CITY OF MIAMI TREE ORDINANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING 2

POTENTIAL CATEGORY 1 (CODE AND PLAN PROVISIONS AND LANGUAGE) IDEAS FROM INPUT

Revised October 28, 2026, to include suggestions from online input. *Added items appear in italics*.

This revised list has been drawn by the facilitators from the interviewee and participant input outlined in the following documents:

- *Facilitator Summary of Preprocess Interviews*
- *Compilation of Community Workshop Suggestions*
- *Interim Compilation of Online Input*

It is a partial list of substantive suggestions addressing the topics grouped as Category 1 in those documents – i.e. possible revisions to provisions or language in Chapter 17, Miami 21, the Tree Trust Fund and other tree-related codes. It does not include topics from other categories in the materials, such as review and enforcement processes, which will be addressed beginning at the third meeting, although some of the items on this list overlap categories. The wording is largely that of the facilitators. Many items summarize or subsume multiple similar suggestions in the material.

This list is not exhaustive. There may be other substantive suggestions and additional detail in the material.

These items will only be considered by the Committee if pulled forward for discussion by a member.

CHAPTER 17

Protection

- Give extra protection to the oldest and biggest specimen trees. Consider something along the lines of the Tampa and Hillsborough County Grand Oak ordinances.
- Develop a canopy strategy and use that as a guide to individual decisions.

DRAFT

- Focus on preservation, relocation, and replacement of trees with the potential to preserve or enhance canopy, rather than replacing every tree that is 2" DBH or slightly larger.
- Protect nonnative trees and fruit trees that make large contributions to canopy or have other benefits.
- Provide incentives for preservation of trees, rather than just penalties for removal.
- *Focus tree replacement undertaken in conjunction with development on rights-of-way, parks and other public lands, rather than on the site being developed.*
- *Balance tree preservation with the need for additional housing, particularly affordable housing.*
- *Consider the impact of tree regulations on small business.*
- *Ensure that tree protection regulations do not infringe on property rights or require private individuals to pay for a public good (trees).*
- Develop more detailed guidelines for staff regarding which trees must be preserved, which ones relocated, and which may be replaced or mitigated.
- Simplify the regulations.
- Increase required maintenance and bonding of trees after development or improvements are complete.
- Greater flexibility and less onerous requirements for homestead exemption holders who have reason to prune or remove a tree, *or who are expanding their home.*
- Stipulate in code that service providers, such as arborists, tree pruners, and landscapers, rather than homeowners, are legally and financially responsible for violations of code.
- *Provide incentives for property owners to plant more trees. Consider tax credits, or credits that can be sold to developers for use in lieu of mitigation fees, for creating or preserving canopy above a minimum threshold.*
- Broaden standing to appeal tree-removal decisions.
- Lower barriers to appeal, including cost and limited windows for filing.
- Improve transparency around tree removal decisions: broaden notice requirements and post appeals alongside of intended decision. Make this information available online and retain it in easily accessible form after the final decision has been implemented.

Relocation

- Identify receiving sites in advance. Establish a registry of entities or individuals interested in receiving relocated trees.
- Increase the amount, by purchase or designation, of public lands that can receive relocated trees.
- Allow relocation to private land, with appropriate safeguards *(such as easements)* to ensure long-term protection and survival.
- Establish a tree bank in the form of land owned and operated by the city, to temporarily maintain relocatable trees until they are relocated permanently.

DRAFT

- Establish provisions for longer-term monitoring and bonding for relocated trees to help ensure survival.
- Require relocation rather than replacement or mitigation if at all possible. Do not leave as a matter of choice.

Replacement

- More closely tie the DBH and height of individual replacement trees (not just the total DBH of replacement trees collectively) to the size of the trees removed and the canopy they provided.
- Establish provisions for longer-term (more than one year) monitoring and bonding for relocated trees to help ensure survival.
- Remove palms as a replacement option.

Mitigation/Tree Trust Fund

- Increase the mitigation costs to more closely approach the replacement cost or value of the removed tree and the benefits it provided.
- Allow the city to participate financially in the cost of relocating some of the largest and oldest trees, under specified circumstances.
- Place greater emphasis on transparency in the revenues and expenditures of the Tree Trust Fund.

MIAMI 21

- Allow greater flexibility in footprint and design (including additional stories) in return for preservation of more trees on a lot. Include square footage bonus as incentive.
- Include canopy corridors to be developed along arterial roads in the neighborhood plans.
- Develop a canopy succession plan.

DRAFT