URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
May 15th, 2025
9:30am – 11:30am
Hybrid Meeting: Online and in-person at the Portland Building

---

Commission Members present:	Co-Chair Adrianne Feldstein, Co-Chair Leah Plack, Casey Clapp, Megan Van de Mark, Melinda McMillan, Matt Sanchez, Vesla Lee
Commission Members absent:	Derily Bechtold, J.R. Lilly, Bruce Nelson
Urban Forestry staff present:	Jenn Cairo (City Forester), Brian Landoe (Strategy & Planning Analyst III), Jesse Nellis (Senior Tree Inspector), Biz Miller (Botanic Specialist I), Alissa Fuchs (Administrative Specialist II)
City staff present:	Mieke Keenan (Permit Improvement Project Analyst III), Morgan Tracy (City Land Use Senior Planner)

Public Comments

1. No public comments.

Meeting Minutes

1. Co-Chair Plack asked if any of the UFC commissioners had suggestions for changes to the March Urban Forestry Commission (UFC) meeting minutes. No changes were proposed.
2. Commissioner Clapp motioned to approve minutes; Co-Chair Feldstein seconded. Co-Chair Feldstein, Co-Chair Plack, Commissioner Clapp, and Commissioner Van der Mark approved. Commissioners McMillan and Sanchez abstained. March meeting minutes were approved.

New Urban Forestry Commissioner Introductions

1. Co-Chair Plack, Commissioner Clapp, Commissioner Van de Mark, Commissioner McMillan, Co-Chair Feldstein, new Commissioner Sanchez, and new Commissioner Lee each introduced themselves.

City Forester's Report – Jenn Cairo, City Forester

1. Jenn Cairo welcomed new Commissioners Sanchez and Lee and presented some celebratory items to the Commission. Several new, expanded and improved contracts for tree planting and establishment are in place or well on the way to completion. She reminded the Commission that more contracts and diverse contracts are goals for the Portland Clean Energy Fund (PCEF) funded Equitable Tree Canopy Initiative, which aims to add 15,000 new trees in priority areas. Friends of Trees was awarded contract for tree planting for up to 1.8 million over 5 years. The first year, they are aiming for 300 trees and increasing the number after that. UF now has 13 paid outreach partners contractors and 7 planting and establishment partners, half of which are COBID (Certification Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity) diverse-owned companies. That is up from 3 contractors, only one being COBID.
2. Jenn Cairo announced that updates to the City's fees have moved to the second reading at City Council and are nearing completion. This is a required step for any Council decision. If finally approved as Urban Forestry has proposed it, most tree permit application fees will be greatly reduced or eliminated, thanks to PCEF funding. This removes barriers for people to get tree work, implement code, and avoid later issues with compliance.
3. Jenn Cairo reminded the Commission that Urban Forestry gets a significant amount of positive feedback on the work they do, their people, the tree code, and about trees, which is typically not seen in the media. She shared some positive feedback sent to Rick Faber, Urban Forestry Permitting & Regulation Code Compliance Supervisor.

