

PENDEKATAN PERKONGSIAN AWAM-PERSENDIRIAN DALAM  
PERANCANGAN DAN PENGURUSAN HUTAN BANDAR  
DI MAKASSAR INDONESIA

DERMAYANA ARSAL

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

PENDEKATAN PERKONGSIAN AWAM-PERSENDIRIAN DALAM  
PERANCANGAN DAN PENGURUSAN HUTAN BANDAR DI MAKASSAR  
INDONESIA

DERMAYANA ARSAL

Tesis ini dikemukakan sebagai memenuhi  
syarat penganugerahan ijazah  
Doktor Falsafah (Perancangan Bandar dan Wilayah)

Fakulti Alam Bina  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MEI 2017

## PENGHARGAAN

Dengan nama Allah Yang Maha Pengasih Lagi Maha Penyayang. Setinggi-tinggi kesyukuran dipanjatkan kepada Allah SWT, kerana dengan limpahan rahmat dan karunia serta izin-Nya jualah kajian ini dapat disempurnakan.

Saya ingin merakamkan penghargaan dan jutaan terima kasih kepada penyelia saya, PM. Dr. Foziah binti Johar atas segala ilmu, tunjuk ajar, bimbingan, nasihat dan dorongan yang diberikan sepanjang tempoh penyelidikan ini di jalankan. Saya merasa sangat beruntung mempunyai penyelia yang hebat dan saya telah belajar banyak perkara dari beliau.

Penghargaan ini turut ditujukan kepada Gubernur Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan Bapak Dr. H. Syahrul Yasin Limpo yang telah memberikan biasiswa untuk meneruskan pengajian di Malaysia. Penghargaan juga kepada Kepala Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan atas kebenaran yang diberikan selama belajar di UTM. Ucapan terima kasih yang tidak terhingga ditujukan untuk rakan-rakan yang telah memberikan sokongan dari segi ilmu dan moral, juga semua pihak di UTM yang terlibat secara langsung mahupun tidak langsung semasa saya menjalankan penyelidikan dan menulis tesis ini.

Akhir sekali, jutaan terima kasih yang tak terhingga dikirinkan buat ayahanda allayarham Hj. Muhammad Arief Saleh, bonda allayarham Hjh Siti Rugayah, ayahanda mertua allayarham Sudirman Madeali dan ibu mertua Hjh Musri. Penghargaan ini juga buat suami tersayang; Suhasman Sudirman, anakanda Siti Rabiatul Adawiyah, Sulhelmi Ahmad Fadhil dan sodara-sodaraku semuanya yang sentiasa memberikan semangat dan kiriman doa.

## ABSTRAK

Proses perbandaran yang pesat terutamanya di negara sedang membangun sering kali diiringi oleh kemerosotan persekitaran bandar. Hutan bandar telah diperakui memberi sumbangan positif kepada aspek ekologi, sosial dan ekonomi sesebuah bandar. Perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar bagi negara maju seperti Amerika Utara dan Eropah telah berjaya dilaksanakan melalui penglibatan bersama pemerintah bandar, syarikat swasta dan komuniti setempat. Bagi bandar di negara sedang membangun, penyediaan hutan bandar perlu berhadapan dengan kos tanah yang tinggi dan persaingan guna tanah. Justeru kajian ini bertujuan mengkaji pendekatan perkongsian awam-persendirian sebagai alternatif perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar di Kota Makassar, Indonesia. Mantan Walikota Makassar telah menetapkan 10 tapak hutan bandar, namun sehingga kini, masih tidak dilaksanakan kerana masalah pemilikan tanah di samping kos yang terlibat. Kajian ini menggunakan kaedah gabungan melibatkan tiga peringkat. Peringkat pertama yang mengkaji semua polisi dan undang-undang berkaitan hutan bandar, merumuskan bahawa tiada peraturan yang mewajibkan pemerintah bandar memperuntukkan hutan bandar. Peringkat kedua menganalisis ciri biofizik tapak yang dikenalpasti sebagai hutan bandar. Analisis mendedahkan bahawa tapak hutan bandar di Universitas Hasanuddin dan Universitas Negeri Makassar adalah sesuai sementara yang lain tidak memuaskan dari segi saiz, kebolehsampaian dan keadaan semasa. Peringkat ketiga merupakan analisis persepsi pelbagai pihak berkepentingan terhadap pelbagai aspek hutan bandar dan pendekatan perkongsian awam-persendirian. Kajian ini menggunakan kajiselidik berstruktur untuk mendapatkan persepsi 64 responden, yang dipilih berdasarkan persampelan *purposive* dikalangan mereka yang mempunyai kepentingan dalam program hutan bandar iaitu wakil akademik, kerajaan, awam, sukarela dan swasta. Kefahaman lebih mendalam tentang aspek perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar serta perkongsian awam-persendirian juga diperolehi melalui temu bual dengan Walikota Makassar, ahli dewan perwakilan rakyat, pemilik tanah, wakil akademik dan syarikat swasta. Hasil kajian menunjukkan majoriti responden menyedari faedah hutan bandar, justeru perlu diperuntukkan untuk menjamin kelestarian Kota Makassar. Walaupun sebahagian responden menyedari kelemahan pendekatan perkongsian, namun sebahagian besar responden menjangka pendekatan perkongsian awam-persendirian dapat dilaksanakan sekiranya kedua-dua pihak awam dan swasta komited. Kecuali Walikota yang merasakan bahawa hutan bandar adalah mahal, pihak berkepentingan yang lain menyambut baik pelaksanaan perkongsian awam-persendirian yang didasarkan oleh pembahagian peranan dan tanggungjawab yang jelas di antara pihak yang terlibat. Kerangka perkongsian awam-persendirian bagi hutan bandar yang memperuntukkan proses perancangan dan pengurusan serta pengagihan peranan dan tanggungjawab pelbagai pihak berkepentingan telah disarankan.

## ABSTRACT

Rapid urbanisation especially in the developing countries is frequently accompanied by the deterioration of the urban environment. Urban forest has been acknowledged to positively contribute to the ecological, social and economic aspects of a city. Urban forest planning and management in developed countries such as North America and Europe have been successful through the shared involvement of the urban authorities, private companies and the local communities. Cities in developing countries however is challenged by the high land cost and competing land uses. This study therefore aims to explore the public-private partnership approach as an alternative to urban forest provision for Makassar City, Indonesia. Although the former Mayor of Makassar city had declared 10 urban forest sites, to date, none was developed due to land ownership issues and cost incurred. The study applied the mixed method approach involving three stages. The first stage which reviewed the legal provisions and policies relating to urban forest revealed that there is no regulation which makes it mandatory for the city government to provide an urban forest for a city. The second stage analysed the biophysical characteristics of various sites identified as urban forests. It was revealed that only sites in Universitas Hasanuddin and Universitas Negeri Makassar were suitable while others are less satisfactory due to their size, accessibility and current condition. The third stage analysed the perceptions of various stakeholders on the various aspects of urban forest as well as on the private public partnership approach. This study used a structured questionnaire to obtain the perception of 64 respondents, who were selected based on purposive sampling among those who have an interest in urban forestry program from both the public and private sectors, academics, non-governmental organisations and local communities. A deeper understanding of the planning and management of urban forest as well as public-private partnerships was also obtained through interviews with the Mayor of Makassar City, a member of state representative assembly, land owners, selected academics and private companies. The results showed that most respondents perceived that urban forests have environmental benefits thus should be provided to maintain the sustainability of Makassar City. Although most respondents were aware of the weaknesses of a partnership approach, the majority of respondents expect a public-private partnership approach can be implemented if both the public and private sectors are committed. Except for the Mayor who feels that urban forests are costly, other stakeholders welcomed the implementation of a public-private partnership underpinned by clear division of roles and responsibilities between the involved parties. A framework of public-private partnership for the urban forest is recommended providing for both the process of planning and management of urban forest as well as the distribution of roles of various stakeholders.

## KANDUNGAN

<b>BAB</b>	<b>PERKARA</b>	<b>MUKA SURAT</b>
	<b>PENGAKUAN</b>	<b>ii</b>
	<b>DEDIKASI</b>	<b>iii</b>
	<b>PENGHARGAAN</b>	<b>iv</b>
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>v</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>vi</b>
	<b>KANDUNGAN</b>	<b>vii</b>
	<b>SENARAI JADUAL</b>	<b>xiv</b>
	<b>SENARAI RAJAH</b>	<b>xvii</b>
	<b>SENARAI SINGKATAN DAN AKRONIM</b>	<b>xviii</b>
	<b>SENARAI LAMPIRAN</b>	<b>xx</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>PENDAHULUAN</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1 Latar Belakang Kajian	1
	1.2 Penyataan Masalah	3
	1.3 Soalan Kajian	7
	1.4 Matlamat dan Objektif Kajian	7
	1.5 Skop Kajian	8
	1.6 Metodologi Kajian	9
	1.7 Organisasi Tesis	10
<b>2</b>	<b>PERANCANGAN DAN PENGURUSAN HUTAN BANDAR</b>	<b>12</b>
	2.1 Pengenalan	12

2.2	Definisi Hutan	12
2.3	Konsep dan Definisi Hutan Bandar	17
2.4	Faedah dan Fungsi Hutan Bandar	22
2.4.1	Faedah Sosial dan Keindahan	25
2.4.1.1	Hutan Bandar Sebagai Sumber Rekreasi	25
2.4.1.2	Faedah Kesihatan Hutan Bandar	26
2.4.1.3	Potensi dan Arus Sosial dalam Penggunaan Hutan Bandar	28
2.4.1.4	Faedah Senibina dan Estetik	28
2.4.2	Faedah Iklim, Kejuruteraan dan Ekologi	29
2.4.2.1	Kualiti Udara	29
2.4.2.2	Iklim Bandar	29
2.4.2.3	Hidrologi	30
2.4.2.4	Biodiversiti	30
2.4.2.5	Simpanan Karbon	31
2.4.2.6	Faedah Ekonomi Hutan Bandar	32
2.5	Perancangan dan Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	36
2.5.1	Pendekatan Kepada Perancangan Hutan Bandar	36
2.5.2	Proses Perancangan	38
2.5.3	Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	41
2.5.4	Pengurusan Hutan Bandar Mampan	47
2.6	Perkongsian Awam Persendirian dalam Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	54
2.6.1	Pendekatan Kepada Peruntukan Perkhidmatan Awam	54

2.6.2	Konsep Perkongsian Awam Persendirian	56
2.6.3	Perkongsian Awam Persendirian dalam Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	60
2.6.3.1	Konsep PAP dalam Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	60
2.6.1.2	Contoh PAP dalam Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	62
2.6.1.3	Faedah PAP dalam Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	68
2.7	Kesimpulan	70
<b>3</b>	<b>METODOLOGI KAJIAN</b>	<b>72</b>
3.1	Pengenalan	72
3.2	Pendekatan Kajian	72
3.3	Reka Bentuk Kajian	73
3.4	Kajian Perundangan Berkaitan Hutan Bandar	76
3.5	Analisis Kesesuaian Tapak	77
3.5.1	Sumber Data	78
3.5.2	Pemprosesan dan Analisis Data Fizikal	81
3.6	Kajian dan Analisis Persepsi	83
3.6.1	Pemilihan Pihak Berkepentingan	84
3.6.2	Instrumentasi Penyelidikan	88
3.6.2.1	Soal Selidik	89
3.6.2.2	Temu Bual	90
3.6.3	Analisis Data	91
3.6.3.1	Analisis Statistik Deskriptif	91
3.6.3.2	Analisis Kaedah Kualitatif	91
3.7	Kesimpulan	92



<b>PENILAIAN ASPEK PERUNDANGAN DAN CADANGAN TAPAK HUTAN BANDAR MAKASSAR</b>	93
4.1 Pengenalan	93
4.2 Latar Belakang Kota Makassar	93
4.3 Guna Tanah Kota Makassar	95
4.3.1 Perubahan Guna Tanah Kota Makassar 1990-2000	96
4.3.2 Perubahan Guna Tanah Kota Makassar 2000-2010	99
4.4 Perundangan Hutan Bandar di Indonesia	103
4.4.1 Perundangan Berkaitan Hutan Bandar	105
4.4.2 Perundangan Khusus Mengenai Hutan Bandar	109
4.4.3 Peraturan Menteri	113
4.4.4 Pihak Bertanggungjawab dalam Perancangan serta Pengurusan Ruang Terbuka Hijau di Wilayah Bandar Makassar	114
4.4.4.1 Pejabat Tata Ruang dan Bangunan Kota Makassar	115
4.4.4.2 Pejabat Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup dan Keindahan Kota Makassar	115
4.4.4.3 Badan Perencanaan dan Pembangunan Daerah (Bappeda) Bandar Makassar	116
4.4.5 Hutan Bandar Dalam RTRWP Kota Makassar	117
4.4.6 Analisis Perundangan	119

4.5	Siasatan dan Analisis Tapak Cadangan Hutan Bandar di Makassar	122
4.5.1	Analisis Guna Tanah	122
4.5.2	Geologi dan Hidrologi	127
4.5.3	Sifat Tumbuhan	128
4.5.4	Ciri-ciri Komuniti	129
4.5.5	Kesesuaian Tapak	151
4.6	Kesimpulan	152
<b>5</b>	<b>ANALISIS PERSEPSI TERHADAP PERKONGSIAN AWAM PERSENDIRIAN</b>	<b>154</b>
5.1	Pengenalan	154
5.2	Latar Belakang Responden	156
5.3	Persepsi Terhadap Program Hutan Bandar	158
5.3.1	Kepentingan Hutan Bandar	158
5.3.2	Keadaan Tapak Hutan Bandar Semasa	161
5.4	Persepsi mengenai Perkongsian Awam Persendirian	161
5.4.1	Kepentingan PAP dalam Perancangan dan Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	162
5.4.2	Kesanggupan untuk Penglibatan	165
5.4.3	Tahap Penglibatan Pihak Persendirian	168
5.4.4	Skop Perkongsian Program Hutan Bandar	169
5.4.5	Kecenderongan Perkongsian Program Hutan Bandar	170
5.5	Pembentukan Perkongsian Awam Persendirian	175
5.5.1	Cadangan Keahlian PAP	178
5.6	Latar Belakang Responden PAP	180

5.7	Kesediaan untuk Perkongsian Program Hutan Bandar	183
5.8	Persepsi Rakan Kongsi Terhadap Hutan Bandar	185
5.8.1	Faedah dan Keperluan Terhadap Hutan bandar	185
5.8.2	Kepentingan Perancangan dan Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	187
5.8.3	PAP Bagi Program Hutan Bandar	188
5.8.4	Peranan Rakan Kongsi dalam PAP Program Hutan Bandar	189
5.9	Ringkasan Penemuan	191
<b>6</b>	<b>RUMUSAN DAN CADANGAN HASIL KAJIAN</b>	<b>194</b>
6.1	Pengenalan	194
6.2	Rumusan Penemuan Kajian	195
6.3	Rangka Kerja PAP Hutan Bandar	197
6.4	Implikasi Polisi	201
6.5	Cadangan untuk Kajian Selanjutnya	203
6.6	Penutup	204
	<b>RUJUKAN</b>	<b>205</b>
	Lampiran A – B	240-258

## SENARAI JADUAL

NO. JADUAL	TAJUK	MUKA SURAT
2.1	Beberapa Contoh Definisi Hutan	13
2.2	Skop Hutan Bandar	21
2.3	Keadaan yang Perlu untuk Menjamin Faedah dari Pokok dan Kelemahan yang Perlu Dielakkan	24
2.4	Faedah dan Fungsi Hutan Bandar	25
2.5	Pendekatan Perancangan Ruang Terbuka – Perbandingan Panduan Prinsip Perancangan	37
2.6	Perbandingan Kajian Kes Tadbir Urus Hutan Bandar	52
2.7	Objektif Khusus Perkongsian Hutan Bandar	66
3.1	Kaedah Penyelidikan yang Digunakan dalam Kajian Berkaitan Hutan Bandar	75
3.2	Data dan Sumber Data bagi Analisis Tapak	80
3.3	Faktor Dan Kriteria bagi Menilai Kesesuaian Tapak	82
3.4	Bilangan Responden Mengikut Kumpulan	87
4.1	Perubahan Penggunaan/Tutupan Lahan Kota Makassar Tahun 1990-2000	97
4.2.	Perubahan Penggunaan/Tutupan Lahan Kota Makassar Tahun 1990-2000	99
4.3	Peranan Setiap Peringkat Pentadbiran yang Terlibat dengan Hutan Bandar	104

4.4	Cadangan Kawasan Hijau Bersepadu Berdasarkan Zon di Makassar	118
4.5	Matriks Konflik dalam Perundangan, Peraturan, dan Polisi Hutan Bandar	120
4.6	Guna Tanah Semasa Setiap Tapak Cadangan	123
4.7	Litupan Tanah pada Setiap Tapak Cadangan Hutan Bandar	126
4.8	Guna Tanah Persekitaran Tapak Cadangan Hutan Bandar	127
4.9	Spesies Utama dan Litupan Kanopi Pokok Tapak Cadangan Hutan Bandar di Makassar	129
4.10	Saiz Tapak	130
4.11	Kepadatan Penduduk pada Setiap Tapak	132
4.12	Jarak Tapak Cadangan dari Jalan	134
4.13	Status Pemilikan Tapak Hutan Bandar	135
4.14	Kualiti Pemandangan Semasa Tapak Cadangan Hutan Bandar	151
4.15	Rumusan Penilaian Tapak Berdasarkan Kriteria Kesesuaian	156
5.1	Latar Belakang Responden	157
5.2	Keutamaan Faedah Hutan Bandar	159
5.3	Persepsi Mengenai Keadaan Semasa Kawasan Hutan Bandar	161
5.4	Persepsi Mengenai Kaedah PAP bagi Program Hutan Bandar	163
5.5	Persepsi Mengenai Kelemahan PAP bagi Penyediaan Hutan Bandar Mengikut Kategori Responden	165
5.6	Bentuk Perkongsian yang Diketahui oleh Responden	166
5.7	Taburan Komponen Penyertaan Mengikut Kumpulan Responden	167

5.8	Persepsi Responden Mengenai Tahap Penglibatan Pihak Persendirian	168
5.9	Skop Perkongsian Program Hutan Bandar	170
5.10	Persepsi Mengenai Kadar Perkongsian Komponen Perancangan	171
5.11	Persepsi Mengenai Kadar Perkongsian Komponen Pengurusan	172
5.12	Persepsi Mengenai Kadar Perkongsian Sokongan Kewangan	172
5.13	Persepsi Mengenai Kadar Perkongsian Penyediaan Tapak	173
5.14	Persepsi Mengenai Kadar Perkongsian Sumber Manusia	174
5.15	Persepsi Mengenai Kadar Perkongsian Pengawasan	174
5.16	Cara Meningkatkan Kerja Sama dalam Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	176
5.17	Bentuk Penglibatan yang Diharapkan	177
5.18	Pihak yang Dicadangkan sebagai Ahli PAP	180
5.19	Profil Ahli PAP	182

## SENARAI RAJAH

NO. RAJAH	TAJUK	MUKA SURAT
2.1	Perkhidmatan Sistem dan Fungsi Hutan Bandar Pada Skala Pokok, Jalan dan Bandar	23
2.2	Jumlah Nilai Ekonomi Hutan Bandar	33
2.3	Tiga Lokasi Daripada Sepuluh Bandar Terbaik untuk Hutan Bandar di Amerika Syarikat	35
2.4	Titik Campur Tangan Strategik	39
2.5	Model Pelan Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	44
2.6	Model Perhutanan Bandar (Pelaku dan Aktiviti Berhubungan dengan Sumber Hutan Bandar)	49
2.7	Model Perancangan dan Pengurusan Hutan Bandar Mampan	51
2.8	Ciri-Ciri Hutan Bandar Semasa (2015) dan Unjuran bagi 2040	65
2.9	Pusingan Aktiviti Termasuk Perancangan Mencipta, Menjaga, Menyemak, dan Mengubah Hutan Bandar dan Infrastruktur Hijau serta Khidmat Tambahan yang Tertumpu untuk Penduduk	67
3.1	Litupan Kanopi Pokok Secara Vertikal	80
3.2	Reka Bentuk Kajian	85
4.1	Peta Pulau Sulawesi dan Kedudukan Bandar Makassar	94
4.2	Peta Guna Tanah Kota Makassar Tahun 1990	98
4.3	Peta Guna Tanah Kota Makassar Tahun 2000	98

4.4	Peta Guna Tanah Kota Makassar Tahun 2010	100
4.5	Imej Kota Makassar 2014	101
4.6	Sistem Perancangan Spatial	108
4.7	RTRWK (Perancangan Ruang Tempatan) Proses Merumus Polisi	109
4.8	Guna Tanah Semasa Kota Makassar	124
4.9	Peta Litupan Tanah Bandar Makassar	125
4.10	Peta Kepadatan Penduduk Kota Makassar Mengikut Mukim	133
4.11	Taburan Tapak Cadangan Hutan Bandar di Makassar	136
4.12	Hutan Bandar Unhas Makassar	141
4.13	Hutan Bandar UMI	142
4.14	Kampus Universitas Negeri Makassar	143
4.15	Komite Nasional Pemuda Indonesia	144
4.16	Gedung Olahraga Sudiang	145
4.17	Padang Awwalul Islam	146
4.18	Pesantren Darul Arqam	147
4.19	Hutan Bandar Tepi Sungai Jeneberang	148
4.20	Hutan Bandar Persiaran Jalan Metro Tanjung Bunga	149
4.21	Caddika Sudiang	150
6.1	Kerangka Kerja PAP Perancangan dan Pengurusan Hutan Bandar	198



**SENARAI SINGKATAN**

PAP	-	Perkongsian Awam-Persendirian
GOR	-	Gedung Olahraga
KNPI	-	Komite Nasional Pemuda Indonesia
UNM	-	Universitas Negeri Makassar
UMI	-	Universitas Muslim Indonesia
Unhas	-	Universitas Hasanuddin
RTRWK	-	Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kota
UN	-	United Nation
NGO	-	Non Government Organization
Bappeda	-	Badan Perencanaan dan Pembangunan Daerah
IMB	-	Izin Mendirikan Bangunan
APBN	-	Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara
RTH	-	Ruang Terbuka Hijau
RPJMD	-	Rencaana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah
DTRB	-	Dinas Tata Ruang Bangunan

**SENARAI LAMPIRAN**

<b>LAMPIRAN</b>	<b>TAJUK</b>	<b>MUKA SURAT</b>
A	Surat Keputusan Walikota Makassar tentang Lokasi Hutan Bandar di Makassar	240
B	Soal Selidik	248
C	Contoh Skrip Temubual	253

## **BAB 1**

### **PENDAHULUAN**

#### **1.1 Latar Belakang Kajian**

Dengan kadar urbanisasi yang meningkat dalam abad ke-20, kewujudan pokok dalam bandar juga meningkat ke satu tahap di mana pengurusannya dianggap sebagai satu disiplin perhutanan yang tersendiri. Konsep perhutanan bandar bermula di Amerika Utara sekitar tahun 1960an dan turut berkembang di Kanada, Eropah dan Australia (Carter, 1993). Selari dengan keprihatinan terhadap alam sekitar di bandar-bandar negara-negara tersebut, bidang ini asalnya tertumpu kepada pokok-pokok bagi tujuan keindahan dan keselesaan penghuni, namun kemudian mula menyaksikan bagaimana pokok boleh mengubahsuai persekitaran bandar seperti pencemaran udara, air dan sebagainya.

Hutan bandar dianggap komponen penting kerana sumbangannya kepada penduduk bandar dan alam semula jadi (Bulkeley dan Betsill, 2013). Khidmat ekosistem yang disumbangkan oleh hutan bandar termasuk mengurangkan kesan pulau haba, menyimpan karbon, mengurangkan larian air permukaan, mengurangkan pencemaran dan menyediakan habitat kepada beberapa hidupan liar (Cook *et al.*, 2013; Kowarik, 2011; Livesley *et al.*, 2016; Nowak *et al.*, 2013a; Nowak *et al.*, 2014). Menurut Konijnendijk (2005) hutan bandar memberikan kesan positif kepada bandar, menggalakkan rekreasi dan menaikkan ekonomi bandar. Selain itu hutan bandar turut menyumbang terhadap pemuliharaan biodiversiti (Alvey, 2006; Bryant, 2006). Kajian terkini mengenai hutan bandar juga menunjukkan bahawa persekitaran

hijau dapat menurunkan tekanan psikologi, justeru meningkatkan kesihatan (Donovan *et al.*, 2011; Kardan *et al.*, 2015; Mills *et al.*, 2016).

Bandar hanya meliputi kira-kira 3 peratus dari keluasan kawasan bumi. Namun, pada tahun 2014 lebih dari separuh penduduk dunia (54 peratus) tinggal di bandar walaupun terdapat kepelbagaian dari segi urbanisasi bagi negara-negara di dunia. Dekad mendatang akan membawa perubahan yang besar kepada saiz dan taburan spatial penduduk dunia. Urbanisasi yang berterusan dan pertumbuhan keseluruhan penduduk dunia dijangka akan bertambah 2.5 bilion orang kepada penduduk dunia pada tahun 2050, di mana hampir 90 peratus dari jumlah ini akan tertumpu di Asia dan Afrika. Pada masa yang sama, kadar penduduk dunia yang tinggal di bandar dijangka meningkat kepada 66 peratus pada tahun 2050 (United Nations, 2014).

Kenyataan ini disokong oleh Angel *et al.* (2011) yang menganggarkan bahawa penduduk bandar akan meningkat dua kali ganda dari tahun 2000 sehingga 2030, sementara pembangunan kawasan bandar dijangka meningkat tiga kali dalam tempoh yang sama. Jangkaan ini menunjukkan bahawa pembangunan kawasan bandar meningkat 1.5 kali lebih cepat berbanding dengan perkembangan jumlah penduduk. Peningkatan pembangunan dan peningkatan jumlah penduduk akan memberi kesan kepada perubahan corak penggunaan kawasan tanah bandar. Salah satu komponen yang sering terlepas pandang dalam arus pembinaan di kawasan bandar adalah penyediaan ruang terbuka hijau. Disebabkan terhadnya kawasan, pembinaan di bandar cenderung untuk mengurangkan ruang terbuka hijau dengan menukarnya menjadi kawasan kediaman, industri, jalan raya dan kemudahan perbandaran yang lain. Keadaan ini boleh menjejaskan keseimbangan ekosistem bandar, yang dicirikan oleh perubahan iklim mikro, pencemaran udara, banjir, kemasukan air laut ke daratan, peningkatan kandungan logam berat dan penurunan paras air bawah tanah.

Bagi negara-negara maju, penyediaan ruang hijau telah sekian lama menjadi keutamaan menyebabkan kebanyakan bandar-bandar mereka kini sedang berusaha

membangunkan kawasan hijau bandar yang bersepadu bukan sahaja kawasan terbuka hijau, malah menjadi jaringan hijau di samping hutan bandar. Bagi menangani isu-isu persekitaran terkini seperti meningkatkan bio-diversiti dan perubahan iklim, dan selari dengan konsep pembangunan mampan yang mengalakkan penyertaan pelbagai pihak berkepentingan komuniti setempat, pengurusan bandar di negara-negara ini mula menggerakkan inisiatif seperti hutan bandar berasaskan komuniti dan juga perkongsian awam-persendirian (PAP) dalam penyediaan dan pengurusan hutan bandar. Bandar-bandar di Australia seperti Sydney, Perth dan Melbourne, termasuk di Amerika Utara melibatkan pelbagai pihak bermula dari merumus strategi hutan bandar sehingga penanaman dan penjagaan pokok dan lain-lain tumbuhan. Ini akan memastikan perancangan memenuhi citarasa komuniti setempat (Chishaleshale *et al.*, 2015), di samping menjamin hutan bandar yang diurus dengan baik bagi mendapatkan khidmat eko-sistem yang optimum kepada persekitaran dan penghuni bandar (Johnston dan Rushton, 1998; Dwyer *et al.*, 2003; Britt dan Johnston, 2008). Bagi bandar-bandar di negara-negara sedang membangun, terdapat cabaran yang kritikal bukan sahaja dari segi pengekalan kawasan hijau sedia ada, malah pengurusan hutan bandar juga adalah rumit kerana kurangnya sumber kewangan, maklumat dan pakar arboris (Barton dan Johnston, 2015). Lebih kritikal adalah bandar-bandar yang belum berupaya menyediakan hutan bandar kerana pelbagai masalah termasuk persaingan guna tanah dan kekurangan sumber termasuk kewangan dan tenaga. Justeru kajian ini melihat sejauh mana kepentingan hutan bandar dan seterusnya mengkaji kaedah yang boleh digunapakai untuk melaksanakan program hutan bandar bagi Kota Makassar sebagai kajian kes.

## **1.2 Penyataan Masalah**

Peranan dan sumbangan hutan bandar terhadap kemampuan dan kebolehan bandar telah mula diiktiraf dalam pelbagai polisi dan disiplin perancangan dan pengurusan. Pengiktirafan ini lebih jelas dikalangan negara maju, tetapi negara-negara membangun juga semakin menerima kepentingan hutan bandar walaupun terdapat pelbagai cabaran dan halangan sumber (Shackleton, 2012).

Penyediaan kawasan yang secukupnya perlu dipastikan dengan sistem pengurusan yang menjamin kemampanan dan fungsi daripada hutan bandar.

Di Indonesia, pertumbuhan ekonomi yang pesat telah meningkatkan kadar pembinaan fizikal bandar dan kepadatan penduduk. Kedua-dua perkara ini memberi tekanan yang tinggi terhadap kawasan-kawasan terbuka yang boleh dibangunkan sebagai hutan kota. Terdapat keadaan di mana kawasan yang asalnya ruang terbuka hijau kota ditukar menjadi kegunaan lain seperti penukaran jalur hijau untuk pelebaran jalan. Kecenderungan ini akan mengancam keseimbangan alam sekitar bandar yang pada akhirnya akan menjejaskan kewujudan bandar itu.

Beberapa kes di Indonesia menunjukkan bahawa pembangunan kemudahan awam dan persendirian acapkali tidak diikuti dengan penyediaan ruang terbuka hijau dalam jumlah yang cukup. Di Jakarta contohnya, sasaran perancangan ruang terbuka hijau selama 35 tahun bermula 1965 sehingga 2010, telah menurun dari 37.2 peratus pada tahun 1965-1985 menjadi 25.85 peratus tahun 1985-2005, dan seterusnya 13.9 peratus dalam tahun 2000-2010. Pada tahun 2004, ruang terbuka hijau di Jakarta hanya 9 peratus sahaja atau 50 km<sup>2</sup> (Hakim, 2011), walaupun mengalami sedikit peningkatan menjadi 9.6 peratus pada tahun 2007. Keadaan yang sama juga berlaku di beberapa bandar lain di Indonesia. Ruang terbuka hijau di Medan, Bandung dan Makassar masing-masing hanya 8 peratus, 9 peratus dan 10 peratus (Kirmanto, 2010). Undang-undang mengenai perancangan spatial telah memperuntukkan kuasa kepada pemerintah pelbagai tahap kawasan pentadbiran untuk menyediakan sekurang-kurangnya 20 peratus ruang terbuka hijau dari jumlah luas bandar. Walau bagaimanapun, kenyataannya kawasan hijau yang disediakan jauh lebih rendah dari piawai tersebut.

Sehubungan itu, timbul persoalan tentang peruntukan hutan bandar itu sendiri. Perundangan berkaitan perancangan spatial sebenarnya tidak menjelaskan keperluan terhadap hutan bandar, tetapi terdapat peraturan pemerintah di bawah Undang-undang Perhutanan 1999 yang memberi panduan mengenai pelaksanaan hutan bandar. Bagaimanapun terdapat kelonggaran dari segi luas minimum hutan bandar

yang boleh disediakan kerana saiz hutan bandar boleh berdasarkan luas wilayah, jumlah penduduk, tahap pencemaran dan keadaan fizikal bandar khususnya atau secara amnya disesuaikan dengan keadaan setempat. Persoalan timbul mengenai sejauh mana perundangan memberi panduan yang jelas dari segi penyediaan dan pelaksanaan hutan bandar.

Seperti dinyatakan di atas, kajian ini tertumpu kepada penyediaan hutan bandar di Makassar. Makassar merupakan bandar terbesar di kawasan timur Indonesia yang sedang dalam proses penyediaan program hutan bandar. Bandar ini mempunyai lebih kurang 1.3 juta orang atau 16.67 peratus dari jumlah penduduk Sulawesi Selatan (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2013). Berdasarkan jumlah populasi, Makassar merupakan salah satu dari bandar raya metropolitan di Indonesia. Makassar mempunyai luas kawasan 175.77 km<sup>2</sup>, dan merupakan bandar berkepadatan 7200 orang/km<sup>2</sup> di kawasan Indonesia timur. Kedudukan Makassar yang strategik menjadikan bandar ini sebagai pusat perniagaan, industri, perkhidmatan, pendidikan dan pelancongan. Hal ini mendorong pertumbuhan ekonomi yang tinggi dan meningkatkan pembinaan fizikal bandar. Persaingan guna tanah untuk keperluan yang lebih ekonomik menyebabkan penyediaan kawasan terbuka hijau, termasuk hutan bandar acapkali diabaikan. Kawasan pembangunan pada tahun 2006 adalah 7.030 hek., manakala pada tahun 2010 meningkat menjadi 7.343 hek. atau 4.45 peratus dalam tempoh 4 tahun terakhir (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2010).

Pada tahun 2008, Walikota Makassar telah menetapkan 10 tapak hutan bandar di 10 lokasi berbeza dengan keluasan tapak paling kecil iaitu 0.18 hek. dan tapak paling besar seluas 20 hek. Jumlah kawasan tapak adalah 40.1 hek. atau 0.23 peratus dari luas kawasan bandar Makassar. Jumlah kawasan ini jauh dari mencukupi, kerana menurut peruntukan perundangan, luas hutan bandar minimum adalah 10 peratus dari jumlah kawasan bandar. Dari jumlah tersebut, 7 tapak berada di bawah pentadbiran pihak pemerintah, sementara selebihnya adalah milik persendirian seperti tanah yang dimiliki sekolah agama dan tanah milik agensi-agensi kerajaan. Tapak di bawah milik pemerintah juga melibatkan pelbagai agensi. Sehingga kini, program hutan bandar ini hanya terbatas kepada penetapan tapak tetapi tidak meliputi proses seterusnya. Pengurusan tapak dengan pemilikan dan

pentadbiran yang berbeza pastinya akan menimbulkan masalah dari segi peranan dan tanggung jawab. Justeru, timbul persoalan tentang kaedah pengurusan yang boleh dilaksanakan bagi menjayakan program hutan bandar ini. Permasalahan yang lazim dihadapi dalam pembangunan hutan adalah ketersediaan kawasan tanah awam dan pihak-pihak yang seharusnya terlibat dalam pembangunan dan pengurusan hutan ini. Salah satu alternatif pengurusan yang kini digunapakai dengan meluas bagi perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar ialah PAP. Perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar melibatkan pelbagai pelbagai aspek termasuk sumber, struktur pemilikan dan jentera pentadbiran justeru memerlukan tadbir urus yang baik (Lawrence dan Dandy, 2015). PAP telah berjaya dilaksanakan di kebanyakan bandar di negara-negara maju seperti New York (Campbell, 2015), Vancouver (City of Vancouver, 2007) dan Melbourne (City of Melbourne, 2014), namun belum dilakukan di Indonesia amnya atau di kota Makassar khususnya. Memandangkan pentingnya peranan hutan bandar bagi keseimbangan ekosistem bandar, maka diperlukan kajian untuk merangka strategi bersesuaian bagi semua pihak yang terlibat dalam pengurusan hutan bandar di Makassar.

Kajian ini juga dijangka dapat meluaskan penyelidikan mengenai pengurusan hutan bandar di kalangan negara-negara sedang membangun. Menurut Shackleton (2012) kebanyakan kajian mengenai hutan bandar dijalankan oleh negara-negara maju dan sangat kurang sumbangan dari negara-negara di Asia Tenggara atau Afrika Tengah. Di Eropah dan Amerika Syarikat banyak kajian tentang pelbagai dimensi berkaitan dengan hutan bandar telah dijalankan tetapi keadaan kawasan, persekitaran dan masyarakat berbeza, justeru penemuan kajian-kajian tidak dapat diterima pakai terus di Indonesia. Kajian terdahulu mengenai hutan bandar di Makassar tertumpu kepada penentuan luas atau jenis-jenis pokok yang akan ditanam (Rijal, 2008; Tambaru, 2012; Suhadiyah, 2013). Kajian lain di Indonesia juga bertumpu kepada aspek-aspek seperti corak dan struktur hutan bandar (Irwan, 1994), potensi penyerapan karbon oleh beberapa jenis pokok (Dahlan, 2007), pengiraan keperluan keluasan hutan bandar atau ruang terbuka hijau mengikut keperluan oksigen atau bilangan penduduk (Rachman, 2010), kualiti dan keselesaan persekitaran (Hussein *et al.*, 2010) serta keupayaan dan kesesuaian pokok taman bandar untuk menyimpan air (Koeswadi, 2007). Kajian terhadap PAP hutan bandar di Makassar ini belum



pernah dilakukan dan dijangka dapat merapatkan jurang penyelidikan dalam bidang ini.

### **1.3 Persoalan Kajian**

Berdasarkan pernyataan masalah di atas, persoalan kajian ini adalah seperti berikut:

1. Sejauh mana ciri-ciri tapak cadangan hutan bandar di Makassar bersesuaian dengan fungsi yang dicadangkan?
2. Sejauh mana perundangan dan polisi berkaitan yang sedia ada memberi panduan mengenai pembangunan dan pengurusan hutan bandar di Makassar dengan berkesan?
3. Apakah persepsi dan penerimaan pihak-pihak berkepentingan mengenai hutan bandar dan pelaksanaan PAP sebagai kaedah perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar di Makassar?
4. Apakah bentuk rangka kerja PAP bagi perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar yang bersesuaian di Makassar?

### **1.4 Matlamat dan Objektif Kajian**

Berdasarkan persoalan-persoalan di atas, kajian ini adalah untuk mencadangkan dan membangunkan rangka kerja strategi perkongsian pengurusan hutan bandar di kota Makassar, Indonesia yang seterusnya dapat menyumbangkan kepada polisi perancangan pengurusan hutan bandar di bandar-bandar lain di Indonesia.

Berdasarkan matlamat kajian tersebut, maka objektif kajian seperti berikut digariskan:

1. Mengenalpasti ciri-ciri tapak cadangan hutan bandar di Makassar bersesuaian dengan fungsi yang dicadangkan.
2. Mengkaji perundangan dan polisi yang berkait dengan penyediaan hutan bandar bagi mengenalpasti bidang kuasa pelbagai pihak pentadbiran yang terlibat.
3. Menilai persepsi pihak berkepentingan mengenai program hutan bandar amnya dan kaedah pelaksanaan perkongsian awam-persendirian di Makassar.
4. Mereka bentuk rangka kerja pengurusan hutan bandar mengikut konsep perkongsian awam-persendirian yang bersesuaian.

## **1.5 Skop Kajian**

Perhutanan bandar melibatkan banyak aspek dan merupakan bidang pelbagai disiplin. Penyelidikan ini bagaimanapun, menjurus kepada perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar dengan penumpuan terhadap kaedah PAP bagi pengurusan hutan bandar di Makassar. Bagi bandar yang belum melaksanakan program hutan bandar, terdapat banyak aspek yang perlu dikaji namun kajian ini hanya akan melibatkan kajian kesesuaian tapak cadangan dan mendapatkan persepsi pihak berkepentingan mengenai kebolehlaksanaan PAP bagi hutan bandar di Makassar. Kajian kesesuaian tapak pula hanya mengambilkira tapak yang telah dikenalpasti oleh Walikota Makassar dengan andaian bahawa tapak-tapak tersebut telah melalui prosedur seperti yang ditetapkan.

Justeru kajian kesesuaian tapak lebih cenderung kepada menetapkan keutamaan mengikut kriteria tertentu bagi tujuan pelaksanaan. Kajian ini juga melibatkan analisis dokumen melibatkan perundangan dan peraturan yang mempunyai kaitan dengan perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar. Bagaimanapun skop analisis perundangan merangkumi aspek tertentu mengenai perancangan dan pengurusan dan tidak melibatkan semua aspek, contohnya aspek pembiayaan hanya disentuh tetapi tidak dianalisis dengan mendalam. Kajian persepsi

pula tertumpu kepada pihak berkepentingan sahaja. Walaupun kajian-kajian terkini berkaitan proses membuat keputusan terutama melibatkan kepentingan awam menggalakkan penyertaan semua ahli masyarakat, namun bagi kajian ini, masyarakat diwakili oleh persatuan yang terpilih. Penyelidikan ini akhirnya akan mencadangkan rangka kerja untuk PAP namun ini akan terhad kepada beberapa aspek PAP seperti peranan, peringkat dan kaedah penglibatan, justeru tidak melibatkan perincian pembentukan PAP.

## **1.6 Metodologi Kajian**

Secara ringkasnya, penyelidikan ini melibatkan empat peringkat utama:

i) Peringkat pertama merupakan kajian terhadap perundangan, peraturan dan polisi berkaitan hutan bandar. Berdasarkan kaedah analisis dokumen, kajian ini akan mengkaji perundangan berkaitan bagi melihat bidang kuasa pelbagai peringkat pemerintah selain mengkaji kriteria yang diperuntukkan oleh pemerintah mengenai perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar di kota Makassar.

ii) Peringkat kedua merupakan kajian fizikal yang dilakukan terhadap tapak cadangan hutan bandar bagi melihat kesesuaian tapak berdasarkan aspek yang ditetapkan iaitu guna tanah, sifat tumbuhan, topografi dan ciri-ciri komuniti. Kajian fizikal ini merangkumi pengumpulan data dari pelbagai sumber termasuk pemerhatian bagi aspek tumbuhan di tapak-tapak sedia ada, guna tanah semasa dan guna tanah persekitaran. Data juga dicerna dari imej satelit untuk aspek litupan tanah selain untuk tujuan pengesahan data pemerhatian bagi aspek-aspek yang lain. Aspek-aspek kajian ini merupakan kriteria yang akan diberikan pemberat bagi menentukan kesesuaian tapak sebagai hutan bandar.

iii) Peringkat ketiga merupakan kajian persepsi terhadap pihak berkepentingan sama ada secara langsung atau tidak dengan program hutan bandar. Kajian persepsi dilakukan berdasarkan soal-selidik yang meliputi aspek-aspek utama seperti kepentingan hutan bandar, sumbangan dan penglibatan pihak berkepentingan

serta persepsi terhadap kaedah PAP. Soal selidik muka–kemuka dilakukan ke atas 64 responden yang dikenalpasti mempunyai kepentingan dalam program hutan bandar.

iv) Peringkat keempat merupakan temubual terhadap pihak yang dikenalpasti sebagai berpotensi menjadi rakan kongsi dalam PAP yang dicadangkan. Terdapat 10 pihak yang dikenalpasti selain dari walikota dan seorang ahli dewan undangan negeri yang ditemubual secara mendalam bagi mendapatkan persepsi mereka mengenai program hutan bandar dan PAP.

v) Sebahagian data dan maklumat yang diperolehi di analisis secara kuantitatif menggunakan teknik statistik deskriptif sementara hasil temubual dianalisis secara kualitatif menggunakan kaedah analisis tematik.

## **1.7 Organisasi Tesis**

Kajian ini mengandungi enam bab termasuk bab ini yang merangkumi pernyataan masalah kepada penyelidikan, matlamat dan objektif kajian, skop kajian serta huraian ringkas mengenai metodologi kajian. Bab ini memberikan pengenalan dan gambaran ringkas kepada subjek penyelidikan.

