

Appendix H

Arborist Report

397 Blossom Hill Road Mixed-Use Project Environmental Assessment

City of San José



H. T. HARVEY & ASSOCIATES

Ecological Consultants



**397 Blossom Hill Road
Arborist Report**

Project #4198-01



Prepared for:

Sandra Heredia
Charities Housing Development Corporation
1400 Parkmoor Avenue, Suite 190
San Jose, California 95126



Prepared by:

H. T. Harvey & Associates
Matt Pollock
ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist #631
ISA-Certified Arborist WE-11610A

June 11, 2018

Table of Contents

Section 1.	Introduction.....	1
Section 2.	Methods.....	2
Section 3.	Results.....	4
3.1	Site History and General Condition.....	4
3.2	Summary of Findings.....	4
3.3	Tree Condition.....	4
3.4	Ordinance-Sized Trees.....	6
3.5	Invasive Trees.....	6
Section 4.	References.....	7

Tables

Table 1.	Properties Included in this Report.....	1
Table 2.	Tree Health and Structural Condition Evaluation Criteria.....	3
Table 3.	Tree Condition Summary.....	4

Figures

Figure 1.	Locations of Existing Trees.....	5
-----------	----------------------------------	---

Appendices

Appendix A.	Assumptions and Limiting Conditions.....	A-1
Appendix B.	Certification of Performance.....	B-1
Appendix C.	Tree Assessment.....	C-1
Appendix D.	Representative Photos.....	D-1

Section 1. Introduction

H. T. Harvey & Associates has prepared this preliminary arborist report, which describes current conditions on a commercial property (site) located in San Jose, California (Table 1). This report provides an inventory of all trees on the project site (with diameter at breast height [DBH] greater than 4 inches) including species, DBH, an assessment of each tree's health and structural condition, and a figure showing the location of each tree in the inventory.

Table 1. Properties Included in this Report

Street Address	Assessor's Parcel Number
397 Blossom Hill Road San Jose, CA	690-25-021

Section 2. Methods

This report is based on observations made during a site visit conducted on May 31, 2018 by H. T. Harvey & Associates' arborist Matt Pollock. Matt is an American Society of Consulting Arborists (ASCA) Registered Consulting Arborist (#631) and an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist (WE-11610A). All trees with a DBH greater than 4 inches were included in the inventory. Tasks conducted during the site visit consisted of the following:

- identifying each tree to species (scientific name and common name);
- tagging each tree with an identifying number;
- recording the approximate location of each tree;
- measuring tree trunk diameter at 54 inches above finish grade (DBH);
- determining whether any trees are 'ordinance-sized' per the City of San Jose's definition
- evaluating tree health and structural condition using a scale of 0 to 5 as shown in Table 2.

Tree assessments were based on ground-level visual observations and physical measurements. Field data collection was conducted using a diameter tape to measure DBH. A Trimble Geo 7X GPS with laser offset capability was used to determine and record the location of each tree. Evaluations of tree health considered crown indicators such as vigor, density, leaf size, quality, and stem shoot extensions. Evaluations of tree structural condition considered root condition/form, trunk condition/form, and branch assembly and arrangement as well as visible indicators of diminished structural integrity including cavities, dead limbs, and excessive leaning.

An advanced assessment to quantify interior wood structure, root condition, and upper canopy condition was not performed as part of this assessment. Therefore, tasks performed did not include an excavation of the root zones of the trees, drilling for decay detection, collecting soil samples for laboratory testing, sending animal or vegetative material for laboratory testing, climbing the trees for an aerial inspection, a tree risk assessment, or a valuation (see Appendix A: Assumptions and Limiting Conditions and Appendix B: Certification of Performance). These tasks are not typically included in a standard arborist report.

