

**Urban Forestry Subcommittee Work Session
Online Zoom Meeting Summary**

November 16, 2020

Subcommittee Members Present: Jim Buck, Chair
Keith Warren, Vice-Chair
Jay Adams
Steve Stevens
Greg Bettis
Britt McConn

Staff Present: Tina Osterink
Katherine Kelly
David Berniker

Councilor's Present: None

Guests Present: None

1. Chair Call to Order

Chair Buck called the meeting to order at 4:33.

2. Shaul Property "Headwaters Project" Discussion

Proposed Development at 3535 W. Powell Blvd that could remove 250 out of 328 trees. A member commented this is one of the last largest dense stands in the city and if the 30 proposed homes could be clustered around the tree groves. Greg noted there are significant trees nearby, which Tina confirmed those are located in Southwest Community Park to the north and it's a grove of Hogan Cedars. Chair Buck asked if the removal of trees could cause soil saturation and exacerbate laminated root rot. Britt asked how the provision for conifer retention cited in Section 9.1032(E)(2) of the Tree Code is being considered in the application review.

David commented the City did have first right of refusal but was not in a financial position to acquire the property. He also noted the proposal meets minimum density and has submitted an arborist report as part of the application submittal. Steve was curious about the tree replacement requirements for this proposal. Chair Buck commented since the proposal complies with the current Tree Code, this would be a good example of how to change the code to increase tree preservation. There was discussion about street trees, street classification, planter-strip size and Vice-Chair Warren was curious if the bulb outs could be constructed to increase planter strip space. Steve wants to look

closer at the provisions to protect the on-site tree canopy and natural resource features such as the wetland habitat.

Tina will look into the following UFS questions related to the Shaull Property:

- 1) the proposed buffer along the north side between the Shaull property and the undeveloped park (Southwest Community Park)
- 2) how the conifer retention provision in the Tree Code is being applied to the proposal.
- 3) proposed street classification and planter strip width, street tree plan and feasibility of bulb outs.

3. Debrief Planning Commission Work Session and Next Steps

Six top issue areas conveyed by UFS Chair Buck to the Planning Commission at the 11.9.20 work session on behalf of the UFS:

1. Tree preservation policy – how to keep mature and native trees with development?
2. Tree canopy priority – re-examine arterials and street tree plan.
3. Code enforcement – lack of enforcement provisions in the current Tree Code.
4. How reconcile tree protection with stormwater requirements and wildfire protections?
5. Where in the development process can UFS advise staff and planning commission?
6. Consulting arborist – the need for an objective and technical perspective.

Here are the four points summarized as the key areas for the UFS and Planning Commission to focus on next as agreed upon at the 11.9.20 work session:

1. *Coordination.* Add UFS to the meeting and hearing notices for the Planning Commission and Design Commission to continue coordination among groups.
2. *Inventory.* The discussion included the following:
 - Street tree inventory that could contribute to a street tree arterial plan. (Tina noted a street tree inventory is in the UFMP as action item #15 and an arterial street tree plan is action item #28) – Also spatial analysis tool that is part of the EMSWCD PIC grant will provide inventory data citywide and at the parcel-level;
 - Tree canopy targets citywide and by neighborhood. (Tina noted this is in the UFMP as action item #4 and #13); and
 - Tree health assessment. (Tina noted this is in the UFMP as action item #16).
3. *Funding.* Evaluate existing and needed mechanisms to implement measures and practices that better support and prioritize tree canopy preservation at the policy and project level - (i.e. Code Enforcement, System Development Charges, Tree Fund, Consulting Arborist). (Tina noted UFMP action item #20 refers to establishing funding mechanisms).
4. *Code.* Update the Tree Code with stronger language around Tree Preservation, especially preservation of native species; provide clarity around Tree Health (i.e. what is the proper number and mix of trees to ensure that the trees are healthy

and provide canopy, in support of Climate Change; what are best practices for Soil volume and planting; narrowing (if possible) the Street List to more hearty species).

UFS members discussed adding an inventory of tree groves and species diversity to the *Inventory* bullet above. They also noted the importance of addressing urban heat island issues with an arterial street tree and parking lot plan and working closer with Friends of Trees to focus on residential street and yard trees. Chair Buck was curious if staff could assess the number of street trees lost or if it's possible to adjust the right-of-way to increase the planter strip space. Katherine explained an aerial assessment would be resource intensive and acquiring right-of-way is costly.

Members also noted the importance of assessing neighborhood interest prior to implementing a large-scale neighborhood tree canopy initiative and this could be a near-term "bite-size" effort the UFS can pursue in an organized and unified way. An example to build neighborhood level partnerships and support was shared: [Alliance for Community Trees NeighborWoods Program](#) that the Milwaukie Tree Board has successfully implemented. Tina also mentioned a Neighborhood Tree Plan concept she will provide some additional details on at an upcoming meeting. Either way, neighborhood outreach would entail working directly with our Office of Neighborhood Enhancement and David asked to also work with the Planning Commission.

4. Review of Consulting Arborist Scope of Work

The UFS discussed the scope of work document and asked who makes the call to use the city's current on-call consulting arborist. Staff explained a recent internal process is in the works to have Tina integrated into the development application process and we are continuing to assess appropriate input points to have an information exchange with the UFS.

There was general agreement that the scope for the existing on-call consulting arborist's available to the city could accommodate the range of urban forestry activities shared in the one-pager. A next step is for staff to get in writing there is flexibility in the current contract to add the full range of activities.

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.