TREES ON THE HOME DEPOT HUNTINGTON BEACH SITE

January 2005

Consulting Arborist's Report

Prepared for
Art Lucas
Scott A. Mommer Consulting

Prepared by
Alden Kelley
Consulting Arborist

CONTENTS

PROJECT ELEMENTS

Report date: 3 January 2005

Site study date: 1 January 2005

Subject: Arborist's report on trees on redevelopment site at Magnolia Street and Garfield Avenue, Huntington Beach.

Client: Art Lucas
Scott A. Mommer Consulting
4630 W. Jacquelyn Avenue, Suite 119
Fresno, CA 93722
Office: 559/276-2790; Mobile: 559/978-7060; Fax: 559/276-0850
Email: smommer@larsandersen.com

Objectives:

1. Identify trees on site.

2. Indicate size and condition of each tree.

3. Note feasibility of retention or relocation of trees.

DESCRIPTION OF TREES

The site contained 55 trees in the designated development area:

Cupaniopsis anacardioides (Carrotwood)	14
Malaleuca quinquenervia (Paperbark)	29
Phoenix dactylifera (Date palm)	2
Pinus canariensis (Canary Island pine)	2
Washingtonia robusta (Mexican fan palm)	8

Tree locations are indicated by numbers affixed to a copy of the ALTA survey emailed to me. The numbers on the survey map correspond to those identifying the trees in Table 1.

The health assessment of each tree was given as a percentage (condition rating, Table 1). The ratings denote the following descriptives:

90 – 100%	excellent condition
75 – 85%	superior condition
60 – 70%	average condition
45 – 55%	below average condition
30 – 40%	poor condition
15 – 25%	extremely poor condition
0 – 10%	dead or dying

Most of the subject trees were in poor condition (30 – 40%). Two (nos. 12 and 22) were rated extremely poor (25%). Four were judged to be in poor

condition, at 30% or 35% (nos. 11, 13, 16 and 40). Eighteen were rated below average, at 45-55% (nos., 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 17, 18, 24, 26, 27, 31, 32, 51, 52, 53 and 54). Only six were classed as average, at 60 – 65% (nos. 8, 19, 20, 21, 42 and 55).

The generally poor condition of the trees was due to misdesign and substandard pruning. All of the trees were of species which require far more soil surface and soil volume than had been provided. Almost all of the specimens had been subjected to repeated radical pruning ("topping").

The resulting tree and hardscape conditions had produced specimens which could not reasonably be retained *in situ* or successfully relocated. It would not be feasible to attempt salvaging any of the 55 subject trees.

The following photographs show typical examples