SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

John Floberg, Chair • John Small, Vice-Chair
Gordon Bradley • Tom Early • Leif Fixen • Matt Mega • Jeff Reibman • Erik Rundell • Peg Staeheli

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

February 13, 2013
Meeting Notes
Seattle Municipal Tower Room 2750
700 5th Avenue, Seattle
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Attending

Commissioners
John Floberg (JF) - chair
Gordon Bradley (GB)
Tom Early (TE)
Leif Fixen (LF)
Erik Rundell (ER)
Peg Staeheli (PS)

Staff
Sandra Pinto de Bader (SPdB) - OSE
Nolan RUndquist - SDOT
Susan Paine – SDOT
Mark Mead - Parks

Public
Steve Zemke

Absent- Excused
Matt Mega (MM)
John Small (JS) – vice-chair
Jeff Reibman (JR)

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
We had a cancellation. Tracy is sick so we will not be hearing the Climate Action Plan presentation.

Chair report
JF – revisit the UFMP being renamed to the UFSP and the discussion that the new name might lessen the importance of the plan by introducing the term stewardship. I want to make sure we are settled or that we have finished the discussion. Would like to have a consensus on the term.

GB – The book Nolan handed out, all highlighted cities have a management plan. There are exceptions.

LF – I hesitate to change the name because I want to make sure trees are considered at the same level as other utilities. I don't want it to lose its teeth. A management plan is clear on what the goals of the document are. Stewardship is broader.

TE – I don't have a problem. Stewardship encompasses the management of a breathing, living entity. An urban forest is not a degrading system. I see them as fairly equal and the differences are mainly semantic.

LF – why are we renaming it? That's my question.

ER – I'm fine with stewardship both the public and the City have responsibility.

JF – take things that are implicit in the document and make it more explicit. It's a re-shuffling of the content in order to bring out the implicit pieces.

JF – we need two commissioners to attend meetings and provide input on the new version of the UFSP.

Tom Early is interested and so is Leif Fixen.

JF – what does Mark think of the re-naming of the plan. Would they balk?

MMead – the industry standard is Management. I believe that when we talk about sustainability, the term stewardship is linked.

Nolan – is a management plan with a robust stewardship component.

JF – are you comfortable going out into the world and talking about a stewardship plan?

MMead – yes

GB – what would be the process by which the Commission would get involved?

JF – the participating commissioners will be

PS – move UFMP along and if this stays in contact with that, that we continue the approval. Similar to when we send a letter around.

PS – could we make a motion that if the changes that have been talked about are in the same context of the discussions we've had in past meetings, that the approach we take is to provide a provisional approval. As long as the changes that we see are in the same context and spirit we've heard, then I move to approve the plan while keeping the process moving forward.

Any other comments on how we are moving forward with this?

> **ACTION**: **A motion was made to approve the revised Urban Forest Stewardship Plan. The motion was seconded and carried.**

NOTE: By this act the Commission is fully empowering the two Commissioners that will be participating in the working group that will produce a final iteration of the Urban Forest Stewardship Plan.

Climate Action Plan presentation – Tracy Morgenstern
Tracy is out sick. We'll move this presentation to our next meeting.

Update on progress of Street Tree Ordinance – Nolan Rundquist
Nolan – Had meeting with Phyllis. Add is the tree appropriate for the location? If we have a red oak under power lines, has been there for 50 years and has successfully provided benefits- not a standalone removal criteria.

PS – now that we have been hearing the cost of the pruning, I'm getting concern about that operation. The lifecycle cost. At what point does that tree become inappropriate? Do we maintain it every year for 100 years? How do we move this from a maintenance operation to an urban forest enhancement operation?

Nolan – even in the industry there is a fundamental disagreement on whether an oak is appropriate under power lines. It depends on whether you are sitting on the utility side or on the increasing canopy side of the table.

PS – is this type of thing included in the UFSP?

Nolan – we always consider appropriateness of the tree.

