Exhibit D

This page intentionally left blank.

Frank Ono International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist # 536 Society of American Foresters Professional Member 48004 1213 Miles Avenue Pacific Grove CA, 93950 Telephone (831) 373-7086

March 2, 2017

Monterey Bay Builders Mr. Eric Barstad P.O. Box 366 Carmel Valley, CA 93924

RE: 220 Upper Walden Road -Dead Monterey Pines

APN: 241-241-011-000

Mr. Barstad;

A visual tree assessment (VTA) was requested for several unstable trees at the above referenced property due to liquefaction of the soils. Trees are failing on this property and other adjacent properties; they are falling over without any root disturbance. The VTA determined there are three trees with tree hazard evaluation form (THEF) scores of 10 or higher which need immediate removal (trees that rate a score of 12 present the most likelihood of failure). The THEF score rates the relative hazard of trees based upon the criteria of probability of failure, size of failure part, and target from the <u>Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas</u> (Mattheny and Clarke). This letter and the accompanying THEF score sheet may be submitted with other required documents as part of an application for tree removal by the property owner (or their designated representative). The report (and photos which must be submitted in color) is background information for use by the County of Monterey to determine under what circumstances a permit may be issued.

Tree Risk (Hazard) Evaluation Score

The tree(s) assessed for hazard risk are identified as follows:

- Tree #28 is a 36" diameter Monterey pine located along the south property line. The tree is falling over. It is uprooting due to moisture in the soils and heavy wind load. The tree has a THEF score of 11.
- Tree #41is a 26" diameter tree located near the building. The tree has poor structure and dying; it also will fall over soon due to the saturated soils. The tree has a THEF score of 11
- Tree #47 is a 22" diameter Monterey pine dying from bark beetle attack. The tree has a THEF score of 10.

Assessment

The soils on this property are water logged and unstable. Considerable subterranean water has emerged to the surface and has cause a number of trees to become unstable. Significant damage to adjacent areas will occur when failure occurs. Target ratings factored into the THEF score include new structures and adjacent properties. Removal of the trees will not significantly alter air movement, contribute to erosion, or create a significant impact to wildlife; no active bird or animal nesting sites were observed at the time of assessment.

Tree Removal

After proper authorization, the trees shall be removed by a licensed insured professional tree service. No surrounding tree protection is necessary when the tree drop zone is clear of vegetation. Tree removal shall be consistent with safe arboricultural work practices utilizing removal of trees and their parts in smaller manageable pieces and roped down carefully so as not to damage any surrounding trees or plants. The use of specialized equipment may be authorized if it can be shown that no damage to surrounding ecosystem will be sustained. At no time shall the trees be dropped in one piece so as to damage any surrounding trees or property. Tree wood and clippings are to be disposed of consistent with current California Department of Forestry guidelines which would include stockpiling of material on site or disposal at an approved refuse site. When the listed trees are removed, other immediately remaining trees adjacent these should be inspected for potential for pruning (utilizing current arboricultural standards) and deadwood removal.

Replanting

The County of Monterey through the Carmel Area Land Use plan has tree replacement conditions as part of a tree removal permit when sufficient space exists to replant that does not create an overcrowded vegetated situation. The County requires a 2:1 replacement for removed trees which measure 24" or larger in diameter at breast height and/or a 1:1 ratio replacement for trees measuring less than 24" in diameter. It is therefore recommended replanting be with six (6) five-gallon size Monterey pines in locations near or adjacent where the trees are removed (if five gallon is unavailable, smaller sizes may be substituted). In addition, the County also requires independent monitoring of replanted trees to insure replanting is successful (the term of monitoring is at County discretion, typically one –three years dependent on the type of permit).

Disclosure Statement

Use of report: This letter and the THEF score sheet are to be considered and used as background information for the current tree removal application process implemented by the County of Monterey. The report is prepared to assist the County, along with other required documents, in determining if and under what circumstances a permit may be issued.

Inspection limitations: The inspection of the tree consisted solely of a visual inspection from the ground. While more thorough techniques are available for inspection and evaluation, they were neither requested nor considered necessary or appropriate at this time. This report is based on a visual inspection of tree condition and for obvious defects. It is not intended to constitute a complete health and hazard evaluation. Further investigation would be required to more definitively evaluate the health and hazards posed by the subject trees, some of

which may not be disclosed by visual inspections. Investigations include but are not limited to core samples, root crown excavation, and visual inspection of the entire trees by climbing. Please be advised that healthy trees and/or limbs may fail under certain conditions, and that the above recommendations are based on industry standards of tree care.

Urban Foresters/Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance their health and beauty and to attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist or to seek additional advice. Trees and other plant life are living, changing organisms affected by innumerable factors beyond our control. Trees fail in ways and because of conditions we do not fully understand.

Urban Foresters/Arborists cannot detect or anticipate every condition or event that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Conditions are often hidden within the trees and below ground. Urban Foresters/Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, for any specific period or when a tree or its parts may fail. Further, remedial treatments, as with any treatment or therapy, cannot be guaranteed. Treatment, pruning, bracing and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborists skills and usual services such as the boundaries of properties, property ownership, site lines, neighbor disputes and agreements and other issues. Therefore, urban forester/arborists cannot consider such issues unless complete and accurate information is disclosed in a timely fashion. Then, the urban forester/arborist can be expected, reasonably, to rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided. Trees can be managed but not controlled. To live near trees, regardless of their condition, is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate all trees.

Hazard/hazard potential: For the purposes of this evaluation and/report, a tree or tree part that presents a threat to humans, livestock, vehicles, structures, landscape features or other entity of civilization from uprooting, falling, breaking or growth development (e.g., roots). While all large landscape trees in proximity to such targets present some degree of hazard regardless of their condition, such inherent hazard is not intended as within this definition and its usage in this evaluation and report. As trees and other plant life are living, changing organisms effected by innumerable factors beyond our control, F. O. Consulting and its personnel offer no guarantees, stated or implied, as to tree, plant or general landscape safety, health, condition or improvement, beyond that specifically stated in writing in accepted contracts.

Thank you very much and please feel free to call if there are any questions or if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely, 34 Frank Ono Certified Arborist #536

This report is based on a visual inspection of tree condition and for obvious defects. It is not intended to constitute a complete health and hazard evaluation. Further investigation would be required to more definitively evaluate the health and hazards posed by the subject trees, some of which may not be disclosed by visual inspections. Investigations may include but are not limited to core samples, root crown excavation, and visual inspection of the entire tree or trees by climbing. Please be advised that healthy trees and/or limbs may fail under certain conditions, and that the above recommendations are based on industry standards of tree care. This report is made with the understanding that no representations or warranties, either expressed or implied are made that any trees referred to in the report or located on or adjacent to the subject property are sound or safe.

PHOTOGRAPHS



Tree #28 is listing over and uprooting; the tree was standing straight up several weeks ago and has moved several degrees to the south



Tree #47 is dying and unstable in the soils; it will be compromised once tree #46 is removed (permitted due to construction).



Tree #41 is standing but shifting in the saturated soil. The tree has poor structure and will fall or break apart due to its poor branch attachment.