Table 2. Tree Health and Structural Condition Evaluation Criteria

Condition Rating	Tree Health	Tree Structure
5	A healthy, vigorous tree with a well-balanced crown. No apparent pest problems or signs and symptoms of disease. Normal to exceeding shoot length on new growth. Leaf size and color normal. Exceptional life expectancy for the species.	Root plate undisturbed and clear of any obstructions. Root flare has normal development. Trunk is sound and solid. No visible trunk defects or cavities. Branch spacing / structure and attachments are free of any defects.
4	Tree with slight decline in vigor. Imperfect canopy density in few parts of the tree, 10% or less, lacking natural symmetry. Less than half normal growth rate and minor deficiency in leaf development. Few pest issues or damage, controllable. Normal branch and stem development with healthy growth. Small amount of twig dieback. Typical life expectancy for the species.	Root plate appears normal; only minor damage may be found. Possible signs of root dysfunction around trunk flare. Minor trunk defects from previous injury, with good closure; less than 25% of bark section missing. Good branch habit, minor dieback with some signs of previous pruning. Co-dominant stem formation may be present. Minor corrections required.
3	Tree with moderate vigor. Crown decline and dieback up to 30% of the canopy. Overall poor symmetry. Leaf color somewhat chlorotic with smaller leaves. Shoot extensions indicate some stunting and stressed growing conditions. Obvious signs of pest problems contributing to lesser condition. Some decay areas found in main stem and branches. Below average life expectancy.	Root plate reveals previous damage or disturbance and dysfunctional roots may be visible around main stem. Evidence of trunk damage or cavities with decay or defects present. Less than 30% of bark sections missing on trunk. Co-dominant stems are present. Branching habit and attachments indicate poor pruning or damage, which requires moderate corrections.
2	Tree in decline. Epicormic growth. Lacking full crown, more than 50% decline and dieback, especially affecting larger branches. Stunting obvious with little evidence of growth on smaller stems. Leaf size and color reveal overall stress in the plant. Insect or disease infestation may be severe. Overmature. Life expectancy is low.	Root plate disturbance and defects indicate major damage with girdling roots around the trunk flare. Trunk reveals more than 50% of bark section missing. Branch structure has poor attachments, with several structurally important dead or broken branches. Canopy reveals signs of severe damage or topping, with major corrective actions required. Extensive decay or hollow.
1	Tree in severe decline. Crown has very little vigor and/or has a disease or insect problem that is ultimately fatal and, if not corrected, may threaten other nearby trees.	Root plate has major structural problems that present an unacceptable risk. Tree is in severe decline, with dieback of scaffold branches and/or trunk.
0	Dead	Dead

Section 3. Results

3.1 Site History and General Condition

The buildings that currently occupy the site were constructed prior to 1998 and the configuration of planting beds appears largely unchanged since that time (Google Earth 2018). Trees along the site perimeter appeared well established, while several palms within the parking area appeared immature.

3.2 Summary of Findings

Eight trees were identified on the site (Figure 1). Descriptions of each tree are included in Appendix C (Tree Assessment), including DBH, tree health and structural scores, and protected status. Table 2 provides a summary of the assessed trees, which represent six species. Of the eight trees located on the site, six (75%) met the City of San Jose's criteria for ordinance-sized trees (see Section 3.4 below). Seven of the eight trees on the site (88%) were in good condition while the remaining tree was in fair condition due to poor structure and decay.

3.3 Tree Condition

A summary of tree condition ratings is provided in Table 3. The condition ratings in the table are based on both the tree health and structural ratings from Appendix C. Tree condition was rated as follows:

- **Poor** if their combined rating was less than 40%.
- **Fair** if their combined rating was between 40% and 60%; or
- **Good** if their combined rating was 60% or greater;

Table 3. Tree Condition Summary

Scientific Name	Common Name	Tree Condition			Total Trees
		Poor	Fair	Good	
<i>Cordyline australis</i>	Cabbage palm	0	1	0	1
<i>Eucalyptus polyanthemos</i>	silver dollar eucalypt	0	0	2	2
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	0	0	2	2
<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>	Callery pear	0	0	1	1
<i>Syagrus romazoffiana</i>	queen palm	0	0	1	1
<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	Mexican fan palm	0	0	1	1
Total		0	1	7	8



N:\Projects\41004\198-01\Reports\Fig 1 Locations of Existing Trees.mxd



H. T. HARVEY & ASSOCIATES
Ecological Consultants

Figure 1. Locations of Existing Trees
397 Blossom Hill Road – Arborist Report (4198-01)
June 2018

3.4 Ordinance-Sized Trees

Ordinance-sized trees are defined by the City of San Jose as those trees having either:

- A single trunk – 38 inches or more in circumference at 4 ½ feet above ground or
- Multiple trunks – The combined measurements of each trunk circumference add up to 38 inches or more in circumference (at 4 ½ feet above ground).

