

PLAN DE GESTION DE LA FORÊT URBAINE

Des racines pour l'avenir

Rapport sur la consultation des intervenants de la phase 2
Mars 2017

En novembre 2016, la Ville d'Ottawa a tenu une série de séances de consultation (phase 2) afin de recueillir des commentaires sur la version préliminaire du Plan de gestion de la forêt urbaine (PGFU) pour les secteurs urbains et les banlieues d'Ottawa.

Les consultations pour ce projet se divisaient en deux phases; celles de la phase 1 ont eu lieu en novembre 2015, et visaient à obtenir des commentaires sur la vision à adopter pour le PGFU, ainsi que sur les grands enjeux ainsi que les principaux défis et possibilités liés à la forêt urbaine d'Ottawa. Une version préliminaire du PGFU a été préparée en fonction des commentaires recueillis lors des consultations de la phase 1.

Les consultations de la phase 2 ont eu lieu en novembre 2016 et visaient principalement à recueillir les commentaires de la population sur les objectifs et les recommandations de la version préliminaire du Plan de gestion de la forêt urbaine (PGFU). La phase 2 comportait trois séances de consultation publique qui se sont tenues sur deux jours à l'hôtel de ville d'Ottawa, deux séances avec le groupe d'intervenants externes du projet, une séance avec le personnel de la Ville ainsi qu'un sondage en ligne. Plus de 200 personnes ont participé aux consultations : quelque 120 personnes ont assisté aux séances et près de 100 personnes ont répondu au sondage en ligne ou envoyé leurs commentaires par courriel.

Outre les commentaires recueillis dans le cadre des consultations et du sondage et ceux reçus par courriel, plusieurs groupes d'intérêt ont présenté officiellement leurs observations sur la version provisoire, notamment la Fédération des associations civiques d'Ottawa, la Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association, la Première Nation de Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg, le Conseil de l'intendance environnementale d'Ottawa, le groupe de travail sur les arbres et différentes associations du noyau urbain.

La version provisoire du PGFU a été très bien accueillie par le public, le groupe d'intervenants externes et le personnel de la Ville. Les participants aux séances étaient très investis dans le processus, et les discussions ont été constructives et pertinentes. Les réponses au sondage montrent que de 90 % à 97 % des répondants appuient la vision et les objectifs énoncés dans la version provisoire du Plan, et que l'appui aux 30 recommandations qu'elle comporte varie de 77 % à 97 %. (N.B. : Ces statistiques

incluent les répondants ayant indiqué « Je ne sais pas »; lorsque ces réponses sont éliminées, l'appui pour l'ensemble du Plan se situe autour de 94 % à 100 %.)

Les principales conclusions tirées des consultations de la phase 2 peuvent se résumer comme suit :

1. Il faut s'assurer d'allouer suffisamment de ressources à la mise en œuvre du PGFU.
2. Augmenter les activités prévues dans le cadre de la première période de gestion du PGFU; certains éléments représentent des « victoires faciles » et doivent être mis en œuvre immédiatement.
3. L'adhésion au PGFU à l'échelle de la Ville est essentielle à sa réussite.
4. Les éléments se rapportant à l'intendance et à la sensibilisation décrits dans le PGFU doivent être mis en œuvre durant la première période de gestion.
5. La Ville doit s'engager clairement à accroître le couvert forestier urbain.
6. Le PGFU doit mieux tenir compte du rôle important que jouent les arbres fruitiers et les arbres à noix dans la forêt urbaine d'Ottawa.
7. Le PGFU doit mieux tenir compte du rôle que peut jouer l'infrastructure verte dans la croissance de la forêt urbaine d'Ottawa.
8. La conservation des arbres et l'aménagement des terrains intercalaires sont perçus comme conflictuels à Ottawa; il est essentiel de préserver les arbres des vieux quartiers pour maintenir et accroître le couvert forestier urbain.
9. Il faut s'assurer que la Ville est prête à faire appliquer les politiques et les règlements relatifs aux arbres et dispose des moyens pour le faire.
10. La Ville doit se montrer plus proactive en ce qui a trait au remplacement des arbres sur l'emprise routière.

L'équipe de consultation et le personnel de la Ville ont procédé à l'examen des commentaires recueillis dans le cadre des consultations de la phase 2; ils seront dûment pris en compte et intégrés à la version définitive du PGFU, qui sera élaborée ce printemps.

