Appendix C

Arborist Report

Preliminary Arborist Report

469 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA

PREPARED FOR:
Kier + Wright
163 Technology Drive, #150
Irvine, CA 92618

PREPARED BY:
HortScience | Bartlett Consulting
325 Ray Street
Pleasanton, CA 94566

July 2022

HORT SCIENCE
BARTLETT CONSULTING
Divisions of The F.A. Bartlett Tree Expert Company

Preliminary Arborist Report

469 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Exhibits

Preliminary Arborist Report

469 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA

Introduction and Overview

Kier + Wright is preparing plans for the redevelopment of the subject property in San Jose. The proposed project area consists of one large house on an otherwise undeveloped lot. HortScience | Bartlett Consulting (Divisions of The F. A. Bartlett Tree Expert Co.) was asked to prepare a **Preliminary Arborist Report** for the project site for submission to the City of San Jose.

This report provides the following information:

1. An assessment of tree health, structure, and suitability for preservation.
2. A preliminary assessment of the impacts of constructing the proposed project and recommendations for action.
3. Preliminary tree preservation guidelines.

Assessment Methods

Trees were assessed on June 15, 2022. As required by the City of San Jose, trees taller than 6 feet were included in the assessment. The assessment procedure consisted of the following steps:

1. Identifying the tree species;
2. Tagging each tree with an identifying number and recording its location on a map;
3. Measuring the trunk diameter at a point 54 inches above grade;
4. Evaluating the health and structural condition using a scale of 1 – 5:
   - ***5*** - A healthy, vigorous tree, reasonably free of signs and symptoms of disease, with good structure and form typical of the species.
   - ***4*** - Tree with slight decline in vigor, small amount of twig dieback, minor structural defects that could be corrected.
   - ***3*** - Tree with moderate vigor, moderate twig, and small branch dieback, thinning of crown, poor leaf color, moderate structural defects that might be mitigated with regular care.
   - ***2*** - Tree in decline, epicormic growth, extensive dieback of medium to large branches, significant structural defects that cannot be abated.
   - ***1*** - Tree in severe decline, dieback of scaffold branches and/or trunk; most of foliage from epicormics; extensive structural defects that cannot be abated.
5. Rating the suitability for preservation as “high”, “moderate” or “low”. Suitability for preservation considers the health, age and structural condition of the tree, and its potential to remain an asset to the site for years to come.
   - ***High***: Trees with good health and structural stability that have the potential for longevity at the site.
   - ***Moderate***: Trees with somewhat declining health and/or structural defects than can be abated with treatment. The tree will require more intense management and monitoring, and may have shorter life span than those in ‘good’ category.
   - ***Low***: Trees in poor health or with significant structural defects that cannot be mitigated. Tree is expected to continue to decline, regardless of treatment. The species or individual may have characteristics that are undesirable for landscapes, and generally are unsuited for use areas.

Description of Trees

Twenty-seven (27) trees were assessed, representing 12 species (Table 1). Fifteen (15) on-site trees were concentrated in the southern section of the site. Eleven (11) London planes (#166 – 176) and coast live oak #165 were off-site trees, overhanging the northeastern side of the site. No species was represented by more than five trees. Overall, nine trees were in good condition, five were in fair, twelve were poor, and one was dead (Table 1).

Descriptions of each tree are found in the ***Tree Assessment Form*** and approximate locations are shown on the ***Tree Assessment Map*** (see Exhibits).

Table 1: Condition ratings and frequency of occurrence of trees 469 Piercy Road, San Jose.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Condition				Total
		Dead (0)	Poor (1-2)	Fair (3)	Good (4-5)	
Silver maple	*Acer saccharinum*	-	1	-	-	**1**
Silver dollar gum	*Eucalyptus polyanthemos*	-	1	-	-	**1**
Raywood ash	*Fraxinus angustifolia* 'Raywood'	-	1	1	-	**2**
Arizona Ash	*Fraxinus velutina*	-	1	-	-	**1**
Mulberry	*Morus* sp.	-	1	-	-	**1**
Olive	*Olea europaea*	-	1	-	-	**1**
Chinese pistache	*Pistacia chinensis*	-	1	-	-	**1**
London plane	*Platanus* x *hispanica*	-	-	3	8	**11**
Plum	*Prunus domestica*	1	4	-	-	**5**
Almond	*Prunus dulcis*	-	1	-	-	**1**
Coast live oak	*Quercus agrifolia*	-	-	-	1	**1**
Elderberry	*Sambucus* sp.	-	-	1	-	**1**
Total		**1**	**12**	**5**	**9**	**27**

Five plums were growing in a cluster of vegetation in the southwestern portion of the site. Four were in poor condition with a thin crown, poor form and structure, and twig and small branch dieback. Plum #161 was dead.

