City of Seattle
Urban Forestry Commission

SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION
Julia Michalak (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist), Co-chair
Joshua Morris (Position #7 – NGO), Co-Chair
Joe Sisneros (Position #2 – Urban Ecologist - ISA) • **Falisha Kurji** (Position #3 – Natural Resource Agency)
Becca Neumann (Position #4 – Hydrologist) • **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*

Draft meeting notes
May 4, 2022, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Via Webex call
(206) 207-1700
Meeting number: 2491 995 5886
Meeting password: 1234

*In-person meeting are not being held at this time due to the pandemic. Meeting participation is limited to
access by joining the meeting through a computer or telephone conference line.*

Attending

Commissioners	Staff
Josh Morris – Co-Chair	Patti Bakker – OSE
Julia Michalak – Co-Chair	
Laura Keil	Guests
David Moehring	Becca Neumann
Jessica Jones	Hao Liang
Stuart Niven	Lia Hall
	Falisha Kurji
	Toby Thaler
Absent- Excused	
Elby Jones	Public
Jessica Hernandez	Steve Zemke
Blake Voorhees	Lisa Puteska

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

3:02 Call to order: Julia called the meeting to order and offered a land acknowledgement. She acknowledged
the attendance of Becca Neumann, the appointee for Position 4 – Hydrologist, set to be confirmed with the

slate of attendees at next week's Land Use Committee meeting. Becca introduced herself and expressed her enthusiasm for joining the Commission.

Public comment:
Lisa Puteska commented on behalf of Beacon Hill Council, and noted that Beacon Hill is a neighborhood of over 40,000 residents, including 70% people of color and 40% immigrants and refugees. They are impacted by noise and air pollution from several land transportation corridors and air traffic. They have fewer trees than the rest of Seattle, critical for their vulnerable community's climate, environmental justice and health resiliency. They copied the UFC on a letter to the Mayor recommending that the draft tree ordinance be pulled back and strengthened for four reasons: 1) it does not have a race and social justice analysis, 2) it does not follow the guidance of the UFC, 3) it uses six-year-old LiDAR data for its analysis, 4) it does not comply with the climate and equity Green New Deal ordinance. They request that the UFC raise the issue with the Mayor as a climate, environment and health race and social justice equity issue. They are available to have a follow-up meeting.

Steve Zemke made some points regarding the Portland study: overall tree canopy dropped within the margin of error, and need to be careful how the percentage of tree loss is characterized. He noted that they did their analysis different from how Seattle does it. He reinforced the comment made previously that the state's analysis used different height classes in their analysis. He recommended that the analysis of the impact of development not be conducted the same way in this analysis as last time.

Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:
Patti noted that the appointment of the five new Commissioners (in Positions 2, 3, 4, 6 and 13) is set to be on the May 11 Land Use Committee meeting agenda for confirmation, along with the reappointments for Positions 7 and 8. Several of the appointees are in attendance today.

Josh noted that he, Julia, Laura and Jessica Jones had a great meeting with OSE's new Director Jessyn Farrell. They appreciated Jessyn sharing the draft OneSeattle Climate Action Plan and that she acknowledges the important role that trees play in it. Jessyn proposed having another meeting after the canopy cover assessment results are received. Julia agreed it was a very productive meeting and noted the discussion of trees and density issues in the meeting.

Approval of April 6 and April 20 meeting notes

> **ACTION: A motion to approve the April 6 meeting notes as written was made, seconded, and approved.**
> **ACTION: A motion to approve the April 20 meeting notes as amended was made, seconded, and approved.**

Canopy Cover
Patti provided some background on what the city is doing currently around planting and planning to achieve canopy cover goals. The 2016 canopy cover assessment gave us information on areas of the city where canopy cover goals are not met. The city was not yet at the 30% canopy cover goal and specific areas were under the goals, including industrial areas and the Greater Duwamish neighborhood. While the city still needs a comprehensive plan on how we are going to meet canopy cover goals, there has been work going on to accomplish canopy increase:

- OSE has $300,000 of one-time funds in the 2022 budget for Duwamish Valley industrial greening work. The funds are intended to increase vegetation in the industrial areas adjacent to the South Park and Georgetown neighborhoods. We are developing plans for this work and outlining our approach and process for the project. We anticipate this project will include some work on private property given that

there is less opportunity on public lands (though we are talking with SDOT and SPR about possibilities there.)