LF – agree that it's a slippery slope.

SPdB – we added an action agenda item.

Nolan – Posting procedure for trees to be impacted by development. Council asked if we would post the intention to plant a tree. I asked what the purpose was. Would we deny the permit if a neighbor doesn't want the tree there?

Going through the UFC recommendation letter. Concern on how we would make things accessible to the public in terms of not removing more than 15% of canopy when pruning. We will include graphics so it's clear

PS – do that for both conifer and deciduous. That's exactly what we were looking for.

GB – are you going to be able to capture that? There are lots of shapes and forms of trees. Maybe a couple of archetypes.

PS – let's try and see if one of each type would work and add complexity as needed.

TE – address the next question and say what happens when you take out x percentage of the tree.

Nolan – Make sure we have a process that is documented out in terms of procedures for Street Trees with SCL. We'll develop a procedure similar to the street tree list.

Holiday lighting – we've never issued a permit for an individual homeowner. It usually is for a large firm impacting many trees in a commercial location. WE proposed to do a similar wording to sidewalk cafes and limit it to commercial districts.

LF – do we have at least rules for residential. Have something on the books so that the lights are removed after the holidays.

Nolan – we have blanket coverage around attaching things to trees. The final thing is about tree reports in standard format. The association of consulting arborists has templates. I talked to them and we will reference their manual.

PS – the idea there was to streamline some things to get standard reporting and reduction of costs. I can send you formats we already have. If you want people to adhere to the requirements we need to support them to comply. If we can agree on what information is in a report it will help.

PEG TO SEND REPORTS TO NOLAN.

JF – you met with Phyllis. Where are we in the timeline?

Nolan – go to committee in March. We'll provide a redlined version and move it forward.

JF – Where do you see gaps in Seattle's urban forest efforts?

Nolan – the best program is Milwaukee. They have 200 arborists. You don't find a tree that needs work. A dedicated funding source for maintenance activities.

TE – how does Milwaukee fund their system?

Nolan – They had elm and chestnuts at a point in time and the Dutch elm disease issue is what started their program.

GB – they had a champion in the city for decades.

Parks urban forestry budget – Mark Mead
MMead – here to discuss the 2013 budget for Parks. The O&M and Capital budgets interlink.

Mark walked the Commission through three pieces of information: Operations and Maintenance Budget, Capital budget and Green Seattle Partnership budget.

O&M – is what you hear about – staff and facility cost. What' he is allowed to spend. Separated into three areas (low org): Tree Crew, Trails/GSP, and Natural Area crew.
Largest expenditure are the largest trucks in the fleet of City (fleets and fuel). Parks doesn't own their vehicles, they lease them from FAS. They are paying ahead for replacement costs. The largest fuel cost is the running of the lift. Using a hybrid truck.

No overtime in the budget. These charges come out of salary savings due to vacancies.

Have minimal budget for travel and training.

In Chicago all the gardeners are arborists. They do both jobs at once. In Seattle we make a distinction, 13 feet off the ground or bigger than 18 inches are handled by arborists not by gardeners.

Construction projects such as Bell street Park is not considered UF. The issue of accounting for all costs of taking care of trees is complex. We have no way to currently account for leaf blowing (done by district staff). We have a system that tracks staff time working on tree care (which includes leaf blowing) but is not part of his budget.

Capital Budget:

REET and Levy funds are used throughout the city. The specific site budgets are dedicated to specific parks. One $1,000,000 donation comes through the Seattle Foundation to do work on Seward Park reforestation project.

If we have not had such diverse sources of funding for the GSP it would not have accomplished what it has to date.

The original plan called for $3.5M at this point in time. So we are still looking for funding.

Detailed GSP budget spending:
Mark went through the details of the Green Seattle Partnership budget.

Were able to diversify expenditures as well. Maintaining 2,000 trees in developed parks, removing 300, replanting 250 per year through this program. This year will bring 60 new acres into restoration and maintaining 800 acres already in restoration.

