



SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Becca Neumann (Position 4 – Hydrologist), Co-chair

Joshua Morris (Position 7 – NGO), Co-Chair

Hao Liang (Position 6 – Landscape Architect – ISA), Co-Chair

Alicia Kellogg (Position 2 – Urban Ecologist) • **David Baker** (Position 8 – Development)

Nathan Collins (Position 9 – Financial Analyst) • **Logan Woodyard** (Position 10 – Get Engaged)

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

May 8, 2024, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Via Webex call and in-person at the
Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 1872 (18th floor)
700 5th Avenue, Seattle

(206) 207-1700

Meeting number: 2496 897 4978

Meeting password: 1234

Attending

Commissioners

Josh Morris – Co-Chair

Hao Liang, Co-Chair

Alicia Kellogg

Nathan Collins

Logan Woodyard

Jessica Jones

Lia Hall

Absent- Excused

Becca Neumann – Co-Chair

David Baker

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE

Guests

Public

Steve Zemke

Sandy Shettler

Toby Thaler

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details, listen to the digital recording of the meeting at:
<https://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocuments>

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

Public comment:

Sandy Shettler expressed disappointment with how the UFC's letter of recommendations on the Comprehensive Plan was handled, and with the inability for the public to access the chat function in this meeting, and the number of vacant positions on the UFC.

Steve Zemke also expressed concern with not allowing public access to the chat function in UFC meetings the vacant UFC positions.

Toby Thaler agreed with the previous commenters.

Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:

Patti provided some background on the process of submitting the UFC's letter of recommendations on the Comprehensive Plan and the Draft EIS, noting that there was some difficulty caused by the process of finalizing the UFC's feedback at the last meeting. This required some additional due diligence by OSE and the process took longer because of that.

Josh noted his concerns about the process for submitting UFC's letter of recommendations on the Comprehensive Plan. He also expressed concerns about the vacant UFC positions, noting that it reduces the breadth of experience and perspectives on the UFC and reduces UFC capacity, causing difficulty in reaching a quorum for meetings needed to move UFC work forward. He also expressed concerns with OSE guidance to postpone discussion of the UFC budget recommendations, and with the decision to disable the chat function for members of the public.

Adoption of April 10 and April 24 meeting notes

Action: a motion to adopt the April 10 meeting notes as written/amended was made, seconded and approved.

Action: a motion to adopt the April 24 meeting notes as written/amended was made, seconded and approved.

Low-pollution Neighborhoods program – Ian Macek, SDOT

Ian noted that SDOT is just getting started with this work and are conducting conversations with community groups and Boards and Commissions as they start to form what low-pollution neighborhoods can mean for Seattle. Ian explained what is meant by low-pollution neighborhoods, and explained SDOT's approach to doing this work. He outlined the timeline for how the work will be implemented.

Questions and comments from Commissioners included:

- In this analysis phase, are they gathering information on public health such as rates of asthma?
- Re: the what they've learned summary, was the timing for that Q1 this year? When and how will that be distributed?
- Is the neighborhood the right level/scale to work at? Pollution moves and effects larger areas than neighborhoods.
- How does this plan/work fit into the C40 plan for Seattle and other cities? Is the work they've done going to be incorporated into this work?
- Trees have a lot of potential for mitigating impacts of pollution. If there are opportunities to increase pedestrian-only streets, that would be beneficial.
- There is demand for gardening area in the city. Spaces in the ROW could help provide that.
- How do the SR-99 projects integrate into this work?

Presentation debrief

Items to include in follow-up include highlighting how UFC goals align with the goals of the low-pollutions neighborhood program, and including findings of canopy cover assessment to emphasize the need for increased tree planting. Logan volunteered to draft a follow-up letter.

Subgroup reports

- Tree Protection Ordinance

The group discussed the possibility of the UFC have one meeting per quarter that is in person, and wanted to know if other Commissioners are interested in that. All Commissioners present expressed interest in doing this.

Initial budget recommendations for 2025-2026 biennium

Josh reiterated the feedback received from the City Budget Office that May is the preferred timing for budget recommendations from Boards and Commissions. He described the work that he and Nathan did as the budget subgroup to gather information and develop initial recommendations. Josh walked through the draft recommendations and Patti noted some suggested edits that were added to increase consistency and clarity. Commissioners discussed and edited the draft recommendations.

Action: a motion to adopt the initial budget recommendations for the City's 2025-2026 biennial budget 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:

Steve Zemke noted that there was a two-week extension on the public comment period for the draft One Seattle Plan. Regarding the low-pollution neighborhoods work, he recommends that the effort be called "achieving low-pollution neighborhoods", since they aren't necessarily there yet but that's what the goal is. Regarding the budget deliberations, he noted that there was no draft published online. He suggested the UFC consider amending the Bylaws to allow the chat function to be available to all throughout the meeting.

Michael Oxman discussed the Tree Equity session that happened yesterday. He noted that the founder of Tacoma Tree Foundation will be giving a webinar next week through the ISA's Pacific Northwest Chapter.

Sandy Shettler supported the suggestion that the UFC consider changes to the Bylaws around how meetings are run. She urged the UFC to ask with a unified voice for the vacant positions to be filled.

Barbara expressed concern with the inability to access the chat during the meeting.

Toby encouraged the UFC to consider where Seattle is now, expressing the opinion that it is progressive but not liberal in terms of long-range planning, development and dealing the climate.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.

Meeting chat:

from Martha Baskin to everyone: 3:11 PM

Very concerned about the public process for the UFC in order to augment what it does in protecting urban trees. And about the commission's apparent refusal to publish a letter by Josh Morris. In addition it's is very disturbing that vacant commissioner positions.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:18 PM

Sandy Shettler

3:15 PM

OF COURSE she is saying that!! They spent a lot of time making sure they had a good excuse!

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:21 PM

Steve Zemke

3:21 PM

Is there any reason why draft minutes can not be posted on agenda prior to meeting. This was done in the past for many years.

from Martha Baskin to everyone: 3:11 PM

Very concerned about the public process for the UFC in order to augment what it does in protecting urban trees. And about the commission's apparent refusal to publish a letter by Josh Morris. In addition it's is very disturbing that vacant commissioner positions.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:18 PM

Sandy Shettler

3:15 PM

OF COURSE she is saying that!! They spent a lot of time making sure they had a good excuse!

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:21 PM

Steve Zemke

3:21 PM

Is there any reason why draft minutes can not be posted on agenda prior to meeting. This was done in the past for many years.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:46 PM

Steve Zemke

3:31 PM

Urge Commissioners consider bylaw changes to allow chat for public. Commissioners, staff, and presenters are participants in the meeting and can talk to each other any time they want. People in chat are not talking in the meeting or interrupting the meeting in any way. They are only able to submit written comments and information that may help the commissioners in their deliberations. It is a low key way to involve the public without disrupting the meeting and can provide information that commissioners may not have been aware of..

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:46 PM

Sandy Shettler

3:45 PM

Glad for Josh's points. UW's Kathy Wolf will be releasing a meta-analysis of the benefits of trees in transportation plans, which go beyond pollution reduction to decreasing accidents, increasing pedestrian activity. See her previous research at this link, and stay tuned for new release soon:

<https://depts.washington.edu/hhwb/>

[depts.washington.edudepts.washington.edu](https://depts.washington.edu/depts.washington.edu)

Green Cities: Good Health

Research summaries about urban greening for human health and well-being, to promote livable, sustainable cities

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:49 PM

Sandy Shettler

3:48 PM

Agree with Steve Zemke. A brief review of comments from recent meeting chats show that contributions from public often include input from other City employees, arborists and scientists. I hope commissioners consider Lauren's suggestion to amend the bylaws.

from Lia Hall to everyone: 3:52 PM

Sorry I couldn't respond! My phone is charging and I'm supervising my son

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:53 PM

Toby Thaler

3:50 PM

I was in wrong window. Note:

3:52

UFC bylaws say "The UFC will strive to provide a continued remote participation/call in option for the public and Commissioners."

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:57 PM

UFC bylaws indicate that UFC is subject to OPMA. I suggest an inquiry to Law Dept to confirm this. The MRSC OPMA page includes: <https://mrsc.org/explore-topics/public-meetings/opma/open-public-meetings-act-faqs#committees-advisory-boards>

Committees and Advisory Boards

When is an advisory board "acting on behalf" of the governing body (and therefore subject to the OPMA)?

An advisory board is "acting on behalf" of the governing body, when it exercises actual or de facto decision-making authority for a governing body. This happens when the board is formally given decision-making authority or when its governing body, routinely or without discussion, merely rubberstamps the committee's recommendations.

