

# Camas Urban Tree Program

Staff Report – July 27, 2018

DRAFT

**Contributing City Staff:** Sarah Fox; Anita Ashton; James Carothers; Bob Cunningham; Denis Ryan; Jeff Englund; Jerry Acheson; Jim Gant; Lauren Hollenbeck; Phil Bourquin; Randy Miller; Robert Maul and Tami Strunk.

**Urban Tree Program Ad Hoc Committee:** Bonnie Carter (City Council); Charles Ray (City of Vancouver Forester); Damon Webster (Mackay & Sposito); Hunter Decker (Clark County Parks); Lynn Johnston (Johnston Dairy); Patty Barnard (Citizen); Troy Hull (Planning Commissioner); and Cassi Marshall (Camas Parks Commission).

**Consultants:** Dorothy Abeyta, Ruth Williams, Tina McKeand, Ian Lefcourte, Ian Scott --- all of Davey Resource Group

*This project is funded in part through a grant from Washington Department of Natural Resources.*



# Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Recommendation.....	3
Background .....	4
Community Vision.....	5
City Tree Account.....	6
(New) Chapter 3.54 City Tree Fund .....	6
<b>Proposed Amendments to City's Fee Schedule.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Attachment "A" .....	7
<b>Street Tree Removal.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Chapter 12.04 - Sidewalk and Street Tree Maintenance .....	7
<b>Trees in Parks.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Chapter 12.32 - Park Rules and Regulations .....	8
<b>Trees in Critical areas.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Chapter 16.51 General provisions for Critical Areas.....	8
<b>Trees &amp; Development.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Amendments to Title 17 Land Development.....	9
Chapter 18.03 – Definitions .....	10
Chapter 18.09 – Density and Dimensions.....	10
Chapter 18.13 Landscaping .....	10
(Repeal) Chapter 18.31 – SENSITIVE AREAS AND OPEN SPACE .....	17
Attachment "B" .....	18
<b>Comments Received on Draft Urban Tree Program.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Attachment "C" .....	31
<b>Camas Post Record.....</b>	<b>31</b>

# Executive Summary

The city has held two public hearings to date. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on May 15, 2018 to review the proposed draft of the Camas Urban Tree Program. After public testimony and deliberation, the Commission directed staff to do more outreach to the developers. In response to this directive, staff reached out to the following companies to ask for their feedback on the

**Camas (circa. 1967)**



draft Urban Tree Program and met with several

of them: AKS Engineering; BIA of Clark County; Clark Land Design; Olson Engineering; PBS Engineering; Torvale; Arborscape; Cascade Tree Works; Waverly Homes; New Day Arborist and Landerholm. Staff included the above mentioned developers along with the required local and state agencies when sending out the State Environmental Policy Act Determination of Non-significance (non-project action) on May 24, 2018. The deadline for appeal was June 7, 2018, and no appeals were filed. In addition to the required public notices, the Camas-Post Record, published an article in regard to the program on May 31<sup>st</sup> (Attachment "C"), and the city posted updates on Facebook. Public notices were published in the Post Record on May 3, June 7, July 12, and July 26, 2018 (Legal Publication numbers 605736, 608128, and 610293).

At the public hearing on June 19, 2018, Planning Commission unanimously recommended that the Camas Urban Tree Program be forwarded to City Council for approval. Their recommendation and corrections are included in the attached draft (Attachment A). *Their recommendation included two changes that are found on pages 9 and 13 of this document.*

The city has received public comments throughout the evolution of the development of the draft over the past two years. Those that have contacted the city at the writing of this report are compiled in Attachment B.

**In summary, the attached amendments to the Camas Municipal Code will accomplish the following towards a comprehensive urban tree program for the citizens and their city:**

1. Make progress toward achieving the goals of the comprehensive plan, in particular, "To protect Camas' native landscape and mature tree cover." Goal NE 4
2. Define a street tree.
3. Define the process of street tree removal and replacement.
4. Provide for consistent penalties for illegal removal of park and public trees.
5. Clarify process for protection of trees with new developments.
6. Create alignment from one code chapter to another.

## Recommendation

The Planning Commission forwards a recommendation to adopt the Camas Urban Tree Program.

# Background

The goals and policies of Camas 2035 are intended to guide our future efforts to close the gaps between where we are as a community today and where we would like to be in the next twenty years.

Current development standards require an investment in street trees, as new lots must plant a street tree and commercial developments must include new trees to shade paved areas. However, there are *no standards in place to protect that investment*. The city does not have a street tree removal permit, nor does the city require replanting of street trees once they are removed. The city does not have a program to compensate for the loss of tree canopy cover, nor a program to educate the public on tree management.

The **Camas 2035** Comprehensive Plan was adopted in June 2016. It describes specific goals and policies related to urban forest canopy, parks, and community education. Several of the goals and policies are **not** currently supported by regulations in Camas' existing municipal code.

For these reasons, the city applied and was awarded a grant from the Department of Natural Resources (June 6, 2016) to develop an Urban Tree Program (Agreement #IAA 16-338). The grant period runs until May 31, 2018, and is a 50% cost share with the City.

The work plan for the Urban Tree Program included the following:

## June 2016 to December 2016

- Workshops before Planning Commission and City Council [June 6<sup>th</sup> ; October 3<sup>rd</sup> ; November 21<sup>st</sup> ]
- Develop a work plan and hire a consultant

## January to June 2017

- Current zoning diagnosis was conducted. The task included reviewing the Camas 2035 comprehensive plan goals and policies to ensure the proposed codes will be consistent;
- Formed an ad hoc committee. Urban Tree Ad Hoc Committee members were vetted by executive staff and approved by Mayor Higgins prior to invitation to the committee.
- Conducted outreach with a community survey and interviewed key stakeholders.
- Over 250 community members provided feedback through an online survey that was available March 30 through May 12, 2017. The online survey collected qualitative information about public perception of tree protection, tree species preferences, and about the concept of street tree removal permitting. Eighty-two citizens signed up for project updates.

## June to December 2017

- Drafted a tree ordinance and updated the Design Standards Manual.
- Outreach to the community at Camas Days to test initial Ad Hoc Committee ideas and ask more questions.
- Workshops before Planning Commission [October 17<sup>th</sup> and December 12<sup>th</sup>] and City Council [November 6<sup>th</sup> and December 4<sup>th</sup>] to update them on progress and discuss specific ideas that emerged from work with ad hoc committee.

## January 2018 to Present

- Public notices published and emails were sent to 82 interested citizens regarding the upcoming public workshops and hearings.
- Draft Urban Tree Program brought to Planning Commission workshop on March 20<sup>th</sup>
- Draft Urban Tree Program will be brought to City Council workshop on June 18<sup>th</sup>
- Public Hearings with Planning Commission on May 15<sup>th</sup> and June 19<sup>th</sup>

# Community Vision

The Camas 2035 Comprehensive Plan (2016) provides guidance for trees, landscaping, and development. Specific goals and policies that concern the city's trees include:

*Goal LU-4: Develop an interconnected network of parks, trails, and open space to support wildlife corridors and natural resources and enhance the quality of life for Camas residents and visitors.*

**LU-4.1:** Maintain development regulations that encourage the preservation of trees and natural areas, including the use of density bonuses to protect sensitive areas and encourage tree replacement.

**LU-4.2:** Support the purchase by the City, or the dedication and preservation by private owners, of open space and encourage careful consideration and integration of the natural environment in any planning activity to perpetuate the park-like setting of Camas.

**LU-4.3:** Encourage regional trail connectivity and increased access throughout the City to support multi-modal transportation and physical activity.

**LU-4.4:** Development on the edges of the City adjacent to unincorporated land in agricultural use or in a forested or natural state should consider those adjacent uses and, where appropriate, provide buffers.

*Goal NE 4: To protect Camas' native landscape and mature tree cover.*

**NE-4.1:** Encourage the use of native plants in residential, commercial, and industrial landscapes in order to increase the implementation of low-impact site design.

**NE-4.2:** Prioritize management to eradicate aggressive non-native vegetation species.

**NE-4.3:** Analyze the tree canopy citywide and create a plan to encourage retention of significant tree cover.

**NE-4.4:** Develop a program to compensate for the loss of tree canopy coverage, when retention of mature trees within development sites is impractical.

**NE-4.5:** Develop a program of community education regarding healthy tree management and support the management of urban forest areas.

# City Tree Account

## (New) Chapter 3.54 City Tree Fund

### 3.54.010 Created City Tree Fund

A. There is created a city tree fund into which all penalties and revenues received for tree protection under Chapters 12.04 Sidewalk and Street Tree Maintenance; 16.51 General Provisions for Critical Areas; and Chapter 18.13 Landscaping shall be placed. In addition the following sources of funds may be placed in the city's tree fund:

1. Street tree permit fees;
2. Donations and grants for the purposes of the fund;
3. Sale of trees or wood from city property where the proceeds from such sale have not been dedicated to another purpose;
4. Civil penalties imposed under Chapters 12.04, 16.51 and 18.13, or settlements in lieu of penalties.

B. The city shall use the city tree fund for the following purposes:

1. Acquiring, maintaining, and preserving areas of healthy soil and native vegetation within the city;
2. Planting and maintaining trees within the city to compensate for loss of canopy coverage;
3. Support community urban forestry education
4. Support the management of urban forest areas to include eradicating aggressive non-native vegetation species;
5. Other purposes relating to trees as determined by city council.

## Proposed Amendments to City's Fee Schedule

The proposed amount for civil infractions for illegal tree removal is based on the cost of a replacement tree and the size of the tree removed. A replacement tree must be at least a two-inch caliper and costs approximately \$250 to plant. No fee is proposed at this time for a tree removal permit, as this new permit will reduce the amount of staff time **currently** spent when an inquiry is sent to several staff from various departments for a response. It is expected that the permit will provide a streamlined process for tree removal inquiries that are regularly received. For all of these reasons, the following amendments are proposed to the city's fee schedule, to include no initial fees for tree removal permits.

Purpose		Proposed Fee		
1. Tree Removal Permit		No fee if tree(s) is replaced within six months.		
2. Tree Removal Infractions (measured as diameter at breast height “dbh”)				
	2” to 6”	\$250	25” – 30”	\$750
	7” to 12”	\$375	31” – 36”	\$875
	13” – 18”	\$500	Greater than 37”	\$1,000
	19” – 24”	\$625		

# Attachment "A"

- Recommended additions are shown in underlined text.
- Recommended deletions are shown ~~struck through~~.

Please check online for the **entirety** of the chapters of Camas Municipal Code (CMC) that are being proposed for modification. When a section of CMC is not included, then no amendments to that section are proposed.

## Street Tree Removal

In Camas, street tree pruning and removal is generally at the discretion of the adjacent property owner. This means that when street trees are removed, the city has no enforcement power to require replacement. Over the years, the city has received an increasing number of inquiries about street tree removal permitting, as it is a common requirement in other communities. Typically street tree removal permits are a mechanism to require replacement and to monitor the city's tree infrastructure.

