Exhibit 3g Item 5-A Planning Board Meeting July 28, 2025

### **Arborist Report**

### Mariner Square Alameda, CA

Prepared for: **The Martin Group 1970 Broadway, Suite 745 Oakland, CA 94612** 

Prepared by: Woodreeve Consulting 5627 Telegraph Ave., #385 Oakland CA, 94609

May 2025



### **Arborist Report**

#### Mariner Square, Alameda CA

#### Summary

The Martin Group is working on the redevelopment of Mariner Square, located at 2433 Mariner Square Loop, in Alameda. Woodreeve Consulting was asked to prepare an **Arborist Report** for the project as part of the development submittals to the City of Alameda.

A total of 54 trees were assessed across the site, including 6 street trees (#393-398) growing along Mariner Square Loop. Data on individual trees is provided in the *Tree Data* sheet and approximate locations are shown on the *Tree Location Maps* (Exhibits).

Olive, with 25 trees or 46% of the total population, dominated the site (Table 1, page 3). Olives were young to semi-mature, with most growing in irrigated turf. Olives are generally intolerant of regular irrigation and many were showing signs of decline. In addition, the olives were fruiting, producing copious amounts of fruit that create tripping hazards and stain surfaces.

A group of 9 coast redwoods was a prominent feature in the southeast corner of the site. The species had performed well, with all 9 trees in good to excellent condition. The remaining 4 species included 8 crape myrtles (6 of which were street trees), 7 Victorian box, 3 myoporum and 2 blackwood acacias.

Trees were generally in good (54% of the population) to fair (28%) condition. Only 10 trees, or 18% of the population, were in poor condition, most of which were Victorian box and myoporum.

The City of Alameda only protects street trees. As such, only street trees #393-398 were considered *Protected*.

I reviewed the following plans to estimate impacts to the trees. The plans included preliminary grading, drainage and utility information, as well as accurate trunk locations. Although the plans were described as preliminary, they includes sufficient information to make a complete and thorough assessment of impacts to trees.

 2433 Mariner Square Loop Preliminary Site Plan (Sheet C1.0), Preliminary Grading Plan (Sheet C3.0), and Preliminary Utility Plan (Sheet C4.0) prepared by BDE Architecture (dated 5.2.2025).

A total of 12 trees have been identified for preservation, including on-site coast redwoods #386-392, and street trees #394-398 (Table 3, page 7). All 5 street trees qualified as *Protected*.

In general, improvements adjacent to trees identified for retention would be limited to one side of the trees at a distance of 3 to 5x their trunk diameters. The most significant impacts are anticipated for coast redwoods #389 and 391, which would be preserved approximately 11' from the storm drain trench along the new building, and ~13' from the bioretention planter. Both the building and the bioretention planter were shifted and reduced to allow for retention of trees #389 and 392.

Some pruning of the canopy of tree #389 and 392 on the north side to provide construction clearance may be required, and root pruning is anticipated for coast redwoods #387, 389 and 392, where improvements will be located within 15' of the trees.

A total of 42 trees have been identified for removal, all of which would be directly impacted by the proposed changes. Street tree #393 was the only tree identified for removal that qualified as *Protected.* Thirteen of the trees identified for removal were of Low Suitability for Retention.

Both specific and general *Tree Preservation Requirements* are provided at the end of the report (Pages 8-10).

# Arborist Report Mariner Square

## Alameda CA

#### **Table of Contents**

Introduction Project Description Regulatory Context	<b>Page</b> 1 1 1			
Project Limitations	1			
Methods	2			
Tree Resource Condition Protected Status Suitability for Retention	2 3 5 5			
Project Impacts Retained Trees Removed trees	6 6 7			
Tree Preservation Recommendations Specific Requirements General Requirements	8 8 9			
General Limitations	11			
Figures and Tables				
Table 1. Number and Condition of Trees	3			
Table 2. Suitability for Conservation	5			
Table 3. Assessment of Impacts and Recommendations	7			
Exhibits				

#### Tree Data

**Tree Location Map** 

### Arborist Report

#### Mariner Square, Alameda CA

#### Introduction

The Martin Group is working on the redevelopment of Mariner Square, located at 2433 Mariner Square Loop, in Alameda. Woodreeve Consulting was asked to prepare an **Arborist Report** for the project as part of the development submittals to the City of Alameda.

#### Site and Project Description

The site is an existing office park at the corners of Mariner Square Loop and Mariner Square Drive. The site is flat and contains four commercial buildings, with a surface parking lot on the east side of the building and two driveways onto Mariner Square Drive. The site has ample landscaping surrounding the buildings and in the central courtyard, with limited landscaping between the parking lot and Mariner Square Drive.

