CONVENE:	3:00 p.m.
PRESENT:	Chair Michael Althauser and Councilmembers Joan Cathey and Leatta Dahlhoff.
	Staff: City Attorney Karen Kirkpatrick and Planning Manager Brad Medrud.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FEBRUARY 9, 2022:	
MOTION:	Councilmember Cathey moved, seconded by Councilmember Dahlhoff, to approve the General Government Committee meeting minutes of February 9, 2022 as published. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.

URBAN FORESTRY
MANAGEMENT PLAN –Manager Medrud reported implementation actions this year included in
the Urban Forestry Management Plan include street trees, tree protection,
and landscaping requirements. Prior to releasing the scope of work for a
consultant, staff is seeking feedback on the scope of work from the Tree
Board, Planning Commission, and the General Government Committee.
Staff applied for a grant from the Department of Natural Resources for
urban forestry projects. The grant would help fund the Street Tree Plan
update.

The Street Tree Plan guides maintenance, management, and improvements of street trees within public right-of-ways. The plan addresses many issues spanning City codes, development guidelines, and the responsibility for ongoing maintenance and upkeep of street trees. The Street Tree Plan is intended for many audiences to include large and small developers, property owners, and homeowner associations.

Completion of a street tree inventory in 2018 as part of the Urban Forestry Management Plan identified more than 3,500 existing street trees in the City by species, trunk measurement, height, canopy width, and health and condition. The data was inputted to the Public Works GIS system to manage and update moving forward.

Councilmember Cathey questioned whether the scopes of the work for the Street Tree Plan and tree preservation regulations overlap. Manager Medrud explained that there are some areas of overlap. Tree preservation regulations currently govern when a street tree can be removed and replacement requirements while the Street Tree Plan ensures appropriate trees are planted at the onset because the street tree inventory documented many instances of buckling sidewalks and other issues caused by the wrong species of tree planted in some locations. The intent is to establish a healthy network of street trees throughout the City by planting the

appropriate species within appropriate locations. The review of tree preservation regulations addresses replacement of street trees when trees are removed. However, other issues could be addressed as well and combining the reviews might be too overwhelming, which is why the reviews are recommended on separate tracks.

Councilmember Cathey asked whether each update would be coordinated by a different consultant. Manager Medrud said the options could include separate consultants or one consultant dependent upon the capacity of the consultant firm. The Request for Proposals (RFP) is scheduled to be released at different times. The first RFP would likely be for tree preservation regulations. If the consultant indicates interest in pursuing the second RFP based on the firm's experience, staff is receptive to reviewing that possibility.

Councilmember Cathey advocated for beginning with the review of the tree preservation regulations rather than the update of the Street Tree Plan. Manager Medrud advised that the RFP for tree preservation regulations would likely be released first. The proposed schedule calls for the review of tree preservation regulations prior to beginning the review of landscaping codes.

Manager Medrud reported initial efforts will begin with public engagement. The consultant's scope of work includes preparation of a Public Engagement Plan. Recent input from the Tree Board and the Planning Commission resulted in modifying the scope of work. Stakeholders identified for the Street Tree Plan were expanded to include stakeholders from the environmental community, Puget Sound Energy and other private utilities, Tumwater Chamber of Commerce, and Olympia Master Builders.

Chair Althauser asked whether the Tree Board would be considered a stakeholder. Manager Medrud said the Tree Board serves as an internal stakeholder as the Board's role is more defined than a stakeholder. The review will begin with the Tree Board's review and discussion of ideas from the stakeholder group. The Board and the Planning Commission will conduct joint worksessions to take advantage of both the Tree Board's expertise and the Commission's knowledge of developing regulations and forwarding recommendations to the Council.

Councilmember Dahlhoff recommended including retailers and nurseries to the list of stakeholders. Manager Medrud agreed the addition of retail and wholesale nurseries should be included.

Councilmember Cathey asked whether parks are addressed in the update of the Street Tree Plan. Manager Medrud explained that the update is primarily focused on public right-of-ways and the type of trees and

vegetation appropriate for planting in those areas. Parks are addressed individually as they are developed and are governed by the City's landscaping code requirements and the Parks and Recreation Commission's discussion and review on the park design for open space and active recreation. Parks are typically not addressed as part of this update. Councilmember Cathey replied that it speaks to the right tree in the right place, preservation, and the type of trees and understory within parks. She asked how the two updates could include parks and the City's vision for parks within the City. Manager Medrud responded that the Street Tree Plan applies to any improvements proposed as part of any park development abutting a street as one example. In terms of tree preservation and buffering for parks, the City adheres to specific regulations. Development of a park is an element of park planning completed by the Parks and Recreation Department in consultation with the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Councilmember Cathey asked about the purpose of including the addition of Masters Builders and the Chamber of Commerce. Manager Medrud said during the development of regulations, it is important to obtain feedback from a broad range of users. Their inclusion is a way to involve all users in any proposed changes as well as affording an opportunity for the City to promote awareness of City requirements and codes.

