



**PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION**<sup>SM</sup>

Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

# Title 11 Amendment Project March 2022



UF Staff Leads:

Brian Landoe, Analyst III

Nik Desai, Botanic Specialist II – Forestry





## Project Overview

- **Phase 1 (2021 – 2022)**  
Technical and minor Title 11 amendments
- **Phase 2 (2022 – 2024)**  
Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) update
- **Phase 3 (2024 – 2025)**  
UFMP-informed amendments





## PSC & Title 11

- 11.10.040.C
  - The PSC may provide input on the proposed amendments to the UFC. The PSC shall hold a public hearing for any proposed substantive amendments to Chapter 11.50 Trees In Development Situations, Chapter 11.60 Technical Specifications, or Chapter 11.70 Enforcement. A hearing is not required for technical corrections or amendments needed to ensure conformance with other City Titles.



# #15 Clarify City Forester review is required in City projects



Issue	Proposed Solution
<p>Title 11 has been occasionally interpreted as only requiring City Forester review of city projects when trees will be removed. This is not consistent with the role of the City Forester or the intent of Title 11. Development activity can trigger planting requirements regardless of whether trees will be removed.</p>	<p>Amend to state that City Forester review for determining preservation and planting requirements is required whenever regulated trees are on the property.</p>



# #20 Simplify street tree planting requirements for projects over 200 feet

Issue	Proposed Solution
The street tree planting standards for projects affecting 200 linear feet of frontage or more state that the project should "integrate existing trees and maximize new street tree planting."	Amend 11.50.060.C.2 to apply the normal standard requiring a street tree every 25 feet.



# #27 Enforcement Authority

Issue	Proposed Solution
<p>The City Forester has the authority to undertake enforcement actions and issue fines but is not able to place a lien on the property. As a result, UF refers its code enforcement cases to BDS which creates inefficiency and increased costs. This amendment was intended to be in RICAP 8 but was inadvertently left out of the final draft.</p>	<p>Grant the City Forester the authority to place liens on properties when a violation is not resolved</p>



# #29 Definition of dangerous does not consider site conditions

Issue	Proposed Solution
<p>Determining whether a tree is dangerous or not requires assessing both tree conditions and site conditions. Title 11 does not currently allow for site conditions to be considered.</p>	<p>Allow City Forester to assess site condition when determining whether a tree can be dangerous. This will provided options for addressing dangerous conditions without removing the tree.</p>



# #36 Definition of a Dangerous Tree

Issue	Proposed Solution
Current definition of a dangerous tree does not consider damage that tree may cause to the urban forest (e.g. spread of pests or pathogens).	Allow the City Forester to deem a tree dangerous because of harm it may cause to the health of the urban forest.





# #38 Tree Density and Shared Trees

Issue	Proposed Solution
<p>Title 11 is silent on how trees straddling a property line count towards tree density standards.</p>	<p>Codify BDS' current approach for crediting trees straddling property lines which is one medium canopy size tree for each full increment of 6 diameter inches on the property.</p>



# #40 Update T11 Development Type definitions to match Title 33



Issue	Proposed Solution
Title 11's Development Types and definitions are no longer consistent with Title 33's following the Residential Infill Project changes.	Update T11 definition of Multi Dwelling to match T33. Update Table 50-2 to read "One to Four Family Residential" requiring 40% tree density requirement to include triplexes and fourplexes.



## Next Steps

- May 19: UFC Public Hearing
- May 24: PSC Public Hearing
- June 14: PSC Work Session and Recommendations
- July: City Council Hearing