Urban Forestry Commission (UFC)
December 7, 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
Tom Early (TE)
Gordon Bradley (GB)
John Floberg (JF)
Jeff Reibman (JR)
Peg Staeheli (PS)
Nancy Bird (NB)

Staff

Sandra Pinto de Bader (SPdB) - OSE
Dave LaClergue (DL) - DPD

Public
Steve Zemke (SZ)
Margaret Thouless (MT)

Absent- Excused
John Small (JS)

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
MM – let's get started

Public comment
SZ – Look at the Street Tree ordinance so that it is consistent with the overall tree ordinance. This ordinance could be included inside the other, more general one. Definitions need to be included for: tree canopy, drip line. There should be a requirement to replace street trees removed (either on site or elsewhere to compensate for the loss of canopy). This should be an official City-policy. Sign posted on trees to be removed as well as on line so people have an idea of the magnitude of removals. Support the effort of SDOT that arborist doing the work have some kind of qualification and do some monitoring. Add a provision that people that are arborist sign a statement saying that they are familiar with City ordinances.

MT – This is a problem we've had on the Burke Gilman trail where we are trying to increase tree canopy. The 1998 Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) there is a section that only allows for blackberries to be removed when they affect trees. We removed blackberries and one of the neighbors complained to Parks. We had to leave a section with blackberries. How does one get a VMP changed?

PS – I would like to talk about this issue at a future meeting.

SPdB – I have scheduled a meeting with Mark Mead to talk about this. I would like to have the opportunity to do that and then come back and report.

Approval of November 2 and November 9 minutes

> **ACTION**: **A motion was made to approve the November 2 meeting notes as written. The motion was seconded and carried.**
>
> **ACTION**: **A motion was made to approve the November 9 meeting notes as written. The motion was seconded and carried.**

Yesler Terrace redevelopment briefing – Dave LaClergue (DPD)

PS – I'm working on this project and will not be part of the conversation.

DL – Thank you for having me here today. I would like to talk about the Yesler Terrace redevelopment. We are getting close to having a draft proposal for public review and to submit to Council. Trees and landscape and stormwater are pieces of the puzzle. I would like to

JF – This is for our interest. There is no expected outcome?

DL – I don't have a specific ask. Part of the proposal is a tree protection plan and I expect that is something that is of interest for the UFC. I will welcome comments from the Commission.

Dave gave a presentation on the project. 33 acre site owned by the Seattle Housing Authority. It was the first racially integrated public housing development in the country. Built in the late 1930's. Today it provides housing for 561 extremely low income households (below 30% of median income). Very high immigrant population. Units were build to have a 50-year life span and we are beyond it.

GB – there are currently 500 units and it's going to 5,000?

DL – it's a substantial increase in density. It's going from 2-soty buildings to 6-7 stories and 12-13 high rise buildings.

JF – there is a difference in the footprint

DL – There will be a 30-35% increase of impervious surfaces. The requirements are 561 replacement units, 290 for very low income and one moderate income unit per 3.4 market rate units, a green loop, three pocket parks and pedestrian connections.
Tree protection: there are lots of trees in Yesler Terrace. Canopy cover is 24% with a lot of exceptional trees and valuable trees (10, 15, 20" DBH). There were many topped trees under utilities. SHA did an inventory of trees on site. Developed a tree protection plan with 40 trees slated for preservation.

NB – which properties will belong to SHA?

DL – they don't know at this point. They are waiting for the re-zoning. Might not know until each block develops. This is a 15-20 year build out. Tier 1 trees are to be preserved (they are healthy and in a good location); tier 2 trees are healthy and might be feasible to preserve. Replacement will not necessarily take place on the same parcel. All replacements are for comparable size trees at maturity.

NB – appreciate the contingency especially in this market. But tier 1 trees should be mandated to be preserved.

DL – need to recognize the reality. Can't guarantee a healthy tree today will continue to be healthy in the future.

JR – a 10:1 replacement policy will be preferable compared to the cost to preserve trees. There are a lot of issues with excavation and other building staging processes, that will make preservation difficult. Add financial incentives to replacement at current functioning value.

JF – There should be a monitoring and maintenance plan for new plantings which are more vulnerable.

JR – Have to consider marketability of the project.

NB – High Point created new standards. Yesler Terrace could set new standards for tree preservation.

JR – Besides preserving the trees preserve the area to be able to plant another tree there if the original tree dies or comes down in a storm.

MM – tree replacement plan for years out when trees start to die

JR – Have talked about incentivizing major institutions to create forest management plans for their institutions

DL – Green Factor requirements will also apply

NB – Green Factor is light on trees

DL – DPD did change the Green Factor scoring based on UFC feedback.

MM – maybe mitigation would be to re-plant in downtown.

