The results of this survey, conducted between May 27, 2021 and June 21, 2021, are not weighted to the City of Surrey’s population.

The results are based on 2,053 survey responses (complete & partial responses).
Background

The City of Surrey is preparing a citywide Urban Forest Management Strategy to provide a clear direction for the future management of urban forest in Surrey.

Feedback gathered from the survey will help City staff understand what role you want the City to play in maintaining and improving our urban forest.

These results are based on 2,053 responses received from two online surveys: CitySpeaks Panel Survey: 1,137 responses from May 27, 2021 to June 21, 2021 Open Community Survey: 916 responses from May 27, 2021 to June 21, 2021
Profile of Survey Participants (#1)

97% of survey participants live in Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrey Community</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unsure which Surrey Community I live in</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other City of Residence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Rock</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coquitlam</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile of Survey Participants (#2)

Demographics are provided as background on the composition of survey respondents. Please note these results are not weighted to the City of Surrey’s population.

Age Range
- 19 or younger: 1%
- 20 to 29 years: 4%
- 30 to 39 years: 11%
- 40 to 49 years: 13%
- 50 to 59 years: 17%
- 60 to 64 years: 13%
- 65 or greater: 37%
- Prefer not to answer: 4%

Gender
- Female: 56%
- Male: 39%
- Do not identify within the gender binary: 1%
- Prefer not to answer: 4%
Profile of Survey Participants (#3)

Ethnicity/Cultural Origins

- British Isles: 52%
- Other European: 33%
- Other North American: 13%
- South Asian: 7%
- French: 7%
- Indigenous: 4%
- Chinese: 3%
- Other East and Southeast Asian: 3%
- Other: 12%
- Prefer not to answer: 5%

Language Spoken Most Often at Home

- English: 90%
- Punjabi: 3%
- Hindi: 1%
- Mandarin: 1%
- Other: 3%
- Prefer not to answer: 3%
Profile of Survey Participants (#4)

Years Living in Surrey

- More than 20 years: 62%
- 15 to less than 20 years: 10%
- 10 to less than 15 years: 12%
- 5 to less than 10 years: 9%
- 1 to less than 5 years: 6%
- Less than 1 year: 1%
Connection to Surrey

Q: How are you connected to Surrey? Select all that apply.
Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.
Total participants: 2051/36

- I live in Surrey: 93%
- I work in Surrey: 23%
- I visit Surrey for various reasons: 6%
- I go to school in Surrey: 2%
- Other: 2%

Other connections to Surrey include:
- Lived or worked in Surrey in the past
- Own rental property
- Volunteer
- Community activist.
Q: What best describes where you live?
Total participants: 2053

- Residential: 92%
- Agricultural/rural: 2%
- Mixed use - commercial/residential: 6%
Q: What best describes the home where you live?
Total participants: 2053

- Single detached house: 65%
- Row house (e.g. townhouse): 17%
- Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys: 10%
- Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys: 3%
- Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.): 3%
- Apartment or flat in a duplex: 1%
- Movable dwelling (e.g. mobile home): 0%
Tenure

Q: Do you rent or own your home?
Total participants: 2053

- Own: 86%
- Rent: 10%
- Neither - Live with family/friends: 4%
- Co-Op: 0%
- Other: 0%
Number of trees on the property where you live

Q: What best describes the number of trees on the property where you live?
Total participants: 2052

- 1-3 trees: 22%
- 4-6 trees: 19%
- 7 or more trees: 56%
- No trees: 3%
Trees in the immediate neighbourhood where you live

- In commercial areas
- Along roads
- In parks (playground and open spaces)
- In parking lots
- On multi-unit residential properties
- In natural areas (forest)
- On private single-family lots
**Trees in the immediate neighbourhood where you live**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On private single-family lots</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In parks (playground and open spaces)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along roads</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In natural areas (forest)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On multi-unit residential properties</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In commercial areas</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In parking lots</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other locations mentioned include:
- Along greenways/ biking paths
- Along boulevards
- Strata complexes
- Complex courtyards
- In riparian zones
- Golf courses
- Agricultural properties.

Q: Where are trees located in the immediate neighbourhood where you live? Select all that apply.  
*Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.*

Total participants: 2053/39
Satisfaction with number of trees in neighbourhood

Q: How satisfied are you with the number of trees in your neighbourhood?
Total participants: 2041. Excludes No Opinion 12 (1%).

