

## 2. REPORT CARD (DRAFT)



| Criteria   | Rating                   |
|--|--------------------------|
| <b>Planning</b>  |                          |
| General awareness in the community and across City departments of the value of the urban forest. | <b>Fair</b>              |
| Cooperation between departments and agencies on Urban Forest management implementation           | <b>Good</b>              |
| Clear and defensible goal for urban forest canopy cover  | <i>In Progress</i>       |
| Tree canopy cover relative to established canopy targets   | <b>Insufficient data</b> |
| Municipality-wide urban forest management plan   | <i>In Progress</i>       |
| Municipal green infrastructure asset management  | <b>Fair</b>              |
| Municipal-wide biodiversity or greenspace network strategy                                       | <b>Good</b>              |
| Municipal urban forest management program capacity   | <b>Fair</b>              |
| Funding levels for relative to expected urban forest management outcomes                         | <b>Fair</b>              |
| <b>Planting</b>  |                          |
| City tree planting program and planting targets  | <b>Fair</b>              |
| Development requirements to plant trees on private land  | <b>Poor</b>              |
| Streetscape specifications and standards for planting trees                                      | <b>Good</b>              |
| Equity in planting program delivery  | <b>Poor</b>              |
| Forest restoration and native vegetation planting  | <b>Fair</b>              |
| Stock selection and procurement in cooperation with nurseries                                    | <b>Fair</b>              |
| Ecosystem services targeted in tree planting projects and landscaping                            | <b>Fair</b>              |
| <b>Managing</b>  |                          |
| Tree inventory   | <b>Poor</b>              |
| Knowledge of trees on private property   | <i>In Progress</i>       |
| Natural areas inventory  | <b>Good</b>              |
| Age diversity in the inventory (size class distribution)   | <b>Insufficient data</b> |
| Species diversity (public tree inventory)  | <b>Insufficient data</b> |
| Species suitability for local area   | <b>Insufficient data</b> |
| Publicly owned tree condition  | <b>Poor</b>              |
| Maintenance of intensively managed trees   | <b>Fair</b>              |

| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Rating</b> |
|--|---------------|
| Extreme weather response planning  | <b>Poor</b>   |
| Tree risk management   | <b>Poor</b>   |
| Pest and disease management  | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Waste biomass utilization  | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Tracking of operational carbon footprints and urban forest carbon-cycle balance                | <b>Fair</b>   |
| <b>Protection</b>  |               |
| Regulating the protection and replacement of private and public trees                          | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Regulating the conservation of sensitive ecosystems, soils or permeability on private property | <b>Good</b>   |
| Internal protocols guiding tree protection or sensitive ecosystem protection                   | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Standards of tree protection and tree care observed during development                         | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Cooperation with utilities on protection of public trees                                       | <b>Fair</b>   |
| <b>Partnership</b>   |               |
| Citizen involvement and neighbourhood action   | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Involvement of large private and institutional landholders                                     | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Urban forest research  | <b>Fair</b>   |
| Regional collaboration   | <b>Fair</b>   |