



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

June 15, 2022, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Via Webex call

(206) 207-1700

Meeting number: 2483 184 8047

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

Josh Morris – Co-Chair

Julia Michalak – Co-Chair

Falisha Kurji

Stuart Niven

Hao Liang

Blake Voorhees

Jessica Hernandez

Lia Hall

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE

Guests

Toby Thaler

Absent- Excused

Joe Sisneros

Becca Neumann

David Moehring

Laura Keil

Jessica Jones

Public

Sandy Shettler

Maria Batayola

Richard Ellison

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: Julia called the meeting to order and offered a land acknowledgement.

Public comment:

Sandy Shettler – regarding the recommendations being developed for the ordinance update, she urges support for developing a permit system for all tree removals for any tree over 6" DBH. Data can be gathered via the Accela system and wouldn't require much additional staffing. SDOT started their system nine years ago, people are used to it and accept it. Tacoma, Issaquah, Redmond and Kirkland all have this in place for trees over 6" DBH. Portland's system currently includes trees 12" and over. Permits would level the playing field, gather the data we need and save trees. She shared with Commissioners tables prepared that compare the current draft ordinance with what the UFC has recommended in the past.

Maria Batayola – Josh read a comment sent via email by Maria, which is included in the public input section at the end of these notes.

Richard Ellison – Julia read a comment sent via email by Richard, which is included in the public input section at the end of these notes.

Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:

Patti provided some updates on the canopy cover assessment work.

- The timeline for this work has been updated. The team had hoped to get the preliminary results in early June. The consultant team had some continued difficulty, though, in sourcing the high-resolution aerial imagery needed to combine with the LiDAR data. The new expected timeline for getting the preliminary results is late June. Again, there is then a process to share those preliminary results with stakeholders and provide input back to the consultant team as they conduct the analyses related to the research questions and then prepare the final report.
- That sharing of preliminary results with stakeholders will happen through the month of July; that will include briefing the Commission as a whole and potentially a deliberative session with a subset of Commissioners between meetings, depending on timing.
- The final report is expected to be finished in early August. So there will be briefings to the Commission first with the preliminary data and then a more full briefing with results of the analyses from the research questions.

Josh reported that he had a meeting with Jessyn Farrell from OSE to discuss collaborating on the Chief Arborist SLI. She recommended requesting an extension to the July 1, 2022 deadline for the response so that better collaboration with better information can happen. She proposed that OSE and the UFC schedule some meetings in August after the canopy cover assessment results are received and there is an outcome to the appeal of the urban forest protection ordinance, so that we can work together on the SLI response.

Julia reported that the subcommittee working on the urban forest protection ordinance met recently and developed the set of refined comments and recommendations that were shared related to this topic for today's meeting.

Seattle Comprehensive Plan Update

The Office of Planning and Community Development is in the process of updating the City's Comprehensive Plan. This plan is to be updated every 8 years; the last update was completed in 2016, and OPCD has started the latest update round, which is a several year process, to be complete by the end of 2024. OPCD staff presented to the Commission in December, 2021 at the outset of the outreach portion of the update process. Brennon Staley from OPCD is now providing further update on the process – where they are with community engagement and the Environmental Impact Statement scoping period, which will start in two weeks.

They have an engagement platform at www.engage.oneSeattleplan.com, which has a lot of information and opportunity to comment, and will continue to be updated with additional engagements as the process continues. There is also continuing work contracted with community-based organizations to outreach to historically under-represented communities, and community liaisons from those communities doing outreach. They are now starting to do topic-specific outreach, which will go on for four months and include varying methods and topics such as equity, climate sustainability, transportation, and housing and displacement.

The goal is to have a draft plan in April 2023 and a Mayor's recommended plan that goes to Council in April 2024. The next six months will be broad, high-level conversations around things like how the city should grow and how to address the three major crises of housing affordability, racial equity and climate change.

