California Natural Diversity Dat	abase (CNDDB)	Commercial	[ds85]

Scientific Name	Common Name	Element Code	Occ Number	MAPNDX	EONDX	Key Quad Code	Key Quad Name	Key County Code	Accuracy	Presence	Осс Туре	Occ Rank	Sensitive	Site Date	Elm Date	Owner Management	Federal Status	State Status
Rallus obsoletus obsoletus	California Ridgway's rail	ABNME05011	43	08969	25849	3712253	San Mateo	SMT	1 mile	Possibly Extirpated	Natural/Native occurrence	None	N	20060409	1975XXXX	CITY OF BURLINGAME	Endangered	Endar
Allium peninsulare var. franciscanum	Franciscan onion	PMLIL021R1	6	45125	45125	3712253	San Mateo	SMT	1 mile	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Unknown	N	18950531	18950531	UNKNOWN	None	None
lschnura gemina	San Francisco forktail damselfly	IIODO72010	1	09064	60773	3712253	San Mateo	SMT	1/5 mile	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Unknown	N	19990517	19990517	SMT COUNTY	None	None
Spirinchus thaleichthys	longfin smelt	AFCHB03010	22	89718	90720	3712252	Redwood Point	ALA	non- specific area	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Unknown	N	1995XXXX	1995XXXX	UNKNOWN	Candidate	Threa
Bombus occidentalis	western bumble bee	IIHYM24250	246	45125	100349	3712253	San Mateo	SMT	1 mile	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Unknown	N	19580818	19580818	UNKNOWN	None	Candi Endar
Falco peregrinus anatum	American peregrine falcon	ABNKD06071	32	69296	70079	3712253	San Mateo	SMT	80 meters	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Unknown	Y	20070515	20070515		Delisted	Deliste
Fritillaria biflora var. ineziana	Hillsborough chocolate lily	PMLIL0V0M1	2	26561	1675	3712253	San Mateo	SMT	specific area	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Good	Y	20160322	20160322		None	None
Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia	San Francisco gartersnake	ARADB3613B	2	09024	14768	3712243	Woodside	SMT	non- specific area	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Good	Y	20160205	20160205		Endangered	Endar
Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia	San Francisco gartersnake	ARADB3613B	10	08937	27537	3712253	San Mateo	SMT	1/5 mile	Presumed Extant	Natural/Native occurrence	Good	Y	19870505	19870505		Endangered	Endar



Plant List

31 matches found. Click on scientific name for details

	Search Crite	eria						
	Found in Q	uad 3712253						
Q	Modify Search	n Criteria 🛛 🔏 Export	to Excel 👘 Modi	fy Columns 🛔 🛔 N	Modify Sort	🔲 Display I	photos	
Scientific Nam	ie	Common Name	Family	Lifeform	Blooming Period	CA Rare Plant Rank	State Rank	Global Rank
Acanthominth	<u>a duttonii</u>	San Mateo thorn- mint	Lamiaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	1B.1	S1	G1
<u>Allium peninsu</u> franciscanum	<u>ulare var.</u>	Franciscan onion	Alliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	(Apr)May- Jun	1B.2	S2	G5T2
<u>Amsinckia lun</u>	<u>aris</u>	bent-flowered fiddleneck	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Mar-Jun	1B.2	S3	G3
Arctostaphylos montaraensis	5	Montara manzanita	Ericaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Jan-Mar	1B.2	S1	G1
<u>Astragalus</u> pycnostachyu pycnostachyu	<u>s var.</u> <u>s</u>	coastal marsh milk-vetch	Fabaceae	perennial herb	(Apr)Jun- Oct	1B.2	S2	G2T2
<u>Calochortus u</u>	<u>mbellatus</u>	Oakland star- tulip	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Mar-May	4.2	S3?	G3?
<u>Castilleja amb</u> ambigua	igua var.	johnny-nip	Orobanchaceae	annual herb (hemiparasitic)	Mar-Aug	4.2	S3S4	G4T4
Chloropyron n ssp. palustre	<u>naritimum</u>	Point Reyes bird's-beak	Orobanchaceae	annual herb (hemiparasitic)	Jun-Oct	1B.2	S2	G4?T2

CNPS Inventory Results

<u>Chorizanthe cuspidata</u> <u>var. cuspidata</u>	San Francisco Bay spineflower	Polygonaceae	annual herb	Apr- Jul(Aug)	1B.2	S1	G2T1
<u>Cirsium fontinale var.</u> <u>fontinale</u>	Crystal Springs fountain thistle	Asteraceae	perennial herb	(Apr)May- Oct	1B.1	S1	G2T1
Collinsia multicolor	San Francisco collinsia	Plantaginaceae	annual herb	(Feb)Mar- May	1B.2	S2	G2
Dirca occidentalis	western leatherwood	Thymelaeaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	Jan- Mar(Apr)	1B.2	S2	G2
Elymus californicus	California bottle- brush grass	Poaceae	perennial herb	May- Aug(Nov)	4.3	S4	G4
Eriophyllum latilobum	San Mateo woolly sunflower	Asteraceae	perennial herb	May-Jun	1B.1	S1	G1
Erysimum franciscanum	San Francisco wallflower	Brassicaceae	perennial herb	Mar-Jun	4.2	S3	G3
<u>Fritillaria biflora var.</u> ineziana	Hillsborough chocolate lily	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Mar-Apr	1B.1	S1	G3G4T1
<u>Fritillaria liliacea</u>	fragrant fritillary	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	Feb-Apr	1B.2	S2	G2
<u>Hesperevax sparsiflora</u> <u>var. brevifolia</u>	short-leaved evax	Asteraceae	annual herb	Mar-Jun	1B.2	S2	G4T3
Hesperolinon congestum	Marin western flax	Linaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jul	1B.1	S1	G1
Lessingia arachnoidea	Crystal Springs lessingia	Asteraceae	annual herb	Jul-Oct	1B.2	S2	G2
Lilium maritimum	coast lily	Liliaceae	perennial bulbiferous herb	May-Aug	1B.1	S2	G2
<u>Lupinus arboreus var.</u> <u>eximius</u>	San Mateo tree lupine	Fabaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Apr-Jul	3.2	S2	G2Q
<u>Malacothamnus</u> <u>arcuatus</u>	arcuate bush- mallow	Malvaceae	perennial evergreen shrub	Apr-Sep	1B.2	S2	G2Q
<u>Malacothamnus</u> <u>davidsonii</u>	Davidson's bush- mallow	Malvaceae	perennial deciduous shrub	Jun-Jan	1B.2	S2	G2
Monolopia gracilens	woodland woolythreads	Asteraceae	annual herb	(Feb)Mar- Jul	1B.2	S3	G3

CNPS Inventory Results

Pentachaeta bellidiflora	white-rayed pentachaeta	Asteraceae	annual herb	Mar-May	1B.1	S1	G1
<u>Plagiobothrys</u> <u>chorisianus var.</u> <u>chorisianus</u>	Choris' popcornflower	Boraginaceae	annual herb	Mar-Jun	1B.2	S1	G3T1Q
Polemonium carneum	Oregon polemonium	Polemoniaceae	perennial herb	Apr-Sep	2B.2	S2	G3G4
Ranunculus lobbii	Lobb's aquatic buttercup	Ranunculaceae	annual herb (aquatic)	Feb-May	4.2	S3	G4
Trifolium hydrophilum	saline clover	Fabaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	1B.2	S2	G2
<u>Triphysaria floribunda</u>	San Francisco owl's-clover	Orobanchaceae	annual herb	Apr-Jun	1B.2	S2?	G2?

Suggested Citation

California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program. 2021. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Website http://www.rareplants.cnps.org [accessed 23 February 2021].

Search the Inventory	Information	Contributors
Simple Search	About the Inventory	The Calflora Database
Advanced Search	About the Rare Plant Program	The California Lichen Society
Glossary	CNPS Home Page	California Natural Diversity Database
	About CNPS	The Jepson Flora Project
	Join CNPS	The Consortium of California Herbaria
		CalPhotos

Questions and Comments

rareplants@cnps.org

© Copyright 2010-2018 California Native Plant Society. All rights reserved.