4. Jenn Cairo reminded the Commission that the June meeting falls on Juneteenth, a holiday, so she proposes moving the meeting to the preceding Thursday on 6/12. She stated she will follow up by email to discern availability for that. If a quorum can't be reached, the Commission will reconvene in July. There is timely content to cover in June including the Urban Forest Plan, so she is hoping the Commission can be available then.
5. Jenn Cairo informed the Commission that she sent an email with some facts about the recent tree removal in Irvington to provide for a new ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) accessible sidewalk ramp. She has designated time at the end of the Forester's Report for questions and Commissioners can also follow up by email.
6. Jenn Cairo gave an updated on the Portland Urban Forest Plan (UFP). The UFP project team is revising the draft plan in response to public comments received, which will be presented to City Council's Climate Resilience and Land Use Committee as part of an informational briefing in June. Pending feedback from that Committee, UF anticipates asking the Commission to vote to approve the revised draft at the July meeting so the plan can be taken back to the Committee for adoption later this summer.
7. Jen Cairo gave an update on PCEF initiatives. All are on track or ahead of schedule, thanks to a dedicated team. The Equitable Tree Canopy and fee elimination initiatives, mentioned earlier, are part of this. Additionally, UF has hired its first ever arborist trainees. Five trainees started in April and three are funded by PCEF. The transition of the former Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) Tree Planting Program to UF is complete. This includes hiring, figuring out where trees are, and establishing communications with the property owners. Jenn Cairo stated that she plans to provide a comprehensive briefing in the next few months on developing the new Street Tree Maintenance Service. Urban Forestry is currently recruiting for two positions, with a third to follow that will be leading initial program development. The are wrapping up work with consultant to update the cost estimates and design of a pilot project, anticipated to start late in the summer or fall of 2026. UF is also looking at options for more immediate support (early roll out) for street tree maintenance prior to full city implementation. Urban Forestry has hired new staff for the Private Property Tree Care Assistance Program and the recruitment/hiring process for UF's first Education Lead staff is underway. They will lead public education, information, and communications.
8. Jenn Cairo gave an update on the budget, with an added request. The Mayor's proposed budget was released and all of UF's proposed reductions were included. At a Council meeting last week, Councilor Zimmerman proposed eliminating the Urban Forestry Permitting & Regulation (UF P&R) team of 37 people, except for 5 inspectors, and moving those 5 inspectors to the Portland Permitting & Development (PP&D) Bureau as a savings measure. This was not discussed with any involved staff, and that was the first they had heard of it. The proposal would cut 1/3 of the entire UF team, effectively shelve or eliminate the Title 11 Tree Code and involved tree protections, eliminate the PCEF funded Private Property Tree Care Program, eliminate "823-TREE/Trees@" the City's tree customer service center, would significantly limit the new Street Tree Maintenance Program and implementation of the City's Urban Forest Plan, and negatively impacts other parts of Urban Forestry. Nearly all of the Permitting & Regulation group's funding is Levy and PCEF funded, with less than $500,000 of General Fund, so would provide little savings. In response, UF staff wrote a document explaining to Council what the team does. UF received follow up questions and responses and working on an updated version to present next week. UF P& R Manager Casey Jogerst and leaders from her team are at Council for the Sustainability Committee Meeting to provide information on the impacts of that proposal, if there is opportunity to do so. On May 21st, Council will hear testimony from the public on the proposed budget. As advisors to the City on budget, it would be appropriate for the Commission to vote to provide a member to provide testimony or draft and submit a letter Would be app. For UFC to designate a member to provide testimony or draft a letter advising Council on what you think about that proposal. Trees for Life Oregon has already written and submitted to the Mayor and Council offices. Jen believes it is an accurate assessment and summary of what the impacts of that proposal would be if it were passed.
    a. Commissioner Sanchez returned to the proposed withdrawing of fees to be enacted in July 2025. He asked if there will be an overlap period where people might be able to get reimbursements/retroactive back pay for permitting if they applied in June.
        i. Jenn Cairo replied that the City's practice in these cases is that it starts from the date the change happens and proceeds forward. It would be administratively complex if not impossible

to do it the other way. Historically, City services, across bureaus, have had to charge fees to customers and property owners to recover costs. Because Urban Forestry has PCEF funding, they are using that funding to cover costs rather than charging the public.

