



SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Becca Neumann (Position #4 – Hydrologist), Co-chair
Joshua Morris (Position #7 – NGO), Co-Chair
Julia Michalak (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist) • **Joe Sisneros** (Position #2 – Urban Ecologist - ISA)
Falisha Kurji (Position #3 – Natural Resource Agency) • **Stuart Niven** (Position #5 – Arborist – ISA)
Hao Liang (Position #6 – Landscape Architect – ISA) • **David Moehring** (Position # 8 – Development)
Blake Voorhees (Position # 9 – Realtor) • **Laura Keil** (Position #10 – Get Engaged)
Jessica Hernandez (Position #11 – Environmental Justice) • **Jessica Jones** (Position # 12 – Public Health)
Lia Hall (Position #13 – Community/Neighborhood)

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

Meeting notes

September 21, 2022, 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
This was the annual joint meeting between the Urban Forestry Commission and the Urban Forestry Interdepartmental Team
Via Webex call and in-person at
Jefferson Horticulture
1600 S. Dakota Street, Seattle

(206) 207-1700
Meeting number: 2491 715 5753
Meeting password: 1234

Attending

Commissioners

Josh Morris – Co-Chair
Becca Neumann – Co-Chair
Falisha Kurji
Julia Michalak
Stuart Niven
Hao Liang
David Moehring
Laura Keil
Lia Hall

Absent- Excused

Joe Sisneros
Blake Voorhees
Jessica Hernandez
Jessica Jones

Guests

Toby Thaler

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE
Eric Sterner – SPR
Lisa Ciecko – SPR
Michael Yadrick – SPR
Clay Antieau – SPU
Anne-Marie Freudenthal – SDOT
Nich Johnson – SPR
Adam Kilborn – SDOT
Cindy Kozak – SDOT
Deb McGarry – SDCI
Nolan Rundquist – SDOT
Whit Bouton – SDOT
Chanda Emery – SDCI
Heidi Asplundh – SCL
Ali Lakehart - SPU
Stephen Socie – Seattle Center
Chris Strader – Seattle Center
Josh Meidav – SPU

Public

Steve Zemke
Michael Oxman
Richard Ellison
Aliesha Ruiz
Dinushi Samara
Jessica Dixon
Sage Miller
Cameron Stecki
Christina Manetti

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: Patti called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Josh provided welcome comments on behalf of the Urban Forestry Commission.

Canopy cover assessment overview – Patti Bakker, OSE

Patti provided a recap of what has been learned so far in the canopy cover assessment work. She reviewed the process used, which utilizes LiDAR as the main data set. LiDAR data is then combined with aerial imagery to give an accurate map of the city that the consultant team can then analyze to tell us a lot of information about our tree canopy. This round of assessment is our first opportunity for trend analysis, since the baseline was completed in 2016 and this is the first replication of that methodology.

The preliminary data we have includes canopy citywide and by land use type (management unit), and the change in canopy since 2016. Through this process, we're able to see where canopy grew and where it was lost. The preliminary findings we have so far are about the net change in canopy.

Patti reviewed some of the benefits of the urban forest, to frame why this work is important, and also outlined the main challenges facing the urban forest. Trees are seeing increased impacts from climate change, with hotter, drier summers and increased pests. That increases maintenance costs since the need for watering is greater, and our budgets have seen cuts rather than increases necessary to meet that increased need. Our primarily second-growth urban forest is aging, and trees near the end of their lifespan are more susceptible to pests and disease. And in this urban setting, trees sometimes need to be removed for infrastructure projects and development, and allow for competing uses in right of way and private property. The bottom line is that our trees are more vulnerable, and we need to invest more to help them withstand the challenges.

Patti then covered the data results received so far. The first data point received is that our tree canopy decreased citywide. There was a net loss of 255 acres of canopy, which is about the size of Green Lake, for context. We don't yet have data to quantify the extent of the ecosystem services lost with the loss of those acres of canopy, but we can consider the scale of what those trees would have provided:

- Hundreds of thousands of pounds of CO₂/year not sequestered
- Millions of gallons of stormwater runoff not avoided
- Hundreds of acres of shade lost, and millions of gallons of water not transpired to help cool neighborhoods, and
- Hundreds of thousands of pounds of pollutants not absorbed to help clean the air.

However, this loss happened during a time of large growth in the city. That 255 acres of loss equates to a net loss of 1.7% during the 5-year period between 2016-2021. During this time, population grew 8.5%, adding ~58,000 people and ~47,000 housing units.

The results received also include canopy cover and canopy change in the nine management units as defined in the Urban Forest Management Plan. Patti showed a slide showing providing details on existing canopy and canopy change in the management units. The largest amount of canopy is in the Neighborhood Residential area, and the ROW and Parks Natural Areas have significant components as well.

