prepared by

KUNTZ FORESTRY CONSULTING INC.

PO Box 1267 Lakeshore W
Oakville, Ontario L6K 0B3

kuntzforestry.ca
consult@kuntzforestry.ca
289.837.1871

Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report
2155 Leanne Boulevard
Mississauga, ON

Prepared for 1000293648 Ontario Inc.
105 Six Points Road
Etobicoke, ON
M8Z 2X3

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. P4969

Introduction

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. was retained by 1000293648 Ontario Inc. to complete a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report as part of a development application for the property located at 2155 Leanne Boulevard in the City of Mississauga, Ontario. The subject property is located south of the intersection between Leanne Boulevard and Erin Mills Parkway, within a mixed-use area.

The work plan for this tree preservation study included the following:

- Prepare an inventory of private tree resources measuring 10cm DBH and greater on and within six metres of the subject property and public tree resources of all sizes within the adjacent road right-of-way;
- Evaluate potential tree saving opportunities based on the proposed development plans; and
- Document the findings in a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report.

The results of the evaluation are provided below.

Methodology

Tree Inventory

Field assessments for the tree inventory were conducted on 6 March 2026. Private tree resources measuring 10cm DBH and greater on and within six metres of the subject property and public tree resources of all sizes within the adjacent road right-of-way were included in the inventory. Trees were located using a topographic survey provided for the property, aerial imagery, and estimations made from known points in the field. Individual trees included in the inventory were identified as Trees 28 – 96 and A – X. Where appropriate, trees were tagged with their identification number. Trees that were not tagged were identified using the alphabetic sequence. Where trees of the same species occurred in a cohesive unit (i.e. a hedgerow feature), they were inventoried as a polygon. One polygon, identified as Polygon P-1, was included in the inventory.

Tree resources were assessed utilizing the following parameters:

Tree # – Number assigned to trees that corresponds to L100.
Species – Common and botanical names provided in the inventory table.
DBH – Diameter (cm) at breast height, measured at 1.4m above the ground.
Condition – Condition of tree considering trunk integrity (TI), crown structure (CS) and crown vigor (CV). Condition ratings include poor (P), fair (F), and good (G).
Crown Die Back – Percentage of dead branches within the crown.
Dripline – Crown radius (m).
Comments – Any other relevant tree condition information.

Refer to L100 for the locations of the trees and polygon, Table 1 for the results of the inventory, and Appendix A for photographs of the trees and polygon.

Tree Valuation

A valuation was conducted for the City-owned trees included in the inventory. The values were calculated using the Trunk Formula method. This method is described in the Guide for Plant Appraisal, 10th Edition (CTLA 2018). The Ontario Supplement (2021) provides regionally relevant data pertaining to species-specific basic costs for trees.

Trunk Formula Method

This method is used for trees that are larger than what is commonly available for transplant from a nursery. The Unit Tree Cost of the replacement tree is derived from a survey of nurseries or supplied by the Regional Plant Appraisal Council and published within the Ontario Supplement. For Ontario, the species-specific Unit Tree Costs have been calculated within the Ontario Supplement and these Unit Tree Costs have been used for the calculation. Where a Unit Tree Cost was not specified by the Ontario Supplement for a species, a generic Unit Tree Cost of $6.51 was assigned.

The Basic Tree Cost is calculated by multiplying the Unit Tree Cost by the cross-sectional area of the subject tree. For multi-stemmed trees, the appraised trunk area considers the cross-sectional area of all stems. The Appraised Value is calculated by multiplying the Basic Reproduction Cost by the three depreciation factors (Condition Rating, Functional Limitation Rating, and External Limitation Rating), as described in the Guide.

The appraised value is therefore calculated using the following equations:

Basic Tree Cost = Appraised Tree Trunk Area X Unit Tree Cost

Appraised Value = Basic Tree Cost X Condition Rating X Functional Limitation Rating X External Limitation Rating

Functional Limitation Ratings and External Limitation Ratings are calculated according to the methods outlined in the Guide. Condition Ratings were calculated based on the assessed condition of the trees on the site and in accordance with the Guide. The final values were rounded to the nearest $100 for values greater than $2000, and to the nearest $5 for values less than $2000.

Refer to Table 2 for the tree valuation calculations.

Existing Site Conditions

The subject property is currently occupied by a two-storey commercial building and surface parking areas. Vehicular access to the subject property exists from Leanne Boulevard and Erin Mills Parkway. Tree resources exist predominantly in the form of landscape trees. Refer to L100 for the existing site conditions.

Individual Tree Resources

The tree inventory documented 93 trees and one polygon on and within six metres of the subject property and within the adjacent road right-of-way. Tree resources are composed of Austrian Pine (*Pinus nigra*), Blue Spruce (*Picea pungens*), Douglas Fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), Eastern White Cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*), Elm hybrid (*Ulmus x*), Green Ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), Hardy Rubber Tree (*Eucommia ulmoides*), Kentucky Coffeetree (*Gymnocladus dioicus*), Manitoba Maple (*Acer negundo*), Northern Catalpa (*Catalpa speciosa*), Norway Maple (*Acer platanoides*), Russian Olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*), Siberian Elm (*Ulmus pumila*), Thornless Honey Locust (*Gleditsia triacanthos var. inermis*), White Oak (*Quercus alba*), and White Spruce (*Picea glauca*).

Refer to L100 for the locations of the trees and polygon, Table 1 for the results of the inventory, and Appendix A for photographs of the trees and polygon.

Proposed Development

The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing commercial building and surface parking areas, and the construction of an eight-storey mid-rise building with an associated subsurface parking garage, nine blocks of townhomes, internal laneways, and surface parking areas. Four vehicular entrances are proposed from Leanne Boulevard and one vehicular entrance is proposed from Erin Mills Parkway. In the absence of detailed civil plans, it is presumed that regrading within the boundaries of the subject property will be required to support the proposed development. Refer to L100 for the proposed development plans.

Discussion

The following sections provide a discussion and analysis of tree impacts and tree preservation relative to the proposed development and existing conditions.

Development Impacts / Tree Removals

The removal of 53 trees and one polygon, including Trees 28 – 34, 36 – 44, 56 – 68, 71, 72, 77 – 81 84 – 96, and B – E, and Polygon P-1, will be required to accommodate the proposed development. These trees either conflict directly with the proposed development or the level of injury that would result from works associated with the proposed development would be at an intolerable level such that the trees would not be expected to overcome the injury.

Trees 28, 29, 31 – 34, 36 – 39, 41 – 44, 56 – 65, 77 – 80, 84 – 91, 93, 95, 96, B, C, and E are situated on private property and measure 15cm DBH or greater. As such, the issuance of a permit will be required prior to the removal of these trees.

In addition to the aforementioned permit requirements, written permission will be required prior to the removal of any tree situated fully or partially on neighbouring properties. As such, written permission will be required for the removal of Trees B – E.

Trees 66 – 68, 71, 72, and 81 are situated within the adjacent road right-of-way and as such, permission from the City of Mississauga will be required prior to the removal of these trees.

Refer to L100 for the locations of trees identified for removal.

Tree Preservation

The preservation of the remaining 40 trees included in the inventory will be possible with the appropriate use of tree protection measures. The tree resources identified for preservation include Trees 35, 45 – 55, 69, 70, 73 – 76, 82, 83, A, and F – X. Tree protection measures must be implemented prior to the commencement of works associated with the proposed development to ensure tree resources designated for preservation are not impacted. Refer to L100 for the locations of the trees identified for preservation, the locations of the prescribed tree preservation fencing, the general Specifications for the Protection and Preservation of Existing Vegetation, and the tree preservation fence detail.

