



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM

Committee Members in Attendance: Mack Pearl, Kol Medina, Ron Peltier, Jon Quitslund, Sarah Blossom

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton, Christy Carr

Public: Jonathan Davis, Charles Schmid, Mike Juneau

Agenda Items 1 & 2: Notes from the meeting of October 4 were approved as distributed. The meeting agenda was approved without modification.

Agenda Item 3, Public Comment: Charles commented on the committee's postponed work on subdivision design standards, and he noted that subdivisions are on the agenda for the Design Review Board's meeting on October 16. As things now stand, the SAR process can do much to affect subdivision design. Jonathan observed that an NVPA and limitation of land disturbance to 35% of a site is not the only legitimate way to handle stormwater and promote aquifer recharge. However, the Committee has favored reliance on the native conditions of the site to the fullest possible extent.

Agenda Item 4, Revisions to BIMC 16.20.090 & .100: There was some discussion of the Council's schedule for discussion of the Critical Areas Ordinance. The Nov. 14 agenda will include continuation of the CAO Public Hearing.

Christy proposed that we start with section .100, and with the questions posed in her memo accompanying a revised text. How should the boundary for Winslow be defined? She distributed a map in which the "Winslow Study Area" is shown, along with the different boundary for the present extent of the water and sewer systems. The pros and cons of these options were discussed. Jon asked, Why not define the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA) simply in terms of zoning designations (i. e., R-2, R-1, & R-0.4)? Ron observed that there is canopy coverage and aquifer recharge in such areas as the Winslow Ravine, but after discussion the Committee agreed unanimously that it's in the Open Space Residential zones that the best opportunities exist for low impact development and preservation of native vegetation. Christy will revise the CARA description accordingly.

Discussion of #2 in Christy's memo was not so conclusive: if less than 65% of a property being developed or redeveloped is forested, what other conditions qualify as a "native condition"? Having soils that permit or promote aquifer recharge seems necessary, and the area must accomplish no net loss of infiltration. Christy has taken a stab at defining "native condition." We discussed several parts of section E in .100 and made some changes in the phrasing and placement of parts. In the definition of "NVPA area" [subsection E.1.(a.) through (f.)], Jon suggested that (f.), describing how the NVPA is to be determined, should be moved into first place. Sarah observed at one point that we were "bouncing between the walls." Admirable as the new material in Christy's text is, it calls for further study.

Agenda Item 5, next meeting: Oct. 18, same time, same place. Jennifer said that either Marilyn or Mike would have a progress report on the work with Herrera.

Notes Approved: October 18, 2017