

Options Listed by WRT in August 2010 Report, Summarizing Comments from Stakeholders

| WRT Options (Policy Changes) | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|-------|
| Ref. WRT Report | WRT Option | Proposed Change | Intent/Reason | Other |
| 5.1.1, p.12 | Establish minimum percent canopy coverage requirement | <i>Evaluate canopy coverage for entire City, allowing evaluation for geographic areas such as river corridor and watershed, and by neighborhood or zoning area.</i> | <i>Canopy cover data is key to knowing what you have in order to better manage it.</i> | |
| 5.1.2, p.16 | Apply more restrictive preservation standards for undeveloped vs. developed lots. | <i>Increase tree retention requirement to qualify for max. recompense formula.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The largest number of trees can be preserved on undeveloped lots.</i> <i>Incentivize rebuilding on developed lots that have been under-utilized, rather than pristine or heavily wooded lots, especially for commercial development where it is difficult to retain trees.</i> | |
| 5.1.3, p.17 | Provide incentives for tree preservation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>On commercial and industrial zoning, increase preservation requirement to qualify for maximum recompense and/or increase the maximum recompense amount.</i> <i>If residential homeowners can show greater preservation (based on a multiple of minimum stocking (tbd) per zoning category), they can remove up to a certain number of trees or dbh (amounts to be determined per staff and stakeholder discussions).</i> <i>If a builder demonstrates innovative building technique such as building on piers, cantilevering, or limiting grading to save trees, X (number tbd) trees destroyed within the footprint of the building will be recompensed at a greatly reduced amount (or recompense could be waived). For each tree demonstrated to have been saved by these techniques (which otherwise would have been destroyed by construction) recompense will be waived for one (or a multiple) tree in the building footprint.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Preserves mature trees, which provide many more public services than replanted saplings.</i> <i>Preserves trees upfront rather than requiring collection of recompense and administration of replanting programs.</i> <i>Preserves trees on private property where it is more difficult to ensure replanting of trees at a later date.</i> | |

| WRT Options (Policy Changes) | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--------------|
| Ref. WRT Report | WRT Option | Proposed Change | Intent/Reason | Other |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If specimen trees are saved on a site where recompense is owed for tree removal and a certain minimum stocking is met, owner may pay for a prescription for retained shade trees en lieu of planting more trees or paying recompense. This would not apply to trees with CRZ impact over 20 and up to 33 percent.</i> • <i>If boring of underground utilities is utilized to a save tree that otherwise could not be saved utilizing conventional methods, recompense may be waived for one tree required to be destroyed in the building footprint.</i> • <i>Increase credits for wooded land placed in conservation easement or donated by fee simple donation (with minimum standards such as min. DBH per acre or min. number of specimen trees); continue to require minimum re-stocking according to established standards.</i> | | |
| 5.1.4, p. 17 | Allow for flexibility in district setback standards to encourage tree preservation. | <i>COA Zoning Code allows this flexibility for the purpose of preserving trees.</i> | | |
| 5.2.1, p. 18 | Establish Tree Quality Point System | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Because point system, per se, is very difficult to administer, utilize other methods to increase quality of trees retained such as: a) planting requirements; and b) additional “undesirable trees” to be exempted from recompense.</i> • <i>Tighten language to require that all replants credited to offsetting recompense shall be overstory and mid-canopy shade trees from the COA’s Recommended Tree Planting List except where conditions to not permit.</i> • <i>Also require that tree planting contracted by the COA utilizing Tree Trust Funds shall require</i> | <i>Would require additional enforcement and staff for complex review process. Other options to accomplish goal, therefore, should be pursued.</i> | |