Where the minimum tree protection zone (mTPZ) of a tree cannot be fully respected, including for Trees 35 and A, special mitigation measures have been prescribed and are outlined below.

Trees 35 and A

Encroachment into the mTPZs of Trees 35 and A will be required to accommodate excavation associated with the installation of proposed hardscape features. If the following mitigation measures are employed, long-term adverse effects are not anticipated for these trees.

1. Prior to the commencement of works associated with the proposed development, tree preservation fencing should be installed as shown on L100 and maintained throughout the duration of the proposed development.
2. The excavation required within the mTPZs of these trees should occur using small machinery (i.e. a skidsteer or miniature excavator) and under the supervision of a Certified Arborist.
3. Any roots damaged during the excavation process should be pruned by a Certified Arborist in accordance with Good Arboricultural Standards.
4. Any branches that extend into the proposed development and require pruning should be pruned by a Certified Arborist or other tree professional in accordance with Good Arboricultural Standards.

A permit to injure Tree 35 will be required.

Compensation Plantings

The City of Mississauga requires compensation for the removal of any trees measuring 6cm DBH or greater, in accordance with the following ratios:

DBH of Tree Identified for Removal	Compensation Ratio
6cm – 15cm	1:1
16cm – 30cm	2:1
31cm – 45cm	3:1
46cm – 60cm	4:1
61cm – 75cm	5:1
76cm – 90cm	6:1
91cm – 105cm	7:1
106cm – 120cm	8:1
121cm +	9:1

A total of 124 plantings will be required within the boundaries of the subject property to compensate for the removal of privately-owned trees. Four plantings will be required within the adjacent road right-of-way to compensate for the removal of City-owned trees. Refer to Table 1 for the number of compensation plantings required for each tree resource identified for removal.

Tree Valuation

A valuation was calculated for all inventoried City-owned trees, including Trees 49 – 52, 55, 66 – 76, and 81 – 83. The total appraised values of the City-owned trees is $4,915.00. Refer to Table 2 for the tree valuation calculation for each public tree resource.

Summary and Recommendations

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. was retained by 1000293648 Ontario Inc. to complete a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report as part of a development application for the property located at 2155 Leanne Boulevard in the City of Mississauga, Ontario. A tree inventory was conducted and reviewed in the context of the proposed development plans.

The findings of the study indicate a total of 93 trees and one polygon on and within six metres of the subject property and within the adjacent road right-of-way. The removal of 53 trees and one polygon will be required to accommodate the proposed development. The remaining tree resources can be preserved provided appropriate tree protection measures are installed prior to the commencement of works associated with the proposed development.

The following recommendations are suggested to minimize impacts to trees identified for preservation. Refer to L100 for the locations of the prescribed tree preservation fencing, the general Specifications for the Protection and Preservation of Existing Vegetation, and the tree preservation fence detail.

- Tree protection barriers and fencing should be erected at locations as prescribed on L100. All tree protection measures should follow the guidelines as set out in the general Specifications for the Protection and Preservation of Existing Vegetation and the tree preservation fence detail.

- No construction activity including surface treatments, excavations of any kind, storage of materials or vehicles, unless specifically outlined above, is permitted within the area identified on L100 as a tree protection zone (TPZ) at any time during or after construction.

- Special mitigation measures have been prescribed for select tree resources, as outlined in the *Tree Preservation* section of this report.

- Branches that extend beyond prescribed tree protection zones that require pruning must be pruned by a qualified Arborist or other tree professional. All pruning of tree branches must be in accordance with Good Arboricultural Standards.

- Site visits pre, during, and post construction are recommended by either a certified consulting arborist (I.S.A.) or registered professional forester (R.P.F.) to ensure proper utilization of tree protection barriers. Trees should also be inspected for damage incurred during construction to ensure appropriate pruning or other measures are implemented.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc.

