

Tree Resource Evaluation for 2321 N. Bay Road, Miami Beach

Prepared for:

Dr. Peter Schatzberg

Prepared by:

Jeff Shimonski

President, Tropical Designs of Florida

Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists

ISA Certified Arborist Municipal Specialist FL-1052AM

ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualification

LIAF Florida Certified Landscape Inspector 2016-0175

305-773-9406

Jeff@TropicalArboriculture.com

November 26, 2019

Summary

I performed a tree resource evaluation at 2321 N. Bay Road, Miami Beach on November 25, 2019. The approximate locations of these trees and palms can be found on the schematic in Appendix B.

The evaluation in Appendix A includes tree and palm measurements, a condition rating, and the size of the tree protection zone.

I rated the trees and palms in accordance with ANSI A300 (Part 5) – 2005, Annex A, Management Report Information. Trees and palms are rated Good, Moderate or Poor, see Appendix C. I recommend the removal of trees and palms that I rate as Poor.

I also followed the Levels and Scope of Tree Risk Assessment from the ANSI A300 Part 9- 2017: Levels of tree risk assessment; Level 1 limited visual tree risk assessment, Level 2 basic tree risk assessment, and Level 3 advanced tree risk assessment. The scope of this report/evaluation was limited to a Level 2 Assessment for all trees onsite.

To perform all measurements, I used a forestry diameter measuring tape and a measuring wheel. I rounded-off to the nearest inch when measuring trunk diameter (DBH); heights and canopy diameters are approximate due to the density of the canopies and some of the canopies extend over the adjacent properties and are difficult to see from grade.

Appendix D contains the ANSI A300 definitions of Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) and Critical Root Zone (CRZ). Trees on this site may have restricted root plates and are not good candidates for relocation.

Protective barriers must be placed and maintained around remaining trees and palms during construction. A schematic for tree protection during construction from the Miami-Dade County Landscape Manuel can be found in Appendix E.

Photos below

The color and brightness on some photos has been adjusted to provide contrast and clarity to the subject matter. This follows the Basic section on Enhancement Techniques found in Section 11, Best Practices for Documenting Image Enhancement in a document produced by SWGIT Scientific Working Group Imaging Technology, www.SWGIT.org. All photos by me.



Photo 1 above is the trunk and aerial root mass of tree 1 viewed from the northeast. This tree should be considered for removal. See following photos.



Photo 2 above is the trunk and aerial root mass of tree 1 viewed from the north.



Photo 3 above is what was originally the trunk, see arrow, that is now leaning to the east and supported by a large aerial root mass. This tree should be considered for removal. The DBH of this trunk is estimated.



Photo 4 above is the trunk and aerial root mass of tree 1 viewed from the east.



Photo 5 above is the canopy of tree 1 viewed from the east. This canopy has received significant utility pruning. This tree should be considered for removal.



Photo 6 above is tree 2 viewed from the southeast. The circles indicate a substantial amount of dead wood and some weak branch attachments.



Photo 7 above is tree 2 viewed from the north. The circles indicate a substantial amount of dead wood and some weak branch attachments. This tree should be considered for removal.



Photo 8 above is tree 3 viewed from the north.



Photo 9 above is tree 3 viewed from the south.



Photo 10 above are the trunks of trees 4 & 5 viewed from the east growing almost against the wall on the western edge of the property.



Photo 11 above is tree 6 viewed from the south. This tree should be removed due to very poor branch/trunk taper and the one-sided canopy.



Photo 12 above is trees 5 & 6 viewed from the east.



Photo 13 above is the trunk of tree 7 almost against the wall along the western edge of the property.



Photo 14 above is tree 7 viewed from the east. This tree should be removed.



Photo 15 above is tree 7 viewed from the north.



Photo 16 above is trees 8 & 9 both invasive species that should be removed.



Photo 17 above is palms 10, 11 & 12 along the eastern edge of the property.



Photo 18 above is the trunks of palms 10, 11 & 12 viewed from the south. The circles on the trunks indicate where they had once been climbed with spikes. These holes will never heal and can become an entry for pathogens and decay fungi. I have rated these palms to be in moderate condition due to this trunk damage and do not recommend the relocation of these palms.



Photo 19 above is the canopy of tree 13 viewed from the north. This is a very soft-wooded species and is very prone to decay and branch failure. This tree should be considered for removal. See following photos.



Photo 20 above is the trunk of tree 13 viewed from the west. The circle indicates where the trunk appears to be leaning against the structure. This tree is likely to fail if the adjacent structure is removed.



Photo 21 is the trunk of tree 13 viewed from the west.



Photo 22 is the trunk of tree 13 viewed from the east.