The Washington State Supreme Court looked at this issue in Citizens Alliance v. San Juan County (2015) when it ruled that committees that serve a purely advisory function are not subject to the OPMA. For more details about the case, see MRSC's blog post, State Supreme Court Says Advisory

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:58 PM

Steve Zemke

3:49 PM

Seems project might be better labeled "Achieving Low Pollution Neighborhoods" It seemed to be confusing just to say "Low Pollution Neighborhoods"

from Alicia Kellogg she/her to everyone: 3:58 PM

Hi all - I need to take a call, I'll be back shortly.

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:08 PM

I'm back

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:10 PM

The current enforcement of the new planting survivability is "take a photo in case you are ever asked."

New

4:10

I.e. there is no other enforcement built into the system. Also agree on the Notice of Tree Work--we are finding errors in these every day, and no one is looking at them.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:12 PM

It would be good to check how many users have actually accessed the searchable map. Thank you for bringing that up.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:23 PM

Sandy Shettler

4:23 PM

Thank you Hao--can you elaborate on your suggestion about bonds? Do you know of other cities which have those? I know Bothell does.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:31 PM

Sandy Shettler

4:30 PM

I agree with Lia. This has been brought up at a number of community meetings given SDCI's poor enforcement. It also encourages active care during construction--such as watering during the hot season--that can make the difference in the tree surviving construction impacts.

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:32 PM

Sandy, here is an example. <https://lexingtonnational.com/blog/preserving-miamis-trees-understanding-the-tree-protection-bond/>

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:34 PM

Again on bonds--a few hundred dollars can work according to developers I've spoken with. Also, it's nearly free to the City. Bothell uses a third party to manage the bond funds, which is insured and bonded themselves.

4:33

Thank you Hao for the link to the Miami tree bond article!

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:35 PM

Steve Zemke

4:35 PM

Tree inspectors should be certified arborists with necessary background technical and experience. Should not just be a land use inspector

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:36 PM

Sandy Shettler

4:36 PM

According to the article Hao linked, Miami is also using a third party for their bonds. Good to have a solution that doesn't cost the city anything which incentivizes tree protection.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:38 PM

Barbara

4:38 PM

Tree issues is helpfully broad and if it is labeled simply as "canopy", it gives the city a restrictive box they can check- keep the language so that it is open.

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 4:42 PM

Steve Zemke

4:41 PM

experienced in tree health and survivability.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:53 PM

Howdy Lauren, and members of the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission,

Thanks for your comments at yesterdays urban forest collaboration meeting in Tacoma.

Video: https://youtu.be/f4-TiQv_N5I

and Discussion: Michael Oxman - Pathways to Powerful Partnerships Learning Lab.... | Facebook

During the meeting, you asked why such effective partnerships that Tacoma city government has with non-profits do not also exist in Seattle.

I thought of several reasons right off the bat, such as: 'Perception that preserving trees will hamper economic growth from construction'. Refusal to admit this has resulted in footdragging since the 2009 tree ordinance was deemed an 'Interim Tree Ordinance'.

I didn't want to interrupt the flow of the agenda. Here's a few more reasons:

1) Unequal access to city officials by urban forestry activists.

How developers helped shape Seattle's controversial tree protection ordinance - InvestigateWest (invw.org)

2) There are vacancies on the Seattle

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:54 PM

2) There are vacancies on the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission, out of 13 member slots. This vacancy rate makes it difficult to generate a quorum for action on the Tree Ordinance, Tree Service Provider legislation, and Comprehensive Plan comments, for example. Developers have exploited the lack of cooperation between the Mayors office and the City Council's appointment process to halt appointments and reappointments of very qualified applicants for over a year. Membership and Roster | seattle.gov

3) Failure to act on the Natural Capital Assessment SLI perpetuates the myth that trees have zero asset value. This is in spite of a new Directors Rule that invented a non-standard method of tree valuation that forms the basis for both fines and for permit fees for trees that are removed & maintained.

Seattle Should Count Its Ecological Assets - The Urbanist

4) The tree fund where these fines & fees are supposed to be set aside in a pool of money dedicated to forest management is una

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:55 PM

unaccounted for in the city budget. The City Attorney has stated SDOT fines for tree violations in the right-of-way must go into the General Fund. This is a pattern of lack of transparency that has resulted in Council asking for quarterly reports and budget provisos from SDCI and Parks in their dealing with trees.
A Review of Seattle Urban Forestry Expenditures, 2021-2024

5) Canopy Cover Analysis is not a scientific plan because it does not corroborate satellite images with ground-truthing measurements taken at eye level. The study belies the need for a tree inventory database to understand tree species, size, condition, location and value, before proper maintenance can occur.

ADOPTEDCanopyAssessmentRecommendations050422.pdf (seattle.gov)

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:56 PM

6) Office of Sustainability and Environment's 'Chief Arborist' duties described in the Statement of Legislative intent SLI MO-001-A-002-2022 - SLI MO-001-A-002-2022 (legistar.com) were envisioned by the Urban Forestry Commission to be a way to oversee & align policy by all 9 departments with authority to condemn a tree. Right before the staff person was hired, the responsibility for oversight of the entire urban forestry program was retracted, and confined to dealing with correcting equity issues in underserved neighborhoods.
ADOPTEDChiefArboristSLIExtensionRequest061522.pdf (seattle.gov)

You mentioned at the Tacoma meeting that we haven't engaged in discussion since you were hired. This is because of the limitation of the duties in your job description that prevent consideration of my concerns, as an arborist, for needed qualitative analysis of the physical urban forest biosphere. I would be willing to give feedback on OSE's equity policies, but haven't been asked.

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:56 PM

The founder of Tacoma Tree Foundation, Sarah Low, is giving a webinar next week on fostering better partnerships. It is to be presented by the Pacific Northwest Chapter, International Society of Arboriculture. Pacific Northwest ISA (pnwisa.org)

Thanks again for your participation in Tacoma. It would be great to see any report generated from your observances.

Arboreally yours,

Michael Oxman

ISA Certified Arborist #PN-0756A

(206) 949-8733

from Michael Oxman to everyone: 4:56 PM

Only a few lines of chat allowed

Public input (additional comments received):

From: J G <plantkingdom1@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2024 6:44 AM

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

Subject: Public comment via email from yesterday's meeting

CAUTION: External Email

Hi Patti,

First of all, thank you so much for all of your work and time. I missed the chance to comment at the beginning and I felt that it might be inhumane to add more comments at the end given how long the meeting already was.

I would echo the comments of many others from the public today who expressed interest in having the four vacant positions filled on the UFC. I am curious why those positions are still open.

Maybe this is an older draft and this has been corrected, but it seems that one of the comprehensive plan drops removed the canopy covered goal completely, which I would encourage reinstating or moving to 40% as others mentioned.

Regarding the DEIS, in a question and answer meeting including Brennan et al, there was no answer on why the DEIS excluded environmental impact study on the starving and polluted Southern Resident Killer Whales from development. As you all know, additional storm water created by the removal of majestic trees would result in greater pollutants into the home of the Southern Resident Killer Whales. And as we know, much of development results in the removal of the highest value conifers and otherwise mature trees. I found this very concerning that they did not address this given the critical state of the 73 remaining SRKWs. And of course all of the wildlife, like bird species, that require the tallest trees for habitat.

Thank you so much again for all of your work and for reading this,
Jennifer Godfrey

From: Hope Sanford <hopesnopos@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 27, 2024 8:35 PM
To: PCD_OneSeattleCompPlan <OneSeattleCompPlan@seattle.gov>
Cc: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>
Subject: Public Comment

CAUTION: External Email

The portion of the site that allows public comment has been down since yesterday, so I am emailing you. I read the 138 page report and attended the open house/mtng at Eckstein Middle School. I asked a couple of city employees about how the plan addresses preserving Seattle's tree canopy and was told, "Good question, The Plan doesn't address that issue".

The "tree ordinance" currently in place results in SDCI's granting permission to every developer to cut down any tree, regardless of size. Walking around Wedgwood and Maple Leaf illustrates this fact. As neither the One City Plan nor the "tree ordinance" protects Seattle's tree canopy, our tree canopy appears slated for destruction. This plan will create more urban heat islands as building progresses. Developers will rake in the big bucks, but Seattle residents will suffer.

