



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM

Report: Update on the State of the Urban Forest

1. Ordinance Amending Portions of Chapters 12.40 and 12.44 of the Glendale Municipal Code to Update Standards and Implement Greater Enforcement Mechanisms for Public and Indigenous Tree Protection
2. Ordinance Amending Portions of Titles 16 and 30 of the Glendale Municipal Code Regarding Tree-Related Zoning Provisions
3. Resolution Adding and Modifying Administrative Citation Fines in the Citywide Fee Schedule for Enforcement of the Public Tree and Indigenous Tree Ordinances

COUNCIL ACTION

Item Type: Action Item

Approved for March 28, 2023 **calendar**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At four City Council meetings between 2021 and 2022, the Public Works Department presented information regarding the state of Glendale's urban forest. At these meetings, the City Council expressed interest in a new ordinance amending the Glendale Municipal Code relating to trees. This report describes this proposed ordinance, proposed fee structure to enforce the ordinance and provides an update on city's tree planting efforts towards the 25% citywide tree canopy goal.

The city currently protects any tree within the city's right-of-way, and six species of private indigenous trees, under its Street Tree Ordinance (GMC 12.40) and the Indigenous Tree Ordinance (GMC 12.44), both of which are administered by the Public Works Department. Additionally, portions of Chapters 16 (Subdivisions) and 30 (Zoning) have requirements concerning protected city and private trees, and give Public Works oversight over the landscape design of trees within new parking lots.

COUNCIL PRIORITIES

Environmental Stewardship: Enhancing protections of existing trees within Glendale helps the city meet its 25% canopy goal and assist with climate action due to trees' positive impact on health, pollution reduction, and water savings.

Mobility/Connectivity/Safety: Shade from trees encourages use of public sidewalks, and trees help to calm vehicular traffic.

Infrastructure: Trees are the only public infrastructure that increase in value with age with proper and regular maintenance.

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council introduce an Ordinance amending the Glendale Municipal Code (GMC) to revise the existing Street Tree Ordinance into a “Public Tree” Ordinance, and revising both Public Tree and Indigenous Tree code language to more effectively protect trees, as well as amending these tree-related codes to align with current city policy and practice. Also, that the Council introduce an Ordinance to simultaneously clean up portions of Titles 16 and 30 to match the other tree-related code modifications and update zoning and subdivision standards in line with current practice. Additionally, that the Council approve a Resolution Adding and Modifying Administrative Citation Fines in the Citywide Fee Schedule for Enforcement of the proposed Public Tree and Indigenous Tree Ordinances.

BACKGROUND

In early 2021, the City Council requested a report on the current state of the urban forest. Over four City Council meetings on May 18 and September 21, 2021, and March 1 and September 27, 2022, staff provided information on aspects of public tree maintenance and tree protection ordinances. Staff recommended a 10-year planting program to return our public tree canopy to previous levels. The City Council provided direction to expand the tree planting program significantly to meet a new 25% citywide tree canopy goal, and allocated funding for this program. This program is currently underway. Council Members also expressed interest in potential tree ordinance modifications. Council requested staff return with a report proposing an expansion of protections for public and private trees.

In addition to the proposed expansion of protections, Public Works staff worked with Community Development Department to review Titles 16 (Subdivisions) and 30 (Zoning) to ensure consistency with existing street and indigenous tree ordinances, inclusive of the parking lot code. The Planning Commission reviewed and approved these code modifications on February 1, 2023.

ANALYSIS

Update on the State of the Urban Forest

The City’s Annual Reforestation Program has undergone significant expansion since the first report on the state of the urban forest. In 2021, Public Works planted 300 trees annually as budget and weather permitted.

Based on Council’s direction and appropriated funds, Public Works now plans to plant 750 trees annually under the regular planting program, with an emphasis on increasing tree canopy in areas with the lowest current density. This approach is in line with our 10-year planting plan to return city tree canopy levels to that of 2010. As such, tree planting locations are now selected based on the following criteria:

1. Resident requests for new tree locations (approximately 50 annually)
2. Locations where a tree was removed in the current or previous fiscal year (approximately 450 annually)
3. Census tracts with lowest current tree canopy coverage, with priority to arterial streets, bus stops, proximity to freeways, and areas with large gaps between trees (approximately 250 annually)

In addition to the 750 trees planted as part of the regular planting program, staff is currently finishing 600 Measure S funded plantings, as well as 500 trees from the Cal Fire planting grant. In sum, we anticipate at least of 1,850 new trees across city streets and parks. In FY 2023-24, if funding allows, we anticipate planting at least 1,500 trees. This effort includes a California Department of Transportation grant funded project to plant 750 additional trees across four census tracts in addition to the regular planting program. In subsequent years, staff will continue to target specific census tracts for planting programs. This targeted approach has the added benefit efficiency for inspections, watering and maintenance. Table 1 below details Public Works plans for reforestation for the next nine fiscal years.

Table 1: Non-Grant Public Works Targeted Reforestation Plantings

	Replacement Trees (citywide)	Resident Requests (citywide)	Targeted Replanting	Targeted Census Tract (Maintenance District)	2021 estimated canopy % in tract
FY 22-23	450	50	250	3016.01 (9/10/11/LLD)	11.11%
FY 23-24	450	50	250	3023.01 & 3018.02 (8)	11.97% & 12.00%
FY 24-25	450	50	250	3024.01 (1)	12.37%
FY 25-26	450	50	250	3020.02 & 3022.01 (3/7)	13.35% & 13.66%
FY 26-27	450	50	250	3020.03 & 3020.04 (3)	14.24% & 16.13%
FY 27-28	450	50	250	3025.04 & 3025.05 (1/2)	14.45% & 14.98%
FY 28-29	450	50	250	3012.04 & 3018.01 (8/9)	15.09% & 15.13%
FY 29-30	450	50	250	3017.02 & 3017.01 (8/9)	15.23% & 18.89%
FY 30-31	450	50	250	3015.02 & 3016.02 (10/11/LLD)	18.48% & 20.36%

A map showing the targeted census tracts and estimated year in which planting will occur is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

Staff estimates 450 trees are removed annually due to death, decline, or structural hazard and staff makes every effort to prioritize replacement in the nearest planting season. This loss partially offsets the benefits from annual new trees planted.

The city's tree maintenance contractor provides a 3-month warranty period for newly planted trees, which includes watering services. Following a tree passing the warranty inspection, it is watered weekly and will be properly maintained under the Tree Maintenance program for five-years. This is the optimal watering and maintenance cycle to protect the city's substantial investment in new trees.

Tree Wells

The possibility of constructing new trees wells was discussed during previous City Council meetings; however, an appropriation for this potential program has not yet been brought to the City Council for consideration. Staff will continue to look for grants and other funding opportunities and will continue our standard practice of including requirements for private development or city projects to include the creation of new cutouts and tree plantings.

Introduction of Revised Ordinances Regulating Public and Indigenous Trees

Staff identified shortcomings and language outdated by the advance of arboricultural science in the current city code. Additionally, staff reviewed multiple ordinance options, with the aim to improve enforceability, close loopholes or clarify opaque sections, address inconsistencies between code chapters, and expand tree protections. Moreover, the City Council has articulated an interest in protecting more trees using the ordinance, without requiring a significant increase in city resources. Staff has prepared proposed modifications to GMC 12.40 and 12.44 accordingly. Additionally, staff reviewed relevant sections of Titles 16 and 30 in collaboration with the Community Development Department to correct minor discrepancies within those codes, and to improve GMC 30.32 concerning private parking lot trees.

The proposed changes to the city's tree protection ordinance are intended to accomplish three goals: (1) update language to be consistent across both ordinances and current city practice; (2) clarify grey areas within the ordinances; and (3) allow stronger protections to trees currently protected, and include all city-owned trees under these protections. These modifications are intended to support and grow the urban tree canopy and not burden property owners and residents with new excessive requirements.

These proposed modifications incorporated feedback from staff, residents, arborists professionals, neighboring communities' ordinances, and the City Council. These changes are not expected to increase staff time required for program administration or enforcement, and may streamline some processes.

Modifications to the Subdivision and Zoning codes are minor, but important. The proposed modifications to Titles 16 and 30 are intended to accomplish two goals: (1) update language to be consistent across city ordinances related to trees, and (2) improve and expand the species able to be planted within parking lots; both without increasing

workload for applicants or city staff.

Street Tree Ordinance, Glendale Municipal Code 12.40

Substantive changes to the Street Tree Ordinance involve the following:

- Expands existing street tree protections to trees located within city parks, lots, open spaces, and other various city-owned properties that were formerly maintained by Community Services and Parks.
- Ensures definitions and word choice are consistent between both tree ordinances, and with current arboricultural language and science.
- Provides specific examples for permit requirements and prohibitions and provides additional protections that are currently enforced but not specifically codified.
- Expands violation classes to empower city staff to utilize more moderate citation levels for instances where a tree is damaged but not destroyed, primarily utilizing the Citywide Fee Schedule rather than restitution or civil penalties.
- Provides option for in-lieu tree replacement in cases where a tree cannot be planted in the same location, for permitted or unpermitted removals.

Indigenous Tree Ordinance, Glendale Municipal Code 12.44

Modifications proposed to the Indigenous Tree Ordinance include the following:

- Clarify language regarding pest infestations and the standard for treatment.
- Update language to fit current arboricultural standards and assert non-liability in line with codes from comparable municipalities.
- Sets a minimum standard replacement tree size at 24" box container size and planting methods for most situations.
- Omits references to dollar amount penalties, instead referencing the Citywide Fee Schedule.

Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 16, Subdivisions

Changes proposed to Chapter 16 include the following:

- Corrects the incorrect minimum tree trunk diameter previously codified. In Glendale, indigenous trees are protected at 6" trunk diameter, not 8" as written in Title 16. Staff believes this 8" diameter reference is an oversight, related to a reference of 8" multi-stem diameter trees in GMC 12.44.
- Insert reference to GMC 12.44 and the additional requirements when plans depict protected trees.

Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 30, Zoning

There are few substantive changes proposed to Zoning codes. Modifications proposed include the following:

- Enhancement and expansion of the species list for parking lot tree planting, in line with city policy on best planting practice and to ensure climate-appropriate trees are being planted. The current codified list includes species now inappropriate for

Glendale's climate and cultivars of species that are difficult to locate, thus artificially limiting the species palette. Expanding this list is achieved by not codifying the species list as it is currently, but instead aligning it with the species found in the city's Designated Street Tree list, which is maintained by the Public Works Department as part of the city's Community Forest Management Plan. This consists of over 100 appropriate species and will soon be available on the city's website, following conclusion of this process. All species on the city's list are at least 25' tall at maturity.

- Correction where trunk diameter for protected trees was codified as 8".
- Clarification that applicants must depict tree on plans per GMC 12.40 and 12.44.
- A suggestion to change applicant consideration of preservation of existing trees from 'should' to 'shall' per Sustainability Commission recommendation.

Chapters 16 and 30 were presented to the Planning Commission at their February 1, 2023 meeting, and their adoption was recommended to Council.

Tree replacement and in-lieu fees, Street and Indigenous Tree Ordinances

In many cities, when a tree is approved for removal, and a city determines that on-site replacement is not possible due to various factors, applicants have the option to pay a fee for off-site tree replacement. Currently, there is no such option for Glendale within the Street Tree Ordinance, though the proposed modifications would rectify this.

The Indigenous Tree Ordinance does provide an in-lieu fee option, though with tree replacement to occur on city property. The Citywide Fee Schedule includes five fees for varying sizes of replacement tree, which are current based on outdated contract amounts. These should be updated based on actual cost for the city or its contractors to procure and install a replacement indigenous tree. At present these fees range from a 15-gallon tree at \$102, to \$2,616 for a 60" box tree, and are based on the cost of the current Tree Maintenance Services contract unit price. Public Works proposes updating this portion of the Citywide Fee Schedule to match current cost to the City, as well as update the language to be inclusive of both the proposed Street and existing Indigenous Tree in lieu functions, as the cost to the city is the same regardless of tree species to be planted, and all plantings would be on city property.

Table 2: Current Citywide Fee Schedule and Proposed

Service Title	Current Fees	Proposed Service Title	Proposed Fees
Indigenous Tree Fees in Public Works Tree Installation Fees 15 Gallon tree	\$102.00	Public Works Tree Installation Fee – 15 gallon tree	\$180.00
Indigenous Tree Fees in Public Works Tree Installation Fees 24 Inch Box Tree	\$102.00	Public Works Tree Installation Fee – 24 inch box tree	\$390.00
Indigenous Tree Fees in Public Works Tree Installation Fees 36 Inch Box Tree (City Staff Install)	\$1,571.00	Public Works Tree Installation Fee – 36 inch box tree	\$1,200.00

Indigenous Tree Fees in Public Works Tree Installation Fees 48 Inch Box Tree (City Staff Install)	\$2,100.00	Public Works Tree Installation Fee – 48 inch box tree	\$1,950.00
Indigenous Tree Fees in Public Works Tree Installation Fees 60 Inch Box Tree (City Staff Install)	\$2,616.00	Public Works Tree Installation Fee – 60 inch box tree	\$5,950.00

In-lieu fees for replacement trees are rare; the city currently plants at least 30 indigenous trees annually within its rights-of-way as required by the Greener Glendale Plan, which typically exceeds off-site mitigation requirements from permitted removals. Public Works can incentivize on-site tree replacement by waiving permit fees in cases of hazard trees, if the tree owner agrees to plant on site.

Other cities use different approaches. For example, Pasadena's in-lieu fee is based on the industry-standardized appraisal value of the trees in question, which most cities utilize. These values may range from a few hundred dollars, to tens of thousands of dollars for mature, healthy specimens. The intent of a standardized appraisal is to determine the current value of a tree, based on its condition (structure, health, and form), functional and external limitations (positive or negative limitations associated with tree and its location on a property), and depreciation based on the previous aspects.

The appraisal value is typically determined by a private arborist hired by the tree owner. On the other hand, Sacramento-area municipalities base in-lieu fees on the same tree appraisal principals, but these jurisdictions created a formula that does not require appraisals from private arborists. Yet other cities, including Glendale, simply require a flat fee based on the cost to replant one tree.

Staff recommends the City Council consider moving away from a tree appraisal method, and instead establish set amounts in the Citywide Fee Schedule. The Glendale Municipal Code allows for non-exclusive penalties, meaning illegal tree removals can result in denial of construction permits, holds on development, and replacement tree requirements or in-lieu fees, on top of restitution fees. Staff also recommends that the city adopt the same in-lieu ability and fee schedule for city trees, as currently there is no mechanism within the Street Tree Ordinance.

Council had also expressed interest in expanding private tree protection to other, non-indigenous trees if over certain large trunk sizes, based on Public Works' previous report on private tree protection, and specifically to allow for collection of in-lieu fees for unauthorized removals. Staff recommends strengthening existing ordinances for existing protected public and private trees, rather than expanding special protection to additional tree classes or species. However, should Council wish to pursue these protections, staff recommends protections that mirror those of the Indigenous Tree Ordinance, for any species 30" diameter or higher, with in-lieu fees assessed in the same way as under current practice for indigenous trees. Staff is concerned about the city's capacity to enforce specific protections this vast in scope.