Recommended changes to implement this permit process would primarily be within Chapter 12.04 at Sidewalk Maintenance. The chapter would be re-titled as "Sidewalk and Street Tree Maintenance". Only the following sections were proposed to be amended: 12.04.010; and 12.04.025 (new).

### Chapter 12.04 - Sidewalk and Street Tree Maintenance

**12.04.010 – Definitions.** For the purposes of this chapter:

- A. All property having a frontage ~~upon the sides or margin~~ on the edge of the right-of-way of any street shall be deemed to be "abutting property" and such property shall be chargeable as provided for by this chapter for all costs or maintenance, repairs or renewal of any form of sidewalk or landscaping improvement between the right-of-way street margin ~~lying in front of and adjacent to the property.~~
- B. "Sidewalk" shall be taken to include ~~all structures or forms of street improvement included in the space between the street margin and~~ any street improvement included in the space between the property line and the improved roadway.
- C. A "street tree" is any tree located in the planter strip of the right of way, unless designated in another location as noted on the face of a plat, or other approved development plan. The planter strip is typically located between the curb and the sidewalk.

### 12.04.025 – Street Tree Permit Required for Removal

1. Persons seeking to remove street trees from the right of way, shall first obtain a permit from the city.
  1. An application for such permit may be required to include the following information relating to the proposed removal of the tree: location; species and size; proposed schedule of removal; and photos of tree.
  2. The city may collect a fee for tree permits and the amount will be set forth in the city's fee schedule.
  3. Tree topping is prohibited and is considered to be a form of removal. Topping is the cutting of tree branches to stubs or to lateral branches that are not large enough to assume the terminal role, and contribute to a future hazardous condition or death of the tree.
  4. Tree replacement may be a condition of tree removal permitting. If required, the tree must be replaced by the adjacent property owner or their agent within six (6) months of removal. The replacement tree may be in an alternative location than in the planter strip of the right-of-way as long the alternative location is approved by the city.
2. Street Tree Permit Exemptions.
  1. When pruning or removal is performed by municipal crews and is necessary to maintain clearance for public rights of way.

2. Hazardous trees determined to pose an imminent threat or danger to public health or safety, or to public or private property, may be removed prior to receiving written permit approval from the city; provided, that city staff or an arborist documents the hazard with photos. The landowner must submit proof of hazard to the city within fourteen days.
3. Enforcement and penalties.
  1. A person who fails to comply with the requirements of the tree permit, who removes a street tree without obtaining a permit, or fails to comply with a stop work order issued under this section may also be subject to a civil infraction as set forth in the city's fee schedule.
  2. Each day that a violation of the requirements of this chapter continues may constitute a separate infraction. In addition, each unlawfully destroyed tree may constitute a separate infraction. Any person who aids or abets in the violation shall be considered to have committed a violation for purposes of the civil penalty.

## Trees in Parks

### Chapter 12.32 - Park Rules and Regulations

#### 12.32.030 - Destruction of Plant Life and Natural Surroundings

No person shall in any park without prior written authorization from the city:

- A. Cut, break, injure, destroy, take or remove any tree, shrub, timber, plant or natural object in any park.
- B. Remove any earth, boulders, gravel or sand ~~without written permission of the public works department.~~

#### 12.32.220 - Penalty

A. It is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine one thousand dollars and/or ninety days incarceration in the county jail to commit any act made unlawful under Camas Municipal Code Sections 12.32.020, 12.32.130, 12.32.140, 12.32.145A, 12.32.145B, and 12.32.150.

B. It is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine as described in the city fee schedule and/or ninety days incarceration in the county jail to commit any act made unlawful under Camas Municipal Code Section 12.32.030.

BC. All other violations of any provision of this chapter are deemed a non-traffic infraction for which a notice of infraction may be issued. Any person found to have committed an infraction under this chapter shall be assessed a monetary penalty not to exceed two hundred fifty dollars

D. Restoration. Violators of this chapter shall be responsible for restoring unlawfully damaged areas in conformance with a plan approved by a Planning Official, which provides for repair of any environmental and property damage, and restoration of the site; and which results in a site condition that, to the extent practical, equals the site conditions that would have existed in the absence of the violation(s). Restoration costs will be based on the city appraised value of unapproved trees removed using the most current edition of Guide for Plant Appraisal (International Society of Arboriculture Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers). The amount of appraisal costs that exceed the approved restoration plan costs will be paid into the city's Tree Fund.

## Trees in Critical areas

### Chapter 16.51 General provisions for Critical Areas

#### 16.51.200 - Unauthorized critical area alterations and enforcement.

C. Minimum Performance Standards for Restoration.

1. For alterations to critical aquifer recharge areas and frequently flooded areas, the following minimum performance standards shall be met for the restoration of a critical area, provided that if the violator can demonstrate that greater functional and habitat values can be obtained, these standards may be modified:
  - a. The historic structural and functional values shall be restored, including water quality and habitat functions;

- b. The historic soil types and configuration shall be replicated;
- c. The critical area and management zones shall be replanted with native vegetation that replicates the vegetation historically found on the site in species types, sizes, and densities; and
- d. The historic functions and values should be replicated at the location of the alteration.
- e. Annual monitoring reports shall be sent to the planning division regarding the success of the required mitigation for a period of five years following the installation of the mitigation. Corrective measures shall be taken if monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met.

2. For alterations to frequently flooded and geological hazardous areas, the following minimum performance standards shall be met for the restoration of a critical area, provided that, if the violator can demonstrate that greater safety can be obtained, these standards may be modified:

- a. The hazard shall be reduced to a level equal to, or less than, the predevelopment hazard;
- b. Any risk of personal injury resulting from the alteration shall be eliminated or minimized; and
- c. The hazard area and management zones shall be replanted with native vegetation sufficient to minimize the hazard.
- d. Annual monitoring reports regarding the success of the required mitigation for a period of five years following the installation of the mitigation shall be sent to the planning division. Corrective measures shall be taken if monitoring indicates that the performance standards are not being met.

3. For unauthorized tree removal within any critical area and associated buffer area, the violator will be subject to a fine established in the city's fee schedule and must plant new trees at a ratio of two replacement trees for each tree felled,<sup>1</sup> within one year in accordance with an approved plan.

#### D. Enforcement.

- 1. Any person, firm, or corporation who knowingly violates or fails to comply with any term or provision of this chapter shall be deemed to have committed a misdemeanor, and if found guilty shall be subject to a fine as set forth in the city's fee schedule, or imprisonment (not to exceed 90 days), or both. Each day shall be a separate offence.
- 2. As an additional concurrent penalty, it shall be a civil infraction for a person, firm, or corporation to violate or fail to comply with any term or provision of this chapter. A person, firm, or corporation found to have committed a civil infraction shall be assessed a monetary penalty as adopted with the city's fee schedule.

## Trees & Development

### Amendments to Title 17 Land Development

The following is a list of the sections that would need to be amended if Chapter 18.31 were to be repealed:

#### Title 17 Land Development

**Note: Only the code references are being changed if Chapter 18.31 is repealed.**

17.09.030 - Preliminary short plat approval.

(B)(5)(p) A survey of existing significant trees as required under CMC Section 18.13.045-~~18.31.080~~;

17.11.030 - Preliminary subdivision plat approval.

(B)(5) A survey of existing significant trees as required under CMC Section ~~18.31.080~~ 18.13.045;

17.15.030 - Preliminary binding site plan (BSP) approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> Comma was added as recommended by Planning Commission.

(B)(4) A survey of existing trees as required under CMC Section ~~18.31.080~~ 18.13.045;  
17.19.030 - Tract, block and lot standards.

(A)(2) Vegetation. In addition to meeting the requirements of CMC Section 18.13.045~~18.31.080~~;

## Chapter 18.03 – Definitions

### 18.03.030 – Definitions for Land Uses

Vision Clearance Hazard – an object that interferes with vision near intersections of roadways and motor vehicle access points where a clear field of vision is required for traffic safety and to maintain adequate sight distance. See also “Vision clearance area” design provisions at Section 18.17.030.

### 18.03.040 – Environmental definitions.

“Significant trees” means evergreen trees eight inches DBH, and deciduous trees ~~other than red alder or cottonwood,~~ twelve inches DBH. Does not include hazard trees or invasive species.

“Critical root zone” is the area of soil around a tree trunk where roots are located that provide stability and uptake of water and minerals required for tree survival.

“Hazard Tree”. A hazard tree is any tree with a combination of structural defect and/or disease, which makes it subject to a high probability of failure and a proximity to persons or property which makes it an imminent threat.

“Tree protection zone” is an arborist-defined area surrounding the trunk intended to protect roots and soil within the critical root zone and beyond, to ensure future tree health and stability. Tree protection zones may be calculated based on multiplying the tree’s DBH by a factor of 12 depending on the tree’s species and tolerance of root disturbance.

“Diameter at Breast Height” (DBH) means the diameter of the tree measured at 4’6” above soil grade.

## Chapter 18.09 – Density and Dimensions

### 18.09.060 - Density transfers.

D. Where a tract under "C" above, includes one-half acre or more of contiguous area, the city may provide additional or negotiated flexibility in lot sizes, lot width, or depth, or setback standards. In no case shall the maximum density of the overall site be exceeded. The city may, also provide the landowner with:

1. A credit against park and open space impact fees per Chapter 3.88; or
2. Cash from the parks and open space impact fee fund or other public fund.

## Chapter 18.13 Landscaping

18.13.010 Purpose

18.13.020 Scope

18.13.025 Exemptions

18.13.030 Expansion **(no amendments proposed)**

18.13.040 Procedure for Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plans

18.13.045 Tree Survey

18.13.050 Landscaping Standards

18.13.051 Tree Density Requirement

18.13.052 Tree and Native Vegetation Preservation

18.13.055 Landscape buffering standards

18.13.060 Parking areas

18.13.070 Assurance device **(no amendments proposed)**

### 18.13.010 - Purpose.

A. To establish minimum standards for landscaping in order to provide screening between incompatible land uses, minimize the visual impact of paved areas, provide for shade, and minimize erosion; and

B. To implement the city's comprehensive plan goals which include preserving natural beauty in the city, and protecting Camas' native landscape and mature tree cover.

#### **18.13.020 Scope**

A. Unless otherwise exempted, the standards of this chapter shall apply to any site to be developed. All applicable development activities shall be required to prepare a landscape plan and shall be required to meet the minimum tree density herein created.

B. The standards of this chapter shall apply to the following:

2. Commercial, industrial, governmental uses, and land divisions;
3. Redevelopment including change of use when Site Plan Review is applicable (refer to Chapter 18.18 Site Plan Review);
4. Parking lots with greater than four spaces;
5. Development that is subject to Design Review (refer to Chapter 18.19 Design Review);
6. Undeveloped property converting to an allowed use in the zone (e.g. infill lots); and
7. Conditional uses. The standards for landscaping will be the same as the landscaping standards in commercial zones if conditional use will occur in a residential zone.

