



Tina Cohen, Certified Arborist

Northwest Arborvitae
8318 26th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

phone 206-789-3283
<http://tinacohen.com/>
email tina@tinacohen.com

October 9, 2015

Sandra Eisert
13315 NE 77th Street
Redmond WA 98052

Arborist Services: Review of Tree Retention Plan

Re: Nouri Short Plat, 7502 NE 132nd St, Redmond, WA 98052
Site visit: October 5, 2015

Dear Ms. Eisert:

On October 5, 2015 we met to discuss the trees at the proposed Nouri Short Plat. The goal was to review the Tree Retention plan to determine if it's consistent with my observations and if it complies with Redmond code. Please note I did not have access to the entire site, I only entered the east portion that was not fenced and had a casual trail. I used binoculars to observe trees from outside of the site.

Documents reviewed: I reviewed the Tree Retention plan sheet L2.0 (9/2/2015), the Civil plan sheet C5.0 (9/2/2015), and the Tree Inventory Report by Tony Shoffner (9/29/2014).

Definitions:

1. Redmond defines trees:

Significant tree is any healthy tree 6 inches or greater in trunk diameter.

Landmark tree is a Significant tree greater than 30 inches in diameter.

2. Redmond has three categories of tree retention:

Retained - No construction within five feet of the drip line. Only retained trees may be counted towards the 35% tree retention requirement.

Impacted - Proposed to remain but will have construction with the drip line or 5-foot drip line set back.

Removed - Healthy trees removed for a project due to design or site constraints.

Summary:

This report lists the inaccuracies or problems I found when reviewing the documents compared with field conditions. I recommend full review of this project including a new tree inventory and assessment.

There are two additional Landmark trees on the proposed short plat that will need an 'exception letter' from Redmond if they're to be removed.



The Summary Calculations on the Tree Retention Plan do not reflect field conditions, and need to be revised. The total replacement trees should be 18, not 10.

The site has 17 viable trees (19 numbered trees minus 2 unhealthy trees). Six trees will be retained, one will be impacted, and ten will be removed. If Redmond considers a Wild cherry to be the equivalent of a mature Douglas fir, this works out to be 35% retained, so minimum retention is reached.

Significant Firs #10, 12, and 13 form a stand, defined as a group of three trees whose driplines touch. They're located in the east portion and listed for removal. Redmond needs to clarify if they have special protection.

The tree locations in the east portion of the site plan are not consistent with field conditions. While ultimately it may not matter, the Tree Retention Plan needs review for accuracy.

Details of Inaccuracies or Problems:

1. The Shoffner report characterizes Douglas firs #3, 4, and 5 in poor health and therefore omits them from the total tree count. The trees recovered from past topping and as typical, have multiple tops. Although this is not the ideal structure (topping is never an appropriate treatment), firs are surprisingly resilient. The report doesn't say how Mr. Shoffner reached his conclusion the trees are 'unstable and prone to failure'. For example there was no damage from the August 29, 2015 windstorm. Therefore I consider them to be removed due to design, not due to condition, and they will need mitigation per Redmond code. On page 2, section 3 of his report he refers to the firs as Red Alders, obviously a cut-and-paste typo.

Error: #3 and 4 are Landmark trees to be removed due to design. They need an 'exception letter' granting permission. #5 is a Significant tree to be removed due to design. All will need mitigation.

Error: Per Code definition, #11, to be retained, is Significant because it's 30 inches. It is erroneously listed as a Landmark tree, which must be greater than 30 inches.

2. Wild cherry trees #15 and 17 have cavities (hollows) in their trunks, and are not viable for the long term. The species is susceptible to decay and short lived. See the attached photos. Therefore I deleted them from the total number of trees.

Error: #15 and 17 should be omitted. There are seventeen trees on the site.

3. Cottonwood #14 will be only 8 feet from the clearing limits. The project will capture and channel the storm water, which will likely result in a net loss in the amount of water this tree will receive. Cottonwoods are very sensitive to root loss and to reduction in water, and will drop limbs in response. Thus it's likely it will become high risk or hazardous when the project is complete.

Error: #14 should be removed due to design and mitigated.

Revised tree totals:

There are total 19 trees per 9/2/15 plan, minus 2 unhealthy equals 17 viable trees.

Landmark: There are total 5 Landmark trees. #3, 4, 6 and 7 are Landmark trees to be removed due to design. Zero Landmark trees are impacted. #9 will be retained.

Significant: There are total 12 Significant trees. #2, 5, 10, 12, 13, and 14 are Significant trees to be removed due to design. #8 will be impacted. #1, 11, 16, 18, and 19 will be retained.



Corrected Table: Summary of Tree Retention

Tree type	Removal	Impacted	Retained	Total
LANDMARK	4	0	1	5
SIGNIFICANT	6	1	5	12
TOTAL	10	1	6	17
	59% of all trees	6% of all trees	35% of all trees	100%
REPLACEMENT TREES	18			

Original from the Tree Retention Plan

Please note the incorrect total trees, and discrepancies listed above.

SUMMARY OF TREE RETENTION				
TREE TYPE	REMOVAL	IMPACTED	RETAINED	TOTAL
LANDMARK	2 12.5%	0 0%	2 12.5%	4 25%
SIGNIFICANT	4 25%	2 12.5%	6 37.5%	12 75%
TOTAL	6 37.5%	2 12.5%	6 50%	16 100%
REPLACEMENT TREES	10			10

TREE REPLACEMENT RATIO:

(1) REPLACEMENT TREE / PER SIGNIFICANT TREE REMOVED
(3) REPLACEMENT TREES / PER LANDMARK TREE REMOVED

(4) SIGNIFICANT TREES AND (2) LANDMARK TREES TO BE REMOVED = 10 REPLACEMENT TREES REQUIRED, 13 REPLACEMENT TREES ARE BEING PROVIDED AS SHOWN ON THE LANDSCAPE PLAN.

Conclusion

The Tree Retention Plan needs review and revisions. An 'exception letter' must be issued if two additional Landmark trees are removed. Assuming a short-lived Wild cherry is equivalent to a Douglas fir, the project manages to save 35% of its trees. However the tree replacement calculations are incorrect.

Limits

Unless expressed otherwise (1) 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 (2) the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without further dissection, excavation, probing, or coring.

Loss or alteration of any part of a report invalidates the entire report.

The report and conclusions expressed herein represent the opinion of Tina Cohen d/b/a Northwest Arborvitae. Our fee is no way contingent upon any specified value, a result or occurrence of a subsequent event, or upon any finding to be reported.



Notwithstanding the recommendations and conclusions made in this report, it must be realized that trees are living organisms and their health and vigor constantly change over time. They are not immune to changes in site conditions or seasonal variations in the weather.

Respectfully submitted,



Tina Cohen, ISA Certified Arborist #PN0245A

American Society of Consulting Arborists, Registered Consulting Arborist #473

ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

tina@tinacohen.com



Attachments: photos





Above: Both trunks are part of Wild cherry #15 (per tag). Note the large wound on the left trunk.



Above: The large cavity on Cherry #17 (per tag) seriously impacts its health and long term viability. Thus #15 and #17 are not healthy and should be omitted from the tree inventory.

