

**From:** [Terry Lavender](#)  
**To:** [Thara Johnson](#)  
**Subject:** Kirkmond Preliminary Plat  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 11, 2013 11:13:08 PM

---

Thara –

There are some pretty glaring math errors on the tree retention table in the Kirkmond Preliminary Plat SEPA DNS. It makes it very hard to trust the information. I would appreciate a correction.

Thank you.

Terry Lavender

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

**From:** [Tom Hinman](#)  
**To:** [Gloria Meerscheidt](#); [Thara Johnson](#)  
**Cc:** [Kathe Low](#); "[Susan Wilkins](#)"; [Kimberly Allen](#)  
**Subject:** Re: City of Redmond / NOA with Optional DNS / Kirkmond Revised LAND 2013-00280  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 11, 2013 6:47:32 PM

---

Hi Thara -

Please help me with some math on tree retention...I am comparing paragraph 4c with the posted tree preservation plan.

The SEPA DNS says 5 of 10 landmark trees will be saved which equals 50% on my calculator

The Land Use Action Notice says 2 of 10 landmark trees will be saved which equals 20%

The SEPA DNS says 83 of 186 significant trees will be retained which equals 44% on my calculator

The Land Use Action notice says 78 of 187 significant trees will be retained which equals 40.6%

Other than the inconsistencies, inaccuracies and co-mingling of tree classifications that I have witnessed on a number of recent projects (Federspiel and Union Hill Garage among others), it suggests that developers are not getting good guidance on tree protection regulations and how to present them clearly in the permitting process. By grouping classifications, it seemingly obscures the required mitigation, especially for landmark trees that have a 100% retention requirement.

Please insure that the SEPA DNS is accurate on this and future projects to facilitate public review and comment.

Regards,  
Tom Hinman

---

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.