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office Federal Building 2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605 Sacramento, CA 95825-1846 Phone: (916) 414-6600 Fax: (916) 414-6713



In Reply Refer To: Consultation Code: 08ESMF00-2021-SLI-1102 Event Code: 08ESMF00-2021-E-03220 Project Name: 567 Airport Blvd February 23, 2021

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the Service under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Please follow the link below to see if your proposed project has the potential to affect other species or their habitats under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service:

http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/protected_species/species_list/species_lists.html

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to

utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 *et seq*.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan

(http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm; http://www.towerkill.com; and http://www.towe

www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

Official Species List

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Sacramento Fish And Wildlife Office

Federal Building 2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605 Sacramento, CA 95825-1846 (916) 414-6600

Project Summary

Consultation Code:08ESMF00-2021-SLI-1102Event Code:08ESMF00-2021-E-03220Project Name:567 Airport BlvdProject Type:DEVELOPMENTProject Description:Burlingame. 2 acres. Building a 8 story building and parking lotProject Location:Ference 100 are 100

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <u>https://www.google.com/maps/@37.58967455,-122.3400851698749,14z</u>



Counties: San Mateo County, California

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 18 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries¹, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Mammals

NAME	STATUS
Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse <i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/613</u>	Endangered
Birds NAME	STATUS
California Clapper Rail <i>Rallus longirostris obsoletus</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4240</u>	Endangered
California Least Tern <i>Sterna antillarum browni</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8104</u>	Endangered
Marbled Murrelet Brachyramphus marmoratus Population: U.S.A. (CA, OR, WA) There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4467</u>	Threatened
 Western Snowy Plover Charadrius nivosus nivosus Population: Pacific Coast population DPS-U.S.A. (CA, OR, WA), Mexico (within 50 miles of Pacific coast) There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8035</u> 	Threatened

Reptiles

NAME	STATUS
Green Sea Turtle <i>Chelonia mydas</i> Population: East Pacific DPS No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6199</u>	Threatened
San Francisco Garter Snake <i>Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5956</u>	Endangered
Amphibians NAME	STATUS
California Red-legged Frog <i>Rana draytonii</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2891</u>	Threatened
Fishes NAME	STATUS
Delta Smelt <i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/321</u>	Threatened
Insects NAME	STATUS
Bay Checkerspot Butterfly <i>Euphydryas editha bayensis</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2320</u>	Threatened
Mission Blue Butterfly <i>Icaricia icarioides missionensis</i> There is proposed critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6928</u>	Endangered
Myrtle's Silverspot Butterfly <i>Speyeria zerene myrtleae</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6929</u>	Endangered
San Bruno Elfin Butterfly <i>Callophrys mossii bayensis</i> There is proposed critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3394</u>	Endangered

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Fountain Thistle <i>Cirsium fontinale var. fontinale</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7939</u>	Endangered
Marin Dwarf-flax <i>Hesperolinon congestum</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5363</u>	Threatened
San Mateo Thornmint Acanthomintha obovata ssp. duttonii No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2038</u>	Endangered
San Mateo Woolly Sunflower <i>Eriophyllum latilobum</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7791</u>	Endangered
White-rayed Pentachaeta Pentachaeta bellidiflora No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7782</u>	Endangered

Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.



TREE SURVEY REPORT

BURLINGAME BAY 555 & 577 AIRPORT BLVD BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA

Prepared for:

DES Architects + Engineers, Inc. 399 Bradford Street Redwood City, CA 94063

Prepared by:

David L. Babby Registered Consulting Arborist[®] #399 Board-Certified Master Arborist[®] #WE-4001B

January 25, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	TITLE P	<u>AGE</u>
1.0		1
2.0	TREE COUNT AND COMPOSITION	2
3.0	SUITABILITY FOR PRESERVATION	4
4.0	TREE PROTECTION MEASURES	5
4.1	Design Guidelines	5
4.2	Before Demolition, Grading and Construction	7
4.3	During Demolition, Grading and Construction	8
5.0	ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS	11

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT TITLE

- A TREE INVENTORY TABLE (40 sheets)
- B AERIAL MAP (1 sheet)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

DES Architects + Engineers has retained me to prepare this *Tree Survey Report* in connection with developing a new office building and a separate parking garage at 555 and 577 Airport Boulevard, Burlingame. The project is titled Burlingame Bay, and specific tasks assigned to execute are as follows:

- Identify 303 trees with trunk situated within the project site; site visits were performed on 1/10/20, 1/13/20, 1/14/20 and 1/20/20.
- Determine each tree's trunk diameter at 54 inches above grade, rounded to the nearest inch. Trees with more than one diameter listed are formed by multiple trunks or leaders.
- Identify which are defined by Burlingame City Code as protected trees.¹
- Ascertain each tree's health and structural integrity, and assign an overall condition rating (e.g. good, fair, poor or dead).
- Rate each tree's suitability for preservation (e.g. high, moderate or low).
- Document pertinent and observed health, structural and adjacent hardscape issues.
- Assign numbers to the trees, and show each individual or group location on the aerial map in Exhibit B (derived from *Google Earth*, image date 8/9/18).
- Nail round metal tags with corresponding engraved numbers onto accessible trees (includes all but #234, 235, 245-247 and 249).
- Provide general design guidelines and protection measures to help avoid or mitigate impacts to retained trees.
- Prepare a written report that presents the aforementioned information, and submit via email as a PDF document.

¹ Section 11.06.020(f)(1) of the Burlingame City Code defines a protected tree, as it relates to this site, as any species which has a trunk diameter of \geq 15.28 inches measured 54 inches above natural grade.

2.0 TREE COUNT AND COMPOSITION

Three-hundred three (303) trees of 19 various species were inventoried for this report. They are sequentially numbered 1 thru 303, and the table below, and continued on the next page, identifies their names, assigned numbers, counts and overall percentages.

NAME	TREE NUMBER(S)	COUNT	% OF TOTAL
Aleppo pine	27-29, 237, 239, 259, 260, 263-266, 268-273, 275, 278, 294, 297, 300-302	24	8%
Blackwood acacia	1, 3, 4, 57-62, 233, 235, 238, 261, 262, 267, 274, 276, 277, 279, 280	20	7%
Brazilian pepper	213-218	6	2%
Brisbane box	141, 142	2	1%
Cajeput tree	177-180, 191-194	8	3%
Crape myrtle	45-48	4	1%
Evergreen pear	41-44, 49, 50	6	2%
Flaxleaf paperbark	281-293	13	4%
Flowering pear	100, 113-117, 125-127, 130, 137, 138, 145-148, 153, 154, 156-161, 173- 176, 195-198	32	11%
Fremont cottonwood	2, 5-8, 12-16, 18-26, 38, 40, 51-56, 199-212, 219-232, 242-249, 251-257	70	23%
Japanese maple	163-172, 181-190	20	7%
Lombardy poplar	39	1	0%
London plane	9-11, 63-74, 78-99, 101- 112, 118-120, 128, 129, 131-136, 143, 14, 155, 162	64	21%

Table continued:

NAME	TREE NUMBER(S)	COUNT	% OF TOTAL
New Zealand Christmas tree	30-37, 250, 258	10	3%
Nichol's peppermint	296, 298, 299, 303	4	1%
Pacific willow	234, 236, 240, 241	4	1%
Red flowering gum	75-77, 121-124, 139, 140, 149-152	13	4%
Red ironbark	295	1	0%
Southern magnolia	17	1	0%
	Total	303	100%

Specific information regarding each tree is presented within the table in Exhibit A, and the trees' numbers and approximate locations (or group locations) can be viewed on the aerial map in Exhibit B.

As illustrated in the table, the property is populated predominantly by Fremont cottonwood and London planes, followed by flowering pears, Aleppo pines and blackwood acacias.

The following 104 trees are defined by the Burlingame City Code as protected: #1, 3, 5, 6, 12-15, 19, 23, 24, 27-29, 38-40, 51-53, 55-57, 62, 155, 162, 170, 177-180, 191-193, 199-212, 215, 216, 219-229, 231, 232, 234, 236-240, 245, 246, 248, 252, 253, 255-257, 262, 265, 266, 270-275, 277, 278, 281, 283-293, 295, 297 and 300-302.

The trees' general locations are as follows:

- Within the parking lot: #1-29, 57-154, 279 and 302.
- Around the 577 building: #30-56.
- Around the 555 building: #155-232.
- Along or near the lagoon: #233-278 and 280-294.
- At the property's southwest section: #295-301 and 303.

3.0 SUITABILITY FOR TREE PRESERVATION

Each tree has been assigned either a "high," "moderate" or "low" suitability for preservation rating as a means to cumulatively measure its existing health; structural integrity; anticipated life span; remaining life expectancy; prognosis; location; size; particular species; tolerance to construction impacts; growing space; and safety to property and persons within striking distance. Descriptions of these ratings are presented below; the high category being comprised of no trees (0%), the moderate category 162 (or 53%), and the low category 141 (or 47%).

High: Applies to none.

These trees appear relatively healthy and structurally stable; have no apparent, significant health issues or structural defects; present a high potential for contributing long-term to the site; and seemingly require only periodic or regular care and monitoring to maintain their longevity and structural integrity.

Moderate: Applies to #11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 39-49, 64-67, 69, 72, 73, 75, 76, 83-85, 100, 104, 111, 113, 115, 117, 122, 125-127, 130, 138, 145-148, 152, 154-176, 178-200, 204, 205, 211-224, 226, 228, 229, 231, 232, 235, 242-246, 248, 249, 251-259, 261-263, 265, 267-273, 275, 278, 280-286, 288-293, 295, 294 and 301.

These trees contribute to the site, but at levels less than those assigned a high suitability; might have health and/or structural issues which may or may not be reasonably addressed and properly mitigated; and frequent care is typically required for their remaining lifespan.

Low: Applies to #1-10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20-28, 31, 33, 36-38, 50-63, 68, 70, 71, 74, 77-82, 86-99, 101-103, 105-110, 112, 114, 116, 118-121, 123, 124, 128, 129, 131-137, 139-144, 149-151, 153, 177, 201-203, 206-210, 225, 227, 230, 233, 234, 236-241, 247, 250, 260, 264, 266, 274, 276, 277, 279, 287, 294, 296, 298-300, 302 and 303.

These trees have significant health and/or structural issues expected to worsen regardless of tree care measures employed (i.e. beyond likely recovery). As a general guideline, they are not suitable for incorporating into the future landscape, and any which are retained require highly frequent monitoring and care throughout their remaining lifespans to minimize risk to any persons or property within striking distance (current and/or future). Note that #15, 17, 31, 140, 150, 233, 234 and 236 are dead or nearly dead.

4.0 TREE PROTECTION MEASURES

Recommendations presented within this section serve as measures to help mitigate or avoid impacts to trees being retained, and should be carefully followed throughout the entire demolition and construction process. They are subject to change upon reviewing future project plans, and I (hereinafter, "project arborist") should be consulted in the event any cannot be feasibly implemented.

4.1 Design Guidelines

- 1. A Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) is necessary to restrict or confine the following activities to help achieve a reasonable assurance of a tree's vigor, longevity and anchoring capacity: trenching, soil scraping, compaction, mass and finish-grading, overexcavation, subexcavation, tilling, ripping, swales, bioswales, storm drains, dissipaters, equipment cleaning, removal of underground utilities and vaults, altering existing water/drainage flows, stockpiling and dumping of materials, and equipment and vehicle operation. For general design purposes, the TPZ of a particular tree should be a minimum distance from its trunk of 7 to 10 times its trunk diameter in all directions away from existing foundations, tall retaining/planter walls, and streets (strive towards 10 times the diameter, and/or, beyond the actual canopy); for trees with multiple trunks, utilize the largest diameter. In the event an impact encroaches slightly within a setback, it can be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the project arborist to determine whether measures can sufficiently mitigate the impacts to less-than-significant levels.
- 2. All site-related plans should contain notes referencing this report for tree protection measures.
- 3. Abandon all existing, unused lines or pipes within a TPZ, and any above-ground section should be cut off at existing soil grade (rather than being dug up and causing subsequent root damage); this provision should be specified on the demolition plan.

- 4. Design and route future utilities, irrigation, storm drains, dissipaters, bioswales (or other bioretention device/structure) and swales beyond TPZs. Dictated by the proximity to tree trunks, an alternative installation method may be warranted, such as hand-digging, a pneumatic air device (such as an Air-Spade[®]), or directional boring. For directional-boring, the ground above any tunnel must remain undisturbed, and access pits and any infrastructure (e.g. splice boxes, meters and vaults) established beyond TPZs.
- 5. Where within 10 feet from TPZ, confine grading (cut and fill), overexcavation, subexcavation, trenching, compaction, and other ground disturbance to within 12 to 24 inches from any foundation, footing, curb, gutter, pavement, drive or retaining wall.
- 6. Any wall constructed beneath a canopy for the purposes of retaining fill away from a TPZ should be, preferably, established on top of existing soil grade with no footing (e.g. drystack), or alternatively, using a pier and above-grade beam foundation, where the piers are minimized in diameter, spaced as far apart as possible, and the beams or spans between the piers established on top or above existing soil grade (i.e. a no-dig design except vertically for the piers). The ground beneath the beams or wall must not be compacted or dug.
- Structures should consider avoiding the need to remove large limbs (e.g. >3" in diameter) or sections of canopies contributing to a tree's overall form, including to erect construction scaffolding or needing manlifts.
- 8. The future staging area and route(s) of access should be routed beyond canopies and unpaved areas of TPZs.
- Avoid specifying the use of herbicides use within a TPZ; where used on site, they should be labeled for safe use near trees. Also avoid prescribing liming within 50 feet of a tree.
- 10. Erosion control should consider that any straw wattle or fiber rolls require no more than a 2-inch deep, vertical soil cut for their embedment, and are established as close to canopy edges as possible (and not against a tree's trunk).

- 11. The landscape design should conform to the following additional guidelines:
 - a. Large growing trees, such as those that can exceed the height of retained trees, should be installed beyond TPZs, and be at least 10 to 15 feet from a future foundation, wall and hardscape.
 - b. Plant material installed beneath tree canopies should be at least 24 to 36 inches from their trunks.
 - c. Irrigation and lighting features (e.g. main line, lateral lines, valve boxes, wiring and controllers) should be established so that no trenching occurs within a TPZ. In the event this is not feasible, they may require being installed in a radial direction to a tree's trunk, and terminate a specific distance from a trunk (versus crossing past it).
 - d. Ground cover beneath canopies should consist of a 3-inch layer of coarse wood chips or other high-quality mulch (avoid gorilla hair, rock, stone, gravel, black plastic or other synthetic ground cover). Keep mulch off the trees' trunks.
 - e. New fence posts (posts) should be placed at least 5 feet from a tree's trunk (depends on trunk size and growth pattern); the post layout should be guided by where large roots are likely located, which can be predetermined using a bully probe (or similar), and collaborating with the project arborist.
 - f. Tilling, ripping and compaction within TPZs should be avoided.
 - g. Bender board or other edging material proposed beneath the canopies should be established on top of existing soil grade (such as by using vertical stakes).

4.2 Before Demolition, Grading and Construction

- 12. Pruning for any retained tall or large tree is needed, and should only be performed in accordance with the most recent ANSI A300 standards, and by a California licensed and bonded tree-service contractor (D-49) which has an ISA certified arborist in a supervisory role and carries General Liability and Worker's Compensation insurance. Also, the rubber wire cable within #187's canopy should be removed.
- 13. Where feasible, manually spread a 4- to 5-inch layer of coarse wood chips, ¹/₄- to ³/₄- inch in size, over exposed ground beneath canopies; the type and source of these wood chips should be from a professional and licensed tree service, and absent of Sudden Oak Death infection (or the possibility thereof). The chips should not be piled against the trunks, and any existing leaf litter should remain in place and the chips spread on top.

- 14. Where within a TPZ, the removal of plant material and groundcover must be manually performed versus using heavy equipment operating and traveling on unpaved ground. Additionally, the removal of stumps shall only be performed using a stump grinder (versus excavating into the ground and inadvertently damaging roots).
- 15. Begin applying supplemental irrigation during the dry months of the year (e.g. May thru October), at a rate of approximately 10 gallons per inch of trunk diameter every two to three weeks via flooding the inside of a 12-inch tall berm established around the canopy perimeters (or as close to the perimeters as possible). Alternatives include using soaker hoses or through deep-root injection. Note, ultimately, the methodology, amount and frequency of irrigation can be best outlined closer to construction commencing, and any applicable dewatering may require a more intensive supplemental watering program than otherwise needed.
- 16. Install tree protection fencing prior to demolition or other site work for the purpose of restricting access into unpaved sections of ground within a TPZ. Fencing does not need to enclose any pavement remaining within a TPZ (in effect, the pavement allows access within a TPZ, while serving as a superior root zone buffer). Fencing should consist of 5- to 6-foot tall chain link mounted on 2-inch diameter steel posts, which are driven into the ground for vertical alignment. Fencing shall remain in place throughout site development, and will need to be installed, as needed, in various phases (e.g. demolition is phase 1, grading and construction phase 2). Also, note that removing hardscape within a TPZ may trigger fencing being modified to capture the newly exposed area.

4.3 During Demolition, Grading and Construction

- 17. Take great care during demolition of existing pavement and other features to avoid damaging a tree's trunk, crown and roots within a TPZ.
- 18. Great care must also be taken by equipment operators to position their equipment to avoid trunks and branches, including the scorching of foliage. Any tree damage or injury should be reported to the project arborist for review of treatment.
- 19. Avoid using the trees' trunks as winch supports for moving or lifting heavy loads.

- 20. Removing existing hardscape (including curbs and gutters) within a TPZ should be carefully performed to avoid excavating roots and soil during the process, and removal of base material shall be performed under direction of the project arborist (and where necessary, shall remain in place and utilized as future base course).
- 21. Any authorized access, digging or trenching within designated-fenced areas shall be foot-traffic only and manually performed without using heavy equipment or tractors.
- 22. Avoid damaging or cutting roots with diameters ≥2 inches without prior assessment by the project arborist. Should roots of this size become encountered, within one hour of exposure, either bury them with soil or wrap in moistened burlap, to remain continually moist until ultimately covered by soil. If approved for cutting, cleanly severe at 90° to the angle of root growth against the cut line (using loppers or a sharp hand saw), and then immediately after, bury the cut end with soil or cover with a plastic sandwich bag (and secured using a rubber band, and removed just before backfilling). Roots encountered with diameters less than 2 inches and require removal can be cleanly severed, using a new handsaw or loppers, at 90° to the direction of root growth.
- Spoils created during digging shall not be piled or spread on unpaved ground within a TPZ. If essential, temporarily pile spoils on plywood or a tarp.
- 24. New irrigation and lighting features (e.g. main line, laterals, valve boxes, wiring and controllers) should be established so that no trenching occurs within a TPZ. In the event this is not feasible, the trenches may require being installed in a radial direction to a tree's trunk, and terminate a specific distance from a trunk (versus crossing past it). The use of a pneumatic air device (such as an Air-Spade[®]) may be needed to avoid root damage. Additionally, any Netafim tubing used should be placed on grade, and header lines installed as mentioned above. All routes within or near a TPZ shall be reviewed with the project arborist several weeks/months prior to installation.
- 25. Digging holes for any new fence within a TPZ shall be manually performed, and in the event a root of ≥ 2 inches in diameter is encountered during the process, the hole should be shifted over by 12 inches and the process repeated.

- 26. Dust accumulating on trunks and canopies during dry weather periods should be periodically washed away (e.g. every three to four months).
- 27. Avoid disposing harmful products (such as cement, paint, chemicals, oil and gasoline) beneath canopies or anywhere on site that allows drainage within or near TPZs. Herbicides should not be used with a TPZ; where used on site, they should be labeled for safe use near trees.
- 28. Fertilization may benefit a tree's health, vigor and appearance. If applied, however, soil samples should first be obtained to identify the pH levels and nutrient levels so a proper fertilization program can be established. I further recommend any fertilization is performed under the direction and supervision of a certified arborist, and in accordance with the most recent ANSI A300 standards.

