

## Notes from Discussion of a County Urban Tree Bill, June 2, 2011 meeting

---

**Present:** Bob Kaufman, Maryland National Capital Building Industry Association  
Caren Madsen, representing Conservation Montgomery  
Diane Cameron, Audubon Naturalist Society  
Marcia Rucker, Glen Echo Heights Citizens Association  
Carter Willson, Carter, Inc.  
Chuck Sullivan, Renewing Montgomery and Chuck Sullivan Homes  
Larry Cafritz, Laurence Cafritz Builders

The discussion was the fifth of a continuing dialogue with members of the public, building and environmental communities in Montgomery County.

Diane Cameron had delivered a stormwater protocol using trees for stormwater management to everyone at the table. Engineers were still reviewing the document. Builders complimented Diane on her work.

Caren had gone out on several construction sites with Carter Willson the weekend before the meeting and found it helpful to compare the site plan with the actual sites.

The group went over some comments provided by about 6 or 7 builders on the beginning of a draft bill. The group covered changes requested on the Findings, Purpose and Definitions sections. We decided to cover the entire bill proposal and then return to the Definitions section.

Builders had discussed the tree permit item in a side meeting at BIA and deleted the permit from the document. They also took out references to the Forest Conservation Law (FCL) and FCL related definitions. The group edited for about two hours. There was discussion about administering an urban tree or urban forestry program within DPS and how that would be accomplished with this written into the draft bill. Caren presented her idea for restructuring county staff to make functions related to urban trees more efficient. There is no proposal to add funding to the county budget to achieve the desired results of an urban tree program.

Bob Kaufman said he would revise the document with the changes and would send around to everyone again before the next meeting.

A goal is to try to come to agreement on the main terms of a proposal at the June 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. However, one group member has been unable to make the past two meetings and may want to revisit some of the changes made in the June 2 and May 16<sup>th</sup> meetings. We are also waiting for response from DPS regarding the stormwater protocol using trees instead of structural devices.

### **NEXT STEPS:**

- 1- Diane will pursue getting comments from her peers on the protocol; likewise builder will talk to their engineers.
- 2- In the interest of transparency, we will set up a webpage hosted by Conservation Montgomery with an online way for stakeholders to comment on the work being done on a tree bill by the working group. Caren will set up and send the link to the group.