From: <u>Lance Young</u>

To: <u>Debbie Tarry</u>; <u>City Council</u>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] MUR-70 clarifications and new information

**Date:** Monday, July 30, 2018 5:28:36 PM

Attachments: ATT00001.png

ATT00002.png

## Dear City Manager and City Council

Thank you Debbie for the reply and update, and congratulations on getting DOT to agree to replant their trees here in Shoreline, this is indeed good news (and a new development). It's I also wanted to provide a little more information for tonight's discussions if its not too late.

First the new information I wanted to provide was what near by cities do for major development.

Seattle: Seattle does have tree code requiring replacements for "Landmark" trees on land being developed. These are there protected trees but much larger than our significant Trees. We are currently working to get smaller trees included in this code. The Also their code has no teeth to it and is rarely enforced. We should try to avoid this same problem here.

Lake Forest Park: city code 16.14.090 They differently require minimum lot coverage rather than minimum retention of existing canopy. $\ddot{\imath}_{\zeta}$ ½ If development brings the coverage below this limit than the developer has the options to either replant on another lot or pay a fee to the city for the replacement trees. $\ddot{\imath}_{\zeta}$ ½ All applicants are required to maintain replacement trees until they are independently viable! $\ddot{\imath}_{\zeta}$ ½ The replacement cost is defined by the current edition of the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers Guide for Plant Appraisal

Thank you Debbie for correcting the misunderstood information from the recent Urban Tree Canopy assessment report I received. \(\vec{i}\_{\ilde{l}}\)\(\sigma\) Our parks director, very kindly, agreed with me that the tables in the report were confusing. \(\vec{i}\_{\ilde{l}}\)\(\sigma\) So if this was confusing for anyone else here is what I understand is the case. \(\vec{i}\_{\ilde{l}}\)\(\sigma\)\(\text{Table 4 listed three Station Areas 1 2 and 3, not two and the canopy in these areas as comprising 3%,2% and 3% of Shoreline's total cover. \(\vec{i}\_{\ilde{l}}\)\(\sigma\)\(\text{If I understand correctly these refer to successive Zoning Rings (not really Station Areas) around the two stations. \(\vec{i}\_{\ilde{l}}\)\(\sigma\)\(\text{So Station Area 1 is Zoning code MUR-70 zoning, Station Area 2 is Zoning ring 2 and MUR-45, and Zoning level 3 is MUR-35. \(\vec{i}\_{\ilde{l}}\)\(\vec{l}{l}\)\(\text{Thank you for that clarification.}

So tonight is discussing only the Zoning Area 1 or MUR-70 ring which affects 3% of our total canopy between both 145th and 185th stations. i; ½ The city manager also provided the good news that the trees on DOT land removed for the rail line and stations is now probably going to be replaced in our vicinity. i; ½ This is new news and was good news to both myself and the Parks Directory, and thanks mostly to the hard work of our city managers office. i; ½ Lets hope that this will stick. i; ½ All of this will help in this area which will be hard hit over the next several years.

Sincerely Lance Young ITTPS 206-363-0859 \_\_\_\_\_\_

## On 7/30/2018 11:14 AM, Debbie Tarry wrote:

Hi Lance �

�

Hope that all is well. it is wanted to let you know that I have provided some clarification to the City Council regarding the letter from the Interurban Tree Preservation Society. it is Below is what I sent to them. I know that there was a lot of information shared during the tree canopy discussion so wanted to make sure that you were aware of the clarification I sent to Council it hopefully this is good news for you. it is please let Eric or I know if you have any questions.

ï¿ ½

I wanted to make you aware of a clarification to Mr. Young�s letter from the Interurban Tree Preservation Society.� I will also send something to Mr. Young.� Mr. Young�s letter states the following:

However the biggest concern from Mr. Friedi�s presentation was the projected 6% canopy loss from the two new transit stations/lines coming soon effectively wiping out all of our gains. Further bad news is that these trees are mostly on DOT land and they are not intending to replant anywhere near Shoreline. Incidentally, these losses will be in the same areas most affected by the MRU-70 issue under discussion this Monday.

1⁄2 ن≼آ

What Eric said in the presentation is the following:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--> $\ddot{i}_{c}$   $\frac{1}{2}\ddot{i}_{c}$   $\frac{1}{2}\ddot{i$
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->�½i¸½i¸½i¸½i¸½i¸½i¸½i¸½i¸½i¸½<!--[endif]-->The light rail line (guideways/tracks) and the actual stations (185<sup>th</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup>) makeup less than 1% of the City�s tree canopy � this includes the WSDOT right-of-way.

ï*ċ 1*/2

Also I wanted to let you know that currently Sound Transit has not made a request for a variance from the City�s tree replacement regulations.� We anticipate that they will be replacing the trees that are removed per the City�s regulations which means that all the trees will be replaced in Shoreline (your letter indicates that the DOT replantings are not intended to be anywhere near Shoreline).� Sound Transit is also meeting the required replanting ratios based on the tree size being removed.� Sound Transit also has to meet WSDOT�s requirements, which could result in some trees being replanted elsewhere, but the last information we had was that WSDOT requirements will likely be met with all replantings occurring in Shoreline.

1⁄2 خ∏

Please let me know if you have any questions.

�

## **Debbie Tarry**

## City Manager | City of Shoreline 17500 Midvale Avenue N, Shoreline, WA 98133

a: (206) 801-2211 | www.shorelinewa.gov

www.SURPRISEDbySHORELINE.com



NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.



Virus-free. www.avast.com