



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 1. | Review and Approve Notes from April 19, 2017 Meeting | 3:00 |
| 2. | Review and approve meeting agenda | 3:05 |
| 3. | Public comment on agenda-related items | 3:05 |
| 4. | Ongoing Business | |
| | A. Discuss Phase 2 Low Impact Development- Potential Scope of Work
<i>City Staff</i> | 3:15 |
| | B. Discuss Creating New Tree Retention Standards for Single-family Lots
<i>City Staff</i> | 3:30 |
| | C. Discuss Staff Proposal for Modifying BIMC Chapters 16.22 & 16.18
<i>City Staff</i> | 4:10 |
| 5. | Public comment on agenda-related items | 4:20 |
| 6. | Discuss Agenda for Next Meeting: May 17 | 4:25 |
| 7. | For the Good of the Order | 4:30 |

Committee Members in Attendance: Jon Quitslund, Kol Medina, Mack Pearl, Sarah Blossom

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton, Mike Michael

Public: Katy Bigelow, Stephanie Foster, Kelsey Laughlin, Robert Dashiell, Charles Schmid, Jonathan Davis

Items 1 & 2: Notes from the meeting on March 29th were approved as distributed; the Agenda was approved, and Jennifer handed out several pages showing how other jurisdictions (notably, Lake Forest Park and Olympia) provide for tree retention and canopy cover.

Item 3: Charles expressed concern that on the fire station lot on Madison Ave., redwood trees are being cut down.

Item 4.A: Mike Michael opened the discussion of Phase 2 work on LID policies, saying that we would need to determine, on an Island-wide basis, what techniques and strategies for achieving LID goals would be suited to our present levels of development and our physical circumstances (soils, vegetation, surface water, rainfall, impermeable surfaces). He spoke of an “Island-wide SAR”; he said that discussions with Herrera are about two weeks away from readiness to describe the scope of their work. Regulations for the Open Space Residential zones (R-2, R-1, R-0.4) are especially important.

Kol and others spoke of the Committee’s interest in a collaborative process. COBI staff and committee members may draft new language for the BIMC for review by the consultants. Going forward, management of the Site Assessment Review processes will require the equivalent of a full-time employee.

Item 4.B: Jennifer led discussion of tree retention standards for single-family residential lots. She observed that there are several ways of describing the standards: in terms of tree canopy (expressed as a % of the lot area), number of significant trees, or tree units. Our Code currently uses 40 tree units per acre as the norm. Since the conditions prior to development or re-development vary widely from one site to another, it was proposed that the S A R should determine which tree retention standard should be used. Jennifer also noted that on sites where solar cells are being installed, trees that block the sun will have to be removed.

Item 6: At the next meeting, May 3rd, Herrera’s scope of work and a completed Table showing tree retention standards for SFR lots will be on the agenda.

Task:	Description:	Phase II List Item:
Potential Revisions to Chpt 15.20 and related	Review of remaining issues related to encouraging LID. Items for potential inclusion in this scope item: • Allowing setbacks to vary to encourage LID BMP use • Strengthening Infeasibility Criteria • Closing “loop-holes” that allow “engineered” solutions as a preferred option • Evaluate “Direct Discharge” standard	Variance Issues “Off-ramps”
SAR Implementation Tools	Assist Staff in creation of tools to ease the implementation of the SAR process. Tools may include: • GIS Mapping tool for creation of SAR submittals (Web App) • Website Content • Additional Forms	Tools
Consider Methods to Encourage greater use of LID	Consider Potential for LID BMP’s to be a minimum requirement of all development or as a prescriptive path in lieu of the SAR process	R1/R2 LID Standards
Assist Planning	Assist Planning Staff as needed to complete implementation of LID components embedded in the SMP, Vegetation Management Codes (16.12 and 16.22), Critical Areas, etc.	SMP Amendments Vegetation Management

