The Corporation of the Town of



TREES AND TRAILS ADVISORY PANEL MEETING AGENDA

Held on Monday May 2, 2022 at 1:00PM

via Telephone and Video Conference (Webex)

Teleconference Toll Free Number - 1-833-311-4101

Video Conference Link: Click Here

Access Code: 2638 595 4158

Meeting password: vuFKmcMb334

1.	Call Meeting to Order					
2.	Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest & General Nature Thereof					
3.	Approval of Minutes (Adoption) – January 27 th 2022					
4.	Public Question/Comment (Only Addressing Reports on the Agenda)					
5.	Disclosure of Additional Items – None					
6.	Delegations – None					
7.	Presentations by Staff (Others) – None					
8.	Unfinished Business – Tree By-law					
9.	Correspondence – Ecosystem Services – Calder Schweitzer					
10.	New Business/Reports					
	1. Report – Friends of Gananoque & Thousand Islands Summer Student Funding – Ted					
	2. Report – Residential Tree Planting Program – Lynsey					
11.	Discussion of Additional Items – Round Table					
12.	Next Regular Meeting –, 2022 @ 1:00PM					
13.	Questions from the Media – None					
14.	Adjournment					

The Town invites and encourages people with disabilities to attend and voice their comments in relation to accessibility related reports. For those who are unable to attend, the Town encourages the use of the Customer Feedback Form found on the Accessibility Page on the Town's website.



TREES AND TRAILS ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

On Thursday January 27th 2022 at 1:00 PM - Online Via WebEx

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT		STAFF PRESENT						
Chair:	Mayor Ted Lojko	David Armstrong, Manager of Public Works						
Members: Angus Fergusson		Robert Kennedy, Superintendent of Parks and Facilities						
	Carl Woodman	Emily Parker, Special Events Coordinator						
	David Frid	Lynsey Zufelt, Recording Secretary						
	Calder Schweitzer							
Regrets:	Terry Childs							
	Douglas Bickerton							

1.	Call Meeting to Order								
	Mayor Lojko, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM								
2.	Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest & General Nature Thereof – None								
3.	Approval of Minutes – December 15, 2021								
	Moved by: Calder Seconded by: David Frid								
	BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE TREES AND TRAILS ADVISORY PANEL HEREBY ADOPTS THE REGULAR MINUTES OF DECEMBER 15, 2021, MEETING								
	CARRIED – UNANIMOUS								
4.	Public Question / Comment								
	There being none, the Chair moved on to the next order of business.								
5.	Disclosure of Additional Items – None								
6.	Delegations – None								
7.	Presentations by Staff (Others) –								

	Emily Parker, Special Events Coordinator, presented the 2Billion Trees Call for Proposals Tree Planting Application guide, and the 2BT Capacity Building Application guide to the Panel. The Panel further possibilities within the Capacity Building stream and the									
	Chair opened a discussion regarding hiring forest management personnel for the purpose of devising a tree management plan, which will be brought to Council.									
	Lynsey Zufelt, Administrative Assistant, presented a tree planting strategy (Backyard Tree Planting Program) for the Town to adopt, in 2022.									
MOTION #T	TAP-22-02									
	Moved By: Calder Schweitzer Seconded By: David Frid									
	BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE TREES AND TRAILS ADVISORY PANEL HEREBY DIRECT STAFF TO IMPLEMENT A RESIDENTIAL TREE PLANTING PROGRAM WITH A BUDGET OF \$5,000.00 IN THE YEAR 2022.									
	CARRIED - UNANIMOUS									
	Unfinished Business – Forgotten Corners									
8.	Member David Frid outlined his proposed budget and concept for the rough "forgotten" areas for cleanup and planting.									
MOTION #T	TAP-22-03									
	Moved By: David Frid Seconded By: Carl Woodman									
	BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE TREES AND TRAILS ADVISORY PANEL HEREBY DIRECT STAFF TO PRICE THE NECESSARY PLANTS AS PER THE PROPOSED "FORGOTTEN CORNERS" BUDGET.									
	CARRIED – UNANIMOUS									
9.	Correspondence – None									
10.	New Business/Staff Reports									
	 Confirm the number, type and location of Spring Boulevard Tree Planting: The Chair outlined the Town Boulevard Tree Planting and Replacement Tree budgets and plan for planting and removals, which 									

	will be discussed with to Public Works to determine what is do-able and what is not do-able, using the \$40,000 Boulevard Planting Budget.								
	 Federal 2 billion Tree Planting Program – As discussed during Section 7 of the Agenda, an application is being pre 								
	3. Discussion re: Capacity Building Grants								
	 Tree Removal Permits / Tree By-law – Action: Lynsey to work on this with Carl and David – Send them Information 								
11.	Discussion of Additional Items (Round Table) The Panel Members had an opportunity to ask questions and share information and to report back on various items. Staff outlined the works that have been done on the trails.								
12.	Next Meeting – February 24 th @ 1:00PM								
13.	Questions from the Media – None								
14.	Adjournment								
	Moved by: Mayor Lojko Seconded by: Carl Woodman								
	Be it resolved that the Trees and Trails Advisory Panel hereby adjourn the January 27 th 2022 meeting at 2:38 PM.								
Mayor Ted L	ojko, Chair Lynsey Zufelt, Recording Secretary								

