

Tree Survey and Assessment

Lake Rd & Everett St
Camas, WA

Prepared for:
City of Camas
616 NE 4th Avenue
Camas, WA 98607

January 14, 2020
PBS Project 71070.000

Prepared by:
Robert Phipps, PLA, PWS
ISA Certified Arborist PN-8751A



415 W 6TH STREET, SUITE 601
VANCOUVER, WA 98660
360.695.3488 MAIN
866.727.0140 FAX
PBSUSA.COM

Table of Contents

1	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF WORK.....	3
2	TREE SURVEY INVENTORY & ASSESSMENT	2
3	MITIGATION AND RESTORATION	7
4	CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION	7
5	POST CONSTRUCTION MONITORING	8
6	REFERENCES	9

Supporting Data

TABLES

Table 1. Significant Tree Condition by Species Summary

Table 2. Monitoring Schedule

Table 3. Tree Inventory and Assessment


FIGURES

Figure 1. Tree Report Plan

Figure 2. Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plan

1 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF WORK

City of Camas (City) is implementing intersection improvements at NE Lake Road and NE Everett Street (SR-500). The project has regional significance with its proximity to important recreational areas of Lacamas and Round Lakes and its connection between the north and south shore areas of Camas. As it currently serves more than 15,000 vehicles daily, the two corridors are vital parts of the citywide, statewide and regional transportation network. The City defines Everett Street as a local corridor that provides primary and secondary gateways to the city. The three-legged Lake Road and Everett Street (SR-500) intersection is currently signalized and it often operates over capacity, which triggers a demonstrated need for improvement. As a result of the access and capacity needs, the City is reviewing options to accommodate current and future traffic volumes.



Alternative Analysis Design Option at Project Site

The potential area of developmental impact is constrained on all sides by City and County park properties, privately owned parcels and environmentally sensitive areas that contain existing trees. Tree species includes Douglas Fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), Big Leaf Maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), Alder (*Alnus rubra*) and others. Sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), Salal (*Gaultheria shallon*). Indian plum (*Oemleria cerasiformis*) was just a few of the native understory species seen. Species diversity was impaired due to the establishment of nuisance vegetation.

The tree survey and assessment report will identify the trees located within the potential area of impact, assess existing health condition, assess the associated risk for trees post impact and construction, recommend preservation or removal, provide restoration/mitigation measures and provide recommendations for management and monitoring in subsequent post construction years.

2 TREE SURVEY INVENTORY & ASSESSMENT

As required under Camas Municipal Code (CMC) Section 18.13.045, a tree survey prepared by a certified arborist or professional forester is required. The tree survey must contain the following:

Inventory

- Map of the site, with tree locations numbered.
- Include all significant trees that will be impacted by the proposed development, which may include trees off-site if canopies overhang the subject property. Open space tracts to be set aside for conservation purposes do not need to be included in survey.
*As defined in CMC Section 18.03.050, "significant trees" are evergreen trees eight inches DBH and greater, and deciduous trees twelve inches DBH and greater.
- Provide the common and scientific name of inventoried trees.

Assessment

- Size. Measure and provide the diameter at breast height (DBH).
- Tree protection zone (defined by CMC 18.03.050 as 1' radius per 1" of DBH).

- Tree health. An overall assessment of the trees structural stability and failure potential based on specific structural features (e.g. decay, conks, co-dominant trunks, abnormal lean) and rated as Good, Fair or Poor.
- Recommendation for preservation or removal. The recommendation will consider proposed grading, trenching, paving, fencing and other construction plans.
- If hazardous, then an evaluation of hazardous trees will include a numerical value of hazard based on the following: failure potential; size of part most likely to fail; and distance to target (e.g. new residence).

An on-site inventory and assessment site visit was performed in three days on January 15th, 16th and 23rd, 2019. The field visits included a Level 2 Basic Assessment inspection following a systematic ground level observation at the base of each tree. The Level 2 assessment is a 360-degree visual evaluation of a tree where the crown, trunk, trunk flare, above-ground roots, and site conditions are evaluated in regard to targets. No physical inspection of the upper canopy, sounding, root crown excavation, resistograph or other technologies were used in the evaluations of the trees. The extensive establishment of English Ivy was the primary curser for limitation of assessment within the root zones. The determinations and recommendations presented within this report are based on current data and conditions existed at the time of the evaluation and should not be a predictor for the outcome of trees. Each tree species was identified and a measurement of the trunk diameter at breast height was recorded with a surveyed location of each tree. Crown, root, trunk and scaffold branching were reviewed for disease, decay, dieback, cracks, swelling, cavities, co-dominance, taper, and structural weakness in lean.



Establishment of English Ivy

From the assessment each tree was given a standard rating of 'Good', 'Fair', 'Poor' or 'Hazard' to describe the level of health condition. Below is the definition of each condition category for rating following the assessment.

Good defines the tree health as one of consistent or continued progression in health. Trees identified as 'Good' typically have more than 90% canopy density including proper scaffold branching, good trunk taper, minimal to no lean or contains proper reactive wood, no co-dominant leaders, little to no pest invasions, minimal to no decay or where present in wounds has proper compartmentalization and little to no deadwood or signs of recent failure history. Trees in this status likely do not need any additional management to continue sustained health long term.

Fair defines the tree health as currently maintaining existing levels of stress. Trees defined as 'Fair' typically have between 60%-90% canopy density with decent scaffold branching, decent trunk taper, minimal lean, no co-dominant leaders, some pest invasion, small branch dieback, minimal decay and no signs of failure history. Trees in this status are in balance between beginning to succumb to the existing levels of stress but not likely improving unless management recommendations are employed.

Poor defines the tree health as a state of downward projection of mortality spiral. Trees defined as 'Poor' typically have between 30-60% canopy density, poor scaffold or minimal branching, poor trunk taper leaning or significant lean past 40% without reactive taper wood, co-dominant leaders, infested, shows signs of decay (conks, fruiting bodies, etc) and branch dieback and failure. Trees in this state are likely to continue to fail without remediation. With remedial management techniques employed, some trees may not show signs of recovery due to the level of stress and species susceptibility.

Hazard defines a health condition past the threshold of recovery. Trees defined as 'Hazard' are less than 30% canopy density, no or heavy missing scaffold branching, poor trunk taper, significant lean, usually co-dominant leaders, pest invasion, large amount of dieback, many signs of decay, recent branch or trunk failure or already determined to be dead. Hazard trees typically require a target with a level of occupancy and magnitude to cause harm. Trees identified as 'Hazard' will include a rating of 1-3 for risk evaluation post construction.