PS – you are not hitting the 2 for 1

MMead – we are not counting trees planted through capital projects. His re-planting budget was reduced.
PS – if we have a Parks playfield project and they take out 10 trees, and when they rebuild they plant 20, they don't help comply with the 2 for 1.

MMead – as we do work and add acres in, we get to a point where there is a threshold where we are spending money to take care of the acres that already are in restoration, then we have to bring fewer acres into the restoration process.

The natural area crew (2003 levy) the intention was to grow the crew from 5 to 18 people to be able to handle the maintenance of restored sites. So at the end of the 20 year period we would have enough people to maintain. IF we don't steward these sites for ever, they will get invaded again. Stewardship is a community investment and involvement. We are looking at continuing to include volunteerism moving forward.

Stewardship means much more than management with the community involvement.

PS – I like that view of stewardship. My concern is that we describe volunteers (one Saturday a year, not 10). Stewardship takes a lot of work to get, it's not just a feel good thing.

MMead – we have reached the ceiling for having the ability to support forest stewards with current resources. Forest Stewards provide a significant return on investment. We only have 2 staff supporting 150 Forest Stewards.

JF – I hope this concept of stewardship is clarified in the UFSP. The Commission wants to look at all the budgets of departments and how they align with the UFSP.

MMead – budget is very much aligned. Research shows that the only area that is losing canopy are Parks areas. More staff would be great if we want to continue moving towards the goals. WE would like to see additional tree crews (four crews of three staff).

Erik – where do 22 contracted staff show up?

Mark – Our of the establishment and maintenance budget. They work in areas where we can't have volunteers working

TE – what's the threshold for steep slope?

MMead – we don't have a threshold. We are using DPD's. It depends on the volunteer group we are bringing in. 25-30% slope. One of the things I appreciate about the existing plan is that it gives structure to explain some things to folks. Our ability to continue to push on the three elements (community, resource, and management) at the same time. They are all interrelated. The circle needs to continue. It's very important for the UFC to be involved.

If we get to a point where the district staff has to make cuts to their budget that causes them to cut their budget for leaf blowing, etc. then we would be impacted.

PS – leaf blowing is not part of urban forestry. I would keep it out of your budget.

MMead – there are easier ways to capture the development work. Landscape architects work on trees should be considered part of the budget. Another cost is enforcement, claims, problem trees.

PS – if a car gets damaged by a tree. Where does the money come from?

MMead – the overall Parks budget. The forested area is 2,500 acres (or half of the department land base) but the budget is just 2%. Summer canopy cover is 85%. They are moving toward coniferous species.

Public comment:
SZ – track gain and loss through permit system. All departments to capture data as well. Also incorporate street trees to figure out gain and loss. Looked at executive summary of the CAP. Trees are short-changed. It's in public period right now. Don't see a mention of overall tree canopy.
Emerald ash borer impact on human health article.

PS – letter submitted by Irene Wall. It's not just the green factor. Was it because it was a residential lot? We don't have a new ordinance or were the trees shown in Green Factor. What struck me was the two for one response. I'd like to see what happened here?

INVITE DPD TO RESPOND TO WHAT HAPPENED AND DO A REVERSE ENGINEERING OF THE ISSUE. To find out if this is symptomatic.

PS – if it wasn't a tree that had to be protected, I don't know that there is a fine.

Next month's agenda items

Adjourn

Community input:

From: iwall@serv.net [mailto:iwall@serv.net]
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 7:03 PM
To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra

Cc: dduthweiler@comcast.net
Subject: Please share this letter with the UFC members for meeting on 2-14-13

Sandra,

The attached letter documents a recent case of urban infill which illustrates significant shortcomings in our current Green Factor permitting practices with respect to preserving large native trees.

I will probably not be able to attend the meeting on Wednesday so I have prepared this letter and attachments (photos, emails). Also attached are two relevant Correction Notices related to this permit.

The location is 5201 Phinney Avenue.