There were net losses in trees across all the land use types, but the areas with the most impact on our overall canopy losses were Neighborhood Residential and Parks Natural Areas.

Parks Natural Areas comprise over 2,000 acres of our canopy. We lost roughly 122 acres of canopy here, mostly due to aging trees that are more susceptible to drought conditions and pests, and are more likely to

come down during weather events. These public lands are important to focus on because natural areas offer substantial environmental benefits, and they need our active management to replant the next generation forest and ensure resilience of these forested areas.

The area that had the next most loss was in Neighborhood Residential. This area makes up roughly 56% of the land in Seattle, so is a critical focus area. Neighborhood Residential also makes up the largest portion of Seattle's tree canopy, by area (over 9,000 acres of our canopy is in this management unit). It's also where residents spend much of their time, so canopy here plays an important role in improving air quality and mitigating extreme heat. We lost 77 acres of canopy in this area, but this was less than 1% of the canopy in this zone. The reasons for loss are complex, and include the same climate and tree age pressures that affect our parks natural areas. Aging trees here – especially aging deciduous trees nearing the ends of their lifespans - are also more susceptible to drought conditions and pests, and are more likely to come down during weather events; large construction projects for utilities, transportation and other infrastructure, that need to remove trees, and the fact that housing grew substantially during this period.

Moving forward with this data then, the areas to focus for the future are:

- Developed parks and natural areas – we have the greatest flexibility and options for increasing canopy in these areas.
- Neighborhood residential – again, this is such a large proportion of the city that protection of trees on these lands will be key to our canopy goals.
- Across all management units, protecting and maintaining existing trees. Mature trees contribute substantial ongoing canopy growth; we would have seen a lot more loss without this growth. Newer trees are important for our long-term forest generation and succession, and for mitigating canopy inequities. But they take years to establish and contribute to our canopy. This all points to the need to invest in protecting and maintaining existing trees.

Patti discussed equity impacts of canopy distribution. Many of the priority neighborhoods with low canopy are burdened by other health, economic and social inequities. Patti showed maps of tree canopy across the City, as well as maps showing areas of disadvantage in the city, air quality data, and the 2020 heat study. From these maps, one can see that there is a correlation between areas of low canopy cover and areas of racial and social inequities, lower air quality and higher heat indexes, including parts of Beacon Hill, Georgetown and South Park.

The data so far reinforces that our Parks Natural Areas and our Neighborhood Residential areas need help, and that BIPOC and low-income neighborhoods have lower canopy. We are still waiting on additional analyses and data from the consultant, but the city is thinking now about what need to do to build on work the city is already doing and to expand with strategies that will allow us to grow canopy rather than see declines. To reverse the backward slide in canopy, our urban forest strategy needs to include actions across a spectrum, including in maintenance, planting, innovation and engagement, and the next item on the agenda will be a brainstorming activity to get input on what those strategies should be.

Associated urban forestry strategy updates

Patti noted that now that we have this first trend point from 2016 to 2021, and we know that we lost canopy despite the city's efforts to maintain and grow out canopy, we have an opportunity to identify how we could update our actions and investments in our urban forest in order to stop the backslide and to grow our canopy.

Patti shared slides listing the potential updates city departments have already identified for the four areas of: public lands, right of way, private lands as well as citywide actions. The group then went into a brainstorming activity to identify what else we could be thinking about for urban forest strategy updates. The prompts for this activity were:

- What’s missing from the current list of possible updates?
- What other strategies can the city, partners and community develop to achieve our canopy goals?
- What are the biggest challenges, what solutions do you think we should be pursuing?

Attendees spent 30 minutes on this activity and generated long lists of suggestions in each of the four areas, which will be compiled in the full meeting notes to be shared with meeting attendees.

City Urban Forester Statement of Legislative Intent

Josh provided background on this SLI, which requested collaboration on a report on the development of a new position with a focus to “promote the preservation of Seattle’s tree canopy and provide independent oversight of the City’s management of trees, with an initial focus on the preservation of exceptional trees.” He recapped the work on this to date, including two meetings between Commissioners and OSE staff and discussions among the Urban Forestry Core Team. These discussions were informed by research Josh conducted on similar positions in other jurisdictions, including listings of job responsibilities and qualifications. Josh provided some basic information on the results of this research.

Meeting attendees participated in another activity to provide input on this, by listing their top three currently unmet urban forestry needs. In-person attendees discussed at their tables, and remote attendees discussed in breakout rooms. The full list of input will be included in the full meeting notes to be shared with meeting attendees.

