

## I. Introduction

Seattle's trees are in danger. Today the City's tree canopy covers only 18 percent of Seattle. Moreover, Seattle officials believe 70 percent of Seattle's forested parklands will, without intervention, become ecological dead zones<sup>1</sup> because of ivy and other invasive plants. As part of the Mayor's 2006 Climate Action Plan, the City started an urban forest initiative<sup>2</sup> to protect and increase the City's tree canopy. This plan described high priority climate protection actions and investments. One of the actions calls for increasing Seattle's canopy cover to 30 percent in 30 years.

The City Council requested the Office of City Auditor review the City's management of its trees. Specifically, we reviewed:

- (1) The actions taken by the City of Seattle and other stakeholders to implement the Urban Forest Management Plan;
- (2) The challenges the City faces in attaining and sustaining the Urban Forest Management Plan goals; and
- (3) The approaches that may be useful in future actions to enhance tree management efforts.

---

## II. Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

To conduct our work, we:

- Interviewed City officials responsible for implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan, officials from other jurisdictions, consultants that advised jurisdictions in developing urban forestry management plans, and other stakeholders involved in tree management issues who do not work for City of Seattle government;
- Examined other jurisdictions' urban forest management plans;
- Reviewed City documents tied to the plan and its implementation including City ordinances, resolutions, regulations, budgets, planning documents, and reports (tree plantings, removals, and other related documents);
- Reviewed the City's funding sources for the plan's implementation;
- Visited City locations where trees have been planted and tree maintenance performed; and
- Visited City locations to see challenges faced in clearing areas for tree plantings.

To assess the reliability of the data provided by the City departments for planting trees, and other tree related activities, we analyzed the data for accuracy and completeness and

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.seattle.gov/climate/docs/SeaCAP\\_plan.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/climate/docs/SeaCAP_plan.pdf); page 30

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.seattle.gov/climate/docs/SeaCAP\\_plan.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/climate/docs/SeaCAP_plan.pdf), page 30-31

# Not for Distribution/Work in Progress

## Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

interviewed City officials knowledgeable about these data. We determined that the data were sufficiently reliable for this project. More details about the scope and methodology about our work are contained in [Appendix I](#).

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

---

### III. Results in Brief

Many City departments and local organizations play a role in preserving, restoring, enhancing, and sustaining Seattle's urban forest. The April 2007 Urban Forest Management Plan imposed an ambitious schedule of requirements on City departments. City stakeholders involved in tree management issues have taken many actions to address the plan's goal of 30 percent tree canopy coverage by the year 2037. These actions include tree planting and maintenance, identifying regulatory changes needed for the preservation of trees, facilitating interdepartmental cooperation, and enhancing public education and outreach. The effort involved in implementing these actions has been considerable.

These efforts have encountered challenges that could significantly affect their success. The six most complex challenges are:

- **Implementing a new tree ordinance:** Regulations and their enforcement play a very important role in tree preservation. The City has been reviewing the old regulations and developing new ones during the last year. The new regulations are supposed to protect more trees in the city than the current regulations. Recently, City Council passed interim regulations that temporarily reduce or limit the removal of certain trees prior to the adoption of permanent regulations. The City has slowed the permanent regulations development process in order to complete a thorough canopy cover analysis. To protect the existing trees, the new regulations should be adopted as soon as possible, and the Department of Planning and Development will have to analyze what resources are needed to implement the new regulations.
- **Funding tree improvements:** While some tree improvements are inexpensive, most require substantial and continuous funding. Although the City has funded tree improvements, the current economy makes it difficult for the City to continue to do this. Further, the demand for improvements exceeds the additional funding provided by the City. For example, the Seattle Department of Transportation and the Parks and Recreation Department requested \$1.1 million and \$500,000 for the

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

- 2009-2010 biennium, respectively, for tree crews to conduct tree maintenance; however, both requests went unfunded.
- **Coordinating tree efforts with stakeholders:** Within the City of Seattle, urban forest management is a vital part of the city's infrastructure with management divided among several departments and outside agencies. This is a challenge when the urban forest competes with utility and transportation infrastructure for limited space in the public right-of-way. Utility and transportation infrastructure includes overhead and underground power lines, trolley lines, roads, sidewalks, trails, drainage and waste water pipes and vaults, and telecommunication equipment. The successful planning and implementation of projects and policy modifications require constant, in-depth coordination across the city. Partnerships within the city can break down even when procedures are in place. For example, Seattle City Light (SCL) recommends that trees planted under power lines should have a mature height of not more than 25 feet for safety and reliability reasons. However, trees are continually being planted that exceed that requirement. Two reasons are cited for this problem. First, capital improvement program (CIP) landscape planning documents were not being reviewed by the subject matter experts within SCL. Secondly, the Seattle Department of Transportation's tree planting list which is used for the department's tree planting decisions differs from what SCL and other utility jurisdictions believe are the appropriate size trees to plant under power lines.
  - **Providing public outreach and education:** According to the Urban Forest Management Plan, the majority of Seattle's current trees and the greatest potential for planting new trees are on private property. That's why the City's public outreach and education program has a significant role in encouraging people to take care of their existing trees and plant more trees on private property. According to officials from other jurisdictions that face a similar situation as Seattle, public outreach and education are the only means to seriously increase tree resources. The Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) is responsible for the City's public education program. Despite its limited resources, it has been doing a good job in reaching and educating the public. There is no OSE employee who focuses on public outreach and education on a full-time basis. As a result, OSE will not be able to sustain the momentum gained in its initial efforts.
  - **Conducting a tree inventory:** A thorough inventory of city trees has not been conducted. The urban forest in Seattle is a complex system of trees, site conditions, and maintenance recommendations. Understanding this system is important for proper decision-making regarding species selection, maintenance, and replacement practices. By accumulating, updating and using this information, urban forest managers, can forecast trends, anticipate maintenance needs, facilitate budgeting for tree-related expenditures, and develop a basis for long-range planning.
  - **The City lacks a stable and effective tree management framework:** While the City has identified tree management as one of its priorities and individual

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

departments are working to improve tree canopy and sustain tree growth, the City's current management framework is not effective for the current challenges it faces. Without an effective framework for tree management issues, the City cannot be assured that its current efforts will be fully implemented and will significantly improve tree sustainment and expand the tree canopy. The City's current approach to tree management is decentralized, with oversight and management responsibilities diffused among several City departments and that the organizational structure established in the Urban Forest Management Plan is not functioning as designed. Additionally, it is not clear where leadership for the City's urban forestry program's authority and accountability resides. Also, an effective comprehensive plan has not been developed. Rather, the Urban Forest Management Plan states that it is a strategic approach, however, it lacks specific critical elements of an effective comprehensive plan.

A discussion of our findings and recommendations can be found in [Chapter V](#), and our conclusion in [Chapter VI](#).

---

## IV. Background

American Forests (AF) believes trees are indicators of a community's ecological health.<sup>3</sup>

“While urban ecology is more complex than just tree cover (it is technically [green infrastructure](#)) trees are good indicators of the health of an urban ecosystem because of the biological functions of the roots and leaves. When trees are large and healthy, the ecological systems that support them are also healthy. Healthy trees provide valuable environmental benefits which can be measured in terms of ecosystem services. The greater the tree cover and the less the impervious surface in a community, the more ecosystem services are produced. These services are measured such as stormwater runoff reduction, increasing air and water quality, carbon storage and energy reduction.”

[Appendix II](#) contains the benefits of an urban forest.

The AF has documented the loss of tree cover in more than 40 U. S. metropolitan areas.<sup>4</sup> The AF advocates that every city set tree canopy goals to ensure that green infrastructure

---

<sup>3</sup> American Forests is the nation's oldest nonprofit citizens' conservation organization. Citizens concerned about the waste and abuse of the nation's forests founded the association in 1875. It is a world leader in planting trees for environmental restoration, a pioneer in the science and practice of urban forestry, and a primary communicator of the benefits of trees and forests.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.americanforests.org/resources/urbanforests/analysis.php>; “These reports calculate the ecosystem services provided by trees and their associated landscapes. The calculations use scientific and engineering models developed by agency experts in hydrology and air quality. The analysis starts with a

# Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

is maintained at minimum thresholds, even as urban areas continue to grow. They recommend an average 40% tree canopy in the Pacific Northwest.<sup>5</sup> The following table shows the tree canopy goals of cities in which the AF analyzed the urban ecosystem.

Table 1: Canopy Goals for Other Cities (includes Seattle)

City	Baseline/Current average canopy cover (measurement year)	Canopy goal established by jurisdiction
Seattle WA	18 % (year 1996)	30% (2037)
Portland OR	26% (2002)	33% (target year not yet determined)
Sacramento CA	35% (1993)	Not yet established
San Diego, CA	13% (2002)	25% (5/19/2005 San Diego City Manager's Report)
San Jose CA	25% (2007)	Not yet established
Washington DC	22% (1999)	Not yet established
New York City <sup>6</sup>	24% (2006)	Goal of increasing number of trees by 1,000,000; not a canopy goal increase (2016)
Chicago IL	13-16%(2007)	Not yet established

## Urban Forest Management Plan Mandates Steps

Issued in 2007, the Urban Forest Management Plan<sup>7</sup> is a product of the Seattle Urban Forest Coalition<sup>8</sup>, a working group representing various City departments with tree management or regulatory responsibilities. Over five years, this coalition tried to assess current conditions, and set goals to help ensure successful long-term management of Seattle's trees. The plan's primary goal is to increase the City's canopy cover by identifying goals, recommendations, and actions that will preserve, restore, enhance, and sustain the urban forest over the long term. The Coalition designed the plan's strategy around four principles:

- Sustainability is a broad, general goal that results in the maintenance of environmental, economic, and social functions and benefits over time.
- Urban forests primarily provide services rather than goods.
- Sustainable urban forests require human intervention.
- Trees growing on private lands compose most of urban forests.

---

detailed map of the land cover classified from high resolution satellite and aerial imagery. The land cover classification of the imagery produces a detailed map of the structure of the land.

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.americanforests.org/resources/urbanforests/treedeficit.php>

<sup>6</sup> All five boroughs: Queens, Brooklyn, Staten Island, Bronx, Manhattan

<sup>7</sup> The 2007 Urban Forest Management Plan is in draft form because it has not been adopted by City Council.

<sup>8</sup> The Urban Forest Coalition was formed in 1994 to provide a venue for coordinating development of tree-related policy, programs, and budget initiatives that need Citywide direction. It is a cooperative effort of nine City departments that have tree management responsibilities.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

The Urban Forest Management Plan’s purpose is to guide a broad range of actions that will achieve a sustainable urban forest in Seattle. The 30-year plan is the first plan for preserving, managing, and improving the condition of Seattle’s urban forest.

The Urban Forest Management Plan sets an ambitious schedule of requirements on City departments. It calls for a comprehensive framework—one that includes understanding the characteristics and complexity of Seattle’s urban forest, facilitating communication and cooperation between City departments, and enhancing public awareness. Canopy cover in Seattle has declined to about 18 percent. To achieve the overall goal of 30 percent canopy cover in 30 years, the plan defines goals and sets short-, mid-, and long-term actions to achieve these goals. The plan’s short term actions to implement within the first 5 years include:

- Improving maintenance of city-managed trees
- Increasing tree planting
- Improving the City’s internal communication and management structure regarding tree issues
- Increasing community engagement in tree policy and planning
- Strengthening incentives and regulations for tree preservation and planting on private property
- Increasing community outreach about the value of trees and proper tree selection, planting, and care

Increasing tree canopy is particularly difficult because most of it needs to occur at single family homes.<sup>9</sup> Currently, inadequate city tree protection and replacement regulations for private property exist. The table below is a citywide snapshot of current canopy cover percentages by land-use type or what the plan calls a management unit. It also shows the estimated number of current trees and the estimated number of new trees needed, by management unit, to meet the 30-year canopy cover goal.

Table 2: Canopy Cover Goals for Seattle Management Unit

<b>Land –use category</b>	<b>% of Current cover</b>	<b>Current trees</b>	<b>30-year goal</b>	<b>Estimated # of new trees to meet goal</b>
Single-family	18%	473,300	31%	350,200
Multi-family	13%	103,400	20%	56,000
Commercial Mixed Use	8%	49,700	15%	44,400
Downtown	9%	9,700	12%	3,800
Manufacturing Industrial	8%	68,100	10%	18,100
Institutional properties	15%	14,600	20%	5,000
Parks: developed sites	19%	90,000	25%	28,400

<sup>9</sup> Seattle’s Urban Forest Management Plan reports that the greatest loss of Seattle’s tree canopy has been from private property.

Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

Parks: natural areas	64%	568,700	80%	143,200
<b>Citywide</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>1,377,500</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>649,100</b>

**Many Stakeholders Are Involved in Managing Seattle’s Trees**

Many City departments and local organizations play a role in preserving, restoring, enhancing and sustaining the urban forest. The list of stakeholders within the City is quite diverse. The two departments most concerned with City trees are the Seattle Department of Transportation, which is responsible for street trees and right of way, and the Parks and Recreation Department which manages thousands of acres of City property, most of which includes trees. Table 3 below shows the different responsibilities that Seattle departments have in managing trees.

Table 3: Selected City Stakeholders with Tree Management Activities

Department and its major tree-related responsibilities	Selected tree-related activities
<p><b>Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Responsible for design, installation, and stewardship of trees and landscapes in the public right-of-way.</li> <li>▪ Responsible for planting and maintaining 35,000 street trees, and regulating the planting and maintenance of another 90,000 street trees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains 35,000 street trees with two, 3-person tree crews.</li> <li>• Regulates planting, pruning, and removal of street trees through SDOT’s permitting process.</li> <li>• Incorporates trees in new street projects and preserves trees along the City’s right of way.</li> <li>• Coordinates with private property owners on tree work permits and with contractors on tree planting and preservation issues, and assists with coordination of neighborhood projects and volunteers who maintain traffic circles and other street side plantings.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Seattle Parks and Recreation (Parks)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manages trees in 6,000 acres of developed parks, boulevards, natural areas, and other publicly-owned open spaces. It includes 90,000 trees in developed parks and over 500,000 trees in the forested areas of parks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains park trees with three, 3-person tree crews.</li> <li>• Manages the Forest Restoration Program which is designed to plan for the restoration and long-term health of forested parklands.</li> <li>• Maintains forest restoration and trail maintenance with a 3-person Pro Parks Levy-funded crew.</li> <li>• Responds to citizens and City staff on tree-related maintenance issues, such as view pruning, hazard trees, and damaged trees.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Seattle Center</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manages trees on a 74-acre campus designed for public use and as a major event and festival space where large crowds impact trees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manages the health and maintenance of 945 trees including tree planting, pruning, and removal of dead and diseased trees.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Seattle City Light (SCL)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manages trees in the utility corridor to maintain electrical safety and reliability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prunes and trims trees for electric line clearance.</li> <li>• Removes trees when an electrical line is down.</li> <li>• Operates a tree replacement program.</li> </ul>

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress**  
**Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

<p><b>Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manages trees along creeks in the City to maintain riparian (interface between land and a stream) and fish habitat.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manages the Urban Creeks Legacy Program which focuses on the relationship between an urban forest and a natural drainage system of streams, lakes, and Puget Sound.</li> <li>• Manages the Natural Landscape Program (aimed at the public) and its construction practices associated with installing water and sewer lines under right-of-way planting strips.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Collaborates with City agencies, business groups, nonprofits, and others to develop and implement the Mayor’s priority sustainability initiatives: climate protection and urban forest restoration and management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a member of the Urban Forest Coalition, OSE is tasked with promoting interdepartmental coordination, and supporting policy/program consistency with the Mayor’s Environmental Action Agenda.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Department of Neighborhoods (DON)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manages the Tree Fund, a component of the Neighborhood Matching Fund.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides trees to neighborhood groups to enhance the City’s urban forest.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Department of Planning and Development (DPD)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enforces regulations relating to trees on private property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewing and revising the City’s tree protection and replacement regulations for private property.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Fleet and Facilities Department</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Manages trees on general municipal purpose properties owned by the City.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains trees in coordination with SDOT, Parks, or landscape vendors, as appropriate.</li> </ul>

On the local side, the private sector is responsible for a wide array of tree related activities. For example, Plant Amnesty conducts training sessions on how to properly prune and care for trees, provides private citizens with arborist referrals, and partners with the City in its Seattle Heritage Tree Program.<sup>10</sup> Table 4 below lists key private organizations with examples of the tree related activities they perform.

Table 4: Selected Private Sector Stakeholders with Tree Management Activities

Stakeholders	Selected Tree Related Activities
<p><b>Plant Amnesty</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A non-profit organization to stop improper pruning of trees and shrubs. They also have many programs to raise general awareness of the value of trees and how to care for them so that they can live long and healthy lives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Partners in Seattle Heritage Tree Program</li> <li>▪ Conducts trainings on proper tree pruning and tree care</li> <li>▪ Delivers presentations to garden clubs and community groups</li> <li>▪ Sends brochures on pruning</li> <li>▪ Uses media for public announcements on the organization’s activities</li> <li>▪ Provides a referral service to link people with arborists and gardeners</li> <li>▪ Conducts different activities, e.g., Arbor Day, Tree Festival</li> <li>▪ Prints 2 or 3 major articles per year on trees</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> The Heritage Tree program was initiated by Plant Amnesty in partnership with the City. Heritage trees may be on either City or private property. Each candidate tree is assessed by a certified arborist and evaluated by a committee. Trees can be nominated as an individual or a collection and must meet criteria for health in addition to other selection categories. Currently, there are 59 Seattle Heritage Trees.

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress**  
**Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Engages volunteers in tree related activities</li> <li>▪ Leads Tree Blog on the City's ReLeaf website</li> </ul>
<b>Seattle Audubon</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A non-profit organization which cultivates and leads a community that values and protects birds and the natural environment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Cascade Land Conservancy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Washington's largest independent land conservation and stewardship organization.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Partners with the City in the Green Seattle Partnership (20-year effort to restore 2,500 acres of Seattle's forested parks, builds community support for long-term park stewardship and passes on a legacy of community service to future generations.)</li> <li>▪ Engages volunteers in tree planting and removing invasive plants</li> </ul>
<b>Emerald City Task Force</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Made up of 12 representatives of the architecture, landscape architecture, development and tree care professions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Critiqued the City's existing tree regulations, and provided recommendations to DPD as it updates tree regulations.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature Consortium</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A locally-based, grassroots organization whose mission is to teach environmental lessons through the creative arts and hands-on conservation projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accomplishes its mission through an Urban Forest Restoration program in the West Duwamish Greenbelt, a Youth Art Program (environmentally influenced art classes) and the annual Arts-in-Nature Festival.</li> <li>▪ Engages volunteers in planting trees, mulching, and removing invasive plants.</li> </ul>
<b>EarthCorps</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ a Seattle-based nonprofit organization with a mission to build global community through local environmental service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Plants trees, shrubs and groundcover.</li> <li>▪ Removes and controls invasive plants.</li> <li>▪ Engages volunteers in mulching, and removing invasive species.</li> </ul>
<b>Seattle Parks Foundation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to improving and expanding Seattle's parks and green spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publishes brochures on tree related issues</li> <li>▪ Manages tree donations to City parks through their Tree Donation Program.</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Property Owners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Plant new trees in their yards and street right-of-ways.</li> <li>▪ Properly maintain trees.</li> <li>▪ Remove dead and diseased trees and invasive plants.</li> <li>▪ Adopt Traffic Circles.</li> </ul>
<b>Neighborhoods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinate neighborhood tree planting projects, such as a DON project.</li> <li>▪ Adopt Traffic Circles.</li> </ul>

Transportation, Parks, City Light, and other departments have varying degree of influence over and responsibility for the urban forest. The successful planning and implementation of projects and policy modifications require constant, in depth coordination across the City's government. Also, successful implementation of the Urban Forest Management Plan requires broad support and participation from all sectors of the community. In addition to the comprehensive activities of government departments and non-governmental organizations, property owners, and neighborhoods can help to achieve the plan's goals.

**Many Actions Have Been Taken or Are Underway to Address Tree Preservation**

Since the issuance of the Urban Forest Management Plan the City stakeholders involved in tree management issues have undertaken many actions to move toward the ultimate goal of 30 percent tree canopy coverage. City departments have made strides in implementing the Plan's goals. The various City stakeholders have begun to strengthen such areas as tree planting and maintenance, interdepartmental cooperation, and public education and outreach. These efforts extend across several city departments, but the levels of effort vary from department to department. See [Appendix III](#) for actions that key City departments have taken and are underway to strengthen the City's management of trees.

---

## **V. Challenges Remain in Developing Regulations, Securing Resources, Building Effective Partnerships, Expanding Education and Outreach, Conducting a Tree Inventory, and Establishing an Effective Management Framework**

Propelled by a strong sense of urgency to increase tree canopy, City departments have accomplished a considerable amount in a short time. City departments face many challenges in implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan. While the City will resolve some of these challenges with time, there are other challenges that may prove to be considerably more difficult to overcome. Six of the greatest challenges involve:

- Developing new tree protection and replacement regulations for private property;
- Determining how to pay for these efforts;
- Coordinating between different stakeholder interests, both within and outside the City;
- Expanding the City's public outreach and education programs;
- Conducting a comprehensive inventory of Seattle's tree resources; and
- Establishing a stable and effective management framework to implement the Urban Forest Management Plan

## **Finding 1**

### **Implementing new regulations is an important next step for tree preservation.**

During the last year in Seattle, the City saw trees cut down, with more slated for the same fate. Despite some current protections for exceptional trees, substantial tree removal still occurs throughout the city. When the City wrote the Urban Forest Management Plan, it established the goal of increasing the city's tree canopy thus ensuring that the city continues to provide substantial benefits to the city's citizens. The plan tasked the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) with evaluating the existing tree protection regulations that govern tree retention on private property.<sup>11</sup> At that time a group made up of architects, landscape architects, developers, and tree care professionals established the Emerald City Task Force. They were tasked by DPD to improve the existing private property tree protection and preservation regulations and to inspire more tree planting and care. In December 2007, the Task Force submitted a letter to the City recommending changes to the current tree regulations regarding private property owners.

Following the Task Force's recommendations, DPD began a project to review all current regulations and to develop and propose new ones.<sup>12</sup> This project led DPD to recognize that significant short-term loss of trees is endangering long-term goals of tree retention and preservation. Current regulations focus primarily on sites undergoing development and allow substantial removal of trees on sites not undergoing development. Current regulations also give developers an incentive to remove trees before submitting a development permit application on sites that are subject to development.<sup>13</sup>

Since DPD's project began, the Mayor proposed new interim tree regulations in September 2008 and City Council passed the interim regulations in February 2009. The new regulations will close a loophole used by developers to take down trees before applying for a development permit. The proposal will restrict tree removal on single-family zoned lots of more than 5,000 square feet, as well as all low-rise and mid-rise multifamily and commercially zoned property. The new regulations would:

---

<sup>11</sup> According to the Urban Forest Management Plan, the greatest loss of Seattle's tree canopy has been from private property and there is a need to plant 650,000 trees on private property to meet the Plan's overall goal of 30 percent tree canopy.

<sup>12</sup> This includes the review of the street tree ordinance to better preserve and protect street trees. An updated version of the ordinance will be included in the citywide regulatory review process.