- Very satisfied: 26%
- Satisfied: 35%
- Neutral: 10%
- Unsatisfied: 20%
- Very unsatisfied: 9%
## Satisfaction with number of trees in neighbourhood (#1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Satisfied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Plenty of trees surrounding homes, neighbourhoods, city roads and parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good variety of trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trees provide shade, privacy and noise reduction barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bring beauty and tranquility to area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Older homes where mature trees are well-spaced and in-scale with surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Natural ecosystem and haven for wildlife and birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There could always be more trees especially along streets, roads and in parks for nature, beauty and shade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As new houses are built, developers are allowed to remove too many mature trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Want to see owners of new homes replace and care for the trees they remove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adjacent properties have neglected trees until they have become unhealthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Natural areas seem to have appropriate mix of deciduous and coniferous trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trees are providing nesting area for birds and good shade during in summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There can and should always be more especially on streets and in parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A large number of older trees have been cut down to develop new single-family homes and replant rules are not always followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some species are perceived negatively e.g., trees are dirty, surface roots cause significant damage to driveways etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many trees are not cared for or well-maintained by homeowners or the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many older/larger trees overhang the sidewalks which can pose safety risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trees debris can be a nuisance e.g., blocking sun, leaves/needles can block gutters/drainage leading to flooding etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: How satisfied are you with the number of trees in your neighbourhood?

Q: Please tell us why.

Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.

Total participants: 1193
### Satisfaction with number of trees in neighbourhood (#2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsatisfied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many would like to see more trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are too many trees being cut down, Surrey needs to restore its tree canopy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too many trees are being cut down for new developments, bigger homes and residential parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commercial spaces lack trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Often large trees are removed and replaced with saplings that will take years to reach the size of the ones removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents have paved entire yards to make parking for (illegal) secondary suites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More greenery is required for beautification and to provide wildlife habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some species in parks and park corridors are not appropriate for the location and don’t survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many trees were planted on small lots too close to homes and have had to be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very unsatisfied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trees are constantly being cut down for new developments and large homes and new trees are not planted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many residential trees are wrongly grafted, then die and are eventually removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents remove trees without permits and pave back/front yards, leaving no greenspace or permeable surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many trees pose risks to property causing damage to yards, driveways and water/sewer systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many trees pose risks to property during storms and heavy rains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many mature trees are threatened by invasive ivy and other species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restrictive City tree bylaws leave some residents feeling that they can't manage their own property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mature trees on private lots are being cut at an excessive rate to provide a &quot;view&quot; for residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a need for more shade and non-shade trees – a better mix of deciduous and coniferous trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There needs to be more significant consequences for developers/ homeowners who cut down trees illegally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: How satisfied are you with the number of trees in your neighbourhood?  
Q: Please tell us why.  
*Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.*  
Total participants: 1193
Q: Before today did you know what an urban forest was?

Total participants: 1993

Yes: 55%
Somewhat: 32%
No: 13%
Urban forest and tree canopy

The urban forest consists of all the trees within the City of Surrey - on private and public land. The urban forest includes trees in parks, natural forests, along roads, and on residential, commercial, institutional and industrial properties.

The tree canopy is the branches, stems, and leaves of trees that cover the ground when viewed from above. Many communities measure the tree canopy to determine the extent and distribution of the urban forest and how it is changing over time.
Importance of measuring and tracking Surrey’s tree canopy

Q: How important is measuring and tracking Surrey’s tree canopy to you?

- Important: 68%
- Somewhat Important: 21%
- Less Important: 4%
- Not Important: 3%
- I don’t know | No opinion: 3%

Total participants: 1993
## Importance of benefits provided by the urban forest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves air quality</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides habitat for birds and other wildlife</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides health benefits</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides access to nature within the City</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces soil erosion</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves water quality</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces flooding by absorbing rainwater</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides shading from sun</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves appearance of property or neighbourhood</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides cooling in warm weather</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases property value</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: How important to you are the following benefits provided by the urban forest?
Total participants: 1998
Other important benefits of the urban forest

Other benefits of urban forests mentioned include:

- Beautification of areas, aesthetically pleasing and add to the character of neighbourhoods.
- Improving physical health and wellbeing (e.g., recreational activities).
- Improving mental health and wellbeing (e.g., provide a sense of calm and connectedness to nature).
- Act as a sound barrier for traffic, residential areas etc.
- Provide privacy around residential properties, especially in densely populated areas.
- Enhance soil health and micro-flora diversity.
- Urban forests help to combat some of the effects of pollution, greenhouse gases, urban heat and global climate change.

