i-Tree
Ecosystem Analysis

Village of Canton Park

Urban Forest Effects and Values

August 2019

Summary

Understanding an urban forest's structure, function and value can promote management decisions that will improve human health and environmental quality. An assessment of the vegetation structure, function, and value of the Village of Canton Park urban forest was conducted during 2019. Data from 60 trees located throughout Village of Canton Park were analyzed using the i-Tree Eco model developed by the U.S. Forest Service, Northern Research Station.

- Number of trees: 60
- Tree Cover: 35.0 %
- Most common species of trees: Sugar maple, Norway maple, Red maple
- Percentage of trees less than 6" (15.2 cm) diameter: 18.3%
- Pollution Removal: 28.31 pounds/year ($46.9/year)
- Carbon Storage: 55.56 tons ($9.48 thousand)
- Carbon Sequestration: 1960 pounds ($167/year)
- Oxygen Production: 2.613 tons/year
- Avoided Runoff: 1.415 thousand cubic feet/year ($94.6/year)
- Building energy savings: $0/year
- Carbon Avoided: 0 tons/year ($0/year)
- Structural values: $201 thousand

Ton: short ton (U.S.) (2,000 lbs)
Monetary values $ are reported in US Dollars throughout the report except where noted.
Ecosystem service estimates are reported for trees.

For an overview of i-Tree Eco methodology, see Appendix I. Data collection quality is determined by the local data collectors, over which i-Tree has no control.

Table of Contents

I. Tree Characteristics of the Urban Forest

The urban forest of Village of Canton Park has 60 trees with a tree cover of 35.0 percent. The three most common species are Sugar maple (26.7 percent), Norway maple (18.3 percent), and Red maple (8.3 percent).



Figure 1. Tree species composition in Village of Canton Park

The overall tree density in Village of Canton Park is 27 trees/acre (see Appendix III for comparable values from other cities).



Figure 2. Number of trees/ac in Village of Canton Park by stratum



Figure 3. Percent of tree population by diameter class (DBH - stem diameter at 4.5 feet)

Urban forests are composed of a mix of native and exotic tree species. Thus, urban forests often have a tree diversity that is higher than surrounding native landscapes. Increased tree diversity can minimize the overall impact or destruction by a species-specific insect or disease, but it can also pose a risk to native plants if some of the exotic species are invasive plants that can potentially out-compete and displace native species. In Village of Canton Park, about 65 percent of the trees are species native to North America, while 63 percent are native to New York. Species exotic to North America make up 35 percent of the population. Most exotic tree species have an origin from Europe & Asia (18 percent of the species).



Figure 4. Percent of live tree population by area of native origin, Village of Canton Park

Invasive plant species are often characterized by their vigor, ability to adapt, reproductive capacity, and general lack of natural enemies. These abilities enable them to displace native plants and make them a threat to natural areas. One of the 19 tree species in Village of Canton Park are identified as invasive on the state invasive species list (). This invasive species (Norway maple) comprises 18.3 percent of the tree population though it may only cause a minimal level of impact (see Appendix V for a complete list of invasive species).

II. Urban Forest Cover and Leaf Area

Many tree benefits equate directly to the amount of healthy leaf surface area of the plant. Trees cover about 35 percent of Village of Canton Park and provide 5.096 acres of leaf area. Total leaf area is greatest in Park.



Figure 5. Leaf area by stratum, Village of Canton Park

In Village of Canton Park, the most dominant species in terms of leaf area are Sugar maple, Norway maple, and Silver maple. The 10 species with the greatest importance values are listed in Table 1. Importance values (IV) are calculated as the sum of percent population and percent leaf area. High importance values do not mean that these trees should necessarily be encouraged in the future; rather these species currently dominate the urban forest structure.

Table 1. Most important species in Village of Canton Park

Species Name	*Percent Population*	*Percent Leaf Area*	*IV*
Sugar maple	26.7	29.4	56.1
Norway maple	18.3	24.8	43.1
Silver maple	6.7	18.4	25.1
Littleleaf linden	6.7	4.8	11.4
Red maple	8.3	2.8	11.2
Northern red oak	3.3	5.3	8.7
American elm	5.0	2.7	7.7
Crimson king norway maple	3.3	2.9	6.2
White ash	3.3	1.9	5.2
Siberian elm	1.7	2.3	4.0

Common ground cover classes (including cover types beneath trees and shrubs) in Village of Canton Park are not available since they are configured not to be collected.



Figure 6. Percent of land by ground cover classes, Village of Canton Park

III. Air Pollution Removal by Urban Trees

Poor air quality is a common problem in many urban areas. It can lead to decreased human health, damage to landscape materials and ecosystem processes, and reduced visibility. The urban forest can help improve air quality by reducing air temperature, directly removing pollutants from the air, and reducing energy consumption in buildings, which consequently reduces air pollutant emissions from the power sources. Trees also emit volatile organic compounds that can contribute to ozone formation. However, integrative studies have revealed that an increase in tree cover leads to reduced ozone formation (Nowak and Dwyer 2000).

Pollution removal[1] by trees in Village of Canton Park was estimated using field data and recent available pollution and weather data available. Pollution removal was greatest for ozone (Figure 7). It is estimated that trees remove 28.31 pounds of air pollution (ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5)[2], and sulfur dioxide (SO2)) per year with an associated value of $46.9 (see Appendix I for more details).



Figure 7. Annual pollution removal (points) and value (bars) by urban trees, Village of Canton Park

[1] Particulate matter less than 10 microns is a significant air pollutant. Given that i-Tree Eco analyzes particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5) which is a subset of PM10, PM10 has not been included in this analysis. PM2.5 is generally more relevant in discussions concerning air pollution effects on human health.

[2] Trees remove PM2.5 when particulate matter is deposited on leaf surfaces. This deposited PM2.5 can be resuspended to the atmosphere or removed during rain events and dissolved or transferred to the soil. This combination of events can lead to positive or negative pollution removal and value depending on various atmospheric factors (see Appendix I for more details).

In 2019, trees in Village of Canton Park emitted an estimated 8.79 pounds of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) (4.164 pounds of isoprene and 4.627 pounds of monoterpenes). Emissions vary among species based on species characteristics (e.g. some genera such as oaks are high isoprene emitters) and amount of leaf biomass. Fifty- seven percent of the urban forest's VOC emissions were from Northern red oak and Sugar maple. These VOCs are precursor chemicals to ozone formation.[3]

General recommendations for improving air quality with trees are given in Appendix VIII.

[3] Some economic studies have estimated VOC emission costs. These costs are not included here as there is a tendency to add positive dollar estimates of ozone removal effects with negative dollar values of VOC emission effects to determine whether tree effects are positive or negative in relation to ozone. This combining of dollar values to determine tree effects should not be done, rather estimates of VOC effects on ozone formation (e.g., via photochemical models) should be conducted and directly contrasted with ozone removal by trees (i.e., ozone effects should be directly compared, not dollar estimates). In addition, air temperature reductions by trees have been shown to significantly reduce ozone concentrations (Cardelino and Chameides 1990; Nowak et al 2000), but are not considered in this analysis. Photochemical modeling that integrates tree effects on air temperature, pollution removal, VOC emissions, and emissions from power plants can be used to determine the overall effect of trees on ozone concentrations.

IV. Carbon Storage and Sequestration

Climate change is an issue of global concern. Urban trees can help mitigate climate change by sequestering atmospheric carbon (from carbon dioxide) in tissue and by altering energy use in buildings, and consequently altering carbon dioxide emissions from fossil-fuel based power sources (Abdollahi et al 2000).

Trees reduce the amount of carbon in the atmosphere by sequestering carbon in new growth every year. The amount of carbon annually sequestered is increased with the size and health of the trees. The gross sequestration of Village of Canton Park trees is about 1960 pounds of carbon per year with an associated value of $167. See Appendix I for more details on methods.



Figure 8. Estimated annual gross carbon sequestration (points) and value (bars) for urban tree species with the greatest sequestration, Village of Canton Park

Carbon storage is another way trees can influence global climate change. As a tree grows, it stores more carbon by holding it in its accumulated tissue. As a tree dies and decays, it releases much of the stored carbon back into the atmosphere. Thus, carbon storage is an indication of the amount of carbon that can be released if trees are allowed to die and decompose. Maintaining healthy trees will keep the carbon stored in trees, but tree maintenance can contribute to carbon emissions (Nowak et al 2002c). When a tree dies, using the wood in long-term wood products, to heat buildings, or to produce energy will help reduce carbon emissions from wood decomposition or from fossil-fuel or wood-based power plants.

Trees in Village of Canton Park are estimated to store 55.6 tons of carbon ($9.48 thousand). Of the species sampled, Sugar maple stores and sequesters the most carbon (approximately 44.5% of the total carbon stored and 36.1% of all sequestered carbon.)



Figure 9. Estimated carbon storage (points) and values (bars) for urban tree species with the greatest storage, Village of Canton Park

V. Oxygen Production

Oxygen production is one of the most commonly cited benefits of urban trees. The annual oxygen production of a tree is directly related to the amount of carbon sequestered by the tree, which is tied to the accumulation of tree biomass.

Trees in Village of Canton Park are estimated to produce 2.613 tons of oxygen per year.[4] However, this tree benefit is relatively insignificant because of the large and relatively stable amount of oxygen in the atmosphere and extensive production by aquatic systems. Our atmosphere has an enormous reserve of oxygen. If all fossil fuel reserves, all trees, and all organic matter in soils were burned, atmospheric oxygen would only drop a few percent (Broecker 1970).

Table 2. The top 20 oxygen production species.

Species	*Oxygen (pound)*	*Gross Carbon Sequestration (pound/yr)*	*Number of Trees*	*Leaf Area (acre)*
Sugar maple	1,886.37	707.39	16	1.50
Norway maple	1,185.95	444.73	11	1.26
Silver maple	595.83	223.44	4	0.94
Northern red oak	296.24	111.09	2	0.27
Red maple	206.80	77.55	5	0.14
Crimson king norway maple	205.56	77.09	2	0.15
Littleleaf linden	176.24	66.09	4	0.24
White ash	143.33	53.75	2	0.09
American elm	118.30	44.36	3	0.14
Pin oak	98.37	36.89	1	0.03
Siberian elm	82.22	30.83	1	0.12
Common linden	65.82	24.68	1	0.06
Green ash	55.60	20.85	1	0.09
Scarlet oak	42.05	15.77	1	0.03
Gray birch	36.97	13.86	1	0.01
Red spruce	8.20	3.08	2	0.00
Blue spruce	7.95	2.98	1	0.01
Sunburst honeylocust	7.57	2.84	1	0.00
Japanese tree lilac	7.12	2.67	1	0.00

VI. Avoided Runoff

Surface runoff can be a cause for concern in many urban areas as it can contribute pollution to streams, wetlands, rivers, lakes, and oceans. During precipitation events, some portion of the precipitation is intercepted by vegetation (trees and shrubs) while the other portion reaches the ground. The portion of the precipitation that reaches the ground and does not infiltrate into the soil becomes surface runoff (Hirabayashi 2012). In urban areas, the large extent of impervious surfaces increases the amount of surface runoff.

Urban trees and shrubs, however, are beneficial in reducing surface runoff. Trees and shrubs intercept precipitation, while their root systems promote infiltration and storage in the soil. The trees and shrubs of Village of Canton Park help to reduce runoff by an estimated 1.42 thousand cubic feet a year with an associated value of $95 (see Appendix I for more details). Avoided runoff is estimated based on local weather from the user-designated weather station. In Village of Canton Park, the total annual precipitation in 2015 was 30.4 inches.



Figure 10. Avoided runoff (points) and value (bars) for species with greatest overall impact on runoff, Village of Canton Park

VII. Trees and Building Energy Use

Trees affect energy consumption by shading buildings, providing evaporative cooling, and blocking winter winds. Trees tend to reduce building energy consumption in the summer months and can either increase or decrease building energy use in the winter months, depending on the location of trees around the building. Estimates of tree effects on energy use are based on field measurements of tree distance and direction to space conditioned residential buildings (McPherson and Simpson 1999).

Trees in Village of Canton Park are estimated to reduce energy-related costs from residential buildings by $0 annually. Trees also provide an additional $0 in value by reducing the amount of carbon released by fossil-fuel based power plants (a reduction of 0 pounds of carbon emissions).

Note: negative numbers indicate that there was not a reduction in carbon emissions and/or value, rather carbon emissions and values increased by the amount shown as a negative value.[5]

Table 3. Annual energy savings due to trees near residential buildings, Village of Canton Park

	Heating	*Cooling*	*Total*
MBTU[a]	0	N/A	0
MWH[b]	0	0	0
Carbon Avoided (pounds)	0	0	0

[a]MBTU - one million British Thermal Units

[b]MWH - megawatt-hour

Table 4. Annual savings [a]($) in residential energy expenditure during heating and cooling seasons, Village of Canton Park

	Heating	*Cooling*	*Total*
MBTU[b]	0	N/A	0
MWH[c]	0	0	0
Carbon Avoided	0	0	0

[b]Based on the prices of $176.366666666667 per MWH and $15.8378446412362 per MBTU (see Appendix I for more details)

[c]MBTU - one million British Thermal Units

[c]MWH - megawatt-hour

[5] Trees modify climate, produce shade, and reduce wind speeds. Increased energy use or costs are likely due to these tree-building interactions creating a cooling effect during the winter season. For example, a tree (particularly evergreen species) located on the southern side of a residential building may produce a shading effect that causes increases in heating requirements.

VIII. Structural and Functional Values

Urban forests have a structural value based on the trees themselves (e.g., the cost of having to replace a tree with a similar tree); they also have functional values (either positive or negative) based on the functions the trees perform.

The structural value of an urban forest tends to increase with a rise in the number and size of healthy trees (Nowak et al 2002a). Annual functional values also tend to increase with increased number and size of healthy trees. Through proper management, urban forest values can be increased; however, the values and benefits also can decrease as the amount of healthy tree cover declines.

Urban trees in Village of Canton Park have the following structural values:

- Structural value: $201 thousand
- Carbon storage: $9.48 thousand

Urban trees in Village of Canton Park have the following annual functional values:

- Carbon sequestration: $167
- Avoided runoff: $94.6
- Pollution removal: $46.9
- Energy costs and carbon emission values: $0

(Note: negative value indicates increased energy cost and carbon emission value)



Figure 11. Tree species with the greatest structural value, Village of Canton Park

IX. Potential Pest Impacts

Various insects and diseases can infest urban forests, potentially killing trees and reducing the health, structural value and sustainability of the urban forest. As pests tend to have differing tree hosts, the potential damage or risk of each pest will differ among cities.Thirty-six pests were analyzed for their potential impact and compared with pest range maps (Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team 2014) for the conterminous United States to determine their proximity to St. Lawrence County. Twelve of the thirty-six pests analyzed are located within the county. For a complete analysis of all pests, see Appendix VII.



Figure 12. Number of trees at risk (points) and associated compensatory value (bars) for most threatening pests located in the county, Village of Canton Park

Beech bark disease (BBD) (Houston and O'Brien 1983) is an insect-disease complex that primarily impacts American beech. This disease threatens 0.0 percent of the population, which represents a potential loss of $0 in structural value.

Butternut canker (BC) (Ostry et al 1996) is caused by a fungus that infects butternut trees. The disease has since caused significant declines in butternut populations in the United States. Potential loss of trees from BC is 0.0 percent ($0 in structural value).

Dogwood anthracnose (DA) (Mielke and Daughtrey) is a disease that affects dogwood species, specifically flowering and Pacific dogwood. This disease threatens 0.0 percent of the population, which represents a potential loss of $0 in structural value.

American elm, one of the most important street trees in the twentieth century, has been devastated by the Dutch elm disease (DED) (Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry 1998). Since first reported in the 1930s, it has killed over 50 percent of the native elm population in the United States. Although some elm species have shown varying degrees of resistance, Village of Canton Park could possibly lose 6.7 percent of its trees to this pest ($5.12 thousand in structural value).

Emerald ash borer (EAB) (Michigan State University 2010) has killed thousands of ash trees in parts of the United States. EAB has the potential to affect 5.0 percent of the population ($8.19 thousand in structural value).

