



**SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION**

**Becca Neumann** (Position #4 – Hydrologist), Co-chair  
**Joshua Morris** (Position #7 – NGO), Co-Chair  
**Julia Michalak** (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist) • **Joe Sisneros** (Position #2 – Urban Ecologist - ISA)  
**Falisha Kurji** (Position #3 – Natural Resource Agency) • **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**

September 7, 2022, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Via Webex call and in-person at the  
Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 1872 (18<sup>th</sup> floor)  
700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Seattle

(206) 207-1700

Meeting number: 2493 595 1350

Meeting password: 1234

**Attending**

Commissioners

Josh Morris – Co-Chair  
Becca Neumann – Co-Chair  
Julia Michalak  
Stuart Niven  
Hao Liang  
Jessica Hernandez  
Laura Keil  
Lia Hall

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE

Guests

Toby Thaler

Public

Sandy Shettler  
Sharon Ricci  
Steve Zemke  
Sage Miller  
Jennifer Kovach

Absent- Excused

Joe Sisneros  
Falisha Kurji  
David Moehring  
Blake Voorhees  
Jessica Jones

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

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

**Public comment:**

Sandy Shettler commented on SDCI enforcement of the tree protection ordinance, citing another instance of exceptional tree cutting (branches being trimmed) happening at a time when the SDCI call number was not available. There needs to be a wider range of hours that folks are able to reach SDCI when these things happen, to improve enforcement.

Sharon Ricci shared slides regarding the potential SPU Taylor Creek project, and urged the Commission to support the community in the preservation of Dead Horse Canyon/Lakeridge Park. The canyon has a vital dense tree canopy in one of the most economically and culturally diverse areas of Seattle that also has high heat and air pollution. The Friends of Dead Horse Canyon group is focused on three things: protecting the slope, as this is already a landslide prone area; retaining trees in an area struggling with heat and air pollution (removing the trees is going to increase temperatures and further degraded air quality and exasperate loss of the canopy); the difficulty of replacing the tree canopy, as replacing 100-year old trees, dense woods, the thriving microbial soil, and the wildlife will be impossible. They ask Commissioners to help request that the project team seek input from engineers with experience in erosion, soil management and conservation, and to look at options that align with sustainability goals in Seattle's Green New Deal.

Steve Zemke urged the Commission to invite the new SDOT director to meet regarding the Transportation Plan they're working on now. The Plan doesn't refer to management of trees currently. Regarding the Chief Arborist SLI, recommend reframing that as the Urban Forester for the city. There's no Urban Forestry Division in charge of trees, and there's no plan for how the city will get to 30% canopy cover.

Sage Miller shared the information that there was a group in Olympia yesterday, calling for action to conserve the last legacy forests. There was a recent ruling that DNR was not required to sell legacy forests for raising funds for schools. Sage thinks this is an important shift in how to conserve and protect the forest legacy throughout the state, and is happy to follow up with any additional folks who want more information.

Jennifer Kovach noted that she is the principal of Rising Star Elementary School in south Seattle, which has an ephemeral wetland and a rich diversity of trees and plants on about 6 acres. They started last year to remove blackberry and plant new plants, including conifers; she is forest steward for the area. They are looking to understand who manages the land between the school and I-5, and partner with the city for management of the forest there.

Lia Hall commented to build on what Sandy Shettler said about shortcomings in enforcement and SDCI limited hours. Lia has heard from community members their frustrations in seeing cutting happening after hours, and then when they are able to report the activity, inspectors have difficulty accessing property to verify the status of the tree and the activity. She noted that it's important to look the enforcement mechanisms and find ways to make them more robust.

**Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:**

Patti provided updates on a couple of events:

- Urban Forestry Symposium – registration is now open for this event, to be held on October 6, 9:30 am – 4:30 pm. The focus this year will be Restoring Ancestral Stewardship with Community & Our Urban Forests. The program “aims to bridge the gap between tribal practices and local government, fostering the kinds of partnerships that can interweave community, access, ancestral stewardship, and current management practices that all work towards collaborative stewardship of our urban forests”. Patti provided a link to the event registration in the chat.

- Seattle Forest Week – the dates for this week have been confirmed as October 22-29. This week will be bookended by Arbor Day on October 23<sup>rd</sup> and Green Seattle Day on October 29<sup>th</sup>, with online and in-person events happening during the week between. Patti provided a link in the chat to the Seattle Forest Week website.

