



Corporate Headquarters
1500 North Mantua Street
P.O. Box 5193
Kent, OH 44240-5193
330-673-5685
Toll Free 1-800-828-8312
Fax: 330-673-0860

Northern California Office
PO Box 5321
Larkspur, CA 94977
831-291-2245
Sabrina.huey@Davey.com

ARBORIST REPORT AND TREE PROTECTION PLAN

6720 Leslie Place
Lucerne, CA 95458

August 2023; Updated November 2023





Arborist Report & Tree Protection Plan for
6720 Leslie Place
Lucerne, CA

Prepared for:

Mr. Bill Lewis
Assurance Development
1499 Huntington Drive, Suite 305
South Pasadena, CA • 91030

August 2023; Updated November 2023

Prepared by:

Davey Resource Group, Inc
A Division of The Davey Tree Expert Company
1500 North Mantua Street
Kent, OH 44240

Contact:

Sabrina Huey
ISA Certified Arborist #WE-14060A
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
www.daveyresourcegroup.com

Notice of Disclaimer

Inventory data provided by Davey Resource Group is based on visual recording at the time of inspection. Visual records do not include testing or analysis and do not include aerial or subterranean inspection. Davey Resource group is not responsible for discovery or identification of hidden or otherwise non-observable risks. Records may not remain accurate after inspection due to variable deterioration of inventoried material and site disturbance. Davey Resource Group provides no warranty with respect to the fitness of the urban forest for any use or purpose whatsoever or for future outcomes of the inventoried trees.

Contents

Summary	3
Introduction	3
Background	3
Assignment	3
Limits of the Assignment	3
Purpose and Use of Report	4
Observations	4
Methods	4
Site Observations	5
Tree Observations	5
Tree Protection Zones and Root Zones	5
Conclusion and Recommendations	6
Appendix A – Site Map	7
Appendix B – Tree Data Tables	8
Table 1. Tree Inventory	8
Table 2. Tree Condition	9
Table 3. Preservation Priority, Protected/Removal Status, and Notes	10
Appendix C – Tree Photographs (*additional photos available upon request)	12

Summary

In May of 2023, Davey Resource Group (DRG) was contracted by Mr. Bill Lewis of Assurance Development to conduct a tree inventory and develop a tree protection plan for the trees in the area of impact from the installation of cell phone towers and access road expansion at 6720 Leslie Pl. in Lucerne, California. The request was made to assess the current condition of the trees and establish a tree protection plan based on the findings.

On July 13, 2023, an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Certified Arborist (Sabrina Huey, #WE-14060A) from Davey Resource Group evaluated thirty-eight (38) trees that may be impacted by development. The trees were assessed by their location, size, health, form, and structure. The data were used to determine if the trees fall under the definition of protected or regulated as defined by the County of Lake. None of the trees fall under this definition. The data were used to calculate the critical root zone (CRZ) and structural root zone (SRZ) of the trees. These calculations will help guide construction options and mitigate potential impacts to the trees. In November 2023, the report was revised to reflect the narrowing of the fire road.

The trees were located on a 47.97 acre parcel located in Lucerne, CA within the County of Lake. The trees were assessed if they were 4 inches or greater (diameter), and had any part of the drip line overhanging the proposed project site. The majority of trees (11) were in good condition, twenty-four (24) trees were in fair condition, and three (3) trees were in poor condition. Under the current plans, no trees are within the planned cell tower area footprint, but thirty-five (35) trees are within or adjacent to the expansion of the access road. Removal will be required for sixteen (16) of these trees, and the twenty two (22) trees that are located near the limits of disturbance should have fencing installed along the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ), as described in the Conclusions and Recommendations. Any excavation within the TPZ of protected trees must be done under arborist supervision and may require adjustment if substantial roots are encountered.

Introduction

Background

Assurance Development and the property owners are planning a construction project on an undeveloped section of at 6720 Leslie Place (APN #006-003-010-000) in Lucerne, CA. The plans include the construction of one cell phone tower. The most recent design plans were used to evaluate impacts on trees on site and adjacent parcels (if applicable). A revised plan set narrowing the fire road was provided and evaluated in November 2023

Assignment

The arborist visually assessed any tree (4 inches or greater in diameter) on the property or adjacent properties with drip lines overhanging the project site. Following data collection, specific tree preservation plan elements were calculated that identified each tree's critical and structural root zones (CRZ and SRZ) to better ensure survivability during the planned development.

