November 26, 2019

Council File No.: 16-0461-S1

The Honorable City Council of the City of Los Angeles

The Honorable Councilmember Blumenfield, Chair, and members of the Public Works and Gang Reduction Committee

The Honorable Councilmember Krekorian, Chair, and members of the Budget and Finance Committee

Room 395, City Hall 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
Attn: Los Angeles City Clerk

Subject: Proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan Relative to Tree Replacement Guarantee Ordinance No. 185573

Honorable Members:

Transmitted herewith, the Board of Public Works in collaboration with the Bureaus of Street Services and Sanitation, is pleased to submit the proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan for future tree planting efforts, including primary and alternate planting locations, to ensure the right tree is planted in the right place at the right time relative to the Tree Replacement Guarantee In-Lieu Ordinance No. 185573 adopted by the Los Angeles City Council via Council File No. 16-0461. Ordinance No. 185573 codified in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 62.177 went into effect on July 5, 2018, which provides an option for private development and residential projects to satisfy the City’s tree replacement policy or zoning code requirements. The Board of Public Works adopted the first Tree Replacement Guarantee non-refundable deposit in October 2018. This report responds to three of five requested items, which is the (1) tree guarantee (replacement) progress update, (2) alternatives to allow for flexibility in tree planting distribution, and (3) proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan. The other two items are still in progress – tree replacement ratio and long-term tree monitoring system.

The proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan provides an action plan (road map) for the Department of Public Works to commence coordination and tree planting activities across the entire City of Los Angeles based on a methodology that is defensible, justifiable, and equitable in determining best tree planting locations to ensure the right
tree is planted at the right place. The proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan is anticipated to provide site planting locations for the next two to three years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Los Angeles City Council (City Council):

1. ADOPT the Proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan;

2. AUTHORIZE the Board of Public Works, in collaboration with the Department of City Planning and Bureaus of Street Services and Sanitation, to approve and coordinate all tree related planting efforts in the proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan locations in each of the 15 Council Districts using fees (non-refundable deposits) collected, in either (a) group/bulk tree planting of no less than 25 trees per effort or (b) less than 25 individual tree planting(s) at least annually in a Council District with less than the equivalent funds required to plant and pay for 25 trees;

3. INSTRUCT the Board of Public Works to return to City Council, as necessary, to seek future approval to amend the proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan when any of each Council District proposed tree planting locations have been satisfied; and

4. AUTHORIZE the Board of Public Works to make technical corrections or clarifications that may be necessary to implement the intent of the proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan.

TRANSMITTALS

1. Tree Replacement Guarantee Planting Location Methodology;
2. Tree Replacement Guarantee Fee Map; and

DISCUSSION

Background

On May 22, 2019, the City Council adopted as amended the Board of Public Works’ (Board) proposed establishment of a Tree Replacement Guarantee (In-Lieu) Fee (Non-Refundable Deposit) to provide development and residential projects an additional permit option to (a) satisfy the Department of Public Works’ Tree Replacement Policy of “2 x 1” or “4X1” ratio (Tree Replacement: Tree Removal) and (b) provide the Department of City Planning with an alternative compliance option for Private Residential Development Projects to meet the City of Los Angeles’ Zoning Code requirements (CF No. 16-0461). Rather than having a nursery bound tree, this option allows the Board via LAMC Section 62.169 or Department of City Planning’s Director via LAMC Section 12.21 (G)(2)(a)(3) to make a determination that a site cannot feasibly accommodate a required tree. Ordinance No. 185573 went into effect on July 5, 2018, which was adopted by City Council as
amended to require "City Council approval of Board determinations of the locations for trees planted using the in-lieu fees based on the location of the project triggering the Development Tree Planting Requirement or the tree removal permit triggering the Public Works Tree Planting Requirement, as well as the need for additional trees in an area." (CF No. 16-0461).

