Urban Forestry Commission (UFC)
July 13, 2011
Meeting Notes

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

The Urban Forestry Commission was established to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the City of Seattle

Attending

Commissioners
Matt Mega (MM) – chair
John Small (JS)– vice chair
Nancy Bird (NB)
John Floberg (JF)
John Hushagen (JH)
Jeff Reibman (JR)
Peg Staeheli (PS)

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

Public
Nicholas Danker (ND)
Steve Zemke (SZ)

Absent- Excused
Gordon Bradley (GB)

Call to Order
MM called the meeting to order

Chair report
MM – Position #6 – landscape architect applicants were interviewed by Matt Mega, Sandra Pinto de Bader, and staff from the Mayor's Office. We made a recommendation and the Mayor is moving it forward. The committee presentation will be August 2 and they will probably move it to full Council vote the following week. The Mayor is proposing appointment of Tom Early, a landscape architect with arborist certification.

Second update is that the tour of the Seafair parade route took place and the UFC finalized the recommendation letter after the tour asking for a long-term solution. The director of SDOT sent an email to Seafair clarifying that Seafair is to cover all expenses incurred to accommodate the parade.

NB – the email was tactful but very clear.

JH – the idea is that this won't happen again.

SPdB – that's what SDOT director said. It will be important to follow up as next year's decision process begins.

MM – Media called wanting UFC to do an interview. Matt was out of the office so he did not engage. He would like to have a strategic plan to engage the Media so he feels prepared to talk about things on behalf of the full commission. Maybe main author of recommendation could also make talking points to help with media interaction. Maybe do a press release every time we make a recommendation.

SPdB – if you wanted to get a training session, maybe the Mayor's Office could do a training.

JF – also important to know protocol if individual members get approached. Don't want to speak if he is not the best person to talk to the media.

NB – important to understand which issues we want to talk to the media about

PS – what issues are worth engaging on.

MM – it's important to address the media as a tool. We need guidelines on how to interact with the media. Who can we send them to.

JF – It would be helpful to have someone come in help us with expectations and protocols

MM – How do other commissions interact with the media? What's our role with the media.

SPdB – it's important to realize that the Design Commission has three full time staff…

PS – other commissions' staff handles that.

MM – Testified on behalf of the Commission at the Comp Plan public hearing. Requested that the UFC's amendment remain on the docket to be further considered.

Approval of June 1 and June 8 minutes

> **ACTION**: **A motion was made to approve the June 1 meeting notes as amended. The motion was seconded and carried. NB abstained.**
>
> **ACTION: A motion was made to move approval of the June 8 meeting notes as amended. The motion was seconded and carried. JF abstained.**

Review of October 20, 2010 UFC recommendation on DPD's proposed tree regulations
MM – the next agenda item to review the letter is trying to see where we are so UFC is ready when they re-open this issue.

Second item is the kickoff discussion on what to include in the agenda for the October meeting with the IDT.

Our letter laid out some of our main points. We also suggested the City hold town hall meetings and we have not followed up on that.

PS – Looking at how to organize public outreach so it can start at the front end this time. There was a discussion from the public. It's not like there wasn't outreach but it could be better framed up. The ordinance was thrown out right?

BS – City Council and the Mayor are to weigh in on whether they want to move forward with a permit system. Based on that outcome DPD would draft something.

JH – what happens if they say no?

BS – DPD would draft an ordinance that wouldn't include the permit process.

PS – we already have an ordinance that didn't include that.

BS – no we don't. We would be creating legislation with more detail on the concept that was put out.

JH – if we don't have a permit, then tree removal would be up for grabs.

BS – we would not be regulating tree removal outside the development process.

JF – then the public process would be seeking public input on a future ordinance.

PS – doesn't sound like it. That's why it has to be clear. If we have a conceptual ordinance we go out the public input on a permit outside development. The second track would be the framework of the ordinance as given. If we have town hall meetings. There was an ordinance and it dropped off the table. What's the purpose of the meeting. There is an ordinance on the table.

BS – to clarify there is no ordinance on the table, there is a concept. Once CC and Mayor make a decision then DPD would draft legislation. We are not proposing new public process because we already had one.

PS – then I do think we need a public process on whether there should be a permit outside of development.

MM – the exceptional tree issue can be discussed. We need guidance from Council here. I would ask a more open ended up front. What would you want to see in an ordinance. I don't know many people would show up, maybe an online survey?

NB – I don't think public process was well framed from the beginning. Asking people for input on a permit seems to be out of the blue. There has to be an understanding on what the ordinance could be and not just talk about a permit from the get go.

PS – I agree. I think we are in a place I don't think people understand what happened.

NB – maybe we started this process and we need to start again. We are starting the conversation over. It's not the best, you guys have put a lot of work into this. I don't think the first time we got it right.

JH - I have a hunch that Council will not make any decisions until the have dealt with the tunnel issue which is very large. It would be great to go around the city and ask what's the best way to build the urban forest. UFC should be champions for trees and ask the hard questions.

