



ARBOR INFO LLC

2406 N Castle Way Brier, WA, 98036

Tree Assessment Report

**Peyree Property
6059 77th Ave SE
Mercer Island, WA**

**Date
June 15, 2017**

1. Introduction 3
2. Competence 3
3. Client 3
4. Assignment 3
5. Purpose and Use of Report 3
6. Limits of Assignment 3
7. Site Description 4
8. Methodology 4
9. Analysis and Testing 4
10. Observations 4
11. Conclusions 5
13. Assumptions and Limiting Conditions 5

Attachments

Plat Map L0.1 with Tree Locations
Tree Protection Assessment Form

1. Introduction

I was contacted by Mr. Dan DiZazzo on May 30, 2017 to conduct a tree assessment on the Peyree property at 6059 77th Ave SE, Mercer Island, Washington. I subsequently visited the site on June 14 and developed the following report.

2. Competence

I have been a practicing consulting forester in the State of Washington since 1971. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Forest Management from the University of Washington and am a certified forester (Society of American Foresters). I have also been a consulting arborist since 1989 and am a Certified Arborist (International Society of Arboriculture, ISA), and a registered consulting arborist (American Society of Consulting Arborists). I am Tree Risk Assessment Qualified (ISA).

3. Client

The client to whom this report is addressed is:

Mr. Dan DiZazzo
Landscape Architect
Dan@dandizazzo.com

4. Assignment

The assignment is comply with The City of Mercer Island Tree Protection and Removal requirements in advance of proposed house removal and new construction.

5. Purpose and Use of Report

The purpose of this report is to assist stakeholders in assessing certain trees on the property and identifying those large trees on site in preparation for reconstruction activities.

6. Limits of Assignment

The assignment is limited to the information gathered during the site visit on June 14, 2017 and references noted in this report. Information from published sources cited herein is assumed to be reliable.

7. Site Description

The subject property is a single family waterfront residence on terraced west facing slopes, similar to others in the neighborhood.

8. Methodology

I visited the site on June 14, 2017 in the company of Mr. DiZazzo who explained the redevelopment concepts and proposals. I subsequently identified each tree shown on the Preliminary Tree Preservation and Removal plat LO.1 (attached) and marked each with a numbered aluminum tag. Trees were identified by common species names, measured for diameter at 4.5-feet (or more reasonable height in the case of multiple sprouts), live crown percentage, total height and radial dripline length. Tree defects were recorded and an estimate of viability for the 3-year valid time frame. Trees within 15-feet of the exterior property line (excluding the south adjacent property which is reported separately) are included.

I examined the trees to the standards of the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) level 2 TRAQ assessment. (Tree Risk Assessment Qualified)

TRAQ Level 2 Assessment

- Locate and Identify Subject Trees
- Determine Targets
- Review Site History
- Assess Tree Health
- Inspect: ocular, mallet, probes etc.
- Record Observations: defects, site conditions, growth rates
- Determine the Likelihood and consequences of failure
- Determine Level of Risk
- Recommend Mitigation if appropriate
- Suggest re-inspection levels

See attached Tree Protection Assessment Form.

9. Analysis and Testing

No laboratory testing was initiated as part of this assignment.

10. Observations

A total of twenty-nine trees were located as shown on the L0.1 plat that was not shown. The trees are numbered 32-56 (tree number 30 was not located and tree #56 was not shown on the plat) . Mercer Island recognizes conifer trees over 6-feet in height and

deciduous trees over 6-inches in diameter at 4.5 feet as “Large” or significant trees subject to protection and removal regulations.

<u>Large Trees</u>	
	Tag #
Conifer	27,28,29,32,33,34,48,49,52
Deciduous	31,38,40,41,46,47,51,54,55,56

All trees were considered viable over the 3-year validity term except No. 36 and No. 42. No. 36, a Dogwood is standing dead. No. 42, an Aspen is growing within one foot of the house is not likely to survive due to lack of light and root development.

The L0.1 plat indicates those trees proposed for removal, retention or transplant. Of concern are trees No. 48 and 49, large Douglas-fir in the northeast corner of the property. A re-configured driveway is planned for encroachment into the root zones to within about 8-feet of No. 48 and 10-feet of No. 49. In either case, total root zone disturbance is expected to be less than 20-percent of the total root area. These two trees are healthy and viable with no visible defects and robust live green crowns.

Off site and within 15-feet of the south property line I noted 35 trees (28 are a tightly planted Thuja pyramidalis hedge) numbered 102-136. Only No. 136, a Hawthorne just off the southeast corner of the property are viable. Since no construction is planned within the driplines of these trees, no extraordinary protections are required.

11. Conclusions

In my opinion tree number 48 and 49 are viable and will remain so with the root zone disturbance contemplated.

12. Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Ownership of the subject trees as provided by the client is assumed to be correct. No responsibility is assumed for legal matters.
2. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. The consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
3. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including additional fees.
4. This report and any values expressed herein represent the opinion of the consultant, and the consultant’s fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified value, a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.

5. The exhibits in this report are included to assist the reader and are not necessarily to scale.
6. Unless expressed otherwise, information in this report covers only items that were examined, and reflects the condition of those items at the time of inspection. The inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible portions of the trees.
7. Loss or alteration of any part of the report invalidates the entire report. Ownership of any documents related to this report passes to the client only.
8. The liability of ArborInfo LLC its contractors and employees is limited to the client only and only up to the amount of the fee actually received for the assignment.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Tom Hanson".

