



City of Tigard Tree Board – Minutes

MEETING DATE: March 8, 2010, 6:30-8:00 p.m.
MEETING LOCATION: Tigard Library, 2nd Floor Conference Room,
13500 SW Hall Blvd., Tigard, OR 97223

Members Present –Dennis Sizemore, Bret Lieuallen, David Walsh, Matt Clemo, Mort Ettelstein, Tony Tycer

Members Absent – None

Council/Staff Present – John Floyd, Susan Hartnett, Todd Prager

Visitors – John Frewing, Paul Miller

1. Introduction and Opening Remarks

At 6:31 p.m., Chairman Dennis Sizemore called the meeting to order.

There were no opening remarks.

2. Review and Approval of January 6, 2010 Meeting Minutes

At 6:32 p.m., the Tree Board unanimously approved the February 8, 2010 meeting minutes (Attachment 1, March 8, 2010 Tree Board Meeting Packet) and suspended Robert's Rules of Order for the remainder of the meeting.

3. Vote on Heritage Tree Designation

Dennis Sizemore then asked Todd Prager to present his findings on the Heritage Tree nominations.

Mr. Prager explained that he had received a nomination for two Heritage Trees at 10380 SW Canterbury Lane from the property owner, Paul Miller (Attachment 2, March 8, 2010 Tree Board Meeting Packet). He said that while both trees have excellent, open grown forms and are in good condition, the red oak stood out as meeting the Heritage Tree Code criteria and the bigleaf maple did not. The reasoning was because the red oak was of a significant size and age relative to others in the City and provided a backdrop to the John Tigard House on the neighboring property. He said the bigleaf maple is further removed from the John Tigard House, and there are other bigleaf maples in the City that are older and larger. Mr. Prager said he spoke to Paul Miller about what the recommendations in his report would be, and Mr. Miller understood and agreed with his assessment. Mr. Prager qualified his report by saying the Heritage Tree Code criteria is subject to interpretation and it was up to the Tree Board to make their own decision.

Matt Clemo asked Todd Prager how he estimated the ages of the trees. Mr. Prager said he compared the size of the trees to other Heritage Trees in Portland of the same species and of known age. He also analyzed aerial photos of the site from as far back as the 1930s and saw that the location was a field at that time. He suspected that the red oak was planted and the bigleaf maple sprouted from seed soon after the house was built in the 1960s. This would give both trees an age of about 40-50 years.

Tony Tycer said it would be nice to recognize the bigleaf maple in some way if it does not receive Heritage designation. Todd Prager said that Portland has a significant tree program that recognizes trees in that way on the City's website.

Dennis Sizemore said it sounded like the group had reached consensus to approve the nomination of the red oak and not the bigleaf maple for Heritage status.

Bret Lieuallen said he thought the bigleaf maple should also receive the Heritage Tree designation because of its historic significance. He read a passage from the book Tigardville Tigard which described the original location of the Tigard House on Pacific Highway near Canterbury and referenced maple trees that were planted there by the Tigard family. He said recognizing the bigleaf maple as a Heritage Tree would be a nod to Tigard family history and add a point of interest for visitors to the East Butte neighborhood which includes the Tigard House and East Butte Park.

After considering Mr. Lieuallen's input, the Tree Board unanimously voted to approve both trees as Heritage Trees. Paul Miller clarified that the bigleaf maple on his property cannot be connected to the Tigard family because the house was not originally in its current location. The Tree Board recognized that fact, but still felt it was appropriate to relate the tree with the Tigard family's history of planting maples.

4. Tree Replacement Fund Prioritization Discussion

Dennis Sizemore then asked Todd Prager to describe his report on the Tree Replacement Fund (Attachments 3-8, March 8, 2010 Tree Board Meeting Packet).

Mr. Prager said that at the last meeting, the Tree Board was interested in discussing alternative uses for the Tree Replacement Fund. He said that as background for the discussion, he put together for the Tree Board past tree planting projects and costs, and the five year project budget in the City's Capital Improvement Plan. Mr. Prager said that when he was hired by the City, one of his main tasks was to create a tree planting program that utilized the Tree Replacement Fund. In order to do this, he said he included tree planting in the City's Capital Improvement Plan which requires budgeting on a five year time horizon. He also hired contractors equipped to implement large and complex planting projects.

Mr. Prager added that through the Comprehensive Plan and Urban Forestry Master Plan process, it became clear that the public wanted to know where and how the funds were being utilized. In response to this, he said he was recording GPS coordinates and data on every tree planted that could be loaded into a publically accessible GIS database. He said he was working to link the GIS database with the Finance and Work Order systems so anyone could easily see how much the planting projects cost, and when and what types of maintenance work was being completed.

Tony Tycer said he wanted to go on record that the City should use some of the money to create a tree preservation fund. Dennis Sizemore said that it is important to separate out issues that require a Code change vs. issues that do not. Tony Tycer asked if tree plantings using mitigation funds are required to be in public parks. Todd Prager said

that there is nothing in the Code requiring trees to be planted in public spaces, but that is how the program has historically been implemented. Tony Tycer said he wanted to see the privatization of funds, specifically at the location where trees have been lost. Dennis Sizemore commented that more opportunities will open up as the size of the Tree Replacement Fund grows due to the City's collection efforts.

