



**Arborist Report-Memorandums (Pages 2 and 4)  
April 21st, 2026**

**Prepared for:**

David Yusen

**Site Address:**

3246 72nd Pl SE  
Mercer Island, Wa.

**Prepared by:**

Douglas Smith  
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist PN 6116-B  
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified (TRAQ)  
3907 Aurora Ave N.  
Seattle, Wa. 98103  
(206)457-5706  
[doug@seattletreeconsulting.com](mailto:doug@seattletreeconsulting.com)

## Arborist Memorandum

**Subject:** Site Plan Review & Tree Protection Measures

**Project Address:** 3246 72nd Pl SE Mercer Island, Wa.

**Date:** April 2nd, 2026

### Site Plan Review

The project designers have provided the most current version of the site plan for review. The plan clearly indicates the location of tree protection fencing for all trees designated for retention.

In all cases, the proposed fencing fully encloses the **Inner Tree Protection Zones (ITPZs)** and extends into the **Outer Tree Protection Zones (TPZs)** to the maximum extent practical, while still maintaining necessary site access and allowing construction crews to perform their work.

Based on our review, it is our professional opinion that the tree protection measures shown on the current site plan (see image below) are **adequate and compliant** for the protection of the retained trees.

#### **Recommendation:**

Tree protection fencing should be installed **prior to the commencement of any construction activities** and must remain in place for the **duration of the project**.

### Additional Notes

#### **Tree Identification Update (Trees #5066 and #5084)**

The original inventory identified Trees #5066 and #5084 as *Crataegus douglasii* (black hawthorn). Distinguishing between black hawthorn and Scarlet hawthorn (*Crataegus laevigata*) can be challenging depending on the time of year.

A follow-up site visit was conducted in March 2026 to verify species identification. Based on observed characteristics—including the absence of red spring growth typical of black hawthorn and overall site conditions—it has been determined that both trees are **Scarlet hawthorn** (*Crataegus laevigata*).

On Mercer Island, black hawthorn is considered an exceptional tree at diameters of **6 inches DBH and greater**. With the updated identification, neither of these trees meets the criteria for exceptional status.



## Arborist Memorandum

**Subject:** Tree #5067 – Risk Assessment Clarification

**Project Address:** 3246 72nd Place SE, Mercer Island

**Date:** April 21, 2026

### Background

A previous memorandum was prepared for this site to update tree identification and to include a tree risk assessment for Tree #5067, a landmark western red cedar (*Thuja plicata*) located in contact with the existing garage.

The original development report for this property was prepared by field technician John Wells and included the following language:

*Tree #5067 – Western Red Cedar (landmark): This tree is located behind and in contact with the garage. It was previously topped and has large, sweeping branches resembling a pitchfork form. If removal is preferred, it can be considered a hazard tree due to proximity to the existing garage. A tree risk assessment will be required and we can provide that for you.*

### Clarification of Assessment Process

John Wells is a construction-focused field technician who regularly prepares development reports; however, he does not hold a Tree Risk Assessment Qualification (TRAQ). As such, the original report appropriately recommended that a formal tree risk assessment be conducted by a qualified arborist.

I hold the appropriate Tree Risk Assessment Qualification and conducted a follow-up site visit to evaluate Tree #5067. The tree was assessed for hazard **in its current condition**, with specific consideration given to its interaction with the adjacent structure.

### Findings

During the site visit, I confirmed that Tree #5067 is in direct contact with the existing garage and is causing observable structural damage. Major portions of the tree are physically bearing on the structure.

Based on these conditions, the **likelihood of impact is considered imminent**, and the tree meets the criteria for a **high-risk condition**. Removal is recommended to prevent further damage and reduce risk.

Additionally, selective pruning to remove only the portions of the tree in contact with the structure is not a viable alternative. Removal of these sections would significantly compromise the structural integrity of the tree and result in excessive foliage loss. Following such work, the tree would no longer be considered viable from either a health or structural standpoint.

## **Construction Sequencing Considerations**

It is my professional opinion that **removal of Tree #5067 should occur prior to demolition of the existing garage.**

The tree currently has significant structural components loaded into the building. Proceeding with demolition prior to tree removal could:

- Place construction crews at increased risk
- Result in sudden or uncontrolled movement of tree components
- Potentially destabilize the remaining structure of the tree

Additionally, the entirety of the existing garage lies within the tree protection zone. Due to these spatial constraints, it is not feasible to adequately protect the tree while also allowing sufficient room for safe demolition activities.

For these reasons, tree removal prior to demolition is the safest and most appropriate course of action.

## **Additional Notes**

Not all field technicians who perform initial tree inventories hold Tree Risk Assessment Qualifications. When potential hazards are identified during initial assessments, it is standard practice for a qualified arborist to conduct a follow-up evaluation to determine risk levels and provide formal recommendations.

## **Conclusion**

This memorandum is intended to clarify the distinction between the initial report language and the subsequent formal risk assessment. The updated findings reflect a qualified evaluation of Tree #5067 and support the recommendation for removal prior to demolition based on current site conditions and safety considerations.

**Please feel free to reach out with any questions or if additional clarification is needed.**

### **Assumptions and Limiting Conditions**

Any legal description provided to the consultant/appraiser is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownership to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters of legal character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other government regulations.

Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified so far as possible, however, the consultant/appraiser can neither guarantee nor be responsible for accuracy of information provided by others.

The consultant/appraiser shall not be required to give testimony or attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payments of additional fees for such services as described in the fee schedule and contract engagement.

Loss or alteration of any of this report invalidates the entire report.

Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any person other than to whom it is addressed, without prior written consent of the consultant/appraiser.

Neither all nor any part of the content in 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 consent of the consultant/appraiser--particularly as to value conclusions, identity of the consultant/appraiser, or any reference to any professional society or institute or to any initialed designation conferred upon the consultant/appraiser as stated in his qualification.