Much of the existing trees are subject to thick established English ivy (*Hedera helix*) in the understory. English ivy is a weedy, invasive, clinging evergreen vine that has taken over close to 90% of the understory native species. The English Ivy in thick bands have attached to the trees' outer layer of bark producing continued biotic stress. Most of the trees have English ivy vines reaching 10' or more up the trunks, adding additional weight to already stressed trees, and deterring production of proper vertical arrangement of scaffold branching, competing for nutrient, water and oxygen availability and suppressing native wildlife habitat. As of 2018, English Ivy is a WA State Class C noxious weed. Class C species are regulated for control but not required under this classification.



English Ivy adding additional stress and promoting early failure

TREE SURVEY RESULTS

Out of the 478 total trees inventoried and assessed within the project area, 380 are defined as *significant trees* per CMC Section 18.03.050. Out of the ones identified as *significant trees*, 184 are evergreen, 196 are deciduous, (31 are rated as 'Good', 104 are rated as 'Fair', 166 are rated as 'Poor' and 79 are rated 'Hazard').

Table 1. Significant Tree by Species Condition Summary

Tree Species	Good	Fair	Poor	Hazard
<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	0	7	66	23
<i>Alnus rubra</i>	0	10	47	39
<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	0	1	0	0
<i>Castanea dentata</i>	0	1	1	0
<i>Prunus virginia</i>	0	0	1	0
<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	31	83	51	17
<i>Quercus garryana</i>	0	1	0	0
<i>Thuja plicata</i>	0	1	0	0
Total Significant Trees	31	104	166	79

Per CMC 18.13.052, healthy, wind firm trees have greater priority for preservation and retention during design development in order of priority below:

1. Trees located within critical area buffers. Trees must be identified within a protected tract.
2. Significant wildlife habitat, or areas adjacent and buffering habitat.
3. Significant trees that are greater than 36 inch dbh.
4. Groves of trees, or other individual healthy trees with the intent to retain must be located in separate tract if part of a land division, or other protective mechanism if other development type,
5. Trees, that if removed would cause trees on adjacent properties to become hazardous.

339 *significant trees* of 380 are within a critical area or regulated habitat of a shoreline or wetland. 61 of the *significant trees* throughout the entire project area are greater than 36" DBH.

See **Table 3** for overall tree inventory and rating spreadsheet. The following spreadsheet headings are defined as:

Tree ID: Surveyed ID tag

Status: S indicated "significant tree" per CMC Section 18.03.050.

Botanical and Common: Nomenclature for identified trees.

DBH: Size in inches for diameter breast height.

Tree Unit: Unit conversion calculated following Table 2: Tree Units for Existing Trees per CMC section 18.13.051 for density.

Comments: Assessed and recorded indicators observed in the field for determining condition rating.

Condition: Standard naming following CMC 18.13.045. Trees rated as hazard include a number rating for risk evaluation post construction.

Treatment: Recommended treatment to remove or retain as part of improvements

See **Figure 1** for tree plan exhibits showing existing tree locations, ID number, and color-coded condition within and outside critical area buffers.

During the assessment site visits, two tree species were identified in the field as an American Chestnut (*Castanea dentata*), 42" dbh, tree ID 2815, rated as Fair and 25" dbh, tree ID 4133, rated as poor. The American Chestnut has cultural and historical identity especially in the eastern half of the United States. In colonial America, chestnut wood was used for structural construction as a rot resistant and high strength material. Its fruit, an edible nut, was a large contributor to the rural economy. At the turn of the century, a fungus, *Cryphonectria parasitica*, was introduced as the casual- agent of chestnut blight. Since then, the chestnut blight has reduced the species from a dominant tree of the eastern forest ecosystem to little more than a small succession stage shrub. The species remains 'functionally' extinct by the USDA as the blight does not destroy the roots allowing sprouts to rise before the disease kills the new growth back to the ground.



Native range of American Chestnut

With an estimated 300-500 mature American Chestnut trees remaining, the identification of the American Chestnut tree in the western United States is unique. City of Vancouver has two American Chestnut trees, 53" DBH and 41" DBH,

now listed as heritage trees (www.cityofvancouver.us/publicworks/page/heritage-trees-american-chestnut). From the City of Vancouver description, it is said these two trees were likely grown from seed prior to 1890.

The American Chestnut Foundation (TACF) is a non-profit organization with multiple chapters along the eastern United States dedicated to developing a blight-resistant American chestnut tree via scientific research and breeding, and to restore the tree to its native forests along the eastern United States. TACF, founded in 1983, is researching and testing the backcross breeding of a blight resistance species from the Chinese chestnut tree into the American chestnut tree, while maintaining the American chestnut's characteristics. The chestnut trees located at the project site have not been analyzed for genetic heredity but nonetheless should be recognized for importance in supporting TACF and local community preservation goals.

3 MITIGATION AND RESTORATION

The proposed infrastructure improvements will remove trees as part of the expanded and realigned roadways, new pedestrian connections, utility improvements and grading. Some trees outside the immediate construction impacts will be recommended to be removed based on the rated condition (hazardous) that are susceptible to new wind exposure from the construction tree removal that now promote added risk over an acceptable threshold. Pursuant to CMC 16.51.125(B) and CMC 18.13.051, mitigation and replacement are required for removed trees within a critical area and preservation of tree density per net acre.

3.1 CRITICAL AREA MITIGATION

Per CMC 16.51.125, a tree removal permit is required when removing trees within a regulated critical area buffer. Under these circumstances, mitigation and replacement of trees within the critical areas must be replaced. Per CMC 16.51.125(B), mitigation shall be two trees per one tree removed. Proposed trees shall be planted within one year of the construction completion. Replacement trees shall be native and indigenous to the site and minimum caliper of two inches.

201 trees (within proposed construction limits and hazard tree removal) are proposed to be removed within the critical area buffers. Following CMC requirements, a minimum of 402 trees will be required to be installed. Tree species will include native species of Douglas Fir (60%), Western Red Cedar (30%) and Big Leaf Maple (10%).

It is recommended that the replacement trees be installed using smaller sized material in support of quicker establishment, long term vigor and typical industry standard habitat restoration. A larger quantity is proposed for the smaller sized material. 402 trees will be installed using 4' min height and 5-gallon containerized material. In addition, 60 seedling trees will be installed within existing archaeological areas.