b. Commissioner Clapp asked what rationale Zimmerman provided for proposing to reduce the UF P&R Division by 1/3 if it would not significantly affect the budget.
    i. Jenn Cairo replied that UF only knows about this through media coverage. She understands that Commissioner Zimmerman is looking to free up General Funds to redistribute elsewhere in Parks.
    ii. Commissioner Clapp asked how much money would be freed up.
    iii. Jenn Cairo stated that the amount would be $500,000. She explained that it is a new Council and UF has offered the opportunity to take them on field tours to educate them, but those have not happened yet. The aforementioned document they are updating for Council is educational and meant to help Council understand the implications of the proposal.
    iv. Commissioner Clapp responded that it sounds like a common tactic used in politics currently which aims to get rid of enforcement, not the rules, so the rules simply don't get enforced. He thanked Jenn Cairo for her answer.
c. Co-Chair Feldstein thanked Jenn Cairo for conveying positive feedback. She asked if some of the written communication had been reviewed recently. Co-Chair Feldstein was shown a letter that a property owner, a young family, in Irvington had received about a hazardous street tree that needed to be removed. She was concerned that the letter started out so negatively when the family had had no prior contact with the city. She stressed that it is important culturally for the whole tree area to seem as supportive and positive as it could be. Co-Chair Feldstein suggested that as UF gets new communications staff that they review the "public face" from A to Z.
    i. Jenn Cairo agreed and stated that UF has gone through a few rounds of document reviews with the Parks Communications and Public Relations Team, though she recognizes that it is not where it needs to be. This will be something the new UF Communications position will work on, along with another person to be hired. Currently, UF is working on reviewing, revising, and focusing on one-on-one communication (on the phone or on-site) that's not written. This has always been encouraged, but staff capacity has been limiting. Jenn Cairo reiterated that they would like to have better written communication as well and are working on it. They are not waiting for the Communications staff. She also explained that City attorneys are always involved in the documents, so it is a balance between what is legally required communication and how that is communicated, which can be more flexible. Jenn Cairo added that Commissioners, as advisors to the City, could help review and contribute to language in the documents, especially if they have the necessary perspective or expertise. She suggested they send an email if they have the time and interest.
d. Co-Chair Feldstein referred back to the topic of providing information to Councilor Zimmerman. She asked if Urban Forestry has data about pre-enforcement vs. post-enforcement.
    i. Jenn Cairo replied that UF does have that data and the original document they sent has an example. UF receives around 10,000 applications a year and 25,000 emails and phone calls. There are other metrics they are adding to these. She explained that they're not able to quickly develop all the metrics they want, as they work in someone else's database. It is owned by Portland Permitting and Development and is not focused on metrics tracking, so we've had to develop that.
    ii. Co-Chair Plack suggested that they track the impacts on canopy when there aren't codes that get enforced.
    iii. Jenn Cairo replied that UF has a qualitative narrative on that, as there is not an easy way to quantify it. She stated that the fact is if there is not a tree code being implemented, we will not have the canopy that we have today.
e. Co-Chair Plack brought up the request for a vote for someone to provide testimony and/or draft a letter.
    i. Jenn Cairo offered that Urban Forestry could assist with the letter.

ii. Commissioner Van de Mark asked for clarity on what the message the UFC would like to communicate would be.
iii. Co-Chair Plack voiced her understanding that the proposal is a bad idea, and they would show the negative impacts of Councilor Zimmerman's proposal.
iv. Jenn Cairo stated that the message is not up to UF staff to determine but she wants the Commission to know that from the staff perspective the proposal would be devastating for everything they are doing currently and trying to build.
v. Co-Chair Plack said that they are at the precipice of something the UFC has been advocating for for years, which is the City being able to take care of street trees and removing some of the fees. These and other programs would be negatively impacted by the proposal, so it is important to tell that story.
vi. Co-Chair Feldstein inquired if they would be able to respond to all the proposed cuts to UF in the Mayor's budget at the May 21st meeting.
vii. Brian Landoe responded that he's not sure what is on the agenda. He expressed that Melinda McMillan added to the chat that they would be willing to edit and participate in the writing of the document. He added that Trees for Life Oregon sent a well-written and accurate statement to Council already that the Commission could review and which could provide guidance for writing the letter.
viii. Co-Chair Plack asked if Commissioner McMillan would be willing to help with that, along with assistance from City staff.
ix. Brian Landoe clarified that UF does not advocate but could help provide information.
x. Commissioner Clapp volunteered to write the letter with anyone else who wants to join.
xi. Brian Landoe said he would start a conversation about the letter after the meeting with the volunteers (Commissioners Clapp and McMillan)
xii. Co-Chair Feldstein asked the UFC if they felt they should provide live testimony too.
xiii. Commissioner Clapp said he would be happy to testify, depending on the timing.
xiv. Commissioner McMillan said she would be willing to testify if she is writing the document and everyone agrees that the testimony will be based on that document.
xv. Co-Chair Plack opened up voting for Commissioners Clapp and McMillan to work with City staff on the letter and for Commissioner Clapp to testify, depending on scheduling.
xvi. Commissioner Sanchez motioned. Commissioner Van de Mark seconded. Co-Chair Plack, Co-Chair Feldstein, Commissioner Sanchez, Commissioner Clapp, and Commissioner McMillan approved. The motion was approved.

Public Hearing: Code Alignment for Title 11 Amendments – Mieke Keenan, Analyst III and Brian Landoe, Analyst III

1. Mieke Keenan presented on the Code Alignment Project
    a. Code Alignment Project (CAP) and Permitting Improvement
        i. CAP Strategy
    b. Guiding Principles and Project Background
        i. CAP Guiding Principles
        ii. Starting with Cost Thresholds
        iii. Portland Economic Challenges
        iv. Intended Amendment Outcomes
        v. Cost Thresholds We Are Focused On
        vi. Summary of Existing Cost Thresholds
    c. Overall Project Proposal
        i. CAP Proposal
        ii. Nonconforming Upgrades – 33.258.070.D.2
        iii. Proposal – Near Term and Long Term
2. Brian Landoe presented on the Title 11 Trees Proposed Amendments
    a. Urban Forestry Commission Role
    b. #1. Tree Plan Requirements (11.50.020)
    c. #2. On Site Tree Density (11.50.050)
    d. #3. Street Tree Planting (11.50.060)

e. #4. Tree Planting Size Specifications (11.60.020)
f. Key Dates
    i. Commissioner Clapp asked, "What is the cost of planting a tree?" He noted that the other items on the upgrade list are much more expensive and wonders what the cost of planting a tree looks like for developers.
    ii. Brian Landoe responded that it can vary depending on preparations needed onsite to plant the tree. He stated that the Title 11 requirements are the lowest cost of everything on the list.
    iii. Commissioner Clapp asked what the mitigation fee for not planting a tree is.
    iv. Brian Landoe stated that it is $450/inch, so around $725 per tree.
    v. Commissioner Clapp stated that the proportion of what it would actually do if UF cut out the requirements, as proposed, is a "drop in the bucket," and so does not seem like a significant step in cost savings or a significant barrier.
    vi. Brian Landoe expressed appreciation for the comment and clarified that the proposal is in regard to smaller projects, initiated by property owners rather than developers, such as a finishing a basement or renovating a bathroom or kitchen. For property owners or small business owners, the costs can compound. He gave examples of the cost of a tree plus the cost of the review the City does.
    vii. Commissioner Clapp pointed out that the City would do that anyways. The City would still review and say "Save this space for a tree," but you don't have to plant the tree.
    viii. Brian Landoe explained that that is not necessarily the case. There are some process changes, but most won't be required to do the actual review because they're exempt from the tree planting requirement. That saves on the permit fee, removes the need for a tree plan, and saves the cost of planting. UF has also found that 75-80% of the time a review is paid for and happens, but there is not actually space for planting, so we're only getting a street tree in 15-20% of cases. With some of the smaller projects, it can lead applicants to feel they're being asked to do a lot and pay a lot without getting the corresponding public benefit. UF is trying to be more thoughtful and balance what they're asking for versus what they get out of it.
    ix. Co-Chair Plack stated that it also adds time to the project.
    x. Jenn Cairo said that it also adds to the complexity and frustration. She appreciates the projects looking at the data, seeing what the outcomes have been, and identifying that it's relatively infrequent that planting a street tree is a result of the project. She added to Brian Landoe's information about a tree plan, stating that the concept of a tree plan is to see if the project may impact existing trees as well as if tree requirements are met or need to be met. In something like a basement, kitchen, or bathroom renovation, there is no activity happening outside of the building. There might be equipment outside. The understanding and expectation is there is not a need to have a tree plan because there is no risk to the trees that are onsite already. Jenn Cairo said she would like to know what the idea behind the construction siding is.
    xi. Brian Landoe clarified that tree protection is still required. So, instead of a tree plan, the applicant would receive information on what the required tree protections are.
    xii. Commissioner McMillan stated she is impressed with the code changes and suggestions. She explained that the tree plan sheet in any permit not only shows the plan, but also details on how existing trees will be preserved during construction. It shows fences, notes, the contractor, etc. Smaller owners won't be familiar with that. She asks, if UF is not requiring a tree plan, do they require an acknowledgement of the protections needed elsewhere? There's usually only one detail, but it's very important.
    xiii. Brian Landoe noted that Dan Gleason, the technical lead on this and whom he would normally refer this to, was supposed to attend the UFC meeting today but is at City Council. He stated that there are process steps that need to be worked out, which is why the Code language allows for that requirement to be reduced or waived rather than proposing specifically what that would look like. He noted that UF could keep in mind Commissioner McMillan's comment when it comes to the implementation.
    xiv. Commissioner McMillan suggested that if the group agrees, maybe they make that a condition if the UFC approves this. She asked if there is an upper threshold of larger project in the tree and landscaping requirements. She does not wish to give developers the option of bowing out of these requirements. Commissioner McMillan saw that 10% of construction budget can go to these landscape improvements and inquired if that is variable based on the type of building,

such as a skyscraper that has an immense budget, but very little landscape. She stated that it doesn't always make a lot of sense for the percentage of landscape, or cost. She asks if there is an upper threshold, or if that is variable.

