

Date: 2-7-18
Submitted in PWR Committee
Council File No: 16-0461
Item No.: 3
Deputy: public

CF-16-0461 Is Bad For LA

Los Angeles once trimmed nearly 80,000 trees annually. In recent years, it has trimmed an average of 20,000 — resulting in roughly 300,000 fewer trees being trimmed over the last five years, according to George Gonzalez, the city's chief forester. — LATimes (11/8/2014)

What Is At Stake

- The City of LA has deemed that the price to NOT plant a tree is \$2612.00
- We are in need of trees due to devastation from fires, floods, and urbanization
- We can influence what the LA landscape will look like for future generations
- This ordinance comes at the issue from a tone-deaf viewpoint

NBS' Objective Is Purely Financial

- Consulting company NBS was tasked with finding ways to generate revenue - i.e. cost recovery (contract C-122003) by the Board of Public Works
- NBS' consulting mission is to provide professional services to analyze individual services provided by the Planning Department and the associated costs and develop user fees to recover City costs either partially or in full. - Council File No. 16-0200
- Their goal (AND FINAL REPORT) is purely budgetary – i.e. what saves the city money, and doesn't take into account any other factors

This Is a Misguided Ordinance

- It permits developers to circumnavigate existing rules in violation of CEQA that are in place to protect the Urban Forest
- It allows the City to take money instead of planting trees
- With no tree replacement requirements, the number of trees planted will DECLINE
- This ordinance is irresponsible in the face of climate change and the issues LA is facing due to extreme weather
- It ignores all the stakeholders who need to weigh in on protected trees (and trees in general)

An Easy Way To Make Money

- It's an excuse for Urban Forestry to get cash and at the same time not do their job

Board of Public Works (Excludes 5 Large Metro and USC Projects)
Monthly 3 or More Tree Removals/Replacement Approvals

Month	Tree Removal	Tree Replacement	Trees to Nursery
June 2015	25	44	4
July 2015	68	136	61
Aug. 2015	104	214	101
Sept. 2015	15	34	0
Oct. 2015	3	6	0
Nov. 2015	55	124	10
Dec. 2015	0	0	0
Jan. 2016	0	0	0
Feb. 2016	36	70	26
TOTAL	306	628*	202

* On a case-by-case basis, the Board of Public Works considers tree removal permit applications that propose higher or lower (i.e. for dead trees) than a 2x1 removal/replacement ratio.

(8 mo.) 202 x \$2,612 = \$527, 624

(1 year) 303 x \$2,612 = \$791, 436

Urban Forestry Is Misguided With This Approach

- This is completely at odds with the charter that Urban Forestry and BSS are tasked with
- We need MORE trees, not less
- Urban Forestry is consistently behind in planting trees
- They do not have the resources to do their job

Why shouldn't this Ordinance be approved?

- There needs to be scientific analysis into viable alternatives as required by CEQA
- LA & Urban Forestry need to partner with forward thinking entities
- Urban Forestry needs to be held to a higher standard

This Ordinance is not a fix. Please do not approve it.