Hope Sanford
3230 NE 91st St
Seattle, 98115

-----Original Message-----

From: kevinorme <kevinorme@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2024 7:20 AM
To: LEG_CouncilMembers <council@seattle.gov>; Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>
Cc: Emery, Adiam <Adiam.Emery@seattle.gov>; Burgess, Tim <Tim.Burgess@seattle.gov>; Farrell, Jessyn <Jessyn.Farrell@seattle.gov>; Caulfield, Michelle <Michelle.Caulfield@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>; DOT_SeattleTrees <Seattle.Trees@seattle.gov>; Wong, Greg <Greg.Wong@seattle.gov>; Nelson, Sara <Sara.Nelson@seattle.gov>; Um, Taemin <Taemin.Um@seattle.gov>; Ellis, Steven <Steven.Ellis@seattle.gov>; Hollingsworth, Joy <Joy.Hollingsworth@seattle.gov>; Kettle, Robert <Robert.Kettle@seattle.gov>; Morales, Tammy <Tammy.Morales@seattle.gov>; Rivera, Maritza <Maritza.Rivera@seattle.gov>; Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; Moore, Cathy <Cathy.Moore@seattle.gov>; Eder, Dan <Dan.Eder@seattle.gov>; Ko, Elaine <Elaine.Ko@seattle.gov>; Marx, Heather <Heather.Marx@seattle.gov>; Gheisar, Leyla <Leyla.Gheisar@seattle.gov>; Turla, Alexis

<Alexis.Turla@seattle.gov>; Carey, Imani <imani.carey@seattle.gov>; Chow, Evelyn <Evelyn.Chow@seattle.gov>; Bowers, Logan <Logan.Bowers@seattle.gov>; Altshuler, Alex <Alex.Altshuler@seattle.gov>; Sykes, Wendy <Wendy.Sykes@seattle.gov>; Maxwell, Sasha <Sasha.Maxwell@seattle.gov>; Thoreson, Hannah <Hannah.Thoreson@seattle.gov>; Aldrich, Newell <Newell.Aldrich2@seattle.gov>; Enbysk, Amy <Amy.Enbysk@seattle.gov>; Hoffman, Kate <Kate.Hoffman@seattle.gov>; Rodriguez, Anthony <Anthony.Rodriguez@seattle.gov>; Smith, Steven (LEG) <Steven.Smith@seattle.gov>; Duran, Rebecca <Rebecca.Duran@seattle.gov>; Lo, Brent <Brent.Lo@seattle.gov>; Mohn, Jeremy <Jeremy.Mohn@seattle.gov>; Silvernail, Devin <Devin.Silvernail@seattle.gov>; Beckerman, Melisa <Melisa.Beckerman@seattle.gov>; Lewis, Naomi <Naomi.Lewis@seattle.gov>

Subject: Why this summer may be especially hot in the United States - Washington Post, 4/23

CAUTION: External Email

"The highest odds for a hot summer stretch from Texas into the Pacific Northwest, as well as much of the Northeast."

and while many of us still don't have A/C in Seattle, we will be looking for the shade of a tree to help us out and to cool the surrounding air - unlike A/C, which vents heat to the surrounding air and actually heats up the vicinity where it is in operation, not to mention the amped-up energy use. Protect Seattle Trees!

Why this summer may be especially hot in the United States <https://www.seattletimes.com/nation-world/why-this-summer-may-be-especially-hot-in-the-united-states/>

kevin orme
Seattle

-----Original Message-----

From: kevinorme <kevinorme@protonmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2024 8:45 PM

To: LEG_CouncilMembers <council@seattle.gov>; Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>

Cc: Emery, Adiam <Adiam.Emery@seattle.gov>; Burgess, Tim <Tim.Burgess@seattle.gov>; Farrell, Jessyn

<Jessyn.Farrell@seattle.gov>; Caulfield, Michelle <Michelle.Caulfield@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia

<Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>; DOT_SeattleTrees <Seattle.Trees@seattle.gov>; Wong, Greg

<Greg.Wong@seattle.gov>; Nelson, Sara <Sara.Nelson@seattle.gov>; Um, Taemin <Taemin.Um@seattle.gov>;

Ellis, Steven <Steven.Ellis@seattle.gov>; Hollingsworth, Joy <Joy.Hollingsworth@seattle.gov>; Kettle, Robert

<Robert.Kettle@seattle.gov>; Morales, Tammy <Tammy.Morales@seattle.gov>; Rivera, Maritza

<Maritza.Rivera@seattle.gov>; Strauss, Dan <Dan.Strauss@seattle.gov>; Moore, Cathy