Bab 2 membentangkan kajian literatur berkaitan hutan bandar serta kaedah perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar. Terdapat dua elemen utama yang dianggap penting dan perlu diterokai dalam kajian ini. Elemen pertama ialah definisi, peranan dan fungsi hutan bandar sebagai sebahagian daripada kawasan ruang terbuka hijau di kawasan bandar. Elemen kedua ialah perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar yang terkandung di dalamnya peranan pelbagai pihak. Elemen ini juga menghuraikan kaedah PAP sebagai alternatif pengurusan hutan bandar.

Metodologi penyelidikan dibincangkan dengan lebih terperinci dalam Bab 3. Bab ini membincangkan kaedah pengumpulan data sekunder dan data primer. Bab ini membentuk asas pemilihan metodologi dan kaedah yang digunapakai dalam

penyelidikan. Ia bertujuan untuk membuktikan kesahihan dan kebolehpercayaan kepada penemuan kajian.

Bab 4 membincangkan sebahagian dari hasil analisis yang dilakukan dalam penyelidikan ini. Bab ini melibatkan hasil analisis kepada dua aspek penting iaitu pertama, aspek perundangan berkaitan hutan bandar dan kedua, analisis kesesuaian tapak cadangan hutan bandar khususnya dari segi fizikal dan ciri-ciri komuniti.

Bab 5 membincangkan hasil analisis dari kajian persepsi yang dilakukan kepada dua kumpulan responden. Kumpulan pertama ialah pihak berkepentingan yang terlibat secara langsung atau tidak dalam program hutan bandar. Bab ini menghuraikan persepsi pihak ini dari segi kepentingan hutan bandar, kaedah pengurusan, sumbangan dan penglibatan mereka dalam PAP. Kumpulan kedua merupakan pihak yang dicadangkan sebagai rakan kongsi dalam PAP dan bab ini akan membincangkan persepsi mereka berdasarkan temubual yang dijalankan bersama mereka. Selain kepentingan hutan bandar analisis juga dijalankan terhadap persepsi mereka terhadap peranan, cabaran dan potensi PAP yang akan diketengahkan sebagai kaedah melaksanakan program hutan bandar.

Bab 6 merupakan penutup kepada penyelidikan dan akan merumuskan penemuan penyelidikan dan seterusnya cadangan berdasarkan objektif dan cadangan dalam perancangan dan pengurusan hutan bandar di Makassar.

## RUJUKAN

- Aanesen, M., Armstrong, C.W., Bloomfield, H.J., Röckmann, C. (2014). What Does Stakeholder Involvement Mean for Fisheries Management?. *Ecology and Society*. 19 (4:35).
- Abelson, P. (2005). Outsourcing of Public Services in Australia: Seven Case Studies. *Research Paper Series No. 0503*, Macquarie University, Macquarie Park. [www.econ.mq.edu.au/.../research\\_papers2/research\\_papers/Outsourcing PublicServ](http://www.econ.mq.edu.au/.../research_papers2/research_papers/Outsourcing_PublicServ)
- Ahern, J. (1991). Planning for an Extensive Open Space System: Linking Landscape Structure and Function. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 21(1-2), 131-145.
- Alinaitwe, H. dan Ayesiga, R. (2013). Success Factors for the Implementation of Public–Private Partnerships in the Construction Industry in Uganda. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 18(2). 1–14.
- Alvey, A. (2006). Promoting and Preserving Biodiversity in the Urban Forest. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 5(4), 195-201.
- American Forest (2016). The Best Urban Forest in America,. Dicapai dari [www.americanforest.org](http://www.americanforest.org). pada 23 Januari 2016.
- Angermeier, P.L.,(1994) Does Biodiversity Include Artificial Diversity? *Conservation Biology* 8(2).600-602
- Angel, S., Parent, J., Civco, D. L., and Blei, A. M. (2011). *Making room for a planet of cities*. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Appelstrand, M (2002). Participation and Societal Values; the Challenge for Law Makers and Policy Practitioners. *Forest Policy and Economics*. 4. 281-290.
- Araujo, M.B., (2003). The Coincidence of People and Biodiversity in Europe. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*. 12. 5–12.
- Arksey H dan Peter T. Knight, (1999). *Interviewing for Social Scientist: An Introductory Resource for Examples*. Sage Publication Ltd. UK

- Arnfield, A.J. (2003). Two Decades of Urban Climate Research. A Review of Turbulance, Exchanges of Energy and Water, and the Urban Heat Island. *International Journal of Climatology*, 23, 1-26.
- Asian Development Bank. (2005). Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Handbook.
- Austin, R., Thompson, N., and Garrod, G. (2016). Understanding the factors underlying partnership working: A case study of Northumberland National Park, England. *Land Use Policy*, 50, 115-124.
- Axelsson Lindgren C (1995) Forest aesthetics. In: Multiple use forestry in the Nordic Countries. (pynt.. Hytönen M).279–289. The Finnish Forest Research Institute, Helsinki.
- Babatunde, S.O., Opawole, A. and Akinsiku, O.E. (2012). Critical Success Factors in Public-Private Partnership (PPP) on Infrastructure Delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 10(3), 212-225.
- Badan Pusat Satatistik. (2010). *Makassar dalam Angka*
- Badan Pusat Statistik . (2013). *Makassar dalam Angka*
- Ballantyne, C.K. (2002), Paraglacial Geomorphology. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 21, 1935–2017. Dicapai pada Doi: 10 .1016 /S0277 -3791 (02)00005 -7.
- Balmford, A., Moore, J.L., Brooks, T., Burgess, N., Hansen, L.A., Williams, P., Rahbek, C., (2001). Conservation Conflicts Across Africa. *Science*. 291, 2616–2619.
- Bartholome´ , E., A. S. Belward, F. Achard, S. Bartalev, C. Carmonamoreno, H. Eva, S. Fritz, J-M. Gregoire, P. Mayaux, And H-J.Stibig. (2002). *GLC 2000: Global land cover mapping for the year 2000*. European Commission Joint Research
- Barton and Johnston (2015) Tree Management and Social Housing in England. dlm Prosiding Persidangan Trees, People and Built Environment 11, Birmingham.
- Barr, Christopher; Mccarthy, John; Resosudarmo, Ida Aju Pradnja; Dermawan, Ahmad; Moeliono, Moira; Setiono, B. (2006). *Decentralization of Forest Administration in Indonesia Decentralization of Forest Administration in Indonesia*. Center for International Forestry Research (Cifor).
- Baur, J. W. R., Tynon, J. F., Ries, P., and Rosenberger, R. S. (2016). Public Attitudes about Urban Forest Ecosystem Services Management: A case study in Oregon cities. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 17, 42-53.

- Bell, S., Blom, D., Rautamki, M., Castel-Branco, C., Simson, A., & Olsen, I. (2005). Design of Urban Forests. Dalam C. Konijnendijk, K. Nilsson, T. Randrup & J. Schipperijn (Pynt), *Urban Forests and Trees* (pp. 149-186): Springer Berlin Heidelberg
- Berg, P.G. (2004). Sustainability resources in Swedish townscape neighbourhoods: results from the model project Hågaby and comparisons with three common residential areas, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 68, 29-52
- Berg, M., Wendel-Vos, W., Poppel, M., Kemper, H., Mechelen, W., Maas, J. (2015). Health benefits of green spaces in the living environment: A systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*. 14(4) 806–816
- Bettinger, Pete; Boston, Kevin; Siry, Jacek; Grebner, D. (2009). *Forest Management and Planning*. Elsevier Inc.
- Blackwell, B. (2012). City of London urban forest strategy draft strategy report, Dicapai dari <http://www.bablackwell.com/Urban-Forestry.html> pada 25 Ogos 2015.
- Booth A. dan Halseth G., (2011). Why the public thinks natural resources public participation processes fail: A case study of British Columbia communities. *Land Use Policy*. 28.898– 906.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*, Stanford University Press.
- Branch, M.C. (1990). *Planning: Universal Process*. Publisher Praeger.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2014) What can thematic analysis offer health and wellbeing researchers? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 9.
- Brenner, N. & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the Geographies of “Actually Existing Neoliberalism” *Antipode*. 34(3) pp. 349–379
- Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2002). Assessing and improving partnership relationships and outcomes: a proposed framework. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 25(3), 215–231.
- Britt, C. and Johnston, M. (2008) *Trees in Towns II: A New Survey of Urban Trees in England and Their Condition and Management*. London, Communities and Local Government Publications.



- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Brown, G., de Bie, K., and Weber, D. (2015). Identifying public land stakeholder perspectives for implementing place-based land management. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 139, 1–15.
- Brugha, R., dan Varvasovsky, Z., (2000). Stakeholder analysis: a review. *Health Policy and Planning* 15, 239–246.
- Bruña-García, X., and Marey-Pérez, M. F. (2014). Public participation: A need of forest planning. *IForest*, 7(4).
- Bryant, M. M. (2006). Urban landscape conservation and the role of ecological greenways at local and metropolitan scales. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 76(1-4), 23–44.
- Buchy, M., and S. Hoverman. (2000). Understanding public participation in forest planning: a review. *Forest Policy and Economics* 1:15–25.
- Buijs A, Elands B, Havik G, Ambrose -Oji B, Ger óházi E, van der Jagt A, Mattijssen T, Møller MS, Vierikko K. (2016). Innovative Governance of Urban Green Spaces: Learning from 18 innovative examples across Europe. Green Surge, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Bulkeley, H., Betsill, M.M., (2013). Revisiting the urban politics of climate change. *Environ. Policy*, 22, 136–154.
- Bungin, B. (2008). *Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta, Prenada Putra Grafika.
- Bunruamkaewa, K., dan Murayama, Y. (2011). Site suitability evaluation for ecotourism using GIS and AHP: A case study of surat Thani Province, Thailand. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*,
- CABE. (2006). Paying for parks eight models for funding urban green spaces, 1–84. dicapai dari //www.cabe.org.uk/AssetLibrary/8899.pdf (4 april 2015).
- Callinicos, A. 2003. *An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Campbell, K. (2015). Constructing New York City’s Urban Forest: The Politics and Governance of the Million Trees NYC Campaign, dalam *Urban Forests, Trees, and Greenspace: A Political Ecology Perspective* (Pynt. Sandberg *et al.*), Routledge, New York.

- Carreiro, M.M. (2008). The Growth of Cities and Urban Forestry in MM Carreiro., YS. Song and J. Wu. (Eds). *Ecology, Planning and Management of Urban Forestry*. International Perspective (2-9), New York, Springer.
- Carter, J. (1993). *The Potential of Urban Forestry in Developing Countries: A Concept Paper*. Forestry Department, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- Carson, L. (2009). Deliberative public participation and hexachlorobenzene. Stockpiles. *Journal of Environmental Management*. vol. 90, pp. 1636-1643.
- Castells, M. (1993). European Cities, The Informational Society, And The Global Economy. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 84(4) pp.247-257.
- Central Park Conservancy. (2017). Official Caratekers of Central Park. Dicapai dari <http://www.centralparknyc.org/> pada 15 Maret 2017
- Central Scotland Green Network. (2015). Central Scotland Green Network Annual review 2014/15. CSGN, Hillhouse ridge, Scotland, 16 p
- Chan, A.P.C., Lam, P.T.I., Chan, D.W.M., Cheung, E., and Ke, Y. (2010). Potential Obstacles to Successful Implementation of Public Private Partnership in Beijing and the Hongkong Special Administrative Region. *Journal Management Engineering*. 26(1), 34-40.
- Chakraborty, S., and R. Stratton. (1993). An Integrated Regional Approach to Risk Management of Industrial-Systems. *Nuclear Safety*. 34 (1): 1-8.
- Chen, C., Hubbard, M., and Liao, C.-S. (2013). When Public-Private Partnerships Fail. *Public Management Review*, 15(6), 839-857.
- Cheung E. Albert P.C. Chan, Patrick T.I. L, Daniel W.M. Chan, & Yongjian, (2012). A Comparative Study of Critical Success Factors for Public Private Partnerships (PPP) between Mainland China and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. *Facility Management Development*. Volume 30, Issue 13/14, 647-666.
- Chishaleshale, M., Shackleton, C.M., Gambiza, J. and Gumbo, D. (2015). The prevalence of planning and management frameworks for trees and green spaces in urban areas of South Africa. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14: 817-825.

- City of Burlington. (2010). Urban Forest Management Plan 2011-2030
- City of London. (2014). Urban Forest Strategy; Enhancing the forest city
- City of Melbourne. (2011). Urban Forest Strategy-Making a great city greener.
- City of Nanaimo. (2010). Urban Forestry Management Strategy, Nanaimo, BC, 120
- City of Sidney (2013). Urban Forest Strategy
- City of Vancouver. (2014). City of Vancouver Urban Forest Strategy.
- Clark, J. R., Matheny, N. P., Cross, G., and Wake, V. (1997). A Model of Urban Forest Sustainability, 23(January), 17–30.
- Collins, J.P., Kinzig A., Grimm, N.B., Fagan, W.F., Hope D., Wu, J., Borer, W.T. (2000). A new urban ecology. *American Scientist* 88: 416–425.
- Colvin, R. M., Witt, G. B., and Lacey, J. (2016). Approaches to identifying stakeholders in environmental management: Insights from practitioners to go beyond the “usual suspects.” *Land Use Policy*, 52, 266–276.
- Conway, T.M. & V. Yip (2016). Assessing residents’ reactions to urban forest disservices: A case study of a major storm event. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 153(1–10).
- Cook, E. (2002). Landscape structure indices for assessing urban ecological networks. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 58(2-4), 269–280.
- Cook, E.M., Hale, R.L., Kinzig, A.P., Grove, M.J., (2013). Urban-suburban biodiversity. *Encycl. Biodivers.* 304–313.
- Cooke, W. dan U. Kothari. (2001) *Participation: the New Tyranny?* London: Zed.
- Costa, C.S., Erjavec, S., Juliane, M. (2008). Green spaces- a key resources for urban sustainability. The greenkeys approach for developing green spaces. *Urbani Izziv*.19(2):199-211.
- Creighton J. (1986) *Managing Conflicts in Public Involvement Settings: Training Manual for Bonneville Power Administration*, Palo Alto, CA.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Approaches (3rd Edition)*. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publication.
- Dahlan, E. N. (2007). Analisis kebutuhan luasan hutan kota sebagai sink gas CO<sup>2</sup> Antropogenik dari bahan bakar minyak dan gas .Tesis Ph. D. Institut Pertanian Bogor.