#### **18.13.025 - Exemptions**

The following activities are exempt from submittal of a Landscape Tree and Vegetation Plan:

A. Commercial Nurseries. Removal of trees and vegetation which are being grown to be sold as landscape trees.

B. Forest Practices Permit. Removal of trees as allowed with a forest practices permit issued by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources. Exemption does not include conversion of forest land to other uses.

C. Developed Residential Lots. Removal of ~~tree~~s-trees on lots which: (1) are less than 24,000 square feet with an existing residential unit; (2) which cannot be further divided in accordance with the underlying zoning district; and (3) trees to be removed are not within shoreline areas or critical areas.

D. Undeveloped property and developed lots (24,000 square feet and greater). Removal of up to 6 trees per acre, up to a total of 6 trees within any 12 consecutive month period when: (1) the property is intended to remain undeveloped for a period of six years and such intent is recorded in a covenant; (2) if a minimum tree density of 30 tree units per acre is maintained; and (3) the trees to be removed are not within shoreline areas or critical areas. Removal of trees on parcels of less than one acre in size shall be limited in proportion to six trees per acre (e.g. a half acre parcel can remove 3 trees).

E. Downtown commercial zone. Downtown commercial zone properties must include properly spaced street trees, and other landscape screening in accordance with downtown design review standards, but are not required to meet tree density minimums.

F. Minor development. A Landscape, Tree and Vegetation plan is not required for any site disturbance less than 500 square feet and where no tree will be removed or adjacent tree(s) impacted.

#### **18.13.040 – Procedure for Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plans.**

- A. Applicants shall submit a detailed Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plan with building and site improvement plans. Included in the plans (at a minimum) shall be type, size, and location of plants and materials.
- B. A tree survey must be included for any applicable development proposing to remove trees.

#### **18.13.045 – Tree Survey**

A. The applicant must submit a tree survey that is prepared by a certified arborist or professional forester.

B. A tree survey must contain the following:

## 1. Inventory.

- a. Map of the site, with tree locations numbered
- b. Include all significant trees that will be impacted by the proposed development, which may include trees off-site if canopies overhang the subject property. Open space tracts to be set aside for conservation purposes do not need to be included in survey.
- c. Provide the common and scientific name of inventoried trees.

## 2. Assessment.

- a. Size. Measure and provide the diameter at breast height (DBH).
- b. Tree protection zone. (Refer to CMC 18.03.050 Environmental Definitions)
- c. Tree health. An overall assessment of the trees structural stability and failure potential based on specific structural features (e.g. decay, conks, co-dominate trunks, abnormal lean) and rated as good, fair or poor.
- d. Recommendation for preservation or removal. The recommendation will consider proposed grading, trenching, paving, fencing and other construction plans.
- e. If hazardous, then an evaluation of hazardous trees will include a numerical value of hazard based on the following: failure potential; size of part most likely to fail; and distance to target (e.g. new residence).

### 18.13.050 - Standards for Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plans.

**Note:** No changes proposed to Subsections A, F, H, I, J, K or L.

A. The property owner shall be responsible for any future damage to a street, curb, or sidewalk caused by landscaping.

B. Landscaping and trees shall be selected and located to deter sound, filter air contaminants, curtail erosion, minimize stormwater run-off, contribute to living privacy, reduce the visual impacts of large buildings and paved areas, screen, and emphasize or separate outdoor spaces of different uses or character.

~~C. Minimum landscaping as a percent of gross site area shall be as follows:~~

<del>Zone</del>	<del>Percent of Landscaping Required</del>
<del>HI</del>	<del>20%</del>
<del>RC, LI</del>	<del>15%</del>
<del>CC</del>	<del>15%</del>
<del>MX</del>	<del>15%</del>
<del>NC, MF</del>	<del>10% on lots less than 10,000 square feet; 15% on lots greater than 10,000 square feet</del>
<del>BP</del>	<del>(see Section 18.37.040 "Landscaping standards")</del>
<del>LI/BP</del>	<del>(see Section 18.21.070 "Landscaping standards")</del>
<del>Parking lots</del>	<del>(see Section 18.13.060 of this chapter)</del>

C. Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plan must include a combination of trees, shrubs, and ground cover to achieve the purposes of this chapter.

1. Required landscaping shall be comprised of a minimum of sixty (60) percent native vegetation (or adapted to northwest climate), or drought-tolerant vegetation, and fifty (50) percent evergreen.

2. Deciduous trees shall have straight trunks, be fully branched, have a minimum caliper of two inches, be equivalent to a fifteen-gallon container size, and be adequately staked for planting.

3. Evergreen trees shall be a minimum of five feet in height, fully branched, and adequately staked for planting.

D. Street trees will be required as part of the frontage improvements. Species, size and spacing of the trees must be consistent with the Design Standards Manual. Unless otherwise specified, trees must generally be spaced 30-feet apart. Substitute varieties are subject to approval by the City of Camas.

E. Proposed vegetation cannot be an invasive species as listed within the most current edition of the Clark County Noxious Weed List (e.g. English Ivy cultivars).

- F. Shrubs shall be a minimum of five-gallon pot size. Upright shrubs shall have a minimum height at planting of eighteen inches. Spreading shrubs at planting shall have a minimum width of eighteen inches (smaller shrub sizes may be approved where it is more appropriate within a particular landscape plan).
- G. Ground cover, defined as living material and not including bark chips or other mulch, shall be from containers of one gallon or larger. Plants shall be planted and spaced in a triangular pattern which will result in eighty (80) percent cover in three (3) years. Lawn cannot be the primary ground cover within required landscape buffers unless approved for stormwater conveyance. Grass species, if used as ground cover, shall be native or drought-tolerant, and appropriate for the use of the area.
- H. Appropriate measures shall be taken, e.g., installation of irrigation system, to assure landscaping success. If plantings fail to survive, it is the responsibility of the property owner to replace them.
- I. Required trees, as they grow, shall be pruned in accordance with the International Society of Arboriculture. The pruned tree will provide at least eight feet of clearance above sidewalks and twelve feet above street roadway surfaces.
- J. Existing trees may be used as street trees if there will be no damage from the development which will kill or weaken the tree. Sidewalks of variable width and elevation may be utilized to save existing street trees, subject to approval by the city.
- K. Vision clearance hazards shall be prohibited.
- L. Street trees and other required landscaping which dies or is removed, must be replaced within one year of death or removal. Replacement street trees may be an alternative species from the city's recommended tree list, and may be in a different location as approved by the city.

#### **18.13.051 Minimum Tree Density Requirement.**

A. Tree Density. A minimum tree density per net acre is required and must be incorporated within the overall landscape plan. The tree density may consist of existing trees, replacement trees or a combination of existing and replacement trees, pursuant to the priority established in Section 18.13.052.

18.13.051 Table 1: Required Tree Density

Proposed Activity	Required Minimum Tree Density per Net <sup>2</sup> Acre	Required Tree Replacement
<b>New Development</b>	20 Tree Units	20 Tree Units per acre
<b>Residential</b>	20 Tree Units	20 Tree Units per acre
<b>Developed commercial and industrial properties</b>	20 Tree Units	3 Tree Units for every 1 tree unit removed up to the minimum tree density per acre.

B. Tree Density Calculation. Specific instructions on how to perform tree density calculations are provided in the Design Standards Manual. "Tree Unit" is a unit of measurement based upon the size of the diameter of the tree measured at the breast height ("dbh"). New trees are given a value of one (1 Tree Unit, as they must be a minimum of 2" dbh when planted. Tree Unit values are summarized in the following Table:

<sup>2</sup> Added the term "net" to the title of the column as recommended by Planning Commission.

18.13.051 Table 2: Tree Units for Existing Trees

Diameter at Breast Height "dbh"	Tree Units	Diameter at Breast Height "dbh"	Tree Units
1" to 5"	1	31" to 32"	12
6" to 12"	2	33" to 34"	13
13" to 14"	3	35" to 36"	14
15" to 16"	4	37" to 38"	15
17" to 18"	5	39" to 40"	16
19" to 20"	6	41" to 42"	17
21" to 22"	7	43" to 44"	18
23" to 24"	8	45" to 46"	19
25" to 26"	9	47" to 48"	20
27" to 28"	10	49" to 50"	21
29" to 30"	11	For larger trees, allow a ½ tree unit for every additional inch of dbh.	

#### 18.13.052 Tree and Native Vegetation Preservation

A. When determining where to retain or plant trees, locations with healthy soils, native understory vegetation, and mature trees shall have priority when there are feasible alternative locations on site for proposed buildings and site improvements to achieve the minimum tree unit density per acre. This may require site redesign. Provided, where necessary, density transfer areas may be used to ensure protection and retention of trees.

B. In designing a development project and in meeting the required tree density, the applicant must provide a Landscape, Tree and Vegetation plan that retains healthy, wind firm trees in the following priority:

1. Trees located within critical area buffers. Trees must be identified within a protected tract.
2. Significant wildlife habitat, or areas adjacent and buffering habitat.
3. Significant trees that are greater than 36 inch dbh.
4. Groves of trees, or other individual healthy trees with the intent to retain, must be located in separate tract if part of a land division, or other protective mechanism if other development type.
5. Trees, that if removed would cause trees on adjacent properties to become hazardous.

C. Mitigation and Replacement. In areas where there are currently inadequate numbers of existing trees to meet minimum tree density, where the trees are inappropriate for preservation, the soils are poor, or there are significant invasive species, then mitigation shall be required to meet the minimum tree density. The applicant's proposed location for replacement trees or mitigation shall be subject to the city's approval of the Landscape Plan. Replacement trees shall be planted in the following priority:

1. Onsite.
  - a. Within or adjacent to critical area buffers or wildlife habitat areas
  - b. Adjacent to stormwater facilities
  - c. Landscaping tracts, such as at entrances, traffic islands or other common areas
  - d. Removal of invasive species and restorative native vegetation planting equivalent to the area necessary for new tree planting.
2. City tree fund. When on-site locations are unavailable or infeasible, then the applicant can pay an amount equal to the market value of the replacement trees into the city's tree fund.