5.0 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

- All information presented herein covers only the inventoried trees, and reflects their size, condition, and areas visible from the ground and project site on 1/10/20, 1/13/20, 1/14/20 and 1/20/20.
- Condition and suitability ratings of dormant trees are subject to change once they can be observed following regrowth of leaves.
- My observations were performed visually without probing, coring, dissecting or excavating.
- The assignment pertains solely to trees listed in Exhibit A. I hold no opinion towards other trees on or surrounding the project area.
- I cannot provide a guarantee or warranty, expressed or implied, that deficiencies or problems of any trees or property in question may not arise in the future.
- No assurance can be offered that if all my recommendations and precautionary measures (verbal or in writing) are accepted and followed, that the desired results may be achieved.
- I cannot guarantee or be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- I assume no responsibility for the means and methods used by any person or company implementing the recommendations provided in this report.
- The information provided herein represents my opinion. Accordingly, my fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified finding, conclusion or value.
- Numbers, individual and group, shown on the aerial map in Exhibit B are solely intended to roughly approximate a tree's location and should not be considered surveyed points.
- This report is proprietary to me and may not be copied or reproduced in whole or part without prior written consent. It has been prepared for the sole and exclusive use of the parties to who submitted for the purpose of contracting services provided by David L. Babby.
- If any part of this report or copy thereof be lost or altered, the entire evaluation shall be invalid.

L.h

Prepared By:

David L. Babby Registered Consulting Arborist[®] #399 Board-Certified Master Arborist[®] #WE-4001B CA Licensed Tree Service Contractor #796763 (C61/D49)

Date: January 25, 2020



EXHIBIT A:

TREE INVENTORY TABLE

(40 sheets)



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
1	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	21, 12, 11	60%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Appears to be on bifurcates at 2' hi throughout. Sma	or immediately igh, and weak at all girdling roots.	adjacent to prop tachment exists b	erty line (pendin between 12" and	g survey). Trunl 11" stems. Dead	k lwood
2	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	11	50%	40%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Deadwood throu	ghout. Excessiv	e limb weight. I	vy within driplin	e and along trun	k.
3	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	10, 8, 7	60%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Three trunks orig Ivy within driplin	ginate at grade.	The 10" and 7" o	nes form a weak	attachment. De	adwood.
4	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	8	40%	40%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Crowded conditions site. Ivy with along trunk at 5'	ons form a one-s nin dripline. Stu high.	ided canopy. Di mp from prior tro	eback at top. Le unk is decayed a	eans towards neig t base. Large pri	ghbor- ior cut
5	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	23	30%	40%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Massive limb sus weight and deady	spended in lower wood throughout	canopy overhan t. Ivy along trun	ging the drive ai k and dripline.	sle. Excessive li	imb
6	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	22	30%	40%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Downslope and s Deadwood throu	sweeping away f ghout. Ivy withi	rom #5 towards 1 n dripline.	neighboring lot.	One-sided canop	py.
7	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	9	30%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Large decaying v Deadwood throu	vound along low ghout. Near top	er trunk. Has a j of slope.	pronounced lean	s beginning at 4'	high.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
8	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	14	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	At top of steep sl	ope. Deadwood	throughout.			
9	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	30%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Pronounced arch and dead ivy ster	and easterly learns along lower to	n. Multi-leader o runk.	crown. Extreme	ly sparse canopy	. Old
10	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	60%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Top sweeps east leader. Limb str	and canopy is m ucture begins at :	ostly one-sided. 5' high.	Large wound al	ong topside of ce	entral
11	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6, 4	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Limb structure b	egins at 4' high.	Low crown and	asymmetrical ca	nopy.	
12	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	18	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Has a slight easte	erly lean. Ivy alo	ong trunk and dri	pline. Deadwoo	od.	
13	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	16	40%	50%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Ivy	along trunk and	dripline.			
14	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	16	50%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Ivy along trunk a	nd dripline. Tru	ink surrounded b	y shrubs. Slight	NE lean. Deadw	wood.
15	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	16	0%	0%	Dead	Low	Х
	Comments:	Roughly 90% de	ad, and for all pr	actical purposes,	consider dead.	Extensive root d	ecay,

and should be removed immediately.



		0175		CONDITION					
		SIZE		CONDITION					
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree		
16	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	14	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate			
	Comments:	Has a slight NE l	ean. Asymmetri	ical canopy with	excessive limb v	weight and deady	wood.		
17	Southern magnolia (Magnolia grandiflora)	7	0%	0%	Dead	Low			
Comments: Dead. Remove asap.									
18	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	12	60%	30%	Poor	Low			
	Comments:	Has a massive gi dead limb overha	rdling root, and a angs parking lot.	a surfaced buttres Leans south into	ss root is decayed o site. Asymmet	d. Deadwood, in rical canopy.	ncluding		
19	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	18	40%	60%	Poor	Moderate	X		
	Comments:	Leans east. Deca	ayed surface root	ts throughout pla	nter. Deadwood				
20	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	6	60%	30%	Poor	Low			
	Comments:	Deadwood and c	rowded condition	ns. Trunk grows	through chain li	nk fence.			
21	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	7	60%	30%	Poor	Low			
	Comments:	Deadwood and c	rowded condition	ns. Trunk grows	through chain li	ink fence.			
22	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	4	50%	20%	Poor	Low			
	Comments:	Thin canopy. Ro	ot crown covered	d by ivy. Sweeps	away & underst	ory to dominant	poplars.		
23	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	19	30%	30%	Poor	Low	X		

Comments: Deadwood. Slight SE lean. Advanced decline.



		SIZE		CONDITION							
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree				
24	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	16	30%	30%	Poor	Low	x				
	Comments: Slight NE lean. Deadwood. Small girdling root. Adjacent to retaining wall.										
25	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	12	30%	30%	Poor	Low					
Comments: Deadwood. Small girdling root. Adjacent to retaining wall. Sinuous form.											
26	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	<15	30%	10%	Poor	Low					
	Comments:	Large decaying v creates a safety t	wound or canker hreat. Adjacent	at base, and a ho to retaining wall.	llow opposite le Leans SE.	an. Extensive de	ecay				
27	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	25	60%	30%	Poor	Low	Х				
	Comments:	Grows away fror	n adjacent pine #	28. Asymmetric	cal form. Adjace	ent to retaining w	vall.				
28	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	31	70%	20%	Poor	Low	Х				
	Comments:	Crowded conditi weak attachment	ons between #27 Also weak atta	and 29. Two le chments with lir	aders originate a nbs above. Low	t 4.5' high and fo er stem leans. G	orm a alls.				
29	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	25	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	Х				
	Comments:	Adjacent to #28.	Trunk bifurcate	s at 4' high and l	eans SE. Multi-	leader structure.					
30	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	8	80%	70%	Good	Moderate	1.				

Comments: Within circular planter covered by grates. Trunk has grown slightly over grate. Multileaders originate at 5.5' high. In front of 577 building.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
31	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	3	10%	0%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	In front of 577 be and should be reasupports the tree	uilding. Within moved asap; it has s entire weight.	circular planter c as uprooted and l	overed by grates eans against grat	Tree is nearly te, which seemin	dead agly
32	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	5	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	In front of 577 b	uilding. Within	circular planter c	overed by grates	5.	
33	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	4	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	In front of 577 be and deadwood.	uilding. Within	circular planter c	overed by grates	. Leans east. D	ieback
34	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	6	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	In front of 577 b Multiple leaders	uilding. Within originate at 6' hi	circular planter c gh.	overed by grates	s. Asymmetrical	canopy.
35	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	5	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	In front of 577 b Asymmetrical ca	uilding. Within nopy. Multiple	circular planter c leaders originate	overed by grates at 6.5' high.	s. Slight NW lea	n.
36	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	6	60%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	In front of 577 b originate at 7' hig	uilding. Within gh. Swelling aro	circular planter c und large old wo	overed by grates ound at 4' high. S	. Multiple leade Slight NW lean.	ers
37	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	7	60%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	In front of 577 bioriginate at 6' hig	uilding. Within gh. Leans north.	circular planter c Swelling around	overed by grates d old wound at 4	. Multiple leade	ers



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
38	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	28	40%	40%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Crowded conditi Significantly pru	ons. Entire tree ined in past.	leans north away	r from adjacent b	ouilding. Deadw	ood.
39	Lombardy poplar (<i>Populus n</i> . 'Italica')	16	60%	70%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Vertical form ne	ar building. Dea	dwood.			
40	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	32	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Adjacent walk is surfaced roots al	cracked, and moong walk. Large	ounds from roots canker along on	have formed in he limb. Girdling	lot. Some decay g roots. Deadwo	ing od.
41	Evergreen pear (Pyrus kawakamii)	8	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Asymmetry	ical canopy.			
42	Evergreen pear (Pyrus kawakamii)	8	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Asymmetry	ical canopy. Poc	or lateral root dev	velopment.	
43	Evergreen pear (Pyrus kawakamii)	5	50%	30%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling. Asymmetr	ical canopy.			
44	Evergreen pear (Pyrus kawakamii)	9	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling. Asymmetr	ical canopy. His	tory of limb fail	ure. Low crown.	
45	Crape myrtle (Lagerstroemia indica)	4	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	

Comments: Grows against edge of #44's canopy. Within a circular planter covered by grates.