JF – would that mean that we would not ask for public input?

MM – what's happening with the street tree ordinance? Maybe that's a way to do, as we are collecting public comment on this ordinance, maybe have a larger conversation on trees in general.

RF – the next step is to have input from the Mayor

JR – the public process that happened wasn't that flawed. The feedback received is not necessarily gospel. It's public feedback and it's all over the map. The job of making recommendations doesn't fall on a broader public process. It falls on the UFC. We are here to advise. We hear public comment at every meeting. We should use it instead of pushing the process out. Let's take ownership of the process.

NB – it's difficult to make recommendations to the City when you are talking to staff saying that the public process was flawed and having Brennon say, we are not doing it.

BS – I showed the presentation we were going to be doing with the public to the UFC. I received and incorporated those comments. I tried to be very open on what the process was and received feedback on it. If now you tell me to scrap it and start again, I would say no. The current question of do we want to implement a permit system is short hand for the bigger question originally asked of should the City regulate trees in private property outside of ECAs and development and if so, how.

NB – that helps. Thank you.

JH – in the Urban Forestry Symposium there were small groups that talked about what is the urban forest all about. If we are going to a public process we will need a different approach. That gets people's attention.

JF – urban forestry is off putting to a lot of people. What was the hook? How were these public meetings advertised?

BS – it was as broad as it could be to talk about trees.

JR – the presentation was given different names based on the group that was hosting it. We shouldn't expect to get educated input on best practices during outreach process. It's an opportunity to educate.

JF – so further input is not necessarily something we are after?

JR – public process the way it was done has run its course

JH – people want to engage and feel like they are doing something to make a difference.

SPdB – may I pose a question as part of the IDT? I'm a bit confused because when I read the recommendation the UFC first issued, I was left with the idea that it was important to consider a permit system, it was because the public comment and the very direct input that the UFC provided that DPD is now asking the electeds if they would support moving in that direction. And right now I'm hearing that the UFC is not all that happy about making a permit system the next issue to tackle. So, I'm a bit confused.

The way the process is going, as I understand it, is that it's not going to the public right now. It's going to the electeds for them to make a decision regarding further exploring a permit system and then if they say yes, then DPD would put legislation to that effect and that legislation would go out to public

comment. If they say no, then DPD would create legislation that wouldn't include a permit system and that would go out to public comment.

My understanding is that the UFC wanted the City to explore a permit system because of the many benefits, the tracking, the public education component, the comprehensive management of the urban forest and enforcement, and that's the next step. That's where it's going. Right? Unless the UFC is willing to tell Council that they should scrap the whole thing and start again because the original public process was flawed… I think public process already took place.

JF – that's why I was asking what input are we seeking.

MM – I think JR clarified it for us. We were confusing public input on the technicality of legislation moving forward with public input on more general issues. Part of the problem is that the process that we saw was traditionally done behind closed doors. Who had input in making the original proposal? That's the question. City staff, technical experts create the ordinance and then bring it out to public process. We have to know where people are in the overall urban forest scheme.

JH – to answer Sandra's question is AND. We are not going to back down from our recommendation. In the meantime there are a host of other urban forest issues that we need to engage the public on.

NB – I was confused on the permit component. When it goes back to Council, who is considering it… their staff? How does Council make a decision?

BS – The people making the decision are going to be Council members and the Mayor. They have a small staff to assist them. Central staff looks into it and informs Council. They are generally not able to do original research.

NB – there is probably not much more 'looking into it'.

BS – they would ask us for more information.

NB – But already told them what you think it's best.

JR – The statement is that this is going back to Council to find out if they support a permit system. Is that a formal statement in the form of a resolution?

BS – that was the question that we posed to them and the answer we got back is let's not talk about that at this point in time. We'll resume conversation in 2012.

JR – at some point there will be a request to Council for an opinion.

PS – I confer. I read our letter and I'm a bit confused but our letter holds until when Council takes on the issue. It's ready and we just have to wait.

SPdB – not necessarily wait. The Commission could meet with Council to talk about this and find out where they stand.

MM – That's our question, if Council is going to make a decision do we want to add any information?

SPdB – or have conversations to explore the issue. It doesn't always have to be via a formal letter. We can request meetings and I'm happy to coordinate that.

PS – if there wasn't going to be more engagement, now is better to have a conversation.

MM – we posed some questions that we think need to be addressed. If we meet with Council and the Mayor, we might want to have some formalized questions. Maybe central staff and DPD should look into this before moving forward.

JS – going back to the letter, we suggested town hall meetings. The concept of the town hall meeting is one that could be moved forward in the process. A tree ordinance will be politically difficult and the average citizen won't understand. Public meetings are opportunity to inform the public and get informed feedback. The things I would want to see out of that is for people to understand the jurisdictions and regulations currently operating in the city. SCL operates separately from SDOT, etc. Explain incentive going on in OSE. Discuss the carrots too. Inform the public what options are. Acknowledge property rights group. Talk about the cost of losing canopy, etc. We are headed for another DPD regulation that doesn't fit with the other ones. With or without a permit it will be a failure. We should have ordinances that work together.

