



SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Julia Michalak (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist), Co-chair
Joshua Morris (Position #7 – NGO), Co-Chair
Joe Sisneros (Position #2 – Urban Ecologist - ISA) • **Falisha Kurji** (Position #3 – Natural Resource Agency)
Becca Neumann (Position #4 – Hydrologist) • **Stuart Niven** (Position #5 – Arborist – ISA)
Hao Liang (Position #6 – Landscape Architect – ISA) • **David Moehring** (Position # 8 – Development)
Blake Voorhees (Position # 9 – Realtor) • **Laura Keil** (Position #10 – Get Engaged)
Jessica Hernandez (Position #11 – Environmental Justice) • **Jessica Jones** (Position # 12 – Public Health)
Lia Hall (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

July 20, 2022, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Via Webex call and in-person at the
Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 1872 (18th floor)
700 5th Avenue, Seattle

(206) 207-1700

Meeting number: 2489 336 0438

Meeting password: 1234

Attending

Commissioners

Josh Morris – Co-Chair
Becca Neumann
Stuart Niven
Hao Liang
Blake Voorhees
Laura Keil
Jessica Jones
Lia Hall

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE

Guests

Toby Thaler

Public

Jesus Torres
Sandy Shettler
Steve Zemke
Sharon London
Satpreet Kahlon

Absent- Excused

Julia Michalak – Co-Chair
Joe Sisneros
Falisha Kurji
David Moehring
Jessica Hernandez

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: Josh called the meeting to order and offered a land acknowledgement.

Public comment:

Jesus Torres wanted to share a situation they've been dealing with over several years, in trying to protect an exceptional tree. SDCI has failed to uphold policies around tree protections, pointing out how they may not be the best agency to manage tree protections. A new development project was proposed next door where there were at least three exceptional trees on site. It seemed like adequate protections were put in place, but when construction started, the developer did not protect the trees with adequate protection zones. Roots were damaged and covered over, and several other violations occurred. Neighbors submitted complaints to SDCI and the project was stalled at intervals, but it was still allowed to proceed. This experience indicates that the tree protections are lip service and developers are allowed to use loopholes to do what they want.

Sandy Shettler asked whether the UFC would consider reaching out to SDOT about their current projects involving street tree removals. Almost all of the only street trees on Aurora, from 80th up to 103rd, are going to be removed for sidewalks. They are healthy trees and this is one of the biggest heat islands in north Seattle, there are no other trees around. SDOT said they weren't properly planted and need to be removed to replace the sidewalks. This area is coping with climate change impacts and needs these healthy trees. pro

Steve Zemke provided some updates: 1) City Council yesterday passed a resolution to add climate resiliency and climate change into the Comp Plan, in particular to enhance tree canopy to reduce airborne pollutants, reduce stormwater runoff and mitigate urban heat island effects especially in areas of low canopy; 2) the appeal to the SEPA determination has completed all of the documents being filed; the briefs filed from the three parties are available online; 3) provided additional comments on the UFC's draft recommendations, including: PIL costs should be based on both tree size and ecosystem services, and tree replacement and maintenance fund should be set up to accept fines, grants and donations to purchase lands, set up covenants and for education. This is supported by Dan Strauss.

Sharon London said that she lives in the Maple Leaf neighborhood a 14-minute walk from the Northgate light rail station, and she's concerned about the health of trees near her home. She works with the Forest Stewardship Council and used to be Executive Director of Seattle Urban Nature. She's trying to avoid a situation like Jesus described earlier and sent a letter to Director Torgelson at SDCI. There are two exceptional trees on the property behind her, which are adjacent to exceptional trees on her property, which together make a grove. She wants to make sure they maximize the retention of trees in the development and also that the roots of her and her neighbors aren't harmed during the project. The trees in this neighborhood form an important greenbelt. She encouraged the UFC to encourage SDCI to follow the rules with this project.

Satpreet Kahlon is a representative of Yehaw Indigenous Creatives Collective. They are looking for a space to run sovereign programming and identified a series of parcels near Kubota Garden that Mapes Creek runs through. An environmental report identified over 500 trees there. They wanted to purchase a parcel there, but it ended up going to a developer who is running feasibility and filing for permits for luxury housing. They are looking for sources of advocacy and support so that their collective can purchase the parcel for long-term community benefit, especially given how quickly this area is being gentrified and losing canopy coverage. As permits are being refiled, they are looking for support to pause the development so the land can be returned to community for equitable public use.

Tessa stated that she is an artist who joined with several others to co-buy their home. They have been trying to get a permit to remove a hazard tree. They have found the cost for doing this is prohibitive for many homeowners, between the cost of the permit and hiring an arborist it's over \$1,000.

Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:

Patti provided some information on the urban forest-related conferences coming to Seattle in November. There are several conferences and meetings overlapping in the same week November 14-18:

- Partners in Community Forestry Conference will be Wednesday through Friday that week and is the larger conference – Nov. 16-18.
- That will be preceded on Monday and Tuesday by the Society of Municipal Arborists conference, and the associated Alliance for Community Trees Meeting. These are associated with the Arbor Day Foundation, which is what Seattle's Tree City designation comes from. This is a good chance to have these folks in town and be able to showcase Seattle's urban forest. As the host city, we have some city staff working with the conference planners on welcome sessions and field trips.
- Also happening on Monday and Tuesday that week is the Forests in Cities Network annual meeting being hosted here in Seattle. This network was founded in 2019 by the Natural Areas Conservancy in New York and now convenes folks from cities across the U.S. to collaborate on natural areas management. That meeting isn't necessarily open to the public for broad attendance, but it does increase the focus on natural areas and urban forest management in the city during that week.

More information will be coming out about the conferences, including registration and schedules; Patti put links to the organizations' websites in the chat so that folks interested can check them out and have that information for when registration does go live.

Josh reported on a few items:

- He is working to get some meetings set up with OSE Director Jessyn Farrell to collaborate on the Chief Arborist Statement of Legislative Intent, and asked for Commissioners who are interested in joining those to let him and Patti know.
- There is a meeting scheduled July 29th with Chanda Emery in SDCI to talk about the UFC recommendations on the draft protection ordinance; other Commissioners are likewise invited to join that if interested.
- Emerald ash borer has been detected in Oregon. Seattle has more than 4,000 street trees that are ash trees, so this is a concern and the Commission might think about how they might want to respond, potentially with some policy recommendations.
- Co-Chair Julia has taken another position that will require more of her time and she will not be able to continue on the Commission. That will leave a leadership gap, so Josh urged Commissioners to consider nominating themselves or others for a Co-Chair or Vice-Chair role. Josh noted the advantages and the duties of the role. Patti recapped the election process for last year, where there were no Commissioners able to take on the Chair role alone, so three Co-Chairs were elected. The third Co-Chair needed to leave the Commission shortly thereafter, leaving Josh and Julia to serve in the leadership roles. Now with Julia needing to leave, Josh is left with more responsibility than originally considered to take on, and the Commission really needs additional Commissioner(s) to step in to assist.

Solutions for density and trees

Blake introduced Michael Eliason from Larch Labs, who are experts in designing high-density and climate-resilient buildings with an eye to the protection and enhancement of urban trees. They were invited to present to the UFC because their work dovetails with addressing the UFC's recognition that potential conflicts exist between achieving tree protection and other city goals like developing affordable housing, which the UFC believes can be accomplished with careful planning.

Michael has worked for many years in both Seattle and Germany. He outlined development patterns in Seattle and compared them to other cities in the world. Multi-family housing was legal on every parcel 100 years ago, similar to other cities. The city adopted the zoning ordinance in 1923, most of the city was

designated single family and most of the trees were cut down. This facilitated sprawl and exacerbated climate impacts. There are ways to develop cities that are more compact. It is not possible in many areas of Seattle to get to natural areas without a car; livability and walkability are not supported with our current development patterns.

The orientation and size of our buildings could also be more smartly designed. Since we have very little mid-rise and mostly low-rise, that contributes to the sprawl we see. We have also lost very large opportunities around light rail stations, where climate adapted neighborhoods and affordable housing could be developed in a diversity of building forms along with open space and trees.

Where we put trees matters. Streets are always the hottest parts of cities, so focusing trees there provides great benefits – quiet, wildlife, calmer, cars slow down. Another thing Seattle doesn't do as much as other cities is prioritizing sustainable mobility; we are a car-focused city. Some cities are incorporating green streets, which have no car traffic, they have trams and trees, and courtyards with trees behind the buildings. So the buildings are surrounded by trees.

Michael showed some examples of how to adapt development to be more climate friendly. Elements of these include incorporating parks in the neighborhood blocks as well as day care so that people don't have to drive to them, thin buildings around the edges of blocks, with green courtyards inside. Buildings are small but tall in order to allow more green space. Cities in other countries are more willing to adapt brownfields into ecofriendly greenfields.

Ecodistricts are park-oriented development, as an alternative to transit-oriented development. There are some such developments underway in Singapore, China and Europe; they can be very elegant places to live with high quality of life and diversity of housing. They incorporate variable-height buildings, diversity of public and private buildings, green spaces. The variable buildings offers a wide variety of housing options. Many of the developments focus on low-carbon living, and these ecodistricts can be carbon sinks.

Seattle hasn't opened up the development pattern options yet that allow for that mix of social and economic diversity within blocks. New typologies are recommended to rethink urbanism, combining the city model and the village model into a new typology.

Alternative housing types are also a good avenue for diversity and advanced development patterns. Michael described baugruppen, as self-developed urban housing projects. These can serve a wide variety of housing needs, and also provide a wide variety of amenities. Flexibility in design is an important element of this concept; buildings can be tailored to the need by switching out components as necessary.

Other examples of innovative development options:

- Self-managed and self-developed student housing can be structured so that it is tailored specifically for the needs of the project, with some shared spaces and rooms sized as needed.
- Ausbauhaus is a very simple shell that can be tailored to the level of quality the family can afford inside it. So this also allows for a range of social diversity.
- 7-story ADUs are being built in Paris, unlocking innovative housing options.
- Vertical additions to existing buildings – adding lightweight wood additional space on top of buildings. Vienna determined they can add 50,000 homes doing this, and Germany can add two million homes.

Questions from Commissioners included:

- Whether Michael is involved in advocacy and if so, what does he prioritize? He used to be more involved in advocacy, but since starting Larch Labs, has been working with other cities because

Seattle isn't going in this direction right now. Talking about these things helps to spread the ideas and get others interested.

- Are there studies showing how those tall thin buildings can supply the needed housing, as opposed to how Seattle has been building large, square buildings. Building codes and land use codes in the U.S. are not really conducive to these buildings.
- What are the opportunities for adaptation given that Seattle is already built out? What are the incentives that make it work for associated services in the mixed-use model? A lot of the districts are associated with transit and the services are incorporated into it. The U.S. is not as good at co-locating a lot of services. Adaptation is one of the biggest issues in planning in the U.S. Finding ways to incorporate new housing and open up neighborhoods is key.
- Has Michael noticed changes in managing streets during the pandemic and might those changes last beyond the pandemic? Some of the Stay Healthy streets may stay around for a while. Some of them were really successful. Around the larger arterials, it's harder to be successful with this, but in some of the smaller neighborhood streets, there is good potential.
- Regarding some of the examples incorporating multi-generational living, that is similar to what Seattle was seeming to do with pod living; how will that work in the age of the pandemic. Ventilation is key here, and can be maximized in design to make that work.

Blake will draft a follow-up letter to Michael.

Urban Forest Protection SEPA Draft Ordinance

Josh was not present at the last meeting, so added some comments and questions into the current draft of the recommendations. Commissioners reviewed Josh's edits on the recommendations and worked through additional edits.

Action: a motion to adopt the recommendations on the SEPA draft ordinance as amended was made, seconded and approved.

Community engagement

Commissioners reviewed the draft statements aimed at outlining the UFC's work around community development, as originally discussed a couple of months ago and with edits made by David recently. These draft statements build on the conversations the Commission has been having on this and synthesize feedback to provide direction for community engagement work.

Commissioners discussed and made additional edits to the statements. Defining "community" is a key area for discussion and understanding while outlining this work.

Action: a motion to adopt the community engagement statements as amended was made, seconded and approved.

Website review and potential updates

Josh shared some slides outlining some thoughts for updating the UFC's website. This is a lot of people's first impression of the UFC, so it is worth reviewing how the experience is for folks using it. Josh reviewed the current pages on the website, to inventory what there is to work with. On the home page, the "above the fold" area currently doesn't have much information. Josh shared some possible ways to improve the page, with more dynamic and interactive options. Josh called for volunteers to work on developing website updates. Hao and Laura would like to participate. Patti will also participate and work to reconcile desired updates with some of the restrictions inherent in the city's webpage templates.

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:

Steve Zemke thanked the UFC for the work on what should be in an updated ordinance. SDCI's ordinance is a draft and most of what was discussed is within parameters of the DNS. It would benefit the UFC to look at the One Seattle Plan website; the comment period was extended into August beyond the next two meetings to look at the five alternatives. He encourages the UFC to urge them to put some of the innovative things discussed today into the Comp Plan and not just stick to the usual housing options, and considering changes in zoning and planning. In terms of the city budget, the UFC should keep in mind to encourage the city to at least create an urban forestry position in addition to OSE's current position.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Meeting Chat:

from Lia Hall to everyone: 3:04 PM

having trouble hearing

from Tessa to everyone: 3:05 PM

I'd like to comment but am not seeing where to raise a hand, sorry!

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 3:21 PM

Please send any follow-up info to me at: patricia.bakker@seattle.gov

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 3:24 PM

Conferences: <https://www.arborday.org/programs/pcf/>

<https://naturalareasnyc.org/national>

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:32 PM

recommended change -A robust payment -in-lieu program that adequately prices based both on tree size and on their ecosystem services ...

