

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Public Comment Log [June 2024]

The Community Forest Management Plan (CFMP) for the County of Los Angeles (County) was open for Public Comment from April 8, 2024, to May 8, 2024. The table below displays the relevant portions of comments received, with a total of 26, received by email and the CFMP website comment portal during the Public Comment period.

1. Public Comment

#	Comment	Response
1	<p>1. In favoring native trees and shrubs (the right thing to do), why not add that this should be instead of <i>ficus</i> and other non-natives that dominate our urban landscapes? Developers and the general public have never heard an argument in favor of natives, and <i>ficus</i> is now an invasive species. Honestly, this failure to use the bully pulpit disappoints me.</p> <p>2. More emphasis on working with schools - especially Los Angeles Unified - this is a key vector for education. Reach the kids and that way reach the parents.</p> <p>3. Surely you can work in an argument in favor of natural (native) landscapes instead of artificial turf, which leaches microplastics into our land and water (which is why the EU bans it). Not in LA apparently...</p>	<p>1. The plan provides recommended species that includes both native and climate appropriate species. Action 3.3 shows an action item to expand native tree and landscape design practices to additional County managed facilities.</p> <p>2. Comment received. Section 2.4 highlights the need to collaborate with various landowners including schools.</p> <p>3. This plan is focused on trees in the urban forest and can be used to inform decisions on landscapes.</p>
2	We need more trees on the west side of Altadena, specifically down Figueroa Drive in Altadena.	Comment received.
3	I found the 'Unincorporated Community Profiles Snapshot' one of the most useful takeaways from the draft CFMP. It would be great to see these for all the unincorporated communities.	All unincorporated community profiles are available on the CFMP website.
4	Will the Community Forest Management Plan include partnerships with other non-profit organizations to ensure the maintenance and care of our urban forest? The Partnership is uniquely positioned to help leverage resources in the Hollywood neighborhood to mitigate the heat island effect, provide greenery, and ensure proper maintenance of our urban canopy in a disadvantaged neighborhood. With the proper resources, organizations like ours can provide a hyper-focused management approach and serve as an extension of the CFMP. We are passionate about our forest.	The County is exploring partnerships with local community-based organizations as outlined in Chapter 5 in the CFMP.
5	This is a beautiful plan and very impressive and its presentation. However, the monitoring aspect needs to be strongly improved.	Comment received. Implementation plan specified to

#	Comment	Response
	<p>There have been many government plans which are nicely laid out, only to go by the wayside in terms of actually meeting all of the goals. LA had 1 million tree plan which was beautifully laid out, but after a few years, it was never followed. We are seeing a similar plight with the lack of oversight for all of the money we are spending on homeless. This plan should have very specific goals as well as Milestones and some authority to check on progress and to hold somebody accountable if progress is not being made. Having goals like “work on” are not specific enough to determine whether progress is being made.</p>	<p>review actions annually to measure and report on progress.</p>
6	<p>Please consider DTLA, the heart of our city, for a place at the top of your list. It's the only downtown area I've ever been to in the world that has almost no squirrels or pigeons. There's so little green space here, we barely have a surviving urban wild ecosystem. DTLA needs more trees everywhere, but certainly between the Financial District, Bunker Hill, and Little Tokyo. There's a strip mall on the corner of First and Hope that should be a pocket park with seats for dining. Across the street, the DWP's parking lot should be entirely converted into green space. The areas around the new Bunker Hill train station should feel like a shady, tree-lined public plaza, not a sun-bleached field of concrete. (A few small trees were planted, but not nearly enough – particularly considering many mature trees were torn down to widen the roads around the station against the wishes of the general public, and Metro's own plans.) And the dirt lot in front of City Hall...I hope this one's obvious.</p>	<p>Comments focus on areas managed by the City of Los Angeles. Comment was communicated to the City of Los Angeles.</p>
7	<p>I'm happy with the thoroughness and detail of this action plan. As a resident of the West Athens community, I look forward to not only being a witness but an active participant in regard to the upcoming changes over the years.</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>
8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Every new city landscape planting being restricted to natives-only. Create more spongy spaces. Spread the word about incentives for people to remove lawns and either grow produce gardens or provide habitat to support local insect and bird species. Require all new housing developments to dedicate a % of the proposed property be a pocket-forest/natives-only park/meadow. Urge/expect property owners to have at least 50% native, if not 100%, particularly from larger properties.</li> <li>2. Create more pocket forests.</li> <li>3. Create jobs and volunteer opportunities to remove all non-native plants from public spaces, and recognition to every non-public outdoor space that is open to volunteers removing non-native plants.</li> <li>4. Make it illegal to "spray" for insects outdoors. Make poisons illegal - Roundup, rodent poison and spread information about why.</li> <li>5. Make cutting down trees illegal or require special circumstance permits More food-trees for people to eat.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Action 2.1 states a goal to “develop, update, and implement policies that support biodiversity...” which includes the need for native species.</li> <li>2. Comment received.</li> <li>3. Biodiversity, workforce development, and community engagement are items addressed in the CFMP.</li> <li>4. Regional coordination goals on plant health care practices are discussed in Action 2.3.</li> <li>5. Action 2.1 states a goal to update the County Oak Ordinance and add other tree protection</li> </ol>

#	Comment	Response
	6. Work closely with indigenous people.	<p>measures. Guidelines for cities to develop Tree Protection Ordinances are found on the CFMP website. <a href="https://lacountycfmp.org/">https://lacountycfmp.org/</a></p> <p>6. Comment received. The CFMP highlights partnering with Tribal communities in multiple sections.</p>
9	<p>1. Incorporate multiple facets of equity (incl. recognition and procedural), not just distributional. See references: <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1618866722002801">https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1618866722002801</a> and rec #2 on pg 119 of <a href="https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1gt5f9x2">https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1gt5f9x2</a>.</p> <p>2. On pg 20, while the Joshua tree is an iconic species, it would be best to use a photo of a species that is botanically a tree.</p> <p>3. Pg 36: what are the temporal targets for these % goals?</p> <p>4. Canopy need classification (pg 41): would be good to add climate and ecological constraints as a factor - e.g., expectations for canopy in desert vs foothill can be different.</p> <p>5. Action 1.2 clarify County's intent for providing maintenance for street trees. Will residents need to provide any of the care?</p> <p>6. Incorporate the LA Urban Forest Equity Collective tools/frameworks as a resource (see <a href="https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1gt5f9x2">https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1gt5f9x2</a>).</p> <p>7. Please address (prevention of) topping of trees.</p>	<p>1. Comment received.</p> <p>2. Comment received.</p> <p>3. Addressed to provide clarity in CFMP.</p> <p>4. Our community canopy target of 15% considers climate and ecological constraints. The table on page 41 is used to help prioritize communities.</p> <p>5. When a County street tree is planted, after the establishment phase provided by the County, dependent on funding, the responsibility of providing supplemental water falls on the adjacent property owner or resident until the tree is fully established, which is at least three years after planting. However, page 30 of the CFMP states the need to pursue creative opportunities to offset costs and burdens related to private property trees.</p> <p>6. Added as a resource to <a href="https://lacountycfmp.org/">https://lacountycfmp.org/</a></p> <p>7. Addressed to provide information on the consequences of tree topping in the CFMP.</p>
10	1. East LA and City Terrace lack tree equity. We need trees all	1. Comment received.

