



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

Committee Members in Attendance: Mack Pearl, Kol Medina, Ron Peltier, Jon Quitslund
COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton
Public: Jeff Kanter, Paul Bonham, Jonathan Davis, Mike Juneau, Charles Schmid

Agenda Items 1 & 2: Notes from the meeting of September 15 were approved as distributed. A brief report by Kol on the Council's discussion of the CAO Critical Aquifer Recharge Area policies was added to the Agenda, which was then approved.

Item 3: Mike J. spoke of some CAO-related topics that he had overlooked in remarks at the Council meeting. Alders should be removed from the species list for coppicing: alders are not "strong regenerators." He observed that it's too bad that work on hillsides is all shut down between Oct. 1 and Apr 1, since pruning is best done in the dormant season.

Item 4, BIMC 16.18: Kol led off the discussion with some comments on the Council's response to Christy's presentation and the DRAFT text of BIMC 16.20.100 (Aquifer recharge areas). No questions were raised by the 65 / 35% ratio to provide for aquifer recharge.

Discussion of BIMC 16.18 began with reference to Jon's version, with its decision points. The Committee went along with Jon's preference for putting Definitions at the end rather than in subsection .020. Mack asked about the applicability of this chapter: Would it pertain only to the portion of a lot that has been developed, and not at all to an NVP Area or the comparable undeveloped portion of a lot developed prior to the new regulations? Jon confessed that he had not considered how BIMC 16.18 would interface with 16.20. When and where do the regulations in each chapter apply? Would 16.20 and a Critical Area permit apply only when tree removal and/or land disturbing activity accompanies construction, while 16.18 applies to small-scale tree removal and other maintenance activities?

Delineation of the NVP Area would accompany substantial development and re-development activity. Would the NVPA boundaries be firm, or subject to change over time? For a lot that has already been developed, would an NVPA be delineated, and if it is much less than 65% of the lot, would that mean that no trees could be removed?

Some questions were raised about allowing, without a permit, removal of up to six significant trees within 36 months. Should the number removed be related to the number remaining, and to the size and zoning classification of the lot? Jon and Jennifer acknowledged that they should work together on a single draft for discussion at the next meeting. Jon asked all those present to read through the entire draft of 16.18 and provide some feedback.

Item 5, Public comment. Jeff Kanter expressed frustration with regulations that are unnecessarily complicated and burdensome. Planning staff are sometimes obliged to insist on applying a rule that doesn't solve the problem.

Item 6. Jennifer mentioned that the Public Hearing on the CAO is scheduled for Oct. 3. The next Ad Hoc Committee meeting will be Oct. 4, for further discussion of BIMC 16.18.

NOTES APPROVED: October 4, 2017