

To Michael Espinosa

RE: CF 19--1088

Please post before 1:00 Public Works and Gang Reduction Committee Meeting

Honorable members,

The Coalition to Preserve LA, authors of the in-depth research report, "LA's Tree Canopy Needs a Better Plan," opposes the current proposal to conduct a decades-late inventory of Los Angeles street trees by using volunteers and untrained non-professionals.

We agree that Los Angeles must conduct a tree inventory but only using BEST PRACTICES which 20 leading tree canopy cities have demonstrated to us repeatedly. To waste months and perhaps years, using volunteers and non-professionals, and getting in return a substandard assessment of our public trees is akin to asking a bicycle repair shop to assess an engine problem -- they may pull it off through luck and emergency calls to a real mechanic, but what is the point of all this wasted time and money? L.A.'s public trees are in crisis, not leisurely awaiting their medical checkup.

In Seattle, a leading reformer in the urban tree canopy movement (they are 18 years ahead of where LA is right now), a full tree inventory and assessment was made by pros. Once they had fully verified the size, health, species, age, location and mini-climate of each tree, and entered every data point into their full-service real-time computer system, and once they learned all of the misconceptions they had going into the project about the types of threats to trees, who/what was causing them, why they were happening and what to do about it, Seattle then reorganized their original highly innovative system to do an even more complete inventorying job. Once they had this fine basis of facts, they were able to tap college students taking city internships in forestry, to go back to check up on each fully professionally assessed public tree, to help relieve some of the professionals who went on to other complex issues involving the Seattle tree canopy. But even then, interns did not replace the pros in assessing Seattle's trees.

Was this unusual? No. Easily a dozen leading cities in the US and many in Europe and Australia, are firmly planted in 2019 in assessing their crucial shade trees as the first step to saving and regrowing their canopies to fight the heat island effect, GHG and storm runoff.

Los Angeles is so far behind that the only answer is to follow best practices from the very start. Please don't harm our city further with shortcuts, guesswork, and poor practices. We agree wholeheartedly with the Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance Trees Committee, of which I am also a member.

We also hope this body learns about the loss of life from the urban heat island effect in Los Angeles, to spur it to greater action on regrowing the canopy. We are currently losing about 150 Angelenos to heat wave deaths per year, and if the canopy is not viewed as a lifeline that must be dramatically increased in size, the University of Miami and Case Western Reserve predictions will pan out. They predict that by 2070 or so, 2,500 Angelenos will die each year from heat waves -- the vast majority of them old and young people living in homes that cannot afford AC and in which shade trees have been needlessly cut down for city projects like sidewalk repair.

We have looked at which neighborhoods are most threatened, and found that Pacoima, Sylmar and other hot northern SF Valley areas, South Los Angeles, and the Eastside will suffer the greatest. So it's not just a matter of getting the environmental issues right by hiring professionals to examine the state and breadth and specifics of our canopy. It's a key issue of public health. Don't skimp. Start off on the right foot, spend the money, follow best practices. Please don't surmise, guess and hope for the best.

Sincerely, Jill Stewart
Executive Director
Coalition to Preserve LA
(and member, Tree Committee, NCSA)

--

Jill Stewart
Coalition to Preserve LA

Please post before 1:00 Public Works and Gang Reduction 3-20-'19 meeting

1 message

Joanne DAntonio <montaggiojoanne@yahoo.com>
To: Michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Tue, Mar 19, 2019 at 5:10 PM

Agenda item (2)

19-0188

I represented Neighborhood Councils on the Dudek Working Group, and from we learned I am against conducting a tree inventory of Los Angeles street trees utilizing volunteers and non-professionals as described in the report by Controller Ron Galperin. While I agree that a tree inventory and maintenance software is absolutely vital to the function of Urban Forestry and these are badly needed quickly, this non-professional enterprise could be a huge waste of time and money unless it is conducted by an outside professional inventory company employing certified arborists who do an "in person" evaluation of the City's street trees -- trees which sometimes, but not always, have been subjected to invasive insects, often over-pruned, and can be mistaken for dead during certain times of the year unless inspected by a pro. We are losing our urban forest at a rapid rate due to many factors, and we cannot afford the mistakes of a non-professional identifying the large number of species (many that look nearly the same but have different ecosystem services), as well as trying to assess the widely varying and complicated conditions of the City's trees. Urban Forestry Division can acquire the same Davey software as RAP but must follow the good example of the County of Los Angeles and populate the software using unbiased professionals to determine the species and condition of each tree. Anything less would be pennywise and pound foolish.

A professional Urban Forestry Management Plan would not advise this approach for Los Angeles.

Joanne D'Antonio

Sent from my iPhone

PW, GR 3/20/19 - Item 2 - File# 19-0188

1 message

The SEO Doctors <theseodoctors@gmail.com>
To: michael.espinosa@lacity.org

Wed, Mar 20, 2019 at 8:48 AM

Tree trimming program.

We should make a streamlined way to request. I'm pretty sure there already is one, but the content could be played with. I've heard the service can be difficult to obtain.

Korie Schmidt
(310)600-2278
TheSEODOctors@gmail.com