
URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
August 18, 2016
City Hall, Lovejoy Room

Commission Members present: Chair Mark Bello, Vice Chair Barbara Hollenbeck, Secretary Catherine Mushel, Damon Schrosk, Vivek Shandas, Gregg Everhart, Brian French,

Absent: Meryl Redisch

City Staff present: City Forester Jenn Cairo, City Attorney Tony Garcia, Urban Forestry Permitting Supervisor Casey Jogerst, Tree Inspector Andrew Gallahan, Botanic Specialist Nik Desai, Interim UFC Admin Natasha Lipai

Guests present: Jane Bacchieri and Jennifer Karps, Bureau of Environmental Services (BES); Gustavo Rojas and Whitney Dorer, Friends of Trees; Bruce Nelson; Joe Petrina, Petrina Construction; Emma Stammer, City of Vancouver Urban Forestry Division; Bryan Burch; Seth Longaker; Connecticut Longaker

Call to Order and Public Comments: UFC Chair Mark Bello

Mark called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM. One member of the public provided public comment.

Joe Petrina, Petrina Construction

Joe is a private developer and also a member of the Home Builder's Association. He sees disconnect in communication between this commission and contractors, and recommends that a pamphlet be created for contractors about the tree code. He said he has even met a City staff person working with building permits that knew very little about the tree code. How can the commission help contractors become more aware of the code?

Catherine asked if trees are part of the licensing for building contractors. Joe said no, but he got his license about 40 years ago. He reiterated that this tree code affects thousands of contractors, but there are no outreach materials that he is aware of besides the 95-page code itself. Is there someone on the commission willing to have a discussion about how to improve outreach about the tree code?

Damon asked where small contractors find out about plumbing code, electrical code, and the like. Joe said that contractors find out about plumbing and electrical code through a national-level booklet. Damon commented that there is no national-level tree code.

Brian asked if UF could explore hosting classes for developers, since there is a class provided annually for arborists. Joe replied that there are educational committees within the Home Builder's Association, but he suggested that an informational pamphlet would be helpful for contractors that need to be informed.

Jenn said that there are one-pagers about trees and development and encouraged Joe and other developers to reach out to the Tree Techs. She also said that it would be helpful for Joe to share any specific contacts for organizations to whom existing informational material should be sent.

Joe asked again if someone from the UFC could attend a HOA monthly meeting. Mark said that the Bureau of Development Services is continuing their outreach; the commission will work on improving outreach. Joe replied that he would be happy to help arrange a group discussion at the UFC's convenience.

New Business: UFC Chair Mark Bello

Mark asked each commissioner to share topics/issues that need more attention. Barbara opened by advising that improving communications and outreach goals is best done by going to where people are. She added that there should be agenda time in the future dedicated to working on the Urban Forest Management Plan and Action Plan.

Damon and Brian passed on sharing. Catherine and Vivek said they would hold their topics for later in the meeting.

Gregg said that she is still concerned about Heritage Tree penalties. The Heritage Tree Committee (HTC) will be meeting in September. She recently looked at a map of tree removal permits created by Vivek and Jackson, and noticed that violations are a city-wide issue.

Mark reminded commissioners that the purpose of this time is to share what is not being addressed.

Forestry Report: City Forester Jenn Cairo

Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 8 (RICAP 8):

RICAP 8 is progressing. It is intended to make easy changes to the code and is not for controversial code issues. A couple of changes were shared: The threshold for requiring a pruning permit is proposed to become ½ inch instead of ¼ inch; additionally, the fine for Heritage Tree violations would be increased to inch-for-inch for private trees and will continue to include the civil fee and administrative fee. Jeff Caudill from the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) will present UF-focused RICAP 8 items at next month's meeting. A public hearing will need to be arranged; Jenn will discuss scheduling this later on.

Neighborhood Tree Stewards:

UF's annual Neighborhood Tree Stewards course will happen again this year. This course educates community members about how to be effective tree stewards in their neighborhoods. Botanic Specialist Nik Desai is the lead coordinator. Please contact him if there are any questions or if there is interest in registration.

Heat Advisory:

UF's establishment program for young trees is continuing as extreme high temperatures approach. An average of 500 trees are watered per summer, and staff also mulch and prune, where needed. As a result, the mortality rate is quite low. Trees established include those planted in parks and natural areas, in streets, and on school properties, as part of Learning Landscapes.