As part of the adopted action, the City Council requested the Board to report on the: (1) progress on tree replacement and planting six months after instituting the in-lieu fee; (2) tree replacement ratio, including not just a 2 to 1 ratio, but possible equivalents in replacement trees accounting for canopy size of the removed mature tree; (3) alternatives to allow for more flexibility in the distribution of the trees throughout the City; (4) creation of a detailed plan to accompany the aforementioned Ordinance for future tree planting, covering planting locations (e.g., streets and parks), quality of trees, and a timeline to ensure the right tree in the right place; and (5) a long-term tree monitoring system.

In brief, Tree Removal Permits are required when removing street trees located in the public right-of-way or removing protected trees. Tree Removal Permits for 1 or 2 trees are issued and approved by the City's Chief Forester pursuant to LAMC Sections 46 and 62 and in adherence to Board policies. The Board is responsible for approving, upon scheduling a public hearing, the removal of three or more street trees, and any Southern California native protected tree. On June 17, 2015, the Board codified and adopted its Street Tree Removal Permit and Tree Replacement Conditions Policies, which among others designates the Bureau of Streets Services' (BSS) Chief Forester as the authorized agent to issue tree removal permits, require a 30 day public notice and hearing for removal of three or more street trees, and establishes tree replacement on a 2 X 1 basis with 24" box size trees and three years of watering.

On a case-by-case basis, the Board may approve adherence to the tree replacement 2:1 ratio by allowing the applicant to deliver an unplanted tree(s) to the Bureau's nursery due to planting space limitations and/or plan design constraints. The adopted Ordinance now provides both the Board and the Department of City Planning a new option to guarantee that a tree(s) is planted by providing the funds required to plant the tree in the ground instead of the tree going unplanted at a nursery. The new Ordinance also allows the Planning Department an option to offer developers to guarantee tree plantings instead of undergoing an alternative compliance measure, which reduces a considerable amount of time and planning by the developer.

Although the goal is to plant every tree and ensure the survival of all replaced trees, many unplanted trees delivered to a City tree yard or local nursery end up "unplanted" for a long period of time and some eventually die for various reasons. Major drivers of why these trees end-up unplanted, not-adopted, or dead include, include the:

- Quality of Tree Stock;
- Age of Tree Stock (some become root bound due to time);
- Type of Tree Species (mis-match due to space);
- Size of Tree (mis-match between 15gal, 24", 36", or 48"); or
- Care for Inventory (staff expertise and resources).
As a result, the Tree Guarantee Replacement Ordinance has provided an option to bolster the City’s commitment to conserve, replace, and protect the City’s urban tree canopy by reducing the number of trees that go unplanted, un-adopted, or die at a City yard or nursery.

**Tree Guarantee Ordinance Update (Progress)**

From June 2015 through June 2018, the Board approved various Tree Removal Permits with a permit condition to deliver an aggregate of 301 unplanted trees to the City's nursery. However, since the adoption of the Tree Guarantee Ordinance from July 2018 to November 2019, the Board has not approved any nursery bound tree(s) and instead approved 103 trees (from October 24, 2018 through November 25, 2019) under the tree guarantee replacement option for three or more tree removal permits. Therefore, the practice of sending a tree to the nursery, which is likely to go unplanted, appears to be curtailed and the practice of ordering and planting a tree “just in time” or “when ready to plant” is now the new normal in tree planting when a site cannot feasibly accommodate a tree.

In brief, the tree guarantee fee is separated into three major categories for Private Commercial and Residential City Planning Development Projects is $2,612 per tree while the Residential (Non-Development) Public Works Projects is $1,945 with a subsidized amount of $267 per tree for Residential Public Works Projects that are four units or less.

Table 1: Fee by Category Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST ELEMENTS *</th>
<th>PLANNING TREES CODE 5742-22</th>
<th>PUBLIC WORKS TREES CODE 5742-21</th>
<th>PUBLIC WORKS TREES (SUBSIDIZE) CODE 5742-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/Delivery</td>
<td>$ 535.00</td>
<td>$ 225.00</td>
<td>$ 225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting Labor</td>
<td>$ 105.00</td>
<td>$ 105.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Cut</td>
<td>$ 144.00</td>
<td>$ 144.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watering* ($10/visit x 99)</td>
<td>$ 990.00</td>
<td>$ 990.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakes/Ties/Arbor Guards</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
<td>$ 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (20%)</td>
<td>$ 425.00</td>
<td>$ 339.00</td>
<td>$ 22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting (8 hrs/$30)</td>
<td>$ 240.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Cost</td>
<td>$ 153.00</td>
<td>$ 122.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,612.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,945.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 267.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: No Structural Pruning Included (3 Year Establishment Period/Plan)
In terms of non-refundable trees guaranteed fees collected, the following table provides a break down by category type:

Table 2: Fee Collection from October 2018 to November 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018/2019</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2019/20 To-Date (July 1 - Nov. 25)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Approx. Number of Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Trees - Subsidized @ $267 (Code 5742-20)</td>
<td>$ 39,783</td>
<td>$ 23,496</td>
<td>$ 63,279</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Trees @ $1,945 (Code 5742-21)</td>
<td>$ 144,597</td>
<td>$ 147,819</td>
<td>$ 292,416</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Dept. Trees @ $2,612 (Code 5742-22)</td>
<td>$ 125,376</td>
<td>$ 70,524</td>
<td>$ 195,900</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 309,756</td>
<td>$ 241,839</td>
<td>$ 551,595</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some Revenue and Number of Trees listed in Planning Dept. Row (Code 5742-22) were coded and captured in this Revenue Source Code from illegal tree removals investigated by BSS and will be recoded at future date yet planted as a Public Works tree (Code 5742-21). In addition, some deposits will be reclassified to reflect the correct Revenue Source Code due to data entry error or learning curve at launch of program.

It is important to note that deposits in the Public Works Trust Fund will be reconciled annually and expenses related Tree Replacement Guarantee Ordinance will be on an interim basis, but no less than once per fiscal year, reimbursed to the City’s General Fund for associated accounting service or tree planting coordination service expenses incurred from the Public Works Trust Fund No. 834 either as salary and/or contractual services reimbursement (revenue).

Proposed Alternatives and Tree Planting Plan

Tree Planting Location Methodology

Tree Guarantee (replacement) and planting locations for Planning Department development projects are determined by the Director’s Decision and planting sites are determined and aligned with either a community plan or specific area plans. For Department of Public Works Tree Guarantee (replacement) and planting locations, this report proposes to create a defensible, justifiable, and equitable process to determine tree planting locations.
The following methodology and five criterion was used (see Transmittal 1 for full details):

1. **DISADVANTAGED AND LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES**

   In accordance to the State of California, Assembly Bill (AB) 1550 (Gomez, 2016), state law requires communities to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions and create an investment plan that protects and reduces the burden from low canopy tree areas in both disadvantage and low-income communities (referred hereinafter as “DAC” or “LIC”). The proposed planting plan takes into consideration climate impacts from pollution and low canopy, economics, and social factors in alignment with AB1550.

   In addition, State laws were considered under AB 32 and AB 1550, including SB 535. More specifically, AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (2006), authorized cap and trade, the proceeds of which are deposited into the state's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF). SB 535 (2012) required CalEPA to define and identify disadvantaged communities for investment opportunities with GGRF funds. Further, SB 535 mandated that 25% of GGRF funds must be expended in disadvantaged communities as these populations are considered to be the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. CalEPA defined disadvantaged communities as the top 25% of CalEnviroScreen scores. Under AB 1550, the definition of priority populations eligible to receive GGRF funds was expanded to include low-income communities (as defined by median household income). Per AB 1550, an additional 10% of proceeds must go towards projects that mitigate climate change in low-income communities.

2. **LOW CANOPY AREAS**

   Working in communities (areas) to eliminate low canopy areas and expand the city's tree canopy is focal in the proposed planting plan. The City could use the TreePeople canopy study data, and in the future our own tree inventory data, to perform more powerful analysis. However, the proposed plan will work in DAC, LIC, and Severely Disadvantage areas that would benefit from having more trees and shade coverage to reduce the heat island effect and by doing so, this plan is considered to be more inclusive.

3. **SITE SUITABILITY**

   Planting the right tree at the right time and the right location will be critical. The Department of Public Works considered factors, such as high-use or high traffic corridors, anchoring corridors, contiguous tree planting close gap connection, extension of corridors, open public space, existing parkways at four (4) feet+ widths, and infrastructure that would allow enough space for the right trees to grow and provide the right canopy size.
4. EFFICIENCY

Leveraging economies of scale is important to the gospel of efficiency and effectiveness. Therefore, the proposed planting plan takes into consideration watering and maintenance routes that provide efficient route planning, work deployment schedules, bulk or group planting (i.e., more than 25 trees per tree planting effort), proximity to existing maintenance tree crew routes, and most important greatest community impact.

5. COLLABORATION

There is a growing need for government agencies to collaborate, increase civic engagement, and integrate efforts to improve public service delivery. Collaborating with the impacted Council District Offices to determine the right planting site is another critical criteria. The proposed planting plan seeks to plant trees in primary and alternate planting sites determined by the Department of Public Works, which is aligned with AB1550 and other criterion discussed in this report. In addition to working with Council District Offices, collaboration and partnership will also include working with the Department of Planning, Bureaus of Sanitation and Street Services, Board of Public Works, City Forest Officer. Civic engagement will be incorporated by seeking location input for future planting from LA's non-profit planting partners, Community Forest Advisory Committee, and other tree advocacy groups.

Lastly, not listed as a criterion, yet a desired strategic approach, CAL FIRE urban forestry grant programs require applicants to design projects that benefit disadvantaged and low-income communities. As such, plantings done using Guaranteed Tree Fees will complement the ongoing efforts of LASAN’s urban forestry grant programs.

Criterion Applicability and Planting Sites At-A-Glance

Certain populations in Los Angeles are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. DAC (as defined by CalEPA pursuant to SB 535) and LIC communities (as designated by AB 1550) are disproportionately affected by multiple types of pollution. As such, targeting investments that will help mitigate the impacts of climate change in these communities will improve public health, reduce pollution (i.e., vehicular emissions), and improve overall quality of life. In addition, planting in these communities will help mitigate the impacts of climate change by reducing the pollution, increasing shade, reducing the reliance on and cost of air-conditioning, and improving resilience to climate change.

Transmittal 2 maps all potential Guaranteed Tree Fee Planting Locations using Google My App. Proposed corridors to be planted are shown in black, while existing projects/trees that are being maintained by Street Services are shown in green.
Proposed Primary and Secondary Planting Sites

The proposed Guaranteed Tree Fee Planting Plan was developed using the aforementioned five criteria. The proposed Planting Plan is considered to be defensible, justifiable, and equitable plan that used a development process and methodology informed by state law, strategic vision, and other factors, such as income, economics, climate change impact, collaboration, operating efficiencies and tree planting and maintenance crew effectiveness, to determine tree planting locations.

Attachment 3 provides a list of all proposed primary and secondary (alternative) sites to mobilize the tree planting efforts for Public Works trees resultant from the Tree Guarantee Fee. Again, Planning Department tree replacement (guarantee) planting will be in accordance to the Director's Decision aligned to community or specific area plans.

The proposed Guaranteed Tree Fee Planting Plan provides required fields:

- Primary Planting Site Anchoring Corridor
- Primary Planting Site Corridor Start
- Primary Planting Site Corridor End
- Tree Capacity Per Primary Site
- Determination of Disadvantage Community
- Location Justification
- Secondary or Alternate Planting Sites (trees to be planted when primary site is at capacity or at the request of Council Office).
- Near Existing Watering and Maintenance Route

The proposed Guaranteed Tree Fee Planting Plan is anticipated to provide planting sites, upon City Council approval, for a period of 18 months to 24 months. However, at times dependent on number of trees planted, any particular Council District may reach capacity prior to the two year anticipated schedule; thus, will require the Board of Public Works to seek approval to amend the Guaranteed Tree Fee Planting Plan. In addition, the proposed plan is considered organic and the initial step towards planting and replacing tree from fees collected through the Guaranteed Tree Fee ordinance. Therefore, the Planting Plan will need to be revisited, revised, and reapproved every couple to few years, contingent on the amount of fees collected, number of tree replacement guaranteed, and type of tree replacement fee collected.

Metrics

In terms of metrics, the proposed planting plan will aim to:

1. Reduce the Number of Trees delivered to a City tree yard that become Unplanted and Dead Trees to zero percent (0%); and
2. Increase the Tree Plant "In-the-Ground" Rate to 100%.
FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed Tree Guarantee Fee Planting Plan is an administrative matter to allow the planting of tree replacements using the Tree Guarantee Fees collected. Tree planting from Public Works Non-Subsidized and Planning Department Development project will have no impact to the General Fund. However, the planting of subsidized Public Works guaranteed trees will have a General Fund impact of approximately $397,686 (or 237 trees X $1,945 per tree minus $63,279). These cost are currently absorbed by the Bureau of Street Services similar to that of tree replacements (planting) from nursery bound trees.

Respectfully Submitted,

DR. FERNANDO CAMPOS
Executive Officer, Board of Public Works

Questions regarding this report may be referred to:
Fernando Campos, Executive Officer (Funding and Implementation)
(213) 978-0250
Fernando.Campos@lacity.org
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CITY OF LOS ANGELES
GUARANTEED TREE FEE
PROPOSED PLANTING LOCATION METHODOLOGY

Goal: Create a defensible, justifiable methodology to determine tree planting locations for the Public Works Guaranteed Tree Fee.

METHODOLOGY:

• DISADVANTAGED AND LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES
  State of CA Definitions:
  • AB 1550 (Gomez, 2016): Greenhouse gases: investment plan: disadvantaged communities
    • Informed by CalEnviroScreen 3.0 (CalEPA)
    • DACs: communities disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution and population characteristics that make them sensitive to pollution
    • LICs: <= 80% Statewide Median Household Income
  • Plantings should be located in or benefit disadvantaged and low-income communities

• LOW CANOPY AREAS
  • Target low-canopy neighborhoods and corridors

• SITE SUITABILITY
  • High-use corridors (vehicular traffic, pedestrian traffic, transit, multi-family housing, schools, etc.)
  • 4’+ wide parkways
  • Infrastructure allows enough space for trees

• EFFICIENCY
  • CORRIDORS/GRIDS
  • Efficient route planning
  • Efficient use of staff time
  • Greater community impact

• COLLABORATION WITH COUNCIL DISTRICTS
  • Growing the footprint of existing planting projects
  • Seeking location input from LA’s non-profit planting partners
  • Coordination with the Bureau of Sanitation’s current/planned plantings, Bureau of Street Services Urban Forestry Division – Chief Forester, Board of Public Works City Forest Officer, and the Planning Department’s master and community plans for development projects.
Guaranteed Tree Planting Plan

Legend

- Proposed Planting Locations
- Existing/Proposed Partner Plantings
- AB1550

Esri, HERE, Garmin, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Districts</th>
<th>Anchoring Corridor (Primary Planting Site)</th>
<th>Primary Site: Corridor Start</th>
<th>Primary Site: Corridor Terminus</th>
<th>Tree Capacity (Field Assessment)</th>
<th>DAC (Y/N)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Alternate Planting Sites: Other Notes/Options</th>
<th>Near LASAN Trees being watered by UFD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Westlake Avenue/Lafayette Park (Rampart)</td>
<td>3rd Street (northeast)</td>
<td>6th Street (southwest)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Rampart village is one of the densest, most disadvantaged parts of Los Angeles and is subject to high pollution burdens. The selected streets have nice open parkways with some trees. Infill on the selected streets would provide shade for pedestrians and residents in the area.</td>
<td>Priority Areas: (1) 6th Street Between Alvarado and Loma; (2) Alvarado between 3rd and Olympic; and (3) Vermon between Olympic and Washington.</td>
<td>Yes, near Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vanowen</td>
<td>Atoll (west)</td>
<td>Morse (east)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This stretch of Vanowen runs past a large multi-family housing complex &amp; church. Near LASAN’s recent planting.</td>
<td>An alternative would be to fill in Vineland parkway sites (46 locations marked by Amy and Alex). Near UFD sites at the Victory Vineland Recreation Center.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reseda</td>
<td>Erwin (south)</td>
<td>Arminta Street (north)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Planting along Reseda Blvd has been requested by CD3 office. The stretch identified here runs through a long string of DACs and is adjacent to LASAN’s planned planting work on Reseda. Therefore, this collaborative greening effort will provide a beautiful, continuous stretch of trees along a major transit and pedestrian corridor.</td>
<td>Erwin to Victory is a great stretch to start. Portions of Reseda have parkway, others do not, but the existing parkway is bare.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>Melrose (north)</td>
<td>Olympic (south)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Wilton is in one of the only major streets with open parkway in CD4 that qualifies as a DAC under AB1550. This street is a significant artery in the Koreatown area with high vehicular traffic. Parkway size varies in width. Some areas have trees, others have none. A few stretches are concrete (i.e., no parkway).</td>
<td><strong>The stretch of Wilton from 6th Street to 7th Street shares a boundary with CD10. If trees are planted along this stretch on the east side, they will be for CD10. Many of the eligible large boulevards do not have parkway! Koreatown- Beverly, and 3rd Street. Highland would be great, but needs cuts. Rosewood and Elmwood are in desperate need of canopy, but are smaller streets with dense apartment buildings.</strong></td>
<td>Yes (Western)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National Blvd</td>
<td>Rose (south)</td>
<td>Overland (northwest)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>National Boulevard is one of the only major corridors that falls within a DAC in CD5. National is a broad corridor that is totally barren. It has open parkways that are suitable for a large planting.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sepulveda Blvd (submedian)</td>
<td>Lemay (north)</td>
<td>Haynes (south)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This stretch of Sepulveda is extremely wide, with eight lanes of traffic, a center median, a sub median, and ample space for parking. Not only is it very broad, but it has very limited canopy. The open, barren submedian along the west side of Sepulveda Blvd would be a great way to add shade and beauty to this high-traffic corridor.</td>
<td>Kester Ave from Kittridge St to Lemay Street - near school, strip of barren parkway, high pedestrian use.</td>
<td>Yes, near Arbor Day 2019 trees and Victory (TREEmendous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glenoaks</td>
<td>Pierce (southeast)</td>
<td>Van Nuys (northwest)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>There is a large affordable housing parcel at Glenoaks and Pierce. This location would benefit greatly from newly planted street trees. Plus, it is near LASAN’s recent planting on Van Nuys, so it will be efficient to add to watering routes and will continue greening and investing in this deserving neighborhood.</td>
<td>Van Nuys yet Stop at San Fernando Road and Laurel Canyon Blvd.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council District</td>
<td>Anchoring Corridor (Primary Planting Site)</td>
<td>Primary Site- Corridor Start</td>
<td>Primary Site- Corridor Terminus</td>
<td>Tree Capacity (Field Assessment)</td>
<td>DAC (Y/N)</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Alternate Planting Sites: Other Notes/Options</td>
<td>Near LASAN Trees being watered by UFD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Normandie</td>
<td>MLK (north)</td>
<td>Gage (south)</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>While much of CD8 is eligible per the defined methodology, many streets in South LA do not have sufficient parkway space to support a planting. Not only does Normandie have appropriate parkways, but it is a very low-canopy street that would benefit greatly from new street trees. Normandie runs through census tracts that have very high CalEnviroScreen scores (typically 86-90% or 91-95%) and has lots of dense, multi-family housing. This planting would be in conjunction with CD 9.</td>
<td>Start by targeting Normandie from Slauson (southern end) to Vernon (northern end).</td>
<td>Somewhat, near Broadway which will be planted for SHADE LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Normandie</td>