Limits of the Assignment

Many factors can limit specific and accurate data when performing evaluations of trees, their conditions, and the potential for failure or response to site disturbances. No soil or tissue testing was performed. All observations were made from the ground on July 13, 2023, and no soil excavation to expose roots was performed. The determinations and recommendations presented here are based on current data and conditions that existed at the time of the evaluation and cannot be a predictor of the outcome for the evaluated trees in the future. No physical inspection of the upper canopy, sounding, resistance drilling, or other technologies were used in the evaluation of the trees.

Purpose and Use of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary inventory of all trees within the project area, including an assessment of the current condition and health, as well as a tree protection plan for all evaluated trees/canopies that may be impacted by construction plans. The findings in this report can be used to make informed decisions on design planning and be used to guide long-term care of the trees. This report and detailed tree protection plan can also be submitted to Lake County for permitting purposes.

Observations

Methods

A visual inspection was used to develop the findings, conclusions, and recommendations found in this report. Data collection included measuring the diameter (in inches) of trees at approximately 54 inches above grade (DBH), height estimation, a visual assessment of tree condition, structure, and health, and a photographic record. Trees with multiple leaders that branched below 54 inches were measured at the narrowest point below the main union. Multi-stem trees that had all stems originating at ground level had all trunks summed. A rating percentage (0-100%) was assigned for each tree's health, structure, and form, and the lowest percentage was used as the overall tree condition. Condition ratings were based on but not limited to (1) the condition and environment of the tree's root crown; (2) the condition of the trunk, including decay, injury, callusing or presence of fungus; (3) the condition of the limbs, including the strength of unions, amount of dead wood, hollow areas, and whether there was excessive weight borne by them; (4) the condition and growth rate history of the twigs, including pest damage and diseases; (5) the leaf appearance, including abnormal size and density as well as pest and disease damage.

Using an average of the above factors together with the arborist's best judgment, the health, structure, and form of each tree was rated using the following scale:

- **Good (80%-100%):** Vigor is normal for the species and no significant damage due disease or pests. Twig dieback, discoloration, or defoliation is minor. Well-developed structure with minor defects that can be corrected easily. Minor asymmetries/deviations from species norm. Function and aesthetics are not compromised.
- **Fair (51%-79%):** Reduced vigor. Damage due to insects or diseases may be significant and associated with defoliation but is not likely to be fatal. Twig dieback, defoliation, discoloration, and/or dead branches may comprise up to 50% of the canopy. A single structural defect of a significant nature or multiple moderate defects. Structural defects are not practical to correct or would require multiple treatments over several years. Major asymmetries/deviations from species norm. Function and aesthetics are compromised.
- **Poor (30%-50%):** Unhealthy and declining in appearance. Poor vigor, low foliage density, and poor foliage color are present. Potentially fatal pest infestation. Extensive twig or branch dieback. A single serious structural defect or multiple significant defects. Observed structural problems cannot be corrected. Failure may occur at any time. Largely asymmetrical or abnormal form. Form detracts from aesthetics or intended use to a significant degree.
- **Critical (1%-29%):** Poor vigor and appears to be dying. Little live foliage. Single or multiple severe structural defects. Visually unappealing and provides little or no function in the landscape.
- **Dead (0%)**

A preservation priority was assigned to each tree on a scale of 1 to 4: a rating of 1 representing the highest priority for protection due to excellent overall condition, unique specimen, or high-value tree; a rating of 2 for a tree in good to excellent condition and worthy of protection but not uniquely value; a rating of 3 for a fair condition tree that can be

easily replaced; and a rating of 4 for trees in poor to critical condition that should be removed under most circumstances.

Site Observations

The project site is located in Lucerne, Lake County at 6720 Leslie Place. The parcel is 47.97 acres in size. The property is located at the top of a private road. There is an access road near the rear of the property that allows for access to the cell tower project site. The property has several native oaks, pines, shrubs, grasses, and forbs growing throughout. No irrigation was observed. The subject trees were adjacent to the access road on the southeastern side of the property.