Contract Emergency Response:

UF is responsible for clearing tree emergencies that affect the public right-of-way, 24/7. There have never been back-up emergency services for when major events leave UF staff overstretched. There is a need for back-up crews in storm events and this is now being contracted with private providers. UF will release the request for bids for this contracting shortly.

Staffing Update:

The Arborist IV position is now posted, and there are currently two vacancies. The incumbent will work closely with UF's operations crew out in the field. The ideal candidate for this position will have leadership skills. Additionally, an offer has been made for the new Assistant Program Specialist; they will begin by no later than September. Last, interviews have been completed for the Botanic Specialist II position and an offer will be made soon.

Budget:

Since budget season is coming up soon, Jenn requested that the commission bring budget requests to her. She reminded everyone about UF's current services set-up: Park tree and public Heritage Tree maintenance is largely complaint-driven and not proactive, while right-of-way tree maintenance lies with the adjacent property owner.

In response to Damon's question about tree code related to roots, Jenn said that the current list of RICAP items is not yet final. Jeff will go into further detail at the September meeting.

Damon then asked if the emergency services contract will be with one company or with multiple companies. Jenn said she would get back to Damon on this.

Jenn clarified to Mark that Jeff's presentation next month is also when the UFC will be able to provide feedback on items and thus be more involved with RICAP. BPS staff did refer to the list of issues that some of the commissioners helped rank earlier on this year in identifying items to be addressed in RICAP 8.

Chair Report: UFC Chair Mark Bello

One project that needs work is the update of UFC By-Laws, as it currently still references the old tree code. Mark then segued into the need for the commission to update its work plan, and shared a flow chart that he created for organizational purposes. The chart illustrated that there are staff, commission officers, and committee chairs. It may be helpful to understand these roles as projects, such as updating the UFC By-Laws, begin. Mark later added that he would like to organize commission projects and tasks into a simplified chart with three sections: To Do; To Do Today; and Done.

There are three different calendars: The rolling calendar, which shows upcoming meetings or events for the next three months; the annual calendar; and the work plan. The commission needs to schedule a date for the next annual retreat; he recommended that scheduling should happen by no later than the September meeting. Mark hopes that the commission will have its full complement soon, as full membership will help the commission get organized more quickly.

Recruitment and Diversity: City Forester Jenn Cairo

Jenn shared a draft representation table of UFC members, which is based on a template used by the Parks board and is meant to identify gaps in representation of this commission. This could help improve diversity on the UFC in order to better represent all of the various communities residing within the city, which is a goal of Jenn, PP&R and the commissioner's office.

After some discussion, all recommended changes or questions were submitted in writing by the commissioners. Jenn asked commissioners to send Natasha their own demographic information with which to complete the matrix if they have not done so already. Barbara recommended that this document remain internal, as it contains some information that people are not comfortable openly sharing.

Jenn worked with Pooja and Natasha to come up with a draft appointment process for UFC recruitment. If recruitment begins outside of the proposed timeline, the steps would remain the same. The clock for a term does not start over when an individual steps down; the seat gets filled for the remainder of the existing term. Mark added that he thought that new members filling a partially-completed term were able to serve an additional two terms. Jenn said that she would look into that however thought city code specified that only two consecutive terms could be served.

UF has been developing greater equity and inclusion. Outreach and Science Supervisor Angie DiSalvo and Botanic Specialists Gina Dake and Nik have been working on improving equity of services in their own various capacities. Nik is working with PP&R's Art Hendricks and Karen Guillen-Chapman on equity and inclusion strategies, including for improving diversity in this commission. Nik, Jenn, and Karen are in contact with six or seven community groups that represent environmental justice, youth, and public health to expand relationships and services with them.

Vivek thanked Nik for sharing a template outreach message to send to potential candidates. He is going to share it with the rest of the commissioners.

Mark is looking for volunteers in three fields to serve on the interview panel or Nominations Committee. Mark volunteered himself. Gregg also volunteered. Barbara volunteered if Meryl was not available. Mark encouraged everyone to keep the work plan in mind as recruitment moves forward.

BES Tree Planting Program Report: Botanic Specialist Jennifer Karps

Jennifer thanked the commission for hearing today's report. She introduced Whitney Dorer, Deputy Director of Friends of Trees, and Jane Bacchieri, Program Manager for the

Environmental Services Tree Program (ESTP). She said she would answer questions in-writing after the meeting, if time runs out for her presentation.

