

**AN EVALUATION OF THE EXISTING TREES
AT THE
ESPRESSO LANE PROJECT
1990 S. EL CAMINO REAL
SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA**

**PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF
MR. JAKE MAR
JENNA BAYER GARDEN DESIGN, INC.
1954 OLD MIDDLEFIELD WAY, SUITE B
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA 94043**

**PREPARED BY
MICHAEL L. BENCH
CONSULTING ARBORIST
URBAN TREE MANAGEMENT
OCTOBER 8, 2012**

An Evaluation of the Existing Trees
1990 S. El Camino Real
San Mateo, California

**An Evaluation of the Existing Trees located at the
Espresso Lane Construction Project
1990 S. El Camino Real
San Mateo, California**

Assignment

We were asked by Mr. Jake Mar with Jenna Bayer Garden Design, Inc., to evaluate the existing trees located at the Espresso Lane Project, 1990 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, California.

The plan provided for this evaluation is the Topographic Survey Map prepared by Lea & Braze, Engineering, Sheet SU1, dated 5-30-12.

Summary

A total of 14 trees are included in this inventory. The locations of these trees are shown on the attached Tree Map.

The 14 trees are identified by species, briefly described (trunk diameter, height, spread, health, structural integrity) and given an overall condition rating of Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Extremely Poor.

The Appraised Value of Trees # 1 and # 2 are provided in accordance with ISA (International Society of Arboriculture) standards.

Methods

The trunks of the trees are measured using a standard measuring tape at 4 feet above soil grade (referred to as DBH or Diameter at Breast Height), except those specimens whose form does not allow for a representative measurement at this height. The measurement for multi-stem specimens is taken below the lowest fork on the trunk when possible in accordance with the International Society of Arboriculture standards. The canopy height and spread are estimated using visual references only. The estimated shape of the canopy relative to the other nearby trees has been added to the attached map.

The condition of each tree was observed by visual assessment only from a standing position without climbing or using aerial equipment. No invasive equipment was used. Consequently, it is possible that individual tree(s) may have internal defects, which are not detectable by visual inspection. Invasive exploratory inspection and analysis is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

Observations

There are 17 trees within the proposed project area; 11 are outside of the property line

An Evaluation of the Existing Trees
1990 S. El Camino Real
San Mateo, California

and out of the public right of way. However, 3 of the trees are under 6 inches in diameter. These 3 small trees are American sweet gum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), which are noted on the attached map. All of the other 14 trees are 6 inches in diameter or larger. These larger 14 trees are included in this survey. Their locations also shown on the attached map with their approximate canopy dimensions. No labels were affixed to any of the trees.

The 14 trees are listed by number on a Field Data Sheet, which follows this text. This Data Sheet provides the basic information about each tree, including the trunk diameter, height, spread, health, and an estimate of structural integrity. The health and structural integrity is rated on a scale of 1-5: (1) Excellent, (2) Good, (3) Fair, (4) Poor, (5) Extremely Poor.

A working definition of these ratings are: (1) "Excellent" indicates outstanding Health and Structural integrity without obvious structural weaknesses; (2) "Good" usually indicates fine Health but some observed Structural weakness, which can typically be improved by cabling or pruning; (3) "Fair" usually indicates less than desirable but stable Health and often indicates at least one significant structural weakness, which is not observed to be immediately threatening; (4) "Poor" indicates less than average Health, possibly a result of disease or insect infestation, presumed to be in slow decline with unlikely recovery; and (5) "Extremely Poor" indicates significantly declining health with no hope of recovery, and possibly Hazardous structural integrity. Bear in mind that these are rough definitions. There are many variations, all of which cannot be listed here.

All of the trees are experiencing some level of drought stress. It appears that no irrigation is being provided or has been provided this season. Some trees are starting to show symptoms of decline. Without some irrigation, most of the trees will likely continue to decline.