Tree Observations

Thirty-eight (38) trees were assessed within the planned project area comprising seven (7) species: interior live oak (*Quercus wislizeni*, 16 trees), gray pine (*Pinus sabiniana*, 14 trees), manzanita (*Arctostaphylos manzanita*, 3 trees), Northern California black walnut (*Juglans hindsii*, 2 trees), Chinese pistache (*Pistacia chinensis*, 1 tree), bay laurel (*Umbellularia californica*, 1 tree), and deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*, 1 tree). Tree condition ratings were good for eleven (11) trees, fair for twenty-four (24) trees, and three (3) were in poor condition. Tree diameters ranged from 2.5 inches to 38 inches with an average of 13 inches. Tree heights ranged from 12 to 55 feet with an average height of 38 feet. Thirty-six (36) trees are California native trees. All of the native trees appear to be naturally occurring with no additional summer irrigation and all are considered to have low water usage.

Tree photographs can be found in Appendix A and a complete Tree Inventory and Condition Assessment can be found in Appendix B.

Tree Protection Zones and Root Zones

The Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) is often considered as the area around a tree within the drip line radius, determined by measuring the length of the longest horizontal branch from the center of the trunk to the outermost point of the dripline. For this project, DRG recommends a conservative root zone area calculation standard as follows:

The trunk diameters of the surveyed trees were used to illustrate the potential critical root zone (CRZ) of each tree. The CRZ is considered the maximum possible radius of the root zone of a tree. Since Lake County does not have specific ordinances for the measurement used for CRZ, the CRZ was calculated by multiplying the DBH by 1 foot. For instance, tree #1 has a DBH of 36 inches and a calculated CRZ of 36 feet (36 x 1). This distance may extend beyond the tree canopy drip line and is normally considered the tree protection zone (TPZ). Tree protection fencing is commonly installed at the drip line or the edge of CRZ to prevent soil compaction and damage to the root zone or canopy.

Like the CRZ, the structural root zone (SRZ) was also calculated using a commonly accepted method established by Dr. Kim Coder in *Construction Damage Assessments: Trees and Sites*.¹ In this method, the root plate size (i.e. pedestal roots, zone of rapid taper area, and roots under compression) and limit of disruption based upon tree DBH is considered as a minimum distance that any disruption should occur during construction. A significant risk of catastrophic tree failure exists if structural roots within this given radius are destroyed or severely damaged. The SRZ is the area where minimal or no disturbance should occur without arborist supervision. Both the CRZ and SRZ for the surveyed trees are listed in Appendix B, Table 1.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The design plans show none of the assessed trees within the footprint of the cell tower. The cell tower may be within 10 feet of trees #35 and 36; impacts to these trees are expected to be low. The majority of trees (33) are adjacent to the access road and removal of the trees that will be severely impacted will be necessary.

¹ Dr. Kim Coder. *Conserving Trees During Site Development: A Training Manual*. University of Georgia. 2018.

- Trees #1, 2, 3 5-8, 10-15, 17, 32, and 33 are within the limits of or have SRZs that will be impacted by the proposed plan for the road expansion. The trees ranged from good to poor. Removal is recommended.
- Trees #4, 9, 16, and 18-31 are near the proposed road expansion. The trees are predicted to have low to moderate impacts. Tree protection fencing should be installed at or beyond the driplines as they are close to the project site. Any excavation within the TPZ of trees must be done by hand and supervised by a Certified Arborist. Any necessary pruning shall follow ANSI A300 standards, with no more than 25% of the tree's live tissue removed.
- Trees #34-36 are near the proposed pad of the new tower. The trees are predicted to have low to moderate impacts. Tree protection fencing should be installed at or beyond the driplines as they are close to the project site. Any excavation within the TPZ of trees must be done by hand and supervised by a Certified Arborist. Any necessary pruning shall follow ANSI A300 standards, with no more than 25% of the tree's live tissue removed.
- Trees #37-38 were collected due to the possibility of utility lines. The plans do not state the proposed utility lines and the trees will have no impacts from construction.
- Tree removal totals:
 - 2 - *Juglans hindsii*
 - 2 - *Pinus sabiniana*
 - 1 - *Pistacia chinensis*
 - 11 - *Quercus wislizeni*

Additional tree preservation guidelines are as follows:

