



PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

MEETING DATE: JANUARY 28, 2004

ITEM NUMBER: _____

SUBJECT: TREE REMOVAL REQUEST - TEWINKLE PARK ATHLETIC COMPLEX PROJECT

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2004

FROM: PUBLIC SERVICES DEPARTMENT

PRESENTATION BY: BRUCE A. HARTLEY, MAINTENANCE SERVICES MANAGER

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: BRUCE A. HARTLEY, (714) 754-5123

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Commission approve the request for the removal of fifteen (15) City trees and the installation of one hundred sixty-two (162) replacement trees, in conjunction with the Athletic Complex renovation project.

BACKGROUND

At the regular meeting of October 20, 2003 the City Council approved the final field configuration for the renovation of the TeWinkle Park Athletic Complex and directed staff to proceed with the final design and to explore funding options. See Attachment 1. As the result of public workshops and public hearings, the City Council approved a conceptual plan for the complex, which was carefully designed to avoid the removal of any park trees as a result of the outfield fence distances. However, regardless of the outfield fence configuration, the renovation project will require the demolition of all existing structures and re-grading of the site. There are sixteen trees located within the project boundaries. The renovation of the athletic complex will necessitate the removal of thirteen trees to complete it as designed, and may require two additional trees, depending on field conditions encountered during construction. See Attachment 2.

ANALYSIS

The City's landscape design consultant for the Athletic Complex has determined that the existing layout landscape amenities between the ballfields will not be compatible with the new renovation design. This new design calls for the installation of uniform rows of trees within the common areas separating the four ballfields. This design will add significantly more trees than presently exist at the site, and will provide greater shade during the summer months. The new, tightly spaced rows of trees will also serve to deflect and soften the impact of any balls that may be hit out of the field of play.

Three of the sixteen trees located within the project boundary (#8, 9 and 10) have the potential to conflict with the construction of the parking lot and the location of the scoreboard on the baseball field (southeast field). Tree #8, a Mulberry tree will be very close to the new parking lot. This tree is proposed to be removed only if, during construction, there is no practical means to preserve the root system of the tree to construct the necessary parking improvements. Tree #9, a large Indian Laurel Fig (Ficus),

will be preserved and protected. Tree #10, a Mulberry tree, is proposed to be removed only if it interferes with the scoreboard, should the scoreboard need to be relocated to avoid the Ficus tree. The two Mulberry trees are in poor condition, whereas the Ficus tree is a very large, significant tree, and should be preserved.

Following City Council approval of the TeWinkle Athletic Complex project, the City Arborist evaluated the trees proposed for removal. The sixteen trees are described as follows:

Tree #	Species	Height x Width	Health	Relocation
1	Chinese Elm	30' tall x 22" dbh	Fair	Not Recommended
2	Canary Island Pine	40' tall x 13" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
3	Canary Island Pine	40' tall x 13" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
4	Weeping Fig	20' tall x 11" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
5	Weeping Fig	20' tall x 10" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
6	Weeping Fig	20' tall x 11" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
7	Weeping Bottlebrush	20' tall x 15" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
8	Mulberry	18' tall x 12" dbh	Poor	Not Recommended
10	Mulberry	18' tall x 12" dbh	Poor	Not Recommended
11	Camphor	12' tall x 4" dbh	Poor	Not Recommended
12	Camphor	Removed	N/A	N/A
13	Camphor	25' tall x 18" dbh	Fair	Not Recommended
14	Indian Laurel Fig	25' tall x 24" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
15	Indian Laurel Fig	23' tall x 23" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
16	Indian Laurel Fig	20' tall x 21" dbh	Good	Not Recommended
17	Camphor	12' tall x 7" dbh	Fair	Not Recommended

Note: Tree #9 and #18, as shown on Attachment 2 will not be removed and Tree #12, was diseased and was removed.

With the exception of three trees, which are in poor condition, all of the trees affected by the project are in fair or good condition. Most of the trees are similar in age, being mature specimens. That is the primary reason that relocation of the trees is not recommended. The maturity of the trees would greatly reduce the chance of survival. Seven of the trees (all Ficus spp.) are on the City's 'nuisance tree species' list.

The City's Streetscape and Median Development Standards call for the replacement of any removed trees to be on a three-to-one ratio basis. Therefore, a total of forty-five (45) new trees may be required (if all 15 trees are removed), with 15 of those being 24-inch box size. In this case, the project includes the planting of one hundred sixty-two (162) trees, of which two (2) are 36" box size, fifty-six (56) are 24" box size and one hundred four (104) are 15-gallon size.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

1. The Commission could authorize the removal of fifteen trees (thirteen confirmed and two [#8 and #10] only if necessary) and replacement of the trees as specified in the approved project plans, which includes one hundred sixty-two (162) replacement trees.
2. The Commission could deny the request to remove the trees and recommend that the City Council direct staff to redesign the project to preserve or relocate the existing trees. However,

this would result in a significant increase in the cost of the project and a delay in completing the renovation.

FISCAL REVIEW

Funding for the removal and replacement of the trees is included in the funding allocation for the TeWinkle Park Athletic Complex project.

LEGAL REVIEW

No legal review is required for this item.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that the Commission approve the request for removal of a total of fifteen (15) City trees located within the project area for the TeWinkle Park Athletic Complex and that the trees be replaced per the approved plans.

BRUCE A. HARTLEY
Maintenance Services Manager

WILLIAM J. MORRIS
Public Services Director

ATTACHMENTS: 1 [Council Action Minutes – Meeting of October 20, 2003](#)
 2 [Conceptual Plan of Project with Trees Identified](#)

C: Allan L. Roeder, City Manager
 William J. Morris, Public Services Director
 Ernesto Munoz, City Engineer