

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
1	101	pine, eastern white	Pinus strobus	50	Client	3.0	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	All tags on NE side of trunks. No Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
2	102	pine, eastern white	Pinus strobus	32	Client	2.4	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	No Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
3	103	pine, eastern white	Pinus strobus	24	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	No Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
4	104	pine, eastern white	Pinus strobus	36	Client	2.4	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	No Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
5	105	pine, eastern white	Pinus strobus	76	Client	4.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 40, 36 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
6	106	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	70	Client	4.2	Good	Good	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law #71-06
7	107	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	60	Client	3.6	Good	Good	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law #71-07
8	108	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	60	Client	3.6	Good	Poor	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law #71-08
9	109	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	56	Client	3.6	Good	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law #71-09
10	110	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	50	Client	3.0	Poor	Poor	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-22
11	111	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	56	Client	3.6	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
12	112	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	46	Client	3.0	Good	Good	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-22
13	113	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	110	Client	6	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	Multi Stem 30, 20, 30, 30 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
14	114	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	45	Client	3.0	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	Multi Stem 20, 10, 15 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
15	115	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	44	Client	3.0	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
16	116	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	100	Client	6	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	Multi Stem 26, 14, 10, 16, 18, 16 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
17	117	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	60	Client	3.6	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
18	118	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	40	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
19	119	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	44	Client	3.0	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem, 22, 22 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
20	120	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	40	Client	2.4	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
21	121	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	24	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
22	122	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	32	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem, 20, 12 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
23	123	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	30	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
24	124	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	26	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
25	125	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	20	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
26	126	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	42	Client	3.0	Poor	Poor	High	No	Yes	80% dead High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
27	127	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	34	Client	2.4	Poor	Poor	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
28	128	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	36	Client	2.4	Poor	Poor	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
29	129	pine, eastern white	Pinus strobus	26	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
30	130	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	24	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
31	131	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	26	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
32	132	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	16	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
33	133	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	22	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
34	134	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	26	Client	1.8	Fair	Poor	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
35	135	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	66	Client	4.2	Fair	Poor	High	No	Yes	Multi Stem 16, 20, 30 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
36	136	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	32	Client	2.4	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
37	137	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	64	Client	4.2	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
38	138	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	58	Client	3.6	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
39	139	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	50	Client	3.0	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
40	140	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	60	Client	3.6	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
41	141	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	62	Client	4.2	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 22, 40 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
42	142	spruce, Norway	Picea abies	60	Client	3.6	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
43	143	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	32	Client	2.4	Poor	Poor	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
44	144	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	52	Client	3.6	Poor	Poor	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 20, 32 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
45	145	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	40	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
46	146	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	32	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
47	147	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	38	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
48	148	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	38	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
49	149	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	34	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
50	150	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	28	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
51	151	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	26	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
52	152	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	22	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
53	153	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	28	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
54	154	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	28	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
55	155	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	30	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
56	156	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	40	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
57	157	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	40	Client	2.4	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
58	158	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	26	Client	1.8	Fair	Poor	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
59	159	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	20	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 10, 10 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
60	160	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	48	Client	3.0	Good	Poor	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 24, 24 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
61	161	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	62	Client	4.2	Good	Poor	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 40, 22 No Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
62	162	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	52	Client	3.6	Poor	Poor	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 24, 28 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
63	163	hickory, shagbark	Carya ovata	54	Neighbour	3.6	Good	Good	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-22
64	164	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	80	Neighbour	4.8	Good	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-23
65	165	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	18	Client	1.8	Good	Good	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-24
66	166	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	38	Client	2.4	Good	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-25
67	167	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	30	Client	2.4	Poor	Poor	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-26
68	168	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	15	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-27
69	169	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-28
70	170	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-29

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
71	171	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-30
72	172	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-31
73	173	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-32
74	174	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
75	175	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-34
76	176	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-35
77	177	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-36
78	178	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-37
79	179	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-38
80	180	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-39
81	181	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
82	182	cedar, Eastern	Thuja occidentalis	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-41
83	183	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	60	Client	3.6	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
84	184	Basswood	Tilia americana	20	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 10, 10 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
85	185	Basswood	Tilia americana	20	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
86	186	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	12	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
87	187	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
88	188	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
89	189	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
90	190	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
91	191	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	20	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
92	192	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	12	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
93	193	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	26	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-39
94	194	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	26	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-40
95	195	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	28	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-41
96	196	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	30	Neighbour	2.4	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-42
97	197	spruce, Colorado	Picea pungens	32	Neighbour	2.4	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-43
98	198	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	8	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-44

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
99	199	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	10	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-45
100	200	elm, Siberian	Ulmus thomasi	60	Shared	3.6	Good	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-46
101	201	elm, Siberian	Ulmus thomasi	40	Shared	2.4	Good	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-47
102	202	elm, Siberian	Ulmus thomasi	22	Shared	1.8	Good	Fair	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-48
103	203	mountainash, American	Sorbus americana	24	Municipality	1.8	Good	Good	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-49
104	204	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
105	205	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
106	206	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
107	207	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
108	208	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
109	209	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
110	210	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
111	211	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
112	212	cedar, Emerald	Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
113	213	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	28	Client	1.8	Good	Poor	Medium	Yes	No	Twin Stem 16, 12 Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-49
114	214	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	15	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-50
115	215		Acer negundo	15	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-51
116	216		Acer negundo	25	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-52
117	217		Acer negundo	15	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-53
118	218	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	80	Neighbour	4.8	Good	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-54
119	219	catalpa, common	Catalpa speciosa	12	Neighbour	1.8	Fair	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-55

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
120	220	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	22	Client	1.8	Good	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-56
121	221	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	52	Client	3.6	Good	Good	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-57
122	222	maple, Norway	Acer platanoides	46	Client	3.0	Good	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-58
123	223	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	15	Client	1.8	Fair	Fair	Medium	Yes	No	Medium Impact From Project/Root Pruning At Limits of Construction Noted In Blue On TPP	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-59
124	224	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	42	Client	3.0	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
125	225	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	62	Client	4.2	Good	Fair	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 34, 28 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
126	226	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	40	Client	2.4	Poor	Poor	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
127	227	maple, Manitoba	Acer negundo	22	Client	1.8	Good	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
128	228	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	20	Client	1.8	Good	Fair	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 10, 10 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
129	229	pine, Scotch	Pinus sylvestris	42	Client	3.0	Good	Fair	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
130	230	pine, Scotch	Pinus sylvestris	30	Client	2.4	Dead	Dead	None	No	Yes	Dead	Remove

The Urban Tree Management Group

Tree	Tag Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	dbh (cm) @ 1.4 m	Tree Ownership	Tree Protection Zone (m)	Health	Structure	Construction Impact (None, Low, Medium, High)	Preservation Fencing Required	Removal	Field Observations	Recommendations
131	231	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	18	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	Twin Stem 12, 6 High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
132	232	maple, silver	Acer saccharinum	40	Neighbour	2.4	Good	Good	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-59
133	233	pine, eastern white	Pinus strobus	60	Neighbour	3.6	Good	Good	None	Yes	No	No Impact From Project	Preservation Measures As Per Cambridge By-Law 124-60
134	234	maple, Norway	Acer platanoides	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project
135	235	walnut, black	Juglans nigra	10	Client	1.8	Good	Good	High	No	Yes	High Impact From Project	Remove As Per The Project