The ESTP works with property owners to plant trees, especially those who are interested in long-term tree care. The program includes outreach, education, planting, establishment pruning, technical support, and monitoring of all plantings. Pruning and mulching services are also included. The program was started in 2008 to support the goals of the Grey to Green Initiative. Just under 45,000 trees have been planted in the eight years since the program began.

BES is the regulatory body for stormwater and sewer utilities, and is charged with protecting public health, water quality, and the environment; providing sewage and stormwater collection and treatment services; and protecting water quality, as well as planning and promoting healthy ecosystems for healthy watersheds.

The program areas of focus are: Manage stormwater sustainably; protect human health by reducing urban heat island effects; and provide services equitably to meet the needs of diverse and traditionally underserved communities. The Urban Forest Management Plan, Urban Forest Action Plan, The Portland Plan, the Climate Action Plan, and the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, are all plans that shape the goals of the ESTP and call the program to task. Additionally, tree planting is conducted in order to stay compliant with the Clean Water Act.

ESTP conducts outreach to promote tree planting via both public events such as Sunday Parkways and canvassing in target areas. ESTP staff also conduct inspections and monitoring. Program staff inspectors are trained by UF staff, as UF currently does not have the staff capacity to conduct these inspections. Plantings and some establishment care, such as watering, are provided by contractors. ESTP staff provide excellent customer service. The program consists of five seasonal technical support staff members; one AmeriCorps member, who will, again, be Marc Czornij this year; Program Manager Amy Chomowicz, Botanic Specialist Matt Krueger, and Botanic Specialist Jennifer Karps.

The focus areas for planting are: Stormwater system priority areas; low-canopy and low-income areas; and areas with a high concentration of communities of color, which often coincide with low-income and/or low-canopy areas. The focus locations are right-of-way planting spaces that support large-form trees. The focus species are large form, native, evergreen, and non-nuisance species, while ensuring species diversity. Trees that fit this description can be a hard sell for property owners, since these species do not always fit the public's definition of a street tree. Trees are always planted with the consent of the adjacent property owner. Jennifer added that the trees in the FY 2014-15 ESTP report are only what was planted under the programmatic permit and do not encompass all of the trees that BES plants. For example, trees planted on private property are not under the programmatic permit.

The ESTP has seen some major accomplishments. About 80,000 properties are canvassed per season; over 130,000 street tree planting spaces have been located via about 3,000 inspections that occur each season; and about 3,000 street trees per season are planted, plus about 1,000 yard trees. The survival rate of plantings is 96.8 percent in the first year, and 94.1 percent in the second year. About 1,000 trees get pruned by ESTP per season through the Community Tree

Care program, a partnership with Urban Forestry. The adjacent property owner is responsible for establishment.

Some goals for the future include more focus in improving the equity of their services. This includes an intentional equity focus built into their contract with Friends of Trees. ESTP is also helping the City meet goals for sustainable stormwater management, urban forest canopy cover, equitable service delivery, and climate change preparation.

Jennifer informed commissioners that they can play an important role in the program by inviting ESTP staff to provide regular updates at the meetings, as well as advocating for the ESTP program, where possible.

Discussion:

Barbara asked if monitoring goes beyond the second year. Jennifer said yes and stressed that three years really should be the amount of time allotted for monitoring. ESTP staff send postcards with reminders about establishment, especially with abnormal weather. Barbara later commented that tracking the survival of tree species with climate change will be important; Jennifer agreed.

Gregg asked about tree diversity data and how much of it overlaps with the Tree Inventory data. Jennifer responded that she has been working with UF to expand the approved species list. Since species diversity is always on their mind, BES is working on a strategy to update. She referred to Appendix A of the FY 2014-15 report.

Vivek asked how low-income and low-canopy are defined. Jenn said that she or staff would follow-up with an answer later.

Mark asked if their plantings support the interests of communities that value fruit- and nut-producing trees, and if there is a heritage aspect to their program. Jennifer answered that fruit trees are not permitted for planting in most planting strips, except for wide strips with high voltage power lines overhead. BES and Friends of Trees does plant fruit trees on private property, and property owners can receive Treebate credit. BES's Treebate program incentivizes planting private property trees by allowing property owners to receive a credit on their water or utility bill; the amount depends on the size of the tree species at maturity.

July Meeting Minutes Review and Approval

Grammatical and clarifying corrections were submitted by Gregg prior to the meeting and announced by Natasha. Barbara, Mark, and Jenn also shared a few clarifying corrections. Jenn thanked Natasha and acknowledged that she performs a variety of duties that include elm monitoring, providing administrative support to Operations Supervisor Larry Maginnis, and providing back-up coverage during staff absences to support Permitting Supervisor Casey Jogerst.

Barbara motioned to accept the meeting minutes, as corrected; Damon seconded the motion; the commission voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

Education & Outreach Committee Report: Committee Chair Catherine Mushel

Catherine opened by saying that Nik and Outreach and Science Supervisor Angie DiSalvo are working on a strategic plan for education and outreach; it is going well. This year's priority will be to focus on improving education and outreach specifically to underserved communities, rather than to everyone. The Education and Outreach (E&O) Committee has learned that building relationships with underserved communities will take more than just holding events in underserved neighborhoods; it means getting to know who the community leaders are and connecting on a personal level through repeated meetings.

Another issue to consider is how policy recommendations are made, and how these recommendations get translated into education and outreach. It is apparent that the UFC is very focused on land use policy that impacts trees. There is some uncertainty about what input should look like on land use policy recommendations: What are we not doing? What are we forgetting about? What do we not know about?

When the commission learns of policy recommendations, it is often too late to have critical conversations with the community for the purpose of achieving successful outreach and education. For example: I knew that Vivek made a map of large trees in the city. I was at a Comp Plan meeting and, as usual, trees were not brought up. In this meeting, if we had Vivek's map, or showing trees that have been removed or could potentially be removed due to development, the conversation at the meeting may have been different. In short, education and outreach should be refined and prioritized before major policy changes rather than afterward.

Catherine conducted a brief art exercise with the commission. It served to illustrate that trees and other elements such as solar power, earth, air, and water all impact each other in some way, yet professionals in these respective fields tend not to build a sense of community or concern for other overlapping professionals. Commissioners were encouraged to complete the exercise by illustrating their own "unknowns" with activity or fields that impact trees. Catherine shared that she does not know any clean air or solar power advocates. She added that most people can communicate why they love, hate, or fear trees, and conflicting interests should be identified this way in outreach and education efforts.

Mark thanked Catherine for her report. In the interest of time, he recommended that the commission come back to this at next month's meeting.

Urban Forestry Trust Funds: City Forester Jenn Cairo

Under Title 11, UF has two trust funds established, and they must both be reported on to City Council annually. When Jenn presents on these trust funds to Council this year, she will also be requesting approval for an ordinance to finalize a partnership with Portland State University (PSU) for the development of a citywide tree planting strategy, using some of the trust funds.

The two trust funds are the Urban Forestry Fund (UFF) and the Tree Planting and Preservation Fund (TPPF). These are administered by the City Forester and the balances do carry over into subsequent years. These have different funding sources and functions.

The UFF is generated from penalty fees through code enforcement actions involving public trees, such as City or street trees. This fund may be used for the replacement, establishment, and maintenance of City or street trees that have been illegally removed or damaged; to plant, establish, and maintain City or Street Trees; education, outreach, and technical assistance; and for other forestry-related activities or programs.

The TPPF is generated from tree mitigation fees paid under both development and non-development tree permits, as well as from penalty fees regarding private trees. This fund may be used to plant trees on public or private property in the same watershed where collected; purchase conservation easements for perpetual retention of trees and canopy; and acquire land to permanently protect existing trees.

Jenn then presented the revenue of each fund, per fiscal year. The first fiscal year is a half year, since the implementation of Title 11 started in January. Penalty fees were not collected during the first six months of Title 11, since there was more focus on educating the public. The UFF's revenue is \$11,650, all accrued between July 1, 2015, and June 30, 2016. The TPPF's revenue is \$677,000, the majority of which was accrued from mitigation fees.

While the Urban Forestry Fund has seen no expenditures, \$85,683 have been spent from the TPPF. This was spent on UF-led and UF-supported tree planting activities, such as purchasing materials and supplies; this includes tree stock. The TPPF's current balance is \$591,317.

Through the TPPF expenditures, 2,652 trees were planted, 93 percent of which were large form, evergreen, or native tree species. These tree types return the greatest services to the community over their lifetime. A small portion was spent on labor. The TPPF funded Learning Landscapes over the past year and a half, though the program has been around for 10 years. Learning Landscapes is a partnership with schools and include a planting event for the school as well as curriculum about trees. The TPPF also funds street tree projects for which Parks is responsible, as well as planting in developed parks and natural areas. While larger quantities of trees are planted in natural areas, these receive less establishment care and thus have a higher mortality rate. Trees planted in developed parks are often larger and receive more establishment care; only 1 to 2 trees are lost annually.