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 3:57 PM

Stepping away from my computer for a short while to look at a branch failure nearby so will stay signed in here but will be on my phone while I travel to and from.

from Laura Loe she/her to everyone: 3:58 PM

meanwhile in Seattle our future light rails are next to several golf courses and freeways, preventing these kinds of day dreams.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:06 PM

<https://www.larchlab.com/>

from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:07 PM

thank you joshua and micheal!

from Lia Hall (privately): 4:07 PM

Hi Patti, I have to go take a pcr test before they close. Have a fever now and not feeling great. I'll watch the recording of the rest later. Thank you!

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:15 PM

Dedicated tree replacement and Maintenance fund. SDCI draft has funds going into SDCI budget, not dedicated. Fines currently go into city budget. Allow Tree Replacement and Maintenance Fund to not just accept in lieu fees, but accept donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants, accept fines and use for educational purposes. Portland has this type of Fund.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:20 PM

Portland's Fund is a Tree Planting and Preservation Fund - recommend that name. They have a separate fund for fines. Tree <https://www.portland.gov/code/11/15>

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:23 PM

Recommend Tree Planting and Preservation Fund which is more expansive based on type of funds going into it.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:25 PM

Atlanta, GA Lake Forest Park, Tacoma DOT already use Accela system for tree permits

from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:33 PM
perfect joshua
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:34 PM
"Seattle residents"?
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:34 PM
Polls need to be dealt with carefully as they can be gamed depending on who is reached and who responds..
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:34 PM
versus "community"
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:37 PM
"residents, workforce, and visitors"?
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:38 PM
the key is how others will relate to this
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:45 PM
suggested modification to 3) "to ...address fiscal constraints of tree protection..."
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:45 PM
SDOT had permit fees for removing and replacing street trees but eliminated them. Other cities charge less than \$400 for a permit. I think the \$400 permit fee and hiring an arborist ifs for removing an exceptional tree.
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:45 PM
sorry 4)
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 4:46 PM
which actually appears under 5) (I need stronger readers!)
from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:58 PM
<https://seattletransportationplan.infocommunity.org/>
from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:59 PM
The Transportation Plan is also open to public and it's good for us to look at
from Blake Voorhees to everyone: 5:00 PM
thank you joshua!

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

From: Sandy Shettler <sshettler@msn.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 9:19 PM

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

Subject: Patti, can you please forward this to the UFC? 831 NE 96th St--platting question

CAUTION: External Email

Hi Patti and the UFC,

Please see below for concerns neighbors of 831 NE 96th have regarding the platting of the property, which does not appear to save any of the trees except for two which are exceptional.

We are concerned that the guidelines to maximize the retention of existing trees during platting are not being followed. Nearly all of the large trees on this property are on the perimeter, or just a short distance in.

We hope our email to Director Torgelson results in a better plan, but wanted you to be aware of this issue as this neighborhood is coping with significant tree loss.

Sandy Shettler

"There is a magic machine that sucks carbon out of the air, costs very little, and builds itself. It's called a tree." - George Monbiot

From: Sandy Shettler

Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 9:10 PM

To: nathan.torgelson@seattle.gov <nathan.torgelson@seattle.gov>

Cc: slondon.consulting@gmail.com <slondon.consulting@gmail.com>; Jan H. <jan2ski@gmail.com>; sjgates@comcast.net <sjgates@comcast.net>; debora.juarez@seattle.gov <debora.juarez@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <patricia.bakker@seattle.gov>; Cheryl Kordick <cheryl.kordick@gmail.com>; James Davis <jamesdavis1400@gmail.com>; Jessica Dixon-Horton <BARDJESS@msn.com>; BB Photo <bbphoto@gmail.com>; Steve Zemke <stevezemke@msn.com>; katygr@msn.com <katygr@msn.com>

Subject: 831 NE 96th St--plating question

Dear Director Torgelson,

This property slated for development at 831 NE 96th has at least two exceptional trees, two 27" western red cedars. There also appears to be a grove which potentially includes trees marked for removal, although this is not clear. The two exceptional trees have been called out to be preserved, but the platting does not appear to have taken any of the other trees or the grove into account.

Given the location of all the trees near the perimeter of the property, we ask that you review this project to ensure that the platting maximizes the retention of existing trees as required.

I am copying a number of neighbors who are concerned about the potential loss of these trees, as well as Councilmember Debora Juarez as this is in her district, and the Urban Forestry Commission.

Warm regards,

Sandy Shettler

The Last 6000 and TreePac

"There is a magic machine that sucks carbon out of the air, costs very little, and builds itself. It's called a tree." - George Monbiot

From: Sheryl Ramstad <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 10:44 PM

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

Subject: Please Protect Seattle's Trees

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the Seattle City Council has repeatedly asked successive Seattle Mayors and SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its most recent 2019 Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

SDCI, once again, has not responded in a timely manner with a comprehensive tree protection ordinance update. It's been delay after delay. Please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. In 2009 the Seattle City Auditor proposed transferring tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to an independent entity that does not have a conflict of interest. The Auditor proposed oversight be moved to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment.

