

February 6, 2022

CLIENT

Saurabh Khandelwal/Veena Shankaram 8460 SE 83rd St. Mercer Island, Wa. 98040

ASSIGNMENT

To travel to the above residential property to inspect two Douglas Fir trees and perform a Level 2 Visual Tree Health and Risk Assessment of the trees.

ARBORIST'S QUALIFICATIONS

M.S. in Urban Horticulture, University of Washington, 1987
Member of International Society of Arboriculture, (ISA), since 1984
ISA Certified Arborist, PN-0108A, since 1992
ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor, (TRAQ), since 2017
Founder and Owner of Seattle Tree Preservation, Inc., a tree care company, 1987-2018
Consulting Arborist and Principal of Seattle Arboriculture Associates, 2018-present

METHODS/OBSERVATIONS

A Level 2 Tree Health and Risk Assessment is based on what the arborist can observe and measure from the ground, and considers a tree's physiology, its structure, and what the targets it parts would likely strike if it were to fail in determining its risk level. Questions about a tree's physiology include the following: How well is the tree growing? Are the leaves or needles the normal color, size, and well-distributed throughout the canopy? Is the shoot growth normal? What is the percentage of dead wood within the canopy?

Questions about structure include the following: Is there evidence of root, trunk, or stem decay? If so, how extensive is the decay? Are there seams, cracks, or other defects in the trunk or main stems? Does the tree have a history of past failures? If so, can the risk of failure be mitigated and reduced?

Finally, the target or targets are evaluated. Is the primary target a building, parking lot, street or public gathering area? How close is the target to the tree? Can the target be moved or its use restricted? What are the consequences of the tree or its parts striking the target?

The two trees in this assessment are both native Western Washington Douglas Fir, (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*). Presumably neither tree was large enough to warrant harvest when the area was originally logged in the first half of the 20th century. Further, both trees survived the clearing and grading of the lot to build original house. While City of Mercer Island maps show that the eastern part of the lot is within an Environmentally Critical Area, (ECA), because of the steep slope, these two trees grow on a large and flat section of the lot, well to the west of this area.

TREE #1 is the larger of the trees, with a DBH of 43.5" and a height of approximately 130', and a canopy spread of 45'. The Critical Root Zone, (CRZ), radius, or roughly the distance from the edge of the trunk to the outer edge of the drip line, is 22'. The tree appears to be growing very well, with a full canopy of dark green needles and little or no dead wood. I saw no evidence of root or trunk decay, and no other obvious structural defects. The property owner reports that since 2012, the tree has been professionally pruned twice; however, because of its open exposure to high southwest winds, several branches have broken in storms and struck the edge of the nearby house roof. Such branch failures are common with large Douglas Fir trees, but the risk can be mitigated and reduced by additional and very specific pruning. I believe that the chances of whole tree failure by the trunk's shearing or breaking, or root failure and uprooting are low. My opinion is that this tree poses a MODERATE failure risk.

TREE #2 is a 26" DBH Douglas Fir that grows just a few feet north of Tree #1. It's height is also approximately 130', with a canopy spread of 35', and a CRZ of 18'. This tree also appears to be in very good condition, both physiologically and structurally, and received the same professional pruning as Tree #1. My understanding is that branch failures, as described above, have not been as serious an issue as with Tree #1. My opinion is that the chances of stem breaking or uprooting are low and that this tree poses a **MODERATE** failure risk.

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Both trees are healthy and sound second growth Douglas Firs, and Tree #1, especially, is growing extraordinarily well. If the decision is made to retain the trees, they could be preserved on the site for several more decades. Attached or enclosed are copies of the ISA Basic Tree Risk Assessment Form for each tree, and the required City of Mercer Island tree inventory documents. Please contact me if you have further questions.

