

Formulating Recommendations...Discussion of Recommendations Regarding Land Use Planning & Zoning

- **This Urban Forestry Task Force supports the creation of a plan for undergrounding high-voltage lines for the purpose of preserving and increasing canopy trees.**
 - [MGO 19.06](#) – pertaining to the Electrical Code
 - Apply to strategic corridors – how to define strategic corridors? Prioritize areas that don't have trees (i.e., low canopy coverage).
 - **Action Item: Define strategic corridor.**
 - Use neighborhood indicators once Forestry has included its canopy tree information; can combine overlays (design district and canopy tree coverage).
 - **Action item: Define neighborhood indicators.**
 - Use the concept of design districts and use design districts to specify what we want; however, there are areas that wouldn't fall under design districts. Some design districts specify tree coverage, but it is unclear whether all do.
 - **Action item: Is our recommendation to use Design Districts in the decision making process**
 - Decisions should include discussions about how undergrounding affects the canopy – there are costs associated with large tree pruning under lines but there are benefits value of large trees versus smaller trees. The benefits also need to be part of the cost-benefit analysis.
 - Idea proposed to set aside money for underground – piecemeal approach, underground a few streets each year.
 - Two issues: 1) main streets that have many conflicts with trees and 2) residential streets where the terrace is huge and the primary conflict is with overhead lines.
- **The UFTF supports a study in order to identify of areas of the City that would benefit from undergrounding.**
 - Host the discussion about canopy coverage in other recommendations.
 - **Action item: Is this our recommendation to have the City fund a study for undergrounding high voltage lines to determine cost/benefit ratio?**
- **In new, previously undeveloped developments, the UFTF supports setting a minimum terrace width of 8', with 10' being optimal, for local streets and 10', 12' minimums for arterial and collectors.**
 - Terrace width
 - Based on previous meetings, there's a minimum for the road in the ordinance, there's a minimum for sidewalk. There's no minimum for the terrace width within the ordinance.
 - Reallocating both boulevard/median space to the terrace? Why not both? Decided to not get into boulevard
 - **Action item: is this our recommendation to have the terrace width defined and be added to ordinances**
- **HOLD: New development single-family lots shall have planted one tree per lot.**
 - No current requirements for private trees on single-family or duplex lots.
 - Who would be responsible for any incentives/barriers?
 - Issue of maintaining trees – even if planting the tree gets landscape points, there is no penalty if the tree isn't maintained
 - Use point system – each single-family home has to have two points?
 - **Action item: ?**

- **The UFTF supports placement of underground utility conduits [use Minneapolis language].**
 - Drawing for the Minneapolis example – prioritize placing conduits in other locations.
 - Require sharing the tube
 - Action item: ?
- **The UFTF recommends that early neighborhood development plans include an inventory of canopy coverage, identify key areas for conservation, and record justification.**
 - Plans don't include current or future canopy; having this information will allow for future preservation, conservation, removal decisions.
 - Conversations need to occur among developer and Planning Commission. Make the process more formal?
 - Many development plans do address wooded areas.
 - Action item: ?

DRAFT