

## Sabha, Tamer

---

**From:** Mellem, Araceli  
**Sent:** Monday, January 12, 2026 1:52 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** FW: Public comment for city council item #3 and #14 - Master Street Tree Plan

---

**From:** Jessica Richards  
**Sent:** Monday, January 12, 2026 1:29 PM  
**To:** Rick Cole <>; Megheti DerBoghossian <>; Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>  
**Cc:** julianna <>; Hernandez Carol Hunt Hernandez <>; Suzanne York <>; Barbara Lampre <>  
**Subject:** Public comment for city council item #3 and #14 - Master Street Tree Plan

You don't often get email from <> [Learn why this is important](#)

**[ ! ] CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Hello,

I am unable to attend the city council meeting this evening and want to share a few thoughts.

Re item #3 the contract with Greenfield for watering. I wish to share the previous problems with watering the city trees to ensure they are corrected moving forward. In the past, the watering consists of a deluge of water dumped from the truck through a large hose. The vast majority of this water runs off which is not only a waste but it fails to provide water to the trees. This year a significant number of newly planted trees died within several months in part due to incorrect watering. This is a waste of resources (trees and water). Moving forward I want to ensure the issues are resolved to optimize benefit for our urban forest.

Re Item 14. I support the updates to the Master Street Tree plan to include greater flexibility within a menu of climate adapted and native options to promote biodiversity. I caution against the adoption of this change as a result of a concern raised over one tree species on one street. That issue should be addressed separately potentially following this update. Second, I ask that more specific language be added to ensure this policy does not lead to the removal of existing trees. This has been said verbally by staff but could be more explicit in the draft. This flexibility re planting applies only to existing vacancies of street trees. Finally, while the current inventory of coast live oak surpasses the 10-20 rule a significant percentage of mature coast live oaks are declining. Of course, I plea to proactively tend these community assets but I've watched many mature oaks decline over 3-5 years until they are removed. Recently plantings of coast live oaks have been compromised by inappropriate planting practices and watering issues. Therefore, we do not have an adequate stock of young coast live oaks to replace those that will sadly be removed. This species is vital to our ecosystem and provides fabulous shade. I caution

1/12/2026  
Items 3 and 14

against slowing down the planting of this species because the raw numbers do not tell the full story of the status of coast live oaks in the city.

Thank you,

**Jessica Richards**  
**UFAC member**