

Urban Forestry Commission

September 1, 2010

Meeting Summary

Seattle Municipal Tower Room
Seattle City Council Chambers
600 4th Avenue, Seattle
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Attending	
<u>Commissioners</u>	<u>Staff</u>
Elizabeta Stacishin-Moura (ESM) – chair	Tracy Morgenstern (TM) - OSE
Matt Mega (MM) – vice chair	Sandra Pinto de Bader (SPdB) - OSE
Gordon Bradley (GB)	Nolan Rundquist (NR)- SDOT
John Hushagen (JH)	Brennon Staley (BS) - DPD
Kirk Prindle (KP)	
Jeff Reibman (JR)	
John Small (JS)	
Peg Staeheli (PS)	
Absent- Excused	
Nancy Bird (NB)	

Call to Order

ESM began the meeting explaining that there would be two public comment opportunities, one at the beginning of the meeting and the other after the brainstorming exercise around proposed tree regulations

Public Comment

Kay Shoudy (KS) brought a copy of the letter Heron Habitat Helpers (HHH) wrote to DPD regarding buffer zones for nesting areas for Blue Heron and the Director’s Rule 5-2007.

JH mentioned that he saw the ravine from somebody’s back yard and that a lot of it is filled in. He asked how likely it was that more development would take place. KS said the main problem are private owners cutting their trees down. She understands that people might want to take down a tree that is hazardous. Eventually one nesting trees will be preserved.

JH asked what the level of understanding is among home owners in the area. KS said HHH has invited owners to meetings and that those that are aware of the situation are not the problem but when homes get sold is when people cut trees down.

Steve Zemke gave an update on the work being done by Save the Trees Seattle. The group met last weekend to continue working on an alternative tree regulation proposal. He urged the Commission to talk to Brennon Staley from DPD to make the process public and open. He is requesting that DPD post in their website the places and times where presentations about the proposed tree ordinance are being held.

ESM emphasized that the Urban Forest Commission (UFC) is an advisory body and encouraged the public to get in touch with the Mayor and Council and express their opinions about the proposed regulation.

Approve August 4 and August 11 (Special Meeting) Minutes

Only the 8/11 minutes were available. KP mentioned that his name was misspelled in the first page and asked why the UFC thought he had sent the letter in the commission's name.

ESM said that each commission member needs to be clear that a letter is coming from them individually. That his letter made it seem as if he implied that the letter came from the commission.

PS said that not having the letter in front of her she couldn't decide and was proposing to table the issue.

ESM said that the minutes reflected with accuracy what had happened at the meeting.

JH made a motion to amend the section that states: "The letter was sent in the name of the Commission and that was inappropriate." To read "**if** the letter was sent in the name of the Commission, that was inappropriate."

JS seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. The 8/11/10 minutes were approved. The 8/4/10 minutes will be approved at the October UFC meeting.

SDOT Briefing:

The Seattle Department of Transportation's (SDOT) City Arborist, Nolan Rundquist presented a synopsis of permit activity for 2009 and 2010 to date. SDOT issues approximately 500 permits per year (for pruning, planting, and removal) and staff field 4,500 to 5,000 annual calls, many of which result in a site visit.

In 2009 SDOT issued 211 removal permits for a total of 388 trees removed; 104 pruning permits for a total of 351 trees pruned; and 162 planting permits for a total of 378 trees planted.

SDOT issues permits only for regulated trees in the planting strip or city Right of Way (ROW). He usually denies removal permits if the tree is healthy. Sometimes during storm season, some trees are so damaged that they are not salvageable, if that's the case, he allows the removal.

To date in 2010 there have been 285 tree removals and 285 tree plantings. 97 permits were denied in 2009 and 2010.

SDOT's tree program regulates all trees that are in the ROW, approximately 250,000 trees in Seattle. Of those, only 40,000 are planted and maintained by SDOT. Even though SDOT regulates all street trees, the abutting property owner has to maintain trees that are not maintained by the city. Home owners need a permit to prune, plant, or remove street trees. SDOT does not charge for the permit. Unless there is a major traffic plan that requires inspection they try not to give homeowners the additional cost of a permit. They try to make things easy for the public.

JH asked how many removal permits have to do street trees that are in the ROW, how many are in alleys, vacated, or unmaintained areas. NR said that less than 5% of trees are in places other than the planting strip.