Every large project the city does is required to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is a document that summarizes analysis around environmental topics related to the proposal. An EIS outlines existing conditions, potential impacts from the proposal, and mitigating measures that help to address those impacts. The EIS process goes throughout the process of plan development and has three phases. The first phase is the scoping phase, where the city presents its draft proposal about what it wants to study and the potential proposals. The analysis itself starts after the scoping and informs the draft Plan. Public input on that draft then informs a second round of analysis, development of the preferred alternative and preparation of the final plan. The EIS accompanies the final plan.

The scoping period begins June 23 with release of a summary of the proposed topics, the equity and climate analysis framework, and the proposed alternatives. There will be scoping period meetings open to the public and comments can be submitted in a variety of ways through the engagement hub/website. The 30-day scoping period ends July 25. Feedback received will be incorporated into a new document ahead of the analysis period.

Brennon explained what EIS alternatives mean for a plan like this; they are growth strategies for how the city can grow in the next 20 years. The current growth strategy is called the urban village strategy. That strategy has been very effective in some ways. Other alternative growth strategies will be considered in this update. A racial equity analysis was done prior to developing those. Feedback from that included that the current growth strategy resulted in perpetuating historic patterns of exclusion, as there are many areas in the city that only have detached housing, which is hard for people to afford. Less exclusionary options to zoning are being considered. Council specifically asked for certain things to be considered, such allowing more housing types in neighborhoods, creating more walkable neighborhoods and addressing displacement.

Brennon clarified what is meant by historically under-represented communities: those are BIPOC communities, particularly Black and Indigenous communities, and low-income and disabled communities. These are folks who have had difficulty accessing resources of engagement.

Brennon explained the topics to be covered in the EIS. Canopy cover is one of those topics; the canopy cover assessment results coming out this summer is timely for this. That will inform the current conditions and trends, and the potential impacts under the different alternatives. The work will characterize what has been occurring, what the trends have been for development, and what the impacts have been to tree canopy.

Commissioners had questions on the outreach strategies; Brennon provided more details on the survey that was conducted and the continuing outreach methods. Follow-up discussion included:

- Timing of UFC participation in the scoping process

- Asking that staff bring their community outreach information to these briefings to provide more detail on that and potentially bring the person responsible for it to the briefing. Other info to include in a tailored briefing: urban forest and ecology impacts and considerations.

Josh will aim to set up a meeting for next Friday with Julia, Jessica H., Lia and Hao.

Urban Forest Protection SEPA Draft Ordinance

Julia provided an overview of the document she prepared containing draft comments from the UFC on the draft ordinance, subsequent to a meeting of the subcommittee on this topic. The subcommittee looked at the relative costs and benefits of the key points that have come up repeatedly, and thought of them from the standpoints of homeowners, developed and the forest itself, in order to hone in on strategies the UFC thinks have potentially low cost and high urban forest benefit. Those strategies would be obvious ones to recommend, then there may be other protections that important and have significant impact.

The document outlines the UFC's overall goals for tree protections, acknowledges that there are other considerations such impacts to housing stock and affordability, but stating the belief that both are achievable. The recommendations are grouped into several categories:

- Tree replacement requirements – replacement is a relatively low cost thing, so increasing replacement requirements is not considered to be a large impact to housing development. Ensuring protection of replacement trees is important.
- Tree removal allowances – the recommendations emphasize the great benefits that will come from the proposal to lower the exceptional tree threshold to 24", and incorporate additional items such as lowering the number of trees allowed to be removed outside of development.
- Exemptions from the ordinance – there are potentially types of projects exempt from the protections in the ordinance, such as multi-family projects aimed at increasing housing. Residents in those units benefit from tree canopy also, however, so recommendations include not exempting affordable housing projects from requirements ensuring tree canopy.
- Other requests and priorities – this includes developing the tree permit system and adjusting the area required for the root protection zone.