Q: Are there other benefits that are important to you?

Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.
Total participants: 605
**Level of concern about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unconcerned</th>
<th>Very Unconcerned</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private property development</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public property development</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City infrastructure (e.g. roads)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive species</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public recreational use</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: How concerned are you about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest from:

Total participants: 1978
Other potential impacts of concern

Many survey participants reiterated their opposition to/concern with the extent of the residential, commercial and industrial development currently happening in Surrey as well as the planned 84 Avenue extension through Bear Creek Park.

Other concerns for the urban forest include:

- The lack of effective bylaw enforcement for proper tree removal and replacement by homeowners and developers
- The need to ensure that new trees are planted to offset those removed
- The choices of new/replacement trees - some species are more beneficial or more appropriate to certain locations than others.
- Illegal dumping
- Human and pet incursions
- Homeless encampments
- Shrinking wildlife habitats and corridors are forcing coyotes, bears and other animals to roam through residential neighbourhoods, which poses a risk to the wildlife as well as humans.
- Risk of rainwater flooding storm sewers or not being absorbed into the ground due to more impermeable surfaces.
- The lack of restrictions for agricultural land in terms of retaining trees and hedgerows for wildlife, preventing soil erosion etc.
- Increased risk of air and water pollution
- Increased traffic pollution
- As trees continue to be cleared or poorly maintained, neighbourhoods lose their charm and character.

Q: Are there other potential impacts that you are concerned about?  
Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.  
Total participants: 523
Challenges/Concerns experienced due to neighbourhood trees

Q: Which of the following (if any) challenges or concerns have you experienced due to trees in your neighbourhood? Select all that apply.

- Roots cracking sidewalks or roads: 42%
- Removing leaves from building gutters: 39%
- Cleaning up leaves, branches, or other tree parts: 37%
- Damage from falling branches or trees: 29%
- Causing moss growth on building: 20%
- Needing to water trees: 14%
- Attracting insects and pests: 13%
- Blocking views: 11%
- Creating too much shade: 11%
- Risk of forest fire: 8%
- Reducing space to build on property: 6%
- Other: 7%

I have not experienced any challenges or concerns: 31%

Other challenges/concerns include:
- Damage from roots to driveway, sidewalks, house foundations etc.
- Damage from roots to water and sewer lines
- Pollen and allergies
- Risk of damage to home/other buildings/neighbouring homes
- Sticky and hard to remove sap from some tree species
- Unhealthy diseased trees on property/neighbour’s property
- Raccoons/ critters living in trees
- Species planted are not always suitable for a particular location
- Restrictive City bylaws related to problem tree removals
- The permission and expense of removing problem trees

Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.

Total participants: 1960
### Seriousness of challenges

**Q: How serious are these challenges to you?**  
Total participants: 124-812

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Very Serious</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Somewhat Serious</th>
<th>Not Serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk of forest fire</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential damage from falling branches or trees</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing space to build on property</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots cracking sidewalks or roads</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting insects and pests</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating too much shade</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing moss growth on building</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing leaves from building gutters</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking views</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning up leaves, branches, or other tree parts</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needing to water trees</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other challenges caused by neighbourhood trees

Many survey participants believe that cleaning up tree branches and leaves, having to water trees etc. are a small price to pay for the many benefits that trees give them.

Some of the frequently mentioned challenges include:

- Damage from tree roots to driveways, sidewalks, house foundations, water and sewer systems.
- The lack of effective regulations, enforcement and penalties to ensure homeowners and developers meet their tree removal and replacement obligations.
- Lack of timely maintenance, pruning, watering etc. by the City and private property owners.
- Seasonal allergies
- Tree-related issues can cause friction between neighbours (e.g., lack of pruning, young trees being planted too close to property fences and then intruding onto a neighbour’s yard, removing trees that provided shade etc.
- Overhanging tree branches can pose a danger to pedestrians walking on sidewalks, cyclists on bike paths etc.
- Poor tree maintenance can impact road safety e.g., visibility of road signs, unobstructed views while driving etc.
- Power outages caused by trees or branches falling on wires during windstorms.
- Challenges of obtaining a City permit for tree removal, cost of professional tree removal etc.
- Species planted are not always suitable for particular locations.
Importance of having healthy trees

Q: How important is it to you to have healthy trees in the following locations?

Total participants: 1938

- In natural areas (forest): 90% Very Important, 6% Important, 1% Neutral, 1% Unimportant, 0% Very Unimportant, 0% No Opinion
- In parks (playground and open spaces): 86% Very Important, 11% Important, 1% Neutral, 3% Unimportant, 0% Very Unimportant, 0% No Opinion
- On multi-unit residential properties: 62% Very Important, 28% Important, 7% Neutral, 3% Unimportant, 0% Very Unimportant, 0% No Opinion
- On private single family lots: 57% Very Important, 28% Important, 10% Neutral, 2% Unimportant, 0% Very Unimportant, 0% No Opinion
- Along roads: 55% Very Important, 33% Important, 8% Neutral, 3% Unimportant, 0% Very Unimportant, 0% No Opinion
- In commercial areas: 47% Very Important, 36% Important, 12% Neutral, 2% Unimportant, 0% Very Unimportant, 0% No Opinion
- In parking lots: 39% Very Important, 32% Important, 21% Neutral, 3% Unimportant, 0% Very Unimportant, 0% No Opinion

Q: How important is it to you to have healthy trees in the following locations?

Total participants: 1938
Other locations where it is important to have healthy trees

A sizeable number of survey participants said that it is important to have healthy trees everywhere.

Other locations mentioned include:

• City buildings, properties, community centres, libraries, etc.
• Schools and campuses
• Near hospitals and care homes
• Parks, walking trails, golf courses and other recreational areas
• By lakes, rivers, creeks and riparian areas
• Steep slopes and windy areas
• Along waterfronts and waterways
• On agricultural land
• In industrial areas
• In dense housing areas and new subdivisions
• On the rooftops of new residential and commercial buildings
• Along transit lines and near bus stops
• As sound barriers between residential areas and busy roads/highways and in front of existing sound walls.

Q: Where else is it important to have healthy trees in Surrey?

Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.

Total participants: 504
Q: Were you aware of the Tree Voucher Program?

Q: Is the Tree Voucher Program something you would be interested in if it were available to you?

Total participants: 1149 ( Those living in a Single detached house or Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.))
Q: Were you aware of the Tree Sale Program?
Q: Is the tree sale program something you would be interested in if it were available to you?
Total participants: 1149 (Those living in a Single detached house or Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.))
Q: Are you interested in supporting the urban forest in any of the following ways?

Total participants: 1144 (Those living in a Single detached house or Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.))

- Planting trees on my property
  - Yes: 39%
  - Somewhat: 25%
  - No: 36%

- Watering trees on my property
  - Yes: 70%
  - Somewhat: 15%
  - No: 15%
Barriers to planting trees on property

Q: What barriers do you face related to planting trees on your property? Select all that apply.

Total participants: 1144 (Those living in a Single detached house or Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.))

- Lack of space: 48%
- Shade i.e. I already have too much shade or I don’t want it: 15%
- Cost to purchase and maintain: 14%
- Maintenance i.e. I cannot maintain or don’t want to maintain them: 11%
- I need assistance to plant trees: 9%
- Allergies i.e. may cause or worsen allergies: 8%
- I am not interested in planting trees: 6%
- Views i.e. I don’t want to lose the view: 4%
- I don’t have time to do this: 3%
- Other: 16%
- I don’t have any barriers: 18%
Barriers to planting trees on property

Other barriers mentioned include:

- Already have lots of trees on the property
- No space for more trees
- Live in a strata/strata restrictions
- Trees can interfere with drainage on the property
- Negative feedback from neighbors about the existing trees
- Cost of watering trees can be a financial burden for some
- Too many leaves/tree debris to clean up
- Avoiding gas lines, sewer lines, destruction of driveway or sidewalk from root growth
- Plans to move from property.

Q: What barriers do you face related to planting trees on your property? Select all that apply.

Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.

