

01 Process – General			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
Place a moratorium for tree removal permits until the current ordinance is reviewed and revised.	8	8	16
Place a moratorium on tree cutting after property sales so trees are not cut down too soon.	0	9	9
Require 1 year moratorium, post sale of LFP homes before allowing for tree removal (unless diseased, verified by an arborist)	2	2	0
Put more weight on the arborist's suggestions.	3	6	9
Improve ability for public input before making decisions to allow trees to be removed, especially when large numbers of trees are requested to be cut.	4	2	6
Allow opportunities for a public hearing before a certain number of trees are cut.	0	0	0
Require more deliberation and meaningful reasoning in order to cut down more than four trees.	0	1	1
Appeal process for trees tagged for removal. Need adequate time provided (2 weeks); clear appeal process (Tree Board, Staff, City Council); need process established to respond to appeals.	2	0	2
Consider wind exposure to neighbors when large trees are proposed to be cut; and consider other impacts on neighboring properties such as erosion, mudslides, loss of habitat.	0	3	3
Strict monitoring that replacement trees are planted with a once a year, for 5 years, check that they are being maintained.	0	1	1
Add monitoring process with accountability for recommended replacement.	1	0	1
Before granting approval to remove a tree, require the wonder to identify contractors and certify that they are licensed in LFP for business	0	4	4
Tree diversity; sun and views are desirable. Replace tall view-blockers with many small trees	0	2	2
Especially strict monitoring of commercial developers	1	2	3
Cutting landmark trees for more solar access absolutely prohibited	1	0	1
Allow removal of any tree that could fall on a residence or commercial building (not outbuildings) with a branch or stem greater than 2" in diameter counted as direct falling from the point where the tree comes out of the ground with no additional horizontal travel.	6	12	18
Pay home owners who have large tracts of land and lots of trees to save their trees. Don't let owners with small pieces of land dictate to others what to do with their land.	3	10	13

Whatever can be done to save the trees is crucial. We need their invaluable help to get rid of CO2 and their rain bringing powers. Please, please, please restrict their downfall. It will only lead to the downfall of us all.	0	0	0
Focus on healthy trees, not numerous trees.	0	0	0

02 Process—Administration and General Communication			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
Use tree removal fees or other city funding to purchase the software updates needed to share data with the public about proposed activities within the city that affect all residents (e.g., arborist reviews in process, history and maps of tree cut approvals).	0	0	0
Develop and make public a tree permit database that allows people to see more easily the effects of tree cutting their neighborhoods and in the city as a whole.	1	1	2
Add link on website to replacement tree choices.	0	0	0
Clarify your need to meet with Planner regardless.	0	0	0
Website needs redesign and clarify the steps needed.	0	0	0
Be sure that owner and physical property rights are respected throughout the process.	1	2	3
ISA-certified arborist should be able to do their own assessment.	0	0	0
Dead, diseased, and dangerous trees should not go against the property tree count.	0	0	0
Define when a tree removal is necessary due to danger of branches falling on a home. Arborist might just recommend removal of certain branches and not whole tree.	0	1	1
Professional arborist, not homeowner, should assess risk.	5	1	6
Re: approved tree removal companies. Require license to assume full responsibility for any subcontractors. Make a process for citizen complaints re: tree contractors and allow staff executive power to suspend any license if credible complaint filed.	1	1	2
Suggestions: Onerous code is seldom followed. Consider keeping tree regulations simple - _SIMPLE_, easily followed. Onerous codes are expensive to enforce.	1	1	2
Need _some_ follow-up on (accountability) replanted trees.	1	0	1
Require public hearings prior to permit issuance. Attended by those proposing removal.	2	2	4
Consider _sun_ exposure to neighbors.	0	0	0
Better public education of true value of trees. -Rewrite website -Require permit applicants to acknowledge understanding of the true cost -Ecological community benefits property values -Impact to neighbors	0	0	0
Charge \$1,500 (?) per Landmark tree - hold in escrow for 24 months to ensure replanting. No replanting - no refund.	1	0	1
Six-month moratorium on permits during ordinance revision.	0	1	1
Keep permitting process simple and affordable to discourage unpermitted tree removal. Fine homeowners/arborists heavily for illegal removal.	0	0	0