Tree Damage or Destruction Fees

Finally, both the Street and Indigenous Tree ordinances at present enable the city to pursue restitution in cases of unpermitted tree damage or destruction. In the case of the Street Tree Ordinance, beyond restitution for the tree, a removal which occurs after the denial of a removal permit (or when city staff can prove the damage or removal was committed with the knowledge that a permit was required) could lead to civil penalties of three times the appraised value of the destroyed tree. The appraised value would be determined by the city.

With the Indigenous Tree Ordinance, civil penalty fees are capped at \$10,000 per tree removed or destroyed, but there is no appraisal valuation of the tree associated with this amount, and the ordinance is unclear as to what other amounts may be appropriate, if any. Additionally, there is some question whether the \$10,000 fee is even enforceable, due to other provisions of the Glendale Municipal Code which limit civil penalties under the code to \$1,000.

For both ordinances, the City also has the authority to issue administrative citations per violation, with \$400 at the first instance, and \$1,000 and \$2,000 for subsequent violations. This is the citation structure for any tree violation. For example, a well-intentioned resident damaging a large city or private indigenous tree to obtain a view would be assessed a \$400 administrative citation, the same as if they illegally removed the tree. The only difference is the city may opt to pursue restitution for the latter case.

However, it would be a challenge for the city to pursue restitution for an illegal tree removal since the last ordinance modification in 2010, due to vague ordinance language and the proof required to pursue cases. As is, any push back or refusal to pay the billed restitution would necessitate civil action through the City Attorney's office, which is both time- and resource-consuming, which has prevented this avenue from being utilized in the past. A goal of the proposed ordinance is to retain healthy city and private protected trees, and provide sufficient safeguards for them, as well as have actionable consequences for violations to dissuade developers and residents from harming trees on purpose or by carelessness.

As an example, a recent case saw the destruction of a 60' tall city tree's root system, resulting in it being unstable and a necessary removal. Rather than being able to obtain restitution for the estimated value of over \$20,000 for this healthy, mature tree, the city issued two small administrative citations for violations referenced in the municipal code. Public Works works closely with Code Compliance and the City Attorney's office to pursue violations to the appropriate extent, but options can be limited. Such minor consequences do little to dissuade motivated parties. It also limits the city's ability to maintain existing tree canopy, or plant enough new trees to recover from unexpected tree losses.

Glendale is not the only city to encounter this stumbling block. A frequent point of discussion within the arboriculture industry is the difficulty of enforcing restitution when language is vague, especially when dealing with private protected trees, where the city may have little ability to accurately appraise the value of a tree prior to unpermitted

destruction.

A solution by some jurisdictions is to set in the Citywide Fee Schedule citation amounts based generally on the appraised value of trees of certain size classes, with higher amounts in cases where unpermitted actions lead to tree destruction, and set amounts when the exact size of the removed tree is impossible to determine. These types of fees set clear expectations to city staff and the public for the costs of violations.

Staff recommends that the City Council consider moving away from a tree appraisal method and restitution as the primary enforcement mechanism, which though subject to industry guidelines, nevertheless introduces individual interpretations of tree condition prior to damage. Instead, staff recommends that the city establish administrative citation amounts for illegal tree removal and damage resulting in removals, codified in the Citywide Fee Schedule. Staff believes this will provide increased clarity for Glendale's residents of consequences for illegal tree damage and destruction.

The intent here is to not create new, expensive fines, but rather to improve enforceability of our ordinances and take advantage of codified process and procedures surrounding the issuance of administrative citations. Our largest trees, both public and private, have taken decades to reach maturity, and are valuable city assets. In addition, significant staff time and city funds have been spent on maintenance and assessment. Most importantly, these trees have outsized benefits to the communities in which they grow.

Staff recommends retaining the existing \$400, \$1,000, and \$2,000 administrative citations for violations that don't result in tree destruction, such as minor unpermitted pruning. Larger administrative citations would be limited to clear cases where city or private protected trees were removed or damaged to the point where removal is the only option. This framework also streamlines the appeals process for residents, enabling them to utilize the same easy appeals system as with any administrative citation.

Public Works has developed a proposed administrative and in-lieu matrix in the model of agencies such as San Mateo County and La Cañada Flintridge where the administrative citation is based on the size of the removed or destroyed tree. This matrix, and a comparative view of these cities' approach, is in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Proposed and Comparative Administrative Citation Schedule, Removal of Public or Private Protected Trees, 1st Fine

	Glendale Existing	Glendale Proposed	La Cañada Flintridge	San Mateo County
Unpermitted removal or destruction, 0-6" DBH	\$400	\$1,090	N/A	N/A
7-12" DBH	\$400	\$1,770	N/A	N/A
13 -18" DBH	\$400	\$3,650	\$1,062	\$2,500
19 -29" DBH	\$400	\$6,470	\$1,062	\$2,500
30"+ DBH	\$400	\$10,000	\$2,115	\$5,000
Unknown, under 30" DBH	\$400	\$3,650	\$5,400	\$2,500

Unknown, over 30" DBH	\$400	\$10,000	\$10,800	\$5,000
-----------------------	-------	----------	----------	---------

In the above examples, La Cañada Flintridge citations are consistent per of the quantity of violations, while San Mateo County assesses amounts at higher dollar amounts per each additional tree. For example, the removal of two 19" diameter trees within La Cañada Flintridge would result in two citations of \$1,062, for a total of \$2,124. In San Mateo County, the removal of two trees at the same size would result in a citation of \$2,500, and a second citation amount of \$3,750, for a total of \$6,250. Neither fee schedule indicates the underlying rationale for the fee amounts. Public Works proposes that fines for these actions are not increased for second and third fines.

The proposed citation fee schedule in Table 3 is based on the cost to replace and establish a new tree, as well as the calculated value of a tree of similar size, in fair condition, based on established industry standards of tree valuation. The values below are taken from the city's tree inventory software, which calculates an appraised value of each city tree based on its size, health, and location. The mid-range value for each tree size range uses trees of fair condition and normal height. This model is used by Sacramento and other municipalities, but staff proposed a more moderate approach. As shown in Table 4 the appraised value of a mature tree far exceeds the proposed citation amounts above; however, staff recommends retaining the existing \$10,000 framework and not implementing higher citation amounts. Staff believes the intent of the proposed ordinance to protect and preserve existing tree canopy can be accomplished under this framework.

In situations of private tree removal where staff has no recent diameter size recorded for the removed tree, evidence such as past and present site photographs can be utilized to determine a general size of the removed tree, as in La Cañada Flintridge.

Table 4: Glendale Calculated Tree Replacement Values

Tree Diameter Range	City cost to plant new 24"-box tree	Appraised value of this size range tree, assuming fair condition and average height	Total replacement value
0-6"	\$390	\$700	\$1,090
7-12"	\$390	\$1,380	\$1,770
13-18"	\$390	\$3,260	\$3,650
19-24"	\$390	\$6,080	\$6,470
25-30"	\$390	\$9,830	\$10,220
31-36"	\$390	\$17,220	\$17,610
36+"	\$390	\$25,820	\$26,510

In-Lieu Provisions

Aside from provisions requiring replacement of City trees, or in-lieu replacement as added with the proposed ordinance, the City Council had mentioned staff should explore using an in-lieu fee mechanism to protect additional private trees, where 'non-protected' trees could only be removed if the owner paid the City a fee for replanting on public

property. Public Works suggested this be limited to trees in good condition and over a certain specimen size. Under such a proposed system, any tree within the city, public or private, would not be removed without an in-lieu fee paid to the city.