Total participants: 179 (Those living in a Single detached house or Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.))
Importance of ways City can manage the urban forest

Q: The following are some additional ways the City could manage the urban forest. Please rate the importance of each to you:

Total participants: 1909

- Retain more existing trees on sites to be developed: 68% Very Important, 18% Important, 8% Neutral, 2% Unimportant, 2% Very Unimportant, 2% No Opinion
- Improve success and health of trees on new development projects: 63% Very Important, 27% Important, 5% Neutral, 2% Unimportant, 1% Very Unimportant, 3% No Opinion
- Plant more trees in parks: 59% Very Important, 29% Important, 8% Neutral, 2% Unimportant, 1% Very Unimportant, 3% No Opinion
- Provide more and better information to the public on tree benefits and care: 46% Very Important, 34% Important, 13% Neutral, 2% Unimportant, 3% Very Unimportant, 2% No Opinion
- Provide incentives for property owners to plant more trees: 45% Very Important, 30% Important, 15% Neutral, 3% Unimportant, 1% Very Unimportant, 2% No Opinion
- Plant more trees along roads: 43% Very Important, 36% Important, 15% Neutral, 2% Unimportant, 3% Very Unimportant, 2% No Opinion
- Provide more opportunities for residents to get involved in urban forest stewardship: 35% Very Important, 38% Important, 20% Neutral, 3% Unimportant, 4% Very Unimportant, 2% No Opinion
Ideas/suggestions to further support residents to plant and care for trees on private property (#1)

Education
• Educate residents on the benefits of trees, tree species, guidelines on tree planting and maintenance, invasive species etc.
• Develop the tree voucher and sale programs further to raise awareness of tree maintenance best practices, tree species etc.
• More and better information needs to be in multiple languages and directed at cultural values to be effective.
• Communicate with new residents/homeowners e.g., include information packs with garbage schedules, tax notices, utility bills etc.
• Involve local schools and students in education programs and tree maintenance activities.
• Organize information workshops, volunteer events and expert-led walks in local parks.

Financial Support
• Offer free or low-cost tree sales.
• Offer financial support such as grants, rebates, property tax write-offs/credits etc. to encourage more tree planting and maintenance on private property.
• Lower water usage rates for properties with well maintained trees/gardens.
• Incentivize residents to keep and maintain trees by granting carbon credits - these could be applied to property taxes or, in cooperation with BC Hydro, on utilities bills.
• Arborist care is expensive; offer reduced rates for homeowners.

Q: Do you have any ideas or suggestions on how we can further support residents to plant and care for trees on private property?
Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.
Total participants: 715
Ideas/suggestions to further support residents to plant and care for trees on private property (#2)

Tree Management
• Encourage planting of smaller trees more suited to the lot size.
• Plant and promote trees that are known to pose less root damage to sidewalks, driveways, property etc.
• Plant more trees and more native species in parks.
• Introduce tree health assessments for trees on private properties for a nominal fee.
• Require stratas to maintain and care for trees properly.

Enforcement
• Ensure stricter enforcement of fines and penalties for those who illegally remove trees.
• Restrict the number of trees that can be removed/cleared from private development lots.
• Apply tighter controls to ensure new/replacement trees are planted as specified during the development.
• Conduct tree inspections on new build properties after a year to verify that new trees are still in place as required.
• The City should be more flexible when assessing and approving applications for tree removal, especially for overgrown trees that pose safety risks to residents and property.
• Some survey participants believe that single family property owners should be able to decide the number of trees and add or remove trees without permission from the City, to better manage their property.

Q: Do you have any ideas or suggestions on how we can further support residents to plant and care for trees on private property?
Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.
Total participants: 715
Q: Are you interested in supporting the urban forest on public property in any of the following ways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watering trees near roads or on other public land</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in stewardship activities e.g., invasive species removal, planting trees</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in citizen science projects e.g., collecting information on trees</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total participants: 1896
Other suggestions for managing the urban forest in Surrey

Education
- Make tree stewardship part of the school curriculum and involve local schools in tree management activities.
- Create more campaigns and programs to educate the general public on the benefits of trees, tree management best practices etc.
- Post education markers along trailheads promoting the benefits of trees, how to protect etc.

Community Involvement
- Promote neighborhood tree planting events and activities, involve students from local schools, guides/scouts and seniors.
- Organize block party clean-ups of ivy and other invasive weeds.
- Encourage the farming community to include tree planting and stewardship on agricultural lands.
- Post more signage at park entrances to encourage involvement in tree planting/management activities.
- Consider establishing a NeighbourWoods program (refer to Kelowna’s residential planting initiative to encourage citizens to help grow and preserve Kelowna's urban forest).
- Develop a database/registry of significant trees i.e., historical or older trees, eagle nesting trees etc. and ensure they are protected.

