

**Summary of Public Comments on Draft Urban Forest Strategy Reports (January 26 to February 28, 2021)**

During public consultation in January-February 2021 for the draft UFS reports, staff asked two main questions:

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?
2. Are there any new threats or opportunities that the City should consider?

Comments received are shown in the table below, with the staff response and recommended action.

For ease of reading, the comments were grouped into themes/topics.

<b>1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?</b>			
<b>Theme/topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
Support the UFS	<p>Really appreciate that the City is doing this strategy – it is really needed. Hamiltonians are passionate about trees and we look forward to continuing to work with the City and the community to improve the urban forest.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft UFS. I'm impressed with the effort that has gone into the draft strategy and overall, it is well presented. The documentation is engaging and it's good to see the City showing a commitment to improving protection for the urban forest.</p>	Thank-you	None
Canopy cover target of 30%	<p>Target is too low - increase to 35-45% (13 comments).</p> <p>Please consider a higher canopy target - maybe 45% which would bring us more in line with other cities that have been progressive on their urban forest goals.</p> <p>Agree with canopy cover target of 30%.</p> <p>I think the ambitious goal set of 30% is admirable and hopefully will be achieved so we can increase that even more moving forward.</p>	<p>The existing canopy cover in the urban area of Hamilton is 21%. Based on the experience of other municipalities in southern Ontario, increases to canopy cover are slow and gradual. For example, Toronto has planted 1.3 million trees from 2008 to 2018 which resulted in a canopy cover increase of 1.8%.</p>	The target of 40% canopy cover by 2050 has been recommended by staff.

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	Also, clearly state the timeframe for achieving the target.	<p>Mississauga has increased its canopy cover from 15% to 19% (an increase of 4%) from 2007 to 2014. City staff wanted a challenging long-term target.</p> <p>The strategy is to increase public and private tree planting. Young trees planted now will not provide much canopy at first, but as they age, they will provide exponential growth and canopy cover will show notable improvement.</p> <p>Staff agree that canopy cover estimates are more accurate at a finer geographic scale. However, at this time, staff have limited data (i.e. point counts) to determine canopy cover at finer scales. As staff get more data, Hamilton will be better able to measure and model changes to canopy cover at the neighbourhood level.</p> <p>Once Hamilton has land cover mapping, staff can set</p>	

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
		targets on smaller scales or based on land use.	
Canopy cover target should include equity considerations	Target should include equity considerations.	Agree.	An additional note was added related to equitable distribution of canopy cover.  Equity is also included in the Vision Statement and the UFS clearly indicates that this is a priority for Hamilton.
Scale for measuring canopy cover	<p>Could we calculate canopy cover at a smaller scale – such as by neighbourhood? Could we also determine potential tree canopy coverage by neighbourhood? New York City created a report that mapped out these kinds of details.</p> <p>Concern with including large natural areas (escarpment) in canopy cover calculation. Some felt 21% misrepresented urban canopy and were concerned about how the tree canopy was calculated by ward. Some wards include the Niagara Escarpment, which is not a true representation of the actual coverage across the neighbourhoods (i.e. it over-estimates canopy cover). In order for neighbourhoods to take action to improve our tree cover, we need to know the actual tree canopy without the Escarpment being factored in. This needs to be included in the final Urban Forest Strategy.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, Hamilton does not have the detailed land cover data yet to calculate canopy cover at a finer scale, such as by neighbourhoods.</p> <p>All municipalities include natural areas in their canopy cover calculations. Canopy cover is a relative measure. If the City excluded natural areas, it would not be a comparable benchmark with other municipalities. Also, natural areas contribute to the ecosystem functions of Hamilton’s urban forest, so they should be included.</p> <p>Staff have received LiDAR data for the city which allows</p>	<p>The canopy cover map of wards was retained in the final UFS report, with a note that canopy cover will be determined at a finer scale once Hamilton has Staff are recommending that LiDAR data be purchased to more accurately measure the canopy both city wide and at a neighbourhood scale.</p>