John Hushagen, Consulting Arborist Seattle Arboriculture Associates M.S. Urban Horticulture ISA Certified Arborist, PN-0108A

ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor, (TRAQ)

18032 17th Ave NW • Shoreline, Washington 98177 • (206) 510-4107 • hushagenjohnd@gmail.com

Dlin Hushogen

Basic Tree Risk Assessment Form Client SAURABH Khandel WAL Date 2/6/22 Time 2:45 PM Address/Tree location 8460 SE 83rd St. Mencen Island Tree no. dbh 43.5 * Height 130' Crown spread dia. 451 Tree species Douglas Fix Time frame 12 MD Tools used Level 2 VISUAL Assessor(s) **Target Assessment** Target zone Occupancy within Restriction practical? rate **Target description** 2 - occasional - frequent Residential Home GANGE NO 3 4 Site Factors History of failures Broken And Falling Barneals _______ Topography Flat Slope _______ % Aspect Site changes None ☐ Grade change ☐ Site clearing ☐ Changed soil hydrology ☐ Root cuts ☐ Describe _ Soil conditions Limited volume ☐ Saturated ☐ Shallow ☑ Compacted ☑ Pavement over roots ☐ ______% Describe Prevailing wind direction Common weather Strong winds I Ice Snow Heavy rain Describe Seasowal Tree Health and Species Profile Vigor Low □ Normal □ High ☑ Foliage None (seasonal) □ None (dead) ☐ Normal % Chlorotic % None Abiotic Species failure profile Branches Trunk Roots Describe D-Fin Con Fail in AU 3 WAYS Wind exposure Protected ☐ Partial ☑ Full ☐ Wind funneling ☐ ___ Relative crown size Small ☐ Medium ☐ Large ☑ Crown density Sparse ☐ Normal ☐ Dense ☑ Interior branches Few ☐ Normal ☐ Dense ☑ Vines/Mistletoe/Moss ☐ Tree Defects and Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Failure — Crown and Branches — LCR_75_% Lightning damage Unbalanced crown Cracks ___% overall Max. dia. _ Dead twigs/branches □ Codominant Included bark Broken/Hangers Number Max. dia. Weak attachments Cavity/Nest hole % circ. Over-extended branches Previous branch failures □ Similar branches present **Pruning history** Dead/Missing bark ☐ Cankers/Galls/Burls ☐ Sapwood damage/decay ☐ Crown cleaned Z Thinned Raised Conks Heartwood decay Topped Reduced Lion-tailed Flush cuts Other Response growth ___ - Branches may Break and FALL Main concern(s) N/A 🗆 Load on defect Minor

Moderate Significant

. Likelihood of failure Improbable Possible Probable Imminent = — Trunk — — Roots and Root Collar — Dead/Missing bark □ Abnormal bark texture/color □ Collar buried/Not visible ☐ Depth_____ Stem girdling ☐ Codominant stems Included bark Conks/Mushrooms Dead Decay Sapwood damage/decay ☐ Cankers/Galls/Burls ☐ Sap ooze ☐ Ooze Cavity % circ. Lightning damage ☐ Heartwood decay ☐ Conks/Mushrooms ☐ Cracks ☐ Cut/Damaged roots ☐ Distance from trunk ___ Cavity/Nest hole _____ % circ. Depth _____ Poor taper □ Root plate lifting □ Soil weakness Lean _____ Corrected? Response growth Ven V Good Response growth Veny 600 d Main concern(s) NO Serious Concerns Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☑ Moderate ☐ Significant ☐ N/A ☐ Minor ☑ Moderate ☐ Significant ☐ Load on defect Likelihood of failure Likelihood of failure Possible 🗗 Probable Improbable Imminent Improbable Possible 2 Probable Imminent

		1				Risk Cate	egor	izat	ion										-4				
ē)) 0					Likel	ihoc	od	F-11		0 1		<u></u>				
E S				8	nber			Fail	ure			Imp	act				Matrix	pact 1)	Col	nseq	uen	ces	
Condition number	Tree part	Conditions of concern	Part size	Fall distance	Target number	Target protection	Improbable	Possible	Probable	Imminent	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Unlikely	Somewhat	Likely	Very likely	Negligible	Minor	Significant	Severe	Risk rating of part (from Matrix 2)
	heart	History of	34"	391	il.	None		/	, ,			V	, ,		V	,				1	V		CONT
1	RAUY	Bruking				,			1 1	7 h					-	- According	TOWN SERVICE	of the second				1	mod.
	OMnetes	OFF 0	127						/							1						1	
2	Heavy	History of Bruking OFF (Some As ABOVE)	3.410	30'	2	None	700	V			000	V		75 A	/						V		wed.
5 ·						15 No. 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	4 4				Spirit in	2.4,7				10000	100.00						
3					# · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			2.1	2 1 2 1 3 1	. 4	it is					1		v .		3 · ·		- 4	
		in the second se	7722		\$15.00														Service To				F. 7:37
				b .						1 1	7									3	3	2 2 6	
4				No. No. of the last	TO THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN		adotopi		omeout a	- December	HER. SEC.	SHEWROO	OWN WAS	native store	and the	ORDINAL DIAL	Maria Maria	DESCRIPTION OF	atoto so	Sufficiency.	MINISTRA	- SEASON	
	1														400 TA						201		
Mat	rix I . Likelihoo	od matrix.							١,	+			1	- 1		-	2 2			7 2 ·			
A COUNTY	elihood	Likelihoo	od of Imp	pacting	Target				÷.					_		L				_			
1000000	and the second s	y low Low	Section Sections	Mediur	n	High										· ·			1 2				
PROCESS AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PART	CONTRACTOR OF STREET	likely Somewhat likely Unlikely	AMERICA STREET	Likely newhat	likely	Very likely Likely																	
Po	Annual Control of the	likely Unlikely	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	Unlikel		Somewhat like	ly		•				* 8 *			4				1	1		
		likely Unlikely		Unlikel	/	Unlikely			-				* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *			0	+			+	\dashv		
1000	rix 2. Risk ratin	BET THE ORDER OF THE OWN THE WORLD CO.	2.650										2	+		-	+		8 7 2	1 KK			
	ikelihood of lure & Impact		nsequei	ASSESS FROM	Failure ficant	Severe			-			-		-		-	0			2	- 1		a 1
	Very likely	8.8	Minor oderate	Contact Case and the	igh	Extreme																	
10.2	Likely		derate	DATA EXCLUSION SAN	igh	High	4									•				, N	orth		1
So	mewhat likely Unlikely		Low	CARLES AND	lerate ow	Moderate Low					1			1					/				
	Officery	Low	Low	L		LOW	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR							1				1					
Not	es, explanat	tions, descriptions	Th	is t	ne	e has	4_							ł				1					1
3	cow	TO Moder		143	E	Of FAI	4	ne	,		-			1				1					- 1
	FALL	But who	6	The	e F	Ailu M	-0	no	,					1	i.			1					
E	y upi	rooting on	ste	m	Bre	Kige	3	Ve	n	1.					-				1				
Miti	igation optic	ons				O_			wi	J								R	lesio	dual	risk	, 40	WID
ev	1 .1	- Reductiv	u D	nui	rine	of w	ng	e	T	B	10	11	ies	W	ies	<i>st</i>	-	_					red.
_	BATTIC	hes could	1 re	du	ce (The	g	K		pt	<u> </u>	Z	he	t'N				F	Resid	dual	risk	·	
	Brigking and FALLing Residual risk																						
Ove	Overall tree risk rating Low Moderate Wigh Extreme Work priority 1 2 3 4																						
Ove	rall residual	risk Low 🗗	Moderate	e 🗷	ligh 🗆	Extreme 🗆			1	Rec	omr	nen	ded	ins	pect	ion	inte	rval	_	ľ	2	M	0,_
		Preliminary Advance																					
Insp	nspection limitations None Visibility Access Vines Root collar buried Describe																						

Basic Tree Risk Assessment Form Date 2/6/22 Time 3; DO P. M. Client Sound by Khandeluss Address/Tree location #100 SE 8325 st. Men cen Takind Tree no. 2 Sheet 1 of Tree species Doug Us Fix dbh 262 Height 130' Crown spread dia. 35'
Assessor(s) John Hushigen Time frame 2 mo. Tools used Level 2 visual **Target Assessment** Target zone Occupancy Practical to move target? **Target within** Target number rate Restriction practical? 2 - occasional **Target description** 3 - frequent 1 6 Andge 2 3 4 **Site Factors** History of failures None detected Topography Flat Slope □ Site changes None ☐ Grade change ☐ Site clearing ☐ Changed soil hydrology ☐ Root cuts ☐ Describe _ Soil conditions Limited volume ☐ Saturated ☐ Shallow ☑ Compacted ☑ Pavement over roots ☐ ______% Describe Prevailing wind direction NE Common weather Strong winds I Ice Snow Heavy rain Describe Sod Soul Tree Health and Species Profile Vigor Low □ Normal □ High ☑ Foliage None (seasonal) □ None (dead) ☐ Normal % Chlorotic % Pests Now **Abiotic** Species failure profile Branches Trunk & Roots Describe ALL Three Ane Failure Factors Load Factors Wind exposure Protected ☐ Partial ☐ Full ☐ Wind funneling ☐ Relative crown size Small ☐ Medium ☐ Large ☐ Crown density Sparse ☐ Normal ☑ Dense ☐ Interior branches Few ☐ Normal ☑ Dense ☐ Vines/Mistletoe/Moss ☐ Tree Defects and Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Failure - Crown and Branches -Unbalanced crown □ Cracks _____ Lightning damage □ % overall Max. dia. Dead twigs/branches □ Codominant Included bark Broken/Hangers Number_ Max. dia. Weak attachments _____ Cavity/Nest hole % circ. Over-extended branches Previous branch failures Similar branches present **Pruning history** Dead/Missing bark ☐ Cankers/Galls/Burls ☐ Sapwood damage/decay □ Crown cleaned 12 Thinned 12 Raised Conks Heartwood decay □ Reduced Topped Lion-tailed Response growth Vlny 600 d Other Flush cuts Serious Main concern(s) Load on defect N/A 🗆 Minor 12 Moderate □ Significant □ . Likelihood of failure | Improbable | Possible | Probable | Imminent | _ _ —Trunk — — Roots and Root Collar — Dead/Missing bark Abnormal bark texture/color □ Collar buried/Not visible □ Depth Stem girdling Codominant stems Included bark Dead Decay Conks/Mushrooms Sapwood damage/decay □ Cankers/Galls/Burls □ Sap ooze □ Ooze Cavity ☐ % circ. Lightning damage ☐ Heartwood decay ☐ Conks/Mushrooms ☐ Cracks ☐ Cut/Damaged roots ☐ Distance from trunk ____ Cavity/Nest hole _____ % circ. Depth _____ Poor taper □ Root plate lifting Soil weakness Lean _____ Corrected? Response growth VLLY Good Response growth Very Good Main concern(s) Main concern(s) _ 人の Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☑ Moderate ☐ Significant ☐ Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☑ Moderate ☐ Significant ☐ Likelihood of failure Likelihood of failure Possible 2 Probable Imminent Improbable 🔲 Possible 🗗 Probable 🗉 Imminent Improbable

		1				Risk Cate	egoi	rizat	ion														
Je.					_		9.					Like	lihoo	od	Fail	uro	g. Im	pact	C0.	nseq			
mm				9	number			Fail	ure			Imp	act			from M			-	iseq	uen	ces	Diek
Condition number	Tree part	Conditions of concern	- Ba	Fall distance	Target nu	Target protection	Improbable	Possible	Probable	Imminent	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Unlikely	Somewhat	Likely	Very likely	Negligible	Minor	Significant	Severe	Risk rating of part (from Matrix 2)
% ·	hesev	Could be	HC 34"	30'	1	None		V	1	- 1		√			V					V	- I		low TI
1	Bunda	Could But and FALL GARAGE	ar _		The second						2 1 19			- Anados	tettalida	1910,000	ottonical	UNIONA.	,				med.
		GANAGE																					
1					2 7 1							L	,			1 1	2	_					
2	1 2 2		See Set				100000	i sauce	1	; ;	100000	7000	100		10x21 0x		105000		and the same			100000	
1 - 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				Ch. If																		
3	3	4			3 1					9 3	-		A .	-	L		-	1 - 4			-		26 1 20
3							0000	1100	NO.		(COC)					2000	good better						
,	A		20							Sanda Sa												9	
4			3 - 1 - V	6	1 6		*	\vdash	4					-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4	2 2		±.
			W. T.				de det			7/2						120							
22.2		<u> </u>						TISSOR.	1000			20720	1000	300	3985								
	rix I . Likelihod	Annual Control of the		Internal Control	We see to the					- 4 - 4	4 4 4					1				+			+
INDESSIN	elihood Failure Ver	Like Ty low Lov	lihood of Imp	oacting Mediun	fortings of the	High					-	-	-	1		+	+			+	7		
Marketty Storecast		likely Somewha		Likely		Very likely				7 7		200	7 4			+	-		_	-	-		1 - 1
CHICARAGE	Maria Service Control of the Control	likely Unlik	manufacture and the second	ewhat	DOCTOVE ME	Likely																	
vation to be	described to the second state of the second	likely Unlik likely Unlik	A Proposition of the Control of the	Unlikely Unlikely	SCHOOLSE CO.	Somewhat like Unlikely	ely					,											
	rix 2. Risk ratir	the state of the s			10000000000																		
	ikelihood of		Consequer	nces of	Failure																		
Fai	lure & Impac	t Negligible	Minor	Signi	ficant	Severe							1	- /			\top			1			
	Very likely	Low	Moderate		igh	Extreme	14			7 7		-	- 1	- 2			+		-	+	1	-	
So	Likely mewhat likel	Low Low	Moderate Low	3 7 3 7 7 7	igh erate	High Moderate														N	orth		
100	Unlikely	Low	Low		ow -	Low	9							1					/				
N 1-1			To	, ,	6	·								1				/					1
_		tions, description		1 1	9500	5 and								1									
_	A Con	J TO n	nøden	1/0	e	3KOF	_							-				1					
1	dilune										ノ								\				
			- / -			•	_			_	-				,						_	_	
Mit	gation optic	ons end + Brond	WT DE	duc	Hib	n pru	14	MC	1	27	4	M	9	25	<i>t</i> _	de,	4						W T
ru	41/188	OM	ches				-	-					_									200,000	100.
																-		_	resio Resio			-	
Ove	rall tree risl	rating low!	Moderate	n/ 1	ligh 🗐	Extreme	1			Wo	rk n	riori	tv	1 5	1	П	3 [·					
	rali tree risi rali residual		Moderate								-		•					erval		1	2	m	0.
		Preliminary Adv	-		-			e/R															
		tions (ENone E																					
																				-			

CITY OF MERCER ISLAND

COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

9611 SE 36TH STREET | MERCER ISLAND, WA 98040

PHONE: 206.275.7605 | Inspection Requests: Online:

VM: 206.275.7730

TREE SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST

If a box is checked, please provide the information in your next submittal

if a box is checked, please provide the information in your next submittal										
	SUBMITTAL ITEMS									
1. The	Mercer Island Tree Inventory Form									
Prov										
2. Arbo	2. Arborist report/tree inventory									
	ride an Arborist report, prepared by a qualified Arborist. Include the following information in the prist report.									
1.	Description of how the arborist meets the threshold requirements for Qualified Arborist.									
2.	A complete description of each tree's diameter, species, critical root zone, limits of allowable disturbance, health, condition, and viability.									
3.	A description of the method(s) used to determine the limits of allowable disturbance (i.e., critical root zone, root plate diameter, or a case-by-case basis description for individual trees).									
4.										
5.	For trees not viable for retention, a description of the reason(s) for removal based on poor health, high risk of failure due to structure, defects, unavoidable isolation, windfirmness, unsuitability species, etc. If there is no reasonable alternative action (pruning, cabling, etc.) possible, replacement recommendations must be given.									
6.	Describe the impact of necessary tree removal on the remaining trees, including those in a grove									
7. 8.	fencing and be in accordance with the tree protection standards as outlined in MICC 19.10.									
-	shall include planting and maintenance specifications to ensure long term survival.									
<u> </u>	A Tree Inventory containing the following:									
2	a. A numbering system of all existing large trees on the property (with corresponding tags on trees). The inventory shall also include large trees on adjacent property with driplines or critical root zones extending into the property.									
	 b. Tree size (diameter). Where a tree splits into several trunks close to ground level, the dbh (Diameter at Brest Height) for the tree is the square root of the sum of the dbh for each individual stem squared (example with 3 stems: dbh = square root [(stem1)2 +(stem2)2 									
	+(stem3)2]).									
h	c. Proposed tree status (retained or proposed for removal).									
× 1	d. Tree type or species.									
	e. Identify all Exceptional trees and differentiate between those less than 24 inches and those greater than or equal to 24 inches in diameter.									
1 0	f. Brief general health or condition rating of each tree (i.e. poor, fair, good, etc.).									
3. Site/	tree retention plan									

		he following on all civil/utility and grading sheets. If there are no civil sheets indicate on the
arch		ral site plan Location of all proposed improvements (building footprint, access, utilities, buffers, required
0.2	1.	landscape areas).
	2.	Surveyed location of all large trees and Exceptional trees on the property
2.0	3.	Show dripline and limits of disturbance for Large trees on site and adjacent properties if
2000		driplines extend over the subject property line.
	4.	Trees labeled corresponding to the tree inventory numbering system on the Mercer Island Tree
-	_	Inventory Form, and Arborist Report.
	5.	Identify Exceptional trees using different symbols for trees less than 24 inches and trees greater than or equal to 24 inches.
	6.	Location of tree protection measures. Chain-link fence will be required for exceptional trees.
200		Show silt fence outside tree protection measures. Do not use any x in the protection illustration.
5 5 4	7.	Limits of excavation near potential saved trees (e.g. excavation limits for building foundation).
111	8.	Indicate clearing limits/limits of disturbance (LOD) around all trees potentially impacted by site
_		disturbances - grading, demolition, construction activities (including approximate LOD of off-site
_	_	trees with overhanging driplines), etc.
1	9.	Proposed tree status (trees to be removed or retained) noted by an 'X' for removal.
4.	Rep	anting plan
	Prov	ide the Replanting plan showing proposed locations of any required replacement trees.
PEER	REV	IEW AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST
		riew of the tree permit application by a qualified arborist may be required to verify the adequacy promation and analysis. The applicant shall bear the cost of the peer review.
	•	arborist may require the applicant retain a replacement qualified arborist or may require a peer here the City Arborist believes a conflict of interest may exist.
	rist r	ole, if an otherwise qualified arborist is employed by a tree removal company and prepares the eport for a development proposal, a replacement qualified arborist or peer review may be
ARB	ORIST	QUALIFICATION
Eart	roo ro	eviews associated with a development proposal, a qualified arborist must have
-		inimum of three (3) years' experience working directly with the protection of trees during
Ţ		truction
•		experience with the likelihood of tree survival after construction
•		ble to prescribe appropriate measures for the preservation of trees during land development
•		
W	Your	ree Risk Assessment Qualification qualified arborists must have at least one (1) of the following credentials: ISA Certified Arborist; ISA Certified Arborist Municipal Specialist; Suffic Arborist Municipal Specialist;
	•	ISA Certified Arborist; Suffle Anbonica Itunit Associ
	•	ISA Certified Arborist Municipal Specialist; 2/16/22
	٠	ISA Board Certified Master Arborist;
	•	American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA) registered Consulting Arborist;
	•	Society of American Foresters (SAF) Certified Forester for Forest Management Plans;
ADD	TION	AL INFORMATION
Addit	tional	Information. The City Arborist or Code Official may require additional documentation, plans, or
		n as needed to ensure compliance with applicable City regulations.

CITY OF MERCER ISLAND

COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

9611 SE 36TH STREET | MERCER ISLAND, WA 98040

PHONE: 206.275.7605 |

MERCER ISLAND TREE INVENTORY & REPLACEMENT SUBMITTAL INFORMATION

	The second secon
EXCEPTIONAL TREES	
<u>Exceptional Trees</u> - means a tree or group of trees that because of its unique historical, ecological value constitutes an important community resource. A tree that is rare or exceptional by vispecies, condition, cultural/historical importance, age, and/or contribution as part of a tree gradiameter of more than 36 inches, or with a diameter that is equal to or greater than the diathe Exceptional Tree Table shown in MICC 19.16 under Tree, Exceptional.	irtue of its size, rove. Trees with
List the total number of trees for each category and the tree identification numbers from the $$	arborist report.
Number of trees 36" or greater	1 troo
List tree numbers: #1 Dougles Fir 43.5" DBH	
Number of trees 24" or greater (including 36" or greater)	1+580
List tree numbers: #2 Douglas Fire 26" DBH	
Number of trees from Exceptional Tree Table (MICC 19.16)	1 tree
List tree numbers: Tree # 1 6 hown ABOVE: 43,511 DBH	
LARGE REGULATED TREES	
<u>Large Regulated Trees</u> - means any tree with a diameter of 10 inches or more, and any tree definition of an Exceptional Tree.	that meets the
Number of Large Regulated Trees on site	(A)
List tree numbers: 5 hour Azove	
Number of Large Regulated Trees on site proposed for removal List tree numbers: Shown About	(B)_
Percentage of trees to be retained ((A-B)/Ax100) note: must be at least 30%	%_
RIGHT OF WAY TREES	
Right of Way Trees- means a tree that is located in the street right of way adjacent to the p	project property.
Number of Large Regulated Trees in right of way	
List tree numbers:	
Number of Large Regulated Trees in right of way proposed for removal S:\CPD\FORMS\1Current Forms\Engineering Forms\Tree\MercerIslandTreeInventoryReplacementSubmit	talinformation.docx

List tree numbers:	#1,#	- 2			
${\it Reason for removal:}$	Potent	AL Const	nuction	impact TO	
Critical		nes		0	
THE DEDI ACEMENT	-				

Tree replacement- removed trees must be replaced based on the ratio in the table below. Replacement trees shall be conifers at least six feet tall and or deciduous at least one and one-half inches in diameter at base.

Diameter of Removed Tree (measured 4.5' above ground)	Tree replacement Ratio	Number of Trees Proposed for Removal	Number of Tree Required for Replacement Based on Size/Type
Less than 10"*	1		
10" up to 24"	2	7	
Greater than 24" up to 36"	3	1	3
Greater than 36" and any Exceptional Tree	6		6

TOTAL TREE REPLACEMENTS

John/Aushogen Seattle Ansonicultural Associates 2/6/22

^{*}no replacement tree is needed if the tree fits all of the following; Less than 10 inches in diameter, not an exceptional tree, and not a replacement tree from another tree permit. *