<Cathy.Moore@seattle.gov>; Eder, Dan <Dan.Eder@seattle.gov>; Ko, Elaine <Elaine.Ko@seattle.gov>; Marx,

Heather <Heather.Marx@seattle.gov>; Gheisar, Leyla <Leyla.Gheisar@seattle.gov>; Turla, Alexis

<Alexis.Turla@seattle.gov>; Carey, Imani <imani.carey@seattle.gov>; Chow, Evelyn

<Evelyn.Chow@seattle.gov>; Bowers, Logan <Logan.Bowers@seattle.gov>; Altshuler, Alex

<Alex.Altshuler@seattle.gov>; Sykes, Wendy <Wendy.Sykes@seattle.gov>; Maxwell, Sasha

<Sasha.Maxwell@seattle.gov>; Thoreson, Hannah <Hannah.Thoreson@seattle.gov>; Aldrich, Newell

<Newell.Aldrich2@seattle.gov>; Enbysk, Amy <Amy.Enbysk@seattle.gov>; Hoffman, Kate

<Kate.Hoffman@seattle.gov>; Rodriguez, Anthony <Anthony.Rodriguez@seattle.gov>; Smith, Steven (LEG)

<Steven.Smith@seattle.gov>; Duran, Rebecca <Rebecca.Duran@seattle.gov>; Lo, Brent

<Brent.Lo@seattle.gov>; Mohn, Jeremy <Jeremy.Mohn@seattle.gov>; Silvernail, Devin

<Devin.Silvernail@seattle.gov>; Beckerman, Melisa <Melisa.Beckerman@seattle.gov>; Lewis, Naomi

<Naomi.Lewis@seattle.gov>

Subject: Does higher-density city development leave urban forests out on a limb?

CAUTION: External Email

it doesn't have to - if we stop letting MBAKS and SDCI write the rules...

"Current land-use policies support dispersed piecemeal redevelopment of individual lots in existing suburbs, which produces relatively few new homes (as below). At the same time, replacing an existing home with a larger house or with several townhouses typically results in all existing vegetation being stripped from the site."

"Land-use regulation should ensure that both low-yield and higher-density redevelopment maintains the contribution of private land to the urban forest."

<https://theconversation.com/does-higher-density-city-development-leave-urban-forests-out-on-a-limb-57106>

kevin orme
seattle

From: David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 7:43 AM

To: Staley, Brennon <Brennon.Staley@seattle.gov>; PCD_CompPlan_EIS <PCD_CompPlan_EIS@seattle.gov>; PCD_OneSeattleCompPlan <OneSeattleCompPlan@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>; Hubner, Michael <Michael.Hubner@seattle.gov>

Cc: sshettler@msn.com; Steve Zemke <stevezemke@msn.com>; MICHAEL OXMAN <michaeloxman@comcast.net>; SeattleUFC8@protonmail.com; ufclandscape@gmail.com; heidi calyxsite.com <heidi@calyxsite.com>; Josh Morris <joshm@birdsconnectsea.org>

Subject: Discover What You Missed in Our 3-30-300 Webinar! 🌳

CAUTION: External Email

Hello Patti,

Please consider sharing this 3/30/300 program for UFC consideration.

Dear OPCD and Seattle OSE,

Has the One Seattle Plan DEIS considered each dwelling being able to see at least 3 trees ; and within a city of equitable 30% canopy cover?

If nature is "for the wild", has the DEIS considered the logistics and cost of transferring rabbits, squirrels, bats, bees, raccoons, birds and numerous other natural animals and their habitats to other areas of King County?

David Moehring
312-965-0634

Sent: Friday, May 03, 2024 at 10:14 AM

From: "PlanIT Geo" <marketing@planitgeo.com>

To: dmoehring@consultant.com

Subject: Discover What You Missed in Our 3-30-300 Webinar! 🌳

Hi David,

We are sorry you weren't able to attend our webinar: *Mapping the 3-30-300 Rule for Actionable City Greening*. Want to see what you missed from our friends Cecil Konijnendijk, Director of the Nature Based Solutions Institute, and Joost Verhagen, CEO of Cobra Groeninzicht? Just [click here](#) to access the recording.

For more information on the 3-30-300 rule, check out our blog [Unpacking the New Rule of Thumb for Urban Greening](#). If you have any questions on canopy data, software, or possible integrations with TreePlotter, please [get in touch](#).