Containerized material retains a greater portion of the fibrous (nutrient up-taking) roots during nursery production than ball & burlap as most of the roots are severed during harvesting of ball & burlap plant material. The rate of recovery and establishment will be faster after the installation when the fibrous root systems are left intact. The recommended smaller sized material will not need to be staked. Tree staking can be detrimental to proper tree development by producing less trunk taper, smaller root systems and can be subject to breaking and falling in wind susceptible areas.

See the critical areas mitigation report for further discussion on recommended proposal

See **Figure 2** for the Tree Mitigation Plan showing replacement quantities and percentage proposed.

3.2 TREE DENSITY

Overall tree density within the limits of the project area are required to meet 20 tree units per acre (CMC 18.13.051, Table 1). Tree density calculations are based on DBH and follow CMC 18.13.051, Table 2. The Tree Report Assessment Spreadsheet includes tree unit calculations per tree. Per CMC 18.13.051, a minimum tree density per net acre is required and must be incorporated within the overall landscape plan. The tree density

may consist of existing trees, replacement trees or a combination of both pursuant to priority as outlined in CMC 18.13.052.

The remaining net project area post development, that is within the existing right of way and outside critical area buffers is 2.0 acres. 40 tree units is required for tree density. Following the landscape plan's proposed 61 trees and existing trees to remain (American chestnut), the total trees units comes to a sum of 78 tree units. The average tree unit per acre is 39 tree units which satisfies the tree density requirement. See **Figure 2** for the Tree Mitigation Plan showing the tree density calculations.

4 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

Tree management strategies are recommended during design and construction to reduce compounding land disturbance impacts for trees slated for preservation. Vegetation management strategies should be employed where feasible to reduce detrimental impact and support favorable growth. Strategies include but are not limited to:

- reducing impacts within driplines (or where major absorbing roots lie) by installing appropriate BMPs and tree protection zones
- limiting heavy equipment use in specific areas
- define limited access routes and staging areas
- curb around driplines where cut/fills occurs to eliminate suffocating or cutting of roots
- mulch (6" -12") around tree protection zones to be preserved that may be susceptible to soil compaction
- identify opportunities to "tunnel" proposed utilities versus trenching where trees are to be preserved
- introduction of organic mulches to reduce weed competition and retain moisture within the root zone

The importance of protecting trees to be retained should be clearly communicated with the contractor prior to any land disturbance work. A pre-construction meeting with an ISA certified arborist is recommended. All tree protection BMPs should be remain in place for the entirety of the construction and only removed after approval by an ISA Certified Arborist.

Following CMC 16.51.125, it is recommended to utilize restoration pruning on remaining trees within the critical area buffers. Restoration pruning should occur on existing trees 36" DBH and greater including other specific trees as identified by this report. Pruning will include crown cleaning and thinning, reducing weight on scaffold branching, removal of dead branches and overall shaping to retain natural characteristics. Due to the existing conditions of the trees, it is recommended that tree removal and restoration pruning be performed by a company with certified arborist and tree work climber specialist certifications familiar with native species management. It is recommended that vegetation management work include the removal and reduction of English Ivy throughout the critical area buffers and remaining landscape areas. This work should also include removal of ivy attached to trunks. Reduction in competition of ivy will support the recovery of existing trees remaining and provide a favorable condition for newly planted trees to establish and thrive.

The Tree Inventory and Assessment Spreadsheet (**Table 1**) includes recommendations for restoration pruning and management under the treatment heading as "Restore" which is defined as to retain but use additional techniques for reducing risk and support recovery.

All trees to be retained, preserved or protected that include grading, excavation, trenching or other construction activities within their critical root zone (CRZ) shall be performed while under the supervision of a ISA certified arborist.

5 POST CONSTRUCTION MONITORING

With the completion of the project and proposed construction improvements, existing trees remaining will have undergone additional stresses. Some trees may never recover from land development stresses. In support to ensuring trees slated for preservation are recovering correctly post construction, existing (and new trees) should be monitored. This may include the continued efforts of ivy reduction and suppression. There may be opportunities post construction to work with existing volunteer groups to help manage the ivy from encroaching on new and existing trees.

It is recommended that monitoring should be facilitated for the areas where preservation occurs, especially for larger trees that are more susceptible to stress. The below 10 year monitoring cycle is an option that could be introduced.



Volunteer opportunities for post construction monitoring and management of invasive weeds are already available

Table 2. Monitoring Schedule

Monitoring Year	Type of Monitoring	
	Scope of Assessment	Report Deliverables
1	Level 1 Limited	Memorandum
2	Level 2 Basic	Full Report
3	Level 1 Limited	Memorandum
4	Level 2	Full Report
5	Level 1 Limited	Memorandum
7	Level 2 Basic	Full Report
10	Level 1	Memorandum

A Level 3 assessment may be utilized at the recommendation of the arborist or request by the City. A level 3 assessment utilizes advanced assessment techniques (radar, tomography, resistance-recording device, measuring of lean, etc.) and provides for a greater depth of statistical information to the client. The arborist performing the work should detail the scope of deliverables under each assessment activity for what is required or requested.

Remedial and mitigation measures should be introduced when justified by the assessment reports to ensure risk related thresholds retain negligible.

6 REFERENCES

Dirr, M.A. 2009. *Manual of Woody Landscape Plants*. Stipes Publishing Co., Champaign, IL. (1453 p.)

Lilly, Sharon J. 2010. *Arborist's Certification Study Guide*. International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). Premier Print Group, Champaign, IL. (194 p.)

Public Works, City of Vancouver. Vancouver Washington. Available online at
<https://cityofvancouver.us/publicworks/page/heritage-trees-american-chestnut>
TACF National Office. The American Chestnut Foundation. Asheville, NC. <https://acf.org/>

Tree Risk Assessment Manual (2017), International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). Premier Print Group.
Champaign, IL. (352 p.)