Josh shared that several Commissioners had a couple of meetings with Jessyn Farrell and Patti Bakker at OSE on the Chief Arborist SLI, to discuss questions and the process for responding to the SLI.;that will be reflected in the discussion on that topic today.

### **The Nature Conservancy urban forestry work and NYC practical canopy analysis – Michael Treglia and Jessie Israel, TNC**

Josh introduced Jesse Israel from The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in Washington, and Mike Treglia from TNC's New York Program, who will talk about their urban forest work in the Puget Sound area and in New York City, including the practical canopy study looking at potential for canopy and how that informs goal setting and coalition building.

Jesse provided a summary of TNC's urban forest work in Washington. Their urban forest program is focused on making cities more resilient and livable, building support for nature through the development of infrastructure and natural solutions to pollution. They do this through investing in partnerships advocating for policies that incentivize green infrastructure, providing an accessible platform to amplify stories, and using sound science and accelerating funding and projects.

Jesse noted that engaging in this work with a racial equity lens is key, as communities of color continue to experience the impacts of environmental injustice and racism, including proximity to pollution, low access to green space and lower tree canopy. As part of their work in urban forestry, they've invested in partner-driven work and invest in a multi-year partnerships, science and storytelling resources.

Jesse provided information on a specific project of this program, the goals for which were to produce a Central Puget Sound Urban Tree Canopy Assessment to provide tools to support jurisdictions and organizations making decisions about tree canopy projects, and to pilot an urban carbon credit protocol with all of this work. With this project, they are looking at multiple benefits, not just an increase in tree canopy, but stormwater pollution reduction, improved air quality, carbon capture, habitat and human well-being, mental and physical health.

TNC has recently published this urban tree canopy assessment tool kit, which can be found on their website. They aim to have the work they do here in Puget Sound be also highly scalable to other parts of the country. Next, they are looking at ensuring that folks know about these tools, finding partners to look at case studies and using these tools, and continuing to explore how TNC can engage to support a healthy urban canopy in Washington.

Mike then covered TNC's practical canopy work to understand where new canopy can likely go in New York City, and also ultimately how they can use data and partnerships to support the urban forest in New York City.

Historically, a lot of TNC's work has focused on getting large tracts of land into conservation, either through purchasing it or through easements, but their work has evolved in different ways. They now work in over 70 different countries, with local partners and on the ground in different ways. Around 2013, they started their first dedicated city program here in New York focused on New York City. One of their work areas is Future Forest New York City, for which they developed a report that was released last fall called the State of the Urban Forest in New York City. This report was their attempt to characterize everything they could about the urban forest, largely relying on existing research and data, but also doing a lot of new analysis with the data

out there. They partnered with others in lots of different ways, including events with community-based organizations. They acted as leading convener and a member of the urban forest task force, which was comprised of about 50 different organizations, mostly non-profits and that focused either locally, or city wide, and in different realms but also groups like the Real Estate Board of New York. That group developed the New York City Urban Forest Agenda, which set forth a set of goals to work toward in the next few years to help the urban forest succeed in the long term. That task has since evolved into a coalition called Forest for All NYC. Through different aspects of this work the group advocates for policy change to support the urban forest through multiple lenses, including equity.

In talking about the urban forest, it's the over seven million trees in New York City, as well as the physical and social infrastructure that support them. This means thinking about the canopy, the understory of forested natural areas, and also the care for them in different contexts, both volunteer and paid stewards.

There are a lot of tangible and intangible benefits of this urban forest resource, and as part of the work on the State of the Urban Forest in New York City, they worked to understand the baseline of what the resource is and how it's doing. They have high-resolution LiDAR-based data for New York City that shows there was about 22% canopy cover citywide in 2017, and that it varies a lot throughout the city. All of the boroughs have between about 18 and 32% canopy, but if you look at units called neighborhood population areas, some have as much as 78% canopy cover, whereas others have as little as 3%, often in areas like airports and denser parts of Manhattan.

