

**Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan
4050 Yonge Street
Toronto, ON**

prepared for

**Easton's Group of Companies
3100 Steeles Avenue East, Suite 601
Markham, ON L3R 8T3**

prepared by



146 Lakeshore Road West
PO Box 1267 Lakeshore W PO
Oakville ON L6K 0B3
t: 289.259.5958 f: 866.693.6390
e: consult@kuntzforestry.ca

20 May 2015
Revised: 11 February 2020, 07 December 2020, 25 March 2021

KUNTZ FORESTRY CONSULTING INC. Project P2308

Ravine & Natural Feature Protection - letter from Dan Hammerschlag dated January 11, 2021	
<u>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan – Comment Response Matrix</u>	
Comment	Response
<p>1 Page 1 states trees within 5m from the proposed development were surveyed. All trees within 12m from the limit of site disturbance must be included in the report and inventory table.</p>	<p>The original tree inventory conducted in 2010 included trees within 5 metres of the proposed development. All subsequent inventory updates have included all trees within 12 metres of the proposed development. This has been clarified in the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan.</p>
<p>2 Pages 3 and 5 state there are a total of 608 tree existing trees on-site and on adjacent properties, including 251 removals greater than 10cm dbh and 356 removals less than 10cm dbh, however this only adds up to 607.</p>	<p>There is one tree (Tree A) to be retained, which accounts for the remaining tree, totalling to 608 trees.</p>
<p>3 Pages 3 and 5 state there are a total of 251 removals greater than 10cm dbh, however the tree inventory table only documents a total of 243 trees within the proximity of disturbance proposed for removal.</p>	<p>A total of 242 individually inventoried trees over 10cm DBH are proposed for removal. Nine additional trees greater than 10cm DBH have been included in the Stand Tally Analysis, as these trees were unable to be individually tagged due to site topography, totalling to 251 trees proposed for removal. Refer to Table 2 of the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan for the additional nine trees inventoried.</p>
<p>4 Page 5 states that compensation is required for every 25m² of lost soft space. Please note that RNFP no longer requires compensation for the loss of soft surface.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>5 Page 5 states that 10 shrubs will be accepted as the planting of 1 tree. Please note we no longer accept shrubs as compensation for tree removals.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>6 Tree inventory table should differentiate between Ravine & Natural Feature Protection By-law trees, private tree By-law trees, and City-owned trees.</p>	<p>Table 1 of the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan has been updated to include this differentiation.</p>
<p>7 Tree inventory table should provide a rationale for the removal or injury of all trees (stewardship, construction, grading, etc.). Rationale has only been provided for trees identified as poor condition.</p>	<p>Table 1 of the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan has been updated to include this.</p>
<p>8 Tree inventory table documents a total of 243 trees within the proximity of disturbance proposed for removal and an additional 58 trees were documented as missing (removed from site). The Tree Preservation Plan only identifies 107 proposed removals and 32 missing trees. All tagged trees must be included on the Tree Preservation Plan</p>	<p>Due to site topography, the locations of all trees were not identified in the field. Instead, all trees located close to the top of the slope have been identified and key trees near the bottom of the slope were identified. As all trees are currently being proposed for removal due to valley restoration works, RNFP is satisfied with this approach.</p>
<p>9 Tree protection fencing should be installed along the perimeter of the site. If removals are proposed prior to the start of any site works, tree protection can be installed at the edge of the eastern edge of the 10 metre buffer setback.</p>	<p>Stage 1 Tree Protection Fencing has been prescribed at the edge of the existing parking lot to accommodate parking lot deconstruction. The Tree Protection Fencing (Stage 2) can then be relocated to the edge of the 10 metre buffer to protect the trees until ravine restoration works start.</p>

Introduction

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. was retained by Easton's Group of Companies to complete an updated Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan report in support of a development application for a property located at 4050 Yonge Street in Toronto, Ontario. The previous Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan was submitted by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. on 20 May 2015 and last revised 19 December 2019. The site is situated on the northwest corner of Yonge Street and Wilson Avenue.

The work plan for this study included the following:

- Prepare inventory of the tree resources located within the vicinity of the proposed development;
- Evaluate potential tree saving opportunities based on proposed development plans; and
- Document the findings in a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report.

Policy Framework

The proposed development is subject to provisions of the City of Toronto Ravine and Natural Feature Protection By-law (Chapter 658 of the Municipal Code) as the entire subject property is situated within Ravine and Natural Features Protection Area.

The City of Toronto's Ravine Protection By-law prohibits and regulates the injury and destruction of trees, filling, grading, and dumping in ravines and associated wooded areas within the Ravine Protection Line, including the West Don River valley system. All trees are subject to the Ravine By-law regardless of species or diameter. The Urban Forestry Services defines a tree as any woody species that will grow to tree size (4.5 metres height).

All trees on the subject property are classified as City of Toronto Category 4 trees. City of Toronto Category 4 trees are identified as trees:

“On lands designated under City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 658, Ravine and Natural Feature Protection, trees of all diameters situated within 10 m of any construction activity.”

Methodology

The field assessments for the original Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan were conducted on the 13 April 2010, 10 January 2011, and 11 September 2015. Initial field assessments were conducted on 13 April 2010 and included portions of the wooded ravine area that were 5 metres from the proposed development. Individual trees were tagged with the numbers 618 – 735. A second inventory was conducted on 10 January 2011 to include all trees within 12 metres of the proposed development. Individual trees were tagged with the numbers 1 – 147 during the second inventory. A third site visit was conducted on 11 September 2015 to update the existing tree inventory for dead, removed, or missing trees, and to conduct a 100% tally of all untagged trees and tree regeneration.

The majority of the trees identified during the 13 April 2010 inventory were located by topographic survey. Measurements were taken on site from trees on the existing topographic survey to determine the approximate location of trees that were not surveyed but were included in the

inventory. During the 10 January 2011 field assessment, approximate locations of some trees were located on the ortho-photo in-field to provide a benchmark for located the tagged tree resources.

