



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses

1. Do you have comments or suggestions about the draft Vision Statement?

1. No response.
2. Please clean up this statement by correcting the grammar, eliminating redundancy, and providing better focus. Here is a suggestion: Shoreline is dedicated to the protection and effective management of its publicly owned urban trees, in a manner agreeable and equitable to its citizens, so as to enhance the livability and environment of the community today, and for future generations.
3. No response.
4. No response.
5. Any plan/legislation must include an express acknowledgement that, where urban forestation policies/requirements would conflict with private covenants, the covenants will control. Any increase desired in urban canopy arguably should occur on City's property such as parks.
6. No response.
7. Citizens of the City should be able to enjoy the sunshine as well and therefore an enhanced urban forest does not necessarily benefit the livability of the community.
8. No response.
9. Yes. See response for Question #6.
10. The current draft statement is too vague and does not inspire anything. It also should be split into separate vision and mission statements. The vision statement should illustrate what we are striving for and the mission statement should be about what we plan to do to achieve the vision. Here are some a vision and mission statement written by a Shoreline resident that I think are excellent and I can think of no way to improve: Urban Forest Vision Statement: "The City of Shoreline epitomizes the ideal of forest stewardship with a well maintained, vigorous, diverse and sustainable urban forest emphasizing native trees accented with locally appropriate non-natives to create a resilient forest that provides the greatest canopy cover, enhanced livability, and environmental benefits as part of the network of natural systems within the city for the benefit and pleasure of all." Urban Forest Mission Statement: "Shoreline is committed to using the best science available to protect and manage the urban forest as pivotal component of the natural eco-systems within the city and in recognition of its historic, economic, environmental, social and aesthetic importance. "
11. No response.
12. No response



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses

2. Do you have any comments about the draft (green) Desired Levels and (orange) Top Key Objectives for the Vegetative Resource Category? Please indicate what you would like the City to consider.

1. No response.
2. The terms are not clear here. For example, what is meant by 'potential available planting space'? I also see no mention, anywhere, relating to private property rights. Nor do I understand where these figures and percentages came from. I will not comment on each item as much of this is clearly biased towards an absurdly and inappropriately high tree density in an urban area.
3. No response.
4. No response.
5. The “Urban Forest Strategy Plan” should not increase the regulatory burden on private property owners, particularly if it is part of a strategy to up the percentage of urban forest canopy from that which has historically existed in the City. The City cannot enlist homeowners in a crusade to re-forest the City when current homes and developments were sited, permitted, and constructed under different rules. “Urban forestation” must be balanced with maintenance of public and private improvements such as sidewalks, driveways, landscaping, etc.
6. No response.
7. A canopy cover of 50-75% is ridiculous and over-reaching.
8. No response.
9. No response.
10. Generally the key objectives make sense, and are a good starting point. I do think Criteria #4 is confusing. The category is important and the key objective is understandable, but the desired and optimal levels need to be clarified. If no species is more than 10%, and we currently have 5 species dominate, then are we hoping to have just 10 species dominate? Also re Criteria #5: Does this include a work plan at the end? I tried to find a place to make comments at the event (unsuccessfully) on some specific street trees (conifers on 15th NE) that should be removed because they've been completely tortured over the years from pruning for power lines. It wasn't known if or when those trees might be put out of their misery and replaced with something more appropriate.
11. No response.



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses

12. The critical issue ignored here is how much of the city is covered with impervious surface. The goal should be what percentage of the whole land mass is covered with trees + forest, not what percentage of the “potential”. The board could also consider making a regulation of what percentage that a residential lot must be covered with trees – allowing homeowners to decide whether they wanted their non-tree area to be house + driveway or rose garden + corn plants.