Urban Tree Protection By-Law - skeleton outline - Feb 6th 2022

the following is a possible starting point of a direction for a tree by law gleaned from similar enactments by other municipalities

This By-Law provides protection and guidance and care for both Municipal Trees and Private Property Trees within the Town Boundaries or other lands of the Town of Gananoque

Municipal Trees

- are trees solely on or original to Town lands including parks boulevards and other Town properties
- the care and governance of the trees are the sole responsibility of the Town
- the planting and maintenance of these trees are under the jurisdiction of the Town Council via it's employees and with guidance from the Trees and Trails Committee or any future advisory panel that is set up for this purpose

Private Property Trees

- are trees solely on private property(s) or partially on private property(s) with origins on private property
- 1) "Junior Tree" size 5 cm to 30cm diameter
- 2) "Significant Tree" 30 cm and larger in diameter
- 3) "Distinctive Tree" as documented by Town Council
- "Junior Tree" removal require a Notice of Intent" to be submitted to Town with tree description - reasoning – any alternatives listed - 7 days prior notice contemplated action approved if no objection given by Town after 7 days - no fee
 no arborist or professional report required
- "Significant Tree" removal or alteration requires completion of "Significant Tree Removal or Alteration Application Form" and approval "Significant Tree Permit" issued – application either submitted by owner of property or or certified tree service - requires arborist report - form to include the usual info plus - intention reasoning - and alternatives
- "Distinctive Tree" requires Town Council specific approval for any alteration or removal
- delineation of processing of applications fees replacement tree(s) policy penalties - appeals process

Care and Arborculture Best Practices

- information available to both the public and Town personal
- understanding of current issues of disease and other concerns effecting our tree inventory
- references to best arborcultural practices

From:	<u>Carl Woodman</u>
То:	Lynsey Zufelt; David Frid
Cc:	<u>Ted Lojko</u>
Subject:	Re: Urban Tree By-Laws of the City of London Ontario (reference)
Date:	March 2, 2022 4:51:25 PM
Attachments:	Tree Bylaws.docx

Hi Lynsey,

In addition to the information that David sent regarding the City of London tree Bylaw, I have reviewed a number of other tree bylaws and found that the diameter of a tree to be removed is consistently measured at DBH (Diameter at Breast Height) of 1.4 metres, however, the minimum diameter can vary. For example the Town of Peterborough requires permission for removal of trees with a diameter of 7.5cm., Town of Oakville minimum is 15 cm, City of Toronto is 30cm. The tree removal Bylaws vary in complexity, with The City of Toronto Bylaw being the most complex and all encompassing. I have also included the tree Removal Permit for the City of Toronto and the Town of Oakville in addition to the one for the City of London as submitted by David.

There are so many aspects to a tree bylaw , whether on Public property or private property, boundary trees, who applies for the permit whether the owner or a tree removal firm, illegal removal and type of compensation- planting of additional trees, financial compensation and how the financial compensation is determined.

As there are many aspects in developing a bylaw, there needs to be some discussion to determine what should be included and how it should be administered and enforced. I look forward to where we go from here.

Regrards

Carl Woodman

From: Lynsey Zufelt <THadmin@gananoque.ca>

Sent: February 4, 2022 12:58 PM

To: David Frid <cbdavefrid@gmail.com>; carlwoodman (carlwoodman@hotmail.com)

<carlwoodman@hotmail.com>

Cc: Ted Lojko <tlojko@gananoque.ca>

Subject: RE: Urban Tree By-Laws of the City of London Ontario (reference)

David,

I will add this information to the spreadsheet I am keeping for our Tree Removal Permits / Tree By-law research. Thank you!!

Regards,

Lynsey Zufelt Administrative Assistant Corporation of the Town of Gananoque 30 King St East

Gananoque, ON K7G 1E9

613-382-2149 ext 1115



Disclaimer: This e-mail and any attachments may contain personal information or information that is otherwise confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the intended recipient. The contents hereof are protected under the rights and privileges of the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy legislation. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of any part of it is prohibited. The Town of Gananoque accepts no liability for damage caused by any virus transmitted in this message. If this e-mail is received in error, please immediately reply advising of the error, and delete or destroy any copies of it. The transmission of e-mails between an employee or agent of the Town of Gananoque and a third party does not constitute a binding contract without the express written consent of an authorized representative of The Corporation of the Town of Gananoque.

Please consider the environment before printing.

From: David Frid <cbdavefrid@gmail.com>
Sent: February 3, 2022 3:03 PM
To: Lynsey Zufelt <THadmin@gananoque.ca>; carlwoodman (carlwoodman@hotmail.com)
<carlwoodman@hotmail.com>
Cc: Ted Lojko <tlojko@gananoque.ca>
Subject: Urban Tree By-Laws of the City of London Ontario (reference)

Below is a link to London's Tree By-Laws

I have reviewed these By-Laws of the City of London Ontario and found them to be very comprehensive both in their By-laws covering Private Property Trees and Municipal Governed Trees.

