

URBAN FORESTRY SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

Date:	08-18-2025
Time:	4:33 – 5:55 pm
Place:	Virtual Zoom Meeting
Attending:	UFS: Chair Christine Johnson, Jim Buck, Steve Stevens, Thea Hayes (5:30) Staff: Jim Wheeler, Mary Phillips, Gabby Sinagra, Hayley Hamann PC Liaison: John Hartsock, Greg Schroeder Council Liaison: Jerry Hinton Guests: Sara Stacy
Absent	UFS: Keith Warren

Agenda Item #2 – Public Comments

Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Agenda Item #3 – Approval of Meeting Minutes

Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 16, 2025: Steven Stevens motioned to approve the minutes as written. Jim Buck seconded the motion. July 7, 2025: Jim Buck motioned to approve the minutes as written. Steve Stevens seconded the motion.
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 16, 2025, approved 3-0 July 7, 2025, approved 3-0
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Agenda Item #4 – Tree Code Work Session

Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree Code Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Overview Community Goals Recap Policy Alternatives Recap Policy Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Policy Approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Canopy Wildfire Risk Tree Preservation Tree Replacement & Mitigation Tree Removal Enforcement Discussion – Work Session Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General.
-------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Question - coming back to the UFS with draft code? Ans: Not planned, but possible. ▪ Question - Are city-owned trees separated out from other private trees? Ans: This will be considered as part of the draft code language. ○ Does the draft policy outline strike a good balance between supporting community tree goals and maintaining development feasibility? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good balance. ▪ How to calculate canopy will be important, especially for the individual (homeowner/business owner). ▪ Tree canopy minimums seem a bit high. ○ How effective do you think canopy-based metrics and the draft preservation incentives will be in achieving community tree goals? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow street trees in 2-foot wide planters, with trees that are appropriate for such a condition without damaging infrastructure (e.g., curb, sidewalk). ▪ Developer's application needs to have projection of canopy coverage. ▪ Need follow-up subdivision tree planting compliance. ▪ Canopy-based standards instead of number of trees is a better approach. ▪ Tree stand management should be part of the code standards consideration. ▪ For urban/wildland interface and wildfire risk – should involve a forest ecologist. ○ What are the primary challenges you see in meeting canopy coverage standards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need adequate staffing for enforcement of standards. ▪ Underground utilities and conflict with tree roots. ▪ Stormwater facilities. ▪ Emerald Ash Borer. ▪ Need to address the health of the green spaces. ○ Are there any areas of tree priorities that the policy outline does not sufficiently address? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tree removal permit processing needs to be streamlined (need details). ▪ Health/hazard tree removal standards need to be straight-forward (need details). ▪ Interested in the enforcement process. ▪ Emphasize the education aspect, conveying what the “right thing to do” is. ▪ Understanding interdepartmental communications for tree code standards (all departments working for the same goal). ▪ Post-construction or during construction inspections by arborist?
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Agenda Item #5 – Staff Update	
Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of increasing the number of street trees in stormwater facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part of the DCPU2 (Development Code Project Update) is a smaller update that has been termed “Better Subdivisions”. This code update will be looking to have 10-foot-wide planter strips, a minimum street tree “density” (1 tree per 50 feet of frontage) and financial penalties for street densities below a set target (1 per 35 feet of street frontage). • Timing of DES inspectors for street tree and landscape tree planting requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This started as of 8/11/25. Notices went out to the majority of the home builders on 7/29/25. The inspections will include all homes that haven’t received a final inspection as of 7/31/25. • Follow-up street tree inspections for recent subdivisions and potential remediation/enforcement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No, compliance inspections have not been conducted nor are any

	<p>scheduled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skyliner subdivision street tree planting deferment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The development is the Skyliner Subdivision. The developer had asked the building department for this arrangement with the idea of one planting time for all of the trees in the subdivision. It has been determined that this accommodation will not be extended to any other development in the future. • Tree Code – Interdepartmental coordination related to street trees in planting strips <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most of the procedures for reviews and processing would not be covered by the Development Code (only certain big picture review and submittal requirements), so this is not just a development code update topic. Staff have been having ongoing interdepartmental meetings to discuss the issues and conflicts that can lead to fewer street trees being planted and to discuss what standards and processes might be modified/put in place to help ensure planting per approvals/any new regulations. No details yet on this with regards to the updated tree code but based on these conversations the Better Subdivisions Project is proposing to update the required street tree standards and spacing to help address the feasibility of planting the number of required street trees. The Planning Commission public hearing on this proposed update is scheduled for August 18th, and Ashley and Terra are the best people to talk to about this project. • Tree Code – New requirement for developer to provide projected tree canopy level in their landscape plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Short answer is yes it should. We haven't figured out the exact mechanism yet, but since we are likely shifting to a required min. canopy cover standard, part of the submittal requirements will include some form of canopy calculation. The standards, per State law, will be required to be "clear and objective". • EAB and Tree Removal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Healthy Emerald Ash trees asked to be removed. If they are not to be remediated on an on-going basis, they could be removed. • Staff Liaison <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Torrey Lindbo will be the new UFS staff liaison starting next month.
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Next Meeting is September 15, 2025

*These meeting minutes were unanimously approved by the Urban Forestry Subcommittee on September 15, 2025.