

	4/15/2024	308 NW 7th Ave. Pompano Beach, FL												
TREE #	COMMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME	HEIGHT (ft)	WIDTH (ft)	DBH (in)	CLEAR TRUNK (ft)	HEALTH CONDITION	HEALTH CONDITION %	RULE 14-10.057 APPRAISAL (2020) \$	RELOCATION CANDIDATE (Y/N)	OBSERVATIONS	Wholesale Cost Average	\$/3 Inch Tree	Plant Ant 4/15/24
1	Royal Poinciana	<i>Delonix regia</i>	13.8	26	6.5		Good	70%	\$713.62	Y		188.33	156.84	150, 165, 250
2	Live Oak	<i>Quercus virginiana</i>	17.7	15	5.5		Good	70%	\$1,750.00	Y		1000		950, 1000, 1050 (6")
3	Live Oak	<i>Quercus virginiana</i>	17.8	13	5.5		Good	70%	\$1,750.00	Y		1000		950, 1000, 1050 (6")
4	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	25.2	26	17.25		Fair	53%	\$1,930.06	N	Poor structure, canopy dieback, leaf necrosis	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
5	Strangler Fig	<i>Ficus aurea</i>	46.1	62	73.75		Fair	49%	\$11,292.97	N	Poor structure, visual evidence of decay, canopy dieback, deadwood	375	312.5	250, 375, 500
6	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	27.7	8	14.25	23.7	Good	65%	\$176.04	N	Below overhead utility lines	108.33		90, 110, 125
7	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	28.4	4	12	24.4	Fair	57%	\$154.37	N	Utility pruned	108.33		90, 110, 125
8	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	23.5	12	9.5		Fair	53%	\$1,062.93	N	Canopy crowding, poor structure, below overhead utility lines	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
9	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	25.2	8	14.5	21.2	Good	65%	\$176.04	N	Below overhead utility lines	108.33		90, 110, 125
10	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	21.9	8	8		Fair	50%	\$844.43		Canopy crowding, poor structure, below overhead utility lines	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
11	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	12	8	13	6	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y	Immature Palm	108.33		90, 110, 125
12	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	23.3	8	13.5	19.3	Good	65%	\$176.04	N	Below overhead utility lines	108.33		90, 110, 125
13	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	27.7	8	11.75	23.7	Good	65%	\$176.04	N	Below overhead utility lines	108.33		90, 110, 125
14	Silver Buttonwood	<i>Conocarpus erectus var. sericeus</i>	11	8	3.75		Fair	55%	\$176.45	N	Trunk lean, heading cuts	128.33		125, 130, 130
15	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	21.7	8	13	17.7	Good	65%	\$176.04	N	Below overhead utility lines	108.33		90, 110, 125
16	Silver Buttonwood	<i>Conocarpus erectus var. sericeus</i>	8	8	2.75		Fair	48%	\$154.00	N	Poor structure, trunk lean, heading cuts	128.33		125, 130, 130
17	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	18.2	8	17	14.2	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
18	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	22.7	8	10.5	18.7	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
19	Lead Tree	<i>Leucaena leucocephala</i>	33.1	24	14.5		Poor	37%	\$0.00	N	Florida Invasive Species Council Category II Invasive, poor structure, visual evidence of decay			
20	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	22.1	8	12.25	18.1	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
21	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	20.8	8	15	16.8	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
22	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	20.8	22	19		Poor	34%	\$1,363.76	N	Poor structure, canopy dieback, Strangler Fig parasite, visual evidence of decay	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
23	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	23.2	24	21.5		Fair	50%	\$2,269.41	N	Poor structure, canopy dieback, leaf necrosis, schefflera parasite	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
24	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	27.2	8	12.75	23.2	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
25	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	25	8	13	21	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
26	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	26.5	8	13	22.5	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
27	Strangler Fig	<i>Ficus aurea</i>	17	17	11.25		Poor	37%	\$1,300.78	N	Poor structure, heading cut	375	312.5	250, 375, 500
28	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	22.9	8	13.5	18.9	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
29	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	35.2	8	13.75	31.2	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
30	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	30.7	8	12	26.7	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y	Trunk lean	108.33		90, 110, 125
31	Manila Tamarind	<i>Pithecellobium dulce</i>	42.2	40	32.25		Fair	45%	\$2,962.87	N	Poor structure, trunk lean, canopy crowding, water sprouts	245	204.16	Used Green Buttonwood for relative comparison. 225, 235, 275
32	Strangler Fig	<i>Ficus aurea</i>	42.5	50	96		Fair	54%	\$16,200.00	N	Poor structure, severely confined root space, engulfed Sabal Palm, visual evidence of decay heading cuts, canopy dieback	375	312.5	250, 375, 500
33	Live Oak	<i>Quercus virginiana</i>	38.5	60	49.25		Good	64%	\$13,133.44	Y	Poor structure, canopy dieback, deadwood, canopy crowding	1000	446.67	950, 1000, 1050 (6")
34	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	34.4	22	18.5		Fair	53%	\$2,069.92	N	Poor structure, canopy crowding, canopy dieback	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
35	Rubber Tree	<i>Ficus elastica</i>	35.4	44	48		Fair	54%	\$4,284.06	N	Poor structure, canopy crowding, visual evidence of decay, canopy dieback	198.33	164.28	140, 275, 245 used weeping fig

