


Meeting Information		 <b>THE WATERSHED COMPANY</b> 750 Sixth Street South Kirkland, WA 98033 p 425.822.5242 f 425.827.8136 watershedco.com
Date & Time	10/11/2022 @ 7:00 PM	
To/Participants	<p>City of Tumwater Tree Board: Trent Grantham, Joel Hecker, Jim Sedore, Michael Jackson, Dennis Olson (Absent: Brent Chapman and Tonya Nozawa)</p> <p>City of Tumwater Planning Commission: Grace Edwards, Michael Tobias, Terry Kirkpatrick, Kelly Von Holtz, Anthony Varela, Meghan Sullivan, Elizabeth Robbins, (Absent: Brian Schumacher)</p> <p>City of Tumwater Staff: Brad Medrud, Alyssa Jones Wood, Britney Kelton</p> <p>Members of the public: Lynn Fitz-Hugh, Tyra Zeigler, JOLT News/Jerome Tuaño</p>	
Copy to	Mike Matlock, City of Tumwater Ann Cook, City of Tumwater	
From/Meeting Leader	Kim Frappier, Amber Mikluscak (Watershed)	
Project No./Name	220421 – Tumwater Tree and Vegetation Preservation Ordinance Update	
Objective	First worksession with the Planning Commission and Tree Board for TMC 16.08: Tree and Vegetation Preservation Ordinance Update	

## Agenda/Discussion

### Joint Planning Commission and Tree Board Meeting (7:00 PM – 8:30 PM)

1. Policy Objectives & Considerations
  - a. Growing a healthy resilient urban forest. Watershed Staff asked commissioners and board members what they believe defines a healthy urban forest.
    - i. Jim – mixed species, mixed ages, mixed environments (riparian). Challenges of hardscape in urban environments seems contrary to landscape. Seeking compatibility will be a challenge. As more people move here and more areas develop, there is less canopy. On the I-5

corridor to the south, one can see more undeveloped space; encourages spreading out along corridor. Do we pave the corridor? Or do we set goals to maintain 40% canopy, etc. It will be a challenge.

- b. 2021 Urban Forest Management Plan Implementation
- c. Growth Management Act – Balancing tree preservation with sustainable development. Commissioner and board comment summary:
  - i. Really appreciate ecosystem approach. Need a wholistic approach to stitch together both sides of livability aspect.
  - ii. Need to consider wildfire and potential for impact, this wasn't an issue before. How are we looking this? How are we assessing where people should/can live with increased potential for risk?
  - iii. Consider technology. 120 years ago environmental issue was horse manure. Recently Tumwater was many state workers, now many of them are working from home. What technology will come in the future that will alter our needs? Should we be thinking the way we were for last 60 years?
  - iv. Need for accountability to help the city enforce codes, such as when trees are topped, etc. Allow exemptions for developing a less desirable property. Encourage growth in town, rather than on outskirts where one might need to clear/grade, etc.
- d. Climate Resilience – Responding to the Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan
- e. Equity and Environmental Justice
  - i. Community engagement as it relates to diverse communities. Have we thought about incentives for people's time who might not otherwise have time or bandwidth. This could be deployed in other city efforts. Also, have we thought about gatekeepers/community leaders. Liked that some of those groups were identified in the Public Engagement Plan.
    - 1. Brad/City – still in process of working out potential for incentives for public engagement process. It is valuable tool for encouraging engagement, but may need to be applied on a broader scale than for just this project.
  - ii. Regarding Public Engagement Plan recommendation to develop a Task Force. Public Engagement Plan states that Tree Board serves as Task Force. That task force should represent demographic of Tumwater. Should City reflect on the demographic composition of the Tree Board and whether it represents Tumwater at-large?

- iii. Correlation of low canopy with underrepresented/underprivileged neighborhoods; affordable housing often leads to maximum building footprint and less vegetation and canopy cover.
  - 1. Alyssa/City – noted that some of this correlation is relic from redlining and historic practices, where communities are underinvested in.