MM – what does town hall meeting really mean?

PS – We have three points in our letter: slow the process down, have town hall meetings, and have DPD work with UFC to vet issues. I think the public is very confused on what's going on. The public doesn't see departments and are very confused by all the policies. We should be able to hit 'tree' for Seattle and everything should show in the website. That's not the way it is right now. That might be a good thing to talk about with the IDT – to upgrade the website.

MM – Contact CC and talk about it. SPdB and MM will request the meeting.

JS – say thank you for doing #1. Let's talk about #2 and #3 now.

PS – concerned about wasting time on something that will take a long time to grow (canopy). As much as we can plant. We can lose a lot of canopy with storms based on the age of the trees. We have to keep the stuff we have and plant more.

JH – the sense of urgency is not there. We have to start somewhere use as example Lake Forest Park – they started something and got people used to it.

MM – are there ordinance details we need to start working on to go further than we did… are we comfortable where we are? If Council wants us to talk about details. Maybe bring back position papers to the agenda?

JR – I would focus on tools. That's where we need to be stronger

JS – flush out the goals

SPdB – you were already working on position papers. The professional standards hasn't been sent. We were going to work on all position papers and send out as a packet all together?

PS – it might not get lost. Maybe keep on moving those forward?

JF – shouldn't we make sure the goal is in place so the position papers have something to refer to.

PS – I'm hearing from Brennon that the ordinance is still in play

NB – talk to Council and then continue?

MM – the second meeting of the month let's put back in a position paper.

JH – once upon a time the City took the lead in getting some of these boulevards planted. We need to find that energy again. Need a charismatic tree promoter in each department.

SPdB – Bridging the Gap funding is helping SDOT plant 800 trees per year.

NB – resources is a big piece of that

JS – there is rate based government and general fund government. I wonder when SCL is the biggest spender in urban forest management in the City. Should we consider in places where it makes sense removing trees under power lines and planting five trees across the street. Short-term losses for long-term gains? For example SDOT and SCL talk once a month.

SPdB – I'm sorry. Coordination happens ongoingly not just during IDT meetings.

PS – we might want to add something to SCL's spending. From an educational stand point are we sending the wrong message to the public? Encourage people to plant trees in private property.

MM – to wrap up this conversation. We have several position papers that we have not worked on: ecosystems metrics, tree standards, development standards, and mitigation standards. For the second meeting in August do we want to start looking at one of this?

We'll take on Tree Standards. We'll get all position papers done and present them as a packet.

NB – should we include a public outreach position paper? Does DPD survey a lot?

Brennon – Yes they do different types of surveys.

PS – Would like to second Nancy's comment to add a bullet for an outreach position paper.

JS – we should talk to the electeds before jumping to doing the outreach paper. Part of the reason you do public outreach is for political cover.

NB – also important to talk to staff to better understand the process.

JF – in order to be able to advise electeds we need information.

JR – we believe that public outreach should be City policy. Not just about gathering information on points of view, but also to say that City needs to do outreach.

JF – We don't need to do it.

NB – DPD has done outreach but what could make it more effective.

Brennon – wanted to take a few seconds to clarify what the public engagement process has been because there seems to be a lot of confusion around it:

- It started in 2007 with the UFMP outreach. This was a very broad approach to hear from people on what do you want the urban forest to look like, what principles should be used and what the City needs to do holistically to manage the urban forest
- We did a full day workshop and invited City staff, other regulatory agencies to be aware of what was going on.
- We put together a working group to look at these issues with different people
- Then we had a town Hall meeting where we talked about what are the regulatory agencies in the City, what they are doing, what were the incentives we had, and what we are doing to move this forward and what are your thoughts on that
- Then we had individual meetings with community groups and people to ask the broad question of 'should the City be regulating trees in private property outside of ECAs and development'? and here are a variety of approaches we considered, this is the one we are recommending and this is why… so I want people to understand that this has been a broad process that has taken place and it sounds like it's what you are asking for. There is a lot more than just the most recent meetings.

PS – it's unfortunate but you can't have a gap in the public process. When they put this on hold, they opened the door that they have to re-start the public process. Enough time has passed but not more time needs to be invested. That is something we can put in our position paper. You have to refresh the process.

Urban Forest Management, 5-year Implementation Strategy, 2010 Progress Report, and 2011 UFMP Work Plan review

SPdB – you have copies of the Five-year strategy, the 2010 progress report, and the 2011 work plan. The UFMP is on the projector.

JS – We discussed the progress report a while back. What do people want to do, jump into the 2011 work plan?

PS – we should go into the work plan.