- Some of the other city work in these areas includes:
  - Drainage is a significant problem in Duwamish Valley areas. SPU and SDOT are working in a few areas to improve drainage:
    - Georgetown – 8th Avenue street-end and other conveyance swale pilot projects, which all include planting trees and other vegetation
    - South Park drainage and roadway project that SPU is leading to improve drainage and roadway conditions; this will also include tree planting.
  - SPU's RainWise and RainCity programs – provide for installation of green stormwater infrastructure components on private lands
  - Reconnect West Seattle – SDOT planted hundreds of trees in South Park and Georgetown.
  - Parks and Recreation has some upcoming projects on park properties:
    - South Park Plaza – currently an undeveloped park property; park development project will be implemented
    - Flume OLA – to be developed in Georgetown

So some work is happening that includes planting trees in some of these areas we know are low in canopy. As has been discussed, there is a need for a coordinated citywide plan for how we can achieve our goals citywide and in the equity priority areas, the management units and other geographies. City staff have started outlining how we can get to that plan. This UFC input you all are working on now for the assessment work will be incorporated into that work. Then when preliminary results have been developed, we'll brief you on that and get your input on the preparation of the final assessment report.

Julia edited the draft recommendation letter on the canopy cover assessment scope of work, and walked through those updates in the letter. The edits include clarifying the recommendations on the scope of work. Hao also had made suggestions and comments in the letter. Commissioners discussed the size and height classes analyzed in the assessment, the influence of land use and development on tree canopy, and how to expand the analysis of land suitable for planting. They also discussed use of the forest patch model and ecosystem services datasets developed in the assessment, geographies of interest to recommend, and additional questions of interest.

ACTION: A motion to approve the letter as amended was made, seconded, and approved.

City Budget Process
Julia noted that this is a very important process for urban forestry and asked for volunteers to spearhead the effort to develop recommendations. The city is in the formulation phase of developing budget components, so this is a good point in the process for the UFC to weigh in. The Commission discussed details of the budget process, with some suggestions from Toby Thaler on city contacts. This topic will be revisited at the next meeting.

Community Engagement
Josh reviewed the last discussion on this topic as well as the content put into the padlet on community engagement. He pulled out takeaway topics and bulleted statements for each. The topics are:
- Learning from communities to help guide UFC thinking and policy recommendations
- Effective outreach depends on UFC ability to communicate
- The UFC needs to be intentional about outreach
- Community outreach doesn't always mean the UFC are out in the community
- To be most successful, the UFC needs to solve funding and capacity constraints

Josh also included the three draft questions to synthesize the UFC's intentions around community engagement and potential language to answer them, as drafted by Patti. Julia noted it will be good to get input on this also from the new incoming Commissioners. They have the link to the padlet and can provide their input there.

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*

Public comment:
Steve Zemke noted that the updated tree protection ordinance should be called the tree and urban forest protection ordinance, not just the tree protection ordinance, whenever it is discussed. He also noted that it was discovered during the MHA hearing a couple of years ago that a past tree canopy assessment sustainability study was done and should be looked at. It looks at impacts pre- and post-development using data from 2002-2007, using thousands of reference points. He urges the city to do a similar robust analysis of this in the new round of assessment.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 PM.

Meeting Chat:
from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:05 PM
Welcome, Becca! :)
from Laura Keil to everyone: 3:05 PM
Welcome Becca!
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 3:06 PM
Welcome Becca, glad you will be a Commissioner!
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 3:13 PM
Welcome Lia, as well! Proud to see that you will be a Commissioner!
from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:17 PM
Welcome Lia and Felicia. So glad you're all here!
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 3:17 PM
Congratulations Falisha for becoming a Commissioner!
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:34 PM
Please urge canopy study do canopy cover at specific levels to get idea canopy volume eg 0- 10', 11-20' ,21-50', 51-80', 81-110' and 110-190
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:37 PM
24"DBH and larger based on proposed SDCI draft to lower exceptional trees to 24" DBH
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:43 PM
They don't have height breakdown in 2016 analysis. I was basing recommendation on what state is doing.
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:44 PM
Washington State Fish and Wildlife Department is using these heights are are doing canopy studies
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:52 PM
10 canopy points for residential zone covering over 60% of land area and trees is ridiculous. Portland used 10,000 points for there 4 land use types. This is why we need tree permits to ssess actual loss not randominized points but actual tree loss!
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:55 PM
10,000 points in Portland for residential canopy cover, total 4521 points citywide. urge they not include data not statistically valid
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:58 PM
They can do before and after development by parcels and actually did it with previous canopy studies.
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 3:59 PM