Yesler Terrace Redevelopment Legislation

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

Yesler Terrace offers a unique opportunity to rebuild a neighborhood from the ground up. Redevelopment would create a mixed-use, mixed income community within walking distance of downtown and First Hill medical campuses. Consistent with Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, proposed redevelopment would increase affordable housing and overall growth potential within a designated urban center. Seattle Housing Authority's commitment to sustainability, public amenities, and urban design further increase the site's potential.

City departments have drafted legislation to support this vision while making sure that redevelopment benefits current and future Yesler residents, First Hill and Little Saigon neighbors, and the Seattle community as a whole.

GGLO/Parsons Brinckerhoff

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development

Guiding Principles

In drafting regulations for redevelopment, the City is committed to the guiding principles established by the Yesler Terrace Citizen Review Committee:

SOCIAL EQUITY Meet the essential needs and improve the quality of life for current and future Yesler Terrace generations, regardless of racial, cultural, economic or other status. Enable access to employment, education, medical care, social services, nutritious food and quality affordable housing, especially for those with very low incomes, giving priority to those most in need.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY Improve the overall economic conditions, opportunities and quality of life for current and future generations within the Yesler Terrace community. Foster access to jobs, transportation, community services and safe low-income affordable housing and financial tools.

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP & SUSTAINABILITY Integrate smart "green" design and equitable environmental and economic practices. Achieve a positive and healthy community for current and future Yesler Terrace generations, while preserving housing affordability.

ONE-FOR-ONE REPLACEMENT HOUSING Replace or exceed the current number of very- low-income and low-income housing units at Yesler Terrace. Provide choice, options, site integration and affordability in a dense and culturally and economically diverse community. Redevelopment options will guarantee no net loss of very-low-income housing serving public housing-eligible residents on the current site of Yesler Terrace or in the immediate neighborhood.

10/5/2011
www.seattle.gov/dpd/planning/yeslerterrace

Proposed regulations

In terms of allowed uses, building size, and residential density, the City's proposed regulations are consistent with the development plan adopted by SHA's Board of Directors. The rezone and its accompanying ordinances contain additional standards, including size and height of buildings, maximum allowed parking, required locations for certain uses, and detailed provisions on open space and landscape features.

TOPIC	PROPOSAL
Affordable housing	Require that SHA and partners provide the affordable units in the SHA development plan: • 561 replacement extremely low-income units (<30% AMI) • 290 very low-income units (30-60% AMI) • 850 workforce housing units (60-80% AMI) • 100 additional affordable units, preferably <30% AMI
Allowed uses	Residential, office, medical office, lodging, retail, and non-hospital institutional uses (human services, libraries, schools, child care, religious facilities).
Development potential	• 3,900,000 square feet residential - equivalent to a maximum of 5,000 residential units • 900,000 square feet of office, medical office, and/or lodging (to be concentrated in the northwest sector) • 150,000 square feet all other uses (retail, services, etc.)
Maximum building height	Ranges from 25' in view corridors to 240' and 300' highrises. Tallest heights are allowed adjacent to Harborview. A total of 13 highrise buildings would be allowed sitewide, with limited footprints.
Open space	Require private and semi-private open space for use by residents, plus open space open to the public including a central neighborhood park, three pocket parks, a green street loop, pedestrian pathways through large blocks, and at least one acre of community gardens.

Urban design vision

Design guidelines, land use regulations, and street vacation requirements have all been coordinated to ensure high quality urban design. To accommodate the density increase planned for Yesler Terrace, it is crucial that the site have excellent pedestrian routes, generous open space and recreation areas, a street network that improves connections to surrounding neighborhoods, and attractive buildings.

Illustrative site plan
An artist's rendering of the site from above, showing the central neighborhood park, distributed pocket parks, and various pedestrian paths. Conceptual building placement is shown to give a sense of scale and massing; actual building locations will vary.

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development

10/5/2011
www.seattle.gov/dpd/planning/yeslerterrace

Legislation overview

The Department of Planning and Development is leading interdepartmental efforts to coordinate a rezone process for the site with street improvements, the addition of new parks, sustainable building and infrastructure efforts, and City/SHA funding partnerships. Draft legislation includes the following pieces:

ORDINANCE	DESCRIPTION	CONTENT EXAMPLE
Land Use Code amendments	Creates a new zone for Yesler Terrace, allowing greater density and a broader range of uses. Includes **Design Guidelines** to supplement code standards.	• Allowed & prohibited uses • Height limits • Landscaping and open space • Review procedures • Building frontage
Planned Action Ordinance	Designates Yesler redevelopment as a "planned action" covered by the Yesler Terrace EIS. This allows comprehensive consideration of cumulative impacts and a streamlined environmental review process. Includes a detailed **mitigation document**.	• Planned action thresholds: what development qualifies? • Required mitigation including air quality and noise controls for construction, other provisions to protect existing residents
Street vacation & rededication	SHA proposes new street alignments to improve circulation and connections to surrounding neighborhoods. This ordinance authorizes these changes, providing a net increase of public right-of-way.	• New street configuration • Required public benefits: pocket parks, hill climb, green street loop
Cooperative agreement	Establishes agreements between the City and SHA, formally committing to partnerships financial and otherwise.	• Affordable housing funding • Infrastructure agreements • Open space partnerships

