

December 11, 2024 (revised September 4, 2025)

Caden Proctor
Waymark Development
2801 West Coast Hwy Suite 270
Newport Beach, CA 92663
714.310.9617 | caden@waymarkdev.com

Dear Caden,

This revised arborist report addresses the proposed townhomes project at 1101 Walpert Dr, Hayward. **Notable changes to the report are highlighted in red**; minor content or wording changes were not specifically highlighted. For this report, I used the following references:

- Hayward Municipal Code Article 15, Tree Preservation
- Email with City Landscape Architect (July 29, 2024)
- Site visits on November 5 & 7, 2024
- Site plan by CBG with surveyed tree locations (**August 27, 2025**)
- Typical bioretention detail by CBG (undated)

The ordinance (as of this writing) defines “protected trees” as follows:

- Trees with a minimum trunk diameter of 8” (at 54” above ground).
- Street trees or other required trees such as those required as a condition of approval, use permit, or other zoning requirement, regardless of size.
- Memorial trees dedicated by an entity recognized by the city, and all specimen trees that define a neighborhood or community.
- Trees of the following species with a minimum trunk diameter of 4”:
 - Big leaf maple, *Acer macrophyllum*
 - California buckeye, *Aesculus californica*
 - Madrone, *Arbutus menziesii*
 - Western dogwood, *Cornus nuttallii*
 - California sycamore, *Platanus racemosa*
 - Coast live oak, *Quercus agrifolia*
 - Canyon live oak, *Quercus chrysolepis*
 - Blue oak, *Quercus douglasii*
 - Oregon white oak, *Quercus garryana*
 - California black oak, *Quercus kelloggii*
 - Valley oak, *Quercus lobata*
 - Interior live oak, *Quercus wislizenii*
 - California bay, *Umbellularia californica*
- A tree or trees planted as a replacement for a protected tree.
- Exempt: trees located on a developed single-family residential lot that cannot be further subdivided unless they were required to be planted; trees part of a working orchard; trees planted and growing in a licensed nursery

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Site & Project Summary..... | 3 |
| Assumptions & Limitations..... | 5 |
| Tree Impact Discussion | 6 |
| Overall tree condition | 6 |
| Limits to tree growth caused by past development..... | 7 |
| Proposed improvements & options for tree preservation..... | 8 |
| Impacts to off-site & co-owned trees..... | 9 |
| Options & rationale for tree protection..... | 10 |
| Tree Protection Recommendations | 11 |
| Appendix 1: Tree Inventory Table..... | 13 |
| Appendix 2: Tree Protection Plan | 25 |

Site & Project Summary

The subject site is located in a neighborhood with a mix of apartments and lower density residential properties, including the townhomes complex directly across the street. To the west is the All Saints Cemetery. When viewed from the subject property, it does not appear to be an active cemetery with recent burials. To the east is the Walnut Hills Apartments. Power lines run along Walpert Drive and in parallel to the northern part of the east property line.

The site consists of two separate parcels, both currently used by the Arc of the East Bay organization (APN 445-0040-001-01 & 445-0040-003-03, north and south parcels). The north parcel covers 1.74 acres and is almost completely covered with buildings and hardscape, except for a few courtyards and landscape areas along the perimeter. It is partially separated from the south parcel by chain-link fencing, which ends at the existing driveway.

The south parcel is larger, with 4.50 acres that extend south across Ward Creek (Figure 1). A chain-link fence extends along the entire south property line, set about 10'-15' above the top of the creek bank (completely blocking creek access). The south parcel has an oak grove along the north property line, two buildings that appear to be used as offices, and parking areas that extend off the driveway. The



Figure 1. Photo taken facing south to the larger parcel; the tallest tree right of the center is growing on the creek bank.

driveway terminates at the south corner in a fire turnaround, which is supported by a tall retaining wall. The site slopes downwards to the south with a few steep areas that required tall retaining walls to create level surfaces for building.

The site has a decent number of trees, though they are concentrated along the perimeter and within the central oak grove. Within these areas, the trees are very crowded and compete with one another. I included 107 trees that met the City's review criteria, including 92 "protected" trees. The dominant species is the native coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), with 66 oaks making up 61.7 % of the total tree count. It is followed by tulip trees (14 trees, 13.1%), evergreen ash (7 trees, 6.5%), and holly oak, Callery pear, and Chinese pistache (3 trees each,

2.8%). The remaining trees include Southern magnolia, blackwood acacia, mulberry, eucalyptus, Canary Island pine, bottlebrush, Italian stone pine, privet, mayten and plum. There appears to be a minimum of landscape maintenance on both the site and the neighboring properties, so the trees in the best shape consist of drought tolerant and/or native species. Species that require more water or care are doing more poorly. Of the 107 trees, 19 trees are off-site or co-owned, meaning that part of their trunk crosses the property line.

The perimeter trees to the west consist mainly of native coast live oak, with a sprinkling of non-native holly oaks (*Quercus ilex*). These trees grow along the fence line, many of them pushing through such that the fence has become embedded into their trunks and branches. Since the fence line does not follow the property line, many of the perimeter trees were found to be on-site. For partially or completely off-site trees, the neighbor's permission will be needed for any removals or significant impact.

Most of the ornamental trees are found on the north parcel, though Callery pears and Chinese pistaches were planted around the buildings on the south parcel. The neighboring apartment complex has maytens and tulip trees right near the property line. Their parking spaces also extend right up to the trees, so the roots may have been forced to grow more into the subject property.

The proposed project will demolish the existing buildings and hardscape to construct 84 townhomes across both parcels. At the steepest central part of the site, the new driveway will roughly follow the curve of the existing driveway. The central oak grove acts as a delineation between the upper and lower units; mandated



Figure 2. The central oak grove is visible in the background, at the border between the north and south parcels. Several oaks will be removed due to new retaining walls and accessibility ramps; others may be affected by landscaping within the area.

accessibility ramps cut across the grove to connect the two portions. The homes on the north portion extend closer to the west property line, where there is only a 5' wide sewer easement. The easement continues all the way south before jogging over to the east property line, creating a southern border for the development. On the south parcel, an additional storm drain easement parallels the west property line, creating a 17' wide buffer zone in which homes cannot be built.