Contact me if there is any problem with these PDF files or if the Commission has questions.

Thank you

Irene Wall
Phinney Ridge Community Council board member, past president.

day phone is 206 883-9438

c Diane Duthweiler, PRCC President

February 11, 2013

Urban Forestry Commission
Office of Sustainability and Environment
City of Seattle, 700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2748
Seattle, WA 98124-4729

Via email to: Sandra.Pinto_de_Bader@seattle.gov

Re: Needless Demise of Mature Western Red Cedar - Lessons for Tree Protection Code

Dear Commission Members,

First, thank you for your service on the Commission and making recommendations to strengthen tree protection through improvements to Seattle's land use code. I write to offer a recent example which pinpoints several failures in the current code and the Department of Planning and Development's exercise of their enforcement discretion when it comes to saving mature trees.

On November 15, 2012, I stopped at 5201 Phinney Avenue to observe and question the workers there who were "trimming" a very large Western Red Cedar (WRC) on the western boundary of a parcel undergoing redevelopment. The original 1920's home had been demolished, along with all the mature landscaping on the site. Excavation on the site was also alarming as it appeared to be trenching deeply into the root zones of the three mature evergreens trees on the western edge of the parcel to provide a retaining wall for surface parking.

I took photographs of the scene (attached to this letter) and after consulting with an arborist friend, I sent an email on November 19th to DPD. However on Sunday Nov 25th, the stately WRC was chopped down. I send photos of the remaining truck (diameter was nearly 36 inches) to DPD again asking in a phone call and via email how this had been allowed to happen.

During this conversation, the DPD planner revealed that preservation of all the three trees, including the WRC, was a condition of the developer's permit and part of the Green Factor calculation. It was evident from the conversation that the DPD planner was not aware that the tree had been cut down. This was a clear indication that the developer did **not** alert DPD of their intent to violate the terms of their permit. I was told that an inspector would be dispatched that day or the next to issue a stop work order until the matter could be resolved. On Dec 7, 2012, the planner issued a Correction Notice (copy attached).

A series of emails and phone calls ensued as it became clear that work was continuing at the site despite the promised stop work order. As it turns out, no such order was given and DPD's explanation was that they believed that the developer *intended* to comply with the Correction Notice although DPD did not know how the developer would comply or if their offered mitigation would be adequate. This was after the developer clearly ignored the permit condition and failed to alert DPD to their plans to remove the tree. In this case I chastised DPD for giving them the benefit of the doubt under these circumstances. Meanwhile construction continued.

One month later on January 7, 2013, DPD received a reply to the correction notice offering to replant two American Hornbeam trees. DPD responded in a correction notice dated January 11th that these trees were not native and not considered large trees.

On February 6th DPD replied to another inquiry and said that the developer would now plant two 2-inch Pinus contorta in the same space where the WRC had stood. I have since asked DPD how two trees could every reach maturity in this tight space left after the parking lot excavation but I have not received a reply yet. It is interesting that Pinus contorta does not appear on the Green Factor tree list. http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Permits/GreenFactor/GreenFactorTools/default.asp

Remedy Sought

If a developer agrees to preserve trees, secures a permit under those conditions, then intentionally destroys or jeopardizes the trees with excavations, there should be a financial penalty. After-the-fact claims that such trees were actually hazard trees should not be used to reduce this penalty.

The code should be strengthened to require the preservation of large trees that are growing on the perimeter of properties when they are not a hindrance to redeveloping the site.

In future cases where the developer commits to tree preservation and thus earns the largest Green Factor credits for doing so, when those trees are impermissibly destroyed, there should be no Green Factor credits allowed for replacing them with small trees in the hope that they would ever reach maturity and replace the lost trees. To do otherwise encourages the "bait and switch" activity that occurred at 5201 Phinney Avenue.

SMC 25.11.090 should be amended to establish the minimum size (at the time of planting) of any replacement trees in proportion to the size of the tree removed and should require that the developer post a bond against failure of the replacement trees to thrive. Compliance with specific requirements to maintain trees planted under a master use or building permit (Green Factor) should be made a condition of receiving an occupancy permit.

