

1 **City of Lake Forest Park – Tree Board**
2 **Regular Meeting Notes: June 13, 2018**
3 **17425 Ballinger Way NE—Forest Room**
4

5 **Tree Board Members present:** David Kleweno, Courtney Siebken; Tyson Greer; Tim Hohn, Julia Bent,
6 Gordon Smith

7 **Staff and others present:** Lauren Hoerr, Assistant Planner; Steve Bennett, Planning Director; Greg Murphy,
8 ELM Consultants; Sue Coste-Pasche, ELM Consultants

9 **Members of the Public present:** Mike Dee, resident; Don Fiene, resident; Charlene Bender, resident

10 **Tree Board Members absent:** Karen Hugg, Tom Hanson
11

12 **Call to order:** 7:02 PM
13

14 **Short Reflection:** Shared by Ms. Greer.
15

16 **Approval of Meeting Agenda:**

17 Ms. Greer requested to add “Opportunity Proposal” under New Business. Ms. Siebken motioned to approve
18 the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hohn and approved unanimously.
19

20 **Presentation:**

21 ELM: Discussion on Progress and Next Steps for Canopy Study

22 ELM Consultants explained their production of a 2016 LIDAR model of Lake Forest Park with a critical
23 areas overlay which was compared to the 2009 study. 2009 GIS data was unavailable so a deeper comparison
24 was not possible, but based on the results of the current study, the Tree Board should be able to derive plenty
25 of information. Most importantly, commercial and residential zones are able to be compared to 2009 data.
26

27 2016 LIDAR and satellite imagery is more accurate than the 2009 LIDAR. ELM used 12’ and above and
28 tried to exclude homes or other objects that could seem like a tree. They also took field measurements on
29 some lots to verify the data, which proved that the LIDAR data was within 5% accuracy of the ground-
30 truthing data. There are occasional gaps in parcels where trees definitely exist but satellite data did not find
31 anything and it’s unsure as to why that is. However, the technology is still much better than it was in 2009.

32 **Mr. Bennett agreed to distribute the lots that ELM used for ground-truthing.** Don Fiene commented that
33 there was an effort done after the 2009 study that looked at 125 lots for ground-truthing.
34

35 ELM provided a map that showed canopy coverage percentage of lots – which was LIDAR and tree extents,
36 compared to aerial imagery, with adjustments from ground-truthing, and derived a percentage based on
37 vegetation 12’ and above. Parcels on the lakefront show a lower canopy percentage because the property
38 lines extend into the water. The 2016 map compared to the 2009 map shows more dark green areas (>50%),
39 which may be the increased sensitivity of the technology, and tree growth during that interim.
40

41 ELM explained that the critical areas overlay map uses GIS data downloaded from King County, which is
42 often high-level and does not include buffers. It may be a useful tool for specific lot developments. The
43 zoning map provides and overlay of zoning classifications with canopy coverage percentages by parcel.
44

45 ELM provided a spreadsheet that compares the tree canopy coverage percentage by zone for 2009 and 2016,
46 the change between those years, and the current canopy coverage goals. The percent change is all positive,
47 meaning all zones have increased in canopy coverage since 2009, and the city is meeting or exceeding canopy
48 coverage goals. Mr. Bennett mentioned it might be easy through this data to compare canopy coverage by lot
49 size, which would show how well the tree code is doing in terms of canopy coverage goals. Mr. Murphy said
50 that he can provide this information.
51

1 ELM clarified that the technology does not exist to measure canopy volume or density, only canopy area.
2 Understanding this metric could potentially change the recommended replacement planting list. The city may
3 be able to provide a comparison of ELM's GIS data against future studies.
4

5 ELM clarified that the study could not distinguish between deciduous and evergreen trees. ELM will provide
6 a new document with the revised methodologies (12' rather than 20') and a list of tasks not completed. They
7 will also provide the requested spreadsheets to Mr. Bennett for canopy coverage by lot size comparisons.
8

9 **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

10 May 2nd

11 Ms. Greer said that Ridgecrest Teacher Liz Whitney and the 5th graders should be noted. Mr. Hohn motioned
12 to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bent and approved unanimously.
13

14 **Public Comment:**

15 Mike Dee

16 Mr. Dee mentioned his concerns regarding the Crane property's nest removal without tree removal approval
17 permit. He noted that subdivisions short plats tree tract must equal 15% canopy coverage, but seems like it
18 should be more. Mr. Dee asked if the city arborist is able to change canopy coverage goals. He noted that
19 Accela software should make it easier for citizens to access permits, but until it is working fully he encourages
20 city to post all permits. He believes that the tree ordinance seems weak now. He said that other cities are
21 working on tree ordinances and strategies that make LFP seem average.
22

23 **Next meeting:**

24 The next regular meeting on Wednesday July 4, 2018 was rescheduled for July 11th due to the holiday.
25

26 **Communication:**

27 Follow-up from Council Presentation

28 There were no major work plan changes discussed at the presentation or brought up afterward from
29 Councilmembers, so the Board will continue with the work plan as presented. Ms. Hoerr clarified that formal
30 Council approval of the work plan is not needed.
31

32 Follow-up on Action Items

33 Ms. Bent reported that NUD will discuss the possibility of notifying sewer customers of tree regulations at
34 their Monday meeting. NUD did not think it would be possible to do an LFP specific message.
35

36 Mr. Hohn noted that he spoke to some tree contractors who were removing trees and did not believe it was
37 up to them to be aware of permits, instead that it was only up to the homeowner. Ms. Hoerr believes it is
38 possible in the future to make sure tree contractors re-sign the Tree Preservation Acknowledgement Form
39 each time they renew their annual business license. Ms. Hoerr said she would discuss this possibility with the
40 City staff in charge of licensing.
41

42 **Old Business:**

43 Tree Planting/Maintenance at 178th St City Entrance Sign

44 Ms. Hoerr explained that a large portion of that intersection belongs to Shoreline, so it would require some
45 cooperation of governments in terms of permitting and future maintenance. Mr. Zenk, head of public works,
46 wanted to remind the board to keep sight distances in mind and make sure the design is within code. Ms.
47 Bent agreed to look at the sight distance code. Mr. Hohn agreed to check with Shoreline.
48

49 Educational Insert into Sewer Packet

50 The city would like 1/3 of a page for the insert. Ms. Greer volunteered to write something for it.
51
52

1 Real Estate Education—Tyson Update

2 Mr. Kleweno did some research talking to real estate agents and found out that properties are selling so
3 quickly that it may be difficult to reach agents in time. Mr. Kleweno is still planning to follow up with a
4 Windermere agent regarding the best way to reach people.
5

6 Post-Action Report on Arbor Day Poetry Contest Event 4/28

7 The Board decided that if any members would like to provide feedback, they can email it to Ms. Greer to be
8 added to the document. If it seems like a conversation is needed, Ms. Greer will add it to the next agenda.
9

10 **New Business:**

11 Data Collection on Tree Permits

12 Ms. Hoerr provided a document of the year-to-date tree removal permit data and committed to providing this
13 data to the Tree Board and Council on a monthly basis in the future. Mr. Hohn requested the tracking of the
14 type of replacement trees. Ms. Greer suggested adding a verification column for when each permit's tree
15 replacements have been inspected. Ms. Greer also said it would be good to track if removed trees are
16 hazardous or invasive. Ms. Hoerr mentioned it is a top priority of Ashley's to implement a stronger
17 replacement verification program.
18

19 Tyson's Proposal

20 Ms. Greer explained that Streamkeepers has offered to pay for an intern to help the City compile tree removal
21 data. After discussion, Ms. Greer made a motion for the Board to support investigating the possibility of the
22 city working with an intern for the summer who can compile tree removal data. Mr. Hohn seconded the
23 motion and it was approved unanimously.
24

25 Work Plan Subtasks

26 Mr. Kleweno recommended a project plan that supports the work plan. **He said that he will craft this and
27 bring it to the next meeting.** Mr. Hohn recommended a subcommittee meeting to analyze the tree canopy
28 data and discuss the tree canopy study outcomes. Ms. Hoerr will clarify how to address quorum concerns. A
29 subcommittee meeting was tentatively scheduled for June 27th.
30

31 **Reports and Announcements:**

32 Frontlines with Lauren

33 In response to Mr. Dee's comment, Ms. Hoerr clarified that Notices of Application for a short plat only show
34 a preliminary plat that has not been fully approved. While the preliminary plat only has to show the 15% tree
35 tract, the applicants are aware that 28% canopy will need to be met prior to the homes receiving final
36 occupancy. Ms. Hoerr noted that the Crane notice will be published on Monday.
37

38 **Agenda for Next Meeting:**

39 Report from City Arborist Ashley Adams; Tree Board Member Replacement for Ms. Hugg; Street Tree
40 Project; NUD update; Real Estate update; Canopy Study Discussion; Project Plan for Work Plan
41

42 **Adjournment:** 9:02 PM
43

44 APPROVED:

45 _____
46 David Kleweno, Chair
47