Kaylee Harper

Kaylee Harper, B.Sc.Env. Ecology
Ecologist, ISA Certified Arborist #ON-2749A
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
Email: kaylee.harper@kuntzforestry.ca
Office: 289-837-1871 ext. 105
Cell: 519-572-5949

Limitations of Assessment

Only the tree(s) identified in this report were included in the inventory. The assessment of the trees presented in this report has been made using accepted arboricultural techniques. These may include a visual examination taken from the ground of all the above-ground parts of the tree for structural defects, scars, external indications of decay such as fungal fruiting bodies, evidence of attack by insects, discoloured foliage, the condition of any visible root structures, the degree of lean (if any), the general condition of the trees and the identification of potentially hazardous trees or recommendations for removal (if applicable). Where trees could not be directly accessed (i.e. due to obstructions, and/or on neighbouring properties), trees were assessed as accurately as possible from nearby vantage points.

Locations of trees provided in the report are determined as accurately as possible based on the best information available. If official survey information is not provided, tree locations in the report may not be exact. Where KFCI's in-house GPS unit is used (if applicable), tree locations are accurate only to the extent that the technology allows, which can be variable based on satellite available, RTK network / cell coverage, canopy coverage, and/or projection transformation limitations. In this case, if trees occur on or near property boundaries, an official site survey may be required to determine ownership utilizing specialized survey protocol to gain precise location.

Furthermore, recommendations made in this report are based on the development plans that have been provided at the time of reporting. These recommendations may no longer be applicable should changes be made to the development plan and/or grading, servicing, or landscaping plans following report submission.

Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions made in this report, it must be recognized that trees are living organisms, and their health and vigor constantly change over time. They are not immune to changes in site conditions or seasonal variations in the weather conditions. Any tree will fail if the forces applied to the tree exceed the strength of the tree or its parts.

Although every effort has been made to ensure that this assessment is reasonably accurate, the trees should be re-assessed periodically. The assessment presented in this report is valid at the time of inspection.