GB asked what level of activity takes place outside the permitting process. NR said that before SDOT got more active, probably 50% of the planting happened without a permit. Now that the city is providing free trees, they have more control.

ESM asked what the cost of a permit is. NR said it would take around 1 hour of work, or be around \$100 considering staff time and benefits. SDOT seldom follows up. They ask the property owner to do the follow up and say that work is done. They ask the home owner to send a photo.

ESM asked about recording violations. NR said that is on a complaint basis. SDOT sends letters to people giving them the option to replace a tree or paying double what a fee permit would cost. Normally the permit fee \$110 is waived if people used an approved tree service. A violation would cost at most \$200.

MM asked if they can track exceptional trees. NR responded that the permit records the type of tree. If not noted, SDOT can look at the inventory.

MM can we look at diameter at breast height (DBH) cut to figure out canopy loss? The permit system could track that. Also, if there is no real follow-up then there is no sense of survivability. NR said that we can't tell on privately planted trees.

MM asked is there are safety considerations on pruning permits. NR said they don't issue permits if the size of limbs to be cut is less than three inches in diameter. If more is being pruned they want to use permitting to see what will be done with a pruning plan.

JH asked for an update on Dutch Elm disease (DED). NR said it's been a very bad year. They found 17 large trees behind Franklin High school, the biggest 35" DBH and the smallest 16". There are no signs of infection in the Washington Park area, but on Lakeshore Drive, they are all dead. SDOT has been going to those areas and offering to plant trees. The problem is if a large tree is on a steep slope, then they need to go through DPD's process. NR would like to simply get rid of the tree even if it's not considered a hazard.

PS would like to see a reclassification of 'hazardous' trees to include those infected with DED. BS clarified that the process for trees with DED is the same as that for hazardous trees, it's just not called a hazard but it's the same timeframe. PS thinks it should be called hazardous to expedite the process. BS explained that the code allows for an emergency exception where someone can take an infected tree down and then retroactively prove that it was an emergency.

PS asked what's the survival rate for DED and NR said 'zero'.

PS asked NR what he thought needed to be done. NR said that there should be an easy way to get those disease trees out. The disease has been here since 2001.

JH said that because the city doesn't have condemnation power on private property, that's why the disease has spread, because people ignored it.

PS said that some city departments have a two-for-one replacement policy. NR explained that any city department that takes one tree down has to replace it with two, but that this policy was not extended to the general public.

GB said that SDOT has a permitting scheme and we have new proposed tree regulations with no permitting scheme. He asked if this was so because in the ROW SDOT has authority and that maybe permitting would not be viable in private property?

NR said he didn't know about viability, but he thought a permitting system would need to be fee supported, otherwise all inspectors would have to be in the General Fund.

GB asked if the situation was more about funding or about compliance. NR said that there is much less compliance in the Private Property.

ESM said that in the early days people didn't apply for permits for planting, and asked whether compliance has increased with time. NR responded that awareness has increased. He also said that many times he receives calls about people wanting to do things with private property trees.

JS asked about the difference in percentage of work done in areas with curb and gutter vs. areas with no curb and gutter.

NR said that in the north end sometimes it's hard to tell if a tree is in the ROW or on private property and that there are not as many trees in that area. People don't plant as many trees. Several trees can be under the same permit. The permit costs the same to the City (\$100). He can use Google view to see what a tree looks like and can process a permit very fast.

JH asked if the number of permits in the report includes Seattle City Light (SCL) pruning and removals. NR said that it did. That he asks SCL to tell the abutting home owner to get a permit.

He has sometimes denied removal permits to SCL if he believes the tree can be properly maintained under the power lines.

KP asked if SDOT does posting for trees that will be removed. NR said that they have a 4-5 inch cut-off. If it's a large tree SDOT requires 10 days posting.

KP asked what happens when there is conflict with the community not wanting a tree to go down. NR said that he talks to people in the neighborhood, and that if it's a matter of public safety, he lets them know and the tree comes down. He denies between 50-60 removals/year.

ESM asked about sidewalk issues. If someone has a buckled sidewalk that is a hazard what's the process? NR said that they first pull the sidewalk up to assess roots condition. Last year there were 30-40 trees that were in bad shape and were taken down.

Chair's Report:

ESM and MM attended the City Council's Regional Development and Sustainability Committee to present the UFC's letter commenting on DPD's tree regulation proposal.