They also looked at change in canopy between 2010 and 2017, and saw an increase in canopy of 2% overall, from about 20% to 22%. There were areas that lost canopy, especially areas that were hit by Superstorm Sandy in about 2012. There has also been a variety of things like ice storms that have impacted trees. The most recent canopy data that they have is from 2017; they are hoping to get another LiDAR-based dataset so that they can do more rigorous comparisons through time with comparable data. With this type of data they can look at things like jurisdictional dynamics of the urban forest. While about a third of the land in New York City is within the jurisdiction of the city government, over half of the canopy is within that, so actually about 53% is in the jurisdiction of New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, either in formalized parkland, or in street trees. About one-third of the canopy is in private property, and the majority of that is on single-family residential properties that have more yard space around them. There are a few other different city government agencies, state and federal entities that have some of the canopy, but overall the city property is contributing the greatest share of the canopy.

Mike described how they look at the inequities in this resource. They look at areas that have tree canopy within them and around a quarter mile radius, evaluating areas that are within a 5-minute walk. Areas that have less canopy tend to have a higher social vulnerability index, which is a metric developed by the Center for Disease Control and prevention to reflect how vulnerable communities are to events such as major power outages or storms. The areas with higher social vulnerability tend to be those with higher proportions of people of color and lower income communities.

The baseline canopy information shows that the urban forest is really healthy and expanding, with a wide variety of different trees, and it's got a really strong stewardship base, including both individual people and institutions that steward with a strong leadership from New York City Parks in particular, and there are definitely expansion opportunities to expand this resource in more places. But there is currently a patchwork of policies, for private property in particular, and there is insufficient and insecure funding that varies. There is currently insufficient knowledge of resident's attitudes towards trees, which can ultimately inform and improve policy to support the canopy in a way that people buy into. And there are the impacts of climate change and pests and diseases.

The Forest for All NYC Coalition was formed to promote a healthy, biodiverse, robust, understood and resilient urban forest that equitably delivers its benefits to all New York city residents.

There are four main pillars in NYC's urban forest agenda:

- Plan – achieve 30% canopy cover by 2035, develop Master Plan
- Invest – spur investment in the forest itself and also in careers and the people who care for the forest.
- Manage – to help and support management of the forest throughout the full life cycle of trees.
- Learn – to better allow sharing of information about the urban forest.

The practical canopy stemmed from answering the question of how much canopy a landscape can have given current conditions. It gives an idea of where new trees can be planted and given where canopy can fit given the current landscape and informs the goals that support the urban forest. It is considered to be a conversation starter that can promote dialogue; it is not prescriptive.

The practical canopy incorporates an approach called the “three P’s”, which are foundational in thinking about where canopy can go:

- Possible canopy – where is it feasible based on land cover data
- Potential canopy – where is it economically desirable
- Preferable canopy – where is it socially desirable

The approach of this work builds on the three P's by focusing on practical canopy, and then priority canopy. The concept of practical canopy includes where trees can be planted and where trees are able to grow.

Planting only in practical canopy areas would exacerbate inequities since most practical canopy is in areas where there is already high canopy. Mike covered some strengths and weaknesses of the practical canopy analysis, and provided some example areas showing current canopy and practical canopy, and some examples of data limits. He also covered some high-level results of opportunities in the city. There is practical canopy in all neighborhoods and most of it is on private property.

The assessment isn't time bound; there isn't a timeframe described to achieve the canopy. In order to really get to equity they'll need to develop additional potential canopy areas. In developing the goal, they wanted it to be achievable but also visionary, and 30% was determined to be that achievable, aspirational goal. Mike outlined the steps they've identified to get to that goal:

- Protection of the existing or urban forest
- Ongoing management, maintenance and stewardship of existing trees
- New plantings and canopy expansion across all jurisdictions
- Heavy focus on both protecting and planting on private property

The results of this data are available as open data.

Questions and comments addressed included:

- Are climate change impacts being seen on particular species in NYC, similar to how we are seeing big leaf maple decline here?
- Were there diversity, equity and inclusion frameworks included in this study?
- Have there have been any strategies implemented to ensure the information reported in a peer-review article is also available to the local communities? Given how peer review publications are not accessible to community members outside of academia or sectors that have access to these libraries.
- Did you incorporate overhead wires limiting tree height? and was there a maximum tree height considered?
- Did you estimate the number of trees to plant? Or could you estimate number of trees?

- How much of this work can be incorporated into efforts like Seattle developing a plan to reach our canopy goals?
- How have the conversations gone with the partners? Has the city adopted the 30x35 goal? The Coalition is interested in getting the city to officially adopt the goal.
- How can the Commission and the city engage more directly with TNC's work in Puget Sound?
- NYC is very data-rich. How is this work transferable to other places?

