

Appendix B
Arborist Report

ARBORIST REPORT

TREE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

JANUARY 10, 2020

PREPARED FOR:

ANDERSON ARCHITECTS INC

PROJECT:

MITZI PLACE, 4146 MITZI DRIVE, SAN JOSE



BO FIRESTONE
Consulting & Design
Certified Arborist since 2008



BO FIRESTONE CONSULTING & DESIGN
BUSARA FIRESTONE, CERTIFIED ARBORIST #WE-8525A
1755 YOSEMITE DR., MILPITAS, CA 95035
E: BUSARA@BOFIRESTONE.COM P: (408) 497-7158
WWW.BOFIRESTONE.COM

asca
AMERICAN SOCIETY of
CONSULTING ARBORISTS

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

 ASSIGNMENT 1

 LIMITATIONS..... 1

Tree Impact Assessment..... 2

 SITE DESCRIPTION..... 2

 PROJECT DESCRIPTION 2

 IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION & TREE REMOVALS 2

 TREE INVENTORY 3

Conclusion 4

Supporting Documents 5

Glossary..... 5

Photos 7

TREE INVENTORY (TABLE).....22

TREE MAP24

Introduction

ASSIGNMENT

On January 6th, 2020 at Mr. Anderson's request (the project architect), I visited the project site at 4146 Mitzi Drive. The purpose was to generate a report to document the basic characteristics and proposed project impacts for all trees at the site. All 33 trees on the parcel were requested for removal by the client. Please see the attached Tree Inventory and Tree Map for the locations and basic attributes of the four trees identified for removal at the project site.

This report may be submitted to the City of San Jose as part of the building permitting process.

LIMITATIONS

Due to the presence of debris or basal sprouts limiting access, some of my trunk measurements were estimates. Recommendations beyond those related to the proposed construction were not within the scope of work. Full tree risk assessments were not conducted, although assessments of health and structure factored into my condition ratings for each tree. I did not include tree preservation measures in this report, as all trees were requested for removal, and had, in my assessment, low suitability for retainment.

Tree Impact Assessment

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site was a corner lot in a residential neighborhood adjacent to several other apartment buildings. An unmaintained historic house stood on the property, as well as the foundation of a smaller structure. The property was mostly open ground, with debris piled from what I assumed was a recent cleanup effort. It was obvious from the type of debris that the property was an attractive place for homeless encampments.

As the property was not formally occupied for an extended period, most of its trees were weedy “volunteer” sprouts of low-value species such as multi-trunk ash saplings, acacia, and palm “pups.” The original trees on-site appeared to include a row of Mexican fan palms in “fair” condition, as well as a large valley oak looming to the side of the house that was in “poor” condition. An exception to this population of largely unsuitable trees were a few young evergreen oaks, which probably generated from acorns.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

After review of the plan set (dated 10--25-19) it was my understanding that the historic building would be renovated as a multi-family building and moved toward the front of the lot. A new apartment complex would be built toward the back of the lot, with underground parking. The perimeter wall would be demolished, and a more open landscape installed. Locations for new street trees, screening trees, and various ornamental trees were proposed on the landscape plan.

IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION & TREE REMOVALS

I identified 33 trees which would be impacted by the proposed project (all on the property to be developed). Trees have been labeled #1 - #33 on the Tree Map and Inventory table included

in this report. Trees on adjacent properties were sufficiently distant from the proposed areas of disturbance. All 33 trees were requested for removal.

Most trees were low-value species or were in poor condition. The exceptions were trees #21 and #24, young holly oak in good condition along the back-property line. However, these trees were within the footprint of the underground parking area and would be uprooted by the excavation. Even if they were somehow retained, they would be too close to the multi-story building than appropriate for their mature canopy spread.

The large valley oak by the house was in poor condition due to age. Most of the branches appeared to be dead or dying, with cavities and decay present. This tree provided little amenity other than wildlife value. (I did not observe any nesting animals during my inspection). This oak would be within the footprint of the new apartment building and so could not be retained if the project were to move forward. Even if it were preserved, any people or property beneath would be at high risk of impact from failure of tree parts.

The evaluation of anticipated project impacts for all trees was summarized in the Tree Inventory under the heading "Impact Assessment." These included impacts of grading, excavation for utility installation, retaining walls, drainage or any other aspect of the project that could impact the service life of the tree. The anticipated impact due to proximity to work was provided using a rating system. General species tolerance to construction, and condition of the trees (health and structural integrity), was also provided. These factors, as well as tree age, soil characteristics, and species desirability, all factored into an individual tree's suitability rating, as summarized on the Inventory. Suitability of trees to be retained was rated as "high," "moderate," or "low."

TREE INVENTORY

This report includes an attached inventory of all trees over six inches in total cross-section that would be potentially impacted. This inventory also includes any trees on adjacent parcels that extended into the work area (none).


The Inventory includes each tree's number (as shown on the TPZ map), measurements, condition, level of impact (due to proximity to work), tolerance to construction, overall suitability for conservation, and prescription (remove/protect).

Conclusion

The proposed Mitzi Place building project appeared to be a valuable upgrade to the property and neighborhood. After review of the plan set, I determined that retainment of trees #1 - #33 would not be possible if the project were to move forward as planned. Therefore, I assigned a "severe" impact rating to these trees, with "low" suitability for retainment. **With appropriate mitigation measures (such as new plantings on-site), removal of Trees #1 - #33 would be justified for the economic development of the parcel.**

If any of the parties involved have questions on this report, or require Project Arborist supervision or technical support, please do not hesitate to contact me at (408) 497-7158 or busara@bofirestone.com.

Signed,



Bo Firestone | ISA Certified Arborist WE-#8525A | ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor | ASCA Tree and Plant Appraisal Qualification | Member – American Society of Consulting Arborists

Supporting Documents

Glossary

DBH: Diameter at 4.5' above grade.

CIRC.: Combined trunk circumference at 4.5' above grade.

SPREAD: Diameter of canopy between farthest branch tips

TREE STATUS: "Protected" - when related to zoning approvals, most species, when the DBH is four inches or more (includes dead trees and fallen trees). "Large protected trees" – any Oak, California Buckeye, or Pacific Madrone, when the trunk DBH is 24 inches or more. Any other species when the DBH is 48 inches or more. Fruit trees exempt unless over 18". I used the mathematically derived diameter of total cross-sectional area of multi-trunk trees to determine if they qualified.

CONDITION-Ground based visual assessment of structural and physiological well-being:

"Excellent" = 81 - 100%; Good health and structure with significant size, location or quality.

"Good" = 61-80%; Normal vigor, full canopy, no observable significant structural defects, many years of service life remaining.

"Fair" = 41-60%; Reduced vigor, significant structural defect(s), and/or other significant signs of stress

"Poor" = 21- 40%; In potentially irreversible decline, structure and aesthetics severely compromised

"Very Poor" = 6-20%; Nearly dead, or high risk of failure, negative contribution to the landscape

"Dead/Unstable" = 0 - 5%; No live canopy/buds or failure imminent

AGE: Relative to the lifespan of the tree; "Young" <1/3; "Mature" 1/3 - 2/3; "Overmature" >2/

IMPACT: Anticipated impact to an individual tree including.....

SEVERE - In direct conflict, removal necessary if plans proceed (distance to root cuts/fill within 3X dbh)

HIGH - Ideal TPZ significantly encroached upon but could still be retained with monitoring or alternative building methods. Health and structure may worsen even if conditions for retainment are met. May recommend alternative TPZ method due to proximity to work.

MODERATE - Minor or no encroachment on ideal TPZ. Longevity uncompromised with standard protection.

LOW - Ideal TPZ well exceeded. Potential impact only by ingress/egress. Longevity uncompromised.

VERY LOW - Negligible anticipated impact.

TOLERANCE: General species tolerance to construction (GOOD, MODERATE, or POOR) as given in Managing Trees During Construction, Second Edition, by International Society of Arboriculture

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT: An individual tree's suitability for preservation considering impacts, condition, maturity, species tolerance, site characteristics, and species desirability. (HIGH, MODERATE, or LOW)

PRESCRIPTION: Preserve (retain with protection measures) or Remove

Photos










PREPARED BY: BUSARA FIRESTONE
ISA-CERTIFIED ARBORIST #WE-8525A
WWW.BOFIRESTONE.COM









PREPARED BY: BUSARA FIRESTONE
ISA-CERTIFIED ARBORIST #WE-8525A
WWW.BOFIRESTONE.COM



Tree #21 (Holly Oak)



Tree #22 (Coast Live
Oak)


Tree #23 (Holly Oak)





Tree #25 (Siberian Elm)







TREE INVENTORY - MITZI PLACE PROJECT, 4146 MITZI DRIVE

pg. 22

ANDERSON ARCHITECTS 01/10/20

All trees on the property with combined trunk measurements > 19" circ. (6" dbh)

