

# Urban Forestry Commission

September 29, 2010

## 5-year Work Plan Session Meeting Summary

Seattle Municipal Tower Room

Room 4080

600 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Seattle

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

<b>Attending</b>	
<u>Commissioners</u>	<u>Staff</u>
Elizabetha Stacishin-Moura – chair	Sandra Pinto de Bader - OSE
Matt Mega – vice chair	
Gordon Bradley	<u>Facilitating team</u>
John Hushagen	Brad Khan
Kirk Prindle	Emily Goetz
Nancy Bird	
John Small	
Peg Staeheli	
<b>Absent- Excused</b>	
Jeff Reibman (JR)	

1) Overview of Session:

Purpose of discussion is to provide Commission chance to provide feedback, identify gaps, go through work plan as a product in its entirety.

- Overview of Work Plan:

John H: I think it should be higher, heard 35% in 1975. This should be the minimum.

Elizabetha: I thought we concluded on saying “The city’s goal.” Allowing SUFC a little more flexibility.

John H: Concern, in subsequent years, I don’t want them to take the goal number down lower. Should stay stable, we don’t change building regulations with new Mayors. Part of taking trees more seriously.

What about 40% goal? Can we address that?

Matt: My understanding is that American Forest says 40% is goal all cities should go for. The comprehensive plan for City of Seattle says 40%. I want the city to figure it out. Ultimately I want this adopted by City Council, whether it is 30 or 40%.

Elizabetha: I understood that Mayor approved urban forestry management plan, but Council didn’t.

Since this is the urban forestry commission and not canopy commission, bothers me that there is this figure which we are not sure where it comes from. What does canopy mean in terms of functioning urban forest?

Matt: Will send some language on this to BK.

2) Reviewing the draft work plan:

a) General feedback:

b) Purpose of the work plan:

I thought we would see more specifics here of the work. Somewhere in here we have to embody some tasks that are specific enough to grab.

These are more guiding principles of the work plan. In terms of that suggestion, I thought they should be called Guiding Principles.

Identify tasks.

c) Key topics:

d) Criteria for decision making:

Remove redundancies, removing 5 & 6 and maybe 8, cutting down to key issues.

Rob made a good point that leaving them in leaves more flexibility.

10 is also redundant.

I'd like to see us put in our prioritization to public issues, that we will be responsive to issues brought to us by the public.

Elizabetha disagrees, if they fit into the other criteria then we will.

BK: What if the public wanted something that didn't fit any of the criteria?

If you are including stakeholders, public are a stakeholder, maybe they should be included.

Mayor and Council were elected by the public, so we are indirectly serving the public by serving the Mayor.

We could leave the leadership request, but not necessarily include the public, because the public's request should fit into the other priorities, and if it doesn't then we shouldn't be spending time on it.

It is about the issue and not about the who.

Suppose that the school district gets approval to cut down trees at Ingrahm HS, and SUFC is asked to weigh in, we are set up to advise Mayor and Council, is anyone from those offices going to weigh in on this issue?

BK: Is this body the conduit for community input? That kind of input should go to Council, then they would ask you about it.

10: Change the word departments to organizations.

I think #3 should be the first thing.

Council as a whole has never really looked at any of these issues, they look to DPD.  
There is a lack of a comprehensive look at urban forestry.

e) Priority outcomes:

Matt: Programs/ Evaluations: There needs to be more work here, not defined in my mind as to how.

Would be good that we require follow up briefing.

Making sure that each one of these has a feedback loop tied to it.

Would this be the place to broaden the term, not trees, urban forest.

Annual report could serve purposes in each of these 5 categories.

Would help to define what that is.

Engagement/Outreach: City staff will be permanent drivers. This body helps review plans and shape work.

Some of us work for organizations that are conducive to conducting outreach activities. If there appears to be an opportunity to take advantage of those resources, that could be facilitated.

I think we could strengthen #4 to: promoters, cheerleaders, something like that. Gordon is the only one who works for a public entity. Advocate is a good word for that.

Our role is to let people know that we're here and what we do.

Being supporters but advocacy sometimes can go over the top.

We don't want to be perceived as objective.

By definition we are advocates of urban forestry issues within city government, advocates for the recommendations of the Commission.

Need further clarification of hats you wear and roles you play.

Organization/Operations needs to be one of the first things we do, needs to be moved up in task list.

f) Five-year plan: Key Benchmarks:

a. Legislation/ Protection:

Commission doesn't need help developing opportunities, can we reframe this? Or get depts. Who are supposed to be working with SUFC to understand what that means.

We need to refine this down, and really pick the things we want to benchmark.

Maybe we need a 3.5 that says reserve the right to reject a toothless Ordinance.

Want it said somewhere in here that we engage the Council.

Until we fix process of working with DPD this is going to remain a very difficult process.

Writing a letter to each department? Every dept. is managing this, we need to communicate.

Maybe we propose an alternative approach based on what Kirk was saying about Issaquah (?) and the public hearing period that accompanied this there.

We should get the period extended and get more players involved in writing this.  
SDOT should be involved.  
We should lay out what should be in Ordinance, extending it so we can have an open process.

b. Programs/ Evaluation:

4. is a little confusing, maybe combine 2 and 4 to clean up.  
We are missing geographic distribution of loss.  
Add a benchmark that is clarify process of reporting to Commission.

c. Comprehensiveness/ Effectiveness:

d. Engagement/ Outreach:

ReLeaf moved to SPU.  
Need report on how Seattle ReLeaf is developing.  
#4: Promoting trees as infrastructure.  
Internal engagement/internal outreach.

e. Organizational/ Operational:

Not a problem with the Commission not being able to coordinate well, we need people to see we are coordinating with personnel where it counts.  
Including something as internal engagement/internal outreach.  
People need to understand what coordination with the commission should look like.

Don't see anything in here about tackling refinements to code.  
Sub-bullet of Legislation/Protection, #4.

3) Next steps:

Capture public comment.