	HAZARD RATING:
Site/Address: 220 UPPER WALDED	HAZABU NATING.
Map/Location: NEM 5. FENCE LNE	Failure + Size + Target = Hazar
Owner: public private unknown other	Potential of part Rating Ratin
Date: 3/2/17 Inspector: OND	Immediate action needed Needs further inspection
Date of last inspection:	Dead tree
TREE CHABACTERISTICS	
DBH: 36 #of trunks: 1 Height: 85 Spread: 30	
Form: Orgenerally symmetric I minor asymmetry I major asymmetry I stump spr	rout 🔲 stag-headed
Crown class: dominant co-dominant intermediate co-suppressed	
Live crown ratio: 2.5% Age class: Uyoung Esemi-mature Emature	over-malure/senescent
Pruning history: □ crown cleaned □ excessively thinned □ topped □ crown raised □ polla	
none I multiple pruning events Approx. dates:	
Special Value: specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree lacre	een Elshade Llindigenous Elprotected by gov. a
TREE HEALTH	
A	
	rowth obstructions:
	owth obstructions: Stakes wire/ties signs cables
Foliage density: Onormal Isparse Leaf size: Chormal Ismall	
Foliage density: Onormal Isparse Leaf size: Onormal Ismall Image Annual shoot growth: Image] stakes □ wire/ties □ signs □ cables
Foliage density: Omormal Isparse Leaf size: Omormal Ismall Annual shoot growth: Iscellent Oncorrage Ippoor Twig Dieback? Y Impoint] stakes □ wire/ties □ signs □ cables] curb/pavement □ guards
Foliage density: Onormal Isparse Leaf size: Inormal Ismall Image: Small] stakes □ wire/ties □ signs □ cables] curb/pavement □ guards
Foliage density: Onormal sparse Leaf size: Onormal small Image: Small] stakes □ wire/ties □ signs □ cables] curb/pavement □ guards
Foliage density: Onormal sparse Leaf size: Onormal small Image: Small] stakes □ wire/ties □ signs [] cables] curb/pavement □ guards] other
Foliage density: Onormal Isparse Leaf size: Onormal Ismall Annual shoot growth: Inexcellent Onorege Ippoor Twig Dieback? Y N Woundwood development: Inexcellent Onorege Ippoor Inone Impoor Vigor class: Inexcellent Inexcellent Inexcellent Inexcellent Impoor SITE CONDITIONS Impoor Impoor Impoor Impoor	Istakes wire/ties signs colorables Icurb/pavement guards Iother
Foliage density: Onormal Isparse Leaf size: Inormal Ismall Annual shoot growth: In excellent Inormal Isparse Ippoor Twig Dieback? Y N Woundwood development: In excellent Inormal Ippoor Impoor Impoor Vigor class: In excellent In average If fair Ippoor Major pests/diseases: Impoor Impoor Impoor Site Character: Impointed in the state Important Important	Stakes □ wire/ties □ signs □ cables 1 curb/pavement □ guards 1 other □ natural □ woodlandMorest
Foliage density: Onormal Isparse Leaf size: Inormal Ismall Annual shoot growth: Inexcellent Onorrage Ippoor Twig Dieback? Y N Woundwood development: Inexcellent Onorrage Ippoor Inone Impoor Vigor class: Inexcellent Inexcellent Inexcellent Inexcellent Impoor Site Character: Inexcellent Inexcellent Inexcellent Impoor Site Character: Inexcellent Inexcellent Industrial Inexcellent Impoor Site Character: Intersidence Incommercial Industrial Industrial Inexcellent Landscape type: Inarkway Inaised bed Inontainer Impound Inawn	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Icables Icurb/pavement guards Iother
Foliage density: Onormal Isparse Leaf size: Inormal Ismall Annual shoot growth: Inexcellent In	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Icables Icurb/pavement guards Iother
Foliage density: Important I sparse Leaf size: Important I small Annual shoot growth: Important I sparse Important I small Important I small Woundwood development: Important I stratege Impoor Impoor Wigor class: Important I stratege Impoor Impoor Major pests/diseases: Impoor Impoor Site Character: Important I stratege Impoor Site Character: Important I stratege Impoor Important I strategies Impoor Impoor Site Character: Important I strategies Impoor Important I strategies Impoor Impoor Site Character: Important I strategies Impoor Site Character: Important I strategies Important I strategies Site Character: Important I strategies Important I strategies Site Character: Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies Important I strategies	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Icables Icurb/pavement guards Iother
Foliage density: Importantial	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Icables Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement woodland\torest Icurb/pavement woodland\torest Icurb/pavement woodland\torest Icurb/pavement wind break Icurb/pavement wind break Icurb/pavement wind break
Foliage density: Impormal Imparse Leaf size: Impormal Impormal Imparse Imparse Impormal Impormal Imparse Impormal Imparse Impormal Impormal Impormal Imparse Imparse Impormal Impormal Imparse	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Icables Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement woodland\torest Icurb/pavement woodland\torest Icurb/pavement woodland\torest Icurb/pavement wind break Icurb/pavement wind break Icurb/pavement wind break
Foliage density: Imormal sparse Leaf size: Imormal small Annual shoot growth: excellent Gaverage poor Twig Dieback? Y Y Woundwood development: excellent Gaverage poor Imore Gaverage poor Imore Gaverage Imore	Istakes wire/ties signs cables Icurb/pavement guards Iother Iother Inatural woodlandMorest Inub border wind break Inine clearing Pavement lifted? Y
Foliage density: Informal sparse Leaf size: Informal small Annual shoot growth: excellent Information average poor Twig Dieback? Y Y Woundwood development: excellent Information average poor Information average poor Information average Inform	Istakes wire/ties Isigns cables Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement guards Icurb/pavement woodland\forest Inatural woodland\forest Inatural woodland\forest Intub border wind break Illine clearing site clearing Pavement lifted? Y Y tic Ismall volume Idisease center history of round utilities Itraffic adjacent veg.
Foliage density: Informal Isparse Leaf size: Informal Ismall Annual shoot growth: Iexcellent Informal Isparse Ippoor Twig Dieback? Y Impoint informal Woundwood development: Iexcellent Informal Ippoor Twig Dieback? Y Impoint informal Woundwood development: Iexcellent Informal Ippoor Informal Ippoor Wajor class: Iexcellent Informal Ippoor Informal Ippoor Major pests/diseases: Impoint Informal Ippoor Informal Ippoor Site Character: Intesidence Icommercial Industrial Ippark Ippoor Impoint Site Character: Ipparkway Iraised bed Icontainer Impoint Ippark Ippark <t< td=""><td>Istakes wire/ties Isigns Cables Icurb/pavement guards Iother Inatural woodlandVorest Inub border wind break Iline clearing site clearing Pavement lifted? V</td></t<>	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Cables Icurb/pavement guards Iother Inatural woodlandVorest Inub border wind break Iline clearing site clearing Pavement lifted? V
Foliage density: Informal sparse Leaf size: Informal small Annual shoot growth: excellent Information in the excelle	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Cables Icurb/pavement guards Iother Inatural woodlandVorest Inub border wind break Iline clearing site clearing Pavement lifted? V
Foliage density: Onormal sparse Leaf size: Onormal small Annual shoot growth: excellent Deverage poor Twig Dieback? Y Y Woundwood development: excellent Deverage poor none C Vigor class: excellent Deverage fair poor none Site Character: Desidence commercial industrial park open space I Landscape type: parkway traised bed container mound lawn Deverage Krigation: Drone adequate inadequate excessive trunk wetiled Recent site disturbance? Y N Deconstruction soil disturbance grade change % driptine paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % driptine grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % driptine grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % driptine grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75%	Istakes wire/ties Isigns Icables Icurb/pavement guards Iother Inatural woodland\forest Inub border wind break Ine clearing Pavement lifted? Ic Ismall volume Idisease center Ibistory of Inound utilities Itraffic Indivard, canopy edge
Foliage density: Onormal sparse Leaf size: Gnormal small Annual shoot growth: excetlent Onverage poor Twig Dieback? Y Y Woundwood development: excetlent Daverage poor none Image: State in the state i	Istakes wire/ties signs cables Icurb/pavement guards Iother Inatural woodland\torest Inatural woodland\torest Inub border wind break Iline clearing site clearing Pavement lifted? Y Itic I small volume I disease center I bistory of round utilities I traffic I adjacent veg. Iwindward, canopy edge area prone to windthrog

PGI



TREE DEFECTS

ROOT DEFECTS:				
Suspect root rot: Y(N) N	lushroom/conk/bracket present	: Y/N) ID:		
Exposed roots: 🗋 severe	🗆 moderate 🛛 🗛 🛛 U	ndermined: [] severe	I moderate Now	
Root pruned: distan	nce from trunk Root area a	lfected:% Bi	uttress wounded: YNW	/hen:
Restricted root area: 🛛 seve	ere I moderate 12 tow	Potential for root failure:	Severe I moderate I] low
LEAN: 20 deg. from ve	ertical 🗋 natural 🛛 onnati	ural 🖸 self-corrected	Soil heaving Y	
Decay in plane of lean: Y		Soil cracking. Y) N		
Compounding lactors:		\cup	Lean severily: [7] sev	ere 🗔 moderate 🗀 low
CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate pro	esence of individual defects and	rate their severity (s = severe		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper			GCALIOLDO	BRANGAES
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark	×			
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers		· · · ·		
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay			-	
Cavity		·····		
Conks/mushrooms/bracket		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Bleeding/sap flow			,	
Loose/cracked bark		· ·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs		······································		
Borers/termites/ants	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
HAZARD RATING		······································		
Tree part most likely to fail:	PORTS		Failure asterbish d. hours	
				2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe
	annual biannual	_ other	Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 ci	5-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm);
Failure Potential + Size of Part +	Target Rating = Hazard Rating		12	and the second se
4+4+	3 = 11		Target rating: 1 - occasior 3 - trequent	i use; 4 - constant use
HAZARD ABATEMENT			o nequen	. 936, 4 - CONSIGNE 135
	part Treduce end weight	crown clean [] thin [] r	aise canopy 🔲 crown reduce	I restructure Elshane
Cable/Brace:			Al or is because	decay Daerial Dmonitor
0	1			-
Remove tree: Y Y Repl	lace Y N Move larget:	Y		······
Effect on adjacent trees:	none [] evaluate		11-	
Notification: Cowner On	anager 🛛 governing agency	Date: 3	12/17	
COMMENTS			а Паралия и страна и страна.	

~

...