JS – WE can go down line item by line item. Is the intent here to see what is getting done and what won't get done?

SPdB – I think what would be useful might be to compare it to the progress report because the center two pages of the report are the work plan. It might be interesting for you to see the changes in goals from year to year. For example, the first item, last year the goal was to continue restoration on 500 acres, and the goal was to incorporate 100 acres into the restoration process. The accomplishment was that they were only able to bring in 90 acres, so this year's goal is to continue restoration on 590 acres and to bring in 80 new acres. For example on Parks it was to maintain 2,500 trees but they were only able to maintain 1,600 hundred due to cuts in the budget and this year they are striving to maintain 2,000. If you go to SDOT you'll see that they were able to prune the 3,000 trees but they had to go from a 12 year pruning cycle to a 14 year pruning cycle due to new plantings and no additional maintenance resources. I would like to do this type of comparison from the beginning of the UFMP to assess where

we are as we embark upon the 2012 update. For example SCL had a goal to prune trees away from power lines along 390 miles and they actually did 517 miles. This year they are working on 600 miles.

JR – that is the one thing I would like to discourage

SPdB – SCL is the only department that is performing at industry standards levels. This is because of their mandate of safety and reliability.

PS – yes but are they planting?

SPdB – they have the Urban Tree Replacement Program. The community planting is now consolidated into the Seattle reLeaf program and will be residing in SPU as of next year.

JS – why do they report in miles instead of trees?

SPdB – their perspective is miles of power lines.

JS – one of the problems with the work SCL does is that the maintenance cycle results in pretty drastic pruning.

JR – examine SCL practices because they are the bigger spender of tree maintenance…

JH – they have a funding source and they have a mandate.

JR – some of this cases it might be worthwile making a recommendation on SCL goal to prune 600 miles… maybe remove trees that will never be the right size.

SPdB – that's what they are doing now. Instead of overly prune they are removing and giving residents vouchers to buy trees.

PS – Parks was supposed to plant 500 trees and removed 400. They ended up planting 900 but this doesn't comply with the 2x1 replacement policy. They should have replaced 800 because they removed 400. It's double dipping to say they complied with the policy.

SPdB – I don't know they are mutually exclusive.

PS- they should have planted 800. They should clarify that because it sends a funny message out. Because we are not going to catch up.

JF – outside of the replacement program the goal is to plant X trees.

PS – what happens when for example the Seattle Center doesn't comply with their planting.

SPdB – the Seattle Center has a plan and they will be planting this year.

SCL – did not comply with the 2 x 1 policy last year and we reported that. There is no penalty for not complying. It's an aspirational goal.

PS – I would advise the reporting to be clearer so that citizens know what they are getting.

JH – SCL recently hired an arboriculturist do you know what his job is?

SPdB – It's important for UFC to weigh in based on the results achieved.

NB – is there an MOA.

SPdB – we are working on MOAs with SPU and SCL. The reLeaf program is still residing in OSE and will transfer the position and budget to SPU next year.

JH – SPU is going to get more involved in tree planting.

SPdB – they are going to house the reLeaf program

JH – are you going to ask them to fund it more generously out of rates?

SPdB - Council approved $80K to come from SPU.

NB – is that from rates?

SPdB – yes. OSE is transferring the general fund portion.

JH – does that pay for the staff and purchase of trees?

SPdB – the funding pays for staff and pays for outreach, research, and other efforts and activities besides tree purchases. We are allocating $40 per tree. That program is focusing on private property but maybe when we have saturated that land use, we might want to look at commercial, or industrial. Also, ideally the program would continue to grow. That program is a support to the UF IDT in accomplishing the UFMP goals. It's not a program for SPU to do as they want with it. It will reside there.

JH – SPU is a revenue generator. They could put more funding into it.

SPdB – this is the third year of a pilot program that started in 2009. Council asked us to look at the different programs across the City and to propose a consolidated program that would accomplish efficiencies. The program as it looks today has 1.0 FTE and $235K in its budget. As the program grows it might plant more trees. It was a push to place the 978 trees we placed last year. We need to grow the demand so we can place more trees. We could buy 2,000 trees but that doesn't mean people are going to take them. That's why we are increasing the outreach component to engage more people. The utilities can't simply raise their rates to do projects that are not directly related to those rates. SPU is currently paying for the medium and large trees in the program. SPU might prefer to plant large conifers because they have the most stormwater management value but they might not be the best fit for some yards or ROW locations.

JR – the money they use has to be justified.

PS – I don't believe they can't put conifers in the ROW. The issue of large conifers should be marked in our checklist because it's a question of education.

JS – we are at $200 per tree. Can the number of trees planted grow over time without adding an FTE. Put the money into trees instead of overhead.

SPdB – I would be reluctant to simply divide the program's budget by the number of trees because there are a lot of high value activities that FTE is taking on. Including bringing in $90K of grants to other efforts such as Urban Orchards and Tree Ambassadors. But even at $200/tree that is a lower number than what SDOT pays to plant a tree.