- No intrusion whatsoever may occur to the SRZ of any tree to be retained.
- Table 2 below provides the CRZ, SRZ, and TPZ of the trees that may be impacted by the planned construction.
- All trees to be retained should be protected with chain link fencing. The ideal location for the fence is outside or along the TPZ listed in Table 2. At a minimum, tree protection fencing can alternately be placed at the furthest extent of the tree drip line. If no other alternative exists, fencing should be placed at the furthest extent of construction and moved outward as construction is completed.
- Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) fencing shall be a minimum of 6 feet high, constructed of chain link or polyethylene laminar safety fencing or similar material subject to approval by an ISA Certified Arborist, and stabilized using pier blocks. Avoid posts or stakes which may damage the root zone.
- "Tree Protection Area - Keep Out" or similar signs shall accompany the TPZ fencing every 15 feet and include contact information to report violations.
- TPZ fencing should remain in place for the entirety of the project and only be removed, temporarily or otherwise, by an ISA Certified Arborist while activities are directly supervised, and replaced immediately after.
- Due to the sensitive nature of working within the TPZ of trees to be retained, any excavation or grading within the TPZ of protected trees must be performed with hand tools and supervised by a Certified Arborist to monitor and document any tree impacts. Any significant roots (≥ 2 inches in diameter) approved for pruning should be cut cleanly and photo-documented. If substantial/structural roots are encountered and not recommended for pruning, the on-site Arborist may require tree removal if design plans cannot be changed.
- Applying a 4-inch layer of mulch to the TPZ of trees in the work area, particularly if the entire TPZ cannot be fenced due to construction, is a best practice that should be considered.
- No material shall be stored, nor concrete basins washed, or any chemical materials or paint stored within the TPZ of trees, and no construction chemicals or paint should be released into landscaped areas, as these can be toxic to trees and contaminate the soil.
- If any irrigation system is damaged by the excavation, it should be inspected and repaired by a qualified irrigation technician.
- Mycorrhizal treatment can increase nutrient accessibility and compensate for root loss and is a good practice the property owner may consider if significant roots are encountered and must be cut.

- After construction is complete, the retained trees should be monitored for one year and a Certified Arborist should be contacted to inspect if any lean, limb die-back, unseasonal leaf drop, or foliage discoloration develops.
- All heavy equipment should remain outside of the TPZs, and trenching within the TPZ of any Heritage or protected tree should be performed with hand tools and supervised by a Certified Arborist to monitor and document impacts.
- Any roots exposed during excavation must be kept moist if left uncovered for over 12 hours. Covering with wet burlap or similar material and regularly inspecting twice/day to ensure roots remain damp is recommended.
- Ensure the area within the TPZ receives the **weekly watering** equivalent to the amount of average natural rainfall for the specific development site. When the amount of natural rainfall received is less than the historical average, manual watering methods should be employed. The on-site Certified Arborist can make the determination when additional manual watering is necessary.
- All excavated areas within a TPZ must be backfilled as soon as possible with clean, native topsoil.

Appendix A – Site Map



Aerial view of site and tree locations.

Appendix B – Tree Data Tables

Table 1. Tree Inventory

Tree #	DBH (in)	Common Name	Species	Height (ft)	Canopy Radius (ft)	CRZ (Radius in ft)	SRZ (Radius in ft)	TPZ (Radius in ft)
1	8,8	N. CA black walnut	<i>Juglans hindsii</i>	35	16	11	5	10
2	12,8	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	50	20	14	6	12
3	6,5,4,4	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	50	16	10	4	10
4	9,9,8,4	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	50	18	16	7	13
5	14	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	30	16	14	6	12
6	15	N. CA black walnut	<i>Juglans hindsii</i>	30	12	15	7	13
7	16	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	50	18	16	7	13
8	12,6	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	50	18	13	6	11
9	7	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	35	10	7	3	10
10	6,4,4	Chinese pistache	<i>Pistacia chinensis</i>	12	6	8	4	10
11	9	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	40	8	9	4	10
12	14,12,9	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	55	18	21	9	17
13	22,13,8	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	55	20	27	12	22
14	14	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	50	12	14	6	12
15	13, 5, 4, 3, 10,10,10,12	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	45	16	26	12	21
16	5	California bay laurel	<i>Umbellularia californica</i>	25	8	5	2	10
17	9,10,4	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	40	16	14	6	12
18	3,2	Manzanita	<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita</i>	18	8	4	2	10
19	8	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	40	12	8	4	10
20	6,2	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	25	12	6	3	10
21	32	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	55	20	32	14	27
22	4,2,2	Manzanita	<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita</i>	18	8	5	2	10
23	27	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	55	18	27	12	23
24	12	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	35	10	12	5	10
25	5	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	30	8	5	2	10
26	6	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	30	8	6	3	10
27	6	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	30	8	6	3	10
28	4	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	30	8	4	2	10
29	7,1	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	30	12	7	3	10
30	12	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	35	12	12	5	10
31	8	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	35	10	8	4	10
32	38	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	55	20	38	17	32
33	16	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	35	16	16	7	13
34	14,10	Deodar cedar	<i>Cedrus deodara</i>	40	16	17	8	14
35	8	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	40	18	8	4	10
36	3,3,3,2,2,2,2	Manzanita	<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita</i>	20	12	7	3	10
37	15	Interior live oak	<i>Quercus wislizeni</i>	30	18	15	7	13
38	17	Gray pine	<i>Pinus sabiniana</i>	45	12	17	8	14