#	
A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of TREE HAZARD EVALUA	
Site/Address: 220 UPPER UNIDED	HAZABD RATING:
Map/Location:	Failure + Size + Target = Hazard Potential of part Rating Rating Immediate action needed Needs further inspection Dead tree
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	
Tree #: 41 Species: 19. 1986	
DBH: _26 # ol trunks: Height: 80 Spread: 30	
Form: generally symmetric minor asymmetry major asymmetry stump sprout] stag-headed
Crown class: Condominant Condominant Contermediate Constructions and the class: Condominant Contermediate Conterme	
Live crown ratio:% Age class:youngsemi-maturematurefover Pruning history:crown cleanedexcessively thinnedtoppedcrown raisedpollarded	
I crown cleaned a excessively diamed in topped in crown raised in poladed I crown raised in poladed	
Special Value: Specimen Special Value: Specimen Special Value: Specimen Special Value: Specimen Sp	Lishade Lindigenous Liprotected by gov. agenc
TREE HEALTH	
Foliage color: normal chlorotic Enecrotic. Epicormics? Y N Growth	obstructions:
Tonage abrany. Chornal Capparet	es 🗋 wire/ties 🗋 signs 🗋 cables
	D/pavement 🗌 guards
	2r
Vigor class: excellent average fair boor Major pests/diseases: <u>beet/es</u>	
SITE CONDITIONS	
Site Character: Presidence Commercial Cindustrial park Copen space Anal	tural 🔲 woodlandVorest
Landscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn shrub	border 🛛 wind break
Irrigation: Inone adequate inadequate excessive trunk wettled	
Recent site disturbance? YN Construction I soil disturbance I grade change I li	ine clearing 🔲 site clearing
% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pave	ement lifted? V
% dripline w/ fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
Soil problems: Defainage Dehallow Compacted Odroughty Saline Cakaline Cacidic C	I small volume to disease center Additions of tail
□ clay □ expansive □ slope° aspect: Obstructions: □ lights □ signage □ line-of-sight □ view □ overhead lines □ underground	rt utilities 🖂 traffic 🗍 adiacent veo 🗍
Exposure to wind: Single tree Delow canopy Dabove canopy Drecently exposed Dwin	
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms Dever	
TARGETUse Under Tree: Ebuilding parking I traffic I pedestrian I recreation I landscape I	hardscape Small features Dutility lines
Can target be moved? Y (V) Can use be restricted? Y (V)	
Occupancy: 🗋 occasional use 🗋 intermittent use 🗖 frequent use 🗋 constant use	

P6 |



TREE DEFECTS ______

ROOT DEFECTS:				
Suspect root roty Y)N N	lushroom/conk/bracket present:	YTO ID:		
Exposed roots: 🗋 severe	🗆 moderate 💭 tow Un	dermined: 🗋 severe 🗖	moderate	
Root pruned: dista	nce from trunk Root area al l	ected:% Butt	ress wounded: Y 🔊 Wh	en:
Restricted root area: 🗍 seve	ere 🗆 moderate 🔟 ew	Potential for root failure:	Deevere 🗆 moderate 🗆 I	OW
LEAN: deg. from ve	ertical 🖾 natural 🗌 unnatu	al 🗆 self-corrected So	vil heaving:	
	PRoots broken Y			
	EEIS DYIN			
				e Efficience la low
	esence of individual defects and i	ate their severity (s = severe, i	m = moderate, I = low)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments		·······		
Included bark	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits		,	-	
Hangers		·		
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				10 mm
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Loose/cracked bark				
The second s		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	
Nesting hole/bee hive			e	C
Deadwood/stubs		a		
Borers/termites/ants		>	>>	
Cankers/galls/burls		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Previous failure			L	
HAZARD RATING				
Tree part most likely to fail:	ICEOTS		Failure potential: 1 - low; 2	- medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe
	annual biannual	other	Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cm	
Failure Potential + Size of Part +				-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)
Failure Potential + Size of Part +	arget Rainty = Hazaro Rainty		Target rating: 1 - occasiona	Contract of the second s
<u> </u>	4_= 4			ise; 4 - constant use
HAZARD ABATEMENT	· .			
Prune:	part 🖸 reduce end weight 📋	crown clean 📋 thin 🖾 rais	e canopy 🗔 crown reduce 🛛 l	_I restructure [] shape
Cable/Brace:	-	In:	spect further: Cl root crown	□decay ∐aerial □monitor
Remove tree: YN Rep	lace? N Move target:	Y (N) Other:		
Effect on adjacent trees:	none_{] evaluate	1	1	
Notification: Lewmer En	nanager governing agency	Date:3/2	-117	-
COMMENTS			- 	

PG2

5~

¥ <u>47</u>	
A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation TREE HAZARD EVAL	
Sile/Address: 220 UPPER WALDED	HAZARD RATING:
Map/Location: South Papenty LING	3+3+4=1
Owner: public private unknown other Date:	Failure + Size + Target = Hazard Potential of part Rating Rating Immediate action needed
Date of last inspection:	Needs further inspection
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	
Tree #: 47 Species: M Line	
DBH: 22 tol tranks: / Height: 70 Spread: 25	
Form: generally symmetric from asymmetry from asymmetry symmetry symmet	rout 🗔 stao-headed
Crown class: dominant Decidominant intermediate suppressed	
Live crown ratio: Age class:young semi-maturemature	Mor-mature/senescent
Pruning history: Crown cleaned cxcessively thinned topped crown raised polla	
Pruning history: Crown cleaned Clexcessively initiated Clopped Crown raised Clopped	
Special Value: Specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree Sce	
TREE HEALTH	
	rowth obstructions:
] stakes 🖸 wire/ties 🖾 signs 🖾 cables
	Curb/pavement
] other
Vigor class: excellent average fair poor	
Major pests/diseases:	
SITE CONDITIONS	
	anatural woodland/forest
Landscape type: parkway praised bed container mound lawn per	mub border 🔲 wind break
Irrigation: Inone I adequate I inadequate excessive I trunk wettled	
	[] line clearing [] sile clearing
- A	Pavement lilled? XA
% dripline w/ lill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
% dripline grade lowered:0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
Soil problems: Datainage Shallow Compacted droughty saline alkaline acid	lic □ small volume □ disease center
Obstructions: I lights I signage I line-of-sight I view I overhead lines I underg	round utilities 🖾 traffic 🖾 adjacent veg. 🖾
Exposure to wind: Single tree below canopy above canopy recently exposed] windward, canopy edge 🛛 area prone to windthrow
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms	3 seldom 🗋 regularly
TARGET	
Use Under Tree: Douilding parking I traffic I pedestrian I recreation I landscap	pe Li hardscape Li small teatures Li utimy lines
Use Under Tree: Douilding parking traffic pedestrian recreation landscar Can target be moved? Y Can use be restricted? Y	pe Li hardscape Li small teatures Li utimy ines



TREE DEFECTS

ROOT DEFECTS:				
Suspect root rot: (V) N	lushroom/conk/brackel presen	1: X/N 10:		
Exposed roots:	🗆 moderate 🛛 🕹 🗤 🛛	Indermined: [] severe	moderate	
Root pruned: distar	nce from trunk Root area a	offected:% Bu	uttress wounded: Y	ten:
Restricted root area: 🖾 seve	ere 🗆 moderate 🛛 🕮 w	Potential for root failure:	🕒 severe 🗆 moderate 🗆	low
LEAN: deg. from ve	ertical 🗀 natural 🖂 unnat	ural 🖂 self-corrected	Soil heaving N	
Decay in plane of lean: Y A	Roots broken Y N			
	ROB 13		Lean severity: [] seve	re I moderate Diow
CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate pro				
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper			00/11/01/0	
Bow, sweep		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam				
Decay				
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs				s :
Borers/termites/ants				5
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
HAZARD RATING				
Tree part most likely to fail:	Keots		Failure potential: 1 - low: 2	? - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe
Inspection period:		other	Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cm	
8				5-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)
Failure Potential + Size of Part +			Target rating: 1 - occasion	
<u>3</u> +_ <u>3</u> +	-7 = 10			use: 4 - constant use
HAZARD ABATEMENT	·	- <u></u>		
Prune:	part [] reduce end weight []] crown clean l⊒ thin [] ra	iise canopy 🔲 crown reduce	Lirestructure Elishape
	na na panana sa na			
Cable/Brace:	A.177		Inspect further: LI root crown	🗆 decay 🖾 aerial 🖾 monitor
Remove tree: Y N Repi	lace? (Y) N Move target	: Y O Other:		
Effect on adjacent trees:	none [] evaluate		11-	2
Notification: Downer Dr	nanager 🛛 governing agency	Date:	512117	_
COMMENTS				10
			······································	

5-0

Frank Ono

International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist # 536 Society of American Foresters Professional Member 48004 1213 Miles Avenue Pacific Grove CA, 93950

Telephone (831) 373-7086 Cellular (831) 594-2291

April 27, 2017

Monterey Bay Builders Mr. Eric Barstad P.O. Box 366 Carmel Valley, CA 93924

RE: 220 Upper Walden Road -Dead Monterey Pines APN: 241-241-011-000

Mr. Barstad;

A visual tree assessment (VTA) was requested for several Monterey pine trees at the above referenced property needing removal due to instability and their deteriorating condition. The VTA determined the four trees with tree hazard evaluation form (THEF) scores of 10 (trees that rate a score of 12 present the most likelihood of failure). The THEF score rates the relative hazard of trees based upon the criteria of probability of failure, size of failure part, and target from the <u>Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas</u> (Mattheny and Clarke). This letter and the accompanying THEF score sheet may be submitted with other required documents as part of an application for tree removal by the property owner (or their designated representative). The report is background information for use by the County of Monterey to determine under what circumstances a permit may be issued.

Tree Risk (Hazard) Evaluation Score Assessment

ID#	Diameter	Species	Reason for Removal	THEF Rating
31	20	Monterey pine	Beetles	10
32	20	Monterey pine	Beetles	10
33	30	Monterey pine	Beetles	10
34	24	Monterey pine	Beetles	10

The tree(s) assessed for hazard risk are identified as follows:

The listed trees in the above chart are unstable and diseased, as evidenced by their thinning and dying crowns; they are capable of failure to fall onto the structure being built. Removal of the tree(s) will not significantly alter air movement, contribute to erosion, or create a significant impact to wildlife; no active bird or animal nesting sites were observed at the time of assessment.

Tree Removal

After proper authorization, the trees shall be removed by a licensed insured professional tree service. No surrounding tree protection is necessary when the tree drop zone is clear of vegetation. Tree removal shall be consistent with safe arboricultural work practices utilizing removal of trees and their parts in smaller manageable pieces and roped down carefully so as not to damage any surrounding trees or plants. The use of specialized equipment may be authorized if it can be shown that no damage to surrounding ecosystem will be sustained. At no time shall the trees be dropped in one piece so as to damage any surrounding trees or property. Tree wood and clippings are to be disposed of consistent with current California Department of Forestry guidelines which would include stockpiling of material on site or disposal at an approved refuse site. When the listed trees are removed, other immediately remaining trees adjacent these should be inspected for potential for pruning (utilizing current arboricultural standards) and deadwood removal.

Replanting

The County of Monterey through the Carmel Area Land Use plan has tree replacement conditions as part of a tree removal permit when sufficient space exists to replant that does not create an overcrowded vegetated situation. The County requires a 2:1 replacement for removed trees which measure 24" or larger in diameter at breast height and/or a 1:1 ratio replacement for trees measuring less than 24" in diameter. It is therefore recommended replanting be with six (6) five-gallon size Monterey pines in the location near or adjacent each removed tree (if five gallon is unavailable, smaller sizes may be substituted). In addition, the County also requires independent monitoring of replanted trees to insure replanting is successful (the term of monitoring is at County discretion, typically one –three years dependent on the type of permit).

Disclosure Statement

Use of report: This letter and the THEF score sheet are to be considered and used as background information for the current tree removal application process implemented by the County of Monterey. The report is prepared to assist the County, along with other required documents, in determining if and under what circumstances a permit may be issued.

Inspection limitations: The inspection of the tree consisted solely of a visual inspection from the ground. While more thorough techniques are available for inspection and evaluation, they were neither requested nor considered necessary or appropriate at this time. This report is based on a visual inspection of tree condition and for obvious defects. It is not intended to constitute a complete health and hazard evaluation. Further investigation would be required to more definitively evaluate the health and hazards posed by the subject trees, some of which may not be disclosed by visual inspections. Investigations include but are not limited to core samples, root crown excavation, and visual inspection of the entire trees by climbing. Please be advised that healthy trees and/or limbs may fail under certain conditions, and that the above recommendations are based on industry standards of tree care.

Urban Foresters/Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance their health and beauty and to attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist or to seek additional advice. Trees and other plant life are living, changing organisms affected by innumerable factors beyond our control. Trees fail in ways and because of conditions we do not fully understand.

Urban Foresters/Arborists cannot detect or anticipate every condition or event that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Conditions are often hidden within the trees and below ground. Urban Foresters/Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, for any specific period or when a tree or its parts may fail. Further, remedial treatments, as with any treatment or therapy, cannot be guaranteed. Treatment, pruning, bracing and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborists skills and usual services such as the boundaries of properties, property ownership, site lines, neighbor disputes and agreements and other issues. Therefore, urban forester/arborists cannot consider such issues unless complete and accurate information is disclosed in a timely fashion. Then, the urban forester/arborist can be expected, reasonably, to rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided. Trees can be managed but not controlled. To live near trees, regardless of their condition, is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate all trees.

Hazard/hazard potential: For the purposes of this evaluation and/report, a tree or tree part that presents a threat to humans, livestock, vehicles, structures, landscape features or other entity of civilization from uprooting, falling, breaking or growth development (e.g., roots). While all large landscape trees in proximity to such targets present some degree of hazard regardless of their condition, such inherent hazard is not intended as within this definition and its usage in this evaluation and report. As trees and other plant life are living, changing organisms effected by innumerable factors beyond our control, F. O. Consulting and its personnel offer no guarantees, stated or implied, as to tree, plant or general landscape safety, health, condition or improvement, beyond that specifically stated in writing in accepted contracts.

Thank you very much and please feel free to call if there are any questions or if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Hond

Certified Arborist #536

This report is based on a visual inspection of tree condition and for obvious defects. It is not intended to constitute a complete health and hazard evaluation. Further investigation would be required to more definitively evaluate the health and hazards posed by the subject trees, some of which may not be disclosed by visual inspections. Investigations may include but are not limited to core samples, root crown excavation, and visual inspection of the entire tree or trees by climbing. Please be advised that healthy trees and/or limbs may fail under certain conditions, and that the above recommendations are based on industry standards of tree care. This report is made with the understanding that no representations or warranties, either expressed or implied are made that any trees referred to in the report or located on or adjacent to the subject property are sound or safe.

PHOTOGRAPHS



#34, #33, #32, and #31



Tree #31, #32, #33, #34



#31 ZUIZUI011000	
A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation TREE HAZARD EVALU	of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas ATION FORM 2nd Edition
SITE/Address: RRO UPPER WALDEN	HAZARD RATING: $3 + 3 + 4 = 10$
Map/Location: CAST SIDE OF (SUILDING Owner: public Date: 4-27-17 Inspector: ONID Date of last inspection:	Failure + Size + Target = Hazard Potential of part Rating Rating Immediate action needed Needs further inspection
	Dead tree
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	<u></u>
Tree #: <u>21</u> Species: <u>M</u> <u>PINIE</u> DBH: <u>20</u> # of trunks: <u>1</u> Height: <u>80</u> Spread: <u>15</u>	
	□ stag-headed
Form: Degenerally symmetric Definition asymmetry Definition asymmetry Stump sprout	CISIAgritanci
	n-maturaleonoccont
Live crown ratio:% Age class:youngsemi-mature !wature ! Pruning history:crown cleanedexcessively thinnedtoppedcrown raisedpollarde	
Prinning history: Li crowie cleaned in excessively titulica in topped in crowie raised in poliardo	
Special Value: Specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree Screen	
TREE HEALTH	
	th obstructions:
Foliage density: 🗋 normal 💭 sparse 🛛 Leaf size: 🕒 normal 🗆 small 🔅 Sta	ikes 🗌 wire/ties 🗋 signs 🗋 cables
Alunda ander gibwan. El conceletti Charlenge - post ing a state of	rb/pavement 🛛 guards
	ier
Vigor class: excellent average leftair poor	
Major pests/diseases: 2007005	
SITE CONDITIONS	
Site Character: Bresidence Commercial I industrial park Open space D	atorial 🔲 woodland\forest
Landscape type: 🗍 parkway 🗇 raised bed 🗇 container 🗇 mound 🗇 lawn 🕞 shrut	border 🛛 wind break
Irrigation: Brione adequate inadequate excessive Irrunk wettled	
necen site distribution. O in Constant	line clearing 🗋 site clearing
% unpinne pavea.	verment lifted? Y (N)
% dripline w/ lill soit: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	Descell volume O diagons captor O biston of fail
Soil problems: 🗌 drainage 🕞 stallow 🗍 compacted 🗍 droughty 🗍 saline 🗍 alkaline 🗋 acidic I	
Obstructions: I lights I signage I line-of-sight I view I overhead lines I undergrour	nd utililies 🖾 traffic 🖾 adjacent veg. 🖾
Exposure to wind: Distingle tree Delow canopy Dabove canopy Drecently exposed D with	ndward, canopy edge 🛛 area prone to windthrow
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms Enever I se	
TARGET	
Use Under Tree: Drouilding parking traffic pedestrian recreation landscape	□ hardscape □ small features □ utility lines
Can target be moved? Y (N) Can use be restricted? (N)	
Occupancy: 🗋 occasional use 📋 intermittent use 📄 frequent use 🖻 constant use	
The International Society of Arboriculture assumes no responsibility for conclusions or recommendation	ons derived from use of this form.

+

TREE DEFECTS				
ROOT DEFECTS:				
Suspect root rot: ON M	lushroom/conk/bracket present	: Y 🕡 ID:		
Exposed roots: Assevere	🗆 moderate 🛛 low 🛛 U	ndermined: 🗋 severe 🗋	moderate Dilow	
Root pruned: <u>YFT</u> distant	nce from trunk Root area a	lfected: 25-50% Butt	ress wounded: Y (N) W	hen:
Restricted root area:	/		/] low
LEAN: deg. from ye	rtical 🗋 natural 🗍 unnatu		il heaving: $Y(N)$	
Decay in plane of lean: Y	- 1	Soil cracking: $Y(N)$	n neaving.	
Compounding factors:	- 0	•	Lean severity: [] seve	ere [] moderate [] low
8			La construction de la construction de la construction de la constru	
CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate pre	sence of individual detects and	rate their severity (s = severe, n	n = moderate, I = low)	
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks				
Multiple attachments				
Included bark	·			
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits				
Hangers		•		
Girdling				
Wounds/seam		and the second		
Decay		·····		
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow	•			
Loose/cracked bark				
Nesting hole/bee hive				
Deadwood/stubs			~ ~ ~	
Borers/termites/ants			<u>_</u>	5
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure				
HAZARD RATING	OUTS A STAM			
Tree part most likely to tail:	OUTS & STOM			2 - medium: 3 - high; 4 - severe
Inspection period: a		other	Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cr	n); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm);
			3 - 18-30" (45	5-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)
Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use;				
<u> </u>	<u> </u>		3 - frequent	use: 4 - constant use
HAZARD ABATEMENT		<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Prune: 🛛 remove defective p	oart 🛛 reduce end weight 💭	crown clean D thin C raise	canopy 🔲 crown reduce	Ll restructure El shape
Cable/Brace:		Ins	pect further: 🖸 root crown	🗆 decay 🖾 aerial 🗔 monitor
Remove tree: ON Repl	lace? (Y) N Move target:	Y(N) Other:		
Effect on adjacent trees:		1-27.1°	7	
Notification: Notification:	anager 🛛 governing agency	Date:	<u> </u>	-
COMMENTS				

Map/Location:	http://oradion AST_SIDE FGUILDING	SHE/Address: 220 UPER WALDEN	HAZABD RATING:
Durine: uublic	wate: public private unknown other Potential or part Rating ate: if all:	EVER DE LE DUILE	-3 + 3 + 4 = 10
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	REE CHARACTERISTICS	Owner: public private unknown other Date:7777_Inspector: OND	Potential of part Rating Ratin Immediate action needed
Intel #: 32 Species: <pre></pre>	e #: 32 Species:		Dead tree
DBH: Def of trunks:	BH: 20 4 of trunks: I Height: 20 spread: 22 amu: Generally symmetric Import asymmetry I major asymmetry I stump sprout I stag-headed amu: Generally symmetric Import asymmetry I stag-headed I down ratio:	27 1/ 0	
orm: Openerally symmetric prior asymmetry major asymmetry Stump sprout Istag-headed crown class: dominant 'fo-dominant intermediate Stuppressed ive crown ratio: % Age class: young semi-mature Minature over-mature/senescent runing history: Corown class: young cleaned excessively thinned topped crown raised pollarded crown reduced intermediate Special Value:	trim: @ Senerally symmetric [minor asymmetry] major asymmetry] stump sprout] stag-headed rown class: dominant [Scodominant] intermediate] suppressed we crown ratio:% Age class:] young] semi-mature @ mature @ maturesenescent unning historr:] crown cleaned] excessively thinned] topped] crown ratised] pollarded] crown reduced] flush cuts] cabled/brace	2	1
rown class: dominant Go-dominant intermediate suppressed live crown ratio: % Age class: young semi-mature mature over-mature/senescent runing history: crown cleaned excessively thinned topped crown raised pollarded crown reduced Protected Value: specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree screen shade indigenou REE HEALTH 	nove class: dominant Go-dominant intermediate suppressed we crawn ratio: // % Age class: young semi-mature mature over-mature/senescent mining history: Grower cleaned excessively thinned topped Grown raised pollarded Grown reduced flush cuts cabled/brace		Paraut Distan brodied
Live crown ratio: Age class: young semi-mature Annature cover-mature/senescent Pruning history: Crown cleaned excessively thinned topped crown raised pollarded crown reduced indicated Bigecial Value: Special Value: Spec	we crown ratio: Age class: young semi-mature Mintage intercent in the intercent interce		sprour (_) stag-maaded
Truning history: Crown cleaned excessively thinned topped Crown raised pollarded crown reduced Crown reduced <td>marking history: crown cleaned excessively thinned loopped crown raised pollarded crown reduced if ush cuts cabled/brack pecial Value: specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree iscreen istake indigenous Pprotected by gov. approx. dates: pecial Value: specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree iscreen istake istake signs cables pailage cotor: Enformal chlorotic necrotic Epicore istake wirehies signs cables matual shoot growth: excellent average Date istake wirehies signs cables inductored development: excellent average Date other other gor class: excellent average Date other gor class: istructions istructions: <</td> <td>20</td> <td></td>	marking history: crown cleaned excessively thinned loopped crown raised pollarded crown reduced if ush cuts cabled/brack pecial Value: specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree iscreen istake indigenous Pprotected by gov. approx. dates: pecial Value: specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree iscreen istake istake signs cables pailage cotor: Enformal chlorotic necrotic Epicore istake wirehies signs cables matual shoot growth: excellent average Date istake wirehies signs cables inductored development: excellent average Date other other gor class: excellent average Date other gor class: istructions istructions: <	20	
Endore multiple pruning events Approx. dates: Expecial Value: specimen heritage/historic wildlife unusual street tree screen shade indigenou FREE HEALTH	Prione Imultiple pruning events Approx. dates:		da la sidantariototal
special Value: specimen Intrilage/historic wildlife unusual street tree screen shade indigenou REE HEALTH File Character: Side density: Inormal I chlorotic I necrotic: Epicormice? Y Y With obstructions: Side density: I normal I stakes I wire/hies I stakes I stakes I stakes I wire/hies I stakes I wire/hies I stakes I stakes I stakes I stakes	pecial Value: specimen heritage/historic wikilife unusual street tree] screen shade indigenous Photecled by gov. a REE HEALTH Julgae color: Phormal chlorotic necrotic Epicormiss? Y () Growth obstructions: aliage density: normal Sparse call size: fhormal small stakes wire/ties signs cables mutal shoot growth: excellent average poor finds mutal shoot growth: excellent average poor fhone other guards unusuad development: excellent average poor fhone other guards unudwood development: excellent average poor fhone other unusuad stakes wire/ties signs cables ager class: excellent average poor fhone other unusuad average poor fonoe other unusuad unusu		
IREE HEALTH	REF HEALTH <pre> inage color: @normal independence in the end of the end of</pre>	12 22 2 20 2 20 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
Foliage color: Informal Infor	shiage color: Enformat Chlorotic Enerotic Epicormies? Y Y Enorwhall Stakes S	Special value: Lispeciment Linerhage/historic Liwikilite Liunusual Listreef free Lis	creen Lisnade Lindigenous (Hprotected by gov. a
aniage density: normal Leaf size: 'fhormal Ismail Istakes wire/ties innual shoot growth: lexcellent laverage 'phoor Twig Dieback2 N Icurb/pavement Iguar Noundwood development: lexcellent laverage Iphoor 'Phone Introductions ifigor class: lexcellent laverage Iphoor Phone Introductions SITE CONDITIONS list lair Iphoor Industrial Ipark Open space Ipational woodlandVo andscape type: Iparkway Iraised bed Icontainer Imound Iawn Ishrub border wind brea irigation: Prone adequate industrial Ipark I	bilage density: normal Deparse Leaf size: Onormal Deparse Leaf size: Onormal Deparse Leaf size: Onormal Deparse Deparse <t< td=""><td>TREE HEALTH</td><td></td></t<>	TREE HEALTH	
Annual shoot growth: excellent average Opoor Twig Dieback? N curb/pavement guar Woundwood development: excellent average poor Onone other	numed shoot growth: excellent average Opor Twig Dieback? N curb/pavement guards bundwood development: excellent average lair Opor onone other	Foliage color: @normal 🗆 chlorotic 🗆 necrotic. Epicorinics? Y (N) 👘 🛛	Growth obstructions:
Woundwood development: excellent average poor Onone other /rigor class: excellent average fair poor Major pests/diseases: petter poor open space pattiral woodland/lo SITE CONDITIONS	bundwood development: excellent average poor Phone other igor class: excellent average pair Opoor apor pests/diseases: DECTUES ITE CONDITIONS ite Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space pat/mail woodland/lorest andscape type: parkway craised bed container mound lawn 25 shub border wind break rigation: Profile adequate industrial park popen space pat/mail woodland/lorest adriptine paved: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V V driptine paved: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% itte clearing itte clearing driptine grade lowered: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% itte clearing	Foliage density: 🗆 normal 🖬 sparse 🛛 Leaf size: 🖓 normal 🗔 small 🔰 I	🗆 stakes 🗆 wire/ties 🖾 signs 🖾 cables
Higor class: excellent average fair poor Major pests/diseases: performance poor SITE CONDITIONS performance park open space patfiral woodland/do site Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space patfiral woodland/do andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Strub border wind breat rrigation: Borne adequate inadequate excessive trunk wetiled tecent site disturbance? V Construction soil disturbance grade change lline clearing site of 6 driptine paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V V 6 driptine grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Struble diser a driptine grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% struble diser a log parking = line-of-sight view overhead lines underground utilities	igor class:excellentaveragelairfoor ajor pests/diseases:	Annual shoot growth: \Box excellent \Box average \Box poor Twig Dieback2 (Y) N I	🗆 curb/pavement 🛛 guards
Major pests/diseases: STEE CONDITIONS Site Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space patúral woodlandNo andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind brea rrigation: Brone adequate inadequate excessive trunk wetiled Recent site disturbance? V Construction soil disturbance grade change lline clearing site of 6 dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement lifted? V V 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered:	ajor pests/diseases:	Woundwood development: 🗆 excellent 🗆 average 🗉 poor 🖾 none 🛛	🗆 other
STEE CONDITIONS site Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space patúral woodlandMo andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind breat andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind breat andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind breat andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind breat andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind breat wind breat inadequate excessive ltrunk wetiled lawn Shrub border wind breat & dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% k dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% k inategrade lowered: off 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	ITE CONDITIONS ife Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space patirral woodlandWorest andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Pishub border wind break rigation: Brone adequate inadequate excessive tronk wettled eccent site disturbance? 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V dripline grade towered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dripline grade towered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dripline grade towered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dirpline grade towered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dirpline grade towered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% sill problems: drainage Ustanday compacted Ddroughty Dsaline alakine Dacidic Dsmall volume Ddisease center history of the Distory <	Vigor class: 🗆 excellent, 🗆 average 🗆 lair 🕞 poor	
Sile Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space patúral woodlandVo andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Pashrub border wind breat arrigation: Brone adequate inadequate excessive trunk wettled tecent site disturbance? Y Construction soil disturbance grade change line clearing site of 6 dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V V 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75%	ite Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space patfiral woodlandWorest andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind break rigation: Brone adequate inadequate excessive Itronk wetiled eccent site disturbance? Y Construction soil disturbance grade change Iline clearing site clearing dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? Y Y dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% pavement litted? Y Y of problems: drainage Shallow compacted droughty saline lakaline lacidic small volume disease center history of f iclay expansive Islope * aspect:	Major pests/diseases: BEETVES	
Sile Character: Presidence commercial industrial park open space patúral woodlandVo andscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Pashrub border wind breat arrigation: Brone adequate inadequate excessive trunk wettled tecent site disturbance? Y Construction soil disturbance grade change line clearing site of 6 dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V V 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75%	ite Character: Presidence □ commercial □ industrial □ park □ open space □ patkinal □ woodlandWorest andscape type: □ parkway □ raised bed □ container □ mound □ lawn □ Shrub border □ wind break rigation: □ mone □ adequate □ inadequate □ excessive □ trunk wetiled eccent site disturbance? Y 1 □ construction □ soil disturbance □ grade change □ line clearing □ site clearing dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? Y W dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% on off problems: □ drainage □ Shallow □ compacted □ droughty □ saline □ alkaline □ acidic □ small volume □ disease center □ history of the clear	SITE CONDITIONS	
candscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Shrub border wind break rrigation: Genome adequate inadequate excessive trunk wetiled Recent site disturbance? V Construction soil disturbance grade change line clearing site of & dripline paved: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V N & dripline grade lowered: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% to-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% to-25% astine alkaline acidic small volume disex	andscape type: parkway praised bed container pround lawn shrub border wind break rigation: Profile adequate inadequate excessive trunk wettled eccent site disturbance? Y (1) construction soil disturbance grade change [] line clearing site clearing dripline paved: 02, 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? Y (1) dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% all problems: drainage [] shallow compacted droughty saline pakeline pacific provide disease center phistory of the structions: lights signage fine-of-sight view overhead lines punderground utilities praffic padacent veg proves to wind: Prisinge tree phelow canopy precently exposed windward, canopy edge parea prone to windthrow evailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms Prever paddom pregularly astructions: Provide parking parking praffic pedestrian precreation precention precently exposed prever p		
rrigation: Profile adequate inadequate excessive Itrunk wetiled Recent site disturbance? Y Inconstruction soil disturbance grade change Iline clearing site of & dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? Y Y & dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% & dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Mastructions: Itights signage slope ° aspect:	rigation: Brone adequate inadequate excessive trunk wetiled ecent site disturbance? YN iconstruction is oil disturbance igrade change in the clearing is ite clearing dripline paved: 02 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? YN dripline will solt: 03 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% oil problems: idrainage is hallow icompacted idroughty is aline is alkaline in acidic is small volume in disease center is history of the interventions: is ignage intervention intervention interventions: is ignage intervention int		
Recent site disturbance? Y I construction soil disturbance grade change I line clearing site of % dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? Y Y % dripline w/ lill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? Y Y % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade low	ecent site disturbance? Yell © construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing dripline paved: 09, 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? Yell dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% all problems: ☐ drainage [9 shallow] compacted ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of the ☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope ° aspect: hstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☐ adjacent veg. □ hstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☐ adjacent veg. □ passure to wind: ☐ straffic ☐ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow evailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms ☐ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly ARGET see Under Tree: ☐ boilding ☐ parking ☐ traffic ☐ pedestrian ☐ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines in target be moved? Y M Can use be restricted? Y M cupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☐ constant use e intermational Society of Arboriculture assumes no responsibility for conclusions or recommendations derived from use of this form.		
6 dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V V 6 dripline w/ lill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% 6 dripline grade lowered: 0 droughty saline alkaline acidic small volume dises 6 dripline grade expansive Islope o* aspect:	dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement litted? V V dripline w/ lill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% all problems: drainage Shallow compacted droughty saline alkaline acidic small volume disease center history of f all problems: drainage Shallow compacted droughty saline alkaline acidic small volume disease center history of f all problems: lights signage line-of-sight view overhead lines underground utilities traffic adjacent veg		Elline clearing
% dripline w/ lill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% % dripline grade lowered: 0 compacted □droughty □ saline □ alkaline □ acidic □ small volume □ dises □ clay □ expansive □ slope aspect:	dripline w/ fill soil: 07 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% oil problems: □drainage [] Shallow [] compacted [] droughty [] saline □akialine [] acidic □ small volume □ disease center □ history of fill soil: □ clay □ expansive □ slope aspect:	\sim (3)	10
6 dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% colspan="2">colspan="2">compacted □ droughty □ saline □ alkaline □ acidic □ small volume □ disea □ clay □ expansive □ slope° aspect:	dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% bill problems: drainage 9 shallow compacted droughty saline akatine acidic small volume disease center history of the saline clay expansive slope aspect:		
Soil problems: drainage Shallow compacted droughty saline alkaline acidic small volume diser Clay expansive Slope <	all problems: drainage Shallow compacted droughty saline akaline acidic small volume disease center history of the cardinary of the		
Clay expansive Islope orall	Clay expansive Slope or aspect: instructions: lights signage line-of-sight view overhead lines underground utilities traffic adjacent veg.		idic 🗆 small volume 🗆 disease center 🗍 bistory of f
Instructions: Ights signage line-of-sight view overhead lines underground utilities Iraffic information Instructions: Image:	ARGET	•	
image: synapse to wind: Image: synapse to wind: <td>aposure to wind: Distrigle tree below canopy above canopy recently exposed windward, canopy edge area prone to windthrow evailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms Dinever seldom regularly ARGET</td> <td></td> <td>pround utilities 🗆 traffic 🗋 adiacent veo. 🗖</td>	aposure to wind: Distrigle tree below canopy above canopy recently exposed windward, canopy edge area prone to windthrow evailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms Dinever seldom regularly ARGET		pround utilities 🗆 traffic 🗋 adiacent veo. 🗖
Prevailing wind direction:	evailing wind direction:		
ARGET	ARGET		
se Under Tree: b building \Box parking \Box traffic \Box pedestrian \Box recreation \Box landscape \Box hardscape \Box small f an target be moved? Y N Can use be restricted? Y N	se Under Tree: Bouilding Dparking Dtraffic Dpedestrian Drecreation Dlandscape hardscape small features Dutility lines an target be moved? Y N Can use be restricted? Y N ccupancy: Doccasional use Dintermittent use Drequent use Doonstant use e International Society of Arboriculture assumes no responsibility for conclusions or recommendations derived from use of this form.	provide a second s	interest de la contract de
an target be moved? Y N Can use be restricted? Y N	in target be moved? Y (N) Can use be restricted? Y (N) ccupancy: Occasional use Intermittent use I frequent use Occonstant use in International Society of Arboriculture assumes no responsibility for conclusions or recommendations derived from use of this form.		
	cupancy: Occasional use Intermittent use I frequent use Constant use e International Society of Arboriculture assumes no responsibility for conclusions or recommendations derived from use of this form.	Use Under Tree: Brouilding, Uparking, Utraffic, Upedestrian, Urecreation, Chandsca	ipe Li hardscape Li small teatures Li utility lines
The second state of the se	e International Society of Arboriculture assumes no responsibility for conclusions or recommendations derived from use of this form.		
ccupancy: Loccasional use Lintermittent use Lintequent use Linconstant use			
A structure of the second of the	PA	sional use 🗋 intermittent use 🗍 frequent use 🗳 constant use	adations derived from use of this form