The tree inventory assessment was updated on 24 January 2020 and 28 January 2020. Trees of all sizes on and within 12 metres of the proposed development were included in the inventory update. Trees were located using the topographic survey provided and estimates made in the field. Due to the slope topography, not all trees have been identified on Figure 1. Instead, all trees located close to the top of the slope have been identified and key trees near the bottom of the slope were identified using aerial imagery. As all trees are currently being proposed for removal due to slope restoration works, RNFP is satisfied with this methodology.

Individual tree resources were assessed for condition utilizing the following parameters:

Tree # - numbers and letters assigned to tree that corresponds to Figure 1.

Species - common and botanical names provided in the inventory table.

DBH - diameter (centimeters) at breast height, measured at 1.4 metres above the ground.

Condition - condition of tree considering trunk integrity, crown structure and crown vigour. Condition ratings include poor (P), fair (F), and good (G).

Comments - additional relevant detail.

A 100% tally was conducted for all untagged trees and tree regeneration within the subject area. All trees below 10cm DBH and trees that were not able to be tagged due to topography were included in the 100% tally. Trees within the 100% tally were assessed utilizing the following parameters:

Species: Common and botanical names provided in the inventory table;

Size Class (DBH): <10 cm, 11 – 20 cm, 31 – 40cm, 41 – 50 cm

Refer to Table 1 and Table 2 for the results of the tree inventory.

Existing Site Conditions

The subject property is dominated by an existing asphalt parking lot bounded by wooded ravines to the north and to the west, Yonge Street to the east, and Wilson Avenue to the south. The Don River traverses the bottom of the wooded ravine along the western property limit. Refer to Figure 1 for the existing site conditions.

Tree Resources

The updated individual tree inventory documented a total of 243 trees located on and within 12 metres of the proposed development. Trees included in the inventory were tagged 1 – 145, 618 – 735, 780 – 804, and 1418. Two trees located on the neighbouring property were labelled with the letters “A” and “F”. One Siberian Elm located directly on the corner of Yonge Street and Wilson Avenue was labelled with the letter “B”. One Siberian Elm located on the east side of the Wilson Avenue parking lot entrance was labelled with the letter “G”. A Siberian Elm located within the Yonge Street right-of-way was labelled with the letter “H”. Fifty-nine (59) trees that were tagged in the original inventory no longer exist (either missing or have been removed). The 100% tally of all remaining trees (trees not tagged) documented nine trees greater than 10cm DBH and 356 trees less than 10cm DBH, for a total of 365 trees.

Tree resources included in the tree inventory are heavily composed of Siberian Elm (*Ulmus pumila*) with less common occurrences of Norway Maple (*Acer platanoides*), Manitoba Maple (*Acer negundo*), Weeping Willow (*Salix x pendula*), White Elm (*Ulmus americana*), Eastern Cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), Silver Maple (*Acer saccharinum*), Staghorn Sumac (*Rhus typhina*), Filbert species (*Corylus* sp.), Black Locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*), Black Walnut (*Juglans nigra*), White Ash (*Fraxinus americana*), and Green Ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*).

The canopy layer of the wooded ravine is dominated by Siberian Elm with occurrences of Manitoba Maple and Norway Maple. Largetooth Aspen (*Populus grandidentata*) was also noted in the canopy layer outside of the inventoried area. The sub-canopy layer is dominated by Siberian Elm, with occurrences of Manitoba Maple, White Elm, and Norway Maple. The understory is comprised of Buckthorn (*Rhamnus* sp.), Manitoba Maple, Norway Maple, and Honeysuckle species (*Lonicera* sp.). Garlic Mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*) is also prevalent throughout the feature along with the presence of light to moderate grapevine (*Vitis* sp.) competition. Furthermore, refuse and debris are scattered throughout the wooded feature. As documented in Savanta's Natural Heritage Assessment Report, this area is found to be of low ecological integrity.

Refer to Table 1 for the detailed individual tree inventory, Table 2 for the 100% tally of trees located within the inventoried area but excluded from the detailed individual tree inventory, and Figure 1 for the location of the trees.

Proposed Development

The proposed development is comprised of a multi-storey mixed-use building with associated underground parking, amenity areas, and landscaping upgrades. Refer to Figure 1 for the proposed site plan.

Discussion

The following sections provide a discussion and analysis of development impacts, tree removal requirements and tree preservation relative to the proposed development.

Development Impacts/Tree Removals

The removal of all trees except for Tree A will be required due to their species and condition, grading, civil works, landscaping works, and to accommodate the proposed remediation of the ravine system prescribed in the Ravine Stewardship Plan (Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., 25 March 2021). A total of 251 trees greater than 10cm DBH and 356 trees less than 10cm DBH will require removal due to their species, health and condition, and/or to accommodate the proposed development.

The trees included in the inventory are composed almost exclusively of Siberian Elm, Manitoba Maple, and Norway Maple. Manitoba Maple is ranked as a Category 1 invasive species, while Siberian Elm and Norway Maple are both ranked as Category 2 invasive species (Urban Forest Associates Inc., 2002). Many trees are exhibiting moderate to heavy poor form (asymmetrical crowns) as they are growing out over the parking lot in competition for sunlight. It should also be noted that many edge trees have been top-cut towards the base of their original crowns and do not warrant preservation within the urban matrix. Considering the invasive nature of the species dominating the ravine, the poor form of many edge trees and the lack of native regeneration, their

removal is required and recommended with compensation to be provided in the form of restoration of the natural feature.

Tree F is a Siberian Elm in declining condition and is recommended for removal. Removal of Tree F will require the neighbouring property owner's permission as it is a shared tree. Tree H is located within the City of Toronto right-of-way, therefore permission from the City of Toronto will be required prior to its removal.

