

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

Last updated: Dec 7, 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).	3
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).	2
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.	2
E	Open	Public works projects that result in tree removal. Is the City achieving tree goals for urban canopy in the public right-of-way? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk improvement • Capital improvement projects • Greenstreets • Street design 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Recommendation: Issue to be addressed in a follow up process after Dec. 2015	Recommendation: Public inter-bureau planning effort to address issues related to trees in right-of-way. Joint PBOT, BES, and UF project involving key stakeholders and reporting to UFC. History: Requested by Committee in April 2015.	1
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.	1

STATUS		ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES	PRIORITY
G	Closed	CenturyLink pruning/topping near communication lines	Implementation protocols and deliverables	September	Staff provided update on current status. History: Added to issue tracking May 2015 as a result of public comment.	<u>2</u>
H	Closed	Tree Code Outreach and Education Plan	Resources, staff and budget	September	Committee provided input at April meeting. Next step: Update on final plan and implementation. History: Original task of committee in charter	1
K	<u>Closed</u>	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. 	Code fixes, clarifications	<u>December</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, Oct and Nov meetings; also on original list of issues generated by staff (#3).	1
L	Closed (part of Interim Rule, Item F)	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	September	UF Administrative Rule (Oct 2015) provides clarification; monitoring will provide data; committee provided comments as part of interim rule recommendation. History: Original list generated by staff (#1).	1
M	Closed (part of Interim Rule, Item F)	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	September	UF Administrative Rule (Oct 2015) provides clarification; monitoring will provide data; committee provided comments as part of interim rule recommendation. History: Original list generated by staff (#7).	2
N	Open	Arborist training, reporting and enforcement 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? Is enforcement occurring? 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	Recommendation Issue to be analyzed by staff	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.	<u>3</u>

STATUS		ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES	PRIORITY
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>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be addressed by staff	Overview presentation given in June; briefing on monitoring data in July; committee to provide comments on data in Nov, but had insufficient time. History: Requested by Committee in February 2015.	1
P	Open	Fencing requirements for tree preservation and root protection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is fencing working to preserve trees due to the cost of fencing compared to the fee in lieu of preservation? When the performance path is used, do arborists reports clearly describe how a tree will be protected and the reasoning for reduced or no fencing requirements? 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be analyzed by staff	Staff to provide briefing on rule history. History: Committee member discussion in June 2015.	<u>3</u>
Q	Open	No opportunity for public appeal for removal of one healthy tree ≥20" DBH in non-development situations	Code fixes, clarifications	<u>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be addressed by UFC	History: Original list generated by staff (#6).	2
R	Open	Development Impact Areas. Should they be required on heavily forested sites?	Code fixes, clarifications	<u>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be analyzed by staff	History: Requested by Committee members in March 2015. Japanese Garden development used entire property to meet the density requirement rather than the portion of the site to be developed.	2
S	Open	Do the Type A standards for removal on private property in non-development situations make sense for achieving Tree Project goals? (e.g. within 10 feet of a building)	Code fixes, clarifications	<u>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be addressed by UFC	History: Original list generated by staff (#4).	<u>2</u>
T	Open	Building inspectors currently inspect planting requirements: Are inspectors properly trained? Are correct species being planted?	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Recommendation:</u> Staff analyze issue; report to DRAC, UFC	History: Original list generated by staff (#2)	<u>1</u>

STATUS		ISSUE DESCRIPTION	CATEGORY	SCHEDULE	NOTES	PRIORITY
U	Open	Has customer service improved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How should this be measured (surveys, data, etc.)? 	Resources, staff and budget	<u>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be analyzed by staff	History: Original list generated by staff (#8)	<u>2</u>
X	Open	Trees straddling lot lines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to resolve disputes Are code clarifications needed? 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be analyzed by staff	History: Public comment in Sept. 2015	2
Y	Open	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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title 33 (land division, e-zone, landscaping stds) Comprehensive Plan Implementation (Mixed Use, Employment and Industrial, and Institutional Zones Projects) Buildable land inventory 	Implementation protocols and deliverables	<u>Recommendation:</u> Issue to be addressed by PSC and UFC	History: Committee comments in March, June, Sept. 2015	1
AA	<u>Open</u>	Tree preservation in development situations: Is it working as intended to achieve Tree Project goals? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Triggers for preservation requirements on sites under 5000 sq. ft. or greater than 85% building coverage Exemptions for certain commercial and industrial zones 	Code fixes, clarifications	Recommendation: Residential Infill Project and Mixed Use Zone Project should consider.	History: Issue was original identified by staff (#3). Members provided recommendations related to fee in lieu of preservation and preservation of very large trees, but not triggers/exemptions.	<u>1</u>

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?