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
		for a detailed canopy calculation by area. Updated canopy mapping has been included as Appendix E to this report.	
Native trees	<p>Emphasize native trees are the first choice and the City should lead the way by using only (or mostly) native species in its planting.</p> <p>Recognize climate-adapted species.</p> <p>Suggested removal of invasive trees and replacing with natives, Carolinian species, and long-lived trees.</p> <p>It seems counterintuitive to say that Hamilton has a "healthy and diverse" urban forest when two of our top three trees by number are doomed to the emerald ash borer, and the other is an invasive species. Where are the wonderful varieties of oaks and beeches, sugar and red maples, etc.? I'd like to see a plan to increase the number of native trees and especially Carolinian species.</p> <p>The draft Strategy contains little mention of planting native trees first. We know trees planted in City parks are native species, but the City needs to demonstrate leadership in planting across the City, not just in parks.</p> <p>All site plans should only be approved if native species are being planted and it should be the only option given to homeowners through the</p>	<p>Both Forestry and Parks staff note that a mixture of native and non-native tree species are required for a diverse and robust forest. Staff note that non-native species also provide ecosystem functions, especially in confined spaces and compacted soils where native species will not thrive. There are some areas where native species work well (e.g. parks). However, non-natives may be more resilient and suitable in other areas (e.g. confined road right-of-ways).</p> <p>Natural Heritage Planning staff require native species only to be planted in developments adjacent to Core Areas in the Natural Heritage System. In other areas, when reviewing Landscape Plans, staff ensure that a variety of</p>	<p>No changes were made to the UFS, but the importance of native and climate adapted species is recognized and will be addressed in future implementation actions.</p>

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	Street Tree program. We have heard many stories of homeowners having to push to have a native tree planted through the Street Tree program. Homeowners need to be offered a native tree first.	<p>species are planted, with a focus on planting predominately native species.</p> <p>The UFS includes actions to address climate-adapted species (through a climate change vulnerability assessment, Protect Action 17) and an invasive species management strategy (Protect, Action 18).</p>	
Boldness of actions, urgency	<p>The actions are quite cautious and lacking in any courage; there is an urgent need to act; the wording in some themes is too weak.</p> <p>Too much focus on planning, studying, educating, working groups, ‘talk,’ not enough teeth, not enough funds.</p> <p>There is no theme that I would add or subtract. The actions however, are quite cautious and lacking in any courage. We need to take bold action to protect our urban forest and encourage private land owners to plant and maintain native trees, and to strongly punish developers who remove them in the interests of their short-term profit. I'm not seeing much in the way of bold action in this report, I'm seeing a lot of calls for more study. That time is past. It's time to act.</p>	<p>Staff agree that urgent action is needed. It should be noted that some actions are already in progress and have been included in the UFS for transparency and because they are part of a good urban forest management plan.</p> <p>Some actions will be low cost, easy to implement, and will result in immediate benefits (e.g. increase the tree planting budget, Grow, Action 20). Others will require some study and discussion to determine what is the best course of action for Hamilton (e.g. identify and implement options for</p>	<p>The wording of some actions was strengthened, as follows:</p> <p>Protect, Action 16 – was changed to “identify <u>and implement</u> options for increasing the preservation of healthy trees”.</p> <p>Staff is recommending a new city-wide tree protection by-law, city wide wood lot protection by-law and revised tree protection guidelines be developed.</p>

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	<p>Unfortunately, the bold and strong language in the body of the report is not carried over to the actions section and this means that the urgency that is needed for these critical activities is lost when it comes to the recommendations.</p>	<p>increasing the preservation of private trees, Protect, Action 16).</p> <p>Policy and guidelines are required for staff to protect and require planting of trees. By having requirements in policy and guidelines, implementation is more effective, and there are clear standards for what is expected (transparency).</p> <p>Data collection is an important part of a strategy, to determine where to get the most value for staff’s work, and to adjust staff’s actions if required.</p>	
Equity	<p>The concern about equitable tree coverage is briefly mentioned in the report but it is an issue that deserves more attention in the strategy. Many of our neighbourhoods with low tree canopy also suffer from the poorest air quality and need more trees to help improve neighbourhood health.</p> <p>The city must recognize how lower-income, predominantly racialized neighbourhoods with less tree cover must be prioritized to ensure the cooling, noise reduction, air quality, and mental well-being benefits are targeted to populations that need it most.</p>	<p>Staff agree that this is a key issue for Hamilton’s UFS. This was reflected in the Vision Statement, which reflects what is important to the community and City staff.</p> <p>Agree. Once the City has prepared land cover mapping, canopy cover targets can be set based on a variety of indicators, including existing low</p>	<p>Added more specific language in the report related to more equitable distribution of canopy to ensure that the benefits of the urban forest are available to all residents.</p> <p>Added a reference to even distribution of canopy cover under Act, Action 12.</p>