#	Comment	Response
	<p>streets near and around industrial, freeways, trains, bus stop routes and school routes. Definitely a program with free trees for households. Need more green spaces near freeways, trains and industrial areas. 90063 area</p> <p>2. Need water maintenance from LA County or state federal budget.</p>	<p>2. See response 5 to comment 9.</p>
11	<p>We lack trees in the main Blvd streets, school routes, near freeways, industrial areas, small narrow streets, narrow sidewalks, bus stops and overall East Los Angeles lacks trees. Many areas that had trees were covered with cement (those need to be re install trees) East LA needs trees that can resist pollution, low water maintenance. LA county needs manpower and tree maintenance cost covered. City Terrace 90063 need trees to reduce the redlining impacts of freeways, lack of trees and industrial areas. LA County needs to invest in our community for the well being of their constituents.</p>	<p>Comment received. Page 30 of the CFMP recognizes the need to implement policies to increase equitable access of trees. Page 32-33 discusses historical redlining and the role of depaving to increase canopy cover in high need areas.</p>
12	<p>My community of City Terrace in unincorporated East Los Angeles is in dire need of a built environment supportive of positive health outcomes. I am in support of this plan since it seems to be a thorough plan to only plant more trees where they are needed and the sustainability of the trees growth. The greener our spaces the better our quality of life will be.</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>
13	<p>This is fantastic!</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>
14	<p>This looks like an outstanding plan. I would hope that tree management is planned around bird nesting season - March-Late August. If you are proclaiming these resources are going to help biodiversity and are ecologically beneficial, then there should be priority placed on careful management of these trees. Most songbird species are on a major decline and it would be a shame to provide all of these trees for them to nest in, then trim the trees when nests full of eggs and chicks. Also, I do hope that there is laser focus on planting mostly native trees that are more beneficial to our ecosystem. Thank you.</p>	<p>Comment received. Resources for "Tree Care for Birds and Other Wildlife" were added on the CMFP website. <a href="https://lacountycfmp.org/">https://lacountycfmp.org/</a></p>
15	<p>I'm 100% in favor of the Community Forest Management Plan. I've always appreciated trees for their beauty. But, as summer temps have increased in recent years, I've come to value them even more! I live in a condo and the neighboring property decided to drastically cut back a large, mature tree earlier this month. That tree has provided shade and habitat for wildlife for the 25 years I've lived there. I immediately noticed the difference, with rooms that have never been warm/ stuffy in the spring now that way. I was very relieved when the tree started to show some new growth last week! I'd been concerned the extreme trimming might have taken its toll since it had been trimmed but NEVER to this extreme before.</p> <p>I believe all county residents will positively benefit from the beauty</p>	<p>Comment received. A discussion on the consequences of topping trees was added to the CFMP. The County CFMP website provides resources on proper tree maintenance practices including proper pruning practices. <a href="https://lacountycfmp.org/">https://lacountycfmp.org/</a></p>

#	Comment	Response
	and climate protection of trees. But, they need education on their benefits and how to properly care for them. My neighboring tree was NOT cared for by an arborist and we're lucky it's rebounding.	
16	<p>I would like you to only plant native species with my tax payer money.</p> <p>Leimert Park needs the next generation of Western Sycamore trees. Thank you</p>	Comment received. See response 1 to comment 8.