Much has changed since 2009 and it is time to create an independent Department with authority over environment, urban forestry, and climate issues. 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 independent entity take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest. We propose that an Urban Forestry Division be created within a new Department of the Environment and Climate.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people healthy. 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. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and tree equity.

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

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 an 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 lost – 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, purchase land and set up easements.
3. Expand current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24” DBH, protect tree groves and heritage trees 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 for 2 weeks prior to removal and all permit approvals for public viewing. Establish and maintain a city-wide database and inventory of existing trees, trees removed, and trees planted. Post on-line quarterly reports.
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. Require developers throughout the development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
9. Require a Tree Inventory and Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any development permits being approved.
10. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Sheryl Ramstad
sramstad@gmail.com
10739 Fremont Ave N
Seattle, Washington 98133

From: Woody Wheeler <woody.wheeler@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 7:04 PM

To: dmoehring@consultant.com

Cc: Pedersen, Alex <Alex.Pedersen@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>; McConaghy, Eric <Eric.McConaghy@seattle.gov>; Maria Batayola <mbjumpstart@msn.com>; Penni Cocking <artpcocking@gmail.com>; Nelson, Sara <Sara.Nelson@seattle.gov>; DOT_SeattleTrees <Seattle.Trees@seattle.gov>; Steve Zemke <stevezemke@msn.com>; Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>; LEG_CompPlan <LEG_CompPlan@seattle.gov>; LEG_CouncilMembers <council@seattle.gov>; Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; heidi@calyxsite.com; Morales, Tammy

<Tammy.Morales@seattle.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <Teresa.Mosqueda@seattle.gov>

Subject: Re: Today: Comp Plan must include climate resilience for equitable Seattle neighbors

CAUTION: External Email

Thank you! This is excellent.

On Wed, Jul 13, 2022 at 10:43 AM <dmoehring@consultant.com> wrote:

Please pass today the resolution to add evaluating climate impacts to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. The attached promotion for equitable tree canopy in all Seattle neighborhoods was passed off by the OPCD as a major change. Mathematically, Seattle cannot achieve climate resilience and at least a 30 percent urban forest canopy cover without all land management units within the Comp Plan being planned to contribute a land area portion toward canopy cover... especially currently industrial and underserved neighborhoods.

The Seattle City Council Land Use Committee should consider a resolution to add evaluating climate impacts to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. This is an issue (HB 1099) which was in the Washington State Legislature earlier this year.

Seattle City Council Resolution 32059 includes " Enhancing tree canopy to reduce airborne pollutants, decrease stormwater runoff, and mitigate urban heat island effects, particularly in residential areas with low canopy coverage."

Why trees equitably dispersed on private property and streets are needed for healthy communities...

Small green spaces can help keep cities cool during heat waves:

“During heat waves, the highest temperatures are often found in urbanized areas. Urbanization is almost always associated with an increase in paved, impervious areas, and often a decrease in greenery. Concrete and asphalt roads, and other built materials readily absorb, store and release heat, raising city temperatures, a phenomenon called the urban heat island.

Many studies have shown that urban forests can reduce the urban heat island, and many policies focus their attention on large green spaces. Small green spaces, such as yards, rooftops and small parcels of undeveloped land, can make impressive contributions to lowering urban heat, but they are often overlooked when developing strategies for urban cooling.”



<https://theconversation.com/small-green-spaces-can-help-keep-cities-cool-during-heat-waves-183292>

Attached has been Submitted for Comp Plan review is the application via email at compplan@seattle.gov ; Eric.McConaghy@seattle.gov ; (206) 615-1071

For **TreePAC, Beacon Hill Council, Duwamish Valley, Trees and People Coalition**

David Moehring
312-965-0634

--

Woody Wheeler
Conservation Catalyst
P.O. Box 51151
Seattle, WA 98115
206-498-3553
www.conservationcatalyst.org

From: Cheng Dai <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 9:10 AM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Save Our Trees!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the Seattle City Council has repeatedly asked successive Seattle Mayors and SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its most recent 2019 Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

SDCI, once again, has not responded in a timely manner with a comprehensive tree protection ordinance update. It's been delay after delay. Please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. In 2009 the Seattle City Auditor proposed transferring tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to an independent entity that does not have a conflict of interest. The Auditor proposed oversight be moved to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment.

Much has changed since 2009 and it is time to create an independent Department with authority over environment, urban forestry, and climate issues. 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 independent entity take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest. We propose that an Urban Forestry Division be

created within a new Department of the Environment and Climate.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people healthy. 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. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and tree equity.

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

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 an 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 lost – 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, purchase land and set up easements.
3. Expand current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24" DBH, protect tree groves and heritage trees 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 for 2 weeks prior to removal and all permit approvals for public viewing. Establish and maintain a city-wide database and inventory of existing trees, trees removed, and trees planted. Post on-line quarterly reports.
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. Require developers throughout the development process to maximize the retention of existing trees

with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.