Please reach out with any questions you may have, or reply directly to this email to speak with one of our team members.

Communitree

ABOUT

We are your partner in urban forestry, with innovative software and expert services to support all aspects of mapping and managing urban greenspace.



www.PlanITGeo.com

[Unsubscribe](#)

From: SeattleUFC8 <SeattleUFC8@protonmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 8, 2024 5:43 AM

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

Cc: Becca Neumann <ufc.pos4@gmail.com>; Hao Liang <ufclandscape@gmail.com>; Josh Morris <joshm@seattleaudubon.org>; David Moehring <dmoehring@consultant.com>

Subject: SMC 23 and 25 proposed code changes

CAUTION: External Email

Patti, please share with the UFC the need to reach out to SDCI's Mr. David Graves, and omnibus that includes tree modifications.

The Urban Forestry Commission are meeting Wednesday and should be consulted relative to the proposed Omnibus per SMC 3. The Omnibus tree provisions are not included in [the agenda for May 8th](#).

Please ask to David Graves <David.Graves3@seattle.gov to reissue this public notice to include all relative sections of the Omnibus, as well as consult with the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission relative to RSL zones, including South Park, Wallingford, Ballard, and elsewhere.

Note: these four sections were **not included** in the Public notice description (attached) and require the Urban Forestry Commission to be consulted per SMC 3.

- 23.44.016 Parking and garages – removes requirements for a permanent covenant:

9 g. Providing alley access would require removal of a tree on private
10 property that is ~~((an exceptional tree or a tree greater than 2 feet in diameter measured 4.5 feet~~
11 ~~above the ground, provided that a permanent covenant meeting the standard in subsection~~
12 ~~25.11.050.C is recorded and all other applicable criteria for tree protection in Chapter 25.11 are~~
13 ~~met))~~ a Tier 1 or Tier 2 tree, as defined in Section 25.11.130. *p.16*

- 23.44.020 - Tree requirements –Two changes are proposed. Update to Table A for 23.44.020 to include updated tree species for the **tree requirements in RSL zones**. The second change is to correct code reference to reflect updated tree code language in subsection 23.44.020.C.
- 23.44.041 - Accessory dwelling units - The change to the nomenclature for **protected trees from exceptional to Tier 1 and Tier 2** trees consistent with recent tree code update (Ord. 126821) in Table A for 23.44.041 footnote 2. The change provides clarification at Table A for 23.44.041 footnote 4 to make plain the **setbacks along alleys**. The existing code allows DADUs to be built up to an alley line. This amendment will clarify that should include architectural features such as eaves and chimneys that are also allowed up to but not over the property line. The amendment to subsection 23.44.041.C.2 resolves inconsistent language that would disallow flexibility in converting existing structures to detached accessory units in the preceding table A.
- 23.84A – definitions, page 123

1 **23.84A.038 "T"**

2 * * *

3 (~~"Tree, exceptional" means a tree designated as such per Chapter 25.11.~~)

The public notice only covers these sections:

25.05.444, 25.05.675, 25.05.714, 25.09.045, 25.09.160, 25.11.020, 25.11.030, 25.11.040,
25.11.050, 25.11.060, 25.11.070, 25.16.080, 25.16.115, 25.16.150, 25.22.070, 25.22.135,
25.24.060, 25.28.230, and 25.28.290

These sections should be reviewed with the Seattle Urban Forestry Commission in advance of review by the City Council and Mayor per SMC 3:

Tree Protection

- 25.11.020 Exemptions- Changes to section 25.11.020 to clarify the **existing tree removal exemption** that applies in Environmentally Critical Areas and provide correct code reference to the process for approval in Section 25.09.070.
- 25.11.030 Emergency actions- Changes to section to 25.11.030 to provide correct reference to the qualifications and industry standard for Tree Risk Assessments consistent with Ordinance 126821.
- 25.11.040 - Hazardous tree removal – Amendment subsection 25.11.040.B.3 to clarify that normal and routine pruning shall be completed to mitigate hazards.
- 25.11.050 General provisions for regulated tree categories – Updates to Table A for 25.11.050 are provided to correctly implement tree removal regulations in Neighborhood Residential, Lowrise, Midrise, commercial, and Seattle Mixed Zones, to provide corrected reference notation and provide correct code references. Include clarifying footnote 1 that indicates which zones that table does not apply.