The first UFC 5-year work plan session took place on 8/16 with only two Commissioners missing. People can still send comments and ideas to Bran Kahn. ESM and MM are reviewing the first work plan draft and it will be distributed and posted on the website for comment.

GB asked what the Council's questions were. MM said many were related to private property and how to handle. A council member asked whether we really have a canopy problem. Councilmember Godden asked about the benefits of a permit system.

JH would like to talk about new agenda items.

PS said it would be nice to brainstorm on what to do with the DPD proposal. Other than permits UFC has not honed down on the proposal. It's important to find out if there is research or detailed analysis that needs to happen before making changes.

JH said that he participated in the Emerald City Task Force meeting that DPD hosted to get input on the tree ordinance. JH believes it would be very helpful to ask the developer members of the ECTF to present their point of view to the UFC. It would be good to hear what they are up against.

Follow-up to DPD's Proposal for New Tree Regulations:

PS proposed to do an exercise of calling out what commissioners like and don't like about the current tree ordinance proposal and determine what needs to be done. Below are the notes taken on the board:

Like	Don't like	Need to do
Point system	Point spread	Understand the value of tree's

Like	Don't like	Need to do
		life (when does that value jump based on DBH)
Bond proposal	Short term-bond (shorter than 3 years)	Storm water, CO2 sequestration, other value
Payment in lieu of planting	No exceptional tree protection (canopy volume)	Calculations on tree increase by zone (ROW v. SF) from 2002 – 2007. Look at canopy stability. Is ROW planting sustainable long-term?
DON involved in regulations	DPD writing document (no permitting)	Developers point of view. Exceptional tree and development dollars
No tree protected for life = flexibility	Flawed process	Difference between mature trees, wet lands, steep slopes – ECAs
	Arbitrary process for exceptional trees	Review of other model ordinances/programs/systems
	Different process for larger projects	Clearly answer benefits of permitting
	Not fair across range of development	Why save trees? Permit to remove, permit to preserve, permit to plant?
	Removes certainty from larger development	Evaluate incremental permit system
	No regulatory guidance for tree protection	Prevent development loop hole for clear cutting
	Lack of consistency and clarity of regulations across the board	Cost-benefit of Green Factor and Tree Credit
	Doesn't include code (vague)	Business case analysis
	Didn't clearly state proposal for each zoning	All regulatory processes incorporate canopy goals
	Doesn't recognize place (layers, habitat...)	Investigate use of overlay approach

Public Comments on the Follow-up to DPD's Proposal Discussion:

Steve Zemke said that the proposal is missing specific code or language and that UFC can propose language and continue the discussion by proposing specific language. Large projects and Major Institutions should be included because they have more flexibility and large sites. An issue to be researched would be to know how many trees are we dealing with in terms of permits, we might be dealing with a much smaller number than what DPD tells us. Another issue is about licensing arborists. Also, the City Auditor report talked about oversight for trees

and one agency being responsible, or maybe some other variation to be more efficient with more coordination. Look at the idea of real estate disclosure of properties sold to gather tree data. Heritage trees or groves require separate category. Exceptional trees need more flexibility. Large institutions have 10 year master plans and that the UW has a community liaison regarding trees. They have strict internal regulations for trees. He supports imposing more controls on the UW.

Another member of the public said that to address the question: why save the trees? We can look at a PhD thesis saying that native bird species increase with increased canopy, trees help mitigate the urban island heat effect, and they help with storm water issues.

Committee Reports:

JS said that the Ecosystems Committee had a GIS data work session and might have additional requests for the City to provide more layers.

JR said that the last Management Committee was collapsed with the Community Committee for a full Commission special meeting.

ES encouraged people to attend the committee meetings because they are dealing in more detail with the same issues of the full commission.

New Business:

JH would like to invite the developers in the ECTF to present to the Commission

GB would like to hear from City Light on the management of urban trees

PS would like a future topic to be gaining a better understanding how departments are using properties available for tree planting. She is not confident that focusing on residential trees will be enough to fulfill the 30% canopy cover goal.

Announcements:

JR had a meeting with PS and SPU on their rate structure and storm water. There are no action items at this point.

ESM – this was the first meeting where the UFC created their own agenda items. When asking departments to brief the UFC it's important to give them a flavor or the kinds of things the UFC wants to ask. It would be helpful for commissioners who have experience with certain department to help frame the questions for a briefing.