Hao will draft a follow-up letter for TNC.

#### **Follow-up to Michael Eliason's solutions for density and trees presentation**

Blake reviewed the letter he drafted for this purpose. Commissioners discussed the letter and made some edits.

**Action: a motion to adopt the letter to Michael Eliason as amended was made, seconded and approved.**

#### **Chief Arborist Statement of Legislative Intent**

Josh outlined the work done on this SLI to date, including several Commissioners meeting with OSE staff to discuss the SLI request and our potential recommendations on this position. The SLI requests that information on this position include job title, duties and responsibilities and what department it would be hosted in. He noted that there was agreement that it doesn't make sense for the Commission to weigh in on some of the things like where the position fits in the city's internal structure, but it does make sense for the Commission to make recommendations on the duties and responsibilities and the key qualifications. Josh outlined results of research he conducted on similar high level urban forester positions in other cities, of which there are not many. One of the questions being considered is whether this position should be more regulatory or more strategic. Some of the examples he found were a mix of these.

Hao also provided information from his homework from the last group meeting on the SLI, which was to look into whether there are any federal level guidelines similar to ADA that the city needs to adhere to related to urban forestry. He did not find that there are any such guidelines, but there is federal funding support through the USDA for forestry initiatives.

Josh noted also that in the conversations with OSE, there is agreement that describing this position as more of a city urban forest makes more sense than focusing on a Chief Arborist position.

Patti clarified the current due date for the response to this SLI, which had originally been extended to September 15<sup>th</sup>, but was again extended to now be due on September 30.

A subgroup of Commissioners will meet again to further the work of developing recommendations on this.

***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 recommended the Commission consider expanding environmental and climate protection in the city, which includes trees. This would mean making it its own department and giving it more authority. Climate is becoming a much bigger crisis and should be given more attention, not stuck away within the departments. Secondly, when talking about tree canopy, it's not just area; need to also look at canopy volume. The big trees are providing the most protection. It will take decades to grow new trees so we should emphasize protecting the existing trees.

Toby Thaler, as one of the drafters of the SLI, spoke to the regulatory vs policy aspect. The SLI requested independent oversight of the city's management of trees. His office doesn't believe trees are being adequately protected and the tree ordinance is not being adequately enforced. They don't believe that will adequately happen until oversight is removed from SDCl. The SLI asks for the position's responsibilities include review of project applications; this responsibility doesn't have to be in SDCl.

Lia Hall noted her proposal of setting up a social media presence for the Commission. Patti provided information on what would be required regarding city policy, and Josh noted that when this was brought up at a previous meeting, there was general support for it from the Commissioners.

**Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 PM.

**Meeting Chat:**

from sage miller to everyone: 3:05 PM

public comment..sage

from Lia Hall to everyone: 3:06 PM

I'd like to make a public comment

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:10 PM

Clarification: Question Can you explain what is meant by "culturally diverse area"? Is this referring to racial demographics or species?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:10 PM

species\* biodiversity

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:12 PM

thank you

from Callie Neylan to everyone: 3:14 PM

We need a plan for properly caring for new trees once they're planted.

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:16 PM

Question: which state schools are they trying to fund with this?

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 3:18 PM

patricia.bakker@seattle.gov

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:19 PM

Yes, and by the time the inspection occurs the stump has been ground and there is no evidence.

from sage miller to everyone: 3:20 PM

loggomh revenue is connected on state level with school construction. K-12. Also public universities have a trust interest in DNR managed forest lands.

from Sharon Ricci to everyone: 3:20 PM

Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to share concerns and learn about the greater community.

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 3:22 PM

UF Symposium:

<https://botanicgardens.uw.edu/education/adults/conferences-symposia/urban-forest-symposium/>

from sage miller to everyone: 3:22 PM

sorry for mis spell--logging

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 3:22 PM

Seattle Forest Week:

[https://greenseattle.org/get-involved/green-seattle-](https://greenseattle.org/get-involved/green-seattle-day/#:~:text=Save%20the%20date%20for%20Seattle,Day%20(October%2029%2C%202022)!)

