1.0 INTRODUCTION

The site of the proposed mixed use development (residential and commercial) is located at 6233 to 6245 Main Street at the south-east corner of the intersection of Main Street and Lloyd Street in the downtown area of Whitchurch-Stouffville.

A survey of the existing conditions was prepared December 9, 2011 by Reid J. Wilson Surveying Ltd (File 08-322-1) for the property designated as Part of Lot 35, Concession 9, Geographic Township of Markham (being Lot E and Part of Lots D and F), Municipal Map 1155 Village of Stouffville, Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, Regional Municipality of York.

The development site abuts single residential Lot G, Lot F, and Lot 7 to the south and multiple residential Lots 1 and 5 (Registered Plan 858) to the east. Lloyd Street borders the site to the west and Main Street forms the north limit of the property.

Schollen & Company Inc., in association with Carl Hills Horticultural Services, completed an inventory of the existing vegetation located within and immediately adjacent to the site. Carl Hills, certified Arborist, has reviewed the vegetation and in addition to completing a valuation of the trees greater than 30cm (DBH), has assessed the implications of the proposed development on each tree, both within the property or just outside the property limit.

In calculating values, the Trunk Formula Method was used as outlined in the Guide for Plant Appraisal (International Society of Arboriculture) with additional information incorporated from the Ontario Supplement to Guide for Plant Appraisal. The replacement component of this formula is incorporated in the calculations.
2.0 METHODOLOGY

A survey of the property was completed by staff of Schollen & Company Inc and Carl Hills Horticultural Services in May of 2012. The inventory exercise was focused on identifying and assessing all trees within the property as well as those within 6m of the property line of the subject site with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 100mm or greater. However as a component of the exercise trees smaller than this 100mm threshold were identified in some areas of the site.

Trees were assessed to determine their merit for retention based upon the following parameters:

- **Species Quality** – Species that are non-native, invasive, characteristically weak-wooded or prone to disease were considered to be of low species quality. In addition, species that are not well suited for integration into the proposed residential landscape, such as thorn-bearing trees, trees with characteristically poor form and branching characteristics are afforded a lower species quality ranking.
- **Condition** – Trees exhibiting limb loss, crown dieback, splitting, trunk cavities, evidence of insect infestation, and/or bark loss were determined to be in poor condition and are assigned a low merit for retention. Trees that exhibit some of these characteristics but appear to be otherwise healthy and structurally sound were afforded a ranking of fair. Trees that exhibit poor form, structure and health were designated as in poor condition. Several trees within the site are dead or dying and these were identified as well.
- **Age/Size** – Larger trees were assigned a higher merit for retention than saplings or over-mature specimens.

Figure TI-1 ‘Tree Inventory’ provides an illustration of the findings of the inventory exercise and indicates the location of each tree, its assigned reference number and its respective condition. Table 1 provides an itemized description of the species, size and condition of each tree inventoried. Comments related to the specific condition or characteristics of some of the trees are provided within this table. A photographic inventory of site condition has been compiled and is included as Appendix A of this document. Figure TI-1 ‘Tree Inventory’ includes keys that indicate the vantage point and direction from which each photograph was taken. Figure TA-1 – ‘Tree Assessment’ illustrates the respective ‘merit for retention’ of each tree inventoried.

For all trees with a size of over 300mm (DBH), Carl Hills Horticultural Services completed a tree valuation.

To determine the potential for retention of trees within the context of the proposed developments, the draft site plan prepared by &Co, dated June 2012 was overlaid on Drawing TI-1 ‘Tree Inventory’. Table 1 provides a summary of the potential for retention of each tree, indicating the location of trees that can be retained within the context of the proposed development in anticipation of construction, grading and servicing implications.
# Vegetation Inventory and Assessment Report

**Main and Lloyd Street: Mixed Use Residential and Commercial Development**

**June 2012**

---

## Table 1

### PACE SAVINGS AND CREDIT UNION LIMITED

Residential and Commercial Development, Main and Lloyd Street, Stouffville

### Inventory and Assessment: Chart of Existing Vegetation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Photo No.</th>
<th>Size (D.B.H)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Potential For Retention</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Acer negundo</em></td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8-.7m</td>
<td>F-P</td>
<td>AP/GA</td>
<td>broad crown, dripline 8-9m within site</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C/F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Acer platanoides</em></td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.14m</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>small tree, close by house</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Acer platanoides</em></td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3m</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>crown / central stem dieback</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Acer platanoides</em></td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.44m</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>good form</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Acer negundo</em></td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.44m</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>good form, with 4cm ht cedar hedge</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td><em>Acer negundo</em></td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>.12/.24m</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>poor form, two stem, in parking lot</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Ulmus sp</em></td>
<td>Elm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.32m</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>good form, straddling property</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Yew shrub</em></td>
<td>Taxus sp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 @ .1m</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>5m ht, broad form, straddling property</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Acer negundo</em></td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.26 .32 .40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>three stem, 2 stems overhanging prop.</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Tilia sp</em></td>
<td>Linden var</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.12m</td>
<td>F-P</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>good health, Main Street blvd.</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Fraxinus sp.</em></td>
<td>Ash var.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.32m</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>central crown dieback</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Salix sp.</em></td>
<td>Corkscrew Willow</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.32 .18 .16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>multi-stem</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Acer negundo</em></td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.52m</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>broad form</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Fraxinus sp.</em></td>
<td>Ash var.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.08m</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>base trunk damage, Main St blvd.</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Tilia sp</em></td>
<td>Linden var</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.09m</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>base trunk damage, outside of site</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Gleditsia sp.</em></td>
<td>Honeylocust var.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.175m</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>two trees, good health, outside of site</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>Malus sp.</em></td>
<td>Crabapple var.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.15m</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>two trees, good health, outside of site</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Summary of Inventory

Table 1 and Drawing TI-1 ‘Tree Inventory’ combined provide a detailed description of the location, species composition, size and condition of each tree inventoried. In general, trees within the study area are concentrated around the perimeter of the site. Four trees are located within the limits of the property. The remainder of the trees that were assessed straddle the property line or are located on the properties immediately adjacent to the site. The trees (#13 and #9) are located within the Main Street right-of-way, immediately north of the property. One large Manitoba Maple (Tree #1) is located on the residential property on the south side of the proposed development parcel. Although this tree has been assessed to be in fair-poor condition, exhibiting crown dieback, it is a visually prominent specimen and contributes to the character of Lloyd Street. A number of trees that are located along the property line are not significant and include Manitoba Maple, Yew and an Elm. The two trees located on Main Street exhibit damage at the base of their trunks.

4.0 Summary of Assessment

The assessment exercise was undertaken with the objective of determining the relative ‘merit for retention’ of each tree inventoried on the basis of the parameters set out in Section 2 – Methodology. Table 1 indicates the merit for retention assigned to each tree.

Subsequent to determining the ‘merit for retention’ of each tree inventoried, a comparative assessment of the implications of the proposed development was completed to determine the ‘potential for preservation’ of each tree inventoried. Utilizing the June 2012 draft site plan for the proposed mixed use development, the degree of potential impact anticipated to arise as a result of construction, grading and servicing of the proposed development was determined and the potential for preservation of each tree defined.

The proposed mixed-use development will include an underground garage that is proposed to underlay the majority of the area of the development parcel. Excavation and shoring, in some cases to the limit of the property, will be required to construct the parking structure. Consequently, it is not feasible to retain any of the trees that are located within the limits of the site. Regrading and reconstruction of the portion of Main Street that abuts the site is proposed and consequently, the two existing trees that are located along the Main Street frontage of the site will be required to be removed.

Several of the trees that are located along the perimeter of the site will be impacted by construction and it is recommended that these trees be removed. The large Manitoba Maple that is located on the abutting property on the south west corner of the site is proposed to be retained and the design of the garage has been configured to provide a setback from the base of this tree. It should be noted that with respect to this tree, the setback distance does not conform to the recommended limit of the Vegetation Protection Zone (VPZ) for a tree of this size; however, the tree presently abuts an asphalt parking lot and this situation may have limited root growth on the north side of the tree where excavation is proposed. Consequently, working within the limit of the optimal VPZ is not anticipated to pose a significant impact on the health of the tree. To facilitate truck access into the proposed...
development site, the limbs on the north side of the tree should be pruned back to achieve clearance of 4.5m to avoid conflict with over hanging branches.

Table 1 and Drawing TA-1 ‘Tree Assessment Plan’ describe and illustrate the findings of this assessment task.

5.0 Tree Preservation Plan

Drawing TP-1 – ‘Tree Protection Plan’ illustrates the trees that are proposed to be retained and integrated into the proposed development.

The following recommendations are provided with the objective of mitigating potential impacts on trees that are proposed to be retained.

Site Clearing and Plant Protection

1. Protect trees and plants on site and adjacent properties where indicated in the approved plans.
2. Maintain any temporary protective hoarding around trees and vegetation area adjacent to construction work, as shown on drawings. Evaluate all trees to remain within 6m of the proposed limit of new works, prior to finalizing location for the tree protection fencing.
3. Contractor and Owner shall review the limits of construction and proposal location of the tree protection fencing to ensure adequate tree protection zones (T.P.Z.) are maintained for trees to remain to ensure the stability of the trees will not be compromised.
4. Protect roots of designated trees to dripline during excavation and site grading to prevent disturbance or damage. No dumping and storage of materials over root zones is allowed. Heavy equipment should not be allowed to compact the soil over the root zone of existing trees. To avoid damage to trees are to be protected, access routes should be established away from protected areas.
5. Minimize stripping of topsoil and vegetation at limits of work zone adjacent trees to remain.
6. Restrict tree removal to areas indicated on drawings.
7. Restrict final placement of tree protection fencing, contractor to confirm that the setbacks for fencing adjacent protected trees are in general conformance with the recommended setbacks as noted below.
8. No rigging cables shall be wrapped around or installed in trees; and surplus soil, equipment, debris or materials shall not be placed over root systems of the trees within the protective fencing. No contaminants will be dumped or flushed where feeder roots of trees exist.
9. Where limbs or portions of trees are removed to accommodate construction work, they will be carefully removed by an ISA certified Arborist.
10. Where root system of protected trees are exposed directly adjacent to or damaged by construction work, they shall be trimmed neatly by a qualified arborist and the area back filled with appropriate material to prevent desiccation.
11. If grades around trees to be preserved are likely to change, the developer shall be required to take such precaution as dry welling and root feeding.
12. Trees to be preserved that have died or have been damaged beyond repair, shall be subject to suitable compensation and review of the Tree Inventory and Analysis.

13. An ISA certified Arborist shall be on site for any work which impacts any tree or Tree Protection Zone.

**TABLE 2 – TREE PROTECTION ZONES (TPZ)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trunk Diameter (DBH)¹</th>
<th>Minimum Protection Distances Required²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10 cm</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 29 cm</td>
<td>1.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 40 cm</td>
<td>2.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50 cm</td>
<td>3.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 60 cm</td>
<td>3.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 70 cm</td>
<td>4.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 – 80 cm</td>
<td>4.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 90 cm</td>
<td>5.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 – 100 cm</td>
<td>6.0m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† 6 cm protection for each 1 cm diameter

**Tree Preservation**

Specific tree preservation methods will need to be implemented to ensure that trees are not adversely affected by the proposed construction, including hoarding and fencing specifications.

Four important tree preservation measures should be undertaken if the trees recommended for retention are to be preserved in a manner which will maintain their health over the long term. Firstly, construction access areas must be adequately protected against soil compaction. Secondly, tree protection zones (TPZs) of adequate size must be established around the affected trees prior to the commencement of any construction activity. Thirdly, root-sensitive evacuation should be conducted wherever required. Finally, root pruning must be undertaken prior to any construction where root damage may occur.

**Construction Access Areas**

The movement of equipment and materials across root zones should be kept to an absolute minimum. All overhanging branches which may interfere with the movement of equipment should be pruned back in an arboriculturally-correct manner. All pruning must be conducted by a certified arborist; *trades workers must not be involved in any tree-related work.*

**Tree Protection Zones (TPZs)**

The purpose of a tree protection zone is to prevent root damage, soil compaction and soil contamination, and workers and machinery must not disturb tree protection zones in any way. To prevent access and ensure that the TPZ is effective, the following steps are required:
1. No groundbreaking activities or demolition should occur until all tree preservation requirements have been met. The erection of proper hoarding, as described below, is of primary concern.
2. Hoarding shall consist of approved plywood fencing, in accordance with plan details, supported by a solid frame, and must be maintained intact and upright throughout the course of construction.
3. All hoarding is to remain in place in good condition throughout the entire duration of the project. Where fill has been temporarily positioned near a tree protection barrier, no such material will be permitted to enter the Tree Protection Zone. When hoarding is removed at the conclusion of site works, ensure no gravels or other foreign materials are allowed to enter within the tree protection zone and take measures to ensure the preservation of understorey and ground cover.
4. No fill, equipment or supplies are to be stored within the TPZ at any time.
5. All contractors and supervisors should be informed of the tree protection requirements at a pre-construction meeting.
6. If injury should occur to retained trees during construction, appropriate treatment should be performed in a timely manner by a qualified tree service company.

**Root Pruning**

Root pruning can help ease the stresses experienced by a tree with root damage, encourage the growth of new fine and feeder roots, and prevent the spread of decay. Proper root pruning should be done in advance of anticipated root-damaging excavation, or immediately afterwards if such injury was unforeseen. Root pruning may be required during the installation of the proposed works and shall be performed as noted.

1. Roots that are severed, exposed, or diseased are to be properly pruned with clean hand tools only. Shovels, picks or other construction tools shall not be used to prune roots.
2. Roots should be pruned in a similar fashion as branches, taking care to maintain the integrity of the root bark ridge.
3. Wound dressings or pruning paint must not be used to cover the ends of any cut.
4. Prolonged exposure of tree roots must be avoided – exposed roots should be covered and kept moist with soil if they are to be exposed for longer than 4 hours.

**Post Construction Care**

Trees which have been retained through the construction process should be regularly monitored for signs of construction-induced stress, which may not be apparent until 5-10 years after site disturbance. Any broken or dead branches must be properly pruned. Where newly exposed due to adjacent tree removals, existing trees to remain along the perimeter of the work zone are to be reviewed with qualified tree service company for potential hazard or dead tree limbs, and pruned where they may pose a danger to the public.
May 3, 2012

Tree Assessment and Valuation
Main Street and Lloyd Street: Stouffville

The following report outlines a tree assessment and valuation for a proposed development at Main Street and Lloyd Street in the town of Stouffville.

The general distribution of the trees is along the outside property line of the proposal.

In estimating a value the Trunk Formula Method as outlined in the Guide for Plant Appraisal (International Society of Arboriculture) was used. The replacement component was incorporated but is presented in a separate column in the valuation table. The replacement value is intended to represented a upper-sized landscape specimen.

The only exception was the Yew Tree (tree no. 7). The Trunk Formula Method is not really acceptable to calculate. A higher value was assigned to this tree.

Regards,

Carl Hills
ISA Certified Arborist ON-0556A
## Tree Assessment and Construction Impact Review

### Main Street, Stouffville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Impact of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Fair to poor condition, some dieback on branches in the crown and significant pruning has occurred</td>
<td>On drawing this tree is located near the property line. The decline evident on this tree may have been initiated from initial construction and paving of the parking lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Good condition. Growing close to house and will interfere with the structures as it grows</td>
<td>With the small size of this tree presently construction will have negliable impact but as tree increases in size it will cause problems with both house and proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Poor condition. Dieback of approximately 30% of crown</td>
<td>Because of significant dieback present impact of construction is estimated at negligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Healthy tree showing no decline construction impact negliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Tree is close to property line. It has a light well structured crown and impact is estimated at medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>24, 12</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Generally poor tree on property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elm</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Construction has occurred near this tree in the recent past with no visible deterioration and new impact is rated as medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yew</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Good condition. Multistem plant up to 7 meters in height</td>
<td>Tree will be impacted by construction activity. Option is to move the tree to an alternative location or setback from property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tree number</td>
<td>species</td>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>condition</td>
<td>impact of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>26,32,40</td>
<td>Fair. 3 main stems with overhang onto subject property</td>
<td>Although roots would be impacted by construction activity the main concern is the overhanging of 2 of the 3 stems onto the subject property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fair to poor condition. Tree is stressed poor shoot expansion and root plate is pushing upwards suggesting root mass is congested and compacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Poor. Estimated that 50% of crown is dead with poor bud flushing on remainder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Corkscrew Willow</td>
<td>32,18.16</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tree Valuation
### Main Street Stouffville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>tree</th>
<th>DBH cm</th>
<th>species</th>
<th>condition rating</th>
<th>placement rating</th>
<th>contribution rating</th>
<th>estimate value</th>
<th>replacement value</th>
<th>total value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$2,491.42</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$3,491.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$67.88</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,067.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$112.20</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,112.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$1,839.69</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,839.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$1,055.12</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,055.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$24.71</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,024.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elm</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$379.65</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,379.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yew</td>
<td></td>
<td>multistem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Manitoba Maple</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$114.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$73.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$48.33</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,235.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$68.79</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,068.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$13.49</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,013.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHOTO 1: Tree 1 Manitoba Maple

PHOTO 2: Tree 2 Norway Maple

PHOTO 3: Tree 3 Maple – central portion dead
PHOTO 4: Tree 4 Maple

PHOTO 5: Trees #5 and #5B – Manitoba Maple

PHOTO 6: Trees #12, 11 and 10
PHOTO 7: Trees #8, 7 and 6

PHOTO 8: Tree #9
PHOTO 9: Tree #14

PHOTO 10: Trees east of site, Trees #15 (two Honey locust) and Trees #16 (two Crab)
PHOTO 11: Trees #13 and #9 beyond