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	<p>Additionally, while the map of tree cover by ward provides an idea of greenery distribution, this analysis should be performed at a neighbourhood level to understand if green-spaces and trees are experienced equitably by all within that ward or if they are concentrated in a particular location that is not accessible to all. Furthermore, lower income and higher density neighbourhood residents have less ability to grow trees on their private property, as such planting public trees should be prioritized in these areas.</p>	<p>canopy, pollution and noise reduction, flooding, urban heat island effect, transportation corridors, etc.</p> <p>Canopy targets can be developed on a neighbourhood level, with community input. These factors will be considered when implementing the actions, especially the canopy cover targets, climate change vulnerability assessment, and the tree planting priority analysis.</p>	<p>Added wording under Inspire, Action 1 related to ensuring the communications strategy improves collaboration and consultation with all groups, including local Indigenous people.</p>
Partnerships	<p>NGOs are a resource for the City. The UFS should acknowledge the non-government entities are already out there engaged in efforts to enhance the urban forest and willing to continue to do more.</p> <p>Include indigenous communities as partners.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Added text under Inspire, Action 5 to say that the City should expand its existing partnership activities with NGO groups.</p> <p>Added an Action specific to Indigenous people as partners in UFS implementation (Inspire Action 4).</p>
Natural areas	<p>The strategy does not contain actions pertaining to protection to forest ecosystems/biodiversity. Actions specific to forest biodiversity protection pertaining to topics of litter, trampling, trail building, wildlife disruption, and invasive species should be included.</p>	<p>The UFS contains the following actions related to natural areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete a climate change vulnerability</li> </ul>	<p>Added examples of recreation pressures (vegetation trampling, trails, litter) under Grow, Action 23.</p>

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	<p>Stewardship of urban woodlands - the draft Strategy mentions the importance of these areas, yet there is no care for this municipal infrastructure and no concrete actions are identified in the short-term recommendations. It is these natural areas that provide the bulk of the ecosystem services provided by the urban forest. The work the Hamilton Naturalists’ Club has done to manage invasives and plant native species at Captain Cornelius Park demonstrates that volunteers want to help. Residents want to see similar activities and opportunities in other urban woodlands. We need leadership from the City to make this happen, with conservation organizations and neighbourhood groups and volunteers helping with implementation. We have found that these relatively small actions are easy to undertake and have minimal budget implications yet bring high benefits and good opportunities to engage many community volunteers.</p>	<p>assessment (Protect, Action 17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invasive species management (Protect, Action 18)</li> <li>• Natural regeneration and planting (Grow, Action 20)</li> <li>• Management of natural areas (Grow, Action 23)</li> <li>• Implement a forest health monitoring program, including natural areas (Adapt, Action 24).</li> </ul>	<p>Promotion and coordination of stewardship activities and organizing volunteers to care for the health of urban woodlands would be part of the new Forestry FTE. This has been added to Inspire, Action 2.</p>
<p>Involvement of Indigenous people, alignment with Hamilton Urban Indigenous Strategy</p>	<p>There appears to be a lack of coordination with the Hamilton Urban Indigenous Strategy (2019). This strategy outlines goals to involve Indigenous persons in decision-making in municipal activities and projects that affect them, acknowledges that Indigenous persons need outdoor spaces to carry out traditional ceremonies and teachings, and acknowledges that Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) should be included in environmental restoration in Hamilton. None of this is mentioned in either draft of the Urban</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Included Urban Indigenous Strategy in the graphic of city initiatives related to the UFS.</p> <p>Added a new action (Inspire, Action 4), specifically related to cultivating partnerships with Indigenous people when implementing the UFS.</p>



1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	<p>Forest Strategy. How will the Urban Forest Strategy work to further the goals identified above? There is an incredible opportunity to further reconciliation by creating an Urban Forestry Strategy that aligns with the Urban Indigenous Strategy. For example: how will the outreach and communications goals you've identified under Theme 1 include Indigenous persons (as per Action 10 within the Urban Indigenous Strategy)?</p> <p>The Indigenous communities within and around Hamilton hold a wealth of botanical knowledge and environmental values that needs to be included and respected in city planning.</p> <p>Care for the environment, including land and water, are important. Respecting Indigenous ecological knowledge will benefit environmental restoration and preservation in Hamilton.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of traditional Indigenous territory in Hamilton should be practiced across the city. The city needs to demonstrate this acknowledgement beyond words.</p>		<p>Provided specific examples of possible future partnerships.</p> <p>Added section that discusses the role of Indigenous people in UFS implementation.</p> <p>Added consultation with marginalized groups, including Indigenous people, under Inspire, Action 1.</p> <p>Added Indigenous people as subjects of outreach efforts in Inspire, Action 2.</p>
Cultural value of trees	Nothing is mentioned about the cultural values of trees, or heritage trees.	Agree.	Added the cultural value of trees to the graphic – “ways trees help us” in the UFS report.
Planting non-allergenic trees.	There is no mention of planting trees on city property that are non-allergenic (do not produce pollen).	Forestry has removed heavy pollen trees from its planting list.	No change required to report.