Proposal for NEW Minimum Tree Retention Requirements: BIMC 18.15.010

Tree Canopy % OR Tree Units (TU) per acre

Proposal for NEW Minimum Tree Retention Requirements: BIMC 18.15.010

Tree Canopy % OR Tree Units (TU) per acre

	R-0.4	R-1	R-2	R-2.9	R-3.5	R-4.3	R-8 & 14
Existing SFRs	70% Tree Canopy Retention	50% Tree Canopy Retention	25% Tree Canopy Retention	40 TU/Acre	40 TU/Acre	40 TU/Acre	SFR allowed, but MF development is primary use. 18.15.010.G Already requires 40 TU/Acre in these zones
Newly Developing SFR Lots	70% Tree Canopy Retention	50% Tree Canopy Retention	25% Tree Canopy Retention	40 TU/Acre	40 TU/Acre	40 TU/Acre	
Alternative Option for SFR Retention	Lot Size ≥ 100,000 ft²: Retain 70% Tree Canopy Lot Size 70,000 – 100,000 ft²: Retain 60% Tree Canopy Lot Size 40,000-70,000 ft² : Retain 50% Tree Canopy						
Creating New Agriculture OR Agriculture Expansion							

BIMC 18.36.030.258. “Tree canopy” means the total area of the tree or trees where the leaves and outermost branches extend.

BIMC Table 18.15.010-5: Tree Unit Conversion Table for Preserved Trees [1]

DBH	Tree Units	DBH	Tree Units	DBH	Tree Units
3 – 5	1.0	24 – 26	6.2	39 – 40	10.8
6 – 10	1.2	27 – 28	7.0	41 – 42	11.4
11 – 12	1.4	29 – 30	7.8	43 – 44	12.0
13 – 15	2.0	30 – 31	8.4	45 – 46	12.6
16 – 18	3.2	32 – 33	9.0	47 – 48	13.2
19 – 20	3.8	34 – 36	9.6	49+	13.8
21 – 23	4.6	37 – 38	10.2		

[1] For multi-stemmed trees, measure the DBH of each trunk separately, multiply each of these measurements by itself, add up these amounts, and calculate the square root of that total to find the DBH for the tree as a whole.

Combine BIMC 16.18 *Land Clearing* and BIMC 16.22 *Vegetation Management*

- Rename Minor and Major *Clearing and Tree Removal Permits*
- Minor Tree Removal Permit: Required for removing more than 6 significant trees in residential zones (1 significant tree in MUTC/HS Road) in a 12 month period, up to threshold for Major Permit
- Major Tree Removal Permit/Clearing Permit triggered for removing more than 7,000 square feet of trees or land. Consider 7,000 square feet because additional stormwater review. Would integrate any required "Site Assessment Review"
- Cross-reference to new single-family retention requirements of 18.15.010 (TBD) that must be reviewed and met. Cross-reference to CAO, SMP, and Stormwater Regulations (BIMC Chapters 16.20, 16.12 and 15.20, respectively). Retention requirements would be applied.
- Continue to utilize minor permit used to review any amount of tree/vegetation removal in a preserved area (e.g. designated perimeter buffers, critical areas or shoreline areas/buffers).
- Remove provisions in current *BIMC 16.22 Vegetation Management* for that are linked to state DNR forestry permits. Applicants may have to get DNR permits if they meet their thresholds

Major Tree Removal Permit for creation of Farms:

- *Submit farm plan* with Major Clearing application, Minimum single-family retention (TBD) would not apply. The applicant must make substantial progress on implementing farm plan, and submit a report on progress within 1 yr.
- If substantial progress towards implementation of farm plan not made, revegetation could be required or fines imposed.
- Reword "Non-farmed buffer" to be more of a "agriculture activity setback".
- Streamline/better describe Conversion Harvest Option & 6 yr moratorium from State requirements.
- Revisit these requirements when the Transfer of Development Rights program is reviewed and when if Agricultural Resource Land designation created.