Enforcement
- Ensure stricter enforcement of City tree bylaws and impose fines for non-compliance or infractions.
- Be more flexible in allowing removal of very large/dangerous trees on private property.
- Discourage illegal dumping and provide more litter bins in public areas.

Q: Do you have any other suggestions for managing the urban forest in Surrey?
Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.
Total participants: 452
Other suggestions for managing the urban forest in Surrey

**Development**
- Restrict the amount of residential/commercial development in Surrey.
- Restrict development through local parks and urban forests.
- Place greater restrictions on developers in terms of removing trees, clearing lots, replanting trees etc.
- Implement stricter and more significant fines to deter developers from removing healthy trees unnecessarily.
- Ensure that developers plant appropriate tree and plant species in appropriate places.
- Provide incentives for developers to create living roofs on residential and commercial buildings.

**Homeowners**
- Provide incentives for private tree owners to preserve and maintain mature trees as these trees provide City benefits.
- Make property owner responsible for watering City trees on their property.
- The City should re-imburse those households with a metered water supply for the cost of watering trees on public land.

**Tree Management**
- Prune City trees and replace those that have grown too large with smaller varieties.
- Plant new trees in suitable places e.g., smaller trees on sidewalks to avoid having to cut them back later.
- Plant native species - more evergreens, cedar, pine etc. to lower maintenance costs. Plant more fruit and nut trees.
- Remove invasive species.
- Remove dead brush from natural parks to reduce forest fire risk.
- Well maintained walking trails help reduce damage caused by shortcutting.
- Consider introducing a ‘Tree-bate’ - a rebate for every mature well-maintained tree on private property.

Q: Do you have any other suggestions for managing the urban forest in Surrey?

*Please refer to the Verbatims file to read all the comments submitted for this question.*

Total participants: 452
Interest in future engagement opportunities

Q: Are you interested in hearing about future engagement opportunities on this topic?
Total participants: 1882

Yes 62%
No 38%
Appendix
Land use type by Type of home

- **Residential**
  - Movable dwelling (e.g. mobile home): 3%
  - Apartment or flat in a duplex: 17%
  - Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.): 68%
  - Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys: 84%
  - Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys: 35%
  - Row house (e.g. townhouse): 22%
  - Single detached house: 25%

- **Agricultural/rural**
  - Movable dwelling (e.g. mobile home): 2%
  - Apartment or flat in a duplex: 8%
  - Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.): 3%
  - Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys: 3%
  - Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys: 1%
  - Row house (e.g. townhouse): 3%
  - Single detached house: 3%

- **Mixed use**
  - Movable dwelling (e.g. mobile home): 9%
  - Apartment or flat in a duplex: 16%
  - Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.): 3%
  - Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys: 22%
  - Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys: 35%
  - Row house (e.g. townhouse): 10%
  - Single detached house: 65%

- **Overall**
  - Movable dwelling (e.g. mobile home): 3%
  - Apartment or flat in a duplex: 17%
  - Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.): 35%
  - Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys: 65%
  - Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys: 3%
  - Row house (e.g. townhouse): 3%
  - Single detached house: 10%
Land use type by Tenure

- Residential: 87%
- Agricultural/rural: 79%
- Mixed use: 70%
- Overall: 86%

- Other: 4%
- Co-op: 8%
- Neither - Live with family/friends: 2%
- Rent: 13%
- Own: 25%
- 4%

City of Surrey
Surrey Community by Land use type

- City Centre: 28% Residential, 72% Overall
- Cloverdale: 4% Agricultural/rural, 93% Residential, 3% Overall
- Fleetwood: 1% Agricultural/rural, 96% Residential, 2% Overall
- Guildford: 9% Agricultural/rural, 91% Residential, 5% Overall
- Newton: 5% Agricultural/rural, 94% Residential, 5% Overall
- South Surrey: 2% Agricultural/rural, 93% Residential, 8% Overall
- Whalley: 13% Agricultural/rural, 92% Residential, 2% Overall
- Other: 2% Agricultural/rural, 86% Residential, 6% Overall
- Overall: 6% Agricultural/rural, 92% Residential, 2% Overall
Surrey Community by Type of home