Appendix – A – Measurements and condition rating

	Scientific name	Common name	DBH	H/Ct	Canopy	Condition	TPZ
1	Ficus aurea	Strangler fig	60"	90'	90'	Moderate	25'
2	Calophyllum antillanum	Santa Maria	57"	70'	55'	Moderate	25'
3	Mangifera indica	Mango	26"	70'	45'	Moderate	25'
4	Mangifera indica	Mango	10"	30'	25'	Moderate	10'
5	Mangifera indica	Mango	8"	30'	20'	Moderate	8'
6	Conocarpus erectus sericeus	Silver buttonwood	6"	15'	18'	Poor	5'
7	Conocarpus erectus sericeus	Silver buttonwood	18"	18'	24'	Poor	10'
8	Ardisia elliptica	Shoebutton ardisia	2"	14'	8'	Poor	4'
9	Ardisia elliptica	Shoebutton ardisia	4"	12'	8'	Poor	4'
10	Cocos nucifera	Coconut palm	8"	26'	28'	Moderate	5'
11	Cocos nucifera	Coconut palm	9"	26'	28'	Moderate`	5'
12	Cocos nucifera	Coconut palm	8"	26'	28'	Moderate	5'
13	Pithecellobium dulce	Madras thorn	32"	40'	60'	Moderate	20'

- I recommend the removal of trees and palms that I rated to be in poor condition.
- Canopy diameter is measured in one direction and is approximate.
- The "H/Ct" column denotes approximate overall height for trees and approximate clear trunk or gray wood for palms.
- TPZ is a radius measurement from the outside of the trunk.

[illegible]

Appendix – C - ANSI A300 (Part 5) - 2005, Annex A

Management report information

Examples of suitability ratings

Good: These are trees with good health and structural stability that have the potential for longevity at the site.

Moderate: Trees in this category have fair health and/or structural defects that may be abated with treatment. Trees in this category require more intense management and monitoring and may have shorter lifespans than those in the “good” category.

Poor: Trees in this category are in poor health or have significant defects in structure that cannot be abated with treatment. These trees can be expected to decline regardless of management. The species or individual tree may possess either characteristics that are undesirable in landscape settings or be unsuited for use areas.

Appendix – D – Critical Root Zone and Tree Protection Zone

ANSI A 300 (Part 5) – 2012 Management of Trees and Shrubs during Site Planning, Site Development and Construction

Critical Root Zone (CRZ): The minimum volume of roots necessary to have for tree health and stability.

Tree Protection Zone (TPZ): The area surrounding a tree defined by a specified distance, in which excavation and other construction – related activities should be avoided. The TPZ is variable depending on species, factors, age and health of the plant, soil conditions, and proposed construction. The zone may be accomplished by physical barriers or soil protection layers or treatments.

ANSI A300 (Part 5) – 2012 54.7

A tree protection zone (TPZ) shall be delineated around all trees to be protected during a project

- **54.7.1** The area and dimensions of the TPZ should be calculated since species tolerance, age, and health, root structure, rooting depth and soil conditions.

Appendix – F – Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

Tropical Designs of Florida, Inc. Arboricultural and Horticultural Consulting Qualifications, Assumptions, and Limiting Conditions

Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Any titles or ownership of properties are assumed to be good and marketable. All property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

All property is presumed to be in conformance with applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other regulations.

Care has been taken to obtain information from reliable sources. However, the consultant cannot be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.

The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend meetings, hearings, conferences, mediations, arbitrations, or trials by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services.

This report and any appraisal value expressed herein represent the opinion of the consultant, and the consultant's fee is not contingent upon the reporting of a specified appraisal value, a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event.

Sketches, drawings, and photographs in this report are intended for use as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale, and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or surveys. The reproduction of information generated by architects, engineers, or other consultants on any sketches, drawings, or photographs is only for coordination and ease of reference. Inclusion of said information with any drawings or other documents does not constitute a representation Tropical Designs of Florida, Inc. as to the sufficiency or accuracy of said information.

Unless otherwise expressed: a) this report covers only the examined items and their condition at the time of inspection; and b) the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, excavation, probing, or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that structural problems or deficiencies of plants or property may not arise in the future.

Appendix – G - Certification of Performance

Tropical Designs of Florida, Inc.
Arboricultural and Horticultural Consulting

I, Jeff Shimonski, certify:

- That I have personally inspected the trees and/or the property referred to in this report and have stated my findings accurately. The extent of the evaluation is stated in the attached report;
- That I have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or the property that is the subject of this report and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;
- That the analysis, opinions, and conclusions stated herein are my own;
- That my analysis, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;
- That no one provided significant professional assistance to the consultant, except as indicated within the report;
- That my compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party.

I further certify that I am a member of the American Society of Consulting Arborists and acknowledge, accept, and adhere to the ASCA Standards of Professional Practice. I am an International Society of Arboriculture Certified Municipal Arborist FL-1052AM, am ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified and have been involved in the practice of arboriculture and the study of trees for over forty-five years.

Signed: 

Dated: November 26, 2019