Raywood ash #152 and 153 were both in poor condition. Tree #152 had pervasive twig dieback and was heavily suppressed by tree #153. Tree #153 had multiple attachments arising from 4 feet with a seam extending from the attachment point to the ground.

Photo 1: Raywood ash #153 had a vigorous crown, but poor form and structure with multiple attachments arising from a single point and a seam running from the attachment point to the ground.

All other species were represented by single trees:

- Silver maple #162 was in poor condition. The trunk had failed at 7 feet. Foliage was chlorotic.
- Silver dollar gum #163 was in poor condition with multiple attachments at the base, history of stem failure, and twig and small branch dieback.
- Arizona ash #177 grew through the boundary fence over the sidewalk on the southeast end of the site. The tree was in poor condition.
- Mulberry #164 was the largest tree on site with a 39-inch diameter trunk. While new growth was vigorous, the tree had poor form and structure from repeated topping at various heights. The lowest attachment at 3 feet had cracked.

Photo 2: Mulberry #164 had been repeatedly topped. The crown consisted of weakly attached branches.

- Olive #159 was in poor condition and heavily suppressed, growing within the dripline of neighboring trees.
- Chinese pistache #178 was near the on-site house. The tree was all but dead.
- Almond #158 was in poor condition with pervasive twig and small branch dieback.

- Elderberry #156 was in fair condition with multiple attachments arising from the base.

Twelve off-site trees were planted in a row and overhung the northwestern boundary of the site:

- Eight of the 11 London planes were in good condition, while the remaining three were in fair condition. Individual trunks measured between 10 and 18 inches, averaging 11 inches. Trees generally had spreading or vase-shaped crowns. Fair condition London planes had thinner crowns than those in good condition.
- Coast live oak #165 was in good condition. The tree had a 13-inch trunk with multiple attachments arising between 7 to 10 feet. The crown was vigorous and full.

Suitability for Preservation

Before evaluating the impacts that will occur during development, it is important to consider the quality of the tree resource itself, and the potential for individual trees to function well over an extended length of time. Trees that are preserved on development sites must be carefully selected to make sure that they may survive development impacts, adapt to a new environment and perform well in the landscape.

Our goal is to identify trees that have the potential for long-term health, structural stability, and longevity. For trees growing in open fields, away from areas where people and property are present, structural defects and/or poor health present a low risk of damage or injury if they fail.

We must be concerned, however, about safety in use areas. Therefore, where development encroaches into existing plantings, we must consider their structural stability as well as their potential to grow and thrive in a new environment. Where development will not occur, the normal life cycles of decline, structural failure, and death should be allowed to continue. Evaluation of suitability for preservation considers several factors:

- **Tree health**
  Healthy, vigorous trees are better able to tolerate impacts such as root injury, demolition of existing structures, changes in soil grade and moisture, and soil compaction than non-vigorous trees are. For example, Chinese pistache #178 was all but dead. This tree would not tolerate construction impacts. All off-site trees were vigorous, and most were in good condition. These trees would likely tolerate construction impacts more effectively.

- **Structural integrity**
  Trees with significant amounts of wood decay and other structural defects that cannot be corrected are more likely to fail. Such trees should not be preserved in areas where damage to people or property is likely. For example, mulberry #164 had many weakly attached branches and a cracked, low major stem attachment. This tree would not be a good candidate for preservation in a planned use area.

- **Species response**
  There is a wide variation in the response of individual species to construction impacts and changes in the environment. For example, coast live oak, olive, mulberry, silver maple, Arizona ash, and London plane are tolerant of root severance and general construction impacts. Plums are moderately tolerant of root severance and construction impacts, and benefit from irrigation after construction. Raywood ash is intolerant of root severance and moderately tolerant of general construction impacts. Silver dollar gum is moderately tolerant of both root severance and construction impacts.

Tree age and longevity

Old trees, while having significant emotional and aesthetic appeal, have limited physiological capacity to adjust to an altered environment. Young trees are better able to generate new tissue and respond to change. For example, Arizona ash #177 was young and able to adapt to change. Mulberry #164 was mature, and likely less tolerant to change.