<sup>13</sup> Current regulations protect all trees 6 inches or greater in diameter on undeveloped lots as well as exceptional trees on "underdeveloped lots" (lots with single family homes outside of single family zones) and sites undergoing development.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

- Expand the definition of exceptional trees to include more trees with substantial canopy as well as groves of trees,<sup>14</sup>
- Prohibit the removal of exceptional trees unless associated with a corresponding development permit,
- Prohibit the removal of more than three non-exceptional trees, 6 inches or greater in diameter and for four and one-half feet above the ground, in one year when not associated with a corresponding development permit,
- Change the standards and process requirements for issuing notices of tree protection violations for consistency with the process used for other City Code violations,
- Change the maximum civil penalty for an individual who has been convicted of a previous violation from \$500 to \$5,000, and
- Allow for treble damages where tree removal is willful or malicious.

Most recently, the City has slowed the regulations development process until a new thorough canopy cover analysis is completed. Currently, the City has been using the data on canopy cover from 2001. Therefore, the City cannot say for certain what the current canopy cover is and whether it is better or worse than what existed in 2001 and whether current regulations are working or not. An up-to-date, accurate canopy cover figure will also help the City convince the public of the need for any new regulations.

It is anticipated that the new regulations will be proposed in late 2009 with a final proposal to follow. Before the regulations are finalized and approved they will go through a comprehensive review process by not only the Mayor and City Council but environmental groups, developers, and private citizens. Also, according to the DPD official responsible for developing the regulations, DPD will conduct an analysis to determine the resources necessary to fully implement the new regulations, which will be presented to the Mayor's Office and City Council for consideration.

### **Recommendations:**

1. The City should adopt new tree regulations for tree protection on private property. (The Office of City Auditor recommends follow-up of this item at the end of 2009.)
2. DPD needs to conduct an analysis to determine resource needs for implementing the new tree regulations. (The Office of City Auditor recommends follow-up of this item at the end of 2009.)

---

<sup>14</sup> Currently, an exceptional tree is defined as having unique historical, ecological, or aesthetic value and is an important community resource.

Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

## **Finding 2**

### **Funding issues are pivotal for implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan.**

Funding is a challenge to implementing and sustaining effective tree management, according to City officials, tree management experts, and industry representatives. While some tree improvements are inexpensive, most require substantial and continuous funding. For example, the Urban Forest Management Plan estimates that it will cost \$114 million to plant the 640,100 trees needed to meet the 30-year goal.

Since 2000, levies passed by Seattle voters have provided funds to City departments for tree projects. The \$198.2 million Pro Parks Levy, approved in 2000, provided funding for a tree crew to perform preventive maintenance on selected trees in City parks between 2000 and 2008. Also, SDOT plans to use funds from the \$365 million 2006 Bridging the Gap levy. The levy proceeds, combined with a commercial parking tax and an employee hour's tax, increased available funds for transportation capital projects and needed infrastructure maintenance. Over the 9-year life of the levy, SDOT plans to prune 25,000 street trees to prevent safety and security hazards and plant 8,000 trees. The City approved \$1.5 million in Capital Improvement Program funding for the 2007-2008 biennium for the Green Seattle Partnership to restore 2,500 acres of forested parkland and to ensure it is sustained by proper long-term maintenance and community stewardship. Recently, the City approved an additional \$3.5 million for the Green Seattle Partnership for the 2009-2010 biennium.<sup>15</sup>

However, demand has far outstripped the additional amounts made available. For example, the Parks and Recreation Department requested approximately \$800,000 and \$500,000 from the City's General Fund for an additional tree crew to perform necessary maintenance on trees for the 2007-2008 and 2009-2010 biennium's, respectively.<sup>16</sup> The budget requests were not funded. Also, SDOT requested approximately \$1.1 million for a tree crew for the 2009-2010 biennium and it was not funded. According to a Department of Finance official, the current economic environment made it impossible to fund the tree crews though they are important in the City's effort to carry out an effective tree management program. In the 2007-2008 biennium, Seattle Center received capital funding for a tree replacement program, to replace damaged and diseased trees. However, they did not receive funding to enable them to meet the Mayor's 2 for 1 tree replacement policy.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The City of Seattle relies on a variety of sources to finance capital projects, such as locally generated revenues (property taxes, fees, voter-approved bonds, and user charges), intergovernmental revenues (including state and federal grants), and debt issuance.

<sup>16</sup> The City of Seattle's General Fund is supported primarily by taxes, such as property taxes, sales taxes, and business and occupation taxes.

<sup>17</sup> The Mayor's 2 for 1 tree replacement policy requires that two trees replace each tree removed on City-owned property.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

According to officials from the departments responsible for carrying out the Plan, insufficient funding is probably the main obstacle to effective management of City trees. Department officials agreed that the largest inadequately funded activity is tree maintenance, even though it is the activity that can do the most to improve the immediate health of urban trees.<sup>18</sup> According to Parks officials, without a sufficient number of tree crews they spend only about 5 percent of its time on proactive maintenance (preventative trimming, including structural pruning, reducing cycle time, etc.). The remaining time is used for reactive maintenance which includes about 30 percent of its time removing risk trees/branches or cleaning up after their fall, and 65 percent of its time performing corrective pruning. Corrective pruning includes removing dead and dying branches, removing cross branches or removing limbs that are overhanging streets, homes, or facilities for clearance.

An important benchmark for urban forestry program performance is how often staff prune trees. The industry standard for tree pruning is every 5 to 7 years. The advantage of shorter pruning cycles is longer living, healthier trees that provide maximum environment, economic, and social benefits. If SDOT had received funding for its requested additional tree crew, this would have enabled it to maintain an average 10-12 year pruning cycle, while with no funding by 2014 the cycle will be 16 years. Parks faces the same dilemma as SDOT. According to Parks, if their request was funded, the pruning cycle would have been reduced from 17-18 years to 13 years. According to SDOT and Parks officials, their pruning cycles will result in inadequate tree maintenance and the removal of many trees much earlier than with a more frequent pruning cycle.

### **Recommendation:**

City decision-makers need to determine the highest funding priorities to reach the 30 percent tree canopy goal in 30 years.

## **Finding 3**

### **Shared Responsibilities Place a Premium on Effective Cooperation and Coordination**

Effective cooperation and coordination on tree management issues is essential, though not ensured, among City departments and outside stakeholders. Urban forestry management impacts utility and transportation infrastructure that compete for limited space in the public right-of-way. This infrastructure includes overhead and underground power lines, trolley lines, roads, sidewalks, trails, drainage and waste water pipes and vaults, and telecommunication equipment. Conflicting and individual goals exist between City departments and outside agencies, and even within departments. Regulatory requirements also pose challenges to urban forestry management. Without

---

<sup>18</sup> Maintenance includes pruning, fertilizing, damage repair and control of pest problems.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

effective partnerships and collaboration, the City's ability to meet urban forest and sustainability goals is compromised.

The management of Seattle's urban forest, which is a vital part of the City's infrastructure, is divided among several departments. Transportation, City Light, Parks, Seattle Public Utilities, and the Department of Planning and Development have the most influence over and responsibility for the urban forest. Most of these departments need to work in the limited public right-of-way and face challenges because of actions taken by other City departments that have different goals. For example:

1. SCL cited conflicts with SDOT about selecting trees that grow to a height greater than 25 feet, thus requiring more frequent pruning to prevent safety and reliability problems for power lines;
2. SDOT Street Maintenance cited conflicts with SDOT Urban Forestry about selecting street trees that are too large for their planting space. These trees will eventually cause damage to pavement, sidewalks, and curbs, and certainly compromise sidewalk safety and accessibility.
3. SDOT cited conflicts with SPU and SCL about how the placement of underground drainage and electrical infrastructure (such as water mains and waste water pipes under planting strips, and electrical vaults) limits available planting space because a five feet clearance is required between trees and underground utilities; and
4. SDOT cited conflicts with SCL about installing street lights too close to existing trees, thus requiring pruning to maintain street illumination.

Our review of tree management interactions have found that partnerships can break down even when procedures are in place. For this report, we will use the first two examples above to illustrate the need for effective cooperation and coordination between City entities.

According to City officials responsible for tree selecting, planting, and maintaining trees, conflicts with overhead and underground utilities are common problems when improper species are planted. These officials stated that the City also continues to plant trees that will grow too large for their space. For example, SCL recommends that trees planted under most power lines should have a mature height of not more than 25 feet because much of the electrical distribution system can reach up to 35 feet in height.<sup>19</sup> Trees, like humans, contain much moisture and are prime conductors for electricity. Overhead electric wires are not insulated and direct contact as well as indirect contact with a tree branch can cause electrocution. Trees directly touching power lines put constant stress on

---

<sup>19</sup> Washington Administrative Code requires a minimum of 10 feet clearance for lines rated 50 kilowatt or below and City Light contractors who are Certified Line Clearance Trimmers prune vegetation to that specification. Only Electrically Qualified workers are allowed to perform that work. According to City Light's web site, and virtually all electrical utilities, trees exceeding 25 feet could cause safety and reliability problems in the future and will have to be trimmed.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

live wires, disrupt electrical flow, can cause outages and burn branches, sometimes causing fires in trees. We observed several locations (i.e., street trees in the public right-of-way and privately planted trees on private property) where trees were burnt because the power lines are too near the trees. Also, trees taller than power lines that are too close to the line can be blown over in high winds, pulling the line down from supporting towers or poles, even while the line remains energized—thus creating a very dangerous, life threatening situation for an unaware passerby. According to the SCL official that accompanied us on our tour of Seattle neighborhoods, the trees we observed that were causing problems, which were planted in the 1970s and 1980s, are still being planted under power lines.

During our tours, we visited two locations where trees were planted as part of two new transportation projects. For the most part, the types of trees planted were appropriate. However, according to a SCL official, in both projects some improper tree species were planted under the power lines. While these trees are not currently 25 feet in height, at full maturity they will exceed that height in approximately 20 to 30 years. We discussed this situation with SCL and SDOT officials, who noted that there are two mechanisms in the City for identifying inappropriate trees before they are planted. First, during the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) review process, involved City departments can raise concerns about tree selection. The officials stated that SCL could have, but did not, raise concerns during the project's review process. An SCL official noted that internal bureaucracy at SCL did not direct the planning documents to the appropriate unit for review. Although SCL reviewed the landscape portions of CIP plans, SCL's Vegetation Management unit, which has the expertise to raise concerns about inappropriate trees being planted, did not review the plans. According to SCL officials, since this has been brought to their attention, SCL has begun discussing how to improve its procedures so that the appropriate unit will review the CIP landscape planning documents.

The second mechanism SDOT uses to help ensure that appropriate trees are planted is the City's tree list. This list, known as the Recommended Seattle Tree Planting List, shows trees recommended for planting within the planting strip area. The list includes a variety of tree species, shapes, and sizes. According to Seattle street tree planting procedures, only small scale trees should be planted underneath the lowest voltage power lines. Trees in the list that are categorized as small to medium may be appropriate for planting under other power lines that have higher clearances. However, some of the trees on the list at maturity will exceed 25 feet in height, and as a result, conflict with what SCL and other utility jurisdictions believe are the appropriate size trees to plant under power lines. According to SDOT officials, while they use the list as criteria for tree planting, they realize in some instances SCL will have to prune the trees when they exceed 25 feet in height.

SCL believes that the City should have learned from the mistakes made with trees planted in the 1970s and 1980s; unless more appropriately sized trees are planted under and around power lines, time and money will be spent maintaining non-suitable trees for the next 30 to 50 years instead of being used to increase the tree canopy. SCL recommends

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

that SCL and SDOT review the list and agree on the appropriate trees that can be planted under power lines, which would reduce pruning required by state law to maintain a ten foot clear zone around power lines.