17	<p>1. We would like to see the Overarching Mission of the Plan Stated before the “Goals” of the document. We believe the mission should be stated as: This Urban Forestry Management Plan will serve to protect, enlarge, and maintain the urban canopy for the beauty, health, biodiversity and public enhancement of the entire County of Los Angeles. The mission of protecting the urban forest seems buried under item 3 of the Goals, p. _____. This should be first up, before the equity piece. Equity is important, but the understanding about the overall mission, should lead.</p> <p>2. Equity should be a thread throughout our city policies, and one of several threads of an urban forest document. The history and background seem too much. The document is too long.</p> <p>3. Further Studies seem to be called for – the time for study is over. The Urban Forest is being depleted, either by development, drought, or city and county neglect, let’s begin on the active part of the plan now.</p> <p>4. Push the funding of seeding many community groups, like VVG, to plant, water and maintain trees in each neighborhood. A county coordinator of such groups should be funded.</p> <p>5. Incomplete and vague language on tree removal.</p> <p>6. Language in this plan does not address one of the major problems – that is that there must be protection of the presently existing canopy from developers, lack of water, enforcement of city and county codes regarding the increase and maintenance of tree canopy (i.e. the LA city rule that each parking lot must have 1 tree for every 4 parking spaces, and 30% coverage after 10 years (sic))</p> <p>7. Applaud the plans use of “depaving” as an action item and this should be emphasized. This term is correct and should be pushed as much as possible in our public spaces, sidewalks, medians, parking lanes, etc.</p> <p>8. Above all, the plan should serve as a ROAD MAP FOR ACTION – without the sizeable amounts of time devoted to “assessment.”</p>	<p>1. Comment Received.</p> <p>2. Comment Received. Page 30 of the CFMP recognizes the need to implement policies to increase equitable access of trees.</p> <p>3. The County is actively pursuing funding and resources for the implementation phase of the CFMP.</p> <p>4. Chapter 5 in the CFMP discusses the County’s commitment to funding and partnerships.</p> <p>5. Comment received.</p> <p>6. See response 5 on comment 8.</p> <p>7. Comment received.</p> <p>8. Comment received.</p>
18	You have failed to account for the impact on trees that is made by private developers on privately owned land. First, without permission, they commonly remove or injure large mature protected trees in order to clear land for large projects. Second,	See response 5 on comment 8.



#	Comment	Response
	<p>they obtain various density and other bonuses, such as reduced setback, and CEQA avoidance, in exchange for including a few so-called affordable units, and they are not required to maintain or replace trees. Third, there is a trade-off (and hard choices) between more housing (which is needed) and more trees (which are needed) that the Plan ignores.</p>	
19	<p>1. There is no mention of tree spacing guidelines. This is important to consider given equity concerns. Also, might want to consider greater consistency across LA County (p. 74 discusses a regional framework for more consistent policies, so spacing guidelines might belong here).</p> <p>2. Why are manufacturing land uses exempt from shade and tree goals since their buildings and huge paved surfaces contribute so much to urban heat island? Where is the discussion of urban heat island within the forest?</p> <p>3. It would be ideal to offer an org chart of all the various departments and positions managing urban forestry at LA County and include the contracting model for services. The public has a hard time understanding the complexity of this system. Let's make it easier for everyone.</p> <p>4. The discussion of tree benefits is fairly broad. The impacts of extreme heat throughout the county are varied from the coast to the desert. The value of shade could be emphasized more specifically in relation to canopy equity, species, spacing and evaluation of whether targets for quantities of trees are appropriate or sufficient. Canopy targets should likely be based on criteria including demographic factors and vulnerability to extreme heat. USC Trees has example criteria, if helpful to share.</p> <p>5. I think the potential need to widen sidewalks should be more directly addressed throughout the document - part of "depaving" might need to include the street (initial results from my research indicate that the sidewalks are more often narrow in Boyle Heights vs. Studio City, limiting the opportunities for large-stature trees within existing sidewalk width). This would also be important to address sidewalk quality issues, which are a greater issue where tree space is constrained, leading to uplift from tree roots. The plan acknowledges on p. 49 that there is minimal room for trees on private property in burdened neighborhoods, so I think part of the discussion should be how do we find that additional space in the public right-of-way.