### 18.13.055 - Landscape buffering standards.

A. Landscape buffers shall be in compliance with the below referenced table:

**Table 1—Landscape Buffers**

Abutting zone ►	Residential		Commercial		Business Park		Industrial	
Uses on Site ▼	Not Separated by a Street	Separated by a Street	Not Separated by a Street	Separated by a Street	Not Separated by a Street	Separated by a Street	Not Separated by a Street	Separated by a Street
<b>Multifamily Residential</b>	5' L1	5' L1	10' L3	10' L2	10' L2	10' L2	10' L2 w/F2 Fence	10' L3
<b>Commercial</b>	10' L3	5' L2	5' L1	5' L2	5' L2	5' L2	10' L3	10' L2
<b>Industrial</b>	10' L2 w/F2 Fence	<u>10'</u> L2	<u>10'</u> L3	<u>10'</u> L2	10' L3	<u>5'</u> L2	5' L2	5' L1

B. Landscaping and Screening Design Standards. **Note: No amendments are proposed to this Section.**

#### 1. L1, General Landscaping.

- Intent. The L1 standard is intended to be used where distance is the principal means of separating uses or development, and landscaping enhances the area between them. The L1 standard consists principally of groundcover plants; trees and high and low shrubs also are required.
- Required Materials. There are two ways to provide trees and shrubs to comply with an L1 standard. Shrubs and trees may be grouped. Groundcover plants, grass lawn, or approved flowers must fully cover the landscaped area not in shrubs and trees.

#### 2. L2, Low Screen.

- The standard is applied where a low level of screening sufficiently reduces the impact of a use or development, or where visibility between areas is more important than a greater visual screen.
- Required Materials. The L2 standard requires enough low shrubs to form a continuous screen three feet high and ninety-five percent opaque year-round. In addition, one tree is required per thirty lineal feet of landscaped area, or as appropriate to provide a tree canopy over the landscaped area. Groundcover plants must fully cover the remainder of the landscaped area. A three-foot high masonry wall or fence at an F2 standard may be substituted for shrubs, but the trees and groundcover plants are still required.

#### 3. L3, High Screen.

- The L3 standard provides physical and visual separation between uses or development principally using screening. It is used where such separation is warranted by a proposed development, notwithstanding loss of direct views.
- Required Materials. The L3 standard requires enough high shrubs to form a screen six feet high and ninety-five percent opaque year-round. In addition, one tree is required per thirty lineal feet of landscaped area, or as appropriate to provide a tree canopy over the landscaped area. Groundcover plants must fully cover the remainder of the landscaped area. A six-foot high wall or fence that complies with an F1 or F2 standard may be substituted for shrubs, but the trees and groundcover plants are still required. When applied along street lot lines, the screen or wall is to be placed along the interior side of the landscaped area.

#### 4. Fences.


##### a. F1, Partially Sight-Obscuring Fence.

- Intent. The F1 fence standard provides partial visual separation. The standard is applied where a proposed use or development has little impact, or where visibility between areas is more important than a total visual screen.


- ii. Required Materials. A fence or wall that complies with the F1 standard shall be six feet high, and at least fifty percent sight-obscuring. Fences may be made of wood, metal, bricks, masonry, or other permanent materials.
  - b. F2, Fully Sight-Obscuring Fence.
    - i. Intent. The F2 fence standard provides visual separation where complete screening is needed to protect abutting uses, and landscaping alone cannot provide that separation.
    - ii. Required Materials. A fence or wall that complies with the F2 standard shall be six feet high, and one hundred percent sight obscuring. Fences may be made of wood, metal, bricks, masonry or other permanent materials.
5. The applicant may provide landscaping and screening that exceeds the standards in this chapter provided:
- a. A fence or wall (or a combination of a berm and fence or wall), may not exceed a height of six feet above the finished grade at the base of the fence or wall (or at the base of a berm, if combined with one), unless the approval authority finds additional height is necessary to mitigate potential adverse effects of the proposed use, or other uses in the vicinity; and landscaping and screening shall not create vision clearance hazards.
  - b. The community development director may approve use of existing vegetation to fulfill landscaping and screening requirements of this chapter, if that existing landscaping provides at least an equivalent level of screening as the standard required for the development in question.
  - c. Required landscaping and screening shall be located on the perimeter of a lot or parcel. Required landscaping and screening shall not be located on a public right-of-way or private street easement.

#### 18.13.060 - Parking areas.

- A. Parking areas are to be landscaped at all perimeters.
- B. All parking areas shall provide interior landscaping for shade and visual relief.
- C. Parking lots shall include a minimum ratio of one tree per six parking spaces ~~or one tree per three single-loaded stalls~~. (See Figure 18.13.060-1).



(New) Figure 18.13.060-1 Example of Parking Lot Planter Areas. In this example, there are three medium-sized trees (“A”) for 18 parking spaces, with ground cover (“B”) and shrubs (“C”).



**Figure 18.13-1 Parking Lot Planting Islands**



**Figure 18.13-2 Parking Lot Landscape Divider Strip**

- D. Planter strips (medians) and tree wells shall be used within parking areas and around the perimeter to accommodate trees, shrubs and groundcover.
- E. Planter areas shall provide a five-foot minimum width for trees must provide a minimum of 500 cubic feet of soil, and shall provide eight-foot by eight –foot (8'x8') minimum of clear planting space. For other vegetative buffer areas a minimum of a five foot clear width must be provided.
- F. Wheel stops should be used adjacent to tree wells and planter areas to protect landscaping from car overhangs.
- G. Curbed planting areas shall be provided at the end of each parking aisle to protect parked vehicles, and provide shade.
- H. No more than fifteen parking spaces shall be located in a row without a landscaped divider strip (See Figure 18.13.060-1).

## **(Repeal) Chapter 18.31 – SENSITIVE AREAS AND OPEN SPACE**

~~18.31.010 – Purpose.~~

~~18.31.020 – Scope.~~

~~18.31.030 – Administration.~~

~~18.31.080 – Tree retention.~~

~~18.31.090 – Vegetation removal.~~

~~18.31.110 – Mandatory preservation.~~

~~18.31.120 – Negotiated preservation.~~ (Staff Note: Portions of this section were moved to Sec. 18.09.060)

# Attachment “B”

## Comments Received on Draft Urban Tree Program

There were 250 responses to the Community Survey (Spring 2017). The following people provided additional comments at the conclusion of the survey.

1. jim.callerame@ipaper.com	Focus on HOA's that have let common areas go unmaintained. There is really no good reason to let the views and property values decrease to this extent.
2. aikotabcal@hotmail.com	Thank you for this opportunity to participate!
3. dcamin@comcast.net	Please remove, not just cut, blackberries. They are taking over! Require developers to have more permanent green space in new developments. Natural areas and trails will become more valuable to the community as things develop around us. The green space and trails in our neighborhood were a major reason for us to purchase a home here. Thank you. Darin Camin
4. catherineandrichard@comcast.net	An active tree protection/regulation program is way overdue. Thanks!
5. 4Brett@live.com	Thanks for asking! I'd love to help get more sound & interesting trees around Camas.
6. mudpony@hotmail.com	I am all for less regulation!
7. Gennygrimm@hotmail.com	It would be lovely if developers who cut trees outside their legal boundaries were fined more harshly. Landslides in the area should have been avoided but greed put our neighbors at risk.
8. doug.wells@comcast.net	none
9. dmhood@comcast.net	I am very pleased with the priority put on keeping trees in Camas
10. julie.mike.hill@gmail.com	We can only do this ONCE, so please do it RIGHT. SAVE MORE TREES.....SAVE MORE OPEN SPACES....THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL PLACE~NATURALLY! We can grow AMONG the trees! Thank you all for all you do for this community!
11. junestiehl94@gmail.com	On any new development please restrict the planting of trees too close together in medians, and narrow parking strips. These trees get big way too fast and they impair our vision.
12. msaptanner@yahoo.com	To prevent landslides and to preserve the views of trees-no more clear cutting.
13. bryceasherrell@gmail.com	Think it would be a good idea to drop all the dead trees around Round Lake. I don't want one falling on me. That is a heavily used park and trail system. Also maybe a volunteer tree replant day to fill in the dying forest around the lake and surrounding park.
14. cathy.sawyer@yahoo.com	Every time I walk anywhere around the lake with my partner, the comments always turn to the dying trees. City trees are the least of my concern. Property owners should be able to plant and remove trees as necessary if it doesn't block people's view, but the city and county must model proper tree care by preserving, protecting and treating sick or insect infested trees in park land. They also need to do more to clean the lake and preserve the green space areas that make our community great. Developers should be required

to plant native trees and have green space in every development. Please drop all dead trees around Lacamas Lake and replant immediately. This is a huge factor to the appeal of the city of Camas. The rate of change I've seen in the Lacamas Park system is unconscionable and irresponsible!

15. Rdkhking@gmail.com	Thank you for valuing our input.
16. Warwolfner@gmail.com	I sat on a homeowner's board where multiple people removed street trees which were cared for by the city and homeowner's were fined for their removal. Many never paid their fines nor did they pay for a replacement tree. The overall neighborhood appearance was marred by these empty treeless spaces, simply because these homeowners were too lazy to rake up leaves. Killing and removing the trees solved their immediate problem without any regard or responsibility for their actions.
17. lisasikkema@gmail.com	Trees are one of the defining characteristics of Camas that make it beautiful - the more the better!!
18. Alivia@justagirlinecamas.com	Please, please make more of an effort and create much stricter policies to protect our trees. Thank you for having this survey. It is a start. Please contact me if you have a committee for this.
19. Dscholtes1@gmail.com	Trees beautify our community and add value to the esthetics once matured. Careful selection to balance neighboring concerns should be applied and considered but city of Camas enforcement is critical.
20. Elocin71@gmail.com	Would love to see the ivy taken care of that has spread up the trees on lake and Everett. Would be interested in volunteering in a group to do so, after instruction.
21. Jasonlind440@gmail.com	We need more evergreens, and large pines, less leafy messy trees. New developments should have to plant 2 for every one taken out.

Comments compiled from the 97 Skyridge Middle school students in response to the question, "*Are there any other changes to Camas' tree regulations that you would like to see?*"

- A tree that is removed must be replanted
- An adequate reason should be provided before a professional to request permission to remove a tree(s). Make tree regulations in Camas more accessible.
- Another regulation to consider might be the amount of fee to pay when removing different types of species too.
- Chop down the minimum amounts if you have to remove them. Be careful around growing trees. Leave enough trees so animals can stay in their natural habitats.
- During construction or new developments, trees should only be cut down if they are causing hazards or conflicts within the construction site.
- Fix forest home road.
- I don't want to see any more trees removed. I understand that The City of Camas is growing immensely, but I want all wildlife and trees to stay the way it is.
- I think if someone removes a tree, they have to plant a new one somewhere else.
- I think that in Camas we cut down too many trees. So instead of cutting down more trees we could build in places that have no trees in the first place like an open space. Unless we cut down the trees and replant them in a more suitable place which would be a better cause for the environment and people.
- I think that people should replace trees they cut down because TREES HELP US LIVE!!
- I think that there should be more protected area for the trees in Camas.
- I want forests to stop being destroyed and animals' habitats being destroyed.
- I would like for people to show or write down a valid reason to remove trees when they think fit.