- **Invasiveness**
  Species which spread across a site and displace desired vegetation are not always appropriate for retention. This is particularly true when indigenous species are displaced. The California Invasive Plant Inventory Database (https://www.cal-ipc.org/paf/) lists species identified as being invasive. San Jose is part of the Central West Floristic Province. Olive is listed as having limited invasive potential.

Each tree was rated for suitability for preservation based upon its age, health, structural condition, and ability to safely coexist within a development environment (Table 2).

Table 2: Tree suitability for preservation.
469 Piercy Road, San Jose

High	Trees in good health and with structural stability that have the potential for longevity at the site. Nine London planes and coast live oak #165 had high suitability for preservation.
Moderate	Trees in fair health and/or with structural defects that may be abated with treatment. Trees in this category require more intense management and monitoring, and may have shorter lifespans than those in the "high" category. Elderberry #156 and London planes #172 and 173 had moderate suitability for preservation.
Low	Trees in poor health or with significant defects in structure that cannot be abated with treatment. These trees can be expected to decline regardless of management. The species or individual tree may possess either characteristics that are undesirable in landscape settings or be unsuited for use areas. Twelve (12) trees had low suitability for preservation: almond #158, Arizona ash #177, Chinese pistache #178, mulberry #164, olive #159, four plums, Raywood ash #152, silver dollar gum #163, and silver maple #162.

Note: plum #161 was not included this table. The tree was dead.

We consider trees with high suitability for preservation to be the best candidates for preservation. We do not normally recommend retention of trees with low suitability for preservation in areas where people or property will be present. Retention of trees with moderate suitability for preservation depends upon the intensity of proposed site changes.

Preliminary Evaluations of Impacts and Recommendations

Appropriate tree retention develops a practical match between the location and intensity of construction activities with the quality and health of trees. The ***Tree Assessment*** was the reference point for tree condition and quality. Impacts from construction were estimated given the project information available to date. To evaluate impacts from the project, I used the topographic survey (Kier + Wright, August 2021) and communications with Stephen Penrose, Kier + Wright.

Plans were preliminary in nature. As such, the assessment of impacts to trees is preliminary. The development proposes to clear and re-grade the site, removing all 15 on-site trees. Grading extent was not included in the plan, but Stephen Penrose identified all trees on-site for removal for re-grading. Some on-site trunk locations were missing from the plan.

Twelve off-site trees are identified for preservation. Individual recommendations are described for each tree in the ***Preliminary Tree Disposition*** (Table 3, page 9).

The retention of all trees identified for preservation is predicated on adherence to the ***Preliminary Tree Preservation Guidelines.***

San Jose Tree Protection Requirements

The City of San Jose Municipal Code 13.32 defines all trees, living or dead, with a trunk circumference of 38 inches or greater (12 inches diameter) as an ***Ordinance Sized Tree***. Individual trunk measurements are combined for multi-stemmed trees. Ten (10) of the 15 trees identified for removal meet the requirement of an ***Ordinance Sized Tree.*** Individual designations are described in the ***Tree Assessment*** (see attachments).

Note that plum #161 was dead but met the City's requirements for ***Ordinance Sized Tree*** designation.

Table 3: Preliminary Tree Disposition
469 Piercy Road, San Jose.

Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Ordinance Sized Tree?	Condition 1=poor 5=excellent	Suitability for Preservation	Proposed Action	Comments
152	Raywood ash	10	No	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
153	Raywood ash	29	Yes	3	Moderate	Remove	Within project area
154	Plum	16	Yes	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
155	Plum	3,3,2	No	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
156	Elderberry	5,4,3,3	Yes	3	Moderate	Remove	Within project area
157	Plum	9,3,3,1,1,1	Yes	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
158	Almond	5,5,5,3,3,3	Yes	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
159	Olive	1,1,1	No	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
160	Plum	11,10,8	Yes	1	Low	Remove	Within project area
161	Plum	4,3,3,2	Yes	0	NA	Remove	Within project area
162	Silver maple	21	Yes	1	Low	Remove	Within project area
163	Silver dollar gum	9,6,6,4,3,3,3	Yes	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
164	Mulberry	39	Yes	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
165	Coast live oak	13	Yes	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
166	London plane	18	Yes	5	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
167	London plane	11	No	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
169	London plane	13	Yes	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
169	London plane	10,7	Yes	3	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
170	London plane	11	No	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
171	London plane	14	Yes	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
172	London plane	12,6,4	Yes	3	Moderate	Preserve	Off-site tree
173	London plane	11	No	3	Moderate	Preserve	Off-site tree
174	London plane	11	No	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree

Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Ordinance Sized Tree?	Condition 1=poor 5=excellent	Suitability for Preservation	Proposed Action	Comments
175	London plane	10	No	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
176	London plane	10,6	Yes	4	High	Preserve	Off-site tree
177	Arizona ash	2,2	No	2	Low	Remove	Within project area
178	Chinese pistache	10	No	1	Low	Remove	Within project area

Tree Mitigation

The City of San Jose requires mitigation for trees removed on development sites. The species and exact number of trees to be planted on the site will be determined in consultation with the City Arborist and the Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement.

