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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

LGL Limited was retained by Eno Investments Limited and Ankara Realty Limited to prepare a Tree Management Plan for a residential development proposed in the Town of Oakville, Regional Municipality of Halton, between Neyagawa Boulevard to the west, Dundas Street to the south, Burnhamthorpe Road to the north, and Sixth Line to the east (Figure 1), herein referred to as the Eno/Ankara Lands. The objectives of this report are to identify tree resources and site characteristics for consideration during design of the draft plan and include:

- A survey and a detailed description including mapping of the existing tree resources in or near proposed work zone;
- Identification of trees that may pose a constraint to the proposed work zone;
- Identification and quantification of trees that require removal to facilitate the proposed work zone; and,
- Specification of the type and locations of tree protection zone and fencing.

The information, interpretation and analysis contained within this Assessment are to be used solely for the purposes outlined within this Assessment. This Assessment is for the exclusive use of Eno Investments Limited and Ankara Realty Limited.

### 2.0 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Tree Inventory

Oakville's Tree Protection By-Law (No. 2017-038) regulates or prohibits the injury or destruction of trees on private property. Exceptions Section 5. (f) confirms that this submission is not regulated by the By-law "for the purpose of satisfying a condition to the approval of a site plan, a plan of subdivision, a plan of condominium, or a consent under sections 41,51 , and 53 of the Planning Act, or as a requirement of a site plan or subdivision agreement under those sections of the Act." Exceptions Section 5. (j) "in the sole discretion of the Director of Development Engineering for the Town of Oakville, as a result of activities or matters undertaken as part of the approved process for the Environmental Implementation and Functional Servicing requirements for the lands in the North Oakville Secondary Plan area other than the lands designated Natural Heritage System" is also relevant as this property is subject to an ongoing Environmental Implementation Report and Functional Servicing Plan. Relevant definitions used in this report include:

- Boundary Tree means a tree whose trunk is growing across one or more property lines;
- Dead means a tree that has no living tissue;
- DBH means the diameter at breast height, measured outside the bark, of the trunk of a tree, measured at 1.37 metres above grade;
- Dripline means the vertical projection of the outermost edge of a tree's canopy;
- Good Arboricultural Practices means the proper implementation of removal, renewal and maintenance activities known to be appropriate for individual trees in and around urban areas to minimize detrimental impacts on urban forest values and includes pruning of trees to remove dead limbs, maintain structural stability and balance, or to encourage their natural form, provided that such pruning is limited to the appropriate removal or not more than $25 \%$ of the live branches or
limbs of a tree, but does not include pruning to specifically increase light or space;
- High Risk Tree means there is a high risk of tree failure with significant consequences, but tree failure is not imminent as assessed and identified by an arborist report; and,
- Tree means a self-supporting woody plan which will reach a height of at least 4.5 metres at physiological maturity.

The Subject Lands were investigated by LGL's ISA Certified Arborist (Trent Meyers) on April 22, 24, 29, and May $5^{\text {th }}, 2020$. Trees on the Subject Lands were surveyed using the following methodology for tree inventory and impact assessment:

- Species: each tree was identified to species level using common and scientific names;
- Size: diameter at breast height (DBH) was recorded in centimetres, measured 1.37 metres above ground level consistent with International Society of Arboriculture standards. All live trees greater than 10 cm were inventoried;
- Health: each tree surveyed was assigned a ranking of poor, fair or good health, based on trunk integrity, crown structure, and apparent vigour. Note that surveys were conducted from ground level only and did not include excavation of root systems or aerial inspections of the canopy;
- Site identification: each tree was marked with a numbered ISA-approved aluminum tag. Note that part of the Subject Lands shared south boundary had been inventoried prior to 2017 under separate submission/proponent. Tags remaining from that study were used in this inventory, where possible, rather than affixing new tags;
- Species were screened against the Ontario Endangered Species Act, 2007 to determine if special regulations apply;
- Geographic location: the location of each tree was recorded with a differential TopCon GRS1 GPS unit plotted in the appended figures with a horizontal accuracy of 1-2 metres. Identification numbers in the figures correspond with identification numbers in the inventory table (Appendix A); and,
- Impact assessment: listing trees identified for removal and protection in relation to the proposed draft plan.


### 2.2 Tree Species at Risk Screening

Tree species at risk screening was completed by comparing inventory data against the Endangered Species Act, 2007 species listings.

### 3.0 RESULTS

### 3.1 Tree Inventory

The Eno/Ankara lands are primarily composed of cropped field bordered by hedgerows, two small cultural thickets outside of the Natural Heritage System and afforded protection (consistent with North Oakville Creeks Subwatershed Study, North Oakville East Secondary Plan, and the Environmental Implementation Report/Functional Servicing Study).

A total of 872 trees were surveyed within the Subject Lands. Trees ranged in size from 10 centimeters to
the largest tree documented at 146 centimeters DBH. Of those, 261 were equal to or greater than 15 cm diameter. A total of 18 tree species were inventoried to species level. Two were identified only to genus (Pyrus and dead Fraxinus trees) A list of species and their relative abundance can be found below in Table 1 and Figure 2.

Table 1 Species Abundance of Inventoried Trees

| Scientific Name | Common Name | Quantity | Composition (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Acer negundo | Manitoba Maple | 90 | 13.8 |
| Acer rubrum | Red Maple | 4 | 0.6 |
| Acer saccharinum | Silver Maple | 9 | 1.4 |
| Acer saccharum ssp. saccharum | Sugar Maple | 73 | 11.2 |
| Carya cordiformis | Bitternut Hickory | 2 | 0.3 |
| Carya ovata var. ovata | Shagbark Hickory | 57 | 8.7 |
| Fraxinus Sp. | Ash | 45 | 6.9 |
| Pyrus Sp. | Fruit tree | 50 | 7.7 |
| Juglans nigra | Black Walnut | 5 | 0.8 |
| Ostrya virginiana | Ironwood | 28 | 4.3 |
| Pinus strobus | White Pine | 11 | 1.7 |
| Prunus serotina | Black Cherry | 1 | 0.2 |
| Quercus alba | White Oak | 84 | 12.9 |
| Quercus macrocarpa | Bur Oak | 4 | 0.6 |
| Quercus rubra | Red Oak | 75 | 11.5 |
| Thuja occidentalis | Eastern White Cedar | 4 | 0.6 |
| Tilia americana | Basswood | 37 | 5.7 |
| Tilia cordata | Little Leaf Linden | 38 | 5.8 |
| Ulmus americana | White Elm | 15 | 2.3 |
| Ulmus pumila | Siberian Elm | 21 | 3.2 |

A complete, detailed inventory of all surveyed trees is provided in Appendix A. Many of the Ash (Fraxinus spp.) were in fair to poor condition or dead due to Emerald Ash Borer (Agrilus planipennis) infestation.

Part of the wooded area in the south portions of the Subject Lands is included within the Core Preserve Areas (Core 5) as identified by the North Oakville Creeks Subwatershed Plan, 2006 (NOCSS) and the North Oakville East Secondary Plan. Core Preserve Areas include key natural features or groupings of key natural features, together with required buffers and adjacent lands intended to protect the function of those features and ensure the long-term sustainability of the NHS components within the urban context. The wooded area of Core 5 in the southwest portion of the Subject Lands (Figure 2d) has been characterized in the NOCSS as FOD5-2 Dry-Fresh Sugar Maple-Beech Deciduous Forest, and the wooded area in the adjacent to the southcentral portion of the Subject Lands has been characterized as FOD2-4 Dry-Fresh Oak Hardwood Deciduous Forest. The balance of the Subject Lands is currently agricultural fields with few narrow, linear hedgerows.

### 3.2 Privately Owned Boundary Trees

There are boundary trees on the Subject Lands/adjacent lands. Boundary trees cannot be removed unless permission is granted by the lawful property owner in conjunction with applicable permits issued by the Town of Oakville. Note that the adjacent parcel to the south; Mattamy's Preserve North neighborhood, is also undergoing a development application. While written authorization must be obtained from the legal
owner, it is expected that tree removals along this boundary will be coordinated between respective landowners.