Discussion ensued on Councilmember Cathey's preference not to include those specific users because of the differences in philosophy as to the City's vision for promoting the protection of the environment. Manager Medrud emphasized the importance of pursuing an inclusive process during any update of regulations and planning processes. It is also important not to exclude those voices that might disagree.

Manager Medrud reported the consultant will be asked to address how the Street Tree Plan will promote equity and environmental justice, as all neighborhoods in the community should be treated equally and everyone should have an equal opportunity to experience the benefits of street trees and vegetation.

Manager Medrud addressed questions on the timing of both RFPs to inform consultants of both opportunities. Within the explanation of the first RFP, information is included about the implementation of the Urban Forestry Management Plan and how the City is seeking consultant assistance during 2022 to complete several updates.

Manager Medrud said the scope of work also includes project schedules for stakeholders, a community meeting, and Tree Board, Planning Commission, and City Council meetings. Staff seeks consultant support for sessions with the Tree Board, Planning Commission, and the City Council, as well as identifying deliverables in sufficient time to engage in

thorough discussions. The scope also includes identifying materials for implementation of the Public Engagement Plan, City website, social media materials, and materials to support external and internal stakeholder groups.

The consultant will serve as the lead for conducting stakeholder meetings with staff involvement. The consultant will support a public open house and assist staff during worksessions and through the adoption process.

Councilmember Cathey cited previous plan development processes that involved interested Councilmembers prior to full Council worksessions or briefings. She asked about the opportunity for Councilmembers to participate during the public engagement process. Manager Medrud affirmed that the intent is keep the Mayor and the Council informed on each stage of the process likely through written summaries followed by worksessions early in the process with the consultant.

Manager Medrud outlined the elements of the Street Tree Plan:

- A. Introduction, describing the reasons why the City developed the Street Tree Plan, its benefits, and its purpose
- B. Background, referring to the process for creating the Street Tree Plan, public engagement process for updating regulations, and completed street tree surveys
- C. Street tree planning, describing the vision for future street tree plantings, including:
 - 1) Arterials and connectors
 - 2) Guidance for other street types
 - 3) Street tree design recommendations
- D. Street tree planting, containing recommendations for the following:
 - 1) Street tree planting and maintenance guidance
 - 2) Street tree management responsibilities
 - 3) Best management practices for street tree care
 - 4) Street tree planting list
 - 5) Street tree planting specifications and details
 - 6) Street tree pruning guidelines
- E. Shorter, individual documents derived from the Street Tree Plan for specific audiences and their needs
 - 1) Residential property owners and homeowner associations
 - 2) City maintenance staff
 - 3) Tree cutting/landscape maintenance companies

Councilmember Dahlhoff asked whether the plan addresses areas where trees should not be planted, such as roadway medians. Manager Medrud said the plan addresses that aspect as well. In September 2021, the Tree Board and the Planning Commission toured several locations in the City

to view street tree plantings and existing conditions. In many instances, street trees are confined to a minimum amount of space between the curb and the sidewalk. The update will address those planting sizes, as well as areas that would not be conducive for a tree.

Councilmember Cathey commented on a number of studies completed on how human health is improved in areas with trees. Of additional importance is the type of trees and different levels of shade offered by different species of trees.

Manager Medrud reviewed potential amendments to existing codes and regulations:

- a. Tumwater Municipal Code Amendments:
 - 1) TMC Title 12 Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places (TMC 12.08 Street and Sidewalk Obstructions, TMC 12.12 Construction of Curbs and Sidewalks, and TMC 12.24 Street Trees)
 - 2) Title 16 Environment (TMC 16.08 Protection of Trees and Vegetation)
 - 3) Title 17 Land Division (TMC 17.04 *Definitions*)
- b. Tumwater Development Guide, Chapter 3 General Engineering Considerations and Chapter 4 Transportation, text and details
- c. Littlerock Road Subarea Plan, Chapter 5 Implementation
- d. Tumwater Town Center Street Design Plan
- e. Capitol Boulevard Community Zone Design Guidelines
- f. The ordinance should be assessed for compliance with the Growth Management Act (GMA) requirement to comply with the Attorney General's Guidance regarding takings

Manager Medrud reviewed the update schedule. During May through June 2022, the RFP process and selection of the consultant is scheduled with the project beginning in July 2022. It is anticipated the City will receive notification of the DNR grant award in early July. The project is scheduled for completion by the end of this year.

Manager Medrud added that staff is recommending the Tree Board and the Planning Commission participate in a worksession on a sample development proposal and what is required as the proposal works through the City's development review process to help create a better understanding on how staff applies numerous regulations and codes to a development proposal. At some point, staff anticipates offering a similar review to the City Council.