Equity and resilience planning

Patti introduced this topic and provided a brief recap of the last two years’ joint meetings, which focused on learning about equity in relation to our urban forest, as hosted by Seattle Public Utilities’ Community Connections team. Ali Lakehart from SPU’s Trees for Seattle team then provided some background on equity in relation to trees and urban forest management. She shared some of slides used by the Community Connections team in the last sessions, outlining how and why the City centers race, why racial equity is important when we talk about trees and the ways in which racism as a system of power influences at different levels. It’s also important to consider who is being centered as we do our urban forestry work and who is being pushed to the margins, and consider actions to take to amend that.

The Trees for Seattle team focuses on working with residents because about 70% of the city’s tree canopy is on residential lands. We also know that canopy cover is not equitably distributed, and we know that healthy canopy is directly correlated to lower temperatures. Ali reinforced some of the other inequities that areas with low tree canopy face. All of this information feeds into the ways that the team prioritizes neighborhoods. They look at where trees are now (trees where people live, distance to trees from homes) and also the health of canopy given factors like threats from pests and diseases, and consider where trees are going to be into the future and where activities should be focused.

Ali also covered the Tree Equity Score, which is a national metric of canopy cover and varies across Seattle neighborhoods by up to 40 points. Race is as strong a predictor of canopy cover in neighborhoods as income in Seattle. There are many factors that have contributed to the current distribution of canopy across the city, including deforestation and development, redlining and historic under-investment in communities of color, changing climate impacting native tree populations, and issues such as soils, air quality, mycorrhizal disturbance, and forest fragmentation.

Considering equity in our urban forestry work means investing more in certain areas. The city aims to someday move beyond even achieving equity, to achieving justice in tree canopy, where we’ve addressed and broken through the barriers to having trees in neighborhoods and barriers to racial equity and social justice.

One of the next steps as a team is to consider how we are going to reach our goals for 30% canopy that is equitable distributed and healthy and thriving, and to develop a plan to outline the steps to achieve them. The group then moved into a breakout group activity related to potential plans for developing that planning effort.

Patti recapped the potential project of developing a Tree Canopy Equity and Resilience Plan, and outlined the goals for this activity, which are aimed at setting us up for involving and working with community in developing this plan. Given where we know now with new canopy data and applying that equity lens we just talked about, we can start to outline what groundwork is already happening and what more we can do to lay the foundation for working with community to develop the plan. To that end, the goals for this exercise were to:

- Recap current efforts by city and partners
- Determine additional actions needed
- Identify potential next steps

The prompts for the breakout groups were to consider:

- What efforts are you aware of where the city and/or partners are already working with community to develop canopy plans and take action?
- What else is needed? What are next steps the city and partners need to take to prepare for planning and action toward equitable canopy?
- What resources are needed to take those steps? Who will do them?
- What relationships are missing? Ideas for cultivating those relationships?

Groups spent about 45 minutes on this exercise, after which each group provided a report back to the larger group on what was covered in their groups. The full list from these report-backs will be included in the full meeting notes to be shared with meeting attendees.

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>

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.

Meeting Chat:

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 1:16 PM

Audio is unclear in conference room

from Antieau, Clayton to everyone: 1:31 PM

The population of Seattle (and Salishland) is expected to triple by the end of this century. That does not bode well for Seattle's urban forest (and other natural resources)???

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 1:34 PM

37 minute Youtube video with South Park neighborhood activists, TreePAC, and Seattle Green Spaces Coalition discussing Parks and citywide tree management issues. <https://youtu.be/XAmnhyBTxDU>

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 1:40 PM

Facebook videos show SDOT watering method of street trees is inefficient.

[https://www.facebook.com/michael.oxman.3/posts/pfbid0bnMARyxyxBKJKszvcomG5Akq2Ke87qUJhqQTWaBiLVPbFVMfUap9xtjoxTYFK7FXI?__cft__\[0\]=AZUM3RZehplvXuKsqLIFsNgF4gMwtrzVSgq98vsJbpXVL3o3P2TV1bGLH0VaUV_-t8g46xDjMxsl79uTL7guTiyPwOekABrK5rB8QUh6leDi9CU8BDSqYN0qPsFq-BaxJXkb_wSrUDWfBrUDcUtJr0nLEMklHhH26BME8j7jGJHzYg&__tn__=%2CO%2CP-R](https://www.facebook.com/michael.oxman.3/posts/pfbid0bnMARyxyxBKJKszvcomG5Akq2Ke87qUJhqQTWaBiLVPbFVMfUap9xtjoxTYFK7FXI?__cft__[0]=AZUM3RZehplvXuKsqLIFsNgF4gMwtrzVSgq98vsJbpXVL3o3P2TV1bGLH0VaUV_-t8g46xDjMxsl79uTL7guTiyPwOekABrK5rB8QUh6leDi9CU8BDSqYN0qPsFq-BaxJXkb_wSrUDWfBrUDcUtJr0nLEMklHhH26BME8j7jGJHzYg&__tn__=%2CO%2CP-R)

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 1:40 PM

Agree volume measurement is very important to evaluate as to what is happening

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 1:42 PM

can't hear Josh

from richard Ellison to everyone: 1:43 PM

still cant hear well. can the question be repeated/ summarized?