JS – there are economic of scale that the program can grow with the same staff.

JH – SCL has a check off to round up the bill to the next dollar for other causes. It can be done. SPU did a tremendous job to promote recycling. Why not a check off on their bills to add a dollar for the urban forest.

Public comment
Steve Zemke – I think you are having a lot of good discussion. Trying to revolve around the issue of why you are here and what's your purpose. DPD is being asked to produce a tree ordinance but they have a conflict of interest because their main mission is to help people build things. UFC has a mission that addresses that. DPD is looking at things from a narrow viewpoint. You are here to advise and recommend to the City Council and the Mayor. You have a mission to lead. You are right now reacting. You saw what they came up with and you said it was not good enough. Good idea to meet with Council.

SDOT used you on the Seafair issue to move their mission forward. If you come up with ideas and take the lead you then give cover to City Council to support you. Let DPD react to you. Good idea to come up with position papers so the ideas are put out there by you first. Become advocate for a strong tree ordinance. I think you are going in the right direction.

Regarding the media, use it to get exposure of why you are trying to protect trees in the city. Don't' think about responding to their questions, but take the opportunity to talk about protecting trees. You have no obligation to directly answer their questions. Turn it around and don't play their game. It's free exposure.

Next month's agenda items
Sandra to send out agendas for next month.

Adjourn

Community input
From: seattle observer [mailto:seattleobserver@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2011 2:43 PM
To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Subject: regarding improper tree planting

Dear Matt Mega,

The following letter is in regards to the trees which have been recently planted on 3rd Ave between Virginia and Cedar in downtown Seattle.

Many of the trees are crooked. The Seattle arborist were given street addresses the crooked trees fronted. For the last six months a friend of mine has spoke to the arborist about replacing or correcting these trees in some way. The arborist have been unwilling to correct these trees.

Recently is has become obvious other new trees in the downtown area are also crooked/not planted well. My friend asked for information from the arborist as to who was planting or not maintaining these trees. They refused to provide this information or address the issue at all.

In reviewing the downtown core there are large trees that the city let grow crooked and did not correct while they were still small.

Surely your commission or the city council or the mayor will address this problem if the arborist are not willing to.

Sincerely,

Renee Glass
(206) 624-8873

P.S. Shane Dewald, who I saw listed on your home page, was one of the persons my friend communicated with. He, along with several other arborist have been given the addresses of the trees to be corrected.

_____
From: Ruth Williams [mailto:ruthalice@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2011 8:49 PM
To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Subject: Public Posting Prior to Tree Removal

Hi Sandra,

I have a few comments for the UFC.

Thanks!

Ruth

Greetings Commissioners,

In reviewing the work you have done toward developing the tree protection ordinance I was impressed with the diligence and clarity of the stated goals and the benefits of a permit system.

There is one very useful component of a permit system that seems to be lacking, however. That is the requirement that the process include a public two week notification period before cutting mature trees can occur. Notice should be posted on-line and at the site. This would allow more time to educate the property owner and also alert the neighborhood to what is in store.

Very often it is new home owners who cut down mature trees. If they had any idea how much those trees mean to their neighbors they might well be dissuaded and learn to love a natural community asset whose value they

hadn't appreciated before. Peer pressure in a good way.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ruth Williams
1219 NE 107th St.
Seattle, 98125
206-930-8965

From: Kimberly Scrivner [mailto:KScrivner@psrc.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2011 6:13 PM
To: Kimberly Scrivner
Subject: Trees on Winslow Place next to Fremont Troll

We have heard from many neighbors and supporters of the Troll's Knoll in the past few days who have expressed their anger and frustration over the trees that have been removed along Winslow Place. We also are disappointed to see these trees removed. The tree removal was not associated with the Troll's Knoll Park Proposal, but a maintenance effort performed by Seattle City Light. The Troll's Knoll Concept Plan had hoped to preserve these trees to retain the tree buffer between the alley and the future park.

We met with City Light and the City's Arborist several times this past month to understand why the trees needed to be removed. In our opinion, there appeared to be several trees marked for removal that were not in conflict with the power lines. City Light indicated the trees marked for removal were either in direct conflict with the power lines or within a three year growth zone of the wires, which required their removal. City Light explained to us how they are establishing a new three-year maintenance plan that requires any tree not in direct contact with power wires to be trimmed or removed if the tree or its branches are within a three year growth zone of the wires.

In addition to City Light and the City's Arborist explaining their protocols, they worked with us to see if any of the trees marked for removal could be preserved. We developed two plans identifying trees we hoped to preserve and reviewed each tree individually with City Light staff. Unfortunately, only a couple of the trees on the southern end of Winslow Place were far enough from the wires to remain. The City's Arborist also pointed out a few trees with poor tree structure that needed to be removed for safety reasons (we learned that when several trees within a grove are removed the trees that remain are more susceptible to wind loading. this can result in the trees being knocked down or branches falling).

