

May 5, 2023

Island Crest Builders c/o Justin Davis 3605 86th Ave. SE Mercer Island, WA 98040

Re: **Tree Survey Report** for the address above (Parcel #5021900045).

To Whom It May Concern,

The purpose of this report is to identify and locate significant trees and determine their condition for construction on the property mentioned above. The following survey table documents the identification, measurements, and condition of each significant tree. A property map with the locations of the tagged trees is included at the end of this report. Hazard assessments for Right-of-Way trees are also included in this report.

On May 2, 2023, I provided a basic inspection of trees within and adjacent to the parcel mentioned above. The trees were measured (diameter tape) and tagged with a number engraved metal strip. The tag numbers correspond with the data in the following tree inventory table. Tree trunks were measured 4 ¹/₂ feet from the ground which is known as the Diameter at Standard Height (DSH). The City of Mercer Island considers a significant tree to have a 10-inch DSH or greater. The number in the brackets is the total DSH for multiple trunks derived from the square root of the total diameter of all trunks; DSH = $\sqrt{[(DSH1)^2 + (DSH2)^2 + (DSH3)^2 + ...]}$.

The tree protection zone, also known as the Limit of Disturbance (LOD) is the radius around the trunk where construction activities and access are limited to protect the tree(s) and soil from damage, and to sustain tree health and stability. The LOD is determined by species, branch length from trunk (dripline), DSH, surrounding conditions, and slope. The LOD protection plan and Critical Root Zones (CRZ) will be discussed later in this report.

Each tree is given a level of risk for hazards in the inventory table. Hazards are categorized into four types of risk assessed for a five-year period: *Improbable, possible, probable, and imminent. Improbable* risk means the tree is stable, void of defects, and unlikely to fail under normal, and may not in extreme, weather conditions. *Possible* risk means that failure is unlikely to occur in normal weather conditions but may be expected in extreme weather conditions. *Probable* risk means failure may be expected under normal weather conditions. Trees with *imminent* risk are in the act of failing and should be worked on as soon as possible.

The health of the trees is defined as good, fair, and poor. Sturdy trees with no signs of decay, disease, or structural defects have good health. Fair health describes a tree as having vigor but has defects such as disease, included bark, wood decay, weak structure, or root zone issues (i.e., impervious surfaces, compacted soil, etc.) that may not be feasible for mitigation. Poor health describes a tree that is dead, a state of decline, severely diseased, injured, or a hazard to surrounding property with no chance of recovery.

Tree Survey Table:

Tag #	Species	DSH	Drip- line	LOD	Health	Condition
101	Red Cedar Thuja plicata	27.5"	12.0'	18.0'	Good	Sturdy tree with no signs of decay, disease, or structural defects. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
102*	Holly Ilex aquifolium	4.8" 5.5" [7.3"]	6.0'	6.0'	Good	Asymmetric canopy to the south. No signs of decay or disease. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
103*	Holly	8.0"	6.0'	6.0'	Good	Asymmetric canopy to the south. No signs of decay or disease. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
104*	Holly	4.8" 5.1" [7.0"]	6.0'	6.0'	Good	Asymmetric canopy to the south. No signs of decay or disease. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
105*	Holly	5.1"	6.0'	6.0'	Good	Asymmetric canopy to the south. No signs of decay or disease. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
<mark>106</mark>	Holly	4.3" 7.5" [8.6"]	8.0'	6.0'	Good	Sturdy tree with no signs of decay, disease, or structural defects. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
<mark>107</mark>	Holly	6.5"	6.0'	6.0'	Good	Asymmetric canopy to the south. No signs of decay or disease. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
<mark>108</mark>	Holly	7.0"	8.0'	6.0'	Good	Sturdy tree with no signs of decay, disease, or structural defects. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
109	White Birch Betula pendula	16.9" 19.8" [26.0"]	18.0'	20.0'	Fair	Dead top stem growth from Borer (insect) activity. No signs of decay or disease. <i>Possible</i> large part failure. <i>Improbable</i> whole tree failure.
110	Red Cedar	30.5"	18.0'	22.0'	Good	Sturdy tree with no signs of decay, disease, or structural defects. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.
111	White Birch	15.2"	14.0'	12.0'	Fair	Dead top stem growth from Borer (insect) activity. No signs of decay or disease. <i>Possible</i> large part failure. <i>Improbable</i> whole tree failure.
112	White Birch	13.6"	14.0'	12.0'	Poor	Dead top canopy from Borer (insect) activity. 50% live crown ratio. No signs of trunk decay. Probable large part tree failure.
113	Lawson cypress Chamaecyparis lawsoniana	29.3"	16.0'	22.0'	Good	Sturdy tree with no signs of decay, disease, or structural defects. <i>Improbable</i> risk of tree failure.

Trees in the Right-of-Way.

* Tree off-site with overlying root zones.

General Requirements:

30% of the trees over 10 inches DSH shall be retained and protected during the development process under Mercer Island Tree Retention Code 19.10.060.2.a. There are four (4) good to fair trees on the parcel. At least one (1) good, significant tree shall be retained to meet the minimum tree retention requirements for development.

Tree Retention Table:

Tag #	Species	DSH
110	Red Cedar	30.5"
113	Lawson	29.3"
	Cypress	

Keeping the trees listed above provides a 50.0% tree retention plan.

I recommend removing Red Cedar tree #101 even though it's considered an exceptional tree under code 19.10.060.3. Retaining this tree may be difficult as its root zone hinders access around the south and southeast corners of the existing and planned structures. Utilities such as the water line may impact the root zone. In addition, too much soil work and disturbance are needed within the critical root zone to either renovate the existing retention wall or to slope between grades.

The removal of Cedar #101 will require the planting of three (3) new trees on the site. I recommend a combination of Red Cedar (*Thuja plicata*) and Douglas Fir (*Psuedotsuga menziesii*) as new tree plantings. New tree placement for mitigation is shown on the included site map (page 10). New Cedar and Fir trees are required to be at least six feet tall when planted under code 19.10.070.3.a.

New trees are best planted during the fall season and second-best during spring season. They should be watered during their first two consecutive dry seasons (June – October). Drip systems and watering bags are the most efficient ways to keep new trees watered. A rate of 2 gallons per week is a start for drip irrigation systems while watering bags need filling about once a week.

Tree Protection Plan:

Protective fencing is required around the perimeters of the LOD for each retained or group of trees during grading and construction. Temporary chain-link fencing is recommended to preserve the trees from soil disturbance due to machines, foot traffic, and materials. Grading and construction should not be allowed within the LOD of retained trees, unless described in this report. Some of the trees have irregular root zones because of compacted surfaces, retaining walls, and structures.

I allow the protection fencing to cut across part of the LOD of retained trees 110 and 113 to provide room for building as shown on the map (page 10). This fencing plan results in less than 30% disturbance of the outer root zone area and protects the inner (critical) root zone area. The bottom branches (canopy) of trees 110 and 113 may be pruned up to 8 feet above the ground prior to fencing placement.

The radius of the Critical Root Zone (CRZ) depends on the species, dripline (branch length), and DSH of the tree. The CRZ is the area around the tree where the minimum biological capacity of roots are located for essential structural stability and health - a distance from the trunk where root growth can recover and still maintain stability. Generally, the CRZ ranges from $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{3}{4}$ of the LOD radius. The threshold for outer root zone disturbance of the LOD is no more than 30% of the area, not including the CRZ area.

Retention walls within the root zones may be renovated with minimal effects to tree health. Installation of updated stone may be done with minimal impact to the root zone. Before fencing and demolition of the existing retention wall, 3-4 inches of mulch (i.e., bark or wood chips) shall be applied over the LOD to minimize root zone disturbance. Thick plywood ($\geq \frac{1}{2}$ inch) shall be used over the mulch where foot traffic is needed to demo and build a new retention wall. A Certified Arborist is recommended during soil work (base work) within the CRZ to ensure root mitigation and report procedures. Orange barricade fencing may be used around the wall construction to protect the rest of the LOD. Tree protection placement during retention wall renovation is shown on the included map. No foot traffic or material staging within the LOD other than on plywood. Machinery used for wall demo and construction shall stage outside the LOD. Tree protection fencing shall be replaced back to its original placement as shown on the included map when the new retention wall is finished.

Please reply if you have questions.

Thank you,

] onnie Olson

Lonnie Olson, Owner ISA Certified Arborist (PN-5427A) exp. 12/31/2023 Qualified Tree Risk Assessor (#697) exp. 7/23/2024

Birch Tree #109:



The picture above taken at the time of the inspection shows Birch tree #109. The red arrows indicate the two trunks of the tree. The top canopy exhibits dieback from Birch Bronze Borer (insect) activity which there is no control. This tree is not feasible for preservation and will not be able to recover from insect activity.

Nome IIII IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Residual risk Residual risk Residual risk	nded Inspection inter		Image: second	High Very Eady Sorresoltat III Sorresoltat III Sorresoltat III U-Bilety High Frode-1 I fow activity, Ne gottinued rretention.	Likely Likely Lunikely Lunikely Unikely Unikely Significan	Are Reselved So Selve So Selve So Selve So Mainor Mainor Mainor Low Low Low Low Low Low Low Are Sect activity Tree is n	Nucre 2	Internet Unitive listice able Unitive bible Unitive bible 2 Rick rating in site Internet site 2 Rick rating in site Internet site what filely niliely Internet site Internet site niliely niliely Internet site Internet site niliely Internet site Internet site	Imm Pro Pro Marzie Sam Sam Sam Sam Sam Sam Sam Sam Sam Sam	In Meekun IX. Larr Inducts brik Camage I Inducts brik Camage Steepent Inducts Brik Inducts Brik	lietov/Moss En lietov/Moss E saturners S soci decay E mosside E pepth prosside D pastie Depth prosside D pastie Dista	Vines/Mise Vines/Vine	Normal IIC Dense acting the Likelli Branches — Codet = Codet and brack Septense yeard Sector of Content Dead on defect Load on defect Collar burleo/h Docat = Collar burleo/h Docat = Const of Content = Collar burleo/h Collar burleo/h Docat = Collar burleo/h Collar burleo/h Collar burleo/h	sande ingli Sameli kg/ sand Conditions Affi Crown and I wax. diaV vax. diaV va	Alloc Severall realized factors Season of factors factor	ed change in John ed change in John excess B excess B v v v v v v v v v v v v v	and caposure 17 and caposure 17 and caposure 17 based of the caposition of the caposition based of the caposition of the caposition based of the caposition of the caposition based of the caposition of the caposition of the caposition of the caposition of the caposition of the caposition of the caposition of the caposition of the caposition of the capos
						of impact	Likelihood	atrix.	. Likelihood m	Matri	% Necrotic	Chloratic	armal 80 %	ne (dead) 🗆 No siotic None pod	e (seasonal)	orer W Trunk Roots D	ormal 🗆 High onze Birch Be ofile Branches	r Low 🕅 Nu s/Biotic_Bru cies failure pro
											% Aspert	It Slope	Topography Fi Describe s□ rain ⊠_ Descri	tors ay Real ats wement over rout species Profile	Site Fact Changed soil hydroleg w Compacted D Pa Strong winds D led D Tree Health and S	nge□ She c'earing □ □ Saturated □ Sha lo _ Common weather	None B Grade cha mited volume [Irrection_NE	ory of failures changes None conditions Li ailing wind d
Low	×			×	ood	Deadw	branch	Stem/	2		4 4 4 Practical	driplin × Target will 1xHL Target will 1.5 x Ht	lone transforme	Target	E)	Tanget description inucture (existing & Road (86th Ave S	ş	
Severe 205 Risk (From Charter 2)	Very likely 2 2 Negligible X Minor Significant	X Medium High Unlikely Likely Likely	Imminent Very low	Improbable Possible	sion(s) seem	condi of co	part /branch	Tree Stem/	Target reget nurriber v sincription) 1		end dia. 36' end dia. 36' e frame 4 years	2 the target zone	sht 80'	.9", <u>19.8"</u> Hei ed Basic inspe ssment	cer Island dbh <u>15</u> Tools us Target Asse	86th Ave. SE, Mer 7 -5427A	ation 3605 t tula pendula nie Olson PN	species <u>Be</u> ssar(s) <u>Lon</u>

6

Birch Trees #111 and #112:



The picture above shows Birch trees #111 and #112 at the time of the inspection. The yellow arrow indicates tree #111 and the red arrow indicates tree #112. Both trees exhibit partial dead canopies from Bronze Birch Borer (insect) activity with tree #112 having the most dieback. These two trees are not feasible for preservation and cannot recover from insect activity.