Several trees along the east property boundary are either on the subject property boundary or off site but within proximity such that site works may cause an impact. Tree impact mitigation is proposed where a development application is not imminent.

### 3.3 Municipal Trees

Several municipal trees exist along the Burnhamthorpe Road West right-of-way and include volunteer pear, sugar maple, Eastern white cedar, and most are less than 15 cm dbh.

### 3.4 Tree Species at Risk - Provincial Endangered Species Act

Tree species listed under the Endangered Species Act, such as Butternut (Juglans cinerea), were not observed on or within 50 m of the Subject Lands.

### 4.0 PROPOSED PLAN

The proposed draft plan (April 2021) includes single detached, street townhouses, lane based townhouses, live/rent, high density block, neighborhood park, elementary school, SWM pond (and inlet), natural heritage system, open space, various reserves, street network and Burnhamthorpe Road (William Halton Parkway) widening. Access from Burnhamthorpe Road is proposed through Carding Mill Drive Trail and two east/west streets to convey traffic.

### 5.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Trees within the proposed development limit were evaluated and prescribed with management actions based on criteria such as ownership, proximity/relation to development, grading and servicing. Recommendations for removal are based on conflict with the draft plan and/or poor health condition. The remainder of the surveyed trees are either outside the limit of the draft plan or are situated within the protected Core 5 area.

Impacts to trees can occur in a variety of forms including:

- complete removal of a tree;
- damage or removal of canopy limbs; and,
- compaction of soil surrounding the root system and partial or complete removal of root systems due to grading or excavation.

It is commonly considered that impacts of $25 \%$ or more to canopy and/or root systems will likely result in the eventual demise or failure of the tree. Removal of these trees is suggested in order to prevent future hazardous situations caused by deteriorating trees near the development. Appendix A includes rationale for removal or preservation based on specific conflicts identified through desktop analysis of tree location overlaid on draft plan details, as well as considerations of tree health. Anticipated tree removals are illustrated in Figures 3a-31.

### 5.1 Tree Removals

All trees within the subject lands but outside of the NHS are proposed for removal, consistent with the NOCSS and the NOE Secondary Plan. This includes a total of 261 trees greater or equal to 15 cm dbh.

### 6.0 TREE PROTECTION

Trees that are located on the legal property boundary are considered shared ownership and require written authorization from the appropriate landowner for their removal. All trees in the hedgerow along the south boundary are expected to be removed by both applicants (Eno/Ankara and Mattamy-Preserve North), as both applicants have submitted applications for site alteration.

Trees along the east boundary (e.g. 303, 304, 307, 308,309,313) are currently part of an occupied residence and shall be protected until development of those lands proceed. This is particularly important as tree \#303, 307, 309 have limbs overhanging the subject lands and may require mitigative pruning to avoid damage/conflict with machinery. Discussions should be held on site with the contractor to determine the likelihood of machine conflict, pruning, and the possibility of avoidance.

### 6.1 Tree Protection Zones

Tree Protection Zones (TPZ) and Tree Protection Fence (TPF) have been identified on Figures 3a-31. The TPF shall be installed prior to ground-breaking. The Tree Protection Zone is the minimum setback required to maintain the structural integrity of the tree's anchor roots, based on generally accepted arboricultural principles and Town of Oakville specifications of tree protection (Appendix B). No grade change, storage or materials or equipment is permitted within the TPZ.

### 6.2 Tree Protection Fence

Tree protection fence must be erected prior to the commencement of any construction activity that may injure a tree on the site and are to remain in place throughout the entire duration of the project. If fill or excavated material must be temporarily located near the tree protection barrier, a wooden barrier must be used to ensure no material enters the TPZ. See Appendix A for a list of trees requiring avoidance/protection. In this case, site perimeter fencing/erosion control fencing is recommended to protect off-site trees while permitting site works to occur within the subject lands.

### 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Mitigation measures shall be implemented to minimize impacts to trees adjacent to the construction zone and local wildlife. The following recommendations conform to good arboricultural practices and responsible natural heritage impact mitigation:

- Site works shall conform to the recommendations of the governing Environmental Implementation Report (EIR). As the EIR has not yet been approved, the recommendations herein may be revised to conform to an approved EIR;
- No trees shall be pruned or removed or impacted without prior approval from the Town;
- The Site Supervisor, design engineers, landscape architects shall be familiar with the Town's Tree Protection standards and understand the purpose and function of Tree Protection Zones (TPZ);
- It is the responsibility of the project team to become directly acquainted with the site, to carefully examine the location of the proposed work, and to notify the Town of any discrepancies in the site conditions;
- Construction equipment shall not access the NHS;
- No fill, machinery, chemicals, fuel or materials are to be placed within the NHS;
- Heavy machinery is not to be operated within NHS(including overhead swinging of machine arms);
- Any tree removals or pruning required is to be conducted by a qualified Arborist or Town Forester;
- Should any additional, incidental or accidental tree injuries occur during construction, a qualified Arborist or Town Forester should be consulted to determine whether additional mitigation measures should be employed;
- Delineation of the TPF's shall be clearly defined on drawings and on the site;
- The tree protection hoarding/barrier must be erected prior to commencement of work;
- Any area inside the TPF must be left undisturbed (including overhead), other than the prescribed pruning;
- Construction materials or equipment are not to be stored within the TPZ of the trees;
- No signs or objects should be displayed or affixed to any retained trees;
- Disposal of liquids shall not occur within the TPZ;
- Tree protection measures are to remain in place until all site works have been completed, at which point tree protection measures shall be removed;
- Periodic inspections of TPZ's during construction and assessments of hazard potential postconstruction should be conducted to ensure adequate protection is provided for trees identified for preservation and to ensure the risk of hazard is kept to a minimum;
- For project planning and scheduling purposes, removal of vegetation should not occur during the autumn months, outside of April 1-September, to mitigate impacts to breeding birds and roosting bats. In the event that vegetation removal must occur during this mitigation period (AprilSeptember), the proponent shall have a qualified biologist conduct, at a minimum, a nest search of the vegetated areas prior to vegetation removal. A nest search does not guarantee that tree clearing can proceed. Consultation with Environment Canada and/or the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) may be required depending on the results of the nest search and that a nest search does not guarantee that vegetation removals will be permitted. Temporary avoidance or other mitigation may be required to minimize impacts on wildlife.


### 8.0 CONCLUSION

A tree inventory and preservation plan has been prepared for the Eno/Ankara Lands as part of a development application. The tree inventory can be summarized as:

- A total of 872 trees were surveyed, ranging from 10 cm to 146 cm dbh ;
- A total of 606 of those are greater than or equal to 15 cm dbh;
- A total of 261 greater than or equal to 15 cm and are proposed for removal and subject to the Town of Oakville review;
- The prescribed removals are part of agricultural field boundary hedgerows, and two small cultural thickets;
- Tree protection has been specified to protect the NHS at the southwest portion of the subject lands and off-site trees east of the subject lands; and
- Species at Risk trees were not found within 50 metres of the Subject Lands.

A draft plan has been prepared which proposes removal of hedgerow trees and preservation of trees within the natural heritage system and those that are off site. Mitigation has been designed to protect selected trees, to responsibly plan for 261 tree removals, and to schedule timing of tree removals to minimize or avoid impacts to wildlife.

### 9.0 DISCLAIMER

### 9.1 Limitations of this Assessment

This Assessment is based on the circumstances and observations as they existed at the time of the site inspection of the Client's Property and the trees situate thereon and upon information provided by the Client to LGL Limited. The opinions in this Assessment are given based on observations made and using generally accepted professional judgment, however, because trees and plants are living organisms and subject to change, damage and disease, the results, observations, recommendations, and analysis as set out in this Assessment are valid only as at the date any such testing, observations and analysis took place and no guarantee, warranty, representation or opinion is offered or made as to the length of the validity of the results, observations, recommendations and analysis contained within this Assessment. As a result, the Client shall not rely upon this Assessment, save and except for representing the circumstances and observations, analysis and recommendations that were made as at the date of such inspections. It is recommended that the trees discussed in this Assessment should be re-assessed periodically.

