

**Urban Forestry Commission Briefing
Portland Plant List Update
April 21, 2016**

Comment Matrix

Commenter	Date	Comment(s)/Issue(s) Raised
John McDonald, District Board Chair & Zone 4 Director, Tualatin Soil & Water Conservation District	03/29/16, letter	<p>(1) TSWCD recognizes the PPL as an extremely valuable resource for municipalities & other regional entities. PNW ecosystems are under constant pressure from non-native, nuisance plant species, many of which were historically introduced as landscape plants.</p> <p>(2) Efforts to control nuisance plants consume a considerable amount of management dollars & resources throughout the region. It is important that the PPL present the most up-to-date and rigorously evaluated information available.</p> <p>(3) TSWCD staff reviewed the evaluation process and agree that it was based on a sound, rigorous scientific process for which City staff should be commended.</p> <p>(4) Inclusion of specific non-native trees to the nuisance species list is necessary to help prevent problem plants from finding their way into landscapes and high-value habitat.</p> <p>(5) TSWCD urges the bureau to adopt the list as proposed.</p>
Elaine Stewart, Chair, 4-County CWMA Steering Committee	03/18/16, letter	<p>(1) PPL is an extremely valuable tool to the CWMA membership, providing valuable info for jurisdictions without the resources to conduct this type of work.</p> <p>(2) Pleased with the scientific basis of the review process and commend the City on its work.</p> <p>(3) Support inclusion of horse chestnut; at least one member agency has need to control naturalizing horse chestnut in oak woodland & riparian woodland settings.</p> <p>(4) King County considered listing horse chestnut as a Weed of Concern last year, due to its spread in parkland & forests.</p> <p>(5) Understands the concern about urban tree canopy while recognizing that many invasive species were planted with the best intentions. Science is finding that native plants provide better wildlife habitat than introduced species.</p>
Terri Preeg-Riggsby, Board Chair & Zone 5 Director, W Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District	03/15/16, letter	<p>(1) Vigilance is required to spot new problem species in our natural areas; the rigorous scientific and objective review of the Portland Plant List illustrates such vigilance.</p> <p>(2) PPL is considered the most authoritative reference on locally indigenous and non-indigenous plants.</p> <p>(3) WMSWCD recognizes that some non-indigenous plants, including some tree species, pose significant threats to natural areas and ecological resources.</p> <p>(4) WMSWCD supports the additions and changes to the nuisance species list, including removal of non-indigenous species from the native plants list and inclusion of documented noxious species in the invasive plants list.</p> <p>(5) WMSWCD urges the adoption of the list as proposed.</p>

Commenter	Date	Comment(s)/Issue(s) Raised
Dan Moeller, Metro Conservation Program Director	03/08/16, letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Concur with the additions and changes to the nuisance list (2) Vouch for the veracity of the review & scoring process (3) Concur with the removal of several species from native plants list (4) Appreciates the thorough & scientifically grounded work by City staff (5) Metro spends tens of thousands of dollars per year treating landscape plants that have become “problematic weeds”
Damon Schrosk,	02/09/16, Testimony at hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Sees a lot of yards as a part of his business. There are often a collection of tree species, including sweet cherry, holly, and the two species under consideration, found growing in disturbed areas. (2) Incidents of tree species proposed for inclusion are often more localized, in areas such as Forest Park (Horse Chestnut) and in SE urban grid (Sycamore Maples). (3) Concerned about what the listing of these species will do to the urban forest, with caveat that it is unlikely that large trees will be removed right away due to the cost of removal. These trees are unlikely to be replaced by large trees after removal. (4) Does find that the two tree species tend to be more invasive, but is concerned about where the line is drawn (“where do we stop”) because many common landscape trees can be defined as at least minimally invasive. (5) Noted that there are many seedless cultivars that are available. Request that the cultivars be considered separately if these trees placed on the Nuisance Plants List.
Gregg Everheart	02/09/16, Testimony at hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Opposes both tree species being listed. Not convinced these tree species are actually a significant issue warranting placing them on the Nuisance Plants List. (2) The ramifications of the Nuisance Plants List has gone beyond original aims. (3) Plant List process is a “one-size-fits-all” approach that does not adequately address unique characteristics of species; revise process to better define species that are an issue all over the city and those that are not a significant issue. (4) Not convinced that the expert reviewers selected for the process have a deep understanding of the issues in Portland. The approach used to identify nuisance plants is not scientifically sound. Recommends updating the process to identify nuisance species to include on-the-ground surveying of species. (5) These species have significant variability across the city that should be recognized in Plant List updates. These tree species have not been shown to be an issue in urban context (based on input from neighborhood tree teams). There is a place for them in certain parts of the city.
Jeff Burns	02/09/16, email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Amendments not fully vetted through “parties of interest”; need better process for input.

Commenter	Date	Comment(s)/Issue(s) Raised
Gregg Everheart	02/09/16, Letter 01/21/16, email	<p>Listing of Horse Chestnut & Sycamore Maple is undesirable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) makes many existing large trees vulnerable to removal and requires no or only minor mitigation (2) could result in significant loss of much-needed tree canopy – large existing trees that are surviving in often challenging urban conditions (3) reduces species diversity even though the trees are not invasive in every landscape (4) may impact existing Heritage Trees (5) Horse Chestnut does not develop a persistent seed bank & removed seedlings don't persist or resprout aggressively (UF staff – Jan 21, 2015) (6) no provision for seedless cultivar. (7) BES comments regarding the issue with Sycamore Maple (re: self-sown individuals, Oaks Bottom) are “informal assessments”. Conduct a study to identify impacted areas. (8) Sycamore Maple not catalogued but she expects that there are a number of large trees in City.
Tim Wessels	02/09/16, email	<p>Horse Chestnut</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) not proven to be invasive in local gardens; (2) provides both pollen & nectar, sugar concentration varies b/w 30-75%; (3) Only 17 of 2,325 trees in Sabin are Horse Chestnuts; (4) One heritage tree on NE Going & 14th Pl
Eileen Stark	01/28/16	Trouble locating appendices