Risks to Trees By Proposed Construction

The trees at this site would likely be at risk of damage by construction or construction procedures that are common to most construction sites. These procedures may include the dumping or the stockpiling of materials over root systems, may include the trenching across the root zones for utilities or for landscape irrigation, or may include construction traffic across the root system resulting in soil compaction and root die back.

The owner proposes to remove Trees # 1 and 2, located adjacent to the sidewalk on 20th Avenue. For this reason, I have included a Value Assessment of these 2 trees.

Mr. Mar reports that Trees # 3, 4, 5, and 6 are planned to be removed by the City of San Mateo for street improvements on El Camino Real.

Value Assessment

The method used for the appraisal of these Trees # 1 and # 2 is the Trunk Formula Method, in accordance with the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA), Guide for Plant Appraisal, 9th Edition. Also, the ISA Western Chapter Species Classification Guide

An Evaluation of the Existing Trees
1990 S. El Camino Real
San Mateo, California

is used to provide species ratings and to provide a trunk values per square inch, which is part of the trunk formula method. I have applied the trunk formula method to a spreadsheet for the calculation. The spreadsheet calculation is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael L. Bench". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "M" and "B".

Michael L. Bench, Consulting Arborist
International Society of Arboriculture Certification # WE 1897
American Society of Consulting Arborists Member

Attachments Field Data Sheet
Tree Map
Value Assessments on an Excel Worksheet
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

Field Data Sheet Espresso Lane 1990 S. El Camino Real San Mateo, CA								INDEX After Tree #14		
Tree No.	Tree Name	DBH	Hght	Spnd	Hlth	Strc	Condition	P	R	Notes
1	Aristocrat flowering pear (<i>Pyrus calleryana</i> 'Aristocrat')	16	25	35	1	2	Good		R	Remove by Owner
2	Aristocrat flowering pear	16	25	35	1	2	Good		R	Remove by Owner
3	Blue atlas cedar (<i>Cedrus atlantica glauca</i>)	6	10	10	3	1	Fair		R	Remove by City for Street Improvements
4	Aristocrat flowering pear	15	25	30	3	2	Fair		R	Remove by City for Street Improvements
5	Aristocrat flowering pear	15	25	30	2	2	Fair		R	Remove by City for Street Improvements
6	Aristocrat flowering pear	14	25	30	1	2	Good		R	Remove by City for Street Improvements
7	Fern pine (<i>Podocarpus gracillor</i>) (Outside of Property Line)	7	15	15	1	1	Good	P		
8	Fern pine (Outside of Property Line)	6	20	15	2	1	Fair	P		
9	Fern pine (Outside of Property Line)	6	20	15	2	1	Fair	P		
10	Fern pine (Outside of Property Line)	6	25	15	2	1	Fair	P		
11	Fern pine (Outside of Property Line)	10	30	25	1	1	Good	P		
12	Fern pine (Outside of Property Line)	10	30	25	1	3	Fair	P		Girdling wire @ 8 feet
13	Monterey pine (<i>Pinus radiata</i>) (Outside of Property Line)	13	35	30	2	2	Good	P		
14	Canary Island pine (<i>Pinus canariensis</i>) (Outside of Property Line)	11	35	20	1	1	Excellent	P		
INDEX DBH = Diameter in Inches at Breast Height (54 inches above grade) Hght = Approx. Canopy Height in Feet Spnd = Approx. Canopy Spread in Feet Hlth = Health (1-5 = Good to Poor) Strc = Structure (1-5 = Good to Poor) P = Preserve R = Remove										

Value Assessments

Cost Assessment

Tree #	Species	Group	DBH	Area 1	In. Sq.	Replace In. Sq.	Price In. Sq.	BASIC VALUE	Species %	Condition %	Location %	Un- rounded Value	Rounded Value	Running Total
1	<i>Pyrus calleryana</i> 'Aristocrat'	2	16	201	201.0	2.24	77.04	\$15,655	30%	90%	60%	\$2,536	\$2,540	\$2,540
2	<i>Pyrus calleryana</i> 'Aristocrat'	2	16	201	201.0	2.24	77.04	\$15,655	30%	90%	60%	\$2,536	\$2,540	5080

