



City of Woodinville, Washington

**TREE BOARD REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 24, 2013**

Woodinville City Hall City Council Chambers, 17301 133rd Avenue NE, Woodinville, WA

<b><u>CALL TO ORDER</u></b>	The regular meeting for the Woodinville Tree Board was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Quigley.
<b><u>ROLL CALL</u></b>	<p><u>Tree Board Present:</u> Chair Quigley, Board Member Waters, and Board Member Yabroff. Board Member Munniks arrived at 5:35 p.m.</p> <p><u>Absent:</u> Board Member Manickam.</p> <p><u>City Staff Present:</u> David Kuhl, Development Services Director, Sarah Ruether, Planner, and Sandy Guinn, Sr. Administrative Assistant</p> <p><b>MAIN MOTION: to excuse Board Members Manickam and Munniks.</b></p> <p><b>Motion by: Board Member Waters</b></p> <p><b>Second by: Board Member Yabroff</b></p> <p><b>Action for the Main Motion: PASSED 3 - 0</b></p> <p><b>Vote: Ayes: Chair Quigley and Board Members Waters and Yabroff</b></p> <p><b>Nays: None.</b></p> <p><b>Abstain: None.</b></p>
<b><u>APPROVAL OF AGENDA ORDER AND CONTENT</u></b>	Chair Quigley noted there was consensus to make no changes.
<b><u>PUBLIC COMMENTS</u></b>	None.
<b><u>BUSINESS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS</u></b>	
<i>Approval of May 22, 2013 Tree Board Minutes</i>	<p>1. <u>Approval of May 22, 2013 Regular Tree Board Meeting Minutes</u></p> <p>Tree Board approved the regular meeting minutes of May 22, 2013, as presented.</p> <p><b>MAIN MOTION: to approve the regular meeting minutes of May 22, 2013, as presented.</b></p> <p><b>Motion by: Board Member Waters</b></p> <p><b>Second by: Board Member Yabroff</b></p> <p><b>Action for the Main Motion: PASSED 3 - 0</b></p> <p><b>Vote: Ayes: Chair Quigley and Board Members Waters and Yabroff</b></p>

	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Nayes:   None.</b> <b>Abstain:  None.</b></p>
<p><i>Discussion and Review of Tree Regulations and Proposed Recommendations</i></p>	<p><u>2. Discussion &amp; Review of Tree Regulations and Proposed Recommendations</u></p> <p>Discussion started with Commissioner Yabroff's discovery of diseased trees on his property, his submittal of a Tree Removal application on Monday, and the process whereby applicants are notified that their Tree Removal permit has been issued. Planner Ruether advised that normally the Permit Technician would call the applicant; however, since the Tree Board was meeting today, Ms. Ruether said she would advise Commissioner Yabroff that the Tree Removal permit was issued. Commissioner Yabroff recommended that how an applicant is notified should be added to the Tree Removal Permit Decision Tree.</p> <p>The Commissioners discussed how to encourage citizens to take care of diseased trees when the disease could spread to other trees (e.g. need to remove tree from property). One of the issues with current tree regulations is the requirement that a diseased tree that needs to be felled in a Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA) may not be removed from the NGPA. The Commissioners expressed that a break on the amount of tree credits should be given to a citizen when diseased trees (where disease may be spread to nearby healthy trees) are removed. The rationale for this is that removal of large trees are expensive and there are circumstances where a tree should not be replanted for a period of time (e.g. fungus). Planner Ruether said she would propose revised language to address diseased trees in the NGPA and how to encourage citizens to remove diseased trees.</p> <p>There was further discussion on how to write code so that the current tree goals are not diluted while the code is rewritten to be more applicable to what is actually occurring; e.g. the spreading of disease when a diseased tree is not removed. Commissioner Waters expressed one possibility could be to give more discretion in the code to the Development Services Director, provided an Arborist Report is required as staff needs science to make decisions defensible.</p> <p>Director Kuhl responded to questions from Tree Board members regarding recent felling of trees and if permits were first obtained. Director Kuhl commented on the projects that did have permits and what the City was doing regarding the situations where no permits were obtained. Commissioner Munnicks asked what portions of the City's code was reviewed for the Canterbury Square project. Planner Ruether commented that the City reviews a large development in the Central Business District (CBD) for both tree regulation requirements and landscaping requirements.</p> <p>Ms. Ruether talked about the 40% canopy and the 2009 detailed analysis performed by the UW students and that the City's tree goals should be based on this study. Tree Board members discussed deleting tree regulations from the CBD and Industrial (I) Zones and using strictly the landscaping code in these areas, provided the code is written to ensure</p>

	<p>that there shall be no net loss of tree canopy coverage. Planner Ruether advised that she will research what other cities have for landscaping code and their incentives; e.g. % of native vegetation in the CBD and I Zones or applicant may get a little more height when green roofs with structured parking is used. After the Tree Board reviews the researched information, the next step for the Tree Board is to make recommendations to City Council. The members stressed that the revised code should not create loopholes that allows for unnecessary tree removal and that the over-all 40% tree canopy coverage should be maintained, with 50% tree canopy coverage in residential.</p> <p>Chair Tom Quigley explained the 12 point risk factor (as adopted by ISA) and that any tree above 9 points should be felled. Tree Board members were supportive of the Director using the 12 point risk factor, provided an Arborist Report was submitted. There was dialogue regarding the current code requiring only a certain number of trees to be removed each year versus removing many trees in one year and then no removal of trees for a certain number of years (tree management plan). Tree Board member Yabroff said there should be a middle ground where citizens want to honor what the goal is and not have citizens throw their hands up. Planner Ruether said she would bring back provisions creating future tree credits; provisions for diseased trees that are likely to infect other trees or trees that have a high risk factor, including poor structured trees that should be felled.</p> <p>Chair Quigley asked who is responsible for the routine pruning and how is it decided what to maintain. Planner Ruether advised Public Works provides the maintenance in the public right-of-way and on public property; however, there has been difficulty in finding seasonal help. Ms. Ruether said she would find out more information regarding maintenance for the next meeting. Tree Board member Munniks commented that Wilmot Gateway Park is in great shape. Chair Quigley asked how the current tree funds are used.</p> <p>Director Kuhl commented that he believes the funds will be used for the Gateway landscaping, and, at the next meeting, we could talk about what to do with current tree funds and make a recommendation.</p>
<b><u>PUBLIC COMMENTS</u></b>	None.
<b><u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</u></b>	<p>Director Kuhl reviewed the existing tree violation in the Lower/Upper West Ridge area and mentioned he hoped to meet with the violator next week to complete the process. An arborist has made a recommendation and we need to work out the number of tree credits that need to be replaced.</p> <p>He also recommended that guests are allowed to participate and have five (5) minutes to present their ideas or comments. They should be required to sit in the audience and not at the table with the Board.</p>
<b><u>ADJOURNMENT</u></b>	Chair Quigley called the meeting adjourned.

	The meeting was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.
--	--

**Respectfully submitted,**



**Sandy Guinn**  
**Sr. Administrative Assistant**