

**EFFT 1530
Tree Conservation Report
1015 and 1045 Dairy Drive, Ottawa Ontario**

**December 12, 2024
Updated Report**

Submitted to: Alexander Shafran

KILGOUR & ASSOCIATES LTD.
www.kilgourassociates.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
2.0 PROPERTY INFORMATION	3
2.1 PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT AND ARBORIST CONTACT INFORMATION	5
2.1.1 Qualifications of Arborist.....	5
2.2 ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS	5
<hr/>	
3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS	5
3.1 TREE INVENTORY	5
3.1.1 Hazardous Trees.....	7
3.1.2 Unique Ecological Features.....	7
3.2 ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF TREES ON SITE	7
3.3 OTHER NATURAL ENVIRONMENT ELEMENTS	7
3.3.1 Surface Water Features	7
3.3.2 Steep Slopes.....	7
3.3.3 Valued Woodlots	7
3.3.4 Significant Woodlands.....	7
<hr/>	
4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	8
5.0 MITIGATION MEASURES.....	10
5.1 SITE PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION	10
<hr/>	
6.0 CLOSURE	11
7.0 LITERATURE CITED.....	13

List of Figures

Figure 1 Site context	4
Figure 2 Tree inventory	6
Figure 3 Site plan and tree impacts.....	9

List of Tables

Table 1 Contact information for the property owner/apPLICANT and arborist	5
---	---



1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Tree Conservation Report (TCR) was prepared by Kilgour & Associates Ltd. (KAL) on behalf of Effort Trust in support of the proposed development at 1015 and 1045 Dairy Drive. The client requires the removal of 28 trees from the proposed work area (the “Site”) to allow for the construction of a storage facility.

A TCR is required for all Plans of Subdivision, Site Plan Control Applications, Common Elements Condominium Applications, and Vacant Land Condominium Applications where there is a tree of 10 cm in diameter at breast height (DBH) or greater on a site and/or if there is a tree on an adjacent site that has a critical root zone (CRZ) extending into the proposed work area. A “tree” is defined as any species of woody perennial plant, including its root system, which has reached or can reach a minimum height of at least 450 cm at physiological maturity. The CRZ is calculated as DBH x 10 cm.

The removal of trees on the Site cannot occur until written approval of the TCR has been granted through a tree permit as per the City of Ottawa’s Tree Protection By-law. The approval of the TCR will come in the form of a letter (the tree permit) from the General Manager¹ with conditions specific to the Site, tree retention, and associated tree protection and tree removal. The approved TCR is a requirement for the approval of the development applications listed above. A copy of the report must be available on the Site during tree removal, grading, construction, or any other site alteration activities, and for the duration of construction on the Site.

2.0 PROPERTY INFORMATION

The area of proposed development is on a portion of lands owned by Effort Trust, located off Dairy Drive (Figure 1). The Site covers approximately 1.51 ha in area (1.21 ha at 1045 Dairy Drive and 1.30 ha on 1015 Dairy Drive) and is zoned as light industrial (IL4).

The Site is surrounded by:

- Cardinal Creek to the east
- A warehouse facility to the north
- A warehouse facility to the west
- Old Montreal Road to the south

¹ General Manager of the Public Works & Environmental Services Department or the General Manager of the Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department of the City of Ottawa, or their designate.






Figure 1 Site context



2.1 Property Owner/Applicant and Arborist Contact Information

Table 1 Contact information for the property owner/applicant and arborist

Organization	Role	Contact Person	Phone Number	Email Address
Effort Trust 50 King Street East Hamilton, ON, L8N 1A6	Proponent	Alexander Shafran	(905) 667 4892	ashafran@efforttrust.ca
Kilgour & Associates Ltd. 2285-C St. Laurent Blvd., Unit 16, Ottawa, ON, K1G 4Z6	Arborist	Kurtis Westbury, Biologist	(613) 367 5559	kurtis@kilgourassociates.com
Kilgour & Associates Ltd. 2285-C St. Laurent Blvd., Unit 16, Ottawa, ON, K1G 4Z6	Arborist	Anthony Francis, Senior Ecologist	(613) 367 5556	afrancis@kilgourassociates.com

2.1.1 Qualifications of Arborist

Kurtis Westbury (MSc) has over four years of comprehensive field experience in biology and has worked in a variety of field settings, including cut land, construction sites, and greenhouses. Kurtis’ background is predominantly in aquatic ecology; however, he has worked in forestry and horticulture with a variety of experience in biological fieldwork. Since joining KAL in 2022, Kurtis has contributed to Environmental Impact Statements and Erosion and Sediment Control Reports, as well as a variety of wildlife field surveys.

