

TUMWATER

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Online via Zoom and In Person at Tumwater City Hall, Council Chambers, 555 Israel Rd. SW, Tumwater, WA 98501

> Thursday, March 21, 2024 6:30 PM

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Changes to Agenda
- 4. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting 07/20/2023
 - b. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting 09/21/2023
 - c. Historic Preservation Commission Meeting 11/16/2023
- 5. Public Comment
- 6. Election of 2024 Vice Chair & Chair
- 7. Davis/Meeker Oak Tree
- 8. Next Meeting Date 04/18/2024
- 9. Adjourn

Meeting Information

The public are welcome to attend in person, by telephone or online via Zoom.

Watch Online

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81895868340?pwd=NXkyYW9QUmUxV3RCYnZ1WnZqZmZnUT09

Listen by Telephone

Call (253) 215-8782, listen for the prompts and enter the Webinar ID 818 9586 8340 and Passcode 641746.

Public Comment

The public may submit comments by sending an email to <u>sklein@ci.tumwater.wa.us</u>, no later than 4:00 p.m. the day of the meeting. Comments are submitted directly to the Commission members and will not be read individually into the record of the meeting.

Post Meeting

Audio of the meeting will be recorded and later available by request, please email <u>CityClerk@ci.tumwater.wa.us</u>

Accommodations

The City of Tumwater takes pride in ensuring that people with disabilities are able to take part in, and benefit from, the range of public programs, services, and activities offered by the City. To request an accommodation or alternate format of communication, please contact the City Clerk by calling (360) 252-5488 or email <u>CityClerk@ci.tumwater.wa.us</u>. For vision or hearing impaired services, please contact the Washington State Relay Services at 7-1-1 or 1-(800)-833-6384. To contact the City's ADA Coordinator directly, call (360) 754-4128 or email <u>ADACoordinator@ci.tumwater.wa.us</u>.

CONVENE:	6:30 p.m.
PRESENT:	Chair David Shipley and Commissioners Alex Rossiter, Renee Radcliff Sinclair, and Marnie Slakey.
	Absent: Commissioners Don Trosper and Dave Nicandri.
	Staff: Parks and Recreation Director Chuck Denney and Parks and Facilities Manager Stan Osborn.
CHANGES TO AGENDA:	Chair Shipley reported on one addition to the agenda.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 2023:	
MOTION:	Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Rossiter, to approve the minutes of June 15, 2023 as presented. A voice vote approved the motion unanimously.
PUBLIC COMMENT:	There were no public comments.
UPDATE ON IMPROVEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE SCHMIDT	Karen Johnson, Schmidt House Curator, Olympia Tumwater Foundation, provided information on the completion of improvements to the Schmidt House.
HOUSE:	The Commission previously approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for some improvements and additions to the Schmidt House. The Olympia Tumwater Foundation received a heritage capital grant from the state of \$117,000 with a required 2:1 match. Project areas involved interior rehabilitation of the basement where archives are stored, addition of an exterior wheelchair lift, addition of an ADA restroom in the detached garage, and upgrades to building systems.
	Ms. Johnson shared "before" and "after" photographs of the project. Exterior foundation walls of the house have been leaking for many years with water seeping from the porch and windows into the basement. The work included cleaning and sealing foundation walls, repainting of basement walls, and addition of climate-controlled spaces, lighting, and electrical outlets. Abandoned plumbing lines in the basement were removed and replaced with overhead water pipes. A small closet was improved with the addition of shelving. The Foundation uses the space as its art storage room for framed photographs, paintings from the Schmidt family dating to the 1600s, and other pieces of art.

An ADA wheelchair was installed at the corner of the front porch. A new ADA-width sidewalk was also added to provide access to the wheelchair lift. Existing evergreen shrubs were replaced with lowerheight shrubs. The wheelchair lift was certified by the state. The basement, second floor, and third floor of the house remain inaccessible to individuals with mobility issues. To accommodate for the height difference of the porch floor with the interior first floor, the contractor installed a rubberized floor mat manufactured at a specific height to accommodate the difference in height between the two floor areas. To ensure wheelchairs did not slide off the porch, the architect installed a low-height curb along the perimeter of the porch painted to match the house trim.

A major undertaking was installing an ADA restroom. The restroom was installed in the garage area. Restroom windows were designed to mimic the three windows on the third floor of the house. A sign was installed by the entry door of the restroom; however, the Foundation plans to add directional signs from the house to the restroom.

Of the building system upgrades, most of the improvements included the lighting systems with replacement of inappropriate light fixtures on the first floor in rooms with public access and the addition of lowprofile art lighting along the walls of rooms for artwork of framed vintage photographs. New chandeliers were added to the dining room, front room, and entry hall.

Ms. Johnson reported the Foundation expended approximately \$350,000 on the entire project with \$117,000 from the grant. The improvements did not include audio/visual upgrades or fire suppression in the basement because of cost. All contractors working on the project were respectful of the house and its legacy. She invited Commissioners to contact her for a tour of the house.

Director Denney conveyed appreciation to Ms. Johnson for sharing information on the project. He noted that the City has contracted with the Foundation to provide historical programs and events.

Ms. Johnson said she has also been working with the Tree Board on research for the Board's legacy tree project. It is likely the large magnolia tree in front yard of the Schmidt House will be nominated as a heritage tree.

BREWMASTER'S Manager Osborn reported on recent vandalism to the Crosby House **HOUSE REPAIRS:** Manager Osborn reported on recent vandalism to the Crosby House involving a homeless individual who threw a large rock through a large window in the rear of the house near the kitchen. The individual did not enter the house. The window has been since boarded. Heritage Restoration inspected the window and was able to save the window to

include replacement of some wood around the jam. The company is matching the window to mimic the older style of the previous window.

Manager Osborn updated the Commission on the status of repairs to the Brewmaster's House following the recent arson fire. The City completed the service contract with Heritage Restoration to assess the damage and provide recommendations on the work necessary to repair the house. All interior contents of the house were removed. Some of the contents that were essentially destroyed have been discarded and other contents were stored to help eliminate the smell of smoke. Pending action is the Commission's recommendation for moving forward on wallpaper choices to enable staff to secure cost estimates.

Chair Shipley asked how the smell of smoke was rectified. Manager Osborn advised that the contractor initially cleaned all surfaces to the extent possible. For those areas that could not be accessed, the contractor sealed the areas using a product that eliminates the smell of The product is an organic compound manufactured using smoke. insects as an ingredient. The product seals any remaining smoke in rafters and in wood. The product is the consistency of milk and is amazingly effective. The product is sprayed on objects. Anv remaining smell from fire is attributed to the lack of completing the repairs to the building to reframe some affected areas, resealing drywall, and wallpapering and painting. The entire repairs will seal any remaining smoke smell.