Commissioners worked through edits to the recommendations, discussing various aspects of the recommendations and the ordinance provisions, including the payment in lieu option and the tree replacement ratio requirements. The subcommittee will meet again to review the edits made and continue to develop these recommendations.

Chief Arborist SLI

Josh outlined the draft letter he prepared requesting an extension to the deadline for response on this SLI, as recommended by OSE's Jessyn Farrell and noted by Josh above. The letter notes the three reasons for the extension: the timing of both the canopy cover assessment results and the resolution of the appeal to the SEPA draft urban forest protection ordinance, and allowing additional time for collaboration subsequent to those two things. The requested extension is through September 9.

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

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:

Lia relayed that she had heard some concern from community members about the delay in David Moehring's reappointment to his position. Patti provided an update on where that process is: Land Use Committee Chair Strauss indicated they needed more time to review the information provided about the reappointment, so they were not able to have that item on the June 8 agenda as originally hoped. Patti reiterated that David is still free to continue serving as Commissioner while the reappointment process is ongoing. Toby Thaler also noted that Council staff person Noah An has left his position, so that may cause a delay in Council's ability to do the due diligence that will allow moving the reappointment forward.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Meeting Chat:

from Lia Hall to everyone: 3:22 PM

<https://engage.oneSeattleplan.com/en/>

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:28 PM

Are "underrepresented communities" defined? Who are we referring to? People of color, low socioeconomic, etc. I think being more specific and clear on that is useful.

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:30 PM

^ I am basing this off on the verbal presentation (cant open the document sent)

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:33 PM

Question: How would displacement/gentrification be addressed?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:37 PM

Do you have the current % of people of color in this area? and other demographics?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:39 PM

Can you also mention some of the "literature" that is being used?

from Blake Voorhees UFC 9 to everyone: 3:43 PM

<https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/population-and-demographics>

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 3:43 PM

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/lockfc6nj7ipsbi/AAAa8dmQdh4aCi08PXL9V4Rga?dl=0> Some work that is no longer available on City website

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 3:45 PM

Correction: Some of the documents I posted are still on City site. HDRI is not. ("Background..." is more of a political document, but references a number of City documents.)

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:53 PM

Will other strategies be implemented aside from surveys?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 3:53 PM

Communities of color have survey fatigue.

from Lia Hall to everyone: 4:06 PM

<https://dailyplanit.seattle.gov/community-partnerships-will-drive-one-seattle-comprehensive-plan-update/>

from Lia Hall to everyone: 4:07 PM

<https://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/community-liaisons>

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:11 PM

I recommend being specific on what we are referring to as "areas traditionally underserved by ecosystem services"

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:11 PM

My same feedback to the previous presenter

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:16 PM

go through it all ?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:22 PM

I am thinking*

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:25 PM

<https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/SDCI/Codes/ChangesToCodes/TreeProtection/DDRTreesPayment.pdf>

from Lia Hall (privately): 4:52 PM

A community member reached out to me re: David Moehring's position status. I'm wondering if I can pose the question here?

from Jessica Hernandez to everyone: 4:57 PM

what were the comments made?

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:58 PM

I'm sending WSDOT's Roadside Policy Manual for your reference regarding tree replacement ratio. There are a few tree replacement charts in the appendix. I don't see Seattle has a similar procedure yet toward tree replacement so this is sending as an example.

<https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/publications/manuals/fulltext/M3110/RPM.pdf>

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

From: Eli Shechtman <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Friday, June 3, 2022 2:44 PM

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

Subject: Save our Trees!

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

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the Seattle City Council has repeatedly asked successive Seattle Mayors and SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its most recent 2019 Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

SDCI, once again, has not responded in a timely manner with a comprehensive tree protection ordinance update. It's been delay after delay. Please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. In 2009 the Seattle City Auditor proposed transferring tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to an independent entity that does not have a conflict of interest. The Auditor proposed oversight be moved to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment.