Thank you for considering the lessons from this instance where a beautiful large tree was needlessly destroyed and the underlying goals of the Green Factor and tree preservation were significantly undermined.

Thank you

Irene Wall

Irene Wall
207 North 60th St., Seattle, WA 98103

Attached are photos and some of the emails related to this project.

Western Red Cedar on SW corner of lot at 5201 Phinney November, 14, 2012. Photo looking west from Phinney Avenue.

Workers allegedly "saving" the Western Red Cedar at 5201 Phinney Avenue, November 14, 2012. Note the deep excavation within the root zones of all the three trees to be preserved along the western property boundary.

Remaining stump after Western Red Cedar was removed November 25, 2012 without notifying DPD. Note diameter is at least 35 inches.

Some of the email correspondence on this subject between Irene Wall and DPD Staff.

From: <iwall@serv.net>
To: <Colin.Vasquez@seattle.gov>,
<Bill.Ames@seattle.gov>,<Onum.Esonu@seattle.gov>
Cc: "Diane Duthweiler" <dduthweiler@comcast.net>, <Lyle.Bicknell@seattle.gov>
Subject: RE: 6318733, Failure of tree protection at 5201 Phinney Demo
Date: Mon 11/26/12 02:17 PM

Colin, Onum and Bill,

Since this correspondence began, the largest tree at this site have been cut down. What's going on here? I have not received a reply from any of you. Did the original demolition permit allow this or is this part of the townhouse construction permit? All of these trees were located near or on the west property line. This is not a case where saving the trees was impossible because they were located in the middle of the site. Sadly this looks like a typical urban infill destruction where all our grand talk about tree preservation is proven meaningless. The site in question is in a residential area, across the street from Woodland Park, not in some denuded urban center. This also demonstrates the failure of policies to reduce design review oversight on "smaller" projects.

BTW - months ago I left voicemail and email for the developer requesting that they allow the neighbors to rescue some of the mature plants in the large front yard at 5201 before the dozer arrived. No response was received.

Irene Wall

--- iwall@serv.net wrote:

From: <iwall@serv.net>
To: "Vasquez, Colin" <Colin.Vasquez@seattle.gov>
Cc: <Bill.Ames@seattle.gov>, <Onum.Esonu@seattle.gov>
Subject: RE: 6318733, Failure of tree protection at 5201 Phinney Demo
Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2012 13:24:58 -0800

Colin

I did look at the website below and it appears that the demolition permit required a site inspection for ground disturbance but there are no details about any conditions imposed for tree preservation. The status of the Ground permit is "Passed" which led me to question if the inspector saw the tree root damage.

Irene Wall

--- Colin.Vasquez@seattle.gov wrote:

From: "Vasquez, Colin" <Colin.Vasquez@seattle.gov>
To: "iwall@serv.net" <iwall@serv.net>, "Ames, Bill" <Bill.Ames@seattle.gov>, "Esonu, Onum" <Onum.Esonu@seattle.gov>
Subject: RE: 6318733, Failure of tree protection at 5201 Phinney Demo
Date: Tue, 20 Nov 2012 13:02:15 -0800

Onum, Please see Irene's email below. I did not review this application.

Irene, Here are the weblinks to the permit status and reviewers.
http://web1.seattle.gov/DPD/permitstatus/
http://web1.seattle.gov/DPD/permitstatus/Project.aspx?id=6318733
click on the review tab.
From: iwall@serv.net [mailto:iwall@serv.net]
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2012 11:50 AM
To: Vasquez, Colin; Ames, Bill
Subject: Failure of tree protection at 5201 Phinney Demo
Colin and Bill,
Re Project 6318733 with related demo permit 632811
This photo was taken last week when, driving by the site, I was shocked to see the extent of root destruction as well as other damage to the large trees on west side of this site. The workers there, clearly not landscape contractors or arborists, told me they were "saving the trees." I don't think so.
What permit conditions were place on demo to preserve these trees?
What inspections took place?
Was anyone on the inspection team competent to judge the impact of the extensive excavation on the trees?
I showed this photo to an arborist friend and she encouraged me to contact you. These trees may be so damaged they will become a hazard in the future for both the new "rowhouses" and the property to the west.
Irene Wall
207 North 60th St.