Tree Preservation

Preservation of Tree A will be possible with appropriate tree protection measures. The tree is located 2.1 meters from the surveyed bottom of slope. Tree roots generally exploit water resources and other resources that can be easily accessed, and considering water runs downhill, very few tree roots are anticipated to be located uphill within the boundaries of the proposed development.

Based on the City of Toronto's standards, the minimum Tree Protection Zone (mTPZ) for this tree is 24.6 meters. This distance extends past the top of bank and onto the existing asphalt parking lot. It is unlikely that tree roots exist here and the tree protection fencing has been proposed at the stable top of slope line.

Encroachment into the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of this tree will be required to accommodate tree removals, site preparation for restoration planting, and restoration planting. Tree removals within the TPZ of Tree A should occur during the winter months while the soil is frozen, to prevent damage to the root zone of this tree. The removal of debris, refuse, and fill will be required to prepare the northern slope for restoration planting. The removal of debris and refuse within the TPZ should be conducted by hand. Tree root exploration using hand tools and/or air spading may be used to ensure fill removal does not impact the roots of this tree. The application of topsoil within the TPZ of this tree should retain pre-existing grades. No heavy equipment is permitted within the TPZ of this tree. Horizontal hoarding should be laid underneath the path of light equipment to minimize soil compaction within the TPZ. All works completed within the TPZ of this tree should be supervised by a Certified Arborist or Registered Professional Forester (R.P.F.).

Tree protection measures must be implemented prior to construction phase to ensure that all trees identified for preservation are not impacted by the development. Refer to Figure 1 for tree protection zone locations and further tree protection notes.

Detailed preservation and enhancement of the natural feature area is outlined in the Ravine Stewardship Plan Report prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., dated 25 March 2021. Restoration efforts will address all ecological issues currently present in the natural feature. Prescriptions will deal with tree removals, site preparation, restoration of ecological integrity including enhancement of species diversity and ecological function of the riparian forest. It is proposed that the Ravine Stewardship Plan will work in concert with the Landscape Plan to be prepared by NAK Design Group and be informed by the Natural Heritage Assessment report prepared by Savanta.

Compensation

The City of Toronto, Urban Forestry, Ravine and Natural Feature Protection requires a replacement ratio of three native trees planted for each tree greater than 10cm DBH removed,

one native tree planted for each tree less than 10cm DBH removed, and one native tree planted for each tree injured.

A total of 251 trees greater than 10cm DBH and 356 trees less than 10cm DBH are being removed. One tree (Tree A) will be injured. Based on the tree removals, the required compensation is calculated to be 1110 trees. The total number of trees proposed to be planted as part of the Ravine Stewardship Plan and the Landscape Planting Plan (NAK Design Strategies Sheet L2, December 2020) is 351 trees. The resulting number of required compensation planting is 759 trees.

Summary and Recommendations

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. was retained by Easton's Group of Companies to complete a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan report in support of a development application for a property located at 4050 Yonge Street in Toronto, Ontario. A tree inventory was conducted and reviewed in the context of the proposed development plan.

The findings of the study indicate a total of 608 existing trees on-site and on adjacent properties. Removal of 251 trees greater than 10cm DBH and 356 trees less than 10cm DBH is recommended to accommodate the proposed development and provide opportunity for enhancements of the natural ravine feature area. All trees identified for removal are identified as City of Toronto Category 4 trees.

The following recommendations are suggested to minimize impacts to trees identified for preservation. Refer to Figure 1 for the location of the required tree protection fencing, general Tree Protection Plan Notes, and tree preservation fencing specifications.

- Tree protection barriers and fencing should be erected at locations as prescribed on Figure 1. All tree protection measures should follow the guidelines as set out in the tree preservation plan notes and the tree preservation fencing 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 Figure 1 as a tree protection zone (TPZ) at any time during or after construction.
- Branches and roots 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 roots and branches must be in accordance with Good Arboricultural Standards.
- Site visits, pre, during and post construction is 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.

Kimberly Dowell

Kimberly Dowell, Urban Forestry Specialist
Master of Forest Conservation, ISA Certified Arborist #PN-8858A
Email: kim.dowell@kuntzforestry.ca
Phone: 289-837-1871 ext. 24

Jeremy Jackson

Jeremy Jackson, H.B.Sc.
Associate ♦ ISA Certified Arborist ♦ GIS Analyst

Amy Choi

Amy Choi, B.Sc.(Env.), M.Sc.F.
ISA Certified Arborist #ON-1609A, Associate Forest Ecologist

References

City of Toronto, 2004. Ravine Protection By-law. Toronto Municipal Code – Sections 223.1 and 223.2 of the Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.45, Chapter 658. September 9, 2004.

Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. 25 March 2021. Ravine Stewardship Plan, 4050 Yonge Street, Toronto.

NAK Design Strategies. March 2021. Landscape Planting Plan, 4050 Yonge Street, Toronto.

Urban Forest Associates, January 2002. Invasive Exotic Species Ranking for Southern Ontario.