- I would like to be a well-known punishment for removing trees.
- I would like to see less deforestation, and if there is we need to plant more trees in places like parks and preserved. Also we should build more parks to accommodate for the rise of population.
- I would like to see more of the forested areas to be protected by Camas. I would also like for people to not be able to cut down trees unless they plant another tree for every tree they cut down.
- I would wish to see more tree replanting programs / more tree replanting after construction.
- I'd like to see more regulations of trees being replanted if cut down for wood, paper, etc.
- if the tree is on their yard they should be able to chop it down without permission
- Make the tree regulations more clear
- more trees and plants [more environment]
- no more trees cut down
- No, I wasn't aware that this was a problem because I just moved here though.
- People should be allowed to water the plants/trees, their choice.
- That all invasive trees should be removed.
- that tree should be planted for every tree cut down
- There shouldn't be a fee for removing invasive species'.
- Whenever I have seen a development in my area I have never seen trees remaining.
- Yes, for every tree you cut down, 2 should be planted
- Yes, I would like to see no one cutting down places densely populated by trees due to my sightings of animals such as rabbits and deer which live in the areas.

Comments received by mail and email to City Staff (Arranged by date order). Some of the comments were abbreviated given their length. When abbreviated, their full unedited comments are part of the record and referenced.

Prof. Buck Abbey,  
Landscape Architect,  
Louisiana State  
University

8/14/17

Sarah, Thank you for your note. Attached are two files that have been created to calculate shade requirements for landscape trees. One file provides a table showing tree shading capability for various sized trees Extra Large, Large, Medium and Small. You can easily determine trees sizes for your region that will match these sizes and their shading capability. In order to use the calculator a landscape plan showing tree sizes and placement is necessary. Most landscape codes do require landscape plans to be drawn.

I have studied landscape codes and tree ordinances since the mid-1980's and very few actually require landscape plans to be designed with shade in mind. Many do not take trees to be a major factor in the design process. Many landscape codes address trees only based upon spacing. Very few high school math calculations are essential in creating a landscape plan. Most codes and ordinances do not set quantifiable standards for tree spacing based upon size, growth potential, root space and shadow patterns. Communities should set better standards for trees in landscape plans based upon some reasonable environmental standard such as trees per acre or caliper inches per acre, shade production per acre or some other meaningful environmental basis. Quantities are not as important as growth potential. Many landscape codes set standards for too many trees in too little planting spaces. The calculator can assist in deterring tree canopy standards and shadow coverage potential on development site.

When tracts and lots are cleared from standing timber, the calculator can be used to determine a minimum canopy standard to be replace or a minimum shadow pattern to be produced following construction. I would like very much to see you incorporate shading requirements into public street frontage and parking lots. Asking designers and developers and builders to provide well thought out shade patterns in the city if not going to far. Landscaping in urban areas should be more than merely decoration with living materials.

I have looked at your code and it is very basic. I hope you can add shading into your regs. The city will be better for it.

Please keep me informed as to the outcome of your work. My best to you and good luck with your important task of thinking about how to rebuild nature in the city with the use of shade to make your urban spaces more comfortable for people. Henry David Thoreau a naturalist-poet carefully studied trees as Darwin studied animals. Thoreau writing in 1859

---

foresaw that "one day they (trees) will be planted and nature reinstated" in villages and cities "to some extent." Shade, being incorporated into community landscape codes will help restore this important aspect of nature to the city.

---

Ben Thompson,  
Department of Natural  
Resources

8/24/17

Note: Mr. Thompson included the (former) draft with tracked comments and changes within the document. These are his summary comments.

Many of my comments are in the form of a question to you. I took this approach because there is not a single right approach. It all depends on what you're trying to achieve and what the community tolerances are for degrees of regulation in the code. I'm happy to clarify my comments or answer any follow-up questions if necessary.

1. It appears that language prohibiting tree topping has been removed from section 16.51.125. I fully support invoking the ANSI A300 standards for tree pruning that define topping as an unacceptable practice, but few who are affected by the ordinance will be familiar with the A300 standards. Furthermore, the standards are not available for reference on-line. Therefore, I think the ordinance still needs to explicitly state, in relatively plain language, the most important provisions of the A300 that the city wants people to adhere to—including that topping is a prohibited practice. Pardon my oversight if this is mentioned or included elsewhere in the code.
2. The fee schedule seems reasonable to me, except that the examples "...provided to demonstrate the range of penalties in Washington" do not include the upper extent of that range, that is fines equal to triple the value of the tree(s) removed. This idea of "treble damages" is part of Washington State's Timber Trespass Law (RCW 64.12.030). I can't tell you specifically how often this RCW gets cited in legal cases involving "urban" trees, but some cities have adopted similar language in their own tree protection codes. The courts in Washington have supported cities pursuing treble damages, where value is based on the appraised value of trees as determined by a certified consulting arborist according to appraisal formulas in the Guide for Plant Appraisal, 9<sup>th</sup> edition. The intent for such a provision is that it only gets applied to the cases that are the most egregious, willful, or malicious, and it should be a sufficient deterrent. The city may wish to reserve the right to pursue this when and where appropriate. When a person's property benefits from new views created by illegal cutting, that has often been enough evidence to pursue fines and damages against the benefitting homeowners. See Bellevue's code section #1.18.045:  
<https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Bellevue/html/Bellevue01/Bellevue0118.html> Here are some examples:
  - a. <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/eastside/illegal-tree-cutting-may-mean-fines/>
  - b. <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/politics/city-files-lawsuits-seeks-16m-over-cutting-of-150-trees-in-west-seattle-greenbelt/>
3. The ordinance will require a tree protection plan, which is good, but it doesn't say what needs to be included on the TPP. Without clear standards, the plans or permits you receive will vary greatly as applicants attempt to interpret what you want to see, which will make plans more challenging and time consuming for city staff to review. As an example, check out Lake Forest Park's municipal code section 16.14.040, #2:  
<http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/LakeForestPark/>. You definitely want the applicant to include a visual representation of the area they are counting as tree canopy. Autocad can automatically calculate the area of a drawn polygon. The drawn coverage on the plan corroborates the number they are using in their calcs, and you can use this to double check suspicious or 'inflated' canopy cover estimates by measuring out the claimed tree canopy area in the field if necessary.
4. The table outlining canopy coverage credits doesn't make sense to me, and the use of cork oak as an example tells me it was cut and pasted from outside our region. Cork oak isn't planted around here.
5. The ordinance will require 30% canopy coverage through preservation, planting, or both, but it doesn't say how the percentage will be calculated. This is heavily nuanced, but your interpretations of what constitutes 30% will make big differences in which trees get preserved and why. Hear me out... I am assuming that the 30% figure will be based on acres or square footage of the surveyed lot to be developed. It sounds simple, but:

- a. If trees' canopies overhang the boundary of the property, will the applicant get credit for the entire canopy, or just the portion of the canopy that lies within their property boundary? Trees to be preserved are often at or near the property boundaries. If tree canopy that overhangs adjacent property makes up 10% of preserved canopy, that means the lot to be developed would only have 20% within the lot boundaries.
- b. Can applicants get credit for overhanging canopy from adjacent properties that are not part of the permit? To flip my previous example, if 10% of preserved canopy comes from trees on adjacent properties, and those adjacent property owners remove those trees at some point in the future, then the lot to be developed would only have 20%.
- c. Trees that are bisected by a property boundary are co-owned. In the case of co-owned trees, will the applicant get credit for 100% of the tree canopy, 50% of the tree canopy, or only the percentage of that tree's canopy that overhangs on their lot?
- d. If a co-owned tree will be removed for development, you would need consent from the other owner. How will the city address that in the permitting/plan approval process?
- e. Will the preservation or planting of street trees be eligible for canopy credit? If so, recognize that this canopy is off-site/outside of the surveyed property boundary, which gets back to the question of whether off-site trees are eligible for coverage. OR, will the area of the adjacent ROW be added to the area of the surveyed lot for purposes of calculating the 30% of canopy area required?
- f. Will you require that a minimum portion of canopy preserved, planted or both be native conifer species? Our native conifers are doing the heavy lifting for stormwater mitigation. Vancouver, WA (among other cities in the PNW) does require this though I can't recall what the split is.
- g. Will the city define what planting spaces look like for trees being planted for credit? A row of Douglas fir planted on 10' centers as a hedgerow, or any trees planted 5' from a new foundation are not likely to mature into the area of canopy that is expected of them because their planting locations are so poorly selected.
- h. How will you account for trees that die within a short time after the project has been completed? Many cities ask the applicant to post a bond for the value of trees to be planted, where the bond can not be released until a follow-up inspection is made after some period of time (usually at least a year in the case of new trees).
- i. What will be your guidance to developers who finish their projects in the middle of summer, when tree planting is ill-advised?
- j. What happens when a developer cannot meet their canopy coverage requirements? Will they be able to pay a fee-in-lieu? If so, who gets the money from those fees? Several cities have revolving tree accounts where fees in lieu are deposited and the city periodically taps that funding source for new tree projects on public property elsewhere in the city.

**Geri Rubano**  
gerigalassi@yahoo.com

10/22/17

Sarah, I am currently listening to you speak for planning commission meeting on the Urban Tree Program. Thank you for bringing this to issue to our community. I am a tree lover and protector.

Under the Urban Tree Program is there a plan to protect old growth trees that are located on privately owned properties? For example, a neighbor cut down an old growth pine tree that was probably close to 100 years old. I don't believe the tree was a danger to the home or surrounding area. The loss of that tree was very devastating to many of the neighbors. These types of trees should be protected.

Many of the developers, if not most, in Camas have devastated the land by ripping trees out of the earth without integrating them into the master plan.

Please, can you do something about this? We need trees to protect our air, water and the beauty of our community.