### 9.2 Restriction of Assessment

The Assessment carried out was restricted to the Property. No assessment of any other trees or plants has been undertaken by LGL. LGL is not legally liable for any other trees or plants on the Property except those expressly discussed herein. The conclusions of this Assessment do not apply to any areas, trees, plants or any other property not covered or referenced in this Assessment.

### 9.3 Professional Responsibility

In carrying out this Assessment, LGL Limited and any Assessor appointed for and on behalf of LGL Limited to perform and carry out the Assessment has exercised a reasonable standard of care, skill and diligence as would be customarily and normally provided in carrying out this Assessment. The Assessment has been made using accepted arboricultural techniques. These include a visual examination of each tree for structural defects, scars, external indications of decay such as fungal fruiting bodies, evidence of insect attack, discolored foliage, the condition of any visible root structures, the degree and direction of lean (if any), the general condition of the tree(s) and the surrounding site, and the current or planned proximity of property and people. Except where specifically noted in the Assessment, none of the trees examined on the property were dissected, cored, probed, or climbed and detailed root crown examinations involving excavation were not undertaken.

While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the trees recommended for retention are healthy, no guarantees are offered, or implied, that these trees, or all parts of them will remain standing. It is professionally impossible to predict with absolute certainty the behaviour of any single tree or group of trees, or all their component parts, in all given circumstances. Inevitably, a standing tree will always pose some risk. Most trees have the potential to fall, lean, or otherwise pose a danger to property and persons in the event of adverse weather conditions, and this risk can only be eliminated if the tree is removed.

Without limiting the foregoing, no liability is assumed by LGL or its directors, officers, employers, contractors, agents or Assessors for:
a) any legal description provided with respect to the Property;
b) issues of title and or ownership respect to the Property;
c) the accuracy of the Property line locations or boundaries with respect to the Property;
d) the accuracy of any other information provided to LGL by the Client or third parties;
e) any consequential loss, injury or damages suffered by the Client or any third parties, including but not limited to replacement costs, loss of use, earnings and business interruption; and,
f) the unauthorized distribution of the Assessment.

### 9.4 General

Any plans and/or illustrations in this Assessment are included only to help the Client visualize the issues in this Assessment and shall not be relied upon for any other purpose.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  | Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tag\＃ | Scientific Name | Common Name | $\underset{(c m)}{\text {（cm }}$ |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  | 脣 |  |  |  | ） | ¢ |  |  | 先 |  |  | $\left.\frac{3}{2} \right\rvert\,$ | 景 |  |  |  |  | Rationale |  | ｜r |  |
| 751 | Acer saccharinum | Silver Maple | 30.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 752 753 | Cara ovata var．ovata Carya ovata var． vota | Shabaak kickory Shagbark hickory | 28.0 24.0 |  |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 9 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conflicts with proososd dovelopment |  |  |  |
| 754 | Caryo ovata var．ovata | Shagoark hickory | 20.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { x }}{\times}$ |  | Conflicis with ropoosed d develoloment |  |  |  |
| 755 | Quercus alba |  | 24.0 |  |  |  | 9 | 9 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proossed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{756} 75$ | Quercus alas | White Oak | 20.0 2.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | t | 3 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{758}^{757}$ | Carya ovata var ovata | Shagaak hickory | 25.0 14.0 |  |  | f | $\stackrel{9}{\text { f }}$ | ！ | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ $\times$ $\times$ $\times$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 759 | Carva ovata var．ovata | Shagoakk hickory | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | ＋ | t | 2 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed devevoloment |  |  |  |
| 760 | Cara ovata var．ovata | Shagaak kickory | 20.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Confilics with proposed dovelopment |  |  |  |
| 761 | Cara ovata var．ovata | Shagaak hickory | 24.0 37.0 |  |  | 9 | $\frac{9}{\text { f }}$ | t | $\frac{3}{5}$ | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | Conficics with proosed development |  |  |  |
| 763 | Cara ovata var．ovata | Shagbak hickory | 25.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 764 | Carva ovata var．ovata | Shagaak hickory | 17.0 |  |  |  | 9 | 9 | － | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{ }{\times}$ |  | Confilict with proososed development |  |  |  |
| 765 766 | Cara ovotat var．oveta Carya ovata var． ovata | Shagoark hickory Shagoark hickory | 25.0 16.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{g}{9}$ | ${ }_{9}^{9}$ | ${ }_{9}^{9}$ | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＋ |  | Conficics with proposed dovelopment |  |  |  |
| 767 | Carya ovata var．ovata | Shagaark hickory | 10.0 |  |  |  |  | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Confilics with ropoososed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 768 | Cary ovata var．ovata | Shagbak hickory | 20.0 | 19.0 |  | f | f | 9 | 4 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 770 | Cara ovata var．ovata | Shagaark hickory Lronvood | 22.0 10.0 |  |  | 9 | $\frac{9}{\text { f }}$ | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ， |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conficics with proosed d development |  |  |  |
| 771 | Quercus alba | White oak | 28.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{772}^{773}$ | $\frac{\text { Quercus alba }}{\text { Prusus so．}}$ | $\frac{\text { White oak }}{\text { Fruit }}$ | 35.0 26.0 |  |  |  | f | $\stackrel{9}{p}$ | ${ }_{3}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Confilict with reoosed dovelopment |  |  | Field edge，root damage |
| ${ }_{774}$ | Py Prus spo． | Frinitree | ${ }^{26.0} 38.0$ |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | $\stackrel{p}{9}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Confifics with ropoposed devevelopment |  |  |  |
| 775 | Quercus ala | White oak | 13.0 <br> 3.10 |  |  |  | t | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | Conflict with proososed development |  |  |  |
| 777 | Craximus sp． | White Oak | 31.0 14.0 |  |  |  | f | P | ${ }^{4}$ | ${ }^{90}$ |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conilicicts with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 778 | Carra ovata var．ovata | Shagaak hickorv | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | － | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with prooosed development |  |  |  |
| 779 | Quercus nura | $\frac{\text { Red oak }}{\text { White oak }}$ | $\frac{12.0}{14.0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | f | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{\text { t }}$ | $\frac{2}{2}$ | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conticict wit proposed development |  |  |  |
| 781 | Quercus nubra | Redoak | 18.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | Confilics with prooosed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{783}^{782}$ | $\frac{\text { Cara ovata var．ovata }}{\text { Ouerus }}$ | $\frac{\text { Shagoark hickory }}{\text { Red oak }}$ | 22.0 17.0 | 19.0 |  | $\underline{9}$ | t | 9 | ${ }^{4}$ | 5 | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 784 | Quercus alba | White oak | 16.0 |  |  | 9 | t | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with prooosed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{785}^{786}$ | Uimus amenicana | White Elm | 10.0 |  |  | 9 | － | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed development |  |  | Field edge，root damage |
| ${ }_{787}$ | Quercus aida | White oak | $\frac{12.0}{21.0}$ |  |  | 9 | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 9 | ${ }_{3}$ | ${ }^{20}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Conificics with repopososed dovevelopmentit |  |  |  |
| 788 | Tilia amenicana | Basswood | 30.0 <br> 170 | 19，19，11 |  |  | ＋ | － | 5 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | Confilict with proososed development |  |  |  |
| 789 | Cara ovat var．ovata | Shagoak Shickory | $\stackrel{17.0}{17.0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | ${ }_{3}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\mathrm{x}}{\times}$ |  | Confificts witit proposed doveloponent |  |  | Field edge，root damage |
| 791 | Carya ovata var．ovata | Shagaak k hickory | 28.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{4}$ | 9 | － | 5 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  | － | － |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilict with proposed dovelopment |  |  |  |
| 793 | Cara ovat var．ovata | Shagoark hickory Shaobark hickory | 27.0 10.0 | 26.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | ${ }^{5}$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | Conticis with proposed development |  |  | On neighborina proenty |
| 794 | Carra ovata var．ovata | Shagaak hickory | 34.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | － | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outiside imits of dratt plan |  |  | On neighboring property |
|  |  |  | 104.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outiside imits of dratat plan |  |  | On neighooring property |
| ${ }_{797}$ | Carya ovatatarar．vovata |  | 12.0 17.0 | 6.0 |  |  | $\underline{9}$ | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\mathrm{x}}{\times}$ |  | Soundary tree |  |  |  |
| 798 799 | Cara ovota var．ovata | Shagoark kickory | 10.0 10 |  |  |  | 9 | 9 | $\stackrel{2}{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  |  | $\times$ |  | Bounday tree |  |  |  |
| 800 | Cara ovatat var．ovata | Shagabark hickory | 17.0 |  |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | Boundary tree |  |  |  |
| 801 | Quercus rubra | Redo oak | 27.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | ${ }_{4}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilict with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 802 803 | Quercrus alba Querus rubra | White oak Red oak | 18.0 14.0 |  |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 9 | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x $\times$ $\times$ |  | Conflict with proososed development |  |  |  |
| 804 | Quercus rubra | Redoak | 36.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | － | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Conflicts with proposedd development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{805}^{806}$ | Quercus nubra | Red oak | 16.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proossed development |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{806}{807}$ | $\frac{\text { Fraxius sp．}}{\text { Quercus }}$ Subra | $\frac{\text { ash }}{\text { Red oak }}$ | 53．0 | 46.0 |  | ＋ | t | p | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{80}$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 808 | Quercus rubra | Redod oak | 16.0 | 4.0 |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proposed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 809 | Quercus nubra | Redoak | 66.0 | 16,15 |  |  |  | 9 | 8 | 10 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{811}^{810}$ | Quercus subra | ${ }_{\text {Reco oak }}$ | $\stackrel{29.0}{11.0}$ |  |  |  | f | 9 | ${ }_{2}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ $\times$ $\times$ $\times$ |  | Conilicis wit proposed development |  |  |  |
| $\frac{812}{813}$ | $\frac{\text { Quercus subra }}{\text { Quercus rubra }}$ | $\frac{\text { Red oak }}{\text { Redo oak }}$ | $\frac{14.0}{28.0}$ | 13.0 |  |  | f | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ | 10 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＋ |  | Confilict with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 814 | Pyyus sp． | Fruit tree | 25.0 |  |  | 9 | t | 9 | 4 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conflicics with ropoosesed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 815 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 30.0 |  |  | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{817}^{816}$ | Quercus macrocarapa | $\frac{\text { Redoak }}{\text { Bur oak }}$ | 30.0 10.0 | ${ }^{28.0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | ${ }_{2}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 818 | Quercus rubra | Red oak | 40.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{820}^{819}$ | Quercus aba Ouerus rubra | ${ }_{\text {White oak }}^{\text {Red oak }}$ | 32.0 420 |  |  |  | $\frac{9}{\text { f }}$ | 9 | ${ }_{5}^{4}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 821 | Tria americana | Basswod | 16.0 | 6.0 |  | f | f | 9 | 2 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confifics with ropopsesed devevolopment |  |  |  |
| 822 | Quercus alia | White ook |  |  |  | g | t | 9 | 4 |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  | Roor damage from land clearing |
| ${ }_{824}^{823}$ | Quercrus alba | White oak | 36.0 37.0 |  |  |  | $\frac{9}{\text { f }}$ | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | ${ }_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Conficics with proosed dovelopment |  |  | Root damaee from and clearing |
| 825 | Quercus alba | White oak | 14.0 |  |  |  | f |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Conflicis with proposedd development |  |  | Rool damage trom land dlearing |
| 826 827 | PYurus sp． | Frit tree | 13.0 16.0 |  |  | 9 | t | ＋ | $\stackrel{2}{3}$ | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Confilict with popoosesed doveloloment |  |  | Rooldamage from land clearing |
| ${ }_{828}^{827}$ | Quercus saba | White Ooak | $\stackrel{10.0}{10.0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | f | t | $\stackrel{3}{1}$ | ${ }_{25}^{20}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conilicicts with propososeded deveveloment |  |  | Root damamage trom liand lilearing |
| 829 830 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 15.0 |  |  | 9 | t | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proossed development |  |  | Root damaee from land clearing |
| ${ }_{831}^{830}$ | Quercus siba | White Ooak | 23.0 14.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | f | 9 | ${ }^{2}$ | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conticics wit proposed dovelopment |  |  | $\frac{\text { Root damage from land clearing }}{\text { Rood damage from land learing }}$ |
| ${ }_{832}^{832}$ | Quercus alba | White Oak | 12.0 | 6.0 |  | t | t | 9 | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with prooosed development |  |  | Root damaae from land clearina |
| ${ }_{834}^{833}$ | Quercrus iliab | White oak | 104.0 18.0 | 87.0 |  | $\stackrel{g}{9}$ | f | $\stackrel{9}{\text { f }}$ | ${ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{10}^{20}$ | ${ }^{\times}$ |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Conflict with proposed dovelopment |  |  | Root damage from land clearing |
| 835 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 36.0 |  |  | 9 | f | 9 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with prooosed development |  |  | Root damage from land clearina |
| 836 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 19.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside limits of dratt plan |  |  |  |
| 837 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 56.0 |  |  | d | d | d | 5 | 100 |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ | $\times \times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | － $\begin{aligned} & \text { off site－interim protection untila diacent property } \\ & \text {（east site ateration permits accuired }\end{aligned}$ |  |  | boundary tre |
| 838 <br> 839 | Quercus macrocarpa | $\xrightarrow{\text { Bur Oak }}$ Fruit tree | 25.0 28.0 | ${ }^{26,21}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{\text { t }}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  | x $\times$ $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {x }}$ | Outside limits of drat plan |  |  |  |
| 840 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 44.0 |  |  | p | P | d | 5 | 100 | $\stackrel{\times}{x}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ | $\times{ }^{\text {x }}$ |  |  |  | x | Boundary tree |  |  |  |
| 841 | Quercus macrocarpa | Bur Oak | 19.0 |  |  | g | 9 | f | 3 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 842 | Fraxinus sp． | ash | 15.0 | 13.0 |  | f | p | f | 3 | 75 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | сомments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TAG\＃ | Scientific Name | Common Name | $\underset{\substack{\text {（bm）} \\(\mathrm{cm})}}{\text {（ }}$ |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  | － |  | ｜r｜r |  |  | \％ |  | \％ | 隹 |  |  | 3 |  |  | \％ | － | 㜢 | Rationale |  | 鹪 |  |
| 843 | Quercus alba | White oak | 14.0 | 10.0 |  | t ${ }^{\text {t }}$ | t | ＋ | 3 | 10 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | －off site－interim protection until adicacent property |  |  |  |
| 844 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 38.0 |  |  | d d | d | d | 5 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 845 | Quercus alba | White oak | 13.0 |  |  | 9 g | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 846 | Quercus alba | White oak | 11.0 |  |  | 9 g | 9 | f | 1 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 847 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 38.0 |  |  | d | d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | d | 4 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | ＊ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{488}$ | Fraxinus sp． | ash | 14.0 |  |  | p 1 | f | p | 2 | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 849 | Fraxinus sp． | ash | 21.0 |  |  | 9 t | f | p | 3 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 850 | Quercus alba | White oak | 12.0 |  |  | 9 g | 9 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Off site－interim protection until adiacent property |  |  |  |
| 851 | Fraxius sp． | ash | 16.0 |  |  | f t | f | p | 3 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＊ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 852 | Fraxinus sp． | ash | 13.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | p | 2 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 853 | Quercus alba | White oak | 16.0 |  |  | 9 t | f | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 854 | Fraxinus sp． | ash | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | p | 3 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 855 | Fraxinus sp． | ash | 10.0 | 6.0 |  | p P | p | p | 2 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 856 | Quercus alba | White oak | 20.0 |  |  | 9 t | f | f | 3 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 857 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 10.0 |  |  | p ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | t | － | 2 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | ＊ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 858 | Fraxius sp． | Ash | 10.0 |  |  | $p$ | f | － | 2 | 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 859 | Fraxins sp． | Ash | 11.0 | 10.0 |  | p | f | p | 2 | 75 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 860 | Quercus alba | White oak | 17.0 |  |  | 9 t | f | 9 | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 861 | Quercus alba | White oak | 14.0 | 8.0 |  | 9 t | f | 9 | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 862 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 13.0 |  |  | f 1 | f | p | 2 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adiacent property |  |  |  |
| 863 | Fraxius sp． | Ash | 18.0 | 14.0 |  | p | ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | p | 2 | 80 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | x |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 864 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 14.0 |  |  | f | f | p | 2 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | ＊ |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 865 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 16.0 |  |  | t 1 | f | p | 2 | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | ＊ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 866 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 52.0 |  |  | － | ¢ | व | 4 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 867 | Ouercus alba | White oak | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | Boundarat tee |  |  |  |
| 868 | Quercus alba | White oak | 18.0 |  |  | 9 | t | f | 3 | 20 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  | Vines |
| 869 | Quercus alba | White oak | 16.0 |  |  | 9 | P | 9 | 2 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 880 | Fraxinus sp． | Whth | 12.0 |  |  | $p$ | t | t | 2 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | Buoudar tree |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{8}^{871}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { Cuercus alba }}$ Fraxius sp． | White oak | 16.0 23.0 | $\stackrel{10.0}{16,13,9}$ |  | p | t | t | 3 | ${ }_{90}^{15}$ | $\stackrel{x}{\times}$ |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | Bounday tree |  |  | Vines |
| 873 | Fraxinus sp． | Ash | 18.0 |  |  | $p$ | $\bigcirc$ | p | 2 | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ | ${ }^{\times}$ |  |  | $\times \times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | Boundary tree |  |  | Only epicorric shoots alive |
| 874 | Quercus alba | White oak | 18.0 |  |  | g | f | f | 2 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＊ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property |  |  | Vines |
| 875 | Quercus alba | White oak | 22.0 |  |  | g | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 876 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 24.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 877 | Prus sp． | Fruittee | 24.0 | 16.0 |  | 9 | f | f | 3 | 50 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | Vines |
| 878 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 14.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 879 | Prus sp． | Fruit tre | 20.0 | ${ }^{8.6}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | f | f | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 880 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 11.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 881 | Pyrus sp． | Fruit tree | 18.0 | 14.0 |  | f | f | f | 3 | 20 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 882 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 16.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adiacent property easil site alteration permits accuired |  |  |  |
| 883 | Pyrus sp． | Fruit tee | 10.0 |  |  | f | f | t | 2 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＊ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  | Vines |
| 884 | Pyrus sp． | Fruit tree | 20.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | g | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 885 | Quercus alba | White Oak | 20.0 |  |  | g | 9 | 9 | 2 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 886 | Quercus rubra | Red oak | 18.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 887 | Pyrus sp． | Fruit tre | 34.0 | 28，24 |  | g | f | f | 3 | 30 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 888 | Pyrus sp． | Fruit tree | 22.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 889 | Ulmus americana | White Elm | 14.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 890 | Quercus alba | White oak | 26.0 | 18.0 |  | 9 | f 9 | 9 | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 891 | Quercus alba | White oak | 14.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
| 892 | Pyrus sp． | Fruittee | 34.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 893 | Pyrus sp． | Fruit tee | 22.0 | 10.0 |  | 9 | f | 9 | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 894 | Pyrus sp． | Fruit tree | 48.0 | 24.0 |  | 9 | － | － | 4 | 10 | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{x}$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | off site－interim protection until adjacent property （east）site alteration permits acquired |  |  |  |
| 895 896 | Pruts sp． | Frait tree | 30.0 26.0 | $\stackrel{24,0}{16,16,14}$ |  | f | f | f | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | ${ }^{10}$ | x <br> $\times$ <br> $\times$ | ${ }^{x}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | （enter |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{897}^{896}$ | ${ }_{\text {Acerrneg sumdo }}$ | mantitob mame | 16.0 | $\stackrel{16,16,14}{10,6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | conflicts with proposeseds site peplan |  |  |  |
| $\xrightarrow{900}$ | Fraxius sp． | Ash | 16.0 |  | $\times$ | p | ${ }_{\text {f }}$ | p | 2 | 75 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | conflicis with proposesedsite plan |  |  |  |
| 907 | Prus sp． | Fruittree | 36.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | conflicts with proposeds site plan |  |  |  |



|  |  |  |  |  |  | Location Managent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TAG\＃ | Scientific Name | Common Name | $\underset{(c m)}{\text { DEH }}$ |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言 } \\ & \text { 感 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{0}{3} \\ \xi \end{array}\right\|$ |  | 先 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 毖 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { red } \\ & \text { rut } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Rationale |  |  |  |
| 1，016 | Acer sacchasinum | Silver Maple | 31.0 | 25，24，15 |  | $p$ | f | 4 | 20 | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\times \times$ | $\times \times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 1,017 1018 | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Suara maple | 32.0 280 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  | Conflict with proosoded development |  |  |  |
| $\xrightarrow{1,018} 1.019$ | Acer negundo Acernegundo | ${ }_{\text {manitoba maple }}^{\text {manito maple }}$ | 28.0 14.0 |  |  | 9 | f | ${ }^{3}$ | ${ }^{10} 10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Conflics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{1}{1,020}$ | Acern negundo | manitoba maple | 13.0 |  |  | t | ＋ | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { x }}{ } \times$ |  | Conflicis with ropoosed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 1，021 | Acer negundo | manitoba maple | 11.0 |  |  | f | t | 3 | 20 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposed development |  |  | Included bak w／ash tree |
| 1,022 <br> 1 <br> 1 <br> 1,023 | ${ }_{\text {Acer negundo }}^{\text {Acernegundo }}$ | manitoba maple | 24.0 | 10.0 |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposed ddevelopment |  |  |  |
| 1,023 <br> 1,024 | ${ }_{\text {Acer negundo }}$ | manitoba maple | 30.0 24.0 | ${ }^{11,8}$ |  | $\stackrel{9}{\text { f }}$ | p | $\frac{3}{4}$ | ${ }^{80}$ | $\times$ |  | $\underset{\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{E}}{\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{E}}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{\mathrm{x}}$ |  | Contilics with proosesd development |  |  |  |
| 1，025 | Fraxius sp． | Ash | 60.0 |  |  | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | d | 0 | 100 |  |  |  |  | $\times \times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis w with proposesed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1.0226}$ | Acerregundo | manitoba maple | 13.0 |  |  | ＋ | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with prooosed development |  |  |  |
| 1,027 <br> 1,028 | Acer negundo Acer negundo | ${ }_{\text {mantitoba maple }}^{\text {mantioba maple }}$ | 14.0 14.0 |  |  | p | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | H，E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x $\times$ $\times$ |  | Conflics with proposed d development Conflics with proosed develoment |  |  |  |
| 1，029 | Acernegundo | manitoba maple | 22.0 | 11.0 |  | f | f | 3 | 30 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicts with ropoosed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 1，030 | Acer negundo | manitoba maple | 21.0 | 17.0 |  | f | t | 3 | 10 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposed development |  |  | op broke off |
| 1，031 | Acer negundo | manitoba maple | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | p | 1 | ${ }^{90}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | － |  | Conflicics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 1.032 1.033 1 | Acer negundo | ${ }_{\text {manituba maple }}^{\text {manitoa maple }}$ | 14.0 30.0 | 30.0 |  | f | ${ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{3}$ | 75 | $\times$ |  | H．s |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x $\times$ $\times$ $\times$ |  | Conflics with proososed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,034}$ | Acerrnegundo | manitoba maple | 21.0 | ${ }^{15.0}$ |  | f | t | 3 |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Conflicis with ropooseded develoloment |  |  |  |
| 1.035 | Acer negundo | manitoba maple | 14.0 |  |  |  | g | 3 |  |  |  | I．N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1,036}$ | Acer negundo | manitoba maple | 12.0 |  |  | t | p | 1 | 90 |  |  |  | $\times \times$ | $\times \times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposed development |  |  | Top dead |
| 1，037 | Acer negundo | manitoba maple | 11.0 |  |  | f | － | ${ }^{2}$ | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{+}{\times}$ |  | Conflicis with prooosed developoent |  |  |  |
| 1,038 <br> 1,039 | $\frac{\text { Acer rubrum }}{\text { Thuio ocididentals }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Easter }}^{\text {Red Maple }}$ | $\frac{24.0}{40.0}$ | ${ }^{11.0}$ |  | ¢ | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ | 10 | $\frac{\mathrm{x}}{\times}$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\mathrm{x}}{\mathrm{x}}$ |  | Conflics with proposed d development |  |  | In water，vines |
| 1，040 | Acerrnegundo | manitoba maple | 14.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with ropoosed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 1，041 | Thuia ocididentals | Eastern white cedar | 15.0 |  |  | 9 | g | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | Conflicis with proposed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,042}$ | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Sugar maple | 14.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 1,043 <br> 1.044 <br> 1 | $\frac{\text { Acer saccharum ssp．sacharum }}{\text { Acer negundo }}$ | Suara maple | 25.0 37.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{g}{9}$ | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflics with proosesed development |  |  | Rubbing on 1，044 |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,045}$ | Acerrnegundo | manitoba maple | 17.0 | 16，12，11 |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ | 20 | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { x }}{ } \times$ |  | Conflicts with proposesed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 1.046 | Acernegundo | manitoba maple | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicis with proposesed development |  |  |  |
| 1.047 <br> 1.048 <br> 1 | Acer negundo ${ }_{\text {Acer megundo }}$ | ${ }_{\text {mantitoa ample }}^{\text {manitoa maple }}$ | 10.0 17.0 |  |  | 9 | t | ${ }_{3}^{2}$ | ${ }^{10}$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | Conflics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 1.049 | Juglans nigra | Black Wanut | 17.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | Conflicis with ropoosed develoloment |  |  |  |
| 1.050 | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Sugar maple | 15.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conflicics with proposesd development |  |  |  |
| 1，051 | Thuia occidentalis | Eastern white cedar | 40.0 | 28，24，14 |  | f | 9 | 3 |  | x | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\times$ |  | municipal tree to be removed for future road widening |  |  |  |
| 1，052 | Thuja occidentals | Eastern white cedar | 31.0 | 29.0 |  | 9 t | 9 | 3 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | $\times$ |  | municipal tree to be removed for future road widening |  |  |  |
| 1.053 | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Sugar maple | 11.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proposed development |  |  | Under hydro lines |
| 1，054 | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Sugar maple | 10.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | $\times$ |  | municipal tree to be removed for future road widening |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{1}^{10.055}$ | Acer regundo Acerneumdo | manitoa maple | 13.0 150 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ $\times$ $\times$ |  | Conflicts with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 1，056 | $\frac{\text { Acer negundo }}{\text { Quercus rubra }}$ | $\underset{\text { manitoba maple }}{\text { Red oak }}$ | $\frac{15.0}{56.0}$ | ${ }^{24.0}$ |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 9 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | Conflicts with proposed development Core 5 protected area |  |  |  |
| 1．058 | Acer saccharum sso．saccharum | Sugar maple | 16.0 |  |  | 9 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on ElR results |
| 1.059 | Ostry viriginiana | lronwood | 16.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be retined based on EIR results |
| 1,060 <br> 1,061 |  | Sugar made | ${ }^{15.0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | g | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | Core 5 proteleted area |  |  | TPF may be refened dased on Elil results |
| 1，062 | Ostry viriginina | Hornwood | 16.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protecteded area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on Eli results |
| 1，063 | Ostry a virimina | lronvod | 17.0 140 |  |  | 9 | 9 | $\frac{2}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be refined dased on ER R results |
| 1.064 <br> 1.065 | $\frac{\text { Ostry a viriminana }}{\text { TTlua }}$ | Herswood | 14.0 18.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | t | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 5rotected drea |  |  | TPF may be efetine dased on El｜ Resestis |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,066}$ | Tliua americana | Basswood | 54.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be refined dased on Elil results |
| 1,067 <br> 1.068 | Acer saccharum ssp．sacocharum | $\frac{\text { Suarar maple }}{\text { Hronwood }}$ | 34.0 11.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ <br> $\times$ <br> $\times$ | Core 5 5roteleted area Core 5 5rotected area |  |  | TPF may be refined dased on ER R results |
| 1，069 | Ostrya virginima | Honwood | 19.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protecteded area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on EIR results |
| 1，070 | Ostry virginina | Ironwood | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF mav be refined based on EliR results |
| 1.071 <br> 1.072 | Ostry viriginina | $\xrightarrow{\text { Ironwod }}$ Siver Maple | 15.0 360 | 34.0 |  | $\frac{\mathrm{g}}{\mathrm{t}}$ | 9 |  | 40 | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be erefined dased on ElR results |
| 1.073 | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Sugar maple | 21.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protectected area |  |  | TPF mav be refeined basedod on EliR results |
| 1.074 | Ostry viriginina | Ironwood | 18.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected a area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on ElR results |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,075}$ | Acer saccharum ssp．Saccharum | Sugar maple | 19.0 | ${ }^{7} \mathbf{7} 0$ |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected a area |  |  | TPF may be retined based on ElR results |