9. Require a Tree Inventory and Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any development permits being approved.

10. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Cheng Dai

cdz512@gmail.com

8829 Ashworth Ave N

Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Sandy Shettler <sshettler@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 12:32 PM

To: Torgelson, Nathan <Nathan.Torgelson@seattle.gov>

Cc: slondon.consulting@gmail.com; Jan H. <jan2ski@gmail.com>; sjgates@comcast.net; Juarez, Debora <Debora.Juarez@seattle.gov>; rchmn22mtns@gmail.com; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>; Cheryl Kordick <cheryl.kordick@gmail.com>; James Davis <jamesdavis1400@gmail.com>; Jessica Dixon-Horton <BARDJESS@msn.com>; BB Photo <bbphoto@gmail.com>; Steve Zemke <stevezemke@msn.com>; katygr@msn.com

Subject: Clarification re 831 NE 96th St--platting question and exceptional or "potential exceptional" trees

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Director Torgelson,

I apologize that my previous email wasn't clear about exceptional trees on this property! I'm clarifying this below.

Neighbors and I are asking if you could review this site's platting plans to maximize the retention of existing trees. We also concerned that there may be an exceptional grove on this site and adjacent two properties.

Finally, would you consider the two Western red cedars as "potential exceptional trees" given their health and size? As noted in SMC 25.11.050, these trees are nearly exceptional already, and are conveniently located near the periphery of the lot.

Corrected list of trees:

- 1: Two exceptional trees in the SE corner, a 31" DBH Douglas fir and a 38" DBH Western white pine.
- 2: Several exceptional trees just off-site along the back border of the property, which are called out on the developer's tree report and which may form part of a grove.
- 3: Two Western red cedars, 25" and 27" DBH, which are along the east border of the property near the front.

SMC 25.11.050:

Exceptional trees and potential exceptional trees shall be identified on site plans and exceptional tree status shall be determined by the Director according to standards promulgated by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections.

Thank you for your thoughtful approach and we hope to hear from you soon!

Warm regards,

Sandy Shettler
The Last 6000 and TreePac

"There is a magic machine that sucks carbon out of the air, costs very little, and builds itself. It's called a tree." - George Monbiot

From: Sandy Shettler
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2022 9:10 PM
To: nathan.torgelson@seattle.gov <nathan.torgelson@seattle.gov>
Cc: slondon.consulting@gmail.com <slondon.consulting@gmail.com>; Jan H. <jan2ski@gmail.com>; sjgates@comcast.net <sjgates@comcast.net>; deborajuarez@seattle.gov <deborajuarez@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <patricia.bakker@seattle.gov>; Cheryl Kordick <cheryl.kordick@gmail.com>; James Davis <jamesdavis1400@gmail.com>; Jessica Dixon-Horton <BARDJESS@msn.com>; BB Photo <bbphoto@gmail.com>; Steve Zemke <stevezemke@msn.com>; katygr@msn.com <katygr@msn.com>
Subject: 831 NE 96th St--platting question

Dear Director Torgelson,

This property slated for development at 831 NE 96th has at least two exceptional trees, two 27" western red cedars. There also appears to be a grove which potentially includes trees marked for removal, although this is not clear. The two exceptional trees have been called out to be preserved, but the platting does not appear to have taken any of the other trees or the grove into account.

Given the location of all the trees near the perimeter of the property, we ask that you review this project to ensure that the platting maximizes the retention of existing trees as required.

I am copying a number of neighbors who are concerned about the potential loss of these trees, as well as Councilmember Debora Juarez as this is in her district, and the Urban Forestry Commission.

Warm regards,

Sandy Shettler
The Last 6000 and TreePac

"There is a magic machine that sucks carbon out of the air, costs very little, and builds itself. It's called a tree." - George Monbiot

From: Melissa Glass <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2022 8:57 PM

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

Subject: Please Update Seattle's Tree Ordinance

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the Seattle City Council has repeatedly asked successive Seattle Mayors and SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its most recent 2019 Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

SDCI, once again, has not responded in a timely manner with a comprehensive tree protection ordinance update. It's been delay after delay. Please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. In 2009 the Seattle City Auditor proposed transferring tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to an independent entity that does not have a conflict of interest. The Auditor proposed oversight be moved to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment.

Much has changed since 2009 and it is time to create an independent Department with authority over environment, urban forestry, and climate issues. 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 independent entity take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest. We propose that an Urban Forestry Division be created within a new Department of the Environment and Climate.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban

forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people healthy. 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. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and tree equity.