- Dale, V.M., Brown, S., Hanber, R.A., Hobbs, N.T., Naiman, R.J., Riebsame, W.E., Turner, M.G., and Valone, T.J. (2000). Ecological Principles & Guidelines for Managing the Use of the Land Ecological Application. *The Ecological Design and Planning Reader*, 279-298.
- Danin, S. 2002. *Menjadi Peneliti Kualitatif*. Bandung, Pustaka Setia.
- De Meo I., Cantiani M. G., Ferretti F., Paletto A., (2011). Stakeholders' Perception as Support for Forest Landscape Planning. *International Journal of Ecology* 1: 1-8.
- De Montis, A. (2014). Strategic Environmental Assessment of energy Planning Tools: A Study Italian Regions and Provinces. *Environment Impact Assessment Review*, 46. 32-42.
- Dempsey, N., Burton, M., and Duncan, R. (2016). Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Cross-Sector Partnership for Green Space Management: The Case of Southey Owlerton, Sheffield, UK Available eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/93726
- Dennis, M. dan James, P. (2016) .User participation in urban green commons: Exploring the links between access, voluntarism, biodiversity and well being. *Urban Forest and Urban Greening*. 15: 22-31.
- Dennis, M., and James, P. (2016). User participation in urban green commons: Exploring the links between access, voluntarism, biodiversity and well being. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 15, 22–31.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The Good Research Guide: For small-scale social research project*. Fourth Edition. Open University Press.
- Devers, K. J., and Frankel, R. M. (2000). Study design in qualitative research-2: Sampling and data collection strategies. *Education for Health*, 13(2), 263–271.
- De Vries, R.A. Verheij, Groenewegen, P.P., Spreeuwenberg, P.(2003) Natural environments - healthy environments? An exploratory analysis of the relationship between greenspace and health. *Environ. Plann. A*, 35 (10). 1717–1731
- Donovan, G.H., Michael, Y.L., Butry, D.T., Sullivan, A.D., Chase, J.M., (2011). Urban trees and the risk of poor birth outcomes. *Health Place*, 17, 390–393.
- Dramstad, W.E., Olson, J.D., and Forman, R.T.T. (1996). *Landscape Ecology Principles in Landscape Architecture and Land-Use Planning*. Harvard University. Washington DC.

- Dwyer, J. F., Nowak, D. J., and Noble, M. H. (2003). Sustaining Urban Forests, 29(January), 49–55.
- Duffield. (2010). Different delivery models, in Hodge GA, Greve, C and Boardman, A.(Pnyt)). *International Handbook on Public-Private Partnerships*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.
- Eiter, S., and Vik, M.L. (2015). Public Participation in Landscape Planning: Effective Methods for Implementing the European Landscape Convention in Norway, *Land Use Policy*. 44 (March 2015), 44-53
- El-Gohary, N. M., Osman, H., and El-Diraby, T. E. (2006). Stakeholder management for public private partnerships. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24(7), 595–604.
- Escobedo, F., dan Seitz, J. (2009). The Costs of Managing an Urban Forest 1. *Journal of Arboriculture*, 1–4.
- European Commission, 2003. Guidelines for Successful Public –Private Partnerships, Mac.p100. dicapai dari [http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/guides/PPPguide.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/sources/docgener/guides/PPPguide.htm). pada Ogos, 2016.
- European Commission (2013): Questions and answers: EU strategy on adaptation to climate change, dicapai dari [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_MEMO-13-334\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-334_en.htm). pada Ogos 2016.
- Eriksson, L. (2012), Exploring Underpinnings of Forest Conflicts: A Study of Forest Values and Beliefs in the General Public and among Private Forest Owners in Sweden. *Society and Natural Resources* 25, pp. 1102–1117.
- Eva, H. D., A. S. Belward, E. E. De Miranda, C. M. Di Bella, V. Gond, O. Huber, S. Jones, M. Sgrenzaroli, And S. Fritz. (2004). A land cover map of South America. *Global Change Biol.* 10: 731–744.
- FAO. (2001). *State of the World's Forests 2001*. Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations, Rome
- FAO. (2012). Forest Resources Assessment 2015: Terms and Definitions, 36. Dicapai dari <http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/ap862e/ap862e00.pdf> pada 26 June 2014.
- FAO. (2015). *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015. Desk Reference*.
- Fisher, R.D., Engel, E., and Galetovic, SA. (2014). *The Economics of Public-Private Partnerships: A Basic Guide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Flores, A., Pickett, S. T. ., Zipperer, W. C., Pouyat, R. V, and Pirani, R. (1998). Adopting a Modern Ecological View of the Metropolitan Landscape: the Case of a Greenspace System for the New York City Region. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 39(4), 295–308.
- Forman, R.T.T., and Gordon, M. (1986). *Landscape Ecology*. Wiley, New York.
- Friedrich, G.W. (2003). *Sampling Theory*. Methods of Inquiry Syllabus, 154, Fall.
- French, J.S., (1973). *Urban Green: City Parks of the Western World*. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, Iowa
- Frewer, L.J. (1999). Risk Perceptions, Social Trust and Public Participations in Strategic Decision-Making- Implications for Emerging Technologies. *Ambio*, 28, 569-574.
- Gerhold, H.D. (2007) *Origins of Urban Forestry*, Dlm. Kuser, J (Pynt.) *Urban and Community Forestry in the Northeast*, Springer. New York.
- Germain, R. H., Shwartz J., & Parrish, J. (2001). The New York City Watershed Model Forests: Working laboratories to study and demonstrate sustainable forestry. *Journal of Extension* , 39(2).
- German-Chairi, C. and Seeland. (2004). Are Urban Green Spaces Optimally Distributed to Act as Places for Social Integration? Results of a Geographical Information System (GIS) Approach for Urban Forestry Research. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 6(1):3-13
- Godefroid, S., Koedam, N., (2003). Distribution pattern of the flora in a peri-urban forest: an effect of the city–forest ecotone. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 65, 169–185.
- Gómez-Vázquez, I., Álvarez-Álvarez, P., Marey-Pérez, M.F. (2009). Conflicts as enhancers or barriers to the management of privately owned common land: A method to analyze the role of conflicts on a regional basis. *Forest Policy and Economics* 11: 617-627.
- Grey, G.W. (1996). *The Urban Forest: Comprehensive Management*, John Wiley and Sons
- Grimble, R. dan Chan, M.-K. (1995), Stakeholder analysis for natural resource management in developing countries. *Natural Resources Forum*, 19: 113–124

- Gül, A., Gezer, A., and Kane, B. (2006). Multi-criteria analysis for locating new urban forests: An example from Isparta, Turkey. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 5(2), 57–71.
- Gustavsson, R., Martin Hermy., Konijnendijk, C., dan Schwan, AS. (2005). *Management of Urban Woodland and Parks Searching for Creative and Sustainable Concept in Urban Forest and Tree*, pp, 369-397.
- Haaland, C., dan Konijnendijk, C. (2015). Challenges and strategies for urban green-space planning in cities undergoing densification: A review. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(4), 760–771.
- Hakim, R. (2011) Pengurusan Kawasan Hijau yang Berkesan untuk Bandaraya Jakarta, Tesis Ph.D. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Hale, J.D., Pugh, T.A.M., Sadler, J.P., Boyko, C.T. (2015) Delivering a Multi-Functional and Resilient Urban Forest. *Sustainability*, 7, 4600-4624.
- Hansen, S.H., and Mäenpää, M. (2008). An Overview of the Challenges for Public Participation in River Basin Management and Planning. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 19(1), 67–84.
- Hansmann, R., Whitehead, I., Ostoić, S.K., Živojinović, I., Stojanovska, M., Jones, N., Bernasconi, A., Benamar, S., Lelieveld, C., Barstad, J. (2016). Partnerships for Urban Forestry and Green Infrastructure Delivering Services to People and the Environment: A Review on What They Are and Aim to Achieve. *South East-European Forestry*, 7(1), 9-19.
- Harrison, S.R., and Qureshi, M.E. (2000). Choice of Stakeholder Groups and Members in Multicriteria Decision Models. *A United Nation Sustainable Development Journal*. 24(1), 11-19.
- Heiligmann, R.B. (2002). Forest Management, Developing a Plan to Care for Your Forest. School of Natural Resources, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. Extension Fact Sheet F-34-02.
- Helms, J.A., (1998). *The Dictionary of Forestry*. The Society of American Foresters, Bethesda.
- Helms, J.A., (2002). Forest, forestry, forester: what do these terms mean? *Journal of Forestry* 100 (8), 15–19.

- Heynen, N., Perkins, H. A., dan Roy, P. (2006). The Political Ecology of Uneven Urban Green Space. *Urban Affairs Review*, 42 (1), 3-25.
- Hidayati, R., (1990). Assessment of climate behavior Jakarta. Changes and differences in the surrounding area. Bogor Agricultural University Graduan.
- Hussein R., Yanuwijaya B., Soemarna. (2010). Analisis kualitas dan kenyamanan lingkungan kawasan hutan kota. *Agritek*. Vol.18. No. 2
- Hwang, B.G., Zhao, X., Mindy, J.S.G., (2013). Public private partnership projects in Singapore: Factors, critical risks and preferred risk allocation from the perspective of contractors. *International Journal of Project Management*. 31(3):424-433
- Idris, A., Kura, S. M. and Bashir, M.U. (2013). Public Private Partnership in Nigeria and Improvement in Service Delivery: An Appraisal. *IORS Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 10(3), 63-71.
- IPCC (2000), *Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*, Cambridge University Press, UK
- Irwan, Z.D. (1994). Peranan Bentuk dan Struktur Hutan Kota terhadap Kualitas Lingkungan Kota. Disertasi, Pasca Sarjana. IPB Press. Bogor.
- James, P., Tzoulas, K., Adams, M.D., Barber, A., Box, J., Breuste, J., Elmqvist, T., Frith, M., Gordon, C., Greening, K.L., Handley, J., Haworth, S., Kazmierczak, A.E., Johnston, M., Korpela, K., Moretti, M., Niemela, J., Pauleit, S., Roe, M.H., Sadler, J.P., and Thompson, C.W., (2009). Towards an Integrated Understanding of Green Space in the European Built Environment. *Urban For, Urban Green* 8, 65–75.
- Janusonic, S. (2009). Comparison two small sample with unstable, treatment-independent baseline. *Journal Neuroscience Method*, 179(3), 173-178.
- Jefferies, M and Mc George, W.D. (2009). Using Public Private Partnership (PPPs) to Procene Social Infrastructural in Australia. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 16(5). 415-437.
- Jennings, S. B., Brown, N. D., and Sheil, D. (1999). Assessing forest canopies and understorey illumination: canopy closure, canopy cover and other measures. *Forestry*, 72(1), 59–74.



- Jensen, F.S. (1999) Forest recreation in Denmark from the 1970s to the 1990s. The Research Series No.26. Danish Forest and Landscape Research Institute, Horsholm.
- Jim, C.Y., dan Chen, S. S. (2003). Comprehensive greenspace planning based on landscape ecology principles in compact Nanjing city, China. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 65(3), 95–116.
- Jim C.Y., dan Chen W.Y., (2008). Assessing the ecosystem service of air pollutant removal by urban trees in Guangzhou (China). *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88, 665–676.
- Jim, C. Y., dan Chen, W. Y. (2009). Ecosystem services and valuation of urban forests in China. *Cities*, 26(4), 187–194.
- Jim, C. Y., dan Liu, H. T. (2001). Species diversity of tree major urban forest types in Guangzhou City China. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 146, 99-114.
- Jim, C.Y., dan Shan, X., (2013). Socioeconomic effect on perception of urban green spaces in Guangzhou, China. *Cities*. 31, 123–131.
- Johnston, M.; Rushton, B.S. (1998) A Survey of Urban Forestry in Britain, Part I: Aims and Method of Research. *Arboricultural Journal* 22: 129-146
- Jones, N. Collins, Kevin., Vaughan, John., Benedikz, Thorarinn., Brosnan, J. (2005). The Role of Partnership in Urban Forestry. In B. J. (Pnyt. . Konijnendijk, Cecil C.; Nilsson, Kjell; Randrup, Thomas; Schipperijn.), *Urban Forest and Trees: A Reference Book* Springer. pp. 187–205.
- Junker, F., Gauvreau, B, Ecotiere ,D., and Blanc-Benon,P. (2007). *Meteorological Classification for Environmental Acoustics – Pratical Implications Due to Experimental Accuracy*. 19th International Congress on Acoustics Madrid, 2-7 September 2007.
- Kahane, D., Loptson, K.,Herriman, J., and Hardy,M. (2013). Stakeholder and Citizen Roles in Public Deliberation. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 9(2), Art 2.
- Kaplan, R. (1980). Citizen Participation in the Design and Evaluation of a park. *Environment and Behavior*. 12(4): 494-507
- Kaplan, R. and Kaplan, S. (1989). *The Experience of Nature: A psychological perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Kardan, O., Gozdyra, P., Misic, B., Moola, F., Palmer, L.J., Paus, T. (2015). Neighborhood Greenspace and Health in A Large Urban Center. *Sci. Rep.* 5, 11610.
- Kangas, A., Heikkilä, J., Malmivaara-Lämsä, M., and Löfström, I. (2014). Case Puijo—Evaluation of a Participatory Urban Forest Planning Process. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 45, 13–23.
- Kazmierczak, A. (2013). The Contribution of Local Parks to Neighbourhood Social Ties. *Landscape And Urban Planning*, 109, 31–44.
- Kartojo, (1992). Cities as central heat (City as Urban Heat Island). Proceedings of the Seminar on Urban Climate Day, PERHIMPI Jakarta.
- Kattwinkel, M., Kühne, J., Foit, K., and Liess, M. (2011). Climate Change, Agricultural Insecticide Exposure, and Risk for Freshwater Communities. *Ecological Applications, Ecological Society of America*, 21(6), 2068-2081.
- Ke, Y. (2014). Is Public-Private Partnership a Panacea for Infrastructure Development? The Case of Beijing National Stadium. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 14(2), 90–100.
- Kementerian Kehutanan RI. (2009). Peraturan Menteri Kehutanan nombor P.71/ Menhut-II/ 2009 tentang Pedoman Penyelenggaraan Hutan Kota.
- Kenney, W. A., Wassenaer, P. J. E. Van, and Satel, A. L. (2011). Criteria and Indicators for Strategic Urban Forest Planning and Management. *Arboriculture and Urban Forestry*, 37(3), 108–117.
- King, C.S., Feltey, K.M., and Sused, B.O. (1998). The Question Of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 58 (4), 317-326.
- Kirmanto, J. (2010). Ruang Terbuka Hijau: Menteri PU Akui Sulit Dilaksanakan. *Suara Karya Online*. Jakarta. Dicapai 28 Oktober 2011
- Koeswadi, M. (2007). The ability and sustainability of urban park for supporting water conservation case study: Jakarta. Tesis Ph.D. International Islamic University Malaysia.
- Kotler, P., dan Armstrong, G. (1997). *Marketing: An Introduction*. Prentice Hall International.