From: <iwall@serv.net>
To: "Esonu, Onum" <Onum.Esonu@seattle.gov>
Cc: "Diane Duthweiler" <dduthweiler@comcast.net>, "Richard Conlin"<Richard.Conlin@seattle.gov>, "Sally Bagshaw" <sally.bagshaw@seattle.gov>,<Diane.Sugimura@seattle.gov>
Subject: Re: 6346741 5201 Phinney Avenue N Magical Thinking Does Not Protect Trees
Date: Thu 01/10/13 05:06 PM

Onum,

The developer submits plans and receives a permit to build with an explicit condition to preserve all the trees on the western boundary. Then the developer disregards those permit conditions, cuts down a tree unlawfully (and seriously jeopardizes the remaining trees because of excavation in their root zones) and does not report this to DPD until after a citizen complaint is lodged, but you continue to give them the benefit of the doubt? You did not issue a stop work notice because they told you they "intend to comply" after they clearly demonstrated NON-COMPLIANCE!

Further you have not yet reviewed the revised plans so you have no idea if they have actually proposed an adequate response to the correction notice.

This situation is made all the more pathetic because the tree loss is to accommodate surface parking when the slope on this site could have accommodated buried parking (as in all other cases along Phinney Ridge) and left the trees and their root zones wholly intact. Some Green Factor indeed.

At least this will become a lesson as the City Council finalizes the tree protection ordinance. This situation should have resulted in a stiff penalty equal to the value of the lost huge Western Red Cedar, to

discourage similar shortcuts by developers in the future.

Irene Wall

--- Onum.Esonu@seattle.gov wrote:

From: "Esonu, Onum" <Onum.Esonu@seattle.gov>
To: "iwall@serv.net" <iwall@serv.net>
Subject: 6346741 5201 Phinney Avenue N
Date: Thu, 10 Jan 2013 11:52:26 -0800

January 10, 2013

Irene, Thank you for your email inquiry regarding DPD Project 6346741 dated January 8, 2013. As with DPD process a revision to an issued permit is assigned a new project DPD project number linking it to the original permit number. The applicant resubmitted a landscape ,Green Factor/tree replacement plan on January 7, 2013. The estimated review due date is January 21, 2013. I anticipate to be able to complete my review by due the date.

On December 4th when you made your concern and complaint, I called the inspector to request a **stop work action** on the project site. The stop work was not instituted because the applicant had informed DPD of his intention to comply with DPD instruction to resubmit a revised landscape,Green Factor/tree replacement plan for review and approval in compliance with 23.45.524. Whether or not a stop work order is posted on a project is the discretion of the building inspector. Please feel free to visit DPD's Microfilm to see the revised plan.

I hope this information is helpful to you. *Onum Esonu*

From: Oslund, Janet [mailto:Janet.Oslund@seattle.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2013 4:28 PM
To: iwall@serv.net
Cc: Sugimura, Diane; Chinn, Bonita; Bagshaw, Sally; Conlin, Richard; Esonu, Onum; Baker, Roberta
Subject: 5201 Phinney Avenue North

Irene,

I am Onum's supervisor and am responding to your e-mail regarding the tree removal at 5201 Phinney Avenue N. as Onum is out of the office today.