Much has changed since 2009 and it is time to create an independent Department with authority over environment, urban forestry, and climate issues. SDCI has a conflict of interest in tree oversight – their priority mission has been to help developers build, not protect trees. Years of inaction on effective oversight and protection of trees by SDCI demands that a separate independent entity take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest. We propose that an Urban Forestry Division be created within a new Department of the Environment and Climate.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban

forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people 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 tree equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed and not even replaced. It is urgent to act now to stop 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.

Please update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance as recommended in the latest draft by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission.

Here are the key provisions that need to be in an updated tree ordinance:

1. Expand the existing Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program, including 2-week public notice and posting on-site, as used by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) – to cover all Significant Trees (6" and larger diameter at breast height (DBH)) on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require the replacement of all Significant Trees removed with trees that in 25 years will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee into a City Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund. Allow the Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land and set up easements.
3. Expand current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24" DBH, protect tree groves and heritage trees and prohibit Significant Trees being removed on undeveloped lots.
4. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-Exceptional Trees in 3 years per lot outside development.
5. Establish one citywide database for applying for Tree Removal and Replacement Permits and to track changes in the tree canopy.
6. Post online all permit requests for 2 weeks prior to removal and all permit approvals for public viewing. Establish and maintain a city-wide database and inventory of existing trees, trees removed, and trees planted. Post on-line quarterly reports.
7. Expand SDOT's existing tree service provider's registration and certification to register all Tree Service Providers (arborists) working on trees in Seattle.
8. Require developers throughout the development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
9. Require a Tree Inventory and Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any development permits being

approved.

10. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Eli Shechtman

eli.shechtman@gmail.com

4024 NE 125th St.

SEATTLE, Washington 98125

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

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 5:07 AM

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

Subject: Save our Trees!

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

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the Seattle City Council has repeatedly asked successive Seattle Mayors and SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its most recent 2019 Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

SDCI, once again, has not responded in a timely manner with a comprehensive tree protection ordinance update. It's been delay after delay. Please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. In 2009 the Seattle City Auditor proposed transferring tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to an independent entity that does not have a conflict of interest. The Auditor proposed oversight be moved to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment.

Much has changed since 2009 and it is time to create an independent Department with authority over environment, urban forestry, and climate issues. SDCI has a conflict of interest in tree oversight – their priority mission has been to help developers build, not protect trees. Years of inaction on effective oversight and protection of trees by SDCI demands that a separate independent entity take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest. We propose that an Urban Forestry Division be created within a new Department of the Environment and Climate.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people 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 tree equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed and not even replaced. It is urgent to act now to stop 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.

Please update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance as recommended in the latest draft by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission.

Here are the key provisions that need to be in an updated tree ordinance:

1. Expand the existing Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program, including 2-week public notice and posting on-site, as used by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) – to cover all Significant Trees (6" and larger diameter at breast height (DBH)) on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require the replacement of all Significant Trees removed with trees that in 25 years will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee into a City Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund. Allow the Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land and set up easements.
3. Expand current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24" DBH, protect tree groves and heritage trees and prohibit Significant Trees being removed on undeveloped lots.
4. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-Exceptional Trees in 3 years per lot outside development.
5. Establish one citywide database for applying for Tree Removal and Replacement Permits and to track changes in the tree canopy.
6. Post online all permit requests for 2 weeks prior to removal and all permit approvals for public viewing. Establish and maintain a city-wide database and inventory of existing trees, trees removed, and trees planted. Post on-line quarterly reports.
7. Expand SDOT's existing tree service provider's registration and certification to register all Tree Service Providers (arborists) working on trees in Seattle.
8. Require developers throughout the development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
9. Require a Tree Inventory and Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any development permits being approved.
10. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Milena D
dogpuppy23@gmail.com

1539 ne 94th street
Seattle , Washington 98115

From: Maridel Fliss <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 9:38 PM

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

Subject: Save Our Trees!