Based on this definition, six ordinance-sized trees were identified on the site, including two green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*) and two silver dollar eucalypts (*Eucalyptus polyanthemos*) (see Appendix C: Tree Assessment).

Per the City: *For multifamily residences, commercial properties, and industrial properties, a permit is required for the removal of trees of any size. For trees on these properties, a Tree Removal Permit is required if the tree is ordinance sized, or a Permit Adjustment is required if the tree is smaller than ordinance sized.* (City of San Jose, 2018)

3.5 Invasive Trees

Of the eight trees (six species) on the site, only one tree is listed by the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC, 2018) as moderately invasive; that is one Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), tree #844.

Section 4. References

[Cal-IPC] California Invasive Plant Council. 2018. California Invasive Plant Inventory Database. Accessed online at <http://cal-ipc.org/paf/> [May 2018].

Google Earth. 2018. Aerial imagery of 397 Blossom Hill Road in San Jose, California. <<https://www.google.com/earth/>>. Accessed May 17, 2018.

San Jose (City of). Planning Division > Tree Removal. Accessed online on 6/11/2018 at <<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?NID=3655>>

Appendix A. Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownerships to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.
2. Property lines were not clearly surveyed or marked in the field by the owner, consultant attempted to provide as accurate of boundary for the inventory as possible using the limited data available.
3. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data have been verified insofar as possible; however, the consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
4. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule and contract of engagement.
5. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
6. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant.
7. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report, nor copy thereof, shall be conveyed by anyone, including the client, to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales, or other media, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant particularly as to value conclusions, identity of the consultant, or any reference to any professional society or institute or to any initialed designation conferred upon the consultant as stated in her qualifications.
8. This report and values expressed herein represent the opinion of the consultant, and the consultant's fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of specified value, a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.
9. Sketches, diagrams, graphs, and photographs in this report, being intended as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or surveys.
10. Unless expressed otherwise: a) information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflects the condition of those items at the time of inspection and b) the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, excavation, probing, or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property in question may not arise in the future.

Appendix B. Certification of Performance

I, Matthew Pollock, certify that:

I have personally inspected the trees and the property referred to in this report and have stated my findings accurately. The extent of the evaluation is stated in the attached report and the terms of the assignment.

I have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or the property that is the subject of this report and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved.

The analysis, opinions, and conclusions stated herein are my own and are based on current scientific procedures and facts.

My analysis, opinions, and conclusions were developed and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices.

No one provided significant professional assistance to me, except as indicated within the report.

Compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party nor upon the results of the assessment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any subsequent events.



Matthew Pollock

ASCA-Registered Consulting Arborist #631

ISA-Certified Arborist WE-11610A

Appendix C. Tree Assessment

Tree Tag	Scientific Name	Common Name	DBH	Health	Structure	Protected Tree?	Health and Structure Rating
842	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	16	4	3	Yes	Good
843	<i>Eucalyptus polyanthemos</i>	silver dollar eucalypt	28	4	2	Yes	Good
844	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>	Mexican fan palm	20	5	3	Yes	Good
845	<i>Eucalyptus polyanthemos</i>	silver dollar eucalypt	14, 11	4	2	Yes	Good
846	<i>Syagrus romazoffiana</i>	queen palm	8	5	5	No	Good
847	<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>	Callery pear	7	4	3	No	Good
848	<i>Cordyline australis</i>	Cabbage palm	6, 5, 5, 4	4	1	Yes	Fair
849	<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	29	5	2	Yes	Good

Appendix D. Representative Photos



Photo 1. Silver dollar eucalypt (*Eucalyptus polyanthemos*) and Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), tree #'s 843 and 844.



Photo 2. Green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), tree # 842.



Photo 3. Cabbage palm (*Cordyline australis*), tree # 848.