Tree Resource Evaluation for 71 La Gorce Circle, Miami Beach

Prepared for:

Marsh C. Kriplen, RLA MAKwork 305-322-2896

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

May 6, 2020

Summary

I performed a tree resource evaluation on the property located at 71 La Gorce Circle, Miami, Miami Beach on May 6, 2020. The approximate locations of these trees and palms can be found on the schematic in Appendix B.

The evaluation in Appendix A includes measurements, condition rating and recommended radius of the tree protection zone (TPZ) for each tree and palm.

The City of Miami Beach requires trees with a DBH of 3 inches and a minimum 10 feet in height and palms 4 inches DBH and a minimum height of 10 feet in height to be documented.

I rate 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 or 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 the trees and palms inspected.

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, heights and canopy diameters are approximate.

Appendix D contains the ANSI A300 definitions of Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) and Critical Root Zone (CRZ). The TPZs that I have assigned to the trees on this site are sufficient to maintain CRZs as well as the TPZs.

It is important to note that when structures are next to, or had previously been next to trees, there may be no roots from that tree underneath the foot print of the structure or driveway and therefore the CRZ can change. The CRZ of a tree can be determined by monitoring demolition and/or via airspading.

Any trees to remain onsite should have their canopies cleared of dead and hazardous branches by an ISA Certified Arborist.

Any arboricultural work done on trees in the powerlines or within 10 feet of an electrical conductor measured radially must be an Incidental Line Clearance Arborist as identified by American National Standard ANSI Z133-2017.

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, <u>www.SWGIT.org</u>. All photos taken by the author of this report.



Photo 1 above is palms 1 & 2. Palm 2 is developing a correctable nutrient deficiency.



Photo 2 above is palms 3, 4, 5 & 6. Palm 3 appears to have Royal Palm bug on its fronds. This normally corrects itself without the use of pesticides.

See following photo for closer view of the trunk of palm 5.



Photo 3 above is the trunk of palm 5. There is a cavity that is about 3 inches deep. There does not appear to be active decay inside. I do not recommend the relocation of this palm. The orange knife is 7 inches in length.



Photo 3 above is palms 6, 7, 8 9 & 10. Palm 10 appears to have Royal Palm bug on its fronds. This normally corrects itself without the use of pesticides.

See following photo for closer view of the trunk of palm 8.



Photo 4 above is the trunk of palm 8. There is a cavity that is 5 to 6 inches deep. There does not appear to be active decay inside. I do not recommend the relocation of this palm. The orange knife is 7 inches in length.



Photo 5 above is tree 11.



Photo 6 above is palm 12 showing signs of a severe nutrient deficiency. This palm should be removed.



Photo 7 above is multi-trunked palm 13.



Photo 8 above is tree 14.



Photo 9 above is palms 15 & 16. Palm 15 appears to have Royal Palm bug on its fronds. This normally corrects itself without the use of pesticides.



Photo 10 above is trees 17 & 18.



Photo 11 above is palms 19 & 20. Palm 19 appears to have Royal Palm bug on its fronds. This normally corrects itself without the use of pesticides.



Photo 12 above is palms 20, 21 & 22. Palm 21 appears to have Royal Palm bug on its fronds. This normally corrects itself without the use of pesticides.



Photo 13 above the tree 24, palm 25, and multi-trunked palm 23.



Photo 14 above is are the trunks of palms 25, 26 & 27.



Photo 15 above is palms 25, 26, 27 & 28. Palm 33 may be on the adjacent property.



Photo 16 above is palms 29 & 30.



Photo 17 above is dead palm 31.



Photo 18 above is palms 28 & 33. Palm 32 has a severe nutrient deficiency and should be removed.

Appendix – A – Measurements and condition rating

	Scientific name	Common name	DBH	H/Ct	Canopy	Condition	TPZ
1	Wodyetia bifurcata	Foxtail palm	10"	22'	16'	Moderate	4'
2	Wodyetia bifurcata	Foxtail palm	10"	20'	16'	Good	4'
3	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	18"	60'	30'	Good	6'
4	Phoenix roebelenii	Pygmy date palm	14"	9'	18'	Good	3'
5	Phoenix canariensis	Canary Island date palm	20"	25'	26'	Moderate	6'
6	Bismarckia nobilis	Bismarck palm	17"	12'	28'	Good	5'
7	Bismarckia nobilis	Bismarck palm	18"	20'	28'	Good	5'
8	Phoenix canariensis	Canary Island date palm	23"	30'	25'	Moderate	6'
9	Phoenix roebelenii	Pygmy date palm	10"	8'	18'	Good	3'
10	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	20"	60'	30'	Good	6'
11	Cordia lutea	Yellow geiger	20"	18'	35'	Good	6'
12	Wodyetia bifurcata	Foxtail palm	10"	24'	15'	Poor	4'
13	Ptychosperma elegans	Solitare palm	11"	28'	25'	Good	4'
14	Mangifera indica	Mango	28"	14'	25'	Good	8'
15	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	21"	45'	28'	Good	6'
16	Phoenix canariensis	Canary Island date palm	18"	35'	28'	Good	6'
17	Jatropha integerrima	Peregrina	10"	15'	20'	Good	6'
18	Jatropha integerrima	Peregrina	12"	15'	20'	Good	6'
19	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	17"	65'	28'	Good	6'
20	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	16"	25'	28'	Good	6'
21	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	18"	65'	28'	Good	6'
22	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	19"	28'	28'	Good	6'
23	Adonidia merrillii	Christmas palm	18"	23'	20'	Good	4'
24	Psidium cattleyanum	Cattley guava	8"	18'	20'	Good	6'
25	Adonidia merrillii	Christmas palm	6"	12'	12'	Good	4'
26	Ptychosperma elegans	Solitare palm	3"	20'	12'	Good	4'
27	Ptychosperma elegans	Solitare palm	3"	22'	12'	Moderate	4'
28	Wodyetia bifurcata	Foxtail palm	6"	20'	16'	Good	4'
29	Ptychosperma elegans	Solitare palm	3"	6'	10'	Good	3'
30	Ptychosperma elegans	Solitare palm	3"	20'	10'	Good	4'
31	Wodyetia bifurcata	Foxtail palm	9"	20'	0	Dead	
32	Wodyetia bifurcata	Foxtail palm	9"	22'	15'	Moderate	4'
33	Roystonea regia	Royal palm	17"	30'	28'	Good	6'

• TPZ is the radius of the tree protection. The measurement is from the outside of the trunk.

- The TPZs that I have assigned to the trees on this site are sufficient to maintain CRZs for these trees as well as the TPZs.
- The CRZ of a tree may be limited by adjacent structures (or former adjacent structures).
- The column H/Ct denotes overall height for trees and clear trunk for palms.
- I recommend the removal of trees and palms that I rated to be in poor condition.



<u>Appendix – B – Approximate tree and palm locations</u>

<u> Appendix – C - ANSI A300 (Part 5) - 2005, Annex A</u>

Management report information

Examples of suitability ratings

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

<u>Moderate</u>: 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 life-spans than those in the "good" category.

<u>Poor</u>: Trees in this category are in poor health or have significant defect s 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 on the basis of species tolerance, age, and health, root structure, rooting depth and soil conditions.

Appendix – E – Schematic for tree protection during construction



TREE PROTECTION AND SUPPORT

TREE PROTECTION AND SUPPORT



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:

Jeff Shimonski

Dated: <u>May 6, 2020</u>