPdB – I send an email to the Commission and the community when I post new documents on the website

JF – how is this document going to be used?

MM – this is to be used by Commissioners as they see fit. First piece of literature to be used with public. As companion piece to media inquiries.

NB – for everybody to be on the same page.

JF – would everyone answer similarly when asked what is 'vegetation'

PS – That is what it says. I thought it was interesting that it was included.

SPdB – unless the term is included in the FAQ in the back and we all agree on what it should mean

PS – it's important to make the point that vegetation still has value and not just pave under trees. We need that undergrowth

JS – it's useful in terms of having an ecosystem and layers of vegetation

PS – tree and grass alone overtime are not the healthiest condition

MM – for me it was put in there for wildlife. It helps connectivity through the ground. In our FAQs we want to refer back to Seattle reLeaf as well? We don't want to get too much into the details but it's good to provide links to more information

JS – what functions does the UF provides. Use that as a starting point. What threatens the health of the UF

NB – management?

MM – Sandra and I will work on finishing the document

SPdB – when they go to the Urban Forest Management Plan

NB – Provide a way for people to get the information they need

SPdB – I can be the contact and direct people to the right person and department

MM – we are getting a long list...

PS – As long as we don't have more than 7-10 questions

**Finalize UF IDT/UFC meeting agenda - vote**

SPdB – OSE was able to find funding to hire a facilitator to help us with the IDT/UFC meeting. We are hiring Brad Khan to facilitate the meeting so Matt and I can participate. We met with him last week to work on an agenda based on input provided by Commissioners. We also put together a survey to gather information from IDT and UFC members to have a productive discussion at the meeting. You probably already received the survey. Sandra walked through the proposed agenda with its four main sections: Big Picture Q&A, Barriers and Opportunities for implementing UFMP goals, Wish list for the 2012 UFMP update, and the path forward

PS – I think it's great

JF \_ It's nice to have the structure. When new plan comes out different agencies will be writing the plan and UFC will advise the IDT on the update. Will the public have a chance to comment?

SPdB – yes it's part of the process

MM – Sandra will be the project manager and in her dual role is great.

JF – some of our advice can be challenging... and it gets incorporated

SPdB – yes

MM – Gordon had the idea of a matrix for City departments can report on goals and accomplishments. This would provide a master sheet with check marks.

PS – would we want to make roles and inputs more formal? Clarify our role and each of the departments' roles and for them to know that we will be looking at metrics tracking.

NB – as preparation for the meeting it would be helpful for departments to put together a one-pager, including the UFC, this could be a good tool for understanding how complex some of the processes are. Roles might be redundant in some areas, not clearly defined in other areas, etc. Sheet to include: Role, UF vision, priorities, organization, regulatory role, budget.

PS – do you know if that one-page sheet is available

SPdB – it can be created

PS – it might be in the UFMP

SPdB – I would like to have the exercise to be new for people to create and give to me so they can start getting involved in the process.

PS – NYC has one document on which agencies are involved in their streets. I'll send it out.

JF – the last UFMP was created without the benefit of the UFC. There needs to be education for the IDT to understand the UFC role and make sure they don't go and write the plan by themselves

SPdB – now that I have this role, being part of the IDT, the Project Manager for the UFMP update and given that I'm staffing the UFC I will make sure there are points in time where UFC comments on the update.

JF – important to know what the process will be like.

MM – Sandra will be sharing the timeline

SPdB – we talked about forming working groups for UFC to provide input as the plan gets updated

MM – excellent point to get folks involved in different roles. Do we want more time for that section of the agenda?

NB – Brad can get a sense on how the event is flowing and allocate enough time for the different pieces

SPdB – if we have the one-pagers we can avoid lengthy presentations and shorten the Q&A section and add time to the last section. This is the first meeting, we could meet twice a year or quarterly.

NB – also include their budget. You can figure out the politics by looking at the budget.

JF – it would be nice to know if UF is not the priority for the department

SPdB – they'll be able to give us information they have available. For example in SDOT, urban forestry is part of one of nine divisions

PS – if I'm looking at a budget and we talk about pedestrian environment improvements and if trees are already considered we might be double dipping... getting information on budget is complicated.

NB – we just need order of magnitude

SPdB – and historic trends. Goals are the same and budget is smaller. Budget is an important conversation to have.

PS – it's important to understand the budget in order of magnitude.