L'annexe 1 comprend tous les commentaires notés sur les tableaux de papier lors des séances de consultation publique et de la séance de consultation des intervenants externes.

L'annexe 2 contient les observations officielles présentées par les différents groupes d'intérêt nommés ci-dessus.

N.B. : La Ville d'Ottawa peut fournir les données brutes du sondage ou traduire les annexes ou certaines parties du présent rapport sur demande. Présentez votre demande à Martha Copestake, au 613-580-2424, poste 17922, ou à l'adresse martha.copestake@ottawa.ca.

APPENDIX 1

KEY MESSAGES FROM CONSULTATION SESSIONS:

Overall themes –

1. Buy-in throughout City is vital to success of plan.
2. Need more early quick wins.
3. Need adequate resources to implement plan.
4. Stewardship and outreach items need to happen in first management period.
5. Intensification and trees – how do we solve this conflict?

Public Session 1 (Mon afternoon)

- Make clear, up front, the City's commitment to increasing urban tree canopy.
- Need more tangible items earlier – what are the quick wins?
- Earlier emphasis on outreach and stewardship.
- Ensure the city has adequate resources to implement the recommendations of the plan.

Public Session 2 (Mon evening)

- Need more quick wins earlier
- Need to ensure we have buy-in throughout the city to make implementation successful – council, management, staff.
- Need to ensure the City has adequate resources to implement the recommendations of the plan.

Public Session 3 (Tues evening)

- Ensure that the city is committed and able to enforce tree by-laws and policies.
- Ensure we have buy-in throughout the city and through partners to make implementation of plan successful.
- Work to resolve the conflict between intensification and trees – need to make sure we are retaining trees in existing neighbourhoods.
- Ensure the city has adequate resources to implement the plan.

- Bring the stewardship elements of the plan to the first management period.
- Bring some more quick wins to the first management period.

External Stakeholder Session (Tues afternoon)

- Ensure that adequate resources are allocated to implement the plan. What are the resource requirements?
- More quick wins for the first management period.
- Incorporate ways to plant more trees – trees in trust (opt out rather than opt in – more proactive, when trees are removed make it default to plant replacement tree – don't ask).
- Make sure that consistent metrics are used throughout report.
- More focus on LID – green infrastructure.

NOTES FROM PUBLIC CONSULTATION SESSIONS

Overall Themes

1. Tree by-law review required asap – focus on enforcement, reporting, and resources to implement.
2. Need buy-in throughout the city.
3. Outreach and stewardship are key and must come earlier in the plan.
4. Tree protection during development is a big problem.

Report Back Summaries

Session 1, Group 1:

- Need more quick wins, earlier.
- Plan must commit to expand tree canopy.
- Need initiatives around equity.
- Better collaboration internally/externally.
- Needs to include more than just trees (flora and fauna).

Session 1, Group 2:

- Must involve community, internal stakeholders (cross departmental), other agencies.
- Outreach coordinator must come earlier – first management period.
- Tree maintenance important – these assets have value.
- Put value on our green assets.

Session 1, Group 3:

- Language should be stronger – rather than ‘working to’ should be ‘achieve’.
- Trees need to be considered earlier in the process for development projects.
- Better enforcement of tree by-laws.
- Need to allocate adequate resources to implement the plan.

Session 1, Group 4:

- Engagement and outreach needs to be in first management period – must be earlier.
- Coordination between internal and external groups.
- Education important – work with school groups, school boards, etc.

Session 2

- Need buy-in by councillors, need to educate for buy-in.
- Implementation – concerned that the city won't implement the plan, need a strong implementation strategy.
- Early wins are important.

Session 3, Group 1:

- Increase community awareness on value of trees – outreach, stewardship, engagement.
- Tackle tree/intensification issue (lot coverage).
- Review tree by-law.
- Fund community initiatives.

Session 3, Group 2:

- Enforcement
- Improved mechanism for tree protection in the planning process.
- Need adequate resources to implement plan.

Public Sessions – Overall Notes

- Plan needs to be clear that the aim is to increase canopy cover (EO does not want to see target go below 30%).
- Green infrastructure should be included in the plan.
- Issues with trees not surviving after being planted in infrastructure projects – need to ensure that they survive.