The project proposes to construct an 8-story residential structure with apartments surrounding and above the 3-story garage. Garage access would be in the southwest corner of the site, from Mariner Square Loop, and a residential access and parking stalls would be constructed in the northeast corner, off of Mariner Square Drive. An approximately 5' wide bioretention planter would be installed around the entire building.

#### **Regulatory Context**

The City of Alameda Public Works Department protects all street trees, and the Planning Department considers the following trees as *Protected* in Alameda. Removal of a *Protected* tree requires a Certificate of Approval and removal of a street tree requires approval from the Public Works Department and public posting. *Protected* trees are defined as:

- 1. All coast live oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*) in Alameda with a ten inch (10") or greater diameter measured four and a half feet (4.5') above ground.
- 2. All Mexican fan palms (*Washingtonia robusta*) and California fan palms (*Washingtonia filifera*) in the public rights of way on both sides of Burbank Street, Portola Avenue, and Eighth Street between Central and Portola Avenues.
- 3. All trees in the three median islands on Thompson Avenue between High Street and Fernside Boulevard, known as Christmas Tree Lane. First island: Atlas Cedar (*Cedrus atlantica*); Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*). Second island: Atlas Cedar (*Cedrus atlantica*); Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*); Monterey Pine (*Pinus radiate*). Third island: Atlas Cedar (*Cedrus atlantica*); Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*); Monterey Pine (*Pinus radiate*). Third island: Atlas Cedar (*Cedrus atlantica*); Coast Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*); Jellicote Pine (*Pinus patula*); Bradford Pear (*Pyrus calleryana*).
- 4. All sycamore (London plane trees) (*Platanus* x *hispanica*) in the public rights of way on both sides of Central Avenue between Fernside Boulevard and 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

#### **Project Limitations**

The following plans were reviewed relative to the proposed development. These plans did not include all the information required to make a complete and thorough assessment of impacts to trees.

• 2433 Mariner Square Loop Preliminary Site Plan (Sheet C1.0), Preliminary Grading Plan (Sheet C3.0), and Preliminary Utility Plan (Sheet C4.0) prepared by BDE Architecture (dated 5.2.2025).

#### Methods

Trees were assessed on October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2023. All on-site trees measuring  $\geq$ 6" in diameter and any street tree, irrespective of diameter, were included in the survey.

The assessment procedure consisted of the following:

- 1. Identifying each live tree as to species;
- 2. Tagging each tree with an identifying number (attached to the trunk);
- 3. Recording each tree's location on a map;
- 4. Measuring the trunk diameter at 54" above grade;
- 5. Measuring the dripline in four cardinal directions;
- 6. Evaluating the health and structure using a scale of 1 5, where 5 is excellent condition and 1 is a tree in severe decline:
  - **5** = *Excellent* health and vitality. Good form and structure. No insect or disease problems of significance.
  - 4 = Good health and vitality. Minor dieback and/or decline in vigor. Insignificant structural defects or insects/disease issues that can be corrected.
  - 3 = Moderate health and vitality. Moderate twig and branch dieback or chlorotic foliage. Fair structure, limited decay and/or insects/disease issues that would require a concerted effort to correct.
  - 2 = Poor health and vitality. Declining tree with extensive dieback or very thin crown. Significant decay and/or structural defects that cannot be corrected.
  - 1 = Very poor health and vitality. Tree is mostly dead or has extensive structural defects that cannot be corrected.

7. Rating the suitability for retention as 'high', 'moderate' or 'low'. Suitability goes beyond tree health and structure to consider the interaction of the tree and its current environment and its potential to be retained and continue to provide benefits.

*High*: Trees with good health and structure that have been appropriately located and can continue to provide benefits well into the future.

*Moderate:* Trees with fair health and/or structure that have minimal restrictions to their growth and development. The tree can continue to provide benefits but will require ongoing management to address health, structure and/or tree/site conflicts.

*Low:* Trees with poor health and/or significant structural defects. The tree may be in conflict with overhead utilities, hardscape or other site features that require ongoing abatement. The species may be invasive or have other characteristics that are undesirable or inappropriate for their location.

#### Tree Resource

A total of 54 trees were assessed across the site, including 6 street trees (#393-398) growing along Mariner Square Loop. Data on individual trees is provided in the *Tree Data* sheet and approximate locations are shown on the *Tree Location Maps* (Exhibits).

Olive, with 25 trees or 46% of the total population, dominated the site (Table 1, following page). Half the olives were semi-mature, with trunk diameters about 10", and half were young with trunk diameters below 10". Those planted in irrigated turf had not performed as well, with the regular irrigation leading to dieback and decline. Unfortunately, all of the olives were fruiting, producing copious amounts of fruit that create tripping hazards and stain the concrete.

A group of 9 mature coast redwoods, with trunk diameters between 26" and 42", were growing in the southeast corner of the site, near the corners of Mariner Square Drive and Mariner Square Loop. The species had performed well, with all 9 trees in good to excellent condition.

The remaining 4 species included 8 crape myrtles (6 of which were street trees), 7 Victorian box, 3 myoporum and 2 blackwood acacias.

#### **Tree Condition**

Table 1 provides the number and condition for each species of tree assessed as part of the project. Brief descriptions and representative photographs are provided on the following page(s).

Trees were generally in good (54% of the population) to fair (28%) condition. Only 10 trees, or 18% of the population, were in poor condition, most of which were Victorian box and myoporum.

Common Name	Scientific Name		No.		
		<b>Poor</b> (1-2)	ondition Ra Fair (3)	<b>Good</b> (4-5)	of Trees
Blackwood acacia	Acacia melanoxylon	1	1	-	2
Crape myrtle	Lagerstroemia indica	-	1	7	8
Myoporum	Myoporum leatum	3	-	-	3
Olive	Olea europaea	2	11	12	25
Victorian box	Pittosporum undulatum	4	2	1	7
Coast redwood	Sequoia sempervirens	-	-	9	9
Total		10	15	29	54
		18%	28%	54%	100%

Table 1: N	Jumber, Conditio	on and	Protected	Status	of Trees
	Mariner S	quare,	Alameda (	CA	



mature trees were growing

in irrigated turf and were in

fair condition. Both trees

dieback in their crowns.

were fruiting and had

Photo 3 (L): Show olive #383. This young tree was growing in an unirrigated landscape bed and was in excellent condition. The tree was fruiting but had no dieback in the crown.



**Photos 4** (above L) shows coast redwood #383, growing on the south/Mariner Square Loop side of the property. **Photo 5** (above R): Show the group of 5 coast redwoods (#389-392 - L to R), growing at the corners of Mariner Square Loop and Mariner Square Drive. Coast redwoods at the site were mature, with trunk diameters between 26" and 42". #386, 387 and 389 had their crowns lifted on the building side to ~35', presumably to keep needles and duff off the building's roofs.

All of the coast redwoods were in good to excellent condition, in part due to the regular irrigation they are receiving in the irrigated turf. This practice will need to continue if the trees are to remain alive and an asset to the site.



Photo 6 (L): Looking northeast at crape myrtle #375. On-site crape myrtles #375 and 382 were young and in excellent condition.

Photo 7 (R): Looking west at crape myrtles #393 and 392 (foreground to background). A row of 6 crape myrtles had been planted as street trees along Mariner Square Loop and were in fair to excellent condition. Some had displaced the sidewalk from 2" to 3".



#### **Protected Status**

The City of Alameda Public Works Department protects all street trees, and the Planning Department protects specific trees or groups of trees growing in the medians and public rights-of-way on Burbank Street, Portola Avenue, and Eighth Street between Central and Portola Avenues, Thompson Avenue between High Street and Fernside Boulevard, and Central Avenue between Fernside Boulevard and 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Removal of a *Protected* tree requires a Certificate of Approval and removal of a street tree requires approval from the Public Works Department and public posting.

Based on the City's definitions, only street trees #393-398 are considered Protected.

#### Suitability for Retention

Irrespective of impacts from development, some trees are inappropriate for retention. Suitability for Retention ratings incorporate tree health, structure, species characteristics, tree age and longevity and tree-site conflicts. The goal is to identify trees that are healthy, well structured, and that can tolerate impacts from proposed site changes.

Factors affecting Suitability for Retention ratings, include:

- **Tree health and structure**: The better the health and structure, the more tolerant of development impacts and the less likely the tree will fail.
- Species characteristics: Species differ in their tolerance to root loss, grade change, hydrological changes and pruning. In addition, some species are listed as invasive, as defined by the California Invasive Plant Inventory Database (<u>http://www.calipc.org/paf/</u>) and are considered inappropriate for retention.
- **Tree age and longevity:** Older trees are less capable of responding to site changes and disturbance and can be expected to have shorter life-spans than young trees.
- **Tree-Site Conflicts:** Where large-growing species have been planted in tight spaces or beneath overhead utilities and require ongoing maintenance (root or crown pruning), they may not be appropriate for retention. The tree may have simply outgrown the available space, or the species may produce fruit/litter that represents a mismatch between the tree and its planting location.

Table 2 provides a summary of the Suitability for Retention ratings. Trees in the High category represent the best opportunities for successful tree preservation. Those in the moderate category may be preserved but will require more space, management and monitoring to successfully preserve. I generally do not recommend retaining trees in the Low category.

Table 2: Suitability for RetentionMariner Square, Alameda CA

	These are healthy, well-structured trees	17 trees were considered Highly
High	that can be expected to continue to	suitable for retention, including 7 crape
	provide benefits for many years.	myrtles, 6 coast redwoods and 4 olives.

(**Continued**, following page)

### Table 2: Suitability for Retention, continued<br/>Mariner Square, Alameda CA

Moderate	These are trees with moderate health and structural defects that can be managed but which may not be correctable. They can be expected to continue to provide benefits, but may have a shorter life-expectancy and require more management than Highly suitable trees.	24 trees were considered of Moderate suitability for retention, including 18 olives, 3 coast redwoods, Victorian box #368 and 385 and crape myrtle street tree #396.
Low	These are trees in decline or with structural defects that can't be managed. The tree may be inappropriately located on the site, requiring ongoing management, often to the detriment of tree health and structure. Any benefits the tree provides are limited and outweighed by the costs of management. In addition, blackwood acacia is considered invasive.	13 trees were considered of Low suitability for retention, including 5 Victorian box, olives #349, 351 and 384, myoporum #355, 376 and 377 and Blackwood acacias #366 and 367.

#### **Project Impacts**

The project proposes to construct an 8-story residential structure with apartments surrounding and above the 3-story garage. Garage access would be in the southwest corner of the site, from Mariner Square Loop, and a residential access and parking stalls would be constructed in the northeast corner, off Mariner Square Drive. An estimated 5' wide bioretention planter would be installed around the entire building. Between the building footprint, new site features, and perimeter planter, the primary opportunity for tree preservation is in the southeast corner of the site and along Mariner Square Loop.

I reviewed the following plans to estimate impacts to the trees. The plans included preliminary grading, drainage and utility information, as well as accurate trunk locations.

• 2433 Mariner Square Loop Preliminary Site Plan (Sheet C1.0), Preliminary Grading Plan (Sheet C3.0), and Preliminary Utility Plan (Sheet C4.0) prepared by BDE Architecture (dated 5.2.2025).

#### **Retained Trees**

A total of 12 trees have been identified for preservation, including on-site coast redwoods #386-392, and street trees #394-398. All 5 street trees qualified as *Protected*. Table 3, following page, provides the disposition, protected status, and anticipated impacts for each tree.

In general, improvements adjacent to trees identified for retention would be limited to one side of the trees at a distance of 3 to 5x their trunk diameters. Impacts are expected to be tolerable at these distances. The most significant impacts are anticipated for coast redwoods #389 and 391, which would be preserved approximately 11' from the storm drain trench along the new building, and ~13' from the bioretention planter. Both the building and the bioretention planter were shifted and reduced to allow for retention of trees #389 and 392.

Some pruning of the canopy of tree #389 and 392 on the north side to provide construction clearance may be required. Root pruning is anticipated for coast redwoods #387, 389 and 392, where improvements will be located within 15' of the trees.

#### **Removed Trees**

A total of 42 trees have been identified for removal, all of which would be directly impacted by the proposed changes. Street tree #393 was the only tree identified for removal that qualified as *Protected.* Thirteen of the trees identified for removal were of Low Suitability for Retention.

Tree #	Species	Diameter	Protected	Disposition	Impacts
345	Olive	9	No	Remove	Within new site features
346	Olive	6,5,5,2	No	Remove	Within new site features
347	Olive	6,4,4,3,2	No	Remove	Within new site features
348	Olive	9	No	Remove	Within new site features
349	Olive	6,3,2	No	Remove	Within new site features
350	Olive	5,5,4	No	Remove	Within new site features
351	Olive	5,5,4	No	Remove	Within new drive
352	Olive	9,7	No	Remove	Within new drive
353	Olive	8,7,4	No	Remove	Within new drive
354	Olive	8,5,4	No	Remove	Within new building
355	Myoporum	8	No	Remove	Within new building
356	Olive	9	No	Remove	Within new building
357	Victorian box	9	No	Remove	Within new building
358	Victorian box	8	No	Remove	Within new building
359	Coast redwood	26	No	Remove	Within new building
360	Coast redwood	26	No	Remove	Within new building
361	Olive	8,7,7,5,3	No	Remove	Within new building
362	Olive	14,6	No	Remove	Within new building
363	Olive	10,9,8	No	Remove	Within new building
364	Olive	14	No	Remove	Within new building
365	Olive	14	No	Remove	Within new building
366	Blackwood acacia	14,13,11	No	Remove	Within new building
367	Blackwood acacia	10	No	Remove	Within new building
368	Victorian box	10	No	Remove	Within new building
369	Victorian box	10	No	Remove	Within new building
370	Victorian box	10	No	Remove	Within new building
371	Olive	11	No	Remove	Within new building
372	Olive	15	No	Remove	Within new building
373	Olive	13	No	Remove	Within new building
374	Olive	11,10	No	Remove	Within new building
375	Crape myrtle	6	No	Remove	Within sidewalk
376	Myoporum	16	No	Remove	Within sidewalk
377	Myoporum	22	No	Remove	Within sidewalk
378	Victorian box	8	No	Remove	Within new building
379	Olive	10,10,9	No	Remove	Within new dog run
380	Olive	12,7,6	No	Remove	Within sidewalk
381	Olive	7,7,5	No	Remove	Within sidewalk
382	Crape myrtle	6	No	Remove	Within sidewalk
383	Olive	11	No nuod fallowin	Remove	Within sidewalk

Table 3: Assessment of ImpactsMariner Square, Alameda CA

(**Continued**, following page)

Tree #	Species	Diameter	Protected	Disposition	Impacts
384	Olive	10,8,7,7,3	No	Remove	Within new site features
385	Victorian box	9	No	Remove	Within new building
386	Coast redwood	39	No	Preserve	~20' S. of biotreatment
387	Coast redwood	42	No	Preserve	~15' SW. of biotreatment
388	Coast redwood	36	No	Preserve	Outside impacts
389	Coast redwood	35	No	Preserve	~11' S. of SD & 13.5' SW.
					of biotreatment
390	Coast redwood	32	No	Preserve	~22' S. of biotreatment
391	Coast redwood	36	No	Preserve	Outside impacts
392	Coast redwood	35	No	Preserve	~11' S. of SD & 13' SE. of
					biotreatment
393	Crape myrtle	8	Yes	Remove	Street tree, within entry
394	Crape myrtle	7	Yes	Preserve	Street tree, outside impacts
395	Crape myrtle	7	Yes	Preserve	Street tree, outside impacts
396	Crape myrtle	2	Yes	Preserve	Street tree, outside impacts
397	Crape myrtle	6	Yes	Preserve	Street tree, outside impacts
398	Crape myrtle	5	Yes	Preserve	Street tree, outside impacts
Root lo	oss within 1-2xDBH		Root loss wit	thin 4x DBH	
Root lo	oss within 3x DBH		Root loss ≥5	x DBH	

### Table 3: Assessment of Impacts, continued Mariner Square, Alameda CA

#### Tree Preservation Recommendations

Preservation of trees during construction requires a deliberate and concerted effort from the planning stage, through demolition and construction and installation of plants and irrigation. Every contractor on the project must be made aware of the following recommendations for the protection of trees identified for preservation if the trees are to remain an asset and continue to provide benefits to the site for years to come.

Damage to trees on construction sites is typically associated with root injury and loss. Direct injury severs roots while indirect injury, such as soil compaction, creates an inhospitable environment for root growth.

#### **Specific Tree Preservation Requirements**

The primary recommendations for preservation on the Mariner Square project include:

- The Consulting Arborist must review all plans to adequately assess impacts to trees. These include, but are not limited to, improvement plans, utility and drainage plans, grading plans, landscape and irrigation plans.
- Consider supplying the coast redwoods with supplemental irrigation. These trees developed with regular supplemental irrigation and will require ongoing supplemental irrigation during the demolition and construction phases if they are to remain an asset to the site.
- Design utilities and irrigation requiring excavation of 6" or deeper to remain outside the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE** (see below for specific **TPZs**).
- Plan to protect trees identified for preservation by installing 6' chain link tree protection fencing around trees/groups of trees prior to demolition, grubbing or grading.
- If utilities or irrigation will be replaced with the **TPZ**, excavate the trenches by hand to avoid damaging roots ≥2" in diameter or design the irrigation to be run on ground surface and covered with mulch or gravel.

• Have trees #389 and 392 pruned to reduce the canopy on the north for construction clearance. Any pruning should be done in accordance with the pruning requirements provided below.

#### **General Tree Preservation Requirements**

In addition to the specific recommendations provided above, the following general recommendations are designed to minimize impacts to trees from site demolition, grading, utility work and construction.

Any work within the designated **TREE PROTECTION ZONE** must be approved and monitored by the Consulting Arborist. If fences have been erected at the limit of the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE** the fences will be **temporarily** removed and work performed under the direct supervision of the Consulting Arborist. Fences will be replaced following completion of the work based on the recommendations of the Consulting Arborist.

#### Design phase

- 1. The Consulting Arborist must review all plans to adequately assess impacts to trees. These include, but are not limited to, improvement plans, utility and drainage plans, grading plans, landscape and irrigation plans and demolition plans.
- 2. *Tree Preservation Recommendations* prepared by the Consulting Arborist should be included on all plans.
- Establish a TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ) for trees to be preserved, in which no disturbance is permitted. TREE PROTECTION ZONES are provided the following table. No grading, excavation, construction or storage of materials shall occur within that zone.

Tree No.	TPZ
#386	20' N., dripline in all other directions
#387	15' N. and E., dripline in all other directions
#389	10' N., 13' NE., dripline in all other directions
#390	20' N., dripline in all other directions
#392	10' N., 12' NW., dripline in all other directions
#394-398	Dripline in all directions

#### **Specific Tree Protection Zones**

- 4. Underground services including utilities, sub-drains, water or sewer shall be routed around the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE**. Where encroachment cannot be avoided, special construction techniques such as hand digging or tunneling under roots shall be employed where necessary to minimize root injury.
- 5. Irrigation systems must be designed so that no trenching will occur within the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE**.

#### Pre-demolition and construction phase

- 1. The demolition contractor and construction superintendent shall meet with the Consulting Arborist before beginning work to discuss work procedures and tree protection.
- 2. Fence all trees to be retained to completely enclose the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE** prior to demolition, grubbing or grading. Fences shall be 6 ft. chain link and are to remain until all grading, construction and landscaping is completed. Place weatherproof signs, 2' x 2', on the fencing that read "**TREE PROTECTION ZONE** Keep Out" (eg. one sign for each of the four compass points).

- 3. Where possible, cap and abandon all existing underground utilities within the **TPZ** in place. Removal of utility boxes by hand is acceptable but avoid trenching within the **TPZ**.
- 4. Prune trees #389 and 392 to provide construction clearance.
- All pruning shall be done by a State of California Licensed Tree Contractor (C61/D49). All pruning shall be done by Certified Arborist or Certified Tree Worker in accordance with the Best Management Practices for Pruning (International Society of Arboriculture, 2017) and adhere to the most recent editions of the American National Standard for Tree Care Operations (Z133.1) and Pruning (A300).
- 6. All tree work shall comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as well as California Fish and Wildlife Code 3503-3513 to not disturb nesting birds. To the extent feasible tree pruning and removal should be scheduled outside of the breeding season. Breeding bird surveys should be conducted prior to tree work. Qualified biologists should be involved in establishing work buffers for active nests.

#### Construction phase

- 1. Any contractor working in the vicinity of trees to be preserved is required to meet with the Consulting Arborist at the site to review all work procedures, access routes, storage areas and tree protection measures.
- Any excavation that is expected to encounter tree roots, such as the perimeter planter and building foundation work adjacent to trees #386, 387, 389, 390 and 392, must be approved and monitored by the Consulting Arborist. Roots shall be cut by manually exposing roots and pruning all roots ≥2" in diameter with a <u>sharp</u> saw. The Consulting Arborist will identify where root pruning is required and monitor all root pruning activities.
- 3. If injury should occur to any tree during construction, it should be evaluated as soon as possible by the Consulting Arborist so that appropriate treatments can be applied.
- 4. Fences have been erected to protect trees to be preserved. Fences define a specific TREE PROTECTION ZONE for each tree or group of trees. Fences are to remain until all site work has been completed and may not be relocated or removed without permission of the Consulting Arborist.
- 5. No materials, equipment, spoil, waste or wash-out water may be deposited, stored, or parked within the **TREE PROTECTION ZONE** (fenced area).
- 6. Any additional tree pruning needed for clearance during construction must be performed by a qualified arborist and not by construction personnel.

Woodreeve Consulting

le Feffingwell

John Leffingwell Board Certified Master Arborist #WE-3966B Registered Consulting Arborist #442

Exhibits: Tree Data Tree Location Map

#### **General Limitations**

- My assessment of the trees is based on a visual evaluation of external conditions and defects observable from the ground. While defect-free trees do fail, especially under extreme wind loading or wind and rain, identifying trees with observable defects is a critical step in enhancing safety.
- Trees are dynamic, living entities that change over time. My assessment of the tree(s) is based on their condition at the time of my inspection. Trees should be inspected annually to monitor for changes in health and structure and following storms. Initiating these inspections is the tree owner/manager's responsibility.
- Trees require management to perform well in a giving setting. Periodic pruning, mulching, pest management and irrigation are typically required.
- Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct.
- Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources; however, the consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- Sketches, drawings, and photographs in this report are intended for visual aids. They are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or surveys unless expressed otherwise.
- Information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflects the conditions of those items at the time of inspection.
- The inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, excavation, probing, or coring.

Tre	ee Data	Mariner's 2433 Mariner Alameda, Cali October 2023	r's Loop ifornia				VO( c o N	DDR sui	(EE)	VE NG
TREE No.	SPECIES	<b>TRUNK</b> DIAMETER	PROTECTED	<b>CONDITION</b> 1=POOR	SUITABILITY FOR	COMMENTS	DR	IPLI	NES (	[ft.)
		(in inches)		5=EXCELLENT	RETENTION		N.	S.	E.	W.
345	Olive	9	No	5	High	Codominant trunks at 5'; good form; a little one sided E.	10	10	12	8
346	Olive	6,5,5,2	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at base; fruiting; in narrow planter.	12	10	12	10
347	Olive	6,4,4,3,2	No	4	Moderate	Codominant trunks at base; fruiting; in narrow planter.	12	12	12	10
348	Olive	9	No	3	Moderate	Good form; thinning crown; fruiting; in narrow planter.	8	10	8	10
349	Olive	6,3,2	No	3	Low	Codominant trunks at base; moderate dieback; fruiting; in narrow planter.	6	8	8	8
350	Olive	5,5,4	No	3	Moderate	Codominant trunks at base; thinning crown; fruiting; in narrow planter.	6	10	6	8
351	Olive	5,5,4	No	2	Low	Multiple attachments at base; mostly dead; fruiting; in narrow planter.	10	5	5	8
352	Olive	9,7	No	4	High	Codominant trunks at 1'; good form; a little sparse; fruiting.	12	10	12	15
353	Olive	8,7,4	No	4	High	Codominant trunks at 3'; lateral SE.; a little sparse; fruiting.	12	16	12	10
354	Olive	8,5,4	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at base; a little sparse; fruiting; in medium planter.	10	15	12	12
355	Myoporum	8	No	2	Low	In decline; myoporum thrip.	5	5	10	5
356	Olive	9	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 7'; one sided E.; a little sparse; fruiting.	8	10	15	6
357	Victorian box	9	No	2	Low	Codominant trunks at 5'; moderate dieback.	12	12	10	8
358	Victorian box	8	No	2	Low	Codominant trunks at 8'; moderate dieback.	8	8	8	10
359	Coast redwood	26	No	4	Moderate	Good form; minor dieback; large surface roots.	12	12	12	10

Tre	e Data	Mariner's 2433 Mariner Alameda, Cal October 2023	r's Loop ifornia					DDF su		VE N G
TREE No.	SPECIES	<b>TRUNK</b> DIAMETER (in inches)	PROTECTED	<b>CONDITION</b> 1=POOR 5=EXCELLENT	SUITABILITY FOR RETENTION	COMMENTS	DR N.	IPLI S.	NES ( E.	(ft.) W.
360	Coast redwood	26	No	4	Moderate	Good form; minor dieback; large surface roots; displaced asphalt walkway 4".	12	12	10	12
361	Olive	8,7,7,5,3	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at base; a little sparse; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	12	10	18	12
362	Olive	14,6	No	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 4"; moderate dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	15	12	15	10
363	Olive	10,9,8	No	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 3"; moderate dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	15	12	12	12
364	Olive	14	No	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 7'; slight lean & one sided E.; dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	10	12	10	12
365	Olive	14	No	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 7'; slight lean E.; moderate dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	12	8	12	8
366	Blackwood acacia	14,13,11	No	3	Low	Multiple attachments at base; narrow attachments; stems lean SE.; 11" stem losing bark; displaced asphalt walkway 4".	15	25	20	15
367	Blackwood acacia	10	No	2	Low	Only one stem remains after others failed; leans E.	10	5	10	8
368	Victorian box	10	No	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 8'; slight lean SE.; dieback	10	12	10	12
369	Victorian box	10	No	3	Low	Multiple attachments at 8'; sparse crown	10	10	10	10
370	Victorian box	10	No	2	Low	Poor form; in decline.	10	6	8	8
371	Olive	11	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 8'; a little one sided E.; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	12	10	15	8

Tre	e Data	Mariner's 2433 Mariner Alameda, Cali October 2023	's Loop ifornia					S U I		VE N G
TREE No.	SPECIES	<b>TRUNK</b> DIAMETER	PROTECTED	<b>CONDITION</b> 1=POOR	SUITABILITY FOR	COMMENTS	DR	IPLI	NES (	 (ft.)
		(in inches)		5=EXCELLENT	RETENTION		<b>N.</b>	S.	Е.	w.
372	Olive	15	No	3	Moderate	Codominant trunks at 8'; W. half of tree w/ moderate dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	12	10	15	15
373	Olive	13	No	4	High	Multiple attachments at 8'; good form; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	12	12	12	15
374	Olive	11,10	No	3	Moderate	Codominant trunks at base; upright form; moderate dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	10	15	15	10
375	Crape myrtle	6	No	5	High	Good young tree; narrow form.	6	6	6	6
376	Myoporum	16	No	2	Low	One sided W.; in decline; myoporum thrip.	10	8	10	10
377	Myoporum	22	No	1	Low	All but dead; myoporum thrip.	12	5	8	5
378	Victorian box	8	No	2	Low	Topped at 12'; poor form and structure.	6	6	6	3
379	Olive	10,10,9	No	3	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 2'; lateral N.; moderate dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	18	15	10	15
380	Olive	12,7,6	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 2'; good form; little sparse; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	15	15	12	12
381	Olive	7,7,5	No	3	Moderate	Codominant trunks at base; one sided S.; moderate dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	8	10	12	15
382	Crape myrtle	6	No	5	High	Good young tree; narrow form.	6	6	6	6
383	Olive	11	No	5	Moderate	Codominant trunks at 5'; good form; base close to parking lot; fruiting.	8	15	8	10
384	Olive	10,8,7,7,3	No	2	Low	Codominant trunks at base; one sided S.; extensive dieback; fruiting; in irrigated turf.	10	12	10	12

Tre	e Data	Mariner's 2433 Mariner Alameda, Cal October 2023	r's Loop ifornia					S U I		VE v g
TREE No.	SPECIES	<b>TRUNK</b> DIAMETER	PROTECTED	<b>CONDITION</b> 1=POOR	SUITABILITY FOR	COMMENTS	DR	IPLI	NES (	[ft.)
		(in inches)		5=EXCELLENT	RETENTION		N.	S.	E.	w.
385	Victorian box	9	No	4	Moderate	Multiple attachments at 7'; close to building.	10	10	8	10
386	Coast redwood	39	No	4	High	Good form; crown reduced N. to $\sim$ 35'; windburned top.	15	15	15	15
387	Coast redwood	42	No	4	High	Good form; crown reduced N. to $\sim$ 35'; windburned top.	15	16	15	15
388	Coast redwood	36	No	4	High	Good form; crowded & one sided S.; windburned top.	10	16	15	15
389	Coast redwood	35	No	4	High	Good form; crown reduced W. to $\sim$ 35'; windburned top.	15	10	10	15
390	Coast redwood	32	No	4	Moderate	Crowded; narrow form; windburned top.	15	15	10	10
391	Coast redwood	36	No	4	High	Good form; crowded & one sided E.; windburned top.	15	16	15	10
392	Coast redwood	35	No	4	High	Good form; windburned top.	15	16	15	15
393	Crape myrtle	8	Yes	5	High	Street tree, no tag; good form and structure; displaced sidewalk 3".	8	8	8	8
394	Crape myrtle	7	Yes	5	High	Street tree, no tag; good form and structure; displaced sidewalk 2".	8	8	8	8
395	Crape myrtle	7	Yes	4	High	Street tree, no tag; good form and structure; dieback; displaced sidewalk 2".	8	8	8	8
396	Crape myrtle	2	Yes	3	Moderate	Street tree, no tag; small crown.	3	3	3	3
397	Crape myrtle	6	Yes	5	High	Street tree, no tag; good form and structure; displaced sidewalk 2".	8	8	8	8
398	Crape myrtle	5	Yes	5	High	Street tree, no tag; good form and structure; displaced sidewalk 1".	8	8	8	8