Anthony Francis (Ph.D.) is a Senior Ecologist with 20 years of consulting experience for both government agencies and private industry. He has worked on a diversity of projects relating to species at risk (SAR), invasive species, terrestrial and aquatic habitat, environmental effects monitoring and mitigation, and fate/effects of contaminants. Within each of these subject areas, Dr. Francis has completed projects addressing specific site concerns and broader policy initiatives. Dr. Francis’ academic background is in spatial ecology with a focus on tree species diversity. As a Senior Ecologist at KAL, he regularly completes TCRs, Environmental Impact Statements, and Integrated Environmental Reviews for land development projects throughout Ottawa and eastern Ontario. He is also a certified Butternut Health Assessor (BHA #104).

2.2 Additional Applications

Not applicable.

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

3.1 Tree Inventory

An inventory of trees on the Site was performed on March 15, 2023, following guidelines set forth by the City of Ottawa (2020). All trees with a DBH \geq 10 cm having a potential to be removed under the proposed development were identified, enumerated, and mapped, their DBH measured, and their general health and condition documented (Figure 2, see Appendix A for detailed tree conditions). Trees sufficiently set back on neighbouring properties such that CRZs do not extend onto the Site were not identified.






Figure 2 Tree inventory

Legend

- Property Line
- Current Trees and Ownership**
 - Proponent
 - Boundary Tree
 - Neighbouring Tree
- CRZ
- Negotiated Setback
- Top of Bank
- Top of Slope
- Floodplain



Project: EFFT 1530
 Map File: EFFT 1530 Map - 2409b.map
 Universal Transverse Mercator - Zone 18 (N)
 Printed on: 2024-09-23





Figure 2 Tree inventory



3.1.1 Hazardous Trees

A formal risk assessment for hazardous trees (e.g., Tree Risk Assessment) was not completed for the Site.

3.1.2 Unique Ecological Features

The Site does not contain any riparian woodlots, rare communities, or other unique ecological features not already addressed in this document.

3.2 Ecological Significance of Trees on Site

No federally or provincially significant tree species (i.e., those listed under the *Species at Risk Act* (SARA), the *Endangered Species Act* (ESA), or those tracked on the Natural Heritage Information Centre (MNRF, 2021) are present on or adjacent to the Site. None of the trees occurring near the Site are considered regionally rare or uncommon species by Brunton (2005).

Including a 10 m buffer around the Site to fully capture the canopy contributions of neighbouring trees, the current canopy cover on the site (and buffer area) is 4.4%. Considering their urban context, the limited tree cover associated with the Site likely plays a minor role in the regulation of relative humidity, sequestration of carbon and removal of pollutants, wind-shielding, shading and reduction of urban heat island effects, and filtration of dust, noise, and light pollution. Trees here may also provide some habitat structure in the surrounding urban landscape. However, the trees on the Site likely only provide habitat for common bird and small mammal species in the Ottawa area and not species of significance (i.e., species that are at risk, rare, or provincially or federally significant).

3.3 Other Natural Environment Elements

3.3.1 Surface Water Features

There are no surface water features located within the project area.

3.3.2 Steep Slopes

A steep slope is located east of the site leading to Cardinal Creek.

3.3.3 Valued Woodlots

The Site does not contain any woodlots designated as Urban Natural Features or Natural Environment Areas, areas evaluated in the *City of Ottawa Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study* (UNAEES; Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc. and Brunton Consulting Services, 2005), or other areas that meet the criteria used in the UNAEES.