The gypsy moth (GM) (Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry 2005) is a defoliator that feeds on many species causing widespread defoliation and tree death if outbreak conditions last several years. This pest threatens 16.7 percent of the population, which represents a potential loss of $30.4 thousand in structural value.

Quaking aspen is a principal host for the defoliator, large aspen tortrix (LAT) (Ciesla and Kruse 2009). LAT poses a threat to 1.7 percent of the Village of Canton Park urban forest, which represents a potential loss of $795 in structural value.

The pine shoot beetle (PSB) (Ciesla 2001) is a wood borer that attacks various pine species, though Scotch pine is the preferred host in North America. PSB has the potential to affect 0.0 percent of the population ($0 in structural value).

Spruce beetle (SB) (Holsten et al 1999) is a bark beetle that causes significant mortality to spruce species within its range. Potential loss of trees from SB is 5.0 percent ($745 in structural value).

Spruce budworm (SBW) (Kucera and Orr 1981) is an insect that causes severe damage to balsam fir. SBW poses a threat to 0.0 percent of the Village of Canton Park urban forest, which represents a potential loss of $0 in structural value.

The sirex woodwasp (SW) (Haugen and Hoebeke 2005) is a wood borer that primarily attacks pine species. SW poses a threat to 0.0 percent of the Village of Canton Park urban forest, which represents a potential loss of $0 in structural value.

Since its introduction to the United States in 1900, white pine blister rust (Eastern U.S.) (WPBR) (Nicholls and Anderson 1977) has had a detrimental effect on white pines, particularly in the Lake States. WPBR has the potential to affect 0.0 percent of the population ($0 in structural value).

Appendix I. i-Tree Eco Model and Field Measurements

i-Tree Eco is designed to use standardized field data and local hourly air pollution and meteorological data to quantify urban forest structure and its numerous effects (Nowak and Crane 2000), including:

- Urban forest structure (e.g., species composition, tree health, leaf area, etc.).
- Amount of pollution removed hourly by the urban forest, and its associated percent air quality improvement throughout a year.
- Total carbon stored and net carbon annually sequestered by the urban forest.
- Effects of trees on building energy use and consequent effects on carbon dioxide emissions from power sources.
- Structural value of the forest, as well as the value for air pollution removal and carbon storage and sequestration.
- Potential impact of infestations by pests, such as Asian longhorned beetle, emerald ash borer, gypsy moth, and Dutch elm disease.

Typically, all field data are collected during the leaf-on season to properly assess tree canopies. Typical data collection (actual data collection may vary depending upon the user) includes land use, ground and tree cover, individual tree attributes of species, stem diameter, height, crown width, crown canopy missing and dieback, and distance and direction to residential buildings (Nowak et al 2005; Nowak et al 2008).

During data collection, trees are identified to the most specific taxonomic classification possible. Trees that are not classified to the species level may be classified by genus (e.g., ash) or species groups (e.g., hardwood). In this report, tree species, genera, or species groups are collectively referred to as tree species.

<u>Tree Characteristics:</u>

Leaf area of trees was assessed using measurements of crown dimensions and percentage of crown canopy missing. In the event that these data variables were not collected, they are estimated by the model.

An analysis of invasive species is not available for studies outside of the United States. For the U.S., invasive species are identified using an invasive species list ()for the state in which the urban forest is located. These lists are not exhaustive and they cover invasive species of varying degrees of invasiveness and distribution. In instances where a state did not have an invasive species list, a list was created based on the lists of the adjacent states. Tree species that are identified as invasive by the state invasive species list are cross-referenced with native range data. This helps eliminate species that are on the state invasive species list, but are native to the study area.

<u>Air Pollution Removal:</u>

Pollution removal is calculated for ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns. Particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM10) is another significant air pollutant. Given that i-Tree Eco analyzes particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5) which is a subset of PM10, PM10 has not been included in this analysis. PM2.5 is generally more relevant in discussions concerning air pollution effects on human health.

Air pollution removal estimates are derived from calculated hourly tree-canopy resistances for ozone, and sulfur and nitrogen dioxides based on a hybrid of big-leaf and multi-layer canopy deposition models (Baldocchi 1988; Baldocchi et al 1987). As the removal of carbon monoxide and particulate matter by vegetation is not directly related to transpiration, removal rates (deposition velocities) for these pollutants were based on average measured values from the literature (Bidwell and Fraser 1972; Lovett 1994) that were adjusted depending on leaf phenology and leaf area. Particulate removal incorporated a 50 percent resuspension rate of particles back to the atmosphere (Zinke 1967).

Recent updates (2011) to air quality modeling are based on improved leaf area index simulations, weather and pollution processing and interpolation, and updated pollutant monetary values (Hirabayashi et al 2011; Hirabayashi et al 2012; Hirabayashi 2011).

Trees remove PM2.5 when particulate matter is deposited on leaf surfaces (Nowak et al 2013). This deposited PM2.5 can be resuspended to the atmosphere or removed during rain events and dissolved or transferred to the soil. This combination of events can lead to positive or negative pollution removal and value depending on various atmospheric factors. Generally, PM2.5 removal is positive with positive benefits. However, there are some cases when net removal is negative or resuspended particles lead to increased pollution concentrations and negative values. During some months (e.g., with no rain), trees resuspend more particles than they remove. Resuspension can also lead to increased overall PM2.5 concentrations if the boundary layer conditions are lower during net resuspension periods than during net removal periods. Since the pollution removal value is based on the change in pollution concentration, it is possible to have situations when trees remove PM2.5 but increase concentrations and thus have negative values during periods of positive overall removal. These events are not common, but can happen.

For reports in the United States, default air pollution removal value is calculated based on local incidence of adverse health effects and national median externality costs. The number of adverse health effects and associated economic value is calculated for ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns using data from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Benefits Mapping and Analysis Program (BenMAP) (Nowak et al 2014). The model uses a damage-function approach that is based on the local change in pollution concentration and population. National median externality costs were used to calculate the value of carbon monoxide removal (Murray et al 1994).

For international reports, user-defined local pollution values are used. For international reports that do not have local values, estimates are based on either European median externality values (van Essen et al 2011) or BenMAP regression equations (Nowak et al 2014) that incorporate user-defined population estimates. Values are then converted to local currency with user-defined exchange rates.

For this analysis, pollution removal value is calculated based on the prices of $1,380 per ton (carbon monoxide), $2,056 per ton (ozone), $282 per ton (nitrogen dioxide), $75 per ton (sulfur dioxide), $38,623 per ton (particulate matter less than 2.5 microns).

Carbon Storage and Sequestration:

Carbon storage is the amount of carbon bound up in the above-ground and below-ground parts of woody vegetation. To calculate current carbon storage, biomass for each tree was calculated using equations from the literature and measured tree data. Open-grown, maintained trees tend to have less biomass than predicted by forest-derived biomass equations (Nowak 1994). To adjust for this difference, biomass results for open-grown urban trees were multiplied by 0.8. No adjustment was made for trees found in natural stand conditions. Tree dry-weight biomass was converted to stored carbon by multiplying by 0.5.

Carbon sequestration is the removal of carbon dioxide from the air by plants. To estimate the gross amount of carbon sequestered annually, average diameter growth from the appropriate genera and diameter class and tree condition was added to the existing tree diameter (year x) to estimate tree diameter and carbon storage in year x+1.

Carbon storage and carbon sequestration values are based on estimated or customized local carbon values. For international reports that do not have local values, estimates are based on the carbon value for the United States (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2015, Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon 2015) and converted to local currency with user-defined exchange rates.

For this analysis, carbon storage and carbon sequestration values are calculated based on $171 per ton.

Oxygen Production:

The amount of oxygen produced is estimated from carbon sequestration based on atomic weights: net O2 release (kg/yr) = net C sequestration (kg/yr) × 32/12. To estimate the net carbon sequestration rate, the amount of carbon sequestered as a result of tree growth is reduced by the amount lost resulting from tree mortality. Thus, net carbon sequestration and net annual oxygen production of the urban forest account for decomposition (Nowak et al 2007). For complete inventory projects, oxygen production is estimated from gross carbon sequestration and does not account for decomposition.

Avoided Runoff:

Annual avoided surface runoff is calculated based on rainfall interception by vegetation, specifically the difference between annual runoff with and without vegetation. Although tree leaves, branches, and bark may intercept precipitation and thus mitigate surface runoff, only the precipitation intercepted by leaves is accounted for in this analysis.

The value of avoided runoff is based on estimated or user-defined local values. For international reports that do not have local values, the national average value for the United States is utilized and converted to local currency with user-defined exchange rates. The U.S. value of avoided runoff is based on the U.S. Forest Service's Community Tree Guide Series (McPherson et al 1999; 2000; 2001; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2006a; 2006b; 2006c; 2007; 2010; Peper et al 2009; 2010; Vargas et al 2007a; 2007b; 2008).

For this analysis, avoided runoff value is calculated based on the price of \$0.07 per ft^3.

Building Energy Use:

If appropriate field data were collected, seasonal effects of trees on residential building energy use were calculated based on procedures described in the literature (McPherson and Simpson 1999) using distance and direction of trees from residential structures, tree height and tree condition data. To calculate the monetary value of energy savings, local or custom prices per MWH or MBTU are utilized.

For this analysis, energy saving value is calculated based on the prices of \$176.37 per MWH and \$15.84 per MBTU.

Structural Values:

Structural value is the value of a tree based on the physical resource itself (e.g., the cost of having to replace a tree with a similar tree). Structural values were based on valuation procedures of the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers, which uses tree species, diameter, condition, and location information (Nowak et al 2002a; 2002b). Structural value may not be included for international projects if there is insufficient local data to complete the valuation procedures.

Potential Pest Impacts:

The complete potential pest risk analysis is not available for studies outside of the United States. The number of trees at risk to the pests analyzed is reported, though the list of pests is based on known insects and disease in the United States.

For the U.S., potential pest risk is based on pest range maps and the known pest host species that are likely to experience mortality. Pest range maps for 2012 from the Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team (FHTET) (Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team 2014) were used to determine the proximity of each pest to the county in which the urban forest is located. For the county, it was established whether the insect/disease occurs within the county, is within 250 miles of the county edge, is between 250 and 750 miles away, or is greater than 750 miles away. FHTET did not have pest range maps for Dutch elm disease and chestnut blight. The range of these pests was based on known occurrence and the host range, respectively (Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center; Worrall 2007).

Relative Tree Effects:

The relative value of tree benefits reported in Appendix II is calculated to show what carbon storage and sequestration, and air pollutant removal equate to in amounts of municipal carbon emissions, passenger automobile emissions, and house emissions.

Municipal carbon emissions are based on 2010 U.S. per capita carbon emissions (Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center 2010). Per capita emissions were multiplied by city population to estimate total city carbon emissions.

Light duty vehicle emission rates (g/mi) for CO, NOx, VOCs, PM10, SO2 for 2010 (Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2010; Heirigs et al 2004), PM2.5 for 2011-2015 (California Air Resources Board 2013), and CO2 for 2011 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2010) were multiplied by average miles driven per vehicle in 2011 (Federal Highway Administration 2013) to determine average emissions per vehicle.

Household emissions are based on average electricity kWh usage, natural gas Btu usage, fuel oil Btu usage, kerosene Btu usage, LPG Btu usage, and wood Btu usage per household in 2009 (Energy Information Administration 2013; Energy Information Administration 2014)

- CO2, SO2, and NOx power plant emission per KWh are from Leonardo Academy 2011. CO emission per kWh assumes 1/3 of one percent of C emissions is CO based on Energy Information Administration 1994. PM10 emission per kWh from Layton 2004.
- CO2, NOx, SO2, and CO emission per Btu for natural gas, propane and butane (average used to represent LPG), Fuel #4 and #6 (average used to represent fuel oil and kerosene) from Leonardo Academy 2011.
- CO2 emissions per Btu of wood from Energy Information Administration 2014.
- CO, NOx and SOx emission per Btu based on total emissions and wood burning (tons) from (British Columbia Ministry 2005; Georgia Forestry Commission 2009).

Appendix II. Relative Tree Effects

The urban forest in Village of Canton Park provides benefits that include carbon storage and sequestration, and air pollutant removal. To estimate the relative value of these benefits, tree benefits were compared to estimates of average municipal carbon emissions, average passenger automobile emissions, and average household emissions. See Appendix I for methodology.

Carbon storage is equivalent to:

- Amount of carbon emitted in Village of Canton Park in 1 days
- Annual carbon (C) emissions from 39 automobiles
- Annual C emissions from 16 single-family houses

Carbon monoxide removal is equivalent to:

- Annual carbon monoxide emissions from 0 automobiles
- Annual carbon monoxide emissions from 0 single-family houses

Nitrogen dioxide removal is equivalent to:

- Annual nitrogen dioxide emissions from 0 automobiles
- Annual nitrogen dioxide emissions from 0 single-family houses

Sulfur dioxide removal is equivalent to:

- Annual sulfur dioxide emissions from 14 automobiles
- Annual sulfur dioxide emissions from 0 single-family houses

Annual carbon sequestration is equivalent to:

- Amount of carbon emitted in Village of Canton Park in 0.0 days
- Annual C emissions from 0 automobiles
- Annual C emissions from 0 single-family houses

Appendix III. Comparison of Urban Forests

A common question asked is, "How does this city compare to other cities?" Although comparison among cities should be made with caution as there are many attributes of a city that affect urban forest structure and functions, summary data are provided from other cities analyzed using the i-Tree Eco model.

I. City totals for trees

City	*% Tree Cover*	*Number of Trees*	*Carbon Storage (tons)*	*Carbon Sequestration (tons/yr)*	*Pollution Removal (tons/yr)*
Toronto, ON, Canada	26.6	10,220,000	1,221,000	51,500	2,099
Atlanta, GA	36.7	9,415,000	1,344,000	46,400	1,663
Los Angeles, CA	11.1	5,993,000	1,269,000	77,000	1,975
New York, NY	20.9	5,212,000	1,350,000	42,300	1,676
London, ON, Canada	24.7	4,376,000	396,000	13,700	408
Chicago, IL	17.2	3,585,000	716,000	25,200	888
Baltimore, MD	21.0	2,479,000	570,000	18,400	430
Philadelphia, PA	15.7	2,113,000	530,000	16,100	575
Washington, DC	28.6	1,928,000	525,000	16,200	418
Oakville, ON , Canada	29.1	1,908,000	147,000	6,600	190
Boston, MA	22.3	1,183,000	319,000	10,500	283
Syracuse, NY	26.9	1,088,000	183,000	5,900	109
Woodbridge, NJ	29.5	986,000	160,000	5,600	210
Minneapolis, MN	26.4	979,000	250,000	8,900	305
San Francisco, CA	11.9	668,000	194,000	5,100	141
Morgantown, WV	35.5	658,000	93,000	2,900	72
Moorestown, NJ	28.0	583,000	117,000	3,800	118
Hartford, CT	25.9	568,000	143,000	4,300	58
Jersey City, NJ	11.5	136,000	21,000	890	41
Casper, WY	8.9	123,000	37,000	1,200	37
Freehold, NJ	34.4	48,000	20,000	540	22

II. Totals per acre of land area

City	*Number of Trees/ac*	*Carbon Storage (tons/ac)*	*Carbon Sequestration (tons/ac/yr)*	*Pollution Removal (lb/ac/yr)*
Toronto, ON, Canada	64.9	7.8	0.33	26.7
Atlanta, GA	111.6	15.9	0.55	39.4
Los Angeles, CA	19.6	4.2	0.16	13.1
New York, NY	26.4	6.8	0.21	17.0
London, ON, Canada	75.1	6.8	0.24	14.0
Chicago, IL	24.2	4.8	0.17	12.0
Baltimore, MD	48.0	11.1	0.36	16.6
Philadelphia, PA	25.1	6.3	0.19	13.6
Washington, DC	49.0	13.3	0.41	21.2
Oakville, ON , Canada	78.1	6.0	0.27	11.0
Boston, MA	33.5	9.1	0.30	16.1
Syracuse, NY	67.7	10.3	0.34	13.6
Woodbridge, NJ	66.5	10.8	0.38	28.4
Minneapolis, MN	26.2	6.7	0.24	16.3
San Francisco, CA	22.5	6.6	0.17	9.5
Morgantown, WV	119.2	16.8	0.52	26.0
Moorestown, NJ	62.1	12.4	0.40	25.1
Hartford, CT	50.4	12.7	0.38	10.2
Jersey City, NJ	14.4	2.2	0.09	8.6
Casper, WY	9.1	2.8	0.09	5.5
Freehold, NJ	38.3	16.0	0.44	35.3

Appendix IV. General Recommendations for Air Quality Improvement

Urban vegetation can directly and indirectly affect local and regional air quality by altering the urban atmosphere environment. Four main ways that urban trees affect air quality are (Nowak 1995):

- Temperature reduction and other microclimate effects
- Removal of air pollutants
- Emission of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and tree maintenance emissions
- Energy effects on buildings

The cumulative and interactive effects of trees on climate, pollution removal, and VOC and power plant emissions determine the impact of trees on air pollution. Cumulative studies involving urban tree impacts on ozone have revealed that increased urban canopy cover, particularly with low VOC emitting species, leads to reduced ozone concentrations in cities (Nowak 2000). Local urban management decisions also can help improve air quality.

Urban forest management strategies to help improve air quality include (Nowak 2000):

Strategy	*Result*
Increase the number of healthy trees	Increase pollution removal
Sustain existing tree cover	Maintain pollution removal levels
Maximize use of low VOC-emitting trees	Reduces ozone and carbon monoxide formation
Sustain large, healthy trees	Large trees have greatest per-tree effects
Use long-lived trees	Reduce long-term pollutant emissions from planting and removal
Use low maintenance trees	Reduce pollutants emissions from maintenance activities
Reduce fossil fuel use in maintaining vegetation	Reduce pollutant emissions
Plant trees in energy conserving locations	Reduce pollutant emissions from power plants
Plant trees to shade parked cars	Reduce vehicular VOC emissions
Supply ample water to vegetation	Enhance pollution removal and temperature reduction
Plant trees in polluted or heavily populated areas	Maximizes tree air quality benefits
Avoid pollutant-sensitive species	Improve tree health
Utilize evergreen trees for particulate matter	Year-round removal of particles

Appendix V. Invasive Species of the Urban Forest

The following inventoried tree species were listed as invasive on the New York invasive species list ():

Species Name[a]	*Number of Trees*	*% of Trees*	*Leaf Area (ac)*	*Percent Leaf Area*
Norway maple	11	18.3	1.3	24.8
Total	**11**	**18.33**	**1.26**	**24.80**

[a]Species are determined to be invasive if they are listed on the state's invasive species list

Appendix VI. Potential Risk of Pests

Thirty-six insects and diseases were analyzed to quantify their potential impact on the urban forest. As each insect/ disease is likely to attack different host tree species, the implications for {0} will vary. The number of trees at risk reflects only the known host species that are likely to experience mortality.

Code	Scientific Name	Common Name	Trees at Risk (#)	Value ($ thousands)
AL	Phyllocnistis populiella	Aspen Leafminer	0	0.00
ALB	Anoplophora glabripennis	Asian Longhorned Beetle	44	165.86
BBD	Neonectria faginata	Beech Bark Disease	0	0.00
BC	Sirococcus clavigignenti juglandacearum	Butternut Canker	0	0.00
BWA	Adelges piceae	Balsam Woolly Adelgid	0	0.00
CB	Cryphonectria parasitica	Chestnut Blight	0	0.00
DA	Discula destructiva	Dogwood Anthracnose	0	0.00
DBSR	Leptographium wageneri var. pseudotsugae	Douglas-fir Black Stain Root Disease	0	0.00
DED	Ophiostoma novo-ulmi	Dutch Elm Disease	4	5.12
DFB	Dendroctonus pseudotsugae	Douglas-Fir Beetle	0	0.00
EAB	Agrilus planipennis	Emerald Ash Borer	3	8.19
FE	Scolytus ventralis	Fir Engraver	0	0.00
FR	Cronartium quercuum f. sp. Fusiforme	Fusiform Rust	0	0.00
GM	Lymantria dispar	Gypsy Moth	10	30.44
GSOB	Agrilus auroguttatus	Goldspotted Oak Borer	0	0.00
HWA	Adelges tsugae	Hemlock Woolly Adelgid	0	0.00
JPB	Dendroctonus jeffreyi	Jeffrey Pine Beetle	0	0.00
LAT	Choristoneura conflictana	Large Aspen Tortrix	1	0.79
LWD	Raffaelea lauricola	Laurel Wilt	0	0.00
MPB	Dendroctonus ponderosae	Mountain Pine Beetle	0	0.00
NSE	Ips perturbatus	Northern Spruce Engraver	0	0.00
OW	Ceratocystis fagacearum	Oak Wilt	4	15.50
PBSR	Leptographium wageneri var. ponderosum	Pine Black Stain Root Disease	0	0.00
POCRD	Phytophthora lateralis	Port-Orford-Cedar Root Disease	0	0.00
PSB	Tomicus piniperda	Pine Shoot Beetle	0	0.00
PSHB	Euwallacea nov. sp.	Polyphagous Shot Hole Borer	0	0.00
SB	Dendroctonus rufipennis	Spruce Beetle	3	0.75
SBW	Choristoneura fumiferana	Spruce Budworm	0	0.00
SOD	Phytophthora ramorum	Sudden Oak Death	3	14.32
SPB	Dendroctonus frontalis	Southern Pine Beetle	3	0.75
SW	Sirex noctilio	Sirex Wood Wasp	0	0.00
TCD	Geosmithia morbida	Thousand Canker Disease	0	0.00
WM	Operophtera brumata	Winter Moth	48	178.89
WPB	Dendroctonus brevicomis	Western Pine Beetle	0	0.00
WPBR	Cronartium ribicola	White Pine Blister Rust	0	0.00
WSB	Choristoneura occidentalis	Western Spruce Budworm	1	0.47

In the following graph, the pests are color coded according to the county's proximity to the pest occurrence in the United States. Red indicates that the pest is within the county; orange indicates that the pest is within 250 miles of the county; yellow indicates that the pest is within 750 miles of the county; and green indicates that the pest is outside of these ranges.



Note: points - Number of trees, bars - Structural value

Based on the host tree species for each pest and the current range of the pest (Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team 2014), it is possible to determine what the risk is that each tree species in the urban forest could be attacked by an insect or disease.

Spp. Risk	Risk Weight	Species Name	AL	ALB	BBD	BC	BWA	CB	DA	DBSR	DED	DFB	EAB	FE	FR	GM	GSOB	HWA	JPB	LAT	LWD	MPB	NSE	OW	PBSR	POCRD	PSB	PSHB	SB	SBW	SOD	SPB	SW	TCD	WM	WPB	WPBR	WSB
Red	14	Gray birch		Orange												Red				Red															Orange			
Red	11	Northern red oak														Red								Orange							Green				Orange			
Red	11	Pin oak														Red								Orange							Green				Orange			
Red	10	American elm		Orange							Red																								Orange			
Red	10	Siberian elm		Orange							Red																								Orange			
Red	10	Green ash		Orange									Red																						Orange			
Red	10	Scarlet oak														Red								Orange											Orange			
Red	8	Blue spruce																											Red			Orange						Green
Red	7	White ash											Red																						Orange			
Red	7	Red spruce																											Red			Orange						
Orange	6	Sugar maple		Orange																															Orange			
Orange	6	Norway maple		Orange																															Orange			
Orange	6	Red maple		Orange																															Orange			
Orange	6	Silver maple		Orange																															Orange			
Red	4	Littleleaf linden														Red																						
Red	4	Common linden														Red																						
Orange	3	Crimson king norway maple		Orange																																		

Note:
Species that are not listed in the matrix are not known to be hosts to any of the pests analyzed.

Species Risk:
- Red indicates that tree species is at risk to at least one pest within county
- Orange indicates that tree species has no risk to pests in county, but has a risk to at least one pest within 250 miles from the county
- Yellow indicates that tree species has no risk to pests within 250 miles of county, but has a risk to at least one pest that is 250 and 750 miles from the county
- Green indicates that tree species has no risk to pests within 750 miles of county, but has a risk to at least one pest that is greater than 750 miles from the county

Risk Weight:
Numerical scoring system based on sum of points assigned to pest risks for species. Each pest that could attack tree species is scored as 4 points if red, 3 points if orange, 2 points if yellow and 1 point if green.

Pest Color Codes:
- Red indicates pest is within St. Lawrence county
- Red indicates pest is within 250 miles county
- Yellow indicates pest is within 750 miles of St. Lawrence county
- Green indicates pest is outside of these ranges

References

Abdollahi, K.K.; Ning, Z.H.; Appeaning, A., eds. 2000. Global climate change and the urban forest. Baton Rouge, LA: GCRCC and Franklin Press. 77 p.

Baldocchi, D. 1988. A multi-layer model for estimating sulfur dioxide deposition to a deciduous oak forest canopy. Atmospheric Environment. 22: 869-884.

Baldocchi, D.D.; Hicks, B.B.; Camara, P. 1987. A canopy stomatal resistance model for gaseous deposition to vegetated surfaces. Atmospheric Environment. 21: 91-101.

Bidwell, R.G.S.; Fraser, D.E. 1972. Carbon monoxide uptake and metabolism by leaves. Canadian Journal of Botany. 50: 1435-1439.

British Columbia Ministry of Water, Land, and Air Protection. 2005. Residential wood burning emissions in British Columbia. British Columbia.

Broecker, W.S. 1970. Man's oxygen reserve. Science 168(3939): 1537-1538.

Bureau of Transportation Statistics. 2010. Estimated National Average Vehicle Emissions Rates per Vehicle by Vehicle Type using Gasoline and Diesel. Washington, DC: Burea of Transportation Statistics, U.S. Department of Transportation. Table 4-43.

California Air Resources Board. 2013. Methods to Find the Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects. Table 3 Average Auto Emission Factors. CA: California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board.

Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center. 2010. CO2 Emissions (metric tons per capita). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Cardelino, C.A.; Chameides, W.L. 1990. Natural hydrocarbons, urbanization, and urban ozone. Journal of Geophysical Research. 95(D9): 13,971-13,979.

Ciesla, W. M. 2001. Tomicus piniperda. North American Forest Commission. Exotic Forest Pest Information System for North America (EXFOR).

Ciesla, W. M.; Kruse, J. J. 2009. Large Aspen Tortrix. Forest Insect & Disease Leaflet 139. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 8 p.

Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center. Dutch Elm Disease. http://threatsummary.forestthreats.org/threats/threatSummaryViewer.cfm?threatID=43

Energy Information Administration. 1994. Energy Use and Carbon Emissions: Non-OECD Countries. Washington, DC: Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.

Energy Information Administration. 2013. CE2.1 Fuel consumption totals and averages, U.S. homes. Washington, DC: Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.

Energy Information Administration. 2014. CE5.2 Household wood consumption. Washington, DC: Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy.

Federal Highway Administration. 2013. Highway Statistics 2011.Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. Table VM-1.

Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team. 2014. 2012 National Insect & Disease Risk Maps/Data. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. http://www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/technology/nidrm2012.shtml

Georgia Forestry Commission. 2009. Biomass Energy Conversion for Electricity and Pellets Worksheet. Dry Branch, GA: Georgia Forestry Commission.

Haugen, D. A.; Hoebeke, R. E. 2005. Sirex woodwasp - Sirex noctilio F. (Hymenoptera: Siricidae). Pest Alert. NA-PR-07-05. Newtown Square, PA: Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Area State and Private Forestry.

Heirigs, P.L.; Delaney, S.S.; Dulla, R.G. 2004. Evaluation of MOBILE Models: MOBILE6.1 (PM), MOBILE6.2 (Toxics), and MOBILE6/CNG. Sacramento, CA: National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board.

Hirabayashi, S. 2011. Urban Forest Effects-Dry Deposition (UFORE-D) Model Enhancements, http://www.itreetools.org/eco/resources/UFORE-D enhancements.pdf

Hirabayashi, S. 2012. i-Tree Eco Precipitation Interception Model Descriptions, http://www.itreetools.org/eco/resources/iTree_Eco_Precipitation_Interception_Model_Descriptions_V1_2.pdf

Hirabayashi, S.; Kroll, C.; Nowak, D. 2011. Component-based development and sensitivity analyses of an air pollutant dry deposition model. Environmental Modeling and Software. 26(6): 804-816.

Hirabayashi, S.; Kroll, C.; Nowak, D. 2012. i-Tree Eco Dry Deposition Model Descriptions V 1.0

Holsten, E.H.; Thier, R.W.; Munson, A.S.; Gibson, K.E. 1999. The Spruce Beetle. Forest Insect & Disease Leaflet 127. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 12 p.

Houston, D. R.; O'Brien, J. T. 1983. Beech Bark Disease. Forest Insect & Disease Leaflet 75. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 8 p.

Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government. 2015. Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866. http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/inforeg/scc-tsd-final-july-2015.pdf

Kucera, D. R.; Orr, P. W. 1981. Spruce Budworm in the Eastern United States. Forest Pest Leaflet 160. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 8 p.

Layton, M. 2004. 2005 Electricity Environmental Performance Report: Electricity Generation and Air Emissions. CA: California Energy Commission.

Leonardo Academy. 2011. Leonardo Academy's Guide to Calculating Emissions Including Emission Factors and Energy Prices. Madison, WI: Leonardo Academy Inc.

Lovett, G.M. 1994. Atmospheric deposition of nutrients and pollutants in North America: an ecological perspective. Ecological Applications. 4: 629-650.

McPherson, E.G.; Maco, S.E.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Xiao, Q.; VanDerZanden, A.M.; Bell, N. 2002. Western Washington and Oregon Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planting. International Society of

Arboriculture, Pacific Northwest, Silverton, OR.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R. 1999. Carbon dioxide reduction through urban forestry: guidelines for professional and volunteer tree planters. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-171. Albany, CA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station. 237 p.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Crowell, A.M.N.; Xiao, Q. 2010. Northern California coast community tree guide: benefits, costs, and strategic planting. PSW-GTR-228. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-228. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Gardner, S.L.; Vargas, K.E.; Maco, S.E.; Xiao, Q. 2006a. Coastal Plain Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planting PSW-GTR-201. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Gardner, S.L.; Vargas, K.E.; Xiao, Q. 2007. Northeast community tree guide: benefits, costs, and strategic planting.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Maco, S.E.; Gardner, S.L.; Cozad, S.K.; Xiao, Q. 2006b. Midwest Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs and Strategic Planting PSW-GTR-199. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Maco, S.E.; Gardner, S.L.; Vargas, K.E.; Xiao, Q. 2006c. Piedmont Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planting PSW-GTR 200. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Maco, S.E.; Xiao Q.; Mulrean, E. 2004. Desert Southwest Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs and Strategic Planting. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Community Tree Council, Inc. 81 :81.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Scott, K.I.; Xiao, Q. 2000. Tree Guidelines for Coastal Southern California Communities. Local Government Commission, Sacramento, CA.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Xiao, Q. 1999. Tree Guidelines for San Joaquin Valley Communities. Local Government Commission, Sacramento, CA.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Xiao, Q.; Maco, S.E.; Hoefer, P.J. 2003. Northern Mountain and Prairie Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs and Strategic Planting. Center for Urban Forest Research, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Xiao, Q.; Pittenger, D.R.; Hodel, D.R. 2001. Tree Guidelines for Inland Empire Communities. Local Government Commission, Sacramento, CA.

Michigan State University. 2010. Emerald ash borer. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University [and others].

Mielke, M. E.; Daughtrey, M. L. How to Identify and Control Dogwood Anthracnose. NA-GR-18. Broomall, PA: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area and Private Forestry.

Murray, F.J.; Marsh L.; Bradford, P.A. 1994. New York State Energy Plan, vol. II: issue reports. Albany, NY: New York State Energy Office.

National Invasive Species Information Center. 2011. Beltsville, MD: U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Invasive Species Information Center. http://www.invasivespeciesinfo.gov/plants/main.shtml

Nicholls, T. H.; Anderson, R. L. 1977. How to Identify White Pine Blister Rust and Remove Cankers. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry

Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. 1998. How to identify and manage Dutch Elm Disease. NA-PR-07-98. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry.

Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. 2005. Gypsy moth digest. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry.

Nowak, D.J. 1994. Atmospheric carbon dioxide reduction by Chicago’s urban forest. In: McPherson, E.G.; Nowak, D.J.; Rowntree, R.A., eds. Chicago’s urban forest ecosystem: results of the Chicago Urban Forest Climate Project. Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-186. Radnor, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station: 83-94.

Nowak, D.J. 1995. Trees pollute? A "TREE" explains it all. In: Proceedings of the 7th National Urban Forestry Conference. Washington, DC: American Forests: 28-30.

Nowak, D.J. 2000. The interactions between urban forests and global climate change. In: Abdollahi, K.K.; Ning, Z.H.; Appeaning, A., eds. Global Climate Change and the Urban Forest. Baton Rouge, LA: GCRCC and Franklin Press: 31-44.

Nowak, D.J., Hirabayashi, S., Bodine, A., Greenfield, E. 2014. Tree and forest effects on air quality and human health in the United States. Environmental Pollution. 193:119-129.

Nowak, D.J., Hirabayashi, S., Bodine, A., Hoehn, R. 2013. Modeled PM2.5 removal by trees in ten U.S. cities and associated health effects. Environmental Pollution. 178: 395-402.

Nowak, D.J.; Civerolo, K.L.; Rao, S.T.; Sistla, S.; Luley, C.J.; Crane, D.E. 2000. A modeling study of the impact of urban trees on ozone. Atmospheric Environment. 34: 1601-1613.

Nowak, D.J.; Crane, D.E. 2000. The Urban Forest Effects (UFORE) Model: quantifying urban forest structure and functions. In: Hansen, M.; Burk, T., eds. Integrated tools for natural resources inventories in the 21st century. Proceedings of IUFRO conference. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-212. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Research Station: 714-720.

Nowak, D.J.; Crane, D.E.; Dwyer, J.F. 2002a. Compensatory value of urban trees in the United States. Journal of Arboriculture. 28(4): 194 - 199.

Nowak, D.J.; Crane, D.E.; Stevens, J.C.; Hoehn, R.E. 2005. The urban forest effects (UFORE) model: field data collection manual. V1b. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station, 34 p. http://www.fs.fed.us/ne/syracuse/Tools/downloads/UFORE_Manual.pdf

Nowak, D.J.; Crane, D.E.; Stevens, J.C.; Ibarra, M. 2002b. Brooklyn’s urban forest. Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-290. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station. 107 p.

Nowak, D.J.; Dwyer, J.F. 2000. Understanding the benefits and costs of urban forest ecosystems. In: Kuser, John, ed. Handbook of urban and community forestry in the northeast. New York, NY: Kluwer Academics/Plenum: 11-22.

Nowak, D.J.; Hoehn, R.; Crane, D. 2007. Oxygen production by urban trees in the United States. Arboriculture & Urban Forestry. 33(3):220-226.

Nowak, D.J.; Hoehn, R.E.; Crane, D.E.; Stevens, J.C.; Walton, J.T; Bond, J. 2008. A ground-based method of assessing urban forest structure and ecosystem services. Arboriculture and Urban Forestry. 34(6): 347-358.

Nowak, D.J.; Stevens, J.C.; Sisinni, S.M.; Luley, C.J. 2002c. Effects of urban tree management and species selection on atmospheric carbon dioxide. Journal of Arboriculture. 28(3): 113-122.

Ostry, M.E.; Mielke, M.E.; Anderson, R.L. 1996. How to Identify Butternut Canker and Manage Butternut Trees. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.

Peper, P.J.; McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Albers, S.N.; Xiao, Q. 2010. Central Florida community tree guide: benefits, costs, and strategic planting. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-230. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

Peper, P.J.; McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Vargas, K.E.; Xiao Q. 2009. Lower Midwest community tree guide: benefits, costs, and strategic planting. PSW-GTR-219. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-219. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2010. Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA-420-R-10-012a

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2015. The social cost of carbon. http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/EPAactivities/economics/scc.html

van Essen, H.; Schroten, A.; Otten, M.; Sutter, D.; Schreyer, C.; Zandonella, R.; Maibach, M.; Doll, C. 2011. External Costs of Transport in Europe. Netherlands: CE Delft. 161 p.

Vargas, K.E.; McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Gardner, S.L.; Xiao, Q. 2007a. Interior West Tree Guide.

Vargas, K.E.; McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Gardner, S.L.; Xiao, Q. 2007b. Temperate Interior West Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planting.

Vargas, K.E.; McPherson, E.G.; Simpson, J.R.; Peper, P.J.; Gardner, S.L.; Xiao, Q. 2008. Tropical community tree guide: benefits, costs, and strategic planting. PSW-GTR-216. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-216. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.

Worrall, J.J. 2007. Chestnut Blight. Forest and Shade Tree Pathology.
http://www.forestpathology.org/dis_chestnut.html

Zinke, P.J. 1967. Forest interception studies in the United States. In: Sopper, W.E.; Lull, H.W., eds. Forest Hydrology. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press: 137-161.

ID	Species	DBH 1 (in)	Maintenance Recommended	Maintenance Task	Side	Uti	Lat	Long	Comments
1	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	13	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595141	-75.167191	Frost crack in trunk with slime flux (wetwood) and girdling roots
2	Littleleaf linden (Tilia cordata)	8.4	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595223	-75.167166	Damage: included bark
3	Scarlet oak (Quercus coccinea)	9.7	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595134	-75.167389	Frost crack in trunk
4	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	27	Critical concern (public safety)	Remove			44.595184	-75.16728	Frost crack in trunk
5	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	27.2	Critical concern (public safety)	Remove			44.595132	-75.167473	Dead, remove.
6	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	13.2	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595213	-75.167324	Frost crack in trunk with slime flux (wetwood)
7	Northern red oak (Quercus rubra)	24.1	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch	> 1 1/2		44.595072	-75.167531	Sidewalk conflict, remove pavers around base of tree and soil aerate and mulch.
8	Northern red oak (Quercus rubra)	22.6	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch	> 1 1/2		44.595072	-75.167629	Sidewalk conflict, remove pavers around base of tree and soil aerate and mulch.
9	Gray birch (Betula populifolia)	8.8	Small tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.59509	-75.167651	Remove dead wood in canopy
10	Silver maple (Acer saccharinum)	41.7	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595053	-75.168075	Remove dead wood and raise canopy
11	Littleleaf linden (Tilia cordata)	16.5	Small tree (routine)	Formative pruning			44.595381	-75.167182	Remove dead wood in canopy and formative pruning
12	Pin oak (Quercus palustris)	17.2	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595283	-75.167379	Remove dead wood in canopy
13	Littleleaf linden (Tilia cordata)	10.1	Small tree (routine)	None			44.595253	-75.167432	Included bark, poor form, weak unions.
14	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	22	Remove	Remove			44.595312	-75.167666	> 50% dieback, girdling roots, mower damage
15	American elm (Ulmus americana)	11.2	Critical concern (public safety)	Remove			44.595309	-75.167586	Remove 90% dead
16	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	29.1	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595384	-75.167422	Remove large deadwood in canopy. Mower damage to roots.
17	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	33.4	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595421	-75.167349	Remove deadwood in canopy
18	Blue spruce (Picea pungens)	5.1	Small tree (routine)	None			44.59548	-75.167259	
19	Littleleaf linden (Tilia cordata)	19.3	Large tree (routine)	Install Cable			44.59553	-75.167245	Included bark, weak unions, mower damage to roots
20	Japanese tree lilac (Syringa reticulata	3.8	Small tree (routine)	Formative pruning			44.595494	-75.167364	Remove competing leader
21	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	16.4	Remove	Remove			44.595344	-75.167506	> 50% dieback, girdling roots, mower damage.
22	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	3.1	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595614	-75.167297	Browning leaves, Frost crack in trunk with slime flux (wetwood), planted above grade, mower damage to base of trunk.

