



City of Davis
Tree Commission Special Meeting Minutes
Remote Meeting
Thursday, February 8, 2023
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: Will Arnold

Staff Present: Charlie Murphy, Urban Forestry Manager
Jeremy Ferguson, Deputy Director
Adrienne Heinig, Assistant to the Director
Chelsea Becker, Administrative Coordinator
Stan Gryczko, Director – Public Works Utilities & Operations

Also in Attendance: Tina McKeand & Rachael Sitz, Davey Resource Group
(names voluntarily provided) Jacob Byrne, Julia Mouat, Cheryl Essex, Marcus Marino,
Elaine Roberts-Musser, John Johnston

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairperson Walsh called meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

L Guenther moved to approve the agenda, seconded by J Cramer. Approved by the following votes:

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

Noes:

Absent:

3. Public Comment

Two public comments were received:

- John Johnston: wanted to provide feedback on the draft Urban Forest Management Plan website, indicating that it was difficult to find the plan on the website. He suggested a note on the homepage or a link in the homepage

“Spotlight” section would be helpful, and allow for people to find the plan more easily.

- (No name provided): Indicated that the Tree Commission could be a better voice for citizens impacted by trees. Stated that in the last week, a huge branch was hanging in a City park, and that after a call the branch was removed, however there are concerns around the number of trees not maintained and with more storms coming, a bigger voice is needed. Stated that only fixing the trees after the storm events doesn't work, proactive maintenance is necessary.

4. Regular Items

A. Urban Forest Management Plan: Draft Orientation.

The item was opened by C Murphy, who outlined the proposed process to review the draft Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP). First, Tina McKeand from Davey Resource Group (DRG) would provide the facilitated orientation of the draft Urban Forest Management Plan webpages. He asked that Commissioners note larger, more complex questions (outside of navigability or clarifying webpage questions) for the second step in the UFMP draft review, the regularly scheduled Tree Commission meeting on February 16 to address the larger questions from the Commission, Commission liaisons and the public. He introduced T McKeand from DRG to provide the walk-through of the draft webpages.

Commission clarifying questions included the following:

- If the parcel map could differentiate between public and private locations. DRG indicated yes.
- If special software was necessary to load the maps. DRG indicated no, but with the amount of data on the maps the loading could often be very slow. It was suggested that the map include a warning that there could be a delay in the map opening.
- If the trees on the map would be labeled as public, City trees or private trees. DRG indicated that the trees appearing on the map (as “dots” to show location) are only City trees. It was suggested that the map legend be revised to make this clear.
- If Landmark Trees were included as a layer in the map. DRG indicated not yet, as a current inventory has not been completed.
- If additional layers could be added to the map, including: City bike paths, Safe Routes to Schools, parking lots and bus stop locations. DRG and staff indicated that recommendations in the UFMP include adding more map layers.
- When asked who would be updating the UFMP pages in the future, staff indicated that it would be done in-house.

- Updates to the benefits of trees page (if possible) for navigability, and clarification on how the benefits (and graphic) specifically relates to Davis. DRG indicated that challenges with the webpage platform prevented the kind of navigability originally proposed for the page, however ideas for revisions were being considered. In addition, the benefits of the trees would apply to all trees, not just the ones in Davis.
- The inclusion of an additional side menu for navigation, and the importance of making it clear what information is included where on the pages. It was also suggested that the pages could be a different color.
- The suggestion to include a percentage in the progress bars on the Implementation Plan page.
- Corrections of references in the Parking Lot section were provided.

Other comments included:

- Clarification of the location of existing City webpages containing information on tree care, pruning schedules, and other urban forestry division information. Concern was also expressed that navigating between the City's urban forestry program pages and draft management plan pages was too easy, and readers could leave the plan without knowing it.
- Concern that the history of the urban forest page included significant issues that need to be addressed with the history of Native Americans and the history of Yolo County.
- Concern that the tree planting list included in the draft included problematic species and should be addressed prior to Council review.
- The importance to prioritize canopy cover along active transportation routes.
- The suggestion to move the sustainability indicators from the Benchmark section to the State of the Urban Forest.
- Appreciation for the plan, with a note that the implementation objectives and action items reflected the conversation of the Tree Commission. Outstanding was an action item to include a plan for the Tree Commission's role in the development projects approval process.
- Appreciation for the TreeKeeper Canopy as a tool for use not only by the City's Urban Forestry Manager for planning, also the community to keep tabs and track as well.
- It was noted that the webpages were well-organized, utilized GPS technology well, and appreciation was expressed for working within the existing City webpage structure.

- How the City Council would approve the UFMP if the plan was built to be modified regularly. It was noted that what was first approved by Council would need to be recorded.
- The need to include information on fire resilience and the urban canopy.

MOTION: L Guenther moved to offer a second period of public comment on the special meeting item. Seconded by C Walsh, the motion was approved by the following votes:

Ayes: Walsh, Guenther, Cramer, Daniel, Reuter

Noes:

Abstain: Lowry

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

- John Johnston: stated that the presentation was a great 90-minute overview of the management plan, however the web-based format poses additional questions. He indicated that the public may not take the time to figure out the navigation, and suggested a short video would help folks understand how to review the pages.

No formal action was taken on this item.

5. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by consensus of the Commission at 7:38 p.m.