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# An Analysis of Street Tree Benefits for Westerville, Ohio 

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An existing inventory of street trees less park trees was modified to allow an analysis of environmental benefits to be run. A total of 12,176 street trees were inventoried. A common bid price for this service is $\$ 3.00$ per tree and thus the inventory represents a savings of $\$ 35,568$ for Westerville taxpayers had the inventory not been maintained by the Department of Parks and Recreation Urban Forestry Section. More importantly however, is that the City of Westerville now has an expanded use for the tree inventory that can be used to better manage the street tree resource. Benefits mentioned above do not include the subsequent analysis which was performed by The School of Environment and Natural Resources at The Ohio State University.

Analysis of the inventory data was done using iTree, a software suite distributed by the USDA Forest Service. The specific program in the iTree suite used to identify benefits was Shade Tree Resource Analysis Tool for Urban forest Managers (STRATUM) and is soon to be known as iStreets. This program allows individuals with interests in making informed decisions about the community tree resource to evaluate costs and benefits of some of those decisions such as biodiversity.

A long standing rule of thumb for biodiversity is the 10-20-30 guideline which suggests that no more than 10 percent of trees should be from the same species, no more than twenty percent should be from the same genera, and no more than thirty percent should be from the same family. In Westerville, crabapples and Callery pears exceeds the limit for specie at 15 and $14 \%$ respectively. While maple ( $24 \%$ ) somewhat above the $20 \%$ genera limit. This is low relative to other Ohio communities and will assist in dealing with Asian longhorned beetle should it reach central Ohio. The Rose family is over represented at $32 \%$. It is tough to reduce this as crabapples and Callery pears are among the longest lived small flowering trees.

Limiting future plantings of maples and plants in the rose family is desirable to maintain a diverse urban canopy. The problem with emerald ash borer, now established in central Ohio, is well known. Ash has not been planted for four years and is presently preferentially removed when conflicts arise but still represents $9 \%$ of Westerville's street trees. Using statewide averages, this may cost Westerville more than $\$ 700,000$ to cut down, remove the stump, and replace the 1119 ash trees on the streets.

Under ideal conditions tree numbers among size classes of larger growing trees such as oaks and maples should remain somewhat constant to 24 -inch caliper then decline as tree size increases and then die from old age. Westerville's tree population is skewed toward smaller trees even for larger growing species because few plantings exceed 40 years of age. High numbers of smaller trees indicate an active planting program as seen in the overall numbers for Westerville (Tables 2 to 3 ). Westerville's trees are now reaching sizes where environmental benefits per tree will increase dramatically (Table 4).

Larger growing broadleaved deciduous trees such as honeylocusts have importance values greater than their respective percentages in the inventory because of their larger size. For example silver maple represents 2 percent of the trees but constitutes $15 \%$ of the leaf area, $6 \%$ of the canopy cover, and has an
importance value of 5\% (Table 4). Further this demonstrates Westerville’s need for larger statured trees whenever possible as the importance value is a measure of the overall contribution of the species.

A major benefit of urban trees is their ability to intercept rainfall and reduce storm water runoff (Table 6). Storm water runoff is a major cost for many communities. Columbus is about to embark on a multibillion dollar sewer and storm water upgrade for the community. Trees in Westerville intercept more than 10,674 CCF (5,576,340 gallons) of storm water annually at a savings of $\$ 151,134$ per year.

Carbon sequestration, as reported here, represents the carbon removed from the air and stored in Westerville’s trees (Table 8). More than 15 million pounds or nearly 8,000 tons of carbon have been stored by Westerville's 12,176 trees over time. Westerville's trees currently sequester and avoid nearly 1.8 million lbs of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ (Table 9) and could represent carbon credits worth $\$ 25,434$ per year if a carbon trading system were in place and if a system for accounting for them were available for community trees. These are net gain figures and include deductions for tree losses and maintenance. Larger, longer lived species and species requiring less maintenance would also produce greater benefits (Table 8).

Annual air quality savings (reduced ozone, nitrous and sulfur oxides as well as particulate matter) for Westerville's trees is $\$ 33,097$ (Table 9). This includes both direct savings $(\$ 4,548)$ from the trees and avoided pollution which is even greater $(\$ 29,892)$. Avoided pollution is pollution not generated at power source because energy was not required by the community. The total annual air quality benefits are discounted by $\$ 1,343$ for the volatile emissions from the trees themselves.

Planting trees in our communities may well be more cost effective than building power plants to as an alternative to meeting our energy needs. Energy is saved by shading structures, evaporating water (evapotranspiration) and reducing wind speed around structures (Table 10). Citywide, Westerville saves $\$ 75,611$ in electricity and $\$ 193,885$ in natural gas for a total savings of $\$ 217,053$ or $\$ 17.83$ per tree.