Tree related activities on developed lots in <u>Neighborhood Residential, Lowrise, Midrise, commercial, and Seattle Mixed Zones</u> including but not limited to removal and topping by tree category ¹		
Tree category	Not part of a permit application(⁽¹⁾) ²	During development—Part of a permit application
Tier 1 Includes trees designated as heritage trees	May not be removed unless deemed hazardous or in need of emergency action with documentation required	May not be removed unless deemed hazardous or in need of emergency action with documentation required
Tier 2 Includes trees 24 inches at DSH or greater, tree groves, and specific tree species as provided by Director's Rule	May not be removed unless deemed hazardous or in need of emergency action with documentation required	Approval for removal is part of overall development permit <u>consistent with Sections 25.11.070 or 25.11.080</u> Documentation required for hazardous and emergency actions
Tier 3 Includes trees 12 inches at DSH or greater but less than 24 inches at DSH that are not considered Tier 2 trees as provided by Director's Rule	May not be removed unless deemed hazardous or in need of emergency action with documentation required, except as provided in subsections 25.11.050.B (and), 25.11.050.C, and 25.11.050.D.	Approval for removal is part of overall development permit Documentation required for hazardous and emergency actions

-
- 25.11.060 Requirements for trees when development is proposed- Changes to section 25.11.060 to provide corrected reference to indicate which portion of the Tree Protection Area may be reduced by the Director consistent with the language in Ordinance 126821.
- 25.11.070 Tree protection on sites undergoing development in Neighborhood Residential, Lowrise, Midrise, commercial, and Seattle Mixed zones- Three changes are proposed. The first amendment is to subsection 25.11.070.A.2 to provide clarity around reducing yards and setbacks in order to voluntarily protect Tier 1,2,3 and 4 trees. The second amendment is in subsection 25.11.070.A.3 address the calculation of maximum lot coverage and that minimum width of structure that must be able to be achieved in order to determine of a tree may be removed. The third change is to subsection 25.11.070.B.2.b to clarify that developments identified are for low-income housing meeting the definition in Title 23.

4 c. Tree removal is necessary for the construction of new structures~~((7))~~;
5 vehicle and pedestrian access, utilities, retaining wall, or other similar improvements associated
6 with development.

7 2. ~~((Permitted extension into front or rear yards shall be limited to an area equal to
8 the amount of the basic tree protection area not located within required yards.))~~ For purposes of
9 retaining an existing on-site and off-site Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, or Tier 4 tree, extension into front
10 or rear yards is permitted but limited to an area equal to the amount of the tree protection area of
11 those trees not located within required yards. The maximum projection into the required front or
12 rear yard shall be 50 percent of the yard requirement.

13 3. If the maximum lot coverage permitted on the site can be achieved or a
14 structure will be less than 15 feet in width without extending into required front and/or rear
15 yards, then no such extension into required yards shall be permitted.

25.11.030 Emergency actions

Emergency actions may be undertaken without obtaining ~~((a permit))~~ approval in advance from the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections. Prior to an emergency action, a registered tree service provider, that has an employee or a person on retainer who is currently credentialed with an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Tree Risk Assessment Qualification, must determine if there is an extreme risk of imminent failure for the tree or tree part ~~((using the TRAQ method in its most current form))~~. Any person undertaking an emergency action must ~~((complete the following))~~:

=====

https://www.seattle.gov/dpd/luib/SDCI132_PublicNoticesSummary.pdf?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery

Project Description:

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.340 and WAC 197-11-340 Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) is proposing to amend the Land Use Code (Title 23) and related land use regulations in Chapters 25.05.444, 25.05.675, 25.05.714, 25.09.045, 25.09.160, 25.11.020, 25.11.030, 25.11.040, 25.11.050, 25.11.060, 25.11.070, 25.16.080, 25.16.115, 25.16.150, 25.22.070, 25.22.135, 25.24.060, 25.28.230, and 25.28.290 to clarify and improve the function of various provisions. The proposed amendments generally include “clean-up” amendments that correct inadvertent clerical errors, incorrect cross-references and clarification of

existing Code language. The need for these amendments has been identified by citizens, elected officials and City staff. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION After review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file, the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) has determined that the amendments described above will not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact and has issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) under the State Environmental Policy Act (no Environmental Impact Statement required).

David Moehring, AIA, NCARB

mobile. 312.965.0634