

From: [Dorothy Freeman](#)
To: [Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft](#); [Tracy Jensen](#); [Tony Daysog](#); [Michele Pryor](#); [Greg Boller](#); [Lara Weisiger](#); [Manager Manager](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Special City Council Meeting on Urban Forest Plan January 29, 2025
Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 11:49:15 PM

Regarding: Special City Council Meeting on Urban Forest Plan January 29, 2025

Dear Mayor Ashcraft, Vice Mayor Pryor, Councilmembers Daysog, Boller, and Jensen

On Page 6, 34, and 67 of the Urban Forest Plan there are images of the path and trees in the Jean Sweeney Open Space Park. For some reason the Sweeney Park has been completely ignored in the plans for a citywide urban forest. In the Placeworks master plan for Sweeney Park that was approved by the City Council the central area of the park was planned as an urban forest. Enough trees could be planted in the park in a shorter period of time than could be planted on city streets in several years. The idea of the Sweeney Park was presented to the people as a place like the San Francisco Golden Gate Park. A place where people would walk in a forest with in the city. Jean Sweeney Park needs to be added to the urban forest plans.

There is a small urban forest already in the Jean Sweeney Park on the south side between the fence and the Union Pacific Rail Road land. Were these trees inventoried? These trees need to be part of the urban forest plan and the land beneath the trees cleaned up to allow the trees to be protected from possible disease from the left over growth of weeds, black berries, and railroad pollution. Jean Sweeney Park is located in a census tract with only 12.9% canopy cover. Adding trees to the park would increase this percentage a great deal with the least amount of effort.

Tree preservation during construction is barely addressed in the Urban Forest Plan and trees are always removed during construction projects. It is a fallacy that trees must be removed for a development to happen. The neighborhood community worked with the developer to save 8 mature city trees during the construction of 2100 Clement, now referred to as the Mulberry development. These mature trees gave the Mulberry development a more established community feel right from the start. City policy of allowing trees to always be removed during construction should be re-thought. It's better to save a mature tree than to pay to grow a new one that will take years to mature.

Another area of concern in the Urban Forest Plan is consideration for back yard trees and how to protect them. Back yard trees, are important to the forest canopy of the city. The list of protected trees should be expanded to include major established trees on streets and in back yards. Plans should be in place to address the necessity of removing any mature tree in private back yards, not just those on the protected tree list. The following statement is from the plan "residential areas have some of the highest canopy cover of any land use type, they should still be considered for additional tree planting efforts as residential yards tend to have the highest potential space for new trees".

Water for the trees, especially during our droughts must be addresses in greater detail. Street trees are often cared for by the owners of the homes the trees are in front of and encouraging back yard planting will increase water demands. Water is often rationed during reoccurring droughts and prices increased creating a hardship on the owners of private buildings. There must be a plan in place to verify that these trees will get the necessary water and the home

owners will not be jeopardized for the water they use caring for the trees.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Freeman

CC: City Manager Ott
City Clerk Weisiger