## 2. Public Engagement Plan

- a. Tools & Strategies
- b. Online Open House – currently in development, City staff is currently reviewing, we are finalizing it over the next week, plan to go live to public on 10/17.
  - i. Change banner image to be more representative of Tumwater's trees.
  - ii. Glad to see people of color represented in the Online Open House images. Did not see individuals with compromised mobility.
- c. Stakeholder Meetings
  - i. Elizabeth/PC – Can you speak to external stakeholders at workshop 1 vs. stakeholder makeup at next meetings (select/closed sessions?)
    - 1. Amber/Watershed - explained
  - ii. Kirpatrick - If we notice that individuals are not represented in workshop 1, will we have ability to go back?
    - 1. Amber/Watershed – explained process
  - iii. Would not be appropriate to ask staff to make visual assessment of demographics. Need to provide opportunity to self-identify.
  - iv. In favor of online survey, it could be used as a tool for self-identification to get participant demographics.
  - v. What are success metrics for reach on process? (noted included in Public Engagement Plan)
- d. Postcards and Posters
  - i. Printing should be on recycled content, and it should be listed on postcard and poster [This is a tree preservation effort].
  - ii. Will poster/postcard be crosslinked/connected to OOH, via QR code, etc?
    - 1. Yes.
  - iii. Many individuals in community may not be online. How do we reach them?
    - 1. Coordinate with Brad to add phone number or mailing address to mailer and postcard.
- e. Demographics and Outreach

- i. What about non-residents and non-voters? Are they critical pieces of the engagement effort, and do we need to reach them the same way?
    - ii. Looking at schools/school district as gatekeepers – what is the capacity for grassroots engagement, such as handing out at football games, etc.
      1. Brad/City – aiming for multi-media engagement using all tools and partners available. Especially outreach to high school population.
  3. Municipal Code Update
    - a. Capacity Assessment
    - b. Regulation Assessment Topics
      - i. Are we collecting data/measurements to track whether we are doing better or doing it right? We have lots of measurements from UFMP to keep tracking and would like that to continue. Allows to identify failures and opportunities
      - ii. What are opportunities where we are not meeting those metrics/expectations/goals?
      - iii. Email received from resident about upcoming development that received tax deferral. Is there a connection between this and in lieu fee vs. maintaining tree canopy instead?
        1. Brad/City –There is a multifamily tax exemption that allows for in lieu fee. Only three have been filed, so sample too small currently, but is valid point and should be looking at these data in future.
      - iv. Supports middle-to-high school reading level for outreach materials as noted in Public Engagement Plan; would support this as standard for the code update. First paragraph of current code [according to reading level tool] is a 14.2/sophomore in college content level.
        1. Kim/Watershed – Goal for code rewrite is clear, concise, and actionable. Should be accessible to both code users and the city staff.
  4. Project Timeline
  5. Questions & Comments

#### Public Comment (8:30 PM – 9:00 PM)

- Lynn FitzHugh – Director of Restoring Earth Connection, from group Friends of Trees. Very excited that this process is starting; Has been connecting with Brad/City for three

years. Public Engagement Plan is different than what was presented in January/February; Lynn likes the process that has been presented and thinks it is an improvement. At stakeholder meetings, what is avenue for providing input? Will public get two minutes each like at other meetings? What will be avenues for presenting information? [My] group has done lots of research into similar projects/precedent. Would like opportunity to present idea and have back and forth. Would like dialogue. All members of public are not equal; Hopes to engage individuals who may be new to subject matter, but also acknowledges that some members of the public have expertise/are experts in this topic. Liked the Regulation Assessment topics presented. Would like to see enforcement added as an item. Looked for Tree Board minutes from last meeting online and would request meetings be posted sooner.

- Tyra Ziegler – From Olympia, 98205 zip code. Advocating for outreach to high school students; they are at most 4 yrs from voting age and are next block of voters. Climate action protests demonstrate their care and interest in this topic.
  - Suggestion to reach out to Tumwater Fresh program, active and organized group who might be interested; This group predominantly advocates for fruit trees (not acceptable for street trees, but are part of urban canopy).