All trees that are to be removed shall be replaced at the following ratios:

Circumference of Tree to be Removed (measured at 4.5 feet above ground)	Type of Tree to be Removed			Minimum Size of Each Replacement Tree
	Native	Non-Native	Orchard	
38 inches or greater	5:1	4:1	3:1	15-gallon container
19 – 38 inches	3:1	2:1	none	15-gallon container
less than 19 inches	1:1	1:1	none	15-gallon container

x:x = tree replacement to tree loss ratio

Note: Trees with a circumference of greater than or equal to 38" (=12.1" diameter) shall not be removed unless a Tree Removal Permit, or equivalent, has been approved for the removal of such trees.

One 24-inch box tree = two 15-gallon container trees.

Alternative Mitigation Measures

In the event the project site does not have sufficient area to accommodate the required tree mitigation, one or more of the following measures may be implemented, to the satisfaction of the City's Environmental Principal Planner, at the development permit stage:

- The size of a 15-gallon replacement tree can be increased to 24-inch box and count as two replacement trees.
- An alternative site(s) will be identified for additional tree planting. Alternative sites may include local parks or schools or installation of trees on adjacent properties for screening.
- A donation of $775 per mitigation tree to Our City Forest or San Jose Beautiful for in-lieu off-site tree planting in the community. These funds will be used for tree planting and maintenance of planted trees for approximately three years. A donation receipt for off-site tree planting will be provided to the Planning Project Manager prior to issuance of a development permit.

Of the 27 trees assessed, 15 will be removed. These trees were categorized by provenance (native, non-native, or orchard) and trunk diameter to estimate tree mitigation. Mitigation measures require 40 replacement trees (15-gallon containers). Individual mitigation measures are described in ***San Jose Replacement Calculations*** (Table 4, page 10).

Table 4: San Jose Replacement Calculations
469 Piercy Road, San Jose.

Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Circumference	Ordinance Size?	Disposition	Provenance	Replacement Trees
152	Raywood ash	10	31	Yes	Remove	Non-native	2
153	Raywood ash	29	91	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
154	Plum	16	50	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
155	Plum	3,3,2	25	Yes	Remove	Orchard	0
156	Elderberry	5,4,3,3	47	Yes	Remove	Native	5
157	Plum	9,3,3,1,1,1	57	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
158	Almond	5,5,5,3,3,3	75	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
159	Olive	1,1,1	9	No	Remove	Orchard	0
160	Plum	11,10,8	91	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
161	Plum	4,3,3,2	38	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
162	Silver maple	21	66	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
163	Silver dollar gum	9,6,6,4,3,3,3	97	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
164	Mulberry	39	122	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
177	Arizona Ash	2,2	13	No	Remove	Non-native	1
178	Chinese pistache	10	31	Yes	Remove	Non-native	2

Preliminary Tree Preservation Guidelines

The following recommendations will help reduce impacts to trees from development as well as maintain and improve their health and vitality through the clearing, grading, and construction phases. The key elements of a tree preservation plan for 469 Piercy Road would include:

- Establishing **Tree Protection Zones** for each tree to be preserved. **Tree Protection Zones** are identified by the Consulting Arborist based on species tolerances, tree condition, trunk diameters and the nature and proximity of the proposed disturbance.

- Providing supplemental irrigation prior to and during the demolition and construction phases.

Design recommendations

1. All plans affecting trees shall be reviewed by the Consulting Arborist regarding tree impacts. These include, but are not limited to, demolition plans, grading and utility plans, landscape, and irrigation plans.

2. For trees identified for preservation, designate a **Tree Protection Zone** in which no construction, grading and underground services including utilities, sub-drains, water or sewer will be located. For design purposes, the **Tree Protection Zone** should be either the dripline or edge of the planting bed where the tree is located. Depending in the tree to be preserved, additional space beyond the dripline may be required.

3. No grading, excavation, construction, or storage of materials shall occur within that zone.

4. No underground services including utilities, sub-drains, water, or sewer shall be placed in the **Tree Protection Zone**.

