

Appendix B
Arborist Report



Preliminary Arborist Report

644 & 675 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA

PREPARED FOR:
HPA Architects
600 Grand Avenue, Suite 302
Oakland, CA 94610

PREPARED BY:
HortScience | Bartlett Consulting
2550 Ninth Street, Suite 112
Berkeley, CA 94710

October 27, 2022



HORT SCIENCE

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

Preliminary Arborist Report

644 & 675 Piercy Road

San Jose, CA

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction and Overview	1
Tree Assessment Methods	1
Description of Trees	2
San Jose Tree Ordinance	4
Suitability for Preservation	4
Preliminary Evaluation of Impacts and Recommendations	6
Tree Mitigation	8
Preliminary Tree Preservation Guidelines	11

List of Tables

Table 1. Condition ratings and frequency of occurrence of trees	2
Table 2. Tree suitability for preservation	6
Table 3. Preliminary tree disposition	7
Table 4. San Jose replacement calculations	9

Exhibits

Tree Assessment Form

Tree Assessment Plan

Preliminary Arborist Report

644 & 675 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA

Introduction and Overview

HPA Architects is planning the development of the properties located at 644 and 675 Piercy Road in San Jose, CA. Both parcels are currently vacant and overgrown with trees, shrubs, and other plants. HortScience | Bartlett Consulting (Divisions of The F. A. Bartlett Tree Expert Co.) was asked to conduct a tree inventory and prepare a **Preliminary Arborist Report** for the trees potentially impacted by the project as required by the City of San Jose.

This report provides the following information:

1. An assessment of the health and structural condition of the trees within the proposed project area based on a visual inspection from the ground.
2. An evaluation of the impacts to trees based on site plans provided by HPA Architects.
3. Recommendations for tree removal and preservation based on an evaluation of project plans.
4. Guidelines for tree preservation during the design, construction, and maintenance phases of development.

Tree Assessment Methods

Trees were assessed on October 14, 2022. The assessment included all trees exceeding 6 feet in height within the project boundary or with canopy overhanging the property. Trees were tagged #1 - 14, 16 - 21, 23 - 34. The assessment procedure consisted of the following steps:

1. Identifying the tree species.
2. Tagging additional tree with an identifying number and recording its location on a map and replacing missing tags.
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

Thirty-four (32) trees were assessed, representing 11 species (Table 1). All species were relatively common ornamentals in the San Francisco Bay area. Valley oak is native to the area, but the single tree did not appear to be indigenous to the site. Over half (56%) of the trees were in good condition, and 25% were in poor condition. Nineteen percent (19%) of the trees were in fair condition. 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.
 644 & 675 Piercy Road, Santa Jose**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Condition			Total
		Poor (1-2)	Fair (3)	Good (4-5)	
Silk tree	<i>Albizia julibrissin</i>	1	-	-	1
Italian cypress	<i>Cupressus sempervirens</i>	4	-	-	4
Evergreen ash	<i>Fraxinus uhdei</i>	-	1	-	1
Crape myrtle	<i>Lagerstroemia indica</i>	1	-	-	1
Olive	<i>Olea europaea</i>	-	1	-	1
Date palm	<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>	-	-	5	5
Almond	<i>Prunus dulcis</i>	2	1	-	3
Peach	<i>Prunus persica</i>	-	1	1	2
Valley oak	<i>Quercus lobata</i>	-	-	1	1
California pepper	<i>Schinus molle</i>	-	-	1	1
Mexican fan palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	-	2	10	12
Total		8	6	18	32

The proposed project area consisted of two adjacent residential parcels. A graded trailer pad was present on the northeast side of the 644 Piercy Road lot and on the southeast corner of the 675 Piercy Road lot. All of the assessed trees were located relatively close to the graded trailer pads. The majority of both parcels was undeveloped and overgrown.

Twelve (12) Mexican fan palms were growing on the northeast half of the 644 Piercy Road lot. Ten (10) were in good condition and two (#24, 30) were in fair condition. Trunk diameters ranged from 12 to 20 inches. The palms had between 9 and 15 feet of brown trunk, and all had a skirt of dead fronds.

