## CITY OF GRESHAM

## URBAN FORESTRY SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

Date:	12-11-2023
Time:	4:30 – 6:35 pm
Place:	Virtual Zoom Meeting
Attending:	UFS: Vice Chair Jim Buck, Steve Stevens, Keith Warren, Charlotte Becker, Thea Hayes, Christine Johnson Staff: John Heili, Jim Wheeler Guests: Janet Unruh, Anne Nesse, Jacquenette McIntire
Absent	Councilor Morales, Councilor DiNucci, PC: Phil Wich

Agenda Item #1 - Meeting Minutes for November 2023		
Discussion:	Weston of Weston Kia misspelled	
Decisions:	Approved with spelling correction.	
Action:	Minutes will be corrected and will be posted on the UFS website by staff.	

Agenda Item #2 – UFS Chai Discussion:	Staff provided an explanation of the Gresham Revised Code (GRC) criteria for Chair and Vice-Chair positions and suggested the Chair be elected for the full 2-year term and that the Vice-Chair be elected to serve for just a one-year term to
	get to alternating terms required by the GRC.
	<ul> <li>The members discussed their interest, and lack of interest, in serving in either of these positions.</li> </ul>
Decisions:	<ul> <li>Steve nominated Christine Johnson as Chair and Thea Hayes as Vice-Chair. Keith seconded the motion. There was no discussion.</li> <li>The committee members voted unanimously to appoint Christine Johnson as Chair and Thea Hayes as Vice-Chair.</li> </ul>
Action:	Chair Buck turned the proceedings over to newly elected Chair Johnson.

Agenda Item #3 – Significant Tree Survey Follow-up		
Discussion:	<ul> <li>Staff provided a summary of the requirements for, and status of, the 2023 significant tree survey.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Staff presented the inspectors findings for the trees that were noted as possible candidates for delisting and the Committee members discussed each as follows in the Decisions section of these minutes.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>The committee discussed in general what warrants trees being considered as significant and the evaluation criteria for recommending listing of a tree. This topic needs further discussion. It was noted that arborists generally are not involved in the Significant Trees original listing review or the surveys unless the inspector happens to have that certification.</li> </ul>	

Decisions:	Tree#34 Norway Spruce. The committee felt the tree was still significant due to
Decisions:	its size and regardless of its current condition but will also check with the owner regarding required maintenance and then re-visit this tree next year or following construction of the new school clinic facility.
	<ul> <li>Tree Grove#27 Spanish Firs at MHCC. The committee felt the campus setting and unusual species warrant its listing and felt the remaining trees still constitute a significant tree grove after the dead/dying trees are removed. Jim offered to follow up with MHCC regarding the possibility of propagating more of these trees to replace the trees to be removed. The committee agreed trees 3, 5, and 7 of the grove would be recommended for delisting.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#25 Spanish Chestnut. The committee decided no action was necessary at this time but will revisit in Spring of 2024 to better determine the health of the tree and check on the Owner's desire to keep the tree listed.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#40 Hawthorn. The committee decided no action was necessary at this time but will revisit in Spring of 2024 to better determine the health of the tree and the specific species.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#49 Quince. The committee felt this tree warrants remaining on the list due to its unusual shape, size and trunk characteristics.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#49 Magnolia. The committee agreed this tree is normal for its size and species. Jim will have a conversation with the owner to gage their interest in keeping the tree listed before delisting in Spring 2024.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#1 Japanese Maple Grove. Despite these trees not being accessible to the public the committee felt the grove contains beautiful specimens and warrants remaining on the list due to the size and age of trees and some historic significance of the Ambleside Garden originally at this site.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#31 Western Red Cedar and Doug Fir Groves and a Dogwood at SW         Community Park. These tree groves are in various states of failing health and do         not represent characteristics of significance. The Dogwood is a large unique         specimen but is difficult to appreciate this due to the lack of maintenance with         the surrounding vegetation. Jim will follow up with the City Parks Dept. to         determine their interest in making improvements and upkeep required to keep         these trees on the list.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#45 Chestnut. This tree no longer exists and staff is unable to locate any delisting or tree removal permit so its delisting will be formally addressed with the Type II MISC permit.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Tree#29 Incense Cedars. The committee agreed one of the two trees would be delisted due to its condition. The other tree will be reviewed during the next survey.</li> </ul>
Action:	Jim Buck will follow up with MHCC, Gresham Parks, and owners of tree#49.
	<ul> <li>Other trees listed in the Decisions section will be reviewed by UFS members in Spring 2024 as noted and will remain on the list at this time.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>UFS will consider tree listing recommendations at the next UFS meeting.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Staff will proceed with the Type II MISC permit for tree delisting and listing following the next UFS meeting discussions on this topic.</li> </ul>

•	Staff will send letters of maintenance recommendations to the property owners
	of those trees noted in the survey to have maintenance issues.

Agenda Item #4 – UFS draft Work Plan	
Discussion:	Jim Wheeler, UDP Manager asked for an update on the UFS work plan and wanted to remind UFS that the work plan items should be related to the Council Strategic Plan. For example, the Tree Code and Climate Action items are aligned with the Strategic Plan. He noted that code enforcement issues and new residential development and green space monitoring were not appropriate as work plan items because these are City operations items.
	<ul> <li>Jim Buck stated these items are on the work plan because these fall into the stated purpose of the UFS to advise Planning Commission (PC) and Council on the health of the City's urban forest. He suggested these items need to be continued to be tracked until successfully resolved and this requires oversight by the committee.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Mr. Wheeler acknowledged Mr. Buck's comment that certain responsibilities UFS has had since its beginning, such as meeting the Tree City requirements, are not within the strategic goals of the city but would be a legitimate part of our work plan.</li> </ul>
	Jim Wheeler encouraged the UFS to take another look at their work plan under the lens of the Strategic Plan and how the work plan items are aligned with the Strategic Plan and provide more definition to the items listed. Deviations from this will need to be addressed with the PC.
Decisions:	• N/A.
Action:	<ul> <li>Chair Johnson offered the UFS will revisit the issue and update the list to demonstrate how the work plan items align with the Strategic Plan.</li> <li>Staff will look into any deadline for deliverables to the PC work plan project.</li> </ul>

Discussion:		<ul> <li>Staff reminded new members to complete the review of training materials and provide staff with the signed form acknowledging their receipt and review of these.</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Staff also reminded UFS members to refrain from conversations with other members outside the meeting including group emails that involve responses.</li> </ul>
Decisions:		• N/A
Action:		New UFS members will complete their training and sign off that this has occurred.
Next Meeting:	January 22, 2024 at 4:30 PM remotely via ZOOM	
Adjournment:	6:35 pm	