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

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 an 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 lost – 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, purchase land and set up easements.
3. Expand current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24" DBH, protect tree groves and heritage trees 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 for 2 weeks prior to removal and all permit approvals for public viewing. Establish and maintain a city-wide database and inventory of existing trees, trees removed, and trees planted. Post on-line quarterly reports.
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. Require developers throughout the development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
9. Require a Tree Inventory and Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any development permits being

approved.

10. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Melissa Glass
mktenant@yahoo.com
1122 25th Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98122

From: Jesus <jesus.odp@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 3:17 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>; Merrilie Gunnier <merrilieg@yahoo.com>; Sandy Shettler <SSHETTLER@msn.com>

Subject: SDCI is not the correct agency to uphold Tree Protections

CAUTION: External Email

Hello,

Thank you for the time today to share our story. Here is a summary of how SDCI first used tree protections to provide the developer building code exemptions but then didn't uphold them or continued to reduce them in order to allow the construction to continue:

- We started alerting the SDCI in 2019 about the trees at risk from a proposed construction project, including at least 3 exceptional trees recorded as such with the city from a previous project
- We pointed out that the developer's arborist recorded one of the exceptional trees as shrinking just below the exceptional threshold and SDCI said it must have been a mistake on the previous project
- We highlighted the need to protect the exceptional tree along the boundary and SDCI formally logged a Tree Protection Correspondence note in the project's documentation
- The developer submitted plans that used the tree protections to justify a reduced front yard and allowed two large homes to be built, a SFH and DADU
- The tree protections stated leaving the existing surface intact, installing a fence to the dripline, adding mulch and watering the TPA. Instead the developer started bulldozing the entire site, including the TPA that had no fence. We reported to SDCI but no one responded. The developer kept excavating the TPA, ripping up the roots with the excavator bucket
- When the SDCI inspector finally came out the following week, he spent his time on-site yelling about how he hates addressing complaints, tried to help the developer keep excavating by saying the TPA was only temporary and told them to cut up the roots with a saw to get rid of them

- We confronted him and he told us that citizens have to protect themselves because they don't have time, provided us with his manager's info and left. The bulldozing continued and they raised the grade in the TPA by several feet

- After repeated calls to the SDCI leadership, there was a violation issued and stop work order posted

- The developer met with another inspector and they talked about how tree protections are not important because they don't make money, only the construction does. The inspector initially stated the tree protections need to be met but told the developer he would sign off on anything that resembled a TPA and he did

- Also during this time, another SDCI official told us that the permit would be revoked because the plans were contingent on adhering to the tree protections, instead SDCI allowed a smaller TPA and reduced the number of parking spots required after an updated arborist report was submitted

- The new arborist report was submitted by the same arborist that lied about the size of the exceptional tree. The new report said the tree was healthy so the TPA could be reduced if mulch and watering were added. It also stated the tree canopy should not be pruned for a year

- Because the TPA was reduced to a rectangular shape that was only a foot away from the edge of the foundation, SDCI allowed the developer to work inside the TPA

- SDCI also allowed the canopy to be pruned back by over a third so the developer could have space to install and paint siding

- now that the landscaping work has started, SDCI has allowed another reduction to the TPA size

This whole experience has showed us that SDCI only has a tree protection policy for two reasons: 1. To provide developers more loopholes (approving more projects provides more revenue to the city). 2. It can be used as lip service for the public

--

Jesus Torres (he, him)
253-347-9992

From: Jesus <jesus.odp@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 3:22 PM

To: Merrilie Gunnier <merrilieg@yahoo.com>; Sandy Shettler <SSHETTLER@msn.com>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Re: SDCI is not the correct agency to uphold Tree Protections

CAUTION: External Email

PS The juxtaposition of this picture best sums up which side SDCI is on when it comes to tree protections:



Jesus Torres (he, him)
253-347-9992

From: Satpreet Kahlon <dr.spatula@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 3:33 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: yəhaw Indigenous Creatives Collective: Land acquisition

CAUTION: External Email

Hi Patricia,

My name is Satpreet Kahlon. I am co-founder of yəhaw' Indigenous Creatives Collective, a non-profit organization that has provided over \$2m of opportunity to 400 Indigenous artists in the Coast Salish territories since our founding in 2017.

Per my public comment, we are looking to buy a series of parcels for public programming and ecological rehabilitation and maintenance. I would love to talk more about how we might increase our odds of purchasing this parcel.

- Here are the **parcels in question:7131300092-717300100**
- UFC already heard public comment against development of these parcels in 2019 under **project number: 3018093**
- Here is the public listing: https://www.zillow.com/homedetails/9666-51st-Ave-S-Seattle-WA-98118/305508949_zpid/
- Here are our plans for the parcels: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1dYeVazbWjQgl8pnce77w91UQyMC9wil_gWEP3baPI74/edit?usp=sharing

Long story short, we have been in conversation with the seller. They would like to sell to us but have been under contract with a developer for almost three months at this point and can't seem to find a way to get out of the contract while the developer keeps pushing the timeline for feasibility while filing for permits.