Because of the density of the proposed project, most of the interior trees will need to be removed, except for selected trees within the oak grove and along the curved portion of the driveway where elevations may remain roughly the same (Figure 2). Again, because of the slope of the site, tall engineered retaining walls are needed throughout, reaching as high as 11' at the south end. In the previous design revision, additional retaining walls and water lines have further increased impact on trees along the property perimeter. My understanding is that the water lines cannot be relocated closer to buildings, nor can they be installed with less invasive methods that do not require long open trenches. **A moderate adjustment was then made at the south corner, pulling the proposed retaining wall further away from two oaks.** Based on the plans that were provided, **69** trees will need to be removed, including **62** protected trees **(decrease of one protected tree removal from the May 2025 revision).**

There are 10 trees whose fates remain uncertain, because the design is not final (eight of which are off-site or co-owned). If the design can be adjusted by shifting certain features or by using less impactful specifications, there's a better chance of preserving those trees. Occasionally, preliminary trenching is an option to expose tree roots ahead of construction so the design can be adjusted accordingly. That may not be a feasible option for this site because of the sheer lengths that would need to be hand dug ahead of the project. For that reason, some of the trees will need to be reviewed during construction, with an arborist on-site during ground-disturbing work. The arborist can make real-time assessments as to whether the trees need to be removed, and how the overall impact can be lessened. Lastly, **28** trees appear to be far enough from the proposed improvements that they can be saved.

Assumptions & Limitations

Surveyed trees: For this revision, tree trunk locations have been surveyed. The locations of trees #13, 25 & 26 were not visible in the plan, but their precise locations do not affect whether they can be preserved.

Plans: I did not review detailed grading, utility, drainage, or landscape plans, which may all pose additional tree impacts. Since the grading plans are conceptual, there will likely be updated plans as the submittal process progresses. Revisions to the report may be needed once those plans and details are available.

Arborist disclosure statement: The tree assessment provided by this report represents a snapshot in time of the trees' conditions. It is not possible for arborists to predict long-term tree condition. Changes in weather/climate or environmental alterations can present unexpected impacts on the health and stability of trees (e.g. storm events, severe drought or heat, landscaping, repairs, irrigation reduction, other changes especially on adjacent properties). Because of these reasons, it is not possible for arborists to guarantee that trees will not fail. To live with trees means to accept a certain level of risk, which can only be fully eliminated by removing the trees.

Lastly, my evaluation of the post-construction tree condition is contingent on following the recommendations in this report. Deviations even for short periods could cause unknown impacts

to the trees such that they become more likely to decline in the future. Even weekly monitoring by an arborist would not capture the day-to-day and hour-to-hour activities that could negatively impact the trees. It is the responsibility of the property owner and/or contractor to closely follow the recommendations to minimize tree impact and maximize tree health.

Tree Impact Discussion

Overall tree condition

In general, tree care has been lacking on the site. Some clearance pruning and crown reduction work has been done over the buildings and parking areas, but a nearly dead ash tree (tree #104) has not been removed. Based on the tree conditions, the irrigation is likely absent or insufficient, since the species that require more water are showing signs of stress (southern magnolia, mulberry, etc.). The young Callery pears (#90-92) by the southern buildings are stressed because they require more water, while the young Chinese pistaches (#48, 93 & 94, Figure 2 foreground) are thriving despite growing on a steeper slope where water likely runs off the surface. This general trend plays out across both the site and adjacent properties, specifically the apartment complex. The apartment complex has mayten and tulip trees along the east property line, both of which require more water. They exhibit stress symptoms such as sparse canopies, stunted foliage, and yellow leaves (Figure 3). The parking lot on the apartment side also comes right up to their trunks, limiting the space that is available for root growth. Their roots thus may have grown more into the subject property, which could heighten the project's impact.



Figure 3. Tulip tree #80 grows on the apartment's side of the fence. Its stunted and sparse canopy is likely due to insufficient water. Parking spaces extend within 2' of its trunk on the apartment side.

There are also poorly structured trees, including eucalyptus (#7) and oaks that were topped. Many native oaks are growing through the west fence, with the chain-link firmly embedded in their trunks. Although the embedded fences don't appear to affect tree health, the foreign material makes pruning and removal more difficult. Some of the perimeter trees appear to have

been cut down before but could not be completely eliminated because of the fence. They have since regrown with multiple trunks, which are all embedded in the fence (Figure 4). I expect this issue to recur as long as the fences exist, and there may be structural or health complications in the future. Additionally, the west perimeter trees are very crowded. Their overall forms and structures are affected, since the less-dominant trees are forced to lean out from under the larger trees to reach sunlight.

Limits to tree growth caused by past development

Overhead power lines limit tree growth in a visible manner since the power companies regularly clear the lines. Power lines run along Walpert Drive and outside the east edge of the north parcel – any tree along this area would be pruned in perpetuity to maintain service.

Existing features and past development or construction can have

unknown impacts on tree roots. Trees growing near the parking lot, driveway, and sidewalk are affected both by the heavily compacted soil under the hardscape, as well as regular root pruning when sidewalks are repaired. The presence of hardscape and buildings means that some degree of grading & compaction was done in the past. Since the existing buildings and hardscape appear older, it's not obvious how far the tree roots would've grown under them. After the original construction, other impacts can continue to occur – such as drainage installation, irrigation repair, utility excavation. The compacted soil and physical structures also act as deterrents to root growth, since roots prefer to grow into moist & loose soil. The new homes also encroach closer to trees in a few areas, impacting previously unaffected rooting area. This results in additional tree removals, **including the off-site/co-owned eucalyptus #10 and oak #11 on the cemetery property. Originally, the plan was to carefully work around the roots so an arborist could assess the impact during construction. Unfortunately, new water lines between the buildings and the property line do not have the same flexibility, so the trees will need to be removed.**



Figure 4. Tree #65 is an example of the trees growing along the west property line. Its trunk grew at the fence, which has now been embedded into the wood. The small tree at the left of the photo is forced to grow in an odd way to reach sunlight.

Over time, the barriers created by the built environment become less significant, since tree roots are resourceful and can tap into cracks and weaknesses. A good example is the cemetery to the west. Though I do not know the details of this specific cemetery, modern cemeteries typically excavate to 6' depths to install concrete vaults. Roots are cut during the process, and the vaults themselves act as physical barriers. Roots can also be recut when the plot is opened for burial. From what I



Figure 5. Oaks #53-55 (center) and #51 (right) are part of the oak grove. #51 is in the accessibility switchback and must be removed; the others may be affected by landscaping improvements but the plan was not yet available.

could observe from the subject property, the cemetery doesn't appear to be active. The perimeter trees have grown to mature size, so the presence of underground vaults may not have significantly limited their growth. Storm drain lines and sewer lines also follow the west property line, in the same area. The underground manhole(s) and pipes could have diverted root growth. While the easement does not appear to be disturbed – based on the sizes of the existing trees – future repairs or improvements could impact all the trees along the property line.

