



Urban Forest Strategic Planning Open House

Meeting Overview & Agenda

January 23, 2014

6:00pm-7:00pm

Shoreline City Hall Council Chambers

17500 Midvale North

Join the Shoreline Tree/PRCS Board at an open house on Thursday, January 23 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. to learn about the City's efforts to develop an Urban Forest Strategic Plan for the City. An outline of the development of the strategic plan will be discussed. Guests are encouraged to ask questions, provide comments, and weigh in on the top priorities for the City's urban forestry program. Board members, staff and consultant Elizabeth Walker, Consulting Urban Forester, of Terra Firma Consulting will be available to discuss this exciting project. The development of this strategic plan is a collaborative process between City staff, the advisory Tree Board (PRCS Board), and the public, facilitated by an urban forestry consultant.

6:00pm Welcome and Introduction

Dick Deal, Shoreline Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director

Elizabeth Walker, Terra Firm Consulting Urban Forester

6:15pm Breakout Session Stations

- The Vegetation Resource Key Objectives
- Urban Forest Management Key Objectives
- Community Framework Key Objectives
- Right of Way Trees
- Draft Vision Statement
- Project Overview and Schedule & Other Issues or Concerns
- Tree Removal Process

6:55pm Closing Statements/Next Steps

For those unable to attend the open house, comments will be received via our online comment form on our website at www.shorelinewa.gov/urbanforest or via email at pks@shorelinewa.gov until February 7.



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Draft Vision Statement

Part of creating an Urban Forest Strategic Plan is creating a vision statement for the care and management of Shoreline's Urban Forest. The Shoreline Tree Board developed a draft vision statement at their October 19th Tree Board Retreat and December 5th Regular Meetings. The vision statement will be posted for review at the January 23rd Urban Forest Strategic Plan Open House.

Shoreline is dedicated to protect and manage its vibrant and thriving urban forest through good stewardship by the City and citizens alike in order to preserve and enhance its benefit to the environment and the livability of the community today and for generations to come.

Urban Forest Strategic Planning Process Overview

The City of Shoreline needs a plan to help guide the care and management of our City's public trees. An urban forest strategic Plan is a working document that outlines where Shoreline wants to go regarding its urban forest and ideas of how to get there. Part of this plan includes an overarching vision statement under which all goals and strategies align. In concert, a sustainable urban forestry model (Matrix) is utilized to demonstrate the comprehensive nature of resource management and to identify the feasible goals to strive for and key priorities in which to focus short-term action steps. The strategic recommendations in the plan are to guide the community over the next five years regarding planning, management and maintenance of public trees

Overview and History:

The City became a Tree City USA in 2012. To meet the qualifications for the Tree City USA designation, the City of Shoreline adopted Ordinance 617 and Ordinance 627 in 2012 creating a Tree Board and street tree ordinance. In 2013, the City received a \$10,000 Community Urban Forestry Assistance Grant from the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WA DNR) to create an Urban Forest Strategic Plan. Like other progressive municipalities, Shoreline has a goal to better manage its urban forest. The City emphasized its commitment by becoming a Tree City USA.

Currently the city has thousands of trees that provide tremendous benefit and have high value, but no comprehensive plan for managing these assets. Realizing its limited resources, the City sought assistance in developing a strategic plan toward a more sustainable urban forestry program. With a grant from the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, in partnership with the USDA Forest Service, the City will have a clear direction for a more effective and cost-efficient management of public trees and urban forest. Terra Firma Consulting was contracted to work with City staff and the Tree Board to develop a strategic plan that addresses how to manage and maintain public trees and lead the City to more specific action plans and budgets over time.

The goal of this project is to establish priorities for an on-the-ground urban forest management program. Based on the identified goals and priorities of the plan, an annual 2015 work plan with budget implications would be generated from the strategic plan.

During this planning process, the City will review the Engineering Development Manual's Recommended Street Tree List, evaluating it for acceptable street tree species. The strategic plan will incorporate findings from the recently completed inventory of street trees (funded by WA DNR) along 10 major [Shoreline street corridors](#).