Table 1. Tree Inventory

Location: 2155 Leanne Boulevard **Date: 6 March 2026** **Surveyor: KNH**

Tree #	Common Name	Scientific Name	DBH	Calculated DBH (Multistem)	TI	CS	CV	CDB	DL	mTPZ	Comments	Ownership	Action	Comp.
28	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	30	-	F	P	P	50	3	1.8	Sweep (L), top-down die back, asymmetrical crown (M)	Subject	Remove	2
29	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	45	-	G	F	F	20	4	3.0	Asymmetrical crown (L)	Subject	Remove	3
30	Siberian Elm	*Ulmus pumila*	12	-	G	FG	FG	-	2	1.5	Epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	1
31	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	32	-	P	P	P	90	3	2.4	Lean (L), sap ooze (H), moribund	Subject	Remove	3
32	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	41	-	F	F	F	20	6	3.0	Lean (L), growth deficit (L)	Subject	Remove	3
33	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	27.5	-	FG	PF	PF	30	3	1.8	Epicormic branching (L), lean (L), broken branches (L)	Subject	Remove	2
34	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	32	-	PF	PF	PF	60	4	2.4	Lean (L), cavity (L), top-down die back, asymmetrical crown (M), decay (M)	Subject	Remove	3
35	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	15.5	-	F	FG	FG	-	2	1.5	Sweep (M), epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Preserve (Injure)	-
36	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	38	-	FG	F	F	10	3	2.4	Lean (L), epicormic branching (M)	Subject	Remove	3
37	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	34	-	F	PF	PF	40	2	2.4	Sap ooze (L), crook (L), epicormic branching (M)	Subject	Remove	3
38	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	43.5	-	FG	F	F	20	5	3.0	Burls (L), epicormic branching (M)	Subject	Remove	3
39	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	20.5	-	PF	F	F	-	2	1.5	Lean (L), poor form (L), included wire (H), pruning wounds (M)	Subject	Remove	2
40	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	12, 8	14.5	F	FG	G	-	2	1.5	V-union at base with included bark	Subject	Remove	1
41	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	22	-	PF	F	F	-	2	1.8	Lean (L), poor form (L), included wire (H), pruning wounds (M)	Subject	Remove	2
42	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	23	-	F	FG	F	-	2	1.8	Lean (L), trunk swell, bow (L), pruning wounds (L)	Subject	Remove	2
43	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	16	-	PF	F	F	20	2	1.5	Included wire (H), sweep (L), asymmetrical crown (M)	Subject	Remove	2
44	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	~24	-	F	G	FG	-	3	1.8	Included wire (H)	Subject	Remove	2
45	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	30	-	F	F	F	20	3	1.8	Lean (L), epicormic branching (M), pruning wounds (M), sap ooze (L)	Subject	Preserve	-
46	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	35.5	-	F	F	F	20	3	2.4	Lean (L), epicormic branching (M), pruning wounds (M), sap ooze (L)	Subject	Preserve	-
47	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	30	-	F	F	F	30	3	1.8	Lean (L), epicormic branching (M), pruning wounds (M), sap ooze (L), crook (L)	Subject	Preserve	-
48	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	34	-	F	F	F	20	4	2.4	Girdling roots (L), epicormic branching (L), v-union at 2m with included bark	Subject	Preserve	-
49	Elm hybrid	*Ulmus x*	14	-	F	FG	FG	-	2	1.5	V-union at 1.5m with included bark, epicormic branching (L)	City	Preserve	-
50	Elm hybrid	*Ulmus x*	15	-	F	FG	FG	-	2	1.5	V-union at 1.5m with included bark, epicormic branching (L), stem wounds (L)	City	Preserve	-
51	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	7.5	-	G	FG	G	-	2	1.2	Broken branches (M)	City	Preserve	-
52	Elm hybrid	*Ulmus x*	10	-	FG	FG	FG	-	2	1.5	Stem wounds (L), epicormic branching (L)	City	Preserve	-
53	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	34.5	-	F	F	F	30	3	2.4	Pruning wounds (M), epicormic branching (M), sap ooze (L)	Subject	Preserve	-
54	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	23	-	F	PF	PF	40	2	1.8	Pruning wounds (M), epicormic branching (M), sap ooze (L), sweep (L)	Subject	Preserve	-
55	White Oak	*Quercus alba*	12.5	-	G	G	G	-	2	1.5		City	Preserve	-