Aesthetic and miscellaneous benefits from trees contribute $\$ 204,364$ annually to the community in the form of increased property values and enhanced community identity among other things (Table 11). Research in public housing has shown that areas with trees facilitate civil interactions among residents and lead to reduced domestic violence and more sociable environments. Customer surveys suggest that customers prefer to spend their money and time in commercial streetscapes with trees and are willing to spend up to $11 \%$ more in such settings.

When all benefits are included the average tree in Westerville contributes $\$ 51.83$ per tree annually to the community (Table 12). Species vary in their annual benefits. Mature size, longevity, and maintenance costs are but some of the factors determining annual benefits. Thus Westerville's 12,161 trees contribute more than $\$ 631,082$. This would be well in excess of their maintenance and planting costs.

The budget for the City of Westerville's urban forestry budget is $\$ 250,000$ yet the community receives \$631,082 in benefits including storm water abatement, CO2 avoidance and storage, energy savings, air quality, and aesthetic benefits. Dividing benefits by costs yields a $252 \%$ return on the community's investment in urban forestry. Trees are truly a contributing part of Westerville, Ohio's infrastructure. Unlike most community infrastructure, tree benefits per tree continue to increase over a tree's lifetime especially when a community has a young tree population as does Westerville.

Table 1 Species Distribution of Westerville's Ten Most Commonly Planted Street Trees (\%)

| Species | Percent |
| :--- | ---: |
| Flowering crabapple | 15.48 |
| Pears | 14.03 |
| Ashes | 9.19 |
| Norway maple | 8.13 |
| Honeylocust | 7.68 |
| Red maple | 7.09 |
| Littleleaf linden | 5.31 |
| Sugar maple | 4.70 |
| Sweetgum | 2.60 |
| Northern red oak | 2.39 |
| Other species | 23.40 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |



Table 2. Relative Age Distribution of the Top 10 Most Commonly Planted Street Trees in Westerville (\%)

םFlowering crabapple
$\square$ Pear
$\square$ Ash
$\square$ Norway maple
■Honeylocust
םRedmaple
$\square$ Littleleaf linden
$\square$ Sugar maple
$\square$ Sweetgum
$\square$ Northern red oak
$\square$ Citywide total

| Species | DBH class (in) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-3 | 3-6 | 6-12 | 12-18 | 18-24 | 24-30 | 30-36 | 36-42 | >42 |
| Flowering crabapple | 13.79 | 31.46 | 39.10 | 15.07 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pear | 7.26 | 17.74 | 35.13 | 32.96 | 6.79 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ash | 6.61 | 29.40 | 49.78 | 9.92 | 1.70 | 1.61 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.36 |
| Norway maple | 20.61 | 42.02 | 31.11 | 5.76 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Honeylocust | 3.53 | 28.24 | 46.31 | 20.96 | 0.64 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Red maple | 20.39 | 41.25 | 34.41 | 3.13 | 0.35 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.12 | 0.00 |
| Littleleaf linden | 9.74 | 34.47 | 49.15 | 6.18 | 0.31 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Sugar maple | 24.13 | . 90 | 21.85 | 9.97 | 6.99 | 5.59 | 1.22 | 0.35 | 0.00 |
| Sweetgum | 5.68 | 25.87 | 47.32 | 20.19 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Northern red oak | 23.02 | 29.55 | 21.99 | 16.49 | 5.84 | 1.37 | 1.03 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Citywide total | 16.95 | 31.67 | 33.15 | 14.48 | 2.51 | 0.79 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.09 |



Table 4. Totals for Five Benefit Categories and Grand Total for Westerville's Street Tree Benefits by Diameter at Breast Height


| Species | DBH Class(in) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{0 - 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 - 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 - 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{> 4 2}$ | Avg. |
| Energy | $\$ 0.80$ | $\$ 6.41$ | $\$ 20.54$ | $\$ 37.51$ | $\$ 51.20$ | $\$ 57.94$ | $\$ 61.64$ | $\$ 53.92$ | $\$ 55.93$ | $\$ 17.83$ |
| Aesthetic | $\$ 1.09$ | $\$ 7.03$ | $\$ 18.82$ | $\$ 31.53$ | $\$ 48.69$ | $\$ 62.53$ | $\$ 52.77$ | $\$ 68.54$ | $\$ 45.71$ | $\$ 16.78$ |
| Water | $\$ 0.27$ | $\$ 3.05$ | $\$ 11.86$ | $\$ 24.78$ | $\$ 53.55$ | $\$ 88.60$ | $\$ 109.49$ | $\$ 116.90$ | $\$ 101.57$ | $\$ 12.41$ |
| Air Quality | $\$ 0.10$ | $\$ 0.87$ | $\$ 2.91$ | $\$ 6.32$ | $\$ 8.54$ | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 11.20$ | $\$ 10.10$ | $\$ 10.49$ | $\$ 2.74$ |
| CO2 | $\$ 0.08$ | $\$ 0.73$ | $\$ 2.28$ | $\$ 4.52$ | $\$ 6.82$ | $\$ 7.71$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 9.29$ | $\$ 7.99$ | $\$ 2.09$ |
| Westerville Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 . 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 6 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 4 . 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 6 8 . 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 6 . 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 3 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 8 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 1 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 1 . 8 5}$ |