Table 3. Tree Inventory & Assessment

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
1590		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Leaning towards Everett	Fair	Remove
1591		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Leaning towards Everett	Fair	Remove
1592		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	3	1	Leaning towards Everett	Fair	Remove
1593		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	3	1	Leaning towards Everett	Fair	Remove
1594		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Leaning towards Everett	Fair	Remove
1595		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	5	1	Leaning towards Everett	Fair	Remove
1596		<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	7	2	Little taper, twig dieback	Fair	Retain
1597		<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	6	2	Little taper, twig dieback	Fair	Retain
2749	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2750		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	6	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2751		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	11	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2752	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2753		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2754		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Leaning	Poor	Retain
2755	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Severe lean, broken top	Hazard	Remove
2756		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	6	2	Lean, broken top	Hazard	Remove
2757		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	6	2	Snag, broken top	Hazard	Remove
2758	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	15	4	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2759	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2760		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2761	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Good taper	Fair	Retain
2762		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2763		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
2764	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	13	3	Poor taper, leaning, minimal crown	Poor	Retain
2765	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Significant lean, minimal crown	Poor	Retain
2766		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Broken top, Dead	Hazard	Remove
2767		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Leaning, Poor taper, minimal branching	Poor	Remove
2768	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	15	4	Cavity in trunk, dieback, decay	Poor	Remove
2770	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	48	20	Broken top, Dead	Hazard	Remove
2772	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Good taper	Fair	Remove
2773	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Good taper	Fair	Remove
2775		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	8	2	Codominant leader, Leaning	Poor	Retain
2777	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Good taper	Fair	Retain
2778	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Good taper, Double leader (non-dominant)	Fair	Retain
2779	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Broken top, Dead	Hazard	Remove
2781		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Minimal dieback	Fair	Remove
2782	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	16	4	Broken top, Severe dieback	Hazard	Remove
2783	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Broken top	Hazard	Remove
2784	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Broken top, Severe dieback	Hazard	Remove
2786	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Dead	Hazard	Remove
2789	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	41	17	Lower branching suppressed	Fair	Retain, Restore
2792	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Remove
2793	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Remove
2794		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	8	2	Leaning, Minimal branching	Poor	Remove
2798	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Suppressed, poor taper	Poor	Remove
2799	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	17	5	Codominant leader, Minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove
2800	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Leaning, Minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
2801	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	25	9	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Remove
2802	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	21	7	Minimal lower branching, slight lean, acclimating	Fair	Remove
2804	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	26	9	Codominant leader, Minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove
2806	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Codominant leader, Leaning	Poor	Remove
2809	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	29	11	Codominant top, minimal lower branching	Hazard	Remove
2810	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	19	6	Leaning, Suppressed, minimal lower branching	Hazard	Remove
2815	S	<i>Castanea dentata</i>	American chestnut	42	17	Slight lean towards road, relatively intact	Fair	Retain
2820	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	Poor taper, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain, Restore
2821	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	30	11	Minimal lower branching, co-dominant top leaders	Poor	Remove
2822	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	25	9	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Remove
2824	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	30	11	Broken top, Dead	Hazard	Remove
2834	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Leaning	Poor	Retain
2867	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	45	19	Good taper, minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain, Restore
2868	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Minimal taper, minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2869	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	56	23	Slight lean(towards wetland)	Fair	Retain
2870	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	29	11	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2872		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Severe lean, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
2873	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	35	14	Suppressed by ivy, good taper	Fair	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
2877	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	17	5	Dieback, Leaning, Minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
2879	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	34	13	Good taper, minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain, Restore
2881	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	34	13	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2882	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	19	6	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
2883	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Codominant leaders x3, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
2885	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Heavy lean, Poor taper, suppressed	Hazard	Remove
2886	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	31	12	Minimal lower scaffold	Fair	Retain
2888		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Poor taper, heavy dieback, suppressed, leaning	Hazard	Remove
2891	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2892	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	41	17	Slight lean(towards wetland)	Fair	Retain
2893	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Suppressed, Minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2894	S	<i>Thuja plicata</i>	Western Red Cedar	17	5	Suppressed	Fair	Retain
2895	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	Suppressed, Minimal lower branching, Slight lean	Poor	Retain
2896	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain, Restore
2897	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Minimal lower branching, Slight lean	Poor	Retain
2899	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Dead	Hazard	Remove
2901	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	16	4	Slight lean, minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
2902	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	Slight lean, minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2905		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	8	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
2906	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	25	9	Minimal branching, good taper	Fair	Retain
2907	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	32	12	Minimal branching, good taper	Fair	Retain
2908	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Minimal branching, good taper	Fair	Retain, Restore
2909	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Leaning, dieback, 30% crown	Hazard	Remove
2912	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	45	19	Minimal lower branching, 30% crown	Poor	Retain
2913	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Minimal lower scaffold, suppressed, decent taper	Fair	Retain, Restore
2917		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
2920	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Slight lean, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
2921	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	25	9	Good taper, minimal ivy suppress	Fair	Retain
2922		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Minimal branching, 30% crown, poor taper, leaning	Hazard	Remove
2923	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	28	10	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2924	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	61	23	Good taper, some ivy suppression	Fair	Retain
2926	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Suppressed, Minimal lower branching on one side,	Fair	Retain
2927	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	Suppressed, Minimal lower branching on one side,	Fair	Retain
2929	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	28	10	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
2930	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Codominant leader, dieback, minimal crown	Poor	Retain
2931		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
2933		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Multiple codominant leaders, partial dieback	Poor	Retain
2934	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Leaning, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
2935	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Broken top, Dead	Hazard	Remove
2936	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Significant lean, Poor taper, minimal branches	Hazard	Remove
2938		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Codominant leader, suppressed, crooked leaders	Hazard	Remove
2940	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	8	2	Leaning, decay, dieback	Hazard	Remove
2941	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	16	4	Codominant leaders, suppressed by ivy	Hazard	Remove
2942		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	8	2	Broken top, dead	Hazard	Remove
2943	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	49	21	Good taper, suppressed by ivy	Fair	Remove
2943	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	49	21	Minimal lower branching, ivy suppression	Good	Remove
2945	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	33	13	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Remove
2946	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	58	23	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Remove
2948		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	6	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
2949	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	55	23	Minimal lower branching, ivy suppression	Fair	Retain
2950		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Significant lean, ivy suppressed	Poor	Retain
2951	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Severe lean, broken top	Hazard	Remove
2952		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	Significant lean, ivy suppressed	Poor	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
2953	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Leaning, dieback, 60% crown	Poor	Remove
2955	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
2956		<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	7	2	Dead, leaning	Hazard	Remove
2961	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	16	4	Significant leaning, suppressed by ivy	Hazard	Remove
2976	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	30	11	Codominant, broken top	Hazard	Remove
2979	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Slight lean, poor taper	Fair	Retain
2981	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Slight lean, poor taper	Fair	Retain
2984	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	70	23	Some dieback, good taper	Fair	Retain, Restore
2985	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Codominant, heavy lean	Hazard	Remove
2987	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	19	6	Significant lean, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
2988	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Poor taper, leaning, heavily suppressed	Hazard	Remove
2989	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Poor taper, leaning, heavily suppressed	Hazard	Remove
2992	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Leaning, poor taper	Poor	Retain
2994	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	30	11	30% crown, poor taper	Poor	Retain
2995	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	16	4	J rooted trunk, 30% crown	Poor	Retain
2998	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	41	17	Minimal lower branching, decent taper, 30% crown	Poor	Retain, Restore
3000	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	24	8	Minimal scaffold, 30% crown	Hazard	Remove
3001	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	19	6	Significant lean, dieback, suppressed	Hazard	Remove
3005		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	9	2	Poor taper, dieback branching, suppressed by ivy	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3009	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Codominant leader, poor taper	Poor	Retain
3016	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
3039	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	33	13	Leaning, Minimal limbs on one side, Reactive wood	Fair	Remove
3043	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	20	6	Codominant leader	Poor	Remove
3050	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Significant lean, minimal crown, codominant leader	Hazard	Remove
3051	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Poor taper, dieback branching, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Remove
3052	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	13	3	Codominant leaders, suppressed scaffold branching	Poor	Remove
3055	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Codominant tops, slight lean, poor taper	Poor	Retain
3056	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Leaning, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3057	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	17	5	Suppressed by ivy, lean, minimal lower scaffold	Poor	Remove
3058	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Suppressed by ivy, heavy lean, poor taper	Hazard	Remove
3059	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Slight lean, minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove
3060	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Slight lean, minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove
3061	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Leaning, Poor taper	Poor	Remove
3062	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Significant lean, Poor taper, minimal branches	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3072	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Suppressed, minimal branching on one side	Poor	Remove
3073		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	No scaffold branches, leaning, heavily suppressed	Hazard	Remove
3076	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	28	10	Supressed, Minimal lower branching	Fair	Remove
3079	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Poor taper, minimal lower branching, Leaning	Poor	Remove
3080	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Leaning, Poor taper, minimal branching	Poor	Remove
3081	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	25	9	Codominant leader	Fair	Remove
3082		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Decaying, dieback, significant lean	Hazard	Remove
3083	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Leaning, Minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove
3085	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	16	4	Minimal lower branching, ivy suppression	Poor	Remove
3086	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Minimal lower branching, ivy suppression	Poor	Remove
3087	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Codominant leader, Minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove
3090	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	26	9		Poor	Remove
3091	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Minimal lower scaffold, Slight lean	Poor	Remove
3093		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	8	2	Leaning, dead	Hazard	Remove
3094	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3095	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	17	5	Leaning, Minimal lower branching, suppressed	Poor	Remove
3097	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	52	22	Minimal lower branches	Fair	Remove
3099	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Codominant leader, Minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3100		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Leaning, Suppression	Poor	Remove
3102	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	39	16	Dieback, Dead	Hazard	Remove
3103	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	37	15	Dieback, Dead	Hazard	Remove
3104	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Codominant leader, minimal branching, 50% crown	Hazard	Remove
3105	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	25	9	Codominant leader, minimal branching, 50% crown	Hazard	Remove
3107	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	30	11	Codominant leader, minimal branching, 40% crown	Hazard	Remove
3109	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	16	4	Slight lean, branching one side	Fair	Remove
3110	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	20	6	Slight lean, branching one side	Fair	Remove
3112	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	41	17	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3113	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3114	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3117		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3118	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	46	19	Good taper, suppressed by ivy	Fair	Remove
3119	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Leaning, suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Remove
3120	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Leaning, suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Remove
3127	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Poor taper, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Remove
3128	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	33	13	Good taper, suppressed by ivy	Fair	Remove
3129	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Poor taper, minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3130	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3132	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	24	8	Codominant leader, suppressed, poor taper, decay	Hazard	Remove
3133		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Minimal branches, dieback, 30% crown	Hazard	Remove
3136	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Codominant leader, decay, crooked top	Poor	Remove
3137	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	24	8	Some decay, ivy suppressed	Fair	Remove
3139		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Codominant leader, Broken top, Poor taper	Poor	Remove
3141	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Significant lean, Poor taper, minimal branches	Poor	Remove
3142	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	50	21	Good taper, suppressed by ivy	Fair	Remove
3146		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	11	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3147	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	16	4	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3148		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	9	2	Poor taper, Leaning	Poor	Remove
3149		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	8	2	Significant lean, suppressed, minimal lower branches	Poor	Remove
3151	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	21	7	Broken top, Dead	Hazard	Remove
3152	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Codominant tops, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Remove
3153	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	21	7	Leaning, suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Remove
3156	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	38	15	Codominant leader, Broken top, Poor taper	Hazard	Remove
3159	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	15	4	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3163	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	53	23	Minimal lower branching, ivy suppression	Good	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3164	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	28	10	Minimal lower branching	Good	Remove
3165		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Leaning, suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Remove
3166	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	42	17	Codominant leader, Minimal lower branching	Fair	Remove
3168	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Broken top, Dead	Hazard	Remove
3171		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Ivy suppression	Poor	Remove
3237	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Good taper	Good	Remove
3238	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	26	9	Slight lean, decent taper	Fair	Remove
3251	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	26	9	Good taper	Good	Remove
3252	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	29	11	Good taper	Good	Remove
3253	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Good taper	Good	Remove
3254	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	20	6	Good taper	Good	Remove
3255	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	42	17	Suppressed branching from adjacent tree	Fair	Remove
3355	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	35	14	Suppressed top branching	Fair	Remove
3464	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	32	12	Suppressed top branching	Fair	Retain, Restore
3465	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	37	15	Suppressed top branching	Fair	Retain, Restore
3468	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	22	7	Dead, aircraft cable around trunk	Hazard	Remove
3470	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Stressed, aircraft cabling around trunk	Poor	Retain
3473	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	37	15	Suppressed by, minimal lower branching	Fair	Retain
3474		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	8	2	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branch	Poor	Retain
3476	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	24	8	Stressed, aircraft cabling around trunk	Poor	Remove
3477	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	23	8	Stressed, aircraft cabling around trunk	Poor	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3479	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Poor taper, wound on trunk not healing	Poor	Remove
3482	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	37	15	Suppressed branches, aircraft cabling choking trunk	Poor	Retain
3496	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	29	11	Good taper, recovering from recent ivy removal	Fair	Remove
3497	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	16	4	Codominant leaders, crooked top	Poor	Retain
3498	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Some ivy suppression	Good	Retain
3504	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	8	2	Decay, poor taper, heavy ivy suppression	Poor	Retain
3505	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	Decent taper, minimal lower branching	Good	Remove
3506		<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	6	2	Decay, poor taper, heavy ivy suppression	Poor	Remove
3511	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	31	12	Decent taper	Good	Retain
3512	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	22	7	Decent taper, top branch suppression with 3511,3515	Fair	Remove
3515	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	35	14	Some suppression	Good	Retain
3516	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	33	13	Few scaffold breaks, some dieback	Fair	Retain
3519	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Some ivy suppression, good taper	Good	Retain
3522	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	49	21	Some ivy suppression, good taper	Good	Retain
3532	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	26	9	Good taper, good scaffold branching	Good	Retain
3622	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Suppressed by branch of 3623	Fair	Remove
3623	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	35	14	Good taper, some dieback	Fair	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3630	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	11	2	Slight lean, ivy suppression	Fair	Retain
3632	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	90% crown, suppressed branch interior	Fair	Retain
3633		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Leaning, heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3634	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	22	7	Suppressed branching with 3635, good taper	Fair	Retain
3635	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	14	3	Poor taper, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3637	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Suppression by ivy, decent taper	Fair	Retain
3638	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	19	6	Suppression by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
3642		<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	6	2	Heavy suppression by ivy	Poor	Retain
3643	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	75% crown, suppressed branch on interior	Fair	Retain
3646	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	19	6	Suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Fair	Retain
3647		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Abnormal growth, stressed	Fair	Retain
3649	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	44	18	80% crown, some suppression up top	Fair	Retain
3650	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	24	8	70% crown, some suppression top branches	Fair	Retain
3652	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Heavy suppression by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Retain
3653		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	11	2	Suppressed by ivy, codominance	Poor	Retain
3654		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	Suppressed, broken top	Poor	Retain
3723	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	13	3	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3724	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3725		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3728	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Leaning, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
3729	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	27	10	Leaning, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
3732	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	13	3	Suppressed by ivy, good taper	Fair	Retain
3733	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	12	2	Heavily suppressed by ivy, minimal scaffold	Poor	Retain
3734	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	13	3	Heavily suppressed by ivy, poor scaffold branching	Poor	Retain
3735	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	12	2	Co-dominance, heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3736	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	16	4	Multiple dominance, broken tops	Hazard	Remove
3737	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Leaning, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
3743	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	24	8	Suppressed by ivy, leaning, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3744	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Suppressed by ivy, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3755		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	6	2	Suppressed by ivy, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3756	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Suppressed by ivy, leaning, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3759	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Suppressed by ivy, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3761	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	30	11	Heavily suppressed, minimal branching	Poor	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3765	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Leaning, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3766	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	14	3	Suppressed, decent taper, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3767		<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	7	2	Suppressed by ivy, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3768		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Suppressed by ivy, younger tree	Fair	Retain
3769	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Suppressed by ivy, younger tree	Fair	Retain
3770		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Suppressed by ivy, broken top	Poor	Retain
3777	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	39	16	Heavily suppressed by ivy, minimal scaffold	Poor	Retain
3778		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	7	2	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3779	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3781	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3782	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	16	4	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3783	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Leaning, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3787		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	8	2	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3788	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Heavily suppressed, decay in cavities	Poor	Retain
3789	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Heavily suppressed by ivy, dieback	Poor	Retain
3790	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	19	6	Suppressed by ivy, 60% crown	Poor	Retain
3791	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	28	10	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branches	Poor	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3793	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	12	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3794		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	6	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3824	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Multiple leaders, heavy ivy suppression, topped	Poor	Retain