| ${ }_{\text {1，076 }}^{1077}$ | Tlia americana | Basswood | 30.0 150 | 26.0 |  | f | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected drea |  |  | TPF may be eritind dased on EIR Results |
| $\frac{1,077}{1,078}$ | Ostry viriginina | $\frac{\text { Ironood }}{\text { Honwood }}$ | 15.0 12.0 |  |  | $\frac{g}{9}$ | 9 | $\frac{2}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 proteleted area |  |  | TPF may be refined dased on El｜results |
| 1，079 | Ostry viriminana | Ironovod | 12.0 140 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － <br> $\times$ <br> $\times$ | Core froteleted dea |  |  | TPF mav be refined dasedod on ER R ressuls |
| $\stackrel{1}{1,081}$ | Ostry virimina | $\xrightarrow{\text { Ironwood }}$ | 14.0 10.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protocected a area |  |  | TPF may be refefined doasedod on Enl｜R resulits |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,082}$ | Quercus rura | Redo oak | 34.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on EIR results |
| 1,083 <br> 1,084 <br> 1 | Ostrya virimina | $\xrightarrow{\text { Shagbaravod } \text { hickory }}$ | $\frac{11.0}{12.0}$ |  |  | $\frac{9}{9}$ | 9 | $\frac{2}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\frac{\text { Core } 5 \text { 5roteleted area }}{\text { Core } 5 \text { Protected area }}$ |  |  | TPF may be efetined dased on El｜ |
| 1.085 | Ulimus americana | White Elm | 19.0 |  |  | 9 | ＋ | ${ }^{2}$ | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protecteded area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on Eli results |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,086}$ | Ostry viriginina | Hornvod | 14.0 |  |  |  | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on El｜ |
| $\stackrel{1,087}{1.088}$ | Tila americana | Basswood | 24.0 10.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | ${ }_{9}^{9}$ | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＋$\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be refined dased on El｜Results |
| 1.089 | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Sugar maple | 12.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protecected area |  |  | TPF may be refefined basedod on ElR results |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,090}$ | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Sugar maple | 14.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be eretined dased on ElR Results |
| 1，091 |  | $\frac{\text { Shagaak hickory }}{\text { Sugar maple }}$ | 34.0 36.0 | 16.0 28.0 |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | 9 | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 proteleted area |  |  | TPF mav be refined dased on El｜ |
| ${ }_{1}^{1,093}$ | Pyrus sp． | Fruittree | 14.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Cores 5 protecteded area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on EIR results |
| 1，094 | Acer saccharum ssp．saccharum | Suara maple | 12.0 | ${ }^{9.8}$ |  | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{2}$ |  | x | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on EIR results |
| 1,095 <br> 1,096 |  | ${ }_{\text {Sugar maple }}^{\text {Black chery }}$ | 21.0 18.0 | 28，28 |  | $\stackrel{g}{9}$ | f | ${ }^{3}$ | 20 | ${ }^{\times} \times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ $\times$ $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be erefined dased on El｜ |
| 1.097 | Cara cordiformis | Bitemut hickory | 13.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Cores 5 proteceleded area |  |  | TPF may be refined based on ElR results |
| ${ }^{1,098}$ | Tlua americana | Basswood | 17.0 |  |  |  | 9 | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected drea |  |  | TPF may ber refined based on El｜R results |
| 1,099 1,100 | Tilia americana | $\xrightarrow{\text { Basswood }}$ Irowwod | 12.0 16.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{9}{9}$ | $\frac{9}{9}$ | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Core 5 protected area |  |  | TPF may be efetined based on El｜ |
| 1，431 | Quercus rubra | Red oak | 11.0 |  |  | 9 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | remove tor Maior Trail alignment |  |  | within NHS－Maior Trail permited use in NHS |
| 1,435 <br> 1436 | Acer saccharum Ssp．saccharum | Sugar Maple | 13.0 |  |  | $p$ | p | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | remove for Maior Trail liganment |  |  | within NHS－Maior Tral persitited use in NHS |
| 1,436 <br> 1285 | $\frac{\text { Ostry viriginina }}{\text { Pyrus serotina }}$ |  | 14.0 19.0 | 11 |  | ${ }_{6}$ | ${ }_{6}$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Temove for Major T Tailaligament |  |  | within NHS－Major Trail permited use in NHS |
| ${ }^{1286}$ | Fraxius americana | White Ash | 18.0 |  |  | $\square^{6} \mathrm{G}$ | G | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside inits of dratt plan |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{1287}{1288}$ | $\frac{\text { Quercus macrocarpa }}{\text { Ostra }}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { Bur Oak }}$ Horwood | 13.0 11.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{G}{G}$ | G | ${ }_{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＋ | Outside limits of darat plan |  |  |  |
| 1289 | Quercus macrocapa | Bur Oak | 17.0 |  |  | 6 | G | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside limits of dratt plan |  |  | healed frost crack |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Locatio |  |  |  | Management |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TAG\# | Scientific Name | Common Name | $\underset{(c m)}{\text { (cm }}$ |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \frac{0}{2} \\ \stackrel{y}{c} \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { c }}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \text { it } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \\ & \stackrel{0}{6} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Rationale |  | ¢ | comments |
| 13789 <br> 1379 | Malus pumila Quercus subra | ${ }_{\text {Apole }}^{\text {Aedoak }}$ | $\frac{20.0}{50.0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{G}$ | ${ }_{\text {F }}{ }_{\text {F }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { G }}{\text { F }}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Outisid ilinit of dratit lan |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r}1389 \\ \hline 1380 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | Acer sacharurum sso. saccharum | Sugar Maple | 50.0 | ${ }_{9} 9$ |  | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | G | G | ${ }^{6}$ |  | $\stackrel{\mathrm{x}}{\times}$ |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times} \times$ | Outsisid imitit of dirat plan |  |  |  |
| 1381 <br> 1382 <br> 1 | Quercus rubra | ${ }_{\text {Shed Oak }}^{\text {Stan }}$ | 19.0 1.0 |  |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proososed develoment |  |  | moved Doint |
| -1382 <br> 1383 <br> 18 | $\frac{\text { Cara ovita var. ovata }}{\text { Quercus rubra }}$ | Shagbark Hickory | 23.0 58.0 | 22 |  | $\stackrel{G}{\text { F }}$ | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { G }}{\text { F }}$ | ${ }_{6}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ ${ }^{\times}$ | Outside limits of dirat plan |  |  | leader dead, cavity $m$ from qround, side branch is the main stem |
| ${ }_{1}^{1384}$ | Quercus subra | Red oak | 21.0 |  |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside limits of diatat loan |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{1}^{1385}$ | Quercus nubra | Redoak | $\stackrel{150}{150}$ | 7 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ |  | 2 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside ilinits of dratt lan |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r}1386 \\ 1386 \\ \hline 1\end{array}$ | Cava ovata ver. ovata | ${ }_{\text {Shagark Hickory }}^{\text {Ree }}$ |  |  |  | - | G | G | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Removed under Matatamy Presenve permit tor access |  |  |  |
| 13862 | Carya ovata var. ovata | Shagbark Hickory | 12.0 |  |  |  | G | G | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | - |  |  |  |
| 1387 1388 1388 | Acer saccharum sso. Saccharum | Suad Mak | 130 31.0 31 |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{G}$ | F | ${ }_{\square}^{\text {G }}$ | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | Outside ininit of dratiflan |  |  | airiled bv ence |
| ${ }^{13889}$ | Quercus $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oubra } \\ & \text { Ouerus mbira }\end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\text { Red oak }}{\text { Redoak }}$ | 20.0 360 | 15 |  | ${ }_{\square}$ | ${ }^{\text {G }}$ |  | ${ }_{5}^{4}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - ${ }^{\times}$ | Outisid limits of diatit lan |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1390}$ | Quercus nubra | ${ }_{\text {Red od oak }}^{\text {Red }}$ | 36.0 27.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{a}$ | ${ }^{-}$ | ${ }_{\square}$ | ${ }_{4}^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outsisidel inits of ofraft plan |  |  |  |
| 1391 | Cara ovata var. ovata | Shabark Hickorv | 11.0 |  |  | G | G | c | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conticics with proposed developme |  |  |  |
| 1392 <br> 1393 | Querctus O ubra | $\xrightarrow{\text { Red Oak }}$ Redo Oak | 30.0 34.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{G}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ | Oulside initis of dorat plan |  |  |  |
|  | Ostrya virginina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outsidel limits of dratat plan |  |  |  |
| 1395 <br> 1396 <br> 1 | Cara ovita var. ovata | Shagaark Hickor | 14.0 170 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | ${ }_{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proososed development |  |  | suopessed by y ines |
| ${ }_{1396}^{1397}$ | $\frac{\text { Cara ovela var.ovata }}{\text { Querus rubra }}$ | ${ }^{\text {Shabaara Hickor }}$ | $\frac{17.0}{18.0}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | F | G | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | x | Outside limits of dratt plan |  |  | suporessedorvines |
| 1398 <br> 1399 <br> 1 | Quercus nubra Ouerus rubra | $\frac{\text { Red Oak }}{\text { Red oak }}$ | 18.0 13.0 | 4 |  | ${ }_{6}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{\text {F }}{ }_{\text {G }}$ | ${ }_{\text {F }}$ G | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x <br> $\times$ <br> $\times$ | Outside limitit of diatat plan |  |  | leader dead |
| 1400 | Carva ovata var. ovata | Shagaark Hickory | 17.0 |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Contificis with ropoososed develolopment |  |  |  |
| 1401 | Cara ovata var. ovata | Shagark Hickory | 11.0 |  |  | G |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Confilics with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 1402 <br> 103 | Tria americena | Shasswodd | 13.0 110 | 12 |  | ${ }_{6}$ | ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | $\stackrel{F}{\text { F }}$ | $\stackrel{2}{1}$ |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | Contifict with proposed development |  |  |  |
| 1404 | Querus siba | White Oak | 82.0 |  |  | G | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | G | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside limits of dratt plan |  |  |  |
| $\frac{1405}{1406}$ | $\frac{\text { Cara ovata var. ovata }}{\text { Ouercus rubra }}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Shabaiar hickory } \\ \text { Redo Oak }}}{\text { a }}$ | 33.0 18.0 |  |  | ${ }_{6}$ | ${ }_{6}{ }^{6}$ | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | Outside limits of dratt plan |  |  |  |
| 1407 | Quercus rubra | Red Oak | 30.0 |  |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | G | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside linits of doratit plan |  |  |  |
| 1408 <br> 1409 <br> 1 | $\frac{\text { Tilia americana }}{\text { Ouerus }}$ | $\frac{\text { basswood }}{\text { Redoak }}$ | $\begin{array}{r}150 \\ 35.0 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 12 |  | $\stackrel{\square}{6}$ | P | P | $\frac{3}{5}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | ${ }^{\text {x }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | Conficis with proosesd development |  |  | leader dead |
| 1410 | Acer sacheharum ssp. saccharum | Suaar Maple | 29.0 |  |  | G | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | G | 4 |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside limits of dratt plan |  |  |  |
| $\frac{1411}{1412}$ | Quercus nubra | $\frac{\text { Red Oak }}{\text { Red oak }}$ | 31.0 35.0 |  |  | $\frac{G}{6}$ | ${ }^{\text {G }}$ G | $\frac{G}{G}$ | $\frac{4}{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\mathrm{x}}{\times}$ | Outside linitit of diatt plan |  |  |  |
| 1413 | Cara ovata var. ovata | Shabair Hickorv | 17.0 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | G | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proossed dovelopment |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{1}^{1414} 1$ | $\frac{\text { Ouercuis }}{\text { Qubra }}$ | $\frac{\text { Red Oak }}{\text { Red Oak }}$ | $\xrightarrow{11.0} 38.0$ | ${ }^{34}$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{6}$ | G | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | $\frac{2}{5}$ |  | $\times$ |  | L.S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Conticics with proosed d development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{1416}^{1416}$ | Pinus strous | White Pine | $\xrightarrow{20.0}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {D }}$ | 0 | ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{0}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | Dead tree |  |  |  |
| 1418 <br> 1420 | Acers sacharamm sspo. saccharum | Suar Maple | $\stackrel{11.0}{31.0}$ |  |  | ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{\text {G }}$ | $\frac{2}{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ | Preevousis removed tor access road |  |  | ${ }^{\text {coavty a base }}$ (teet 4 m tall |
| 1421 | Tila americicana | basswood | 11.0 8.0 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | G | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Contilics with proosed development |  |  |  |
| 1422 <br> 1423 <br> 14 | Acer sachararum ssob, sacocharum | Shate Oak | $\begin{array}{r}85.0 \\ 27.0 \\ \hline 8.0\end{array}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{6} \mathrm{G}$ |  | ${ }^{8}$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{x}$ | Outsidid init of dratitlan |  |  |  |
| 1424 <br> 1425 | Quercus alas | White Oak | 57.0 44.0 | 40 |  | ${ }_{6}$ | ${ }_{6}{ }^{\text {G }}$ | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | ${ }^{10}$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ | Outside limitit of diatt plan |  |  |  |
| - 14265 | Tlua emericana | basswod | 12.0 | 3 |  | G | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ |  | Conticts with proposed don development |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1427} 14$ |  | $\frac{\text { Red Oak }}{\text { Bur oak }}$ | 10.0 37.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{6}$ | F | ${ }_{6}$ | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Conticis with proososed development |  |  | leader dead |
| 1429 <br> 1430 | Quercus | ${ }_{\text {Red oak }}^{\text {Rasswod }}$ | 48.0 120 | ${ }^{32}$ |  | ${ }_{6}$ | ${ }^{\text {G }}$ | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | ${ }^{6}$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | Outside limits of diat plan |  |  |  |
| 1440 <br> 1431 <br> 148 |  | bassood | 12.0 <br> 11.0 <br> 1.0 |  |  | ${ }_{6}{ }^{\text {G }}$ | ${ }^{\text {G }}$ | ${ }_{\square}^{\text {G }}$ | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{x}{x}$ | ${ }^{\times}$ | conlicics with proposesed mavior trail |  |  |  |
| 14322 <br> 1433 | Quercus subar | Red oak | 38.0 65.0 |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{G}$ | ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\stackrel{\text { NHS }}{ }$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {wound a base }} \begin{aligned} & \text { meaded fost rack }\end{aligned}$ |
| 1434 | Acer sacharum ssp.. saccharum | Suar Maple | 18.0 |  |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ | F | ${ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }_{3}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - $\times$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acer saccharum sisp. sacocharum | $\underset{\text { Suar Maple }}{\text { Horwood }}$ | 13.0 14.0 |  |  | ${ }_{\text {P }}$ | ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ | $\times$ |  |  |  | leader dead |
| ${ }^{1437}$ | Ouercus macrocarpa | Bur oak | 40.0 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | G | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside linits of dratt plan |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{1439}$ | ${ }^{\text {Querclus macrocaraa }}$ | Redo oak | $\stackrel{2170}{37.0}$ |  |  | ${ }^{-}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | Outsisdel imitsis of toratt plan |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1442}$ | Quercus sura | Redoak | $\stackrel{24.0}{2.0}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ | Outside initis of dratitlan |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1443}$ | Quercus spora | ${ }_{\text {Rear }}^{\text {Redoak }}$ | $\stackrel{22.0}{50.0}$ | 19 |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { G }}{ }$ | - | ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | Outside ilime inits of ofrat tran |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{402}{404}$ | $\frac{\text { Tila americana }}{\text { Ouerus rubra }}$ | basswood Redo Oak | 24.0 41.0 |  |  | ${ }_{6}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | P | F | $\frac{2}{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\mathrm{x}}{\mathrm{x}}$ | Outiside ilitit of dratt plan |  |  | Leader dead |
| 405 | Tlia amenicana | basswood | 19.0 |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {x }}$ | Outsidel elinits of doratat loan |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{406}^{407}$ | $\frac{\text { Tlia americana }}{\text { Tlia americana }}$ | ${ }_{\text {basswood }}^{\text {baswood }}$ | 29.0 28.0 | ${ }^{10} 26$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{G}$ | ${ }^{6}$ |  | ${ }_{3}^{4}$ |  | $\stackrel{\times}{\times}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\mathrm{x}}{\mathrm{x}}$ | Outside initit of dratitlan |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{4}^{408}$ | Quercus subra | Red oik | 59.0 |  |  | G | ${ }^{\circ}$ | G | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ |  | Conficics with proossed development |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{409}^{411}$ | $\frac{\text { Tlia americana }}{\text { Tlila meneicana }}$ | basswood | 30.0 25.0 | ${ }^{23}$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\text { F }}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }_{\text {G }}$ | ${ }_{4}^{4}$ |  | $\times$ |  | L, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\times}$ | Outisid ilitits of diatit lan |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{4}^{412}$ | Quercus nuba | Redoak | $\begin{array}{r}33.0 \\ 4.0 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , | Outside initis of dirat lolan |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{4}^{413}$ | Ouercus macrocara | Bur Oak | 42.0 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | - | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times$ | Outside limits of dratit plan |  |  |  |
| Legend |  | Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | or greater than 15 cm dbh identified for removal |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {DBH ( }} \mathrm{m}$ ) | Diameter a threas heightTrukk rnegriy |  | G Good |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {ti }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {F }}^{\text {F F Fair }} \mathrm{p}$ Poor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{cs}^{\text {cs }}$ | ${ }^{\text {Crown Strucure }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{C V}{\text { DL (m) }}$ | Crown VigourDrip Line |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CDB |  |  | L Light M Moderate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| eab |  |  | ${ }_{\text {M M Hoarale }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Esasara |  |  | ${ }_{\text {E East }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TPZ | Tree Procection Zonc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lan Dir. |  |  | n North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {S S South }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{\mathrm{F}}$ F Frost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Cempression |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix B Town of Oakville Tree Preservation Specifications

## SCHEDULE 1 TREE PROTECTION BARRIER

## OAKVILLE



PLWOOD
(1) Tree protection barriers must be 1.2 m ( 4 ft ) high, waferboard hoarding or an equivalent approved by Urban Forestry Services.
(2) Tree protection barriers for trees situated on the Town road allowance where visibility must be maintained can be 1.2 m ( 4 ft .) high and consist of plastic web snow fencing on a wood frame made of 2 "x 4 "s .
(3) Where some excavate or fill has to be temporarily located near a tree protection barrier, plywood must be used to ensure no material enters the Tree Protection Zone.
(4) All supports and bracing should be outside the Tree Protection Zone. All such supports should minimize damaging roots outside the Tree Protection Barrier.
(5) No construction activity, grade changes, surface treatment or excavations of any kind is permitted within the Tree Protection Zone.