LU Assessment

ID #	Existing	Proposed	Location	Caliper Box Size	Botanical Name	Common Name	Condition Value	Species Value	Heritage Value	Location Value (Within Building Area)	Location Value (Not Within Building Area)	LU
1	1		20th Avenue	16	<i>Pyrus calleryana</i> 'Aristocrat'	Ornamental Pear	0.9	0.3	1.25	0.7		7.56
2	1		20th Avenue	16	<i>Pyrus calleryana</i> 'Aristocrat'	Ornamental Pear	0.9	0.3	1.25	0.7		7.56
T61	1		20th Avenue	2	24 Citrus 'Meyer Improved'	Meyer Lemon	1	1				2.00
T61	1		Side Property Line	3	36 <i>Carpinus betulus</i> 'Fastigiata'	European Hornbeam	1	1				3.00
T61	1		Side Property Line	3	36 <i>Carpinus betulus</i> 'Fastigiata'	European Hornbeam	1	1				3.00
T61	1		Side Property Line	3	36 <i>Carpinus betulus</i> 'Fastigiata'	European Hornbeam	1	1				3.00
T143	1		Corner	3	36 <i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> 'Muskogee'	Crape Myrtle	1	1				3.00
T143	1		Corner	3	36 <i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> 'Muskogee'	Crape Myrtle	1	1				3.00
T143	1		Corner	3	36 <i>Lagerstroemia indica</i> 'Muskogee'	Crape Myrtle	1	1				3.00

Replacement Trees LU 20.0 > Existing Trees to be Removed LU 15.12

Michael L. Bench
Consulting Arborist
ISA #1897, ASCA
(831) 594-5151 Fax (831) 663-0373
7327 Langley Canyon Rd., Prunedale, CA 93907

October 8, 2012

Subject: Espresso Lane Project
1990 S. El Camino Real
San Mateo, California

Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Any description provided to the appraiser/consultant is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownerships to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for legal matters in character nor is any opinion rendered as to the quality of any title.
2. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other governmental regulations.
3. Care has been taken to obtain information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as reasonably possible. However, the appraiser/consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
4. The appraiser/consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this appraisal unless written arrangements are made, including payment of additional fees for services.
5. Loss or removal of any part of this report invalidates the entire appraisal/evaluation.
6. Possession of this report, or any copy thereof, does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any person other than to whom this report is addressed without written consent of this appraiser/consultant.
7. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report, nor copy thereof, shall be used for any purpose by anyone but the client to whom this report is addressed, without the prior written consent of the appraiser/consultant; nor shall it be conveyed by anyone, including the client, to the public through advertizing, public relations, news, sales, or other media, without the written consent and approval of the author; particularly as to value considerations, identity of the appraiser/consultant to any professional society or institute or to any designation conferred upon by the appraiser/consultant as stated in his/her qualifications.
8. This report and the values expressed herein represent the opinion of the appraiser/consultant. Further, the appraiser/consultant's fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified value nor upon any finding or recommendation reported.
9. Sketches, diagrams, graphs, photos, etc., in this report are intended as visual aides and are not done necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering information or specifications.
10. This report has been made in conformity with generally acceptable appraisal/evaluation/diagnostic reporting methods and procedures and is consistent with practices recommended by the International Society of Arboriculture and the American Society of Consulting Arborists.
11. The appraiser/consultant takes no responsibility for any defects in any tree's structure. No tree described in this report/evaluation has been climbed, unless otherwise stated, and, as such, structural defects that could only have been discovered by climbing are not reported. Likewise, a root collar inspection, consisting of excavation of soil around the tree for the purpose of uncovering major root defects/weaknesses, has not been performed, unless otherwise stated.