3825	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Leaning, Suppressed, minimal lower branching	Hazard	Remove
3830	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	36	14	Heavy suppression by ivy to the top	Poor	Retain
3833	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	33	13	Heavy suppression by ivy to the top	Poor	Retain
3834	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	20	6	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3835	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Dead	Hazard	Remove
3840	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	42	17	Codominance, heavily suppressed, Broken scaffold	Poor	Retain
3842		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	11	2	Leaning, poor taper, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
3845	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	20	6	Suppressed by ivy, minimal crown	Poor	Retain
3846	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Suppressed by ivy, minimal crown, dieback	Poor	Retain
3847	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Leaning, previous abiotic injury	Poor	Retain
3849	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	14	3	Suppressed on interior side, slight lean	Poor	Retain
3850	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	24	8	Slight lean, poor taper	Poor	Retain
3874		<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Black Locust	8	2	Heavily lean towards water, dead	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3879		<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	Black Locust	7	2	Suppressed by ivy, no scaffold branches, nuisance	Hazard	Remove
3880	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Suppressed by ivy, younger tree	Fair	Retain
3885		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	10	2	Suppressed by ivy, leaning, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
3888		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	8	2	Broken top, ivy suppression	Poor	Retain
3889		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	6	2	Broken top, ivy suppression	Poor	Retain
3892	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	15	4	Heavy ivy suppression, codominance, 60% crown	Poor	Retain
3894	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Heavy ivy suppression, codominance, 60% crown	Poor	Retain
3904	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Heavy ivy suppression, codominance, 60% crown	Poor	Retain
3906	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	20	6	Heavy ivy suppression, codominance, 60% crown	Poor	Retain
3916		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Heavy lean to road, topped heavy	Hazard	Remove
3917	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Heavy suppression, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
3918	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	33	13	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching, taper	Poor	Retain
3919	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	11	2	Heavily suppressed	Poor	Retain
3920		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	Heavy lean to road, topped heavy	Hazard	Remove
3953	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Suppression by ivy, multiple leaders, decay	Poor	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3954	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Suppression by ivy, multiple leaders, decay	Poor	Retain
3955		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Suppression by ivy, multiple leaders	Poor	Retain
3956	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	40	16	Some trunk damage	Good	Retain
3957	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	21	7	Some dieback, poor taper	Fair	Retain
3958	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	30	11	Lower trunk abiotic damage, some interior decay	Fair	Retain
3959	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	33	13	Suppression of top branching	Good	Retain
3960	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	32	12	Suppression of top branching	Good	Retain
3961	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	19	6	Suppression of top branching	Good	Retain
3962	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Suppression of top branching	Good	Retain
3963	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Good taper	Good	Retain
3964		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	Small, codominant leaders, bad scaffold structure	Poor	Retain
3965	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	No major defects	Good	Retain
3966	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	20	6	Suppressed top branches from adjacent trees	Fair	Retain
3967	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	16	4	Poor taper, slight lean	Fair	Retain
3968	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	22	7	Leaning towards Round Lake	Fair	Retain
3969	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Crooked leader about 2/3 up	Fair	Retain
3970	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	31	12	60% dieback	Poor	Retain
3971	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	22	7	60% dieback	Poor	Retain
3972	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Leaning, stressed	Poor	Retain
3973	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	34	13	Leaning to Round Lake	Fair	Retain
3974	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Suppressed branching	Fair	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
3976	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	21	7	Split leader, ivy suppressed	Poor	Retain
3977	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Poor taper	Fair	Retain
4015	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	14	3	Heavily suppressed, no scaffold branches, poor taper	Poor	Remove
4016	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	37	15	Suppressed, good taper	Fair	Remove
4017	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	16	4	Heavily suppressed, no scaffold branches, poor taper	Poor	Remove
4020	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	12	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
4022	S	<i>Prunus virginia</i>	Choke cherry	18	5	Codominant leader, heavily suppressed	Poor	Remove
4023	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	34	13	Heavily suppressed by ivy, 40% crown	Poor	Remove
4026	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Leaning, heavily suppressed	Poor	Remove
4029	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	29	11	Broken top, dead	Hazard	Remove
4030	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Remove
4031		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Heavily suppressed, no scaffold branches, poor taper	Poor	Remove
4032	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	30	11	Suppressed branching on east side	Fair	Remove
4033	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	34	13	Suppressed branching on east side	Fair	Remove
4038	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Good taper, suppressed by ivy	Fair	Remove
4039		<i>Prunus virginia</i>	Choke cherry	8	2	Heavily suppressed by ivy, no scaffold branches	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
4040		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	8	2	Heavily suppressed by ivy, no scaffold branches	Hazard	Remove
4041	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Suppressed by ivy, additional stress factors	Poor	Remove
4042	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	13	3	Suppressed by ivy, adjacent branching suppression	Poor	Retain
4043	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	20	6	Suppressed by ivy, adjacent branching suppression	Fair	Retain
4045	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	15	4	Suppressed by ivy, 70% crown	Poor	Retain
4047	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Suppressed by adjacent tree branching	Poor	Remove
4048	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Suppressed by adjacent tree branching	Fair	Retain
4100	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	43	18	Suppressed by ivy, 75% crown	Fair	Retain
4101	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	Suppressed by ivy, 75% crown	Fair	Retain
4102	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	32	12	Suppressed by ivy, 75% crown	Fair	Remove
4103		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	9	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
4104	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Suppressed by adjacent tree branching	Fair	Remove
4106	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	48	20	Suppressed by adjacent tree branching	Fair	Retain, Restore
4112	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	24	8	Suppressed by ivy, slight lean	Poor	Retain
4113		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	No ivy, poor taper	Fair	Retain
4114	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Suppressed by ivy, dieback, 60% crown	Poor	Retain
4117	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	30	11	Heavily suppressed by ivy, no scaffold branches	Poor	Retain
4128		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
4133	S	<i>Castanea dentata</i>	American chestnut	25	9	Suppressed, 60% crown, good taper	Poor	Retain
4136	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	62	23	No needles, dead	Hazard	Remove
4141	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	37	15	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branchign	Poor	Retain, Restore
4144		<i>Prunus virginia</i>	Choke cherry	6	2	Suppressed by ivy	Poor	Remove
4145	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	19	6	Leaning, heavily suppressed, poor taper	Poor	Remove
4146	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Significant lean, Poor taper, mininal branches	Hazard	Remove
4147	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	16	4	Significant lean, Poor taper, mininal branches	Hazard	Remove
4148	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Fallen over	Hazard	Remove
4150		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	11	2	Leaning over	Poor	Retain
4151	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	13	3	Significant leaning, poor taper, dieback	Hazard	Remove
4152	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Leaning, Poor taper, minimal branching	Poor	Retain
4153	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	18	5	Codominant leaders, bad taper, leaning	Hazard	Remove
4156	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
4157		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Leaning, poor taper	Poor	Retain
4158	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	49	21	Suppressed by ivy, good taper	Fair	Retain
4159	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Retain
4161	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	17	5	Suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Retain
4162	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Codominant leaders, Leaning, Fallen	Hazard	Remove
4163	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Multiple codominant leaders, Leaning, poor taper	Hazard	Remove
4168	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Dead	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
4169	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Codominant leaders x3, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
4174		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	11	2	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4175	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4176		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	11	2	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4177	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4178	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4179		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4180		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	11	2	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4181		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	7	2	Heavy ivy suppression, no scaffold branching	Hazard	Remove
4182	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	13	3	Significant leaning, suppressed by ivy	Hazard	Remove
4183	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Broken top, dieback, suppressed	Hazard	Remove
4184	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	38	15	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain, Restore
4185	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	20	6	Broken top, heavily suppressed	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
4187		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	6	2	Codominant tops	Poor	
4190	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	36	14	Split tops, broken top, 30% crown	Hazard	Remove
4193	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Heavily suppressed by ivy, no scaffold branches	Hazard	Remove
4194	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Heavily suppressed by ivy, no scaffold branches	Hazard	Remove
4195	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	14	3	Heavily suppressed by ivy, no scaffold branches	Hazard	Remove
4196	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	30	11	Suppressed by ivy, decent taper, 4197 fallen onto it	Poor	Retain
4197	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	15	4	Dead, Fallen onto 4195	Hazard	Remove
4204	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	18	5	Suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Retain
4209	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	16	4	Codominant leaders, leaning, heavily suppressed	Hazard	Remove
4231		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	8	2	Suppressed by ivy, poor taper	Poor	Retain
4243		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	8	2	Some suppression, younger tree	Fair	Retain
4244	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Some suppression, younger tree	Fair	Retain
4309	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Codominance, heavily suppressed	Poor	Retain
4312	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
4313	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	34	13	Broken top	Poor	Retain
4314	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	48	20	Slight lean, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
4315	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	10	2	Poor taper, heavy dieback, suppressed, leaning	Hazard	Remove
4316	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	12	2	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
4317		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	7	2	Heavy lean, Poor taper, suppressed	Hazard	Remove
4318	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Heavily suppressed, no scaffold branches, poor taper	Poor	Retain
4320	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	18	5	Heavily suppressed, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
4321	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	15	4	Suppressed, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
4323	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	25	9	Heavy lean, suppressed, dieback	Poor	Retain
4324	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Heavy lean, suppressed, dieback	Poor	Retain
4337	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	51	21.5	Suppressed top branches	Good	Retain
4338	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Suppressed top branches	Good	Retain
4339	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	28	10	Heavy lean to Round lake, Broken top	Poor	Retain
4340		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Leaning, dieback, split leader, recent branch failure	Poor	Retain
4341		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	10	2	Split leader, internal cavity	Poor	Retain
4342	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	29	11	Slight lean to Round Lake	Good	Retain
4343	S	<i>Quercus garryana</i>	White Oak	11	2	Split top	Fair	Retain
4344	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	21	7	Leaning towards Round Lake, little dieback	Fair	Retain
4345	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	31	12	Good taper, little dieback	Good	Retain


Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
4346	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Leaning towards Round Lake	Good	Retain
4385	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Broken tops, competing codominance	Poor	Retain
4404	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Topped by pruning, no dominant, poor scaffold	Poor	Retain
4405	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	14	3	Topped by pruning, no dominant, poor scaffold	Poor	Retain
4410	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	23	8	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
4412	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	24	8	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
4413	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	13	3	Suppressed by ivy, minimal lower branching	Poor	Retain
4414	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	11	2	Dead	Hazard	Remove
4415	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	27	10	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
4420	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	32	12	Multiple leaders, heavy ivy suppression	Poor	Retain
4422	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	24	8	Multiple leaders, heavy ivy suppression	Poor	Retain
4423	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	28	10	Multiple leaders, heavy ivy suppression	Poor	Retain
4426	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	29	11	Multiple leaders, heavy ivy suppression	Poor	Retain
4429	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	17	5	Suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
4430		<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	12	2	Suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
4439		<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	English Laurel	6	2	Multiple stemmed, suckering	Good	Retain
4446	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	24	8	Heavy lean, heavy suppression, 30% crown	Hazard	Remove

Tree ID	Status	Species Name		Size (DBH)	Tree Unit	Assessment	Rating	Recommended Treatment/Action
		Botanical	Common			Comments		
4449	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	21	7	Heavy lean, heavy suppression, 30% crown	Hazard	Remove
4450	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	30	11	Suppressed, some dieback	Poor	Retain
4468	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	16	4	Heavily suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
4470	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	49	21	Good taper, good scaffold branching	Good	Retain
4472	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	36	14	Good scaffold branching	Good	Retain
4474	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	34	13	Codominant leaders, suppressed from branching	Fair	Retain
4475	S	<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	12	2	Some leaning, codominance, suppressed branching	Fair	Retain
4492	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	14	3	Suppressed by adjacent tree branching	Good	Retain
4492		<i>Alnus rubra</i>	Red Alder	8	2	Good taper, 90% crown	Good	Retain
4498		<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	Holly	10	2	Nuisance vegetation	Fair	Retain
4887	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	10	2	Good taper, 90% crown	Good	Retain
4888	S	<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	8	2	Codominant leaders, good taper, 90% crown	Fair	Retain
4889		<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	Douglas Fir	6	2	Good taper, 90% crown	Good	Retain
28821	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	22	7	Codominant leaders, suppressed by ivy	Poor	Retain
30761	S	<i>Acer macrophyllum</i>	Big Leaf Maple	30	11	Leaning, Suppressing 3076 DF	Hazard	Remove
44921	S	<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i>	Incense Cedar	8	2	Good taper, some dieback	Fair	Retain