							TREE IMPACT ASSESSMENT					
Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	Circ. (inches)	DBH (inches)	Height (feet)	Spread (feet)	Condition	Age	Species Tolerance	Impact Level	Suitability Rating	REMOVE/ RETAIN
1	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	22	7	40	20	GOOD	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
2	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	25	8	35	15	GOOD	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
3	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	28	9	30	20	GOOD	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
4	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	16, 6	5, 2	25	5	FAIR	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
5	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	13, 13, 9, 6, 6	4, 4, 3, 2, 2	35	20	FAIR	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
6	Blackwood Acacia	<i>Acacia melanoxylon</i>	50	16	15	25	FAIR	MATURE	POOR	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
7	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	31	10	18	12	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
8	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	31	10	15	10	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
9	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	31	10	20	12	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
10	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	57	18	70	20	FAIR	MATURE	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
11	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	31	10	20	12	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
12	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	57	18	70	20	FAIR	MATURE	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
13	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	50	16	70	20	FAIR	MATURE	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
14	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	50	16	70	20	FAIR	MATURE	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
15	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	31	10	15	10	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
16	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	50	16	70	20	FAIR	MATURE	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
17	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	38	12	25	15	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
18	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	38	12	25	15	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
19	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	25	8	25	20	POOR	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
20	Valley Oak	<i>Quercus lobata</i>	126	40	60	60	POOR	OVERMATURE	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
21	Holly Oak	<i>Quercus ilex</i>	28	9	40	30	EXCELLENT	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
22	Coast Live Oak	<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	28	9	40	30	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
23	Holly Oak	<i>Quercus ilex</i>	19	6	30	20	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
24	Holly Oak	<i>Quercus ilex</i>	25	8	30	20	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
25	Siberian Elm	<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	(4) 16", (2) 13"	(4) 5", (2) 4"	30	35	FAIR	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
26	Blackwood Acacia	<i>Acacia melanoxylon</i>	22, 22, 9, 9, 6	7, 7, 3, 3, 2	30	20	FAIR	YOUNG	POOR	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE

TREE INVENTORY - MITZI PLACE PROJECT, 4146 MITZI DRIVE

ANDERSON ARCHITECTS 01/10/20

All trees on the property with combined trunk measurements > 19" circ. (6" dbh)

							TREE IMPACT ASSESSMENT					
Number	Common Name	Botanical Name	Circ. (inches)	DBH (inches)	Height (feet)	Spread (feet)	Condition	Age	Species Tolerance	Impact Level	Suitability Rating	REMOVE/ RETAIN
27	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	44	14	60	15	FAIR	MATURE	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
28	White Ash	<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	16, 13	5, 4	30	20	FAIR	YOUNG	MODERATE	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
29	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	38	12	20	20	GOOD	YOUNG	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
30	Mexican Fan Palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	57	18	70	20	FAIR	MATURE	GOOD	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
31	Blackwood Acacia	<i>Acacia melanoxylon</i>	31, 31, 22	10, 10, 7	50	25	FAIR	YOUNG	POOR	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
32	Blackwood Acacia	<i>Acacia melanoxylon</i>	31	10	50	25	FAIR	YOUNG	POOR	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE
33	Blackwood Acacia	<i>Acacia melanoxylon</i>	38, 28	12, 9	40	25	FAIR	YOUNG	POOR	SEVERE	LOW	REMOVE

BASE MAP USED: TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY

FOR TREE MEASUREMENTS, REFER TO
“TREE INVENTORY TABLE”

NOTE: I ADDED EIGHT TREE LOCATIONS TO THE SURVEY INFORMATION: #1 - 3, #13, #19, #21, #23, AND #31. TWO LOCATIONS DID NOT HAVE TREES WHEN I DID MY INVENTORY ON JANUARY 6TH (LABELED "NA"). THE EVIDENCE ON-SITE SUGGESTED THAT THESE WERE ERRORS, NOT SITES OF RECENT REMOVAL.

TREES INCLUDED IN MY SURVEY WERE THOSE ON THE PROPERTY OR IMPACTED BY THE PROJECT, OVER 6" TALL, AND OVER 6" IN DIAMETER. (WEEDY SINGLE SPROUTS < 6" WERE NOT COUNTED.)

THIS INFORMATION SHOULD BE USED TO UPDATE THE "TREE DEPOSITION PLAN" AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT PLAN DOCUMENTS.

LOT 88
[41 M 18]

TPZ MAP LEGEND:

n

PROTECTED TREE TO REMOVE (ALL 33)


n

TREES TO REMAIN (0)

n

TREE ON NEIGHBORS' PROPERTY (NONE IMPACTED)

NA - NO TREE OBSERVED AT THIS LOCATION



EV
FL
GRN
GV
IE
LIP
PED
RE
SDMH
SSCO
SSMH
TB
TC
TE
TS
TW

EL
FL
GR
GV
IN
LI
PE
RI
ST
SA
SA
TE
TO
TO

TREE MAP

4146 MITZI DRIVE, SAN JOSE, CA



DATE:
01/10/20

TPZ ELEMENTS DRAWN:
B. FIRESTONE
ISA-CERTIFIED ARBORIST
#WE-8525A

TITLE:
MITZI PLACE TREE SURVEY

SHEET
1 OF 1
report pg. 24