

Jacksonville Tree Commission  
Meeting Minutes June 13, 2019  
Approved August 8, 2019

<b>Commissioners Present:</b>	John Crescimbeni, Chair Curtis Hart, Vice Chair Mike Robinson John Pappas Aaron Glick	<b>Staff:</b>	Cindy Chism
<b>Advisors:</b>	Susan Grandin, OGC Kathleen McGovern, City Arborist Joel Provenza, Accounting Richard Leon, Urban Forest Manager	<b>Public:</b>	Anna Dooley, Greenscape Dave McDaniel, Public Works Fred Pope, Public Works Tracey Arpen, Scenic Jax Mike Zaffaroni, Liberty Landscape Courteny Wilson, Greenscape Kim Benjamin, Greenscape Cory Nichols, AE Engineering Dalton Smith, Public Works

**A.** Meeting was called to Order by Chair at 12:00 AM.

1. All present introduced themselves for the record.
2. Submittal of Speaker's Cards.
3. M. Robinson pointed out there were two errors in the May 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting Minutes: the date at the top should say May 23, 2019 Not April 11<sup>th</sup>; on page 4, 5.e, ISA H300 should read ISA A300. Motion made by Mr. M. Robinson, seconded by CM Crescimbeni, for approval of minutes with noted corrections, none opposed.
4. Fund balance and encumbrance report for 15(F), 15(N) and BJP (Attachment A) – Joel Provenza.
5. Status of Pending Tree Projects including Levels 1 and 2 (Attachment B) – Kathleen McGovern.
  - a. S-Line Biodiversity Corridor Tree Planting project is being revised and will be resubmitted. The revisions include moving the citrus garden to a different area. CM Crescimbeni pointed out there are no citrus trees on the Approved Tree List and the legislation does not allow for exceptions. Ms. Grandin added that the Approved Tree List has a footnote (11) which allows for unlisted trees to be considered for approval from the Tree Commission which should not be a conflict with the legislation. **Ms. Grandin will check the legislation and ensure there is no conflict.**
6. Status of Countywide Tree Planting Contract – Dave McDaniel
  - a. The Pre-bid meeting for the two year warranty contract was held. The Bid closes June 19<sup>th</sup>.

**B. New Business**

1. Level 1 630-CITY Program (Attachment C) – Richard Leon
  - a. Mr. Leon reported to the Commission that before any advertising, word of mouth only, there were 67 tree planting requests. This is why the trees are clustered in the areas of Springfield and Riverside (page 1 of Attachment C).
  - b. On June 4<sup>th</sup>, a social media blast was done and a hold script was recorded for the call center. Page 2 of Attachment C shows how many requests came in as a result (486). There was a TV news interview filmed today which should generate even more requests.

- c. With all the requests so far, the \$200,000 of the appropriation has been earmarked. \$87,000 has been encumbered for the first group of 67 shown on page 1 of Attachment C. There is approximately another \$73,000 ready to be encumbered shown on page 3. CM Crescimbeni pointed out that if the \$200,000 has already been earmarked, this program is going to need more money. Mr. Leon agreed and proposed requesting an additional 1.6 Million.
- d. CM Crescimbeni asked if it was going to be possible to plant all the trees requested over the summer. Mr. McDaniel responded that typically we don't plant during the summer however last year it rained a lot and we did more planting and this year because we are asking the property owner to help water the tree combined with the contractor's 3 month warranty, we will be planting this summer. Mr. McDaniel asked the Commission for some input on how Public Works can approach this mass reforestation of Jacksonville. Mr. Hart asked how many trees the contractor can plant per day. Mr. Zaffaroni replied, with an experienced crew, 8-12 trees per day as long as they are located nearby.
- e. CM Crescimbeni added that if the program continues to grow at this rate, it's going to become a problem and will need to be managed because there is no supply line for delivery. What we do not want is to have people call and request a tree but have yet to be contacted 4 months later. Perhaps the public relations people need to dial the advertising back until the manpower situation is resolved. Mr. Leon responded that the only promised trees are those already funded with the \$200,000.
- f. Mr. Hart recommended setting a goal of number of trees to be planted in the next 12 months. If the contractor can plant 150 days out of the year at 10 trees per day, there will need to be money for 1500 trees. That amount is appropriated for the year. Then as the requests come in the customers can be told we are reaching the end of our appropriation and won't get to you this year. This way you will manage the expectations of the customers requesting a tree. Mr. Hart made a motion for 1.6 million additional funds for the Level 1 (630-CITY) program, seconded by Mr. Glick, motion passed. **CM Crescimbeni said he would submit the legislature for additional funds.**

### C. New Business

- 1. Incidental Landscaping Legislation – Susan Grandin – This was approved.
- 2. Vote on Proposed Level 2 Project(s) – Kathleen McGovern

San Marco Tree Planting Project (Attachment D)– CM Crescimbeni requested information regarding the trees being removed in an effort to ensure the Tree Fund does not become a refurbishment fund. We want the trees we plant with these funds to survive and mature. Ms. McGovern responded that no healthy trees are scheduled for removal. The trees scheduled for removal are dead, dying or diseased. The reason why for each is unknown except possibly because San Marco flooded during IRMA. The Bradford Pears have reached the end of their life cycle and are in various stages of dying. The others scheduled for removal are dead.

**CM Crescimbeni requested any trees scheduled for removal be listed including reasons why.** Mr. Glick asked if flood-tolerant trees are being selected. Ms. McGovern said this was considered and when not trying to blend with existing healthy trees, those types were selected.

Mr. Papas made a motion to approve the San Marco Tree Planting Project, seconded by Mr. M. Robinson, no discussion, motion passed.

- 3. Status of PDF Forms - Level 3 Documents – Ms. Chism reported the forms are ready to be published. Attachment E is a screen shot of the Tree Commission webpage; where would the Commission like to place the forms? CM Crescimbeni suggested a new heading titled Tree Planting Programs to be located before the Committee Members heading. Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 documents will be listed there as well as the Approved Tree Planting List.

#### 4. Landscape & Tree Protection Regulations

- a. Ms. Grandin and Mr. Pope worked on the definition of Public Protected Tree from Page 6, item 2 Landscape and Tree Protection Regulations. The suggested definition is Attachment F. The definition is proposing to place the City on the same footing as a developer. The current definition requires everything 6" or greater in the right-of-way to be mitigated.
- b. Mr. Arpen asked if there is a 50' wide easement then the area within 20' of the outside line will be a different category than 10' in the middle; why are the 10' in the middle treated more leniently than the outside? It's not comparable to a lot where we're protecting closer to the street, whereas here the whole thing is going to be the street; seems like the same standard should be applied to the entire right-of-way.
- c. Mr. Pope responded the basis for the different areas on a lot are the closer you are to the street or to the public image, those trees need to be protected as much as possible. Any trees close to the lot get more protection than the trees farther away from the lot. Mr. Arpen replied that the middle of a right-of-way is very public, the whole thing is the same, you shouldn't be allowed to cut down bigger trees in the middle of it without paying than you would around the perimeter. We are used to thinking of the lots as boxes, and proposed iv, v and vi make sense they are being treated alike but you cannot analogize a linear right-of-way with a square or rectangular lot.
- d. Ms. Grandin added we were trying to distinguish whether it's a private development putting in roads or it's the City putting in regional transportation improvements. A private developer may design their road in such a way that they avoided trees they would have to mitigate for whereas large regional transportation project would not have that luxury. However a developer has to mitigate for the roads because they haven't yet turned it over to the City, so no right-of-way definition applies to this process.
- e. Mr. Pope said a lot of these issues came up when the City was building very wide right-of-ways for new roads, purchasing 100-150' so when you calculate all those 6" trees within that area, even pine trees, the mitigation was pretty extreme; which is what is being followed today. Mr. Hart asked why the City should pay anything, because its tax dollars. Ms. Grandin replied the whole point was to save the tree canopy so it should be replaced. If the money for replacement goes into the general fund, it will never get spent for planting the trees, if the City is exempt. So the thought was to split the difference and treat the City the same as developers. Mr. Arpen pointed out that the developers pay for every tree 6" or larger but the City would only pay for 11.5", with the proposed revision.
- f. Ms. Grandin suggested that no changes be made to the definition of Public Protected Tree. The Commission concurred. Mr. Hart asked if this had anything to do with cleaning up a site. Ms. Grandin said no, it does not. Ms. Grandin continued if there is a Governmental Consent order to clean up a site, the site is exempt from mitigation. This is to put the State and Local requirements on par with the Federal level.
- g. Page 11 – Item (5), on Attachment F page 2 are 2 different suggestions for re-doing this item. Mr. Pope elaborated this addresses maintenance of any type of drainage facility exempting the City from paying mitigation. The difference between the 2 paragraphs is the first paragraph includes construction of drainage facility. The Commission agreed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> proposed paragraph to replace (5) on page 11.
- h. Page 22, (ii) - Attachment F, page 3 – The Charter references mean and the Ordinance uses median, as we cannot change the Charter, the Ordinance will be changed to use mean as the measurement. CM Crescimbeni asked how we get to the price; Mr. Pope responded the Building department contacts 4-5 nurseries for their prices for 2" Live Oak which is then averaged for the median price. The median price is then multiplied by 2 to get the installed price. This cost calculation is significantly less than the current contracted price. CM Crescimbeni then asked how to make this cost calculation line up better with what is currently being charged. Mr. Pope answered conversations should be held with contractors to determine what multiplier they use. Mr. Hart asked Mr. Zaffaroni what he charges to plant a 2" Live