[day/#:~:text=Save%20the%20date%20for%20Seattle,Day%20\(October%2029%2C%202022\)!](https://greenseattle.org/get-involved/green-seattle-day/#:~:text=Save%20the%20date%20for%20Seattle,Day%20(October%2029%2C%202022)!) and

<https://seattle.gov/trees/get-involved/events>

from Lakehart, Ali to everyone: 3:23 PM

At the request of our Jewish Community and with support from Rainier Beach Action Coalition members, Arbor Day is Sunday, October 23rd - location is Be'er Sheva Park.

from Lakehart, Ali to everyone: 3:24 PM

We have never tried a Sunday date but we are excited to be able to welcome those who observe Shabbat.

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 3:24 PM

Thanks for that clarification, Ali!

from Callie Neylan to everyone: 3:34 PM

Is NYC seeing any kind of climate change effects on specific tree species like we're seeing on our Big Leaf Maples?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:39 PM

Question: Was there any DEI frameworks included in these studies, aside from the social vulnerability assessment? For example: resources or tools to support communities with the highest social vulnerability?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:41 PM

Question: Can you speak more on the "equity" lens that was used?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:43 PM

Question: have there have been any strategies implemented to ensure the information reported in a peer-review article is also available to the local communities? Given how peer review publications are not accessible to community members outside of academia or sectors that have access to these libraries.

from Laura Keil she/her to everyone: 3:46 PM

^scientific language can also be difficult to unpack, have there been other forms of sharing this information?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:52 PM

+1 Laura

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 3:52 PM

Thank you for the very informative presentation. I am sorry but I have to leave the meeting as my neighbour has just called to say a passing delivery truck has knocked and broken part of their street tree! Eeek. I will hopefully be back in time to join the rest of the meeting, depending on the situation.

from Julia Michalak She/Her to everyone: 3:59 PM

Did you incorporate overhead wires limiting tree height? and was there a maximum tree height considered?

Did you estimate the number of trees to plant? Or could you estimate number of trees?

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:01 PM

What are the concerns and pressures for increased housing density which is affecting lots of areas in Washington State?

from Jessie Israel The Nature Conservancy to everyone: 4:05 PM

Here is a direct link to the Puget Sound Urban Tree Canopy Toolkit: <https://tinyurl.com/bddpnfpp> which includes: 1) High-resolution Tree Canopy Analysis for urban areas of Snohomish, King and Pierce Counties 2) Planting prioritization storymap 3) Optimized i-Tree Landscape + Tree Equity Score online tools 4) Climate Species Guide 5) Case studies for urban carbon credits

from Mike Treglia to everyone: 4:26 PM

Here are the links from my slide deck:

from Mike Treglia to everyone: 4:26 PM

Practical Canopy Preprint:

<https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202206.0106/v1>

Practical Canopy Supplementary Data:

<https://zenodo.org/record/6547492>

The State of the Urban Forest in NYC:

<https://www.nature.org/content/dam/tnc/nature/en/photos/TheStateoftheNYCUrbanForest.pdf>

NYC Urban Forest Agenda:

<https://forestforall.nyc/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/NYC-Urban-Forest-Agenda-.pdf>

Forest for All NYC Website:

<https://forestforall.nyc/>

from Mike Treglia to everyone: 4:26 PM

Recent News Coverage:

<https://www.silive.com/news/2022/08/how-much-tree-canopy-can-nyc-sustain-study-explores-question->

opportunities.html

from Jessie Israel The Nature Conservancy to everyone: 4:32 PM

I have preschool pickup so will have to leave now. THANK YOU for your time today.

from Mike Treglia to everyone: 4:33 PM

Thanks all! I'd love to stay on but need to hop off myself

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:43 PM

Is Executive still on Sept 15 deadline for SLI response? (From emails June 17)

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:43 PM

Difference between arborist and Urban Forester in their area of expertise and knowledge. Recommend qualified urban forester.to look at larger picture.

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:46 PM

This is page of the Urban and Community Forestry Program,

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:46 PM

<https://www.fs.usda.gov/managing-land/urban-forests/ucf>

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:47 PM

City Comprehensive Plan actually has long range canopy goal of 40%. And canopy is both canopy as area and canopy volume. Large trees help more in many ways, eg climate resiliency.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:49 PM

Really need an urban forestry division, not just one person. Need to be independent entity, like in a new Dept of Environment and Climate, with an Urban Forestry division.

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:49 PM

From these positions, the "people" or "community" aspect is removed. Can we leverage to include that? Especially since we often talk about DEI and I see it dropped too often but without any set guidelines or components that allow me to see the direct connections to "people" and "community"

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:51 PM

^the oregon one is the only one that mentions "community" work

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:52 PM

Can the package of job descriptions be posted at UFC site?

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:52 PM

Thanks

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:55 PM

Was public utilities the one that sent their DEI experts to give presentations at the retreat?

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:55 PM

I'll make an observation in public comment if you do that...

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 4:56 PM

Yes, Jessica, that was a team from Seattle Public Utilities

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:57 PM

Then they would be the best to house this new position :) (in my opinion!)

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:59 PM

Yes, Volume is so much more valuable than Canopy!! Thanks Steve!!

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:59 PM

Josh: I might be able to work with you on the new position alongside Becca. Can you add me to that email?

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 5:00 PM

Absolutley, Jessica! :)

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 5:02 PM

Clafirication: Isn't Lia a comissioner?

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 5:03 PM

She is :)

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 5:03 PM

Can commissioners give public comment?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 5:03 PM

I am confused :)

from Callie Neylan to everyone: 5:03 PM

@Lia Hall. What about TikTok, too?

from Callie Neylan to everyone: 5:03 PM

Hug trees.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 5:04 PM

I love Lia's idea. UFC is too under the radar. You guys are awesome and need to get more of the public aware of what you're doing

from Laura Keil she/her to everyone: 5:04 PM

An urban planning side of tiktok exists, we could begin the urban forestry side !

from Laura Keil she/her to everyone: 5:04 PM

<https://www.planning.org/podcast/tiktoks-talkingcities-makes-urban-planning-fast-and-easy-to-grasp/>

from Callie Neylan to everyone: 5:06 PM

Thank you!

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

**From:** Phil Maulding <philm@churchbcc.org>

**Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 1:59 PM

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

**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE TREES!!!

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

Trees give life: oxygen, shade, bird habitat AND are beautiful! Humans need nature!

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Phil Maulding  
[philm@churchbcc.org](mailto:philm@churchbcc.org)  
8023 Green Lake Dr. N  
Seattle, Washington 98103

**From:** Emily McRen <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 6:06 PM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Emily McRen  
[emailecm@gmail.com](mailto:emailecm@gmail.com)  
1128 N 77th Ave  
Seattle , Washington 98103

**From:** Deborah Hutchinson <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 3:28 PM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We urge our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But it would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Deborah Hutchinson  
[deborahhutchinsonphd@gmail.com](mailto:deborahhutchinsonphd@gmail.com)  
7045 40th Ave NE  
Seattle, Washington 98115

**From:** Matt Newton <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 29, 2022 8:18 PM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Matt Newton  
[matthew.robert.newton@gmail.com](mailto:matthew.robert.newton@gmail.com)  
6833 Oswego pl ne  
Seattle , Washington 98115

**From:** Larin Summer <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2022 5:26 PM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Save Our Trees!

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

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 related are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Larin Summer

[flowingwaters8@hotmail.com](mailto:flowingwaters8@hotmail.com)

4251 Aurora Ave N 416

Seattle, Washington 98103

**From:** Laurel Kelnhofer <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 31, 2022 4:04 PM

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

**Subject:** Save Our Trees!

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

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

Laurel Kelnhofer  
[lkelnhofer95@gmail.com](mailto:lkelnhofer95@gmail.com)  
8215 12th Ave S  
Seattle, Washington 98108

**From:** Susan Ward <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 31, 2022 11:04 PM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

It is ironic that the City is considering cutting ("removing") mature sweetgum trees on Aurora Ave N. You can travel miles on Aurora N. and not see a single tree alongside the street, and yet these few are apparently too many. These are healthy, big trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), and yet are at risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already. Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is rough in some areas between N 80th and N 105th, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But cannot the City fix the sidewalks without removing these trees?

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree. So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Susan Ward  
[susward27@outlook.com](mailto:susward27@outlook.com)  
10330 Wallingford Ave N  
Seattle, Washington 98133

**From:** Lauren Tozzi <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 1, 2022 9:19 AM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Lauren Tozzi  
[lrntozzi2@gmail.com](mailto:lrntozzi2@gmail.com)  
4648 Sunnyside Ave N  
Seattle, Washington 98103-6941

**From:** Susan Burnett <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 1, 2022 11:15 AM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Save our Trees!

