

SUF

SOUND URBAN FORESTRY, LLC

Appraisals ~ Site Planning ~ Urban Landscape Design & Management
Environmental Education & Restoration ~ Risk Assessments ~ Diagnosis

8/30/2024

Woodfield Estates Homeowners Association
C/o: John O'Conner
2418 Woodfield Loop SE
Olympia, WA 98501

RE: Woodfield Estates Open Space Tree Risk Assessment

Mr. O'Conner:

Upon the request of the Woodfield Estates HOA, I have conducted tree risk assessments within three community open space tracts. I visited the site and met with you on August 21, 2024. This is a follow-up to my previous assessments in 2019 and 2021. The following report presents my findings and recommendations.

Tree Risk Assessment

The tree risk assessment methodology used for this report was developed by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) in 2013. It replaces the original method adopted in 2011.

Tree risk assessment can be conducted at different levels of intensity, each employing varying methods and providing the client with varied options of reporting and recommendations. The level selected should be appropriate for the assignment.

The ANSI standard for risk assessment and ISA's *Best Management Practices: Tree Risk Assessment* defines three levels of tree risk assessment:

- Level 1: Limited visual
- Level 2: Basic
- Level 3: Advanced

Level 1 assessment involves a visual assessment of an individual tree or populations of trees near specified targets, conducted from a specified perspective in order to identify certain obvious defects or specified conditions. A limited visual assessment typically focuses on identifying trees with *imminent* and/ or *probable* likelihood of failure.

A Level 2 or basic assessment is the standard assessment performed by arborists in response to most private client requests for tree risk assessments. It consists of a detailed visual inspection of a tree and its surrounding site and a synthesis of the information collected. A basic assessment requires walking completely around the tree – looking at the site, buttress roots, trunk and branches. Looking at the tree from some distance away, as well as close up, to consider crown shape and surroundings.

Level 3 is an advanced assessment and it is performed to provide detailed information about specific tree parts, defects, targets, or site conditions. It may be in conjunction with or after a basic assessment if additional information is needed and the client approves the additional service. Specialized equipment, data collection and analysis, and/or expertise are usually required for advanced assessments. These assessments are, therefore, generally more time intensive and more expensive.

After determining the likelihood of failure and the likelihood of impacting a target, the combined likelihood of a failure impacting a target can be categorized. Matrix 1 can be used as a guide in relating these likelihood factors within a given time frame. The resulting terms (unlikely, somewhat likely, likely, very likely) are defined by their use within the table and are used to represent this combination of occurrences in Matrix 2.

Matrix 1. Likelihood of Failure

Likelihood of Failure	Likelihood of Impacting Target			
	Very Low	Low	Medium	High
Imminent	Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very likely
Probable	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat likely	Likely
Possible	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat likely
Improbable	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely

Matrix 2. Risk Rating

Likelihood of Failure and Impact	Consequences of Failure			
	Negligible	Minor	Significant	Severe
Very likely	Low	Moderate	High	Extreme
Likely	Low	Moderate	High	High
Somewhat likely	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Unlikely	Low	Low	Low	Low

Field Data and Recommendations

Level 2 risk assessments were conducted on all trees with potential targets, within the three areas. Table 3 presents a summary of my findings and recommendations for those trees identified as of concern. Please see the included aerial for the locations and photos. The trees were marked with aluminum tags indicating their corresponding ID# and those recommended for removal are also flagged with green ribbon.

Table 3. Complete Risk Assessment Summary

ID#	Common Name	DBH Height Live Canopy Ratio	Target/ Distance	Overall Condition	Risk Rating	Comments/Recommendation
1	Willow	10" 30' 25%	Bench Mailboxes	Poor	Low	Tree has experienced root failure and is lying onto the bench and mailboxes. It is not a high risk as it has already failed but it is obstructing use. Remove Tree
2	Big Leaf Maple	7" 22' 5%	Fence, 6'	Poor	Moderate	Tree is in decline due to Maple Anthracnose infection. Large fungal fruiting body found on the main stem. Remove Tree
3	Big Leaf Maple	11" 30' 20%	House, 15' Walkway, 11'	Poor	Moderate	Open decay column along the main stem associated with Maple Anthracnose infection. Tree leans toward the adjacent house. Remove Tree