We plan to continue a dialogue with City Light to discuss tree replacement opportunities. City Light recently hired a full time employee to manage their tree replacement program. It is our understanding City Light will provide tree certificates for the removed trees and we hope there are opportunities to plant new trees to begin re-establishing the tree buffer that has been removed.

We hope you find this information helpful regarding the trees on Winslow Place. This email is intended to keep you informed as to actions taken by the city so please keep in mind we are **just the messenger** of this information.

Thanks,
The Friends of Troll's Knoll

_____

From: Anna Nissen [mailto:nnarch2@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2011 6:15 PM
To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Subject: Re: Add Trees to Comments 6/17/11, Phase I Permit LID rules

Yes, please deliver this email thread to the UFC. I am aware from reviewing online records that UFC is aware of the role of trees is LID and that the state is working on LID rules after legal proceeding made LID requirement in Phase I cities (Seattle) "to the maximum feasible", so your request for further information surprises me. I was kinda hoping my cc would be redundant. Possibly it is, and turnover is responsible for the confusion. Hope so. Anyway, here's the website with the info and a history of (in)action; note that June 17th was the close of informal comments, but that formal comments are to be requested on a close to final draft in the foreseeable future. http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/forms/lidspubcomments.html & http://www.psp.wa.gov/LID_GLG.php

The online history indicates that the City of Seattle participates in the state's LID Advisory Committees or has submitted comments at those meetings in the past. If the UFC is not already coordinating commenting efforts with other Seattle agencies on this matter, maybe they should make an effort to do so.

Anna

On Jun 30, 2011, at 3:52 PM, Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra wrote:

Hi Anna,

Was your intention by cc'ing me on the email below that I would deliver it to the Urban Forestry Commission? If so, it would be helpful to get more background.

Thank you,

Sandra Pinto de Bader | Environmental Sustainability Coordinator | Seattle Office of Sustainability and Environment | (206) 684-3194

From: Anna Nissen [mailto:nnarch2@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2011 6:26 PM
To: SWPermitComments@ecy.wa.gov
Cc: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Subject: Add Trees to Comments 6/17/11, Phase I Permit LID rules

Please consider this as a P.S. to the comments that I submitted yesterday.

The high LID value of urban trees escaped my attention completely until the following arrived in my inbox today from the Linkedin Urban Forestry group
http://www.linkedin.com/groupItem?view=&srchtype=discussedNews&gid=2563716&item=56887880&type=member&trk=eml-anet_dig-b_pd-ttl-cn

"Congratulations to Philly on the EPA and PADEP approval of their Green Infrastructure Plan.

What can urban foresters do to make sure that trees are given their fair share in the plan?

Large urban trees are much cheaper to install and than large tanks and pipes, and you get multiple benefits.Also, Philly's plan is heavy on green roofs and green walls, much more expensive options when you consider cost per gallon treated. What should our actions be?

Al Key • There are many disadvantages to grey infrastructure.

1) it's more expensive: Giving everybody new pipes to comply with new federal stormwater regulations coming down the line (NPDES phase III) was going to cost Philly 12 billion dollars, as opposed to this plan which will cost 2 billion.

2) Grey infrastructure is only used when it rains. Philly get 80 days of rain per year, so the pipes lay redundant 280 days of the year. Green infrastructure stays in use regardless of weather.

3) Grey infrastructure is single purpose. there are no other benefits to pipes except water conveyance. There are many benefits to green infrastructure: urban heat island reduction, carbon sequestration, urban pollination, increased property value & etc..

Philadelphia sees this as a cost saving measure while getting much more bang for the dollars by doing more things for less money. In my experience, Trees are a much more cost effective means than green roofs for water management, if you look at cost per gallon treated.

So my question is what can urban foresters do to increase their share of the pie?"

In any case, in thinking over the material that I reviewed, I remember green roofs discussed, but other than the obvious merits of "native vegetation I do not recall new or retained trees considered as highly appropriate LID measures in urban settings.

Along with the merits of retaining and recovering absorbent soil, planting trees so they grow and thrive, as opposed to unrealistic provisions for "street" trees, are extremely cost productive. On some steep, very urban sites, well considered trees and adequate understory may be the most, if not the only effective use of low impact stormwater management funds.