JH when talking to SCL it would be nice to ask them if they would rather be removing trees and planting more adequate trees instead of pruning so many. It would be nice to hear their input.

SPdB announced that all of the 2011 full Commission and committees meetings will take place in room SMT 2750 to avoid confusion and that she will put together a table with the location of the remaining 2010 meetings.

Urban Forestry Commission

September 1, 2010

Like-don't like-need to do exercise table

Follow-up to DPD's Proposal for New Tree Regulations:

Like	Don't like	Need to do
Point system	Point spread	Understand the value of tree's life (when does that value jump based on DBH)
Bond proposal	Short term-bond (shorter than 3 years)	Storm water, CO2 sequestration, other value
Payment in lieu of planting	No exceptional tree protection (canopy volume)	Calculations on tree increase by zone (ROW v. SF) from 2002 – 2007. Look at canopy stability. Is ROW planting sustainable long-term?
DON involved in regulations	DPD writing document (no permitting)	Developers point of view. Exceptional tree and development dollars
No tree protected for life = flexibility	Flawed process	Difference between mature trees, wet lands, steep slopes – ECAs
	Arbitrary process for exceptional trees	Review of other model ordinances/programs/systems
	Different process for larger projects	Clearly answer benefits of permitting
	Not fair across range of development	Why save trees? Permit to remove, permit to preserve, permit to plant?
	Removes certainty from larger development	Evaluate incremental permit system
	No regulatory guidance for tree protection	Prevent development loop hole for clear cutting
	Lack of consistency and clarity of regulations across the board	Cost-benefit of Green Factor and Tree Credit
	Doesn't include code (vague)	Business case analysis
	Didn't clearly state proposal for each zoning	All regulatory processes incorporate canopy goals
	Doesn't recognize place (layers, habitat...)	Investigate use of overlay approach

Public input:

From: John "Hooper" Havekotte [mailto:4.hooper.4@comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, August 29, 2010 9:11 PM

To: Sugimura, Diane

Cc: PintodeBader, Sandra; McGinn, Mike; Harrell, Bruce; Godden, Jean; Licata, Nick; Conlin, Richard; Clark, Sally; Burgess, Tim; Rasmussen, Tom; O'Brien, Mike; Bagshaw, Sally

Subject: HHH Response to recent Seattle DPD decision

August 29, 2010

Diane Sugimura, Director
Department of Planning and Development
City of Seattle
700 Fifth Avenue Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Re: Director's Rule 5-2007, Great Blue Heron Management Areas

Dear Ms. Sugimura:

We are writing in regard to your recent letter to the Urban Forestry Commission relevant to the proposals forwarded by the Commission. We are particularly concerned about your recommendation against the proposed extension of year-around protection for the screening trees in the habitat buffer zones, as well as adjusting the size of the trees to protect.

As you know the present rule protects screening trees during the nesting season only. We are assuming that this existing, limited provision is supported by "Best Available Science". We do not understand why the removal of trees at other times, leaving no screening left for the colony when they return to nest, has no science to support it. Either a buffer zone is required to protect the colony or it is not. We would suggest that a common sense approach to protecting the herons would lead to the conclusion that their screening trees should be protected all year long, and we believe that this protection is intended in the spirit of the Director's Rule.

One of the most serious problems encountered by the heron colony has been eagle and crow predation. With removal of the buffer trees, the nests are fully exposed to predators as well as human activity. The loss of the Black River herons was evidence of how easily a colony can be destroyed. The buffer zone is our only natural protection for the herons and further destruction of their habitat will only assure the loss of this special place and these special birds.

Kiwanis Ravine is in the process of becoming the City's first "Wildlife Sanctuary," designated by Seattle Parks. A habitat protection plan is being prepared for the lands within the park. But DPD is responsible for lands in the 500-foot buffer around the park. Current interpretation of DR 5-2007 would allow cutting of all trees in this buffer area during non-nesting time of the year so that the nesting area could eventually be surrounded by a totally built environment, providing no

screening against noise and predation, nesting material, or perching locations for adults and chicks.

HHH also opposes the recently announced DPD approach to a new Seattle draft tree ordinance. With “exceptional trees” removed from the City ordinance, there would be no protection for any trees in the 500-foot buffer area during non-nesting time of the year, further hastening the demise of the unique Kiwanis Ravine heron colony. We will be submitting comments separately regarding the proposed trees regulations.

