

- Intro
 - Self intro
 - One of leaders of what was known as the Washington County Joint CPO Tree Code Group.
 - We were all learning, no one with govmt experience except our CPO coordinator.
 - Started late '07
 - interest notice to cpo members. LATE '07
 - ~20 people at first meeting
 - Advocacy vs Joint CPO aka CIG (community-of-interest)
 - Prior Joint CPO - wireless towers and noise ordinance some success
 - pros/cons
 - Need 3+ CPOs represented
 - Public meetings/minutes. Reports to CPOs representing
 - connected to the govmt
 - Opted CIG 2 key reasons,
 - CPOs have an official place (an ear) in the cnty govmt and they provided us logistics support (facilitator) CPO managed by the OSU extension office
 - While we had much passion and determination and Skills matrix revealed we may not have the dynamic leadership needed for an aggressive push on the advocacy front.
 - Many Engineers
 - 6 CPOs initially, 3 later OSU extension Facilitator - us driving making sure following rules
- Ground rules
 - Public meetings, minutes published External visibility for CPO rules.
 - <https://groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/CPO-Treecode/info> (minutes/documents etc)
 - Washcotreegroup.org expired
 - Stakeholder identification both sides
 - Scope
 - Cities have their own codes
 - State would stay out of UGB - State Forests Practices Act would not apply w/in
 - >> Unincorporated washington county - w/in UGB urban growth boundary
 - Objectives for the Tree Code Group
 - increase public awareness on values and benefits of trees and ecosystem
 - Educate/encourage developers benefits of green building
 - Good legislation in place to protect urban trees and their ecosystems
 - maintain or increase current tree canopy in WA Co.
 - Educate ourselves on government process.
 - Have fun.
- Process we went through to come up with our recommendations
 - Research
 - WaCo
 - Evaluating current waco regulations, met with DLUT leader Kathy Letola and they assigned a staff person Nadine Smith to work with us to bring us up to speed.
 - street trees. Locations, sizes, types

- Sections 430-72.3 and 407-3 are the two ordinances used by the county planning staff. Section 430-72.3 provides for a buffer and is used for privacy considerations where an additional set-back may be allowed. Section 407-3 addresses exemptions and submission requirements for applications to remove trees. Developers are required to do an inventory of all trees greater than 6 inches on a site.
 - The relevant code for Significant Natural Resources requires buffers to protect habitat, but does not specifically address the preservation of trees. Significant Natural Resources are identified in the Community Plans which were created in the 1980's. DLUT planning staff also works with Clean Water Services on the requirements for vegetative buffers.
 -
 - Other jurisdictions: Research other jurisdictions to understand what others are doing. What was considered acceptable in other cities and counties
 - Matrix of other area ordinances/policies
 - Cities: Beaverton, Tigard, Hillboro, Sherwood, Portland, Lake O,
 - Counties hard to find: Fulton Co, Ga (Atlanta Metro), Monterey Co, CA (S of sanfran), Sacramento Co. also but didn't do a full study yet.
 -
 - Top categories
 - Permitting required
 - Protections of trees during development
 - Penalties for Violations
 - Tree Inventory requirements
 - Mitigation
 - Provisions for preservation
 - Tree friendly design/planning guidelines
 - Organizational support/outreach (tree board, Tree City USA,
 - Other Stakeholders
 - Metro, Nature in Neighborhoods program, support for canopy coverage analysis, but funding is hard. Not a given
 - Urban Forestry Commission
 - Audubon Society - List of Urban Forestry Resources
 - Developers
 - Help us present a balanced plan:
 - How can we preserve the tree canopy in ways that create incentives for developers and is a win-win for the entire community?
 - What are ways that tree preservation and enforcement can work for developers?
 - What are the financial considerations used when determining whether trees are removed or preserved?
 - Feedback from HBA to tigard who already had a code. Mitigation fees too high, no land to plan to mitigated trees. No space to keep trees due to Metro's density reqmts
 - Notes from small time builder we interviewed
- Urban Green Clackamas Co - Advocacy
 - <http://ccurbangreen.org>
 - Formed when county did nothing to stop developer from cutting down a heron rookery since they could do thsi before the development applications were filed.
 - "Loophole" cut before you apply for dev apps.

- Feedback from county
 - issues/barriers to county of adopting:
 - density reqmts restrict ability to preserve
 - urban/municipal services. District may be required
 - flexibility people to change things on existing lots (non-developing)
 - Board is reluctant to have volunteer committees, because it is costly to county (staff support, minutes, attendance, etc)
 - Cost of county assuming maintenance of public trees push to private/corporate
 - Clarity in what is to be protected - minimize the cost to evaluate an application-by-application.
 - Suggestions:
 - Agreement that Tree inventory (significant groves and historical trees important, would help this effort in clarity above)
 - Speak up for trees. Get our CPO friends - the development community needs to hear that people place a priority on protecting trees. . Attend nhood meetings and ASK what they are doing with existing trees on site. Continuously bringing this up will make developers aware of the value placed on them by potential buyers
 - Thought the matrix would help enable conversations with cities to bring commonality between jurisdictions. DLUT thought this could have a significant impact on canopy coverage across the area.
-
- lessons learned
 - Development is going to happen - must accept this and we must not attempt to stop development (the way we talk often sounds like this and the opponents key off those comments). Work in elements of tree code that will work for development.
 - Requested too much all at once. Should have staggered the asks.
 - We requested and made the official DLUT work plan 3 years – but Tier 2
 - Start with the policy first, then the code
 - Branding/PR
 - Newspapers
 - Advocacy CCUG ?
 - broad coalition Every time a commissioner went somewhere, someone would be asking them about tree ordinance.
 - We definitely raised awareness w/in county govmt, forced the discussion of urban services. Papers covered the effort.

Wrap up.

County is familiar with our recommendations. Commissioner change may be a point at which to revive an effort, in similar or different format.

My life is changed, Given work and family obligations I can no longer take an active role in leading this campaign but I may be interested in playing some role