

X= Tree to be removed 0 = Trees to remain

Basic Tree Risk Assessment Form _____ Date <u>8/13/25</u> Time <u>2 pm</u> Address/Tree location 1798 Marion St. Tree no. 1 Sheet 1 of 2 dbh 161' Height 50 Crown spread dia. 30 Tree species Tree of Newer Time frame 5 45 Tools used USUM Assessor(s) Joseph Mitchell **Target Assessment** Target zone Practical to move target? Occupancy arget within 1.5 x Ht. Restriction practical? rate 1-rare 2 - occasional Target description - frequent 4 - constant Home 2 3 4 **Site Factors** Topography Flat□ Slope□ _____% Aspect Site changes None ☐ Grade change ☐ Site clearing ☐ Changed soil hydrology ☐ Root cuts ☐ Describe __ Soil conditions Limited volume Saturated Shallow Compacted Pavement over roots ______ 8 Describe 5 local house Screen Prevailing wind direction \(\) Common weather Strong winds \(\) (ce \(\) Snow \(\) Heavy rain \(\) Describe _____ Tree Health and Species Profile Vigor Low □ Normal 🕱 High □ Foliage None (seasonal) □ None (dead) □ Normal 🗘 % Chlorotic % Necrotic % Abiotic Species failure profile Branches Trunk Roots Describe Fast growing & brittle Load Factors Relative crown size Small ☐ Medium 🗓 Large ☐ Wind exposure Protected ☐ Partial Full ☐ Wind funneling ☐ ____ Crown density Sparse ☐ Normal Dense ☐ Interior branches Few ☐ Normal Dense ☐ Vines/Mistletoe/Moss ☐ ______ Recent or planned change in load factors NO Tree Defects and Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Failure — Grown and Branches — LCR95 % Cracks Lightning damage □ Unbalanced crown 💆 Dead twigs/branches _____% overall Max. dia. _ Codominant Included bark Broken/Hangers Number _____ Max. dia. Weak attachments W weak by native Cavity/Nest hole ___ % circ. Over-extended branches Previous branch failures \$\ \frac{1005 in ice}{2000} Similar branches present Pruning history Dead/Missing bark ☐ Cankers/Galls/Burls ☐ Sapwood damage/decay ☐ Crown cleaned Thinned Raised Heartwood decay Reduced Topped 💆 Lion-tailed Response growth were new tops Flush cuts Other_ Main concern(s) Previous M N/A 🗆 Load on defect Minor □ Moderate Significant □ _____ Likelihood of failure | Improbable □ | Possible ▼ Probable □ | Imminent □ ___ -Trunk -- Roots and Root Collar -Collar buried/Not visible □ Depth_____ Stem girdling □ Dead/Missing bark Abnormal bark texture/dolor □ Cracks Included bark Codominant stems Decay □ Dead Conks/Mushrooms Sapwood damage/decay ☐ Cankers/Galls/Burls ☐ Sap doze ☐ Ooze Cavity \(\square \) % circ. Lightning damage ☐ Heartwood decay ☐ Conks/Mushrooms ☐ Cracks ☐ Cut/Damaged roots ☐ Distance from trunk Cavity/Nest hole _____ % circ. Depth _____ Poor taper □ Root plate lifting □ Soil weakness Lean _____° Corrected? _____ Response growth _____ Response growth Main concern(s) -Main concern(s) ____ Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor 🗷 Moderate ☐ Significant ☐ Load on defect N/A ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Significant ☐ Likelihood of,failure Likelihood of failure Imminent 🗆 Improbable Possible Probable Imminent Possible 🗖 Probable Improbable 1

Dago Laf 2

										Risk Cate	gor	izati	ion														
L							П		П		Likelihood																
nmbe	Tree part						9	number	$\ $			Failure			Impact				Failure & Impact (from Matrix 1)				Consequences				Diele
Condition number			Conditions of concern			Part size	Fall distance	Target nur	p	Target protection		Possible	Probable	Imminent	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Unlikely	Somewhat	Likely	Very likely	Negligible	Minor	Significant	Severe	Risk rating of part (from Matrix 2)
	Crow		Low Lead		4	80'	30'	1	П		0	(X)	0	0	C	C	0		C	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	Modera
1			m,	J(000)	R				Ħ		Ŏ	Ö	Ŏ	Ó	Č	X	C	O	Č	0	0	0	O	Ō	0	Ô	1
			9	up & dos	V				Ħ		Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Č	KČ	Č		Č	Ŏ	0	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	
		+							Ħ	-	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ř	No.	NO.		ř	Ŏ	Ŏ	ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	ŏ	
2							\vdash	_	$\dagger \dagger$		ŏ	C	ŏ	Ŏ	ř	V			Image: Control of the con	NO.	ŏ	ŏ	Ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	
	İ								Ħ		ŏ	Š	ŏ	ŏ	ř	F	T	K	ř	0	0	ŏ	ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	ŏ	
	<u> </u>	+					 		Ħ		ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ř	10	F	F	ř	K	0	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	
3						-	-	-	╫		K	K	5	5	F	1	F	F	6	K	\leq	K	K	5	5	\preceq	
							-		$^{\rm H}$	1	K	K	K	K	K	\Rightarrow	F	\mathbb{H}	K	\mathbb{H}	X	X	\approx	\approx	\geq	K	
\vdash		+				-			╫		K	K	K	K	K	\Rightarrow	\Rightarrow	\approx	K	\mathbb{H}	2	K	K	X	X	X	
4						_	-	-	₩		K	\geq	\geq	\mathbb{H}	K	\Rightarrow	\Rightarrow	\cong	K	\mathbb{R}	2	K	\approx	\approx	\geq	K	
							-	-	╫	-	\cong			K	K	+		\succ		\mathbb{R}	\geq	X	\geq	\geq	\geq	X	
L_									4		\cup									10	U	U	\cup	U	U	\cup	
Mat	Matrix 1. Likelihood matrix.																-			-	-			1			-
Likelihood of Impacting Target							:																				
of	Failure	Very	\rightarrow	Lo		Medium			1	High																	
Imminent		Unlik	\rightarrow	Somewh					4	Very likely	-			T													
		Unlik	_	Unli		Somewhat likely Unlikely S			Sa	Likely newhat like	dv			4		-	-	-		+	-		-	+			
		Unlik	$\overline{}$	Unli		Unlikely			30	Unlikely	Ty			4													
Mat	rix 2. Risk	rating	matri	ix.					T		_																
Likelihood of Consequences of Failure																											
Failure & Impact			Ne	gligible	Mir	nor	Significant			Severe				7		T	Ť			Т							
Very likely				Low	Mode	erate	Н	igh	1	Extreme				-		-	+	-		-	-						
Likely Somewhat likely			_	Low	Mode	_		High Moderate		High Moderate														Ν	orth		
50	Unlikely		_	Low	Lo		Low		+	Low								-					1				
Not	Notes, explanations, descriptions Tursiu spec								ec	_	_											(
									\exists		_											1	\				
Mitigation options Remove								4									_									one	
-									+																		
	\dashv							-																			
Ove	rall tree	risk r	ating	Low	□ Мо	oderate	e V F	ligh 🗆		Extreme 🗆			i	Woi	rk p	rior	ity	1	Z 2		3 [uudi	115		
	rall resid									Extreme Recommended inspection interval																	
Data	Final	□Pr	elimir	nary Ad	vanced	asses	sment	neede	ed	□No □Yes	Тур		easo	n													