## **ORDINANCE NO. 467**

## AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 459, PERTAINING TO THE WILSONVILLE ROAD PHASE 1 PROJECT, TO CLARIFY THE RECORD AND CORRECTLY IDENTIFY EXHIBITS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 459, adopted by the Wilsonville City Council June 17, 1996, is entitled "An Ordinance of the City of Wilsonville Adopting Alignment, Cross-section, and Access Plan for the Wilsonville Road Phase 1 Project; and Identifying These Designs Determinations as Implementing Detail Refinement to the Transportation Master Plan"; and,

WHEREAS, Section 5.e.1 of Ordinance No. 459, identifies the consulting arborist's report as Exhibit B; and,

WHEREAS, in the Supplemental Findings for Ordinance No. 459, item b under objection 1 refers to Exhibit B as a list of public meetings; and,

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 459 Exhibit B as adopted on June 17, 1996, is a list of Wilsonville Road Phase 1 project related public meetings; and,

WHEREAS, staff recommends correcting the exhibits of Ordinance No. 459, to include the arborist's report.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Exhibit B of Ordinance No. 459, as adopted June 17, 1996, shall be re-identified as "Supplemental Findings Exhibit B".
- 2. The Wilsonville Road consulting arborist's report dated November 29, 1995, and identified as Exhibit 1, attached hereto, shall be identified as Exhibit B of Ordinance No. 459.

SUBMITTED to the Wilsonville City Council and read the first time at a regular meeting thereof this 7th day of October, 1996, and scheduled for second reading at a regular meeting of the Council on the 21st day of October, 1996, commencing at the hour of 7 p.m. at the Wilsonville City Hall Annex, Community Development Hearings Room.

Sandra C. King, City Recorder

ENACTED by the Wilsonville City Council on the 21st day of October, 1996, by the following votes:

AYES: -4- NAYS: -0-

Sandra C. King, City Recorder

DATED and signed by the Mayor this day of October, 1996.

GERALD A. KRUMMEL, Mayor

SUMMARY of votes:

Mayor Krummel

Yes

Councilor Lehan

Yes

Councilor Hawkins

Yes

Councilor MacDonald

Yes

## WILLIAM L. OWEN art ASSOCIATES Tree and Landscape Consulting Services

P.O. BOX 641, PORTLAND, OREGON 97207 503/222-7007



November 29, 1995

Mike Stone, P.E. City Engineer City of Wilsonville 30000 Town Center Loop, East Wilsonville, OR 97070

RE: Wilsonville Road Alignment and Street Scape Project/City of Wilsonville, Oregon

Dear Mr. Stone:

Relative to the subject project, I met with Andy Leisinger at his request on site on Tuesday, November 28, and have subsequently examined the subject trees (see enclosed plot plan) as numbered. The purpose of the examination and visual inspection was to 1) assess the impact of the proposed project on the trees, 2) make recommendations regarding preservation of those worth preserving, and 3) discuss the impact and other relative factors regarding tree condition and preservation. Based on my examination of the trees, as numbered on the enclosed plot plan, I can report the following:

Tree #1:

31" DBH Atlas Cedar (Cedrus atlantica). This tree is an excellent specimen of an outstanding species, doing amazing well in a very tight planting site. There is some inevitable upheaval of the asphalt to the west with a break in the curb, but the tree is doing very well. This tree is well worth preserving and can be preserved with appropriate safeguards during construction. It is an outstanding specimen and it is quite fortunate that it has been preserved to this time. It can and should survive the construction and do well given proper professional care on a regular basis by Certified Arborists.

WLO & Assoc #9570



INSPECTION. DIAGNOSIS AND EVALUATION OF TREES. SHRUBS AND RELATED PLANTINGS. CONSULTATION WITH RESPECT TO PLANTING, TRANSPLANTING, PRESERVATION, MAINTENANCE AND ARBOREAL PLANNING. COMPREHENSIVE LOSS OR DAMAGE REPORTS. DULY SANCTIONED APPRAISALS FOR LEGAL OR CONTRACTUAL PURPOSES. LEGALLY ACCEPTABLE TESTIMONY IN COURT CASES.

Mr. Mike Stone Page 2 November 29, 1995

- Tree #2

  18.50" DBH Maple (Acer spp). A decent though not outstanding specimen. This tree has some historic significance though it is not ancient by any means. It is preservable and can be preserved if your decision is to retain a tree of this size and condition. With reasonable care it should do well over time, though it is subject to breakage more than some deciduous species. With professional care during construction as planned, and regular professional care by Certified Arborists, this tree can be preserved.
- Tree #3 25.00" DBH Oregon Big Leaf Maple (Acer macrophyllum). This is a typical tree for its size and age. A decent specimen. Some history of improper cutting but it is tolerable. The callus indications are of good vigor. As with trees #1 and 2, it can be preserved and provide character to the setting. It should tolerate the construction as planned quite well, given professional care during construction and in the future, per trees #1 and 2.
- Tree #4 21.00" DBH Silver Poplar (Populus alba). This tree should not be left in its location, regardless of the road widening project. The tree has a distinct lean to the southeast, over the entry drive to the parking lot, and is becoming more of a hazard every year. This tree should be removed as a hazard for that reason.
- Tree #5 7.00" DBH Pine (Pinus spp.). Average to poor condition and character. A tree that is not worth any extraordinary work to preserve. It is no great loss due to its general condition and character.
- Tree #6 11.50" DBH Pine (Pinus spp.). A better tree than tree #5 and larger. Another tree impacted by the sidewalk construction. It cannot be preserved as shown. The size and condition indicates no extraordinary steps should be taken to transplant the tree.
- Tree #7 9.00" DBH Pine (Pinus spp). Very similar to trees #5 and #6 in general condition and character. Another tree which the construction will take out that does not merit the cost of transplant because of its size and condition.
- Tree #8

