

Communication from Public

Name: Cindy Rosene

Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 08:02 PM

Council File No: 22-1469

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of the motion to use ONLY native plants in all city sponsored landscaping, with the exception of projects where food is being grown to feed people, or at athletic fields. Native plants increase biodiversity, attract a wide range of pollinators, birds and other animals, and are adapted to survive with minimal watering needs once established. Native plants thrive without the use of toxic chemicals or fertilizers, and provide habitat for many animal species that were once in abundance in the LA Basin. There has been tremendous loss of habitat in our city, due to development and paving over of the landscape. That said, there is plenty of green space even in humble areas, like traffic medians, that would greatly benefit both humans and wildlife if planted with native plants. Areas that are planted with natives abound with wildlife, and use minimal resources like precious water. Please pass this motion!

Communication from Public

Name: Lindsay Kerns

Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 08:53 PM

Council File No: 22-1469

Comments for Public Posting: As a gardener and native plant enthusiast, I am very happy to see movement from the Council in support of native drought-tolerant plants, and I strongly applaud your push to encourage desperately-needed biodiversity in our local environment. However, in my opinion, the motion as written lacks some nuance, and the proposed outright ban on the sale and planting of non-native plants in 2025 may not actually be as climate conscious as many might assume. Because our climate has already changed and is currently changing still, many local landscape designers recommend a combination of native AND certain non-native plants that are climate-appropriate -- many from Mediterranean climates, which are better suited to survive Los Angeles heat waves (which, as we all know, will only intensify with climate change). Some of these non-native plants can be even more drought-resilient than our own "native" riparian and shade plants -- and allowing for a certain proportion of appropriate non-native plants can be another way to promote biodiversity. Rather than outright banning non-native plants, I encourage you to revise the motion with more allowance for nuance and informed climate-conscious planting. Especially in regards to the proposed ban, I encourage you to ask: instead of relying on a ban, how can we instead educate and encourage Los Angelenos to plant (and -- crucially -- to tend for) both native and non-native drought-tolerant plants, creating a local culture that celebrates biodiversity and adapts wisely to our warming climate? In other words, can we find a way to frame this adaptation as something to **support**, rather than something to **oppose**? I think that would do a lot to build community buy-in and enthusiasm -- which will be crucial in our journey toward collective climate resilience. Thank you for your work on this issue, and for giving it some more thought. Sincerely, Lindsay Kerns

Communication from Public

Name: Sean McMillan

Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 09:28 PM

Council File No: 22-1469

Comments for Public Posting: I AM COMPLETELY IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION AS WRITTEN: The City has prioritized the protection of biodiversity for most of the last decade through the recruitment <>fa Biodiversity Expert Panel, made up of scientists, researchers, professors and practitioners from the various world-class universities and organizations around Los Angeles. The Bureau of Sanitation has led the Expert Panel in the creation of an LA City Biodiversity Index to count and account for the plants, animals and insects that inhabit the region, and to better prioritize their protection, especially from City-related activities. Yet, the Los Angeles region faces a biodiversity crisis wherein over 90% of local butterflies, songbirds, and other pollinators have disappeared in the last century, driven by the heretofore unconscious replacement of local native flora with non-native plant and tree species. The City is aware that addressing our local biodiversity crisis is necessary as part of any larger effort to address climate change risks to human health and the long tenn habitability of our city. Now through the work ofthe Biodiversity Experts, the City more fully understands the impacts of its choices, particularly landscaping choices, on the region's future biological health. As many Angelenos experienced during the COVID lockdown, such nature-based activities as seeing butterflies and hearing songbirds have been linked to human health benefits such as lower blood pressure and an increased sense of well-being and overall happiness. California native landscaping plants and trees can thrive in our urban environment and furnish all the benefits non-native plants and trees can offer in tenus of canopy shade to offset the heat island effect, beauty, and shade comfort for humans, while being low in maintenance costs, yet native plant and tree species provide the only true path to regional climate resilience for biodiversity, water and energy savings, and the elimination of soil amendment runoff pollution. There are abundant and sufficient California native plant and tree options for every ornamental landscaping application in Los Angeles, including more than 30 California native tree species already on the City of Los Angeles Approved Street Tree List and over 500 California native drought tolerant plants that have been adopted into horticulture trade to fill every landscaping niche for size, shape, color, fragrance, bloom season, and beauty. California

native plant and tree species present an underutilized opportunity to foster local identity, embrace the Indigenous, geographical and cultural heritage of Los Angeles, and continue the City's trajectory of biodiversity leadership in a time of mass extinctions ..

Communication from Public

Name: Adrian Chi Tenney

Date Submitted: 11/29/2022 06:35 PM

Council File No: 22-1469

Comments for Public Posting: I am a landscape designer who designs (mostly) residential gardens with a majority of California native plants. I always advocate for native plants because of the wildlife habitat they provide, and because of their inherent low-maintenance (when planted in their ideal conditions). I agree we should be changing City policies to support the sales, planting, and cultivation of native plants. However, this issue has complexities which I do not yet see reflected in the motion as written. Starting with the proposal to "ban the sale of non-native plants and trees by 2025". There are plenty of non-native plants that are climate-appropriate, and many from Mediterranean climates around the world that are more suited to survive Los Angeles heat waves, and require less water than our own "native" riparian and shade plants. Second, if we simply ban plants that are culturally relevant to immigrant populations Los Angeles loses something that makes it incredibly awesome. There's so much beauty and diversity in people's front yards. This biodiversity provides important habitat to pollinators already, whereas monocultural, water-intensive lawns provide little habitat. A ban on non-natives will not address this issue. It will actually remove biodiversity from Los Angeles residential landscapes. Third, the section specifying "except in situations where plants and trees are designed to produce food for human consumption" raises many questions. Who is making the list of plants that are used for human consumption? How is this enforced? Are people going to have to prove that the plants they brought from Central America (that we might call "weeds" here) are "for human consumption"? A policy like this has the potential to become something that in the end, does not support biodiversity, but actually turns into more monoculture which is what we are trying to avoid. We need to introduce legislation that gives people incentives to sell, plant, and cultivate natives? Rather than jumping to banning and restrictions? Furthermore, the climate science is saying we should be planting more species that currently thrive in regions south of Los Angeles. A lot of our natives, like our beloved Coast Live Oak, *Quercus agrifolia*, aren't going to survive the extreme heat of the coming decades. Rather than introducing sweeping bans on non-natives, I urge the Councilmembers to revise the motion to instead encourage the sale, planting, and cultivation of native plants and trees. I believe

it is critical that we emphasize long-term cultivation in any legislation changes and make it easy for members of the public to take care of their native trees, not just plant them. Trees should be adopted the way animals are adopted, they need long-term care and the public should experience caring for native plants not as a burden, but as something joyful, meaningful, and fulfilling for generations to come. Thank you, Adrian Tenney, ASLA
Landscape Designer at Terremoto Landscape