- Movable dwelling (e.g. mobile home)
- Apartment or flat in a duplex
- Semi-detached house (e.g. duplex, triplex etc.)
- Apartment in a building that has five or more storeys
- Apartment in a building that has fewer than five storeys
- Row house (e.g. townhouse)
- Single detached house

### City Centre
- Movable dwelling: 3%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 33%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 13%
- Row house: 21%
- Single detached house: 30%

### Cloverdale
- Movable dwelling: 4%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 15%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 74%
- Row house: 7%
- Single detached house: 6%

### Fleetwood
- Movable dwelling: 1%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 23%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 79%
- Row house: 13%
- Single detached house: 58%

### Guildford
- Movable dwelling: 1%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 9%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 22%
- Row house: 65%
- Single detached house: 65%

### Newton
- Movable dwelling: 5%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 8%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 20%
- Row house: 65%
- Single detached house: 65%

### South Surrey
- Movable dwelling: 2%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 17%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 6%
- Row house: 69%
- Single detached house: 65%

### Whalley
- Movable dwelling: 2%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 20%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 17%
- Row house: 65%
- Single detached house: 65%

### Other
- Movable dwelling: 3%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 6%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 20%
- Row house: 17%
- Single detached house: 10%

### Overall
- Movable dwelling: 3%
- Apartment in a building with five or more storeys: 10%
- Apartment in a building with fewer than five storeys: 17%
- Row house: 65%
- Single detached house: 65%
Number of trees on the property where you live by
Satisfaction with number of trees in neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Trees</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 trees</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 trees</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more trees</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trees</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Surrey Community by Satisfaction with number of trees in neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding of urban forest by
Importance of measuring and tracking Surrey’s tree canopy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by
Importance of measuring and tracking Surrey’s tree canopy

City Centre: 84% Important, 9% Somewhat Important, 5% Less Important, 1% Not Important, 1% I don’t know | No opinion
Cloverdale: 61% Important, 25% Somewhat Important, 6% Less Important, 6% Not Important, 2% I don’t know | No opinion
Fleetwood: 68% Important, 23% Somewhat Important, 4% Less Important, 2% Not Important, 3% I don’t know | No opinion
Guildford: 64% Important, 23% Somewhat Important, 6% Less Important, 3% Not Important, 3% I don’t know | No opinion
Newton: 66% Important, 23% Somewhat Important, 5% Less Important, 3% Not Important, 3% I don’t know | No opinion
South Surrey: 70% Important, 21% Somewhat Important, 3% Less Important, 4% Not Important, 2% I don’t know | No opinion
Whalley: 72% Important, 16% Somewhat Important, 5% Less Important, 2% Not Important, 5% I don’t know | No opinion
Other: 75% Important, 17% Somewhat Important, 2% Less Important, 6% Not Important, 3% I don’t know | No opinion
Overall: 68% Important, 21% Somewhat Important, 4% Less Important, 3% Not Important, 3% I don’t know | No opinion
Surrey Community by Level of concern about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest – Climate change

City Centre: 58% No Opinion, 45% Concerned, 4% Very Concerned, 3% Very Unconcerned, 7% Unconcerned
Cloverdale: 45% No Opinion, 44% Concerned, 2% Very Concerned, 5% Very Unconcerned, 11% Unconcerned
Fleetwood: 58% No Opinion, 45% Concerned, 4% Very Concerned, 3% Very Unconcerned, 7% Unconcerned
Guildford: 49% No Opinion, 47% Concerned, 4% Very Concerned, 5% Very Unconcerned, 3% Unconcerned
Newton: 51% No Opinion, 47% Concerned, 4% Very Concerned, 3% Very Unconcerned, 3% Unconcerned
South Surrey: 61% No Opinion, 45% Concerned, 3% Very Concerned, 4% Very Unconcerned, 5% Unconcerned
Whalley: 30% No Opinion, 30% Concerned, 5% Very Concerned, 4% Very Unconcerned, 11% Unconcerned
Other: 30% No Opinion, 30% Concerned, 6% Very Concerned, 4% Very Unconcerned, 5% Unconcerned
Overall: 47% No Opinion, 49% Concerned, 4% Very Concerned, 3% Very Unconcerned, 3% Unconcerned
Surrey Community by Level of concern about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest – Private property development

- No Opinion
- Very Unconcerned
- Unconcerned
- Neutral
- Concerned
- Very Concerned