Tree #	Common Name	Scientific Name	DBH	Calculated DBH (Multistem)	TI	CS	CV	CDB	DL	mTPZ	Comments	Ownership	Action	Comp.
56	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	42	-	PF	PF	PF	20	4	3.0	Multiple branch attachments, broken branches (M), poor form (L), epicormic branching (M), decay (M)	Subject	Remove	3
57	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	35	-	F	F	F	20	3	2.4	Lean (L), epicormic branching (L), sap ooze (L)	Subject	Remove	3
58	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	32	-	F	F	PF	30	3	2.4	Lean (L), epicormic branching (L), pruning wounds (L), top-down die back	Subject	Remove	3
59	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	35	-	PF	PF	PF	40	3	2.4	Lean (L), sap ooze (M), pruning wounds (L), bow (L), epicormic branching (M)	Subject	Remove	3
60	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	32	-	F	F	F	30	3	2.4	Sweep (L), epicormic branching (M), sap ooze (L), pruning wounds (L)	Subject	Remove	3
61	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	23	-	F	F	F	20	3	1.8	Lean (L), epicormic branching (L), multiple branch attachments	Subject	Remove	2
62	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	38	-	PF	PF	PF	30	3	2.4	Pruning wounds (M), v-union at 1.5m with included bark, poor form (M), sap ooze (M), crook (M), epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	3
63	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	25	-	P	P	P	90	2	1.8	Lean (L), epicormic branching (M), pruning wounds (L), moribund, top-down die back	Subject	Remove	2
64	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	27	-	PF	PF	PF	30	2	1.8	Lean (L), sap ooze (M), pruning wounds (L), top lost, top-down die back, epicormic branching (M)	Subject	Remove	2
65	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	37	-	PF	PF	PF	30	5	2.4	Pruning wounds (H), broken branches (M), decay (M), multiple branch attachments, epicormic branching (L), asymmetrical crown (M)	Subject	Remove	3
66	White Oak	*Quercus alba*	9	-	FG	G	G	-	1	1.2	Crook (L)	City	Remove	1
67	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	6	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Remove	1
68	Elm hybrid	*Ulmus x*	11	-	G	FG	FG	-	2	1.5	Epicormic branching (L)	City	Remove	1
69	Hardy Rubber Tree	*Eucommia ulmoides*	4	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Preserve	-
70	Hardy Rubber Tree	*Eucommia ulmoides*	4.5	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Preserve	-
71	Hardy Rubber Tree	*Eucommia ulmoides*	5	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Remove	0
72	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	4.5	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Remove	0
73	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	7.5	-	G	G	G	-	2	1.2		City	Preserve	-
74	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	8	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Preserve	-
75	Northern Catalpa	*Catalpa speciosa*	5	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Preserve	-
76	Northern Catalpa	*Catalpa speciosa*	5	-	G	G	G	-	1	1.2		City	Preserve	-
77	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	17.5	-	F	FG	F	-	3	1.5	Stem wounds (M), lean (L), bow (L), epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	2
78	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	33	-	FG	F	F	20	4	2.4	Lean (L)	Subject	Remove	3
79	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	37.5	-	FG	F	F	20	4	2.4	Crook (L)	Subject	Remove	3
80	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	31.5	-	F	F	F	20	4	2.4	Crook (L), asymmetrical crown (L)	Subject	Remove	3
81	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	9	-	G	G	G	-	2	1.2		City	Remove	1

Tree #	Common Name	Scientific Name	DBH	Calculated DBH (Multistem)	TI	CS	CV	CDB	DL	mTPZ	Comments	Ownership	Action	Comp.
82	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	8.5	-	G	G	G	-	2	1.2		City	Preserve	-
83	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	10	-	F	G	F	-	2	1.5	Decay (L)	City	Preserve	-
84	Manitoba Maple	*Acer negundo*	32.5, 21	38.5	PF	F	F	20	6	2.4	V-union at 1m with included bark, bow (M), cavity (L), broken branches (L), epicormic branching (M)	Subject	Remove	3
85	Manitoba Maple	*Acer negundo*	16	-	F	F	F	20	3	1.5	Lean (L), bow (L), asymmetrical crown (M), cavity (L), epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	2
86	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	31.5	-	FG	F	F	30	5	2.4	Epicormic branching (M), crook (L), pruning wounds (L)	Subject	Remove	3
87	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	32	-	G	FG	F	10	5	2.4	Pruning wounds (L), epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	3
88	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	26	-	G	F	F	20	4	1.8	Pruning wounds (L), epicormic branching (L), asymmetrical crown (L)	Subject	Remove	2
89	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	39	-	G	F	F	20	5	2.4	Pruning wounds (L), epicormic branching (L), asymmetrical crown (L)	Subject	Remove	3
90	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	50	-	F	F	F	20	6	3.0	Pruning wounds (L), epicormic branching (L), burls (L), v-union at 4m with included bark	Subject	Remove	4
91	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	13, 12	17.5	F	FG	FG	-	3	1.5	V-union at base with included bark, epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	2
92	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	12	-	FG	G	G	-	3	1.5	Sweep (L)	Subject	Remove	1
93	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	12, 9.5	15.5	F	G	G	-	3	1.5	V-union at base with included bark	Subject	Remove	1
94	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	11	-	G	G	G	-	3	1.5		Subject	Remove	1
95	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	35	-	F	F	PF	30	5	2.4	Lean (L), multiple branch attachments, epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	3
96	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	24.5	-	PF	PF	PF	40	4	1.8	Lean (L), multiple branch attachments, poor branch unions, cavity (M), epicormic branching (L)	Subject	Remove	2
A	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	~10, 10	~14	F	FG	G	-	2	1.5	V-union at base with included bark	Neighbour	Preserve (Injure)	-
B	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	34	-	G	F	F	20	4	2.4		Neighbour	Remove	3
C	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	47	-	G	FG	F	10	4	3.0		Neighbour	Remove	4
D	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	10.5	-	F	F	FG	-	2	1.5	Lean (L), pruning wounds (M), v-union at 0.5m with included bark and one stem cut at 0.75m, epicormic branching (L)	Neighbour	Remove	1
E	Austrian Pine	*Pinus nigra*	~34, 24	~41.5	F	PF	PF	60	3	3.0	V-union at 0.5m with included bark	Neighbour	Remove	3
F	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	~18	-	G	G	G	-	3	1.5		Neighbour	Preserve	-
G	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	~12	-	G	F	FG	-	3	1.5	Asymmetrical crown (L), epicormic branching (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-

Tree #	Common Name	Scientific Name	DBH	Calculated DBH (Multistem)	TI	CS	CV	CDB	DL	mTPZ	Comments	Ownership	Action	Comp.
H	Blue Spruce	*Picea pungens*	~22	-	PF	F	PF	-	2	1.8	Decay (H), crowded, lean (L), asymmetrical crown (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
I	Norway Maple	*Acer platanoides*	~26	-	F	F	F	-	4	1.8	Multiple branch attachments, girdling roots (L), epicormic branching (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
J	White Spruce	*Picea glauca*	~26	-	FG	F	F	20	3	1.8	Lean (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
K	White Spruce	*Picea glauca*	~26	-	FG	F	F	20	3	1.8	Lean (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
L	White Spruce	*Picea glauca*	~24	-	FG	F	F	30	3	1.8	Lean (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
M	Douglas Fir	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	~16	-	FG	F	F	30	3	1.5	Lean (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
N	Douglas Fir	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	~22	-	FG	FG	FG	10	3	1.8	Lean (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
O	Douglas Fir	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	~22	-	FG	F	F	30	3	1.8	Lean (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
P	Douglas Fir	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	~28	-	G	FG	FG	10	3	1.8		Neighbour	Preserve	-
Q	Douglas Fir	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	~28	-	FG	FG	FG	10	3	1.8	Lean (L)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
R	Russian Olive	*Elaeagnus angustifolia*	~10	-	F	F	F	20	3	1.5	Bow (M), epicormic branching (M), asymmetrical crown (M)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
S	Russian Olive	*Elaeagnus angustifolia*	~32, 28, 18, 12, 10	~48.5	PF	PF	PF	30	5	3.0	V-union at base with included bark, bow (H), epicormic branching (H)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
T	Siberian Elm	*Ulmus pumila*	35, 21	41	F	PF	F	30	6	3.0	V-union at 1m with included bark, epicormic branching (M), broken branches (M)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
U	Green Ash	*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*	~12, 10, 10, 8, 8	~21.5	P	PF	PF	50	3	1.8	Emerald Ash Borer (H), v-union at base with included bark, epicormic branching (H)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
V	Green Ash	*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*	~14, 14	~20	P	PF	PF	50	3	1.5	V-union at base with included bark and one stem cut at 0.5m, Emerald Ash Borer (H), epicormic branching (H), sweep (M)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
W	Siberian Elm	*Ulmus pumila*	12	-	G	F	F	-	2	1.5	Epicormic branching (M)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
X	Siberian Elm	*Ulmus pumila*	10.5, 10	14.5	PF	F	F	-	3	1.5	V-union at base with included bark, stem wounds (M), epicormic branching (M)	Neighbour	Preserve	-
P-1	Eastern White Cedar	*Thuja occidentalis*	~2 - 12	-	G	G	G	-	2	1.5	Average DBH is ~8cm, approximately eight trees measuring 10cm DBH and greater, approximately 25 additional undersized trees	Subject	Remove	8