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

To the Decision Makers regarding Seattle's tree canopy:

I moved to northwest Seattle nearly 5 years ago. One of the reasons I moved from the Bryant area was the wonderful trees. As you know, Greenwood Ave North is seeing an explosion of residential building. While I see the need for housing, I lament that hundreds of trees are not only being felled, but the entire landscape is being scraped clear of any vegetation.

Aside from the fact that certain areas of our city are the dumping grounds for all density-with other areas not at all accepting high density units-it is obvious that GREED plays a large part in the decisions of developers!! These units are not for people with regular jobs, but cost much more than regular folks can afford. One builder, who on the corner of Greenwood Ave N. and 140th, has been personally building two

four condo units for nearly ten years (the second is still not finished). With the rezoning, he turned them into 11 units each. So, instead of 8 units there are now 22 units. The neighbors know that he was a former Seattle Government employee in the housing department! He saw the opportunity and took it.

A few buildings north on Greenwood, developers took out two four unit apartments and erected two eight unit townhouses. Around \$800 K each unit! Several mature trees had to go!

My point is that it appears as if there is little oversight, planning, and accountability in development. And developers get free rein. So, of course, the trees have to go. I don't know who is in charge of the mess and assault on our trees, but they ought to lose their jobs!!! It is a complete denial of scientific research. It demonstrates the false lip service from our city council and the housing and transportation departments. Talk about climate change is cheap! Walk your talk!!

Additionally, many areas populated by low income, disadvantaged people, have few or no trees!! NW Seattle still has trees and we don't want to lose any more of them. (We finally are getting sidewalks on Greenwood, and that has stripped a lot of large trees.) So, please understand that we want Seattle Government and its departments to get their act together. How long does it take for a new tree to become a carbon sink? Educate yourselves and get planting. In the mean time, STOP CUTTING DOWN SEATTLE TREES!

Respectful, but wanting accountability,  
Susan Burnett  
14002 Palatine Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98133

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

Susan Burnett

[truebluemorpho@hotmail.com](mailto:truebluemorpho@hotmail.com)

14002 Palatine Ave North

SEATTLE, Washington 98133

**From:** Gabriel Kennedy-Gibbens <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

**Sent:** Friday, September 2, 2022 4:24 PM

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

**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Gabriel Kennedy-Gibbens  
[kennedy.gibbens.gabriel@gmail.com](mailto:kennedy.gibbens.gabriel@gmail.com)  
117 W Graves Rd  
Spokane , Washington 99218

**From:** Jeffrey Green <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 3, 2022 10:59 AM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Jeffrey Green  
[swoosh.pullout-08@icloud.com](mailto:swoosh.pullout-08@icloud.com)  
523 Broadway E Apt 225  
Seattle, Washington 98102

**From:** Jeffrey Green <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 3, 2022 11:00 AM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Jeffrey Green  
[swoosh.pullout-08@icloud.com](mailto:swoosh.pullout-08@icloud.com)  
523 Broadway E Apt 225  
Seattle, Washington 98102

**From:** Michael Stratman <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 5, 2022 8:22 AM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Michael Stratman  
[mikenike192@gmail.com](mailto:mikenike192@gmail.com)  
947 N 82nd St  
Seattle , Washington 98103

**From:** Christopher Brown <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 5, 2022 10:49 AM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

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

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Christopher Brown  
[chrishikes@gmail.com](mailto:chrishikes@gmail.com)  
7339 W Green Lake Dr N  
Seattle, Washington 98103

**From:** noelcatharine@hotmail.com <info@email.actionnetwork.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 5, 2022 11:44 AM  
**To:** Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Save our Trees!

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

I have just come back from being away for a couple weeks to see that an entire block of old, beautiful maple trees with very thick trunks and dense green foliage is going to be cut down, on 36th and Stoneway. This seems due to development. After a summer of many weeks over 90 degrees, do we really want to cut down mature green canopy in an urban area? The neighborhood needs the trees for shade, cooling, and making oxygen! On the other side of the intersection is a row of three young trees--"replacement trees"--that are three feet high, brown and shriveled, and clearly dead because no one watered them over the summer.

We need a good, functioning tree ordinance that preserves our mature trees and takes care of new trees so that they live and thrive. We need to prepare for the onslaught of climate change by increasing the

urban canopy, not cutting it down and pretending we're replacing it while actually creating an urban baking tray.

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 related are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

[noelcatharine@hotmail.com](mailto:noelcatharine@hotmail.com)

Noel Allen, 3610 Ashworth Ave N  
Seattle, WA, Washington 98103