Please include HHH in your future staff discussions and public meetings regarding the Director’s rule and a new Seattle tree ordinance that would truly protect our Emerald City’s green infrastructure, as well as its wildlife and human citizens. And please do not wait to revise DR 5-2007 until the next round of Critical Area Ordinance revisions. By our estimate, that is another seven years away. By then the Kiwanis Ravine buffer could have lost many trees, and who knows how many adults and chicks will be populating the nesting area in Kiwanis Ravine Park.

Sincerely

John “Hooper” Havekotte, President
Heron Habitat Helpers, stewards of Kiwanis Ravine Park

cc: Mayor McGinn, Seattle City Council, Seattle Urban Forestry Commission

From: Michael Oxman [mailto:michaeloxman@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 9:33 AM
To: Morgenstern, Tracy
Subject: Please forward to Urban Forestry Commission

Seattle Urban Forestry Commission,

I feel the rejection of the 2007 Urban Forest Management Plan should finally be put on the table. City Council Resolution 31138 <http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~scripts/nph-brs.exe?s1=&s2=&s3=31138&s4=&Sect4=AND&l=20&Sect2=THESON&Sect3=PLURON&Sect5=RESN1&Sect6=HITOFF&d=RES3&p=1&u=/%7Epublic/resn1.htm&r=1&f=G> describes the UFMP as NOT being adopted by Council. So does Ordinance 116404 <http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~scripts/nph-brs.exe?s1=&s2=&s3=&s4=122919&s5=&Sect4=and&l=20&Sect2=THESON&Sect3=PLURON&Sect5=CBO R1&Sect6=HITOFF&d=CBOR&p=1&u=%2F%7Epublic%2Fcbor1.htm&r=1&f=G>.

The agenda for the Urban Forestry Commission goal setting meeting unequivocally states that the canopy cover goal is 30% http://www.seattle.gov/trees/docs/Commission_agendas/8-16-10%20work%20planning%20agenda.pdf, not the 40% listed in the comp plan. http://www.seattle.gov/DPD/Planning/Comprehensive_Plan_Annual_Amendments/Proposed2007Amendments/default.asp

Here's some comments on some remarkable discrepancies in other official city documents:

Page 47 of the UFMP details how the Green Factor will play an increasing role, but it was untested at the time. Green Factor has proven to be an easy way for developers to misrepresent flexible incentives as a suitable way to protect existing trees during construction. This is demonstrated in the June 3rd letter by the Urban Forestry Commission to Councilmember Obrien. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z-V8lv-XnPk>

Here's an example of the defective nature of the Green Factor: Permeable paving can substitute for part of the tree credit. This can involve killing existing trees by scraping the grade down, and laying the required 6" depth of gravel for drainage, plus the 4" thickness of the paving stones. Root damage can also be occur by using harmful heavy equipment to lay down the 10" thick covering on top of existing roots. This change of grade will effectively kill roots and trees, while ostensibly saving them. A better technique is simply lay a thin topdressing of sand on the existing soil, then add interlocking pavers or bricks.

Another defective feature of the UFMP is the correlation of canopy width to tree trunk diameter. The science of Urban Forestry considers groups of trees, while the science of Arboriculture concerns itself with the health & structure of an individual tree. No connection links the canopy cover concept to the criteria or ability to give a permit for one single tree to be removed. In the mind of the public, trees are individuals.

After the opening pages of the UFMP, a huge leap in logic essentially dismisses concern for individual trees. The remainder of the document rationalizes euthanasia by focusing on the good of the whole forest. The portion of the document following the goals statements is cold as ice. The best indication of this is the statement that "Freight Movers" must be consulted prior to planting trees in industrial areas. 8% canopy cover should not be increased to the meager 10% UFMP target so that 75' long trucks can make U-turns. The goals are way too conservative, and public discussion needs to become a factor, regardless of how difficult staff feels progress will be.

The policy development occurring behind closed doors has continued to the July 14th, 2010 misrepresentation of stakeholders involvement in the Proposed Tree Protection legislation. This document was developed in secret. It is a euphemism for "Tree Removal Specifications". Another huge leap in logic occurs in the document after the 'decision' was made by DPD not to implement a tree removal permit system as requested by Council.

http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@treeregulation/documents/web_informational/dpdp019340.pdf Page 4 states that multifamily construction projects routinely bulldoze 95% of all trees on site. The proposed multifamily ordinance, if adopted, will allow developers to bulldoze even more than 95% of the trees, if it means cramming more profitable units on a lot. In the chess game of 'greenwash', the dollar is king; trees are just pawns. Trees are expendable when concrete is poured, forever desertifying that spot.