- Comment about: 1. Relative Canopy Cover – A different question should be asked.
- Comment about: 2. Species suitability Good Indicator “No diameter class represents more than 50% of the tree population –
- Comment about: 3. Species suitability – What determines “suitable”?? I would not cut “unsuitable” trees unless they are invasive exotics and then only maybe. We should encourage a move toward older trees. It would be fantastic if Shoreline was dominated by ancient forest groves’. I would not advocate a policy that would cut trees just because they’re the “wrong” age. There is no such thing as an “over-mature” forest. If a 1000 yr old conifer dies, it becomes a snag or nurse log – very vital to the native forest.
- Comment about: 4. Species Distribution: We should not plant trees so that no single species represents more than 10% of the planted trees. Native species might very well be naturally more than 10%. Certainly no living tree should be cut down just because it represents more than 10%, unless perhaps if it is an invasive exotic.
- Comment about: 5. Condition of Publicly-managed trees Optimal Level: Risk for what? See below.
- Comment about: 6. Publicly-owned natural areas Optimal Level: Good.
- Comment about: 7. Native Vegetation Optimal Level: It depends how they are eradicated – pulling?? Poisoning??

3. Do you have any comments about the draft (green) Desired Levels (goals) and (orange) Top Key Objectives for the Resource Management Category? Please indicate what you would like the City to consider.

1. No response.
2. Consider the rights of residents who want open spaces, gardens (and sunlight for them), lowered maintenance costs by NOT having towering Doug Firs over their roofs, power line issues, etc.
3. No response.
4. No response.
5. Tree species for street rights of way must be limited to 40-feet, maximum height to accommodate utilities and to respect neighboring properties’ rights including pursuant to private covenants.
6. No response.
7. The City should require any property owner to immediately remove a dead or diseased tree for the health and well-being of the community.



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses

8. Please consider the following:

1. In the area of Tree Risk Management and hazardous trees, please provide for removal of unhealthy trees on both public and private property. Under the current UFSP, the idea of increasing canopy while inhibiting hazard tree removal seems to increase the risk to public health and safety.
2. The policy should encourage residents and businesses to increase canopy, but not require them to do so. In addition, any measure to increase canopy should focus on areas where the canopy is currently below the historic City average - i.e. commercial properties which contribute more to storm water than residential neighborhoods.
3. The plan must specifically recognize the benefits of solar access for energy. The plan should state that urban forestation cannot rule over residents' right to solar access.

9. No response.

10. No response.

11. No response.

12. Risk of what? I'm more concerned about trees that seem stressed by drought or disease than ones leaning. I would be interested in age + size + species inventory – measuring DBH and perhaps making biomass calculations.

Comment about: 1. Tree Inventory Optimal Level: Good.

Comment about 2: Canopy Cover Assessment Optimal Level: For both summer + winter inventories.

Comment about: 3. City-wide management plan Good Level - It depends what form the “management” takes. Nature often does a better job of “managing” than humans – i.e. an old growth forest is much healthier than a forest service or Weyerhaeuser tree plantation.

Comment about: 4. Municipality-wide funding Key Objective - Circled Key Objective – More funding is key – should be a high priority.

Comment about: 5. City Staffing Good Level - Good. Hire ecologists, biologists instead of timber industry trained + focused “foresters”. Certified arborists should hopefully be members of the Plant Amnesty, and have a demonstrated record of upholding those values.

- Comment about: 8. Tree Risk Management Good Level - Don't agree with arrow pointing to confirmation of.
- Comment about: 8. Tree Risk Management Key Objective – Trees are inherently “risky”. Risk from what? To whom? I am not afraid of trees. I am afraid of mass species extinction + global destabilization of climate. “risk” is often used just to cut trees down. So “safety” is not necessarily a priority.
- Comment about: 9. Tree protection policy development and enforcement Optimal Level - Yes agree with arrow pointing to included in process.
- Comment about: 10. Publicly-owned natural areas management Optimal Level and Key Objective – good.



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses

4. Do you have any comments about the draft (green) Desired Levels (goals) and (orange) Top Key Objectives for the Community Framework Category? Please indicate what you would like the City to consider.

1. The city is being too aggressive with these goals particularly criteria 3-6. The city has failed to work with Innis Arden and recognized the private property values, rights and enjoyment attached to neighborhoods sound and mountain views. The existence of preceding legal status of covenanted communities and the enforceability of their covenants. The city must recognize these property rights and avoid costly legal action which will certainly arise if the city tries to place the burden of growing the urban tree canopy on privately held property.
2. No response.
3. No response.
4. No response.
5. Residents and businesses may be encouraged to increase canopy on private property – but cannot be required to do so. Further, any measures to increase canopy should first address neighborhoods and communities where the canopy is currently below the historic City average. It should start with commercial and business districts and properties which contribute as much or more to storm water and carbon problems as residential neighborhoods do.
6. No response.
7. The City does not have the funds for more management of private property.
8. Please consider the following:
 1. The Plan must specifically acknowledge that when urban forestation policies conflict with private covenants, the covenants will prevail.
 2. The UFSP should not impact or burden private property owners in the City of Shoreline. Many current homes were permitted and constructed under different rules, and private homeowners should not be required to comply with a new strategy to increase the urban forest.
9. No response.
10. No response.
11. No response.
12. Comment about: 1. Public agency cooperation Optimal Level – good.
Comment about 2. Involvement of large institutions Good Level and Key Objective – good. City should help landowners develop strategies especially for those landowners who desire it. A property owner might want to enhance the urban forest but need advice or tools etc. to do it. And also restrictions on destruction of trees, with consequences + enforcement – not just incentives. Comment about: 6. General awareness of trees as a community resource Optimal Level – yes.



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses

5. Do you have comments on the City's Street Tree List?

1. Shoreline's city street trees should be kept under 40' tall preferably 30' and not interfere with solar access, public utilities, sidewalks, pedestrian amenities and non-view obstructing for drivers and residential neighborhoods.
2. There is mention, in the 'mission statement', of putting plan in place for 'future generations'. Why allow large, dangerous trees - native or otherwise - under or near power lines or houses? There is NO PLACE for 100-200' ft tall Douglas Firs, Western Red Cedar, (California Naive Giant Sequoia), etc near houses, roads, power lines, etc., especially for future generations, which will bear the brunt of the damage, injuries, deaths, higher insurance costs and so on caused by inappropriate tree choices.
3. No response.
4. No response.
5. Any plan must recognize that public and/or private roof gardens ("green roofs"), bio-swales, low impact development, and/or recycled roof runoff (e.g., rain barrels, cisterns) are viable, legal alternatives to urban forestation measures adopted for example for storm water control reasons, particularly in residential neighborhoods. In addition, increasing the size and diversity of the urban canopy can be achieved without expanding the City's established ROW tree list to include huge species such as Douglas Firs, Grand Firs, Western Red Cedars or Big Leaf Maples. Canopy is provided by trees (and shrubs) of all heights and varieties – promoting the tree canopy should not eclipse the importance of planting site- appropriate trees.
6. No response.
7. The maximum tree height for the street tree list should be less than 25 feet because residents already experience too many power outages and funds are wasted pruning trees.
8. No response.
9. No response.
10. No response.
11. The tree list is 100% inadequate because you've left out all natives and all existing street trees.
12. The street tree list is completely inadequate. It's mostly a list of shorter deciduous varieties that are convenient for utility lines and sidewalks. WHERE ARE THE NATIVE CONIFERS?? NOT A SINGLE ONE IS LISTED!! Our native trees both conifer, deciduous +broadleaf evergreens must be protected. They are our gems. The natives must be added to the tree list. Consult the Lake Forest Park Street Tree List.



Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses

6. Or other ideas you would like to share?

1. The urban forest management plan should focus on public ally owned trees and public property - parks, schools etc. the city should not inhibit private property owners rights. Neighborhood covenants and view preservation must be acknowledged and take precedence over any new restrictions due to urban forest goals.
2. Along with the above comment, you need to consider, for future generations, the impact of much more severe wind conditions caused by global warming. There are many smaller, native trees that can be used that are more likely to survive high winds than towering, solitary rows of Firs, Cedar, Big Leaf Maple, etc.
3. Why is there an advisory tree board? Why does Shoreline need an urban forestry consultant? There are too many trees now in this city. We have too much shade and our gardens could do better with more sun. I am for the city taking care of city property and respecting the private property rights of each resident and the various covenants such as those in Innis Arden where there are approximately fifty acres of vegetation. This is not City of Shoreline property and neither are any of the city residences.
4. If you don't have anything better to do than creating more rules and regulation than it is time to decrease the size of the City government.
5. The City should revisit hazard tree issues and provide for streamlined removal of unhealthy trees on public and private property, even where the hazard is not "imminent". Any strategy that demands increase in canopy while inhibiting hazard tree removal such as in the current Code is certain to increase risk to public health hand safety. Finally, I emphasize again that the City needs to recognize the covenants of Innis Arden and work with this community instead of thwarting it attempts to enforce its covenants at every turn.
6. No response.
7. Please do not continue trying to force additional trees onto private property if the owner has other priorities such as gardening, solar panels, or enjoying the sunshine.
8. No response.
9. I have been a resident of Shoreline for nearly 39 years, at 17029 !4th Ave. NW. Shoreline attracted me because of the Sound and Mountain views that were, in large part, the result of the foresight and decisive action of Bill Boeing, who platted Innis Arden with a clear intent to capture the spectacular views there. Need more be said about the foresight of Mr. Boeing? His foresight is evident all over Puget Sound country. How much of th Puget sound economy is the result of what he started here? Too often regulations are adopted with a "one size fits all" mentality. In Shoreline, we have apartment dwellers, condo dwellers and single family home dwellers. And within each of those categories we have sub-categories. With respect to single family homes, some prefer ramblers, some prefer split levels, others two story ,etc. Some want to be nestled among the trees and others prefer open air and others prefer view property. Most of the 500 plus homes in Innis Arden are owned by people who prefer views. If people



**Urban Forest Strategic Plan Public Comment
Jan 23 – Feb 7, 2014
Comment Form Responses**

want a forest setting, they may settle east of I-5 or in Lake Forest Park. I paid for a view location in my purchase price in 1975 and I pay extra taxes every year for a view location. My wife and I thrive in sunlight, not in the shadows. In old England, the "doctrine of ancient lights" protected property owners' views. View preservation is nothing new and in spite of its origins hundreds of years ago, it deserves consideration and protection today. My views and the views of my neighbors are fiercely protected by covenants upon which hundreds of property owners have relied upon for years. We are not to be deprived of our property rights by some trendy concept and hastily conceived regulations. "Urban canopy" and "Urban forest" are oxymoron's. How can canopy and forest exist over four lane highways, concrete slabs, grocery and hardware stores, shopping centers, park and ride lots, transit stations, apartment complexes and sprawling school buildings? Let's keep the canopy and the forest where they can thrive and prosper and not infringe upon other established and equally worthwhile standards. If city construction has destroyed the canopy and the forest, should the city be destroyed? Should we stop street and highway construction or preserve this canopy? Have public works or private dwellings destroyed more canopy and forest? If concrete surfaces excessively contribute to water runoff, perhaps we should resort to gravel roads and parking lots. Have you considered the benefits of the large lots and the green belts in Innis Arden and the lawn areas around all of the single family homes in Shoreline? Let's not take away what thousands of home owners, not just those in Innis Arden, have chosen as a life style by some trendy concept and ill-conceived regulations.

10. Thank you for all the work on this. It's extremely important for the sustainability & health within our city.

11. This dot program is very confusing. I suggest you recognize each dot as a message in its location.

12. I like community tree plantings, ivy-outs + clean-ups. It would be helpful for both education + on the ground accomplishment if a city staff member organized more school + community service projects.