Tentative Schedule: (subject to change)

Fall 2013:

- Tree Board Retreat and Board Development
- Tree Plantings at Sunset School Park and South Woods Park

Winter 2014:

- January 23 - Open House on Beginning the Urban Forest Strategic Plan & Plan Key Objectives
- February 7 – Deadline for Public Comment
- February 27 Tree Board Discuss Shoreline Street Tree List and Review Community Input on Sustainable Urban Forest Matrix
- March 27- Tree Board Review Draft Plan & Street Tree List Discussion

Spring 2014:

- April 8 Draft Urban Forest Strategic Plan & Street Tree List Review & Open House
- City Council Reviews Urban Forest Strategic Plan and Street Tree List Recommendations
- PRCS Board Recommends Approval of the Urban Forest Strategic Plan
- City Council Adopts Urban Forest Strategic Plan
- City updates the Street Tree List in the [Engineering Development Manual](#)

For more information or questions: Visit our webpage at www.shorelinewa.gov/urbanforest, or contact Maureen Colaizzi at mcolaizzi@shorelinewa.gov.



Draft Urban Forest Sustainability Matrix

In order to begin the conversation about a sustainable urban forestry program for the City of Shoreline, the following matrix was used. The three categories - vegetative resource, resource management, and community framework described below – along with the performance indicator spectrum and key objectives are based on a sustainability model developed by Clark, et al (1997). The criteria in each category are comprehensive in order to demonstrate all the aspects of an urban forestry program to consider when setting goals and priorities. The **GREEN** levels are the draft desired levels to strive for and the objectives with **ORANGE** are the draft suggested priorities for the Urban Forest Strategic Plan. We are looking for community input to help us in determining if these are the desired level (goal) and top key objectives (priorities) to guide the City in the implementing the first 10-20 years of the Urban Forest Strategic Plan.

Vegetative Resource

This category has criteria that relate to the composition and condition of the urban forest. The performance indicators range in the level of diversity and known health of the trees across the community. These are often used as performance benchmarks to assess the effectiveness of resource management.

Resource Management

The criteria in this resource management speak to the significant components of a city urban forestry program – staff, funding, resources, planning, policy, and operations.

Community Framework

This category offers all aspects and possible community relationships that impact the sustainability of the urban forest. The criteria stress the importance of cooperation and deep understanding of the value of the urban forestry for a successful program.

The matrix was distributed to City staff and the Tree Board (Parks Recreation and Cultural Services Board) to introduce these concepts to consider which of the 24 key objectives would be potential top priorities the City should focus on within the first 10-20 years of implementation of the Urban Forest Strategic Plan. The responses were combined into one matrix and vetted by the Tree Board and City staff at a Tree Board Retreat on October 19, 2013. The goal of the exercise was to reach consensus on both the desired level (goal) and the top objectives (priorities) for the strategic plan to focus on for short-term strategies. The results of this exercise are shown on the attached matrix. There will be an opportunity at the January 23, 2014 Urban Forest Strategic Plan Open House to ask questions about the matrix and provide comments on the draft desired levels and top objectives. The matrix will also be available online and comments will be received online at www.shorelinewa.gov/urbanforest and by email at pks@shorelinewa.gov until **February 7**.

Contact Maureen Colaizzi, Park Project Coordinator at mcolaizzi@shorelinewa.gov for questions on how to read the matrix.



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Draft Vegetative Resource Criteria and Indicators

Green = Desired Level

Orange = Top Objective

Criteria	Performance Indicator Spectrum				Key Objective	
	Low	Moderate	Good	Optimal		
1. Relative Canopy Cover	The existing canopy cover equals 0-25% of the <u>potential</u> .	The existing canopy cover equals 25-50% of the potential.	The existing canopy cover equals 50-75% of the potential.	The existing canopy cover equals 75-100% of the potential.	Achieve climate-appropriate degree of tree cover, community-wide	*
2. Age distribution of trees in the community	Any Relative DBH (RDBH) class (0-25% RDBH, 26-50% RDBH, etc.) represents more than 75% of the tree population.	Any RDBH class represents between 50% and 75% of the tree population.	No RDBH class represents more than 50% of the tree population.	25% of the tree population is in each of four RDBH classes.	Provide for uneven-aged distribution city-wide as well as at the neighborhood/HOA level.	
3. Species suitability	Less than 50% of trees are of species considered suitable for the area.	50% to 75% of trees are of species considered suitable for the area.	More than 75% of trees are of species considered suitable for the area.	All trees are of species considered suitable for the area.	Establish a tree population suitable for the urban environment and adapted to the regional environment.	*
4. Species distribution	Fewer than 5 species dominate the entire tree population city-wide.	No species represents more than 20% of the entire tree population city-wide.	No species represents more than 10% of the entire tree population city-wide.	No species represents more than 10% of the entire tree population at the neighbourhood level.	Establish a genetically diverse tree population city-wide as well as at the neighborhood level.	
5. Condition of Publicly-managed Trees (including ROW trees)	No tree maintenance or risk assessment. Request based/reactive system. The condition of the urban forest is unknown	Sample-based inventory indicating tree condition and risk level is in place.	Complete tree inventory which includes detailed tree condition ratings.	Complete tree inventory which includes detailed tree condition and risk ratings.	Detailed understanding of the condition and risk potential of all publicly-managed trees	