<u>ح</u>

<u>#32</u>

TREE DEFECTS	α 				
ROOT DEFECTS:		2			
1-	ushroom/conk/bracket present;	Y(N) ID:			
. 0	/	0			
			moderate Dłów		
Root pruned: distan	ce from trunk Root area all	ected:% Buttr	ess wounded: Y (N) WI	1en:	
Restricted root area: 🛛 seve	re 🗆 moderate 🛛 Now	Potential for root failure:	🛛 severe 🖬 moderate 🗆	low	
LEAN: deg. from ve	rtical 🗋 natural 🗌 unnatu	ral 🗋 self-corrected Soi	l heaving: Y(N)		
Decay in plane of lean: Y N		Soil cracking: Y/N)			
U			tana asuarity 171 asus	ra (Denoderata (C)leur	
Compounding factors:			Lean severity: 13 seve	re 🗆 moderate 🖾 low	
CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate pre	sence of individual defects and i	ate their severity (s = severe, n	n = moderate, l = low)		
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES	
Poor taper					
Bow, sweep		2			
Codominants/forks					
Multiple attachments					
included bark			-		
Excessive end weight					
Cracks/splits					
		• •			
Hangers Girdling			Leans,		
Y					
Wounds/seam					
Decay					
Cavity					
Conks/mushrooms/bracket			<u> </u>		
Bleeding/sap flow		~ ~ ~			
Loose/cracked bark		<u>_</u>			
Nesting hole/bee hive					
Deadwood/stubs					
Borers/termites/ants					
Cankers/gails/burls					
Previous failure			<u> </u>		
HAZARD RATING	<u></u>	·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Tree part most likely to fail:	OUTS & STEM		Failure potential: 1 - low; 2	2 - medium: 3 - high; 4 - severe	
	ranual biannual	other	Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 ci	n); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm);	
	annual biannual		3 - 18-30" (4	5-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)	
Failure Potential + Size of Part +	Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Paling = Hazard Rating Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use;				
3 + 3 + 4 = 10 3- frequent use; 4 - constant use					
HAZARD ABATEMENT	ī				
Prune: 🗌 remove defective	part 🔲 reduce end weight 💭	crown clean 🗋 thin 🗍 rais	e canopy 🔲 crown reduce	LI restructure El shape	
Cable/Brace:		ln:	spect further: Cl root crown	🗆 decay 🖾 aerial 🖾 monitor	
1	lace? (V)N Move larget:	Y (N) Other:			
Effect on adjacent trees:	none [] evaluate	J-27.1	7		
Notification: Downer Danager Doverning agency Date: 4-241-11					
COMMENTS					
nd que		1			