Several tall retaining walls were already constructed on the south parcel – one separating the buildings from the oak grove (Figure 5), and another supporting the fire turnaround portion of the driveway by trees #73 & 74. **The southernmost retaining wall was shifted north, which creates enough distance from oak #73 that it can be preserved (though other trees affected by retaining walls will still be removed). This change means that an additional protected tree can be preserved.**

Proposed improvements & options for tree preservation

On-site trees will need to be removed unless they are significantly clear of the grading. Due to the development density, setbacks, slope, and other factors, there are limits to how much the design can be adjusted to reduce tree impact. In the previous revision, additional retaining walls and water lines have further increased impact on trees along the property perimeter. My understanding is that the water lines cannot be relocated closer to buildings, nor can they be installed with less invasive methods that do not require extensive open trenches.

During the first round of comments, the city specifically highlighted multiple trees that would “remain on site and be counted as....part of the required Tree Preservation Bond” – including trees #43, 50, 51, 67-73, 84 & 89. Some of these were already noted as preserved trees.

Several trees cannot be saved – oaks #72 and 84 are located within proposed retaining walls or buildings. In the oak grove, a proposed switchback connects the north and south portions of the new development. Oaks #43, 50, and 51 are located in the proposed accessibility ramp, which could not be eliminated or relocated. Unless it shifted significantly closer to the driveway, it is not possible to avoid removing oaks. Shifting the switchback east increases the length of its path and runs into a more aggressive slope. It also cannot be moved further west because other oaks will then be affected. A minimum of two trees will need to be removed to construct the switchback no matter where it is located. Even if it could be relocated, oak #43 is in conflict with one of the proposed buildings. Additionally, my understanding is that the oak grove would be used as a park-like area. The slope is steep and the trees are well distributed across the area. Any attempts at grading to create level functional areas may cause significant impact to the trees' roots. Since landscape plans were not available for review, this area may be more heavily impacted than anticipated (Figure 5). As of the September 2025, tree #89 cannot be retained either, since grading is proposed throughout its entire root zone. **However, retaining wall adjustments were recently made to preserve oak #73 as requested.**

Overall, future design adjustments should focus more on the specifications rather than relocating entire features. This especially applies to the co-owned or off-site trees.

Impacts to off-site & co-owned trees

Off-site & co-owned trees cannot be damaged or removed without the consent of the tree (co-)owner, including during construction or pruning activities. On the east property line, there are no co-owned trees; they are either wholly on the subject property or on the apartment property. After the tree locations were surveyed, many of the trees along the west property line turned out to be on-site trees, since extensive portions of the fence are located east of the property line.

Some of the co-owned or off-site trees cannot be guaranteed to survive and thrive after construction unless significant design changes occur, like relocating retaining walls, buildings, or driveways. Since the significant changes are not feasible at this time, effort will be focused on specifications and practices to reduce impacts on trees. An example is the retaining walls along the property line. Retaining wall footings are commonly continuous, so they require a linear trench that removes all the roots down to a set depth. When the trench occurs close to the trunk, it damages the largest structural roots and severs almost half of the root system. The risk of the tree uprooting and/or dying is significantly higher. As an alternative, sections of the walls may be built with piers instead – they are discontinuous and damage a smaller area, limited to the diameter of the pier. The impact of the wall construction is lessened if the pier can be paired with a wall that does not require trenching below ground (if the wall itself still requires trenching, the effect is largely the same). Fill soil is still an issue since it reduces the water and oxygen that

can reach the roots, but its effect occurs over a longer period during which the trees may adjust to the new environment.

On smaller sites, exploratory trenching is a good option to expose the roots ahead of construction. Exploratory trenches mimic the work that will occur during construction – if a footing requires 2' deep trenching for a length of 25', the exploratory trench follows the same path. Trenching must also be done by hand or with air/water-assisted methods – these are less damaging to tree roots compared to excavators or trenching machines. Exploratory trenching would be a massive undertaking for this project, spanning most of the east and west property lines. Existing buildings and hardscape also block access to tree roots. Instead, an arborist shall be on site during excavation & grading activities for nearly every off-site and co-owned tree (minus the ones that are further away from the property line). After reviewing the root impact, the arborist can provide immediate recommendations as to whether a tree can remain and what care is needed to improve its health.

Options & rationale for tree protection

The trees that have been noted for preservation are located far enough that they will tolerate the construction impacts, assuming there is no grading within the areas that I highlighted for protection. However, on large jobs like this, contractors spread out as much as possible, usually parking vehicles or equipment and staging materials under trees. Though these seem like harmless activities, soil compaction and contamination usually result with long-term effects.

Understanding the impacts of soil compaction requires an understanding of how soil works. Soil that is ideal for root growth has about 50% solids and 50% voids; the voids hold air and water and provide space for root growth. The space is reduced as equipment runs over the soil. Over time, tree health declines as the roots struggle to access the resources they need. It can take many years for the negative impacts to show, at which time it is usually too late (and very expensive) to reverse the impacts. The simplest way of protecting the soil and roots is to install a temporary chain-link fence to close off as large of an area around each tree. Other types of fencing are not appropriate for a project of this scale since they will be easily removed. Signage is also needed to identify the purpose of the fencing - otherwise it will be moved without regard for the trees.

If the fencing is in the way, other alternatives can be considered but should be discussed with an arborist. For example, wood chips may be used as a buffer layer over the roots – and the chips can be recycled from the tree removals. Even if fencing is installed, wood chips can still be spread over the soil within the fenced areas to improve tree health. The wood chips generated by the tree removals are ideal - they contain a chipped mix of leaves, twigs, branches and wood which break down at varying rates. The different sized material allows the wood chip layer to lock together, limiting their dispersal and creating a buffer layer that resists compaction more than homogenous chips. The layer should be at least 6" deep to account for settling during construction. They will further improve the soil, provide nutrients, and conserve water - increasing the trees' resilience to future stresses.

Tree Protection Recommendations

Design Phase

- If feasible, adjust the retaining wall specifications to use pier footings, with the wall built on grade (no continuous excavation/trenching) around these trees:
 - Within 8' of tree #98
 - Within 5' of trees #79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87
 - If this is not feasible, the trees may need to be removed if root loss is high.
- As the design progresses, ensure that grading does not occur within the temporary fencing areas shown on the Tree Protection Plan – especially by trees #65-67. Otherwise, additional impacts will be incurred, and the trees may need to be removed. If encroachment is needed within the fenced area, discuss the impacts with the project arborist before finalizing the design.

Pre-Demolition Phase

- **Contractors:**
 - Inform all contractors and subcontractors of the significance of protecting the trees, as the financial consequences for tree damage will be significant (city fines are assessed based on the appraised values of the trees). A pre-construction meeting may be needed to review the tree protection measures and work plan before demolition begins.
 - Keep your project arborist informed of the construction schedule, especially the excavation and grading phases where an arborist should be on-site to review the roots.
- **Temporary tree fencing:**
 - Install temporary tree protection fencing to enclose the areas shown on the Tree Protection Plan. The fencing material shall be 6' tall chain link fencing mounted on 2" diameter galvanized posts, driven 24" into the ground and spaced no more than 10' apart. Attach signs to the fencing that state "TREE PROTECTION FENCE - DO NOT MOVE WITHOUT APPROVAL FROM PROJECT ARBORIST."
 - The fencing shall stay upright and secure throughout the project. To modify the fencing, consult the project arborist to determine what substitute tree protection measures are needed to provide the same degree of protection.
 - If the fencing location will obstruct construction access, discuss other options with the project arborist.
 - Ensure that fencing is installed before equipment arrives or demolition begins.
- **Pruning:** Limit clearance pruning to the bare minimum, i.e. enough to just clear the air space needed for construction. Pruning shall be done by a tree service with a certified arborist on staff.

Demolition Phase

- Remove trees #1-12, 15-47, 49-51, 58, 59, 63, 64, 68, 69, 71, 72, 81, 84, 88-92, 97, 100 & 103-106 (69 trees)
 - Trees #1-5, 8-12, 15, 16, 18-47, 49-51, 58, 59, 63, 64, 68, 69, 71, 72, 81, 84, 88, 89, 100 & 103-106 are considered protected (62 trees).

- Trees #10, 11 & 97 are off-site or co-owned; their removal requires the adjacent property owner's approval.
- **Wood chips, optional:** If desired, spread the wood chips generated by tree removal within the fenced areas. The wood chips will conserve water and contribute nutrients to the trees; they can also be left in place after construction.

Construction Phase

- The bioretention basin around trees #13 & 14 shall be excavated by hand or with air/water assisted methods that allow large roots to be preserved. Alternately, if large equipment is used, an arborist shall be on-site to monitor the excavation. If significant roots must be removed, the tree(s) may need to be removed (they are both protected trees).
- The project arborist shall be on-site during grading or excavation by trees #79, 80, 82, 83, 85-87 & 98 (8 trees). If root loss is significant and there is no flexibility in working around roots, the tree(s) may need to be removed.
 - Trees #79, 85, 87 & 98 are considered protected.
 - Trees #79, 80, 82, 83, 85-87 & 98 are co-owned or off-site and require the neighbors' approval for removal.
- Consult the project arborist for recommendations if roots ≥ 2 " diameter are encountered during grading by trees #54, 62 & 70. If appropriate, root pruning shall be completed with sharp tools (handsaw, Sawzall, or circular saw), making the smallest possible cut – perpendicular to the length of the root rather than at a diagonal. Roots must then be covered and kept moist until the soil is backfilled.
- At any time, if damage occurs to any tree, immediately consult the project arborist for recommendations on how to mitigate the damage.
- Supplemental irrigation may be needed during and after construction depending on the root impact. The method of irrigation may include water trucks, soaker hoses, drip irrigation, etc., which shall be finalized based on what is available during each stage of construction.

Post-Construction Phase

- If the project arborist deems it necessary, supplemental irrigation should be provided for one growing season after construction is completed (~9 months). A temporary option with soaker hoses may be used. The hoses should be laid out as close to the edge of the tree canopies as possible. Leave them on a slow drip rate for 8 hours once a month (overnight is ideal). The irrigation off-sets water stress that may result from root pruning.

Should you have any questions or need clarification, please reach out at any time.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Tso
 Michelia Arboriculture, LLC
 Board Certified Master Arborist #WE-10270B
 925-515-1362 | jennifer@micheliarborist.com