Five date palms in good condition were growing behind the trailer pad and along the fence line on the 644 Piercy Road lot. Trunk diameters ranged from 14 to 44 inches, with an average diameter of 29 inches. The palms were young, with 1 to 4 feet of brown trunk and fronds that reached the ground at the outer edge of the crown.

Four Italian cypress were in poor condition. Trunk diameters ranged from 4 to 15 inches, with an average diameter of 11 inches. The lower several feet of the cypresses were bare, and the crown of the trees appeared wilted with browning throughout (Photo 1). Cypresses #27 and 29 each had a decay column on the trunk of the tree. Signs of termite activity were evident on cypress #29.

Three almonds were the only trees growing on the 675 Piercy Road lot. Two (#32, 33) were in poor condition and one (#34) was in fair condition. Trunk diameters had little variance at between 8 to 9 inches. All the almonds had codominant trunks between 1 to 3 feet and were growing on banks on the southwestern side of the property.

One peach each was in fair and good condition. Both peaches had multiple trunks at ground level ranging from 1 to 2 inches in diameter. Peach #5 had twig dieback throughout the small crown of the tree. Peach #7 had a full crown.

The remaining six species were represented by one tree each. These trees included:

- Silk tree #18 was in poor condition. The tree had multiple trunks at ground level with a lean to the north and a sparse crown.
- Evergreen ash #14 was in fair condition. The tree had a trunk diameter of 16 inches. The codominant trunks at 6 feet had a 3 foot long seam below the trunk union.

Photo 2. The trunk of evergreen ash #14 had a three foot long seam below the codominant trunk union.



Photo 1. Italian cypresses #27 – 29 were in poor condition with browning throughout the crown of the trees.



- Crape myrtle #4 (4 inch diameter) was in poor condition. The crown of the tree was sparse, and the trunk had a decay column from ground level to 4 feet.
- Olive #16 was in fair condition. The tree had multiple trunks at ground level with an unusually swollen trunk base and some twig dieback throughout the crown of the tree.
- Valley oak #31 was an off-site tree in good condition growing along Piercy Road. There was chain link and barbed wire wrapped loosely around the 21 inch diameter trunk. A tire swing was attached to a large lateral branch on the south side of the tree.
- California pepper #21 was in good condition. The 12 inch diameter trunk bows to the west and utility lines pass through the crown of the tree.



Photo 3. Olive #16 had a swollen base and dead twigs throughout the crown of the tree.

San Jose Tree Ordinance

The City of San Jose defines an Ordinance Sized Tree as “*any live or dead woody perennial plant...having a main stem or trunk 38 inches or more in circumference [12 inches diameter] at a height measured 54 inches above natural grade slope*” (SJMC 13.32.20.L.). For multi-stem trees, all stems must be measured at 54 inches above the ground; the sum of all these measurements equals the diameter of the tree for ordinance and mitigation purposes. Twenty-five (25) trees met this criterion. Ordinance Sized Trees are identified on the **Tree Assessment Form**.

The City of San Jose also protects Heritage trees and Street trees. No Heritage or Street trees were present.

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. Crape myrtle #4 had poor health and would not likely tolerate construction as well as a healthier tree.
- **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. Italian cypress #29 had significant visible decay from the base of the tree to 10 feet. This was a tree with compromised structural integrity that should not be preserved.
- **Species response**
There is a wide variation in the response of individual species to construction impacts and changes in the environment. For example, evergreen ashes tolerate impacts from construction well, while California pepper trees are moderately tolerant of 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. Peach trees #5 and 7 were young trees and would be able to tolerate construction better than an older tree.
- **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. Olive, Mexican fan palm, and California pepper.

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

**Table 2: Tree suitability for preservation.
644 & 675 Piercy Road, San Jose**

High	Trees in good health and with structural stability that have the potential for longevity at the site. Fifteen (15) trees had high suitability for preservation: date palms #2, 3, 6, 17, 25, and Mexican fan palms #1, 8 – 13, 20, 23, 26.
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. Seven trees had moderate suitability for preservation: Mexican fan palm #24,30, peaches #4, 7, almond #34, California pepper #21, and valley oak #30.
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. Ten (10) trees had low suitability for preservation: Italian cypresses #19, 27 – 29, almond #32, 33, crape myrtle #4, evergreen ash #14, olive #16, silk tree #18.