I am hoping that Seattle's Urban Forestry Commission has already submitted or will submit supporting comments along these lines.
http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/forms/lidspubcomments.html

Anna Nissen
Nissen/Nissen Architect
Seattle

_____

From: Anna Nissen [mailto:nnarch2@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2011 6:18 PM
To: Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Subject: Fwd: Draft PSP LID Guidebook Available for Review

Sandra,
Things are more than a little confusing. This email from deeper in my inbox,says that comments on drafts of an associated LID handbook are still open. Please see that the UFC is aware.
Thanks.
Anna

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Beale, Harriet (ECY)" <HBEA461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Date: June 1, 2011 3:58:38 PM PDT
To: ECOLOGY-LID-STANDARDS@LISTSERV.WA.GOV
Subject: Draft PSP LID Guidebook Available for Review
Reply-To: "Beale, Harriet (ECY)" <HBEA461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Puget Sound Partnership Draft LID Guidebook and Model Ordinances are Available for Review

The Puget Sound Partnership, in collaboration with the Washington Department of Ecology and with assistance from AHBL, Inc., is developing a new guidebook and several model ordinances designed to help local government staff integrate low impact development (LID) requirements into local codes and standards.

The Partnership is seeking comment from interested parties on drafts of the guidebook and model ordinances from June 1 to June 30, 2011. The Partnership plans to release final versions of the guidebook and model ordinances during Fall 2011. If you would like to review the drafts and provide comments, please visit the Partnership's web site or see:
http://www.psp.wa.gov/LID_GLG.php

Bruce Wulkan
Stormwater Program Manager

PUGETSOUNDPARTNERSHIP

p: 360.339.4626 | c: 360.701.3568
326 East D Street | Tacoma, WA 98421-1801

Harriet Beale
Municipal Stormwater Planner
Water Quality Program
Department of Ecology
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia WA 98504-7600
360-407-6457
harriet.beale@ecy.wa.gov
www.ecy.wa.gov

_____
From: Cheryl Trivison [mailto:ctrivison@richhaagassoc.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 1:30 PM
To: SeattlePOSA@yahoogroups.com; Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Cc: 'Constance Bain'
Subject: FW: Emailing: Barred Owl - Strix varia - Information, Pictures, Sounds.htm

From: Cheryl Trivison [mailto:ctrivison@richhaagassoc.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 1:23 PM
To: 'Mark Mead'
Subject: FW: Emailing: Barred Owl - Strix varia - Information, Pictures, Sounds.htm

Hi Mark,
Please do what you can to save the tree, habitat for the Barred Owl family. I live adjacent to Interlaken Park, one of the City's urban refuges. Let me know if there is anything we can do to assist in saving trees in city parks. We're so fortunate that we have the Barred Owl family nested in our midst!!
Cheryl Trivison
SUFS

From: montlakeforum@yahoogroups.com [mailto:montlakeforum@yahoogroups.com] **On Behalf Of** caroltroup@live.com
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 9:17 PM
To: montlakecoop@yahoogroups.com; montlakeforum@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [Montlake] Interlaken Park tree maintenance and Barred Owl family

Hi there,

Along with many of my Montlake neighbors I've been following with great interest as a Barred Owl family has established a nest in an Interlaken Park tree. Today I was surprised to see a Tree Maintenance sign hanging on the tree that said the Parks department was going to have to bring the tree down. ! It is where Interlaken Boulevard makes the last sharp turn before it straightens and meets up with 19th Ave E. A new trail directly across from the tree goes up into the park.

I've sent a message to Mark Mead at the parks department and I encourage you to do the same. His email is mark.mead@seattle.gov and his phone number is 206-684-4113.

Thanks
Carol

To: 'Cheryl Trivison'
Subject: Emailing: Barred Owl - Strix varia - Information, Pictures, Sounds.htm

http://www.owlpages.com/owls.php?genus=Strix&species=varia

_____

From: Cheryl Trivison [mailto:ctrivison@richhaagassoc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 9:01 AM
To: SeattlePOSA@yahoogroups.com; Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra
Cc: 'Constance Bain'
Subject: RE: [SeattlePOSA] FW: Emailing: Barred Owl - Strix varia - Information, Pictures, Sounds.htm

Though I appreciate Mark's response to not remove the Cottonwood tree until after the owls have fledged, it would be better if SPR's policies for tree/wildlife protection were in place to protect trees/wildlife in our public parks. As Richard notes SPR is removing hundreds of trees in our city parks!
I have forwarded these emails to Sandra Pento de Barder, City staff for the Urban Forestry Commission.

From: Mead, Mark [mailto:Mark.Mead@seattle.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 4:00 PM
To: Potter, Dewey; anne.preston@kerry.com; montlakeforum@yahoogroups.com; kolson_fip_interlakenpark@msn.com; Corrie Watterson Bryant; Kari Olson; TAMARA A. TURNER; Cheryl Trivison; Carder, Justin; Fay Chapman; Corrie Watterson Bryant; alwinr@u.washington.edu; montlakeforum@yahoogroups.com; Aimee Palacios; KerriLyn Vander Heyden; freya; Tasha Irvine; Polly Kenefick; Tom and Katherine Kummerow; Michelle Jacobsen; Lucy Anderson; caroltroup@live.com
Subject: RE: [Montlake] Interlaken Park Tree

Hello One and All,

Thank you for your notes regarding the removal of the large cottonwood in Interlaken Park. I am sorry to have caused you any concerns.