Appendix 1: Tree Inventory Table

The tree inventory table includes individual tree data as required by the City of Hayward. The data is explained as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| ID # | # assigned to each tree, correlating with a metal tag affixed to their trunks or on the fence for co-owned/off-site trees. For some trees, 1-2 tags from older inventories were still on the trees; the new tags were placed over them wherever possible. |
| Species | Common & botanical name |
| DBH | Diameter at Breast Height (4.5' above ground) in inches; trunk is measured with a diameter tape. For off-site or inaccessible trees, the trunk size is visually estimated and indicated with a "~". |
| Protected | "X" indicates a protected tree, as defined on page 1. |
| Health | Health and vigor of the tree. Ratings are broken down into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good: The tree is growing well with vigor appropriate for its age – canopy is full with good color. Pest or disease issues may be present but have low impact on the tree. • Fair: The tree is showing signs of stress, exhibited as sparseness of canopy, change in foliage color, and minor-moderate signs of pest or disease issues. It can recover as long as conditions naturally improve. • Poor: The tree is stressed with tip dieback; it is unable to overcome pest & disease issues. Immediate long-term intervention and care is needed to avoid decline to the point of non-recovery. • Very Poor: The tree has significant issues and has declined so far that it is unlikely to recover. • Dead: No life remains in the tree. |
| Structure | Architecture & defects of the tree. Ratings are broken down into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good: The tree has ideal trunk & branch architecture. • Fair: Branch defects, poor attachments and decay may be present, but they can be mitigated with 1-2 pruning cycles (over 3-5 years). • Poor: Defects cannot be mitigated without long term management (10+ years); support systems like cabling and bolting may be needed in conjunction with pruning to reduce risk to the property. • Very Poor: The tree has significant issues that cannot be corrected and may be a hazard to the property. |
| Dripline | The canopy ("dripline") radius in feet is measured with a TruPulse 200L Rangefinder in each cardinal direction (north, east, south, west). If the canopy extended off-site, the dripline was visually estimated. |
| Notes & Impact | Proximity to the project's improvements, and the anticipated impact based on tree condition, species tolerance to disturbance, future longevity, etc. |
| Actions | Includes recommended actions based on impacts, including removal and tree protection measures. |
| Appraised Value | An estimate of the value of each tree is obtained using the Trunk Formula Technique outlined in the 10 th Edition of the Guide for Plant Appraisal by the Council of Tree & Landscape Appraisers (CTLA). The cost to replace a perfect specimen of like-size is calculated, then depreciated by the subject tree's current health, structure, form, factors that are inherent to the species and property, and external factors that are out of the property manager's control. Dead/dying trees, as well as trees with severe structural defects, are not appraised since they technically have a negative value. |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---|---------|-----------------|
| 1 | Holly oak (<i>Quercus ilex</i>) | 8.5 | X | Good-Fair | Good | 5, 8, 8, 5 | Slightly sparse canopy. Pruned back from power lines, sidewalk 3' to N. Slightly crowded by #2. In proposed grading. | Remove. | \$770.00 |
| 2 | Evergreen ash (<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>) | 17.5 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 10, 20, 15, 15 | Gate bowed in at N side. Pruned away from power lines. Slightly sparse canopy, large epicormics. Sidewalk 6' to N. In proposed grading. | Remove. | \$3,910.00 |
| 3 | Evergreen ash (<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>) | 13 | X | Fair | Fair | 18, 15, 16, 18 | Earlier coloring than others. Almost touching fence. Curb within 6" of trunk with driveway beyond. Dead branches. In proposed grading. | Remove. | \$1,200.00 |
| 4 | Evergreen ash (<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>) | 21.5 | X | Fair-Poor/Fair | Fair | 25, 20, 15, 17 | Curb 5' to W with parking beyond. Power lines to E. Large dieback with old sprouts making up canopy. Juniper obscuring base of trunk. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$3,560.00 |
| 5 | Evergreen ash (<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>) | 25 | X | Fair/Fair-Poor | Fair | 13, 18, 23, 21 | Driveway 6' to S, 9' to E. Dieback on N/E/W sides of canopy with more chlorosis; full over driveway. Cracking in asphalt may not be completely due to tree, though root shaped. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$1,730.00 |
| 6 | Southern magnolia (<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>) | 6 | | Fair-Poor | Good | 8, 7, 10, 14 | Suckering. Sparse chlorotic and stunted canopy, shaded by #5. In proposed grading. | Remove. | \$50.00 |
| 7 | Eucalyptus (<i>Eucalyptus</i> sp.) | 3.5, 3.5 | | Good | Poor | 7, 6, 5, 5 | Topped at 1' above grade, multiple stems. 1' from sidewalk. In proposed walkway/grading. | Remove. | \$240.00 |
| 8 | Blackwood acacia (<i>Acacia melanoxylon</i>) | 20.5 | X | Good | Fair-Poor | 7, 11, 17, 21 | Pruned and leaning away from power lines (uncorrected). Driveway 1' to S, sidewalk 2' to N. Cracking asphalt. 4 codominant stems with included bark. Top of roots damaged. In proposed walkway/grading. | Remove. | \$2,090.00 |
| 9 | Evergreen ash (<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>) | 22 | X | Fair-Poor/Poor | Fair/Fair-Poor | 26, 23, 33, 20 | 6' from driveway and building, raising asphalt to ~25' away (may be in combination with other issues). Deadwood and dead branches over building. Sidewalk ~18' to N. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$3,110.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|---|----------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 10 | Eucalyptus (<i>Eucalyptus</i> sp.) | ~26.5 | X | Good | Fair | 12 NESW | Co-owned tree; pushing on fence. Building 8' to SE. Barbed wire in trunk. All canopy in upper 1/3. 2.5' from proposed water line. | Remove. | \$10,700.00 |
| 11 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~26, 22 | X | Good | Fair | 25, 28, 30, 25 | Neighbor's tree. Could be lifting concrete slab 1' N of trunk. Native grade between building and fence. Multiple codominant attachments with bark inclusion, including main trunk. Second trunk has an extended secondary branch following fence. 5' from proposed water line. | Remove. | \$17,400.00 |
| 12 | Mulberry (<i>Morus alba</i>) | 11 | X | Fair/Fair-Poor | Fair | 15 NESW | Sparse and yellow canopy, no irrigation. Root zone 100 percent covered by concrete and artificial turf, swelling may be large root growing to N. Moderate dieback and stunted leaves. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$430.00 |
| 13 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~5 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 12W | Cleared from property line. Trunk on other side of fence but pushes against chain link. Barbed wire engulfed into trunk. Concrete within 6" of trunk, building nearby. ~3' from proposed drainage area. | Protect with temporary fencing until basin grading occurs. Basin & swale to be excavated by hand or with air/water assisted methods that allow large roots to be preserved, otherwise arborist on site during excavation. If roots cannot be left in place, tree may need to be removed. | \$340.00 |
| 14 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~7, 8.5 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 0, 7, 12, 12 | Chain link fence embedded in both lower and upper trunks. Codominant trunks at 1' above ground. Old tag 69. Concrete within 6" of trunk, building beyond, slightly crowded by neighbor. ~3' from proposed drainage area; ~3' from proposed basin. | Protect with temporary fencing until basin grading occurs. Basin & swale to be excavated by hand or with air/water assisted methods that allow large roots to be preserved, otherwise arborist on site during excavation. If roots cannot be left in place, tree may need to be removed. | \$850.00 |
| 15 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~6.5 | X | Good | Fair | 3, 3, 0, 18 | Trunk on N side of chain link fence, fence embedded in trunk. Trunk almost horizontal to W. Crowded by #16. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$540.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|---|---------|-----------------|
| 16 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~12 | X | Good | Good | 7, 6, 15, 15 | Trunk N of fence but grown back through so fence is embedded in trunk. Pruned back for clearance. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$3,090.00 |
| 17 | Evergreen ash (<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>) | 2.5, 2.5 | | Good-Fair | Poor | 0, 8, 8, 0 | Trunk right up against building, previously cut down multiple times. Branches tearing out at 5'. In proposed open space/grading. | Remove. | \$50.00 |
| 18 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 13.5, 12 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 19, 13, 13, 15 | Trunk pushes into fence, included bark at 4'. 6' from building and stairs. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$4,990.00 |
| 19 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 11 | X | Fair | Fair | 10, 1, 6, 17 | Upper trunk veers W through fence, 6' from stairs. Swooping out from under other trees to SE. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$1,310.00 |
| 20 | Holly oak (<i>Quercus ilex</i>) | ~7, 9, 4, 3, 6 | X | Good | Poor | 5, 4, 8, 12 | Growing through fence. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$5,400.00 |
| 21 | Holly oak (<i>Quercus ilex</i>) | 7, 5 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 2, 6, 8, 9 | Barbed wire through 2 stems. Narrow crowded canopy. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$1,960.00 |
| 22 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 11 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 6, 5, 9, 9 | Pushing into fence. Lower trunk phototropic to SE, correcting. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$1,930.00 |
| 23 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 9.5 | X | Good | Good | 8, 5, 8, 15 | Crowded. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$1,920.00 |
| 24 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 7.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 14, 8, 6, 15 | Pushing fence into property. Minimal foliage until the top, sparse canopy. Asymmetrical to NE. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$710.00 |
