

TREE EMERGENCY INSPECTION REPORT

I. BASIC INFORMATION

TREE NO	T17	REF NO	005
INSPECTION NO	E03	INSPECTION DATE	23 Jan 2010 24 Jan 2010
OWNER	Maryknoll Convent School	ACTUAL LOCATION	114° 10' 43" E 22° 19' 40" N
GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION	Northwest Corner of the Building of Maryknoll Convent School, No. 130 Boundary Street, Kowloon.	WEATHER CONDITION	Fine

II. TREE CHARACTERISTICS

SPECIES	Araucaria heterophylla (Salisb.) Franco			FAMILY	Araucariaceae	
ENGLISH NAME	Norfolk Island Pine			CHINESE NAME	異葉南洋杉	
HEIGHT(m)	23.5m			DBH (mm)	553.80	
CROWN SPREAD	N - S : 3.2m W - E : 3.5m					
ROOT	METHOD	VTA	INSECT	Nil	FUNGUS	Nil
	DISEASE	Nil	TERMITE	Nil	ELEVATION	Very Bad
TRUNK	METHOD	VTA	INSECT	Nil	FUNGUS	Nil
	DISEASE	Nil	TERMITE	Nil	ELEVATION	Good
BRANCH	METHOD	VTA	INSECT	Nil	FUNGUS	Nil
	DISEASE	Nil	TERMITE	Nil	ELEVATION	Good
LEAF	METHOD	VTA	INSECT	Nil	FUNGUS	Nil
	DISEASE	Nil	TERMITE	Nil	ELEVATION	Good
CONDITIONS OF GROWTH	1. The general condition of the tree on Jan 24. (Fig.1) 2. Two trenches were dug closed to the tree trunk less than 1 meter. apart (Fig.2) 3. Roots system was damage. (Fig.3 to 8) 4. Heavy duty machinery movement on ground surface. (Fig 9 to 10) 5. The works finished on Jan 24. (Fig 11 to 13) Conclusion: 1. The overall condition of the tree at this moment is still good as judged by Visual Tree Assessment Method. However, with the excavation of the two sides nearby, damage of the rooting system and compaction of the soil surface by machinery, severe damage would have been done.					

	2. Danger signal was identified.
--	---

III. SITE CONDITIONS

SITE	<p>1. Two deep trenches 400 mm (wide) x 800 mm (deep) were dug on two sides of the tree by the Construction Contractor.</p> <p>2. The distances between the trenches and the base of the main trunk of the tree were less than 1 meter.</p> <p>3. Two major side roots 100 mm (dia) was exposed and badly damaged, much of small roots was find by cutting.</p> <p>4. QA was identifying the fungicide to protect the damage root surface asap.</p> <p>5. The Construction Contractor backfill the soil on Jan 24 noon.</p>
GROUND COVER	The ground vegetation cover surrounding the tree was completely ruined by machinery movement. The soil was also compacted by the movement of the machinery and the weight of the machinery plus the concrete mixed carried.

IV. EXISTING PROTECTION

LABEL	T17	TREE HOLE	None
RAILING	None	AIR ROOTING	None
SUPPORTING	None	OTHER PROTECTION	None



V. RISK ASSESSMENT

ORIGIN OF RISK	Due to the Construction Contractor digging the trench very closed to trunk, and damage tree roots system.		
HAZARD RATING	<p>Hazard Rating = Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating</p> <p style="text-align: center;">11 = 3 + 4 + 4</p> <p>Hazard Location: <u>Roots</u></p>	<p>Failure potential: 1 = low; 2 = medium; 3 = high; 4 = severe</p> <p>Size of part: 1 = <50mm; 2 = 51 – 100mm; 3 = 101-150mm; 4 = >150mm</p> <p>Target rating: 1 = occasional use; 2 = intermittent use; 3 = frequent use; 4 = constant use</p>	
RISK RATIO	Due to 50% surface root system was damage, surface soil was compact by heavy machine, tree dead ratio more than 50%.		

VI. SUGGESTION

HAZARD ABATEMENT	<p>1. Restrict Area : 1</p> <p>2. Cable : 0</p> <p>3. Removal : 0</p> <p>4. Replanting : 0</p> <p>5. Prune : 0</p> <p>6. Supporting : 1</p> <p>7. Effect on adjacent tree : 0</p> <p>8. Inspect further : 0</p> <p>9. Notification : 0</p> <p>This kind of work defied the purposes of protecting the respective tree.</p>	<p>CARRY OUT THE WORK :</p> <p>0=NONE;</p> <p>1=IMMEDIATELY;</p> <p>2=STAY BEHIND;</p> <p>3=UNNECESSARY;</p> <p>4=OTHER_____</p>
COMMENT	<p>1. The tree unstable now, tree supporting system immediate needs.</p> <p>2. Inspection by weekly.</p>	

VII. PHOTO RECORD

PHOTO RECORD	 <p>Fig 1: Tree overall looking on Jan 24.</p>	 <p>Fig 2: Two trenches were digging up on Jan 23 that closed to tree trunk.</p>
-----------------	---	--