Lynn Johnston, Member of Ad Hoc Committee	12/4/17	(Exhibit, PC Meeting 12/4/17) <b>The City should not require preservation of existing trees on development land.</b>
<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p><b>Growth Management Act</b></p> <p>Cities are areas of land that are set aside for people to live and to work in higher densities than outlying areas. In fact, the City is mandated by the State through the Growth Management Act to achieve certain densities for residential growth. One premise of the Growth Management Act is to more efficiently utilize the space in our population centers in an effort to reduce "sprawl" into the rural areas. Naturally, we can expect that where a higher density population is required that accommodating mature trees becomes more difficult. With a comprehensive landscaping policy, however, these areas can still be pleasant places to live.</p> <p><b>Trees are already protected in critical areas.</b></p> <p>Camas is located in the foothills of the Cascades which provides us with a unique geographic setting. The consequence of this is that Camas possesses more than its share of critical areas in the form of steep slopes and wetlands. We end up with a great deal of unbuildable land where trees are already protected. Speaking specifically about the Northshore area (530 acres located north of Lacamas Lake) it has been documented that at least half of the gross acreage out there will be unbuildable due to steep slopes and wetlands. With so much land tied up in critical areas this makes the buildable land all the more important to our City's future. The city needs buildable land to continue to grow and prosper. This cannot be overstated.</p> <p><b>Let developers build the best plan.</b> Developers should be allowed to design the best, most efficient layout for a particular parcel. Forcing the alteration of a workable plan to accommodate existing trees could drastically impact the functional and financial viability of a project and could even affect whether a project moves forward. Developers do a lot already. Developers are expected to install segments of utility infrastructure, to build roads, to provide park and open space to projects. Adding a complex tree preservation/mitigation policy could be viewed as a posture that is unfriendly to development. If the City continues to add layers of regulation to developable land developers may begin looking elsewhere for projects. Isolating single or small groups of mature trees can have an obvious negative impact. These isolated trees become more vulnerable to future wind damage creating a danger to both people and property. This may not be the best fit in a new housing development.</p> <p><b>Inequity</b></p> <p>If a tree preservation policy on development land is adopted the landowners who have chosen to maintain a forest cover on their property (in most cases for decades) will be immediately penalized as compared to a landowner who has chosen to clear their land of trees long ago. A good example would be the future residential areas north of Lacamas Lake. Fewer buildable acres and more design constraints translate into less development interest and lower land value.</p>		
Joseph Roush, Environmental Services Manager, City of Olympia	4/17/18	<p>Quick look over your code, couple of comments.</p> <p>It doesn't appear that you have a requirement for a tree tract as a separate tract to preserve trees in subdivisions. This can be a foundational flaw.</p> <p>Not sure if you have open space requirements as part of your subdivision code or not. If so, then you will probably be saving trees as part of that process. If you don't require open space or developers pay an open space fee instead, then you will just end up with an argument at every subdivision with conflicting requirements to meet residential densities per GMA and your attempts to save trees. Olympia got past this by subtracting the tree tracts out of the gross site area before calculating the minimum residential density.</p> <p>Also... landscape islands that are 6' x 6' are typically lacking in adequate soil volume to support a canopy size tree in a parking lot. Back in the mid 1990's I was able to get Olympia's code changed to require the islands to be 12' wide. I can show you great side by side examples of how effective this was at growing healthy trees. I also have calculations with research that supports this requirement in the attached.</p>
Charles Ray, Urban Forester and Ad Hoc Committee Member	4/18/18	<p>Email comments on draft:</p> <p>Street tree. Street tree could be a tree growing within the right of way for example behind attached sidewalks if the right of way extends beyond the attached sidewalk. Or in unimproved right of way</p>

		<p>where there is not a planter strip or sidewalk. You might want to change the definition to incorporate this. Street tree is a tree growing within the right of way which could be located in unimproved right of way, behind attached sidewalks or located within the planter strip when the sidewalk is detached.</p> <p>Re Tree Density, you might want to also require at a minimum 1 tree per lot. For example if you have a subdivision (6 lots) that is 1 acre and you save a group of 4 firs that are 28" each which is on back of 3 lots, the other lots (3) would only have to plant street trees because the density has been met with these 4 trees which are only on 3 lots.</p>
<b>Charles Ray</b>	5/7/18	<p>Email comments on draft:</p> <p>In the Tree Preservation Ordinance, "D. Restoration. Violators of this chapter or of a permit issued thereunder shall be responsible for restoring unlawfully damaged areas in conformance with a plan, approved by the Planning Official, which provides for repair of any environmental and property damage, and restoration of the site; and which results in a site condition that, to the greatest extent practical, equals the site condition that would have existed in the absence of the violation(s). Restoration costs will be based on the City appraised value of unapproved trees removed using the latest edition of Guide for Plant Appraisal (International Society of Arboriculture, Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers). The amount of costs above the approved restoration plan will be paid into the tree account." Instead of using the appraised value you could use a formula such as 200-300 per inch diameter. So that if they remove a 12" tree restoration cost would be at a rate of \$200, total \$2,400.</p> <p>You may want to think about requiring setbacks so that will by default create a tree tract such as 20 foot setbacks in backyard would create a 40 foot wide tree tract if properties are back to back. I have often thought our setbacks are in adequate and in some cases not enough room for trees.</p>
<b>Mike Odren, Olson Engineering</b>	5/15/18	<p>Testimony recorded at May 15<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing. Mr. Odren submitted a letter to Phil Bourquin, dated May 15, 2018 (Exhibit #3 from May 15, 2018 hearing). The following is a brief summary of the letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 17.19.030(A)(2)- "Every reasonable effort shall be made to preserve existing significant trees and vegetation..." However, the term "every reasonable effort" is subjective in nature; its interpretation being a potential issue between City staff, consultants and developers...</li> <li>• 18.03.040 Significant Trees – The proposed definition does not include unhealthy, dead, diseased, hazardous or invasive trees.</li> <li>• 18.13.045(B)(1)(b) Tree Survey – There is no exemption of Christmas tree farms or other heavily treed sites.</li> <li>• 18.13.045(B)(2)(d) Assessment – At the time of a Tree Survey, a development proposal will not know the extent of grading, trenching, paving, fencing or have construction plans developed.</li> <li>• 18.13.050(C)(1)- Does not support provisions for 60% native vegetation and 50% evergreen.</li> <li>• 18.13.050(F) – Does not support minimum 5-gallon size for shrubs.</li> <li>• 18.13.050(G) – Does not support the prohibition of lawns as ground cover.</li> <li>• 18.13.051(A) Tree Density- "Net Acre" is not defined. "Net acre" should be defined as the net acreage of developed area.</li> <li>• 18.13.051 Table 1 Required Tree Density – Notes that the replacement requirements for trees in commercial developments is not well defined. The tree units per acre (at 30 tree units) is too high for residential development.</li> <li>• 18.13.052– The required Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plan is too subjective.</li> <li>• 18.13.052(B) Mitigation and Replacement– This section is not clearly defined. Should meeting minimum tree density only apply to net developable area, this argument is moot as it would not include those areas not slated for development and therefore not needing mitigation and replacement per this section.</li> <li>• 18.13.053 Native Vegetation Management Plan – Would this be required in addition to the already regulated critical areas?</li> </ul> <p>"Because of the number of issues raised above, as well as what appears to be an underrepresented ad hoc committee associated with the development of the program, it is respectfully requested that the Planning Commission remand the Program in its entirety back to staff for further work."</p>
<b>Ryan Makinster</b>	5/15/18	(Exhibit 5, PC hearing May 15, 2018)

---

The Building Industry Association of Clark County (BIA) commends the City of Camas for development of a tree planning, permitting and protection code. We applaud the city's desire to use grant funding for the development of this long-needed code and understand the time restrictions inherent in the grant funding but have some concerns with the process to date.

According to the background section of the document, the program was developed by city staff with the assistance of consultants from the Davey Resource Group and informed by surveys, feedback requests and meetings with neighboring jurisdictional staff, parks representatives, property owners, the general Camas public and a civil engineer.

Unfortunately, it seems this process has overlooked some very important segments of the affected stakeholders; namely those that would bear the financial burden of these regulations and the contract professionals they would work with to address the proposed requirements. These include, but aren't limited to, developers, architects and designers, biologist, and industry advocates such as the BIA.

Without the input of these groups, potential financial impacts, design issues and implementation challenges cannot be fully addressed or mitigated in the final program.

Although we have recognized numerous concerns with the proposed language, due to the short time in which we have been aware of this proposal, we have only given the proposal a cursory review and would need more time to quantify and properly convey these concerns. Because of this, and the fact that a large segment of stakeholders has been left out of the initial discussion and draft creation, the BIA respectfully requests that the Planning Commission return this program back to the staff for further work and review.

---

<b>Thomas Kelly, Lacamas Shores</b>	5/14/18	(Exhibit 1, PC hearing May 15, 2018) Letter submitted summarized below. "The project may be well motivated, but it is incomplete and does not address the majority of the geographical characteristics of the City of Camas or the cost to both the taxpayers and utilities that serve the citizens of Camas." <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Best place for trees is in the forest. Trees planted throughout the city are inefficient.</li><li>• Trees planted along the streets interfere with lighting and are unsafe.</li><li>• Trees impact views from hillside homes and lower property values.</li><li>• Does not support Section 18.13.053(2) Maintenance, "pruning for health of tree, not for view enhancement".</li></ul>
<b>Paul Dennis, Torvale and CWEDA</b>	5/15/18	(Exhibit 2, PC hearing May 15, 2018) The Camas-Washougal Economic Development Association (CWEDA) was just made aware of the hearing before Camas' Planning Commission regarding the proposed Tree Ordinance. While CWEDA was made aware City Staff was developing a proposed Tree Ordinance, no proposed draft language has been supplied to CWEDA for it perspective on impacts to expanding businesses, limitations on attracting new employers, or impacts to developable employment lands. While the President of CWEDA was asked and accepted to participate on the Urban Tree Program Ad Hoc Committee, CWEDA was not kept apprised of committee meeting dates, and therefore not afforded an opportunity to provide early input. CWEDA has no opinion to offer for your hearing on May 15, 2018, but asks that the hearing be continued so that CWEDA can properly evaluate the potential effects to Camas' employers and employment lands.
<b>James Clark, Clark Land Design</b>	5/15/18	(Exhibit 4, PC hearing May 15, 2018) Letter supported comments submitted by Mike Odren.
<b>Donna Buntten CAO Coordinator Department of Ecology PO Box 47600 Olympia, WA 98504</b>	5/28/18	Hi, Sarah,  I took a quick look at the tree code that you sent to Commerce for expedited review. I noticed that there is some specific language for frequently flooded and geohazard critical areas, but not for wetlands. And then #3 on page 22 mentions that for "unauthorized tree removal within any critical area and associated buffer area, the violator will be subject to a fine established in the city's fee schedule and must plant new trees at a ratio of two replacement trees for each tree felled within one year in accordance with an approved plan." Can you tell us how this is intended to interact with the city's CAO?

We recommend that you include a provision for replanting AND retaining any downed tree in wetlands or buffers (as LWD) in the case of unpermitted danger tree removal. Left to natural processes, the tree or trees would have eventually become LWD. Does the CAO have a

---

general statement for critical areas that tree removal (including for danger trees) is prohibited unless specifically authorized? Even if it does, should it also be included here?

---

**Heidi Rosenberg, Camas School District**

6/1/18

The following is a summary of the issues raised in an email to Phil Bourquin that is on file.