| 25 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 6.5, 6, ~6.5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 8, 8, 2, 15 | Fence embedded. Codominant stems, one growing through fence. Asymmetrical to NE. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$2,300.00 |
| 26 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 10, ~11, 15, 16 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 12, 8, 18, 15 | 4 stems, chain-link through center of tree. Slightly crowded by #36. Canopy slightly sparse. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$15,400.00 |
| 27 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 15.5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 12, 21, 13, 8 | Pushing into chain-link fence, included bark at 6'. Codominant stems. Minor asymmetrical canopy to E. In proposed bioretention basin. | Remove. | \$4,870.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|---|---------|-----------------|
| 28 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5, 2.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 8, 8, 2, 2 | Narrow canopy. In center chain-link. In proposed bioretention basin. | Remove. | \$470.00 |
| 29 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5.5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 11, 9, 1, 6 | Phototropic lean to N due to crowding. Canopy in upper half only. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$610.00 |
| 30 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 10, 11, 1, 2 | Phototropic lean to N due to crowding. Canopy in upper half only. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$470.00 |
| 31 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 14.5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 13, 18, 8, 2 | Asymmetrical to N/E due to crowding. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$5,100.00 |
| 32 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 8, 8, 8, 3 | Narrow canopy. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$420.00 |
| 33 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 6.5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 12, 5, 4, 7 | Narrow but denser canopy. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$870.00 |
| 34 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5, 3 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 3, 15, 9, 2 | Asymmetrical to SE/E. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$800.00 |
| 35 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 17 | X | Fair | Good | 14, 18, 21, 13 | Sparse canopy. Growth cracks on trunk. Concrete debris to W. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$6,500.00 |
| 36 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 10, 9, 12.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 15, 14, 17, 13 | Codominant stems at 1' with included bark, more bark inclusion above. Crowded by #35. Slightly sparse canopy. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$5,800.00 |
| 37 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 4 | X | Good | Poor | 1, 10, 5, 1 | In center fence, grows through 2 sets. Phototropic to E, crowded. 3' from proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$270.00 |
| 38 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 4 | X | Good | Poor | 2, 10, 4, 1 | In center fence, fence in trunk. Phototropic to E, crowded. Within 1' of proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$290.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|---|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 39 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 17, 14.5, ~15 | X | Poor/Poor-Very Poor | Fair-Poor | 19, 15, 19, 17 | Very sparse and stunted. Steel post and chain-link in tree. Concrete 6' to N, included bark at 8' on center stem. 3' from proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$3,260.00 |
| 40 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~20 | X | Good | Fair-Poor | 20, 2, 10, 17 | Trunk flush and embedded in fence for 8' until it veers vertical. Phototropic lean to N after the W orientation. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$5,100.00 |
| 41 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 12, 14, 8.5, ~12 | X | Fair | Fair | 13, 23, 25, 13 | Trunk through fence and around post. Stunted and sparse, gap in canopy. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$7,400.00 |
| 42 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5 | X | Fair | Poor | 0, 17, 25, 10 | Completely understory; sparse canopy. Within 1' of proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$250.00 |
| 43 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~27 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 15, 26, 18, 24 | Fence through trunk in 3 places, elongated secondary branch to NW. Top looks slightly sparse. In proposed accessibility ramp; within 7' of building. | Remove. | \$14,000.00 |
| 44 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5.5, 6.5 | X | Fair/Fair-Poor | Poor | 5, 22, 10, 2 | Codominant stems with included bark, fence through trunk. Understory to #43, reaches sun to E side. In proposed accessibility ramp. | Remove. | \$600.00 |
| 45 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 9.5, 7.5, 6, ~7.5 | X | Poor | Fair-Poor | 6, 7, 12, 10 | Growing through fence. Sparse, stunted chlorotic. Asphalt up to trunk, building 8' to N. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$1,170.00 |
| 46 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 10, 11, 11, 11 | X | Good | Fair | 7, 14, 15, 13 | Asphalt up to trunk, building 9' to NW. Lifting asphalt. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$6,000.00 |
| 47 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 8, 8, 6.5, 10.5 | X | Good | Fair | 6, 16, 15, 5 | Asphalt up to trunk, lifting asphalt. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$3,640.00 |
| 48 | Chinese pistache (<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>) | 6 | | Good | Good-Fair | 10, 11, 10, 10 | Typical structure. Stakes still attached. 9' from proposed road. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$1,720.00 |
| 49 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 8, 6 | X | Good | Good | 5, 8, 9, 6 | Slightly lean to S. Within 2' of proposed road. | Remove. | \$2,470.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 50 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 22, 21, 12.5 | X | Good | Good | 20, 24, 20, 22 | Trunk flare buried by leaves (maybe soil). Minor seams between trunks; nice tree. 1.5' from proposed accessibility ramp; not feasible to adjust ramp away from tree. | Remove. | \$30,100.00 |
| 51 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 16, 15.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 15, 19, 15, 15 | Codominant trunks with included bark. Sparse and stunted canopy. In proposed accessibility ramp. | Remove. | \$10,000.00 |
| 52 | Privet (<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>) | 4.5, 4, 3 | X | Poor | Fair-Poor | 3, 5, 6, 8 | Largest stem is dead, crowded, multiple trunks. 8' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. NOTE: Tree is likely to continue to decline regardless of the project. | \$270.00 |
| 53 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 7 | X | Fair | Poor | 8, 5, 0, 0 | No canopy except a tuft at very top, almost understory. ~12' from proposed accessibility ramp. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$300.00 |
| 54 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 15, 11.5, 12, 12.5 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 18, 19, 24, 22 | Crowded, slightly sparse canopy. Fill on upper side of trunk. Significant included bark in lower attachments. ~11.5' from proposed accessibility ramp. | Protect with temporary fencing. Consult arborist if roots > 2" diameter are encountered during excavation by #54. | \$10,900.00 |
| 55 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 11, 9.5 | X | Good | Fair | 10, 8, 23, 16 | Codominant stems at 1'. Phototropic lean to W/SW due to #54. Soil accumulated at the top. 16.5' from proposed accessibility ramp. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$3,120.00 |
| 56 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 10.5, 14, 11, 9 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 11, 18, 19, 13 | Codominant trunks intertwining and growing in different directions; flush for short height. Clear of construction. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$9,600.00 |
| 57 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 16 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 14, 11, 14, 15 | Old wound closing to the S, cause unclear. Clear of construction. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$5,300.00 |
| 58 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 7 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 0, 3, 1, 10 | Phototropic lean to W. 1' from proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$700.00 |
| 59 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 9 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 5 NESW | Crowded. 2.5' from proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$1,620.00 |
| 60 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 4.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 2, 5, 5, 2 | Sparse, crowded. 4.5' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$240.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|---------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 61 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~8, 11, 6, 10, 7, 9 | X | Fair/Fair-Poor | Fair | 5, 16, 13, 12 | Neighbor's tree. Buried trunk flare. Barbed wire in some branches. Stunted, slightly sparse canopy especially understory. 18' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$5,700.00 |
| 62 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 18.5, 14.5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 12, 23, 24, 24 | Deforming fence. Codominant trunks, extended branch to E. Manhole 3' to E. 11.5' from proposed limit of grading. | Protect with temporary fencing. Consult arborist if roots \geq 2" diameter are encountered during grading. | \$7,100.00 |
| 63 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 15 | X | Good | Fair | 17, 27, 8, 20 | Through fence. Short for size. Trunk is horizontal to E before uprighting at 8' from the fence, low canopy. 9" stem grows back to W. 3.5' from proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$3,280.00 |
| 64 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 4 | X | Good | Fair | 8, 2, 3, 11 | Growing through fence in 3 places. Narrow, crowded canopy. Within 1' of proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$210.00 |