Table 2. Tree Condition

Tree #	DBH (in)	Stems	Common Name	Water Use	Health (%)	Structure (%)	Form (%)	Overall Condition
1	8,8	2	Black walnut	Low	55	60	60	Fair
2	12,8	2	Interior live oak	Low	40	40	40	Poor
3	6,5,4,4	4	Interior live oak	Low	60	55	60	Fair
4	9,9,8,4	4	Interior live oak	Low	55	60	55	Fair
5	14	1	Interior live oak	Low	60	60	60	Fair
6	15	1	Black walnut	Low	80	90	90	Good
7	16	1	Interior live oak	Low	55	55	55	Fair
8	12,6	2	Interior live oak	Low	40	55	55	Poor
9	7	1	Interior live oak	Low	90	90	90	Good
10	6,4,4	3	Chinese pistache	Low	40	40	40	Poor
11	9	1	Interior live oak	Low	80	90	90	Good
12	14,12,9	3	Interior live oak	Low	60	60	60	Fair
13	22,13,8	3	Interior live oak	Low	60	60	60	Fair
14	14	1	Interior live oak	Low	90	80	90	Good
15	13,5,4,3,10,10,1,0,12	8	Interior live oak	Low	60	60	60	Fair
16	5	1	Bay laurel	Low	90	90	90	Good
17	9,10,4	3	Interior live oak	Low	60	60	60	Fair
18	3,2	2	Manzantia	Low	60	60	60	Fair
19	8	1	Gray pine	Low	60	90	90	Fair
20	6,2	2	Interior live oak	Low	60	60	60	Fair
21	32	1	Gray pine	Low	60	90	90	Fair
22	4,2,2	3	Manzantia	Low	60	60	60	Fair
23	27	1	Gray pine	Low	60	60	60	Fair
24	12	1	Gray pine	Low	60	60	60	Fair
25	5	1	Gray pine	Low	60	60	60	Fair
26	6	1	Gray pine	Low	55	60	60	Fair
27	6	1	Gray pine	Low	55	60	60	Fair
28	4	1	Gray pine	Low	55	60	60	Fair
29	7,1	2	Interior live oak	Low	90	90	90	Good
30	12	1	Gray pine	Low	90	80	80	Good
31	8	1	Gray pine	Low	60	60	60	Fair
32	38	1	Gray pine	Low	55	60	60	Fair
33	16	1	Gray pine	Low	90	90	90	Good
34	14,10	2	Deodar cedar	Low	90	90	90	Good
35	8	1	Gray pine	Low	60	60	60	Fair
36	3,3,3,2,2,2,2	7	Manzantia	Low	90	90	90	Good
37	15	1	Interior live oak	Low	90	90	90	Good
38	17	1	Gray pine	Low	60	60	60	Fair