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

It's time to end the delay by the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) on presenting the Seattle City Council with an updated draft Tree and Urban Forest Protection Ordinance. Over the last 12 years, the Seattle City Council has repeatedly asked successive Seattle Mayors and SDCI for an updated workable and effective ordinance draft to consider and it is obvious SDCI is not responding as requested. In its most recent 2019 Resolution 31902, the Council gave specific issues for SDCI to address.

SDCI, once again, has not responded in a timely manner with a comprehensive tree protection ordinance update. It's been delay after delay. Please remove tree and urban forestry protection from their Department. In 2009 the Seattle City Auditor proposed transferring tree and urban forestry oversight and authority to an independent entity that does not have a conflict of interest. The Auditor proposed oversight be moved to the Office of Sustainability and the Environment.

Much has changed since 2009 and it is time to create an independent Department with authority over environment, urban forestry, and climate issues. SDCI has a conflict of interest in tree oversight – their priority mission has been to help developers build, not protect trees. Years of inaction on effective oversight and protection of trees by SDCI demands that a separate independent entity take over the city's responsibility to protect and enhance our urban forest. We propose that an Urban Forestry Division be created within a new Department of the Environment and Climate.

Seattle's trees and urban forest are vital to keeping our city healthy and livable. Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people 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 tree equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed and not even replaced. It is urgent to act now to stop 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.

Please update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance as recommended in the latest draft by the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission.

Here are the key provisions that need to be in an updated tree ordinance:

1. Expand the existing Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program, including 2-week public notice and posting on-site, as used by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) – to cover all Significant Trees (6" and larger diameter at breast height (DBH)) on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require the replacement of all Significant Trees removed with trees that in 25 years will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee into a City Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund. Allow the Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land and set up easements.
3. Expand current protections for Exceptional Trees and reduce the upper threshold for Exceptional Trees to 24" DBH, protect tree groves and heritage trees and prohibit Significant Trees being removed on undeveloped lots.
4. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-Exceptional Trees in 3 years per lot outside development.
5. Establish one citywide database for applying for Tree Removal and Replacement Permits and to track changes in the tree canopy.
6. Post online all permit requests for 2 weeks prior to removal and all permit approvals for public viewing. Establish and maintain a city-wide database and inventory of existing trees, trees removed, and trees planted. Post on-line quarterly reports.
7. Expand SDOT's existing tree service provider's registration and certification to register all Tree Service Providers (arborists) working on trees in Seattle.
8. Require developers throughout the development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
9. Require a Tree Inventory and Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any development permits being approved.
10. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance.

Maridel Fliss
mflissm@aol.com
4705 S. 124th St.
Tukwila, Washington 98178

From: Sandy Shettler <SSHETTLER@msn.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 10:01 PM

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

Subject: Hi Patti--can you please send to commissioners -- draft analysis tables

CAUTION: External Email

Hi Patti,

Steve and I put together an analysis in table form to quickly compare the two ordinance drafts with current code. Would you kindly share this with the commissioners prior to the meeting tomorrow? I'd like to make a comment and what I'm saying will make more sense if I can reference the document.

If that's not possible no worries, I'm sorry for the late notice. Thanks for supporting this work and see you tomorrow!

Warm regards,
Sandy Shettler

Last updated: May 9, 2022

Ordinance drafts condensed for purposes of comparison. Refer to original documents for exact language. Please contact us at info@treePAC.org with any questions.

| Urban Forestry Commission Draft | SDCI Draft (February 2022) | Current SMC 25.11 - Tree Protection | Current SMC 25.11 - Tree Protection |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| SEPA appeal possible? ¹ | Yes | No | Yes |
| Covers all land use zones in the city? ² | Yes | Excludes industrial, downtown and others | Excludes industrial, downtown and others |
| Exceptional trees protected (unless hazardous): ³ | 24" DBH + Director's Rule | 24" DBH + Director's Rule | 30" DBH + Director's Rule |
| Permits required for developers removing significant trees on private property? ⁵ | Yes | Wrapped into building permit | No |
| Two-week advance notice of application to remove tree required (with on- site/online posts)? ⁶ | Yes | No | No |
| What trees are developers required to replace? ⁷ | Trees 6+ inches DBH | Significant Trees 12+ inches DBH and exceptional trees | Trees 24+ inches DBH trees and exceptional trees |
| Replacement formula for lost trees: ⁸ | Number trees planted proportional to size of tree lost (25-year goal to achieve lost canopy) | 1:1 replacement of similar- sized species | 1:1 replacement of similar- sized species |
| Do developers pay a replacement fee in lieu of replanting on site? ⁹ | Yes Goes to fund for replanting, preservation, and maintenance | Yes Goes to SDCI general fund | No |
| Is maximizing the retention of trees during entire | Yes | No | No |

development process a

priority? ¹⁰

Tree inventory and
landscape plan required
before a building permit is
issued? ¹¹

Yes

No

No

Minimum size of trees
considered during
development planning
(site plan): ¹²

6+ inches DBH (**45%** of
current Neighborhood
Residential trees)

12+ inches DBH (**18%** of
current Neighborhood
Residential trees)

6+ inches DBH (**45%** of
current Neighborhood
Residential trees)

Is tree replacement
required for trees removed
one year before property
purchased? ¹³

Yes

No

No

Comparison Table Footnotes

1. SEPA Appeal: Both the UFC draft and current ordinance allow appeals to ensure environmental protections are in place. In contrast, the SDCI draft states that implementation of SMC 25.11 will now fall under Master Use Permit I classification. That means that SDCI decisions regarding trees during development will no longer be appealable to the Hearing Examiner. Under this broad designation, *the Director or anyone he designates will be able to make final, non-appealable decisions regarding any implementation of SMC 25.11*, and also issue SEPA Determinations of Non-Significance which are unappealable.

2. Covers all land use zones: The UFC draft covers all Seattle zones, including downtown and industrial areas where a single large tree can provide vital cooling. Current ordinance and the SDCI draft exclude downtown, industrial, high-rise, and other zones. As these zones may be particularly vulnerable to the urban heat island effect, they should be included in urban forest planning.

3. Exceptional trees protected at 24" DBH: Both the UFC and SDCI drafts propose lowering the protected DBH to 24" because it will protect our large, mature trees. Compared to saplings, large trees provide exponentially greater ecosystem benefits such as summer cooling, filtering air pollutants, and reducing stormwater runoff.

4. Number of significant non-exceptional trees that homeowners can remove in three years: The UFC draft lowers the number of trees homeowners can remove to two trees within a three year period. In contrast, the SDCI draft allows homeowners to remove three trees (of up to 12" DBH) per year, which would result in the loss of nine trees within a three year period. For comparison, Shoreline allows a total of three trees in three years to be removed.

5. Permits for removing trees: Knowing how and where losses are occurring can guide decisions and plans for our future urban forest. Without the data permits provide, there is no way to track the removal and replanting of trees, and we will continue the current complaint-based system which is not working. The UFC draft requires permits to remove trees starting a 6" DBH. The tree service provider can file for the permit, or the homeowner can file online. Data entered should include the tree species, DBH, photos of tree from a distance and leaf or needle picture for identification. In 2013, the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) began requiring tree removal and replacement permits starting at 6" DBH, and this system has worked well. The following local cities require permits for tree removals starting at 6" DBH: Issaquah, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Redmond, Black Diamond, and Woodinville. In contrast, the SDCI draft proposes voluntary reporting of tree removal, which is unlikely to be widely followed

6. Advance posting of tree removal application: The UFC draft provides consistency with SDOT and requires two weeks posting of applications to remove trees, on site and online. A two-week period allows time to ensure that errors have not been made in ownership of a boundary tree, diagnosis of disease or species incorrectly identified. This system has worked well for SDOT. The two-week posting is especially important for trees on private property,

which may not be as visible as street trees and could be mistakenly removed. In contrast, the SDCI draft does not require posting of permits.

7. Which trees must be replaced if removed: The UFC draft requires that removed trees with a 6" or greater DBH be replaced. Trees this size which will eventually become large are generally 25 or more years old and already are providing significant ecosystem benefits. In contrast, the SDCI draft only requires replacement for trees with a 12" DBH or greater. This is more limited for homeowners, who only need to replace 12"+DBH trees lost to poisoning, topping or accidents.

8. Replacement formula for removed trees: The UFC draft uses a 25-year time horizon in planning for replaced canopy. As the size of the tree removed increases, so does the number of trees that need to be replanted, so that in 25 years an equivalent canopy can be achieved. In contrast, the SDCI draft and current law require a simple one to one replacement ratio. This means that if a large conifer is removed, we could wait 100 years or more before an equivalent canopy is grown. This overlooks the current value of the tree's ecosystem services as well as the continued growth and value of the tree if it had not been removed.

9. Replacement fee in lieu of replanting: The UFC draft sets a simple fee schedule based upon the trunk diameter as part of the ordinance. In contrast, the SDCI draft would set the fee as the tree's appraised value, a highly variable figure which would depend on the tree's age/health/location and is potentially subjective. The cost of obtaining a professional appraisal would significantly increase costs. In addition, the SDCI draft has the formula set by Director's Rule, rather than in the ordinance as Portland does.

In lieu fee funds destination: The UFC draft directs in lieu funds to replanting, maintaining, and watering replacement trees. (Without a care and watering plan, most newly-planted trees die.) Since in lieu fees are based upon the loss of ecosystem benefits previously provided by the removed tree, the funds are appropriately used to replace those benefits to the community. In contrast, the SDCI draft directs in lieu funds to the SDCI general fund

10. Prioritizing the retention of trees during the entire development process: The UFC draft requires maximizing the retention of existing trees—the climate warriors—throughout the development process. In contrast, the SDCI proposal allows developers to clearcut lots and gives no protection or reason for developers to protect 6"-12" DBH trees—our future large trees that are needed for climate resiliency. For comparison, SDCI is currently required under SMC 23 to maximize the retention of existing trees during platting and short platting, but this provision ends at this point and the trees are often subsequently lost. Other cities such as Austin Texas follow this principle.

11. Tree Inventory prior to development: The UFC draft recommends that Seattle adopt **Portland's Tree Inventory Assessment program** (which uses Excel) to do Tree Inventory and Landscape Plans prior to a building permit being issued. By giving developers the opportunity to enter tree data directly into Accela, the process would be significantly streamlined and save SDCI resources and staff time. In contrast, the SDCI draft overlooks this opportunity. For comparison with current practice, SDCI's own compilation of site plan data reveals substantial errors and omissions of trees. Streamlining this process would have the added benefit of increased accuracy and foster better planning.

12. Minimum size of trees on site plan: The UFC draft maintains the current requirement that trees 6" DBH and greater be shown on site plans. Trees with trunk diameter of 6" or more are resilient, having survived the period of highest mortality for trees, the first five years after planting. They are also substantial in size (see Treenagers slide deck) In contrast, the SDCI draft requires that only trees 12" DBH and greater be shown.

Percent of Neighborhood Residential trees recognized: The UFC draft requiring trees 6" DBH or greater be on site plans would cover 45% of Seattle's trees in the Neighborhood Residential zone. In contrast, the SDCI draft recommendation of 12" DBH or greater would reduce the percentage of covered trees to just 18% of those in Neighborhood Residential zone. The Seattle's Ecosystem Services Report states that "on average 46% of the tree species that will be large at maturation currently have a trunk diameter less than 12 inches." These trees are our

future urban forest. Over time they will grow and replace our current oldest trees. Keeping this next generation of large trees will ensure Seattle's climate resiliency for future generations.

13. Tree replacement required for one year prior to property being purchased by a developer: The UFC draft includes this provision to address the widespread practice of homeowners removing large trees at the request of the purchasing developer, or to make their properties more marketable to developers. In contrast, the SDCI draft re-sets tree removal with each new owner, which will enable this practice to continue, resulting in greater tree loss as properties develop.

TreePAC's Perspective on Housing Density and Trees

TreePAC supports sustainable, nature-based urban development. Planning that increases housing density while maintaining a vibrant urban forest creates healthy communities.

Trees in cities contribute significantly to human health and environmental quality. Urban trees filter air pollutants, counteract the urban heat island effect and reduce building energy use. They clean stormwater which runs into creeks, crucial to salmon habitat. Trees also increase our mental and physical well-being and foster feelings of relaxation and calm.

Housing density contributes to human health and environmental quality too. It allows us to live within a reduced environmental footprint and is more inclusive of all socioeconomic backgrounds.

The benefits of our urban trees are not realized by all Seattleites – injustice has resulted in sparse tree coverage in neighborhoods with fewer resources, while other neighborhoods have a larger urban canopy. TreePAC is working toward restoring our urban forest in neighborhoods where it has been lost, as well as protecting our existing forest for future generations.

(Along with the numerous tangible benefits trees bring by creating a more livable, sustainable, and climate-resilient Seattle, we believe trees connect people to the natural world and bring joy. Below is more information on why we love trees in our city.)

From: Maria Batayola <mbjumpstart@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 5:06 PM

To: Josh Morris <joshm@seattleudubon.org>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Cc: Beacon Hill Council (Group Email) <bhc-directors@googlegroups.com>; BHC-EJtaskforce <bh-ejtaskforce@googlegroups.com>; David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Subject: Re: 6-15-22 UFC Public Comment

CAUTION: External Email

Thank you, Josh.

Kindly submit to the record correction for immigrants and refugee population typo. It should be 40%. Resending to Patti with correct email address.

From: Josh Morris <joshm@seattleudubon.org>

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 3:02 PM

To: Maria Batayola <mbjumpstart@msn.com>; patti.bakker@seattle.gov <patti.bakker@seattle.gov>

Cc: Beacon Hill Council (Group Email) <bhc-directors@googlegroups.com>; BHC-EJtaskforce <bh-ejtaskforce@googlegroups.com>; David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Subject: RE: 6-15-22 UFC Public Comment

Thank you, Maria. I will read this.

Josh

From: Maria Batayola <mbjumpstart@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 2:59 PM

To: Josh Morris <joshm@seattleaudubon.org>; patti.bakker@seattle.gov

Cc: Beacon Hill Council (Group Email) <bhc-directors@googlegroups.com>; BHC-EJtaskforce <bh-ejtaskforce@googlegroups.com>; David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Subject: 6-15-22 UFC Public Comment

Dear Co-Chair Morris and Members of the Urban Forestry Commission,

I would appreciate your reading this comment to the record.

My name is Maria Batayola and I want to make a request from our beloved Beacon Hill neighborhood.

It is understandable that you are using the UFC rules to deny our recommended Comp Plan amendments for a 30% canopy goal which means a higher goal for our neighborhood green desert. We have 40,000 residents, 70% BIPOC and 49% immigrants and refugees.

We are at a time of climate countdown and for our neighborhood compounded air and noise from roads, aircraft, and oil heating pollution that makes the tree canopy critical for our health and our very lives.

The UFC and other rules have not caught up with the Green New Deal ordinance directive to eliminate climate pollution by 2030 and center on equity for impacted communities like us.

We respectfully ask that you include in your transmittal letter to the Mayor this contradiction and advocate towards equity.

Thank you.