

**Ad Hoc Tree Committee
Meeting Notes
March 30, 2016**

Committee Members in Attendance: Jon Quitslund, Sarah Blossom, Mack Pearl, Kol Medina, Ron Peltier

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton

Public: Stephanie Foster, Jeff Bouma, Jonathan Davis, Charles Schmid, Tom Brobst, Kelsey Laughlin

The meeting ran, as scheduled, from 2:30 to 4 p. m. Notes from the March 16 meeting were approved as amended by Lisa Marshall and distributed prior to the meeting.

The committee continued discussion of Subdivision Design Standards (BIMC 17.12). For several reasons, discussion did not settle on specific passages in the chapter that should be amended, except to reiterate the decisions that had been made in previous meetings. The Low Impact Development (L I D) regulations that are in development will need to be coordinated with subdivision design standards, so our committee should be cognizant of those regulations, in touch with the staff responsible.

Ron said that he had been reading the Futurewise study, *The Lay of the Land*, which provides perspective on L I D policies. Jennifer said she had been studying open space provisions in the codes of Olympia and Sammamish. Charles proposed that rather than relying entirely on prescriptive measures (e. g., a percentage of the subdivision acreage retained as forest or open space, or minimum lot size), 'performance standards' should be emphasized. Jon observed that opportunities for harmonizing or reconciling development potential with conservation values exist primarily in the lower density zones.

The recurrent question, "What do we want to accomplish?" hung over our discussion, which was oriented toward consensus but did not reach a conclusion.

At 3:40 p. m., we turned attention to item 3 on the agenda, pertaining to provisions on pp. 10-11 of the Administrative Manual: Landscaping. This prescribes the information required for all new development except single-family residential at the time of land use permit application. A Tree Retention Plan and a Planting Plan are described in detail.

Some discussion turned on how to value the trees being retained: if there are many that are alike in value, the loss of one or two would not be so great as if they stand alone on the property. Valuation, as required in D.1.b (iv), is most important for trees put at risk during construction, when utilities are installed, or on account of changes on the site over time.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 13, from 3 to 5 p. m.

NOTES APPROVED: APRIL 13, 2016