

Archived: Tuesday, August 30, 2022 3:47:00 PM

From: [Boni Biery](#)

Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 4:22:47 PM

To: [City Council](#); [Betsy Robertson](#); [Doris McConnell](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Chris Roberts](#); [Keith Scully](#); [Eben Pobece](#); [John Ramsdell](#)

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Save Trees on MUR-70' Zones; Council agenda item on 9/12/22

Response requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments:

[22 Aug 25 MUR 70 Tree Retention.pdf](#) 

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Shoreline. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

August 25, 2022

To: City Council

Subject: Save Trees on MUR-70' Zones; Council agenda item on 9/12/22

I am writing to ask that you, as my representatives, revise the tree retention percentages for MUR 70', 80', 90', and 140' tall buildings. The Deep Green incentive program has nothing to do with trees. It is about electricity in lieu of natural gas and energy efficiency in new construction over all. Deep Green and similar programs will make a difference, however to do so does not require that we sacrifice every living thing to accomplish them.

- o Retaining a very small percentage of our mature trees which are not only making a difference right now toward addressing climate change is critical -- they shade from the sun and provide protection from the winds which both save energy, and these tall icons absorb and filter stormwater runoff while simultaneously offering shelter to the birds and small wildlife that enrich our lives.
- o Adjusting the tree retention percentages will still allow developers (most of whom don't live in Washington State let alone Shoreline), to remove up to 90% of existing canopy with no requirement to replant. Requiring developers to respect the needs and values of those who live here is not unreasonable. It is simply good business. Who wants to live in a concrete jungle?
- o People moved to Shoreline for the trees and quality of life they offer. Why do we allow life protecting and enriching resources to be thoughtlessly destroyed for the financial benefits of a handful of developers?
- o People also moved here for the great schools should we allow developers to begin razing them too? I'm sure they would be happy to do so for their bottom line since they won't have children living here to attend them? The logic is the same.

This is the time for the City Council to stand tall, like our native evergreens, for the values of those who have chosen to move here with their families for a better life living among the trees and the wildlife they support. I ask that Council save the 10%, 15% and 20% retention of the trees on the MUR zones as it appears in the optional language of the MUR-70' regulations before Council on September 12.

Furthermore, I believe the 2016 EIS subarea decisions eliminating public input in the "Planned Action Determination" needs to be revisited. We have much greater understanding of both the effects of climate change and the impacts of development on Shoreline residents now and they should have the option to comment on MUR-70' zoned developments.

always,

Boni Biery, Shoreline resident and voter

August 25, 2022

To: City Council

Subject: Save Trees on MUR-70' Zones; Council agenda item on 9/12/22

I am writing to ask that you, as my representatives, revise the tree retention percentages for MUR 70', 80', 90', and 140' tall buildings. The Deep Green incentive program has nothing to do with trees. It is about electricity in lieu of natural gas and energy efficiency in new construction over all. Deep Green and similar programs will make a difference, however to do so does not require that we sacrifice every living thing to accomplish them.

- Retaining a very small percentage of our mature trees which are not only making a difference right now toward addressing climate change is critical -- they shade from the sun and provide protection from the winds which both save energy, and these tall icons absorb and filter stormwater runoff while simultaneously offering shelter to the birds and small wildlife that enrich our lives.
- Adjusting the tree retention percentages will still allow developers (most of whom don't live in Washington State let alone Shoreline), to remove up to 90% of existing canopy with no requirement to replant. Requiring developers to respect the needs and values of those who live here is not unreasonable. It is simply good business. Who wants to live in a concrete jungle?
- People moved to Shoreline for the trees and quality of life they offer. Why do we allow life protecting and enriching resources to be thoughtlessly destroyed for the financial benefits of a handful of developers?
- People also moved here for the great schools should we allow developers to begin razing them too? I'm sure they would be happy to do so for their bottom line since they won't have children living here to attend them? The logic is the same.

This is the time for City Council to stand tall, like our native evergreens, for the values of those who have chosen to move here with their families for a better life living among the trees and the wildlife they support. I ask that Council save the 10%, 15% and 20% retention of the trees on the MUR zones as it appears in the optional language of the MUR-70' regulations before Council on September 12.

Furthermore, I believe the 2016 EIS subarea decisions eliminating public input in the "Planned Action Determination" needs to be revisited. We have much greater understanding of both the effects of climate change and the impacts of development on Shoreline residents now and they should have the option to comment on MUR-70' zoned developments.

always,

Boni Biery, Shoreline resident and voter