The tree has a potential to fail just above the nest and when it fails it will have a high potential of hitting the well traveled road surface. Hazard on a tree is measured by the potential to fail, the size of the part that will fail, and the potential a target will be under the part that fails. While it is difficult to determine exact dates of failure, our experience and the past history of this species, cottonwood, would indicate that this tree will most likely fail in the next couple of years.

Parks will not remove the tree or work on the tree until the owls have fledged. If we can leave it as a tall snag we will do that to ensure some ongoing habitat. The removal also has cost implications. Because of the height of the tree and the decay our crew can't safely climb it to take it down/create a snag. We would have to hire a large crane to get the crew up there and section the tree down to a safe height.

We will be removing the sign tomorrow and place the sign again when we are ready to do the work.

From: John "Hooper" Havekotte [mailto:4.hooper.4@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 12:26 PM
To: McGinn, Mike; Harrell, Bruce; Godden, Jean; Licata, Nick; Conlin, Richard; Clark, Sally; Burgess, Tim; Rasmussen, Tom; O'Brien, Mike; Bagshaw, Sally
Cc: WA Growth Management Hearings Board; Brennan Staley; DeCaro, Barbara; Christopher D (DFW) Anderson; Matt Mega; Pinto_de_Bader, Sandra; Sugimura, Diane; Kay Shoudy; Donna Kostka
Subject: Seattle Herons Need Your Help

Mayor Mike McGinn and
Members of the Seattle City Council

July 13, 2011

RE: Seattle Herons Need Your Help

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Can you imagine a colony of Great Blue Herons with their nests close together high up in trees being able to survive with NO TREES as a buffer to human activity? Our Kiwanis Ravine Park is home to Seattle's largest colony of Great Blue Herons, over 80 nests for the last several years, and the city's first Wildlife Sanctuary established by Seattle Parks. It now has a thick stand of trees surrounding the nesting colony that provide a buffer zone to human activity. So what is the problem?

Although DPD adopted Director's Rule 5-2007 that protects trees within the habitat area and the 500 foot buffer zone, the trees can be preserved ONLY if they are affected by a building permit, are over 22" in diameter and (it is) during the nesting season. Trees of any size can be cut in the buffer area during any other time of the year**,** if the land is not under permit. This lax rule resulted in an exceptional tree being cut within a block of the colony in May while the herons were nesting.

For the past 3-4 years, the Seattle Department of Planning and Development (DPD) has been telling us that "best available science" says nothing about whether trees are important at a colony's periphery**,** and therefore there is no reason to protect them. Why? Because the Department of Fish and Wildlife says there are no scientific studies (Best Available Science) that say what would happen to an urban nesting colony if the trees around it were cut, and it is unlikely that any studies of this kind will ever be undertaken.

DPD also has been telling us it does not have the finances to undertake such a study, and furthermore a study would be out of sync with its "Critical Areas Ordinance" updates that happen every 10 years. Yet when it was decided by DPD not to protect trees on private land in the Kiwanis buffer zone, that was not part of the update cycle either.

We have protested repeatedly to DPD that one tree after another is being cut in the buffer zone. The cumulative effect of this tree cutting is that the heron colony has fewer and fewer trees around the colony to provide new or alternate nest sites, twigs and branches for nest building, perching trees, and a screen from nearby human activities. We are just lucky the noise and disruption from cutting has not caused the colony to be abandoned.

After getting these unsatisfactory answers from DPD, we are now appealing to you, our elected officials to direct DPD to correct this problem. These trees are not only important to the success of the heron colony but also to our own urban environment where we play and live.

Heron Habitat Helpers (HHH) is a 10-year old organization dedicated to protecting the heron colony in Kiwanis Ravine. We're the official adopt-a-park advocate for Kiwanis Ravine established by Seattle Parks. Please join us in advocating to DPD to fix Director's Rule 5-2007 to make it apply to all trees over 6" in diameter on 500 foot buffer lands adjacent to the nesting colony year round whether there is a building permit or not. An updated Critical Areas Ordinance or new tree ordinance must also provide such protection for Seattle's largest heron colony at Kiwanis Ravine.

Sincerely,

John "Hooper" Havekotte, President
Heron Habitat Helpers
2420 Armour St.
Seattle, WA 98199
(206) 818-1867
4.hooper.4@comcast.net

Cc:
Chris Anderson, WDFW – christopher.anderson@dfw.wa.gov
Barb DeCaro, Seattle Parks – barbara.decaro@seattle.gov
Matt Mega, Seattle Audubon – mattm@seattleaudubon.org
Seattle Urban Forestry Commission – sandra.pinto_de_bader@seattle.gov
Diane Sugimura – diane.sugimura@seattle.gov
Brennan Staley – brenan.staley@seattle.gov
WA Growth Management Hearings Board – central@cps.gmhb.wa.gov
Kay Shoudy – shoudypk@comcast.net

Donna Kostka – donna4510@comcast.net