5. Irrigation systems must be designed so that no trenching will occur within the **Tree Protection Zone**.

6. As trees withdraw water from the soil, expansive soils may shrink within the root area. Therefore, foundations, footings and pavements on expansive soils near trees should be designed to withstand differential displacement.

Pre-construction treatments and recommendations

1. The demolition contractor shall meet with the Consulting Arborist before beginning work to discuss work procedures and tree protection.

2. Where possible, cap and abandon all existing underground utilities within the **TPZ** in place. Removal of utility boxes by hand is acceptable but no trenching should be performed within the **TPZ** in an effort to remove utilities, irrigation lines, etc.

3. Fence all trees to be retained to completely enclose the **Tree Protection Zone** prior to demolition, grubbing or grading. Fences shall be 6 ft. chain link or equivalent as approved by the Consulting Arborist. Fences are to remain until all grading and construction is completed.

4. Trees to be preserved may require pruning. All pruning shall be done by a State of California Licensed Tree Contractor (C61/D49). All pruning shall be done by Certified Arborist or Certified Tree Worker in accordance with the latest edition of the Best

Management Practices for Pruning (International Society of Arboriculture) and adhere to the most recent editions of the American National Standard for Tree Care Operations (Z133.1) and Pruning (A300). The Consulting Arborist will provide pruning specifications prior to site demolition. Branches extending into the work area that can remain following demolition shall be tied back and protected from damage.

5. All tree work shall comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as well as California Fish and Wildlife code 3503-3513 to not disturb nesting birds. Tree pruning and removal should be scheduled outside of the breeding season to avoid scheduling delays. Breeding bird surveys should be conducted prior to tree work. Qualified biologists should be involved in establishing work buffers for active nests.

6. Trees to be removed shall be felled so as to fall away from **Tree Protection Zone** and avoid pulling and breaking of roots of trees to remain. If roots are entwined, the consultant may require first severing the major woody root mass before extracting the trees, or grinding the stump below ground.

7. Apply and maintain 4-6 inches of wood chip mulch within the **Tree Protection Zone.**

Recommendations for tree protection during construction

1. Prior to beginning work, the contractors working in the vicinity of trees to be preserved are required to meet with the Consulting Arborist at the site to review all work procedures, access routes, storage areas and tree protection measures.

2. All contractors shall conduct operations in a manner that will prevent damage to trees to be preserved.

3. Any grading, construction, demolition or other work that is expected to encounter tree roots should be monitored by the Consulting Arborist.

4. Tree protection fences are to remain until all site work has been completed. Fences may not be relocated or removed without permission of the Consulting Arborist.

5. Construction trailers, traffic and storage areas must remain outside fenced areas at all times.

6. Prior to grading, excavation for foundations/footings/walls, filling, or trenching, trees may require root pruning outside the **Tree Protection Zone** by cutting all roots cleanly to the depth of the excavation. Roots shall be cut by manually digging a trench and cutting exposed roots with a saw, with a vibrating knife, rock saw, narrow trencher with sharp blades, or other approved root pruning equipment. The Consulting Arborist will identify where root pruning is required and monitor all root pruning activities.

7. If injury should occur to any tree during construction, it should be evaluated as soon as possible by the Consulting Arborist so that appropriate treatments can be applied.

8. No excess soil, chemicals, debris, equipment, or other materials shall be dumped or stored within the **Tree Protection Zone**.

9. Any additional tree pruning needed for clearance during construction must be performed by a Certified Arborist and not by construction personnel.

Maintenance of impacted trees
Preserved trees will experience a physical environment different from that pre-development. As a result, tree health and structural stability should be monitored. Occasional pruning, fertilization, mulch, pest management, replanting and irrigation may be required. In addition, provisions for monitoring both tree health and structural stability following construction must be made a priority. As trees age, the likelihood of failure of branches or entire trees increases. Therefore, annual inspection for structural condition is recommended.