		SIZE		CONDITION						
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree			
46	Crape myrtle (Lagerstroemia indica)	5	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate				
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter covered	by grates.						
47	Crape myrtle (Lagerstroemia indica)	11	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate				
Comments: Within a circular planter covered by grates. Old wound below union of multiple leaders at 5' high.										
48	Crape myrtle (Lagerstroemia indica)	5	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate				
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter covered	by grates. Burie	ed root collar.					
49	Evergreen pear (Pyrus kawakamii)	8	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate				
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling.							
50	Evergreen pear (Pyrus kawakamii)	7	50%	30%	Poor	Low				
	Comments:	Adjacent to build lean away from a	ling. History of adjacent building	limb failure, part . Vertical form.	icularly over dri	ve aisle. Pronou	inced			
51	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	21	30%	30%	Poor	Low	Х			
	Comments:	Adjacent to and I High canopy and	leans away from top heavy.	building. Small	girdling root. E	xtremely thin ca	nopy.			
52	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	26	30%	20%	Poor	Low	Х			
	Comments:	Pronounced lean top heavy.	away from adja	cent building. Ex	xtremely thin car	nopy. High cano	py and			



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
53	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	27	30%	20%	Poor	Low	Х

Comments: Has a large basal canker with extensive decay. Leans east. Buttress root alongside walk. Small girdling roots. High canopy and top heavy.

	Fremont cottonwood						
54	(Populus fremontii)	12	30%	30%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Leans east. Basal canker. Crowded conditions amongst surrounding cottonwoods.

Deadwood. High canopy and top heavy.

	Fremont cottonwood	01	200/	••••	P	T	
55	(Populus fremontii)	21	20%	20%	Poor	Low	Х

Comments: Pronounced SE lean. Girdling roots. Basal canker. Deadwood. High canopy and top heavy.

	Fremont cottonwood						
56	(Populus fremontii)	29	40%	40%	Poor	Low	Х

Comments: Leans SE, and opposite lean is a mound, indicating it likely partially uprooted in past.

Girdling roots. Deadwood. Thin canopy. Adjacent walkway raised in past (repaired now). High canopy and top heavy.

	Blackwood acacia						
57	(Acacia melanoxylon)	16	20%	20%	Poor	Low	Х

Comments: Advanced decline with at least 50% of canopy being dead. Surface roots. Deadwood.

	Blackwood acacia						
58	(Acacia melanoxylon)	11	30%	20%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Advanced decline. Mounds in lot from roots. Within a circular planter, and surrounding curb is cracked and raised.

	Blackwood acacia						
59	(Acacia melanoxylon)	8	40%	30%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Pronounced lean away from #58. Within a circular planter and surrounding curb is cracked and raised.



		SIZE		CONDITION					
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree		
60	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	10	30%	20%	Poor	Low			
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter and mos	st roots are surfac	ced. Appears to	have partially up	prooted.		
61	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	12	30%	30%	Poor	Low			
Comments: High crown. Adjacent curb is cracked and raised. Girdling roots. Within a finger planter. Declined.									
62	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	28	30%	10%	Poor	Low	Х		
	Comments:	Adjacent curb is advanced level o development. M in lot from roots.	cracked and rais f internal decay. ultiple leaders of	ed. Fungal body Asymmetrical, ¹ riginate at 5.5' hi	r (Ganoderma) at broad canopy. F gh forming a we	t base, indicating oor lateral root ak attachment.	; an Mounds		
63	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	<15	40%	30%	Poor	Low			
	Comments:	Entire tree leans in past. Deadwo	and there is a sho od and leggy cro	ort mound oppos own.	ite lean due to h	aving partially u	prooted		
64	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	<15	40%	50%	Fair	Moderate			
	Comments:	Thin, asymmetrie	cal canopy with	deadwood. Sligh	nt lean. Limb str	ructure begins at	4' high.		
65	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	11	50%	60%	Fair	Moderate			
	Comments:	Slight lean. Sma	ll girdling root.						
66	London plane tree (Platanus × hispanica)	10	40%	50%	Poor	Moderate			
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr	own. Limb strue	cture begins at 4'	high. Slight lea	n.			



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
67	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	10	50%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr	own and a mostl	y one-sided canc	py. Leans.		
68	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr this site) over ad	own which swee jacent parking sp	ps downward (li baces.	ke a large numbe	er of London pla	nes at
69	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	8	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter. Sinuou	s crown and asyn	mmetrical canop	y.	
70	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown and	d thin canopy. D	eadwood.			
71	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	40%	40%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter. Leggy	crown.			
72	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	9	70%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	At light pole.					
73	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	9	50%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Sinuous crown a	nd low limb stru	cture. Low cano	py with deadwo	od.	
74	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	40%	40%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Leggy asymmetrical crown. Thin canopy. Slight lean.



		SIZE		CONDITION				
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree	
75	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	8	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate		
	Comments:	Pronounced lean		I				
76	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	13	80%	60%	Fair	Moderate		
	Comments: Deadwood along bottom of canopy. Bleeding at union of leaders. Excessive branch weight. Girdling root.							
77	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	12	70%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Pronounced lean tree partially upr	with surfaced be ooted in the past	uttress roots oppo	osite the lean, po	tentially indicati	ng the	
78	London plane tree (Platanus × hispanica)	8	50%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Leggy and asymptotic	metrical crown.					
79	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	60%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Leggy and asymptotic	metrical crown.	Leans. Girdling	root.			
80	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	4	30%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Leggy crown.						
81	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	40%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Low canopy over	r parking space.	Leggy crown w	ith excessive lim	b weight.		
82	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	50%	40%	Poor	Low		

Comments: Low canopy and leggy crown.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
83	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
<u> </u>	Comments:	Somewhat asym	metrical canopy.				
84	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr	own sweeping av	way from #83.			
85	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Leggy crown.					
86	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	50%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	One-sided, asym	metrical crown.	Watersprouts alo	ong lower trunk.		
87	London plane tree (<i>Platanus</i> × <i>hispanica</i>)	5	40%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown. L	ow canopy over	parking space. V	Watersprouts alor	ng lower trunk.	
88	London plane tree (<i>Platanus</i> × <i>hispanica</i>)	6	50%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy asymmetr	ical crown. Lim	b structure begin	is at 4.5' high.		
89	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	50%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown.					
90	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	30%	20%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Asymmetrical, leggy crown with deadwood.



		SIZE		CONDITION				
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree	
91	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	30%	40%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	High root crown	due to being pla	nted too high. L	eggy main leade	r. Deadwood.		
92	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	50%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments: Leggy, one-sided crown. Root crown exposed from soil erosion. Watersprouts along lower trunk.							
93	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	50%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Squat form with	a sinuous crown	and low canopy	Deadwood.			
94	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Squat form due t	o top breaking y	ears ago.				
95	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	40%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Leggy and asym	metrical, one-sid	ed crown. Limb	structure begins	at 4.5' high.		
96	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	30%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Leggy asymmetr	ical crown with	deadwood.				
97	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	50%	40%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr	own. Leans.					
98	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	40%	30%	Poor	Low		

Comments: Asymmetrical crown with deadwood. Leans. Limb structure begins at 4.5' high.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
99	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	40%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy form and indicating the tre	a one-sided cance the likely partially	py. Leans, and l uprooted in past	outtress root opp	osite lean are su	faced,
100	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	8	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
Comments: Fireblight infection. Squat form. Adjacent curb is separated, perhaps from roots.							
101	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	50%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical le revealing tree pa	ggy crown. Lear rtially uprooted s	ns, and buttress of sometime ago.	pposite lean is s	urfaced, potentia	lly
102	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy and asym	metrical crown.	Plants cover sec	tion of trunk's ba	ise.	
103	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	50%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy and asymptotic	metrical crown.	Limb structure b	egins at 4' high.		
104	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	13	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Low canopy over	r lot. Asymmetr	ical crown. Adja	acent to light pol	e.	
105	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	4	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within circular p	lanter. Asymme	etrical crown. Sc	oil eroding from	beneath root area	a. Leans.
106	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	4	40%	30%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Within circular planter. Leans. Leggy and asymmetrical crown.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
107	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	4	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within circular p	olanter. Leans. A	Asymmetrical cro	own.		
108	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	4	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within circular p	olanter. Leggy ar	nd asymmetrical	crown. Pronour	nced lean.	
109	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical an	nd leggy crown.	Leans.			
110	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Low canopy over	r parking space.	Asymmetrical c	rown.		
111	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	50%	70%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Ok structure and	form.				
112	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	8	50%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr	own. Leans.				
113	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	8	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr	own. Squat forn	n. Fireblight. Lo	ow canopy over j	parking spaces.	Leans.
114	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	7	40%	30%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Mostly one-sided canopy. Leans. Low canopy over drive aisle. Fireblight and deadwood.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
115	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	7	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Mostly one-sided Large wounds ale	l canopy. Slight ong lower trunk.	lean. Fireblight	. History of limb	o failure. Deadw	vood.
116	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	7	60%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leans. Mostly o	ne-sided canopy	. Buried root col	llar.		
117	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	9	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Leans. Canopy r	educed in past. N	Mounds in lot fro	om roots. Adjace	ent curb is cracke	ed.
118	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leans. Within ci	ircular planter. I	Leggy crown and	low canopy. Ex	cessive branch v	weight.
119	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	40%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leans. Within ci	ircular planter. I	Leggy crown.			
120	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within circular p sweeping downw	lanter. Pronound ard.	ced lean. Asymr	netrical and legg	y crown. Sinuo	us crown
121	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	5	30%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within circular p with deadwood.	lanter. Leans. V	Wound along trui	nk. Crown swee	ps downward. D	Declining
122	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	6	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	

Comments: Within circular planter. Very low canopy.