23	White ash (Fraxinus americana)	11.2	Remove	Remove			44.595645	-75.167262	Mower damage to roots, remove and replace with alternative species
24	Red maple (Acer rubrum)	3.3	Remove	Remove			44.59564	-75.167348	Planted above grade, root damage from mower, Frost crack in trunk with slime flux (wetwood), girdling roots, chlorosis.
25	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	4.3	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595635	-75.167425	Root damage from mower
26	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	35.1	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595593	-75.167466	Remove large dead wood, some mower damage to roots
27	Red maple (Acer rubrum)	2.4	Remove	Remove			44.595618	-75.167526	Frost crack in trunk with slime flux (wetwood), mower damage to trunk, crown dieback. Tree should be removed and start over
28	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	38.4	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595501	-75.167584	Some mower damage to roots. Remove deadwood from canopy.
29	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	3.7	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595609	-75.167615	Planted slightly above grade, mower damage to roots
30	Red maple (Acer rubrum)	3.4	Small tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595607	-75.167704	Some chlorosis, mower damage to base of trunk
31	Red maple (Acer rubrum)	19.4	Large tree (routine)	Install Cable			44.595498	-75.167683	Included bark on one of the two leaders with slime flux (wetwood) in union, tree will eventually split. Root damage from mower.
32	White ash (Fraxinus americana)	16.2	Remove	Remove			44.595435	-75.167766	~~Two leaders, union looks sound; possible candidate for tree-age injection.~~ Remove
33	Silver maple (Acer saccharinum)	33.3	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.59541	-75.167867	Remove deadwood from canopy, mower damage to roots
34	Crimson king norway maple (Acer pla	21.2	Large tree (routine)	None			44.595546	-75.16787	Frost crack in trunk
35	Red spruce (Picea rubens)	3.5	Small tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595603	-75.16783	Planted above grade (5 inches)
36	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	22.5	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595568	-75.16795	Frost crack in trunk with slime flux (wetwood), girdling roots, damage to roots from mower. Remove deadwood in canopy
37	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	33.5	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.59555	-75.168077	Split in trunk with some decay, girdling roots, root damage from mower. Remove deadwood from canopy.
38	Siberian elm (Ulmus pumila)	19.2	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595572	-75.16821	Remove deadwood and touching/rubbing branches.

39	Green ash (Fraxinus pennsylvanica)	25.3	Remove	Remove			44.595501	-75.168247	~~Root damage from mower. Large amount of deadwood to remove from canopy~~. Remove
40	Red maple (Acer rubrum)	21.2	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595479	-75.168336	Root damage from mower, remove deadwood from canopy and formative pruning.
41	Norway Spruce (Picea Abies)	~~2~~ 3.5	Remove	Remove			44.595543	-75.168464	Dead, remove. Remove and start over
42	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	26	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595536	-75.168641	Some root damage from mower
43	Silver maple (Acer saccharinum)	19	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595299	-75.16801	Some root damage from mower
44	Common linden (Tilia x vulgaris)	20	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595202	-75.168097	Some root damage from mower
45	Sunburst honeylocust (Gleditsia triac	4.1	None	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595128	-75.168242	Root crown damage from mower
46	American elm (Ulmus americana)	13.3	Large tree (routine)	Install Cable			44.595318	-75.168192	Root damage from mower, large fork with weak union; tree will eventually split. Install cable.
47	Silver maple (Acer saccharinum)	32.6	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595359	-75.168274	Girdling roots, root damage from mower, remove some small deadwood. Roots meet up to sidewalk but no damage to walkway.
48	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	24.3	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.59523	-75.168261	Decay and conk present where branch union failed but seems to be sound on reaction side. Mower damage to roots
49	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	32.2	Large tree (immediate)	Crown cleaning			44.595166	-75.168344	Losts of decay on one side of tree. Root decay. Remove large deadwood in canopy. Possibly think of removing in the near future
50	American elm (Ulmus americana)	19	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595362	-75.168503	Damage to roots from mower. Remove small deadwood from canopy
51	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	23.4	Large tree (routine)	Crown cleaning			44.595396	-75.168431	Remove large deadwood in canopy. Damage to roots from mower
52	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	19	Large tree (routine)	Install Cable			44.595488	-75.168793	Weak branch union with decay, cabling needed. Girdling roots with damage from mower
53	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	22.7	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595434	-75.1687	Girdling roots, mower damage.
54	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	8.5	Remove	Remove			44.595421	-75.168801	Dead, remove
55	Crimson king norway maple (Acer pla	21	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595362	-75.168783	Girdling roots, damage to roots from mower.
56	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	22.8	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch		Pre	44.595262	-75.168674	Girdling roots, damage to roots from mower. Cable limb hanging over road.

57	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	23.5	Large tree (immediate)	Install Cable			44.595274	-75.16859	Sever split in branch union with decay. Cable or remove tree. Girdling roots with damage from mower
58	Sugar maple (Acer saccharum)	18.8	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch		Pre	44.595175	-75.168574	Root damage from mower.
59	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	26	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch			44.595088	-75.168459	Girdling roots with damage from mower
60	Norway maple (Acer platanoides)	22	Large tree (routine)	Soil Aeration and Mulch		Pre	44.594996	-75.168509	Girdling roots with damage from mower. Frost crack in trunk with slime flux (wetwood)
61	Stump	27.2	Remove	Remove			44.595122	-75.167496	Grind Stump
62	Stump	8	Remove	Remove			44.595118	-75.167629	Grind Stump

Recommended Native Tree Species Based on Soil Type, Mature Growing Height and Hardiness (Zone 4b)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Height (ft)	Spread (ft)
ADIRONDACK CRABAPPLE	*MALUS ADIRONDACK*	18	8
AMERICAN HAZELNUT	*CORYLUS MERICANA*	18	12
AMERICAN WITCHHAZEL	*HAMAMELIS VIRGINIANA L.*	20	20
BALDCYPRESS	*TAXODIUM DISTICHUM*	70	45
BITTERNUT HICKORY	*CARYA CORDIFORMIS*	80	50
BLACK BIRCH	*BETULA LENTA*	70	60
BLACK ELDERBERRY	*SAMBUCUS CANADENSIS*	12	12
BLACK TUPELO	*NYSSA SYLVATICA*	75	35
BLACK WALNUT	*JUGLANS NIGRA*	75	75
BLUE BEECH	*CARPINUS CAROLINIANA*	30	30
BLUE MAGNOLIA	*MAGNOLIA ACUMINATA*	75	35
BUR OAK	*QUERCUS MACROCARPA*	80	80
CHINKAPIN OAK	*QUERCUS MUEHLENBERGII*	60	70
DOWNY HAWTHORN	*CRATAEGUS MOLLIS*	30	30
EASTERN HOPHORNBEAM	*OSTRYA VIRGINIANA*	40	30
HONEYLOCUST	*GLEDITSIA TRIACANTHOS*	80	70
KENTUCKY COFFEETREE	*GYMNOCLADUS DIOICUS*	80	55
NORTHERN CATALPA	*CATALPA SPECIOSA*	70	50
NORTHERN HACKBERRY	*CELTIS OCCIDENTALIS*	60	60
NORTHERN RED OAK	*QUERCUS RUBRA*	75	75
NORTHERN WHITE CEDAR	*THUJA OCCIDENTALIS*	40	15
OHIO BUCKEYE	*AESCULUS GLABRA*	40	40
OZARK WITCHHAZEL	*HAMAMELIS VERNALIS*	10	15
RED MAPLE	*ACER RUBRUM*	70	50
RIVER BIRCH	*BETULA NIGRA*	70	60
SERVICEBERRY	*AMELANCHIER ARBOREA*	25	25
SUGAR MAPLE	*ACER SACCHARUM*	80	60
SWAMP WHITE OAK	*QUERCUS BICOLOR*	60	60
SYCAMORE	*PLATANUS OCCIDENTALIS*	100	100
YELLOW BUCKEYE	*AESCULUS FLAVA*	75	50

*For moderately well drained soils; Croghan loamy fine sand (CvA) and Elmwood fine sandy loam (EmA)