

## MINUTES

### University Lakes, Vegetation and Landscape Committee May 09, 2019, at 9:00 AM Facilities, Planning & Construction Conference Room 235 Stadium West

The University Lakes, Vegetation and Landscape Committee (ULVLC) met Thursday, May 09, 2019 at the University of Florida Facilities Planning and Construction Division Conference Room 235 Stadium West.

#### **Members attending:**

Donna Bloomfield – Grounds, Facility Services  
Brad Barber – University Police Department  
Gregg Clarke – Director of Operations, Facility Services  
Linda Dixon – Director, Planning, Design & Construction  
Gail Hansen De Chapman – Environmental Horticulture - Chair

#### **Members not attending:**

Kristen Curington - Student  
Adam Dale – Assistant Professor, Entomology and Nematology Department  
Carlos Dougnac – AVP, Planning, Design & Construction  
Craig Hill, AVP, Business Affairs  
Matthew Mears – City Arborist, City's Park, Recreation & Cultural Affairs  
Alpa Nawre – Assistant Professor, Landscape Architecture  
Francisco Oquendo – Assistant Director, Planning, Design & Construction  
Betsy Ruff – Assistant Program Director & Lecturer  
Tom Schlick – Assistant Director of Grounds, Facility Services  
David Steadman – Curator, Natural History Museum  
Emma Weeks – Assistant Research Scientist, Entomology and Nematology Department  
Matt Williams – Director, Sustainability

#### **Visitors attending:**

Melissa Thomas – Planning, Design & Construction  
Tom Wichman – Project Manager, IFAS Extension  
Erik Lewis – Planning, Design & Construction  
Steve McElroy – Shands Facilities  
Laurie Hall – Project Manager, CHW  
Frank Javaheri – Planning, Design & Construction  
Cydny McGlothlin – Planning, Design & Construction  
Joey Mandese – Planning, Design & Construction  
Doug Jones – Florida Museum of Natural History

Gail Hansen De Chapman, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00am. She requested that Linda Dixon chair the meeting since she was the only voting member.

#### **I. Adoption of Agenda and March Minutes**

**Motion:** Gail Hansen De Chapman moved to adopt the agenda with removing the Tree Mitigation Revisions from the agenda and approved the March minutes.

**Second:** It was the consensus of the committee to approve the March minutes and May agenda with the Tree Mitigation Revisions being done at another meeting.

**Motion Carried Unanimously**

## II. MAJOR PROJECTS

### UF – 373 – FLNMH Special Collections

**Joey Mandese**

Joey Mandese introduced himself and stated the location of the new building will be behind the existing Florida Museum of Natural History, south of Powell Hall. He is presenting today during the programming phase and asking for site selection approval. He discussed the history and background of the project. There are specimens stored in various places around campus. Many are located in unsecured storage areas. These areas are not equipped to house these items. The goal is to provide a single, up to date, and controlled collection facility that is easily accessible to Powell Hall.

*Email text from Emma Weeks: “On behalf of NATL I checked the trees in the site and we agree that they are not longleaf pines but loblolly/slash. Some trees in the section to the west of the parking spots are longleaf but we are assuming based on the maps that these are not being touched (despite them being marked with orange paint)? We recommend that any longleaf pines in this area are preserved. I recommend standard mitigation as per the policy for all trees to be removed, NATL wonders if they monies could be redirected into tidying up this entrance to NATL, especially given that the direct access from the boardwalk into NATL will be cut off by this building. What do the presenters propose for the access into NATL? Will this building be appealing to people that are trying to access a nature area?”*

The committee discussed the comments from Emma. Joey stated that Cydney McGlothlin thought we could enhance the east elevation and use it as the entrance to the building and to NATL. It would give the NATL a defined entrance. Joey is working with the design team to minimize the tree impact, define the NATL entrance, as well as the overall building layout. Joey stated that the building will look like a storage building not a shed. It will be a two story building with a controlled environment.

*Email text from Adam Dale: “I am curious if the entire highlighted space would be occupied by the building or if that is just the lot the building will be on? It appears that the marked area will sit on top of the path connecting the FLMNH to NATL. If the building does interfere with the path, I recommend integrating the path into the construction design so that people can still use it to get to NATL from the FLMNH. Given that it is for the natural history museum, it seems like a design that incorporates a nature trail would be appropriate. Based on the map on page 12, it appears there is a >20”DBH tree outside of the proposed site to be removed. Please provide an explanation for this. Is this the 24” laurel oak? I approve and recommend standard tree mitigation in compliance with our current mitigation policy.”*

The committee discussed the building footprint and confirmed the highlighted space is the proposed building footprint. The layout shows the proposed limits of the footprint but Joey is still working with the design team on the actual design of the building, the NATL path, and the tree impacts. We currently show a 24” laurel oak outside of the proposed site to be removed but if the building footprint is smaller the 24” laurel oak may be saved. As of now it is 10’ away from the building and it may need to be removed in order to maneuver around the building with the construction equipment. Joey will talk to the design team to try to minimize the impact.

**Motion:** Gail Hansen De Chapman moved to approve the site selection and coming back at another time for the tree mitigation on this project.

**Second:** It was the consensus of the committee to approve the site selection and coming back at another time for the tree mitigation on this project.

**Motion Carried Unanimously**

## III. OTHER BUISNESS

## Wilmot Botanical Gardens – Tree Removal Project

Dr. Craig Tisher

Dr. Craig Tisher presented tree removals to the committee for the Wilmot Gardens. He started by saying the garden will be changing its name to the Wilmot Botanical Garden. The Garden was built in 1952 on about 10 acres with a pine tree canopy which created filtered light that was ideal for growing camellias. The increasing number of volunteer trees (coming up in the garden on their own), grew in the understory of the southeast corner of the garden. There are 8 trees in the area that are being requested to be removed. They are in an area that frequently has standing water for extended periods of time and is affecting the filtration system and the grading. Dr. Tisher would like to fix the water retention and rework the grading and drainage improvements for this area in order to create a special garden that contains approximately 30 camellias. This is a reflective shade garden and removing the trees and reworking the area for camellias will help create the botanical theme or appearance while keeping the pine canopy for still allowing the filtered light throughout this area of the garden.

*Email text from Emma Weeks: “Would be nice to see the photos of the trees rather than a section of the trunk. Are the diameter measurement DBH? I recommend standard mitigation as per the policy.”*

The committee asked about the photos and Dr. Tisher showed the pictures of the area trying to show the trees and where they were located in the garden. The close up pictures showing the tree trunks show some of the damage to the trees because of the standing water. The tops are hard to photograph because they are high and narrow in the mixed canopy.

*Email text from Adam Dale: “It would be helpful to have an idea of the condition of each of the trees to be removed. I agree that the area needs improvements to mitigate water accumulation before camellias are planted in there. From the photos, it appears that some decent sized trees are staying, although they likely have significant root tissue in the tree removal area. I recommend taking measures to protect the root zones of adjacent trees that are remaining during the tree removal, grading, and drainage improvements. I approve and recommend standard tree mitigation in compliance with our current policy.”*

The committee asked that if these trees are removed will it still be a reflective shade garden and Dr. Tisher stated now these trees are fighting for light. This area will remain a reflective shade garden because we are only asking to remove the understory trees in this area in order to repurpose the area and plant the camellias. The committee also agreed with Adam to protect the adjacent trees root zones.

**Motion:** Gail Hansen De Chapman moved to approve the 8 trees to remove with standard mitigation and recommending taking measures to protect the root zones of adjacent trees that are remaining during the tree removal, grading, and drainage improvements.

**Second:** It was the consensus of the committee to approve the 8 trees to remove with standard mitigation and recommending taking measures to protect the root zones of adjacent trees that are remaining during the tree removal, grading, and drainage improvements.

## Motion Carried Unanimously

## UF Health – Tree Removals

Steve McElroy/Laurie Hall - CHW

Steve introduced himself and Laurie Hall from CHW and stated he was here for approval and tree mitigation on the project. The project is in the Shands courtyard in front of the Atrium. Laurie is trying to design this area with a pediatric program for this area. This is a grant based program by Nature Explore Group. This will be designed as an educational area that will be used by HSC Baby Gator, Shands Pediatrics Children’s hospital, and the public. There will be different educational zones created in this area that will be specific to the grant restrictions. The condition of the space now is not conducive for this process and the area will have to be completely reworked in order to comply with the grants verbiage. Their main goal is to connect children with nature.

The project is requesting approval of the committee to fence this area completely for the safety of the children. The goal is to put up a decorative and safe fence to secure the children while playing. They will also be adding shrubs around the fence line to help secure the children as well. There will be 14 trees removed in this area and CHW will be planting 23 trees of different varieties. The committee asked that CHW look at the fencing

standards that are in the Landscape Master Plan. If it doesn't work for you or if you deviate from the Landscape Master Plan then come back to the committee. It was also asked by the committee that they look at the plants and paving standards that are already created for that area so they follow compliance. The committee understood deviations within the play area but asked for consistency in areas that will be viewed on the public side of the fence. The committee asked if they will be labeling the plants and trees for an educational standpoint for the children.

The grant is specific as to what is being put back in that area and UF Forestry Department will be working with the project to make sure that the grant is followed. It was asked by the committee if UF Facility Services will be maintaining this area and they said no that it will be maintained by Shands Facilities.

*Email text from Emma Weeks: "I approve the removal of the 4/5 holly trees in the bed and the 2 holly trees in the bed close to the building. I do not approve the removal of the 3 shumards."*

The committee discussed the holly trees in the beds and agreed these were a mistake planting them in the beds close to the buildings. They are growing too large for the beds. They are having to be pruned back to keep them contained in the beds. The committee agreed these should come out. There are two Shumards in large brick planters and they are out growing the planters. There is a hazard of the limbs breaking on these trees and it is a danger for them to be in an active children zone. The planters are damaged and have had a few repairs but the trees are still out growing them. The committee agreed these should not have been planted in the planters and noting the damage to the bricks they agreed they should be removed. The third Shumard oak is about 7' from the building and has to be trimmed a lot to stay off the building.

*Email text from Adam Dale: "It is not clear to me why these trees are being proposed for removal, particularly the Shumard oaks. I can see justification for removing the hollies because they are pretty gangly and not in a great location. All three Shumard oaks appear to be in great condition and in locations that do not present any hazards or problems. I approve removing the hollies and do not approve removing the Shumard oaks."*

The committee noted that they did not receive the presentation prior to the meeting so absent committee members were lacking important information and may have responded differently in their emails.

**Motion: Gail Hansen De Chapman moved to approve the project as presented with 23 trees planting back on the site or in areas adjacent to the site to be sufficient for the tree mitigation on this project.**

**Second: It was the consensus of the committee to approve the project as presented with 23 trees planting back on the site or in areas adjacent to the site to be sufficient for the tree mitigation on this project.**

**Motion Carried Unanimously**

**There being no further business for discussion, the meeting adjourned at 10:08 AM.**