1

R2

1

<u># 33</u>	
A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation TREE HAZARD EVALU	
SITE/Address: 220 UPER WALDEN Map/Location: EAST SIDE OF BUNDING	HAZARD RATING:
Owner: public private unknown other Date:7.7.17 Inspector: ONO	Failure + Size + Target = Hazard Potential of part Rating Rating Immediate action needed
Date of last inspection:	Needs further inspection Dead tree
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	
Tree #: 33 Species: M P N E DBH: 30 # of trunks: 1 Height: 80 Spread: 40	
Form: 🕒 generally symmetric 🛛 minor asymmetry 🔲 major asymmetry 🗍 stump sprou	t 🗔 stag-headed
Crown class: dominant Co-dominant intermediate suppressed	
Live crown ratio: 30 % Age class: 🗆 young 🗆 semi-mature igmature 🗔 ov	er-mature/senescent
Pruning history: Crown cleaned excessively thinned topped crown raised pollardy	ed 🗆 crown reduced 🗋 flush cuts 🗖 cabled/braced
Special Value: Specimen Cheritage/historic Cwildlife Cunusual Street tree Screen	Shade Lindigenous Protected by gov. agency
TREE HEALTH	
	th obstructions:
	ikes 🗆 wire/ties 🗋 signs 🗋 cables
	rb/pavement 🔲 guards
Woundwood development:	er
Major pests/diseases:	
SITE CONDITIONS	
	atural 🔲 woodlandMorest
Landscape type: parkway raised bed container mound lawn Pshrul Irrigation: Phone adequate inadequate excessive trunk wettled	
6	line clearing
\sim	ement litted? VN
% dripline w/ iill soit: 09 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
% dripline grade lowered:0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%	
Soil problems: drainage Shallow compacted droughty saline alkaline acidic	□small volume □ disease center □ history of fail
□ clay □ expansive □ slope° aspect: Obstructions: □ lights □ signage □ line-of-sight □ view □ overhead lines □ undergrout	vi utilities Etraffic Eladiaceut ven
Exposure to wind: Exingle tree below canopy above canopy recently exposed with	
	Idom 🖸 regularly
TARGET	
Use Under Tree: Duilding parking traffic pedestrjan recreation landscape	hardscape small features utility lines
Can target be moved? Y W Can use be restricted? Y W	
Occupancy: Occasional use O intermittent use O frequent use B constant use	

The International Society of Arboriculture assumes no responsibility for conclusions or recommendations derived from use of this form.

TREE DEFECTS DROT DEFECTS Suspect root rot: Muchraen/const/brackel present: ID: Root prunet: Service I moderate Div Root prunet: Service I moderate Div Restricted root area: Dever Imoderate Div Restricted root area: Contract I moderate Div Soll cracking: Vite Decay in plane of teas: Y @ Root stress stress in moderate Div Catomonanting teators: Imoderate Div Soll cracking: Vite Catomonanting teators: Imoderate Div Soll cracking: Vite Dock area Root area Imoderate Moderate Div Dock area Root area Imoderate Div Div Catomonanting teators: Imoderate Div Soll cracking: Div Dock area	# 33							
ROUT DEFECTS: Suspect root rot: Div Understalle Div Exposed roots: Service Div Understalle Div Root prunet: Service Div Understalle Div Restricted roots: Div Div No When:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	eL i					
ROUT DEFECTS: Suspect root rot: Div Understalle Div Exposed roots: Service Div Understalle Div Root prunet: Service Div Understalle Div Restricted roots: Div Div No When:								
Suspect root rot: Mushreom/conk/bracket present; ID:	TREE DEFECTS		2 					
Suspect root rot: Mushtraom/conk/bracket present; ID:	ROOT DEFECTS:							
Exposed roots: Devere Diverse Diverse<	Alara.							
Capacity for the second provided in the second provided provided in the second provided provided in the second provided provided provided in the second provided provid		* ¹	Ŭ		<u></u>			
Restricted rol ares: □ severe □ moderate □ low LEAN:								
LEAN:	Root pruned: <u>>FT</u> distan	ce from trunk Root area al	lfected:20-30 % Bu	ttress wounded: Y (N)	When:			
Decay in plane of lean: Y Routs broken Y Soll cracking: Y Compounding tactors:	Restricted root area: 🛛 seve	re 🗆 moderate 🖬 tow	Potentiat for root failure:	Deevere I moderate	🗆 low			
Becay in plane of lear: Y Routs braken Y Soll cracking: Lean soverity: Discourse Construction Discourse Constant constand construction Discoursen	LEAN: dea, from ve	rtical 🖾 natural 🗌 unnatu	ural 🗆 self-corrected S	oil heaving: (VN				
Compounding factors:	1	- /-	1					
CADWN DEFECT: Individual defects and rate their severity (s = severe, m = moderate, 1 = bw) DEFECT RODT CROWN TRUNK SCAFFOLDS BRANCHES Poor taper Bow, sweep	and the second se			loga cavarity []ca	wara (Timodarata (Tilow			
DEFECT ROOT CROWN TRUNK SCAFFOLDS BRANCHES Poor taper Bow, sweep				-				
Poor taper	CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate pre	sence of individual defects and	rate their severity (s = severe,	, m = moderate, I = low)				
Bow, sweep Codominants/forks Codominants/forks	DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES			
Codominants/forks	Poor taper							
Multiple attachments								
Included bark								
Excessive end weight								
Cracks/splits Imagers Hargers Imagers Grading Imagers Wounds/seam Imagers Decay Imagers Cavity Imagers Cavity Imagers Cavity Imagers Cavity Imagers Cavity Imagers Conker/nushrooms/bracket Imagers Biteding/sap flow Imagers Loose/cracked bark Imagers Mesting hold/bee hive Imagers Decawood/stubs Imagers Borers/termiles/ants Imagers Canters/galle/sburds Imagers Previous failure Imagers HAZARD RATING Imagers Tree part most likely to fait Imagers Previous failure Imanual Inspection period: annual Inspection period: annual Inspection period: annual Inspection period: annual Previous failure Imagers HAZARD ABATEMENT Imagers Failure Potelefective part Imagerstread Rating								
Hangers Girding Girding Wounds/seam Decay								
Girdling Wounds/seam Decay								
Wounds/seam Decay Cavity Cavity Cavity Conks/mushrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow Statushrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow Conks/mushrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow Statushrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow Statushrooms/bracket Borers/tarmites/ants Statushrooms/bracket Borers/termites/ants Statushrooms/bracket Borers/termites/ants Statushrooms/bracket HAZARD RATING Failure potential: 1 - low; 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe Size of part: 1 - c6" (15 cm); 2 - 6-18" (15 -45 cm); a - 18 - 30" (45 - 75 cm); 4 - severe Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Øding = Hazard Rating Target rating; 1 - coccasional use; 2 intermitter use; Sature Potential + Size of Part + Target Øding = Hazard Rating Target rating; 1 - coccasional use; 2 intermitter use; Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Øding = Hazard Rating Target rating; 1 - coccasional use; 2 intermitter use; HAZARD ABATEMENT								
Cavity Conks/mushrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Loose/cracked bark Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Nesting hole/bee hive Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Deadwood/stubs Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Borers/termiles/ants Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Canters/galls/burls Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Previous failure Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket HAZARD RATING Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Inspection period: Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Inspection period: Image: Conks/mushrooms/bracket Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Pating = Hazard Rating Image: Constant use; 2 intermittent use; 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use; 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use; 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use HAZARD ABATEMENT Image: Constant use Image: Constant use; 1 - corown clean Prune: Iremove delective part Ireduce end weight Corown clean Intin (Iraise canopy (Icrown reduce (I restructure (I shape) Cable/Brace: Image: Constant use Image: Constant use Image: Constant use Cable/Brace: Imanuel (I covaluate) Image: Constant us								
Conks/mustrooms/bracket Bleeding/sap flow Bleeding/sap flow Image: Conks/frage flow Loose/cracked bark Image: Conks/frage flow Nesting hole/bae hive Image: Conks/frage flow Deadwood/stubs Image: Conks/frage flow Borers/termites/ants Image: Conks/frage flow Cankers/galls/burts Image: Conks/frage flow Previous failure Image: Conks/frage flow HAZARD RATING Image: Conks/frage flow Tree part most likely to fail: Image: Conks/frage flow Inspection period: annual tiannual Inspection period: annual tiannual Inspection period: annual tiannual Step of part: 1 - c6" (15 cm); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 5 - 18 - 30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm); 4 - 30	Decay							
Bleeding/sap flow	Cavity							
Loose/cracked bark Nesting hole/bee hive Deadwood/slubs S Borers/termites/ants S Cankers/galls/burts S Previous failure S HAZARD RATING S Tree part most likely to fail: S Inspection period: annual the potential + Size of Part + Target Bating = Hazard Rating S Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Bating = Hazard Rating S - 18-30" (15-45 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm) Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Bating = Hazard Rating S - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm) HAZARD ABATEMENT S - 100 Prune: I reduce end weight Crown clean I thin Prune: I reduce end weight Crown clean I thin I raise canopy Crown reduce I restructure I shape Cable/Brace: Inspect further: I root crown I decay I aerial I monitor Remove tree: N Reptace2 N Move target: Y N Other: Effect on adjacent trees: I' none I evaluate Y - 27 - 17								
Nesting hole/bee hive		•						
Deadwood/stubs S S Borers/termites/ants S S Cankers/galls/burds Previous failure S HAZARD RATING S S Tree part most likely to fail: Conters/galls/burds S Inspection period: annual other Size of part: 1 - c6" (15 cm); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - 30" (75 cm) Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Bating = Hazard Rating Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use; 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use HAZARD ABATEMENT								
Borers/termites/ants S S Cankers/galls/burls Previous failure S HAZARD RATING								
Cankers/galls/burts Previous failure HAZARD RATING					12			
Previous failure								
HAZARD RATING				(5	.5			
Tree part most likely to fail: <u>200756</u> STEM Inspection period:annualbiannualother Failure Potential: 1 - low; 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe Size of part: 1 - 66" (15 cm); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm); 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm) 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm) 3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm) 3 - frequent use; 2 intermittent use; 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use HAZARD ABATEMENT Prune: □ remove defective part □ reduce end weight □ crown clean □ thin [] raise canopy □ crown reduce □ restructure □ shape Cable/Brace: Inspect further: □ root crown □ decay □ aerial □ monitor Remove tree: □ N Replace? V N Move target: V N Other: Effect on adjacent trees: □ none [] evaluate Motification: □ rowner □ manager □ governing agency Date: <u>4-27-17</u>			<u>, </u>					
Inspection period:	HAZARD RATING	DEST STEAD		Foiture potentials 1 Jan	= 2 modium: 2 high: 4 coupro			
Inspection period:	Tree part most likely to fail:	001303000		Contractive and the second				
Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Paling = Hazard Haling Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use; * * * * * 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use HAZARD ABATEMENT			_ other					
3 + 3 + 4 = 0 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use HAZARD ABATEMENT 3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use Prune: I reduce end weight I crown clean I remove defective part I reduce end weight I crown clean Cable/Brace: Inspect further: I root crown Remove tree: N Replace? N Move target: Y N Other: Ettect on adjacent trees: If none I coaluate 4-27-17 Notification: If owner I manager I governing agency Date:	Failure Potential + Size of Part +	Target Baling = Hazard Rating						
HAZARD ABATEMENT Prune: remove defective part reduce end weight crown clean thin raise canopy crown reduce restructure shape Inspect further: root crown decay rearial monitor Remove tree: N Replace2 N Move target: N Other: Effect on adjacent trees: Finone Governing agency Date:								
Prune: Iremove defective part Ireduce end weight Icrown clean Ithin Iraise canopy Icrown reduce Irestructure Ishape Cable/Brace: Inspect further: Iroot crown Idecay Iaerial Imonitor Remove tree: N Replace2 N Move target: Y N Other: Imonitor Effect on adjacent trees: Imone Ill evaluate 4-27-17 Imone Imone Notification: Imone Igoverning agency Date: 4-27-17 Imone Imone				0 118400				
Cable/Brace: Inspect further: □root crown □ decay □ aerial □ monitor Remove tree: N Replace2 N Move target: Y Notification: □ monager □ governing agency □ ale:								
Remove tree: N Replace? N Move target: YN Other:	Prune: 🗌 remove delective j	part [] reduce end weight [] crown clean \Box thin \Box ra	ise canopy 🔲 crown reduce	LI restructure II shape			
Effect on adjacent trees: Einone Devaluate U-27-17	Cable/Brace:		I	inspect lutther: [] root crown	n 🗋 decay 🖾 aerial 🗋 monitor			
Notification: Bowner Danager Dete: 4-21-11	Remove tree: N Rep	lace2(Y) N Move largel	; Y(N) Other:					
Notification: Bowner D manager D governing agency Date:	Effect on adjacent trees: ۲	none [] evaluate	177-1	7				
CORRECTLY C	Notification: Bowner Dn	nanager 🛛 governing agency		/	ar			
	COMMENTS							