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
		Pollen travels far, so it is difficult to address this issue with just City plantings. This issue will continue to be addressed through the City tree planting list, which is revised annually.	
New Forestry Staff Position (permanent FTE) Theme Inspire #2	<p>Please clarify the purpose of this position and the expertise needed.</p> <p>The report recommends creation of a permanent staff position focused primarily on communications and partnership development. In my view, the UFS will fail in its aspirations if it does not prioritize creation of a position that is responsible for directing a comprehensive urban forest management program, of which communications and outreach would be a function, but not the sole mandate.</p>	<p>Agree. The new FTE in Forestry and Horticulture Section would be a Senior Program Coordinator to implement the UFS. Qualifications would include Forestry Health and Communications and Outreach.</p> <p>Duties would include implementing the communications strategy, seeking partnerships, coordinating volunteer events, developing guidelines and policies, data management and analysis, liaising with staff from other departments, and forest health monitoring.</p>	Duties have been clarified in Inspire, Action 2.
Private tree By-law	The current action “Investigate feasibility of private tree by-law” is too vague. Unfortunately, the report sets the expectation that there will be no tangible action taken toward regulating the removal of healthy mature trees on private property in the	The UFS notes that private tree by-laws are an important tool for protecting existing tree cover and that there is some private tree	Added a sentence about the online poll in 2021 where the majority of respondents agreed that the city should have consistent tree

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	<p>short term, nor in the long term - aiming only to "identify options". There is no amount of study, marketing or consensus building with the public that will make it easier to introduce regulation to protect this irreplaceable resource in a time-frame that is sensitive to the permanence of mature tree removal. It will doubtless remain a difficult and polarizing issue, so the city simply needs to take a position on the issue and act.</p> <p>We are concerned that the need to undertake Private Tree Protection is not given the importance that is needed. With almost 60% of the urban tree canopy on private lands, it is critical that private trees are protected, otherwise it is not possible to have a healthy urban forest. We know there is strong community support for the protection of all trees across Hamilton and urge the City to make this a priority action. Tree protection bylaws had been in place in Dundas and Ancaster pre-amalgamation and these could be used as a starting point for a bylaw that covers the whole city.</p> <p>I am a long-time residential home owner, 50 years in Hamilton, four different houses. My main concern with any new tree bylaw is residential back yards. I would like backyards of residential properties to be free of tree bylaws. People need full control of their back yard to garden, put a pool in, build a garage, build a shed, build a gazebo, etc. unimpeded. I understand the importance of trees in our environment. Trees have a lot of</p>	<p>protection in effect now. However, regulations are patchy and inconsistent across the City. A poll conducted in 2021 showed that a majority of residents felt there should be consistent protection for private trees across the City.</p>	<p>protection across urban area.</p> <p>Revised wording in Protect, Action 16 to say “identify <u>and implement options</u>” for increasing preservation of healthy trees.</p> <p>Staff is recommending a new city-wide tree protection by-law, city wide wood lot protection by-law and revised tree protection guidelines be developed.</p>

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	<p>space to be planted without infringing on residential backyards.</p> <p>As an ISA certified arborist, I am appalled private tree protection is not in place. There is NO EXCUSE - review City of Oakville, Burlington, Toronto, etc. private tree bylaws to see how a municipality can successfully deliver both rural and urban tree protection. Act now!</p>		
Private tree protection	<p>Protecting healthy mature trees in the city is a different matter altogether. Once they are gone, they are gone. We cannot turn back the clock to regain the decades lost when an old tree is removed at the whim of a property owner - that event is catastrophic. Several of the largest mature trees have been removed from back yards in my own Ward 1 neighborhood during the time it has taken to draft this report - destroying, in just a few years, what was a beautifully maturing canopy, and all the benefits it provided. Undoubtedly this is happening across the city. Protection and preservation of healthy mature trees on private property should be a top priority for Hamilton. Unfortunately, the report sets the expectation that there will be no tangible action taken toward regulating the removal of healthy mature trees on private property in the short term, nor in the long term - aiming only to "identify options". The options have actually been identified in the report, but it shies away from recommending them in the face of controversy. This is a grave mistake.</p>	<p>A variety of actions are proposed to address preservation of existing trees. Staff agree that private tree protection is needed to achieve our vision for the urban forest. Protection will involve a variety of tools, both regulatory and incentive programs.</p>	<p>Revised wording in Protect, Action 16 to say “identify and implement options” for increasing preservation of healthy trees.</p> <p>Staff is recommending a new city-wide tree protection by-law, city wide wood lot protection by-law and revised tree protection guidelines be developed.</p>