Figure 1

Tree Report Plan

23 Exhibits



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE PLAN - OVERALL

Scale: 1"=200'

Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:12:13 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT A

Scale: 1"=20'

Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT B

Scale: 1"=20'

Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT C

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	




LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT D

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	




LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT E

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:13:39 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT F

Scale: 1"=20'


Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:14:38 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT G

Scale: 1"=20'

Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:14:49 PM



LEGEND

- WETLAND / SHORELINE
- WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER
- TREE - GOOD
- TREE - FAIR
- TREE - POOR
- TREE - HAZARD
- TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT H

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT I

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:15:12 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT J

Scale: 1"=20'


Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:15:37 PM



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT K

Scale: 1"=20'


Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:15:49 PM




LEGEND

- WETLAND / SHORELINE
- WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER
- TREE - GOOD
- TREE - FAIR
- TREE - POOR
- TREE - HAZARD
- TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT



**LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS
TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT L**

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	




LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT M

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT N

Scale: 1"=20'


Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:17:05 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT O

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:17:36 PM



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT P

Scale: 1"=20'


Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:17:48 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT Q

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:18:00 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT R


Scale: 1"=20'

Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT S

Scale: 1"=20'

Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:



LEGEND


- WETLAND / SHORELINE
- WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER
- TREE - GOOD
- TREE - FAIR
- TREE - POOR
- TREE - HAZARD
- TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT



**LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS
TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT T**

Scale: 1"=20'	Date: 5 February 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:18:43 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



**LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS
TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT U**

Scale: 1"=20'


Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg

Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

L:\Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 2/6/2019 1:18:53 PM



LEGEND	
WETLAND / SHORELINE	
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER	
TREE - GOOD	
TREE - FAIR	
TREE - POOR	
TREE - HAZARD	
TREE - NOT SIGNIFICANT	



LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE ASSESSMENT - SHT V

Scale: 1"=20'

Date: 5 February 2019

Drawing: TreeReport.dwg


Job #: 71070.000

Reference:

Figure 2

Landscape, Tree and Vegetation Plan

Projects\71000\71070\71070-000\Civil\CAD\Working\Exhibits\TreeReport\TreeReport.dwg Robert Phipps 10/28/2019 6:36:18 AM



TREE REMOVAL CALCULATIONS	
TREES REMOVED WITHIN CRITICAL AREAS	201
TREES PROPOSED FOR REPLACEMENT	402 (2:1 REPLACEMENT) + 60 TREE SEEDLINGS (SEE CRITICAL AREAS REPORT)
EXISTING TREES RETAINED	251 TREES
TREE DENSITY CALCULATIONS	
TREE DENSITY CALCULATION AREA (NET SITE AREA)	85,840 SF (2.00 ACRES)
TREE DENSITY REQUIRED	40 TREE UNITS (20 UNITS PER ACRE)

TREE REPLACEMENT LEGEND		
WETLAND / SHORELINE		
WETLAND / SHORELINE BUFFER		
TREE REPLACEMENT AREAS QTY: 402 @ 14' O.C. TO BE STAKED IN FIELD		
SPECIES DISTRIBUTION		
QTY: 242	PSUEDOTSUGA MENZIESII	4' MIN. HT
(65%)	DOUGLAS FIR	5 GALLON
QTY: 120	THUJA PLICATA	4' MIN. HT
(30%)	WESTERN RED CEDAR	5 GALLON
QTY: 40	ACER MACROPHYLLUM	4' MIN. HT
(10%)	BIG LEAF MAPLE	5 GALLON
EXISTING TREES RETAINED		

LAKE RD & EVERETT ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS TREE MITIGATION PLAN - OVERALL

Scale: 1"=200'	Date: 28 October 2019	Drawing: TreeReport.dwg
Job #: 71070.000	Reference:	