</p> <p>6. Depaving must go hand in hand with proactive future thinking policies that will minimize paving and impermeable surfaces that will create greater opportunities for our community forest. The document seems to avoid questioning the specific policies and practices of our agencies that have led to our over paved land</p>	<p>1. Tree spacing guidelines are provided in the recommended tree species list and are available on the CFMP website. <a href="https://lacountycfmp.org/">https://lacountycfmp.org/</a></p> <p>2. The CFMP uses an "adjusted" canopy cover to focus on the places where people interact with the community forest. Our planting goals are actionable in the "included - community-focused" areas. However, different groups may find other analysis helpful. To allow for additional analysis, raw data will be available on the County GIS data portal.</p> <p>3. Comment received.</p> <p>4. There were many relevant factors to consider for this plan. Additional consideration to factors mentioned is noted in the CFMP.</p> <p>5. Comment received. Page 30 of the CFMP states the County's commitment to increasing equitable access to trees to address historically disinvested areas.</p> <p>6. Comment received. Page 32 highlights the specific practice that have led to current conditions.</p> <p>7. Comment received. Raw data will be available for additional analysis on the County GIS portal.</p> <p>8. Comment received. The CFMP and its actions were developed in</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>surface. Zoning, street design and park planning all have major impacts on the community forest.</p> <p>7. Page 36; This page does an excellent job of outlining that canopy cover is not equally distributed in LA County. It mentions that Hi Vista has 1% compared to East Covina at 58%. Are there additional data points that can help nonprofits and others make the case that canopy coverage runs along racial and economic lines (e.g., figures/graphs that compare the median household income of neighborhoods to canopy cover across LA County). Can we clearly highlight impactful findings (e.g., TreePeople 2016 report stating that 18% of canopy coverage in LA City was in only 5 affluent census tracts where less than 1% of the population lives)? <a href="https://www.treepeople.org/project/latreecanopy-data/">https://www.treepeople.org/project/latreecanopy-data/</a></p> <p>8. Page 48; The format of each action item assigns a lead department and partner departments. There is a lot of discussion throughout the document of collaborating across departments but very few details of how that would actually work - how do you operationalize this desire to collaborate and share resources and knowledge? Having one lead department and multiple supporting might improve the likelihood of implementation and motivate champions within each department rather than diffusion of responsibility.</p> <p>9. What about “depaving” on private property? To my knowledge, programs that exist to change out turf, for example, are rebates, so I think substantial financial outlay is required at the outset. Also, can that money be used for projects that would involve depaving on private property?</p> <p>10. Pg 55; This comment from the community is one of the only places schools are discussed in the entire document. Public school yards seem like a huge opportunity in terms of their area, public function, and the vulnerability of the population they serve, so it seems like this aspect should be considered much more than it is. A lot of federal and state funding is currently being dedicated to school greening projects. Again, p. 89 considers other agencies, like public libraries, but not schools.</p> <p>11. Pg 75; Community has concerns for tree maintenance on private property. Tree pruning in particular is very costly. Might there be an opportunity for publicly-funded tree maintenance on private property for qualifying low-income residents?</p> <p>12. Pg 79; Really interested in how the Department of Public Health is involved in trees day-to-day. Are there additional funding opportunities that are public health-focused rather than specifically tree-focused that might be applied to trees projects?</p>	<p>collaboration with each department mentioned.</p> <p>9. See comment 9, response 5.</p> <p>10. Page 73 addresses the need to collaborate among different landowners, including schools.</p> <p>11. See comment 9, response 5.</p> <p>12. Page 79 states the Department of Public Health’s (DPH) role in community forest planning interventions by supporting policy changes for a healthy built environment. Action 5.1 shows DPH’s role in advancing innovative funding solutions to support the County’s community forestry management needs.</p> <p>13. Comment noted.</p> <p>14. Tree loss is considered in the analysis at 2% mortality of existing trees and 5% mortality of newly planted trees.