



City of Davis
Tree Commission Minutes
Remote Meeting
Thursday, December 15, 2022
5:30 P.M.

Commissioners Present: Colin Walsh-Chair, Larry Guenther-Vice Chair,
Jim Cramer, Ann Daniel, W. Allen Lowry, John Reuter

Commissioners Absent: None

Council Liaison(s) Present: None

Staff Present: Charlie Murphy, Urban Forestry Manager
Jeremy Ferguson, Deputy Director
Adrienne Heinig, Assistant to the Director
Chelsea Becker, Administrative Coordinator

Also in Attendance: Tina McKeand & Rachael Sitz, Davey Resource Group
(names voluntarily provided) Jacob Byrne, Judith Ennis, Cheryl Essex, Marcus Marino,
Elaine Roberts-Musser, Alan Hirsch

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairperson Walsh called meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. Swearing in of New Commissioner

Ann Daniel was sworn in as a regular member of the Commission.

3. Approval of Agenda

L Guenther moved to approve the agenda, seconded by A Lowry. Approved by the following votes:

Ayes: Walsh, Guenther, Cramer, Daniel, Lowry, Reuter

Noes:

Absent:

4. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commission Members, and City Council Members

- L Guenther noted recent projects using reclaimed wood.

- J Byrne (liaison from the Natural Resources Commission) noted that the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan was presented to City Council, the process is moving ahead and timely with the work of the Urban Forest Management Plan.
- C Walsh mentioned that the Downtown Davis Specific Plan was approved by Council on Tuesday night.
- A Daniel provided an introduction, and highlighted her interest in participating in discussions around public education.

4. Public Comment

One public comment was received:

- Alan Hirsch: Noted that on Tuesday at the City Council meeting, the Downtown Plan was approved, and with that approval was modified to include a Downtown tree plan. He noted that money was available in the plan for the City's ARPA funds, and that the Downtown tree plan should be the first priority after the Urban Forest Management Plan. He said that it is the responsibility of the staff liaison to the Tree Commission to update the commission on what happens at City Council. He said the Urban Forest Management Plan is deeply flawed, as the inventory isn't correct, that the City doesn't know how many trees it has, how many are public or private. He asked how the City can have a plan and a budget when the City doesn't know where the trees are. He added the City should focus on where trees should be, including bike paths and sidewalks, and equity, and suggested that the Urban Forest Management Plan could address fire danger, and the scientific basis of the report should be fixed.

5. Consent Calendar

A. Informational Tree Removals

L Guenther moved to approve the consent calendar, seconded by J Cramer.

Approved by the following votes:

Ayes: Walsh, Guenther, Cramer, Daniel, Lowry, Reuter

Noes:

Absent:

6. Regular Items

A. Urban Forest Management Plan: Review & Consider 2002 Community Forest Management Plan Goals & Vision, Cont'd.

The item was opened by C Murphy, who outlined the work of the Commission over the last few months to update the goals of the 2002 Community Forest Management Plan for the current work of the Urban Forest Management Plan. He reiterated the framework of tree planning efforts as they relate to the completion of

the Urban Forest Management Plan. The Commission reviewed the word document provided in the meeting packet by the Urban Forest Management Plan Subcommittee.

Commission discussion included the following:

- The need to address the movement for solar power, and how it can reduce the amount of room for trees in parking lots.
- An analysis of policies and goals about urban forestry concerns completed by C Essex, to share the concerns of the Planning Commission, which was shared at the meeting.
- The role of the Tree Commission moving forward in development reviews and agreements, and questions about the consequences for developers that remove trees.
- The timing of updating the ordinance update, policy guidance etc. as they are important to address the challenges of the urban forestry program.
- The concern that projects not be drawn out for years and years as they have in the past.
- Concern that the consultants might not have enough time to incorporate the goals and objectives as drafted by the Commission given that the draft is due to be released in a month.
- Specific grammatical adjustments to the language in the material presented by the UFMP Subcommittee.
- Information related to the description of the enforcement mechanisms and process, and how that would work for the UFMP was indicated as missing from the goals.
- In response to a question regarding who determines what goes in the UFMP, commission discussion included the reminder that the UFMP is ultimately approved by City Council.
- How best to incorporate additional comments from other commissions involved in the UFMP process.
- The estimated timing of updates to information, based on the amount of change anticipated in one year, five years, etc.

The item was opened for public comment and one comment was received:

- Alan Hirsch: He indicated that the goals document is a vision document, and shows a lot of work. He said it was a comprehensive document, and emphasized that the tree inventory is very important. He said the Downtown Davis Business Association (DDBA) should be mentioned as a collaborator, as well as neighborhoods and school sites committee should be included along with UCD. He said the framework needs to have

neighborhood specific plans, a downtown plan, but expressed concern that the goals don't mention other people involved. He added concern that the plan will be siloed. He said the plan is the last holdover from the time before Charlie, and that because of delays the plan is being completed in nine months.

Motion: That the City of Davis Tree Commission recommends including Commissioner Essex's comments in the Urban Forest Management Plan and policies related to the urban forest.

Ayes: Walsh, Guenther, Cramer, Daniel, Lowry, Reuter

Noes:

Absent:

Motion: To accept and recommend Tree Commissions thoughts on the 2002 Community Forestry Management Plan's Goals & Vision in setting priorities for the 2023 UFMP as revised.

Ayes: Walsh, Guenther, Cramer, Daniel, Lowry, Reuter

Noes:

Absent:

The Commission recessed from 7:36 p.m. to 7:42 p.m.

B. Urban Forest Management Plan: Pre-Draft Update.

The item was opened by C Murphy, who introduced the consultants (R Sitz and T McKeand) from Davey Resource Group, to provide a pre-draft update on the process of developing the Urban Forest Management Plan. T McKeand provided a presentation to the Commission on the plan format, including details on pages of the plan and a tour of the interactive plan components.

Commission discussion included the following:

- The recommendation to undertake a land cover assessment every 5-10 years to update the data. This can be accomplished via free sites available on the internet, but it would be anticipated that updating information of the benefits of the tree resource would be updated with the inventory data.
- The process for setting recommended levels or targets in the UFMP as a completion of the preliminary information gathering process, wherein the consultant will take in all the information received and start reviewing more precise goals based on the input.
- Including a section of the website for the UFMP to include a narrative of how the elements tie together.

- The tools utilized can be programmed to automatically update the size of trees.
- The difference between the Story Map as a summary of the current tree resource, and the TreeKeeper Canopy as a planning tool.
- Clarification that the canopy calculations for the City include public and private trees. The information in the resource analysis includes only public (City) trees.
- Clarification that the right of ways (ROW) included in the TreeKeeper Canopy tool include roads, sidewalks and bike paths adjacent to the roads. It was requested the map also show bike paths not connected to the roads and bus stops, as transportation routes for active transportation should be the highest priority for tree shading.
- Clarification that the next inventory would include additional data points for collection. This would include vacant sites. Collecting information on private trees was also recommended.
- The benefits of an online plan for navigation, setting an example for other projects of the kind.
- An error in the list of species that are underused from the tree resource analysis was highlighted.
- Highlighted consideration for four main points in supporting the urban forest: climate (adaptation and action) / environment (stormwater, heat island) / social (shade where shade is needed) / habitat value.
- The question of how the City can protect canopy on private land.

No public comment was received and no formal action was taken on this item.

7. Commission and Staff Communication

A. Subcommittee Updates.

- a. The Urban Wood Reclamation Subcommittee reported hitting a wall with West Coast Arborist (WCA).

B. Workplan and Long Range Calendar

Brief discussion included:

- The next few months of Commission meetings, with a focus on the draft Urban Forest Management Plan.
- The request to include a discussion of the City's on-street yard material pile collection in January, to look to form a subcommittee.
- The request to include an item on continued recording of commission meetings.

No public comment was received on the item and no formal action was taken.

8. Adjourn

Motion: to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Moved by L Guenther, seconded by J Reuter. Approved by the following votes:

Ayes: Walsh, Guenther, Cramer, Daniel, Lowry, Reuter

Noes:

Absent: