



TREE AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2016
3:00 – 5:00 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jon Quitslund, Ron Peltier, Sarah Blossom, Kol Medina, Mack Pearl

COBI STAFF: Jennifer Sutton, Josh Machen

PUBLIC: Jonathan Davis, Charles Schmid

The meeting came to order at 3:05, and the Notes from the previous meeting (5/25/16) were discussed, as were Jennifer's notes detailing what had been decided as to particulars for ***Landscape Plans*** in the COBI *Administrative Manual*. Those notes, conveyed to the committee by email, are as follows:

1. ISA Valuation also required for any trees used to meet tree unit requirements, in addition to trees that are at risk due to proximity to construction/grading (Admin Manual)
2. Recommend changing the code enforcement section of the BIMC 18.15.010.C to be a generic fine related to tree size, not the ISA valuation.
3. Consider whether or not the tree "valuation" requested during the land use permit applies just during the construction period or maintenance period (5 yrs) or does that valuation apply forever (as opposed to the new generic fine related strictly to size).

There was considerable discussion of the alternatives presented in #4, and the committee was in favor of maintaining the valuation for five years, as the basis for a fine if the tree dies or is removed. The committee also discussed when an individual valuation of one or more trees is called for, and when the valuation of a number of trees can be based on a chart with generic values based on species and size.

With an understanding that Jennifer's notes would be on the record via the notes for the present meeting, the notes from June 25 were approved.

Some of the discussion that followed re-affirmed what had been decided in a previous meeting regarding the particulars of the Administrative Manual requirements.

Josh surprised some members of the committee when he referred to a provision in BIMC 18.15.010 (subsection C.1.b, on p. 7 of the text reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by the Council). This provision calls for trees and tree stands in a perimeter area, such as a roadside buffer, to be "retained and protected . . . unless an applicant can demonstrate during the land use permit review process that the existing trees and vegetation will be compromised after the development is complete, and would likely become hazardous." Members of the committee could not recall approving such language, and rather thought that the buffer should be widened to protect the critical root zone.

{In fact, the last sentence of this subsection, unchanged from the old ITPO, says, "Perimeter landscape widths may be averaged to save significant trees, but shall not be reduced to less than the allowed minimum perimeter dimension." A look at earlier versions of the ordinance text reveals that the language in question was highlighted as an addition in the version "Updated 12/11/2015" and again, after other changes were made elsewhere, in the version "Updated 1/14/2016."}

The meeting ended without getting to item 3 on the agenda, pertaining to BIMC 16.22.

Notes Approved: June 15, 2016