Table 3. Complete Inventory of Westerville’s Trees by Scientific Name and Size Category

| Species | DBH Class (in) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-3 | 3-6 | 6-12 | 12-18 | 18-24 | 24-30 | 30-36 | 36-42 | >42 | Total |
| Broadleaf Deciduous Large (BDL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acer rubrum | 176 | 356 | 297 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 863 |
| Acer saccharinum | 13 | 57 | 50 | 67 | 44 | 18 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 263 |
| Acer saccharum | 138 | 171 | 125 | 57 | 40 | 32 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 572 |
| Acer x freemanii | 70 | 102 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178 |
| Betula papyrifera | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Betula pendula | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Carya species | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Carya cordiformis | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Carya ovata | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Castanea dentata | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Catalpa species | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Celtis occidentalis | 19 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 37 |
| Cercidiphyllum japonicum | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Fagus grandifolia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Fagus sylvatica | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Gymnocladus dioicus | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Juglans cineria | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Juglans nigra | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Liquidambar styraciflua | 18 | 82 | 150 | 64 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 |
| Liriodendron tulipifera | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Platanus occidentalis | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Platanus x acerifolia | 26 | 63 | 71 | 52 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 218 |
| Populus species | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Populus tremuloides | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Quercus species | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Quercus acutissima | 29 | 19 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Quercus alba | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Quercus imbricaria | 12 | 41 | 26 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| Quercus lyrata | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Quercus macrocarpa | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Quercus muehlenbergii | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Quercus palustris | 0 | 9 | 15 | 30 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Quercus phellos | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Quercus robur | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Quercus rubra | 67 | 86 | 64 | 48 | 17 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 291 |
| Quercus velutina | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Tilia species | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Tilia tomentosa | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Ulmus species | 29 | 41 | 27 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 116 |
| Ulmus americana | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Ulmus parvifolia | 13 | 31 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Total | 687 | 1,101 | 869 | 382 | 130 | 62 | 26 | 10 | 7 | 3,274 |

## Table 3. (contd.) Inventory by scientific name and size class

| Species | DBH Class (in) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-3 | 3-6 | 6-12 | 12-18 | 18-24 | 24-30 | 30-36 | 36-42 |  | >42 | Total |
| Broadleaf Deciduous Medium (BDM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acer buergeranum | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Acer campestre | 30 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Acer miyabei | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Acer negundo | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Acer platanoides | 204 | 416 | 308 | 57 | 3 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 990 |
| Acer tartaricum | 15 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Acer truncatum | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Aesculus glabra | 9 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Betula nigra | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Carpinus species | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Cladrastis kentukea | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Corylus colurna | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Diospyros virginiana | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Eucommia ulmoides | 11 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Fraxinus species | 74 | 329 | 557 | 111 | 19 | 18 | 7 |  | 0 | 4 | 1,119 |
| Ginkgo biloba | 43 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Gleditsia triacanthos | 33 | 264 | 433 | 196 | 6 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 935 |
| Koelreutaria paniculata | 23 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Nyssa sylvatica | 20 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Phellodendron amurense | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Prunus serotina | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Quercus bicolor | 37 | 104 | 52 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 197 |
| Robinia pseudoacacia | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Sassafras albidum | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Tilia cordata | 63 | 223 | 318 | 40 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 647 |
| Zelkova serrata | 7 | 21 | 8 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Total | 617 | 1,572 | 1,713 | 430 | 34 | 29 | 8 |  | 0 | 4 | 4,407 |
| Broadleaf Deciduous Small (BDS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acer ginnala | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Acer palmatum | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Albizia julibrissin | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Amalanchier species | 120 | 139 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 260 |
| Asimina triloba | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Cercis canadensis | 5 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Cornus florida | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Cornus kousa | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Cornus mas | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Crataegus species | 13 | 32 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Hibiscus syriacus | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Maackia amurensis | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Malus hybrid | 260 | 593 | 737 | 284 | 11 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1,885 |
| Morus species | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Ostrya virginiana | 35 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 43 |