<b>1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?</b>			
<b>Theme/topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
Private tree protection - support and incentives for homeowners	<p>Think about how the City can support homeowners to address their concerns related to private tree protection because it is in the City’s interest to keep these trees on private lands. However, the landowner bears the cost and risk. Work to align City and landowner interests. Examine people’s concerns about private trees and address them using incentives.</p> <p>Support to private landowners could include advice on controlling invasive trees, providing watering bags, recognizing the real value of a mature tree, tax incentives (reduction in taxes based on tree cover on property), or financial incentives to plant or retain trees on private property.</p> <p>More regulations and incentives for private landowners to plant more trees on their property would be fantastic.</p>	<p>Private landowner incentives are an important tool to protecting existing private trees.</p> <p>A key part of the FTE in Forestry will be outreach to private landowners (tree give-aways, education and awareness/arborist advice, grants to increase planting, working with NGOs to implement a tree planting program). This will help to empower the community.</p>	Protect, Action 16 was revised to specifically outline incentive and grant programs as an implementation action.
State of the Urban Forest report	<p>Does the City want to commit to doing a State of the Urban Forest report annually?</p> <p>We support an annual State of the Urban Forest report and it should be available to the public.</p> <p>These reports should be accessible to the public and promoted through outreach activities.</p>	<p>Forestry already provide annual updates to Council on the Emerald Ash Borer program, planting, removals, and mortality. This will continue, but it applies to public trees only.</p> <p>Staff agree that the “State of the Urban Forest” reports may best be done every 3-5 years. This will allow sufficient time to detect</p>	<p>Changed Inspire, Action 5 to state the report will be done every 3-5 years. Added that the report will be available to “Council and the public”.</p>

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
		<p>trends and results of UFS implementation. The purpose of this report will be more extensive than the Forestry Section updates described above. It will access our progress based on the “Sustainable Urban Forest” indicators in the Technical UFS report.</p> <p>Agree that these reports would be public and posted on the Forestry and UFS web pages.</p>	
City initiatives are missing	<p>The following initiatives are missing from the graphic on page 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hamilton Community Energy and Emissions Project</li> <li>• Hamilton Urban Indigenous Strategy</li> <li>• Biodiversity Action Plan</li> </ul>	Agree.	<p>Added the following initiatives to the graphic in the UFS report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hamilton Community Energy and Emissions Project</li> <li>• Hamilton Urban Indigenous Strategy</li> <li>• Biodiversity Action Plan</li> </ul>
Monitoring	Add more specific timelines, targets and indicators and reporting requirements on key indicators.	Each action in the UFS Technical Report is linked to a Monitoring Indicator and a timeline.	Added text in the UFS Technical Report to better explain the “Sustainable Urban Forest – A Step by Step Approach”.
Minimum Canopy cover requirements	I am happy to see an action plan to establish minimum canopy cover targets for new development proposals. I believe the targets should be significant for dense urban areas to	Noted.	No change required to UFS Report.

<b>1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?</b>			
<b>Theme/topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
	<p>improve quality of life and environmental sustainability, even if these areas are the most constrained in terms of space.</p> <p>Suggest stronger language on requirement for minimum canopy for developments. I suggest that the word "targets" on page 27 of the technical report be strengthened e.g. "minimum requirements".</p>	<p>Noted – this will be considered when the minimum canopy guidelines are prepared.</p>	
Standard tree planting specifications, best practices	Perhaps Act, Action 11 (applying standardized tree planting details and specifications in all city tree planting projects) should apply to planting on private properties as well, if they are best practices.	Agree. These standards should be considered in future guideline updates (Act, Action 13) and implemented through Landscape Plans.	No change required to UFS Report.
Timelines for actions	I agree with the themes, but question some of the timelines under each theme - 3 to 5 years for many of the actions is too long. For example, why should we wait 3-5 years to implement a Forest Management Asset System?	Staff reviewed the timelines on the actions. Some actions need to take place in sequence. For example, land cover mapping (Act, Action 9) must be completed before we can move on to a tree planting priority analysis (Grow, Action 11) or the canopy cover guidelines (Act, Action 12).	The timeline for some actions was adjusted (Inspire Action 6, Grow Action 22, Grow Action 23).
Hydro corridors	<p>I didn't see anything about hydro corridors and their tree cutting, bush removing strategies to reduce the risk of damage to their infrastructure.</p> <p>Partner with hydro to implement tree cutting and plantings that improve wildlife quality but still meet</p>	Staff met with staff from Hydro One. Hydro does not allow tree planting within corridors for safety reasons. Hydro has indicated that their staff will work with the City to inform us of	<p>No change to UFS Report.</p> <p>City staff will continue to work closely with hydro and utility companies to coordinate activities.</p>

