

## Tree Project Oversight Advisory Committee: Title 11 Implementation Issues and Workplan

Last updated: Oct. 5, 2015

STATUS	ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES
<b>Closed</b>	Does the waiver policy regarding “unreasonable burden” need to be clarified and/or standardized (11.40.060 C 2 pg 41)?	Code fixes/clarifications	April	Committee made recommendation April 2015. History: Original list generated by staff (#7).
<b>Closed</b>	‘Building’ and ‘attached structure’ definitions absent in Title 11 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What should the definition be?</li> </ul>	Code fixes/clarifications	June	Committee recommended definition in June 2015. Slated to be considered by Council as part of RICAP 8. History: Original list generated by staff (#5).
<b>Closed</b>	RICAP 8	Code fixes/clarifications	June	Briefing on schedule and proposed amendments provided to Committee June 2015. No action taken. History: Requested by Committee member in April 2015
<b>Closed</b>	Programmatic permits for City bureaus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it functioning to preserve trees, especially in City Capital Improvement Projects?</li> </ul>	Implementation protocols and deliverables	June	Memo provided to Committee June, 2015. No action taken. History: Requested by Committee members request of March 2015.
<b>Closed</b>	Public works projects that result in tree removal. Is City following tree code intent? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sidewalks</li> <li>• Capital improvement projects</li> <li>• Greenstreets</li> <li>• Low traffic streets</li> </ul>	Implementation protocols and deliverables	August	PBOT and BES presented information in August. No action taken.  History: Requested by Committee in April 2015.
<b>Closed</b>	Interim Administrative Rule: Replanting requirements for tree removal on private property, city-owned and managed sites and public rights-of-way <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$1200 cap for non-development</li> <li>• Public works projects</li> <li>• Forester discretion</li> <li>• Tree credits</li> </ul>	Code fixes/clarifications	Sept.	Action on final memo in Sept.  History: Interim Rule went into effect April 20; requested to be added to work plan by Committee members in April, 2015. Committee received overview and training in April and May; initial comments discussed in June. Committee finalized recommendation in August during special meeting.
<b>Closed</b>	CenturyLink pruning/topping near communication lines	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>September</u>	Staff to provide update on current status. History: Added to issue tracking May 2015 as a result of public comment.

STATUS	ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES
<b>Closed</b>	Tree Code Outreach and Education Plan	Resources, staff and budget	<u>September</u>	Committee provided input at April meeting. Next step: Update on final plan and implementation. History: Original task of committee in charter
<b>Closed</b>	Tree regulations in Commercial, Employment and Industrial zones. Consider additional tree regulations in these zones.	Code fixes/clarifications	September	BPS staff to give presentation to Committee. History: Requested by Committee members in March and June 2015.
<b>Closed</b>	Mixed Use Zones project. Ensure that trees are regulated in the new zone.	Code fixes/clarifications	September	BPS staff to give presentation to Committee. History: Requested by Committee members in March 2015.
<b>Open</b>	Policy on preserving very large, healthy trees in development situations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$1,200 fee in lieu of preservation: Is the fee appropriate, given current City policies.</li> <li>• Triggers for exemption requirements</li> <li>• Exemptions</li> </ul>	Code fixes/clarifications	<u>Oct: Refine comments</u>	Committee to refine recommendation in <u>Oct.</u>  History: Request from Commissioner Amanda Fritz in June 2015 to address development proposal where several sequoia trees were proposed for removal; discussed at July and August meetings; also on original list of issues generated by staff (#3).
<b>Open</b>	Non-development mitigation policy for Type B permits, where mitigation can be up to inch-per-inch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should this be evaluated on a case-by-case basis or as a standardized policy?</li> <li>• Effect of the \$1200 cap on fee in lieu of planting</li> </ul>	Code fixes/clarifications; implementation protocols	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	Interim Rule provides clarification; monitoring will provide data; committee to decide on recommendation as part of interim rule.  History: Original list generated by staff (#1).
<b>Open</b>	Does the waiver policy regarding sites that already meet tree density standards need to be clarified and/or standardized (11.40.060 C 1 pg 41)?	Code fixes/clarifications; implementation protocols	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	Covered by Interim Rule and monitoring plan; will be included in Interim Rule. History: Original list generated by staff (#7).
<b>Open</b>	Arborist training and <u>reporting for land use reviews and building permits</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are arborists sufficiently trained on the new tree code?</li> <li>• <u>What peer review occurs and is appropriate?</u></li> </ul>	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	<u>In Sept. 2015, Committee said an assessment is needed before any recommendations can be made.</u>  History: Commissioner Fritz requested Committee consider issue in June, 2015.

STATUS	ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES
<b>Open</b>	Monitoring and evaluation report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report to City Council due early 2016</li> <li>Investigate where trees are being replaced and include data in report</li> </ul>	Implementation protocols and deliverables	October ( <u>non-Development</u> )  November ( <u>development</u> )	Overview presentation given in June; briefing on monitoring data in July; committee to provide comments on report format and data in Oct. History: Requested by Committee in February 2015.
<b>Open</b>	Fencing requirements for tree preservation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is fencing working to preserve trees?</li> </ul>	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	Staff to provide briefing on rule history. History: Committee member discussion in June 2015.
<b>Open</b>	No opportunity for public appeal for removal of one healthy tree ≥20" DBH	Code fixes/clarifications	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Original list generated by staff (#6).
<b>Open</b>	Development Impact Areas. Should they be larger?	Code fixes/clarifications	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Requested by Committee members in March 2015.
<b>Open</b>	Do the Type A standards for removal on private property make sense for achieving Tree Project goals?	Code fixes/clarifications	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Original list generated by staff (#4).
<b>Open</b>	Building inspectors currently inspect planting requirements rather than Tree Inspectors. Who is best suited to do this task?	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Original list generated by staff (#2)
<b>Open</b>	Has customer service improved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How should this be measured (surveys, data, etc.)?</li> </ul>	Resources, staff and budget	November	History: Original list generated by staff (#8)
<b>Open</b>	Buildable land inventory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the tree code affect available land for infill?</li> </ul>	Code fixes/clarifications; implementation protocols	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Committee member comment in June 2015

STATUS	ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES
<b>Open</b>	Role of Urban Forestry Commission to implement/advise on tree code long-term.	Implementation protocols and deliverables	November	History: Committee member comment in May 2015; <u>Sept. 2015</u>
<b>New</b>	Trees straddling lot lines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How to resolve disputes</li> </ul>	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Public comment in Sept. 2015
<b>New</b>	Overlap of City policies and projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effect to tree canopy</li> <li>Relates to mixed use zones project, PBOT rules and others</li> </ul>	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Committee comment in Sept. 2015
<b>New</b>	Title 33: Effect of implementation on tree preservation and canopy	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	Committee member said an assessment of Title 33 sample data needed.  History: Committee comment in Sept. 2015

**Definitions provided in February:** Types of Project and Code Issues

**1. Code Intent & Purpose**

-Why do we have a Tree Code? What are its goals?

**2. Implementation Protocols and Deliverables**

-What has been put in place (processes/staff) to accomplish the Tree Project objectives?

-What are the adopted or needed policies that standardize decision-making?

**3. Code Fixes & Clarification**

-Where is the Tree Code silent, unclear, or inconsistent?

**4. Resources, Staffing, and Budget**

-Are these sufficient to achieve project goals?