## Table 3. (contd.) Inventory by scientific name and size class

| Species | DBH Class (in) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-3 | 3-6 | 6-12 | 12-18 | 18-24 | 24-30 | 30-36 | 36-42 |  | >42 | Total |
| Broadleaf Deciduous Small (BDS) (contd.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prunus species | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 |
| Prunus serrulata | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |
| Prunus spp | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 |
| Pyrus species | 124 | 303 | 600 | 563 | 116 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1,708 |
| Syringa pekinenesis | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 |
| Syringa reticulata | 114 | 77 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 202 |
| Total | 728 | 1,168 | 1,371 | 864 | 132 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4,267 |
| Broadleaf Evergreen Small (BES) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Magnolia species | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 11 |
| Magnolia virginiana | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 12 |
| Conifer Evergreen Large (CEL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metasequoia glyptostroboides | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |
| Picea species | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 14 |
| Picea abies | 1 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 29 |
| Pinus nigra | 0 | 0 | 32 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 83 |
| Pinus strobus | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 16 |
| Pinus sylvestris | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 12 |
| Taxodium distichum | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 13 |
| Thuja occidentalis | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Tsuga canadensis | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 24 | 9 | 52 | 76 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 171 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conifer Evergreen Medium (CEM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Picea glauca | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |
| Picea pungens | 3 | 4 | 25 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 37 |
| Total | 3 | 4 | 26 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 38 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conifer Evergreen Small (CES) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Juniperus virginiana | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Westerville Totals |  | 2,064 | 3,856 | 4,036 | 1,763 | 306 | 96 | 34 | 10 | 11 | 12,176 |

Table 4. Totals for Five Benefit Categories and Grand Total for Westerville’s Street Tree Benefits by Diameter at Breast Height


| Species | DBH Class(in) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{0 - 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 - 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 - 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 - 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 - 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{> 4 2}$ | Avg. |
| Energy | $\$ 0.80$ | $\$ 6.41$ | $\$ 20.54$ | $\$ 37.51$ | $\$ 51.20$ | $\$ 57.94$ | $\$ 61.64$ | $\$ 53.92$ | $\$ 55.93$ | $\$ 17.83$ |
| Aesthetic | $\$ 1.09$ | $\$ 7.03$ | $\$ 18.82$ | $\$ 31.53$ | $\$ 48.69$ | $\$ 62.53$ | $\$ 52.77$ | $\$ 68.54$ | $\$ 45.71$ | $\$ 16.78$ |
| Water | $\$ 0.27$ | $\$ 3.05$ | $\$ 11.86$ | $\$ 24.78$ | $\$ 53.55$ | $\$ 88.60$ | $\$ 109.49$ | $\$ 116.90$ | $\$ 101.57$ | $\$ 12.41$ |
| Air Quality | $\$ 0.10$ | $\$ 0.87$ | $\$ 2.91$ | $\$ 6.32$ | $\$ 8.54$ | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 11.20$ | $\$ 10.10$ | $\$ 10.49$ | $\$ 2.74$ |
| CO2 | $\$ 0.08$ | $\$ 0.73$ | $\$ 2.28$ | $\$ 4.52$ | $\$ 6.82$ | $\$ 7.71$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 9.29$ | $\$ 7.99$ | $\$ 2.09$ |
| Westerville Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 . 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 6 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 4 . 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 6 8 . 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 6 . 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 3 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 8 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 1 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 1 . 8 5}$ |



Table 5. Importance Values for Westerville's Most Abundant Street Tree Species Ordered by Importance Value

| Species | Number <br> of <br> Trees | \% of <br> Total <br> Trees | Leaf <br> Area <br> (ft2) | \% Total <br> Leaf <br> Area | Canopy <br> Cover <br> (ft2) | \% Total <br> Canopy <br> Cover | Importance <br> Value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pears | 1708 | 14.0 | 776,519 | 11.3 | 714,541 | 17.8 | 14.39 |
| Flowering crabapple | 1885 | 15.5 | 417,827 | 6.1 | 494,192 | 12.3 | 11.30 |
| Ashes | 1119 | 9.2 | 829,598 | 12.1 | 435,009 | 10.8 | 10.71 |
| Honeylocust | 935 | 7.7 | 761,345 | 11.1 | 535,686 | 13.3 | 10.71 |
| Sugar maple | 572 | 4.7 | 708,578 | 10.4 | 249,749 | 6.2 | 7.09 |
| Norway maple | 990 | 8.1 | 366,419 | 5.4 | 240,364 | 6.0 | 6.49 |
| Red maple | 863 | 7.1 | 320,091 | 4.7 | 230,766 | 5.7 | 5.84 |
| Silver maple | 263 | 2.2 | 666,976 | 9.7 | 217,255 | 5.4 | 5.77 |
| Littleleaf linden | 647 | 5.3 | 258,994 | 3.8 | 144,581 | 3.6 | 4.23 |
| Sweetgum | 317 | 2.6 | 277,293 | 4.1 | 122,149 | 3.0 | 3.23 |
| Northern red oak | 291 | 2.4 | 216,962 | 3.2 | 102,496 | 2.6 | 2.70 |
| London planetree | 218 | 1.8 | 163,426 | 2.4 | 75,073 | 1.9 | 2.02 |
| Swamp white oak | 197 | 1.6 | 56,267 | 0.8 | 40,408 | 1.0 | 1.15 |
| Freeman maple | 178 | 1.5 | 45,398 | 0.7 | 20,493 | 0.5 | 0.88 |
| Serviceberry | 260 | 2.1 | 5,365 | 0.1 | 14,831 | 0.4 | 0.86 |
| Japanese tree lilac | 202 | 1.7 | 5,320 | 0.1 | 12,073 | 0.3 | 0.68 |
| Other trees | 1531 | 12.6 | 969,433 | 14.2 | 366,257 | 9.1 | 11.95 |
| Westerville Totals | $\mathbf{1 2 , 1 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 8 4 5 , 8 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 0 1 5 , 9 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0}$ |



Table 6. Annual Stormwater Benefits of Westerville's Street Trees by Common Name and Ordered by Average Benefit per Tree

| Species | Total <br> Rainfall <br> Interception <br> (CCF) | Total (\$) | \% of <br> Total <br> Tree <br> Numbers | \% of <br> Total \$ | Avg. <br> \$/tree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Silver maple | 630 | $\$ 12,777$ | 2.2 | 8.4 | $\$ 48.58$ |
| Sugar maple | 593 | $\$ 12,014$ | 4.7 | 7.9 | $\$ 21.00$ |
| Honeylocust | 878 | $\$ 17,793$ | 7.7 | 11.8 | $\$ 19.03$ |
| Sweetgum | 277 | $\$ 5,614$ | 2.6 | 3.7 | $\$ 17.71$ |
| Ashes | 927 | $\$ 18,794$ | 9.2 | 12.4 | $\$ 16.80$ |
| Northern red oak | 226 | $\$ 4,572$ | 2.4 | 3.0 | $\$ 15.71$ |
| London planetree | 164 | $\$ 3,324$ | 1.8 | 2.2 | $\$ 15.25$ |
| Pears | 928 | $\$ 18,813$ | 14.0 | 12.4 | $\$ 11.01$ |
| Littleleaf linden | 303 | $\$ 6,142$ | 5.3 | 4.1 | $\$ 9.49$ |
| Norway maple | 462 | $\$ 9,375$ | 8.1 | 6.2 | $\$ 9.47$ |
| Red maple | 401 | $\$ 8,130$ | 7.1 | 5.4 | $\$ 9.42$ |
| Swamp white oak | 75 | $\$ 1,513$ | 1.6 | 1.0 | $\$ 7.68$ |
| Flowering crabapple | 588 | $\$ 11,918$ | 15.5 | 7.9 | $\$ 6.32$ |
| Freeman maple | 50 | $\$ 1,011$ | 1.5 | 0.7 | $\$ 5.68$ |
| Japanese tree lilac | 12 | $\$ 245$ | 1.7 | 0.2 | $\$ 1.21$ |
| Serviceberry | 14 | $\$ 290$ | 2.1 | 0.2 | $\$ 1.12$ |
| Other street trees | 928 | $\$ 18,809$ | 12.6 | 12.4 | $\$ 12.29$ |
| Citywide total | $\mathbf{7 , 4 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 1 , 1 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\$ 12.41$ |



Table 7. Stored CO2 Benefits of Westerville's Street Trees by Common Name and Ordered by Average Benefits per Tree

