

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
OSE	Sandra Pinto de Bader, 4-3194	Melissa Lawrie, 4-5805

Legislation Title:

A RESOLUTION adopting the 2013 update of the Urban Forest Stewardship Plan.

Summary of the Legislation:

Resolution adopting the first five-year update of the city-wide Urban Forest Stewardship Plan, which provides a framework for taking action to preserve and enhance Seattle’s urban forest.

Background:

The original Urban Forest Management Plan was created in 2007 to identify goals and strategies to help Seattle maintain, preserve, restore, and enhance its urban forest, making our city a healthier, more beautiful place to live and work. The Plan established a 30-year goal of increasing tree canopy cover to 30 percent from a 2007 level of about 23 percent.

Urban forests provide residents with environmental, economic, and social value such as retaining storm water runoff, cleaning the air and water, sequestering carbon, providing wildlife habitat, and raising property values, as well as providing treed relief in the built-up urban environment.

Through City Council input it was determined that changing the Plan’s title to Urban Forest Stewardship Plan would more clearly convey the importance of engaging residents, organizations, along with City staff in the care of Seattle’s urban forest.

The updated Plan keeps the 30 percent canopy cover goal; incorporates current data on the state of the urban forest including trees on public property, in parks, and along the right-of-way; establishes action strategies to improve our knowledge, strengthen the City’s management practices, and support community stewardship of the urban forest; establishes priority actions; and creates a research agenda identifying areas in which the City could benefit from additional knowledge, and represent an excellent opportunity to collaborate with universities and research groups.

Please check one of the following:

X **This legislation does not have any financial implications.**

(Please skip to “Other Implications” section at the end of the document and answer questions a-h. Earlier sections that are left blank should be deleted. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each question.)

This legislation has financial implications.

(If the legislation has direct fiscal impacts (e.g., appropriations, revenue, positions), fill out the relevant sections below. If the financial implications are indirect or longer-term, describe them in narrative in the "Other Implications" Section. Please delete the instructions provided in parentheses at the end of each title and question.)

This is a planning document, which provides a framework for a range of potential future actions, none of which are being adopted through this Resolution. Individual actions implemented under the Plan may have fiscal implications, which will be assessed during the next biennial budget or in future ordinances.

Appropriations: n/a

Anticipated Revenue/Reimbursement Resulting from this Legislation: n/a

Total Regular Positions Created, Modified, or Abrogated through this Legislation, Including FTE Impact: n/a

Spending/Cash Flow: n/a

Other Implications:

a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?

This is a planning document, which provides a framework for a range of potential future actions, none of which are being adopted through this Resolution. Individual actions implemented under the Plan may have fiscal implications, which will be assessed during the next biennial budget or in future ordinances.

b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?

This is a planning document, which provides a framework for a range of potential future actions, none of which are being adopted through this Resolution. Individual actions implemented under the Plan may have fiscal implications, which will be assessed during the next biennial budget or in future ordinances.

c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?

Yes. This Resolution affects the following City departments which are represented in the City's Urban Forest Interdepartmental Team: SCL (Brent Schmidt), DPD (Brennon Staley), SDOT (Darren Morgan), SPU (Jana Dilley), Parks (Mark Mead), FAS (Sarah Calvillo-Hoffman), Seattle Center (Beth Duncan), and the Zoo (David Selk).

The goals and recommendations for protecting and increasing Seattle's tree canopy as articulated in the Plan provide the broad framework for City departments' work plans and the Urban Forestry Commission's work plan and recommendations

d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives? n/a

This is a planning document, which provides a framework for a range of potential future actions, none of which are being adopted through this Resolution.

- e) **Is a public hearing required for this legislation?** Public comment process was open from August 1 through October 1, 2012.
- f) **Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?** No.
- g) **Does this legislation affect a piece of property?** No.
- h) **Other Issues:**
DPD issued an opinion stating that the SEPA review process for the 2007 Urban Forest Management Plan (which resulted in a Determination of Non-Significance -DNS), applies to the 2013 plan update.

The 2013 version of the UFSP updates urban forest information, revises and includes additional descriptive and strategic/policy information including a research agenda, methods to address funding shortfalls based on needs, and updates short-, mid-, and long-term action agenda items. The 2013 update of the UFSP retains its overall intent, its dominant strategic/policy approaches, and its diagnoses of challenges and opportunities.

Recognizing the 2007 SEPA analysis as valid, DPD issued a “note-to-file” to record additional observations about the SEPA implications of the Plan update. Because there is little if any added potential for adverse impacts to result, the 2007 DNS plus the note-to-file will be considered to provide sufficient “coverage” to fulfill SEPA review requirements.

List attachments to the fiscal note below: