

**Ad Hoc Tree Committee
Meeting Notes
April 14, 2015**

Committee members in attendance: Jon Quitslund, Sarah Blossom, Mack Pearl
COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton
Public: Jeff Bouma, Charles Schmid, Charles Wenzlau, Olaf Ribeiro

The meeting began at 9 and ended at 11:15. Meeting notes from 1/20/15 and 3/10/15 were approved as drafted and distributed.

Discussion focused on a number of details in BIMC 18.15.010 (the 'Interim Tree Protection Ordinance'), as amended in the draft of Ordinance No. 2015-04. In their meeting on April 9, the Planning Commission gave some time to discussion of changes in the ordinance language and further changes that might be made.

Referring to the Planning Commission discussion, Mack expressed concern that the regulations for roadside and perimeter buffers may not produce the results we want. Jennifer observed that we could add more provisions to the ordinance.

Charles W. found fault with several passages in the draft ordinance. #1: On p. 4, at 4.b.ii, where new language would add to the areas to be protected during construction and development, he sees "project creep" and an impractical imposition on the developer of a tightly constrained lot. #2: On p. 7, in 4.a.i, the requirement of "at least 30 tree units" seemed burdensome, but in subsection iii (bottom of the page), the applicant is only responsible for "at least the same number of tree units" as before. #3: On p. 9, at 5.c.iii, where new trees in parking lots do not count toward the tree unit requirement, Charles thought this is "just adding complexity."

Mack introduced a brief digression, asking if the tree unit conversion table for preserved trees on p. 8 allowed enough credit for big trees. A specific tree in the T & C parking lot came up: is it being adequately protected? It was agreed that we need to incentivize saving trees (i. e., assuring that they are adequately protected during and after development) vs. replacement.

Charles W. directed attention to section G.3 on p. 7 (retained unchanged in the ordinance, but open to question), pertaining to canopy cover and the requirement of an inventory. The purpose served by this inventory is not clear; how is it related to the description of Intent in G.1? Jennifer said she would come up with new language for subsection b. The committee, echoing concerns of many citizens, has been concerned with the impact of development on canopy cover, so this is a trouble spot.

In response to discussion of trees that are lost before their value is known, Jennifer said that ISA valuation of significant trees should be among the items required in applications for clearing and construction permits.

We agreed that landscaping plans (including, but not limited to, the stipulated requirements for screens, buffers, and parking areas) are important design elements and should be subject to design review. Where in the BIMC does this provision belong?

Mack took the discussion back to a passage on p. 4 of the ordinance, in subsection 4.b.ii: some sites impose tight constraints on the use of equipment during site preparation and construction, but where there are broad areas that can be preserved without disturbance, it's important that they be protected. Jennifer said she would work on some new language.

In the full text of BIMC 18.15.010, we looked at p. 9 (regulations for perimeter buffering and screening) and p. 13 (roadside buffers): these provisions call for close study. Also, on p. 8 of the draft ordinance, Mack questioned the tree unit values assigned to larger trees and heritage trees. With reference to buffer regulations, it was pointed out that for 25-ft and 50-ft buffers, the regs produce a lower density in the wider buffer.

Jennifer observed that we have not yet discussed tree unit requirements for single family residential and business/industrial developments.

Notes Approved: April 28, 2015