

<b>TO:</b>	<b>CHAIR AND MEMBERS STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING ON FEBRUARY 9, 2012</b>
<b>FROM:</b>	<b>JOHN FLEMING DIRECTOR OF LAND USE PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>IMPACT OF SERVICES REVIEW COMMITTEE 2012 FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EMERALD ASH BORER STRATEGY AND MILLION TREE CHALLENGE</b>

<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
-----------------------

That, on the recommendation of the Director of Land Use Planning And City Planner, with the advice of the Manager of Urban Forestry:

(i) the following report **BE RECEIVED** which recognizes the Emerald Ash Borer Strategy endorsed by Municipal Council, the previously submitted Emerald Ash Borer Business Case and recommendations by the Services Review Committee within the context of Council's 2012 budget targets;

(ii) the following existing budgets **BE UTILIZED** as sources of financing to fund the 2012 Emerald Ash Borer program:

1. Services Review Committee recommendation of an additional \$400k to existing Forestry-related budgets;
2. Street Tree Planting Program - \$30k of the \$260k budget for 2012 – meaning that there will be some delays for infill tree-planting;
3. Woodland Management Program - \$40k of the \$150k budget for 2012 – meaning that there will be funding available for planning and implementation of some identified projects in Woodlands
4. EAB designated tree planting - \$443k – which includes surplus from previous years EAB re-planting and \$200k planned EAB planting in 2012.

(iii) The coordination, administration and education components of the Emerald Ash Borer program **BE DELAYED** for 1 year, eliminating \$100,000 of cost from the endorsed EAB strategy.

(iv) Reforest London **BE ADVISED** that if the Million Tree Challenge Business Case, is approved: 1) the funding cannot be used for staffing purposes and 2) a report shall be submitted identifying the actual leveraged funding achieved.

**IT BEING NOTED THAT** the (i) above-noted approach will not achieve the endorsed Emerald Ash Borer tree replacement ratio of two trees for every tree removed (an additional \$281k is required to fully fund the endorsed strategy and implementation plan); (ii) the above-noted approach will achieve an Emerald Ash Borer tree replacement ratio of three trees for every two tree removed (replacement ratio of 1.5:1); (iii) the above-noted approach will have impacts on street tree planting, and woodland management in London in 2012 and a similar approach and funding level is not sustainable for 2013 and beyond; and (iv) the unspent amount from previous years relating to EAB planting, to be applied in 2012, will not be available for 2013 and beyond.

## RELATED REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER

Report to Services Review committee November 17, 2011  
Council Resolution – October 3, 2011  
8<sup>th</sup> Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee – September 28, 2011  
Report of the Community and Neighbourhoods Committee – September 27, 2011  
Emerald Ash Borer Strategy – September, 2011  
22<sup>nd</sup> Report of the Committee of the Whole – June 21, 2011  
Emerald Ash Borer Update - Report to the ETC - July 19, 2010  
2<sup>nd</sup> Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee - February 25, 2009  
Emerald Ash Borer Strategy - Report to the ETC - May 26, 2008

Reforest London Business Case for the Million Tree Challenge

## BACKGROUND

Table 1 below shows the endorsed EAB management strategy and associated implementation budget. Council directed staff to identify the program budget impacts of different levels of replacement planting to removals and explore alternative sources of financing and revenues in support of the strategy. These were presented to the Service Review Committee in November.

Service Review Committee, on January 18, recommended that an additional \$400 be allocated to existing Forestry budgets in support of the EAB management strategy. The Committee also recommended that \$100k be allocated to support ReForest London's Business Case for the Million Tree Challenge.

This report identifies the impacts of the additional recommended funding and existing forestry budgets on achieving the EAB management strategy targets. This report also identifies direction to ReForest London for the use of the Million Tree Challenge funding if approved by Council.

**Table 1. Recommended EAB Management Strategy Program and Costs (in thousands of dollars) endorsed in Principle by Council**

YEAR	Treatment*	Removal (Streets and Manicured Mark Areas)*	Removal (Wooded Park Areas)*	Inventory and Survey (Wooded Park Areas)*	Risk Inspections (Wooded Park Areas)*	Restoration and Rehabilitation (Wooded Park Areas)#	Plant 2:1 (Streets and Manicured Park Areas)#	Coordination, Administration & Education#	TOTAL
2012		184	145	50			715	100	1194
2013	109	187	145	50		30	751	100	1372
2014		191	145		20	30	828	100	1314
2015	115	195	145		20	30	828	100	1433
2016		199	145		20	30	869		1263
2017	122	203	145			30	912		1412
2018		207	145			30	1007		1389
2019	130	211	145			30	1005		1521
2020		215	145			30	1056		1446
2021	137	219	145			30	1108		1639
2022									0
2023	146								146
2024									0
2025	155								155
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>914</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>1450</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>9079</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>14284</b>

\*Risk related activities

#Restoration related activities

## DISCUSSION

### Planting Ratio

As identified to Service Review Committee in November 2011, funding the recommended EAB management strategy solely from existing Forestry budgets has significant negative impacts on the delivery of existing infill street and downtown planting and Woodland management programs. Service Review Committee recommendations of minimizing impacts on the infill street and no impacts on downtown tree planting programs increased pressure.