| Species | Total stored <br> CO2 (lbs) | Total (\$) | \% of <br> Total <br> Tree <br> Numbers | \% of <br> Total \$ | Avg. <br> \$/tree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Silver maple | $1,317,474$ | $\$ 9,881$ | 2.2 | 8.7 | $\$ 37.57$ |
| Sugar maple | $1,385,608$ | $\$ 10,392$ | 4.7 | 9.1 | $\$ 18.17$ |
| Northern red oak | 531,881 | $\$ 3,989$ | 2.4 | 3.5 | $\$ 13.71$ |
| Pears | $3,105,884$ | $\$ 23,294$ | 14.0 | 20.5 | $\$ 13.64$ |
| London planetree | 373,348 | $\$ 2,800$ | 1.8 | 2.5 | $\$ 12.84$ |
| Ashes | $1,653,560$ | $\$ 12,402$ | 9.2 | 10.9 | $\$ 11.08$ |
| Sweetgum | 430,976 | $\$ 3,232$ | 2.6 | 2.8 | $\$ 10.20$ |
| Honeylocust | $1,112,989$ | $\$ 8,347$ | 7.7 | 7.3 | $\$ 8.93$ |
| Flowering crabapple | $1,714,864$ | $\$ 12,861$ | 15.5 | 11.3 | $\$ 6.82$ |
| Littleleaf linden | 543,711 | $\$ 4,078$ | 5.3 | 3.6 | $\$ 6.30$ |
| Norway maple | 692,296 | $\$ 5,192$ | 8.1 | 4.6 | $\$ 5.24$ |
| Red maple | 561,105 | $\$ 4,208$ | 7.1 | 3.7 | $\$ 4.88$ |
| Swamp white oak | 105,731 | $\$ 793$ | 1.6 | 0.7 | $\$ 4.03$ |
| Freeman maple | 32,590 | $\$ 244$ | 1.5 | 0.2 | $\$ 1.37$ |
| Japanese tree lilac | 25,248 | $\$ 189$ | 1.7 | 0.2 | $\$ 0.94$ |
| Serviceberry | 27,275 | $\$ 205$ | 2.1 | 0.2 | $\$ 0.79$ |
| Other street trees | 701,768 | $\$ 11,604$ | 12.6 | 10.2 | $\$ 7.58$ |
| Westerville totals | $\mathbf{1 5 , 1 6 1 , 6 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 3 , 7 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\$ 9.34$ |



Table 8. Annual Energy Benefits of Westerville's Street Trees by Common Name and Ordered by (\$/tree)

| Species | Total <br> Electricity <br> (MWh) | Clectricity <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ | Total <br> Natural <br> Gas <br> (MBtu) | Natural <br> Gas (\$) | Total (\$) | \% of <br> Total <br> Tree <br> Numbers | \% <br> Total $\mathbf{\$}$ | Avg. <br> \$/tree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Silver maple | 47 | $\$ 3,571$ | 607 | $\$ 5,944$ | $\$ 9,516$ | 2.2 | 4.4 | $\$ 36.18$ |
| Honeylocust | 129 | $\$ 9,757$ | 1775 | $\$ 17,399$ | $\$ 27,156$ | 7.7 | 12.5 | $\$ 29.04$ |
| Pear | 179 | $\$ 13,559$ | 2655 | $\$ 26,014$ | $\$ 39,573$ | 14.0 | 18.2 | $\$ 23.17$ |
| Ash | 112 | $\$ 8,486$ | 1688 | $\$ 16,545$ | $\$ 25,030$ | 9.2 | 11.5 | $\$ 22.37$ |
| Sweetgum | 32 | $\$ 2,459$ | 421 | $\$ 4,128$ | $\$ 6,587$ | 2.6 | 3.0 | $\$ 20.78$ |
| Sugar maple | 56 | $\$ 4,284$ | 761 | $\$ 7,461$ | $\$ 11,745$ | 4.7 | 5.4 | $\$ 20.53$ |
| London planetree | 21 | $\$ 1,598$ | 289 | $\$ 2,831$ | $\$ 4,429$ | 1.8 | 2.0 | $\$ 20.31$ |
| Northern red oak | 25 | $\$ 1,915$ | 342 | $\$ 3,352$ | $\$ 5,266$ | 2.4 | 2.4 | $\$ 18.10$ |
| Flowering crabapple | 123 | $\$ 9,335$ | 1922 | $\$ 18,839$ | $\$ 28,174$ | 15.5 | 13.0 | $\$ 14.95$ |
| Norway maple | 64 | $\$ 4,859$ | 982 | $\$ 9,625$ | $\$ 14,484$ | 8.1 | 6.7 | $\$ 14.63$ |
| Red maple | 55 | $\$ 4,198$ | 798 | $\$ 7,824$ | $\$ 12,022$ | 7.1 | 5.5 | $\$ 13.93$ |
| Littleleaf linden | 40 | $\$ 3,037$ | 593 | $\$ 5,811$ | $\$ 8,849$ | 5.3 | 4.1 | $\$ 13.68$ |
| Swamp white oak | 11 | $\$ 807$ | 169 | $\$ 1,652$ | $\$ 2,459$ | 1.6 | 1.1 | $\$ 12.48$ |
| Freeman maple | 5 | $\$ 378$ | 72 | $\$ 709$ | $\$ 1,087$ | 1.5 | 0.5 | $\$ 6.11$ |
| Japanese tree lilac | 3 | $\$ 220$ | 50 | $\$ 495$ | $\$ 715$ | 1.7 | 0.3 | $\$ 3.54$ |
| Serviceberry | 4 | $\$ 270$ | 62 | $\$ 603$ | $\$ 873$ | 2.1 | 0.4 | $\$ 3.36$ |
| Other street trees | 91 | $\$ 6,877$ | 1246 | $\$ 12,211$ | $\$ 19,088$ | 12.6 | 8.8 | $\$ 12.47$ |
| Citywide total | $\mathbf{9 9 6}$ | $\$ 75,611$ | $\mathbf{1 4 4 3 3}$ | $\$ \mathbf{1 4 1 , 4 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 1 7 , 0 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\$ 17.83$ |