Any advocacy and help would be welcome!

Thank you,
Satpreet

--

[artist](#), [curator](#)

recent:

2022: Roddenberry Fellow, Roddenberry Foundation

2022: Painting Finalist, Neddy Artist Award

2023: Solo exhibition, Bellevue Art Museum

From: Sharon London <slondon.consulting@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 3:49 PM

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

Subject: Fwd: Clarification re 831 NE 96th St--plating question and exceptional or "potential exceptional" trees

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Patricia,

I gave public comment today at the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission. My comments were a condensed version of the email below that I sent to Director Torgelson at SCDI. Please forward my note to the commissioners as I would really appreciate their help ensuring SCDI is reviewing these plans correctly. As I

said on the call, I should not have to pre-emptively hire lawyers or listen for chainsaws when rules and regulations should be protecting all exceptional trees, both on my property and neighboring properties.

Thank you,

Sharon

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sharon London** <slondon.consulting@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2022 at 5:47 PM

Subject: Re: Clarification re 831 NE 96th St--plating question and exceptional or "potential exceptional" trees

To: nathan.torgelson@seattle.gov <nathan.torgelson@seattle.gov>

Cc: Jan H. <jan2ski@gmail.com>, sjgates@comcast.net <sjgates@comcast.net>, deborajuarez@seattle.gov <deborajuarez@seattle.gov>, rchmn22mtns@gmail.com <rchmn22mtns@gmail.com>, Bakker, Patricia <patricia.bakker@seattle.gov>, Cheryl Kordick <cheryl.kordick@gmail.com>, James Davis <jamesdavis1400@gmail.com>, Jessica Dixon-Horton <BARDJESS@msn.com>, BB Photo <bbphoto@gmail.com>, Steve Zemke <stevezemke@msn.com>, katygr@msn.com <katygr@msn.com>, Pat Limberg <patlimberg@gmail.com>, Jesse Shook <jesseshook69@gmail.com>, Danae Moore-Downing <danaepmoore@gmail.com>, Cynthia King <catladyof808@gmail.com>, Annie Fanning <anniefanning@gmail.com>, Kim Romano <kimromano24@gmail.com>, Michael Cuddy <mike@michaelcuddymedia.com>, Sandy Shettler <sshettler@msn.com>, Brian Berry <brianberry@gmail.com>, Rowan Foster <rowansfoster@gmail.com>

Dear Director Torgelson,

As a former Executive Director of Seattle Urban Nature, the nonprofit that created the vegetation management plans behind the Green Seattle Partnership and someone who has dedicated her career to environmental conservation, I am extremely concerned about the property slated for development at 831 NE 96th which is directly behind my home at 824 NE 95th St.

This property has at least two exceptional trees (as noted in SMC 25.11.050), including two 27" western red cedars. My adjacent property is composed of five evergreen trees (including at least one, and up to five exceptional trees), two madrone trees, and mostly native plants in the understory. We also have a greenbelt with my three neighbors to the west of me that may qualify as an exceptional grove. I urge you to do the following:

- 1) Review this site's platting plans to maximize the retention of existing trees, especially since this will be entirely new construction.
- 2) Ensure that any development does not harm the roots of my trees, nor the trees on neighboring properties, as this is a rare urban greenbelt.

I am also concerned that the tree report from the developer indicated the standing "snag" (dead tree that provides habitat for wildlife) on my property be removed. My yard is a certified wildlife habitat through the National Wildlife Federation and the indifference to wildlife and wildlife considerations is extremely concerning. We have had visits from bald eagles, red tailed hawks,

flickers, woodpeckers, coyote, and other species, and while I believe in urban density, it is imperative we keep what remaining habitat we have left in the city as habitat for wildlife and pollinators is rapidly shrinking. I also urge you to consider the many ecosystem services this grove of trees provides our community including carbon sequestration, air and water filtration, and numerous benefits for both humans and wildlife.

Finally, as the block co-captain for the 800 block of NE 95th street, I am copying a number of neighbors who may be impacted by the potential loss of these trees, Councilmember Debora Juarez as this is in her district, and the Urban Forestry Commission.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sharon London (and Brian Berry)

From: Jayn Foy <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 7:42 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Save Our Trees!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

There is no Planet B. We would not be alive if all trees disappear. They sustain us with OXYGEN!!!

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

The draft Tree Protection Ordinance is currently under a Hearing Examiner appeal by the Master Builders of King and Snohomish County and six development companies. Their goal is to delay and potentially weaken the ordinance. We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. 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. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase

land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.

7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Jayn Foy

jaynfoy@gmail.com

3302 S. Charles St.

Seattle, Washington 98144