DRAFT

<p>6. Publicly-owned natural areas (e.g. woodlands, sensitive areas, etc.)</p>	<p>No information about publicly-owned natural areas.</p>	<p>Publicly-owned natural areas identified in a “natural areas survey” or similar document [PROS plan].</p>	<p>The level and type of public use in publicly-owned natural areas is documented</p>	<p>The ecological structure and function of all publicly-owned natural areas are documented through an Urban Tree Canopy Analysis and included in the city-wide GIS</p>	<p>Detailed understanding of the ecological structure and function of all publicly-owned natural areas.</p>	<p>*</p>
<p>7. Native vegetation</p>	<p>No program of integration</p>	<p>Voluntary use of native species on publicly and privately-owned lands; invasive species are recognized.</p>	<p>The use of native species is encouraged on a project-appropriate basis in actively managed areas; invasive species are recognized and discouraged; some planned eradication.</p>	<p>The use of native species is required on a project-appropriate basis in all public and private managed areas; invasive species are aggressively eradicated.</p>	<p>Preservation and enhancement of local natural biodiversity</p>	

DRAFT



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Draft Resource Management Criteria and Indicators

Green = Desired Level

Orange = Top Objective

Criteria	Performance Indicator Spectrum				Key Objective	
	Low	Moderate	Good	Optimal		
1. Tree Inventory	No inventory	Complete or sample-based inventory of publicly-owned trees	Complete inventory of publicly-owned trees AND sample-based inventory of privately-owned trees.	Complete inventory of publicly-owned trees [AND sample-based inventory of privately-owned trees] included in city-wide GIS	Comprehensive inventory of the tree resource to direct its management. This includes: age distribution, species mix, tree condition, risk assessment.	*
2. Canopy Cover Assessment	No inventory	Visual assessment	Sampling of tree cover using aerial photographs or satellite imagery; I-Tree;	Mapped urban tree cover using aerial photographs or satellite imagery included in city-wide GIS	High resolution assessments of the existing and potential canopy cover for the entire community.	
3. City-wide management plan	No plan	Existing plan limited in scope and implementation	Comprehensive plan for publicly-owned, intensively- and extensively-managed forest resources accepted and implemented	Strategic multi-tiered plan for public and private intensively- and extensively-managed forest resources accepted and implemented with adaptive management mechanisms.	Develop and implement a comprehensive urban forest management plan for private and public property.	*
4. Municipality-wide funding	Funding for only emergency reactive management	Funding for some proactive management to improve the public portion of urban forest.	Funding to provide for a measurable increase in urban forest benefits.	Adequate private and public funding to sustain maximum urban forest benefits.	Develop and maintain adequate funding to implement a city-wide urban forest management plan	*

DRAFT

5. City staffing	No staff.	Limited trained or certified staff.	Certified arborists and professional foresters on staff with regular professional development.	Multi-disciplinary team within an urban forestry program.	Employ and train adequate staff to implement city-wide urban forestry plan	*
6. Tree establishment, planning and implementation	Tree establishment is ad hoc (no plan or budget)	Limited tree establishment occurs on an annual basis with minimal budget.	Tree establishment is directed by needs derived from a tree inventory or strategy	Tree establishment is directed by needs derived from a tree inventory and is sufficient to meet canopy cover objectives (see Canopy Cover criterion in Table 1)	Urban Forest renewal is ensured through a comprehensive tree establishment program driven by canopy cover, species diversity, and species distribution objectives	*
7. Maintenance of publicly-owned, intensively managed trees (not open space)	No maintenance of publicly-owned trees	Publicly-owned trees are maintained on a request/reactive basis. No systematic (block) pruning.	All publicly-owned trees are systematically maintained on a cycle longer than five years; <i>all immature trees are structurally pruned.</i>	All mature publicly-owned trees are maintained on a 5-year cycle. All immature trees are structurally pruned.	All publicly-owned, intensively managed trees are maintained to maximize current and future benefits. Tree health and condition ensure maximum longevity.	
8. Tree Risk Management	No tree risk assessment/remediation program. The condition of the urban forest is unknown	Sample-based tree inventory which includes general tree risk information; Request based/reactive risk abatement system.	Complete tree inventory which includes detailed tree failure risk ratings; risk abatement program is in effect eliminating hazards within a maximum of one month from confirmation of hazard potential.	Complete tree inventory which includes detailed tree failure risk ratings; risk abatement program is in effect eliminating hazards within a maximum of one week from confirmation of hazard potential.	All publicly-owned trees are managed with safety as a high priority.	