URBAN FORESTRY MANAGEMENT PLAN – TREE PRESERVATION Manager Medrud reported the update includes contracting with a consultant to work with staff, stakeholders, Tree Board, Planning Commission, and the City Council to update the City's tree preservation

REGULATION UPDATE, SCOPE OF WORK:	regulations. The scope of work includes project administration, which will also be added to the scope of work for the update of the Street Tree Plan.
	The update includes a similar public engagement plan as the Street Tree Plan. The Planning Commission recommended adding environmental stakeholders, private utilities, such as Puget Sound Energy because of their involvement in the right-of-way, Chamber of Commerce, and the Olympia Master Builders.
	Manager Medrud reviewed an outline for the scope of work, which is similar to the Street Tree Plan. The consultant will lead the public engagement process and the development of the associated materials, as well as supporting staff during the development of the ordinances.
	Councilmember Dahlhoff recommended exploring different and unique methods for engaging the public similar to the recent survey conducted for the Old Highway 99 Transportation Study as different demographics respond differently to outreach approaches. Manager Medrud said the consultant will be asked to provide input on different ways of engaging the public based on different demographics within the City. Councilmember Dahlhoff recommended the consultant provide different examples of public engagement and outreach methods. Manager Medrud said he would add the request to the RFP.

Councilmember Cathey referred to the section of the staff report on the *Purpose of the Regulations* and questioned whether the list of reasons would be included in the RFP to help to inform consultant applicants. Manager Medrud said the purpose of the section is an identification of issues that should be included to help guide the consultant to review those particular areas. If the consultant identifies additional issues, staff would be receptive to those additions as well. The primary focus of the update is to Tumwater Municipal Code 16.08, *Protection of Trees and Vegetation*. However, the update process would be an open process for consideration of changes to other sections of the code. Today, the section on the purpose of the regulations is typically provided to developers who question City requirements for tree protection for their development proposal. Developers are also directed to review other sections of the code, landscaping codes, development guidelines, and design guidelines.

Councilmember Cathey recommended adding "wetlands" to "G" and "Climate Action Plan and the Habitat Conservation Plan" to "M."

Councilmember Dahlhoff asked whether the RFP would include a request for the consultant to provide content to assist the City in refreshing the website for approved tree species and tree care, etc. Manager Medrud affirmed the information could be included in the RFP.

Manager Medrud reviewed the proposed work schedule as reviewed with the Tree Board and the Planning Commission:

- March April 2022 RFP process and consultant selection
- May 2022 Consultant work starts

Tree Board Meetings

- May 9, 2022 Tree Board worksession
- June 13, 2022 Tree Board worksession
- July 11, 2022 Tree Board worksession schedule joint meeting with Planning Commission
- August 8, 2022 Tree Board worksession schedule joint meeting with Planning Commission

Notice of Intent and SEPA Review

- July 2022 Submit Notice of Intent to Commerce
- July 2022 SEPA Review Planning Commission

Planning Commission

- July 12, 2022 Planning Commission worksession schedule joint meeting with Tree Board
- July 26, 2022 Planning Commission worksession
- August 9, 2022 Planning Commission worksession schedule joint meeting with Tree Board
- August 23, 2022 Planning Commission public hearing

City Council

- March 9, 2022 GGC briefing
- May 24, 2022 City Council worksession
- September 14, 2022 GGC briefing
- September 27, 2022 City Council worksession
- October 11, 2022 City Council worksession
- October 25, 2022 City Council consideration

Project Completion

• October – November 2022

Councilmember Dahlhoff inquired as to whether a joint session with the Tree Board, Planning Commission, and Council might be necessary. Manager Medrud recommended retaining the option of a joint meeting as the schedule could be revised for a joint meeting during a Council worksession.

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR Manager Medrud reported the proposal involves the City's efforts with Thurston County and the Cities of Lacey and Olympia to implement the Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan. The Council approved Phase 4 to

ELECTRIFICATION COST ASSESSMENT:	implement the plan beginning in April. In support of those efforts, the jurisdictions are exploring completion of an electrification cost assessment to evaluate the costs associated with building and operating all-electric housing, commercial development, and mixed-use development in Thurston County. The assessment would focus on new development only and not consider retrofitting existing development. The City of Olympia is leading project management of the assessment. Staff recommends participating in the assessment. The City's cost would be \$7,619. Staff recommends the committee forward the interlocal agreement to the City Council's consent calendar for the first meeting in April.
	Chair Althauser commented that for other regional activities, costs for each jurisdiction have been based on a per capita formula. He asked whether an equal split is because all partners would benefit equally from the assessment. Manager Medrud affirmed that was the intent but he would review the cost structure within the Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan, as he believes the costs were evenly split to fund support by the Thurston Regional Planning Council, as all jurisdictions would receive similar benefits.
	Councilmember Dahlhoff noted that she forwarded a resolution from the City of Olympia to staff. She asked about the possibility of engaging in a discussion on the resolution in conjunction with consideration of the interlocal agreement. The resolution speaks to electrification of City of Olympia-owned buildings. Manager Medrud offered to copy the resolution to the City Council.
MOTION:	Councilmember Dahlhoff moved, seconded by Councilmember Cathey, to recommend approval of the Interlocal Agreement for Electrification Cost Assessment and forward the proposal to the April 5, 2022 City Council consent calendar for consideration. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.
ADJOURNMENT:	With there being no further business, Chair Althauser adjourned the meeting at 4:11 p.m.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net