| 65 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 14, ~10, 10, 10 | X | Good | Fair-Poor | 13, 22, 6, 15 | Growing through fence. Significant included bark with weeping in between attachment. 9' from proposed retaining wall, 11' from proposed road. | Eliminate/minimize grading between road, wall and tree. Protect with temporary fencing. | \$6,200.00 |
| 66 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 8, ~6 | X | Good | Fair-Poor | 5, 20, 15, 15 | Fence in stem 1-2 places, one stem horizontal and low over graves. 12' from proposed road. | Eliminate/minimize grading between road, wall and tree. Protect with temporary fencing. | \$960.00 |
| 67 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~2, 5 | X | Fair | Fair | 3, 1, 1, 4 | Slightly pushing on fence. Smaller stem in fence in 4 places. Other stem phototropic lean to W. 12' from proposed road; 6' from proposed water line. | Eliminate/minimize grading between road, wall and tree. Protect with temporary fencing. | \$280.00 |
| 68 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 8.5, 12, ~7 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 5, 24, 13, 15 | Fences in trunk in 2 places. Asymmetrical canopy to E. 11' from proposed road; 3' from proposed water line. | Remove. | \$4,670.00 |
| 69 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~9, 13 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 3, 16, 15, 15 | Pushed through fence. 11' from proposed road; 4' from proposed water line. | Remove. | \$4,160.00 |
| 70 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~23, 12, 15 | X | Good-Fair/Fair | Good-Fair | 27, 22, 21, 22 | Neighbor's tree. Slightly sparse with upper dieback. Tag on fence - keep clear of canopy? Edge of trunk is 13' from fence. 28' from proposed building; 17.5' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. Consult arborist if roots \geq 2" diameter are encountered during trenching. | \$13,900.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|---------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 71 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 13, 8.5, ~18, 17 | X | Fair | Fair | 9, 26, 25, 25 | Fence through smaller trunks. Sparse stunted canopy with elongated scaffolds to east (smaller diameter). 15' from potential grading area & 13' from proposed retaining wall; 5' from proposed water line. | Remove. | \$12,700.00 |
| 72 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | ~32 | X | Fair/Fair-Poor | Fair-Poor | 14, 36, 34, 30 | Fence embedded in trunk. Upper canopy, sparse extended branches (natural lions tail); low canopy to E, about 10' above grade. Looks good from E & inside. In proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$13,400.00 |
| 73 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 14, 16.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 19, 17, 13, 13 | Co-dominant stems. Stunted & sparse. 11' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$7,600.00 |
| 74 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 8, ~4 | X | Good | Fair | 5, 12, 9, 13 | All canopy at top, shaded below. 21' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$1,330.00 |
| 75 | Plum (<i>Prunus</i> sp.) | ~5, 4, 4 | X | Fair-Poor | Fair | 3, 6, 8, 8 | Poison oak, sprouting. Slightly purple. Clear of construction. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$1,280.00 |
| 76 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 13.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 3, 5, 13, 17 | Buried, phototropic lean to SW. Clear of construction. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$2,600.00 |
| 77 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 18.5, 22 | X | Poor | Fair/Fair-Poor | 17, 16, 16, 25 | Co-dominant stems at 3'. Sparse canopy and included bark. 1' x 1' canker on stem. Clear of construction. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$6,700.00 |
| 78 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 20 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 23, 6, 17, 23 | Phototropic lean to N due to #77, gap in mid canopy. Spike marks on trunk. Clear of construction. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$8,500.00 |
| 79 | Mayten (<i>Maytenus boaria</i>) | ~12 | X | Fair-Poor/Poor | Poor | 12N | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. ~2' from existing fence (on center). Trunk phototropic lean to N with crack. Sparse and yellow canopy. 1.5' from proposed retaining wall. | To reduce impact, specify pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 5' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$1,910.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 80 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~6 | | Fair | Good | 8, 8, 8, 6 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 18" to E. Stunted growth. 1.5' from proposed retaining wall. | To reduce impact, use pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 5' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$2,630.00 |
| 81 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 12, ~12, 12 | X | Good-Fair | Fair | 11, 14, 14, 22 | Guy wires - may have been transplanted or replaced in past. 2 stems flush at 4.5', other stem also has included bark below. Asymmetrical to the W, slightly sparse. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$9,400.00 |
| 82 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~7 | | Fair | Good | 10, 5, 6, 9 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Dieback, stunted. 1.5' from proposed retaining wall; 4.5' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. To reduce impact, use pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 5' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$470.00 |
| 83 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~7 | | Poor | Fair | 6, 6, 6, 4 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Crowded, stunted & sparse. 2.5' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. To reduce impact, use pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 5' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$360.00 |
| 84 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 16.5, 17.5 | X | Good | Good-Fair | 17, 12, 17, 16 | Minor included bark. Nice tree. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$14,900.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|--|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 85 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~9 | X | Good-Fair | Good | 8, 6, 9, 9 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Adjacent concrete slab lifted. 2' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. To reduce impact, use pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 5' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$1,020.00 |
| 86 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~6 | | Poor | Poor | 3, 3, 2, 2 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Previously topped, small canopy. 1.5' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. To reduce impact, use pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 5' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$190.00 |
| 87 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~10 | X | Good | Fair | 10, 8, 8, 10 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Previously topped or lost top at 15', resulting in multiple stems. 1.5' from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. To reduce impact, use pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 5' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$1,250.00 |
| 88 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 5.5, ~4.5, 4, 8 | X | Good | Fair | 9, 11, 10, 12 | 3 stems flush to each other, parking 12' to NW. 3' & 8.5' from proposed retaining wall. | Remove. | \$2,680.00 |
| 89 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 17, 13.5, 14 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 14, 15, 17, 14 | Parking 4' to W. Codominant trunks, top sparse. 14' from proposed retaining wall, 24.5' from proposed road; 14.5' from proposed water line. | Remove. | \$10,300.00 |
| 90 | Callery pear (<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>) | 5.5 | | Fair | Fair | 8 NESW | Minor dieback and fireblight. Suckers. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$630.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|---|----------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| 91 | Callery pear (<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>) | 5.5 | | Fair | Fair | 5 NESW | Stunted, minor dieback and fire blight. Suckers. In proposed building. | Remove. | \$920.00 |
| 92 | Callery pear (<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>) | 5.5 | | Fair/Fair-Poor | Fair | 7 NESW | Stunted, suckering, fire blight. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$910.00 |
| 93 | Chinese pistache (<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>) | 7.5 | | Good | Good | 9, 10, 9, 9 | Stakes still on. 13' from proposed road. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$2,460.00 |
| 94 | Chinese pistache (<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>) | 5 | | Good | Good | 6 NESW | Stakes still on. Typical structure, more squat than usual. Trunk bleeding. 9' from proposed road. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$1,210.00 |
| 95 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~11 | X | Good-Fair | Good | 11, 8, 10, 11 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Slightly stunted. 6.5' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$1,400.00 |
| 95B | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~11 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 8 NESW | Neighbor's tree, NOT TAGGED. Asphalt 12" to E. Slightly stunted. 6' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$1,230.00 |
| 96 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~11 | X | Good-Fair | Good-Fair | 6, 6, 9, 9 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Slightly stunted. Codominant stems at 8'. 6' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$1,470.00 |
| 97 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~6.5 | | Fair | Poor | 3, 4, 6, 6 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Topped or died at 12' above grade, wide growing sprouts. 1.5' from proposed utility area. | Remove. | \$350.00 |
| 98 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~10 | X | Good-Fair | Good | 10, 6, 8, 6 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Pruned back from property line. Slightly stunted. ~2. from proposed retaining wall. | Protect with temporary fencing. To reduce impact, use pier footings for wall without continuous trenching within 8' of tree. Arborist on-site during excavation, tree may need to be removed if root loss is high (requires neighbor approval). | \$1,300.00 |