03 Process—Notification and Participation in Tree Removal Discussions and Decisions			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
Make sure that application for tree cutting notice shows how many trees will be cut, what the status of those trees are and why they being cut.	2	1	3
Provide some rights for neighbors to comment on requests to cut significant trees.	0	3	3
Have City officials post the notices for tree removal so that they go in the right places at the right times to enable the right amount of time for people; or require a resident who obtains a tree cutting permit to show proof (e.g., via an emailed picture) to show that the notice was properly posted.	4	1	5
If a certain number of trees are requested to be cut (e.g., four or more), send notice to neighbors when the application is filed so that those most immediately affected have an opportunity to respond to the application. This could be done when the arborist review is conducted. When on site, the arborist could collect the addresses of the neighboring properties to make sure that the arborist recommendation is sent or emailed to the neighbors as well as to the homeowner who requested.	0	2	2
Send PDF copies of all requests for arborist reviews to properties that surround the property of the person requesting the review.	0	0	0
Make requests for tree removal more public.	0	0	0
Make notifications larger, have them posted in more obvious places, and have them posted long enough for neighbors to see and react to them.	0	0	0
In addition to posting the tree removal permit request, use bright colored tape mark trees that are proposed for removal so that observers outside the property can more easily visualize what kind of cutting is going to take place. Such markings should be visible from beyond the property line.	0	9	9
City to verify compliance with tree replanting requirements when any tree removed (i.e., planted & maintained to City code).	0	2	2
New owner must have (illegible) arborist review for tree removal. Tree must be deemed bad or marginal for tree removal process. No removal for 6 months unless deemed dangerous or severely failing	0	1	1
Enlarge landmark tree to 38-40"	0	1	1
Longer posting time prior to removals. Mark (ribbon) actual trees applied for removal.	0	4	4
Mechanism to verify neighbors when infection parasitic threat identified (use volunteers)	0	1	1

Require all _developers_ to meet tree ordinances #36. Remove loopholes they use to cut trees.	1	2	3
Moratorium for new owners (2-5 years) before allowing significant tree removal.	1	0	1
Consider _CUMULATIVE IMPACT_ for permitting. Able to place moratorium on NON-HAZARD tree removal if canopy [decreases] by __% in a __ft radius.	1	2	3
"Hire" interns from the University of Washington Forest Resources Program* to help arborists measure trees and do follow-up work that one arborist cannot do alone. *or other reputable organization.	0	3	3
Increase wait time between permit application and permit issuance to allow more public comment.	3	5	8
Change one-size-fits-all definition of Heritage Tree to top 5% for that species in LFP = harder to permit removal of Heritage Trees	2	2	4
Problem. Co-owned trees - ones that neighbor planted on their property that grew into adjoining property. Even if tree is hazard, both owners have to agree on removal.	1	0	1

04 Process—Funding			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
Require a per-tree fee for cutting a living, viable tree (e.g., \$75 or enough to replace it with a tree of proper size, age, species, etc.) and offer the homeowner a voucher to be used within one year to get and plant a replacement tree. If the homeowner does not use it, give it to someone who will. Such trees could be planted on private property, not on the parking strip owned by the City. This will help insure more re-planting.	2	4	6
Ask or require residents in tree-sparse areas to pay for the benefits of trees that we all receive.	0	3	3
The city should explore extra insurance to protect itself from any lawsuits if it denies permits to cut trees when homeowners fear that a healthy tree might in some way harm them.	2	2	4
Enforcement/inspection of trees planted for mitigation. Penalties for failure to replant. Fines to go into tree fund.	0	2	2
Keep fees low for permits.	1	0	1
Per Tree Fee for any tree that is a 'landmark' tree should be \$10,000 for such a tree.	3	3	6
Community based 'Tree Insurance' for heritage trees, to protect trees and property owners from \$ liability/loss.	3	1	4
If property owner elects to remove healthy low-risk trees, a fee should be assessed based on the 30yr financial benefits of the in terms of carbon footprint, groundwater absorption, pollution control etc. (based on iTree calculation developed by the US Forest Service.	7	10	17
Long term goal. Create city wide tree tax assessed based on property owners canopy cover; if below average- assess a fee, if below bottom 25%- abigger fee and if below bottom 10%- bigger fee. Allow access to this revenue for tree maintenance vouchures for those in top 255 canopy coverage.	0	1	1
If the removal of a tree will alter sun exposure to a neighbors house, then the neighbor would need to be consulted.	0	1	1
Community wide tree canopy goals(consideration of cumulative impact). Incentives for good stewardship for those who have trees. Incentives for people who don't have trees to plant them.	0	2	2
Allow residents to pay to have view blocking trees on their property; \$4,000? per tree plus additional design and replanting fees.	0	0	0
Detail costs of permit to alleviate hidden costs, (hourly arborist cost- not by visit).	0	0	0
	0	0	0

05a Requirements—General	0	0	0
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
Provide the city with more authority to deny a tree cutting permit in order to preserve the tree canopy (especially for landmark trees).	18	15	33
Require an EIS type of review on major tree removal requests.	2	1	3
Do not allow trees to be cut in order to build bigger homes.	2	6	8
Make fines or fees higher to provide more of a deterrence effect.	0	5	5
Do not allow the sale of lumber for trees that are cut or require payment of a large percentage of that windfall back to the city.	1	6	7
Require more deliberation and meaningful reasoning in order to cut down more than four trees.	0	0	0
When trees are removed because they are infected (for example with bark beetles) require replanting as is done with property owners who elect to remove healthy trees.	3	5	8
Require realtors to implement item #26. Have new owners sign statement acknowledging understanding of Tree Ordinance.	4	6	10
Trees of artistic value that have been cut (removed) being placed into a formal/informal service such as art, instruments, mycillium etc. How do we as a community work on this type of mindfulness for 7 generations to come? (-Alan "Many Red Feathers" Ashford)	1	2	3
Homeowner should SERIOUSLY consider (City Arborist's) risk mitigation measures (e.g., pruning) before taking down lower risk, healthy trees. Proof of mitigating actions should be provided by a third party arborist.	2	4	6
No "taking" without compensation. Tree owners are providing a tangible benefit to the City; don't fine them with fees and excessive requirements.	1	1	2
Charge \$1500 per Landmark Tree. Removal deposit, refundable after 2 years if: replaced by same species at least 12 feet tall; refundable if replacement is satisfactory.	1	2	3
Replanting: require homeowners to follow through with their replacement plan.	0	2	2
Change tree canopy requirement thresholds to (lot size/1,000 sf - % canopy target): <3, 0%; 3-5, 10%; 10-15, 15%; 15-40, 20%; >40, 35%.	3	0	3
Do not allow removal merely to create a staging area for construction.	4	0	4
Record lot conditions when (word unreadable); i.e., steep slope, significant trees, etc. on title so new owners are not surprised. Info available before purchase, not after.	1	1	2

Value trees closer to the value they add to the community and to neighboring properties.	1	0	1
Pass an ordinance requiring real estate firms selling properties in LFP to notify clients of LFP Tree Ordinance.	0	2	2
Lower number of trees on Admin. Permit to 1.	0	2	2
City needs the "clout" to enforce arborist's recommendations.	0	0	0
Requirements-General: items #21 thru #36 should all be relaxed (especially 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 35)	0	0	0
Require residents or homebuyers to read and initial statements recognizing the benefits of trees and their intention not to cut them unlawfully or unwisely.	0	0	0

05b Requirements—General			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
When trees are removed because they are infected, the city should provide free trees to the property owner to replant appropriate species and the property owner should be educated on how to take care of them.	0	5	5
Never allow property owners to cut more than two trees.	0	2	2
Do not allow landmark trees that are at low risk to be removed without more serious consideration or clear circumstances.	1	5	6
Do not allow homeowners to remove trees simply because they fear that branches from them might fall onto their property and cause damage. Homeowners in the city should recognize that living in a forest carries some risk like this.	2	11	13
In reviewing requests to cut trees, consider the cumulative impact of removing trees from the surrounding area that might have occurred before or might occur later. In other words, consider the general neighborhood, the tree cover in it, and other actions that might also affect the tree canopy.	6	0	6
Make it harder to get a permit to cut trees that are healthy	0	2	2
Removal of non-native invasive tree species should require a permit, but the permit should be free of cost. Replanting of a native tree in the removed tree's spot should be encouraged.	0	1	1
When the arborist has made recommendations less severe than removal, require the owner to either follow them or to provide a <i>convincing</i> reason for removal.	0	5	5
Tighten up requirements for appropriate replacement of trees.	1	0	1
Consider a tree's healthy canopy need in allowing removal to avoid crowding.	0	1	1
One homeowner - maximum number of trees that can be removed in a 10-year period.	2	1	3
Limit total number of trees on arborist's permit (4?)	0	2	2
Do not require homeowners to plant a tree where there is no room for a mature tree.	1	2	3
Restrict removal during first two years after title transfer or sale.	0	1	1
Mitigation measures recommended by city arborist must be implemented prior to removal of multiple trees at low risk	0	1	1
Require developers to protect existing trees in a meaningful manner and fix tree issues prior to selling the property - and require city to enforce it.	2	0	2
[?] the tree list to species we cannot plant rather than trees we must choose from.	0	1	1
Add language to ordinance that trees over a certain diameter that present a hazard can't be removed if hazard can be mitigated with cabling, bracing, or pruning.	0	0	0

Protect open space as well as forests and park space.	0	0	0
Restrict landmark tree removal to one every three years.	0	0	0
Restrict significant tree removal to five every three years.	0	0	0
When trees are removed they should be replaced by native species capable of equal measure of canopy and l-tree [?] performance unless doing so would create a hazard as determined by arborist review.	0	0	0

05c Requirements—General			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
In reviewing requests to cut tree consider the cumulative impact of removing trees from the surrounding area that might have occurred before or might occur later. In other words, consider the general neighborhood, the tree cover in it, and other actions that might also affect the tree canopy.	0	0	0
Consider having Lake Forest Park Tree Board review some requests for the removal of trees of certain sizes, ages, conditions, or numbers.	0	0	0
If solar access is a reason for tree removal require the installation of solar panels to make use of some of that sunshine, thereby mitigating some of the environmental effects of the tree cutting.	1	2	3
Require a tree cutting permit for each tree, not for each property.	0	7	7
Reduce loopholes for developers to get authority to remove trees.	14	11	25
Special consideration should be made for view property owners. Such properties could be identified on the property tax rolls.	2	2	4
Include an exemption for specific invasive or undesirable species.	0	1	1
New regulations are too restrictive especially for properties with high percentage canopy.	1	1	2
Common sense and flexibility needed even for sensitive areas since each one is unique.	1	1	2
Step up conditions for removal of large numbers or stands of trees. Projects could be phased, or mitigation to prevent effects to adjacent properties could be applied.	1	1	2
Define when trees threaten homes and outline what constitutes a threat to a homeowner's home. Such trees should not become an undue burden to the homeowner.	0	1	1
If a proposed tree cutting is deemed unreasonable due to the healthy (or healling?) nature of the trees, the cutters should have to bring in a second source, like an arborist - not a private company employee who could make money off a tree cutting.	2	1	3
If a private citizen or company trespasses and damages or removes or "prunes" someone's tree, make that citizen or company accountable. (Fines, payment for repair, replanting, etc.)	2	1	3
Require any topping of mature trees to go through a permit process - a) to consider the health of the tree being topped, b) topping of non-mature, landscaping trees would not require any payment for a permits.	0	2	2

Do not allow private citizens or companies to do any tree work on someone else's property without written communication and signature.	0	0	0
Ordinance must acknowledge that community benefits and services legally take precedence over private property rights (same as zoning).	3	4	7
Decrease canopy-recovery window from 30 years to 10 years. No dots	0	0	0
Allow over-mature trees to be removed to prevent dangerous situations.	1	0	1
Constrain removal when it would expose more trees to wind risk.	1	3	4
Make very stiff requirements for the takedown of any healthy tree - not at the owner's whim - substantial rationale relating to threat to safety - NOT power line interference - we need the power of trees to clean our air.	0	5	5
Increasing sun exposure is an unacceptable reason to cut down ANY tree.	0	0	0

08 Collaboration and Community Development			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
Set up a citizens-managed Facebook page or other media to keep residents informed about important decisions or threats to the local environment. This has been done. It is called Friends of the Forest Watershed of Lake forest Park on Facebook.	0	1	1
Develop a citizens committee similar to stream keepers that can advocate for and work toward maintaining healthy urban forests. Possible name: Tree Keepers.	0	3	3
Organize neighbors in particular neighborhoods to work together to protect and manage trees in their areas and to learn more about how to care for trees in general. These could be similar to neighborhood watch type committees.	0	1	1
Develop covenants similar to those for historic properties that place restrictions on tree cutting in some areas of Lake forest Park where all neighboring property owners agree to self-restrictions so that future owners in the area are bound by the norms for that area. This could be done by groups of neighbors who come to mutual agreement about how to manage and maintain the trees in their neighborhoods.	9	8	17
Property rights matter.	0	0	0
Neighborhood covenant among willing tree owners to preserve trees after sale. #48	0	0	0
Provide an avenue for courteous discussion between/among neighbors regarding trees that may threaten other property and possible mutually agreeable solutions that respect the tree canopy and property rights and safety.	0	1	1
Ivy removal could be organized by neighborhoods. This could also include other noxious weeds.		2	2
Citizens' group on call for when unpermitted trees . . . [are cut] . . . , especially on the weekends when chainsaws run unabashed.	0	4	4
Please adopt friendly rules that respect the homeowner. (This should not become government intervention.)	3	3	6
Develop a volunteer workforce to provide assistance to homeowners who are (able?) maintaining their trees. Ivy is a big problem in my neighborhood and some owners are elderly and no longer able to take care of their trees.	0	2	2
Tree Board needs greater representation from all LFP neighborhoods.	0	7	7
Add an all-volunteer surveillance team to check out concerns or complaints regarding trees in LFP neighborhoods--i.e., 911-TREES.	0	1	1

09 Education			
Comment	Red dots	Blue dots	Total
Educate residents on the value of trees and impacts on neighbors neighboring trees in order to achieve a better balance between individual property rights and the needs of the commons.	0	3	3
Find ways to ensure that when new trees are planted someone cares for them so they are more likely to survive. This could be through education or enforcement.	0	1	1
Educate homeowners on options for protecting trees from bark beetles.	0	1	1
When tree infestations are known, and when trees are removed for such reasons, notify neighboring property owners in areas that might also be affected.	2	10	12
Make sure that the arborist who reviews a property provides options for risk mitigation and that these options are considered by the homeowner (for example by having the homeowner read and initial parts of the report that provide this information).	0	0	0
Provide City or volunteer staff to monitor what is being planted as replacement trees and help homeowners care for them.	0	0	0
Educate homeowners about the hazards they face by living in a forest and how to mitigate those hazards (for example by appropriate tree pruning, watering in general were during a drought, dealing with infestation, and better placement trees).	0	3	3
I would like a list of legitimate reasons for requesting tree removal; e.g., disease, view blocking, etc. I would like clarification of what replacement consists of: species type, biomass vs. canopy size.	2	0	2
Realtors working in the city should educate potential homebuyers about tree ordinance.	1	2	0
Educate homeowners about the tree species when planting in their yard; i.e., ultimate height, health risks, canopy, dropping hazard.	1	0	0
Welcome packet for new homeowners with information about the City's commitment to maintaining a healthy tree canopy and where to find the Tree Ordinance.	0	13	0
More positive public communication from the city BRANDING and IDENTIFYING LFP as a city COMMITTED TO PRESERVING OUR TREE CANOPY with clear links to our Tree Ordinance. This should be widely disseminated to local realtors so new buyers are aware of the prevailing values in our city.	0	8	0
Annually educate residents about the dangers from stripping branches of trees.	0	5	0

Risk to tree (falling) when ivy isn't removed that is growing on tree.	0	2	0
Require full disclosure to potential home purchasers and/or remodels in LFP about the Tree Ordinance and requirements prior to purchase/remodel.	0	2	2
Property owners with >50% canopy and large second growth forests need help in maintaining a healthy forest and management that may include thinning. Workshops on maintenance and management of forested properties would help. This should include issues when these properties contain sensitive areas such as slopes.	0	0	0
Education about "right tree, right place." Require native trees when possible. Canopy value of trees replanted should equal value or better of trees removed.	0	0	0
Education is valuable. If you educate people prior to purchase their time and \$ won't be wasted nor will the City's. Maybe arborist classes, e.g., prior to Tree Board meeting.	0	0	0
Educate or map out what are landmark trees in all of LFP.	0	0	0
Homeowners need help/guidance when deciding which trees to plant and where so the trees have the greatest chance of surviving and thriving for years to come.	0	0	0
There should be some type of informed consent where prospective homeowners are informed about the Tree Ordinance before they buy a house in LFP. The act of buying can therefore be an acknowledgement that they have been informed and understand the ordinances and have had an opportunity to become educated about Lake Forest Park and its trees.	0	0	0