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 1:55 PM

Canopy survey report is a type of self-assessment that is equally as important as our capability to deal with the trees that are identified. Understanding human resources and equipment available for creating solutions for urban forest management should be included in our inventory of the structure & function of our biosphere.

from Kozak, Cindy to everyone: 1:57 PM

oh i couldn't find the chat

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 1:57 PM

Set up maintenance fund to help private lower-income property owners maintain trees. This could be similar to funds that already exist to support home repair. I've looked into it a little but don't have capacity to pursue this idea.

from Michael Oxman (privately): 1:59 PM

I have a recording of the meeting if it is needed.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 1:59 PM

No mention of increasing tree protection via updated Tree Ordinance eg requiring permits to remove any tree 6"DBH and larger to get on the ground data of tree loss.

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 1:59 PM

Create incentives for private property owners and developers to maintain and plant trees. These could include utility rebates, property tax rebates, or accelerated permitting for development projects that preserve large trees.

from richard Ellison to everyone: 1:59 PM

there is a failure in addressing invasive ivy, clamatis on trees on steep slopes. examples include westlake below apts, n cap hill mansions, under the west seattle bridge, innumerable sites in south sestlle visible from lightrail etc.

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:00 PM

Increase funding for SDCI Code Compliance to fund both an arborist and weekend coverage to make it harder to illegally remove trees.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:00 PM

Require as other cities do that the larger the trees removed by developers that the number of tree required to be replaced increases.

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:01 PM

Require "special inspector" for development projects to ensure that the required tree protection measures are properly installed and maintained.

from richard Ellison to everyone: 2:01 PM

need for a more aggressive education and action teams on this. weathy homeowners could hire crews if they were made aware and offered education and hiring options

from Antieau, Clayton to everyone: 2:01 PM

The population of Seattle (and Salishland) is expected to triple by the end of this century. That does not bode well for Seattle's urban forest (and other natural resources) because the City of Seattle does not place a high priority on preserving and stewarding its urban forest! This is evidenced by the multi-decade absence of an effective tree protection ordinance and continuing loss of canopy. City needs leaders that will change the culture of the Mayor's office, the City Council, the development community, and the public so that trees are given the same priorities as a....Seattle Film Ccommission.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:01 PM

Parks arborist staff is currently 7 employees, out of the 12 positions that are funded. How many SDOT arborists are currently employed, versus how many are funded?

from Whit Bouton to everyone: 2:02 PM

Great suggestions Deb!

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:02 PM

Soil preservation area requirements so that even if existing property don't have existing trees, future trees would get a good start.

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:02 PM

Require replacement planting for hazard trees that are approved for removal.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:03 PM

Proposed in lieu fee needs to increase as diameter of tree increases Portland increases in lieu fee by \$450/ in over 20" DBH.

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:03 PM

Require trees (and space for trees) in multi-family development, in addition to street trees, even if there were no existing trees prior.

from richard Ellison to everyone: 2:04 PM

need for more pocket parks in high density areas. funded by development fees

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:04 PM

Reduce parking requirements on private property in residential and low-rise zones or find another way to reduce parking to make room for trees.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:05 PM

Infrastructure Reduction Act funding of \$150 Billion nationwide is coming, for \$1.5 Billion per year. Prepare grant applications of our highest priorities.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:06 PM

Proposed In lieu fees should be used to plant trees on school properties and other public facilities like university and colleges and hospitals, not just in parks and right of way.

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:06 PM

Biggest challenge: finding space while increasing density. I think it can be done but we need to think carefully about replacement species, creating available space and healthy soil volume (potentially using soil cells under pavement) and probably reduce the space dedicated to parking in exchange for space for trees.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:07 PM

Permits to remove trees need to be instituted to reduce illegal tree cutting. The current new posting by tree care providers for 3 days n

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:08 PM

may give the false illusion that the work being done is approved by the city which may not be the case.

from Dinushi Samarasekara to everyone: 2:08 PM

It's important to create programs that educate young people and new residents of the city's concern and plan for the tree canopy conservation, and the native trees that create tree canopy

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:10 PM

Need to explore creating more pocket parks with tree groves as housing density increases in city and lots are clearcut for development as is occurring with townhouse development

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 2:10 PM

Keep in mind that we need density to reduce development in suburban and exurban areas and rural areas and overall reduce our carbon footprint. The nature of Seattle's canopy may change somewhat but there are ways to save space for trees.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:12 PM

Need to calculate just how many trees need to be planted now and taking into account growth, just how many are needed to reach 30% tree canopy by 2037. No where is that calculated 1000 trees a year is not going to do it..

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:12 PM

How many staff urban foresters are employed by SPU, compared to how many are funded?

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:13 PM

How many staff urban foresters are employed by SDCI, compared to how many are funded?

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:13 PM

How many staff urban foresters are employed by OPCD, compared to how many are funded?

from richard Ellison to everyone: 2:14 PM

trees are only a part of the component of a living green matrix. Seattle cannot be an urban sacrifice zone, which is a solution offered by many urbanists and councilmembers

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:14 PM

We can build housing and save trees but only if we plan for it. We need trees in Seattle and other urban areas for people health, both mental and physical.

from Dinushi Samarasekara to everyone: 2:14 PM

Give opportunities for urban/suburban residents to exhibit their creative gardens could be motivational and inspire other inhabitants

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:17 PM

Consider consolidating tree oversight in a new Department of Environment and Climate with an urban forestry division. Right now tree oversight is in 9 city Departments which also have other missions to accomplish. Trees need a voice speaking for them in city government

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:17 PM

How is the breakdown of staff duties billed to urban forestry budget, when an employee works on multiple initiatives?

from Richard Ellison to everyone: 2:18 PM

Scouting troops, school clubs, fraternities could "adopt" watering and maintenance projects. Too many of these groups plant trees but then ignore watering. They post signs advertising their group planting achievements but then fail to carry through the responsibility. How to address this?

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:19 PM

Acknowledge financial value of trees as green infrastructure through a Natural Capital Assessment.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:19 PM

It seems having more arborists in SDCI would help with the workload...Evaluate how many are needed.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:20 PM

Create a tree street that plants different street trees for people to view in helping them choose trees for their street right of way on their lots. Spokane

from Richard Ellison to everyone: 2:20 PM

Roundtable conference with urban forestry advocates, urbanist, developers, to find common ground solutions to housing and tree issues

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:21 PM

Each city staff member attending this meeting should submit a report on the current situation in their department.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:21 PM

Spokane has a street with different street trees planted for the public to see..

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:23 PM

Require that a tree inventory and landscape plan be done prior to approving a building project. Portland does this.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:24 PM

Each Urban Forestry Commission member attending this meeting should submit a report identifying issues in their representative constituency. IE: The Hydrologist was appointed to offer expertise on water issues; the real estate appraiser was appointed to let us know the urban forest's value in land use transactions.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:25 PM

Expand SDOT's tree removal and planting permit system using Accela to SDCI for all private trees both during development and outside development. This would give ground truthing to loss and planting of trees every year in the city.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:27 PM

During the introductions at the beginning of the meeting, each person should brief the group on the primary problems they are facing, and the resources that are needed. Then, the other people can know where their expertise is needed. So far, no one has said they need any help.

from Dinushi Samarasekara to everyone: 2:27 PM

Pocket parks and walkways should not include concrete floors but porous outdoor flooring options - Redmond downtown park is a concrete island

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:30 PM

Allow a proposed Tree Planting and Preservation Fund to allow for purchasing pocket parklands for tree groves and exceptional trees. We will never see most exceptional tree replacement trees at their maturity in our lives .

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:30 PM

How many staff urban foresters are employed by SDOT, compared to how many are funded?

from Rundquist, Nolan to everyone: 2:32 PM

When a development project is submitted to SDCI, the tree inventory aspect should be input into an online inventory, instead of onto a paper plan to be reviewed. If this could happen, tree canopy and loss could be tracked as an aspect of development and the cost of inventory input would be borne by the project.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 2:33 PM

Include Urban Forestry Commission in writing of proposed legislation, as required by law establishing the Commission.

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 2:33 PM

Is sound still okay? Are you hearing Josh well?

from Rundquist, Nolan to everyone: 2:34 PM

Arborist office is fully staffed at this time - 5 positions

from Julia Michalak She/Her (privately): 2:35 PM

Hey Patti - the sound is pretty hard to follow

from Julia Michalak She/Her (privately): 2:36 PM

Just went into my break out room, but no one else was there :)

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:58 PM

Might be good to have Urban Forester report to both Mayor and City Council

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 2:58 PM

Support renaming position as City Urban Forester

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 2:59 PM

Give us a minute- we are having mic issues

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 3:00 PM

we can hear you.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:01 PM

Need to ultimately have an independent urban forestry division in an independent Department like a new dept. of Environment and Climate

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 3:05 PM

Duties of Chief Arborist: 1) Enforcement 2) Grants 3) Administer ordinance

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 3:10 PM

4) Assimilate and apportion staff duties 5) Evaluate & adjust equipment resources 6) Steer resources into appropriate geographies 7) Expand contracting because it's cheaper 8) Populate committees with citizens from general population 9) Indoctrinate politicians as they are elected

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 3:15 PM

Equity analysis fails to consider that poor people damage trees with pound-foolish poor maintenance practices (such as having untrained workers improperly prune trees. Then the trees die.

from Aliesha Ruiz to everyone: 3:16 PM

@ Michael Oxman.

from Aliesha Ruiz to everyone: 3:17 PM

@ Michael Oxman, "poor people damage trees". Seriously????!!!!

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 3:19 PM

Improper pruning is why PlantAmnesty was formed 30 years ago-to educate people

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 3:31 PM

I have another call; will return c. 4

from Bakker, Patricia to everyone: 3:37 PM

Breakout groups will go until 4:10. I see a couple of groups only have a couple of people in them. Let me know if you'd like to combine with another group.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:14 PM

incorporate neighborhood groups in deciding on neighborhood tree goals. Contact community groups.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:15 PM

Set up grant programs for local neighborhood tree programs.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:16 PM

Contact tech companies and philanthropists to support tree planting in neighborhoods

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:17 PM

Need to calculate tree planting goal now, eg 300,00 trees now to reach 2037 goal citywide

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:18 PM

Involve Green New Deal Commission in planting more trees

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:19 PM

Upzoned neighborhoods that are now RSL Residential Small Lot are seeing 5' setbacks against low-rise buildings. There are no trees. This sends a message that ecology doesn't matter. To patch this relationship would require repealing laws allowing people to sit in their living room with pedestrians 7 feet away looking in their windows.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:19 PM

Use fee in lieu and fines in Tree Planting and Maintenance for neighborhood grants.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:27 PM

Get metrics by having developers do tree inventories before development begins so can track tree loss and replacement. Metrics on the ground help keep track of what is happening

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:29 PM

Need goal on how many trees are needed to be planted now to reach 30% tree canopy goal. Is it 50,000 or 150,000 planted today and 15 years growth to reach goal?

from McGarry, Deborah to everyone: 4:31 PM

need to leave.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:32 PM

Outreach to tech companies philanthropists and others to donate to effort to plant trees to reach 2037 30% canopy goal, Donate to Tree Planting and Maintenance Fund

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:34 PM

Two sides to streets/ Plant larger trees where not under powerlines. Allow larger planting strip and setback for space to plant trees.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:35 PM

Plant more trees, especially large ones along Trails like Burke Gilman Trail and Interurban Trail

from Dinushi Samarasekara to everyone: 4:36 PM

And place pollinator strips edges of parks

from Richard Ellison to everyone: 4:37 PM

can't hear

Public input: (see next page and posted notes):

From: Judith Hance <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 7:28 AM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Save our Trees!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

The draft Tree Protection Ordinance is currently under a Hearing Examiner appeal by the Master Builders of King and Snohomish County and six development companies. Their goal is to delay and potentially weaken the ordinance. We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees related are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Judith Hance
judithhance2@gmail.com
7300 47th Ave NE
Seattle, Washington 98115

From: jebendich@comcast.net <jebendich@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 9:28 AM

To: Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; Morales, Tammy <Tammy.Morales@seattle.gov>; Mosqueda, Teresa <Teresa.Mosqueda@seattle.gov>; Pedersen, Alex <Alex.Pedersen@seattle.gov>; Nelson, Sara <Sara.Nelson@seattle.gov>

Cc: Lewis, Naomi <Naomi.Lewis@seattle.gov>; Turla, Alexis <Alexis.Turla@seattle.gov>; House, Erin <Erin.House@seattle.gov>; Lewis, Andrew <Andrew.Lewis@seattle.gov>; Dawson, Parker <Parker.Dawson@seattle.gov>; Thaler, Toby <Toby.Thaler@seattle.gov>; Ellis, Steven <Steven.Ellis@seattle.gov>; 'treesandpeoplepacificwest.com' <treesandpeople@pacificwest.com>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: CB 1203942 - Letter for today's 2pm public comment on Townhouse Reform - Staley

Importance: High

Dear Chairperson Strauss and Committee members,

I concur with the letter, which includes the above attachments, from Mr. Mohring and regarding the amendments proposed to CB 1203942 and urge you to adopt these.

