



TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT  
AD HOC COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING NOTES  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 2018  
3:00 – 4:30 PM  
MAP ROOM

---

**Committee Members in Attendance:** Ron Peltier, Jon Quitslund, Mack Pearl, Rasham Nassar

**COBI Staff:** Jennifer Sutton

**Public:** Charles Schmid, Mike Juneau

**Agenda Items 1 & 2:** Notes from the previous meeting were discussed and approved as amended after a version with uncorrected errors had been posted on the COBI website; the agenda was approved as distributed.

**Agenda Item 3, Public comment:** Mike advised that the definition of “significant tree” should include “live” status. This led to some discussion: The Committee agreed that retention requirements assume that trees to be retained will remain alive, although a snag is also worth preserving until it decays and becomes hazardous. Jon noted that a big leaf maple, for example, may lose its crown and branches, and yet remain alive for years.

**Agenda Item 4, Revisions to BIMC 16.18:** Jennifer distributed copies of yet another iteration of the Chapter, in which several changes had been made (highlighted in yellow) in response to discussion at the previous meeting. In 16.18.040, (F) pertaining to existing farmed areas has been simplified. In the same section, the provision for removal of “some healthy significant trees” without a permit was once again a springboard into discussion of hypothetical scenarios. Jon had prepared a list of six “Trouble Spots Remaining” but several remain unsettled. There was concern that a “gap” exists between the allowance for removal of some significant trees and the 7000 sq. ft. area of disturbance that would trigger a Site Assessment Review: is this gap not filled by what is said in (A) and (B) of section .050 (Activities Requiring a Permit)? Some of the discussion was highly specific (e. g., allowing for “up to 2000 sq. ft.” of clearing and disturbance on a half-acre lot, and 4000 sq. ft. on an acre), but discussion didn’t result in any fixes of the Code language. There was interest in tree retention requirements for single family lots of different sizes, perhaps within BIMC 18.15.010 with cross-reference in 16.18.

The meeting ended with several scattered suggestions for things that could or should be added to the chapter, but the substance of those ideas wasn’t captured adequately in the notes.

**Agenda Item 5, Public Comment:** Mike observed that the phrase “no net loss of functions and values” is scattered “like seasoning” through the CAO (“like garlic” as someone else said), and perhaps his point was that the phrase is conspicuously absent from the current draft of BIMC 16.18.

The next regular meeting would be April 4, 2018.

**Notes Approved:** April 13, 2018