3.3.4 Significant Woodlands

The Site does not contain any significant woodlands per *Significant Woodlands: Guidelines for Identification, Evaluation, and Impact Assessment* (City of Ottawa, 2018).



4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed project will comprise a Site Plan Control at 1015 and 1045 Dairy Drive, located in Ward 1 (Orléans East-Cumberland), in the City of Ottawa. The property has a total area of approximately 1.51 ha (1.3 ha on 1015 Dairy Drive and 1.21 ha on 1045 Dairy Drive). Both properties are listed as IL4 H(21), which allows for the building of warehouses. The site plans include the construction of four storage buildings with one that includes administration offices. Two access driveways are included in the proposed plans.

Figure 3 shows the fate of each tree in response to the proposed development. Of the 46 trees reviewed as being associated with the Site, 28 are located fully on the Site and 13 are “boundary” trees (i.e. situated on a property line and thus co-owned with the neighbouring landowners). All 41 of these trees will be removed to support site regrading and development (with the permission of neighbours to be required for boundary trees). Five additional trees were reviewed but were found to be located fully on the adjacent property to the north. These trees have 97% or more of their CRZs on the neighbouring property. The small retaining wall to be installed inside the northern property line will be situated such that it intersects 1% or less of those CRZs. As such, those trees – as well as other trees present on neighbouring sites even further removed from the proposed development (not specifically reviewed) – will be fully retained. Neighbouring trees will be protected per the mitigation measures indicated in Section 5 below including (but not limited to) the installation of construction fencing along the northern boundary.

Tree planting details for the site will be established separately in a Landscape Plan to be developed in accordance with the recommendations of Section 5 below.






Figure 3 Site plan and tree impacts

Legend

- Property Line
- Tree Impacts**
 - Remove
 - Retain
 - CRZ
- Site Plan**
 - Building
 - Retaining Wall
 - Tree Protection Fence



Project: EFFT 1530
 Map File: EFFT 1530 Map - 2412A.map
 Universal Transverse Mercator - Zone 18 (N)
 Printed on: 2024-12-12



5.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

5.1 Site Preparation and Construction

The following mitigation measures should be applied during Site preparation and construction:

- Tree and vegetation clearing should not take place during sensitive times of the year for wildlife (breeding season; early spring throughout summer) unless mitigation measures are implemented and/or the habitat has been inspected by a qualified biologist.
 - The *Migratory Birds Convention Act* protects the nests and young of migratory breeding birds in Canada. No clearing of vegetation shall occur during the breeding bird window (between April 15 and August 15; City of Ottawa, 2015) to prevent impacts to birds. Combining the breeding bird window with the bat roosting season (May to September; MNRF, 2015a), no clearing of vegetation shall occur between April 15 and September 30 inclusive to prevent impacts to both birds and bats.

While vegetation removal on the Site should be limited to that which is necessary to accommodate construction, it is expected that all trees within the development footprint will need to be cleared for the proposed project. All retainable trees on the Site outside of the development footprint must be subject to the following general protection measures recommended during site preparation and construction (City of Ottawa, 2015):

- Erect a fence beyond the critical root zone (CRZ; i.e., 10x the diameter at breast height) of trees to be retained. The fence should be highly visible (orange construction fence) and paired with erosion control fencing. Pruning of branches is recommended in areas of potential conflict with construction equipment;
- Do not place any material or equipment within the CRZ of trees.
- Do not attach any signs, notices, or posters to any trees.
- Do not raise or lower the existing grade within the CRZ of trees without approval.
- Tunnel or bore when digging within the CRZ of a tree.
- Do not damage the root system, trunk, or branches of any remaining trees.
- Ensure that exhaust fumes from all equipment are not directed toward any tree's canopy.
- Do not extend any hard surface or significantly change landscaping within the CRZ of trees.

Removal of trees located on the site boundary (i.e. having shared ownership with a neighbouring land owner) requires express permission from the neighbouring land owner).