xv. Brian Landoe replied that for the street tree requirement, within new construction, the cost of new street tree required planting is capped at 10% of the project value. It is intended for really small projects to not have the street tree planting take up a disproportionate share of the overall project. With street trees and new construction it doesn't tend to become much of an issue, but it could be an issue with nonconforming upgrades.

xvi. Morgan Tracy stated that this is the kind of question the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability is wrangling with: "how do we set the threshold?" It is variable and there can be disproportionate impacts. It has proved to be more challenging than they thought, and there are lots of caveats they need to consider. That's why they are starting with a "time out." They know they have an impact and are frustrating certain customers, they're not a big-ticket cost item all the time, but they are a cumulative impact issues they need to be responsive to. In the interim period, they will work towards solution that's more related to the level of impact.

xvii. Co-Chair Plack expressed that a lot of homeowners would appreciate education about protecting their trees. She stated that the new that as new education/communication staff could help with that communication piece. These are technical diagrams that the lay person will have difficulty understanding.

g. Commissioner Lee asked for clarification on amendment 4, specifically the size of stock of new trees to be planted. Her understanding is the plan is to allow for more discussion about the sizes of those trees, and a ruling instead of a set size for private and public areas.

   i. Brian Landoe replied that the amendment itself gives greater discretion to the City Forester to set those size requirements. Urban Forestry has a draft they'll bring to the UFC in month or two, but would still set the requirements across all permits, not case by case, permit by permit. It is meant to be a predictable standard. For example, right now if a property owner removes a tree and need to replant, it must be a 1.5"caliper tree. The Administrative Rule could allow for a 0.5" caliper tree. This would make it easier to acquire those trees and would also allow for PCEF funded trees, which can have a smaller caliper in some cases, to meet that requirement. It's a way of reducing the steps needed to be in compliance with the Tree Code.

   ii. Jenn Cairo added that it is based on the data and outcomes from the UF Free Yard Tree Program, which are small stock trees, established by property owners, not professionals, and the survival rates are very high. They concluded it isn't necessary to have that larger, more expensive stock to obtain the desired tree growth.

h. Commissioner Van de Mark commented that she is excited about this as someone who has worked in trying to get a lot of trees planted. Variability is important for tree health, because of the research that Jenn Cairo referenced. She also highlighted that trees are getting very expensive, and it can be challenging for the general public to source them. Commissioner Van de Mark asked Brian Landoe if he could speak to the proposed pause and address what is the potential number of trees that may or may not be planted during this time. She has received feedback from the public that they are concerned about that pause period and what it will or will not mean for the number of trees being planted.

   i. Brian Landoe responded that his understanding of the permit data is that the overall volume is fairly similar to the past and it would be reasonable to expect, if not making changes, to see those 450 trees/year going forward. He believes that is a fair estimate of the reduction in required tree planting through projects like that per year. New construction is what is less common at the moment. There have been around 475 trees/year with the new construction. Brian Landoe stipulated that he does not have a percentage of decrease to expect, or what the increase would look like over the next few years. He estimated that it would be fewer than that 475, but he does not know how low.

   ii. Morgan Tracy calculated that with 450 trees/year, for a 3.25 year pause between Oct.1 and January, works out to 1462.5 trees.

   iii. Brian Landoe proposed that after the public comment period, they do a "temperature check" to see if they are in a position to vote or would rather wait until June.

i. Commissioner Sanchez affirmed that it is a good idea to allow an option for size thresholds. He noted that larger trees are more difficult to procure, and their survivability is lower. In regard to taking back the requirement for street tree planting for interior projects, he sees a disconnect in that the City is not

saying they want to use PCEF planting as a way to make up for the planting that is not happening. He asks if there is language they can use to say that the 10,000 trees/year will be filling those planting spots for those properties or will there still be a tree plan required to show potential trees to be planted, but that could potentially be covered by PCEF. This is where Trees for Life has concerns as well. These properties are "getting off the hook" and not planting for tree canopy the neighborhood can benefit from. If they can say that the PCEF program will plant these trees so that property owners don't need to do it, that could keep development going.

j. Brian Landoe acknowledged the distinction and explained that PCEF prioritizes tree planting in low income, low canopy neighborhoods and is guided by an advisory group. That program will not be looking at recent development and filling those holes in. That is not what is guiding the tree planting program. Brian Landoe stated that what they are trying to emphasize is that one of the benefits of having a street tree planting requirement in development for these additional alterations is that there is review happening to ensure space for the tree to be planted. They are looking at ways within the process that, if a new utility connection is happening, a Tree Inspector is involved to make sure it's placed in a way that doesn't prevent eventual tree planting. It does not mean UF is necessarily going in and planting. They are trying to get as positive of an outcome as possible without going through the full review and planting requirement.
k. Co-Chair Plack asked if that requirement includes leaving an unpaved area for trees, or just affects the placement of utility lines.
l. Brian Landoe clarified that it mainly affects the placement of utility lines. Sometimes with a street tree planting requirement, sometimes there is de-paving required to make space for the tree, but in these cases they would not be doing that review and not requiring it.
m. Jenn Cairo added that curb cut placement would not be relevant because that is not changing.
n. Commissioner Clapp stated that curb cut placement would be relevant as it takes up planting space.
o. Jenn Cairo clarified that it is relevant, but not in these cases, with internal modifications that are not affecting the Right of Way. That would be a different permitting process.

3. Co-Chair Feldstein asked to see the slide on tree impact (Amendment #3 Street Tree Planting). She inquired if UF has data parsing what percentage of additions and alterations are interior versus exterior and what percentage of new construction is frontage.
    a. Brian Landoe stated that he does not have that breakdown, and that is part of the challenge.
    b. Co-Chair Feldstein concluded that without having that data, the impact could be assumed to be less than what is shown on the slide. She asked for an example of a non-frontage exterior modification that has been an issue in the past.
    c. Morgan Tracy gave the example of a $28,000 value permit for demolishing an exterior chimney.

Public Comments

1. Barbara Wharton spoke on behalf of Trees For Life Oregon (TFLO). She noted that TFLO submitted a longer and more comprehensive written testimony. She stated that TFLO supports the intent to develop simpler, more cohesive code triggers and better procedures for administering upgrades required for additions and alterations to existing development but are concerned about the proposal to suspend these upgrade requirements for 4 years, while code amendments and better procedures are developed. They are most concerned about losing requirements affecting onsite trees, street trees, and improvements that support public health and climate resilience. TFLO states that suspending existing City Code requirements for 4 years while staff addresses code cleanup is not common practice and would set a negative precedent. They believe that the upgrade requirements for trees are less costly and onerous than the other requirements and that the change reflects development interests only rather than reflecting the public's interest. She added that TFLO found that the City's upgrade requirements are sometimes more stringent when compared to other peer cities. In particular, the requirements for interior-only improvements seem to be atypical and are often perceived as code overreach. To balance Portland's goals for development, public health, and climate resilience, TFLO recommends revising the proposal to limit the suspension of Title 33 nonconforming upgrade and Title 11 street tree planting upgrade requirements to apply only to projects involving interior improvements. They also recommend that any outcome include monitoring transparent reporting at least annually to City Council and the public, detailing the impact of suspended City upgrade requirements. Reporting will allow for appropriate programmatic corrective actions based on the loss of canopy or canopy opportunity during that prior period.
2. Ariel Witner, a Portland citizen, was made aware of the proposal through a Friends of Trees (FOT) email. She urged the UFC to revise the code alignment proposal so it does not suspend tree protection for 4 years. She

stated that the requirements cost developers little but are important to communities. She asked the UFC to limit the suspension to interior-remodel only and put in place a plan to track and report the impacts.