Manager Osborn thanked the Commission for working with staff to render some decisions on the house. Some of the information shared during the Commission's tour of the house was incorrect necessitating clarification from a wallpaper supplier. The company researched the historical home to help identify needed repairs. Based on the research, only well-to-do owners would have wallpapered ceilings using the same wallpaper on walls. The information as conveyed to him initially was different. The company provided additional information in several letters. Not all ceilings were originally wallpapered with some ceilings installed with backing paper or plastered. Wallpaper is currently available mimicking plaster.

Manager Osborn said he is seeking authority to enable him and Director Denney to make any necessary decisions prior to the next meeting. He shared letters from the wallpaper supplier from Tacoma. The supplier recommends plastering many of the ceilings in white.

Commissioner Slakey noted that plastering would likely be the best option in terms of long-term maintenance. Manager Osborn agreed. He added that the option would be less costly and is aesthetically pleasing. He shared some wallpaper samples and identified the rooms for

Item 4a

wallpapering, as well as some ceiling options that mimic plaster, which would be more expensive.

Chair Shipley recommended agreeing on the ceiling option. Manager Osborn clarified that some of the prior direction is not possible. For example some minor changes in wallpaper color or design might be necessary as the supplier lacks sufficient stock to complete the dining room ceiling and walls. The supplier provided samples of similar wallpaper that would be appropriate. Staff recommends plastering ceilings in the first floor office and bathroom and all rooms in the upper story except for one bedroom.

MOTION: Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Sinclair, to approve plastering ceilings of the first floor office and the bathroom, and in the rooms on the upper story except for one of the two bedrooms with the Commission to determine the bedroom to wallpaper. The motion carried unanimously.

Manager Osborn shared different samples of wallpaper for the kitchen ceiling. He requested authority for flexibility in the wallpaper color based on the Commission's previous selection of wallpaper for kitchen walls.

Manager Osborn shared wallpaper samples previously selected for the entry and the living room and requested approval for flexibility on the final selection. New wallpaper for the dining room is necessary for consideration. He shared four samples of dining room wallpaper. Dining room wallpaper will cover only the top four to five feet of wall space with wallpaper or plaster for the ceiling. He suggested using the same ceiling choice for the entry in the dining room and selecting wallpaper that does not clash with the living room ceiling.

Commissioners reviewed the four wallpaper samples.

Staff was afforded flexibility on the stamped ceiling wallpaper in the kitchen, entrance, and living room for compatibility with gray wallpaper. The Commission recommended the #2 wallpaper sample for the dining room and #19 sample wallpaper for the dining room ceiling.

Manager Osborn reviewed wallpaper samples for the upper story rooms. All ceilings except for one bedroom would have plaster ceilings. He cited the prior selection of wallpaper of a room located north of the turret room.

MOTION: Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Sinclair, to approve design changes to the Brewmaster's House for the following:

	 For the first floor, staff has flexibility for the selection of stamped wallpaper for the ceiling in the kitchen. Staff has flexibility for the selection of the ceiling wallpaper in the entrance and dining room to be compatible with previously selected gray wallpaper. Selection of #2 wallpaper for the dining room. Selection of #19 wallpaper for the dining room ceiling.
MOTION;	The motion carried unanimously.
MOTION:	Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Sinclair, to approve the following design changes:
	 All ceilings in the upper story will be plaster except for the northwest bedroom (#9). The southwest bedroom (#8) with the bird wallpaper will have a plaster ceiling.
MOTION:	The motion carried unanimously.
MOTION:	Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Rossiter, to afford some flexibility to staff for decision-making to adjust any final decisions in the design for compatibility with colors and materials
	mater rais.
	Commissioner Slakey asked about the timing for completion of wallpapering. Manager Osborn advised that the original date of completion projected at the end of October would likely not be achieved for several reasons. Commissioner Slakey recommended scheduling a Commission meeting at the Brewmaster's House after all repairs are completed.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President Puget Sound Meeting Services, <u>psmsoly@earthlink.net</u>

CONVENE:	6:41 p.m.
PRESENT:	Chair David Shipley and Commissioners Dave Nicandri, Alex Rossiter, Renee Radcliff Sinclair, Marnie Slakey, and Don Trosper.
	Staff: Parks and Recreation Director Chuck Denney, Communications Manager Ann Cook, and Parks and Facilities Manager Stan Osborn.
CHANGES TO AGENDA:	There were no changes to the agenda.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2023:	Consideration of the minutes of July 20, 2023 was deferred.
PUBLIC COMMENT:	There were no public comments.
OLD BREWHOUSE TOWER PHASE 2	Manager Cook introduced Jim Cary, Cardinal Architecture. Mr. Cary presented the final plan for seismic improvements to the old brewhouse.
IMPROVEMENTS:	Mr. Cary reported that since the last update in February, the geotechnical engineer and the structural engineer have been developing the construction drawings, which will be submitted to the City for Phase 2 of the project.
	Mr. Cary displayed historic images of the old brewhouse and the original construction drawings produced in Milwaukee, Wisconsin used by the team throughout the project. The building sections reflect how brewery equipment was placed in the building. The team was able to develop a 3D model of the gravity brewing system used in the tower.
	Foundation drawings assisted the team in recreating building details and how the building was used. Additional photos were of construction workers building the original roof of the brewery tower.
	During Phase 1 of the project, masonry was repaired and installed and new roofs were installed. Phase 2 of the project is only for seismic improvements. The phase includes geotech exploration and input, installation of micropiles, and the addition of concrete and steel to preserve the structure during future earthquakes and seismic events.
	Phase 2 efforts began with the foundation. The team worked from an historic foundation plan; however, the version was not developed in Milwaukee because it had been revised and developed onsite to accommodate the addition of 494 timber piles underneath the structure.

Mr. Cary shared photographs of the crawl space. The water table is

located four feet below grade. The foundation of the tower is approximately 14 feet below the main floor of the structure. Since initial construction of the building, the crawl space has been flooded with water. To assist the team in inspecting the foundation, the City pumped all water from the crawl space. The geotech engineer, structural engineer, and several members of the team were able to access the crawl space. They discovered approximately 18 inches of mud and an understanding of how the concrete was designed and installed. The original plan called for concrete footings that spread to distribute the load to the soil. However, after initial digging discovered groundwater, the water table prohibited further digging to reach basalt bedrock At 14 feet, the maximum digging capacity was reached in 1905 necessitating a new foundation drawing to add a new piling plate comprised of 494 timber piles driven through the ground to bedrock with the piles topped with steel caps. The Milwaukee-designed concrete foundation was then poured on top of the timber pile to serve as the base for the old brewhouse.

Since the site inspection, the geotech engineer identified ways for ground forces imparted during an earthquake to be determined and measured on the building with the structural engineer using those measurements to design the amount of concrete and steel to be added to the building to mitigate seismic forces.