According to SDOT officials, they realize some trees they are planting may need future trimming around power lines, but they are trying to find a balance between maximizing tree canopy and the amount of pruning necessary by SCL. These officials believe selecting the most appropriate tree for a particular site is often a professional opinion, which could involve compromise. For example, SDOT has suggested planting trees that grow to a maximum height of 30 feet, which would maintain a distance of 5 feet under the power lines, not require constant trimming, and also maximize tree canopy. According to SCL and SDOT officials, they will review the Recommended Tree List during the first quarter in 2009, and also seek input from the Urban Forest Coalition. The officials said that they will produce the new tree list by the end of the second quarter.<sup>20</sup>

Another example for the need for effective cooperation and coordination between City entities is the ongoing conflict between preserving the safety and accessibility of sidewalks and accommodating tree growth and preservation. Various city tree management officials, as well as those from other jurisdictions, stated that the costs of tree maintenance and damage to trees caused by hardscape (pavement, sidewalks, and curbs) can be reduced through better matching of tree types to where they are planted. Larger street trees are often placed in planting spaces that have no expansion capacity. This leads to premature tree decline and/or hardscape damage, and also causes pedestrian accessibility in some instances to fall below Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.<sup>21</sup> To put the sidewalk issue into perspective, Seattle has 33,296 block faces with a paved sidewalk and about 130,000 street trees.<sup>22 23</sup> A 2008 sidewalk survey in urban villages found that of 9,831 block faces, 23 percent had sidewalks with tree root uplifts. Although private development and abutting property owners are helping to make spot repairs on sidewalks, an SDOT briefing<sup>24</sup> stated that with current Bridging the Gap sidewalk repair funding levels, it would take the City over a thousand years to fix the sidewalks at an estimated cost of over \$48 billion.<sup>25</sup> Even with this extensive backlog of sidewalk repair, Bridging the Gap levy funding is only available until 2015.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> According to the SDOT Urban Forestry manager, they plan to review state laws governing tree clearances from power lines as well as utility industry standards relating to power line clearances and obtain input from SCL, other departments, and other SDOT divisions on the tree list before it is approved. Also, they plan to document the CIP project review process for obtaining input from other departments for new tree plantings.

<sup>21</sup> The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 mandates the establishment of minimum walkway clearance widths.

<sup>22</sup> SDOT Street Maintenance Sidewalk Survey conducted in 2007.

<sup>23</sup> City of Seattle Urban Forest Management Plan p. 27.

<sup>24</sup> Extrapolated from 2007 Sidewalk System Summary, SDOT Street Maintenance, Charles Bookman, October 22, 2007.

<sup>25</sup> SDOT has recently conducted a condition survey of sidewalks distress in urban villages. Preliminary results from the survey indicate that 22.9 percent of sidewalks have tree root heaves of 3 to 5 percent in longitudinal slope (which is about 2 to 3 inches over a 5 foot distance). Within that set 10 percent have

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress**  
**Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

According to a City Law Department officials, pedestrian falls are the single largest numerical category of claims and lawsuits against the City of Seattle. The great majority of these pedestrian falls on sidewalks are caused by sidewalk offsets caused by the levering action of tree roots. Data from the City’s Risk Management Office shows that the number of sidewalk fall claims has been rising since 2003. Risk Management records indicate that over half of the sidewalk falls claims are related to tree roots. The City Director of Risk Management stated that he has discussed the issue of adopting planting standards by both SDOT divisions (Urban Forestry and Street Maintenance) as a means to minimize future sidewalk damage from trees. Table 5 below shows sidewalk claims and settlements related to trees between 2003 to 2008.<sup>27</sup> However, these figures do not include the larger cost that the City incurs from lawsuit settlements.

Table 5: Sidewalk Claims and Settlements Related to Trees

Year	Fall on Sidewalk Claims		Fall on Sidewalk Claims related to Trees		% of Trees vs. Sidewalk
	# of Filings	\$ Amt Paid to Claimants	# of Filings	\$ Amt Paid to Claimants	
2003	54	\$ 39,615	25	\$ 11,138	46%
2004	58	\$ 175,461	19	\$ 127,700	33%
2005	67	\$ 99,602	32	\$ 19,887	48%
2006	82	\$ 93,075	32	\$ 50,129	39%
2007	75	\$ 74,774	24	\$ 4,380	32%
2008	81	\$ 109,650	34	\$ 24,279	42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>\$ 592,177</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>\$ 237,513</b>	40%

Damage caused by trees and hardscape add to the sidewalk repair backlog even as new and current projects come on line. Sidewalk damage may occur a few years after construction, as a tree reaches its desired size, or at tree maturity depending on tree selection and site conditions. In order to reach Urban Forest Management Plan canopy goals, street trees are often planted in planting spaces that may meet standard plan requirements at planting, but are not adequately sized to support the long-term growth of a healthy tree or sustain the useful life of other infrastructure. We visited several locations throughout the city to observe damage caused by trees being planted in too small of a planting space. We also visited more recent plantings in which trees,

---

heaves greater than 5 percent. The results were extrapolated from the urban village data out to Seattle’s larger 32,737 block-face sidewalk system yields around 7,496 city sidewalks with tree root uplift issues. The cost to completely rebuild 7,496 block faces of sidewalk is approximately \$495 million. Seattle’s current dedicated sidewalk repair budget of funds replacement of 15 to 25-sidewalk block faces per year.

<sup>26</sup> Bridging the GAP is a nine-year, \$365 million levy that addresses years of deferred maintenance caused by chronic under-funding of transportation infrastructure.

<sup>27</sup> As of January 1, 2009, there were 22 open claims for the category “fall on sidewalk claims related to trees.”

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

according to an SDOT official were planted in too small of a place and, damage will occur in the future.

SDOT officials agree that everything possible needs to be done to ensure the proper trees are planted to reduce hardscape damage and to maximize the benefits of the trees.<sup>28</sup> However, SDOT needs to define planting and setback standards for trees that are acceptable throughout the department. According to SDOT officials, the City should be making decisions in tree selections so that it maximizes the investment in both trees and infrastructure. For this to occur there needs to be collaboration between SDOT divisions that repair damage to sidewalks (Street Maintenance) and those that design or manage trees (Urban Forestry).

Recognizing the competing priorities between the Street Maintenance and Urban Forestry Divisions, SDOT developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two divisions in 2007.<sup>29</sup> Although the divisions agree on overall goals for tree planting, canopy cover, and tree preservation, they have professional differences of opinion on the type of trees to plant, planting pit size, and setbacks from built infrastructure, and when trees should be removed. The MOU establishes a process for resolving differences that arise. However, the MOU's effectiveness is unknown because, according to both SDOT divisions, it was not used during its first year. Also, both divisions note that in its current form, the MOU is intended to resolve issues related to pruning or removing existing trees and does not address planting of new trees. According to SDOT Urban Forestry and Street Maintenance managers, there is a need for the MOU to address the planting of new trees. Furthermore, SDOT has initiated an effort to develop and adopt clear guidelines and standards for tree planting to ensure that trees at maturity will not exceed the capacity of the planting space and to limit conflicts resulting from professional differences of opinion. According to an SDOT manager, SDOT is currently drafting the guidelines, and expects to have them completed for review in March 2009.

### **Recommendations:**

1. SCL needs to review its current process for reviewing the landscape portions of CIP plans to ensure that its Vegetation Management unit is included in its review process. (The Office of City Auditor recommends follow-up of this item in 6 months.)
2. SCL and SDOT need to review the current Recommended Tree Planning List and come to agreement on the appropriate trees to plant under power lines. (The Office of City Auditor recommends follow-up of this item in 6 months.)
3. SDOT Urban Forestry and Street Maintenance Divisions need to revise the MOU process between the two divisions to address resolving differences of opinion on new

---

<sup>28</sup> According to SDOT officials a certain amount of damage is acceptable, but the City needs functional sidewalks.

<sup>29</sup> This Memorandum of Understanding between the SDOT Street Use and Urban Forestry Divisions and the SDOT Street Maintenance Division describes support services that the Urban Forestry section will provide to Street Maintenance, December 14, 2007. This MOU addresses the process for resolving issues for existing trees and not issues that may arise regarding future tree plantings.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

tree plantings. (The Office of City Auditor recommends follow-up of this item in 12 months.)

4. SDOT needs to finalize and adopt new tree planting guidelines that are consistent throughout the department.

### **Finding 4**

#### **The Urban Forest Management Plan's education and outreach program is still in its preliminary stage.**

To achieve urban forestry goals, City government needs the support of the citizens in the community. In Seattle, as in most cities, the overwhelming majority of the trees that make up the urban forest are on private property and the greatest potential for planting new trees is also on private property. For all practical purposes, the care of these privately owned trees is up to the residents of the community. A local government cannot completely control tree management on private lands, but it can take steps to promote proper management of privately owned trees. Educational and outreach programs are positive ways to encourage new tree planting in addition to good tree care within the community.

The Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) is responsible for leading the City's public outreach and education program for the Urban Forest Management Plan and providing a common message for City departments concerning trees. According to an OSE official, public education and outreach is paramount in the City's effort to sustain and expand the City's tree canopy. Since the Urban Forest Management Plan's inception it has been a priority for OSE. However, there is no full-time position within OSE for public outreach and education. Rather, since the beginning of 2007, the official carrying out those activities was responsible for many other OSE activities, such as policy and budget decisions and developing annual work programs. In mid-2008, a temporary employee from the Parks and Recreation Department (Parks) was added to OSE for six months to assist with the public education and outreach program. During this period, the individual focused primarily on working with the public by participating in community events such as street fairs, festivals, neighborhood clean ups, and business employee fairs. During those events, OSE distributed brochures informing people about tree issues.

OSE has developed and implemented public outreach and education with limited resources, and will require adequate resources to continue this effort. OSE will have fewer resources in 2009 than in 2008 for these efforts. According to OSE officials, in 2009 OSE will lose the temporary position that had been filled by a Parks employee, and as a result, its outreach efforts will be limited. According to officials from Seattle as well as other jurisdictions, because the maintenance and care of most of a city's trees is the responsibility of private property owners, public outreach and education are the only means to seriously increase and maintain trees. These officials stated that

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

implementation of an effective outreach and education program requires at least a full-time permanent position if the City of Seattle is interested in meeting its canopy goals.

OSE has taken initial steps in carrying out the public outreach and education program in the past two years, such as developing a communication plan. Because nine departments are involved in the Urban Forestry Management Plan's implementation, the communication plan contains strategies which help to make messages to the public more coherent and consistent, improve public access to information related to tree preservation and care, and increase public involvement in planting and maintaining trees on both public and private land. Also, in April 2008, OSE initiated the reLeaf campaign which included developing a website to improve public access to tree information, creating brochures addressing tree benefits and tree selection, planting and care information, and supporting the creation by high school students of a documentary film on the West Duwamish Greenbelt restoration project. In 2008, OSE expanded its efforts by surveying environmental stakeholders on the message that the City should be getting out to the public about trees. Also, OSE published articles in City and community newsletters, launched radio spots informing the public about the importance of trees, displayed information posters around the City in public gathering places including restaurants, coffee shops, libraries, nurseries, community centers, parks, and busses. In addition, OSE and SDOT have cooperated in giving classes at local nurseries on tree selection and maintenance.

OSE has conducted seasonal outreach efforts. In the spring it conducted demonstrations on how to prevent and care for tree damage. In the summer it emphasized watering and choosing the proper tree, while in the fall it demonstrated tree planting and mulching. During an event in the International District, OSE and the United States Forest Service provided free trees to people but, most importantly, helped each individual select the correct tree for their residence. In addition, City libraries have been used to disseminate information on different tree events or classes. According to the official carrying out these activities, she has been able to reach different communities, such as West Seattle, Ballard, South, Central, and South East Seattle, and citizens who haven't participated in previous city activities dealing with trees. Also, this official conducted a survey of Department of Neighborhoods' tree plantings for the past three years. The survey covered approximately 550 of the 1,500 trees distributed as part of the Tree Fund Program from 2005-2007. The survey, which documented the condition of each tree, is being used to improve the information distributed for the Tree Fund Program.