<b>1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?</b>			
<b>Theme/topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
	safety guidelines. Can the City/CA plant in hydro corridors?	maintenance activities. Hydro staff are willing to undertake projects to compensate for the impacts of the required maintenance. City staff have increased coordination of activities with Hydro. They have a 6-year cycle for clearing and have staff patrol annually to review vegetation growth.	
Private tree compensation	For those who remove private trees, having a higher tree replacement ratio would help the city of meet their designated tree canopy goals. A 3:1 replacement ratio would allow for replacements to better replicate what is being lost through the removal of mature trees.	Staff agree that the current 1:1 compensation requirement for private trees will not replace canopy cover lost to development. This will be revised as part of the Tree Protection Guidelines update (Act, Action 13).	No change to UFS Report.
Youth engagement	I think it would be good to add an action to get young people (in schools) educated and engaged.	Noted. This would be part of the Communications Strategy (Inspire action 1) and the outreach to be done by the new FTE Forestry Coordinator (Inspire, Action 2).	No change to UFS Report.
Increasing public tree planting	I would like to see an easier process or toolkit made for residents to request additional trees in city parks and greenspaces, as there are several non-profit organizations, community partners and funding opportunities available to bring more trees into our city.	Increasing public tree planting will be addressed in the implementation of the Inspire actions (communication, web site improvements, etc.).	No change to UFS Report.



<b>1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?</b>			
<b>Theme/topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
	The one thing that I think is buried a bit in the document is how low tree survivorship in the city impacts our ability to achieve our canopy targets. We can plant a million trees, but if only 50% of them survive past 10 years, so much of our effort is wasted!	Forestry and Horticulture Section is currently monitoring survival of public tree plantings and this data will guide improvement of planting practices.	
Commitment to providing resources to implement	City funding to get priority actions underway, a commitment to move past the strategy to the critical implementation.	Specific timelines and reporting and general funding requirements have been provided for in each action in Appendix “D”. For now, general costs and staff resources are outlined.  As each project moves forward, staff will provide a detailed budget request for funding and resources to Council.	Refer to Appendix “D”.
Natural regeneration as planting strategy	Page 32 mentioned allowing natural regeneration by reducing mowing in designated park areas. In Hamilton Conservation Authority’s experience this has not led to an increase in canopy as these areas are dominated by non-native grasses which stall natural succession to thickets or forest. Directed restoration in these areas would allow for a structured development of the ecological communities.	Noted.	Grow, Action 20 was altered to include directed planting of native trees.
Data collection for monitoring and identifying planting areas	We would like to recommend ensuring accurate tree data that differentiates the number and locations of street trees versus other kinds of tree cover – ex. Urban forest, parks, natural areas along the escarpment, Hamilton Conservation	Agreed. This work will be completed as part of the land cover mapping (Act Action 10), tree planting priority analysis (Grow Action 22),	No changes to UFS Report.

1. Do you agree with the themes and actions? Is anything missing from the reports?			
Theme/topic	Comments	Staff Comments	Recommended Action
	<p>Authority, Royal Botanical Gardens, etc. to provide a baseline for tracking progress.</p> <p>Further, collecting and mapping data for sites that remain viable for street trees and locations where street trees are not viable -ex. data on locations where requests for a street tree were made but found unsuitable after inspection by Forestry staff would benefit ongoing outreach by narrowing down possible locations.</p>	<p>and Forestry asset management system (Adapt Action 25).</p>	

<b>2. New Things to Consider – threats or opportunities</b>			
<b>Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
Provincial policy (threat)	<p>Effects of MZO’s, restrictions on Conservation Authorities, and Bill 21.</p> <p>With Doug Ford’s Bill 21, our Hamilton Conservation Authority will have less power to protect our forested areas. As a City, we must try to stop uncontrolled development in our natural wilderness.</p>	Noted. The City has the ability to go beyond Provincial requirements when protecting natural heritage.	No change to UFS Report.
Wildlife impacts (threat)	<p>Beavers felling trees waterfront trail; wild animal damage (deer, beaver).</p> <p>I hate to mention beavers, but they really are devastating the urban forest, which is already under stress.</p>	Noted. Control of beavers is not recommended.	No change to UFS Report.
Trails (threat)	Unauthorized trail building in forests.	<p>Agree that recreational use is placing increased pressure on natural areas, especially with the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>While staff want to encourage recreational use, staff recognize that this must be balanced with natural area management (trail planning, controlling invasive species, providing safe parking and access).</p>	Added a reference to recreational impacts on natural areas in Grow, Action 23.
Permaculture (opportunity)	Nothing in the report that mentions trees as food, fruit orchards, alleyway berry bushes. Why can we not apply permaculture principles to our public landscape and create food security for both our	Forestry staff noted that there are no fruit trees on the City planting list.	Staff are recommending a review of fruit and nut trees on public property to