  10.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.) A tree of excellent configuration and character. This is a tree that could be transplanted by tree spade providing the cost is not prohibitive. Often the cost for a single tree move of this size is quite substantial, (as much as \$375.00 and up) with no guarantee given by the tree spade

Mr. Mike Stone Page 3 November 29, 1995

companies that the tree will survive. A complicating factor here is the substantial Pine growth at the base of this tree which would require substantial work in clearing the way for the tree spade. The clearing away of Pine roots would unavoidably impact, and could injure, the Cherry roots, complicating the whole process. On balance, even though the specimen is a desirable transplant candidate, I believe the City of Wilsonville would be better served by planting a new tree in the design at substantially less expense.

- Tree #9 13.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). This tree has a bad split in the stem. It is not a good specimen and not worth transplanting.
- Tree #10 17.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). It has a substantial split in the stem and a large amount of deadwood and decay. This tree is not worth transplanting.
- Tree #11 17.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Has extreme girdling root problems as well as a split in the stem. A poor specimen not worth transplanting.
- Tree #12 13.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Very similar in all points to tree #11. A heavy girdling root and substantial split in the stem. Not worth transplanting.
- Tree #13 7.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Has an extreme split in the stem and girdling root problems. A tree not worth transplanting.
- Tree #14 12.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Similar in all points to tree #13. Split in the stem and some root problems. Not worth transplanting.
- Tree #15 6.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Has decay within the split in the stem. Poor specimen. Not worth transplanting.
- Tree #16 12.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Has a severe split in the stem and advanced Saprophytic Fungi (fungal growth) in the decaying inner wood. A tree not worth transplanting.
- Tree #17 6.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.) Has a bad inversion into a split in the stem. Not worth transplanting.
- Tree #18 11.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Has decay and marked split in the stem. A very poor tree not worth transplanting.

Mr. Mike Stone Page 4 November 29, 1995

Tree #19

10.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.). Has split in the stem and decay evident in the inner wood. Not worth transplanting.

Tree #20

9.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp.) Has a severe split in the stem and girdling root problems. Not worth transplanting.

Tree #21 12.00" DBH Flowering Cherry (Prunus spp). Similar to tree #20, though larger, with root problems and severe split in the stem. Not worth transplanting.

Trees #9 through #21 are a group of trees which appear to have been planted at the same time during the construction of the street and parking lot in this area. Over time they have all developed severe frost and/or sunscald cracks in the stems on the southwest side. A common problem, this condition has worsened over time and certainly been exacerbated by sun heat reflection from the southwest off the parking lot. That element, combined with their locations in a fairly narrow planting strip, has stressed them heavily over time. The entire row merits no special consideration and not a single tree is worth transplanting. The general maintenance, cost/benefit ratio for this row of trees is such that the city is better served by the removal of these trees and replanting in the new design.

In summary, the trees unavoidably taken by the construction, as shown on the drawing, trees 5, 6 and 7, possibly tree 8, and trees 9 through 21 (and tree 4 for reasons stated), are no great loss to the city considering all factors as recited herein. Trees 1, 2 and 3, however, add significantly to the character and "feel" of the area by their size and historical significance, not to mention their beauty, shade, screening and other benefits. Tree 1 is the paramount specimen in the entire project, although trees 2 and 3 are of significant cultural and landscape amenity value.

Finally, if it very important to note here that, as I discussed with Andy Leisinger, I need to be involved in 1) any design decisions which way impact these three candidates for preservation, and 2) during the construction process itself where it comes near these three trees and their root zones. I will need to be on-site to do situational, root exposure examinations and provide recommendations for therapy as necessary, based on the root impact. In addition, recommendations regarding pruning, fertilizing and other therapeutic measures which may be indicated will be made at that time. Based on my discussions with Andy Leisinger, and with C.J. Sylvester of the City of Wilsonville today regarding this project, I am predicating this report on the assumption that I will be involved as recited herein.

Mr. Mike Stone Page 5 November 29, 1995

I believe this report is sufficient for your needs at this time. Please let me know if you need further

information. Thank you very much

Very truly yet

William L. Owen, B.S., M.A., C.A.

American Society of Consulting Arborists #114

Andy Leisinger - Leisinger Designs CC;

C.J. Sylvester - City of Wilsonville