P62

1-3

A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation	
TREE HAZARD EVALU	ATION FORIVI 2nd Edition
SHE/Address: <u>220 UPFER WALDEN</u> Map/Location: EP3T JIDE, DF BUILDING	HAZARD RATING: $4 = 10$
Owner: public private unknown other Date: Inspector:	Failure + Size + Target = Hazard Potential of part Rating Rating Immediate action needed
Date of last inspection:	Needs further inspection
TREE CHARACTERISTICS	Dead tree
Tree #: 34 Species: M PINIES	
DBH: 24 # of trunks: Height: 75_ Spread: 15	53 1
Form: B generally symmetric D minor asymmetry D major asymmetry D stump sprot	ut 🗔 stag-headed
Crown class: dominant Bco-dominant dintermediate disuppressed	
IE	ver-malure/senescent
Pruning history: Crown cleaned excessively thinned Stopped Crown raised pollard	
Special Value: Specimen Cheritage/historic Cheritage/	n Lisbade Lindigenous Protected by gov. agence
TREE HEALTH Foliage color: Enormal Chlorotic Inecrotic Epicormics? Y B Grov	vth obstructions:
	akes wire/ties signs cables
	urb/pavement 🗌 quards
	her
Vigor class: excellent vigor class: excellent vigor class:	
Major pests/diseases: BEETVES	
SITE CONDITIONS	natural El umodiografifornot
	natural Dwoodland/forest
	ib border 🗋 wind break
) line clearing
	l line clearing \Box site clearing version of ∇
1	vernent inteu? Y (1)
% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-59% 50-75% 75-100% Soil problems: 🗋 drainage 💭 shallow 🗋 compacted 🗋 droughty 🗋 saline 🗋 alkaline 🗋 acidic	Demail volume O disease center O bistori of fail
Clay Clay Clausie Clause Clause Clause	
Obstructions: Ilights Isignage Ine-of-sight I view I overhead lines I undergrou	nd utilities 🛛 traffic 💭 adjacent veg. 🖾
Exposure to wind: Esingle tree , the low canopy above canopy recently exposed with	indward, canopy edge 🛛 area prone to windthrow
Prevailing wind direction: Occurrence of snow/ice storms Briever [] se	eldom [] regularly
TARGET	
Use Under Tree: Building parking traffic pedestrian recreation landscape	hardscape small features utility lines
Can target be moved? Y(N) Can use be restricted? Y(N)	
Can target be moved? Y N Can use be restricted? Y N	ions derived from use of this form

34

TREE DEFECTS							
ROOT DEFECTS:							
Suspect root rot: (V), M	ishroom/conk/bracket present	: Y(N) ID:					
Exposed roots: Esevere	🛛 moderate 🗌 low 🛛 Ui	ndermined: 🗋 severe 🗋	moderate Drow				
Root pruned: 5H distan	ce from trunk Root area al	fected: 25-50% But	ress wounded: Y 🔊 W	hen:			
Restricted root area: 🗆 seve		Potential for root failure:	Devere Domoderate D	low			
			iil heaving: Y (N)	8			
LEAN: deg. from ver Decay in plane of lean: Y N			ni neavnig. T				
5 77 73	Ŭ	6075-000	lean coverity [] cov	ere 🗔 moderate 🗀 iow			
Compounding factors: Lean severity: [] severe [] moderate [] low CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate presence of individual defects and rate their severity (s = severe, m = moderate, l = low)							
CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate pre	sence of individual detects and	rate their sevenity (s = severe,	m = moderate, I = low)	······			
DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES			
Poor taper							
Bow, sweep			11 NI				
Codominants/forks							
Multiple attachments							
Included bark	<u> </u>						
Excessive end weight							
Cracks/splits							
Hangers		· ·					
Girdling							
Wounds/seam							
Decay							
Cavity							
Conks/mushrooms/bracket							
Bleeding/sap flow	•						
Loose/cracked bark							
Nesting hole/bee hive							
Deadwood/slubs			5	5			
Borers/termites/ants	3	S	5	S			
Cankers/galls/buris							
Previous failure							
HAZARD RATING							
Tree part most likely to fail: p	NOTS & STEM		Failure potential: 1 - low:	2 - medium: 3 - high; 4 - severe			
			Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 c				
Inspection period:		_ other		5-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)			
Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use;							
3 + 3 +	4 = 10		 A strategy and the strategy	t use; 4 - constant use			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
HAZARD ABATEMENT				Lizertructure Elebone			
Prune: Cremove defective part reduce end weight Crown clean C thin C raise canopy crown reduce restructure c shape							
Cable/Brace: Inspect further: C root crown C decay C aerial C monito							
· · · ·	lace?(Y)N Move largel	: V(N) Other:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Effect on adjacent trees Innone Devaluate 4-27-17							
Notification: Downer manager governing agency Date: 7-0111							
COMMENTS		······································					

r~>

This page intentionally left blank