Oak for. Mr. Zaffaroni replied because the availability of Live Oaks has declined the cost would be in the \$400 range, installed. Mr. Pope added, typically a wholesale 2" tree costs \$110-150, which means we are paying \$200-250 versus Mr. Zaffaroni's \$400. Mr. M. Robinson asked if there were many nurseries in North Florida doing balled and burlapped versus container. Mr. Pope replied yes there are; perhaps we should redefine what we mean by North Florida. Perhaps it should extend to Ocala because there are so many nurseries there which are in the same temperature zone as Jacksonville.

- i. CM Crescimbeni pointed out there is a large gap between what we are collecting per tree which is \$200 and what we are paying which is \$400, and with a 1 year warranty the cost goes up to \$2500. The amount the City is collecting needs to be closer to the number the City pays for the installation. Mr. Pope added the wholesale cost of the tree hasn't gone up much; the installation cost is what has driven the price up. The easiest way to handle it would be to develop a multiplier which is more in line with today's market such as a 3:1 or 4:1 multiplier. There is a website called PlantAnt.com which lists wholesale prices. **Mr. Pope will provide the Commission with the cost of a 2" Live Oak from PlantAnt.com.** Then the Commission will be able to determine a multiplier to sync the fee and the cost.
- j. The next workshop is tentatively scheduled for June 20<sup>th</sup> at 2pm.

#### **D. Public Comment**

Anna Dooley – Was going to make a presentation about an upcoming project Greenscape would like to do but as time is short, and the application forms are now available, she will wait.

Tracey Arpen – On the Tree Commission website perhaps a link could be added to Part 12, the Landscape Regulations. As all the new requests come in from 630-CITY, it may be advantageous to have a standard reply which goes out to all who requested a tree, such as "We're delighted to report there have been an overwhelming interest in these trees. We are answering the requests in the order in which they were received, it may be sometime before we get back to you, please be patient." Grouping the plantings by location is a good idea. Perhaps have 3 categories; historic and shaded which would be Riverside, Avondale, San Marco and Mandarin; Challenge Neighborhoods such as Arlington Area and the Northwest; Newer suburbs; East Arlington and Baymeadows and maybe Northside. This may help with alleviating accusations of favoritism.

CM Crescimbeni – this is my last meeting. The Council President will appoint another City Council member to be the liaison for the Tree Commission.

#### **E. Action Items**

**CM Crescimbeni will submit the legislation for additional funds for the Level 1 Tree Planting Program.**

**Ms. McGovern will include the reason why a tree is being removed on any tree planting projects which requires removal in the future.**

**Ms. Chism will have the Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 documents as well as the Approved Tree Planting List added to the Tree Commission webpage.**

**Mr. Pope will provide the Commission with the cost of a 2" Live Oak from PlantAnt.com.**

#### **F. Adjournment – the next meeting is scheduled for July 11, 2019 at noon.**