Spending with the TPPF will remain low while UF plans for the most effective and strategic use. UF intends to work with Dr. Vivek Shandas and his team at PSU to create a citywide tree planting strategy. The plan would identify priority planting areas, including for example, areas with a high urban heat island effect impact or other negative health factors, and communities under-served by the urban forest. The current distribution presents an environmental justice issue, since affluent areas have more trees. Development of the plan would include stakeholder engagement. The goal is to get the most out of these funds, and the plan would be final and ready for implementation by summer of 2017.

Vivek shared that his program has been focusing on canopy issues for some time. Barbara was his US Forest Service program officer back in 2010 for the Healthy Trees, Healthy People project. The goal was to understand the role that tree canopy plays in everyday life. From 2010 to 2014, Metro participated in a LiDAR consortium, where they collected surface data for the

region. PSU contributed \$100,000 for the data to be processed. Every single tree crown was captured through this LiDAR dataset for the region, which includes Bull Run Watershed to the east and the Coast Range foothills to the west. A total of 13.6 million tree crowns were counted. Data captured includes location, height, and functional type (deciduous or coniferous). Land use and environmental stressor data was integrated. This data is available on RLIS. The goal is to use this data to determine planting potential in the region, as part of working on a planting strategy with UF. Other cities' planting strategies will be considered in the process.

Jenn continued by explaining that planting effort would be organized by watershed, including the Willamette River Watershed, Johnson Creek Watershed, Fanno Creek/Tryon Creek Watershed, and the Columbia Slough Watershed. The map showed points where mitigation fees were collected, and included percentage labels to indicate the percentage of the TPPF that would be dedicated to each watershed. The ordinance for planting plan strategizing with PSU will be presented to Council in September, the exact date is to be determined.

Discussion:

Gregg commented that the Willamette River Watershed has two sides, and development is different on each side. This should be considered as a tree planting plan is developed. Vivek responded that he would like to have a couple of brainstorming sessions, starting in October, and said he would put out a request for volunteers to attend the sessions later. Jenn responded that a lot of variables will be considered, but that the equity of canopy services distribution would be one of the main priorities. Mark agreed that the varying development on either side of the Willamette River is important to consider.

Mark closed by saying that Jenn has provided him with several power point presentations that can be used for more effective public outreach.

Business adjourned at 10:39 AM.

Appeal: 4219 NE Cesar E. Chavez Blvd.

Appeals Board present: Barbara Hollenbeck, Damon Schrosk, Brian French, and Mark Bello
Staff present: Jim Field, Casey Jogerst, Jenn Cairo, Andrew Gallahan, and Interim UFC Admin
Natasha Lipai

Guests present: Seth Longaker and Connecticut Longaker

Barbara opened the hearing by thanking everyone for their attendance and effort toward the appeal. She reminded the audience of the Appeals Board (AB) role, being that the board is an error-correcting body composed of volunteers that must uphold the City Forester's tree permit decision unless it is found to be arbitrary, capricious, or in violation of Title 11. Mark and Barbara shared that they made site visits to the tree under today's appeal; Damon and Brian did not make site visits.

Tree Inspector Jim Field gave an overview of the permit decision under appeal. He denied a removal permit for a red oak in the backyard at 4219 NE Cesar E. Chavez Boulevard. The tree is 49 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH), and is 70 to 80 feet tall. Jim was the initial inspector assigned to the removal application. Dylan Saito and Kelly Koetsier were the

secondary inspectors. Supervisors Casey Jogerst and Larry Maginnis, as well as City Forester Jenn Cairo, also inspected the tree. All five of the staff members that conducted secondary inspections are Qualified Tree Risk Assessors.

The applicant had reported that small branches fall regularly and a large limb broke off in the winter, creating a concern. They also claimed that the tree had been topped and growing outward at an exuberant pace. Since the tree overhangs three residences, the primary concern was safety. The applicant also says that the tree has not been pruned in at least 13 years.

Jim considers the tree to be significant, as it is visible from a distance in the neighborhood. Upon inspection, the tree appeared to be in fair to good condition based on both Level 1 and Level 2 tree risk assessments. A Level 1 assessment is a visual inspection of the tree from the streets surrounding the residence. A Level 2 assessment is a visual assessment of the stem and canopy, the exposed root structure, and the crown structure, all from the base of the tree. He developed mitigation options and estimated the residual risk for each option. He did not find any evidence of significant or recent failures, but did find a wound from an old failure over the residence. This wound can be mitigated through pruning the limb, and he advised this to the applicant.

The permit was denied under the following applicable standards and review factors: The tree is healthy and not dead, dying, or dangerous, the tree is not a nuisance species, the tree is not within 10 feet of a building or attached structure, and the tree is greater than 20 inches DBH; the species of the tree is appropriate for its location; and the tree's growth habit has not developed in a manner that would prevent continued healthy growth or is not negatively impacting other trees. Jim cited Title 11, chapter 11.40.050, A and B.

Jim showed some photos of the tree. He then closed by saying that he had recommended pruning to remove deadwood, reduce the weight, and raise the canopy to clear the residence and neighboring properties, to the applicant. He also recommended removing the decaying limb over the residence, caused by an old failure.

Seth Longaker is the property owner at the tree's location and was the appellant. He started his presentation by clarifying that he and his wife, Connecticut, only recently acquired the property, which explains why the Warranty Deed had to be included with the initial application. It is his hope that his parents-in-law can reside in the home after it is renovated. However, he claimed that the size and location of the tree currently makes it impossible to do the renovations necessary to accommodate all of their needs. The appellants intend to develop in an environmentally-friendly way and plant two replacement trees in the backyard through Friends of Trees, once the time comes.

The reasons that the property owners wish to remove the tree are: Tree location and tree size does not allow the homeowner to accomplish the objectives of reasonable use and enjoyment of the property, and there are no practical alternatives to removal; maintenance of the tree creates an unreasonable burden to the property owner; and, the removal of the tree would not have an adverse impact on neighboring trees—in fact, they noted that another tree in the yard now grows at a 90 degree angle because of this tree. The appellants cited chapter 11.40.050 B, 2 of Title 11 in the hopes that this case fits as an example of when this review factor would apply. The

alternative of pruning the tree would not allow them to execute their proposed plans. Seth added that he and his wife do not hate trees; they simply do not think that this tree under appeal is appropriate for their property.

The appellant's in-laws want to run an herb and garden shop out of the backyard, but there is currently no level ground where this is possible without the removal of this tree. The proposed plans show that the root system and new garage structure would be in conflict if the tree remains. A landscape architect that Seth consulted with agrees that the tree does not allow for the best use of the lot, such as increasing the density of the property, without ruining the character of the house or neighborhood. After getting quotes from five tree care companies, the appellants found that it would be cheaper in the long-run for them to remove the tree, rather than prune the tree. Seth acknowledged that not all of the tree care companies he spoke with were certified arborists. Connecticut, Seth's wife, agreed that they support trees and their importance to the city, but they want to be able to use the backyard to its full potential. She added that they want to focus on planting trees in the right-of-way space adjacent to their property, which is currently barren.

Barbara commented that large trees offer more benefits for the environment than small, young trees. Street trees, by virtue of the limited space in which they often grow, do not usually reach sizes that are comparable to this tree under appeal. Most of the large form tree canopy in Portland, outside of parks, is on private property. Seth responded that he believes the tree code is intended to respect both the property owner's desired use of the property and the preservation of trees in the city.

Damon asked if there was evidence that the tree had been topped. Jim responded that he did not find any. Jim added that he did not see evidence of a recent limb failure. Some of the deadwood in the tree ranges from three to six inches and can be remedied with pruning. Connecticut responded that the limb failure happened in 2014 and it was significant.

Damon asked the appellants if they had consulted with any tree care providers that would help preserve the tree while keeping their development interests in mind. Seth said that yes, he spoke with Chad Honl and Emerald Tree Service, and they agreed that the easiest way to build a new garage would require encroaching on the tree's root zone and making adjustments to the property line fence.

Brian commented that Title 11 calls for upholding the goals of the Urban Forest Management Plan, which includes preserving large-form trees, such as the oak in question. He then recommended that the property owners seek more quotes from other tree care providers.

Mark asked for clarification on how the tree would look after being pruned, as recommended by Jim. Jim answered that the overall form of the tree would remain the same, and that only deadwood is recommended to be pruned out.

Mark commented that he found the quality of the development plans troubling and as a former planner, he knows there are better alternatives to the proposed plan presented today, for the sake of preserving the tree. He added that the plan shared by the appellants actually hurts their case.

Damon motioned to deny the appeal; Brian seconded the motion. The Appeals Board voted unanimously to deny the appeal.

Appeal adjourned at 11:18 AM.