Project: Burlingame Bay, Burlingame Prepared for: DES Architects + Engineers, Inc. Prepared by: David L. Babby



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
123	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	8	50%	40%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr Low canopy ove	own. Within cir r parking space.	cular planter. M	ounds in lot fron	n roots. Deadwo	od.
124	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	5	30%	20%	Poor	Low	
Comments: Within circular planter. Significant decline with deadwood. Asymmetrical, mostly one- sided canopy.							y one-
125	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	11	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Fireblight. Weal	k attachments be	tween leaders. F	Reduction cuts m	ade within lower	crown.
126	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Fireblight. Small	girdling root. R	eduction cuts m	ade in lower crov	wn.	
127	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	11	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Fireblight.					
128	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	7	50%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Limb structure b	egins at 4' high.	Asymmetrical, r	nostly one-sided	canopy.	
129	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	30%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown. D	eadwood.				
130	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	9	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	

Comments: Fireblight.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
131	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	4	20%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown.		- / *	-		I
132	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	30%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown. So	ection of trunk's	base covered by	plants.		
133	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	6	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown. So	ection of root col	llar covered by p	lants.		
134	London plane tree (<i>Platanus</i> × <i>hispanica</i>)	6	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Low canopy. Le	eggy crown. Sec	tion of trunk's ba	se covered by pl	ants. Girdling ro	oots.
135	London plane tree (<i>Platanus</i> × <i>hispanica</i>)	5	40%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown. L	eans.				
136	London plane tree (<i>Platanus</i> × <i>hispanica</i>)	6	40%	10%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Leggy crown. H begins at 4.5' hig	as a pronounced h.	lean, and tree pa	rtially uprooted	in past. Limb st	ructure
137	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	9	60%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within a large pl	anter. Adjacent	curb is cracked a	nd raised. Fireb	olight.	
138	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	7 Firshlight With	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	

Project: Burlingame Bay, Burlingame Prepared for: DES Architects + Engineers, Inc. Prepared by: David L. Babby



		SIZE		CONDITION				
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree	
139	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	8	60%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Pronounced lean	. Within a circul	ar planter. Low	canopy.			
140	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	6	10%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments: Within a circular planter. Low canopy. Nearly dead and should be removed. Leans. Deadwood.							
141	Brisbane box (Lophostemon confertus)	4	30%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter. Leans.	Deadwood. Leg	ggy crown.			
142	Brisbane box (Lophostemon confertus)	4	30%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Pronounced lean	. Within a circul	ar planter. Dead	lwood.			
143	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	4	30%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter. Leggy	and asymmetrica	al crown.			
144	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	5	40%	30%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Within a circular at 4' high. Leans	planter. Very lo s.	ow crown sweepi	ng downward.	Limb structure be	egins at	
145	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	9	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate		
	Comments:	Fireblight.						
146	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	8	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate		

Comments:

Project: Burlingame Bay, Burlingame Prepared for: DES Architects + Engineers, Inc. Prepared by: David L. Babby



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
147	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	8	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical cr	own. Fireblight.				
148	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	8	60%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Fireblight. Cano	py reduced in pa	ist.			
149	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	6	10%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within a circular	planter. Advan	ced decline with	deadwood.		
150	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	3	0%	0%	Dead	Low	
	Comments:	Dead and should	be removed asa	p. Within a circu	ılar planter.		
151	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	9	40%	40%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Two bleeding les Mounds in lot fro	tions along lowe om roots. Leans	r trunk, likely we Asymmetrical	etwood. Within a canopy with dea	a circular planter dwood.	
152	Red flowering gum (Corymbia ficifolia)	9	40%	50%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Within a circular weight. Low sui	planter. Leans. tability should it	Sparse and low continue to decl	canopy with dea	dwood. Excessi	ve limb
153	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	6	60%	30%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Within a large pl	anter. Canopy r	educed in past. I	Fireblight.		
154	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	8	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	

Comments: Within a large planter. Fireblight. Low canopy over parking lot.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
155	London plane tree (<i>Platanus × hispanica</i>)	18	60%	70%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Has an old trunk	wound. Genera	lly good conditio	on relative to all	other London pla	ines.
156	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Partial girdling r	oots.				
157	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	11	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:						
158	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:						
159	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Leans.					
160	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Fireblight.					
161	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Fireblight.					
162	London plane tree (<i>Platanus</i> \times <i>hispanica</i>)	18	60%	80%	Fair	Moderate	x

Comments: Generally good condition relative to all other London planes.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
163	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	4, 3, 3, 2	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Elevated canopy, staked. Asymme	, as for all Japan etrical canopy. N	ese maples listed Aulti-leader.	below. In front	of building. Sin	gle-
164	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	3(4), 2, 2	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	In front of building	ng. Multi-leader	r.			
165	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	6(4), 5, 1	70%	30%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	In front of building	ng. Multi-leader	r.			
166	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	6, 6, 5, 5	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	In front of building	ng. Multi-leader	r.			
167	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	6, 5, 4, 2	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	In front of building	ng. Multi-leader	r.			
168	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	4, 3, 2, 2, 1	70%	30%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical ca	nopy. Multi-lea	der. In front of b	building.		
169	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	10, 4	70%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Multi-leader. In	front of building	<u> </u>			
170	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	5, 5, 4, 4, 3(3), 2, 1	70%	30%	Fair	Moderate	Х

Comments: Multi-trunk. In front of building.

Project: Burlingame Bay, Burlingame Prepared for: DES Architects + Engineers, Inc. Prepared by: David L. Babby



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
171	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	6, 5, 4	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Multi-leader. In	front of building	•			
172	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	5, 4, 3(3)	70%	30%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments: Asymmetrical canopy. Multi-leader. In front of building.						
173	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	7	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical an	nd leggy crown.	Low canopy ove	r parking space.	Fireblight.	
174	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	70%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Alongside buildi	ng. Fireblight.				
175	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	10	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Alongside buildi	ng. Fireblight.				
176	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	11	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Alongside buildi	ng. Fireblight.				
177	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	8, 8, 7, 4	40%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Four trunks. Spa	arse canopy. Par	tial girdling roots	s. Decaying can	ker wound at bas	se
178	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	15, 9, 7	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	X

Comments: Three trunks. Decaying hollow at base of largest trunk.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
179	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	10, 7, 7, 5, 3	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Five trunks. Low	w canopy over w	alk.			
180	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	12, 8, 8	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	The two 8" meas leaning towards	surements repress walkway, or the	ent a single trunk very least, a lead	. Deadwood. R er from it.	emove the trunk	
181	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	7	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Trunk bifu	rcates at 11" higl	h.		
182	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	9	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Trunk bifu	rcates at 12" higl	h. Multi-leader.		
183	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	9	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Trunk bifu	rcates at 12" higl	h. Multi-leader.		
184	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	9	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Trunk bifu	rcates at 14" higl	h. Multi-leader.		
185	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	5	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build edge of #184's ca	ling. Trunk bifu anopy.	rcates at 8" high.	Multi-leader.	Crowded condition	ons, at
186	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	6	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Trunk bifu	rcates with a wea	ak attachment at	9" high into mul	tiple

leaders. Asymmetrical canopy growing away from #187.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
187	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	4, 4, 2	70%	30%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build crown and embe	ding. Trunk bifu dded in wood.	rcates at 8" into	multiple leaders.	Rubber wire ca	ble in
188	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	7	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build included bark.	ding. Trunk bifu	rcates at 18" into	multiple leaders	s, and contains 12	2" of
189	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	6	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ding. Trunk bifu	rcates at 18" into	multiple leaders	5.	
190	Japanese maple (Acer palmatum)	5	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling. Trunk bifu	rcates at 12" into	multiple leaders	s. Old basal wou	inds.
191	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	7, 7, 4, 4, 3, 3	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Three trunks. Or	ne of the 7, 4 and	d 3 measurement	s represent a sing	gle trunk.	
192	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	7, 6, 6	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Three trunks.					
193	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	4, 3(5), 2	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Six trunks. One	pair of 3 and 3 n	neasurements rep	present a single t	runk.	
194	Cajeput tree (Melaleuca quinquenervia)	6, 5, 4	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	

Comments: Two trunks. The 5 and 4 measurements represent a single trunk.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
195	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	9	70%	50%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling.				
196	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	6	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling. Fireblight.				
197	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	7	60%	70%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling.				
198	Flowering pear (Pyrus calleryana)	9	70%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Adjacent to build	ling.				
199	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	29	40%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood throu very large limbs along adjacent pa	ghout, which is t and smaller brar ath from roots.	he norm for all c iches. Excessive	ottonwood listed limb weight. Gi	l below, to inclue rdling roots. Mo	de both ounds
200	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	24	40%	50%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird	lling roots.				
201	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	21	30%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird	lling roots. Narr	ow form.			
202	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	27	30%	40%	Poor	Low	Х

Comments: Deadwood. Girdling roots.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
203	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	22	20%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird	lling roots. Narr	ow form.			
204	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	30	40%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Girc	lling roots. Mod	erate to low suita	ability for preser	vation.	
205	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	39	40%	50%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird	lling roots. Lean	IS.			
206	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	30	30%	20%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Large decaying of surface opposite	canker at base op lean may indicat	posite lean. Also te tree partially up	o has a hollow at prooted sometim	t base, and the gr ne ago.	ound
207	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	20	30%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird and sweeps away	lling roots. Deca 7 from #206.	aying canker at w	vest side of base.	Leans. Narrow	form
208	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	17	30%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Nar	row form.				
209	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	22	40%	20%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Pronounced lean decaying hollow	towards path wi at base. Deadw	th buttress roots ood. Girdling ro	surfaced opposit ots.	te lean. Has a la	ge



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
210	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	23	40%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood, inclu crown. Girdling	iding a large brar roots.	nch suspended in	canopy. Leans	towards path. S	inuous
211	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	21	40%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Girc	lling roots. Sma	ll decaying hollo	w at base. Lean	S.	
212	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	30	40%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Girc	lling roots. Has	a pronounced lea	ins towards path		
213	Brazilian pepper (Schinus terebinthifolia)	10	40%	50%	Poor	Moderate	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical ca	nopy. Girdling	root.			
214	Brazilian pepper (Schinus terebinthifolia)	15	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Girdling roots.					
215	Brazilian pepper (Schinus terebinthifolia)	15	50%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Trunk diameter i	s 15.3" (at 54" h	igh). Leans. La	rge old cuts when	re remaining lead	ders meet.
216	Brazilian pepper (Schinus terebinthifolia)	16	30%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Sparse and has a	mostly one-side	d canopy. Prono	unced lean. Mo	derate to low sui	tability.
217	Brazilian pepper (Schinus terebinthifolia)	13	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	

Comments: Fair overall condition.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
218	Brazilian pepper (Schinus terebinthifolia)	10	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
	Comments:	Leans, and opposition in past).	site lean are surfa	aced roots and a	short mound (po	ssibly partially u	prooted
219	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	38	40%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Small opening re Girdling roots. I	presents a decay Deadwood. Mou	ing hollow at 8' nds in path from	high. Massive li roots. Moderate	mb cut away in j e to low suitabili	past. ty.
220	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	28	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	X
	Comments:	Girdling roots. I	Deadwood and le	ans.			
221	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	23	40%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Girdling roots. I	Deadwood and le	ans.			
222	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	30	40%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Girdling roots. I	Deadwood and le	ans.			
223	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	26	50%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Girc	lling roots, inclu	ding a very large	one at base.		
224	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	25	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Girc	lling roots.				
225	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	24	40%	30%	Poor	Low	X

Comments: Deadwood. Girdling roots. Very weak attachment where trunk bifurcates 10' high.



		SIZE		CONDITION					
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree		
226	Fremont cottonwood (<i>Populus fremontii</i>)	30	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	х		
	Comments:	Deadwood. Girc	lling roots. Mou	nds in asphalt ar	e from roots.		I		
227	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	34	60%	30%	Poor	Low	Х		
	Comments: Deadwood. Girdling roots. Weak attachment where trunk bifurcates at 9' high. Mounds in asphalt path from roots.								
228	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	24	50%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х		
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird	lling roots.						
229	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	17	50%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х		
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird	lling roots.						
230	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	5	30%	20%	Poor	Low			
	Comments:	Poor form. Deac	lwood. A possib	le replacement f	or a prior cotton	wood removed.			
231	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	29	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х		
	Comments:	Deadwood. Gird	lling roots.						
232	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	36	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х		
·	Comments:	Deadwood. Girc	lling roots.						
233	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	6	0%	0%	Dead	Low			

Comments: Can be regarded as dead. Remove asap.

Project: Burlingame Bay, Burlingame Prepared for: DES Architects + Engineers, Inc. Prepared by: David L. Babby



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
234	Pacific willow	19	0%	0%	Dead	Low	x
No tag	Comments:	Dead. Dense, tal	ll and thick shrut	os surround trunk	. Mounds along	g asphalt path fro	m roots.
235	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	9	50%	60%	Fair	Moderate	
No tag	Comments:	On bank.					
236	Pacific willow (Salix lasiandra)	19	0%	0%	Dead	Low	Х
	Comments:	Dead. Dense, tal	ll and thick shrut	os surround trunk	. Mounds along	g asphalt path fro	m roots.
237	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	27, 22	70%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Two trunks form roots. Low cano	a weak attachm py over parking	ent. Excessive li lot and planter.	mb weight. Mo	unds in parking l	lot from
238	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	9, 5	80%	20%	Poor	Low	
	Comments:	Asymmetrical ca Low canopy and	nopy. Two trun excessive branc	ks form a weak a h weight. Large	ttachment. Lear mound in parkir	ns towards lagoo ng lot from roots.	n.
239	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	26	60%	20%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Deadwood. Two Asymmetrical ca a weak attachme	large old cuts of nopy. Remainin nt.	prior trunks. Si g trunk bifurcate	gnificant excession at 5.5' high int	ive limb weight. o three leaders fo	orming
240	Pacific willow (Salix lasiandra)	26	40%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Trunk is covered limb weight. On	by shrubs. Asy e dead limb brok	mmetrical canop te and is suspend	y with multi-leaded in canopy.	der crown. Exce	ssive



		SIZE		CONDITION				
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree	
241	Pacific willow (Salix lasiandra)	12	10%	20%	Poor	Low		
	Comments:	Mostly dead. Tr	unk is covered b	y shrubs. Leans	and has an asym	metrical canopy.		
242	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	6, 4	60%	10%	Poor	Moderate		
	Comments: Leans towards lagoon, and originate at edge of steep and wall. Soil has eroded around base.							
243	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	12	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate		
	Comments:	Trunk covered by	y shrubs. Leans	towards lagoon.	Ivy along lower	25' of trunk.		
244	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	13	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate		
	Comments:	Leans towards la Girdling roots. I	goon and has a p vy along base.	pronounced buttre	ess root mass op	posite lean.		
245	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	9, 8	50%	10%	Poor	Moderate	Х	
No tag	Comments:	Along vertical ba	ank and leans out	t towards lagoon	. Deadwood and	excessive limb.		
246	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	15, 5	40%	20%	Poor	Moderate	Х	
No tag	Comments:	Deadwood with	excessive limb w	eight. Along ero	oding bank. Lea	ns towards lagoo	on.	
247	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	9 Along bank Tr	40%	20%	Poor	Low		
NO TAG	Comments:	Along bank. Iru	INK COVERED by S	nrubs. Leans sou	iin away from #2	240. Deadwood.		
248	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	17, 16, 14, 8	60%	20%	Poor	Moderate	X	

Comments: At top of bank. Leans towards lagoon. History of limb failure and excessive limb weight. Weak attachments at base of two largest trunks. Broad canopy.



		SIZE		CONDITION					
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree		
249	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	10	60%	10%	Poor	Moderate			
No tag	Comments:	At top of vertical	bank. Mostly la	ateral limb growt	h. Deadwood ai	nd excessive lim	b weight.		
250	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	11	40%	30%	Poor	Low			
Comments: Leans SE. Limb structure begins at 5.5' high. Low canopy over path. Asymmetrical, mostly one-sided canopy. Slight mound opposite lean. Girdling roots.									
251	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	6, 4	70%	30%	Fair	Moderate			
	Comments:	Along vertical er	oding bank. Lea	ns towards lago	on.				
252	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	22, 15	60%	20%	Poor	Moderate	Х		
	Comments:	Trunk bifurcates limb weight and	at 4' high. Alon deadwood.	g top of steep ba	nk. Leans towar	ds lagoon. Exce	essive		
253	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	19, 17, 15, 13	40%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х		
	Comments:	Deadwood and e leans out from be	xcessive limb we eneath #252, and	eight. Along top has a pronounce	of nearly vertica of mound along of	al bank. The 13' opposite side.	trunk		
254	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	6, 5	40%	20%	Poor	Moderate			
	Comments:	Leans, and has a growth beneath #	pronounced butt 253's canopy.	ress root mass al Deadwood.	ong the opposite	e side. Suppresse	ed		
255	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	16, 16, 6	50%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х		
	Comments:	Deadwood and e Originates along	xcessive limb we nearly vertical b	eight. Pronounce ank. Pronounce	ed lean into #254 d buttress root m	and towards lag	goon. 1.		



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
256	Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii)	15, 14, 11	40%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: Leans towards lagoon. Along steep bank of lagoon. Deadwood and excessive limb weight. Three trunks originate near grade.

	Fremont cottonwood						
257	(Populus fremontii)	15, 5	50%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: Deadwood. Leans towards lagoon. Along steep bank.

258	New Zealand Christmas tree (Metrosideros excelsa)	8	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate					
Comments: Trunk bifurcates at 4.5' high into codominant leaders.											
259	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	13	70%	30%	Poor	Moderate					
Comments: Mostly one-sided canopy. Leans towards lagoon. Western gall rust infection. Excessive limb weight. Mounds in asphalt path from roots.											
260	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	7	70%	30%	Poor	Low					
	Comments: Trunk bifurcates at 5' w/ a weak attachment. Excessive limb weight and deadwood. Gall rust. Mound opposite lean from partially uprooting in past. Mounds in path from roots.										

	Blackwood acacia						
261	(Acacia melanoxylon)	6	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	

Comments: One-sided canopy out from beneath #262's canopy. Deadwood.

	Blackwood acacia						
262	(Acacia melanoxylon)	22	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: Trunk bifurcates at 7' high. Deadwood with excessive limb weight. Large surface roots throughout and beyond dripline. Low canopy. Mound in parking lot from roots.



		SIZE		CONDITION						
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree			
263	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	7, 4, 4	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate				
<u> </u>	Comments: Dieback at top. Leans towards lagoon. Mound in lot from root.									
264	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	8	70%	30%	Poor	Low				
	Comments: Trunk bifurcates at 6' high and forms a weak attachment. Grows out from beneath #265.									
265	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	27, 13	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	Х			
	Comments:	Excessive limb v dominant toward	veight. Western s lagoon. Moun	gall rust. Two tr ds from roots.	unks originate a	t grade. Canopy	is			
266	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	25, 23	60%	30%	Poor	Low	X			
	Comments:	Multi-leader forr attachment. Exc	n. Trunk bifurca essive limb weig	ttes at 3' high into the Mounds from	o codominants w n roots.	hich form a wea	k			
267	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	14	70%	30%	Fair	Moderate				
	Comments: Low canopy over path. Girdling roots. Mounds from roots. Leans. Excessive limb weight. Large old, decaying basal wound is 2.5' tall.									
268	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	7	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate				
	Comments:	Leans towards la	goon and along	steep bank. Asy	mmetrical and lo	w canopy.				
269	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	5, 4(3), 3, 2	40%	20%	Poor	Moderate				
	Comments:	Multi-trunk, sma	ll tree (trunks re	presents suckers)	. Western gall r	ust. Leans towa	rds			

lagoon. Along steep bank.



		SIZE		CONDITION							
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree				
270	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	31	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х				
	Comments: Multiple leaders begins at 2' high. Crown sweeps towards lagoon. Low canopy with excessive limb weight. Soil mound opposite lean.										
271	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	25, 15, 7	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х				
	Comments: Crown sweeps towards lagoon. Low canopy.										
272	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	17, 14, 5	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х				
	Comments:	Leans towards la	goon. Near top	of steep bank.							
273	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	35	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	Х				
	Comments:	Adjacent curb is in parking lot fro Has a partial gird	cracked and rais m roots. Excess lling root.	ed. Uphill from ive limb weight.	parking lot. Lar Multiple leader	ge and tall moun s originate at 5.5	ds '' high.				
274	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	19, 10	60%	30%	Poor	Low	Х				
	Comments:	Adjacent to light Uphill from park	pole. Has a bro ing lot and adjac	ad canopy. Exce	essive limb weig ed and slightly r	ht. Girdling root aised.	S.				
275	Aleppo pine (Pinus halapensis)	21, 18	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	Х				
	Comments:	Extremely wide a Deadwood.	and unique spaci	ng between two	leaders. Excess	ive limb weight.					
276	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	10	30%	40%	Poor	Low					
	Comments:	History of limb f	ailure. Deadwoo	od and significan	t dieback. Surfa	ice roots.					



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
277	Blackwood acacia (Acacia melanoxylon)	17	60%	30%	Poor	Low	Х

Comments: Asymmetrical canopy with large deadwood over parking lot and path. Has a massive girdling root at base. Small crack along adjacent curb.

270	Aleppo pine	21	700/	400/	Enir	Madarata	v
2/8	(Pinus naiapensis)	31	/0%0	40%	ган	woderate	Λ

Comments: Trunk bifurcates at 5' high with wide spacing. Near parking lot. Excessive limb weight. Girdling roots.

	Blackwood acacia						
279	(Acacia melanoxylon)	12	40%	40%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Low canopy over parking lot. Within a finger island, and has a pronounced buttress root located along windward side.

	Blackwood acacia						
280	(Acacia melanoxylon)	6	90%	60%	Fair	Moderate	

Comments: Adjacent to path, likely a volunteer. Will eventually encroach into the path.

	Flaxleaf paperbark						
281	(Melaleuca linariifolia)	16	60%	40%	Fair	Moderate	Х

Comments: Three leaders at 3.5' high and form a weak attachment. Asymmetrical canopy.

Flaxleaf paperbarkFairModerate282(Melaleuca linariifolia)1470%40%Fair	282	Flaxleaf paperbark (<i>Melaleuca linariifolia</i>)	14	70%	40%	Fair	Moderate	
---	-----	---	----	-----	-----	------	----------	--

Comments: Multi-leader crown.

	Flaxleaf paperbark						
283	(Melaleuca linariifolia)	16, 11	50%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: Three leaders form a weak attachment. Asymmetrical canopy. Leans. Multi-leader crown. Surfaced-buttress root opposite lean.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
284	Flaxleaf paperbark (<i>Melaleuca linariifolia</i>)	16	50%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Leans and has an	asymmetrical ca	anopy.			
285	Flaxleaf paperbark (Melaleuca linariifolia)	18	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Limb structure b	egins at 4' high.	Leans and has an	n asymmetrical c	canopy.	
286	Flaxleaf paperbark (Melaleuca linariifolia)	17	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Asymmetrical, m	nostly one-sided	canopy. Limb st	ructure begins a	t 4.5' high.	
287	Flaxleaf paperbark (<i>Melaleuca linariifolia</i>)	27	50%	30%	Poor	Low	Х
	Comments:	Limb structure b	egins at 4' high.	Low crown over	path and walkw	/ay.	
288	Flaxleaf paperbark (Melaleuca linariifolia)	24	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Low canopy over	r path.				
289	Flaxleaf paperbark (<i>Melaleuca linariifolia</i>)	27	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Limb structure so towards drive ais	urrounds light po le. Moderate to	ole. One-sided, a low suitability fo	nd low canopy or preservation.	over path. Leans	
290	Flaxleaf paperbark (Melaleuca linariifolia)	29	50%	40%	Poor	Moderate	Х
	Comments:	Asymmetrical an	id low canopy ov	ver path.			
291	Flaxleaf paperbark (Melaleuca linariifolia)	18, 12, 9	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: Limb structure begins at 3' high. Asymmetrical canopy. Low canopy over parking lot.



		SIZE		CONDITION			
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
292	Flaxleaf paperbark (Melaleuca linariifolia)	29	50%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: History of limb failure with large wounds. Four leaders originate at 6' high. High canopy over lot. Surface roots.

	Flaxleaf paperbark						
293	(Melaleuca linariifolia)	22, 17	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: Old large limb cut from lower trunk. Extensive decay along inside of largest trunk. Many small branches along trunk. History of limb failure. Girdling roots.

	Aleppo pine						
294	(Pinus halapensis)	7	40%	20%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Crowded conditions, suppressed and growing out from beneath #295. Sinuous trunk. Asymmetrical canopy.

	Red ironbark						
295	(Eucalyptus sideroxylon)	22	60%	60%	Fair	Moderate	Х

Comments: Mounds in asphalt path from roots.

	Nichol's willowleafed peppermint						
296	(Eucalyptus nicholii)	4	60%	20%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Leans into fence, and one wire is embedded in trunk. Old wooden stake adjacent to trunk (not attached). Suppressed, crowded-growing conditions.

	Aleppo pine						
297	(Pinus halapensis)	22, 9	60%	30%	Poor	Moderate	Х

Comments: Leans towards neighboring site. Poor form. Surface roots, and mounds in path from

roots. The 9" measurement represents a limb originating from trunk at 3.5' high.

	Nichol's willowleafed peppermint						
298	(Eucalyptus nicholii)	6	40%	30%	Poor	Low	

Comments: One wire embedded in trunk. Leans away from adjacent pines. Crowded conditions.



		SIZE	CONDITION				
TREE/ TAG NO.	TREE NAME	Trunk Diameter (in.)	Health Condition (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Structural Integrity (100%=Best, 0%=Worst)	Overall Condition (Good/Fair/Poor/Dead)	Suitability for Preservation (High/Moderate/Low)	Protected Tree
299	Nichol's willowleafed peppermint (Eucalyptus nicholii)	8	20%	30%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Crowded-growing conditions, sweeping away from adjacent pines. Mound in lot from root. Deadwood.

	Aleppo pine						
300	(Pinus halapensis)	27	60%	30%	Poor	Low	Х

Comments: Trunk bifurcates at 4' with okay spacing. Weak attachment where one leader divides into codominant leaders at 3' above. Mounds in lot from roots. Excessive limb weight.

	Aleppo pine						
301	(Pinus halapensis)	24	60%	50%	Fair	Moderate	Х

Comments: Deadwood. Trunk bifurcates at 5.5' high with okay spacing. Western gall rust. Mounds in lot from roots.

	Aleppo pine						
302	(Pinus halapensis)	20	70%	40%	Fair	Low	Х

Comments: Trunk bifurcates at 5.5' high with wide spacing. Within a finger planter, and there are many large mounds in lot from roots; tree has outgrown setting. Adjacent curb is significantly

cracked and raised in multiple locations. Adjacent to light pole.

	Nichol's willowleafed peppermint						
303	(Eucalyptus nicholii)	9	50%	20%	Poor	Low	

Comments: Crowded-growing conditions, its crown sweeping away from #300. Suppressed growth.

EXHIBIT B:

AERIAL MAP

(1 sheet)

BURLINGAME BAY 555 & 577 AIRPORT BOULEVARD BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA

