



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23, 2017
8:00 – 10:00 AM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

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

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton, Mike Michael, Christy Carr

Public: Terry Samilson, Mike Juneau, Charles Schmid

Agenda Items 1 & 2: Notes from the August 2 meeting were not available; they will be reviewed at the next meeting. The agenda was reviewed and approved with a slight change proposed by Kol, to discuss the next meeting agenda before public comment.

Item 3, public comment: Terry Samilson, a landscape architect, offered a few brief comments. Emergency preparedness planning needs to take community forest conditions into account. She finds some fault with the Critical Areas update. Are there incentives for removal of invasives? Where replacement of trees is mandated, Kitsap Conservation District guidelines should be followed; small trees are more likely to thrive. On her own property, she wants to plant a woodlot, providing for harvest at some future date: will stewardship of this kind be permitted?

Item 4, Update on Phase 2 LID: Mike Michael and Christy both reported on sessions involving engineers and planners working together. Policies in the Critical Areas chapter relating to Aquifer Recharge areas (comprising all of the Island except the designated Centers) are being integrated with LID regulations (BIMC 15.19-20). Christy also said that staff have been looking at projects that have been problematic or have met with public criticism, to see what difference the Site Assessment Review and LID standards would have made in project design and execution.

Item 5, Update on Critical Areas Ordinance: Kol said that he had been studying the section of the Critical Areas chapter devoted to **Trees and vegetation** (BIMC 16.20.090, pp. 14-17 in the draft dated June 26, 2017). Sarah asked if this section provided in one place regulations applying to trees and vegetation in all critical areas, and Christy's answer was "Yes." Do "all critical areas" include all forested areas that may be subject to development in the future? Kol seemed to think that is the case, but references in BIMC 16.20 to "trees and vegetation within critical areas and their buffers" imply that beyond buffers, forested areas may be cleared for development (subject to Site Assessment Review and LID regulations). An expansion of the scope of areas to which the regulations in BIMC 16.20 apply will need to be very clearly described.

Sarah raised questions about redevelopment, such as re-vegetation of cleared farmland, and she asked how agriculture is to be regarded in relation to aquifer recharge. Ron brought up the Crawford property in the Day Road area. Kol referred to the CAO section devoted to **Aquifer recharge areas** (BIMC 16.20.100) – in particular, the requirements for a "critical area permit" (subsection C, pp. 18-19) when development or redevelopment is proposed. Christy said that one permitting system will be used for activities under .090 and .100; the SAR procedures will be followed, and additional in-depth elements may be required, per 16.20.170.

Somewhat enigmatically (or imperfectly captured in the notes), Christy commented that the City's role in review of proposals is distinct from the application of regulatory constraints.

The Council is scheduled to discuss BIMC 16.20 (CAO) on Sept. 12.

Item 6, Revisions to BIMC 16.18 (Land Clearing). Someone asked, "Do we even need this chapter?" What is the place or function of BIMC 16.18 in relation to the CAO and its Critical Aquifer Recharge Area policies, and the site assessment procedures in BIMC 15.19 & 20? Jon spoke of what the chapter says, or should say, about stewardship of trees and forested areas within existing developed properties, and on properties not yet (or perhaps never to be) developed. In the time available, we did not come to grips with any specifics in either Jon's or Jennifer's approaches to the chapter. Ron spoke to the value of encouraging development of Forest Management Plans, and promoting stewardship.

Item 7, Agenda for the next meeting. Assuming that the next meeting would be on Sept. 6, the CAO chapter was proposed for the agenda.

Item 8, Public comment. Charles counseled against relying entirely on aquifer recharge as a rationale for preservation of trees and forested areas. He also said that the committee should look at what's allowed in grading permits. Mike Juneau stressed that in the course of site assessment and subsequent forest management, the tree canopy needs to be maintained. Terry stressed that woodlots should be permitted (assuming that trees planted will eventually be harvested).