COMMUNITY FOREST ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CFAC)  
BAT (Building Around Trees) Ad hoc Subcommittee  
MINUTES for THURSDAY, January 27, 2021, 3pm – 5 pm PT (virtual)

CFAC Members: Isabelle Duvivier (ID), Shelley Billik (SB), Joanne D'Antonio (JD)  
Other participants (partial list): Stephen DuPrey, Jeanne McConnell, Hugh Kenny, Sarah Wauters,  
Rachel Malarich, Erin H., Dr. Tom Williams, Ann Rubin 

Common acronyms - American Institute of Architects (AIA), Best Management Practices (BMPs), Board of Public Works (BPW), Department of Building & Safety (LADBS) Bureau of Street Services (BSS), Department of City Planning (DCP), City Planning Commission (CPC), Dept. of Water & Power (DWP), LA Sanitation (LASAN), Neighborhood Council (NC), Recreation & Parks (RAP), Public Right of Way (PROW) Santa Monica Mts. Conservancy (SMMC), Urban Forestry Division (UFD aka UF), City Forest Officer (CFO), Contract Administration (Con Ad). 

1. Meeting called to order at 3:04 by Chair ID; Determination of a quorum (2); Welcoming remarks: ID presented a Building of the Month: on Lincoln Blvd. by KFA Architects. Large sycamore shown in the corner of the plaza. This will be a monthly feature and members are encouraged to suggest good examples of BAT. 

Roll call by LK, Determination of a quorum 

2. Approval of December Minutes - Move to approve as corrected, Moved by ID, seconded by SB passed unanimously. 

3. General Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items - none 

4. New Business (Discussion, Motion and Possible Action)  
   A. Draft Guidelines for PROW tree protection during construction- Rachel Malarich, Report back as requested by Commissioner Villegas (BPW Commissioner) on construction guidelines to prevent tree damage during construction. Municipal code currently prohibits storing of construction materials and equipment that might damage any tree or shrub. UFD had prepared a draft document in 2005. In PROW it is not possible to fence off around the drip line or 5-10’ beyond without obstructing sidewalk and entering private property and crossing multiple jurisdictions. Trenching is involved. Goals to require notification of UFD, protection of roots, trunks, branches, soil compaction, toxic materials on soil. Tree Disclosure Form and Tree Report with protection plan will start the process. Looking at points in the permit process, bonding for value of tree, types of fencing, mulching recommendations. Current fine and fee structure is not a good deterrent. Looking at the possibility of a stop work order with the City Attorney. Some initial measures may be implemented before all enforcement is in place. Some communications campaigns being explored, can work with the Enforcement Committee. Recommendations likely in March. CFAC comments: bond and stop work order could be effective deterrents. Comments about fencing & mulch could be best practices. Would like the building inspector to report obvious violations like fencing down or equipment parked under trees. Municipal code of tree protection needs to be on plans and could be a quick first step: LAMC 62.174: No person shall pile building material, or other material, about any tree, plant or shrub in any street in any
manner that will in any way injure such tree, plant or shrub. Community comment: NY has a strong cultural valuation of trees. LA needs a cultural change. A: Some cultural shift is being seen in LA due to the BPW stance supporting tree preservation. SD: temporary fencing gets moved out of the way, steel fencing, standard plans are needed and can be enforced by Con Ad. Small steps would be good. Valuation of trees is key; replacements with 36” box are seen as the cost of doing business.

B. Early notice for planning cases - SB: There is a way to sign up for planning cases, but limited volunteer time to search all cases throughout the city is a problem. Members could search their own areas. This is not CFAC’s role although CFAC has reviewed many projects if brought to our attention by community members. See: https://planning.lacounty.gov/interpretations. CFAC has been criticized for not reviewing projects. Need a full time paid staff member in UFD or LADBS looking at tree removals prior to project design. Significant Tree protection is needed; sometimes clear cutting occurs prior to design. Lack of CFAC opposition has been interpreted as support. Community Comment: SD: 3 UFD staff attended a community meeting last night and saw the value of outreach.

C. Strategies for getting tree-acknowledgement support at LADBS - ID: as a member of AIA ID has attended presentations for execs at LADBS and felt that there was no response. Tree locations should be required on checklists and plans. Many tree removals go past LADBS. Some changes could be done as practice. A regular LADBS rep of higher level at CFAC would be valuable CFAC comments: JD reported violation of an old ordinance requiring a tree in the front yard - response was that this is not a safety issue. Her NC (Valley Glen) is taking a position asking for enforcement.

5. Old Business (Discussion, Motion and Possible Action)

A. SB 9 and Tree Language in the Koretz Motion - SB every local jurisdiction is passing resolutions on how to implement state law. Koretz motion only has some tree replacement language and “up to 4 ft. setback” which is inadequate. Most urban trees are on private land. Proposed language and diagrams were drafted by Jeanne & ID, showing stepbacks and requiring 8% of parcel area for trees. Language was circulated and endorsed by TreePeople & other non-profits and language added to get endorsements. CFAC comment: inch per inch replacement doesn’t seem feasible; requiring a large native shade tree (per CNPS) may limit choices to sycamores and may lead to pushback. Could eliminate some tree constraints - allow smaller natives. More aggressive replacement may spur preservation. RM: large tree needs to be 10’ from building; conservation easement or guaranteed tree fees for land purchasing may be helpful. Community comment: SD: inch per inch would require 20 trees to replace a 10” tree. In lieu tree fee could help. Conservation easements or hedgerows of natives are options. Parking lots are required to have 1 tree per 4 spaces and 50% shade within 10 years but they are pruned to nothing. Non-native trees could be considered. Next Steps: to circulate to more agencies and organizations, goal to add to council file as a CFAC public comment. Council revisions would be likely. Landscape ordinance/parking lot requirements need a review. Thanks to ID, JM, and SB for very thoughtful work.

B. Proposed New On-line Permitting System - more info needed, plans with BuildLA, opportunity to insert Tree Disclosure Form

C. Tree Disclosure form - postponed

D. Downtown Community Plan, CPC Response Letter, other Community Plans - postponed
E. Venice Community Plan - postponed

6. Announcements - none

Meeting adjourned at 4:59.

Next Monthly CFAC Meeting: Thursday, February 3, 1:00-3:00 pm, via Zoom
Next Monthly Policy Meeting: Thursday, February 10, 2022, 1:00-3:00 pm, via Zoom
Next Monthly BAT Meeting: Thursday, February 24, 2022, 3:00-5:00 pm., via Zoom

Minutes prepared by: Lynnette Kampe