Mr. Cary displayed the structural engineer drawings. The construction drawings will be available within the next week for submittal to the City and to the Commission. The seismic improvements essentially build up through the foundation plan by adding new concrete structure within the crawl space, additional vertical and diagonal micropiles of steel casings filled with concrete to provide compression and tension structural support, infilling of some openings previously housing equipment, and adding an internal steel frame attached to the masonry.

Mr. Cary displayed a series of interior elevations and building section drawings reflecting the existing building and blue-colored improvements of concrete, supports in the crawl space, and new steel supports above the main floor. The addition of reinforced concrete extends up through the first floor, commonly referred to as "shock treat" to help protect the height of the first floor during seismic activity.

Mr. Cary displayed a model completed by the structural engineer during modeling to identify earthquake forces on the building. The ground remains stationary in the model with the tall first floor experiencing much movement with movement of the upper floors in unison but not to the same degree as the first floor. During masonry repairs, the team identified many areas that experienced stress during earthquake forces at the top of the building but less so in the lower elevation of the building.

Commissioner Slakey asked whether the team identified any projections in the size of seismic activity based on the Richter scale. Mr. Cary advised that engineer calculations rarely recognize the Richter scale; however, the building would be protected from earthquakes measuring in the 7.0 range. The building would remain standing based on a projected earthquake per the building code and civil engineering codes.

Commissioner Nicandri asked about the exchange of the water within the crawl space and whether the field adaptation of the foundation achieved the original Milwaukee structural desirability for the building Mr. Cary advised that the field design was a solution design. engineered with a specific number of timber piles within a specific design that were laterally connected to create a cap beneath the foundation. The design solved the gravity issue but not the translation of the wet earth to the building. The failure of the earth around the building would be solved by the design incorporating new diagonal piles. The original timber piles are assumed to hold the heavy masonry building during a seismic event. Water in the crawl space was not brackish; however, the mud was old and not fresh. He believes the foundation lacks openings to allow for tidal actions in the crawl space/basement. The water table under the building is higher than the river.

Manager Osborn inquired as to whether the shot crete within the building would cover existing wall tiles. Mr. Cary said the treatment would cover portions of the east and west walls on the first level. Installation includes the attachment of rebar to the masonry wall to create a connection to enable the transference of engineering forces with concrete sprayed onto the wall until a specific thickness is attained with final finish to follow. The treatment would cover tiles on the west wall.

Chair Shipley asked whether that specific solution has been used for other buildings. Mr. Cary responded that the options are standard seismic mitigation solutions. For masonry buildings, lateral steel is used above ground with additional reinforcement of the foundation to distribute energy forces. Chair Shipley asked whether the concrete on the first floor is intended to stabilize the wall on the first level. Mr. Cary said the intent is to stabilize the walls on the first floor and provide a transition from the steel above to the concrete below.

Commissioner Trosper conveyed disappointment for not preserving the decorative tiles on the walls because the tiles were historically important for sanitation and the brewery process. Mr. Cory advised that the documents would include salvaging and preserving the tiles to the extent possible.

Mr. Cary shared drawings for Phase 3 of the project. Future programming explored for the building was based on an analysis of the building code in terms of how much of the building could be occupied using all floors. He displayed a diagram depicting floor plans for floors Usable space is highlighted along with required 1 through 5. circulation, restrooms, and an elevator. Most of the building's space is consumed by stairs, elevator, and restrooms. A second version for building space reflects the existing brewery tower, an addition of a connecting pavilion served by terraced steps for access to the first level of the brewery tower, and connection to the concrete warehouse structure located to the east of the brewery tower. All components consuming space in the brewery tower were relocated with one staircase remaining in the brewery tower with the elevator and another staircase relocated to the outside of the building with access from the connection pavilion. The brewery tower could serve as a site for a museum. The concrete warehouse would be restored for programming space.

Commissioner Sinclair asked whether the City has ownership of the warehouse facility. Director Denney advised that the City controls only the brewery tower. However, the warehouse owner has indicated a willingness to work with the City on a joint project.

Mr. Cary confirmed that the proposed seismic improvements to the brewery tower would preserve the option of adding the connecting pavilion at some point in the future.

Manager Cook reported on next steps. The Commission is requested to forward the proposed structural design drawings to the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). If approved, the drawings would be forwarded to DAHP during the week of October 2, 2023. At the Commission's October 19, 2023 meeting, staff will request approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness based on no other changes recommended by DAHP. It is anticipated DAHP will issue a letter affirming the drawings meet the standards of the Secretary of Interior. During the week of October 23, 2023, the Certificate of Appropriateness would be submitted with the building permit application.

Staff requests the Commission forward the structural design drawings to the DAHP for its review.

MOTION: Commissioner Nicandri moved, seconded by Commissioner Rossiter, to forward the proposed Structural Design Drawings for the Old Brewhouse Tower Phase 2 Seismic Improvements to the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation for review and approval. The motion carried unanimously.

Manager Osborn asked whether the addition of the connecting pavilion located between the brewery tower and the warehouse facility would help to stabilize the structure of the brewery tower and lessen the need for some of the structural seismic improvements. Mr. Cary said the addition of the pavilion structure would be placed in a manner that does not directly connect to the brewery tower. It would be important to protect the brewery tower to avoid damaging or destroying the new structure.

Manager Cook reported on ongoing conversations with the owner of the warehouse facility and surrounding property. The owner is supportive of the proposed pavilion and repurposing the warehouse facility. The conversations included the potential of transfer of property. The owner presented a preliminary proposal for redevelopment of the site representing the most authentic and serious proposal the City has received to date for the historic property.

Commissioner Trosper asked about the timeline for completion of the project. Manager Cook advised that the completion timeline is based on the availability of funding and financing. The Council is scheduled to consider a proposal in early 2024.

- **OTHER BUSINESS:** Commissioner Slakey requested an update on the status of the wallpaper selections for the Brewmaster's House. Manager Osborn said he recently met with the vendor. The vendor offered some recommendations based on logic. As a result, three of the ceilings will be wallpapered with the remaining ceilings to be textured. Following approval of the contract by the City's legal department, the contract will be forwarded to the City Council for approval.
- **NEXT MEETING** The next meeting is scheduled on Thursday, October 19, 2023.
- ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Sinclair, to adjourn the meeting at 7:33 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President Puget Sound Meeting Services, <u>psmsoly@earthlink.net</u>

DATE:

CONVENE:	6:30 p.m.
PRESENT:	Chair David Shipley and Commissioners Dave Nicandri, Alex Rossiter, Renee Radcliff Sinclair, Marnie Slakey, and Don Trosper.
	Staff: Parks and Recreation Director Chuck Denney, Communications Manager Ann Cook, Parks and Facilities Manager Stan Osborn, Don Carney, Capital Projects Manager, and Volunteer Coordinator Brianna Feller.
CHANGES TO AGENDA:	Two additional items were added to the agenda.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 7/20/23 & 9/21/23 - DELAYED:	Action was delayed due to the lack of meeting minutes.
PUBLIC COMMENT:	There were no public comments.
VISIT TO FORMER CHAMBERS PRAIRIE GRANGE (STARBUCKS):	Chair Shipley presented a proposal resulting from his visit to the site of the Starbucks restaurant located at the corner of Yelm Highway and Henderson Boulevard formerly known as the Chambers Prairie Grange. The former owner of the grange property, Tom Schrader, invited him to visit the building, specifically the basement of the restored building.
	Chair Shipley described the building's renovation utilizing existing wood and materials to convert the building to a Starbucks restaurant with a drive through window. The basement is approximately the same size as the main floor and was not restored as part of the renovation project. Mr. Schrader had wanted the basement restored as a meeting room, but the Starbucks Corporation did not support the suggestion, which resulted in the basement serving as a storage room for the building's historic materials.
	Chair Shipley reported he was able to take many photographs of the materials in the basement. One item of interest is a chart listing all grange grandmasters from 1908 to approximately 1978-88 when the grange closed. Mr. Briggs, owner of the former Briggs Nursery, served as the second grandmaster. Other materials included assorted books, financial records, and minutes of grange meetings. He plans to revisit the basement to research some of the materials to learn more about the grange and its history. Based on possible support from the Starbucks Corporation, he plans to submit a proposal for placement of the original grange sign within the restaurant. The original sign was installed in front of the building along Yelm Highway. Mr. Schrader had shared that he first viewed the sign outside the building and discovered later

that the sign had disappeared. After further investigation, he learned

that the sign had been delivered to an antique dealer. Mr. Schroeder found it necessary to purchase the sign in order to preserve it. A new sign could be placed under the original sign visible to patrons in the building and protected from vandalism and weather. He plans to develop a proposal with some illustrations based on historical records. Additionally, he would like to include information on the Farm property, which is now the site of the Farm neighborhood. Some historical stories indicated that a bull on the farm killed two people. Additionally, across the street from the grange was the Hayes School. Although he has been unable to identify the exact location of the school, he plans to research the location. He was able to review some information on a reunion of all the classes held at the school. Roger Easton, a long-time historian, who has since died, had shared some time ago that he attended the school. He plans to incorporate information about the Chambers Prairie Grange, the farm, and the school within the signage proposal.

In response to questions about the current owner of the grange property, Director Denney reported Tom Schrader was the previous owner and the developer for the Starbucks project. Following completion of the project, Mr. Schrader sold the property; however, Mr. Schrader was hired to manage the building.

Commissioner Slakey advised that the original farmhouse still exists and is occupied within the Farm neighborhood.

Director Denney advised of options for signage for the site to include one sign with photographs of the area. Resources are available within the department to assist in designing the signs. The Commission's budget in 2023 is \$10,000 and \$10,000 in 2024.

OLD BREWHOUSE TOWER PHASE 2 SEISMIC IMPROVEMENTS: CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION: Manager Cook presented the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for seismic improvements of the Old Brewhouse. She introduced Don Carney, Capital Projects Manager, and Jim Cary with Cardinal Architecture.

Phase 2 of the project began in 2022 and encountered some delays because of the pandemic, archeology, and historic preservation issues. The application includes a letter of concurrence from the Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP).

Mr. Cary reported Phase 2 of the project is limited to seismic improvements to the building. The construction permit application with documentation was submitted to the City in October. The Commission's approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness is an element of the permit application.

Mr. Cary shared current and historic photographs of the building. Historic documentation available to the team was utilized for the project. Documentation included foundation drawings and other historic drawings produced in Milwaukee. The original foundation drawings anticipated a different type of foundation on substantial soils or bedrock. Communications reflected in letters in the early 1900s describing the building location indicated the owners anticipated a much stronger setting for the building. Other historic photographs were used by the team to review additional details. The Phase 1 project involved masonry work with the historic photographs used to help guide the project.

Mr. Cary shared photographs of the building when the project first began in 2014 as part of a study for the Craft Brewery District project. The photos were taken using a drone and reflect the deterioration of existing brick on the exterior of the building. A temporary roof structure was installed to help prevent infiltration of water until the masonry restoration project was completed in 2019. Mutual Materials provided new bricks with brick color matching existing brick.

Another series of photographs depicted the project's structural engineer and Mr. Cary in the crawl space beneath the building. The City pumped 12 feet of water from the crawl space enabling inspection of the foundation structure. The structure was found to be in good shape; however, the inspections revealed that despite the original drawings of spread footings, the foundation is supported by numerous timber piles. It is likely the owner did not anticipate groundwater problems and dug a hole for the foundation. Because of the inability of the construction crew to lower the water level, some piles were drilled to locate the depth of bedrock, which is located 12 feet below the anticipated footings. Subsequently, it appears a new plan was developed using over 500 timber piles with metal straps connecting the piles and capped with spread footings constructed on top to hold the heavy masonry building.

Part of the construction project for Phase 2 includes pumping water from the crawl space and removing up to 24 inches of mud with construction occurring in the crawl space to support all steel and concrete in the building for seismic improvements.

Mr. Cary shared current construction drawings for the project. The structural foundation plan is the plan for the crawl space. The project includes installation of micro piles of steel pipes driven with machinery down through existing concrete to the depth of the bedrock filled with concrete and capped. The piles will be tied into the existing foundation and to new foundation grade beams installed as part of the project. The project will protect the building from gravity loads and lateral loads to ensure stability of the building during seismic activity.

Level 1 improvements include new concrete walls on the east and west sides of the floor. Upper floors include infilling of some large openings that were originally part of the brewery process. The spaces will be filled with concrete and reinforced steel to provide a stronger diaphragm at each level.

At Level 2, concrete transitions to a steel frame up to the top of the tower to transfer the loads from the top of the tower to the new foundation.

New drawings were prepared of the existing structure and the structure with the improvements to show the seismic reinforcements. Other drawings depict interior elevations with the improvements.

Mr. Cary said the scope of the project is included in the construction permit documents provided to the City of approximately 400 pages of structural calculations with diagrams. Because of the heaviness of the building, seismic forces occur higher with the top of the building moving during a seismic event. Previous phases of the project reflected that a majority of the damage to the building was at the higher levels.

Chair Shipley asked whether concrete and the steel beams would be visible from the interior. Mr. Cary affirmed the visibility within the interior. Additionally, steel beams would cross windows. The team reviewed patterns that would help minimize the size of the steel crossings; however, because of the level of forces, steel crossings increase in size exponentially to accommodate the increase in forces. At some point, the amount of structure added to a building begins to overwhelm the building's capability to withstand forces. Eventually, it is necessary to reinforce the base, which speaks to the proposal as a balance between the competing needs of the building.

Chair Shipley asked about the timeline to complete the project. Mr. Cary said the project would require a minimum of eight months.

Commissioner Nicandri inquired about the possibility of a top floor window being converted to a door to provide access or an elevated viewing platform. Mr. Cary affirmed the possibility. Another series of drawings includes a building code review in terms of future uses within the building. Based on technical aspects discussed with the City's Building Official, it is likely a method has been identified to increase accessibility within the building. A viewing platform would require guardrails, which might change the building's exterior. Such a change would require a separate Certificate of Appropriateness. Phase 3 of the project includes windows, doors, internal design, identification of occupant uses, and placement of stairs and elevators.

Commissioner Trosper mentioned the importance of preserving the tiles on the first-floor walls. Mr. Cary affirmed that the tiles would be salvaged to the extent possible.

As Phase 2 was limited to seismic improvements, it was important to ensure that the scope of the project did not impede future uses in the building requiring some understanding as to the how the building would be used. Mr. Cary shared some drawings of potential occupancy options in the building. A potential use is likely public access or assembly uses, which is an occupancy category included in the Building Code. The Building Code dictates the amount of square footage per person, which establishes the building's occupant load. The occupant load defines the number of stairs, exits, and public facilities within the building. The team considered the minimum occupancy and factored two exits from each floor, public restrooms, and an elevator. Based on those facilities, the space was filled with no space available for other uses. The team considered eliminating vertical circulation within the building with only one stairway remaining in the building and moving the elevator and the second stairway to the exterior of the building built from a steel structure connected on the east side of another existing and restored building to open up floor space for uses.

Chair Shipley pointed out that the City's ownership is limited to the Old Brewhouse (Tower) and 12 feet of property surrounding the building.

MOTION:Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Nicandri,
to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the Historic
Brewery Tower Renovation Project Phase 2 Seismic Improvements.

Commissioner Rossiter commented that the internal structure is an elegant plan. He thanked Mr. Cary for presenting the proposal in such detail. He is looking forward to Phase 3 to design the interior.

MOTION: The motion carried unanimously.

Manager Cook advised members on the next steps. Staff has secured some estimates for the construction for review with the Council in early 2024. In spring 2024, the Discovery Channel is airing a program on abandoned places featuring the brewtower. Concurrently, the City will relaunch the capital fundraising campaign for the brewtower.

- **OTHER BUSINESS:** Commissioner Slakey requested an update on the status of the wallpaper selections for the Brewmaster's House. Manager Osborn advised that the contract is pending approval by the Council.
- **NEXT MEETING** The next meeting is scheduled on January 18, 2023.

DATE:

Commissioner Trosper suggested reformatting the meeting as a retreat to discuss future projects and promotion of tourism.

Denney noted a possible miscommunication Director with Councilmember Schneider who had planned to attend the meeting. Councilmember Schneider is requesting the Commission consider an allocation of approximately \$1,000 for a project at the Pioneer Cemetery. One large fir tree was recently removed from the cemetery after inspection by an arborist deemed the tree to be in poor health and posing a danger of falling on nearby headstones. Additional work was also completed on another adjacent tree. Councilmember Schneider is working with the Tree Board and local arborists to plant a Butternut tree cutting from a tree on the Bush family homestead. The tree is approximately six feet tall and Councilmember Schneider would like to plant the tree near the space of the former fir tree next to the Bush headstone and create a plaque with information about the importance of the butternut tree to the Bush family.

Following some discussion of the proposal, the Commission agreed to defer a decision until the Commission has an opportunity to review the plan and design of the plaque.

ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Slakey moved, seconded by Commissioner Rossiter, to adjourn the meeting at 7:28 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President Puget Sound Meeting Services, <u>psmsoly@earthlink.net</u>

TO:	Historic Preservation Commission
FROM:	Chuck Denney, Parks and Recreation Director
DATE:	March 21, 2024
SUBJECT:	Davis/Meeker Oak Tree

1) <u>Recommended Action</u>:

Staff requests that the Commission consider and approve a recommendation to the Tumwater City Council for de-listing the Davis/Meeker Oak from the City's Historic Register.

2) Background:

Located near the Olympia Regional Airport and adjacent to Highway 99, the Davis Meeker Oak Tree was placed on the City's Historic Register on January 16, 1996. In June of 2023, an 18-inch diameter branch failed about 50 feet up in the tree and fell to the ground. A visual inspection showed that there was rot where the failed branch connected to the main stem of the tree. The City contract Urban Forester was asked to conduct a detailed tree assessment which showed significant rot in the main stem and branches of the tree. That assessment deemed the tree to be a hazard and identified risks to adjacent property. It is the arborist's recommendation that the tree be removed. Washington Cities Insurance Authority (WCIA) has reviewed the report and recommends removal of the tree.

3) <u>Alternatives</u>:

Approve the de-listing from the City's Historic Register.

Do not approve de-listing from the City's Historic Register

4) <u>Attachments</u>:

- A. Historic Register Listing
- B. Tree Assessment

https://www.ci.tumwater.wa.us/departments/executive-department/city-programs/historical-register

Historical Register

• Jack Davis Garry Oak Tree



ADDRESS: Near 7525 Old Hwy 99, Tumwater, WA 98501

AMENITIES:

• None

CATEGORIES:

Historic Properties

The tree is significant as a specimen tree of the Garry oak species, believed to be approximately 400 years old. The Coastal Salish Indian people managed the landscape by burning the prairies to provide open areas where plants, most notably Camas, could thrive. This helped the oak tree by eliminating the over-canopy of fir trees for the sun-loving oak. The Coastal Salish Indian people baked the acorns or ate them with salmon eggs or pounded them up and ate them with fish. Americans settled here because of the open prairie.

The Coastal Salish also used oak for digging sticks to harvest root foodstuffs and to manufacture yellow face paint made from the decaying bark of the oak tree as well as for hide scraping tools, braces for dip nets and firewood.

The tree is also on the historic northern branch of the Oregon Trail, the Cowlitz Trail. Although various stories about its being the "Meeker Oak" have been circulated, no direct connection with Ezra Meeker has been established. Other accounts about its being an Indian gathering site have not been verified.

In 1984 a community effort lead by environmentalist Jack Davis saved the tree when the highway was being improved in this area and the right-of-way was re-routed and a barrier installed to ensure its security. The tree name honors his work.

Listed on the Tumwater Register of Historic Places.

SUF

SOUND URBAN FORESTRY, LLC

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

10/10/2023

City of Tumwater Marc LaVack 555 Israel Rd SW Tumwater, WA 98501

RE: Meeker Oak Risk Assessment

Mr. LaVack:

Upon your request, a thorough evaluation of the Meeker Oak located at the Olympia Regional Airport has been conducted. This tree has become of concern due to the recent failure of a two large diameter scaffold branches on the north side. Per your direction, this evaluation has included a risk assessment by myself, an aerial assessment by a climbing certified arborist and a sonic tomography by Tree Solutions Inc, all conducted during the months of June -August of this year. The purpose of this report is to present the findings and offer my recommendations based on those findings to the City of Tumwater.

The tree risk assessment methodology used for this report was developed by the International Society of Arboriculture 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.

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 1. Likelihood of Failure

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

A level 3 risk assessment was conducted by myself on June 14, 2023. The following table presents a summary of my findings. More detail can be found in Appendix 1, Tree Risk Assessment Form.

Species	DBH (in)	Height (ft)	Live Canopy Ratio	Target	Distances to Target	Condition	Comments	Risk Rating
Oregon White Oak Quercus garryana	66	125	35	Hwy 99, south parking, north parking, power- lines, aircraft hangar	6', 30', 40', 4', 12'	Poor	Recent failure of an 18" scaffold branch on the north side at 50'. Also, a former failure of a 12" scaffold branch on the east side at 65'. There are signs of white rot infection on the upper sides of both points of failure. Failures were likely due to the infection along with the inclusions and end weight. Trunk soundings on the north and northeast sides at the base indicated probable interior decay up to 6'+. An open decay cavity is present within this location. Two core samples extracted from this area at 3' above grade: #1 taken above the cavity revealed 5" of solid wood, #2 revealed 4" of solid wood. A probe inserted into the cavity did not meet any resistance until 2' and the tip was covered in wet, decayed wood.	High

 Table 3. Complete Risk Assessment Summary

Aerial Assessment

An aerial assessment was conducted by Amanda Hancock (ISA Certified Arborist TX4155AU & TRAQ) with Waxwing Tree Specialists on June 29, 2023. This inspection found extensive white rot decay within the large scaffold that recently experienced failure at the union (see photo). Further examination determined that the main stem's decay column continues upward into the eastern co-dominant stem and large diameter scaffold branches (see attached diagram). The west facing co-dominant stem contains solid healthy interior wood upward into the large scaffold branches overhanging the drive and aircraft hangar.

Sonic Tomography

A sonic tomography was conducted on the tree by Tyler Bunton (ISA Certified Arborist PN-8715A and TRAQ) with Tree Solutions Inc. on August 24, 2023. A detailed summary of his findings can be found in Appendix 2 but essentially, his test conducted at 50 cm above the base found that due to the extent of decay, the tree has slightly more sound wood than required to support itself. He is recommending the tree receive retrenchment pruning to reduce the height and spread by 15 feet in order to lower the chance of future failures.

Comments

With the exception of the recent large branch failures, the Meeker Oak appears to be in very good health. The crown density, leaf color, leaf size and internode growth all indicate a vigorous tree. However, there are structural concerns associated with the significant decay found in the stem base, lower main stem, east facing co-dominant stem and large scaffold branches. Probable future failures include large diameter scaffold branches from the east facing co-dominant stem and the entire west facing co-dominant stem at the union. The associated inclusions and stress loads will contribute to future failures. Structural support systems in conjunction with pruning were considered but the extent of decay in the main stem and upper east side of the canopy removes that as a mitigation option in my opinion.

The other mitigation options are retrenchment pruning and removal. A considerable amount of thought has been put into my final recommendation. The retrenchment option would be controversial to say the least along with the potential of its ineffectiveness. The targets around this veteran tree are many and high-use and the risk rating would remain high. If the City of Tumwater and the community opts for retrenchment pruning, there will be a need for the development of pruning specifications and a long-term management plan.

Based on my findings and information I have been provided, I am recommending removal.

ltem 7.

Professionally Submitted,

Hen M. M. Earland

Kevin M. McFarland, Principal Consulting Urban Forester, Contracted City of Tumwater Tree Protection Professional ISA Certified Arborist PN-0373 & Tree Risk Assessment Qualified Sound Urban Forestry, LLC P.O. Box 489 Tahuya, WA 98588 360-870-2511

References

Dunster, Dr, Julian et al. 2017. *Tree Risk Assessment Manual. Second Edition* 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.

Location of Assessed Tree



<u>Photos</u>



27



Appendix 1

lien	t City of Tumwater			D	ate_June 14, 2	023		Tir	me_10AM		
ddro	ess/Tree location 7637 Old Hwy 99 SW, between airport a	and Hwy 99			Tree	no. 1			Sheet 1	of	2
ee s	species Oregon White Oak, Quercus garryana	d	bh_ ^{66"}	н	eight 125'		Crov	vn spi	read dia. <u>7</u>	0'	
sses	ssor(s) Kevin M. McFarland	Ti	me frame 1	year	Tools	used M	allet, inc	rement	borer, binocul	ars, probe	e, D-tap
		Targe	et Assessme	nt							
						Ta	rget zoi	ne			
Target	Target des	scription				Target within drip line	Target within 1 x Ht.	Target with in 1.5 x Ht.	Occupancy rate 1-rare 2 - occasional 3 - frequent 4 - constant	Practical to move target?	Restriction
1	Hwy	99				1			4	No	No
2	Airplane	hangar				1	1		3	No	No
3	North and so	outh parking					1		3	No	No
4	Electric sen	vice drop				1	-		4	No	No
		Si	te Factors			<u> </u>				· · ·	-
sto	ry of failures Large scaffold branches, recent and p	past			Topograph	v Flat	l Slope	e	%	Aspec	t
gor ests	r Low 🗆 Normal 🔳 High 🗆 Foliage None (se	Tree Health easonal)	n and Specie None (de Abiotic	es Profile ad)□ 1	Normal <u>100</u>	% (hlorot	tic	% Ne	ecrotic_	
anci	ies failure profile Branches 🗖 Trunk 🗖 Roots 🗍 De	and the second sec									
Jeci		escribe									
/ind row	I exposure Protected □ Partial □ Full ■ Wind funr n density Sparse □ Normal ■ Dense □ Interior b nt or planned change in load factors	Incling	ew D Normal	I∎ Dens	Relativ e□ Vines/I ihood of Fail	ve crov Aistlete ure	/n size pe/Mo	e Sma oss □	II 🗆 Mediu	um 🗆 I	Large
rind	I exposure Protected □ Partial □ Full ■ Wind funr n density Sparse □ Normal ■ Dense □ Interior b nt or planned change in load factors	Ineling□ branches Fe d Condition - Crown	ad Factors	I∎ Dens the Likel ches —	Relativ e □ Vines/f ihood of Fail	ve crov Aistlete ure	/n size be/Mo	e Sma oss □	II 🗆 Mediu	um 🗆 I	Large
rind row ecer	I exposure Protected □ Partial □ Full ■ Wind funr n density Sparse □ Normal ■ Dense □ Interior b nt or planned change in load factors	branches Fe d Condition - Crown 5"	and Factors W Normal Affecting and Brane Cracks Codominant Neak attachm	I Dens the Likel ches —	Relativ e □ Vines/f ihood of Fail	ve crow Aistlete	/n size be/Mo	e Sma oss 🗆	Lightning da	um 🗌 I amage d bark	Large
/ind row eccer	I exposure Protected □ Partial □ Full ■ Wind funr in density Sparse □ Normal ■ Dense □ Interior b nt or planned change in load factors	d Condition Crown C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	and Factors W Normal As Affecting and Brane Cracks Cracks Codominant Neak attachm Previous bran Dead/Missing	the Likel ches — ents — ch failure:	Relativ e □ Vines/f ihood of Fail	ve crov Aistlete ure	vn size pe/Mo	e Sma oss 🗆 L Cavity/ Similar Sapwo	Lightning da nclude /Nest hole r branches p	amage d bark _% ci present	Large
/ind row ecer	d exposure Protected □ Partial □ Full ■ Wind funr m density Sparse □ Normal ■ Dense □ Interior b nt or planned change in load factors	d Condition d Condition Crown	ad Factors W Normal As Affecting and Brane Cracks Cracks Codominant Neak attachm Previous bran Dead/Missing Conks Response grov	the Likel ches — nents — bark — wrh Norr	Relativ = Vines/f ihood of Fail 5 ■ Cankers/Gall Heartwood nal	ve crow Alistlete ure s/Burls decay	/n size pe/Mc	e Sma oss D Cavity/ Similar Sapwo hite R	Lightning da Include r branches p ood damage Rot	amage ad bark % ci yresent /decay	Large
/ind row ecer	I exposure Protected Partial Full Wind funr In density Sparse Normal Dense Interior bind Int or planned change in load factors		and Factors w Normal as Affecting and Brand Cracks Codominant Veak attachm Previous bran Ocad/Missing Conks Response grov Significan Imminent Imminent	the Likel ches	Relative e □ Vines/f ihood of Fail s ■ Cankers/Gall Heartwood nal	ve crow Aistleto ure s/Burls decay	vn size pe/Mo	Sma	Lightning da Lightning da Include Nest hole r branches p pood damage tot	um 🗌 I amage I d bark % ci resent /decay I	Large
	d exposure Protected Partial Full Wind funr m density Sparse Normal Dense Interior b nt or planned change in load factors Tree Defects and Unbalanced crown LCR 35 % Dead twigs/branches 5 % overall Max. dia. 5 Broken/Hangers Number Max. dia. Pruning history Crown cleaned Thinned Raised Reduced Topped Lion-taile Flush cuts Other Main concern(s) Load on defect N/A Minor Likelihood of failure Improbable Possible -Trunk Dead/Missing bark Abnormal bark textue		and Factors aw Normal as Affecting and Brane Cracks Cracks Codominant Neak attachm Previous bran Dead/Missing Conks Response grov Significan Imminent Cracks Cracks Code Code Code Code Code Code Code Code	the Likel ches — ents — bark — bark — t — t — ch failures bark — bark — bark — bark — bark —	Relativ = Vines/f ihood of Fail	ve crov Aistlete ure s/Burls decay	m size pe/Mc _	e Sma oss l Cavity/ Similar Sapwo hite R	Lightning da Include r branches p ood damage tot	um 1	
	dexposure Protected □ Partial □ Full ■ Wind funr m density Sparse □ Normal ■ Dense □ Interior b nt or planned change in load factors		and Factors and Factors and Brand and Brand Cracks Codominant Weak attachm Drevious bran Dead/Missing Conks Significan Imminent Cod Od Od Od Od Od Od Od Od Od	the Likel ches — the Likel ches — thents □ thents □ with Norr t □ ollar burie ead □ oze □	Relative e □ Vines/f ihood of Fail	re crow Aistleta s/Burls s/Burls decay s and □ De ■ 50000000000000000000000000000000000	n size poe/Mc	e Sma osss l Cavity// Similar Sapwo hite R conks/ c.	Lightning da Lightning da Include Nest hole bood damage tot Lightning da bood damage tot	amage d bark 	
	I exposure Protected Partial Full Wind funr Int or planned change in load factors		and Factors and Factors and Brand and Brand Cracks Codominant Codominant Codominant Codominant Cracks Cracks Cracks Cracks Cracks Cracks Cracks	the Likel ches — hents — bark — wth Norr t — ollar burie ead — oze — racks — pot plate I	Relative Relative Vines/f ihood of Fail Cankers/Gall Heartwood nal	re crow //istleter ure s/Burls s/Burls decay s and Def s and Def s and Def s and S of S of	In size Dec/Mc In size In si	e Sma oss l Cavity// Similar Sapwo hite R t Conks/ Conks/ c. stance stance	Lightning da Lightning da Include /Nest hole r branches p bood damage tot Lot Stem g /Mushroom from trunk	um I I	
	dexposure Protected Partial Full Wind funr m density Sparse Normal Dense Interior bint nt or planned change in load factors		and Factors and Factors and Brane Cracks codominant Codominant Neak attachm Previous bran Dead/Missing Conks Significan Imminent Cod Re M	the Likel ches — ches — ch failures bark — wth Norr t — clar burie ead — oze — racks — poot plate l esponse g lain conce	Relative Relative Vines/f Vines/f Vines/f Cankers/Gall Heartwood nal Cankers/Gall Heartwood nal Cankers/Gall d/Not visible Decay Cavity Cut/Damage ifting □ rowth rowth	ve crow Vistleta ure s/Burls decay s and □ De 5 5 0 1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	n size pe/Mc (_	Sma Siss Cavity/ Cavity/ Cavity/ Cavity/ Cavity/ Conks/ Conks/ Conks/ and fl	Lightning da Include /Nest hole r branches p ood damage Rot Stem g /Mushroom from trunk from trunk 	um I I	