There are two inter-twined critical issues that the proposed legislation ignores. The primary one is affordability, which should be the main topic on the table. OPCD commissioned a comprehensive study where the facts incontrovertibly establish that condos and townhouses are simply not affordable to “middle” wage earners, such as our firefighters, police teachers, clerical employees, etc. As you know, Seattle’s housing market is beyond the reach of those in the lower and lowest economic ladders. **All housing legislation needs to focus first on making all new housing affordable.**

Second, is our tree canopy, which is already being decimated by new development. Trees are an essential part of our infrastructure – heat control, pollution control, water run-off control, making communities feel safer, supporting our wildlife, etc. etc. Their importance cannot be understated in this time of climate change. Tree canopy is lacking in the vast majority of our poorest neighborhoods, and is lacking and would be further eroded in the proposed legislation. The focus, which should be a mantra is “affordable housing and trees,” to make this a livable and vital city for all. The proposed legislation does not accomplish either of these objectives.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours, Judith E. Bendich

1754 NE 62nd St.
Seattle, WA 98115

From: David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 8:42 AM

To: dan.strauss@seattle.gov; Tammy.Morales@seattle.gov; teresa.mosqueda@seattle.gov;

alex.pedersen@seattle.gov; sara.nelson@seattle.gov

Cc: naomi.lewis@seattle.gov; alexis.turla@seattle.gov; erin.house@seattle.gov; Andrew.Lewis@seattle.gov; Dawson, Parker <Parker.Dawson@seattle.gov>; toby.thaler@seattle.gov; steven.ellis@seattle.gov; treesandpeoplepacificwest.com <treesandpeople@pacificwest.com>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: CB 1203942 - Letter for today's 2pm public comment on Townhouse Reform - Staley

Importance: High

For record and recommendation, review the attached pdf letter for amendments needed to this low priority** townhouse and rowhouse **Council Bill 1203942**.

Also included are two documents demonstrating why the OPCD must consider both density AND canopy in the preparation of townhouse / rowhouse reform especially during updates to the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

** For reference is the OPCD's 2019 'Housing Choices Report'.

FIGURE 4.1 Median Home Sales Prices¹²

		Detached House	Townhouse	Condo / Co-op
Median 2018 sales price		\$795,000	\$730,000	\$520,000
Household income at which monthly housing costs are affordable	Necessary annual income	\$198,000	\$182,000	\$139,000
	As % of area median income	213% of AMI for family of 3	195% of AMI for family of 3	169% of AMI for family of 2
Sales price affordable to households making 80% of AMI		\$299,300	\$299,300	\$222,200
Difference between 80% of AMI and affordable		-\$495,700	-\$430,700	-\$297,800

Figure 4.2 Average 2018 Home Sales Price by Market Area

TO:

CC:

Chair: Dan Strauss

naomi.lewis@seattle.gov

Vice Chair: Tammy Morales

alexis.turla@seattle.gov

Member: Teresa Mosqueda

erin.house@seattle.gov

Member: Alex Pedersen

toby.thaler@seattle.gov

Member: Sara Nelson

steven.ellis@seattle.gov

Kind regards,

Elizabeth Darrow, Greenwood Exceptional Trees

Ivy Durslag, Greenwood Exceptional Trees

Richard Ellison, TreePAC Environmental Impact Review

David Moehring, TreePAC Environmental Impact Review, 312-965-0634

From: Saym Imtiaz <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Friday, September 16, 2022 6:29 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Saym Imtiaz
saymimtiz@gmail.com

10306 Meridian Ave N
Seattle, Washington 98133

From: ANTHONY D <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2022 4:17 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

ANTHONY D
Codeanti@gmail.com

8801 Aurora Ave n
Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Ben Freilich <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2022 7:37 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Ben Freilich
benfreilich@gmail.com

1130 N 83RD ST
Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Karin Harrison <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 11:26 AM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Please Update Seattle's Tree Ordinance

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

I believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

I support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers

6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Karin Harrison
karinharrison@me.com
11712 N Park Ave N
Seattle, Washington 98133

From: Elicia Shotland <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 1:48 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Save the Aurora Ave sweetgum trees

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy, mature sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size (one measuring 28 inches in diameter as of 2008). These v trees, which provide shade, help mitigate the heat effects of motor vehicle traffic, and beautify a truly ugly stretch of urban highway, are at risk of being removed by the City during the upcoming sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

If, as City officials, you take your duties to residents, you will save these sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks along Aurora. SDOT is rightly concerned that the sidewalk is rough in those places, a potential hazard to the disabled and those using wheeled mobility aids. However, the trees are not the main risk to pedestrians on Aurora: the vehicles are. Seattle has led the country in vulnerable road users killed by vehicles this year. Safety would be better served by reducing the (excessive) number of travel lanes on Aurora, and replacing that poorly utilized space with pedestrian travel ways.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in paved urban areas have caused numerous deaths this year. These shade trees provide cooling on a busy highway with too few mature trees. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island. Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and I am concerned neighborhood residents have not received adequate notice that these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what is at risk.

SDOT has successfully preserved trees in other areas of Seattle. Our neighbors to the north in Shoreline successfully lobbied its city council and WDOT to alter sidewalk designs, thus saving a long row of mature conifers. Seattle has no good reason not to do the same.

