

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: email to candidates (Email)
Started: Friday, July 24, 2026 4:46:14 PM
Last Modified: Friday, July 24, 2026 6:28:24 PM
Time Spent: 01:42:09
First Name: Silas
Last Name: James
Email: info@silasforseattle.com
IP Address: 212.104.215.84

Page 1

Q1

Please share your information below:

Name	Silas James
Position	SCC D5

Q2

The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections oversees trees on private property and during development. They get most of their funding for development but almost none for overseeing tree protection. To protect and grow our trees and urban forest, we need a city department that does not have conflicting priorities. San Francisco has a Dept. of Environment, with responsibilities for a diversity of issues, including the urban forest and climate. In Seattle, six city departments and the Office of Sustainability and Environment currently oversee tree issues. Would you support moving tree and urban forestry protection into a new independent Department of Environment and Climate that includes an urban forestry division?

Yes,

Comments:

I'm my experience, layers of bureaucracy do not make things more efficient. I believe that simplifying processes and systems usually leads to better outcomes faster. I support having an urban forestry division, headed by an arborist.

Q3

Next year, Seattle will be updating its 5-year tree canopy assessment. Previous studies have only reported on Seattle's canopy area. The environmental and climate benefits of Seattle's urban forest are, however, most dependent on the volume of Seattle's canopy, which cleans the air of pollution, reduces stormwater runoff, provides shade and habitat for birds and other wildlife, reduces urban heat island impacts, and supports the mental and physical health of Seattle's human population. While funding for canopy volume was approved in the city budget in 2021, it was never implemented. In next year's canopy assessment, would you support the city funding and including a canopy volume assessment?

Yes,

Comments::

I think more information is good but even better if it is used to support policy action.

Q4

Ivy is killing many trees in Seattle. Washington State recently banned the sale of invasive English and Atlantic Ivy. Would you support increased efforts to remove ivy from trees, including on city and public property, on private property, and when property owners and developers apply for permits to build on their property?

Yes**Q5**

Currently the cities of San Francisco, CA; Philadelphia, PA; Bellevue, WA; and Vancouver, BC all have assumed responsibility for taking care of street trees which are in the right of way. Seattle currently is responsible for taking care of street trees they planted. Would you support Seattle taking over care of all street trees to help ensure public safety and reduce the burden of residents, particularly in low-tree or low-income areas?

Yes,

Comments::

Patchwork policies aren't effective. I'm definitely open to consistent solutions.

Q6

Many Seattle lots lack trees or have room for more. Portland's Treebate program offers a one-time water, sewer, and stormwater bill credit for planting a tree. Would you support a similar program in Seattle?

Yes,

Comments::

I'm open to an incentive program that would lead to more trees but I'd want to incentivize planting trees that survive and develop an established root structure. So I favor providing that credit in the 1 to 3 years after a tree is planted.

Q7

Many cities in Washington State require developers to pay impact fees for meeting increased services as density increases. Accessible parks in neighborhoods are important for urban areas. Shoreline, WA, recently passed a Parks Impact Fee. A recent study by SDOT has found that tree canopy goals cannot be met even by planting trees in every available street-side spot. Would you support a parks impact fee to create more accessible parks in neighborhoods, including pocket parks and recreation areas, as neighborhood density increases? If not, indicate other sources of funding that you would support to meet the need for neighborhood green areas.

Comments::

I support increasing density in neighborhoods in ways that can maintain the uniqueness of each neighborhood. Stacked flats, court yard blocks, ADU's and DADU's, subdivisions of houses are all compatible with green spaces. Allowing for increased height, houses more people using less land, doing this thoughtfully will lead to more greenspaces while increasing density. Access to greenspaces should be treated like a basic human right, as it is currently most density is centered away from greenspaces. I favor impact fees that motivate growth in density and increased greenspaces in neighborhoods, but that can fund the creation of more greenspaces, pea-patches, and walkable areas in already dense areas.

Q8

Seattle gets 58% of its tree canopy from trees on private property, according to the 2021 canopy study. The mature native trees being removed on most infill projects frequently grow on the very edge of the lot, yet clearcuts are still the first step of almost every development project. Would you support legislation requiring developers to consider alternative site plans to protect existing trees and still build the same amount of housing?

Yes,

Comments:

As I've said above i favor increased density as well as increased tree canopy. to this i favor building up to preserve open spaces and the creation of more green areas and urban gardens.

Q9

Putting 4 to 6 separate housing units, often with separate driveways, on a lot in the neighborhood residential zone leaves no space on most lots for saving or planting trees. Building up with stacked flats or building with common walls for housing units could allow more space to retain and plant trees, yet the preference of developers seems to be to build 4 separate townhouses. Existing trees are providing many benefits now in neighborhoods. Would you support stronger incentives to build stacked flats or housing sharing common walls, like Oregon does to retain more existing trees?

Yes,

Comments:

Absolutely, trees and increased density go together, I also favor the expansion of public transportation to make Seattle less dependent on cars, which would allow us to decrease parking requirements in new construction

Q10

In 2020, Seattle approved funding in the budget for conducting a Natural Capital Assessment of the city's urban forest, but never followed through on conducting the study when COVID struck. The study was to quantify the value of Seattle's urban forest and other natural assets to the city. Would you support Seattle funding and conducting a Natural Capital Assessment Study?

Yes,

Comments::

This is what makes us the emerald city.

Q11

Bellevue, Kirkland, and Edmonds all define a tree grove to be protected as 3 or more significant trees 6" DSH with overlapping or touching crowns. Seattle currently defines a grove as 8 or more trees, 12"DSH as a grove?Would you support reducing the number of trees required to constitute a grove in Seattle, thereby protecting more trees and habitat for birds and wildlife?

Comments::

I want to protect more trees, increase out tree canopy, create more greenspaces, and increase density so that people of all incomes can live in the city and neighborhoods. I'd need to do more research about the implications of changing the definition of "a grove" as described above.

Q12

In Seattle and throughout the Pacific Northwest, there is a growing interest in housing development designs that provide increased urban density while preserving trees and natural areas.Do you have an example of a housing development or project that accommodates both density and trees that could be a model for Seattle development?

High Point in West Seattle comes to mind it, is an affordable housing development project that worked intentionally to preserve and expand greenspaces, and existing trees while growing density and community spaces.

Q13

Advocates for protecting and growing Seattle's trees and urban forests believe that with improved and updated oversight and clearer regulations, we can both increase the needed housing and save more existing trees. Can you think of additional ways Seattle can succeed at saving more of its healthy and large trees while building new housing.

Raising height limitations in more areas and reducing parking requirements will preserve more land for greenspaces and trees. But that is more feasible with better public transportation because then people will be less dependent on personal vehicles.