**DRC**

PZ23-12000048  
07/03/2024

36	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	30.2	22	16		Fair	55%	\$1,857.75	N	Canopy crowding, poor structure, trunk lean	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
37	Seagrape	<i>Coccoloba uvifera</i>	36	44	25.5		Fair	46%	\$2,362.30	N	Poor structure, deadwood, trunk lean, canopy crowding, water sprouts, visual evidence of decay	241.67	201.39	225, 250, 250
38	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	47.5	58	38		Fair	57%	\$4,572.61	N	Poor structure, canopy crowding, deadwood, canopy dieback	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
39	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	33.5	23	13.5		Fair	50%	\$1,424.98	N	Poor structure, canopy crowding, canopy dieback	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
40	Avocado	<i>Persea americana</i>	13	10	16		Poor	25%	\$677.76	N	Canopy collapse, severe visual evidence of decay	203.33	169.44	150, 200, 260
41	Loquat	<i>Eriobotrya japonica</i>	20	16	14		Poor	40%	\$790.72	N	Tree partially toppled, uplifted root zone, canopy crowding	100	141.2	100, 100, 100
42	Seagrape	<i>Coccoloba uvifera</i>	33.6	40	43		Fair	52%	\$4,503.08	N	Poor structure, deadwood, visual evidence of decay, water sprouts	241.67	201.39	225, 250, 250
43	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	29.1	38	24.25		Fair	53%	\$2,713.27	N	Poor structure, canopy dieback, deadwood, leaf necrosis	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
44	Weeping Fig	<i>Ficus benjamina</i>	32.5	26	28.75		Poor	34%	\$1,615.61	N	Tree partially toppled, uplifted root zone, deadwood	198.33	165.28	140, 210, 245
45	Weeping Fig	<i>Ficus benjamina</i>	23.6	28	35.25		Poor	27%	\$1,573.05	N	Poor structure, severe canopy dieback, deadwood	198.33	165.28	140, 210, 245
46	Frangi Pani	<i>Plumeria sp.</i>	18.9	24	11.5		Poor	40%	\$517.50	N	Visual evidence of decay, poor structure	135	112.5	135, 135
47	Simpsons Stopper	<i>Myrcianthes fragrans</i>	8	10	6.5		Poor	40%	\$520.00	N	Visual evidence of decay, poor structure	240	200	150, 245, 325
48	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	31.5	8	12.5	27.5	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
49	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	33.5	8	13	29.5	Good	65%	\$176.04	Y		108.33		90, 110, 125
50	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	32.3	8	8	28.3	Fair	47%	\$127.29	N	Poor vigor	108.33		90, 110, 125
51	Live Oak	<i>Quercus virginiana</i>	34.2	38	32.5		Fair	58%	\$7,854.23	Y	Poor structure, trunk lean, canopy dieback, compacted root zone	1000	416.67	950, 1000, 1050 (6")
52	Sabal Palm	<i>Sabal palmetto</i>	19.6	3	13	15.5	Fair	47%	\$127.29	N	Canopy crowding	108.33		90, 110, 125
53	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	34.7	34	30.5		Fair	52%	\$3,348.18	N	Poor structure, heading cuts, canopy dieback, overlifted crown	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
54	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	37.1	32	30		Fair	50%	\$3,166.63	N	Poor structure, canopy crowding , canopy dieback, overlifted crown, deadwood	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
55	Mango	<i>Mangifera indica</i>	38.1	42	36.25		Fair	56%	\$4,285.50	N	Poor structure, canopy crowding , canopy dieback, overlifted crown, deadwood	253.33	211.1083	200, 260, 300
*I certify that all statements of fact in this appraisal are true, complete and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and that they are made in good faith.														
Mark C. Williams FL-5221 AM, ISA Certified Arborist Municipal Specialist (Treemendous Consulting Group LLC)														

**DRC**

PZ23-12000048

07/03/2024