- Don't want most items to wait until 2nd or 3rd management periods.
- Need early wins on good by-law revision with better enforcement and protection of existing trees.
- Infill process must better consider trees.
- Concern that adequate resources won't be allocated.
- Need increased education throughout city on value of trees to ensure better protection of trees.
- Need to be able to respond to tree damage/cutting issues faster – quickly and urgently.
- Need to better sell the plan to youth, to better engage with youth.
- Need to make the plan more readable and accessible – use infographics and digital content creation.
- Need buy-in from City Planning so that trees are better retained and protected during development.
- Plan needs more focused on trees and major street redevelopments.
- Need a conceptual map of how this plan fits into the puzzle of other city plans and policy documents.
- Urban woodlands are also important.

FLIP CHART NOTES:

WHAT WE LIKED

- Comprehensive.
- Citizen engagement.
- Maintenance.
- Internal/external outreach.
- Citizen feedback.

- Acknowledge role of private landowners.
- Suitable trees for suitable sites.
- Coordination between disciplines.

VISION

- Remove the word global – too arrogant, how is it documented?
- Why wouldn't we want to be a global leader?
- Keep reference to economic prosperity because developer language.
- Wildlife missing – focused on people, does 'residents' include animals too?
- Plan is too tree centric, it silos itself – flora, fauna, waterways should be addressed in more detail.
- Don't like the word clean – connotation is sterile.
- Missing health of waterways and relationship between forests and water.
- Focussed on humans, need to consider wildlife.
- Need resources.
- Focus on protection of existing trees.
- Urban forest needs to be valued equally with other city projects and developments.
- Should be visual and memorable.
- Urban forest is integral to the city, not separate.
- More explicit in values and interactions of urban forest (biodiversity, etc.).
- Nations capital is indicated, but this plan does not include Gatineau.
- Businesses are as important as residents and visitors.
- Include wildlife and birds.
- Trees can create a sense of community.

- Overambitious to say we are global leaders.
- Be bold – green walls.
- Ottawa’s forest is a thriving forest.
- Liveable neighbourhoods.
- simplify language – not equitable, use easy and fair access instead.
- Vision needs to be bolder.
- It needs to sell this plan to the corporation to compete for \$.
- Disagree with saying “world leader” because it’s just PR and doesn’t really mean anything.
- Include something about mitigating climate change.
- Must recognize climate change.
- Must be written so that general public can understand it.
- Biodiverse instead of diverse.
- If use ‘global leader’ define what that means.
- We are not global leaders.
- Should include that people are willing to help.
- Include a definition of urban forest and make it more descriptive – maybe just ‘trees’ vs. ‘urban forest.’
- Too human centric, should include wildlife and other elements/values.
- Include; natural corridors, street trees.
- Global leader is too vague, be more specific.
- Success could be a collaboration, don’t necessarily need to be a leader.

OBJECTIVES

- Must include expanding the tree canopy – maximize tree canopy cover.
- Need to compliment qualitative approach with the quantitative ‘hard facts’.
- Focus should be on planting trees and maintaining them.
- Tree risk assessment should be about maintaining trees and mitigating risk.
- Must have buy in by all departments for full commitment to implement this plan.
- Internal collaboration must be clearer and given more focus in this plan.
- Should indicate which objective and targets each recommendation supports.
- Very comprehensive.
- How do we make the plan more strategic and more current – include ottawa riverkeeper, NCC.
- Want something more tangible and immediate.
- 5 – community associations can assist with notification of urban tree issues.
- Improve knowledge of the importance of urban forest.
- Outreach – approach schools for help.
- New objective – harvest forest products for the benefit of communities.
- 3 – strengthen wording – make it the mandate to protect and enforce.
- 2 – change “work to achieve” – language should be more active, stronger, definitive, measurable.

New principle – city and partners must be accountable (i.e. Ottawa hydro)

- Principle 7 is a good idea – so hard to get large trees, so protecting them is good.
- Need a principle on enforcement.
- 2 – reference to canopy protection.
- 5 – communication to include internal and external stakeholders, all city actors.
- 8 – proactive management – more detail on what this means.
- 4 – applies widely, all stakeholders – knowledge; gaining understanding and open to research.
- 2 – How is urban forest sustainability defined? There are no naturally sustainable forests in the urban area.
- There needs to be an objective about growing the urban forest.
- Objective related to trees and climate change.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND OVERALL

- Hard for the City to answer the question, “how will my city be different in 3-4 years?”
- All investments are pushed to future years.
- Roadside planting should be pushed to first year.
- Put more concrete action items early on.
- Put more tangible items in first management period (i.e. 24-27).
- Different neighbourhoods are at different stages and that needs to be addressed in the plan through pilot projects, neighbourhood stewardship plans, neighbourhood studies.
- 1-4 are about internal departmental collaboration.
- Canopy cover study – make sure that it includes private land so that we have a better idea of species diversity.
- 11 - Look at roads/sidewalk maintenance as it relates to trees (salt).

- 24-30 - How do we increase/improve access to greenspaces?
- 27 – Show more leadership with at risk populations – seniors, low income, public housing, retirement homes, nursing homes (related to Guiding Principle #6).
- City should be doing more proactive planting within the right of ways.
- Population density should be used as an index.
- For compensation, should use leaf area for compensation and not 2:1 ratio method.
- 7, 13, 20, 30 are important.
- 30 – incentives are a good idea for good practices, implementation of tree protection.
- Tree protection on city projects like road refinishing is important.
- 10 Tree Guidelines/Tree Cross Sections/species – important.
- City maintenance of trees planted on private property where there is no space on ROW.
- Adjust timing of recommendations – stewardship coordinator needs to be earlier.
- Is coordinating with terms of council a good idea? Could it leave objectives vulnerable? Is it good for funding programs?
- More outreach needed for specific programs like memorial trees.
- Need to make it more clear how stakeholders can access more information about trees.
- Important to involve the community – external agency, community groups, city departments.
- Outreach coordinator needs to be in an earlier management period – look at it as a green asset.
- Value trees as proactive green infrastructure to be valued similarly to grey infrastructure.
- Forestry needs to be well integrated with all other departments in order to have teeth.

- What is the connection between the internal and external working groups?
- Need more mention/effort to include private trees.
- Need a strong definition of urban canopy – private trees, city trees.
- Recognize and acknowledge partnerships to manage forest.
- Targets need to be broken down in different ways to be appropriate (canopy cover).
- Need to add more resources to achieve most of these recommendations (financial and staff).
- Should incorporate tree costs in all projects.
- 8 and 9 – need to strengthen the wording and associated fines.
- Need political will at all committees to give urban forest priority.
- For incentives, there are 2 populations (developer vs. Homeowner) and we need different incentive programs for each.
- Consider different metrics to define distinctive trees – species? (walnut vs. Norway maple).
- 7 year maintenance cycle is too long – need to improve maintenance practices and mowing.
- Set higher warranty periods and improve standards for contractors and city staff.
- Monitor and incorporate new maintenance standards when streets are upgraded.
- Set a memorial tree park.
- Continue to use private nurseries to grow trees.
- 23 and 30 – integrate these (disincentives and incentives).
- 22 – make explicit mention of diverse and native tree species.
- Involving schools can help students appreciate trees.
- Outreach to public institutions (Landscape ON, Algonquin College, etc.).
- Include enforcement.

- Improve coordination with other levels of government and other landowners (NCC, School boards).
- External urban forestry working group needs good communication, solid mandate to ensure role of group is good.
- Recommendation 4 should be #1.
- Communication on UFMP should be short and clear.
- 12 – lifecycle maintenance is confusing wording.
- Make the language in the whole plan more precise – include a glossary.
- 13 – give the scale of how to increase the maintenance levels – what are the proposed increments AND this should be in the first management period.
- Good by-law enforcement is required.
- Need more education and outreach.
- Schools – provide training to schools (students and parents) and urban forestry or provide support to develop training programs for schools to deliver.
- 27 – good to engage with large property owners.
- Stewardship and outreach must be a priority for the first management period.
- Young people of today need to be engaged and educated on this now.
- Should have comparisons to other cities.
- Need more information on required resources – include a budget for each recommendation.
- Clear milestones for measuring success.
- Need to better attract millennials to the urban forest discussion – how can we help them give back?
- Hidden harvest – food from trees to the foodbank, should have city support.
- Highlight the use of trees for crime prevention, partner with CPTED.

- Should make partnerships with school boards.
- Recognize the benefits of trees for wildlife.
- Important to retain and protect urban trees and retain natural areas.
- Consider connectivity and linkage corridors.
- 4 – look at existing inventories of private trees (Glebe, Stonebridge).
- An Ottawa plant identification app would be helpful.
- Include baseline information – citizen science.
- City needs to work out how to avoid errors in tree inventory information.
- Neighbourhoods type programs should be funded by community environmental grants.
- 5 or 10 – standards for tree placement related to crime prevention.
- Committee of Adjustment must consider impact of trees – use this as an early win because of ongoing infill/tree problems.
- In review of Tree By-law can we include tree in building envelope like other jurisdictions?
- Must balance intensification with tree retention.
- Restrictions should be put on tree retention and development through Committee of Adjustment.
- Increase maintenance levels of service – move this to the first management period.
- Create model of protected neighbourhoods (like the Glens), tree friendly neighbourhoods to slow down tree removal (Mississauga has a planning layer like this).
- Should do tree planting in low areas where water collects.
- Need better protection during snow removal.
- Make links between SWM and trees.

- Seven year maintenance cycle should be altered based on species.
- Need good diversity of trees in neighbourhoods, involve contractors early.
- Replacement of actual tree canopy should be how compensation is done through development and private property tree removals.
- Look at what other cities are doing re. Urban Forestry outreach and make links – through FCM?
- 24 and 25 should be done in first management period.
- Build advocacy early.
- Public consultation on reviewing the success of overall plan and priorities every 4 years.
- Introduce incentives and tie to property values.
- Educate real estate agents about street trees being city trees.
- Teach people the value of trees.
- Move education and outreach to first management period.
- Provide guidance/advice for tree planting to property owners.
- Require condos to look after their trees.
- Plan needs buy in at City hall to work.
- Currently infill development has a lack of consideration for trees.
- Tree by-law is currently not effective.
- Trees need to be considered as benefits during intensification.
- What is protected and what isn't – are there enough people to enforce by-laws?
- Review and update of tree by-law must be one of the first things done.
- Planting native species should be included to help resist climate change.
- Tree diversity should mean native tree diversity, although some non-native tree species have a place in urbanized areas.

- What is native may need to be expanded because of climate change.
- Need education to help people select appropriate tree species.
- Review and update of the language of the tree by-law is not necessary, it is good.
- The problem with the by-law is the reporting, accountability, and implementation.
- Review of the by-law should include review of how to proactively improve implementation.
- Add to 9: “with a view to ensuring better implementation and accountable reporting”.
- UFMP must include the provisions for reporting on the tree by-law, as per Environment Committee direction.
- Add to 9: what info the city should collect on by-law implementation to report on implementation?
- Add to 9: monitoring and reporting or add a new accountability recommendation.
- Tree by-law is not adequate in neighbourhoods where building is done without considering trees (Pine Glen).
- It’s too easy for people to get distinctive tree permits.
- Fines in tree by-law should be reflective of the value of the house/property where the tree cutting occurred.
- People want trees considered in planning processes – management and Council need to hear this.
- Worried about the extinction of mature trees, hedges, and trees less than 50 cm.
- The Official Plan is at odds with Ottawa having a tree conservation by-law.
- Implementation of tree bylaw is the key issue – too many people get permits.
- Intensification provisions of the Official Plan need to take into account trees.
- Issue with tree protection on condo properties.
- Need a recommendation about fruit and nut bearing trees.

- Plan is too human centric – need more focus on wildlife and providing food and habitat for wildlife.
- 24 – needs to be in the first management period.
- Need budget for community associations and organizations to do outreach and implement citizen science.
- Need education to help people better understand sensitive clay soils and foundation damage – people are afraid of damage that may not be happening.
- Consider urban agriculture for stewardship.
- Other plans discuss non wood goods; socio economic, recreation, non timber forest products, measure forest use same as measure park use.
- Need to address short life span of street trees.
- Please note that this is unceded Algonquin territory.
- Consider different types of zoning for urban forests.
- Should look at permeable pavement around street trees to increase survivability or other new pavement types.
- Incorporate trees into city guidance documents to help street trees survive.
- Use older tree canopy studies as background for canopy cover study.
- Need transparency around fines and compensation planting.
- Need annual reporting – state of the resource.
- Internal working group should include all groups in the City.
- Idea to start a provincial/federal outreach working group – ex. CFIA.
- 10 – split urban hardscapes and infill areas separately.
- 7 – reword to give more emphasis on enforcement, build public support for enforcement, proactive enforcement & resources.
- 7 – should move to the first management period.

- 7, 8, 9 - Need better evaluation, monitoring, and reporting on enforcement.
- Replanting in established neighbourhoods – conflicts with utilities.
- Compensation tree planting should be tied to neighbourhoods where trees have been removed.
- Need neighbourhood planting plans for areas where there aren't many suitable planting areas, need innovative solutions to find space.
- Trees in trust should be opt out rather than opt in.
- Need resources for homeowners on tree care, economic value of trees, stormwater functions.
- Outreach to development community.
- Post value of trees to highlight importance.
- Better tree protection on road projects.

NOTES FROM EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER SESSION

Overall Themes:

1. Ensure that adequate resources are allocated to implement the plan. What are the resource requirements?
2. More quick wins for the first management period.
3. Stewardship needs to come earlier in plan.
4. Tree replacement - Incorporate ways to plant more trees – trees in trust (opt out rather than opt in – more proactive, when trees are removed make it default to plant replacement tree – don't ask).
5. Make sure that consistent metrics are used throughout report.
6. More focus on LID – green infrastructure.

GENERAL

- City needs more stewardship engagement and should shift resources in that direction.
- UFMP needs to include more budget implications – what is current urban forest budget and what are the budget requirements to implement this plan?
- If resources are short, City should consider developing pilot projects in interested communities.
- More focus on LID required in the UFMP.
- Need more focus on improving forest the extent of forest/tree canopy in neighbourhoods.
- The plan should highlight the need for Federal and Provincial funding for Urban Forestry.
- Should tie the guiding principles to action items.
- Should include equitable access to the benefits of forest cover across the urban area.

VISION, PRINCIPLES, OBJECTIVES, TARGETS

- Principle re. large trees not explicitly associated with a recommendation.
- Principles and objectives should be linked to specific recommendations and actions – trace the thematic lines.
- Growing the tree canopy should be an explicit objective.
- Equitable access to urban trees should be in the recommendations.
- LID could address multiple principles, objectives, and targets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- There are no explicit directions in the UFMP on a monitoring system. What resources will be needed for the monitoring, using citizens to complete parts of it, what are the timelines for monitoring? The C&I framework is part of the monitoring but how will some be monitored and kept on top of (e.g., Criteria 1 to 7).

- Urban forest cover analysis – mapping should be more clear about jurisdictions (federal, provincial, municipal), should reflect different management objectives for the Greenbelt, should be consistent on what we are measuring with respect to targets, monitoring.
- Neighbourhood targets should be included as an outcome of the canopy study.
- How does the UFMP sit amongst other City planning documents – show this clearly.
- Recommendation 10 – should be split into 2 parts – Urban Hardscapes separate from Infill.
- Recommendation 10 and 11 – utilities as a stakeholder.
- Move Recommendation 22 up to first management period.
- Should do Recommendation 15 first and then do 14 if 15 is not feasible.
- Recommendation 13, 19, 22 – these are high value, high return recommendations, as such they should come earlier in the plan.
- Rec 13 – this recommendation should be moved up earlier.
- In general, climate change is under mention in this plan.
- Rec 21 – tree tendering – how the City purchases trees.
 - Consider splitting the tender so that some smaller local growers are able to compete and participate.
- Trees in Trust – should be an “opt out” program to increase planting, rather than “opt in”. And implement this retroactively in places where trees have been lost in the last x # of years. If Forestry Services can’t accommodate this, then this should be a budget ask. Possibly make a separate recommendation surrounding increasing the capacity of the trees in Trust program.
 - Use a smaller tree to allow money to go further (i.e, more plantings).
 - Ongoing issue that large sized trees are being replace with small sized trees
- Overall, stewardship items need to come earlier in the plan, first management period. City needs to engage communities from the get go. Grassroots is essential; make use of pilot projects – immediate action cannot be underestimated.

- The stewardship coordinator position would be a resource multiplier in terms of the work that could be leveraged if there was someone to focus on this.
- Beech bark disease should be on our radar.
- See lots of planning here but need a focus on implementation.
- What is the cost of not doing this plan?
- Need more tools to engage with the public on urban forest issues, provide more funding to community organizations.
- Develop a certified tree steward program.
- Forest fire management and prevention is also key.

APPENDIX 2