From:	Gerry Kaelin
To:	Nicole Gaudette; John Kenney
Cc:	E. MErcer Highlands Assoc.; arnie EMHA eggebrecht; jill EMHA landauer; Ken Beck; E. Mercer HIghlands Assoc.; Brian Thomas; lgottlieb@bpmlaw.com; lgottlieb@msn.com; Timothy B. Fitzgerald; scott baker; christina demopulos
Subject:	4825 E Mercer 2nd Opinion Arborist Comments Fw: Review Gilles field report
Date:	Wednesday, June 26, 2019 5:07:45 PM

Thank you again Nicole and John for your time yesterday,
Please reference today's comments below from Scott Baker an arborist with Tree Solutions. He conducted a thorough development/tree impact investigation 11 years back during the prior development effort. A copy of his report was previously emailed to you. He reviewed the Gilles report and offered his feedback.
Please confirm that these comments are noted in the file, and downloaded for public access.
Sincerely,
Gerry Kaelin

From: Scott Baker <scott@treesolutions.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 3:51 PM
To: Gerry Kaelin
Cc: Ashley Gruber
Subject: Review Gilles field report

Dear Gerry,

The report is thorough but contains errors, and includes lots of stuff that is not pertinent.

The report does not state how Gilles determined that only the four roots were from the big fir trees.

My observation is that there are many smaller roots from the big trees present in the mass of roots shown in the photos. I would be surprised if the four roots mentioned are actually the only roots from the fir trees, many smaller roots are certainly present.

Tree roots in coniferous trees may extend up to the height of the tree out from the trunk even in forested settings. The general guideline for protection for a tree of this size and age would be 1 to 1.5 feet of protected radius per inch of diameter!

The report makes no mention of the other impacts that cutting a road on this site would likely cause. These include:

- Severing the a portion of the root system of the big trees and any other nearby trees.
- Changes in drainage. (Note: recent clearing in the area is already increasing the flow of the stream.)
- Changes in forest cover. (Note: recent clearing in the area is already a concern.)
- If the four good sized roots are severed to build the house this may be sufficient to cause the big tree to decline, and may compromise its stability.

There are several other thing in the report that are questionable or incorrect. Two good examples are in the Recommendations section of the report; making fungi into “microbes” – they are not (in section 2). Also blanket recommendations for fertilizing and treating the tree with beneficial microbes are not advisable (in section 2). There will be no nutrient deficiencies in the forest soils and all of the soil organisms that are beneficial are already present. If a soil test shows an issue then perhaps some treatment would help, otherwise this is a waste of time and money that will not likely change the outcome for the trees.

In my opinion this report does not do a good job of assessing and addressing the potential impacts to the trees. The Methodology Section contains no methodology. The Conclusions section contains no conclusions that can be verified. It says that it may be possible to build the driveway etc. I would like Mr. Gilles to explain why or how there would be no severe impacts to the big trees.

Being familiar with this site I can say that it will be very difficult to build on this site, and that significant impacts to the surrounding forest and adjacent forested properties will occur.

Respectfully,

Scott Baker, RCA

Scott D. Baker | Tree Solutions Inc.
Registered Consulting Arborist #414
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist PN-0670B, ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor, TRAQ Instructor
Honorary Life Member-International Society of Arboriculture

w. 206.528.4670 | scott@treesolutions.net | www.treesolutions.net | 2940 Westlake Ave N #200 Seattle, WA 98109