The Western Red Cedar that was removed will be replaced by newly planted trees as allowed by the tree protection ordinance section 25.11.090. This section states:

> *"Each exceptional tree and tree over two (2) feet in diameter that is removed in association with development in all zones shall be replaced by one or more new trees , the size and species of which shall be determined by the Director: the tree replacement required shall be designed to result, upon maturity, in a canopy cover that is at least equal to the canopy cover prior to tree a removal."*

The project applicant submitted revised landscape plans with trees to replace the Western Red Cedar that was removed on the site. I reviewed the revisions to the project today. While the type trees they propose to plant will need to be changed, it is clear they are trying to and will meet the code requirements for landscaping and tree removal **with minor revisions to the plans**. (emphasis added)
In your e-mail you stated that the tree removal "should have resulted in a stiff penalty equal to the value of the lost huge Western Red Cedar." Generally, DPD will not impose penalties for tree removal when the situation can be resolved by planting replacement trees as allowed by the ordinance. The inspector determined that a Stop Work Oder was not necessary when the issue could be resolved without affecting the building siting or design.

We are currently discussing more appropriate native species replacement trees with the applicant.

I deeply appreciate your concern about the loss of the large tree. The Green Factor requirements recognize that preserving a healthy trees is as worth as much or more landscaping credit as planting new trees. This is reflected in the amount of credit they will receive for replanting v. tree preservation. This project as revised will have a lower Green Factor score due to the replacement of an existing tree, but will still meet or exceed the code requirements.

Thank you for your concern about this tree removal. I hope you find this information helpful.

Janet Oslund

From: Oslund, Janet [mailto:Janet.Oslund@seattle.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 3:01 PM
To: iwall@serv.net
Subject: Tree replacement at Phinney Avenue site.

Hello Irene,
Thanks for the phone call, sorry I wasn't able to answer earlier.

The trees replacing the Cedar that was removed are two, 2-inch Pinus contorta (also known as Shore Pine) which do grow to be large trees.

They are planting them in the area the Cedar was removed.

I hope this is helpful. Thanks, Janet

City of Seattle
Department of Planning & Development
Applicant Services

PAUL PIERCE
1916 23rd Ave S
Seattle, WASHINGTON 98144

Re: Project# 6318733

Correction Notice #1

Review Type	ZONING	**Date**	December 07, 2012
Project Address	5201 Phinney Ave N	**Contact Phone**	(206) 251-5962
Contact Email	paul@playhousedesigngroup.com	**Contact Fax**	(206) 588-1280
DPD Reviewer	Onum Abbey Esonu	**Address**	Department of Planning & Development 700 5th Ave Suite 2000 PO Box 34019 Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Reviewer Phone	(206) 233-7196		
Reviewer Fax			
Reviewer Email	Onum.Esonu@Seattle.Gov		
Owner	QUINN BORSENO		

Applicant Instructions

Please see the attached flyer to learn "How to Respond to a DPD Correction Notice".
If the 3-step process outlined in the aforementioned document is not followed, it is likely that there will be a delay in permit issuance and there is a potential for penalty fees.

Codes Reviewed

This project has been reviewed for conformance with the applicable development standards of the Land Use Code.

Corrections

1 **Trees.** SMC 25.11.090 states all trees over 24 inch diameter removed shall be replaced by one or more new trees, the size and species of which shall be determined by the Director; the tree replacement required shall be designed to result, upon maturity, in a canopy cover that is at least equal to the canopy cover prior to tree removal. Please work with your arborist or other tree care professional on appropriate species, size and location(s) of the replacement tree(s), and show on the plans.

2 **Green Factor.** SMC 23.45.524.A2 states landscaping that achieve a green factor score of .60 or greater is required for structures containing more than one residential units. Assistance and information on Green Factor calculations are available online at http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/permits/greenfactor/ . Please provide dimensions for each landscape

area, and embed the Green Factor Worksheet and Planting Area Calculation Sheet in the corrected plans.

By removing the 28.4 inch in DBH Western Red Cedar (Thuja plicata) the project Greenfactor is not in compliance with code. Please revise the Green Factor calculation to show compliance to SMC 23.45.524 .A.2 and resubmit.

I hope this information is helpful to you.

Onum Esonu
Senior Land USe Planner

City of Seattle
Department of Planning & Development
Applicant Services

PAUL PIERCE
1916 23rd Ave S
Seattle, WASHINGTON 98144

Re: Project# 6346741

Correction Notice #1

Review Type	ZONING	**Date**	January 11, 2013
Project Address	5201 Phinney Ave N	**Contact Phone**	(206) 251-5962
Contact Email	paul@playhousedesigngroup.com	**Contact Fax**	(206) 588-1280
DPD Reviewer	Janet Kay Oslund	**Address**	Department of Planning & Development 700 5th Ave Suite 2000 PO Box 34019 Seattle, WA 98124-4019
Reviewer Phone	(206) 386-9738		
Reviewer Fax	(206) 233-7902		
Reviewer Email	Janet.Oslund@Seattle.Gov		
Owner	QUINN BORSENO		

I reviewed the revisions to the landscape plans for this project. The following changes are required to the plans.

Applicant Instructions

Please see the attached flyer to learn "How to Respond to a DPD Correction Notice".
If the 3-step process outlined in the aforementioned document is not followed, it is likely that there will be a delay in permit issuance and there is a potential for penalty fees.

Corrections

1 Please revise your landscape plans to include large native species to replace the Western Red Cedar that was removed during construction for this project. The proposed American Hornbeams are not native to this area and are not considered large trees. Work with your arborist or other tree care professional on the appropriate species, size and locations for the replacement trees. Revise the Green Factor scoring sheet as necessary.

City of Seattle How to Respond to a DPD Correction Notice

Step 1: Pick up the Plans

- Plans Routing will notify the primary contact for the project by email or phone when all reviews in the review cycle are complete and plans are ready to pick up
- Once you have been notified, pick up the plans at the Plans Routing counter in the Applicant Services Center (20th floor)
- You may check the status of any review at the following link: http://web1.seattle.gov/dpd/permitstatus

Step 2: Make Corrections

Construction Permits: Coordinate responses to correction items among all designers, architects, engineers, and owners.

Provide a separate written response for each review discipline that has asked for corrections. Be sure to address each item on all correction notices. We won't accept corrected plans without written responses. Include the following information in each response:

- Describe the change you've made.
- Say where the change can be found in the plan set.
- If you have not made a requested change, say why. Give a code citation and provide calculations to support your reason.

If you replace sheets in the corrected plan sets:

- Identify changes on the replacement sheets by clouding or circling the changes.
- Mark the old sheets as "VOID" and roll them up at the back of each corrected plan set. Do not insert or staple voided sheets into the corrected plan sets.

If you add changes to the original sheets:

- Identify the changes by clouding or circling them with ink (preferably red, waterproof ink). Do not use pencil to make changes.
- Do not tape or staple anything to the plan sets.

Platting Actions: Provide new copies of the survey when responding to a correction notice for a shortplat, lot boundary adjustment, or other platting action. Provide the same number of copies that were required when you submitted the project.

Covenants: Send original, signed, and notarized covenants directly to the reviewer who required them.

Electronic Plans:

- Always upload a complete plan set and keep sheets in the same order.
- If you make changes on a sheet, keep it in its place.
- If you remove a sheet and all the information on it, insert a blank sheet in its place.
- If you add new sheets with new information on them, add them to the back of the plan set.

Step 3: Return Corrected Plans

- Return the corrected plans to Plans Routing in the Applicant Services Center (20th floor). If your plans are electronic, upload your corrected sets through the DPD Project Portal.

If you don't follow these instructions:

- **Plans Routing may not accept your corrected plans.**
- **DPD may be delayed in starting corrected plan review, which can delay permit issuance.**
- **DPD may charge a $300 penalty fee.**

DPD Plans Routing - 700 5th Avenue, 20th Floor
Walk-in hours: Monday, Wednesday, Friday: 8 a.m. - 4 p.m., Tuesday, Thursday: 10:30 a.m. - 4 p.m.