### **Recommendation:**

To implement education and outreach activities for the UFMP, the City needs to fund a full-time position to implement education and outreach activities for the Urban Forest Management Plan. If the City decides not to fund a full-time position, it needs to modify the canopy goal.

## **Finding 5**

### **A tree inventory has not been conducted.**

According to the tree experts we interviewed, a sound urban forestry program requires, as a first step, a tree inventory to determine the extent, condition, and needs of the urban forest.<sup>30</sup> The urban forest in Seattle is a complex system of trees, site conditions, and maintenance recommendations. Understanding this system is important for proper decision-making regarding species selection and tree care practices. By accumulating, updating, and using information collected by a tree inventory, urban forest managers can forecast trends, anticipate maintenance needs, facilitate budgeting for tree-related expenditures, and develop long-range plans.

For example, a United States western city conducted an inventory of its street trees before its urban forest management plan was completed and found that the overall health of its trees was below average. The primary reasons for this low rating were many topped trees, high volumes of dead wood in the crowns of many trees, extensive trunk decay in older trees, and damage to younger trees. As a result of the inventory and its findings, the city developed and implemented an urban forestry program and policies to improve its existing tree canopy.

The City of Seattle's current tree inventory is not complete. Acquiring reasonably accurate information for City-managed trees requires adequate staffing and budget. The Urban Forest Management Plan stated that a complete and up-to-date inventory is essential to good resource management and for that reason it placed a high priority in obtaining the inventory information. Currently, only SDOT and Parks are performing tree inventories. SDOT is collecting inventory data on 35,000 street trees it is responsible for. This is approximately 26 percent of the street trees in Seattle. In addition, Parks has inventoried trees in approximately 10 to 15 percent of its developed parks. According to a Parks official, based on current funding, it will take many years to perform a complete tree inventory. Besides SDOT and Parks performing tree by tree inventories, they and other City departments are currently engaged in a satellite canopy assessment of the City. The canopy assessment coupled with judicious and statistically valid sampling of individual trees will provide a reliable measure of the size and health of the City's urban forest.

Seattle's Urban Forestry Management Plan states that a comprehensive tree inventory hadn't been done on Seattle's private and public lands. It also stated the need for an inventory and that preserving the City's existing canopy is an important part of Seattle's

---

<sup>30</sup> The tree inventory identifies the current health and condition of trees. Based on the inventory city staff prioritize management activities to: a) remove dead trees, b) remove trees identified as immediate or scheduled removal, c) work to improve health of trees in poor condition, and d) enhance the maintenance program for young trees during the establishment phase to increase survival rates and reduce future maintenance needs (e.g., pruning to train form of young trees or correct structure problems).

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

goal to restore canopy cover to 30 percent. Specifically, the Plan noted that a current inventory of tree locations, species, age, health, and size is critical for planning tree replacement, pruning, disease management, and planting.

According to officials from a consulting company (Davey Resource Group) that assists cities in developing urban forest management plans, the completion of a tree inventory is essential to avoiding a fragmented tree program that lacks the information on tree resources that need to be managed. Furthermore, with an inventory, decision makers have access to the same information, so that better decisions can be made on who needs to play what role and what resources are needed. Officials from several City departments agree that an inventory is an essential first step and that without it, you don't know if the correct priorities have been established and funded.

A complete inventory is an important database that will be useful in managing trees and ensuring their health. However, the database can become obsolete quickly if not updated to account for changes in the tree population resulting from planting and removal activities. City officials and outside stakeholders suggested that the City invest resources to maintain the database by updating records as work is performed on trees or as trees are removed or planted. Updated field inventories would help keep the database current, and would also allow the City to maintain better records on which trees are performing the best and have the longest lifespan. These data can be used to improve species selections, reduce maintenance costs, and increase tree longevity. Finally, the primary benefit of an accurate tree inventory is that the City can use it to budget and plan for tree related problems and situations in the most cost-effective manner possible. More details about performing a tree inventory are contained in Appendix V.

### **Recommendation(s):**

1. City needs to conduct a tree inventory all City-managed trees.

## **Finding 6**

### **The City lacks a stable and effective management framework to implement the Urban Forest Management Plan.**

While the City of Seattle has identified tree preservation and increased tree canopy as priorities and individual City department efforts are under way to implement these priorities, the City's current management framework is not effective for guiding and overseeing these efforts. Without an effective management framework for tree management issues, the City cannot ensure that its current efforts will be fully implemented and significantly improve tree sustainment and expand tree canopy.

Specifically, we found that the City's current approach to tree issues lacks:

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

1. A stable management structure to ensure that the Urban Forest Management Plan receives the needed attention to be sustained and successful. Only two of the three organizational entities delineated in the Plan, the Urban Forest Coalition, and the Office of Sustainability and Environment are operational, while the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet is not.
2. Top leadership with the authority and accountability to best ensure implementation of the Urban Forest Management Plan. We found that there was no agreement within City government or in the public about where program leadership resides. While the Office of Sustainability and Environment believes they have the authority and accountability for the Urban Forest Management Plan's implementation, this is not widely known within City government and to the public.
3. A comprehensive implementation plan for trees that aligns individual department efforts with City-wide goals and priorities, and establishes approaches or strategies in the pursuit of shared goals and performance metrics.

Lacking a tree management framework that includes these elements, the City has made at best, limited, measurable progress towards its goal of increasing tree canopy.

### **A Stable, Effective Management Framework for Implementing the Plan Is Needed**

The management framework established in the Urban Forest Management Plan is not currently functioning as designed. Only two of the three organizational entities delineated in the Plan, the Urban Forest Coalition and the Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE), are operational; the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet has not been operational since February 2008, according to OSE officials.<sup>31</sup>

The Urban Forestry Management Plan establishes a management framework which includes three entities: the Urban Forest Coalition (UFC), the Office of Sustainability and Environment, and the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet (Sub-cabinet). Together, these entities are designated to work together to implement the Urban Forest Management Plan. The table below lists the roles and responsibilities of the three entities.

Table 6: Roles and Responsibilities of Urban Forest Management Plan Management Framework Entities

Entity	Roles and Responsibilities
Urban Forest Coalition	▪ Functions as responsible body for Urban Forest Management Plan

<sup>31</sup> OSE could not provide any Sub-cabinet agendas or meeting minutes to substantiate that meetings were held.

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

	<p>implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Holds monthly meetings attended by representatives from 9 City departments that have tree responsibilities (Parks, SDOT, Seattle Center, SCL, SPU, OSE, DON, DPD, and FFD)</li> <li>▪ Reports quarterly to its executive level advisory board (Sub-cabinet)</li> <li>▪ Develops an annual work plan for City departments to accomplish;</li> <li>▪ Coordinates program-based biennial budgets that bring together all the initiatives and proposals from the different departments</li> <li>▪ Reports to the Sub-cabinet for annual work plan approval and performance reviews</li> <li>▪ Presents specific projects and initiatives pertaining to plan implementation to the Sub-cabinet for review and comment</li> </ul>
Office of Sustainability and Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides interdepartmental coordination</li> <li>▪ Chairs the UFC and Sub-cabinet</li> <li>▪ Develops and implements overall message and strategy for communication and outreach efforts to outside community</li> </ul>
Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Serves as executive level advisory body for UFC</li> <li>▪ Holds monthly meetings attended by City department heads</li> <li>▪ Provides input to UFC on key program development and policy issues</li> <li>▪ Meets with the UFC quarterly</li> <li>▪ Approves UFC's annual work plan</li> <li>▪ Reviews UFC's performance</li> <li>▪ Reviews and comments on UFC's special projects and initiatives pertaining to Urban Forest Management Plan implementation</li> </ul>

UFC meetings were held approximately monthly in 2008 according to OSE officials. However, UFC members reported that not all department representatives regularly attend. Attendees also reported that UFC meetings are informative because representatives report their individual department's tree activities. We could not obtain UFC agendas and meeting minutes for the period since the Urban Forest Management Plan's inception in 2007. As a result, we couldn't determine the issues discussed and those that needed to be addressed or resolved at higher levels regarding the Plan.

UFC members reported that policy issues are rarely discussed at their meetings, and that there is no mechanism for elevating issues that need resolution to a higher level because the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet was not functioning. Therefore, when differences of opinion in tree policy and operational issues arise between departments, such as the issue we discussed earlier in this report between SDOT and SCL on the type of the trees planted under power lines as there is no established process for elevating them for resolution. Currently, the departments are left to resolve their differences on their own.

OSE chairs the UFC meetings and coordinates with City departments about the Urban Forest Management Plan's annual work plan and monitors department progress on tree activities. In addition, OSE has been leading the City's public outreach and education program and providing a consistent, citywide message about trees.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

OSE's Acting Director stated that the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet has not met since February 2008, and as a result, the UFC has been unable to report to the Sub-cabinet on a quarterly basis. The OSE Acting Director said that although the Sub-cabinet did not meet in 2008, OSE assumed executive leadership for the UFC on policy issues and, when necessary, raised issues to Senior Staff and the Mayor's Executive Team.<sup>32</sup> In reviewing OSE's documentation regarding its meetings with executive leadership, we identified two such meetings in October 2008 since the inception of the Urban Forest Management Plan in 2007. OSE stated that the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet will resume regular meetings in February 2009.<sup>33</sup>

OSE stated that the Sub-cabinet was not operational in 2008 because OSE had a heavy workload with climate change issues and did not have the resources to manage Sub-cabinet meetings. OSE also noted that in 2009, the Office of Policy and Management is assuming some of the staffing activities, and the Department of Finance will be managing both the new Sustainability and Environment Interdepartmental Team<sup>34</sup>, which will identify and prepare issues for Sub-cabinet discussion, and the Sub-cabinet.

The OSE Acting Director and the Parks Superintendent agreed that the Sub-cabinet is needed because it provides a forum for resolving tree-related issues raised by the UFC and City department heads. The Parks Superintendent said that although there are UFC meetings on tree issues, policy issues are not discussed, and without a higher-level forum for these discussions that includes department heads, a clear citywide consensus on policy and operational conflicts regarding trees will not occur. For example, he cited a need for City departments to coordinate more closely with each other on what types of trees to plant and to develop a citywide policy on this issue. He noted that while his department still treats elm trees for Dutch Elm disease in developed parklands, his department is also removing elms from natural areas because they are non-native and invasive. He stated that while he questions his department's internal policy regarding elm trees, he is also not aware of what other City departments' policies are regarding elm trees. Another policy issue cited by the Parks Superintendent is the need to develop common definitions of terms across City departments, such as when a tree is a hazard or risk. Having a citywide policy on this is important because the City's response to these situations is dependent on a common definition. Also, coordination of tree priorities across City departments is also needed so that the highest priority projects are funded. For example, the Superintendent noted that his department requested an additional tree crew for the 2009-2010 budget cycle without knowing what the needs of other departments were.

---

<sup>32</sup> <http://www.seattle.gov/mayor/newsdetail.asp?ID=2333&dept=40>


<sup>33</sup> Since the completion of this audit, meetings have been held in February, March, and April 2009.

<sup>34</sup> OSE has broadened the focus of its Climate Interdepartmental Team (Climate IDT) to include all sustainability and environmental issues, which includes urban forestry issues, and renamed as the Sustainability and Environment IDT. The IDT will identify issues that the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet will need to address and in some cases, resolve.

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

The following chart shows the Urban Forest Management Plan organizational framework. The green shaded boxes are the three entities established in the plan and the dashed box represents a new entity established in 2009, the Environment and Sustainability Interdepartmental Team.

Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only



Parks  
 SDOT  
 OSE  
 DPD  
 SCL  
 SeaCtr  
 FFD  
 DON

Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

**Top City Leadership Should Drive the Urban Forest Management Plan's Implementation**

The City's current approach to tree management is decentralized, with oversight and management responsibilities diffused among several City departments.<sup>35</sup> This lack of a single point of management for citywide tree efforts has caused frustration for the public and City officials who are faced with questions and problems concerning trees. The Urban Forest Management Plan also does not clearly identify a single citywide focal point with program authority and accountability. Although the Mayor made OSE's Director responsible for implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan<sup>36</sup>, Urban Forest Coalition (UFC) members and even a high-level City official we interviewed were not aware that OSE is directly accountable for the plan's implementation. Several UFC members stated that because OSE is the City's lead agency for environmental issues, it would be the logical entity to lead and be held accountable for the implementation of the Urban Forest Management Plan.

According to the OSE Acting Director, OSE is responsible for the development and implementation of the Mayor's Environmental Action Agenda<sup>37</sup> in which enhancing the urban forest is a top priority. The Acting Director believes that OSE is responsible for developing citywide program policy and budget priorities regarding trees, and has the authority to help resolve conflicts between City departments on tree issues. He plans to take steps in 2009 to strengthen OSE's role in managing the program. They include the re-establishment of the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet which will bring together City department heads responsible for implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan on a regular basis. By doing so, he believes that the City will be able to address any issues or conflicts in an effective and timely manner. In addition, OSE has broadened the focus of its Climate Interdepartmental Team (Climate IDT) to include all sustainability and environmental issues, which includes urban forestry issues, and has been renamed as the Sustainability and Environment IDT. This IDT, which is scheduled to convene in March 2009, will have lower level UFC discussions. The IDT will identify issues that the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet will need to address and in some cases, resolve.

The City needs to have a single, executive-level official or entity that has clear authority and accountability for 1) implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan's goal to reach a 30 percent canopy in 30 years, 2) can set the program priorities, and 3) resolve conflicts. Although OSE believes that they have the authority and accountability for the Urban Forest Management Plan's implementation, within the City and among the public there is confusion about where program leadership resides. Effective leadership will help

---

<sup>35</sup> See Table 3 in Chapter IV Background, which outlines various departmental roles and responsibilities for tree management oversight.

<sup>36</sup> Accountability Agreements (2007, 2008, 2009) for OSE Directors.

<sup>37</sup> <http://seattle.gov/html/citizen/departments.htm#environment>

# Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

establish the direction, pace, and tone for implementing the plan and provide a clear focal point to unite all the City departments behind a single mission. The effectiveness of OSE's leadership will be a key factor in determining whether the plan is successfully implemented.

## **The City Needs to Strengthen Implementation Plans to Guide Future Urban Forest Management Plan Efforts**

The City has not developed a comprehensive plan for implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan. According to a U.S. Government Accountability Office report, there is no more important element in results-oriented management than an entity's planning effort.<sup>38</sup> Effective municipal programs require well articulated, comprehensive, and integrated implementation plans. Six of the most important components of such plans are:

- A comprehensive mission statement,
- Goals and objectives,
- Strategies (or approaches) to achieve the goals and objectives,
- Performance metrics/assessments to measure/assess progress,
- Key external factors, and
- Program evaluations used to establish or revise strategic goals.

See [Appendix V](#) that further describes the key questions that need to be considered in developing each of these components.

The Urban Forest Management Plan states that it is “a roadmap for a strategic approach to manage Seattle’s urban forest... (and) the plan contains goals and supporting actions that are critical to the long-term vitality of the forest”.<sup>39</sup> However, the Urban Forest Management Plan is a not comprehensive implementation plan because although it clearly addresses its mission and goals, it does not address:

- Strategies to achieve its goals and objectives,
- Performance measures to measure progress,
- External factors that could impact the plan, and
- Ongoing program evaluations to establish or revise the plan.

We assessed the Urban Forest Management Plan according to how well the six key components of a good implementation plan were addressed:

Table 7: Assessment of the Components of the Urban Forest Management Plan

Plan Component	Description	Office of City Auditor	Assessment Rating
----------------	-------------	------------------------	-------------------

<sup>38</sup> U.S. Government Accountability Office, Agencies' Strategic Plans Under GPR: Key Questions to Facilitate Congressional Review, GAO/GGD-10.1.16 (Washington, D.C.: May 1997).

<sup>39</sup> UFMP, p. 95

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress**  
**Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

		<b>Comments</b>	
Comprehensive Mission Statement	The mission statement explains why the plan/program exists and tells what it does.	The Urban Forest Management Plan (Plan) clearly states that its purpose is to “guide a broad range of actions that will achieve a sustainable urban forest in Seattle. This is a 30-year plan that recommends the steps the City of Seattle must take to preserve Seattle’s trees and the cherished environment...”	<b>Clearly addressed</b>
Goals and Objectives	Goals and objectives explain what results are expected from the plan/program and when to expect the plan/program’s results.	<p>The Plan clearly states that its primary goal is to increase the city’s tree canopy cover to 30% in 30 years, by identifying goals, recommendations, and actions that will preserve, restore, enhance, and sustain the urban forest over the long term.</p> <p>The Plan clearly lists the goals and recommended actions (short-, mid-, and long-term) and by management units (MU).</p>	<b>Clearly addressed</b>
Strategies to achieve goals and objectives	<p>Strategies describe the human resources, processes, expertise, technologies, and capital needed to achieve the goals and objectives.</p> <p>Strategies also describe how the plan/program translates the goals and objectives into specific activities so that managers and staff can be held accountable.</p>	The Plan clearly lists the goals and recommended actions (short-, mid-, and long-term) and by management units (MU) but the Plan does not describe the methods, means, and resources to reach the overall 30 percent tree canopy goal in 30 years.	<b>Partially addressed</b>
Performance Metrics/Assessments to measure/assess progress	This component describes measures to assess progress towards achieving goals and objectives. Annual performance goals will be used to	While OSE collects and synthesizes metrics for the annual work plan it establishes for individual City departments, these metrics do not address performance measures for	<b>Not addressed</b>

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress**  
**Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

	gauge progress and its impact on long-term goals.	evaluating and monitoring <u>overall</u> progress in meeting the 30 percent tree canopy in 30 years.	
Key External Factors	This component identifies and discusses external factors that could impact the plan and could significantly affect achieving goals and objectives.	The Plan does not identify external factors not identified or discuss potential impacts.	<b>Not Addressed</b>
Program evaluations used to establish or revise strategic goals	This component describes evaluating the program's progress to provide decision-makers, 1) information that assesses if the program's goals and strategies are still valid and reasonable and 2) if and what adjustments need to be made to meet the overall goals.	The Plan states it will be updated every 5 years, but contains no description of program evaluation(s) to be performed, if any, and how the findings will be used.	<b>Not addressed</b>

Both the OSE Acting Director and the City's Finance Director confirmed that the City lacks a comprehensive implementation plan for reaching its 30 percent canopy goal in 30 years. Although the OSE develops an annual work plan, department officials said that because there's no comprehensive implementation plan they are not aware how the annual plan's efforts fit with the 30 percent canopy goal. By not having a comprehensive implementation plan, the City cannot know whether it is on track for meeting its goal, and what adjustments are needed.

The City needs to develop a comprehensive implementation plan for reaching its canopy goal. An effective implementation plan will specify the processes, expertise, technologies, and capital needed to reach the goal. An effective implementation plan will also define a program performance review and evaluation system to track the plan's progress. Without a performance monitoring and evaluation system, the City cannot effectively make program and budget decisions, adapt to changing conditions over time, or effectively communicate with decision-makers and the public about the Urban Forest Management Plan's progress.

**Recommendations:**

1. The City needs to re-establish the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet and to set a regular meeting schedule.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

2. Agendas and minutes should be kept for all meetings, including Urban Forest Coalition and Sub-cabinet meetings.
3. The Mayor or the City Council needs to clarify the Office of Sustainability and Environment's roles regarding its authority and accountability for implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan.
4. The City needs to develop a comprehensive implementation plan for trees that aligns and integrates individual department efforts with Citywide goals and priorities, establishes approaches or strategies to achieve goals, and evaluates progress through performance metrics for implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan.

---

## VI. Conclusion

Seattle's urban forest is an important and valuable resource that has unfortunately suffered many decades of decline. However, proper planning and management can reverse this decline and ensure that the City's trees will provide sufficient benefits for Seattle's residents. Increasing the tree canopy in Seattle is not a short-term or easy project. There are many challenges that must be overcome. The City has a good start, but has a long way to go. While there is widespread support in City government for preserving and expanding its urban forest, it is likely that there will be tension between preserving trees and expanding the tree canopy versus removing trees for development. In light of these and other challenges associated with tree preservation, the City has begun increasing its efforts to finding a balance between expanding the urban forest and allowing urban development. Even with these efforts, the City will have difficulty addressing tree management challenges without a stable and effective management framework that is accountable for tree management issues on a citywide basis.

Without such a management framework, the City is not well positioned to effectively guide and oversee tree management efforts from a citywide perspective to prioritize its efforts appropriately, identify critical gaps or duplication of efforts, and address long-term, large-scale tree issues. In particular, we found that the management framework established in the Urban Forest Management Plan is not currently functioning as designed. Only two of the three organizational entities delineated in the Plan, the Urban Forest Coalition, and the Office of Sustainability and Environment are operational, while the Sustainability and Environment Sub-cabinet is not. Without the Sub-cabinet operating, the program does not benefit from critical oversight, coordination and policy direction at the executive departmental level. The City needs to have top leadership that is effective in implementing the Plan. The City and public stakeholders also need to know who has the authority for implementing the plan and is accountable for its success. While the Office of Sustainability and Environment believes it has the authority and is being held accountable for the plan's implementation, this is not apparent to tree

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

stakeholders. A clear, single point of leadership in the City that has the authority and accountability for tree issues and drives the program forward is a key contributing element to the success of any new initiative. Top leadership must set the direction, pace, and tone for the Urban Forest Management Plan's implementation and provide a clear focal point that brings together all City departments behind a single mission.

Another element of a management framework missing includes a comprehensive plan that can help clarify City priorities and unify the City's departments in the pursuit of shared goals. In the coming years, it is likely that public resources for managing the City's urban forest and for achieving tree canopy goals will be extremely limited as these efforts compete against public safety, human services, and transportation needs. This makes it all the more important that the City has a comprehensive plan in place as part of an effective management framework. It is an essential tool that will assist the City in coordinating City department efforts effectively and efficiently. The plan will help City decision-makers make intelligent decisions with the limited resources available. With a management framework in place, the City would be better positioned to address current challenges it faces and to preserve, restore, enhance, and sustain the urban forest over the long term.

## **Appendix I: Objectives, Scope, and Methodology**

The objectives of this report were to (1) provide an overview of the types of actions taken by the City of Seattle and other stakeholders to implement the Urban Forest Management Plan; (2) identify the challenges the City faces in attaining and sustaining Urban Forest Management Plan goals; and (3) describe approaches that may be useful for future tree management efforts.

To determine the progress made in implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan, we conducted interviews with City officials involved with implementing the plan. They included officials from Seattle Department of Transportation, Parks and Recreation, Seattle Center, Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Office of Sustainability and Environment, Department of Neighborhoods, Department of Planning and Development, Fleets and Facilities Department, Department of Finance, and Central Staff. Also, we reviewed numerous city documents tied to the plan and its implementation, including City ordinances, resolutions, regulations, budgets, planning documents, and reports. We also reviewed the City funding sources directed to the plan's implementation, including funding not in the City's base budget, such as funding from the Pro Parks and Bridging the Gap levies. We visited locations where trees were being planted and tree maintenance being performed. We were accompanied on our visits by officials from Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Seattle Department of Transportation, Seattle Center, and Seattle Parks and Recreation. We determined that the selection of these sites was appropriate for our design and objectives and that the selection would provide valid and reliable evidence. We interviewed City officials in each location we visited about what actions were being taken to meet Urban Forest Management Plan goals. We interviewed other stakeholders outside of city government that were familiar with the actions being taken by the City to implement the Plan. They included a private consultant on tree matters for several jurisdictions, and officials from Plant Amnesty, the Seattle Audubon Society, and Seattle Tree Preservation. We have not examined every action regarding tree resources, management or community involvement, but our work to date has covered a number of them.

To determine the challenges faced in implementing the Plan, we interviewed City officials responsible for implementing the plan, including individuals from the Seattle Department of Transportation, Seattle City Light, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Seattle Center, Seattle Public Utilities, Department of Planning and Development, Office of Sustainability and the Environment, Department of Neighborhoods, Fleets and Facilities Department, Seattle Center, Office of Risk Management, Department of Finance, and City Council Central Staff. We interviewed other stakeholders outside of city government that are familiar with the challenges being faced by the City to implement the Plan. They included Sound Tree Solutions, Inc., Plant Amnesty, Seattle Audubon, and

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

Seattle Tree Preservation.<sup>40 41</sup> In addition, we conducted a literature search for other jurisdictions' urban forestry plans. We found plans for Baltimore, Maryland; Lacey, Washington; Leesburg, Virginia; Portland, Oregon; Syracuse, New York; Valley Center, Kansas; Vancouver, Washington; Walla Walla, Washington; and West Lafayette, Indiana. We reviewed each plan to determine the challenges (e.g., conducting a comprehensive tree inventory, funding, tree maintenance, education and outreach) they face in carrying out their plans. We interviewed officials from Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Kirkland, Olympia, and Vancouver, Washington to discuss the challenges they face in implementing their urban forestry plans. We contacted officials from Portland, Oregon; Chicago, Illinois; New York, New York; Washington D. C.; and Sacramento, San Diego, and San Jose, California;; about their current or baseline canopy measurement for their urban forest program, canopy goals and timeframe for reaching their canopy goal. We visited various City of Seattle locations where actions are being taken to plant trees and perform tree maintenance. We were accompanied on our visits by officials from Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Seattle Department of Transportation, Seattle Center, and Seattle Parks and Recreation. We determined that the selection of these sites was appropriate for our design and objectives and that the selection would provide valid and reliable evidence. We interviewed the city officials in each location we visited to get their perspective on the challenges they face in meeting Urban Forest Management Plans goals.

To determine future actions the City could take to enhance its tree management efforts we conducted a literature search to find actions being taken by other jurisdictions. We found urban forestry plans for Baltimore, Maryland; Leesburg, Virginia; Portland, Oregon; Syracuse, New York; Valley Center, Kansas; West Lafayette, Indiana; and Lacey, Vancouver, and Walla Walla, Washington. We analyzed these plans to identify the best practices being used to carry out their urban forestry program. Also, we interviewed officials from other jurisdictions to determine actions that contributed to the successful implementation of their plans. Officials from Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Olympia, Kirkland, and Vancouver, Washington provided reasons for the success of their programs. We interviewed officials from two consulting firms, Davey Resource Group and Sound Tree Solutions, Inc., which advise jurisdictions on developing urban forestry management plans and carrying out successful urban forestry programs.<sup>42</sup> Finally, we interviewed City of Seattle officials responsible for

---

<sup>40</sup> Sound Tree Solutions, Inc. offers arboricultural and urban forestry consulting services for the greater Puget Sound region. A broad range of services are offered ranging from individual tree risk assessment, appraisal, and tree selection to tree retention development and greenbelt or remnant forest management programs. Also the company offers tree ordinance and program development, mediation/facilitation, and consumer outreach and education.

<sup>41</sup> Seattle Tree Preservation is a company dedicated to the proper care of trees in the Seattle area urban forest.

<sup>42</sup> Davey Resource Group (DRG) was launched in 1992 to offer technical consulting to the utility, commercial, and municipal markets. DRG provides urban and utility forestry solutions, natural resources and environmental planning, research and development, and consulting services to utility companies and commercial properties. DRG also offers forestry and vegetation management consulting services and tree inventories.

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

implementing the forestry program to determine what they believe was needed for a successful program.

We conducted this performance audit between April 2008 and January 2009, in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

## **Appendix II: Urban Forest Benefits**

In an increasingly urbanized nation, urban forests provide an essential balance to the built environment and directly influence the daily lives of nearly 80 percent of the country's population.<sup>43</sup> Unlike timber forests which are managed primarily to produce wood products, urban forests are managed for the services, such as air and water quality improvement, they provide to city residents. The pressures on the urban forest are a direct result of their location in growing urban areas; without planning and management, much of the urban forest would be eliminated. Therefore, management intervention is necessary to keep city trees and urban forest lands sustainable and healthy. Increasing urbanization in the United States make it prudent for policymakers, planners, and managers at national, regional, and local levels to focus their attention on urban forest resources.

Effective management of the urban forest requires recognition of the diversity of land uses and landowners within the urban area and the interactions of policies, programs, and physical development. Whether connected by the logistics of managing urban infrastructure (for example, coordinating maintenance of urban trees and power lines, sewers, sidewalks, and roads), or by contributing to the overall character of the area, the urban forest links landscape with architecture and becomes an important component of urban planning.

Cities are realizing that the urban forest is an essential part of a livable and economically sound community. Urban forests are a complex resource, with multiple owners, a variety of landscape types, and site-specific management objectives. For example, trees in Seattle's urban forest affect the city's residents and their environment both directly and indirectly. Managed properly, this valuable resource can provide some or all of the following benefits:

### Stormwater runoff reductions

Pollutants carried in stormwater runoff are the primary cause of degradation of our streams and rivers. Tree canopy reduces runoff and pollutants by intercepting and storing rainfall, increasing stormwater infiltration into the soil, transpiring back into atmosphere, and reducing the rate at which water reaches streams.

### Air quality improvements

Trees absorb gaseous pollutants such as ozone, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur dioxide; and they filter particulate matter such as dust, ash, pollen, and smoke. Reductions in these pollutants results in improved public health and reduces the severity of ozone-induced asthmatic, responses and other respiratory illnesses.

---

<sup>43</sup> Urban forest is comprised of the trees, shrubs and other vegetation in parks, along streets, in yards, on unbuilt properties and in urban natural areas.

# Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

## Energy Savings

Trees shade buildings and pavement, reducing the urban heat island effect and thereby decreasing the demand for electricity.<sup>44</sup> They also cool the air by releasing water vapor through transpiration. In Western Washington, trees strategically planted to shade buildings lower summertime air temperature between 5 and 9 degrees and reduce cooling costs by approximately 4 percent.

## Economic benefits

Improving the aesthetics of our community has tangible economic benefits. Systems of open space and bike trails give a community a reputation for being a good place to live and visit. Increased recreational and community activity attracts new businesses and stimulates tourism.

Not all benefits are realized at all locations within a city. Improper design, lack of management, or lack of tree maintenance can increase costs and reduce urban forest benefits. Urban foresters often have direct control over street and park trees, which typically account for only 10 to 20 percent of the urban forest resource. However, urban foresters can help guide and direct the remaining portion of the urban forest, which is controlled by private landowners, through education outreach, financial incentives, ordinances, and assistance with planting, maintenance, and management.

---

<sup>44</sup> The Environmental Protection Agency describes the following as a heat island: “As urban areas develop, changes occur in their landscape. Buildings, roads, and other infrastructure replace open land and vegetation. Surfaces that were once permeable and moist become impermeable and dry. These changes cause urban regions to become warmer than their rural surroundings, forming an "island" of higher temperatures in the landscape.”

## Appendix III: Many Actions Have Been Taken or Are Underway in Seattle to Address Tree Preservation

The table describes the accomplishments in tree preservation and sustainment by City departments for 2007 and 2008. Current and planned activities by the City to implement the Urban Forest Management Plan are also discussed.

### Key City Departments Have Taken Steps to Implement the Urban Forest Management Plan

City departments have made strides in implementing the Urban Forest Management Plan many objectives and actions. We received information from the departments on their progress in meeting established annual goals. Departments have made progress in areas such as tree planting and maintenance, identifying regulatory changes needed for the preservation of trees, convening teams for interdepartmental cooperation and coordination, and public outreach and education. Table 8 below shows some of the actions that have been taken and activities that are in process of being implemented to meet the Plan's annual goals.

Table 8: Goals and Accomplishments by City Departments

Entity	2007 Goals	2007 Accomplishments	2008 Goals	2008 Accomplishments
Parks, SPU, and OSE	Continue restoration on 162 acres of forested parklands and enroll 100 new acres into the Green Seattle Partnership restoration program	Completed and 100 acres enrolled	Continue restoration on 262 acres of forested parklands and begin restoration on an additional 125 acres	Restoration continued on 264 acres and 120 new acres entered restoration.
Parks, SPU, and OSE	Begin restoration on 10 new acres of forested parklands	Complete		
Parks	Prune 3,600 trees	Pruned 2,600 trees	Prune 3,000 trees	Pruned 2,043 trees
SDOT	Prune 2,100 trees	Pruned 2,530 trees	Prune 3,000 trees	Pruned 3,222 trees <sup>45</sup>
SCL	Prune trees away from power lines along 157 miles of arterial streets	Pruned 162 line miles	Prune trees away from power lines along 210 miles of arterial streets	Pruned trees along 301 miles of power lines
Parks	Plant trees to meet Mayor's	723 trees planted,	Continue to plant trees	1,212 trees planted

<sup>45</sup> SDOT restored 92 downtown tree pits to accommodate growing trees, or re-mulched to make them pedestrian-safe.

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress**  
**Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

	2 for 1 Tree Replacement Policy	450 trees removed (Mayor's policy not met)	and meet Mayor's 2 for 1 policy	and 397 trees removed <sup>46</sup> . (Mayor's policy met.)
SDOT	Plant 500 trees and meet Mayor's 2 for 1 Tree Replacement Policy	1,461 trees planted, 135 trees removed (Mayor's policy met)	Plant 900 trees and meet Mayor's 2 for 1 policy	927 trees planted and 16 removed. (Mayor's policy met.)
SCL	Plant 800 trees through the Urban Replacement Program and meet the Mayor's 2 for 1 Tree Replacement Policy	546 trees planted and 20 trees removed (Mayor's policy met)	Plant 600 trees and meet Mayor's 2 for 1 policy	423 trees planted and 190 trees removed. (Mayor's policy met.)
DON	Plant 500 trees through DON's Matching Fund Program	Planted 427 trees	Plant 800 trees through DON's Matching Fund Program	378 trees planted and 397 water bags distributed
Seattle Center	Plant trees and meet the Mayor's 2 for 1 Replacement Policy	28 trees planted and 30 trees removed (Mayor's policy not met)	Plant trees to meet the Mayor's 2 for 1 Replacement Policy from prior year  Develop Landscape Management Plan including options to address and exceed tree canopy goals  Complete a tree inventory for the 74-acre campus	41 trees planted and 32 trees removed. (Mayor's policy not met.)  Worked with other City departments to meet the 2 for 1 tree replacement off-site  Landscape Management Plan draft completed (final to be issued in 2009)  Tree inventory completed for the campus' 945 trees
DPD	Convene Emerald City Task Force to recommend incentives and regulations to improve canopy cover on private property	Complete		
DPD	Identify and analyze potential regulatory changes (to enhance tree preservation and planting on private property) based on Emerald City Task Force input	Underway	Continue and release regulatory strategy for public comment, incorporate comments, draft legislation and forward to City Council.  Release regulatory strategy for public comment, incorporate comment, draft legislation and forward to City Council.	Analysis was initiated and will be updated in 2009 based on new tree canopy cover data.  A strategy will be released in 2009 after the new canopy cover data is incorporated.

<sup>46</sup> Seattle Parks and Recreation Department also removed 300 trees from forested edge areas and planted more than 13,000 seedlings.

Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

OSE	Develop and implement performance monitoring system	Complete	Monitor performance annually	Annual report for 2007 was released Arbor Day 2008.
SDOT	Update and maintain the street tree inventory of 35,000 City owned trees (4-year process)	26,000 trees inventoried on site and data entry will follow	Continue inventory process	Inventory process continues.
OSE	Convene Urban Forest interdepartmental team bi-monthly and brief Sustainability & Environment sub-cabinet as needed	On-going	Continue 2007 goal	Urban Forest Coalition meets monthly (except August), the Sustainability & Environment sub-cabinet was eliminated, but the Growth Management Sub-cabinet was briefed.
OSE	Develop key messages and speaking points	Complete		
OSE	Develop Communication Plan	Complete		
OSE	Modify city tree websites to strengthen connections between sites and improve access to information	Complete		
OSE	Create brochure addressing tree benefits and tree selection, planting and care information	Complete		
SCL	Provide City Light customers who will be impacted by tree trimming with information about line clearance pruning	Complete		
DPD	Provide tree benefit/tree replacement information to anyone who receives a permit to remove a street tree or as part of a DPD permit	Materials complete, distribution beginning in 2008	Begin distribution of materials	Distribution will not begin until new tree protection regulations are adopted in 2009.
OSE	Partner with a nursery or a non-profit to present two tree information sessions	Deferred to 2008	Same goal as 2007	Classes presented at two nurseries.
OSE	Partner with non-profit on a wide-reaching or replicable kid-oriented tree/art project	Nature Consortium student documentary film complete		
OSE	Mayor appoints tree professionals/advocates to Sustainability and Environmental Advisory Panel	Not complete	Continue 2007 goal	Since the Sustainability and Environment Advisory Panel did not meet appointments were

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

				not made.
OSE	Identify opportunities for ongoing stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder survey completed	Engage stakeholders in urban forest issues	Environmental stakeholders met to discuss regulatory approaches to improving tree canopy cover and working with Plant Amnesty and other stakeholders to produce community event in spring of 2009.  Seattle reLeaf participated in twelve community events.  A tree blog and Ask-the-Expert features were incorporated into the website to engage the community.
OSE	Recruit and manage 51,000 hours of volunteer support through the Green Seattle Partnership	60,000 volunteer hours	Recruit and manage 95,000 hours of volunteer support through the Green Seattle Partnership	78,000 volunteer hours
OSE			Launch Seattle reLeaf campaign, with new website, brochure, poster campaign, realtor outreach, and articles in City and community newsletters	All tasks completed.

The amount of effort involved in implementing these goals and actions has been considerable. For example, in 2005 the Mayor directed City departments to replace every tree removed from City property with two new trees.<sup>47</sup> In some cases, departments have been able to meet the Mayor’s policy; however, in other cases they have not. According to several department officials, it takes considerable effort to find suitable city property to plant new trees to meet the 2 for 1 replacement policy.

**The City Has Taken Many Actions and Is Considering Others**

DPD is reviewing and revising the City’s tree protection and replacement regulations for private property. According to the Urban Forest Management Plan, the greatest loss of

<sup>47</sup> The Mayor’s 2 for 1 replacement policy only applies to City-owned property.

## Not for Distribution/Work in Progress Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only

Seattle's tree canopy has been from private property and there is a need to plant 650,000 trees on private property to meet the plan's overall goal of 30 percent tree canopy. DPD's efforts began by taking comments received during the development of the Urban Forest Management Plan. Next, the Emerald City Task Force was established by DPD to provide early input and guidance as the City began to critique existing regulations to explore options for improving the regulations.<sup>48</sup> The Task Force submitted a letter to the City in December, 2007, recommending changes to the current regulations regarding private property owners. As a result, DPD is now drafting a new regulation for City Council approval. DPD officials anticipate a new regulation will go into effect in mid to late 2009.

Even before the adoption of the Urban Forest Management Plan in 2007, the City had passed levies and initiated programs and projects to enhance tree preservation:

- In 1994 the City allocated funds from the Cumulative Reserve Fund for the purpose of restoring forested parklands. This action was important for several reasons. For the first time trees were identified as City infrastructure assets. This made forest restoration eligible for funding. This action resulted in today's expanded Park's Forest Restoration Program.
- In 1994 Seattle's first Heritage Tree, a Japanese Umbrella Pine was recognized by the City Council.<sup>49</sup>
- In 1999-2000, Seattle implemented the Millennium Woods Legacy Project, which resulted in the planting of nearly 26,000 new trees throughout the city on both public and private property.
- In 2000 the Pro Parks Levy was passed by Seattle voters. The levy contained funding for a third crew in the Department of Parks and Recreation, creation of an Urban Forest Crew Chief position to supervise all Parks Department tree crews, and a 3-person Natural Area Crew dedicated to maintenance work within forested parklands.
- In 2001 the Seattle City Council passed, and the Mayor signed into law, a tree protection ordinance which applies to trees on undeveloped land and allows for the added protection of trees during development.
- In 2004 the Green Seattle Partnership was formed. The partnership is between the City and the Cascade Land Conservancy with a single goal of restoring 2,500 acres of forested parklands by the year 2025.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> The Emerald City Task Force is made up of 12 representatives of the architecture, landscape architecture, development, and tree care professions.

<sup>49</sup> The Heritage Tree program was initiated by Plant Amnesty in partnership with the City. Heritage trees may be on either City or private property. Each candidate tree is assessed by a certified arborist and evaluated by a committee. Trees can be nominated as an individual or a collection and must meet criteria for health in addition to being selected according to several categories. Currently, there are 59 Seattle Heritage Trees.

<sup>50</sup> The Cascade Land Conservancy is Washington State's largest independent land conservation and stewardship organization.

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress**  
**Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

- In 2005 Mayor Nickels issued an Executive Order directing City departments to replace every tree removed from City property with two new trees.
- In 2006, the voters passed a \$365 million levy for transportation maintenance and improvements. Over the nine-year life of the levy SDOT will prune 25,000 street trees to prevent safety and security hazards, and will plant 8,000 new street trees.

## Appendix IV: Conducting a Tree Inventory

A tree inventory is the gathering of accurate information on the health and diversity of the community forest. It answers questions such as how many trees are there? What kind? In what condition are they? A community forest cannot be effectively managed unless you know its condition. Tree inventories are an essential tool of good management. There are many good reasons for doing a tree inventory:

- To determine the need for a community forestry program. For example, if the inventory reveals many dead and diseased trees or areas that are bare of trees, this suggests that a program incorporating tree planting is badly needed.
- To prioritize maintenance schedules to reduce the potential liability that results from hazardous trees. It also streamlines the efficiency of street crews and facilitates long-term budgeting.
- To educate residents about the benefits of a healthy, well-managed community forest, and to inform them about the species best suited to the community.
- To facilitate the planning that is essential to the community's quality of life.
- To provide the basis for the development of a comprehensive community forestry management plan.

Only data that will be used should be collected. A community must determine what objectives it wishes to achieve before conducting an inventory. It must be recognized that information translates into expense: the more data gathered on each tree, the greater the cost of the inventory. Generally, however, information on the following is collected:

- **Species:** To avoid costly mistakes, record the scientific names of trees. Don't use common names or codes.
- **Size:** DBH (diameter at breast height—4.5 feet above ground), height and crown spread.
- **Condition:** Indicate what maintenance procedure is needed. Does the tree need corrective pruning? Does it require removal? It is important to note whether the tree is deemed to be a hazard to the public and removal is mandatory, rather than simply recording the tree as hazardous, it is prudent to record removal.
- **Damage:** Record insect infestations, injuries and diseases by indicating the precise procedure necessary.
- **Maintenance:** Record whether there is a need to fertilize, apply fungicide/insecticide, prune, repair curb and or a sidewalk damage inflicted by roots, remove stump/tree, or plant in an empty planting site. Do so in order to schedule maintenance work, allocate equipment and prepare budgets.
- **Site characteristics:** How much space is available for root system? What is the condition and health of the soil in the planting space? The proximity of overhead/underground utilities and tall buildings? The potential for road salt/traffic damage? Is it zoned commercial?

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

- Planting spaces: Research suggests that a community should give highest priority to planting trees on streets where yard trees are few. Identify planting spaces to encourage the planting of bare areas.

## Appendix V: Comprehensive Plan Components and Questions That Need to Be Considered in Developing Them

The following table provides key questions that City staff may find useful in developing a strategic approach in determining how the Urban Forest Management Plan can be improved to better support City decision-making.

Table 9: Comprehensive Plan Components and Questions That Need to Be Considered in Developing Them

Plan Component	Key Questions
Comprehensive Mission Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the mission results-oriented, and does it fulfill a public need?</li> <li>▪ Is the mission based on statute?</li> <li>▪ Are parts of City's functions or activities not covered in the mission statement? Why?</li> <li>▪ Are there developments (e.g., in technology or competition) that suggest the mission needs to be revised or updated?</li> </ul>
Goals and Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are goals expressed in a quantitative or measurable form or in a manner that will allow assessment of whether the goals are achieved?</li> <li>▪ Are all of the overall plan's goals and priorities consistent with the City's overall goals and priorities? When differences exist, why do they exist, and can they be resolved?</li> <li>▪ What is/are the timeline(s) for reaching the goals and objectives?</li> </ul>
Strategies to achieve goals and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How are the goals to be achieved? Are the strategies logically linked to the goals and the day-to-day activities of the managers and staff?</li> <li>▪ What steps will the City take to align its activities, core processes, workforce, and other resources to support its mission-related outcomes?</li> <li>▪ What are the required resources, such as human, capital, and information?</li> <li>▪ What steps is the City taking to ensure that managers have the authority they need to achieve results? Are there strategies to hold managers accountable for the results? Are there any strategies that focus on providing incentives for managers and other staff to achieve the goals?</li> <li>▪ Are technological advances necessary to successfully execute the strategies? If so, how likely are those advances?</li> <li>▪ What, if any, alternative strategies were considered?</li> <li>▪ Are there programs or activities that need to be eliminated, created, or restructured to achieve the goals?</li> </ul>
Performance Metrics/Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will annual performance goals be tangible or measurable?</li> </ul>

**Not for Distribution/Work in Progress  
Draft for Review & Discussion Purposes Only**

to measure/assess progress	<p>If not, is there an alternative form of performance assessment for its annual performance plan? Will the alternative provide some basis for assessing whether the goals were met?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the plan describe how annual performance goals will be related to long-term goals, e.g., how annual goals will be used to gauge progress? If not, why not?</li> <li>▪ Are long-term strategic goals clearly linked to annual performance plans and the day-to-day activities of managers and staff? For example, are key terms and performance measures defined?</li> <li>▪ Are there revisions needed in current programs and activities?</li> <li>▪ Are there revisions needed in how the program will be funded?</li> </ul>
Key External Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the City monitor external factors that may affect the plan? If not, why not? If it does, is the monitoring process likely to identify all the major factors? What have been the findings of this monitoring?</li> <li>▪ Have any actions been identified that could reduce or mitigate the potential impact of external factors?</li> <li>▪ Are the City's strategies for achieving its long-term goals properly reflective of external factors? For example, if changes in information technology make it possible to increase productivity, does the plan discuss how this change will be translated either into more progress in achieving results or into savings through downsizing the workforce?</li> <li>▪ Does the City monitor internal factors? What internal factors within the control of the agency could affect achievement of the strategic goals?</li> </ul>
Program evaluations used to establish or revise strategic goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Were program evaluation findings used in developing the strategic goals or other components of the plan?</li> <li>▪ Are systems in place or planned to produce a reliable performance and cost data needed to set goals, evaluate results, and improve performance? For example, does the City have trend or baseline data that it can use to confidently set goals?</li> <li>▪ Is there a schedule for future program evaluations? If not, why not? If yes, does it outline the general scope and methodology for the evaluations, key issues to be addressed, and when such evaluations are to occur?</li> <li>▪ How will future program evaluation findings be used to improve performance? How will the City's program evaluations inform executive decision-making?</li> </ul>