I urge you to prioritize the safety and well-being of my neighbors and my neighborhood by preserving the Aurora Avenue sweetgum trees. Trees are a priceless resource we often fail to appreciate until it is too late.

Elicia Shotland
elicia.shotland@gmail.com
8558 Nesbit Ave N
Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Teresa hernández <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 4:39 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Save our Trees!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans

13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Teresa hernández

tereher10@gmail.com

12002 Roosevelt Way NE, Apt A402

Seattle, Washington 98125

From: Xianlong Wang <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 10:06 AM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Keep Seattle Livable!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree

groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.

11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Xianlong Wang
xwt_wt@yahoo.com
6237 29th Ave NE
Seattle, Washington 98115

From: jeanine shepherd <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 2:55 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please Update Seattle's Tree Ordinance

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what

replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.

10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

jeanine shepherd
jeanineshepherd@me.com
4122 ashworth
Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Veronica Kirchoff <veronica@veronicakirchoff.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 8:14 AM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

I live with my two young children, just off 82nd & Aurora. They attend Daniel Bagley Elementary School, just off 80th & Aurora.

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th there is a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We beg our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But it would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood people are not being alerted all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Please save the Aurora Sweetgums!

Veronica Kirchoff
veronica@veronicakirchoff.com
942 N 82nd St
Seattle, Washington 98103

From: jessica dixon <bardjess@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 10:45 AM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: SAVE THE AURORA AVE SWEETGUMS

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

On Aurora Ave. N between 80th-105th has a strip of healthy big Sweetgum trees, some exceptional in size, (one measured in 2008 at 28" diameter), are at great risk of being removed by the City in a sidewalk repair project. Aurora Ave N has too few shade trees already! Please keep these trees so they can continue to benefit all who live, work, shop and visit in the neighborhood.

We urge our City officials to save these Sweetgum trees by utilizing modern design options while rebuilding the sidewalks between 80th-105th, along Aurora Ave N. We know SDOT is concerned the sidewalk is VERY rough in those places, a potential hazard to disabled folks or the less surefooted. But would be great if the City could fix the sidewalks without removing these trees.

Sweetgums are prized across the country as street trees for their resilience, resistance to disease, drought tolerance and beauty. In fact, they are currently recommended by SDOT as an approved street tree! So, we are stunned to find these beautiful shade trees may be removed for sidewalk improvements.

This is not the time to remove any mature trees in the city. Climate change and the urban heat islands formed in bare urban areas are impacting us right now. These shade trees providing cooling on a busy highway and commercial district with too few big trees right now. As shown on the King County urban heat map, removing these trees will expand the hottest part of the urban heat island.

The @seattledot signs alerting the public of this possible removal were ripped down soon after being put up, and we are concerned neighborhood residents are not aware that all these trees could be removed. Please repost these signs so that the public knows what you are considering.

SDOT has already done this in other areas of Seattle. And our neighbors to the north in Shoreline, (@saveshorelinetrees) similarly successfully lobbied its City Council and WDOT to alter the sidewalk design, and thus saved a long row of giant conifers. We can too! It can be done. Save the Aurora Sweetgums!

jessica dixon
bardjess@msn.com
328 n 71st
Seattle, Washington 98103

From: Katy Griffith <katygr@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:42 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Save Meadowbrook's Iconic True-Love Trees

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

I am writing to ask you to support preservation of the Meadowbrook True-Love trees, an exceptional cedar-fir pair in Meadowbrook, and their nearby grove. Because of the True-Love trees' remarkable union and visibility on a busy street, they are well-known and beloved by the community, with over 500 signatures on a recent petition to save them. Together with the adjacent grove, they shelter the north fork of Thornton Creek's and form a vibrant urban forest.

Development plans have been filed for this project on SDCI's portal under 004386-22PA. The plans call for the removal of the trees to achieve maximum development potential. Yet, a respected local architect has drawn plans which would include the trees in the development, a win-win for the homes' future residents, the community, and the environment!

These huge native conifers are our last link to the vast, ancient coastal forest which covered this land before settlement. Now, we benefit from the seedlings of that time, which have grown and reached the size and grandeur of their ancestors. They cool us in our increasingly hot summers, provide habitat for

native birds and wildlife, filter pollutants from the air and stormwater, and provide amazing public health benefits.

With thoughtful planning, Seattle can preserve its forest and build new homes. Please use your authority to ask the developer to include these trees on the development plan, instead of cutting them down.

Katy Griffith
katygr@msn.com
2131 N 132nd Street
Seattle, Washington 98133

From: Celeste Saenz <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 3:46 PM
To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Please Update Seattle's Tree Ordinance

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree

groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside development
9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.

11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees relaced are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Celeste Saenz

livingpractice@gmail.com

6920 Roosevelt Way NE #220

Seattle, Washington 98115