3. Lynn Handlin, a small business owner in Portland, understands the need for code alignment and views the interior-only project changes as reasonable, but opposes any reduction in new tree planting and the possibility of more mature trees being cut. She also expressed concern with the process through which the program was developed, in that it created mostly or only in consultation with developers and not tree advocates. She described it as a "slippery slope" that could end up escalating later and opposes weakening Tree code for 4 years. She advocated for following the recommendations of Trees For Life Oregon.
4. Carol Pinegar is a resident of East Cully in Portland and is a member of the Forest Defense Team (FDT) of 350 PDX. She clarified that she is not necessarily speaking on behalf of 350 PDX. Carol Pinegar expressed appreciation for Commissioner Clapp's contributions to the conversation during the hearing and stated that she agrees with Tress for Life's proposal. In response to the discussion about Urban Forestry bringing on staff to educate the public, she suggested that they collaborate with a graphic designer to provide graphics that explain the Tree Code to smaller developers, so they are not surprised about the necessity of providing trees when they get to permitting.
    a. Co-Chair Plack asked the Commission if they were ready to vote or preferred to wait until June.
        i. Commissioner Clapp opined that he would prefer to consider the proposal and then vote later. He has changes he would like to propose to the UFC which would be more of a middle ground between "turn on, turn off" the requirements. He requested more time for the group to come up with alternative ideas.
        ii. Co-Chair Feldstein stated that based upon testimony they heard, it sounds like there is general agreement that the tree planting size specifications are a good thing. She said that she struggles to find the "rubs" around this. She inquired if they could use language to specify that if it is an internal modification, no requirements are needed, but they are for certain types of external modifications rather than having an "on or off" scenario. She asked for clarification on where the "rubs" and what are options based on all of the feedback.
        iii. Commissioner Van de Mark agreed that it is difficult to digest information "on the spot" and be thoughtful. She noted that one educational staff position is not going to solve all the communication issues. The people who engage with the public regularly are Tree Inspector staff. She suggested that UF focus on is how information is communicated and clear. The issue is not just about what the code is, but also with how people work with the public around the code.
        iv. Commissioner McMillan added to the chat: "To be clear with our communication, permitting information is offered in other languages?"
        v. Co-Chair Plack said it sounds like they will finish in June.
        vi. Commissioner Clapp moved to make the UFC meetings longer. He asked if Brian could send the Code Alignment for Title 11 Amendments slides.
        vii. Brian Landoe confirmed that he would send the slide deck.

Heritage Tree #74 and #324 Removal Request – Biz Miller, Botanic Specialist I and Jesse Nellis, Tree Inspector

1. Biz Miller presented on the Heritage Tree Program, standing in for Sam Wolf, Heritage Tree Program Manager.
    a. Heritage Tree Program Overview
    b. Tree Removals & Delistings
2. Jesse Nellis presented on two Heritage Trees requested for delisting
    a. #74 Spanish Chestnut
    b. #324 Madrone
        i. Brian Landoe explained that the Commission's options are to vote to remove the tree and the delisting is a "housekeeping" step to remove it from the rolls of the Heritage Tree Program.
        ii. Commissioner Sanchez commented on Tree #74. He states that the other Spanish Chestnut that was on that site uprooted or broke off at the base. He suggested it is something to consider being removed sooner rather than later.
        iii. Jesse Nellis stated that there was another Black Walnut adjacent to it that was removed a long time ago and a private property Chestnut that failed into this tree.
        iv. Commissioner Sanchez added "21, I believe. Something to consider"

v. Commissioner Van de Mark went on the record in support, since the trees are in decline and the adjacent property owners are in agreement. She asked if UF has seen an increase in the number of Heritage Trees needing to be delisted because of decline.
vi. Jenn Cairo responded that UF would follow up with Sam Wolf, the Heritage Tree Manager, and get back to the UFC about that. She asked for clarification on what Commissioner Van de Mark means by "increase."
vii. Commissioner Van de Mark clarified that she would like to know the percentage of increase over time.
viii. Jenn Cairo added that folks are welcome to and invited to submit applications, with the property owner's approval.
ix. Co-Chair Feldstein motioned to approve both recommendations for Heritage Tree removal and delisting. Commissioner Clapp seconded. Co-Chair Plack, Co-Chair Feldstein, Commissioner Clapp, Commissioner Sanchez, Commissioner Van de Mark, in favor. The motion was approved.

Meeting adjourned.