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 location in the report may not be exact. 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 site plans that have been provided at the time of reporting. These recommendations may no longer be applicable should changes be made to the site 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: 4050 Yonge St., Toronto

Surveyors: JJJ and AC, JLR, CB, and KD

Date: 13 Apr. 2010, 10 Jan. 2011, 11 Sep. 2015, 24 Jan. 2020

Tree#	Common Name	Scientific Name	DBH	TI	CS	CV	CDB	cat.	Comments	Bylaw	Action	Removal Reason
618	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	25, 16	G	F	P-F		4	Union at base, stem wounds (M), seam (L), 1.5 meters from sidewalk, gypsy moth present	RNFP	Remove	Walkway
619	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	26	F	F-G	F		4	Seam (L), swollen flare (M), gypsy moth present	RNFP	Remove	Landscaping
620	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18, 14	F	F	F		4	Union at 0.4 meters, included bark (M), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Landscaping
621	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	13, 9.5, 4	F	F	F		4	Lean (M), union at base and 0.5 meters, included bark (M), stem wound (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
622	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17, 16, 15	F	F	F		4	Union at 0.5 meters with included bark (M), exposed roots, drainage swale adjacent to base, grapevine competition (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
623	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	31, 19	F	F	F		4	Union at 1 and 1.5 meters, grapevine competition (L), deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
624	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	F-G	F-G	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (M), bow (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
625	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	11, 8	P	P	P		4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
626	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	9	F	F	G		4	Lean (L) towards parking lot, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
627	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	6, 8	F	F	F		4	Union at base, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
628	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	42	F	F	F		4	Union at 1.6 meters, deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
629	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	29	F	P-F	F-G		4	Lean (M) toward parking lot, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
630	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18	G	F	F-G		4	Deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
631	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	22	F-G	P-F	F-G		4	Seam (M), asymmetrical crown (L), broken top	RNFP	Remove	Grading
632	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	9.5	F	F	F-G		4	Understory tree, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
633	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	23.5	G	F-G	F-G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
634	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	24	F-G	P-F	F		4	Broken top, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
635	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	14	F	F	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (H), lean (L)	RNFP	Missing	-
636	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	7, 15, 9.5	F	F	F		4	Union at base and 0.35 m, lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), understory tree, pruning wounds (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
637	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18	F	F	F		4	Epicormic branching (H), lean (L), broken top	RNFP	Remove	Grading
638	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	28	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), union at 5 meters, poor form (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
639	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	25.5	-	-	-	100	4	Elevated hazard potential	RNFP	Missing	-
640	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	28	F-G	F-G	F		4	Grapevine competition (L), union at 5 meters	RNFP	Remove	Grading
641	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	20, 17	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), union at 0.75 meters, asymmetrical crown (H), broken branches (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
642	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18	F	P-F	P-F	50	4	Lean (L), union at 2.5 meters, broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
643	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17, 5	F	P-F	F		4	Lean (L), union at base, broken top	RNFP	Remove	Grading
644	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	26	F	F	F		4	Union at 2 meters, included bark	RNFP	Remove	Grading
645	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	21	F	P-F	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (H), lean (L), broken top	RNFP	Remove	Grading
646	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16	F	P	F		4	Union at 1.6 and 2 m, pruning wounds (M), understory tree	RNFP	Missing	-
647	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	10	F	P	F		4	Lean (M), asymmetrical crown (H)	RNFP	Missing	-
648	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-18, -15	P-F	F	F		4	15 cm stem dead, union at base, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Outlet
649	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17	F	F	F-G		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), broken top	RNFP	Remove	Outlet
650	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	15, 9	F	P-F	P-F		4	Union at base with included bark (L), stem wound (L), lean (M), asymmetrical crown (M), concrete debris against flare, small stem dead	RNFP	Remove	Grading
651	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	24	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (L), sweep (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
652	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	20.5	P	P	P		4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
653	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	22	F	F	F	25	4	Asymmetrical crown (L), seam (L), union at 3 meters, stem wound (M), one stem dead	RNFP	Remove	Grading
654	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	10	F	P-F	F		4	Understory tree, asymmetrical crown (H), canopy conflicting with tree 653, broken top	RNFP	Remove	Grading
655	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13, 10	F	F	F		4	Union at 1.3 meters, asymmetrical crown (L), included bark, broken top	RNFP	Remove	Grading
656	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	21, 6	F	F	F		4	Crook (L), union at 0.2 m, swollen flare (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
657	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	21.5	F	F	F		4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Grading
658	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-9, -7	F	P	F		4	Pruning wounds (H)	RNFP	Missing	-

659	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	F	F	F		4	Pruning wounds (H), lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
660	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18	F	F	F-G		4	Crook (L), lean (L), understory tree, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
661	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-40	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), pruning wounds (L), broken branches (H), one stem dead	RNFP	Remove	Grading
662	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	20.5	F	F	F		4	Understory tree, seam (L), co-dominant stems in crown	RNFP	Remove	Grading
663	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15, 10	F	P	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (H), crook at base (L), stem wounds (L), lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
664	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	36	F	F	F		4	Sweep (L), lean (L), deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
665	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	21, 11	F	F	F		4	Union at base with included bark (L), 11 cm stem dead, asymmetrical crown (M), lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
666	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-10	F	F	F		4	Crook (M), sweep (L), asymmetrical crown (L), included fence	RNFP	Remove	Grading
667	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-10	F	F	F		4	Grapevine competition (M), included fence, broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
668	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-7	P-F	F	F		4	Lean (M), grapevine competition (H)	RNFP	Missing	-
669	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17	-	-	-		4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
670	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	19	F	P	F		4	Understory tree, lean (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
671	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	19	F	F	F	30	4	Asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
672	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	F	P	P-F		4	Animal burrow under root zone, crook at base (L), poor form (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
673	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	F	P-F	F		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), understory tree	RNFP	Remove	Grading
674	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13.5	F	P-F	F		4	Lean (L), understory tree, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
675	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	19.5	F	F	F	20	4	Lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
676	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	38	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
677	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	30.5	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), codominant at 5 meters, understory to 676, broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
678	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	20	F	F	F	20	4	Lean (M), sweep at base (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
679	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	34, 16	F	F	F	25	4	Union at 1 meter with included bark (M), 16 cm stem dead, asymmetrical crown, broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
680	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	12.5	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), understory tree, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
681	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	7	F-G	F	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (M), understory tree	RNFP	Remove	Grading
682	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	6	P	P	P		4	Dead	RNFP	Missing	-
683	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	11, 7	F	P-F	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (H), crown lodged under limb of adjacent tree, union at base, twisting stems	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
684	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15	F	P-F	F		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), broken top, epicormic branching (H)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
685	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	12	F	P	F		4	Main stem broken at 3 meters, union at 1.6 meters	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
686	--	--	-25					4	Elevated hazard potential, all limbs Missing from trunk, just stem remains	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
687	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	27	F	P-F	F		4	Sweep (L), lean (L), topcut at 6 meters, asymmetrical crown (M), epicormic branching (H)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
688	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-12				100	4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
689	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15	F	P-F	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (L), topcut at 5 meters, epicormic branching (H)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
690	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	36	F	F	F-G		4	Pruning wounds (M), asymmetrical crown (M), poor form (M), top cut at 7 meters	RNFP	Remove	Grading
691	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17	F	P	F		4	Lean (L), topcut at 5.5 meters, sweep (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
692	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	7, 11.5, 13.5	F	F	F		4	Clump of 3 stems, lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), sweep (L)	RNFP	Missing	-
693	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16	F	F	F		4	Sweep (M), understory tree	RNFP	Missing	-
694	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	7.5	P-F	P	F		4	Top cut at 1.75 meters, asymmetrical crown (M), poor form (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
695	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	9	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
696	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	8, 5.5	F	F	F		4	Union at 0.3 meters, cavity with heart rot (L)	RNFP	Missing	-
697	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	11.5	F	F	F		4	Understory tree, asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
697	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16.5				100	4	Dead, elevated hazard potential	RNFP	Missing	-
698	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	11.5	F	P	F		4	Top cut at 2 meters, understory tree	RNFP	Missing	-
699	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	35	F	F	F-G		4	Included bark (M), pruning wounds (M), poor form (M), stem pruned at previous union	RNFP	Remove	Grading
700	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17	G	G	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
701	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	9.5	F	P	F		4	Top cut at 2 meters, pruning wounds (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
702	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18	F	P-F	P-F	70	4	Pruning wounds (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
703	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	21	F	P	F		4	Top cut at 4 meters, lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
704	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	P	P	P	80	4	Top cut at 1 meter, understory tree	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
705	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	10	P	F	P		4	Top cut at 1 meter, stem wounds (M), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
706	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	12.5	F	P	F		4	Top cut at 1 meter, epicormic branching (H)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
707	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18, 17	F	P	F	30	4	Union at 0.4 meters with narrow angle, included bark, top cut at 3 meters	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
708	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	37	F	P	F		4	Pruning wounds (M), lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), top cut	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition

709	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	26				100	4	Crown missing, dead, elevated hazard potential	RNFP	Missing	-
710	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
711	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	35	P-F	P-F	F		4	Stem wound at base (H), leaning away from stem wound (H) over parking lot, topcut, pruning wounds (M), elevated hazard potential	RNFP	Missing	-
712	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	9.5	P	P	P		4	Broken branches (H), lean (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
713	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	9.5	P-F	P	P		4	Top cut at 2 meters, lean (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
714	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17	P-F	P	P		4	Lean (L), understory to 716, asymmetrical crown (H), bark peeling, declining	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
715	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	18.5	F	P	F		4	Crooks (M), lean (L), understory to 716, asymmetrical crown (H), large snag against trunk	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
716A	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	49, 45	F	F	F		4	Union at 0.6 meters, broken branches (L), lean (M), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
716B	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	29	F	F	F		4	Asymmetrical crown (M), union at 2.2 meters with included bark and narrow angle	RNFP	Remove	Grading
717	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	42	F-G	F	F		4	Broken branches (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
718	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-47	P	P	P	75	4	Pruning wounds (M), lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
719	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	35, 31.5	F	F	F		4	Clump of 2, union at base, lean (L) away from parking lot, asymmetrical crown (L), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
720	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	60	F	F	F		4	Union at 5 meters, lean (L), broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
721	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	14.5	P-F	P-F	G		4	Lean (H), asymmetrical crown (H)	RNFP	Missing	-
722A	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	27	F-G	F-G	F-G		4	Union at 0.3 meters with included bark (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
722B	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	40	F	F	F	20	4	Broken branches (H), lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
723	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-50	F-G	F	F	20	4	Sweep (L), broken branches (M), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
724	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	20	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M), understory tree	RNFP	Missing	-
725	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	14	F	F	F		4	Understory tree, lean (L), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
726	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	10	P	P	P	90	4		RNFP	Missing	-
727	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	26.5	F	F-P	F		4	Lean (L) towards parking lot, seam (M), pruning wounds (L), poor form (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
728	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-30, -30	F	P-F	F	30	4	Codominant stems at 1.2 meters, pruning wounds (L), top cut at 10 meters	RNFP	Remove	Transformer
729	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	37	F	F	F		4	Codominant at 1 meter with narrow angle, broken branches (L), included bark	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
730	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	14	F-G	F	F		4	Understory tree, asymmetrical crown (M), lean (L), asymmetrical crown (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
731	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	26	F-G	F	F-G		4	Codominant at 2 meters with narrow angles, broken branches (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
732	Filbert species	<i>Corylus sp.</i>	29, 10	F	F	F		4	Seam (M), lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
733	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16	F	F	F-G		4	Seam (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
734	Filbert species	<i>Corylus sp.</i>	17	P	P	P	90	4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
735	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	25.5	F	F	F-G		4	Union at 2 meters, broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
780	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	13, 9, 8	F	F	F		4	Multi-stem at base, included bark, gypsy moth present	RNFP	Remove	Grading
781	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	16	F-G	F-G	F-G		4	Sweep (L), crook (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
782	Black Walnut	<i>Juqians nigra</i>	17	F	P-F	P-F		4	Lean (H) toward parking lot	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
783	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	10	P-F	P-F	P-F		4	Lean (H), epicormic branching (M), deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
784	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	10	F	F	P-F		4	Bark peeling (M), epicormic branching (M), lean (M), deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
785	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	12	F	F	F-G		4	Bow (M), lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
786	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	12	F	F	F		4	Lean (L) towards parking lot	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
787	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	-15	G	G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
788	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	10	G	G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
789	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	10	G	F	G		4	Sweep (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
790	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	15	F	F-G	F-G		4	Crook (L), sweep (L), epicormic branching (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
791	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	11	F	P-F	F		4	Bow (H)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
792	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	14	F	F-G	F		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
793	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	11	F	F-G	F-G		4	Crook (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
794	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	13	F	F	F-G		4	Crook (H), poor form, suppressed	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
795	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	38	F-G	F	F-G		4	Crook (M) in crown	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
796	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	13	F	F	F		4	Lean (M), suppressed	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
797	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	12	F-G	F	F		4	Suppressed	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
798	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	11	G	G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
799	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	12.5	G	F-G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
800	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	14	G	G	G		4	Asymmetrical crown (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
801	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	13	G	G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship

802	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	13	G	G	G		4			RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
803	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	10.5	F-G	F-G	F		4			RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
804	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	10.5	F-G	F-G	F-G		4			RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
1418	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	19, 14	F-G	F	F-G		4	Co-dominant stems at 1 meter, included bark, twisting stems		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
1	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	15	G	G	G		4	Dead		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
2	Eastern Cottonwood	<i>Populus deltoides</i>	52	P	F	F		4	Top cut at 7 meters		RNFP	Missing	-
3	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	15	G	G	G		4	Top cut at 7 meters		RNFP	Missing	-
4	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	30.5	G	G	G		4	Top cut at 7 meters		RNFP	Missing	-
5	Eastern Cottonwood	<i>Populus deltoides</i>	36	G	G	G		4	Top cut at 7 meters		RNFP	Missing	-
6	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	16.5	G	G	G		4	Exposed roots (L)		RNFP	Missing	-
7	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	15	P	G	P		4	Lean (M)		RNFP	Missing	-
8	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	38	G	G	G		4	Grapevine competition (L), co-dominant at 2m		RNFP	Missing	-
9	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	17	G	G	G		4			RNFP	Missing	-
10	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	20	G	G	G		4			RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
11	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	28	G	G	G		4			RNFP	Missing	-
12	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	28	G	G	G		4	Grapevine competition (M), stem wounds (L)		RNFP	Missing	-
13	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	17.5	G	G	G		4	Dead		RNFP	Missing	-
14	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	16	F	F	F		4	Lean (H), stem wounds (M), grapevine competition (M)		RNFP	Missing	-
15	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15	G	F	F		4	Lean (L), grapevine competition (M)		RNFP	Missing	-
16	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	55	P-F	P-F	P-F		4	Co-dominant at 2.5 meters, stem wounds (M), grapevine competition (M), broken branches (H)		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
17	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	14.5	F	F	F		4	Leader impacted by #18		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
18	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	P	P	P		4	Stem wound (M), lean (M), leaning into crown of #17		RNFP	Missing	-
19	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	~20, ~20	P	P	F		4	Co-dominant at base, lean (M), stem wound (M), bark splitting with rot		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
20	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	~35	G	F-G	G		4	Lean (L)		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
21	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	11	P	P	P		4	Dead		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
22	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	15	F	F	F		4	Co-dominant at 1 meter, lean (L), stem wounds (M), broken branches (M)		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
23	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~35	G	G	G		4	Stem wound (L), growth deficit (L), deadwood (M), bow (L), union at 2.5 meters		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
24	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	10	F	P-F	P		4	Asymmetrical crown		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
25	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	32	P	P	P		4	Co-dominant at base, 3 stems dead, exposed roots (M)		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
26	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	~25	P	P	P		4	Lean (M), stem wounds (H)		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
27	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	17.5, 12	P	P	P	98	4	Dead		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
28	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	~25, ~25, ~20	P	P	P		4	Co-dominant at base, 3 stem, 2 stems dead, stem wounds (H)		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
29	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	~20	P	P	G		4			RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
30	Black Walnut	<i>Juglans nigra</i>	21	F	F	F		4	Stem wound (M)		RNFP	Missing	-
31	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	15	F	G	F		4	Lean (L), bark peeling		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
32	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	~30	P	P	P		4	Co-dominant at 0.25 meters, 2 stems, 1 dead, lean (L), epicormic branching (L), broken branches (L), stem wounds (M)		RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
33	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~25	F	G	G		4	Growth deficit at base, debris in root zone, stem wound (L), grapevine competition (L)		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
34	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	~15	G	F-G	F		4	Growth deficit (L) at base		RNFP	Remove	Grading
35	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~30, ~25, ~20, ~15	G	P-F	F		4	Co-dominant at 0.5 meters, 4 stems, stem wounds (M), deadwood (M), lean (L-M)		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
36	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	14	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), stem wounds (L), broken branches (L), asymmetrical crown		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
37	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	12	G	G	G		4			RNFP	Missing	-
38	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	13	G	G	G		4	Lean (M), asymmetrical crown		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
39	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~14	F	F	F		4	Not tagged due to topography, lean (L), asymmetrical crown, stem wounds (M)		RNFP	Missing	-

