

**Draft changes to Table 1: Exceptional Tree Species and Their Threshold Diameters**

Tree Species	Size	Percentage affected (internal)
Bigleaf MAPLE – <i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	<del>30</del> 42	3.2%
Douglas-FIR – <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	<del>40</del> 42	4.3%
Grand FIR – <i>Abies grandis</i> spp.	<del>30</del> 33	
MADRONA – <i>Arbutus menziesii</i>	12	
Western HEMLOCK – <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i>	<del>30</del> 36	
Western Red CEDAR – <i>Thuja plicata</i>	<del>30</del> 42	2.8%
Western White PINE – <i>Pinus monticola</i>	<del>30</del> 36	
Shore pine - <i>Pinus contorta</i>	16	
All Oaks ( <i>Quercus</i> spp.)	30	
Everything else	40	

Formatted Table

Changes: lower threshold diameters for all species; add shore pine, oaks, and “everything else”

This formulation “protects” 1.9% of the trees in the city (compared with 0.75% for the current version), including 4.2% of the conifers, 0.6% of the broadleaved trees (angiosperms), 2.8% of the native trees, and 0.8% of introduced trees.

One possible alternative, slightly less protective, would be to make all these changes but leave the Douglas-fir limit at 42” as it is in the current Code. This would protect 1.6% of the trees in the city, including 3.2% of the conifers, 0.6% of the broadleaved trees, 2.3% of the native trees, and 0.8% of introduced trees.

A third alternative, more protective, would be to set the Douglas-fir limit at 36”. This would protect 2.6% of the trees in the city, including 5.9% of the conifers, 0.6% of the broadleaved trees, 4.2% of the native trees, and 0.8% of introduced trees.

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt