

URBAN FORESTRY SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

Date:	03-16-2026
Time:	4:31 – 5:35 pm
Place:	Virtual Zoom Meeting
Attending:	UFS: Chair Christine Johnson, Jim Buck, Keith Warren, Steve Stevens Staff: Torrey Lindbo (Staff Liaison) PC Liaison: Greg Schroeder, John Hartsock
Absent	UFS: Thea Hayes

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"> • Keith moved and Jim seconded a motion to approve minutes • There was a question about whether to amend the minutes to reflect that Christine plans to step down from her position as chair in June versus May. Hayley suggested not changing and adding updates to the March meeting minutes.
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 23, 2026, minutes approved unanimously
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hayley will finalize and post to web page

Agenda Item #4 – Staff Update	
Discussion:	<p><u>Tree Code Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Torrey shared an update from Gabby and the Planning team working on the Tree Code project. To date they have completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drafts of the tree lists, ○ Technical code amendments (e.g. planting sizes, tree protection plans, tree pruning, definitions, etc.), and ○ Many of the guidebook chapters • In the next round of presentations (April-May) staff will share the options for revising key code provisions based on Council's direction. This includes tree planting and tree protection, among other provisions. Staff plan to join the April 20 UFS meeting. They might also be willing to join August UFS meeting when the draft code is expected to be out for public comment. • Keith asked whether there would be a chance to review any of the draft code or technical manuals ahead of the April meeting. Torrey will check with UDP staff. • Jim thought it would be valuable for UFS members to review past comments/recommendations from UFS prior to the April meeting, Christine said she would look into past comments and might consider setting a summary table and/or schedule a work session, if needed. <p><u>Code Enforcement Update</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair Johnson had provided a list of questions that Planning and Code Enforcement staff provided answers to. Torrey shared those responses during meeting, and planned to email them out to UFS members after the meeting. • Regarding street tree replacement, Keith wondered if 6 months to replace might be too little time to ensure an appropriate replacement could be found; depending upon the time of year and tree availability. • There were questions about whether tree replacement needed to be a minimum size (GRC 9.1042 states that 1.75" caliper is the minimum that can be planted for street trees). Even if a tree is selected from the approved tree list, should there be list that larger landscape strips can plant be different from the smaller trees that need to go in narrower strips or those under power lines? • There was a strong desire to ensure that whomever in Planning is reviewing tree issues has tree knowledge. Need to have someone with professional judgement to make decisions on tree pruning issues. • Jim shared a photo of some severely pruned trees. The responses from Code Compliance/Planning had provided an example of allowing some pruned trees on NE 4th to be retained, but somehow the discussion got confused about that example from code compliance being the same trees in the photo from Jim. While Jim identified that confusion by the next morning and Torrey then notified everyone about it the morning after the UFS meeting, there was discussion at the meeting expressing concern that trees topped like the photo Jim shared would be allowed to be retained. As this confusion was cleared up, there is no need to have UFS express any concern to the city. • Commissioner Hartsock did express a concern about the tree size that were installed along Palmquist at Gradin, since they did not appear to meet the 1.75" caliper minimum. City projects should set an example, as the minimum is required of the development community. Some UFS members noted that the smaller size may have been due to trying to ensure the desired variety was sourced, as many of the trees there are a demonstration project showcasing various colors or foliage.
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim was going to draft a letter until he noted the confusion between the tree topping photo and example from staff being different places.
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Torrey emailed responses from Planning and Code Compliance out to UFS members • Torrey will share feedback/input from UFS with Tree Code and Code Compliance staff

Agenda Item #5 – Chair Update	
Discussion:	<p><u>UFS Membership</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christine clarified that June will be her last meeting as both UFS chair and subcommittee member. • Steve announced that he will also be stepping down from UFS in June, although he is willing to be flexible depending upon the timing on the Tree Code project. <p><u>Gradin Tour Impressions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christine noted how passionate the Parks staff were • Jim was excited that all of the trees that have been planted have irrigation • Keith felt like there were good tree choices given the difficult soils on the site. He noted that maintenance follow up will be important for long term success <p><u>Significant Tree Nomination Site Visit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christine did a site visit of a Western Redcedar with 7 leaders. While it is a large tree (47" DBH) that is 70' tall, there were concerns with long term health, as it looks like there may have been at least one former leader that has broken off that has created a wound. • The group felt like it might be best to deny the application just to make it easier for the homeowner to do long term pruning and maintenance if/when something happens to other leaders. • Jim moved and Steve seconded a motion to not recommend approving the significant tree status <p><u>Other item</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim mentioned that he had a discussion with Ken Koblitz (Infrastructure Development Manager for City) after a recent meeting. Ken told Jim that his team intends to help find places in subdivisions that have already been constructed where trees could be planted, but weren't, and use city funds collected through the tree fund to plant trees.
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UFS unanimously voted to deny significant tree status to the western redcedar

Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christine will draft a letter for UFS to review and then send to the homeowner who submitted the significant tree application.
---------	--

Agenda Item #6 – Upcoming Events	
Discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 31 – Rockwood Neighborhood Heat Island Effect Mitigation Project Celebration, 10:30 – 12pm April 18 – Nadaka Nature Park Stewardship event (Arbor Day) from 9:45am to 1pm April 18 – Park to Park Tree Walk with Equipo de Arboles, Verde and other partners. Details to come
Decisions:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Action:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christine will verify the date and details of the park to park walk with Tina

Future meeting topics:

- Tree list
- Tree code update – April 20. Maybe August as well, once draft code is out for public comment.
- EAB
- Update on Parks comprehensive plan

Meeting adjourned at 5:35pm

Next Meeting is April 20, 2026.

These meeting minutes were unanimously approved by the Urban Forestry Subcommittee on April 20, 2026.

Meeting recording:

https://greshamoregon.zoom.us/rec/share/I7hYLUdsfX5cXUFFdL37dOP6oez8USEKSRLaja_JTlhcyC0yb4tqnw0YpfAglcjk.X6INUwasTUKht9V_C