Table 9. Annual Carbon Dioxide Benefits of Westerville’s Street Trees by Species and Ordered by Average Benefits per Tree

| Species | Sequestered <br> $\mathbf{( l b )}$ | Sequestered <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ | Decomp <br> Release(lb) | Maintenance <br> Release $\mathbf{( l b )}$ | Total <br> Release <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ | Avoided <br> $\mathbf{( l b )}$ | Avoided <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ | Net Total <br> $\mathbf{( l b )}$ | Total <br> $\mathbf{( \$ )}$ | \% Total <br> Tree <br> Numbers | \% of <br> Total <br> $\mathbf{\$}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Avg. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ / t r e e}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

Table 10. Annual Air Quality Benefits of Westerville's Street Trees by Species and Ordered by Average Dollars per Tree

| Species | Deposit O3 (lb) | Deposit NO2 <br> (lb) | Deposit PM10 (lb) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deposit } \\ & \text { SO2 } \\ & \text { (lb) } \end{aligned}$ | Total Deposit (\$) | Avoided NO2 (lb) | Avoided PM10 <br> (lb) | Avoided <br> VOC (lb) | Avoided <br> SO2 (lb) | Total Avoided <br> (\$) | BVOC Emissio n (lb) | BVOC Emission (\$) | Net Total (lb) | Total (\$) | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Tre } \\ \text { e } \end{gathered}$ | Avg. \$/tree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Silver maple | 58.0 | 9.8 | 31.6 | 2.6 | \$321.48 | 220.8 | 32.4 | 31.0 | 213.1 | \$1,384.7 | -37.4 | -\$140.10 | 561.9 | \$1,566 | 2.2 | \$5.95 |
| Honeylocust | 88.5 | 14.6 | 48.7 | 4.0 | \$490.80 | 614.4 | 89.4 | 85.2 | 582.5 | \$3,825.5 | -52.2 | -\$195.59 | 1475.1 | \$4,121 | 7.7 | \$4.41 |
| Pear | 196.5 | 32.4 | 95.0 | 8.9 | \$1,053 | 871.5 | 125.5 | 119.4 | 809.7 | \$5,382.8 | -1.1 | -\$3.96 | 2257.8 | \$6,432 | 14.0 | \$3.77 |
| Ash | 92.0 | 15.9 | 53.2 | 4.1 | \$519.91 | 549.0 | 78.9 | 75.0 | 507.6 | \$3,384.3 | -26.2 | -\$98.43 | 1349.3 | \$3,806 | 9.2 | \$3.40 |
| Sweetgum | 11.6 | 1.9 | 8.2 | 0.5 | \$69.40 | 152.5 | 22.4 | 21.4 | 146.8 | \$955.43 | 0.0 | \$0.00 | 365.3 | \$1,025 | 2.6 | \$3.23 |
| Sugar maple | 47.1 | 8.0 | 26.5 | 2.1 | \$263.95 | 267.9 | 39.1 | 37.3 | 255.6 | \$1,672 | -39.5 | -\$147.99 | 644.4 | \$1,789 | 4.7 | \$3.13 |
| London planetree | 9.5 | 1.6 | 6.2 | 0.4 | \$55.59 | 100.8 | 14.7 | 14.0 | 95.6 | \$627.63 | -10.5 | -\$39.48 | 232.2 | \$644 | 1.8 | \$2.95 |
| Northern red oak | 28.6 | 4.9 | 15.2 | 1.3 | \$157.77 | 119.9 | 17.5 | 16.7 | 114.3 | \$748.12 | -40.3 | -\$151.18 | 278.0 | \$755 | 2.4 | \$2.59 |
| Flowering crabapple | - 99.6 | 16.4 | 51.8 | 4.5 | \$544.13 | 608.3 | 87.0 | 82.6 | 557.4 | \$3,737 | -0.6 | -\$2.13 | 1507.1 | \$4,279 | 15.5 | \$2.27 |
| Norway maple | 35.6 | 6.1 | 23.2 | 1.6 | \$208.75 | 315.8 | 45.3 | 43.0 | 290.7 | \$1,943 | -11.6 | -\$43.48 | 749.8 | \$2,109 | 8.1 | \$2.13 |
| Red maple | 40.0 | 6.8 | 23.3 | 1.8 | \$226.27 | 267.0 | 38.6 | 36.8 | 250.5 | \$1,655. | -16.5 | -\$61.86 | 648.3 | \$1,820 | 7.1 | \$2.11 |
| Littleleaf linden | 19.9 | 3.4 | 13.4 | 0.9 | \$117.91 | 195.4 | 28.2 | 26.8 | 181.7 | \$1,207 | -12.7 | -\$47.63 | 457.0 | \$1,278 | 5.3 | \$1.97 |
| Swamp white oak | 5.1 | 0.9 | 3.6 | 0.2 | \$30.59 | 52.9 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 48.3 | \$324.76 | -1.8 | -\$6.68 | 124.0 | \$349 | 1.6 | \$1.77 |
| Freeman maple | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | \$6.03 | 24.0 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 22.6 | \$149.05 | -2.5 | -\$9.54 | 52.8 | \$146 | 1.5 | \$0.82 |
| Japanese tree lilac | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | \$5.12 | 14.8 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 13.1 | \$89.78 | 0.0 | -\$0.03 | 33.6 | \$95 | 1.7 | \$0.47 |
| Serviceberry | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | \$4.31 | 18.1 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 16.1 | \$109.81 | 0.0 | -\$0.03 | 40.5 | \$114 | 2.1 | \$0.44 |
| Other street trees | 79.5 | 14.1 | 52.8 | 5.4 | \$473.38 | 432.6 | 63.0 | 60.1 | 410.6 | \$2,694 | -105.3 | -\$394.95 | 1012.6 | \$2,773 | 12.6 | \$1.81 |
| Citywide total | 813.8 | 137.2 | 455.1 | 38.4 | \$4,548 | 4825.7 | 697.7 | 664.0 | 4516.2 | \$29,892 | -358.1 | -\$1,343 | 11789.9 | \$33,097 | 100. | \$2.72 |