HortScience | Bartlett Consulting

Ryan Suttle, Consulting Arborist & Urban Forester
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist, Utility Specialist No. WE-12647BU
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

Exhibits

Tree Assessment Form

Tree Assessment Plan

Tree Assessment

469 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA
July, 2022

HORT SCIENCE
BARTLETT CONSULTING

Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Ordinance Sized Tree?	Condition 1=poor 5=excellent	Suitability for Preservation	Comments
152	Raywood ash	10	No	2	Low	Multiple attachments at 6 to 7 feet; engulfed in shrubs; pervasive twig dieback; suppressed and one-sided E.
153	Raywood ash	29	Yes	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 4 feet; seam to ground below attachment; mild twig dieback E; moderate vigor.
154	Plum	16	Yes	2	Low	10-20 attachments at base; measured below attachment; poor form and structure; thin crown.
155	Plum	3,3,2	No	2	Low	Poor form and structure; thin crown.
156	Elderberry	5,4,3,3	Yes	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at base; good vigor; poor form and structure.
157	Plum	9,3,3,1,1,1	Yes	2	Low	Heavy epicormic sprouting from base; thin crown with moderate twig and small branch dieback.
158	Almond	5,5,5,3,3,3	Yes	2	Low	Multiple narrow attachments at base, very thin crown; pervasive twig and small branch dieback.
159	Olive	1,1,1	No	2	Low	Growing within dripline of neighboring trees; heavily suppressed; heavy lean S.
160	Plum	11,10,8	Yes	1	Low	Multiple narrow attachments at 3 - 5 feet; severe twig and branch dieback; history of branch failure.
161	Plum	4,3,3,2	Yes	0	NA	Dead tree
162	Silver maple	21	Yes	1	Low	Main stem failure at 7 feet; pervasive twig and small branch dieback; remaining live foliage is chlorotic.
163	Silver dollar gum	9,6,6,4,3,3,3	Yes	2	Low	Multiple stems arise from base; history of stem failure at base; thin crown; twig and small branch dieback.
164	Mulberry	39	Yes	2	Low	Failing codominant union at 4 feet; measured below attachment; topped at 10 feet; vigorous; all living branches weakly attached.
165	Coast live oak	13	Yes	4	High	Off-site, multiple attachments at 7 to 10 feet; full, vigorous crown; slight lean W; 6 foot overhang.
166	London plane	18	Yes	5	High	Off-site, multiple wide attachments at 6 feet; spreading, wide form; vigorous crown; 20 foot overhang.

Tree Assessment

469 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA
July, 2022

HORT SCIENCE
BARTLETT CONSULTING

Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Ordinance Sized Tree?	Condition 1=poor 5=excellent	Suitability for Preservation	Comments
167	London plane	11	No	4	High	Off-site, multiple narrow attachments at 12 feet; spreading, vase-shape crown; vigorous; 18 feet overhang.
169	London plane	13	Yes	4	High	Off-site, multiple attachments at 10 feet; spreading, vase-shaped crown; slight twig dieback on interior shoots; overhang 11 feet.
169	London plane	10,7	Yes	3	High	Off-site, wide codominant union at 4 feet; slightly thin crown; slightly one-sided N; 11 foot overhang.
170	London plane	11	No	4	High	Off-site, trunk sweeps W; reaching form; moderate vigor; 7 foot overhang.
171	London plane	14	Yes	4	High	Off-site, multiple attachments at 10 feet; good vigor; reaching form; 18 foot overhang.
172	London plane	12,6,4	Yes	3	Moderate	Off-site, multiple attachments between 3 and 5 feet; vase-shaped form; moderate vigor; 1” girdling roots 2 sides of trunk; 8 foot overhang.
173	London plane	11	No	3	Moderate	Off-site, multiple narrow attachments at 10 feet; moderate vigor; heading cuts made over cars; 10 foot overhang.
174	London plane	11	No	4	High	Off-site, multiple narrow attachments at 10-12 feet; vase-shaped form; good vigor; 10 feet overhang.
175	London plane	10	No	4	High	Off-site, slightly sinuous trunk; narrow branch attachments; reaching form; good vigor; overhang 8 feet.
176	London plane	10,6	Yes	4	High	Off-site, codominant attachment at 4 feet; slight twig dieback at top; reaching form; overhang 15 feet.
177	Arizona ash	2,2	No	2	Low	Growing through fence to over sidewalk; extreme lean E with trunk outside dripline; vigorous.
178	Chinese pistache	10	No	1	Low	No tag; multiple attachments at 5 feet; poor form with crossing branches; all but dead.

Tree Assessment Map

469 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA

Prepared for:
Kier + Wright
Irvine, CA

June 2022

No Scale

Notes:
Base map provided by:
Kier + Wright
Irvine, CA

Numbered tree locations are approximate.

HORT SCIENCE
BARTLETT CONSULTING
Divisions of The F.A. Bartlett Tree Expert Company

325 Ray Street
Pleasanton, California 94566
Phone 925.484.0211
Fax 925.484.0596