If effective, this system would protect the largest trees within the city by incentivizing owners to preserve the trees during repairs or development, but will lead to a substantial increase in costs to private tree owners, and additional staff time across multiple departments in terms of administering a program with such a scope/ Public Works does not believe such a program would be effective due to the staffing this would require, as it effectively protects most large trees in the City, meaning staff across departments would need to respond to great volumes of potential violations, without the ability to filter over the phone for our limited existing protected species. Such a major change in use of private property may be better addressed with zoning changes through Community Development.

However, staff believes that adopting the other ordinance changes recommended will lead to improved outcomes for our existing protected trees, without necessitating increased private tree protections at such a large cost to the city and public.

Structural Factors

The proposed ordinance modifications will improve the clarity of the ordinance and provide clear rules and consequences for violations of said rules. However, these changes do not address another underlying issue with enforcement of the ordinance, which is staffing. The existing Street and Indigenous tree codes are enforced by a small group of certified arborist professional staff, and a significant increase in the scope of the ordinance will be a strain on existing resources. An effective program has strong ordinance protections and penalties for violation, but more importantly, would be evenly and proactively enforced to avoid the worst outcomes. Currently, enforcement is necessarily reactive, and based on reported violations, like any other violation of City code.

According to Glendale Municipal Code 1.20.020, the authority to issue citations for code violations is restricted to Neighborhood Services supervisors, inspectors, or building inspectors who have successfully completed the California's Commission on Peace Officer Standards and training. Public Works – Forestry staff are not trained to this standard but are nevertheless tasked to stop indigenous tree violations in progress due to their expertise in arboriculture. This leads to direct confrontation with residents, contractors, and developers, and requires Public Works staff to request permission to enter private property in these exchanges. On many occasions this access has been refused.

Trees are living, dynamic organisms where there is an extreme sense of urgency – and need – to respond to and investigate reported violations. Code Enforcement Officers are

rarely able to deviate from their assigned inspection schedule to immediately respond to reports of illegal tree removals or pruning. At this time, qualified Public Works – Forestry staff are the only two city employees qualified to investigate reports of illegal tree work and accurately assess damage to trees. Because of the urgency to halt violations before complete destruction of a tree, this work results in the regular interruption of tightly-scheduled days with inspections, appointments, and tree maintenance work. This will continue to be the reality of the current program, where we are limited by these factors without proactive enforcement.

STAKEHOLDERS/OUTREACH

Informational letters are mailed to each address or property owner of a parcel receiving a tree prior to planting. These letters state benefits of trees, a chance to ‘adopt’ by watering, inform the adjacent property owner of the incoming planting, and provide contact information of city staff should the recipient wish to cancel the planting.

Adopting any changes to the Glendale Municipal Code will require outreach in the form of informational collateral across numerous city channels, online and in print. The extent of this outreach will be determined by the scale of proposed changes to the ordinance.

FISCAL IMPACT

Proposed fee changes are expected to nominally increase General Fund revenues. The new proposed larger citation amounts are related to mostly infrequent violations.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project is exempt from CEQA review pursuant to Section 15307, as a Class 7 “Actions By Regulatory Agencies For Protection Of Natural Resources” exemption of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) as the project consists of amendments to the city’s tree-related codes within Chapter 12 to assure the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of a natural resource where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1: Introduce the Ordinances amending Chapters 12.40 and 12.44, and portions of Titles 16 and 30 related to trees, of the GMC, and adopt related modifications to the Citywide Fee Schedule via Resolution.

Alternative 2: Elect to not introduce any Ordinances amending portions of the Glendale Municipal Code. No further action would be required.

Alternative 3: Consider any other alternative not proposed by staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

Prepared by:

Loren Klick, Urban Forester

Approved by:

Roubik R. Golanian, P.E., City Manager

EXHIBITS / ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit 1: Map of Non-Granted Public Works Targeted Reforestation Plantings