ID#	Common Name	DBH Height Live Canopy Ratio	Target/ Distance	Overall Condition	Risk Rating	Comments/Recommendation
4	Douglas Fir	23" 105' 15%	Yard, 25' House, 65'	Poor	High	Tree is in apparent overall decline. Epicormic branching found along the west side of the trunk at 32'. Trunk soundings indicated internal stem decay at the base. Fungal fruiting bodies also found in the area. Extracted core sample taken at 2' on the west side revealed only 2" of holding wood, the remaining was decayed. Remove Tree. Create 20' wildlife snag.
5	Douglas Fir	30" 125' 30%	Yard, 10' House, 55'	Fair	Moderate	Trunk soundings indicated internal decay at the base. Extracted core sample taken at 3' on the east side revealed 4" of holding wood, the remaining decayed. Core sample taken on the west side revealed 6" of holding wood. Retain Tree, Monitor
6	Red Alder	16" 50' 0%	House, 40' Yard, 30'	Dead	Moderate	Tree has been dead for some time. Bark is sloughing off and tree is strongly leaning toward adjacent property. Remove tree

Comments

I recommend that Tree #4 be removed within the next 3 months, Trees #2, 3 and 6 removed within the next 6 months and Tree # 5 reassessed in 2 years. It is my understanding that Tree #1 has already been dealt with.

There are three trees within the southern parcel, identified as #6-8 in my past report that have remain unchanged since my previous assessment. I still stand by my findings and recommendations for these trees.

A large big leaf maple located in the southwest corner of the large wetland parcel has also maintained its condition and should be continued to be monitored.

Professionally Submitted,



Kevin M. McFarland, Principal
Consulting Urban Forester
ISA Certified Arborist PN-0373 & ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
Sound Urban Forestry, LLC
P.O. Box 489
Tahuya, WA 98588

References

Dunster, Dr, Julian et al. 2013. *Tree Risk Assessment Manual*. International Society of Arboriculture. Champaign, IL.

Mattheck, C. & Brelor, H (1998). *The body language of trees. A handbook for failure Analysis*. Research for Amenity Trees No. 4. The Stationary Office, London.

Smiley, E. Thomas, Nelda Matheny and Sharon Lilly. 2011. *Best Management Practices – Tree Risk Assessment*. International Society of Arboriculture. Champaign, IL.

Locations of 2024 Identified Trees



Photos



Assumptions and Limitations of Tree Risk Assessment

1. Tree risk assessment is limited in scope to the specific risks(s) of interest, and does not include any and all risks.
2. Tree risk assessment considers significant known and/or assigned targets and visible or detectable tree conditions.
3. Tree risk assessments represent the condition of the tree and site at the time of inspection.
4. Only those trees specified in the scope of work were assessed, and assessments were performed within the limitations specified.
5. Any tree, whether it has visible weaknesses or not, will fail if the forces applied exceed the strength of the tree or its parts.
6. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, the consultant/appraiser can neither guarantee not be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others. Any legal description provided to the consultant/appraiser is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownerships to any property are assumed to be good and marketable.
7. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
8. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of Sound Urban Forestry, LLC.
9. Neither all or any part of the contents of this report, nor copy thereof, shall be conveyed by anyone, including the client, to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales or other media, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of Sound Urban Forestry, LLC – particularly as to the value considerations, identity of Sound Urban Forestry, LLC, or any reference to any professional society or to any initialed designation conferred upon Sound Urban Forestry, LLC as stated in its qualifications.
10. This report and any values expressed herein represent the opinion of Sound Urban Forestry, LLC and the fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified value, a stipulated result, the occurrence neither of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.
11. Diagrams, graphs, photographs and sketches in this report, being intended as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or surveys.
12. Sound Urban Forestry, LLC shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made.
13. Unless expressed otherwise: 1) information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflects the condition of those items at the time of inspection; and 2) the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, excavation, probing, drilling or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the tree or other plant or property in question may not arise in the future.
14. The time frame for risk categorization should not be considered a “guarantee period” for the risk assessment.