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. I reviewed the *Conceptual Site Plan* created by Hines (dated August 2, 2022) to evaluate preliminary impacts to trees. This report is preliminary because accurate trunk locations have not been surveyed and I did not review a comprehensive plan set.

Both parcels will be extensively graded. A large building with loading docks will be constructed with parking lots on three sides of the building. Several landscaped areas are proposed. Impacts from construction will be spread across the entirety of both parcels, from property line to property line. Based on my review of the plans and assessment of preliminary impacts to trees, all on-site trees (30) will be removed (Table 3). Among trees to be removed, 14 are within the building footprint and 16 trees are within or immediately adjacent to areas that will be graded.

Off-site Mexican fan palm #30 and valley oak #31 will be preserved. Successful preservation of trees to be preserved will require adherence to the **Tree Preservation Guidelines**.

**Table 3: Preliminary Tree Disposition
 644 & 675 Piercy Road, San Jose**

Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Ordinance Size?	Disposition	Comments
1	Mexican fan palm	13	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
2	Date palm	44	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
3	Date palm	42	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
4	Crape myrtle	4	No	Remove	Inside footprint
5	Peach	2,2,2	No	Remove	Inside footprint
6	Date palm	14	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
7	Peach	1,1,1	No	Remove	Inside footprint
8	Mexican fan palm	13	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
9	Mexican fan palm	20	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
10	Mexican fan palm	18	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
11	Mexican fan palm	12	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
12	Mexican fan palm	13	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
13	Mexican fan palm	18	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
14	Evergreen ash	16	Yes	Remove	Inside footprint
16	Olive	5,4,4	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
17	Date palm	25	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
18	Silk tree	4,3,2	No	Remove	Adjacent to grading
19	Italian cypress	4	No	Remove	Adjacent to grading
20	Mexican fan palm	17	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
21	California pepper	12	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
23	Mexican fan palm	18	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
24	Mexican fan palm	14, 8	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
25	Date palm	19	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
26	Mexican fan palm	16	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
27	Italian cypress	12	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
28	Italian cypress	15	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
29	Italian cypress	14	Yes	Remove	Adjacent to grading
30	Mexican fan palm	16, 11	Yes	Preserve	Off-site
31	Valley oak	21	Yes	Preserve	Off-site
32	Almond	8	No	Remove	Inside grading area
33	Almond	9	No	Remove	Inside grading area
34	Almond	8,6	Yes	Remove	Inside grading 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 32 trees assessed, 30 will be removed. These trees were categorized by type (native, non-native, orchard) and diameter in the **Preliminary Estimated Tree Mitigation Table** on page 9. Mitigation measures require 94 replacement trees (15-gallon containers).

**Table 4: Preliminary Estimated Tree Mitigation
 644 & 675 Piercy Road, San Jose**

Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Circumference	Ordinance Size?	Disposition	Provenance	Replacement Trees
1	Mexican fan palm	13	41	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
2	Date palm	44	138	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
3	Date palm	42	132	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
4	Crape myrtle	4	13	No	Remove	Non-native	1
5	Peach	2,2,2	19	No	Remove	Orchard	0
6	Date palm	14	44	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
7	Peach	1,1,1	9	No	Remove	Orchard	0
8	Mexican fan palm	13	41	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
9	Mexican fan palm	20	63	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
10	Mexican fan palm	18	57	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
11	Mexican fan palm	12	38	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
12	Mexican fan palm	13	41	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
13	Mexican fan palm	18	57	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
14	Evergreen ash	16	50	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
16	Olive	5,4,4	41	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
17	Date palm	25	79	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
18	Silk tree	4,3,2	28	No	Remove	Non-native	2
19	Italian cypress	4	13	No	Remove	Non-native	1