(Neighborhood Residential is today's Single Family.) Big Picture... We should be interested in 2021 update to the 2016 Assessment (Pages 2 and page 7 Table 1).
These tables shows some of the study findings of the Urban Forest Stewardship Plan Management Units. Important: IF there are changes + or - within the 8 Management Units, the report should make an assessment of why. I believe the 5-year loss in Portland, OR indicated the canopy loss without an assessment to the loss.
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:01 PM
Each Seattle property is listed with its 2016 tree canopy. So very easy to find change on properties from 2016 to 2021... Example... (from SDCI GIS interactive map ...
https://web6.seattle.gov/dpd/ParcelData/Parcel.aspx?pin=7960100440
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:04 PM
Here's a good link... then zoom in to 1:400 to see the 2016 tree canopy for any neighborhood
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:04 PM
Here's from an earlier study done by Seattle that is not well known comparing early LIDAR studies "A more detailed assessment -Tree Canopy Assessment Sustainability & Environment Subcabinet April 9 2009 – (Fremont 32 COS0032951) done on 2,262 redeveloped parcels between 2002 and 2007 pointed to a significant loss of 29% of trees removed on these parcels. 40% of existing trees were removed on SF lots and 70% of existing trees on MF lots."
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:04 PM
http://seattlecitygis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=f822b2c6498c4163b0cf908e2241e9c2
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:06 PM
link - Tree Canopy Assessment Sustainability & Environment Subcabinet April 9 2009
http://friends.urbanforests.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/COS0032951.pdf
from Falisha to everyone: 4:07 PM
I have to hop off early for another commitment, but I will be available for the full time starting next week. See you all next week. I look forward to working with you all!
from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:08 PM
For parcels that had been under development, it is possible to know how many trees that might have been impacted in a long-term perspective. For example, if we see new pavement is built under an existing tree's dripline, it is reasonalbe to say the existing tree is susceptible of long-term impact.
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:09 PM
Good point Hao
from Cedar Mannan to everyone: 4:18 PM
David, do you know if tree retention is required for DADUs? Or is SDCI just requiring replacement trees after they are built? Is a tree assessment required for a DADU permit?
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:21 PM
Analyzing (sic) 10 random points or sites in single family zone in 2016 study is meaningless out of thousands of lots in neighborhood residential zone
from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:24 PM
Assuming the two datasets have similar accuary and were taken in the same period of time of a year, we can tell the tree health condition over time based on Normalized Difference Vegetation Index bands. For example, we know a large number of trees, especially south facing trees were damaged during the heat wave last year. The datasets comparison can help me confirm the location and scale. Not an expert on the details but just a thought.
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:24 PM
Different size trees can be planted on a street - smaller trees under power lines and larger trees on the side of the street without power lines above,
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:26 PM
Lia, full canopy replacement is not required with the development of Attached and Detached Accessory Dwelling Units. All the 2019 code requires is a minimum of two-inches of existing or new tree caliper for any property. Note that DADU and AADU may be located within 5 feet of the rear property line... unlike a single

house which requires 20 percent of the total lot depth (so a 100 ft deep lot with a DADU must be set back from rear lot line by 20 feet.)
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:28 PM
Planting sites would be best evaluated on amount of space available for tree growth and whether power lines are there or not is assessing areas to plant trees.f various sizes at maturity..
from Cedar Mannan to everyone: 4:28 PM
Thanks David, and do you know if tree assessment is required as part of DADU permits?
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:30 PM
Highways would require working with state to plant more trees.
from Laura Keil to everyone: 4:31 PM
Good point Steve, an opportunity to collaborate with WSDOT
from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:33 PM
Yes, Steve. I think similar situation applies to other transportation facilities, such as bases of King County Metro and Sound Transit
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:36 PM
Requiring permits by both property owners not undergoing development and those undergoing development iss the best data to collect on numbers of tree removed and size of trees removed. Need to push city council to require permits to remove trees as many other cities do. Data is what Mayor Bruce Harrell says helps us to make good decisions. .
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:48 PM
Tree inventory and landscape plans being completed before a building permit is issued is what Portland and other cities require. Seattle only requires trees be noted on a site plan which is not a tree inventory or in a database system like accela that can be evaluated. High priority for tree supporters to be in new Tree and Urban Forestry Protection Ordinance!
from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:49 PM
Now is a good time to ask...
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:50 PM
Need to look at creating an independent Urban Forestry Division to oversee trees. SDCI has no such division nor does OSE.
from Hao Liang (privately):   4:54 PM
Hi Steve, good point. Based on my experience of public projects in Shoreline and Bellevue, tree inventory work starts early from 30% design. And it has more detail inventory in 60% and 90%. I'm not very sure about porjects in Seattle but I can double check.
from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:55 PM
Taking a call, bye... Thanks!
from David Moehring Pos 8 to everyone: 4:56 PM
If Josh is seeking a lead, I can take more of a lead of the budget starting from last year's letter. Call Friday? Arborist, Permitted Tree Loss, Reports, GIS map update, Urban Forester... legislative response to last year but not budgeted. Others?
from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:57 PM
Need to start calling SDCI draft ordinance update as the Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. This is what the UFC draft Ordinance was called.

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