Thomas M. Hanson, CF, RCA

Tree Protection Assessment Form

6/14/2017

Date:

N/P*

Site: **Peyree 6059 77th Ave SE**

Inspector: **T Hanson**

Tree #	Species	DBH (inches)	Height (feet)	Large Tree** Y/N	Crown Ratio (%)	Drip Line						Disturbance LOD	Condition	per LO.1		Comments
						N	S	E	W	Remove	Transpl.					
On Site "trees" as indicated on LO.1 Plan																
27	D fir	29	100	Y	80	14	25	20	14	25		Good	Y			
28	Leyland Cyp.	5,4	18	Y	100	7	3	2	6	5		Good	Y	Y		Topped, wire in trunk
29	Leyland Cyp.	8	18	Y	100	7	3	2	2	4		Good	Y	Y		Topped, wire in trunk
30	Not used															
31	White Beam	8	21	Y	60	10	8	10	8	9		Fair	Y	Y		Topped, leaf blight
32	Leyland Cyp.	8	18	Y	100	12	4	10	6	8		Fair	Y	Y		Topped
33	Leyland Cyp.	8	18	Y	100	10	4	4	6	6		Fair	Y	Y		Topped
34	Leyland Cyp.	10	18	Y	100	14	4	12	6	9		Fair	Y	Y		
35	J. Maple	3	10	N	60	4	4	2	4	4		Good	Y		Y	
36	Dogwood	3	12	N	0	4	4	4	4	4		Dead	N	N		Remove
37	Vine Maple	3,3,2	8	N	90	3	4	3	4	4		Good	Y	N		
38	Magnolia	6	14	Y	90	8	6	4	8	7		Good	Y	N		
39	White Beam	3	18	N	80	6	2	5	8	5		Good	Y	N		
40	J. Cherry	6"@3'	8	Y	80	4	5	3	4	4		Good	Y	N		
41	Aspen	9	40	Y	70	4	4	5	5	5		Good	Y	N		
42	Lilac	3	16	N	50	0	3	5	5	3		Fair	N	N		Remove
43	J. Maple	3	14	N	70	5	5	4	3	5		Good	Y	N		
44	Pine	4"@3'	10	N	80	3	2	2	4	3		Good	Y	Y		
45	J. Maple	4"@3'	10	N	80	3	4	4	2	4		Good	Y	N		
46	Red Maple	6	40	Y	80	11	8	13	13	11		Good	Y	N		
47	White Ash	10	18	Y	80	12	9	6	13	10		Good	Y	Y		
48	D. fir	36	108	Y	60	24	24	12	20	20		Good	Y			Drip line encroachment to 8' NW OK
49	D. fir	33	108	Y	60	22	23	30	12	22		Good	Y			Drip line encroachment to 10' NW OK
50	J. Maple	5"@3'	12	N	70	6	7	7	7	7		Good	Y	Y		
51	Cotoneaster	10	10	Y	90	2	2	4	1	2		Good	Y	Y		
52	Italian Cypress	14	14	Y	100	2	2	2	1	2		Good	Y	Y		
53	Pyr. Cedar	12	12	Y	100	3	3	3	3	3		Good	Y	Y		
54	Dogwood	8	8	Y	80	4	3	3	3	3		Good	Y	Y		
55	Red Maple	16	16	Y	70	10	6	10	12	10		Good	Y	?		
56	Aspen	8	40	Y	90	4	3	4	3	4		Good	Y	Y		Next to bldg.
Off Site Trees w/in 15-feet (not tagged)																
102	Birch	3,3,4,2	80	N	50	18	21	18	22	20		Good	Y			Topped
103	Birch	12	15	Y	60	2	10	2	12	7		Good	Y			Topped
104	Birch	3,3,2	14	N	60	14	14	12	12	13		Good	Y			Topped
105	Thuja Pyramidalis	2-8"	14	Y	100	10	6	8	6	8		Good	Y			Sheared
106	Thuja Pyramidalis	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2		Good	Y			Sheared
107	Thuja Pyramidalis	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2		Good	Y			Sheared
108	Thuja Pyramidalis	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2		Good	Y			Sheared
109	Thuja Pyramidalis	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2		Good	Y			Sheared

Tree Protection Assessment Form

Date: 6/14/2017

N/P*

Site: Peyree 6059 77th Ave SE

Inspector: T Hanson

Tree #	Species	DBH (inches)	Height (feet)	Large Tree** Y/N	Crown Ratio (%)	Drip Line					Disturbance LOD	Condition	per LO.1		Comments
						N	S	E	W	Remove			Transpl.		
110	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
111	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
112	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
113	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
114	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
115	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
116	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
117	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
118	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
119	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
120	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
121	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
122	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
123	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
124	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
125	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
126	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
127	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
128	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
129	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
130	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
131	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
132	Thuja Pyramidalis	P	2-8"	10	Y	100	2	2	2	2	2	Good	Y		Sheared
133	Birch	P	7	40	Y	60	14	10	8	14	12	Good	Y		
134	Aust. Pine	P	12	35	Y	70	10	10	12	8	10	Good	Y		
135	Hinoki Ced.	P	3	14	N	80	2	4	2	3	3	Good	Y		
136	Hawthorn	P	14	22	Y	60	14	14	14	14	14	Fair	N		low vigor, thin crown

* N = Native, P = Planted
 ** Large Tree: Conifer 6' tall; Deciduous 6" DBH