- Klijn, E.H., G.R. Teisman (2003), Institutional and strategic barriers to Public-Private partnership: an analysis of Dutch cases, *Public money and Management*, 23 (3): 137-146.
- Knuth, L. (2005). Legal and institutional aspects of urban and peri-urban forestry and greening. *FAO Legislative Study*, (88), xiii–pp.
- Konijnendijk, C. C. (2006). *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 5(3), 151–152. Springer.
- Konijnendijk, C.C.; Nilsson, Kjell; Randrup, Thomas; Schipperijn, B. J. (Pynt). (2005). *Urban Forest and Trees A Reference Book*. Springer.
- Konijnendijk, C. C., Ricard, R. M., Kenney, A., and Randrup, T. B. (2006). Defining urban forestry – A comparative perspective of North America and Europe. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 4(3-4), 93–103.
- Konijnendijk, C. C., Sadio, S., Randrup, T. B., and Schipperijn, J. (2004). Urban and Peri-urban Forestry in a Development Context - Strategy and Implementation. *Journal of Arboriculture*, 30(5), 269–275.
- Konijnendijk, C.C. (1999). Urban Forestry in Europe: A Comparative Study of Concepts, Policies and Planning for Forest Conservation, Management and Development in and around Major European Cities. Research Notes of the Faculty of Forestry nr. 90. Doctoral dissertation. Faculty of Forestry, University of Joensuu.
- Koontz, T.M. (2003). The Farmer, the Planner, and the Local Citizen in the Dell: How Collaborative Groups Plan for Farmland Preservation. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 66 (1), 19-34.
- Koppenjan, J. F. (2015). Public–Private Partnerships for Green Infrastructures. Tensions and Challenges. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 12, 30–34.
- Koschke, L., Fürst, C., Frank, S., and Makeschin, F. (2012). A Multi-criteria Approach for an Integrated Land-cover-based Assessment of Ecosystem Services Provision to Support Landscape Planning. *Ecological Indicators*. 21, 54–66.
- Kowarik, I. (2011). Novel urban ecosystems, biodiversity, and conservation. *Environ. Pollut.* 159, 1974–1983.

- Krajter Ostoić, S., and Konijnendijk van den Bosch, C. C. (2015). Exploring Global Scientific Discourses on Urban Forestry. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(1), 129–138.
- Krott, M., and K. Nilsson (Eds.). (1998). Multiple-use of Town Forests in International Comparison Proceedings of the First European Forum on Urban Forestry, 5–7 May 1998, Wuppertal. IUFRO Working Group S.6.14.00. Wuppertal, Germany. pp.198.
- Kraxner, F., Aoki, K., Kindermann, G., Leduc, S., Albrecht, F., Liu, J., and Yamagata, Y. (2016). Bioenergy and the city - What can urban forests contribute? *Applied Energy*, 165, 990–1003.
- Kuchelmeister, G. 1998. Asia-Pacific Forestry Sector Outlook Study: Urban Forestry in the Asia-Pacific Region - Situation and Prospects. FAO Working Paper: APFSOS/ WP/44. Rome, Bangkok: FAO Forestry Policy and Planning Division, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
- Kuhn, I., Brandl, R., Klotz, S., (2004). The flora of German cities is naturally species rich. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 6, 749–764.
- Kweon, B. S., Sullivan, W. C., Wiley, A. R., (1998). Green common spaces and the social integration of inner-city older adults. *Environment and Behavior* 30(6), 28-59.
- Lake, R. W., and Disch, L. (1992). Structural Constraints and Pluralist Contradictions in Hazardous Waste Regulation. *Environment and Planning A*. 24(5), 663-687.
- Lawrence, A. and Dandy, N. (2014) Private Land Owners Approaches to Planting and Managing Forest in The UK, What's the Evidence. *Land Use and Policy*, 36. 351-360.
- Lawrence, A., De Vreese, R., Johnston, M., Konijnendijk van den Bosch, C. C., and Sanesi, G. (2013). Urban forest governance: Towards a framework for comparing approaches. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 12(4), 464–473.
- Lawrence, A., Johnston, M., Konijnendijk, C. C., and Vreese, R. De. (2011). Briefing Paper 3 : The governance of ( peri- ) urban forestry in Europe. In *Workshop on sharing experiences on urban and peri-urban forestry* (pp. 2–19).

- Li, B., Akintoye, A., Edwards, P.J. dan Hardcastle, C. (2005). "Critical success factors for PPP/PFI projects in the UK construction industry." *Construction Management and Economics*, 23, 459-471.
- Li, F., Wang, R., Paulussen, J., and Liu, X. (2005). Comprehensive concept planning of urban greening based on ecological principles: a case study in Beijing, China. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 72(4), 325–336.
- Lin, W., Yu, T., Chang, X., Wu, W., and Zhang, Y. (2015). Calculating cooling extents of green parks using remote sensing: Method and test. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 134, 66–75.
- Lindley, D.W.(1997). The choice of sample size. *Statistician*. 46(2), 129-139
- Lo, A. Y. , and Jim, C. Y. (2010). Willingness of Residents to Pay and Motives for Conservation of Urban Green Spaces in the Compact City of Hongkong. *Urban For Urban Greening* , 9 ( 2 ), 113–120
- Lohr, V.I., C.H. Pearson-Mims, J. Tarnai, dan D.A. Dillman. (2004). How Urban Residents Rate and Rank the Benefits and Problems Associated with Trees in Cities. *Journal of Arboriculture* 30(1):28-34.
- Liu, Y., Li, J., and Zhang, H. (2012). An Ecosystem Service Valuation of Land Use Change in Taiyuan City, China. *Ecological Modelling*, 225, 127– 132.
- Liu, T., dan Wilkinson, S. (2014). Large-scale Public Venue Development and the Application of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs). *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(1), 88–100.
- Livesley, S.J., McPherson, G.M., and Calfapietra, C. (2016). The urban forest and ecosystem services: impacts on urban water, heat, and pollution cycles at the tree, street, and city scale. *J. Environ. Qual.* 45(1), 119-24.
- Lo, A. Y., and Jim, C. Y. (2010). Willingness of residents to pay and motives for conservation of urban green spaces in the compact city of Hong Kong. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 9(2), 113–120.
- Lukić, N. (2013). Urban Forests and Greening in the Republic of Serbia – Legal and Institutional Aspects, 51–56.
- Lund, H. G. (2002). When is a forest not a forest? *Journal of Forestry* 100(8):21-27.

- Luyet, V., Schlaepfer, R., Parlange, M. B., and Buttlar, A. (2012). A Framework to Implement Stakeholder Participation in Environmental Projects. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 111, 213-219.
- Luz, F. (2000). Participatory Landscape Ecology: a Basis for Acceptance and Implementation. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 50(1-3. 157-166.
- MacArthur, R.H and Wilson, E.O. (1967). *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton University Press. N.Y.
- Macharis, C., and Milan, L. (2015). Transition through Dialogue: A Stakeholder Based Decision Process for Cities: The Case of City Distribution. *Habitat International*. 45, 82-91.
- Mackintosh, L. (2011). Vibrant Cities and Urban Forests, 41. Dicapai dari vibrantcities.org. 20 Januari 2015.
- Madureira, H., Nunes, F., Oliveira, J. V., Cormier, L., and Madureira, T. (2015). Urban Residents' Beliefs Concerning Green Space Benefits in Four Cities in France and Portugal. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(1),
- Mahmoud, A. H. A., and El-Sayed, M. A. (2011). Development of sustainable urban green areas in Egyptian new cities: The case of El-Sadat City. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 101(2), 157-170.
- Maier, C., Lindner, T., and Winkel, G. (2014). Stakeholders' perceptions of participation in forest policy: A case study from Baden-Württemberg. *Land Use Policy*, 39, 166-176.
- Malczewski, J. (2004). GIS-based land-use suitability analysis: A critical overview. *Progress in Planning*, 62(1), 3-65.
- Maru, R., Baharuddin, I. I., Umar, R., Rasyid, R., and Sanusi, W. (2015). Analysis of The Heat Island Phenomenon in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *American Journal of Applied Science*. 12 (9): 616-626.
- Maru, R., Nasaruddin, Ikhsan, M., Laka, B., M., (2015). Perubahan Penggunaan Lahan Kota Makassar Tahun 1990-2010. *Jurnal Sainsmat*, 113-125
- Maruani, T., and Amit-Cohen, I. (2007). Open space planning models: A review of approaches and methods. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 81(1-2), 1-13.
- Matei, A., and Apostu, D. - C. (2014). The Relationship between the State and the Non - Governmental Organizations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*,

- Mathers, A., Dempsey, N., and Frøik Molin, J. (2015). Place-keeping in action: Evaluating the capacity of green space partnerships in England. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 139, 126–136.
- Matheny, N.P., and Clark, J.R. (1998). *Trees and Development: A Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees during Land Development*. Publisher International Society of Arboriculture. The University of Wisconsin – Madison.
- Mathey, A.-H., Krcmar, E., Dragicevic, S., and Vertinsky, I. (2008). An Object-Oriented Cellular Automata Model for Forest Planning Problems. *Ecological Modelling*, 212(3-4), 359–371.
- Mazzotti, F.J and Morgenstern, C.S. (1997). A Scientified Frame-work for Managing Urban Natural Areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 38, 171-181.
- McAllister, R. R., and Taylor, B. M. (2015). Partnerships for sustainability governance: a synthesis of key themes. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 12, 86–90.
- McLaughlin, R.B. (2009). *Does Maryland's Smart Growth Initiative Improve the Balance of Housing Choices? Evidence from Priority Funding Areas*. Working Paper, University of South Australia.
- McBride, J. R., and Douhovnikoff, V. (2011). Characteristics of the urban forests in arctic and near-arctic cities. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 11(2), 113–119.
- McPherson, E. G., and Johnson, C. W. (1988). A community forestry planning process: Case study of citizen participation. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 15(1-2), 185–194.
- Mcpherson, G., Simpson, J. R., Peper, P. J., Maco, S. E., and Xiao, Q. (2005). Municipal Forest Benefits and Costs in Five US Cities. *Journal of Forestry*, 103, 411–416.
- Merrill, M. L., Taylor, N. L., Martin, A. J., Maxim, L. A., D'Ambrosio, R., Gabriel, R. M., Wells, M. E. (2012). A mixed-method exploration of functioning in Safe Schools/Healthy Students partnerships. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 35(2), 280–286.

- Mert, A. (2009). Partnerships for sustainable development as discursive practice: Shifts in discourses of environment and democracy. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 11(5-6), 326–339.
- Mi, Sun Park and Yeo-Chang Youn. (2013). Development of Urban Forest Policy-making Toward Governance in Republik of Korea. *Urban Forest and Urban Greening*, 12, 273-281.
- Michael G Daigneault. (2006). Innovative Governance. *Credit Union Magazine*, 72(1), 44.
- Middel, A., Chhetri, N., and Quay, R. (2015). Urban Forestry and Cool Roofs: Assessment of Heat Mitigation Strategies in Phoenix Residential Neighborhoods. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(1), 178–186.
- Middendorf, G, and Busch, L. (1997), Inquiry for the Public Good: Democratic Participation in Agricultural Research. *Agricultural and Human Values*. 14 (1). 45-47.
- Mikaelaschmitt, H., Sarah K. Mikensey., Matt Petterson., and Burnel, C. Fisher. (2013). Private Residential Urban Forest Structure and Carbon Storage in a Moderate-Sized Urban Area in the Midwest, United States. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 12, 454-463.
- Millard, A. (2000). The Potential Role of Natural Colonisation as a Design Tool for Urban Forestry a Pilot Study. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 52(2-3), 173–179
- Miller, R. W. (1997). *Urban forestry: planning and managing urban greenspaces*. *Urban forestry: planning and managing urban greenspaces*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mills, J. R., Cunningham, P., and Donovan, G. H. (2016). Urban forests and social inequality in the Pacific Northwest. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 16, 188–196.
- Millward, A. a., and Sabir, S. (2011). Benefits of a forested urban park: What is the value of Allan Gardens to the city of Toronto, Canada? *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 100(3), 177–188.
- Millward, A. a., and Sabir, S. (2010). Structure of a forested urban park: Implications for strategic management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 91(11), 2215–2224.



- Mitchell, D., Enemark, S., and van der Molen, P. (2015). Climate resilient urban development: Why responsible land governance is important. *Land Use Policy*, 48, 190–198.
- Miyawaki, A. (1998). Restoration of urban green environments based on the theories of vegetation ecology. *Ecological Engineering*, 11(1-4), 157–165.
- Mock T. (2004). Building a sustainable urban forest. *Urban Agriculture Magazine* 13: 29–30.
- Mohammadi, Z., and Mohammadi Limaiei, S. (2014). Selection of appropriate criteria in urban forestry (Case study: Isfahan city, Iran). *Journal of Forest Science*, 60(12), 487–494.
- Morsing, M., and Schultz, M. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility Communication: Stakeholder Information, Response and Involvement Strategies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15(October), 323–338.
- Moskell, C., Allred, S. B., and Ferenz, G. (2010). Motivations and Recruitment Strategies for Urban Forestry Volunteers. *Cities and the Environment*, 3(9), 1–28.
- Mota, J., and Moreira, a. C. (2015). The importance of non-financial determinants on public–private partnerships in Europe. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(7), 1563–1575.
- Mukhopadhyay, C. (2015). A nested framework for transparency in Public Private Partnerships: Case studies in highway development projects in India. *Progress in Planning*.
- Mullaney, J., Lucke, T., and Trueman, S. J. (2015). A review of benefits and challenges in growing street trees in paved urban environments. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 134, 157–166.
- Mumtas, M., and Wichien, C. (2013). Sustainability Indicators for Assessing and Monitoring the Resource Management of Pak Phanang River Basin, Thailand. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 91, 341–348.
- Muratet, A., Pellegrini, P., Dufour, A.-B., Arrif, T., and Chiron, F. (2015). Perception and knowledge of plant diversity among urban park users. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 137, 95–106

- Nagendra, H., and Gopal, D. (2010). Street trees in Bangalore: Density, diversity, composition and distribution. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 9(2), 129–137.
- Narulita, S., Zain, A. F. M., and Prasetyo, L. B. (2016). Geographic Information System (GIS) Application on Urban Forest Development in Bandung City. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 33, 279–289.
- Nassauer, J. I., and Raskin, J. (2014). Urban vacancy and land use legacies: A frontier for urban ecological research, design, and planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 125, 245–253.
- Newell, J. P., Seymour, M., Yee, T., Renteria, J., Longcore, T., Wolch, J. R., and Shishkovsky, A. (2013). Green Alley Programs: Planning for a sustainable urban infrastructure? *Cities*, 31, 144–155.
- Neville, J. (2007). Policy Failure: Australian Freshwater Protected Area Networks. *Australian Journal of Environmental Management*, 14, 35-47.
- Nguyen, T., Yu, X., Zhang, Z., Liu, M., and Liu, X. (2015). Relationship between Types of Urban Forest and PM2.5 Capture at Three Growth Stages of Leaves. *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 27, 33–41.
- Ng, KL. and Hamby, D.M. (1997). Fundamentals for Establishing a Risk Communication Program-NCBI. *Healthy Phys*, 73(3):473-82.
- Nielsen, A. B., and Nielsen, J. B. (2005). The use of profile diagrams for mixed stands in urban woodlands - The management perspective. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 3, 163–175.
- Niemelä, J. (2014). Ecology of urban green spaces: The way forward in answering major research questions. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 125, 298–303.
- Nilsson K, Konijnendijk CC and Randrup TB. (2005). Research on urban forests and trees in Europe. Dlm.Konijnendijk CC, Nilsson K, Randrup TB and Schipperijn J (pynt), *Urban forests and trees*.Springer, Berlin. 445–463.
- Norton, B. a., Coutts, A. M., Livesley, S. J., Harris, R. J., Hunter, A. M., and Williams, N. S. G. (2015). Planning for cooler cities: A framework to prioritise green infrastructure to mitigate high temperatures in urban landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 134, 127–138.

