



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-1141

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, kay.hartman@palmsnc.la

Mon, Dec 1, 2025 at 9:29 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Palms

Name: Kay Hartman

Email: kay.hartman@palmsnc.la

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(5) Nay(0) Abstain(2) Ineligible(3) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 11/05/2025

Type of NC Board Action: For if Amended

Impact Information

Date: 12/02/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-1141

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary:



CIS Against Unless Amended CF25-1141.pdf

56K

This is another well-intended council motion that wants to promote shade canopy. Increasing shade canopy in Los Angeles is a cost effective and important mitigation for climate change and supports making Los Angeles a more livable city. However, we are also in a climate-driven biodiversity crisis of emergency proportions. CF25-1141 makes no mention of this or the essential role of planting native tree species to support biodiversity. Furthermore, it promotes the fiction of “climate-adapted” exotic tree species. A tree species that evolved in a foreign ecosystem somewhere else in the world that has similar temperature and weather conditions to Los Angeles does not mean that in recent years this species has magically evolved adaptations to support our local ecosystem which evolved through millions of years with complicated interdependent flora-fauna relationships.

Native trees are just as capable of meeting Los Angeles’ tree canopy goals but also provide critical biodiversity that non-native trees can never provide. Despite this, LA City departments and community organizations do not prioritize native species and instead promote a “right tree for the right place” approach that is a euphemism for continuing to plant the same 25 non-native (to California) tree species planted around the world in urban forests. BSS Urban Forestry in particular continues to perpetuate the myth that nearly all California native tree species are somehow less durable for City use in their natural geographical home than exotic tree species that evolved in forests elsewhere in the world. There is no peer-reviewed scientific evidence to support this position, and native plant organizations have demonstrated that when managed properly, survival rates for native tree species are higher than the non-native species the City typically plants.

We simply cannot afford to launch yet another tree planting program in Los Angeles that adds even more exotic species to our public spaces when native fauna relies on native flora in a biodiversity crisis located in one of the most important biodiversity hotspots on the planet. We currently have only 3% native species street trees and under 25% native species park trees. Scientific consensus confirms that a region needs a minimum of 70% native flora to support local biodiversity in an urban forest. With over 90 native tree species available for use as street trees identified by a team of experts led by the Los Angeles Community Forest Advisory Committee, there is no need to ever plant a non-native tree in a public project in Los Angeles. We have a great opportunity to address both shade and biodiversity. Without changes to CF25-1141 to require BSS Urban Forestry to recommend exclusively native species, the City will address the shade crisis while making the biodiversity crisis worse. We urge the council to specify that report backs and subsequent plantings should consist of 100% California native species.

Another impediment to achieving the shade canopy Angelenos deserve is the destruction of mature trees that happens during redevelopment of residential and commercial spaces. Most importantly, the preservation of existing canopy must be prioritized as part of any City Council motion to increase shade canopy in Los Angeles. To provide ample shade when planting new trees, we need to plant trees in the ground, yet developers have sometimes been allowed to

count small trees in containers towards landscaping requirements. Planting of large canopy trees often becomes impossible because subterranean structures are built to the property boundaries and there is no room for tree roots. Thus far, Los Angeles has resisted technologies such as Silva Cells that create opportunities for larger canopy trees in soil that has been disturbed and compacted by development. Many native tree species are downwards rooters that can be particularly successful in smaller planting areas if compaction is addressed. Discussing new canopy without addressing development's role in reducing existing canopy and future canopy opportunities is looking at one side of the coin when both sides are critical. CF25-1141 should request report backs on the role mature tree preservation, Silva Cells, and subterranean setbacks can play in any city effort aimed at increasing canopy.