City Centre: 61%
Cloverdale: 65%
Fleetwood: 65%
Guildford: 67%
Newton: 61%
South Surrey: 67%
Whalley: 66%
Other: 67%
Overall: 64%
Surrey Community by Level of concern about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest – Public property development

- City Centre
- Cloverdale
- Fleetwood
- Guildford
- Newton
- South Surrey
- Whalley
- Other
- Overall

No Opinion
Very Unconcerned
Unconcerned
Neutral
Concerned
Very Concerned
Surrey Community by Level of concern about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest – Public recreational use

City Centre  Cloverdale  Fleetwood  Guildford  Newton  South Surrey  Whalley  Other  Overall

No Opinion  Very Unconcerned  Unconcerned  Neutral  Concerned  Very Concerned

3%  3%  6%  5%  4%  3%  6%  3%  5%  3%  3%  3%  6%  4%  3%  2%  4%  2%  6%  2%  4%  4%  2%  3%  3%  4%  2%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%  4%  3%  3%  3%
Surrey Community by Level of concern about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest – Invasive species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Very Unconcerned</th>
<th>Unconcerned</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Very Concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by Level of concern about the potential negative impacts to the urban forest – City infrastructure (e.g. roads)

City Centre: 45%
Cloverdale: 49%
Fleetwood: 54%
Guildford: 49%
Newton: 53%
South Surrey: 50%
Whalley: 51%
Other: 63%
Overall: 51%

- No Opinion
- Very Unconcerned
- Unconcerned
- Neutral
- Concerned
- Very Concerned
Surrey Community by Importance of having healthy trees *(Sum of Very Important/Important ratings)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Centre</th>
<th>Cloverdale</th>
<th>Fleetwood</th>
<th>Guildford</th>
<th>Newton</th>
<th>South Surrey</th>
<th>Whalley</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Along roads</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In parks (playground and open spaces)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On private single family lots</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On multi-unit residential properties</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In commercial areas</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In parking lots</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In natural areas (forest)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by Awareness of Tree Voucher Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by Awareness of Tree Sale Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by Interest in Tree Sale Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
<th>Somewhat interested</th>
<th>Yes, I am interested</th>
<th>Yes, I have participated in it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by Interest in supporting the urban forest on private property – Planting trees on my property

- City Centre: Yes 43%, Somewhat 36%, No 21%
- Cloverdale: Yes 40%, Somewhat 29%, No 35%
- Fleetwood: Yes 36%, Somewhat 38%, No 26%
- Guildford: Yes 33%, Somewhat 28%, No 28%
- Newton: Yes 42%, Somewhat 32%, No 26%
- South Surrey: Yes 37%, Somewhat 41%, No 25%
- Whalley: Yes 47%, Somewhat 25%, No 32%
- Other: Yes 32%, Somewhat 36%, No 32%
- Overall: Yes 39%, Somewhat 36%, No 25%
Surrey Community by Interest in supporting the urban forest on private property – Watering trees on my property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Yes**
- **Somewhat**
- **No**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Centre</th>
<th>Cloverdale</th>
<th>Fleetwood</th>
<th>Guildford</th>
<th>Newton</th>
<th>South Surrey</th>
<th>Whalley</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant more trees along roads</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant more trees in parks</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve success and health of trees on new</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development projects</td>
<td>Retain more existing trees on sites to be developed</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more and better information</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the public on tree benefits and care</td>
<td>Provide incentives for property owners to plant more trees</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide more opportunities for residents to get involved in urban forest stewardship</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by Supporting the urban forest on public property – Watering trees near roads or on other public land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surrey Community by Supporting the urban forest on public property – Participating in stewardship activities e.g., invasive species removal, planting trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Surrey</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalley</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Yes
- Somewhat
- No
Surrey Community by Supporting the urban forest on public property – Participating in citizen science projects e.g. collecting information on trees

City Centre: 29% Yes, 36% Somewhat, 35% No
Cloverdale: 32% Yes, 32% Somewhat, 36% No
Fleetwood: 44% Yes, 32% Somewhat, 24% No
Guildford: 37% Yes, 34% Somewhat, 29% No
Newton: 34% Yes, 38% Somewhat, 28% No
South Surrey: 30% Yes, 30% Somewhat, 40% No
Whalley: 28% Yes, 30% Somewhat, 42% No
Other: 22% Yes, 34% Somewhat, 44% No
Overall: 33% Yes, 34% Somewhat, 33% No