Table 11. Annual Aesthetic or Other Benefits of Westerville's Street Trees by Common Name and Ordered by Benefit per Tree

| Species | \% Total <br> Tree <br> Numbers | \% Total <br> $\mathbf{\$}$ | Total (\$) | Avg. <br> \$/tree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Silver maple | 2.2 | 6.9 | $\$ 14,205$ | $\$ 54.01$ |
| Honeylocust | 7.7 | 18.5 | $\$ 37,734$ | $\$ 40.36$ |
| Sweetgum | 2.6 | 4.3 | $\$ 8,694$ | $\$ 27.43$ |
| Littleleaf linden | 5.3 | 7.3 | $\$ 14,913$ | $\$ 23.05$ |
| Ashes | 9.2 | 12.1 | $\$ 24,778$ | $\$ 22.14$ |
| Sugar maple | 4.7 | 5.8 | $\$ 11,935$ | $\$ 20.86$ |
| Freeman maple | 1.5 | 1.6 | $\$ 3,267$ | $\$ 18.35$ |
| Norway maple | 8.1 | 8.0 | $\$ 16,419$ | $\$ 16.59$ |
| Red maple | 7.1 | 6.6 | $\$ 13,567$ | $\$ 15.72$ |
| Swamp white oak | 1.6 | 1.5 | $\$ 2,954$ | $\$ 14.99$ |
| London planetree | 1.8 | 1.5 | $\$ 3,152$ | $\$ 14.46$ |
| Northern red oak | 2.4 | 1.7 | $\$ 3,481$ | $\$ 11.96$ |
| Pears | 14.0 | 8.1 | $\$ 16,526$ | $\$ 9.68$ |
| Flowering crabapple | 15.5 | 5.2 | $\$ 10,661$ | $\$ 5.66$ |
| Japanese tree lilac | 1.7 | 0.1 | $\$ 233$ | $\$ 1.15$ |
| Serviceberry | 2.1 | 0.2 | $\$ 297$ | $\$ 1.14$ |
| Other street trees | 12.6 | 10.5 | $\$ 21,549$ | $\$ 14.08$ |
| Citywide total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\$ 204,364$ | $\$ 16.78$ |



Table 12. Totals for Five Benefit Categories and Grand Total for Westerville's Street Tree Benefits


| Benefits | Total (\$) | \$/tree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Energy | $\$ 217,053$ | $\$ 17.83$ |
| Aesthetic/Other | $\$ 204,364$ | $\$ 16.78$ |
| Stormwater | $\$ 151,134$ | $\$ 12.41$ |
| Air Quality | $\$ 33,097$ | $\$ 2.72$ |
| CO2 Stored | $\$ 25,434$ | $\$ 2.09$ |
| Total Benefits | $\$ 631,082$ | $\$ 51.83$ |