- 18.13.040 – Procedure for Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plans. Who determines and what process is used to determine that a Vegetation Management Plan “may be” required?
- 18.13.045 – Tree Survey. If there are existing trees that are in poor health or are a hazard prior to development, it is not clear whether the removal of those trees is included in the tree removal count. Will the removal of unhealthy or hazardous trees require mitigation? Understood regarding removal of healthy trees. Not understood regarding unhealthy tree clearing.
- 18.13.050 (G). Where is this no lawn standard applicable? Is it within the City's road easement area, or on the entire site? Schools include as much lawn as possible because it is easier to maintain than ground cover on such large sites (mowing versus weeding). We don't have the grounds staff to maintain ground cover in large areas. Please clarify.
- 18.13.051 Minimum Tree Density Requirement. Is there any consideration regarding required minimum tree density made for commercial (or industrial) uses that conflict with trees?
- 18.13.052 Tree and Native Vegetation Preservation. Does the City really want to place the preservation of tree density (any trees, not just significant trees) on the same level as wetlands and critical habitat? Depending on the interpretation of this language, it seems like this could be considered an unreasonable taking of private land without the same federal and state basis as wetlands and critical habitat.
- 18.13.053 Native Vegetation Management Plan. For those lands that are proposed to be set aside as undeveloped open space tracts, a vegetation management plan is required... A seasonal maintenance plan for optimal tree care and to control the spread of invasive species must be included in the plan. When a Vegetation Management Plan is required, how long is it applicable and who is responsible to do the maintenance? Does this requirement apply to commercial developments such as schools, or is it associated with residential developments with defined open space tracts? ... (Shortened for brevity)... In other words, have you considered the application of this regulation on large parcels of land with acres of open space?
- 18.13.060 Parking areas. Is there any consideration made for commercial (or industrial) uses that conflict with trees? For example, the school district plans to expand its bus parking area next year. There are no trees in the existing bus parking area, even in the section that was expanded in 2011, and there shouldn't be any trees included in the expanded area. The trees become a nuisance for bus maneuverability and operations. How will the tree ordinance be applied in this case?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this code change. We appreciate your consideration.

---

**Dave Miller  
(Exhibit included with  
June 19, 2018 public  
hearing)**

6/3/18

I saw the 6/1/2018 facebook post about a proposed urban tree program, and I wanted to submit a comment since I won't be able to attend the public hearing on June 19.

My name is Dave Miller and I live at 3509 NW 3rd Ave in Camas.

I haven't seen the details of what is being proposed, but in general I am very supportive of an urban tree program. I am also pleased to read that you are learning from what has been successful in other cities.

It would be great if your program included consideration for the following:

1. Educating residents about non-native invasive plants which threaten our trees, namely English Ivy. Most people don't know that ivy will eventually pull down most trees due to the weight of the vines. I have cut ivy off trees in our neighborhood, including one vine that was 8 inches in diameter (I saved a chunk of it if you'd like to see it). Also people don't know that when they allow ivy to climb and flower/fruit, they are spreading ivy to all of their neighbors and the whole area, via birds who eat the ivy berries. I have seen a dramatic increase in ivy seedlings in my yard in the last 5 years. I never found even a single ivy seedling in the 23 years prior to that. So something has changed recently.
2. Funding for ivy removal from existing trees in the City's open spaces. The City is currently spreading ivy via birds as I described above. By "removal" I don't mean complete eradication, I

---

mean just cut it off the trees every 5-10 years so that it is not flowering and fruiting. This is quite easy to do, you just have to make a cut in the vines on the trees, and ensure that the ivy's cambium layers are no longer touching.

The portion in the tree will die and eventually break down and fall off. Of course to prevent it from climbing the tree again, you would need to kill the entire plant (i.e. the part on the ground), which typically requires herbicide. But you will also need to regularly check for new seedlings. As I mentioned, if ivy is allowed to grow unchecked, it will eventually pull down the tree it is on.

3. Focus on native trees, especially trees which can handle weather extremes and hotter/drier summers which are becoming more frequent due to climate change. A notable example is Oregon White Oak (*Quercus garryana*). I do understand that a *Quercus garryana* would not be happy in an 18" parking strip, so something else would be appropriate there. But for properties which have the space, perhaps you could give a special honor to anyone who plants/preserves a *Quercus garryana* or similar tree that is native to the Camas area.

4. Speaking of special honors, I would give your highest honor to anyone who creates a "living snag" wildlife tree on their property (including the City, on its property). A living snag is created by removing the top 1/2 or 1/3 of a tree by either girdling it at that height, or cutting it leaving a jagged top, with some living branches below the girdle/cut. What this does is create a path for disease to enter the core of the tree, and triggering a slow decline of the tree. This mimics what happens naturally in the forest, and provides roosting and breeding space for birds, bats, and all kinds of creatures for many years. A tree which is girdled near the ground will also provide good habitat, but since the tree is completely dead, it will fall in just a few years. A living snag can remain standing for 20-40 years. Obviously you wouldn't want to do this if the tree could fall on a structure or road. See "Creating Snags from Live Trees" here: <https://wdfw.wa.gov/living/snags/> I have done this to several trees in my yard and it is working well.

As you might guess I have cut a lot of ivy off trees as a volunteer for the county (Lacamas Park), the USFWS (Steigerwald and Pierce NWRs), the Port (Washougal Waterfront Trail), and the City of Vancouver (Ellen Davis Trail/Burnt Bridge Creek). So I have a lot of practice and tips I would be happy to share.

---

**Tom Kelly  
(Exhibit included with  
June 19, 2018 public  
hearing)**

6/7/18

Comments on the Environmental Checklist and Draft of the Camas Urban Tree Program:

SEPA Section 10, item b. "what views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?" Trees or any landscaping that blocks a view of the Lake or other view asset of Camas should not be allowed and measures need to be proposed to protect that asset (views do have dollar values and are defined by the County Assessors Office for locations that have views of the Lake, River or other "

SEPA Section 14, item d. "will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, etc." Yes, any proposed landscaping in the right of way must have a plan to perform maintenance to keep landscaping for view of traffic, etc., max height of 36 inches for bushes, trees limbed to 8 feet over sidewalks, and 12 feet over roadways.

Draft, Chapter 12.04 - Sidewalk and Street Maintenance; This concept is unconstitutional, meaning, the City owns the right of way, not the abutting property owner, and the City, having the authority to assign/control what is put on that right of way, by definition, is responsible for its maintenance and repair of any landscaping or structures or utilities placed in that right of way. To burden the abutting property owner with the maintenance and repair/replacement is unethical and immoral, just as that property owner is not responsible for trimming in any Park that abuts private property.

Draft, Chapter 18.13.053 -Native Vegetation Management Plan; items 2 and 7 should include a plan to provide and protect views, an asset, of at least 70 percent of lot width. A hillside property with a view of Lacamas Lake has a view worth \$100,000.00 or more; the loss of that view, intentional or otherwise, reduces that lots value, as determined by the County Assessors Definitions.

Summary of comments: Landscaping of any type must be maintained to function as designed, and the City should consider long term costs of such maintenance on their property, such as the right of way of every street, present and future. Your expectation of where the City will be in 20 years is far short of what will happen, especially with trees that grow 3-5 feet per year. A more appropriate

		plan would be 50 to 100 years; yes, beyond many of your lifetimes, but realistic for those that follow you. You would be well advised to consider promoting the view and accessibility of the assets of Camas; Lacamas Lake, the Columbia River, Historical sites, etc., with the same effort being expended to protect that landscaping which enhances the City streets and neighborhoods.
<b>Anne Marie Skinner PBS Engineering (Exhibit</b>		<p>This looks good and I really like it. Appears to be reasonable and not onerous to developers in my opinion, yet still provides clear and specific guidelines for trees and landscaping plans and provides for a good mix of native/deciduous/evergreen tree and vegetation requirements to support the goals in the comprehensive plan surrounding trees, nature, and vegetation. It's wonderful when code requirements are quantifiable and objective.</p> <p>I only have one question, and perhaps I missed it, but how is the tree unit determined for newly-planted trees? I see the chart for existing trees based upon their DBH, but if all new trees had to be planted to meet the 20 tree unit/net acre requirement what is the measure for determining how many tree units the proposed new tree equals? Or, maybe that same chart is utilized based upon the DBH of the trees at planting? I'm trying to analyze the current project on 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue based upon this new code, but most of the existing trees are being removed. I need to determine a tree unit number for each of the trees being planted, so do I base it off their DBH at planting? It's not readily clear to me.</p>
<b>Mike Odren Olson Engineering (Exhibit included at June 19, 2018 public hearing)</b>	6/15/18	Note: Comments were handwritten within the draft document. Refer to Exhibit #4 from Planning Commission's public hearing on June 19th.
<b>Bryce Hanson (Exhibit included at June 19, 2018 public hearing)</b>	6/18/18	<p>Again thanks for letting us provide some feedback for consideration. As stated before, we are happy to see some more definition to the code. Here are some comments/suggestions/question:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 3.54.010 B(1) clarify how these acquired areas would be preserved to show the City is being held to the same standard as developers. Will these areas be treated like an off-site mitigation zone for tree planting, education, etc.?</li> <li>2. 18.03.040 – provide a definition for “hazardous tree”</li> <li>3. 18.13.025 – I believe you have exemptions for removal of “hazardous street tress” but no exemptions defined for hazard trees on private sites</li> <li>4. 18.13.025 (D) a minimum tree density of 30 is still referenced. For consistency, we believe it should be 20.</li> <li>5. 18.13.045 (B)2(e) – this sounds like you are asking for a partial tree risk analysis... this could turn into requiring a lot of additional work on the initial tree survey, especially for large heavily treed sites. A lot of which may not be necessary. You are also calling out “targets” which implies risk analysis. Perhaps this part of the assessment should only be required for trees that being considered for tree retention areas.</li> <li>6. 18.13.050(D) – you use “unless otherwise specified” please define where this exception could occur to allow for less than a 30-foot minimum spacing.</li> <li>7. 18.13.051 (B) – have you updated the Design Standards Manual? Basically we are looking for more clarity on how to calculate the tree density requirements when considering some of the following circumstances: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Critical areas that have trees (forested wetlands, steep slopes, etc.)</li> <li>b. Critical area buffers</li> <li>c. If you are only developing part of parcel and not touching the rest. (i.e. you want to build on 2 acres of a 10 acre site). Do you have to survey, assess and provide potential mitigation for tree density on the remaining area?</li> </ol> </li> <li>8. 18.13.052 (A) – Please clarify the statement “This may require site redesign”. First of all, who is going to make this determination at the City? It really should be an arborist who is looking at the design from a tree impact/protection standpoint. This scares a lot people because it implies that the City can dictate the exact use of a site rather than allowing the developer to choose how they want to develop the site. And it opens the door for potential liability issues due to the required redesign and retention of trees that otherwise may have been recommended for removal. Basically it leaves a lot of uncertainty as to where the line is drawn for retention.</li> <li>9. 18.13.052 (B) – Please provide clarity for how these trees will be protected. Do you really want to force them into tracts or can protective covenants work? That way the land use of sites isn't as affected. Number 5 on the priority list makes it sound like the City is more concerned about trees</li> </ol>