| WRT Options (Policy Changes) | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------|
| Ref. WRT Report | WRT Option | Proposed Change | Intent/Reason | Other |
| | | <i>planting of overstory and mid-canopy trees except where constraints require understory trees.</i> | | |
| 5.2.2, p. 20 | Establish a species diversity requirement | <i>If more than 15 trees are being planted on a given site, a single species shall make up no more than 35% of replanting. If more than 50 trees are being planted on a site, no more than 30% of trees shall be of the same species.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Diversity in species will increase probability that trees survive and thrive if disease affects a particular species;</i> • <i>eliminates monoculture and enhances diversity for native insects and wildlife;</i> • <i>can be implemented without increasing cost.</i> | |
| 5.2.4, p. 21 | Allow for expanded off-site planting | <i>Off-site planting is allowed within the NPU or a mile of the NPU. If this requirement cannot be met, recompense may be paid.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Keeps plantings in area near where trees were lost.</i> • <i>If expanded, would increase cost to City for inspection, enforcement, and maintenance over wider geographic area.</i> | |
| 5.2.5, p. 22 | Use “canopy credit” system for recompense | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Because canopy coverage is very resource-intensive to determine, the Arborist Division proposes utilizing established stocking minimums in order to set replanting and recompense requirements.</i> • <i>Recommend continuing to utilize minimum DBH retention and caliper-inch replacement requirements instead.</i> • <i>Could consider additional specific requirements such as requiring min. of one front yard tree (based on space).</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Canopy coverage not available for individual lots.</i> • <i>Costly to measure and monitor canopy for individual lots.</i> • <i>DBH is closest proxy for canopy.</i> | |
| 5.2.6, p. 23 | Allow for alternative mitigation measures on public land | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>For individual property owners permitted to remove a right-of-way tree in association with construction, do not apply monetary recompense , but require replanting of trees in accordance with standard recompense formulas shall be applied (not inch-for-inch replacement).</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Less costly and difficult to enforce.</i> • <i>Increases quality of plantings and long term survival.</i> | |

| WRT Options (Policy Changes) | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--------------|
| Ref. WRT Report | WRT Option | Proposed Change | Intent/Reason | Other |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider requiring replacement of public trees other than r.o.w. trees (such as in Parks) to be replaced 2-for-1 or 3-for-1 to ensure canopy replacement in long term, rather than inch-for-inch. Build in better maintenance monitoring. | | |
| 5.3.1, p. 24 | Prohibit or strictly limit removal of historic and specimen trees and require equal value replacement and/or increased recompense. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place limits on removal of specimen trees for landscape plans. Discuss other ideas for incentive to preserve specimen trees. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specimen trees are by definition healthy and have often adapted well to conditions. It takes many years for a replant to contribute to the canopy as much as a specimen tree. Specimen trees offer more public benefit than young trees which may not survive to maturity. | |
| 5.3.4, p. 26 | Provide incentives for preserving historic and specimen trees. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See 5.1.3. Consider fund to help with maintenance of historic trees. | See benefits of specimen trees above. Incentives in conjunction with prohibitions may be more effective. | |
| 5.4.1, p. 26 | Establish an escrow account for boundary trees | <i>Do not recommend.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundary tree disputes are a civil matter which should be dealt with by property owners except where the current ordinance governs. Escrow very difficult to administer; better to make decision up front regarding preservation of tree, to extent possible. | |
| 5.6.3, p. 30 | Provide financial assistance to income-qualified seniors for tree assistance. | <i>Do not know of means for this within COA.</i> | <i>There is currently no public funding for tree removal on private property. This type of program could be established by Georgia Arborist Association or private industry.</i> | |

| WRT Options (Writing/graphic) | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| WRT Report | WRT Option | Proposed Change | Intent/Reason | |
| 5.2.3, p. 20 | Provide an illustrated “best management practices” guide. | <i>Focus on best management during construction when a great number of trees are inadvertently lost. Utilize existing resources – Univ. of MS, ISA, and others.</i> | <i>Opportunity to protect mature trees.</i> | |
| Option 5.2.7, p. 24 | Expand the recommended species list to include recommended uses and environmental tolerances. | <i>Keep as simple as possible for easy use.</i> | | |
| Option 5.5.1, p. 28 | Reorganize the ordinance. | <i>Discuss new headings and outline.</i> | <i>Increased understanding and accessibility of ordinance.</i> | |
| Option 5.5.2, p. 28 | Develop a user friendly manual with illustrations. | <i>See 5.2.3</i> | <i>Increased understanding of tree care.</i> | |

| WRT Options (Ongoing) | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Ref. WRT Report | WRT Option | Proposed Change | Intent/Reason | |
| Option 5.3.2, p. 26 | Keep an official record of designated Historic trees. | <i>Ongoing</i> | <i>Trees can be monitored; Trees can be viewed by interested parties.</i> | |
| Option 5.6.1, p. 29 | Improve communication about the ordinance. | <i>Ongoing; update of ordinance language and manual providing guidance to ordinance will help.</i> | <i>Increase public understanding and compliance with ordinance.</i> | |
| Option 5.6.2, p. 29 | Create education program on the value of saving and protecting trees. | <i>Ongoing – web site, video, PSA, water bill inserts. Discuss additional options.</i> | <i>Increase public understanding and compliance with ordinance, and overall care for trees in COA, the vast majority of which are on private property.</i> | |