80-100% - Good; 51-79% - Fair; 30-50% - Poor; 1-29% - Critical; 0 - Dead

Table 3. Preservation Priority, Protected/Removal Status, and Notes

Tree #	DBH (in, sum)	Stems	Common Name	Preservation Priority	Proposed Removal (Y/N)	Notes
1	8,8	2	Black walnut	3	Y	2 stems @ ground level, within road expansion, has small deadwood, and pest hole in canopy.
2	12, 8	2	Interior live oak	2	Y	Decay in 1 stem, one-sided canopy, small deadwood, and within road expansion.
3	6,5,4,4	4	Interior live oak	2	Y	4 stems form above ground level, within road expansion, one sided, and decay in roots.
4	9,9,8,4	4	Interior live oak	2	N	4 stems from above ground level, decay in one trunk, unbalanced canopy, and small deadwood.
5	14	1	Interior live oak	2	Y	within the road expansion, unbalanced canopy, and small deadwood.
6	15	1	Black walnut	2	Y	In the road expansion and small deadwood.
7	16	1	Interior live oak	2	Y	within the road expansion, decay in trunk, lean, and unbalanced canopy.
8	12, 6	2	Interior live oak	3	Y	within the road expansion, decay in the trunk, lean, and unbalanced canopy.
9	7	1	Interior live oak	1	N	
10	6,4,4	3	Chinese pistache	4	Y	3 stems from above ground level, within the road expansion, half dead, and decay in the trunk.
11	9	1	Interior live oak	3	Y	within the road expansion, there is a little bit of decay in the trunk.
12	14, 12 9	3	Interior live oak	3	Y	within the road expansion, decay in the trunk, and dead limbs.
13	22, 13, 8	3	Interior live oak	2	Y	within the road expansion, poison ivy in the tree, hangers, and large deadwood.
14	14	1	Interior live oak	1	Y	within the road expansion; lean
15	13, 5, 4, 3, 10,10,10, 12	8	Interior live oak	2	Y	within the road expansion, small deadwood, decay in the trunk, and unbalanced canopy.
16	5	1	Bay laurel	1	N	
17	10,9,4	3	Interior live oak	2	Y	within the road expansion
18	3,2	2	Manzanita	2	N	small deadwood
19	8	1	Gray pine	2	N	showing signs of stress
20	6,2	2	Interior live oak	2	N	has poison oak in the canopy.
21	32	1	Gray pine	2	N	About 1-2 ft from the road expansion

22	4,2,2	3	Manzanita	2	N	
23	27	1	Gray pine	2	N	About 1-2 ft from the expansion, lean, and small deadwood.
24	12	1	Gray pine	2	N	
25	5	1	Gray pine	2	N	
26	6	1	Gray pine	2	N	showing signs of stress
27	6	1	Gray pine	2	N	showing signs of stress
28	4	1	Gray pine	2	N	showing signs of stress
29	7,1	2	Interior live oak	1	N	
30	12	1	Gray pine	1	N	unbalanced canopy.
31	8	1	Gray pine	2	N	unbalanced canopy
32	38	1	Gray pine	2	Y	within the road expansion, hangers, previous failures, and large deadwood.
33	16	1	Gray pine	1	Y	within the road expansion
34	14, 10	2	Deodar cedar	1	N	Right outside of the road expansion
35	8	1	Gray pine	2	N	Near the site plans where the tower is located
36	3,3,3,2,2, 2,2	7	Manzantia	1	N	Near the site plans where the tower is located
37	15	1	Interior live oak	1	N	Possible utility lines
38	17	1	Gray pine	2	N	Possible utility lines

red indicates trees to be removed

Appendix C – Tree Photographs (*additional photos available upon request)



Photo 1. View of the entry way for the expansion of the access road.



Photo 2. Tree #1, in fair condition, in the road expansion plans. Removal is recommended.



Photo 3. Trees #2 and 3 in poor and fair condition. Both trees are in the proposed road construction plans. Removal is recommend.



Photo 4. Tree #5 (left) and tree #7 (right) in fair and poor condition. Both trees are in the proposed road construction plans. Removal is recommend.



Photo 5. View of the pathway for the expansion of the access road.



Photo 6. Tree #10, the tree is half dead, and is in the proposed road expansion.



Photo 7. Another view of the pathway for the expansion of the access road.



Photo 8. Another view of the pathway for the expansion of the access road.



Photo 9. Tree #16 in good condition, but is in the proposed road expansion. Removal is recommended.



Photo 10. Tree #17 is in fair condition, but is in the proposed road expansion. Removal is recommended.



Photo 11. Tree #24 is in fair condition, but is in the proposed road expansion. Removal is recommended.



Photo 12. Another view of the pathway for the expansion of the access road.



Photo 13. Another view of the pathway for the expansion of the access road.



Photo 14. Trees 29 (right) and tree 32 (left) are in good and fair condition. They are located in the proposed road expansion. Removal is recommended.



Photo 17. Tree #34 a is in good condition. The tree is right outside the path of the road expansion. Impacts are predicted to be moderate.



Photo 18. View of the area the proposed tower is to be located.