Residual risk Nor Residual risk Residual risk Residual risk	Recom	Extreme	ment needed ONo	Low D	k None M	ll residual ris GFinal 🗆 Prei	Condition(s) of concern <u>revovernovino</u> Part Size <u>15" dia.</u> Fall Distance <u>20'</u> Overa Load on defect N/h Miron <u>8</u> Moderate <u>D</u> Septicant Inspec	Candidon(s) of concern <u>No concerns</u> Part Size <u>15" dia.</u> Fall Distance <u>40'</u> Load on delect N/A Minor N Wodstram Significant
Residual risk Nor Residual risk Residual risk				s	200	ll tran pick par	Root plate l'fhing 4 Response growth	Cavity/Nest hole% circ. Depth Poor taper Loan° Corrected?
Residual risk Nor					20 20		Cracks C.ut/Damaged roots Distance from trunk	apyrodu dainiego dowy – Generaly Gray Gons – General General – General Hoartwood decay – Gonks/Mushrooms – Lightning damage – Hoartwood decay – Gonks/Mushrooms –
						tion aptions Remove	Collar bunes/Not visible Depth	Deed/Missing.bark Abnormal bark texture/color Codominant.stems Included.bark Cracks Cracks
-	L	on.	t viable for retention	Tree is no	tual death.	ck and ever	- Roots and Root Collar	Trunk
		No	rch Borer activity. Expect continuec	1 Bronze B	lieback fron for such inse	py exhibits o ol available	Load on deflect N/A Single Ninor SID Sisters	*art Size 10" dia. Fall Distance 80" .cad on defect N/A I Minor Modernitr Significant .cad on defect N/A I Minor Modernitr Significant .cad on defect N/A I Minor Modernitr Significant
				15	s, description	, explanation	(s) of contram Lead wood Notes	Canopy dieback Condition
)		a.	Law To	Low	Low	Inlikely	Response provide the second se	ush cuts D Other
North		sh erale	High Ha Moderate Mode	Low	Low	Likely swhat likely	Conks Heartwood decay Some	aduced C Thinned C Raised C Lon-tailed C Topped C Lon-tailed C
	-	OHIC	High Extre	Moderate	Low	ary likely	Previous branch fail unes Smillar branches present W	Verrextended oranches
	-	ere	Significant Seve	Minor	Negligible	re & Impact	Weak attachments Cavity/Nest hole % dro.	koken/Hangers Number /Vax dia.
			res of Failure	Conspauen	HAU IA.	2. INSK FALIN, I	Crademinant Lingtoning camage Lingtoning Lingtoning camage Lingtoning Ling	Inteationund unswin D LCR <u>50 %</u> Johan Subranches 20 20 % sweetall Max. dia. 6"
		ALC: MILE	Annual Annual	W I	The United	J Disk weinen	d Branches -	- Crown and
		t likely	Inlikely Somewha	Y	W Unlike	able Unlike	Affecting the Likelihood of Failure	Tree Defects and Conditions A
		V	what likely Likel	ly Som	W Unlike	able Unlike	Prob	nt or expected change in load factors Seasonal winds
	+	aly I	dedium Higi Ukely Very lik	likely	y Somewhat	inent Unlika	Normal B Dense Vines/Mistletoe/Moss None Immi	n density Sparse D Normal 2 Dense D Interior branches Few D
	1		"Impact	Likelihood o	-	haod	Factors Likeli	Load
	-				natrix.	I. Likelihood n	ad wood	es failure profile Branches 🕅 Trunk 🗆 Roots 🗆 Deacribe Dea
						AL 2.9 2000	None (dead) Normal 80 % Chlorotic % Necrotic %	Low 🛛 Normal 🗆 High 🗆 Foliage None (seasonal)
							ad Species Profile	iling wind direction IVE Common weather strong winds Lick Tree Health an
	20			_			Pavement over routs // Describe Fair	nanges wore we versee change - see realing - vers geveen vers onditions limited volume - Saturated - Shalew - Computed -
							Topography Flat 32 Slope % Aspect	ry of failures None
							actors	Site F
							None X 4 no no	Road (86th Ave SE)
x x x	×		Dead wood	ranch	Stem/b	2	None X 4 no no	Structure (existing & new)
							Tanget with the second	Taryet description
X X X	×		Dead wood	branch	Stem/	4	ithin ictiin ithin ithin tt. Occupancy I to an I?	
Low Medium High Unlikely Somewhat Likely Very likely Negligible Minor Significant Severe	Probable Imminent Very low	Improbable Possible	of contern	i i	Trent	biget number v description/	used Basic inspection tools, camera_Time frame_4 years seesiment	sor(s) <u>Lonnie Olson PN-5427A</u> Tools Target As
Impact Failure & Impact Consequences grow Number 1	re	Failu	Condition(s)			Target	15.2" Height 80" Crown spread dia. 28"	neries Betula pendula dbh
Likelihood	-						Date May 1, 2023 Time 9:10 am	Island Crest Builders

x 4 no no mapping x 4 no no res source source<	Lead on defect N/A Ministrance Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministrance Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministrance Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministrance Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministrance Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministrance Land on defect N/A Dosod/Missing bark Abnormal bark sexture/color Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cack/Damual Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker Cacker <t< th=""></t<>
2 Sem/Varach Dead wood X	Lead on defect N/A Minicrial Materian Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Minicrial Materian Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Minicrial Materian Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Minicrial Materian Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Minicrial Materian Land on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Minicrial Materian Lead on defect N/A Lead on defect Provide Land Restaur/Loobin Caller binite//Not visible Caller binite//Not visible Caller binite//Not visible Concommant stems Include binit Cances/Gall/Shults Sap once Occe Caller binite//Not visible Sapwood damage Hort/Wood deary Contex/Misil/Nomes Occe Call/Dumui Lead materian %ctrc Depth Poor Laper Canders (Introduced Introduced Introdu
2 Stem/branch Dead wood X 4 no N	Lead on defect N/A Ministration Significant Load on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministration Load on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministration Load on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Environment Load on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Environment Lead on defect N/A Lead on defect Probable Inministration Lead on defect N/A Cocommunit stems Innoundet bark Caracts Collar buries/Net Vaisible Sapwood damage(C) Canlest/Galls/Bubb Sap once Occe Occe Lightming damage(C) Heartwood decay(C) Conds/S County Occe Cards C Cur/Dama Lightming damage(C) Heartwood decay(C) Conds/S County Cards C Cur/Dama
2 Stem/March Dead wood X X X X X X X High Target Rul2 Supell	Lead on defect N/A Ministration of an unstance Significant Lond on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministration of an unstance Lond on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministration of an unstance Lond on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministration of an unstance Lond on defect N/A Lead on defect N/A Ministration of an unstance Lond on defect N/A Lead on defect Probable Incruted an transcription of an unstance Lond on defect N/A Codeminant stems Incruted bark Abnormal hark texture/color Cracks Doad Doad Saewood cannees/deal/seture/ Canker/Salls/Sauts Sabo cone Occe Occe
x 4 no no ramby Fut 30 Stope1 % Aspect % <	Lead on defect NAD Mine: 10 Monte: Disputitizant Long on defect NA Lieadino defect NAD Mine: 10 Monte: Disputitizant Long on defect NA Lieadino def failure Immosale: Disputitizant Disputitizant Long on defect NA Lieadino defect NAD - Probable Disministration definitione Imp
x 4 no no randow Fund Stem/branch Dead wood X X X N High real	Load on defect NAL Monor Monorant: Significant Load on defect NA Load on defect NAL Monor Without Significant Load on defect NA Likelihood of failure Improbable Pavilule X Probable Immirem Likelihood of failure Impr
Image: Strength Full Image: Strengt Full Image: Strengt Full I	Part Size Fail Distance Fail of the second s
Image: Second State	
Image: State of the s	Dead canopy Condition(s) of concern Dead scaf
Image: Normality Find Aspent_ Image: Normality Find Nerrorist X <thx< th=""> X <thx< th=""></thx<></thx<>	Reduced D topped D dontration D Response growth
Image: Signed	Crown deaned I Thinned Raised Dead/Missing bark Con-
Image: State Stem/branch Dead wood X X X X X X X X I X I I X I I X I X I X I X I X I <th< td=""><td>Over-extended branches Previous branch failures Previous branch failures Previous branch failures Previous Action Previous Pr</td></th<>	Over-extended branches Previous branch failures Previous branch failures Previous branch failures Previous Action Previous Pr
Image: Name	Isoken,Hargers Number Vax. dia Codominant
Image: Name Image: Name Image: Name	
Image: State of the state o	- Crown and Branches -
Image: Name of the state o	Tree Defects and Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of F
Image: Strate	cent or expected change in load factors Seasonal winds
Image: State of the control of the	nd exposure Protected Livertual Funda wind runneing Liveranches Few 🗷 Normal Dense Liveranches Few 🖾 Normal Dense Liveranches Few Kannan Statement Protected Statement P
X 4 no no 2 Stem/branch Dead wood X	Load Factory Relation Relations
X 4 no no 2 Stem/branch Dead wood X	ecies failure profile Branches Trunk Roots Describe Dead scaffold branches
X 4 no no 2 Stem/branch Dead wood X	sts/Biotic Bronze Birch Borer Abiotic None
Image: Strate in the image	nr tow 🕱 Normat 🗆 High 🔲 Foliage None (seasonal) 🗌 None (dead) 🗌 Normal 🖇
x 4 no no 2 Stem/branch Dead wood x x A x 4 no no no no no no no x 4 no no no no no no no x 4 no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no y no no no no no no no <t< td=""><td>wailing wind direction <u>NE</u> Common weather Strong winds Ucc Snow Heavy rain</td></t<>	wailing wind direction <u>NE</u> Common weather Strong winds Ucc Snow Heavy rain
Image: State of the state	achanges None 🗷 Grade change 🗆 Site clearing 🗆 Changod soil hydrology 🗆 Root cuts 🗆 Tweering I conditions Limited volume 🗆 Saturated 🗆 Shallow 🗖 Computed 🗖 Pavement over roots 🗖
Image: Constraint of the state of	tory of failures None Topogra
Image: state of the state o	Site Factors
X 4 no no 2 Stem/branch X 4 no no no no no	
X 4 no no 2 Stem/branch Dead wood X	Road (86th Ave SE) None
	Structure (existing & new) None
B Tanget wild drij lin Tanget wild drij lin Tanget wild drij lin Tanget wild drij lin Tanget wild drij lin Practical	Target description Target protection
$\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}$	
Improbable Possible P	essor(s) <u>Lonnie Olson PN-5427A</u> Took used <u>Basic inspection te</u> Target Assessment
B0 Crown spread dia: 28 Tagget Failure Impact Failure Impact Guide & Empatic	ress/Tree location 3605 86th Ave. SE, Mercer Island Ire
May 1, 2023 Time 9:20 am Ukelhood	nt Island Crest Builders Date T

9



Property Map: 3605 86th Ave. SE, Mercer Island.

Assumptions & Limiting Conditions

- 1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownerships to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. All property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.
- 2. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, I can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- 3. I shall not be required to give testimony or attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee.
- 4. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
- 5. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant.
- 6. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report, nor copy thereof, shall be conveyed by anyone, including the client, to the public through advertising, news, sales, or other media, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant particularly as to value conclusions, identity of the consultant, or any reference to any professional society or institute or to any initialed designation conferred upon the consultant as stated in my qualification.
- 7. This report and 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.
- 8. Sketches, diagrams, and photographs in this report, being intended as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or surveys.
- 9. Unless expressed otherwise: (1) information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflects the condition of those items at the time of inspection; and (2) the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, excavation, probing, or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property in question may not arise in the future.

Certification of Performance & Appraisal

I, Lonnie Olson, certify that all the statements of fact in this report are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that they are made in good faith.

- □ I have personally inspected the trees and the property referred to in this report and have stated my findings accurately. The extent of the evaluation or appraisal is stated in the attached report and the terms of assignment.
- □ The analysis, opinions, and conclusions stated herein are my own and are based on current scientific procedures and facts.
- □ No one provided significant professional assistance to me, except as indicated within the report.
- □ My compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party nor upon the results of the assessment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any subsequent events.

I further certify that I am a member in good standing with the International Society of Arboriculture. I have been involved in the field of arboriculture in a full-time capacity for more than 26 years.

Lonnie Olson

Signed: _____