



Public Comments - 7/10 Agenda Item 2

From Andy Nevis <andynevis@gmail.com>

Date Sat 7/5/2025 4:06 PM

To Tim Costello <Tim.Costello@edcgov.us>; David Spaur <David.Spaur@edcgov.us>; Jeff Hansen <Jeff.Hansen@edcgov.us>; Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@edcgov.us>; Patrick Frega <Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us>; Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>

Cc Robert J. Peters <Robert.Peters@edcgov.us>; Thea A. Graybill <Thea.Graybill@edcgov.us>; Jefferson B. Billingsley <Jefferson.Billingsley@edcgov.us>; Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Report Suspicious

Hello Commissioners,

I hope you are all doing well! I had a chance to review the proposed Oak Resources Conservation Ordinance amendments that will be on your agenda next Thursday. Overall, I think it is well done and worthy of adoption, but I do have a couple of notes and suggestions. Page numbers refer to the redlined document (Attachment D on the Legistar Item):

1) Page 5 - The definition of "minor trimming" is not clear. It says that minor trimming means "the cutting of dead or diseased limbs or twigs, parts which may result in damage to an existing dwelling, parts which must be removed for safety or public utilities, or pruning to promote the health or growth of the tree". But later in the definition it says that "Trimming which reduces the overall size or density of the tree, or alters the natural shape of the tree is not considered minor trimming". Trimming by nature reduces the overall size and/or density of the tree. I think I understand the intent (if you trim a tree so much that it is no longer recognizable it doesn't count) but perhaps a clarifier could be added. Maybe add the word "significantly" or some sort of measurement (ie. reduces the total size or density by more than 30%).

2) Page 14 - I support the proposed exemption from mitigation for trees required to be removed by an insurance company. But it appears the removal of such trees will still require a permit. That's probably ok, but I'm a bit concerned about the time it will take for the County to process those permits and review the documentation. Insurance companies (especially the few traditional ones that will still do business in our county) typically give fairly short deadlines for mitigation, sometimes only a few weeks. I would hate to have someone lose their insurance because they couldn't get a permit in time. It may not be necessary to include in the ordinance, but I would recommend that these permits be prioritized.

I think that's it for now. Overall, very well done.

-Andy Nevis