



**City Council Workshop Minutes
Monday, July 19, 2021, 4:30 PM
REMOTE MEETING PARTICIPATION**

NOTE: Please see the published Agenda Packet for all item file attachments

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Pro Tem Ellen Burton called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Council Members Greg Anderson, Bonnie Carter, Don Chaney, Steve Hogan, Shannon Roberts and Melissa Smith (in and out)

Staff: Bernie Bacon, Jennifer Gorsuch, Cathy Huber Nickerson, Mitch Lackey, Trang Lam, Bryan Rachal, Heather Rowley, Jeff Swanson, Nick Swinhart, Connie Urquhart and Steve Wall

Press: No one from the press was present

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Cassi Marshall, Port of Camas-Washougal Commissioner, commented about the Waterfront Project and the Parks and Recreation Department.

Brittany Grahn, 1619 NE Franklin Street, Camas, commented about the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Katy Daane, 2836 NW Hill Street, Camas, commented about the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Additional public comments received via publiccomments@cityofcamas.us are attached to these minutes

WORKSHOP TOPICS

1. Council for the Homeless Presentation
Presenter: Kate Budd, Executive Director
Time Estimate: 15 minutes

Budd provided Council a presentation and discussion ensued. This item will be placed on a future Workshop agenda.

2. Staff Miscellaneous Updates
Presenter: Jeff Swanson, Interim City Administrator
Time Estimate: 10 minutes

Mayor Pro Tem Burton introduced Jeff Swanson as the Interim City Administrator for the City. Swanson provided an overview of his background in city government.

Huber Nickerson commented about Finance Department services and the future Tyler ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system.

Lam commented about July being Parks and Recreation month.

Wall commented about the Rose Property's (Legacy Lands) vision and short-term management. Wall commented about the Lacamas Lake committee effort.

Maul commented about the North Shore Phase 2 project.

Rachal commented about the Camas Assistance Program (CAP) program and future internships with Washington State University (WSU).

Urquhart commented about the Read for Change Initiative and the Community Block Party.

Swinhart commented about the Fire Department's Capital Facilities Plan and Internal Strategic Plan. Swinhart answered a Council question about the Camas-Washougal Fire Department partnership study.

Lackey commented about the newest Washington State Police Reform Laws.

COUNCIL COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Carter attended the Library's Read for Change event, and the Finance Committee, and the Council for Homeless meetings.

Roberts attended the Fuel Medical Group's "Coming Out of Covid" celebration, the Downtown Camas Association (DCA) Board Meeting, the Chamber of Commerce luncheon, met with the new Interim City Administrator, and toured the Rose Property.

Anderson commented about the Chamber of Commerce luncheon presentation by C-TRAN and their future changes. Anderson attended the Clark County Historical Society's presentation of the C-TRAN's history story panels at the downtown Vancouver Public Library, and the Georgia-Pacific (GP) Mill Cleanup Citizen Advisory Committee meeting. Anderson commented about the Fire Department studies Chief Swinhart reference in his staff update.

Chaney welcomed Swanson to the community, commented about the Rose Property tour and the Parks and Recreation Commission. Chaney commented about the Staff Updates portion of the meeting.

Hogan met with City Administrator Swanson, attended the Library's Read for Change event, the Lacamas Watershed Committee meeting, the Finance Committee meeting, the Rose Property tour, the Fuel Medical Group's "Coming Out of Covid" celebration, and the Chamber of Commerce luncheon.

Burton commended Chief Swinhart for ten years of service and Connie Urquhart for five years of service. Burton commented about the Library Block Party and the Concert in the Park events. Burton announced that in-person Council Meetings will

resume on August 2, 2021. Burton attended the Port of Camas-Washougal's Waterfront Development meeting with Governor Inslee and a Department of Ecology meeting about the GP Mill Clean-up. Burton commented about an Independent Investigative Team (IIT) opportunity.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one from the public wished to speak.

Additional public comments received via publiccomments@cityofcamas.us are attached to these minutes

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Bernie Bacon

From: alicia . <alicia@justagirlincamas.com>
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2021 3:35 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: For council members meeting 7.10.2021

WARNING: This message originated outside the City of Camas Mail system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the content. If you are unsure, click the Phish Alert button to redirect the email for ITD review.

Dear council members,

I am writing this email in hopes you will understand the urgency of this topic and make changes as quickly as possible to make sure we can protect our tree canopy and put stricter policies in place before one more development gets approved and gets “grandfathered” in to our very weak and gray area codes as they are written. I have researched several other cities urban tree policies in our state and on the west coast. Many others are stricter and hold developers to much more stringent codes.

I think it is always good to re-read our purpose statement regarding our urban tree program.

Code 18.13.010 PURPOSE

B.

To implement the city's comprehensive plan goals which include preserving natural beauty in the city, and protecting Camas' native landscape and mature tree cover

The policies I am hoping you will review and look at ammending immediately are:

18.13.045 - Tree survey.

A.

The applicant must submit a tree survey that is prepared by a certified arborist or professional forester.

This statement is in several places throughout the codes. I would like it to read that the survey, and arborist/professional forester be one that is from a list PROVIDED BY THE CITY.

Too many times a developer uses their “arborist” and I believe the surveys are bias towards the developer

and not in the city's best interest of protecting and retaining our trees.

I would like the council to consider "rewarding" developers that incorporate existing trees into their development plan. I believe if there is incentive for this, then developers might come to the table with more plans that include leaving/incorporating trees and these neighborhoods will be a draw for our community.

Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plan must include a combination of trees, shrubs, and ground cover to achieve the purposes of this chapter.

1.

Required landscaping shall be comprised of a minimum of sixty percent native vegetation (or adapted to northwest climate), or drought-tolerant vegetation, and fifty percent evergreen.

2.

Deciduous trees shall have straight trunks, be fully branched, have a minimum caliper of two inches, be equivalent to a fifteen-gallon container size, and be adequately staked for planting.

3.

Evergreen trees shall be a minimum of five feet in height, fully branched, and adequately staked for planting.

I would love to have the percentage higher than 60% of native vegetation. I believe 80% or higher would be more fitting and 75% evergreen.

To ask that a developer replace trees with a 2 inch tree is unacceptable. These trees struggle to make it, several die in the first year and it takes years for those trees to become what was removed. I would request

for the tree to be 8 inches minimum and an evergreen tree to be minimally 10 feet. The developer also would be accountable for making sure the trees receive adequate water after planting and that they are responsible to check on the trees annually for stakes to be removed when ready. (3 year commitment)

D.

Street trees will be required as part of the frontage improvements. Species, size and spacing of the trees must be consistent with the Design Standards Manual. Unless otherwise specified, trees must generally be spaced thirty feet apart. Substitute varieties are subject to approval by the City of Camas.

Again, I believe NATIVE TREES should be required for our street trees. Also, so many trees that are planted become a hazard in blocking sight for vehicles as they develop. Carefully placing these and choosing the right tree can help this problem.

18.13.052 - Tree and native vegetation preservation.

A.

When determining where to retain or plant trees, locations with healthy soils, native understory vegetation, and mature trees shall have priority when there are feasible alternative locations on site for proposed buildings and site improvements to achieve the minimum tree unit density per acre. This may require site redesign. Provided, where necessary, density transfer areas may be used to ensure protection and retention of trees.

B.

In designing a development project and in meeting the required tree density, the applicant must provide a Landscape, Tree and Vegetation plan that retains healthy, wind firm trees in the following priority:

1.

Trees located within critical area buffers. Trees must be identified within a protected tract.

2.

Significant wildlife habitat, or areas adjacent and buffering habitat.

3.

Significant trees that are greater than 36 inch dbh.

4.

Groves of trees, or other individual healthy trees with the intent to retain must be located in separate tract if part of a land division, or other protective mechanism if other development type,

5.

Trees, that if removed would cause trees on adjacent properties to become hazardous.

C.

Mitigation and Replacement. In areas where there are currently inadequate numbers of existing trees to meet minimum tree density, where the trees are inappropriate for preservation, the soils are poor, or there are significant invasive species, then mitigation shall be required to meet the minimum tree density. The applicant's proposed location for replacement trees or mitigation shall be subject to the city's approval of the Landscape Plan.

Replacement trees shall be planted in the following priority:

1.

Onsite.

a.

Within or adjacent to critical area buffers or wildlife habitat areas

b.

Adjacent to stormwater facilities

c.

Landscaping tracts, such as at entrances, traffic islands or other common areas

d.

Removal of invasive species and restorative native vegetation planting equivalent to the area necessary for new tree planting.

2.

City tree fund. When on-site locations are unavailable or infeasible, then the applicant can pay an amount equal to the market value of the replacement trees into the city's tree fund.

Diameter at Breast Height "dbh"	Tree Units	Diameter at Breast Height "dbh"	Tree Units
1" to 5"	1	31" to 32"	12
6" to 12"	2	33" to 34"	13
13" to 14"	3	35" to 36"	14
15" to 16"	4	37" to 38"	15
17" to 18"	5	39" to 40"	16
19" to 20"	6	41" to 42"	17
21" to 22"	7	43" to 44"	18
23" to 24"	8	45" to 46"	19

Diameter at Breast Height "dbh"	Tree Units	Diameter at Breast Height "dbh"	Tree Units
25" to 26"	9	47" to 48"	20
27" to 28"	10	49" to 50"	21
29" to 30"	11	For larger trees, allow a ½ tree unit for every additional inch of dbh.	

There have been several sites that developers have built on that have taken away trees that are 36 inches in diameter and larger. There needs to be stricter fines for these and encouragement to the developers to incorporate these trees into the housing development areas if possible.

I would like to see the numbers doubled of what a developer would have to replace for taking out a tree of the sizes above. I would also like the fines to be tripled (at least) for the trees that are taken out. Those fees are very trivial and small to developers. It needs to be a fee that will possibly make them consider leaving the tree because the phone is not worth paying.

I am also wondering who at the city calculates the fees to the developer? I would like to see the tree amount that has been collected for the removal of trees to date. Can anyone provide me that number please?

A perfect example of this issue is what happened at the property on 43rd where Waverly Homes took out all those trees that we're going to stay per the hearing examiner. If there were stricter fines in place and a stricter tree replacement policy perhaps the developer would've kept some/or all of the trees that were there.

I know this task might seem overwhelming but I'm hoping a council member will join with me to help work on these policies for our trees in Camas. I'm willing to pair up with you and will do time researching and help write up some of the changes or whatever needs to happen so that this can be implemented. Builders are anxious to get building with all the housing demands and the North Shore development will be upon us before we know it. These policies need to be in place ASAP. I really appreciate you reading this and would love to hear a response. Thank you so much for your time.

I have provided some links below to other cities urban tree programs and policies if you would like to review and compare to ours.

For the trees,

Alicia King

<https://bellevue.municipal.codes/LUC/20.20.900>

<http://www.cityofsacramento.org/Public-Works/Maintenance-Services/Trees>

<https://www.arborday.org/programs/treecityusa/index-become.cfm>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)