



CITY OF  
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

TREE AD HOC COMMITTEE  
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2016  
3:00 – 5:00 PM  
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM  
280 MADISON AVE N  
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

---

---

## AGENDA

1. Review and Approve Notes from June 1, 2016 Meeting
2. Review and Recommend Changes to [BIMC Chapter 16.22](#)  
[\*Vegetation Management\*](#)

Tree ad hoc committee  
Meeting Notes  
Wednesday, June 1, 2016  
3:00 – 5:00 PM  
Council Conference Room  
280 Madison Ave N  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Jon Quitslund, Ron Peltier, Sarah Blossom, Kol Medina, Mack Pearl

**COBI STAFF:** Jennifer Sutton, Josh Machen

**PUBLIC:** Jonathan Davis, Charles Schmid

The meeting came to order at 3:05, and the Notes from the previous meeting (5/25/16) were discussed, as were Jennifer's notes detailing what had been decided as to particulars for ***Landscape Plans*** in the *COBI Administrative Manual*. Those notes, conveyed to the committee by email, are as follows:

1. ISA Valuation also required for any trees used to meet tree unit requirements, in addition to trees that are at risk due to proximity to construction/grading (Admin Manual)
2. ISA Valuation for all trees to be retained through a land use permit
3. Recommend changing the code enforcement section of the BIMC 18.15.010.C to be a generic fine related to tree size, not the ISA valuation.
4. Consider whether or not the tree "valuation" requested during the land use permit applies just during the construction period or maintenance period (5 yrs) or does that valuation apply forever (as opposed to the new generic fine related strictly to size).

There was considerable discussion of the alternatives presented in #4, and the committee was in favor of maintaining the valuation for five years, as the basis for a fine if the tree dies or is removed. The committee also discussed when an individual valuation of one or more trees is called for, and when the valuation of a number of trees can be based on a chart with generic values based on species and size.

With an understanding that Jennifer's notes would be on the record via the notes for the present meeting, the notes from June 25 were approved.

Some of the discussion that followed re-affirmed what had been decided in a previous meeting regarding the particulars of the Administrative Manual requirements.

Josh surprised some members of the committee when he referred to a provision in BIMC 18.15.010 (subsection C.1.b, on p. 7 of the text reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by the Council). This provision calls for trees and tree stands in a perimeter area, such as a roadside buffer, to be "retained and protected . . . unless an applicant can demonstrate during the land use permit review process

that the existing trees and vegetation will be compromised after the development is complete, and would likely become hazardous.” Members of the committee could not recall approving such language, and rather thought that the buffer should be widened to protect the critical root zone.

{In fact, the last sentence of this subsection, unchanged from the old ITPO, says, “Perimeter landscape widths may be averaged to save significant trees, but shall not be reduced to less than the allowed minimum perimeter dimension.” A look at earlier versions of the ordinance text reveals that the language in question was highlighted as an addition in the version “Updated 12/11/2015” and again, after other changes were made elsewhere, in the version “Updated 1/14/2016.”}

The meeting ended without getting to item 3 on the agenda, pertaining to BIMC 16.22.

## **Policy Questions to Consider for Amending BIMC Chapter 16.22 *Vegetation Management***

1. Right now 16.22 is triggered generally when someone needs a Class 4 DNR Forest Practices Permit- clearing more than 5,000 board feet of timber). Keep this threshold? NOTE: Clearing permit required to remove 6 significant trees (1 sig. tree in MUTC) up to 5,000 board feet in a 12-month period.
2. Do we want to apply (pre-plan) subdivision open space/ buffer requirements to properties proposed for clearing that will eventually subdivide?
3. What standards should be applied to undeveloped property that is not big enough to subdivide?
4. What standards should be applied to lots developed with a single-family home, but are not further subdividable?
5. What standards should be applied to property being cleared to expand existing agriculture or for creating new agriculture?
6. Do we want to combine 16.22 with 16.18 *Land Clearing*? Rename resultant chapter? Rename permits “Minor” and “Major” Tree Removal Permit?