		<p>than public safety. It may be prudent to include additional language that holds public safety paramount to all other factors.</p> <p>10. Is a report required? Or just the survey (inventory &amp; assessment), which can be addressed with a table on the tree protection/preservation plans?</p>
<b>Geri Rubano</b>	6/19/18	<p>Sarah,</p> <p>I attended tonight's meeting and would like to know why old growth trees on private property less than 24,000 square feet are not in the proposed Urban Tree project? We have hundred year old trees being cut down without any protections. How can we get those protections into the plan?</p> <p>Thank you for all the hard work, energy and dedication you've put into getting this project off the ground.</p>
<b>Mike Odren Olson Engineering (Exhibit included at June 19, 2018 public hearing)</b>	6/19/18	<p>Thank you for your and staff's efforts in putting this together and addressing our concerns. The proposed changes look good and provide the necessary flexibility that is needed to address a variety of landscape design considerations. The only other comment I have is found below:</p> <p>1. Section 18.130.050(C)(1) – Highly suggest adding the following, "Required landscaping shall be comprised of a minimum of sixty (60) percent native vegetation, drought-tolerant vegetation, or non-invasive naturalized species that have adapted to the climactic conditions of the coastal region of the Pacific Northwest, and 50 percent evergreen." This is used in landscape codes in other local jurisdictions that allow for greater flexibility. Otherwise, the way this section currently reads will severely limit the species and varieties of plant materials that may be used.</p> <p>Please allow this email to be additional testimony from Olson Engineering, Inc., as I will not be attending the hearing this evening.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>From: Sarah Fox</b> <b>To: 'Mike Odren'</b></p> <p>Mike,</p> <p>Thanks for the follow-up.</p> <p>The change that you are suggesting below, I thought that I had addressed on page 15 with "or adapted to northwest climate"?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>To: Sarah Fox</b> <b>From: Mike Odren</b></p> <p>Sorry, Sarah. I didn't see that. The change you are proposing is fine. Sorry I didn't see that. Good luck tonight!</p>
<b>Bryce Hanson (Exhibit included at June 19, 2018 public hearing)</b>	6/19/18	<p>Sarah, I am going to double up on Mike's statement below and thank you for the hard work putting the tree code together. It seems like you addressed some of our comments/questions from the email I sent on 6/18; however there are a few items that are still unanswered or not addressed.</p> <p>As with Mike, I will not be able to attend tonight as I have prior obligations. Please allow my previous email (attached) to be additional testimony for the hearing.</p>
<b>Geri Rubano</b>	6/22/18	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I attended the meeting on Tuesday evening and I spoke in support of the Urban Tree Program. I understand that after meeting with developers on May 15 you amended the program to accommodate them by reducing the amount of trees per acre from 30 to 20. Will the comments voiced from the citizens in approval be heard and amendments on the program changed? Will you increase the fines from \$1K for the removal of a large tree to \$8K? Why is there no protections for old growth trees on private lots less than 24K square feet? We have to live in Camas and witness the death of old growth trees without consequence to the person(s) who decide to remove a tree that has existed far longer than most citizens in Camas. Enough is enough! Let's make Camas a leader in the preservation of its trees.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
<b>Geri Rubano</b>	7/3/18	<p>City Council Members,</p> <p>These photos are what is wrong with our city. Why can we not protect our most important natural resources? These old growth trees will be gone forever because a developer couldn't integrate them and because you allowed it to happen.</p> <p>We have to do better than this.</p>



---

**Claire Houlding**

7/3/18

Dear City of Camas,

I am writing to you to voice my concern for the trees in our area. We have been Camas residents since 2006 and it breaks our hearts to see how many trees are being cut down to make room for new developments. Many of the trees that are being cut down are old growth trees, which our children will never again experience in their lifetimes. Not only are many of these trees beautiful and unique in their mature age, they are a part of the Camas landscape. Once these signature trees are cut down, they gone forever and the personality of the city is altered... and not towards its benefit. The oldest, most established cities in the world, boast of their beautiful and mature vegetation, which grace streets, parks, landscapes and town areas with class. Why are we cutting down so many of these old beauties?! Let's build around them!

The second concern for the trees is not of a cosmetic nature, but of an environmentally conscious one. Trees clean our air of the increased pollution created by car and factories in our exponentially expanding society. We need more trees than ever ... not less! Trees help with corrosion, water distribution, air filtering, habitats for birds and other creatures, provide shade and oxygen. Please stop removing vital trees in Camas!

Why were the trees lining the road at Camas Meadows golf course removed? It looks terrible!!!

It seems as though people are trigger happy with chainsaws. Please prevent this senseless cutting down and invoke heavy fines on those who do alter our landscape and environmental profile with no regard for others. We should be able to vote on the whether healthy old trees are removed. Those which need to be removed due to safety concerns should be replaced by at least 2-3 new trees to make up for the loss.

Please stop this wholesale removal of life- preserving trees in Camas. It is not to the benefit of anyone to remove them. We need our trees to stay where they are. People who want to live in a tree-free environment should move to the desert and stop cutting down ours! Trees belong to the landscape of the PNW, and have defined the look of quaint, lovely Camas for decades.

# Attachment “C”

## Camas Post Record

### Camas moves to save its trees - City leaders eye urban tree preservation plan

By Kelly Moyer | May 31, 2018

Efforts are underway in Camas to preserve the city’s urban trees in the midst of rapid residential and commercial development.

“This was something people cared about, and asked about when we were doing our comprehensive plan update,” Camas Senior Planner Sarah Fox explained of city staff’s two-year project to revamp Camas tree preservation codes.

When city leaders asked Camas residents — at events like Camas Days and in online surveys — what they hoped to see in Camas 20 years in the future, many people said preserving the city’s tree canopy was important to them, Fox said.

“Most people didn’t know that we didn’t have any protections for our trees<sup>3</sup>,” Fox said. “We couldn’t do anything about the areas already being developed, but we could look at (creating a new urban tree program).”

City staff secured a Washington Department of Natural Resources’ Urban and Community Forestry Program grant to pay for consultants from Davey Resource Group, formed an ad hoc committee, and spent nearly two years researching what other cities require from developers and individual property owners when it comes to protecting urban trees.

The city’s current code on tree retention, which states “to the extent practical, existing healthy, significant trees shall be retained” and “preservation of groups of significant trees, rather than individual trees shall be preferred,” is vague and open to interpretation, which has caused legal problems in the past, Fox said.

The current code doesn’t prohibit people from tearing down existing trees on their own property, require developers to retain a certain number of trees or even adequately protect trees within the city’s open spaces.

“We have a code that says developers have to put in a street tree, but no code that says they have to keep it

or replace it if it dies,” Camas City Councilwoman Bonnie Carter pointed out at a May 15 Camas Planning Commission public hearing on the proposed Urban Tree Program. “If my neighbor takes that (street tree) down 15 or 20 years later, that means something to me.”

#### **Program would protect trees, set ‘tree unit’ levels for developers**

Carter, along with Camas Parks and Recreation Commission member Cassi Marshall, sat on the eight-person ad hoc committee that reviewed the city’s tree codes and researched other methods of retaining and preserving an urban tree canopy.

Both women told Camas planning commissioners that the city also has a problem with people removing trees from public property.

“We have citizens who take down trees in public open spaces to preserve their view,” Carter said at the May 15 public hearing. “They can do it, and we have no restoration means to put (the trees) back. This affects all of us in this community.”

Marshall agreed.

“We have a huge frustration with people taking out trees in our open spaces and green spaces,” she told planning commissioners. “(The city code) has no teeth (for) addressing restoration.”

Marshall also said she supported the proposed Urban Tree Program because it would not only give city leaders “teeth” to prevent and punish the theft of open space trees, but also provide guidance for residential and commercial developers.

“You hear so much when a very visible, obvious development goes in and (takes down trees),” Marshall said. “(The proposed program) would go a long way in ... keeping Camas a beautiful, vibrant, green community.”

---

<sup>3</sup> Staff note: This quotation, should have more accurately read “street trees”.

The new Urban Tree Program being proposed by city staff would require a street tree permit, change the city's code relating to park and open space trees, add tree preservation language to existing city code and amend the fines and fee schedule for removing trees.

Much of the program takes its cue from the tree preservation efforts in Olympia, Washington, a city that has had an urban tree program in place for more than 20 years.

The ad hoc committee looked at several urban tree programs, and sent Camas staff to Olympia to meet with that city's planners and urban foresters to better evaluate what did and did not work.

Under the proposed program, the city would — much like Olympia and Vancouver — require developers to meet a “tree unit” threshold based on the size of the project, its usable amount of developable land and the type of existing trees on the site. If developers absolutely could not meet the tree unit requirement, they could opt to instead put money into city tree fund to preserve healthy trees and plant new trees inside city limits.

The program would also allow city leaders to fine people who illegally removed trees from the city's public open spaces and require them to replace the stolen trees.

People looking to remove street trees from their private property would need to secure a permit first. The city may charge a permit fee and could require property owners to replace the street tree within six months. Under the permit program, “tree topping” or cutting off a tree's upper branches would be prohibited and considered a form of tree removal.

Hunter Decker, a Clark County forester who also sat on the ad hoc committee, said he supported the urban tree program in Camas, and told the city's planning commissioners on May 15 that Clark County leaders are considering a similar program to preserve trees in the county's urban growth boundary areas.

“There is a public outcry for the protection of trees,” Hunter said. “Trees help with aesthetics and beauty. They take up water and provide clean air.”

### **Commissioners side with developers, send proposal back to city staff**

The plan did have some opposition at the May 15 public hearing. The “nay” group consisted mostly of

developers and building industry representatives, who said they'd been left out of the planning process, despite the fact that city staff had emailed more than 160 interested stakeholders and met all legal notification requirements for the public hearing.

“It seems this process has overlooked some very important segments of the affected stakeholders; namely those that would bear the financial burden of these regulations,” stated Ryan Makinster, government affairs coordinator for the Building Industry Association of Clark County, in a letter to Camas Community Development Director Phil Bourquin asking that the Camas Planning Commission return the plan to staff for further review before sending to the Camas City Council.

Makinster also spoke to commissioners at the public hearing.

“We do support the plan, but feel it's too premature to move forward to the city council,” he said. “Maybe slow down its movement. I found out about this yesterday.”

In the end, the Camas Planning Commission voted to return the plan to the city's planning department and instructed city staff to do more outreach to the development community before coming back to the commissioners.

“It sounds like we need to meet with some of the development community before we decide to move this forward,” Planning Commissioner Jamia Johnson said.

If the commissioners do adopt the plan and forward it to city councilors, the proposal would still need to go through another round of public hearings and could be altered by council members to address concerns from developers or interested citizens.

For more information about the proposed Urban Tree Program, visit [ci.cammas.wa.us](http://ci.cammas.wa.us)<sup>4</sup> and click “Minutes, Agendas and Videos” link under the “Your Government” tab at the top of the page, then find the May 15, 2018 Camas Planning Commission public hearing link to view attached documents or watch the hearing on video.

---

<sup>4</sup> Staff Note: This is not a valid website address. The correct address is [www.cityofcamas.us](http://www.cityofcamas.us)