Site development would see the removal of 41 trees from the property, the majority of which are located along the eastern property line. The landscape plan of the Site thus must include no fewer than 41 new, locally appropriate native trees. Most of these trees would be along the eastern property boundary



though at least 10 must be planted along the south and/or north sides of the property. While it is recognized that there is likely limited opportunity to include trees within internal areas of the site given tight spacing and anticipated truck passage, the inclusion of some small-sized trees within parking lot medians should be considered where feasible.

Freeman Maple (*Acer freemanii*), a naturally occurring (though uncommon) hybrid species in the Ottawa area, is suggested as an ideal species for this Site where larger trees can be accommodated, e.g. in the broader open space adjacent to Old Montreal Road. This urban tolerant species grows quickly to reestablish canopy cover and is frequently planted on boulevard islands, i.e., it can accommodate relatively narrow footings given its mature height. As such it may also be planted along the central portion of the eastern side of the site, though in limited numbers. White Spruce (*Picea glauca*) could also be planted in some of these locations if preferable for the soil types present but would generate less canopy cover at maturity. Other trees along the eastern side of the site (and as included in other locations) must be small-sized trees at maturity given geotechnical constraints in proximity to site buildings. Regardless of the final species selection, all trees to be planted must be indigenous to the region.

To the extent possible, native ground plants should be incorporated into Site landscaping for the benefit of local wildlife and pollinators (e.g., milkweed species for Monarch). It is recommended that plantings encompass a variety of native flowering species with different blooming periods to provide varied food sources for native pollinators. Further, limit the use of herbicides within and surrounding the planted habitat.

As an additional measure to protect the future health of trees on and/or adjacent to the Site, all snow storage areas must be developed with sufficient grading to ensure that all (potentially salty) meltwater is fully directed to the internal site roadways for collection by the Site's SWM system. Grading and/or surface treatments within the snow storage areas must work to preclude potential drainage of meltwater towards either site trees or directly to site boundaries.

6.0 CLOSURE

This report was prepared for exclusive use by Effort Trust and its agents. The report may only be distributed by those entities. Questions relating to the data and interpretation can be addressed to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

KILGOUR & ASSOCIATES LTD.



Anthony Francis, PhD
Director of Land Development
Email: afrancis@kilgourassociates.com
C 16 – 2285 St. Laurent Blvd, Ottawa, ON, K1G 4Z6
Direct: 613-367-5556

CC: Nick Moore K(KAL)





7.0 LITERATURE CITED

- Brunton, D.F. 2005. Vascular Plants of the City of Ottawa. Appendix A in Muncaster Environmental Planning and Brunton Consulting Services. Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study, Final Report to City of Ottawa.
- City of Ottawa. 2016. Greenspace Master Plan. Available online at: <https://ottawa.ca/en/planning-development-and-construction/official-plan-and-master-plans/greenspace-master-plan>
- City of Ottawa. 2018. Significant Woodlands: Guidelines for Identification, Evaluation, and Impact Assessment. Available online at: <http://ottwatch.ca/meetings/file/572913>
- City of Ottawa. 2020. Tree Protection (By-law No. 2020-340). Available online at: <https://ottawa.ca/en/living-ottawa/laws-licences-and-permits/laws/law-z/tree-protection-law-no-2020-340>
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. 2021. Natural Heritage Information Centre: Make Natural Heritage Map. Available online at: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/make-natural-heritage-area-map>
- Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc. and Brunton Consulting Services. 2005. City of Ottawa Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study Final Report. A report prepared for the Environmental Management Division, Planning & Growth Management Department, City of Ottawa. Available online at: https://app06.ottawa.ca/calendar/ottawa/citycouncil/pdc/2005/05-24/Final%20Report_UNAEES.htm



Appendix A Tree inventory table for the Site



Appendix A: Tree Data

Tree Number	Common Name	Taxonomic Name	Number of Stems	DBH (cm)	Trunk Health	Canopy Health	Decay class	Ownership	Longitude	Latitude	Fate
1	Balsam Poplar	Populus balsamifera	1	11	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47310835	45.49221968	Remove
2	European Buckthorn	Rhamnus cathartica	5	20	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.4724733	45.49238049	Remove
3	Apple Malus	Malus sp.	3	12	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47252066	45.49246583	Remove
4	Bur Oak	Quercus macrocarpa	1	30	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Boundary Tree	-75.47257156	45.49257576	Remove
5	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	15	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	4: Recently dead, bark peeling, only large branches intact	Boundary Tree	-75.47261335	45.49266425	Remove
6	Balsam Poplar	Populus balsamifera	1	17	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47330845	45.49373329	Remove
7	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	19	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47325128	45.49376195	Remove
8	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	2	16	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47337144	45.49399373	Remove
9	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	1	15	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47339594	45.49402573	Remove
10	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	14	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47342621	45.49406908	Remove
11	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	15	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Boundary Tree	-75.47341071	45.49410391	Remove
12	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	13	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47341821	45.49409591	Remove
13	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	1	25	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Boundary Tree	-75.47367703	45.49424951	Remove
14	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	1	28	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Neighbouring Tree	-75.47372685	45.49426124	Retain
15	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	1	23	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Boundary Tree	-75.47375323	45.49422532	Remove
16	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	6	21	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Neighbouring Tree	-75.47388113	45.49423006	Retain
17	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	7	23	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	5: Older dead tree, 90% bark lost, few branch stubs, broken top	Neighbouring Tree	-75.47402689	45.49416192	Retain
18	Blue Spruce	Picea pungens	1	24	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Neighbouring Tree	-75.47408634	45.49416593	Retain
19	Blue Spruce	Picea pungens	1	30	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Neighbouring Tree	-75.47410109	45.49413599	Retain
20	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	13	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47372189	45.49396533	Remove
21	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	16	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47381377	45.49392592	Remove
22	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	14	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47357728	45.49400518	Remove
23	American Elm	Ulmus americana	2	16	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47354236	45.49391276	Remove
24	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	5	17	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47356474	45.49350257	Remove
25	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	2	14	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47351943	45.49349494	Remove
26	Black Willow	Salix nigra	5	25	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47366955	45.49328654	Remove
27	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	2	19	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.47362195	45.4930729	Remove
28	Crack Willow	Salix fragilis	6	32	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.473782	45.49287967	Remove

29	American Elm	Ulmus americana	2	34	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.4733185	45.49290984	Remove
30	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	3	15	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Proponent	-75.4729887	45.4928529	Remove
31	Manitoba Maple	Acer negundo	4	14	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47295487	45.49281057	Remove
32	Green Ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	2	14	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47298197	45.49274513	Remove
33	Green Ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	1	13	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47302452	45.49265356	Remove
34	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	1	14	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47345094	45.49234832	Remove
35	American Elm	Ulmus americana	13	35	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Boundary Tree	-75.47263585	45.49269325	Remove
36	Green Ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	2	15	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47271304	45.49280359	Remove
37	Green Ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	4	13	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	4: Recently dead, bark peeling, only large branches intact	Boundary Tree	-75.47274387	45.49289375	Remove
38	Green Ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	2	14	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Boundary Tree	-75.47276821	45.49292359	Remove
39	European Buckthorn	Rhamnus cathartica	2	26	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	5: Older dead tree, 90% bark lost, few branch stubs, broken top	Proponent	-75.47281159	45.49299014	Remove
40	Green Ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	4	24	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	5: Older dead tree, 90% bark lost, few branch stubs, broken top	Proponent	-75.47284121	45.49304509	Remove
41	Green Ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	5	22	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Proponent	-75.47286687	45.49306559	Remove
42	European Buckthorn	Rhamnus cathartica	3	17	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Boundary Tree	-75.47288871	45.49315809	Remove
43	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	32	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Boundary Tree	-75.47288521	45.49315459	Remove
44	White Ash	Fraxinus americana	4	27	Poor: tree displays greater than 40% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	2: Declining live tree, part of canopy lost	Boundary Tree	-75.47293287	45.49323075	Remove
45	American Elm	Ulmus americana	1	42	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Boundary Tree	-75.47302579	45.49340228	Remove
46	American Elm	Ulmus americana	2	37	Good: tree displays less than 15% deficiency/defect	Fair: tree displays 15-40% deficiency/defect	1: Healthy, live tree	Boundary Tree	-75.47310956	45.49355835	Remove