

Landoe, Brian

From: Jim WP <jwppnw@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2024 1:41 PM
To: Parks - Urban Forestry Commission; Planning Commission
Subject: Title 11 Amendments

To whom it may concern,

I am a Board Certified Master Arborist that has worked in the Metro area for more than 25 years caring for our urban and suburban trees. I was one of the members of the original working group on Title 11 and the only arborist able to attend meetings regularly.

I recognize the need for housing and development in our increasingly tight city and have authored quite a few preservation plans for development projects. I believe that we, as a city, undervalue large trees. The reality is that after many development projects, the remaining space allotted for trees is insufficient to allow a tree that will be more than 50' tall to grow to maturity. As we work to tame our spread through infill, we sacrifice tree canopy and biomass, the things that I love about Portland.

My solution for this problem isn't popular but I'll throw it out there again.

1. Add more parks to neighborhoods where large trees can thrive in groups while limiting the risk to homes and our community.
2. Increase enforcement so you start making the problem actors pay for their actions. Regulations and laws are only 'best practices' if only done by the conscientious. I've witnessed quite a bit of tree removal on weekends.
3. Actually reduce the size limit that triggers additional fees down to 12" instead of the current 20". Use the additional funds raised to attend to the deferred maintenance in our parks or help fund enforcement.

In lieu of those three simple steps, you could at least attend to the needs of the greater community that lives in an area rather than the few people that develop it, and vote to maintain the 20" ruling.

Getting grumpier,
Jim WP
BCMA PN-1314B

Nature's not a place to visit. It's Home.
-Gary Snyder