<td>MLK (north)</td>
<td>Gage (south)</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>While much of CD9 is eligible per the defined methodology, many streets in South LA do not have sufficient parkway space to support a planting. Not only does Normandie have appropriate parkways, but it is a very low-canopy street that would benefit greatly from new street trees. Normandie runs through census tracts that have very high CalEnviroScreen scores (typically 86-90% or 91-95%) and has lots of dense, multi-family housing. This planting would be in conjunction with CD 8.</td>
<td>Start by targeting Normandie from Slauson (southern end) to Vernon (northern end).</td>
<td>Somewhat, near Broadway which will be planted for SHADE LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Obama Blvd</td>
<td>Chesapeake (west)</td>
<td>Crenshaw (east)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Obama Blvd is a Los Angeles thoroughfare with very high CalEnviroScreen scores (86-90%). The high scores are due in part to high traffic, elevated levels of particulate matter (PM 2.5), and high poverty rates. Planting trees along this corridor will ease the pollution load from heavy vehicular traffic.</td>
<td>Formerly Rodeo</td>
<td>While much of CD 10 is considered low-canopy, there are not many corridor options in DACs that have existing, plantable parkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Culver Blvd</td>
<td>Centinela (south)</td>
<td>Sawtelle (north)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Culver has wide parkways and a nice median with walking/bike path. Street has high vehicular and pedestrian traffic plus is located near a school and apartment complexes. Very close to the 405 freeway which brings vehicular emissions.</td>
<td>Back-up option: LAX (Olympics); La Cienega has open parkway, but it is mostly in front of park space/lawn. Freeway adjacent and very public for Olympic! Ingleswood Blvd from Venice to Washington Pl- lots of open parkway, but decent shade from private property trees</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td>Gaynor (west)</td>
<td>Haskell (east)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>DAC, near 405 freeway, near industrial development, near Van Nuys airport. Open parkway along north side of street.</td>
<td>N Heliotrope (could be done in conjunction with Edgemont- one street east); Virgil (north of US 101); Temple (Rano to Parkman): Union</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edgemont</td>
<td>Lexington (north)</td>
<td>Melrose (south)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This corridor is located near US-101, which brings heavy vehicular pollution to the area. In addition, this corridor is near Los Angeles Community College (LACC), an important local academic institution, which serves the local community. Providing shady corridors near this institution will improve commutes to and from campus for thousands of students, teachers, and staff members.</td>
<td>Yes, near Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tree Guarantee Free Planting Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Anchoring Corridor (Primary Planting Site)</th>
<th>Primary Site: Corridor Start</th>
<th>Primary Site: Corridor Terminus</th>
<th>Tree Capacity (Field Assessment)</th>
<th>DAC (Y/N)?</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Alternate Planting Sites: Other Notes/Options</th>
<th>Near LASAN Trees being watered by UFD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Soto Street</td>
<td>4th St (south)</td>
<td>1st St (north)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This area has a high concentration of DACs and is surrounded by some of LA's busiest freeways. While most of Boyle Heights is a very low canopy, many of the existing parkways in Boyle Heights are too narrow to plant, making greening the area difficult. The parkways along Soto are still on the narrow side, but should be wide enough to accommodate small trees. Residential Zone: Breed Street (parallel to Soto, more residential) between 1st Street and 4th Street</td>
<td>Yes (Breed Street Elementary School- to be planted in 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hoover (§120th)</td>
<td>SR-105 (north)</td>
<td>120th St (south); additional sites available on 120th from Hoover west to Vermont</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This area of CD15 has very high CalEnviroScreen scores, lots of dense, multi-family housing, and has very low canopy. The Hoover Corridor is a major transit corridor that runs adjacent to the SR-105. Hoover and 120th have large, open parkways, ideal for planting medium and large trees. This area gets little attention and would benefit from investment. <strong>UFD CAL FIRE grant (use previously identified locations from grant application)</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**METHODOLOGY:**
Proposed planting locations are all in census tracts considered Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) or Low-Income Communities (LICs) according to CA AB1550 and are areas that would benefit from increased canopy. In certain CDs (e.g., 11 and 5), there were very few DAC and LIC tracts, so there were limited options available. However, in other CDs that are largely eligible under this methodology, care was taken to locate planting work in areas that are low-canopy, highly visible, and heavily trafficked (ideally by both vehicles and pedestrians). In addition, consideration was given to location that were either a) adjacent to a recent or planned planting effort by LASAN, UFD, or City Plants or b) were recommended by LASAN, City Plants, and/or UFD due to their unique location attributes, open parkways, and low-canopy, and, in some cases, community input.

**Please note that all recommended locations are for parkway trees. A different set of suggestions would be developed if the goal was to identify barren corridors that would require new tree wells to be created.**