NB – if data is available we could use it. When are done we can have a conversation (recap) one of the issues is that there are high-priority needs for trees and the budget is not appropriately allocated.

JS – look at the departments' budget: planting, maintenance, pruning (routing and emergency), outreach, and overhead coordination.

## **New business and announcements**

PS – Urban Forestry in SDOT has a new director: Barbara Gray  
Great City members met with City team to talk about Green Seattle Partnership

MM - How much do we want to get into individual projects such as Bell Street Park? Maybe have some threshold such as how much canopy there is now, how much will be lost due to project, how much will be gained in the future and when...

TE – and how quickly will the canopy grow back if canopy is replaced?

PS – Good to dig down on some issues such as ADA. There are new rules for ROW that are very clear now. Working session down the line...

MM – We also need to start working on next year's work plan and producing the annual report

JS – meeting with the IDT is a good opportunity to look at programmatic activities, then look at project specific next.

PS – there are no clear guidelines on projects. Should have thresholds

SPdB – To clarify the IDT/UFC agenda, the last piece would be Roles and Input moving forward? To clarify roles and update process as well as touch points for UFC input

MM – The UFMP is a high level plan. The details will be in an implementation strategy document that will be put together after the plan is updated.

SPdB – the five-year implementation strategy

## **Adjourn**

### **Public communications:**

**From:** Steve Zemke [mailto:stevezemke@msn.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 07, 2011 11:45 AM

**To:** Pinto\_de\_Bader, Sandra

**Subject:** Updated resource links on tree survey wikis, info on tree permits by city and Portlan's new tree ordinance.

Hi Sandra,

Please forward the following information prepared by Save the Trees- Seattle to the Urban Forestry Commission and post as public comment for today's meeting. It is research done on links to tree survey wikis and tree permit systems in the NW and other cities. Also included are links to Portland's new tree ordinance they passed on April 13, 2011.

Steve Zemke - Chair

Save the Trees - Seattle

## OpenTreeMap – wiki for tree inventory

"In April Azavea, a geospatial analysis (GIS) software development company launched PhillyTreeMap.org, a wiki-inspired geographic urban tree inventory application that enables the general public to collaborate with Philadelphia Parks & Recreation, the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society (PHS), and other local groups to map trees in the 13-county, 3-state Philadelphia region. ... Azavea announces that the code of the [PhillyTreeMap.org](http://PhillyTreeMap.org) project is released as open source software under the name OpenTreeMap, and is freely available at: <https://github.com/azavea/OpenTreeMap>."

<http://www.azavea.com/products/opentreemap/> - company which produced wiki - open tree map

San Francisco:

<http://dirt.asla.org/2010/06/02/san-franciscos-urban-forest-map-calculates-value-of-ecosystem-services/>  
- info on San Francisco wiki

<http://www.urbanforestmap.org/> wiki site for San Francisco

<http://www.fuf.net/about/index.html> - website for Friends of the Urban Forest - San Francisco

Philadelphia:

<http://technicallyphilly.com/2011/05/17/phillytreemap-org-crowdsourced-census-of-philadelphias-tree-canopy> - philly tree map article with links

<http://phillytreemap.org/> - Philadelphia wiki site

## tree permit information:

Information on Tree Permits in Tree Ordinances in various cities – updated 9/4/2011

### **Seattle – existing tree permit requirements**

<http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/treepruning.htm> - general information SDOT

<http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/docs/TREEPRUNINGAPP-42806.pdf> - SDOT printed permit form

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/publications/cam/cam242.pdf> - DPD Tree Permits CAM 242

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/publications/cam/cam331B.pdf> - CAM 331b – Hazard Trees



## **Seattle – DPD proposal opposing tree permits**

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@treeregulation/documents/web\\_informational/dpdp019340.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@treeregulation/documents/web_informational/dpdp019340.pdf) - DPD tree de-regulation proposal

<http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/docs/Archive/2010/2010%20documents/Permit%20Discussion%20Presentation%20101103.pdf> – DPD presentation to UFC on tree removal permits

[http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@treeregulation/documents/web\\_informational/dpds017734.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@treeregulation/documents/web_informational/dpds017734.pdf) - summary of Pacific Northwest Municipal Tree Regulations done for DPD

## **Seattle Urban Forestry Commission**

<http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/docs/Final%20issued%20docs/Recommendations/ADOPTED%20Tree%20Removal%20Permit%20Position%20Paper%20020711.pdf> – UFC position paper supporting tree permits

## **Other City Specific information on permits**

### **Compilation of NW cities**

[http://www.soundarbor.com/index.php?p=1\\_14\\_Permit-Required](http://www.soundarbor.com/index.php?p=1_14_Permit-Required) – compilation by Sound Arbor

<http://www.mrsc.org/subjects/environment/urbanforest/trees.aspx> - Tree Conservation, Management and Protection Ordinance Provisions. Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington, 2011

### **Bainbridge Island, WA**

<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/bainbridge/BainbridgeIsland16/BainbridgeIsland1622.html#16.22>

### **Bellevue, WA**

[http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/L-8\\_TreeRemove\\_SingFam.pdf](http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/L-8_TreeRemove_SingFam.pdf) - Tree Removal

[http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/L-27a\\_TreePresrv.pdf](http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/L-27a_TreePresrv.pdf) - Tree Preservation. Bridal Trails

[http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/L-27\\_TreePreservation.pdf](http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/L-27_TreePreservation.pdf) - Tree Preservation

### **Bellingham, WA**

<http://www.cob.org/services/recreation/parks-trails/trees.aspx> - trees in the City of Bellingham

<http://www.cob.org/documents/planning/applications-forms/222-street-tree-permit-app.pdf>

**Kirkland, WA**

[http://kirklandcode.ecitygov.net/KirklandZC\\_html/kzc95.html](http://kirklandcode.ecitygov.net/KirklandZC_html/kzc95.html) - tree code current to 2011

<http://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Tree+Removal+Guide.pdf> 5/11/2011

**Issaquah, WA**

<http://www.ci.issaquah.wa.us/Files/Existing%20Single%20Family%20Tree%20CodeFORWEBSITE2.pdf>

[www.ci.issaquah.wa.us/Files/Tree%20Removal%20Form.doc](http://www.ci.issaquah.wa.us/Files/Tree%20Removal%20Form.doc) – tree removal form

<http://www.ci.issaquah.wa.us/Files/Ord2546andCodeOnly.pdf> - Issaquah Tree ordinance

**Lake Forest Park**

<http://www.cityofflp.com/city/documents/Ordinance1015.pdf>

**Lynnwood, WA**

<http://www.ci.lynnwood.wa.us/Content/Services.aspx?id=299>

<http://www.ci.lynnwood.wa.us/Docs/TreeRegulationsCH17-15.pdf> (ordinance)

**Mercer Island – commercial zone**

<http://www.mercergov.org/files/TreeHighlights.pdf>

<http://www.mercergov.org/page.asp?NavID=2636>

**Olympia, WA**

<http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/olympia/html/Olympia16/Olympia1660.html#16.60> – tree ordinance through August 2011

**Redmond, WA**

<http://www.redmond.gov/insidecityhall/planning/codeenforce/faqtreecutting.asp>

<http://www.redmond.gov/insidecityhall/permitting/pdf/Planning/TreeRemoval.pdf>

**Shoreline, WA**

<http://www.cityofshoreline.com/index.aspx?page=501> – Citywide Tree Canopy and Code Amendments

### **Spokane, WA**

[http://spokaneurbanforestry.org/uploads/forestry\\_page\\_content\\_body/New\\_2010\\_StreetTreePermit.pdf](http://spokaneurbanforestry.org/uploads/forestry_page_content_body/New_2010_StreetTreePermit.pdf)

<http://spokaneurbanforestry.org/index.php/Parks/page/138/> - Tree Service and Landscape Contractor Requirements

<http://spokaneurbanforestry.org/index.php/Parks/page/134/> - permitting and licensing

### **Tacoma, WA**

<http://www.cityoftacoma.org/Page.aspx?hid=9748> - Frequently Asked Questions about the permit process for Tree Removal and Pruning in the right-of-way

<http://www.cityoftacoma.org/Page.aspx?nid=153> - links to tree work permits on this page

### **Village of Beaux Arts**

[http://www.beauxarts-wa.gov/pdf\\_files/Ords/ord361\\_amended\\_tree\\_ord.pdf](http://www.beauxarts-wa.gov/pdf_files/Ords/ord361_amended_tree_ord.pdf) - tree protection 2008

### **Woodinville, WA**

<http://www.ci.woodinville.wa.us/Documents/Live/Code%20Enforcement%20Brochure.pdf>

<http://www.ci.woodinville.wa.us/Documents/Live/478.pdf> (ordinance)

### **Walla Walla, WA**

<http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/WallaWalla/wallawalla12/wallawalla1249.html> - urban forestry practices – code

### **Other states:**

#### **Lake Oswego, Oregon**

[http://www.ci.oswego.or.us/plan/Trees/Removing\\_Trees\\_the\\_Proper\\_Way\\_brochure.pdf](http://www.ci.oswego.or.us/plan/Trees/Removing_Trees_the_Proper_Way_brochure.pdf)

#### **Portland, Oregon**

<http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=47008&a=345713> – summary of new tree regulations adopted 2011

<http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=47008&a=350786> –text of new tree regulations adopted 2011

<http://www.portlandonline.com/bds/index.cfm?a=104896&c=45483>

<http://www.portlandonline.com/parks/index.cfm?c=39712> – re- current street tree permits

<http://www.portlandonline.com/parks/index.cfm?c=39712&a=252744> - permit application to plant or remove a street tree

<http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=171829> - Portland’s Urban Forest Canopy Oct 2007

<http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=41664&a=311166> - City Tree Policy Review –July 2010

<http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=46921> - announcement

#### **Atlanta Area**

<http://www.bouttetree.com/permit.htm>

#### **Austin, TX**

[http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/trees/preserve\\_code.htm](http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/trees/preserve_code.htm)

<http://www.bizjournals.com/austin/stories/2010/02/15/story3.html>

#### **Hillsborough County FLa Misc**

<http://urbanforestry.ifas.ufl.edu/TreePermits.shtml>

#### **Monterey County, CA**

[http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/ordinances/Title21/21.64.260\\_ProtectedTrees.htm](http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/docs/ordinances/Title21/21.64.260_ProtectedTrees.htm)

#### **San Antonio, TX**

<http://www.treecoalition.org/canopyordnce.htm>

[http://www.treecoalition.org/PDF/CoSA\\_TPO-6May2010.pdf](http://www.treecoalition.org/PDF/CoSA_TPO-6May2010.pdf)

<http://www.mysanantonio.com/news/environment/article/Stricter-tree-ordinance-receives-OK-787716.php>

[http://www.sanantonio.gov/dsd/pdf/R\\_4298\\_20100518110056.pdf](http://www.sanantonio.gov/dsd/pdf/R_4298_20100518110056.pdf) - 2010 ordinance

## **San Francisco, CA**

[http://www.sfdbi.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/dbi/Key\\_Information/TreeProtectionLegislation.pdf](http://www.sfdbi.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/dbi/Key_Information/TreeProtectionLegislation.pdf) - Tree Protection Legislation

## **South San Francisco, CA**

<http://www.ssf.net/index.aspx?NID=394> - tree removal permits

## **San Francisco area – misc**

<http://www.mcguire.com/posts/634-tree-planting-and-removal-in-the-san-francisco-bay-area>

## **San Mateo County, CA**

[http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit\\_609/1036816321041.pdf](http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit_609/1036816321041.pdf)

## **Tampa, FL**

[http://www.tampagov.net/appl\\_customer\\_service\\_center/form.asp?strServiceID=340](http://www.tampagov.net/appl_customer_service_center/form.asp?strServiceID=340)

[http://www.tampagov.net/dept\\_natural\\_resources/how\\_do\\_i/](http://www.tampagov.net/dept_natural_resources/how_do_i/)

## **Washington, DC**

<http://www.dc.gov/DC/DDOT/Services/Tree+Services/Urban+Forest+Preservation+Act+of+2002> – Urban Forest Preservation Act 2002

## **Canada:**

### **Richmond, BC**

[http://www.richmond.ca/\\_shared/assets/bylaw\\_805718550.pdf](http://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/bylaw_805718550.pdf)

### **Toronto**

[http://www.toronto.ca/trees/private\\_trees.htm](http://www.toronto.ca/trees/private_trees.htm)

<http://www.toronto.ca/trees/pdfs/PrivateTreeBy-lawInfoSheetandPermitApplication.pdf>

[http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/municode/1184\\_813.pdf](http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/municode/1184_813.pdf)

### **Vancouver, BC**

<http://vancouver.ca/commsvcs/planning/treebylaw/treeres.htm> - general information

<http://vancouver.ca/commsvcs/planning/treebylaw/pdf/treeapp.pdf> - application for permit

<http://vancouver.ca/bylaws/9958c.PDF> - Protection of Trees By-Law