Codes		
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height	*(cm)*
TI	Trunk Integrity	*(G, F, P)*
CS	Crown Structure	*(G, F, P)*
CV	Crown Vigor	*(G, F, P)*
CDB	Crown Die Back	*(%)*
DL	Dripline (Radius)	*(m)*
mTPZ	Minimum Tree Protection Zone (Radius)	*(m)*
Comp.	Compensation Requirements	*(# of trees)*
~ = estimate; (L) = light; (M) = moderate; (H) = heavy; G = good; F = fair; P = poor		

Table 2. Tree Valuation

Tree #	Common Name	Scientific Name	DBH	OC	*Appraised Trunk Area (cm^2)*	*Unit Tree Cost (RPAC) ($/cm^2$)*	*Basic Tree Cost ($)*	Depreciation			*Appraised Tree Value*	*Adjusted Tree Value*
								Condition Rating (%)	*Functional Limitation Rating (%)*	*External Limitation Rating (%)*		
49	Elm species	*Ulmus sp.*	14	F	154	7.18	1105.28	0.550	0.8	0.9	$ 437.69	$ 440.00
50	Elm species	*Ulmus sp.*	15	F	177	7.18	1268.81	0.550	0.8	0.9	$ 502.45	$ 500.00
51	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	7.5	FG	44	8.50	375.52	0.725	0.8	0.9	$ 196.02	$ 195.00
52	Elm species	*Ulmus sp.*	10	FG	79	7.18	563.92	0.725	0.8	0.9	$ 294.36	$ 295.00
55	White Oak	*Quercus alba*	12.5	G	123	8.10	994.02	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 644.13	$ 645.00
66	White Oak	*Quercus alba*	9	FG	64	8.10	515.30	0.725	0.8	0.9	$ 268.99	$ 270.00
67	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	6	G	28	8.50	240.33	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 155.74	$ 155.00
68	Elm species	*Ulmus sp.*	11	FG	95	7.18	682.34	0.725	0.8	0.9	$ 356.18	$ 355.00
69	Hardy Rubber Tree	*Eucommia ulmoides*	4	G	13	10.43	131.07	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 84.93	$ 85.00
70	Hardy Rubber Tree	*Eucommia ulmoides*	4.5	G	16	10.43	165.88	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 107.49	$ 110.00
71	Hardy Rubber Tree	*Eucommia ulmoides*	5	G	20	10.43	204.79	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 132.71	$ 135.00
72	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	4.5	G	16	8.50	135.19	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 87.60	$ 90.00
73	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	7.5	G	44	8.50	375.52	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 243.34	$ 245.00
74	Kentucky Coffeetree	*Gymnocladus dioicus*	8	G	50	8.50	427.26	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 276.86	$ 275.00
75	Northern Catalpa	*Catalpa speciosa*	5	G	20	8.21	161.20	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 104.46	$ 105.00
76	Northern Catalpa	*Catalpa speciosa*	5	G	20	8.21	161.20	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 104.46	$ 105.00
81	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	9	G	64	8.31	528.66	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 342.57	$ 345.00
82	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	8.5	G	57	8.31	471.55	0.900	0.8	0.9	$ 305.57	$ 305.00
83	Thornless Honey Locust	*Gleditsia triacanthos var. 'inermis'*	10	F	79	8.31	652.67	0.550	0.8	0.9	$ 258.46	$ 260.00
											Total	**$ 4,915.00**

Codes		
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height	*(cm)*
OC	Overall Condition	*(G, F, P)*
~ = estimate; G = good; F = fair; P = poor		