								Risk Cate	egoi	rizat	ion														
Der							5		⊢				_	Like	lihoo	bd	To:I	uro (P less	nact	Co	nsea	uen	ces	
numt						e	mbe			Fail	ure			Imp	act		rali (f	irom N	Aatrix	1)					Rick
ondition			Condition	s	art size	all distar	arget nu	Target	nprobable	ossible	robable	nminent	ery low	M	edium	gh	nlikely	omewhat	kely	ery likely	egligible	linor	gnificant	evere	rating of par (from
0	Tree part	Eail	or concern	n	16"	6	1 1	None	Ē		ĥ	ĥ	ĥ	ĥ	\sim	Ē	$\dot{\frown}$	ŝ		\sim		2	ĥ	ŝ	Matrix 2
1	scaffold	deca	ure due to ay		16"	30'	3	None	ŏ		Б	K	K	Б	Б	6	K	K	K	K	K	Б	K	ĕ	High
	branch				10		-		ŏ		0	$\check{\circ}$	ŏ		ŏ	$\overline{0}$	ŏ	K	Ď	ŏ	$\check{\circ}$	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	g.
	Co-	Sus	pect weak		30"	80'	2	None	ŏ	ŏ		ŏ	ŏ		ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	$\check{\circ}$	High
2	dominant	unic	n at stem	+					ŏ		ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	
	Stern	deca	ay	.0 .					Õ	ŇŎ	Ŏ	Õ	Õ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Õ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Õ	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	
	Branch	Poo	r attachme	ent	6"	4'	4	None	Õ	$\overline{0}$	Ō	0	Ô	O	$\overline{\mathbf{O}}$	O	Õ	Õ	Õ	Ō	Õ	0	\odot	Õ	Low
3									С			Ο	O		0	O	Ō	Ó	Ó	Ó	0	0	Ο	Ο	
									Ć	Ô	Ó	0	Ô	Õ	Ó	O	Ō	Õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	
									С		O	Ο	Ô	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	Ο	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	
4									С		0	0	О	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	0	0	Ο	0	0	Ο	0	
									С		O	Ο	С		0	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	0	\bigcirc	Ο	Ο	
Lik	elihood	ood ma	Like	elihood	of Imp	acting	Target	:			-														
Im	minent L	e ry low Inlikely	Somewh	w at likely	<u> </u>	Viedium Likelv	1	High Verv likelv	_		_	_			_							_			
Pr	obable L	Jnlikely	Unli	kely	Som	ewhat l	ikely	Likely																	
Po	ossible U	Unlikely	Unli	kely koly		Unlikely	,	Somewhat like	ely																
Nati	ix 2. Risk rat	ting ma	trix.	Kely		оппкету		Officery			-														
L	ikelihood o	f		Cons	equer	ices of I	Failure	2			-														
Fai	lure & Impa	ict M	Vegligible	Mir	nor	Signi	ficant	Severe			-	1										-			
	Very likely		Low	Mode	erate	Hi	igh igh	Extreme	_		-	+			+	-		-	+			+	-		
So	newhat like	ly	Low	Lo	W	Mod	erate	Moderate	:													No	orth		
	Unlikely		Low	Lo	w	Lo	w	Low																	
Not	es, explan	ations,	descriptio	ons																/					
	, ,																								
												/				1	-			1					
лін	gation ont	ione	Retrenchm	nent pri	unina																2001	leuh	rick	Hio	ah
Ren	noval																			F	Resid	dual	risk		ne
																				F	Resid	dual	risł	د	
																				F	Resid	dual	risł	۲	
)ve	rall tree ris	sk ratir	ng Low	D Mo	derate	н	ligh 🔳	Extreme 🗖			,	Woi	r k p i	riori	ty	1	2		3 E	_	1 🗆				
)ve	rall residua	al risk	Low	D Mo	derate	н	ligh 🔳	Extreme 🗖			I	Rec	omr	nen	ded	ins	pect	ion	inte	rval					
		10.1			20000	mont	noode		Tvp	e/Re	aso	n A	eria	l ins	pec	tion	, sor	nic to	omo	grap	bhy				



The tomogram indicates there is slightly more sound wood than is required to support the tree. However, due to the extent of the decay and thin shell wall around measuring points 3, 4, and 18 it is my opinion that this tree should be managed as a veteran tree and have retrenchment pruning performed to reduce the tree height and spread by approximately 15 feet. Reducing the tree height and spread will result in lowered wind loads acting on the trunk and branch unions resulting in a lower likelihood of failure.

If this tree is retained, it should be reassessed with sonic tomography in five years to determine if the decay is continuing to spread and what the remaining shell wall is at that time. Additionally, 4 to 6 inches of wood chip mulch should be added within the dripline of the tree to improve soil conditions. The wood chip mulch should be kept 12 inches from the base of the tree.

TreeSolutions.Net 206-528-4670

2940 Westlake Ave. N #200 Seattle, WA 98109





Арр	endix C Assumptions & Limiting Conditions	
1	Consultant assumes that the site and its use do not violate, and is a applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or regulations.	in compliance with, all
2	The consultant may provide a report or recommendation based or regulations. The consultant assumes that the municipal regulation report are current municipal regulations and assumes no obligatio regulation information.	n published municipal ns published on the date of the n related to unpublished city
3	Any report by the consultant and any values expressed therein rep consultant, and the consultant's fee is in no way contingent upon value, a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, o reported.	present the opinion of the the reporting of a specific r upon any finding to be
4	All photographs included in this report were taken by Tree Solution documented site visit, unless otherwise noted. Sketches, drawings in, and attached to, this report) are intended as visual aids and are should not be construed as engineering drawings, architectural rep reproduction of any information generated by architects, engineer any sketches, drawings or photographs is for the express purpose or reference only. Inclusion of such information on any drawings or o constitute a representation by the consultant as to the sufficiency information.	ns, Inc. during the , and photographs (included e not necessarily to scale. They ports, or surveys. The rs or other consultants and of coordination and ease of ther documents does not or accuracy of the
5	Unless otherwise agreed, (1) information contained in any report to items examined and reflects the condition of those items at the tin inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items with probing, climbing, or coring.	by consultant covers only the me of inspection; and (2) the out dissection, excavation,
6	These findings are based on the observations and opinions of the a provide guarantees regarding the future performance, health, vigo safety of the plants described and assessed.	authoring arborist, and do not or, structural stability, or
7	Measurements are subject to typical margins of error, considering cross-section of most trunks and canopies.	the oval or asymmetrical
8	Tree Solutions did not review any reports or perform any tests rela subject property unless outlined in the scope of services. Tree Solu claim to be soils experts. An independent inventory and evaluatior obtained by a qualified professional if an additional understanding needed to make an informed decision.	ated to the soil located on the utions staff are not and do not n of the site's soil should be g of the site's characteristics is
9	Our assessments are made in conformity with acceptable evaluation techniques and procedures, as recommended by the International	on/diagnostic reporting Society of Arboriculture.

Definitions

<u>Included Bark (Inclusion)</u>: Bark that becomes embedded in a crotch (union) between branch and trunk or between co-dominant stems. Causes a weak structure.

<u>Retrenchment:</u> Natural process during which an overly mature tree reduces its crown and increases its girth to consolidate resources and increase longevity; the deliberate process of reducing tree height to mimic process.

<u>Sounding</u>: Process of striking a tree with a mallet or other appropriate tool and listening for tones that indicate dead bark, a thin layer of wood outside a cavity, or crack in wood.

<u>Tomography:</u> The use of multiple sensors placed around a trunk or limb to record sound or magnetic waves traveling through the wood, with measurements resulting in a picture of internal density characteristics. Typically used in arboriculture to measure the extent of decay in trees.

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.