



## CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

300 FOREST AVENUE  
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950  
TELEPHONE (831) 648-3190 • FAX (831) 648-3184

### URBAN FOREST ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### Items that **HAVE NOT** received consensus:

- Need to determine what trees should be protected. There are a substantial amount of trees that do not meet the protected criteria – not comfortable with this. Recommended expand the tree list and reduce diameter requirements for all trees (ex. more than 1 foot in diameter / 25 feet in height). Others would prefer to leave only some species as protected trees in Pacific Grove.
- Disagreement as to if redwoods should be part of the protected list or not. Section 2.1.1 – Does not concur that coast redwoods (an interior tree) should be on protected trees list – don't grow well in PG, no groves, -- not consensus.
- Table 5-1 – needs to be discussed further.
- Location of permits: Section 2.1.3 – There should be a one stop permitting location in the Community Development department to create separation from Public Works as the main department that oversees tree removal of City trees (not consensus). Where should permit processing be located? Community Development Department or Public Works?
- 3.1.2 #1 “A tree shall not be removed or substantially pruned for the primary purpose of securing or improving a view, for acquiring more sunlight or air, or to reduce litter.” – This section had a disagreement on whether or not to take out “substantially pruned” and just have this section refer to removal or not.
- Section 3.1.2 #4 – Criteria to require propping, cabling, other extensive measures being required prior to removal – property owners should not be forced – not consensus because it is a common practice.
- 3.1.2 #7 “Trees identified as a nuisance and causing illness or emotional distress as verified by a medical doctor.” – This section references allergens; not consensus on whether the section should be left as is or removed.

- 3.1.2 - #9 “Trees in densely planted areas where thinning is the proper forestry practice.” Idea suggested was to take out this section, but consensus was not reached.
- Would like section 3.1.2 #13 to be taken out (#13 is: The City arborist may refer permit applications to the Natural Resources Commission for review and recommendation.) This did not receive consensus – possibly needs to be re-worded.
- Does a permit need to be pulled for dead trees? There was not consensus reached on this question. What consists of a dead or dying tree? If a tree is infected with pitch canker, at what point can it be removed – 50%, 90% ?
- Healthy trees should not be allowed to be removed, of any species – not consensus.
- Not consensus on requirement or not of arborist to notice/post a dead tree.
- Replacement of trees and in lieu fee amounts, especially with consideration to section 3.2.3 – “Alternatives When Trees Cannot Be Replaced on Site.” Not consensus on whether an in-lieu fee should be required or whether standard fees (same fee for every tree) for tree removal should always be required or fee based on tree appraisal formula.
  - We may find out that fee amount we are asking for is too expensive. Maybe fees should be divided based on size of the tree, i.e. a small tree removal has a certain payment and medium and large tree removals have their own allotted payments (i.e. distinguish amount of in-lieu fees based on size).
  - If it is appropriate to remove a tree, let them remove a tree without fees. In section 3.1.2, a person can elect to remove a healthy tree. I don’t see why we should require having to buy in to a trust fund, shouldn’t have to if there is a small lot with no room for another tree.
- Section on tree trust fund should be re-worded. Discretion of the arborist to use the fund at his/her discretion -- did not receive consensus.
- Timeline of verification and details of verifying tree replacement in section 3.2.4 did not receive consensus. Could have verification every 1 and 5 years – suggestion for verification at 10 years also, but this did not receive consensus.
- Consensus not reached in terms of property ownership and permits – would new owners be required to keep permits that were taken out by previous tenants?

- What trees are we protecting? Are we protecting certain species in particular with strict guidelines on permit issuance, or are we protecting all trees under this new plan?
- Should the City have to take out a permit to prune its trees or to remove dead or dying trees?
  - Don't agree that the City needs permission from itself to prune its own trees – need to clarify to mean right of way. Yet, this should not be confused with the fact that the City needs a permit to remove its own tree. Don't agree – if a tree is dead / dying, the City should not have to take out a permit to remove from the City (not consensus).
  - When does a tree become a City tree?
- Is the property owner responsible for trees on sidewalks they had to plant – i.e. property owners pay for the trees, but would the City care for them?
- Not consensus on street tree plantings - should they be considered first by private property owners adjacent to the potential tree planting? Need to establish consensus of the private property owner if planting a public tree on their street.