It is comprehensive

There is also a description of their "*treeMe*" program for supporting and funding private tree plantings.

Not to imply that a complete reading of it is necessary but perusing the contents is good guidance for us I believe.

Dave

https://london.ca/living-london/water-environment/trees

I have made notes for when we meet.

Hi Ted and Lynsey,

I've put together some information pertaining to Ecosystem Services that I brought up at the last Trees and Trails meeting. Thank you for hearing this information, I really think it's pertinent to the town and something we could benefit greatly from considering.

Ecosystem Services are the services that are provided to people by the natural environments that surround them. There are many to consider; some examples are control of air and water quality, pollination, and the draw of natural areas for tourists. All of these services have an economic value, whether that be in disaster mitigation, increased draw for tourism, or the cost of replacing the services with manmade infrastructure should they be lost. Despite this value, few governments actually recognize the value of ecosystem services in an official capacity.

Gananoque is, of course, a town with lots of natural spaces, and henceforth one that benefits from a lot of value provided in ecosystem services. I think it would be prudent as the town develops to recognize this value in an official capacity, so that future development projects that may remove those services can be better informed from a budgetary standpoint. A development that creates economic value for the town may in fact take away value provided to the town by ecosystem services depending on where it happens and which ecosystems are impacted by it.

A clear example of this is available in this short YouTube segment from a talk given by the President of the Thousand Islands Watershed Land Trust, Don Ross, just a few weeks ago. It outlines an area in Brockville where such a development was made that ended up costing the taxpayers over \$1 million because of the loss of the ecosystem services present on the site of the development. This link should bring you to the right point in the video, but if not, this case study is discussed from 26:31 to 29:25. (<u>https://youtu.be/uQDJgSnnLDk?t=1592</u>).

I've attached a photo taken from a 2008 study that valued ecosystem services in southern Ontario based on land type, and I think the numbers may surprise you. Using census data, I've found that Gan has a population density of 733/square kilometre as of 2016. Given that we are in the Leeds and Grenville Area, with a population of nearly 70,000, the study considers us an "Urban" area. This means that our Gananoque River, as an urban river, provides approximately \$172,000 in value per hectare each year. If you are interested in reading the study directly, you can find it here: https://alus.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/estimation-of-ecosystem.pdf.

My point in bringing this up isn't to attempt to prevent or even discourage development in the town. My interest lies solely in ensuring that the potential losses associated with development are accurately represented.

I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have and, as requested, will prepare a short presentation to the committee about this for the next meeting.

With Thanks,

Calder

Table 3: Per-hectare ecosystem service value estimates cross-tabulated by land cover and service type

Table 3: Per-hectare ecosystem service	value estima	tes cross-t	abulated by	and cover	and service	type					
CATEGORY	Recreation	Aesthetic/ amenity	Other cultural	Pollination & dispersal	Habitat refugium/ biodiversity	Atmospheric regulation	Soil retention erosion control	Water quality/ nutrient & waste regulation	Water supply/ regulation	Disturbance avoidance	TOTAL
Agriculture	202.0			1.10.2	· · · ·	100					
Agriculture	\$137		\$97	\$28		\$31					\$291
Grassland/Pasture/Hayfield	\$53		\$134	\$19	\$95	\$19	\$4	\$25		\$5	\$353
Forest	i gati	6 83		÷	e		8 8		52 - 253.		
Forest: Non-urban	\$270		\$240		\$2,428	\$992		\$513		2	\$4,443
Forest: Urban	\$14,903		\$249	\$7,536		\$992		\$513	\$1,649		\$25,843
Forest: Suburban	\$11,373		\$249			\$992		\$513	\$1,649		\$14,777
Forest: Adjacent to stream	\$559				\$133	\$992	\$779	\$621	\$1,320	\$148	\$4,552
Forest: Hedgerow			\$7	\$25		\$992					\$1,023
Urban herbaceous											
Urban herbaceous greenspace		\$43,539	\$249								\$43,788
Open water											
Open water: River	\$8,655		\$25		\$10			\$33,906	\$12,957		\$55,553
Open water: Urban/suburban river	\$172,691	\$242						\$45,768	\$17,690		\$236,392
Open water: Inland lake	\$3,820	\$593	\$25					\$612			\$5,050
Open water: Great Lake nearshore	\$554	\$240									\$795
Open water: Estuary/tidal bay	\$451	\$1,289			\$13			\$54	\$45		\$1,852
Wetlands					· · · · ·						
Wetlands: Non-urban, non-coastal	\$3,551	\$6,446	\$2,286		\$75	\$14		\$2,779			\$15,171
Wetlands: Urban/suburban	\$9.861	\$129				\$14		\$3,168	\$48,929	\$99,318	\$161,420
Wetlands: Great Lakes coastal	\$590	\$2,527	\$8,970			\$14		\$2,660			\$14,761
Beach											
Beach: general	\$72,892	\$1,386			Т					\$15,330	\$89,608
Beach: Near structures	\$96,635	\$2,773								\$30,660	\$130,068
Beach: Not near structures	\$49,150										\$49,150