The recommended additional \$400k funding reduces the pressure to use existing funding sources to meet the recommended 2:1 replanting levels. Even with this additional funding, if approved, there would still be significant impacts on existing programs to meet the 2:1 replanting targets.

With the additional recommended funding, a replanting level of three trees planted for every two trees removed (replacement ratio of 1.5:1) is achievable without significant impacts to existing programs. The existing EAB planting budget (\$442k) would only require an additional \$91k to achieve a 1.5:1 ratio compared to \$ 273k to achieve a 2:1 ratio.

This level of funding assumes that two trees will be planted for every three trees that are removed regardless of the size of the original tree.

Pros:

- Immediate effects of tree loss on boulevards may be reduced.
- Less expensive replacement option in the short term than the Council endorsed strategy.
- Allows for the planting of areas currently without trees and distributing the future leaf cover more uniformly across the City
- Leaf cover and environmental benefits will be replaced in a shorter time period than at 1:1 planting ratio.
- Will mitigate natural mortality of planted trees as not all trees survive to an age where they will produce significant leaf cover. In the long term, this will more closely reflect the number of ash trees prior to the EAB infestation.
- Less impact on infill street planting and Woodland management programs to support this level of replanting.

Cons:

- May not have immediate effect of tree loss on boulevards.
- Leaf cover loss due to EAB will not be recovered as quickly as 3:1 or 2:1 planting ratios due to natural mortality.
- Planting costs higher than replanting at 1:1 ratio.
- Funding from existing Forestry programs still required to meet this target replanting ratio

### **Removal and Woodland Management Costs**

The endorsed EAB management strategy identified approximately \$379 required in 2012 for boulevard and park removals as well as EAB management in woodlands. Removals are required to address liability issues associated with infested trees on streets, in parks and woodlands. The proportion of ash trees is higher in woodlands than on boulevards and managed portions of parks. Many of the woodlands have up to 35% ash trees. Because of the significant ecological implications of EAB in woodlands, impact assessments and management plans will also need to be developed.

The Service Review Committee recommended additional funding of \$400k is sufficient to address the above identified activities without impacting on existing tree maintenance or woodland management programs. It should be noted here that, if this new funding is approved, it should not be "earmarked" strictly for removals in order to maximize flexibility and efficiency of EAB management activities.

## Recommended EAB Budget Approach For 2012

The following table is the recommended approach for the use of proposed new EAB funding and direction from Service Review Committee and Council to minimize impacts on existing infill and downtown planting and woodland management programs. The downtown tree planting budget is not affected. Note that this level of funding does not achieve the endorsed EAB replanting ratio of 2:1.

Activity	Cost (\$)	Allocation	Source of Funding	Remaining in Existing Budgets for Planned Activities (\$)
Removals and Woodland Management	379k	379k	New Funding	N/A
Planting 1.5:1	534k	21k	New Funding	N/A
		443k	Existing EAB Planting	0
		40k	Woodland Management	110k
		30k	Infill Planting	199k
EAB Program Support	0	0	Delayed until 2013	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>913k</b>	<b>913k</b>		<b>309k</b>

An additional \$281k “new” funding for 2012 is required to achieve the endorsed EAB management strategy and implementation program level without further affecting existing programs. Current funding sources cannot support the EAB management strategy beyond 2012. Additional funding, in addition to the reallocation of existing budgets is required to implement the endorsed strategy.

## ReForest London’s Million Tree Challenge Business Case

### Background

The Million Tree tree Challenge is an initiative to engage Londoners to plant one million trees in the City over the next ten years. It was launched in June 2011 with ReForest London and the City as founding partners. The short term objective is to plant one tree for every Londoner in the first three years of the program.

The program will seek partners from the private business sector and the public and plant trees on private and public property. The Business Case identified a funding need of \$100k for 2012. If funded, ReForest London can leverage \$7 for every dollar invested. It addresses key City Strategic priorities of *Environmental Leadership, Community Vitality, Economic Prosperity and Infrastructure Renewal*.

Planning Staff recommend the following conditions be included as part of the requirements of the program:

1. The money is not used to staff. The funding for staff should come from other sources.
2. A year-end report be submitted by ReForest London demonstrating the actual amount of leverage obtained as a result of the funding.

<b>Prepared By:</b>	<b>Recommended By:</b>
<b>Ivan Listar, R.P.F. Manager, Urban Forestry</b>	<b>John Fleming, MCIP, RPP Director of Land Use Planning &amp; City Planner</b>

cc: TFAC

John Parsons  
Andrew Macpherson  
Joy Jackson

## EAB – Recommended Approach

### Necessary Costs for EAB

- Removals \$380k
- Re-planting @1.5:1 (vs. 2:1) \$535k
- Total = **\$915k**

### Sources of Financing

- SRC recommended add to 2012 budget \$400k
- Planned in 2012 budget \$200k
- Unspent from 2010 & 2011 \$242k
- From Woodland Management \$ 40k
- From Infill Tree Planting \$ 30k
- Total = **\$915k**

### Remaining in Programs

- Woodland Management \$110k
- Infill Tree Planting \$230k

### Million Tree Challenge

\$100k