Bret Lieuallen said he was interested in using the funds for more than just tree planting, and would like to see it used for things like education, outreach, and incentives. Mr. Lieuallen noted that it will be important to convince the Home Builders Association of alternative uses for the fund. Dennis Sizemore added that it will be important to have buy-in from the Home Builders Association before taking a proposal to Council.

Tony Tycer said he disagrees about the efficacy of increasing education spending because there are already education programs available. Bret Lieuallen said that recycling is a good example of how education and outreach can be used to create a viable program that people utilize. Mort Ettelstein agreed but added that recycling has an educational program combined with funding to support curbside pickup. Mr. Ettelstein said that it will be important combine an educational program with funding for people to plant and preserve trees.

David Walsh said that he heard from the group a diverse range of uses for the fund, but Council will ultimately need to decide how the fund is used. Susan Hartnett said that changes to the Development Code on how the fund should be used would be relatively easy to complete, but there will need to be a proposal to Council on what percentages of the fund should be used for things like education, preservation, and planting.

Dennis Sizemore said that in his experience, education is only effective if it actually changes behavior. Mort Ettelstein said it will be important to define who the City is trying to educate, and what the outcomes of the behaviors should be. Susan Hartnett agreed that it will need to be clarified exactly what the major components of the program will be before taking a package to Council. Considerations include public planting, private planting, preservation, education, percentage of total funding, and staffing implications. Mort Ettelstein said it will also be important to determine who will be involved, what institutional arrangements could be made, and if economies of scale could be utilized.

Dennis Sizemore asked Todd Prager to prepare a recommendation based on the Tree Board's discussion. Susan Hartnett interjected that she thought it was premature for staff to draft a proposal because there was not yet consensus by the Board. Mr. Sizemore clarified that his intentions were to get something down in writing that the Tree Board could react to rather than have staff decide which ideas should be funded.

In order to provide staff with more direction, the Tree Board developed the following list of issues/suggestions:

Planting (CIP/Non-CIP)	Preservation	Education	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Continue existing CIP projects -Use non CIP program to fund neighborhood planting on private property -Plant trees on public lands -Plant trees on private lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Protect tree groves using easements -Protect tree groves with fee simple purchases -Use other incentives such as property tax breaks to protect tree groves -Preserve heritage trees -Fund invasive species removal and forest restoration/maintenance -Fund additional design costs for developers willing to preserve trees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Conduct community outreach -Create an invasive tree list -Hold public workshops -Create flyers -Provide online services -Create youtube how-to videos -Provide hazard tree information -Describe proper planting techniques -Support green building industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fund is finite -Need to develop a programmatic approach -Need to be able to measure success -Need to find partners to support implementation and funding -Need to consider staff resources -Need to plan for a 50 year time horizon

Dennis Sizemore commented that some of the items need to be implemented over the short term, and some need to be implemented over the long term. He also said the program will need to be monitored so the City can be sure it is getting value back for what it is investing in. Bret Lieuallen said the City could require mitigation in a number of different ways other than tree planting such as requiring developers to talk to schools about the value of preserving trees. Tony Tycer added that the City could reward developers for preserving trees by reducing mitigation.

Dennis Sizemore asked staff to give the Tree Board feedback on the percent funding for various projects and the timeline for implementation. David Walsh suggested that staff utilize the Urban Forestry Master Plan in making their recommendations because it has already been approved by Council. Susan Hartnett said that necessary staff resources should be factored in and measurement of benefits for things like education will be required. Ms. Hartnett said that the projects will need to be evaluated in the context of time. Bret Lieuallen asked how much work should be put into this before going to Council. Susan Hartnett said that the package could be brought to Council in July or August after budget season.

5. Tree Code Update

At 7:55 p.m., Susan Hartnett explained to the Tree Board that on February 16, 2010 Council chose the comprehensive code update option 1 (Attachment 9, March 8, 2010 Tree Board Meeting Packet). She said the main reasons for their choice was to avoid a disjointed update of the development and municipal codes, to allow for more public involvement, and to allow for technical input (professional peer review).

Tony Tycer asked why should there be an expanded citizen committee to provide input on the code update when the Tree Board is already charged with advising staff on these issues. Susan Hartnett responded that there are other constituencies in the community that want to be involved in the process, and Council's direction was to include a wide range of participants.

Mort Ettlstein asked who will be representing Tigard citizens. Susan Hartnett said that the composition of the citizen advisory committee is still getting worked out, but a proposal will be going to Council for approval on March 23, 2010.

TIGARD TREE BOARD MEETING MINUTES – March 8, 2010

Ms. Hartnett added that the Community Development Department is reorganizing due to budget constraints and the pending retirement of Planning Manager, Dick Bewersdorff. Part of the reorganization involved reassigning work, including making Todd Prager the project manager for the Tree Code Update project. Other supporting staff members will include John Floyd, Marissa Daniels, Darren Wyss, Cheryl Caines, and Gary Pagenstecher.

Tony Tycer recommended the Tree Board provide Dick Bewersdorff a letter of appreciation for his service to the City of Tigard. The rest of the Board agreed.

6. Closing Remarks and Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Sizemore at 8:07 p.m.