<b>2. New Things to Consider – threats or opportunities</b>			
<b>Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
	wildlife and people in this time of a climate emergency?	Hamilton has a strong community garden program which may provide opportunities for fruit and nut tree food production.	explore opportunities to plant fruit and nut trees.
Lack of political champion (threat)	Establish the strategy so it crosses departments and spreads ownership so if champions at the staff or Council level move on the entire strategy is not forgotten. Create a succession plan for those who will champion the plan both within City and within the community.	<p>Noted. Staff recognize that implementation will require many hands, both within the City and the community.</p> <p>The importance of Council support is noted in Inspire, Action 6.</p> <p>While many actions will be led by Planning or Forestry, many other sections are listed as contributing partners, including Public Health, Neighbourhood Strategies, Risk Management, Public Works, Parks Operations and Maintenance, and Landscape Architectural Services.</p>	No change to UFS Report.
Succession planning (opportunity)	Need a succession plan for trees in old neighborhoods where mature trees will reach the end of their lives and leave large holes in the canopy.	Forestry staff replace trees removed, preferably in the same area. While conducting maintenance, Forestry staff actively canvas for planting in all neighbourhoods.	No change to UFS Report.

<b>2. New Things to Consider – threats or opportunities</b>			
<b>Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
Value of trees (opportunity)	<p>Provide a cost estimate for trees removed in development applications, so Council understands what is lost if they approve the application.</p> <p>Finally, it would be good to provide Council and the public with true estimates, in dollar form, of the value of mature trees, taking into account what it would cost to replace the services provided by a mature tree for water management, air quality improvements, climate mitigation, wildlife habitat, psychological and medical healthcare, and beautification.</p>	<p>Forestry is currently requiring this for tree removals for development applications. When issuing a permit, Forestry uses a trunk formula to determine the value of a tree.</p> <p>Planning will review this as part of Tree Protection Plans for development applications as part of the update to the Tree Protection Guidelines.</p> <p>Planning staff will also be reviewing the compensation requirements for removal of private trees and reporting to Council on any proposed changes to the Tree Protection Plan process. By requiring true replacement costs for private trees, this may deter applicants from removing trees.</p>	No change to UFS Report.
Urban sprawl (threat)	<p>Invest in the care of existing trees in the urban forest by keeping compact urban boundaries (GRIDS2).</p> <p>I think the urban forest strategy needs to look more at preventing urban sprawl and investing more in neighbourhoods that already exist in Hamilton.</p>	Noted. Any new urban boundary expansion will require an assessment of natural areas and tree cover before it proceeds.	Staff is recommending a new city-wide tree protection by-law, city wide wood lot protection by-law and revised tree protection guidelines be developed.

<b>2. New Things to Consider – threats or opportunities</b>			
<b>Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
Infill development (threat)	<p>Infill development is a particularly insidious subset of development as far as our urban forest goes, as it often occurs in areas with mature tree canopies. Of the three developments currently underway on my street, no fewer than 5 mature trees, some as tall as 50 or 60 feet have come down in the past 18 months. Only one was a protected street tree, and that protection was ignored without consequence. Any tree protection by-law must address infill developers removing trees without replacing them, and must level harsh penalties for doing so, with strong enforcement measures, or developers will just ignore those rules, the way they ignore almost every other rule without consequence.</p> <p>Living in Ancaster, I am very sad to see trees come down to build larger homes. Money makers tear down, build and sell and I feel like penalties are futile.</p>	<p>Balancing the need for infill development, a compact urban boundary, and growing our urban forest will be challenging.</p> <p>Forestry Section does not approve driveways within the canopy of a public tree.</p> <p>Addressing impacts of infill development can be done through revised Tree Protection Guidelines, improved compensation requirements (Act, Action 13), canopy cover targets for development applications (Act, Action 12), improved implementation of Tree Protection Plans (Act, Action 9), and better protection for private trees (Protect Action 16). Impacts of infill development can be tracked through Act, Action 14.</p>	Staff is recommending a new city-wide tree protection by-law, city wide wood lot protection by-law and revised tree protection guidelines be developed.
Parking lots as planting areas (Opportunity)	<p>In Europe, parking lots have trees, but rarely here. Need to examine the bylaws that are promoting parking spaces over green spaces. Requiring a percentage of every parking lot to be dedicated to trees/shrubs (natives, of course) would help.</p> <p>My particular interest is the role the large parking lots play. These lots produce a huge amount of</p>	Agree. Increased planting strips and low impact development plantings are being used more than ever. This can be addressed through revisions to the site plan guidelines (Act, Action 13) and can be built into Zoning By-laws (e.g. the City’s	No change to UFS Report.