- Nowak, D.J., Walton, J.T., (2005). Projected Urban Growth (2000-2050) and its Estimated Impact on the US Forest Resource. *Journal of Forestry* 103 (8), 383-389.
- Nowak, D. J., and Greenfield, E. J. (2009). Urban and Community Forests of the North Central East Region, 60.
- Nowak, D. J., Stein, S. M., Randler, P. B., Greenfield, E. J., Comas, S. J., Carr, M. A., and Alig, R. J. (2010). Sustaining America's Urban Trees and Forests, dicapai dari <http://www.fs.fed.us/openspace/fote/sustaining.html> pada 2 Mei 2015.
- Nowak, D.J., Greenfield, E.J., Hoehn, R.E., Lapoint, E., (2013). Carbon storage and sequestration by trees in urban and community areas of the United States. *Environ. Pollut.* 178, 229–236.
- Nowak, D.J., Hirabayashi, S., Bodine, A., Greenfield, E., (2014). Tree and forest effects on air quality and human health in the United States. *Environ. Pollut.* 193, 119–129.
- OECD. 2005. Growth in Services, London: OECD
- Oke, T.R., (1989) the micrometeorology of the urban forest. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Land B* 324, 335-349.
- O'Leary, R., and Vij, N. (2012). Collaborative Public Management: Where Have We Been and Where Are We Going? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(5), 507–522.
- Oludunfe, S. O. (2011). Urban Forest Management Plan. *Forestry.Alaska .Gov*, 64. Dicapai dari <http://forestry.alaska.gov/pada> 20 januari 2014.
- Ordonez, C., and Duinker, P.N. (2013). An analysis of Urban Forest Management Plans in Canada: Implications for Urban Forest Management. *Landscape Urban Planning*. 116: 36-47
- Osei-Kyei, R., and Chan, A. P. C. (2015). Review of studies on the Critical Success Factors for Public–Private Partnership (PPP) projects from 1990 to 2013. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(6), 1335–1346.
- Owley, J., and Rissman, A. R. (2016). Trends in private land conservation: Increasing complexity, shifting conservation purposes and allowable private land uses. *Land Use Policy*, 51, 76–84.

- Palmer, C., and Engel, S. (2007). For Better or for Worse? Local Impacts of the Decentralization of Indonesia's Forest Sector. *World Development*, 35(12), 2131–2149.
- Park, M. S., and Youn, Y. C. (2013). Development of urban forest policy-making toward governance in the Republic of Korea. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 12(3), 273–281.
- Parks, S., Spaces, G., and Life, U. (2002). Briefing: Green Spaces, Better Places. *Proceedings of the ICE - Municipal Engineer*, 151(3), 241–242.
- Patel, M., Kok, K., and Rothman, D. S. (2007). Participatory scenario construction in land use analysis: An insight into the experiences created by stakeholder involvement in the Northern Mediterranean. *Land Use Policy*, 24(3), 546–561.
- Pathak, H., Saharawat, Y.S., Gathala, M., and Ladha, J.K. (2011). Impact of Resource-Conserving Technologies on Productivity and Greenhouse Gas Emission in Rice-Wheat System Greenhouse Gases. *Science and Technology*, 1, 261–277
- Pauleit S, Jones N, Nyhuus S, Pirnat J and Salbitano F. (2005). Urban forest resources in European cities. Dlm. Konijnendijk CC, Nilsson K, Randrup TB and Schipperijn J (pnyt.), *Urban forests and trees*. Springer, Berlin. 49–79.
- Pearce, L. M., Davison, a., and Kirkpatrick, J. B. (2015). Personal encounters with trees: The lived significance of the private urban forest. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(1), 1–7.
- Pearsall, H., and Lucas, S. (2014). Vacant land: The new urban green? *Cities*, 40, 121–123.
- Peckham, S. C., Duinker, P. N., and Ordóñez, C. (2013). Urban Forest Values in Canada: Views of Citizens in Calgary and Halifax. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 12(2), 154–162.
- Peerapun, W. (2012). Participatory Planning in Urban Conservation and Regeneration: A Case Study of Amphawa Community. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 36(June 2011), 243–252.
- Penker M (2009). Landscape governance for or by the local population? A property rights analysis in Austria. *Land Use Policy*. 26: 947-953.

- Pert, P. L., Lieske, S. N., and Hill, R. (2013). Participatory development of a new interactive tool for capturing social and ecological dynamism in conservation prioritization. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 114, 80–91.
- Peston, M. (1972). *Macmillan Studies of Economics*. Public goods and the public sector. The Macmillan Press. London.
- Pickett, S. T. A., Cadenasso, M. L., and Grove, J. M. (2004). Resilient cities: meaning, models, and metaphor for integrating the ecological, socio-economic, and planning realms. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 69(4), 369–384.
- Pickett, S. T. A., Cadenasso, M. L., Grove, J. M., Boone, C. G., Groffman, P. M., Irwin, E., Warren, P. (2011). Urban ecological systems: Scientific foundations and a decade of progress. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 92(3), 331–362.
- Phillips, L.E. (1993). *Urban Trees: A Guide for Selection, Maintenance and Master Planning*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Pirnat, J. (2000). Conservation and management of forest patches and corridors in suburban landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 52, 135–143.
- Polasky, S., Costello, C., and McAusland, C. (2004). On trade, land-use, and biodiversity. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 48(2), 911–925.
- Pomeroy, B. (1998). The limits to public-private partnership. *The RUSI Journal*, 143(4), 27–29.
- Putz, F. E. and Redford, K. H. 2010. The Importance of Defining ‘Forest’: Tropical Forest Degradation, Deforestation, Long-term Phase Shifts, and Further Transitions. *Biotropica*, 42: 10–20.
- Pretzsch, H., Biber, P., Uhl, E., Dahlhausen, J., Rötzer, T., Caldentey, J., ... Pauleit, S. (2015). Crown size and growing space requirement of common tree species in urban centres, parks, and forests. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(3), 466–479.
- Profous, G. V. (1992). Trees and Urban Forestry in Beijing, China, 18(May), 145–154.
- Purvis, R. L., Zagenczyk, T. J., and McCray, G. E. (2015). What’s in it for me? Using expectancy theory and climate to explain stakeholder participation, its direction and intensity. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(1), 3–14.

- Quayle, M., and Leck, T.D. (1997). Corowing Community: A Case for Hybrid Landscape. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 39 (2-3), 99-107.
- Qureshi, S., Hasan Kazmi, S. J., and Breuste, J. H. (2010). Ecological Disturbances Due to High Cutback in the Green Infrastructure of Karachi: Analyses of Public Perception about Associated Health Problems. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 9(3), 187–198.
- Rachman, I.N.A. (2010). Perencanaan hutan kota untuk meningkatkan kenyamanan di Kota Gorontalo. Tesis. Institut Pertanian Bogor.
- Ramos, T. B., Martins, I. P., Martinho, A. P., Douglas, C. H., Painho, M., and Caeiro, S. (2014). An open participatory conceptual framework to support State of the Environment and Sustainability Reports. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 64, 158–172.
- Randrup, T.B., Konijnendijk, C., Dobbertin, M.K., Prüller, R. (2005) The Concept of Urban Forestry in Europe Dlm. Konijnendijk, C.C.; Nilsson, Kjell; Randrup, Thomas ; Schipperijn, B. J. (Pynt). (2005). *Urban Forest and Trees A Reference Book*. Springer.
- Rašković, S., and Decker, R. (2015). The influence of trees on the perception of urban squares. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(2), 237–245.
- Rastogi, A., Badola, R., Hussain, S. A., dan Hickey, G. M. (2010). Assessing the utility of stakeholder analysis to Protected Areas management: The case of Corbett National Park, India. *Biological Conservation*, 143(12), 2956–2964.
- Reed, M. S., Kenter, J., Bonn, A., Broad, K., Burt, T. P., Fazey, I. R., Ravera, F. (2013). Participatory scenario development for environmental management: A methodological framework illustrated with experience from the UK uplands. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 128, 345–362.
- Reed, M. S. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biological Conservation*, 141(10), 2417–2431.
- Reed, M. S., Graves, A., Dandy, N., Posthumus, H., Hubacek, K., Morris, J., ... Stringer, L. C. (2009). Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90(5), 1933–1949.

- Reynaers, A.-M., and De Graaf, G. (2014). Public Values in Public–Private Partnerships. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 37(2), 120–128.
- Richardson, J. J., and Moskal, L. M. (2014). Uncertainty in Urban Forest Canopy Assessment: Lessons From Seattle, WA, USA. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 13(1), 152–157.
- Richards, C., Blackstock, K.L., and Carter, C.E. (2004). *Practical Approaches to Participation*. SERG Policy Brief No. 1. Macauley Land Use Research Institute, Aberdeen.
- Riemann, R., Liknes, G., O., Neil-Dunne, J., Toney, C., and Lister, T. (2016). Comparative Assessment of Methods for Estimating Tree Canopy Cover Across A Rural-to-Urban Gradient in The Mid-Atlantic Region of The USA. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 188(5), 297.
- Rientjes, S. (2000). *Communicating Nature Conservation: A Manual Using Communication in Support Nature Conservation Policy and Action*. Tillburg, European Centre for Nature Conservation.
- Rijal, S. (2008). Kebutuhan Ruang Terbuka Hijau Di Kota Makassar Tahun 2017. *Jurnal Hutan Dan Masyarakat*, III(1), 65–77.
- Rines, D., Kane, B., Kittredge, D. B., Ryan, H. D. P., and Butler, B. (2011). Measuring urban forestry performance and demographic associations in Massachusetts, USA. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 10(2), 113–118.
- Robinette, C. (1972). *Plants, People and Environmental Quality*. Department of the Interior. National Park Service, Washington.
- Roscoe, J.T. (1975). *Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences*, 2nd edition. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.
- Rossi, M., and Civitillo, R. (2014). Public Private Partnerships: A General Overview in Italy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 140–149.
- Ros-tonen, M. a. F., van Andel, T., Morsello, C., Otsuki, K., Rosendo, S., and Scholz, I. (2008). Forest-related partnerships in Brazilian Amazonia: There is more to sustainable forest management than reduced impact logging. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 256(7), 1482–1497.

- Rouhani, O. M., Oliver Gao, H., and Richard Geddes, R. (2015). Policy Lessons for Regulating Public–Private Partnership Tolling Schemes in Urban Environments. *Transport Policy*, 41, 68–79.
- Rowe, G., and L. J. Frewer. (2000). Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation. *Science, Technology and Human Values*. 25 (1). 3-29.
- Rowntree, R. A. (1988). Ecology of the urban forest: Introduction to part III. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 15(1-2), 1–10.
- Rutherford, P. (2000). *Endless propaganda : the advertising of public goods*. University of Toronto Press Incorporated. Canada.
- Safriel, U.N. (1991). Seed Shadows Generated by Frugivorous Birds in an Eastern Mediterranean Scrub. *Journal of Ecology*, 79, 575-590.
- Santoso, I., (1998). Heat island Jabodetabek area. Department of Geophysics and Meteorology, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Bogor Agricultural University.
- Sawtooth Software Inc. (2013). Available at [www.sawtoothsoftware.com/support/technical-papers/cbc/cbc-technical-paper-2013](http://www.sawtoothsoftware.com/support/technical-papers/cbc/cbc-technical-paper-2013).
- Schäffler, A., and Swilling, M. (2013). Valuing green infrastructure in an urban environment under pressure — The Johannesburg case. *Ecological Economics*, 86, 246–257.
- Schanz, H (1999) National forest programmes in Europe—depicting ambiguity and comparing diversity, Dlm. P. Glück, G. Oesten, H. Schanz, K.-R. Volz (Pynt.), Prosiding Seminar, Formulation and Implementation of National Forest Programmes. European Forest Institute (EFI)—Proceedings No. 30, II, , European Forest Institute, 5–12.
- Schmitt-Harsh M., Mincey S.K., Patterson M., Fischer, B.C., Evans T.P.(2013) Private residential urban forest structure and carbon storage in a moderate-sized urban area in the Midwest, United States. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*. 12(4).454-463.
- Schwab, J. (Eds). (2009). *Planning the Urban Forest: Ecology, Economy, and Community Development*. Chicago: American Planning Association (APA).



- Scribner, M. (2011). The Limitations of Public-Private Partnerships. *Issue Analysis*, (1). Retrieved from <https://cei.org/issue-analysis/limitations-public-private-partnerships>
- Scrinzi, G.J., Tosi V., Agatea P., and Flamminj T. (1995) Italians and the wood. The forest recreation demand in Italy. *Comunicazioni di Ricerca ISAFa*, Trento, Italy.
- Schrijnen, P.M. (2000). Infrastructure Networks and Red-Green Patterns in City Regions. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 48(3-4): 191–204.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for business. A Skill Building Approach*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. John Wiley & Sons. USA.
- Selman, P. (2004). Community Participation in the Planning and Management of Cultural Landscapes. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 47(3), 365–392.
- Seppelt, R., Dormann, C. F., Eppink, F. V., Lautenbach, S., and Schmidt, S. (2011). A Quantitative Review of Ecosystem Service Studies: Approaches, Shortcomings and the Road Ahead. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 48, 630–636.
- Serret, H., Raymond, R., Foltête, J. C., Clergeau, P., Simon, L., and Machon, N. (2014). Potential contributions of green spaces at business sites to the ecological network in an urban agglomeration: The case of the Ile-de-France region, France. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 131, 27–35.
- Seymour, R., and Turner, S. (2002). Otonomi Daerah: Indonesia ' S Decentralisation Experiment. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 4(2), 33–51. Retrieved from <http://www.nzasia.org.nz/downloads/NZJAS-Dec02/Seymour-Turner.pdf>
- Shackleton C.M. (2012) Is there no urban forestry in the developing world? *Scientific Research and Essays*.7(40), pp. 3329-3335,
- Shackleton, S., Chinyimba, A., Hebinck, P., Shackleton, C., and Kaoma, H. (2015). Multiple benefits and values of trees in urban landscapes in two towns in northern South Africa. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 136, 76–86. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.12.004>
- Shan, X. Z. (2012). Attitude and willingness toward participation in decision-making of urban green spaces in China. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 11(2), 211–217.

- Shashua-Bar, L., Tsiros, I. X., and Hoffman, M. E. (2010). A modeling study for evaluating passive cooling scenarios in urban streets with trees. Case study: Athens, Greece. *Building and Environment*, 45(12), 2798–2807.
- Sipila, M., and Tyrvaian, L. (2005). Evaluation of Collaborative Urban Forest Planning in Helsinki, Finland. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 4(1), 1-12.
- Skarback, E. (2007). Urban Forest as Compensation Measure for Infrastructure Development. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 6 (4), 279-285.
- Skelcher, C. (2005). *Public-Private Partnerships and Hybridity* in E. Ferlie, L. J. Lynn Jr., and C. Pollitt, *The Oxford Handbook Of Public Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Skelcher, C., and Sullivan, H. (2008). Theory-driven Approaches to Analysing Collaborative Performance. *Public Management Review*, 10(6), 751–771.
- Smith, J., and Wohlstetter, P. (2006). Understanding the different faces of partnering: a typology of public-private partnerships. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(3), 249–268.
- Sobandi, R., and Sudarmadji, N. (2015). Knowledge Sharing and Stakeholder Collaboration Practice in Solo City Planning and Development: Notes on Urban Community Nurturing Processes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 184(August 2014), 161–170.
- Song, X., Lv, X., and Li, C. (2015). Willingness and motivation of residents to pay for conservation of urban green spaces in Jinan, China. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 35(4).
- Stanghellini, P.S., and Collentine, D. (2008). Stakeholder Discourse and Water Management Implementation of the Participatory Model CATCH In A Northern Italian Alpine Sub-Catchment. *Hydro. Earth System Science*, 12, 317-331
- Steenberg, J. W. N., Millward, A. A., Duinker, P. N., Nowak, D. J., and Robinson, P. J. (2015). Neighbourhood-scale urban forest ecosystem classification. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 163, 134–145.
- Steenberg, J. W. N., Millward, A. a., Duinker, P. N., Nowak, D. J., and Robinson, P. J. (2015). Neighbourhood-scale Urban Forest Ecosystem Classification. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 163, 134–145.
- Stenseke, M. (2009). Local Participation in Cultural Landscape Maintenance: Lessons from Sweden. *Land Use Policy*, 26, 214–223

- Stewart, G.H., Ignatieva, M.E., Meurk, C.D., and Earl, R.D. (2004). The Re-emergence of Indigenous Forest in Urban Environment. Christchurch, New Zealand. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 2. 149-158.
- Stringer, L. C., A. J. Dougill, E. Fraser, K. Hubacek, C. Prell, and M. S. Reed. (2006). Unpacking Participation in the Adaptive Management of Social-ecological Systems: A Critical Review. *Ecology and Society*, 11(2), 39. Dicapai URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss2/art39>.
- Soma, K., and Vatn, A. (2014). Representing the Common Goods – Stakeholders vs. Citizens. *Land Use Policy*, 41 (November), 325-333
- Stormwater, R., Off, R., Water, I., Asthma, D., Physical, I., Calming, T., and Change, C. (2011). Benefits of Trees and Urban Forests: A Research List Benefits of Trees and Urban Forests Benefits of Trees and Urban Forests: *A Research List*, (August), 1–19.
- Strom, B A. and Fule, P. Z. (2007) Pre-wildfire Fuel Treatments Affect Long-term Ponderosa Pine Forest Dynamics, *International Journal of Wildland Fire*. 16, 128-138.
- Sudha, P., and Ravindranath, N. H. (2000). A study of Bangalore Urban Forest. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 47(1-2), 47–63.
- Suhadiyah S. (2013). Potensi Akumulasi Timbal (Pb) pada Beberapa Jenis Vegetasi Penyusun Ruang Terbuka Hijau untuk Reduksi Polusi Udara Kota Makassar. Tesis Ph.D. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Suwarno, A., Nawir, A. A., Julmansyah, and Kurniawan. (2009). Participatory modelling to improve partnership schemes for future Community-Based Forest Management in Sumbawa District, Indonesia. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 24(12), 1402–1410.
- Tambaru, E. (2012). Potensi Absorpsi Karbon Dioksida pada Beberapa Jenis Pohon Hutan Kota di Kota Makassar. Tesis Ph.D. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Tasoulas, E., Varras, G., Tsirogiannis, I., and Myriounis, C. (2013). Development of a GIS Application for Urban Forestry Management Planning. *Procedia Technology*, 8(Haicta), 70–80.

- Tatsumi, K., Yamashiki, Y., Canales Torres, M. A., and Taïpe, C. L. R. (2015). Crop classification of upland fields using Random forest of time-series Landsat 7 ETM+ data. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 115, 171–179.
- Taylor, J., and Lassa, J. (2015). How Can Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments Best Impact Policy and Planning?: Lessons from Indonesia. *IIED Asian Cities Climate Resilience WP Series*, No 22/2015: 1-33.
- Teddle, C., and Yu, F. (2007). Mixed Methods Sampling: A Typology With Examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77–100.
- Tibbets, J. (1998). *Open Space Conservation: Investing in your Community's Economic Health*. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Cambridge
- Turner, T. (1992). Open Space Planning in London from Standards per 1000 to Green Strategy. *Town Planning Rev*, 64 (4), 365-386
- Turner RK, Pearce DW, Bateman IJ (1994) *Environmental Economics: an Elementary Introduction*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead
- Trencher, G., Bai, X., Evans, J., McCormick, K., and Yarime, M. (2014). University Partnerships for Co-Designing and Co-producing Urban Sustainability. *Global Environmental Change*, 28(0), 153–165.
- Tsiros, I. X. (2010). Assessment and Energy Implications of Street Air Temperature Cooling by Shade Trees in Athens (Greece) Under Extremely Hot Weather Conditions. *Renewable Energy*, 35(8), 1866–1869.
- Tyrväinen, L. (2001). Economic Valuation of Urban Forest Benefits in Finland. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 62(January), 75–92.
- Tyrväinen, L., Silvennoinen, H., and Kolehmainen, O. (2003). Ecological and aesthetic values in urban forest management. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 1, 135–149.
- Tyrväinen, L., Ojala, A., Korpela, K., Lanki, L., Tsunetsugu, Y., and Kagawa, T. (2014). The Influence of Urban Green Environments on Stress Relief Measures: A Field Experiment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 38, 1–9.
- United Nations. (2015). World Urbanization Prospects The 2014 Revision.
- UNEP. (2009). Forest definition and extent. *Vital Forest Graphics*, 6–9.
- UN-Habitat. (2009). *Planning Sustainable Cities: Global Report on Human Settlements 2009 (Full report)*. Research Report.

- Urban Forestry Commission. (2013). 2013 Urban Forest Stewardship Plan. Dicapai dari from <http://www.seattle.gov/trees/management.htm> pada 20 juli 2016
- USAID. (2003). Public-Private Partnerships in Forestry.
- USDA .2008. Urban and community forestry. dijangkau pada <http://www.fs.fed.us/> (15 Oktober 2014).
- Utama, D. (2010). Prinsip dan Strategi Penerapan “Public Private Partnership” Dalam Penyediaan Infrstruktur Transportasi. *Jurnal Sains Dan Teknologi Indonesia*, 12(3), 145–151.
- Uy, P. D., and Nakagoshi, N. (2008). Application of land suitability analysis and landscape ecology to urban greenspace planning in Hanoi, Vietnam. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 7(1), 25–40.
- Valente, S., Coelho, C., Ribeiro, C., Liniger, H., Schwilch, G., Figueiredo, E., and Bachmann, F. (2015). How much management is enough? Stakeholder views on forest management in fire-prone areas in central Portugal. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 53, 1–11.
- Van Den Berg, M., Wendel-Vos, W., Van Poppel, M., Kemper, H., Van Mechelen, W., and Maas, J. (2015). Health benefits of green spaces in the living environment: A systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(4), 806–816.
- Van Herzele, A., De-Clercq, E.M., Wledemann, T. (2005). Strategic Palnning for New Woodlands in the Urban Peripheryl Through the Lens of Social Inclusivebess. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 3, 177-188.
- Vermeulen, C.Dubiez, É., Proce, P., Mukumary, S. D., Yamba, T. Y., Mutambwe, S., Peltier, R., and Doucet, J. L. (2011). Land Issues, Exploitation of Natural Resources, and Forests of Rural Communities in the Periphery of Kinshasa, DRC. *Biotechnologie, Agronomie, Société et Environnement*, 15 (4), 535-544.
- Waligo, V. M., Clarke, J., and Hawkins, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: A multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism Management*, 36, 342–353.
- Walmsley T., Bradshaw A., and Hunt B. (1995) *Trees in the Urban Landscape*. E and F.N. Spon, London.

- Wan, C., and Shen, G. Q. (2015). Salient attributes of urban green spaces in high density cities: The case of Hong Kong. *Habitat International*, 49, 92–99.
- Wanke, P. F., and Barros, C. P. (2015). Public-private partnerships and scale efficiency in Brazilian ports: Evidence from two-stage DEA analysis. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 51(2015), 13–22.
- Wassenaar, P., and Satel, A. (2012). A framework for strategic urban forest management planning and monitoring. ... *of the Urban Trees* .... Retrieved from <http://www.cabdirect.org/abstracts/20123338420.html>
- Weber, N., Haase, D., and Franck, U. (2014). Zooming into temperature conditions in the city of Leipzig: How do urban built and green structures influence earth surface temperatures in the city? *Science of the Total Environment*, 496, 289–298.
- Whitfield, S., and Reed, M. S. (2012). Participatory Environmental Assessment in Drylands: Introducing a New Approach. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 77(1), 1–
- Winter, J. (2013). Using the Student's t-test with Extremely Small Sample Sizes. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 18(10), 1–12.
- Wolch, J. R., Byrne, J., and Newell, J. P. (2014). Urban Green Space, Public Health, and Environmental Justice: The Challenge of Making Cities “Just Green Enough.” *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 125, 234–244.
- Wolf, K. L. (2004). What Could We Lose? Economic Values of Urban Forest Benefits. *6th Canadian Urban Forest Conference October 19 -23, 2004 ~ Kelowna, B.C.*, 1–8.
- Wong, E. L. Y., Yeoh, E., Chau, P. Y. K., Yam, C. H. K., Cheung, A. W. L., and Fung, H. (2015). How Shall We Examine and Learn About Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the Health Sector? Realist Evaluation of PPPs in Hong Kong. *Social Science and Medicine*, 147, 261–269.
- Wu, C., Xiao, Q., and McPherson, E. G. (2008). A Method for Locating Potential Tree-planting Sites in Urban Areas: A Case Study of Los Angeles, USA. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 7(2), 65–76.
- Wyse, S. V., Beggs, J. R., Burns, B. R., and Stanley, M. C. (2015). Protecting Trees at an Individual Level Provides Insufficient Safeguard for Urban Forests. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 141, 112–122.

- Wyse, S. V., Beggs, J. R., Burns, B. R., and Stanley, M. C. (2015). Protecting Trees at an Individual Level Provides Insufficient Safeguard for Urban Forests. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 141, 112–122.
- Yang, J. (2012). Urban Forestry in Challenging Environments. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 11(2), 103–104.
- Yang, T. (2014). Towards Sustainable Urban Spatial Structure: Research on Urban System Evolution of Pudong New District. *Proceedings of the 11th International Symposium on Environment-Behavior Research*, 450-459.
- Yang, J., McBride, J., Zhou, J., and Sun, Z. (2005). The Urban Forest in Beijing and its Role in Air Pollution Reduction. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 3(2), 65–78.
- Yang, J., Zhao, L., McBride, J., and Gong, P. (2009). Can You See Green? Assessing the Visibility of Urban Forests in Cities. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 91(2), 97–104.
- Yang, W. R., Li, F., Wang, R. S., and Hu, D. (2011). Ecological Benefits Assessment and Spatial Modeling of Urban Ecosystem For Controlling Urban Sprawl in Eastern Beijing, China. *Ecological Complexity*, 8(2), 153–160.
- Yli-Pelkonen, V. (2008) Ecological Information in the Political Decision Making of Urban Land-Use Planning. *Journal of Environmental Planning And Management* 51(3). 345-362
- Young, J. C., Jordan, A., R. Searle, K., Butler, A., S. Chapman, D., Simmons, P., and Watt, A. D. (2013). Does Stakeholder Involvement Really Benefit Biodiversity Conservation? *Biological Conservation*, 158, 359–370.
- Young, R. F. (2010). Managing Municipal Green Space for Ecosystem Services. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 9(4), 313–321.
- Young, R. F., and McPherson, E. G. (2013). Governing Metropolitan Green Infrastructure in the United States. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 109(1), 67–75.
- Zhang, W., Zhang, X., Li, L., and Zhang, Z. (2007). Urban forest in Jinan City: Distribution, Classification and Ecological Significance. *Catena*, 69(1), 44–50.

- Zhang, X. (2005). Criteria for Selecting the Private-Sector Partner in Public–Private Partnerships. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 131(6), 631–644.
- Zhao, M., Kong, Z. H., Escobedo, F. J., and Gao, J. (2010). Impacts of Urban Forests on Offsetting Carbon Emissions from Industrial Energy Use in Hangzhou, China. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 91(4), 807–813.
- Zhou, D., Wang, Z., Lassoie, J., Wang, X., and Sun, L. (2014). Changing Stakeholder Relationships in Nature Reserve Management: A Case Study on Snake Island-Laotie Mountain National Nature Reserve, Liaoning, China. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 146, 292–302.
- Zhu, P., and Zhang, Y. (2008). Demand for Urban Forests in United States Cities. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 84, 293–300.
- Zielke, P., and Waibel, M. (2014). Comparative Urban Governance of Developing Creative Spaces in China. *Habitat International*, 41, 99–107.
- Zoer'aini. (1994). *Peranan bentuk dan Struktur Hutan Kota Terhadap Kualitas Lingkungan Kota: Studi Kasus Lokasi Pemukiman Kota Jakarta*. Institut Pertanian Bogor.
- Xiao, Q., Mc Pherson, E.G., Grismer, M.E., and Simpson, J.R. (2000). Winter, Rainfall Interception by Two Mature Open-Grown Trees in Davis. *California Hydroll Process*, 14. 763-784.