40	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-13	F	G	G		4	Stem wound (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
41	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-25	G	G	G		4	Lean (L), stem wounds (L), union at 2.5 meters	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
42	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-15	G	G	G		4	Stem wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
43	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	-12	G	G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
44	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	11	G	F	F		4	Stem wounds (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
45	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	G	F	F		4	Stem wounds (M), crack (0.5m)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
46	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-40	G	F	F		4	Deadwood (m), exposed roots, broken branches (M), union at 2 meters	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
47	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	26	P	P	P		4	Lean (H), grapevine competition (H), stem wounds (H)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
48	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-25	G	F	F		4	Stem wounds (M), asymmetrical crown, growth deficit at base, deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
49	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	-25	F	F	G		4	Lean (H), growth deficit at base, exposed roots	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
50	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	18	G	G	F		4	Grapevine competition (M), asymmetrical crown (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
51	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-35	P-F	P-F	P		4	Lean (M), impacted by Manitoba maple on other side of river, 2 stems dead, stem wounds (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
52	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	-27	F	P	P		4	Broken leader, grapevine competition (M), not tagged due to topography	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
53	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-23	G	G	G		4	Not tagged due to topography, stem wounds (L)	RNFP	Missing	-
54	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-50	F	F	F		4	Co-dominant at 2 meters, 1 stem dead, stem wounds (L), burls (M), deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
55	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-15	P	G	G		4	Bark peeling	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
56	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	21	G	G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
57	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	19	G	G	G		4	Lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
58	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	15.5	F-G	G	G		4	Crook (VL), exposed roots	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
59	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	12.5	P	P	P		4	Grapevine competition (VL), declining	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
60	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17.5	P	F	P		4	Lean (H), stem wounds (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
61	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-35	F	F	P		4	Asphalt around base, broken branches (L), stem wounds (M), epicormic branching (M), deadwood (H), broken top	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
62	Black Locust	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	-30	P	P	P		4	Multiple dead stems, growth deficit (H), crack, rot at base, lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
63	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	15, 14	F	P-F	P-F		4	Co-dominant at base, 1 stem leans (H) toward ravine & has grapevine competition (H), 1 stem has grapevine competition (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
64	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-25	F	F	G		4	Lean (M), deadwood (L), growth deficit at base	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
65	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-30, -26	F	F	P-F		4	Co-dominant at base, crook (M) in 1 stem, grapevine competition (L), stem wounds (L), deadwood (M), broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
66	Silver Maple	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	-40	F	F	G		4	Lean (H), crook (L), grapevine competition (L), debris at base	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
67	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	14	F	P	F		4	Vine competition (M), poor form (H)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
68	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	21	F	P-F	G		4	Lean (H) toward ravine, vine competition (L), asphalt around base	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
69	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	-20	F	G	G		4	Grapevine competition (M), growth deficit at base, asphalt around base	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
70	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-55	G	G	G		4	Crook, debris in root zone, deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
71	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	75, 31	F	G	G		4	Rot from base to breast height (0.5m width) where pruning occurred, broken branches (L), co-dominant stems in crown	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
72	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	31	P	P	P		4	Stem wounds (H), co-dominant at base, 1 stem dead, deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
73	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18.5	F	F	G		4	Lean (L), asymmetrical crown, impacted by 72	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
74	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15	G	G	F-G		4	Pruning wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
75	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	41, 38	F	P-F	F		4	Co-dominant at base, 36.5cm stem leans (L), 37cm stem has rot, splitting bark, pruning wounds (L), stem wounds (L), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
76	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	27	G	G	G		4	Crook (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
77	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-70	G	F	F-G		4	Canker (L), stem wounds (M), pruning wounds (L), co-dominant stems in crown	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
78	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	18	F	F	F-G		4	Crook (L), growth deficit at base (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
79	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	57	F	F	G		4	Pruning wounds (M), crack from base to breast height with open wound at rot, crack at 5 meters, lean (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
80	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-60	G	G	G		4	Lean (L), crook (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
81	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16	G	G	G		4	lean (L), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
82	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	17.5	F	P	P		4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
83	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16.5	F	F	F		4	Stem wounds (M), pruning wounds, poor form (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
84	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	64	F	F	F		4	Co-dominant stems at 1.5 meters, stem wounds (M), lean (L), included bark, broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
85	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	12	F	G	G		4	Crook (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
86	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	-60	G	G	F-G		4	Stem wounds (M), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
87	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	27.5, 10	F	F	F		4	1 dead stem, pruning wounds (L), grapevine competition (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
88	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	22	G	G	G	25	4	Pruning wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship

89	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~50	F	P	P		4	Pruning wounds (M), epicormic branching (M), grapevine competition (H), co-dominant stems at 2.5 meters	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
90	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17	F	P	P		4	Pruning wounds (L), grapevine competition (H), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
91	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	42	F-G	F	F		4	Crack to 4 meters, rot	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
92	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	12	F-G	F	G		4	Co-dominant at base, growth deficit at base, stem wound (H), bow (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
93	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~35, ~30	P-F	F	P-F		4	Union at base, broken top, included bark, decay in upper crown, pruning wounds (L), stem wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
94	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	41	F-G	F	F		4	Grapevine competition (M), stem wounds (M), seam (L), co-dominant stems in crown, deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
95	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	45, 39, 29	P	P	F		4	Union at base, multiple stem failures, 1 dead and lying across base of tree, grapevine competition (M), pruning wounds (L), stem wounds (M), open wound (H)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
96	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	63	F	F	G		4	Co-dominant at 2 meters, crack at union (L), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
97	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~51	P	P	P		4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
98	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	27	F	F	F		4	Lean (L), stem wounds (M) with rot, asymmetrical crown, bow (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
99	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	28.5	F	F	F		4	Broken branches (M), stem wounds (M), included bark, co-dominant stems in crown	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
100	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~60	G	G	F		4	Stem wounds (H), grapevine competition (H), co-dominant stems at 3 meters, broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
101	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~55	G	G	G	25	4	Grapevine competition (H), pruning wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
102	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~60	G	G	G	15	4	Asymmetrical crown (M), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
103	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	15	F	P	F		4	Pruning wounds (H), lean (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
104	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15	G	G	G		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
105	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13	G	G	F		4	Pruning wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
106	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	12.5	G	G	F		4	Stem wounds (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
107	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	26	P	P	P-F		4	Lean (M), poor form (M), top cut at 2 meters	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
108	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	10.5	F	G	G		4	Lean (M)	RNFP	Missing	-
109	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	13.5	P	P	P		4	Phoenix tree, lean (H), stem wounds (H)	RNFP	Missing	-
110	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	12	F	F	P		4	Pruning wounds (M), suppressed	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
111	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16.5	F	F	F	15	4	Broken branches (L), vine competition (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
112	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	25	F	F	F		4	Crack (M), poor form (M), stem wounds (M), broken branches (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
113	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~35	F	F	F		4	Lean (M), broken branches (L), deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
114	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	17	P-F	P-F	F		4	Stem wound (M), 1 stem pruned at base	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
115	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	21	F	P-F	F		4	Growth deficit at base, crook, stem wounds (M), broken top	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
116	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15	P	P	P		4	Stem wounds (H)	RNFP	Missing	-
117	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	14	G	G	F		4		RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
118	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	19	F	G	G		4	Stem wounds (L), seam (L)	RNFP	Remove	Grading
119	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~40, ~40, ~35, ~20, ~15	F	P-F	F		4	Clump of 5, lean (L-M), stem wounds (L), pruning wounds (M), broken branches (H)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
120	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	20	F	F	F		4	Grapevine competition (L), impacted by neighbouring tree, pruning wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
121	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~37	F	F	F	30	4	Lean (M), asymmetrical crown, deadwood (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
122	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	16	F	F	F		4	Poor form (M), broken branches (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
123	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	46	F-G	F-G	F-G		4	Lean (L), broken branches (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
124	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	16	G	G	G		4	Grapevine competition (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
125	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	12	G	F-G	G		4	Suppressed	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
126	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	11	F	P-F	G		4	Lean (M), top cut at 1.5 meters	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
127	White Elm	<i>Ulmus americana</i>	16	G	G	G		4	Crook (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
128	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	18	P	P	P		4	Both leaders pruned, rot	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
129	Norway Maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	22	G	G	G		4	Lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
130	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	18	P	P	P		4	Lean (H), impacted by neighbouring tree	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
131	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	~14	P	P	P		4	Impacted by neighbouring tree	RNFP	Missing	-
132	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	55	P	P	P		4	Broken leader, stem wound (M)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
133	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	17	G	G	F		4	Pruning wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
134	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	14.5	F	F	F		4	Crook (M), lean (L), stem wounds (M), pruning wounds (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
135	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	20	P-F	P-F	P-F		4	Crack (M), stem wounds (H), epicormic branching (M), decay present	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
136	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	11	P	P	P		4	Dead	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
137	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	17.5	F	F	G		4	Lean (M), crook (H)	RNFP	Missing	-
138	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	55	F	F	G		4	Lean (M), stem wounds (M), epicormic branching (L), deadwood (L), union at 3 meters	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship

139	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	16	F	G	G		4	sweep (M), epicormic branching (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
140	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	14.5	F	P-F	F	35	4	Lean (L), crook (H)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
141	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	29.5	F	G	G		4	Included fence	RNFP	Missing	-
142	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	14	F	F	G		4	Crook (L), broken top	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
143	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	13	F	F-G	G		4	Lean (L), grapevine competition (L), epicormic branching (M)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
144	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	17	F	P-F	G		4	Lean (M), bow (H)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
145	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	14	F	G	G		4	Lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
146	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	31	F	G	G		4	Lean (L)	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
147	Filbert species	<i>Corylus sp.</i>	23, 22	F	G	G		4	Co-dominant at 0.25 meters, included bark	RNFP	Remove	Stewardship
A	Weeping Willow	<i>Salix x sepulcralis</i>	~205	F	F	F		4	Union at 1.5 m, natural branch scars (M), included bark, gypsy moth present, broken branches (M), deadwood (L)	RNFP	Retain	-
B	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15, 13	F	F	G		4	Co-dominant stems at 0.25 meters, included bark, pruning wounds (H)	RNFP	Remove	Walkway
C	Manitoba Maple	<i>Acer negundo</i>	28.5	P-F	F	F		4	Main stem dead with rot and broke off at 3.5 metres, lean(M), wildlife den below root zone, elevated hazard	RNFP	Missing	-
D	Silver Maple	<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	48	P-F	P	P	100	4	Elevated risk potential, tree is dead, removal recommended	RNFP	Missing	-
E	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	45	P-F	F	F	20	4	Target canker on stem(H), asymmetrical crown(M)	RNFP	Missing	-
F	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	59	F	F	F	10	4	Ribbing (H), asymmetrical crown (M), union at 6 meters, broken branches (L)	RNFP	Remove	Poor Condition
G	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	15.5, 11	F	F	F-G		4	Co-dominant stems at 0.25 meters, pruning wounds (M)	RNFP	Remove	Entranceway
H	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	22, 20, 12	G	F	G		4	Multi-stem at 0.25 meters, included bark, pruning wounds (L)	RNFP	Remove	Walkway

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 Dieback	(%)
Cat.	City of Toronto Tree Category	1 - 5
~ = Estimate, (L) = low, (M) = moderate, (H) = heavy		

Table 2. Stand Tally Analysis

Tree Size Class >>>>	11 - 20cm	21 - 30cm	31 - 40cm	41 - 50cm	Regeneration	Total All Sizes
					< 10 cm	
Species						
Siberian Elm (<i>Ulmus pumila</i>)	2				86	88
Manitoba Maple (<i>Acer negundo</i>)	3				107	110
Norway Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>)	4				108	112
Black Walnut (<i>Juglans nigra</i>)					1	1
Staghorn Sumac (<i>Rhus typhina</i>)					26	26
White Elm (<i>Ulmus americana</i>)					5	5
Green Ash (<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>)					23	23
Total Number of Trees	9	0	0	0	356	365