<b>2. New Things to Consider – threats or opportunities</b>			
<b>Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
	heat and the runoff contributes to the overflow of our combined sewer system. If we were to encourage the owners of Limeridge Mall and the Centre on Barton to install bioswales and plant trees we would get the combined effort of reducing runoff plus all the other advantages of the trees. My efforts to contact the heads of sustainability of these companies have been fruitless so far so maybe the city could consider them as part of the urban forest strategy.	Commercial and Mixed use Zoning).	
Groupings of trees (opportunity)	We could plant a high density of indigenous trees in concentrated small areas. Trees mutually benefit from other tree species. If there are in a concentrated area they grow straight and tall competing for the sunlight. This has been done successfully in Tokyo and other high density urban centres. This would also provide a habitat for a vast number of birds, insects, and small mammals.	Agree this is an interesting opportunity in areas where there is space. This opportunity could be achieved through Grow, Action 20 and also be considered in City parks, commercial, industrial and institutional areas.	No change to UFS Report.
Impacts of storms on private trees (threat)	I am concerned about climate change and redevelopment of old neighbourhoods weakening the urban forest that is already there. Fears of homeowners that strong storms expected as a result of climate change will pose a danger to them if they don't cut down the big trees around their houses.	Agree that this will be an increased threat in the future. Incentives and assistance to private landowners to maintain mature trees will be considered in Protect, Actions 16 and 17.	No change to UFS Report.
Tree Nurseries (opportunity)	I would like to see the RBG work with surrounding municipalities to bring back endangered trees and Carolinian species that are less common. For example, an elm tree nursery from stocks of elms that survived Dutch elm disease.	Noted. Partnerships will be addressed through Inspire, Actions 2, 4, and 5.	No change to UFS Report.
Heritage Trees (opportunity)	The City should develop its own Heritage Tree designation, with attendant protections and incentives for landowners. I would be willing to help	Agree. The cultural importance of trees can be addressed through Inspire, Action 2 as part	No change to UFS report.

<b>2. New Things to Consider – threats or opportunities</b>			
<b>Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
	with this and know others more qualified than I who could be approached.	of Communications and Outreach or through protection of private trees, Protect, Action 16.	
Natural areas and fire risk (threat)	<p>I have lived next to Arrohon Natural Area in Waterdown for almost 20 years. I believe it was left natural since the neighbourhood was built in 1990-94 period.</p> <p>I believe it is ready to become a tremendous fire inferno within the next few summers that could ignite several homes in the neighbourhood. Its location is upwind from my home and many dozens of homes. I can imagine the sparks flying down wind on to our roofs and yards if an inferno ever got started at Arrohon on a windy day in the summer.</p> <p>When walking, I have observed Arrohon Natural Area grow from a lovely area that one could walk through parts of it, until its current state which is barely traversable. There are years of buildup of long dead grasses, brush, vines and the larger trees are overcrowded. It seems obvious to me that the average yearly moisture received there cannot sustain this area anymore because it's so overgrown. New trees and grasses and shrubs have difficulty getting establish because of so much deadwood. It is now a tremendous urban fire risk in my opinion.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be addressed through management of natural areas (Grow Action 23) and the climate change vulnerability assessment (Protect Action 17).</p> <p>Specific concerns about City-owned natural areas can be addressed by contacting Public Works staff (Parks Operations and Maintenance and Forestry and Horticulture).</p>	No change to UFS report.



<b>2. New Things to Consider – threats or opportunities</b>			
<b>Theme/Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>
	What can we do to restore this area, to thin out the deadwood and make room for healthier new growth and reduce the fire risk?		
Monitoring partnerships (opportunity)	Hamilton Conservation Authority has a forest monitoring program already in place and 20 of our 40 monitoring plots are within the urban boundary. It would make sense to work together to gather data needed by the City and HCA on existing plots.	Noted. Staff will actively seek partnerships with agencies, community groups, and NGOs to pool resources. This would be done through increased partnerships (Inspire Action 5).	No change to UFS Report.