| D # | Species | DBH (in) | Protected | Health | Structure | Dripline (NESW, ft) | Notes & Impact | Actions | Appraised Value |
|-----|---|----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 99 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~7 | | Good-Fair | Good | 7, 6, 8, 8 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Slightly stunted. ~6' from end of retaining wall; 10' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$650.00 |
| 100 | Coast live oak (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) | 11.5, 11, 11.5 | X | Good | Fair | 13, 12, 14, 11 | 3 trunks with included bark. Within 1' of proposed parking, in proposed walkway. | Remove. | \$9,300.00 |
| 101 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~8 | X | Fair/Fair-Poor | Good | 6 NESW | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Top sparse and very stunted. 5.5' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$770.00 |
| 102 | Tulip tree (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) | ~6 | | Good-Fair | Poor | 6, 6, 5, 5 | Neighbor's tree, tag on fence. Asphalt 12" to E. Previously topped at 10', side branch assumed leader position - canopy more asymmetrical to W. 6' from proposed water line. | Protect with temporary fencing. | \$390.00 |
| 103 | Bottlebrush (<i>Callistemon</i> sp.) | 8.5 | X | Fair | Fair | 5 NESW | Originally shrub. 2.5", 2" volunteers at base. Parking 1' to W, trash enclosure, almost completely dominated by other trees. Within 1' of proposed road. | Remove. | \$250.00 |
| 104 | Evergreen ash (<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>) | 19 | X | Very Poor | Poor | 10, 8, 10, 7 | Dying tree, original trunk almost dead. Multiple 2"-3" suckers responding to decline, also declining. Parking 1' to W. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$0.00 (severe decline) |
| 105 | Italian stone pine (<i>Pinus pinea</i>) | 28 | X | Good | Fair | 32, 20, 11, 15 | Squat form with very elongated branches. Cleared from power lines. Block wall 6' to E, parking 12' to W. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$3,730.00 |
| 106 | Canary Island pine (<i>Pinus canariensis</i>) | 19 | X | Good | Good | 11, 8, 10, 10 | Parking 3' to N/W/S. In proposed road. | Remove. | \$3,160.00 |

Appendix 2: Tree Protection Plan

A tree protection plan is attached on the following page. If it is not included, please contact me and/or the project lead for a copy. It distills the recommendations in a visual format for use in the field.