SHA

GGLO

Yesler Terrace Redevelopment

Planning and Construction Timeline

2006-2007: SHA begins redevelopment planning, establishes the Citizen Review Committee

CRC develops *Yesler Terrace Guiding Principles*

2008-2010: SHA & CRC review redevelopment alternatives

SHA prepares an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

2010-2011: SHA Board adopts development plan; City prepares rezone proposal

Yesler Terrace is awarded $10.3M Choice Neighborhoods grant

2012: Seattle City Council takes up rezone proposal and related legislation

2016: SHA completes construction of Phase 1 buildings, including 98 replacement units for existing Yesler residents

SHA and partners continue 15-20 year phased redevelopment

Stephanie Bower

Public comments

DPD will present draft legislation for public review in fall 2011, accepting comments in written form and at meetings. After revisions, DPD will send the legislation to City Council, where councilmembers will start consideration of the proposal in early 2012. Draft legislation and background materials will be posted at **www.seattle.gov/dpd/planning/yeslerterrace**.

For more information about SHA's redevelopment plans, visit **www.seattlehousing.org/redevelopment/yesler-terrace/**.

Contacts:

Dave LaClergue - (206) 733-9668 or
dave.laclergue@seattle.gov

Gary Johnson (206) 615-0787 or
gary.johnson@seattle.gov

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development

10/5/2011
www.seattle.gov/dpd/planning/yeslerterrace

Urban Forest Management Plan update recommendation to IDT – continues
SPdB – the group working on the UFMP update has created a schedule to comply will all deadlines. I have sent out a schedule for UFC involvement in the discussion of policy issues. I already heard from Peg and Gordon. Tom, Nancy, and John F are participating in the December 12 meeting on canopy cover goals by geography. I will keep this agenda item recurring in all agendas to make sure UFC is kept in the loop on progress towards the first draft.

PS – I did play around with the canopy cover calculator.

NB – I have it but there is not a way to play with it by geography. It's mainly by land use.

PS – I would recommend we make it up. Take the same square footage in a spreadsheet. Know your habitat corridors and make some simple math diagram.

NB – you can use the land use setup and set some policy within it.

PS – keep it very simple.

Street Tree Ordinance recommendation – possible vote
SPdB – I sent out a document that captured all the comments made by Commissioners in the last couple of conversations about the Street Tree Ordinance. I think we have enough information to start putting together a recommendation.

PS – I misplaced the actual ordinance.

SPdB – I have it here. They are expecting comment from the public in early January.

PS – Can we write some things?

SPdB – I can capture the notes and send them out.

PS – hazardous tree definition and rating. Define the term supervise and supervision. The term public place. Redefine the term Street Tree.

Discussion took place about ideas for the recommendation. Sandra captured that in the notes below.

January 20 – deadline for public comment
Definitions: 15024.6 (page 5)
Hazardous tree (and include a rating scale/system and thresholds)
Supervise and supervision (on site)
Public place – clarify because there are public places not controlled by SDOT. Give examples of what's not considered a public place.
Street tree

Pruning – Recommendation for clarifying major pruning section; include mitigation (including utilities).
Revisit the power and franchise issue (in view of the reality that many necessary practices to keep trees from power lines results in detrimental effect to the health of the tree – replacement and/or mitigation.
If in order to maintain the integrity of power line there is a detrimental effect on the tree the utility needs to consult with SDOT's City Arborist.
Mitigation to occur elsewhere? To stay within a neighborhood zone.
Automatic trigger when utilities 'top' a tree.
Do SCL contractors have to get pruning permit? St use permit or decal?
NOTE: In UFMP update – talk about ROW
Tie ROW trees to UFMP – for utilities 'hedging' practices
Utilities should change policy on trees in ROW, remove trees and replace them. Issue with privately maintained trees in ROW.
Yakima v. Shaw (sp?) on ownership
Ownership and damage – power, public sewer, storm drain, sidewalks and pavement… in one paragraph is confusing because it's too broad. NOTE: this is an old rule…

Peg and Tom will work on putting the notes in a letter format for vote at next week's meeting.

New business and announcements
MM – are there any announcements or other items?

PS – I would like to put in the agenda this issue with the blackberries?

SPdB – I have scheduled a meeting with Mark Mead from Parks to talk about this. I would like to have the opportunity to talk to him first and then report back.

MM – Sounds good. Let's look at it in a couple of meetings.

Adjourn