**Table 4 continued: Preliminary Estimated Tree Mitigation
 644 & 675 Piercy Road, San Jose**

20	Mexican fan palm	17	53	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
21	California pepper	12	38	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
23	Mexican fan palm	18	57	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
24	Mexican fan palm	14, 8	69	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
25	Date palm	19	60	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
26	Mexican fan palm	16	50	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
27	Italian cypress	12	38	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
28	Italian cypress	15	47	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
29	Italian cypress	14	44	Yes	Remove	Non-native	4
32	Almond	8	25	No	Remove	Orchard	0
33	Almond	9	28	No	Remove	Orchard	0
34	Almond	8,6	44	Yes	Remove	Orchard	3
Total							94

Preliminary Tree Preservation Guidelines

All on-site trees will be removed. Trees located off-site but close to the project boundary will be retained. The following recommendations will help reduce impacts to off-site trees from development and maintain their health and structural stability through the clearing, grading and construction phases.

Design recommendations

1. Where possible, include the location of all trees within 10" of the project limit. Include trunk locations on all project plans.
2. The project's perimeter security fence will also serve as the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE**. No grading, excavation, construction or storage of materials should occur outside the project limit.
3. All plans affecting trees shall be reviewed by the Consulting Arborist with regard to tree impacts. These include, but are not limited to, demolition plans, grading plans, drainage plans, utility plans, and landscape and irrigation plans.
4. Irrigation systems must be designed so that no trenching severs roots larger than 2" in diameter will occur within the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE**.
5. Any herbicides placed under paving materials must be safe for use around trees and labeled for that use.

Pre-demolition and pre-construction treatments and recommendations

1. The project's perimeter security fence will also serve as the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE**. No grading, excavation, construction, or storage of materials should occur outside the project limit.
2. Off-site trees to be preserved may require pruning to provide clearance for demolition, grading and construction. Tree care firm providing the pruning shall be 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 the American National Standard for Tree Care Operations (Z133.1) and Pruning (A300).
3. The chain-link and barbed wire that is wrapped around the trunk of off-site valley oak #31 shall be removed by hand. Where the wire is embedded in the trunk of the tree, the wire must be cut close to the trunk of the tree. Embedded chain-link or wire shall not be ripped from the trunk of the tree.
4. Tree(s) to be removed that have branches extending into the canopy of tree(s) to remain shall be removed by a Certified Arborist or Certified Tree Worker and not by the demolition contractor. The Certified Arborist or Certified Tree Worker shall remove the trees in a manner that causes no damage to the tree(s) and understory to remain.
5. Trees to be removed shall be felled so as to fall away from **TREE PROTECTION ZONE** and avoid pulling and breaking of roots of off-site trees to remain. If roots are entwined, the Consulting Arborist may require first severing the major woody root mass before extracting the trees.

6. 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. To the extent feasible tree pruning and removal should be scheduled outside of the breeding season. Breeding bird surveys should be conducted prior to tree work. Qualified biologists should be involved in establishing work buffers for active nests.

Recommendations for tree protection during construction

1. Any approved grading, construction, demolition, or other work within 5" of the **Tree Protection Zone** should be monitored by the Consulting Arborist.
2. Any root pruning that will occur within 5" of the **Tree Protection Zone** shall receive the prior approval of and may be supervised by the Consulting Arborist. Roots should be cut with a saw to provide a flat and smooth cut. Removal of roots larger than 2" in diameter should be avoided.
3. If roots 2" and greater in diameter are encountered during site work and must be cut to complete the construction, the Consulting Arborist must be consulted to evaluate effects on the health and stability of the tree and recommend treatment.
4. 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.

If you have any questions about my observations or recommendations, please contact me.

HortScience | Bartlett Consulting



Amber Graves Alvares
Consulting Arborist & Urban Forester
ISA Certified Arborist, WE-13131A
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified



Exhibits

Tree Assessment Form

Tree Assessment Plan



Tree Assessment

644 & 675 Piercy Road
San Jose, California
October 14, 2022



Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Ordinance Size?	Condition 1=poor 5=excellent	Suitability for Preservation	Comments
1	Mexican fan palm	13	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 8 ft of brown trunk; skirt of dead fronds to ground.
2	Date palm	44	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 4 ft of brown trunk; minimal dead fronds.
3	Date palm	42	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 4 ft of brown trunk; minimal dead fronds.
4	Crape myrtle	4	No	2	Low	Typical form and structure; decay column from base to branches at 4 ft; sparse.
5	Peach	2,2,2	No	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at base; twig dieback; staked.
6	Date palm	14	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; young; 1 ft of brown trunk.
7	Peach	1,1,1	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at base; full crown.
8	Mexican fan palm	13	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 9 ft of brown trunk; skirt of dead fronds to ground.
9	Mexican fan palm	20	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 15 ft of brown trunk; 7 ft skirt dead fronds.
10	Mexican fan palm	18	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 12 ft of brown trunk; 7 ft skirt of dead fronds.
11	Mexican fan palm	12	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 5 ft of brown trunk; skirt of dead fronds to ground.
12	Mexican fan palm	13	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 7 ft of brown trunk; skirt of dead fronds to ground.
13	Mexican fan palm	18	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 9 ft of brown trunk; skirt of dead fronds to ground.
14	Evergreen ash	16	Yes	3	Low	Codominant at 6 ft; long seam from 3 ft to 6 ft; rounded crown; seasonally bare.
16	Olive	5,4,4	Yes	3	Low	Multiple attachments at base; large basal swelling; twig dieback; leans S.
17	Date palm	25	Yes	4	High	Typical form and structure; 2 ft of brown trunk; growing against fence.
18	Silk tree	4,3,2	No	2	Low	Multiple attachments at base; leans N; seasonally bare.
19	Italian cypress	4	No	2	Low	Typical form and structure; no foliage from base to 5 ft; wilted and browning.

Tree Assessment

644 & 675 Piercy Road
San Jose, California
October 14, 2022



Tree No.	Species	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Ordinance Size?	Condition 1=poor 5=excellent	Suitability for Preservation	Comments
20	Mexican fan palm	17	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 10 ft of brown trunk; small skirt of dead fronds.
21	California pepper	12	Yes	4	Moderate	Trunk bows W at base then corrects; utility lines pass through crown; along fence.
23	Mexican fan palm	18	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 9 ft of brown trunk; small skirt of dead fronds.
24	Mexican fan palm	14, 8	Yes	3	Moderate	Codominant at base; 12 and 8 ft of brown trunk; small skirt of dead fronds.
25	Date palm	19	Yes	4	High	Typical form and structure; 2 ft of brown trunk; growing against fence.
26	Mexican fan palm	16	Yes	5	High	Typical form and structure; 6 ft of brown trunk; small skirt of dead fronds.
27	Italian cypress	12	Yes	2	Low	Codominant at 4 ft; bare from base to 6 ft; wilted and browning; decay column on S base to 5 ft.
28	Italian cypress	15	Yes	2	Low	Codominant at 10 ft; bare from base to 6 ft; wilted and browning; barbed wire embedded in trunk.
29	Italian cypress	14	Yes	2	Low	Typical form and structure; decay column on N from base to 10 ft; termite activity; bare from base to 10 ft; wilted and browning.
30	Mexican fan palm	16, 11	Yes	3	Moderate	Off-site; no tag; codominant at base; typical form and structure; 10 and 5 ft of brown trunk; next to streetside utility box.
31	Valley oak	21	Yes	4	Moderate	Off-site; no tag; upright; branches droop at ends; rounded crown; chain link and barbed wire wrapped around trunk; tire swing attached to branch on S.
32	Almond	8	No	2	Low	Codominant at 3 ft; growing on side of bank; many rodent burrows under S side; reduced; rounded crown.
33	Almond	9	No	2	Low	Codominant at base; growing on side of bank; rodent burrows all around; trunk wound at 2 ft on N.
34	Almond	8,6	Yes	3	Moderate	Codominant at 1 ft; growing at top of steep slope to Hellyer; rounded full crown with minor twig dieback.



Tree Assessment Map

644 & 675 Piercy Road
San Jose, CA

Prepared for:
HPA Architects
Oakland, CA

October 2022



No Scale

Notes:

Base map provided by:
Google Earth

Numbered tree locations are approximate.



2550 Ninth Street, Suite #112
Berkeley, CA 94710
Phone 925.484.0211
Fax 925.484.0596