Here's my take on the administrative overhead cost of a tree permit system. Seattle needs more staff to perform tree maintenance, so just cross-train these arborists as permit inspectors. Since they will be out in the field pruning and planting anyway, just have them bop over to look at trees that have had on-line permit requests filed. Pay for the labor force with stormwater drainage fees.

Well thanks again for being willing to engage in this debate.

Arboreally yours,

Michael Oxman

From: Michael Oxman [mailto:michaeloxman@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 4:24 PM
To: PintodeBader, Sandra; o.rhyan@gmail.com; okomski@msn.com; Bonnie Miller; Cheryl Trivison; David Miller; Donna Kostka; elizabeth@campbellcentral.org; escigliano@seattlemet.com; Gala, Rob; ghuffman@mbaks.com; heidicar@att.net; Jenkins, Michael; nativetrees@gmail.com; shoudypk@comcast.net; larrylange36@comcast.net; lsu@u.washington.edu; Liz Kearns; thouless1@comcast.net; mpoe@ifcae.org; nicholas@treesolutions.net; richard_ellison@hotmail.com; Steve Zemke; Wallis Bolz
Cc: Morgenstern, Tracy
Subject: Re: New documents posted on Urban Forestry Commission website

Dear Sandra,

Enclosed is my letter about Council Resolution 31138 to City Light Arborist Brent Schmidt. Please forward to the Urban Forestry Commission. Thanks.
Michael Oxman

From: [Michael Oxman](#)
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 11:48 AM
To: brent.schmidt@seattle.gov
Cc: [Mike Obrien](#) ; [Nick Licata](#) ; [Sally Bagshaw](#) ; [Sally Clark](#) ; Tim.Burgess@Seattle.Gov ; [Tracy Morgenstern](#)
Subject: Public disclosure request to City Light - Council Resolution 31138

Howdy,

Please provide overdue responses to Council Resolution 31138.
<http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~scripts/nph-brs.exe?s1=&s2=&s3=31138&s4=&Sect4=AND&l=20&Sect2=THESON&Sect3=PLURON&Sect5=RESN1&Sect6=HITOFF&d=RES3&p=1&u=%2F~public%2Fresn1.htm&r=1&f=G>

Section 1. "submit legislation by May 2010 to establish a comprehensive set of regulations and incentives to limit the removal of trees and promote the retention and addition of trees within the City of Seattle on both private and public property, including city park land."

1.j. Establish criteria to permit the removal of a tree or trees;
What is City Light's tree removal criteria?

Section 3. Heritage Trees in city GIS database;
Which of the 59 Heritage Trees are in proximity to power lines?

Section 5. Tree inventory;

Please present cost estimates for conducting a survey of all trees on City Light property, substations and facilities within the city limits. If inventory data exists for trees on private property in the electric right of way, present cost estimate for converting this data to a format compatible with Hansen GIS used by SDOT, SPU & DPD.

Section 6. Auditors Report. Coordination. ..."coordination between Seattle City Light's Vegetation Management Unit and the Capital Improvement Planning. This report shall be provided to the Council by May 2010."

Please present revised timeline for this report.

Section 7. Auditors Report. Planting List. ..."implement recommendations contained in the May 2009 City Auditor's report concerning a mutually agreed upon tree planting list at or near overhead power lines. This report shall be provided to the Council by March 2010."

Please present revised timeline for this report.

Section 9. Utility Rate Incentive. ..."retain, maintain and plant trees through education and incentives, including an analysis of utility rates and permit fees for the use of City rights-of-way and City facilities."

Please present analysis of possible discount on electric rate for homes with energy-saving tree canopy cover.

What new federal regulations are referenced in the August 23rd press release?

<http://powerlines.seattle.gov/2010/08/24/new-rules-for-transmission-lines-drive-enhanced-vegetation-management/> Please present the proposed changes in vegetation management policy City Light will use to respond.

Thanks.

Arboreally yours,

Michael Oxman
2317 Harbor AV SW
Seattle, WA 98126
(206) 949-8733
www.treedr.com