

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

Last updated: Nov 2, 2015

STATUS	ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES	PRIORITY	
A	Closed	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	‘Building’ and ‘attached structure’ definitions absent in Title 11 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What should the definition be? 	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).	
C	Closed	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	
D	Closed	Programmatic permits for City bureaus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it functioning to preserve trees, especially in City Capital Improvement Projects? 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	June	Memo provided to Committee June, 2015. No action taken. History: Requested by Committee members request of March 2015.	
E	<u>Open</u>	Public works projects that result in tree removal. Is City following tree code intent? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalks • Capital improvement projects • Greenstreets • Low traffic streets 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Proposed: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	PBOT and BES presented information in August. No action taken. History: Requested by Committee in April 2015.	
F	Closed	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"> • \$1200 cap for non-development • Public works projects • Forester discretion • Tree credits 	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 discussed recommendation in August during special meeting.	
G	<u>Closed</u>	CenturyLink pruning/topping near communication lines	Implementation protocols and	<u>September</u>	Staff provided update on current status. History: Added to issue tracking May 2015 as a	

STATUS	ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES	PRIORITY
		deliverables		result of public comment.	
H	<u>Closed</u>	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
I	<u>Open</u> Combine with Issue in Row Y	Tree regulations in Commercial, Employment and Industrial zones. Consider additional tree regulations in these zones.	Code fixes, clarifications	September	BPS staff gave presentation. History: Requested by Committee members in March and June 2015.
J	<u>Open</u> Combine with Issue in Row Y	Mixed Use Zones project. Ensure that trees are regulated in the new zone.	Code fixes, clarifications	September	BPS staff gave presentation. History: Requested by Committee members in March 2015.
K	Open	Policy on preserving very large, healthy trees in development situations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should there be different regulations for large trees \$1,200 fee in lieu of preservation: Is the fee appropriate, given current City policies. Triggers for preservation requirements Exemptions 	Code fixes, clarifications	<u>Nov: Refine comments</u>	Committee to refine recommendation in <u>Nov</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, August and Oct. meetings; also on original list of issues generated by staff (#3).
L	<u>Closed (part of Interim Rule, Item F)</u>	Non-development mitigation policy for Type B permits, where mitigation can be up to inch-per-inch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should this be evaluated on a case-by-case basis or as a standardized policy? Effect of the \$1200 cap on fee in lieu of planting 	Code fixes, clarifications; implementation protocols	<u>September</u>	<u>UF Administrative Rule (Oct 2015)</u> provides clarification; monitoring will provide data; <u>committee provided comments as part of interim rule recommendation</u> . History: Original list generated by staff (#1).
M	<u>Closed (part of Interim Rule, Item F)</u>	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>September</u>	<u>UF Administrative Rule (Oct 2015)</u> provides clarification; monitoring will provide data; <u>committee provided comments as part of interim rule recommendation</u> . History: Original list generated by staff (#7).

STATUS		ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES	PRIORITY
N	Open	Arborist training and reporting for land use reviews and building permits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are arborists sufficiently trained on the new tree code? What peer review occurs and is it appropriate? 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Proposed: <u>Issue to be analyzed by staff</u>	In Sept. 2015, Committee said an assessment is needed before any recommendations can be made. History: Commissioner Fritz requested Committee consider issue in June, 2015.	
O	Open	Monitoring and evaluation report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report to City Council due early 2016 Investigate where trees are being replaced and include data in report 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>November</u>	Overview presentation given in June; briefing on monitoring data in July; committee to provide comments on data in <u>Nov.</u> History: Requested by Committee in February 2015.	
P	Open	Fencing requirements for tree preservation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is fencing working to preserve trees? 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Proposed: <u>Issue to be analyzed by staff</u>	Staff to provide briefing on rule history. History: Committee member discussion in June 2015.	
Q	Open	No opportunity for public appeal for removal of one healthy tree ≥20" DBH <u>in non-development situations</u>	Code fixes, clarifications	Proposed: <u>Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Original list generated by staff (#6).	
R	Open	Development Impact Areas. Should they be larger?	Code fixes, clarifications	Proposed: <u>Issue to be analyzed by staff</u>	History: Requested by Committee members in March 2015.	
S	Open	Do the Type A standards for removal on private property <u>in non-development situations</u> make sense for achieving Tree Project goals?	Code fixes, clarifications	Proposed: <u>Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Original list generated by staff (#4).	
T	Open	Building inspectors currently inspect planting requirements rather than Tree Inspectors. Who is best suited to do this task?	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Proposed: <u>Issue to be analyzed by staff</u>	History: Original list generated by staff (#2)	
U	Open	Has customer service improved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How should this be measured 	Resources, staff and budget	Proposed: <u>Issue to be</u>	History: Original list generated by staff (#8)	

STATUS	ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES	PRIORITY	
	(surveys, data, etc.)?		<u>analyzed by staff</u>			
V	Open Combine with Issue in Row Y	Buildable land inventory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the tree code affect available land for infill? 	Code fixes, clarifications; implementation protocols	Proposed: <u>Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Committee member comment in June 2015	
W	Open	Role of Urban Forestry Commission to implement/advise on tree code long-term.	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>November</u>	History: Committee member comment in May 2015; <u>Sept. 2015</u>	
X	Open	Trees straddling lot lines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to resolve disputes <u>Are code clarifications needed?</u> 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Proposed: <u>Issue to be analyzed by staff</u>	History: Public comment in Sept. 2015	
Y	<u>Open</u>	<u>Coordination with other City policies, projects and codes: Effect of City planning and implementation on tree preservation and canopy goals generally and Title 11 specifically.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Title 33 (land division, e-zone, landscaping stds)</u> <u>Comprehensive Plan Implementation (Mixed Use, Employment and Industrial, and Institutional Zones Projects</u> <u>Buildable land inventory</u> 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Proposed: <u>Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015</u>	History: Committee comment in Sept. 2015	
Z	<u>Open</u> Combine with Issue in Row Y	Title 33: Effect of implementation on tree preservation and canopy	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Proposed: <u>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?