DRAFT

<p>9. Tree Protection Policy Development and Enforcement</p>	<p>No tree protection policy</p>	<p>Policies in place to protect public trees.</p>	<p>Policies in place to protect public and private trees with enforcement desired.</p>	<p>Integrated municipal wide policies that ensure the protection of trees on public and private land are consistently enforced and supported by significant deterrents; <i>education component included in process</i></p>	<p>The benefits derived from large-stature/mature trees are ensured by the enforcement of municipal wide policies.</p>	
<p>10. Publicly-owned natural areas management planning and implementation</p>	<p>No stewardship plans or implementation in effect.</p>	<p>Reactionary stewardship in effect to facilitate public use (e.g. hazard abatement, trail maintenance, etc.)</p>	<p>Stewardship plan in effect for each publicly-owned natural area to facilitate public use (e.g. hazard abatement, trail maintenance, etc.)</p>	<p>Stewardship plan in effect for each publicly-owned natural area focused on sustaining the ecological structure and function of the feature.</p>	<p>The ecological structure and function of allpublicly-owned natural areas are protected and, where appropriate, enhanced.</p>	<p>*</p>

Green = Desired Level

Orange = Top Objective

Criteria	Performance Indicator Spectrum				Key Objective	
	Low	Moderate	Good	Optimal		
1. Public agency cooperation (inter-departmental and with utilities)	No communication or conflicting goals among departments and or agencies.	Common goals but no coordination or cooperation among departments and/or agencies.	Informal teams among departments and or agencies are functioning and implementing common goals on a project-specific basis.	Municipal policy implemented by formal interdepartmental/interagency teams on ALL municipal projects.	Ensure all city department cooperate with common goals and objectives	*
2. Involvement of large institutional land holders (ex. hospitals, campuses, utility corridors)	No awareness of issues	Educational materials and advice available to landholders.	Clear goals for tree resource by landholders. Incentives for preservation of private trees.	Landholders develop comprehensive tree management plans (including funding).	Large private landholders embrace city-wide goals and objectives through specific resource management plans.	
3. Green industry cooperation	No cooperation among segments of the green industry (nurseries, tree care companies, etc.) No adherence to industry standards.	General cooperation among nurseries, tree care companies, etc.	Specific cooperative arrangements such as purchase certificates for "right tree in the right place"	Shared vision and goals including the use of professional standards.	The green industry operates with high professional standards and commits to city-wide goals and objectives.	
4. Neighborhood action	No action	Neighborhood associations/HOA's exist but are minimally engaged or a limited number are engaged.	City-wide coverage and interaction; <i>Neighborhood associations are engaged with the program (education, advocacy, stewardship)</i>	All neighborhoods/HOA's organized and cooperating.	At the neighborhood level, citizens understand and cooperate in urban forest management.	*

DRAFT

5. Citizen-municipality-business interaction	Conflicting goals among constituencies	No interaction among constituencies.	Informal and/or general cooperation <i>with focus to improve relationship with businesses.</i>	Formal interaction e.g. Tree board with staff coordination.	All constituencies in the community interact for the benefit of the urban forest.	
6. General awareness of trees as a community resource	Trees not seen as an asset, a drain on budgets.	Trees seen as important to the community.	Trees acknowledged as providing environmental, social and economic services.	Urban forest recognized as vital to Shoreline's environmental, social and economic well-being.	The general public understanding the role of the urban forest <i>through education and participation</i>	*
7. Regional cooperation	Communities independent.	Communities share similar policy vehicles.	Regional planning is in effect	Regional planning, coordination and /or management plans	Provide for cooperation and interaction among neighboring communities and regional groups.	