</p> <p>15. Chapter 2 highlights regional collaborations to address invasive species. Chapter 5 highlights the County’s commitment to funding and partnerships. Action 4.3 states an action to decrease County wood waste sent to landfills by developing a tree debris re-use program for mulch and compost.</p> <p>16. Actions 3.1 and 3.2 state actions to explore and secure permanent funding mechanisms to support ongoing maintenance of both the exiting and expanding tree inventories. Chapter 5 highlights the County’s commitment to funding and partnerships.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>13. Pg 81-82; The plan discusses the problematic nature of using stocking rate as a metric measure given what was already discussed about fewer easy opportunities in low-income neighborhoods, however, those are the only metrics adopted on p. 129. It seems perhaps better to use something like trees per mile of sidewalk.</p> <p>14. Pg 83; It doesn't seem like their budget projections account for tree loss due to age (as our research does). County might consider zero net loss here as they do for parks on p. 87.</p> <p>15. Tree care is very expensive, particularly pruning and invasive species removal. How can we reduce the costs? Can wood re-use help to reduce the cost of waste disposal?</p> <p>16. Pg 83; While the anticipated decline to gas tax revenue is discussed, not addressed are any efforts that might be made at the state or local level to secure similarly consistent (and perhaps greater) funding to take its place. That seems like an important part of long range planning.</p> <p>17. Pg 88; Might be interesting to look at City of Portland tree management - my understanding from a thesis I came across comparing tree management in Seattle and Portland is that Portland has concentrated authority in the Department of Urban Forestry and has managed trees using an updated comprehensive tree code. Tree management in LA County at the moment seems perhaps overly diffuse and while cross-department collaboration is desired, it's unclear how work will be managed between the different silos. I would imagine there should also be cost efficiencies if work were more consolidated and might allow more work in-house vs. being vulnerable to shifting costs over time with respect to contracting work out. Article reference: Clayton, 2016. A Comparative Analysis of Urban Forestry Regimes in Seattle, Washington, and Portland, Oregon. University of Washington, Seattle.</p> <p>18. Pg 98; Can the county partner with LAUSD and LACCD on workforce development, re: use of logs for site furnishings, habitat snags, mulch and other uses?</p> <p>19. Pg 102; The discussion of the role of nurseries does not discuss the private industry risk aversion in growing more species and those that have the greatest value in our forest. The goal of more nursery stock in LA county is interesting and would reduce our carbon footprint in the procurement of trees for the county, but it defies the pattern of land use and nursery operations where many nurseries have consolidated to Riverside and San Diego CA counties.</p>	<p>17. Comment received. Action 3.3 states the potential to share resources with other departments.</p> <p>18. Comment received. Chapter 4 highlights potential partnerships for workforce development. Section 2.4 highlights the need to collaborate with various landowners including schools.</p> <p>19. Comment received. As part of the analysis phase of the CFMP, nursery experts were interviewed to provide insight on stated concerns.</p> <p>20. Comment received.</p> <p>21. See comment 8, response 5.</p> <p>22. Comment received.</p> <p>23. Comment received.</p> <p>24. See comment 9, response 5. Section 3.1 details trees planted in the public right-of-way.</p>



#	Comment	Response
	<p>20. Pg 113; Approaches like cost-benefit analysis and health impact assessments I think are a great idea, but the plan doesn't address any specifics to making those happen. Also, I think any holistic analysis needs to consider the right-of-way and larger design changes (like Complete Streets) rather than focusing on trees in isolation.</p> <p>21. Large tree preservation policies would preserve shade value beyond oak and native tree ordinances.</p> <p>22. Pg 114; With respect to more consistent (non-grant-based) funding sources, is there an opportunity to leverage development investment? Similar to a TIF, but allowing for allocation of improvement funds to qualifying neighborhoods rather than the neighborhood of the development itself?</p> <p>23. Pg 119; In terms of exploring innovative strategies for tree planting opportunities, I would encourage alignment with existing policies around Complete Streets and coordination to address a host of challenges at once rather than addressing trees separate from sidewalks, etc.</p> <p>24. Pg 121; Discuss pilot programs to assist residents with costs and maintenance of trees – I wonder if part of the innovative approach to identifying planting opportunities could be to install city-managed trees in private front yards (where trees would provide sidewalk shading), especially in areas where sidewalk/parkway widths are constrained, essentially creating an interior parkway.</p>	
20	<p>TNC commends the Los Angeles (LA) County Chief Sustainability Office on its development of this comprehensive plan with a focus on equity and climate vulnerability. Because nature protects and fosters life, it should therefore be considered a critical piece of city infrastructure. Thus, we appreciate the framing of the urban community forest as infrastructure.</p> <p>1. While the plan includes actions, targets and a monitoring plan, there is a need to further develop the monitoring plan and provide more details TNC recommends additional clarity about the responsible parties and process for monitoring. It is also not clear how the monitoring will be funded. These will be important components to ensure success of the plan.</p> <p>TNC's comments on Room to Grow are below.</p> <p>2. Biodiversity and native habitat. TNC applauds the LA Chief Sustainability Office for the inclusion of the section on biodiversity and particularly the focus on oak trees (Action 2.1). We recommend the prioritization of the action item: "Explore the development of a biodiversity target for this CFMP" and believe this would strengthen the biodiversity objectives of the plan.</p>	<p>1. Comment received. Implementation plan specified to review actions annually to measure and report on progress.</p> <p>2. Comment received.</p> <p>3. Comment received.</p> <p>4. Comment received.</p> <p>5. Comment received.</p> <p>6. Comment received.</p> <p>7. Comment received. Partnerships are discussed in Chapter 5.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>3. Tree Maintenance over the long-term. We agree with the pursuit of funding to provide establishment care for street trees for three years instead of the minimum 90 days currently in place. We agree that this will help to ensure more survival. For trees on private property, action 1.2 could be more specific to ensure success.</p> <p>4. Climate Change. The plan mentions the impact of climate change and how the urban forest can help the region adapt, for example that “[w]e may lose many of our trees in our communities if we do not prepare our community forest to be resilient to the impacts of climate change. At the same time, a property managed community forest can help increase resiliency of our communities against some of the risks associated with climate change by providing benefits such as shade and cooling, stormwater management, and more.” However, there could be more attention to drought as a climate change stress.</p> <p>5. In addition, action 2.2 regarding wildfires could be strengthened. Distributing educational materials and communication strategies is important but not sufficient to address the risk. While urban trees can be cared for in a way that more wild forests are not, for example using irrigation, it would be a more efficient use of resources if they are as resilient as possible, without intervention, to climate impacts. We believe the plan should address this explicitly. For example, the plan describes trees that are “climate appropriate,” but it would be better to see a specific definition of “climate appropriate” that includes future climate scenarios and not just current conditions. We recommend adding a research goal of identifying which species and genotypes are future-adapted.</p> <p>6. Action 4.2 describes the need for nurseries, local suppliers, and improved supply chain, and should also include a specific note about ensuring the supply of trees that are future-adapted.</p> <p>7. Community participation and direct impacts. Community engagement includes incorporating community expertise about the issues at hand, and integrating diverse world views and relationships to nature and water specifically. Information sharing is a two-way street and Los Angeles County agencies can benefit and learn from the profound nature-related connections and knowledge that diverse communities have. Capacity-building is an important piece of community engagement, and we encourage Los Angeles County to continue listening and supporting local communities. TNC commends the LA County Chief Sustainability Office for their efforts to date and plants to continue to engage with tribes and local communities.</p> <p>8. Funding and budget. Securing ongoing funding to support the plan will be at the heart of its success. Though there is an action item (5.1) that identifies the need for additional funding, this could use more specificity of how this will occur.</p>	<p>8. Comment received.</p> <p>9. Comment received.</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>9. On page 83, the plan describes the budget for establishment of new trees going down over time. While we understand that LA County has budget constraints, we hope that the LA County Chief Sustainability Office will continue to increase targets going forward to support people, wildlife and ecosystems.</p>	
21	<p>1. Permanent establishment care period of five (5) years not three (3). This policy change would enhance the survivability of trees especially during extreme climatic activity;</p> <p>2. The shortening of the maintenance and pruning schedule from seven (7) years to five (5). This policy adjustment would increase the health of mature trees and contribute to their long-term vitality and preservation; and</p> <p>3. Creating punitive actions for the unauthorized removal of protective trees species and/or significant trees.</p>	<p>1. Comment received.</p> <p>2. Comment received.</p> <p>3. See comment 8, response 5.</p>
22	<p>The CFMP should prioritize and place a greater emphasis on connecting youth to workforce development and mentorship opportunities and focus this effort as a near-term, First Step Action Item rather than a Long-term Item, as it is currently listed. According to the LA County Youth Climate Priorities Report, 91% of youth feel they are being impacted by climate change and 87% are either already taking part in climate action or are looking for ways to do so. The CFMP needs to place a more urgent emphasis on youth, many of whom are looking for ways to connect to climate action, and 37% explicitly expressing a desire to be engaged in youth-focused green jobs training and opportunities. The CFMP's purpose is to "...provide guidance relevant to the entire LA region so that everyone can share the benefits of trees today and for generations to come." To achieve this, the CFMP must not overlook the power and impact of LA County youth in carrying out and implementing this plan in the years to come.</p>	<p>Comment received. Action item moved to earlier timeline.</p>
23	<p>1. Within the document, the terms "groundsman" and "foreman" are used. We suggest replacing those with gender-neutral terms.</p> <p>2. Where possible, we suggest labeling photos with locations, so that readers can see examples of existing parks and landscapes with exemplary trees.</p> <p>3. On page 59, the document shows five native species of trees under the title "Native Tree Species of LA County." In order to make sure the reader understands there are many other native tree species to choose from, we suggest using the title "Selected Native Trees Species of LA County."</p>	<p>1. "Groundsman" was changed to "Groundsperson" and "Foreman" changed was to "Tree Care Crew Leader."</p> <p>2. Captions with locations for all photos were added to the CFMP.</p> <p>3. Title of page 59 was changed to "Selected Native Tree Species of LA County."</p>

#	Comment	Response
	<p>4. On page 62, the document uses the terms “well-watered,” which may cause confusion. We suggest the term “sufficiently watered” replace this.</p> <p>5. On page 62, the sentence "These conditions, combined with the accumulation of vegetation in forested areas resulting from broad fire suppression over the past 150 years, increases the risk of more extreme, and more dangerous, fire conditions” may create a misunderstanding for readers in the context of the different fire regimes and drivers in forest versus the chaparral dominated landscapes that are prevalent in LA County. We suggest revising this sentence with the following: "These conditions, combined with much higher levels of human ignitions in chaparral, increase the risk of more frequent, extreme, and dangerous fires."</p> <p>6. In several areas, the document discusses tree maintenance. We believe that this issue is paramount to successful stewardship of the urban forest. There are many examples of trees that have been topped or pruned in destructive ways throughout the County, on public and private lands. This issue can cause tree failure, shade reduction and loss of biodiversity, all of which come at a cost to residents of the County. We suggest further highlighting of the current risks of uncertified tree crews pruning many trees in the urban forest. As laid out in the report, increasing training opportunities for arboriculture workers is an important step, but there may be other incentives for the County to improve maintenance of mature trees. This could include exploring pathways to increase International Society of Arborists (ISA) certification for tree crews working on private lands. Institutional understanding and support from government agencies on pruning for tree health (e.g. minimizing topping and large mid branch cuts) on rights of way and municipal landscapes would also improve this situation.</p>	<p>4. Comment received. Text on page 62 was modified to address comment.</p> <p>5. Comment received. Text on page 62 was modified to address comment</p> <p>6. See comment 9, response 7.</p>
24	<p>I'm looking forward to seeing more trees in our communities as it helps with the quality of life overall. There are so many benefits on so many levels; mentally, emotionally, aesthetically etc. I'm please to see that this is a program that is in place to bring to our communities which will make a huge difference overall.</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>
25	<p>Why hold it?</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>