



Richard Oberlander
Tree Surgeon
Certified Arborist

NASSAU SUFFOLK TREE SERVICE

PRUNING • REMOVAL • CABLING • STUMPS • SPRAYING

73 Holly Lane • Roslyn Heights, NY 11577

516-456-3968 • Fax: 516-484-2906

Member

International Society of Arboculture

National Arborist Association

New York State Arborist Association

L.I. Arbocultural Association

Richard Oberlander **Certified Arborist**

3-16-14

Spencer Kanis, Chairman and Board Members
East Hills Architectural Review Board
East Hills Village Hall
209 Harbor Hill Rd.
East Hills, NY 11576

Dear Mr. Kanis and Board Members:

I am an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture (IAS), the major national accrediting body for tree experts (certification number NY0918A). I am also a resident of Nassau County and have been for about 45 years. I have been a practicing arborist for about 10 years, and I am the owner of Nassau-Suffolk Tree Service, a firm with about two dozen employees. We work throughout the North Shore and beyond. I was an appointed member of the Village of East Hills Architectural Review Board and helped write the Village's Tree Preservation law several years ago.

I also hold a BS (1962) in Agricultural Science from Cornell University, and I have received additional extensive training in arboriculture in rigorous continuing education seminars required by the IAS.

I was asked to evaluate some of the proposed tree removals tonight at 90 Fir

Dr. and 1 Barberry Lane.

I strongly object to the proposals to remove these healthy trees.

90 Fir Dr --

At 90 Fir Dr there were numerous magnificent oak and other trees in excellent health that were previously removed over strong objections from myself and neighbors. They provided robust ecological and aesthetic services to the community. There was no sound reason in policy to allow these trees to be removed.

Now there is one of the last large oaks that is proposed for removal over the objections of the across the street neighbor. I also object.

I evaluated this tree today. This is a healthy tree and there is no reason to remove it.

I am familiar with the report of the owner's arborist which states that there is supposed decay in limbs. I did not see these areas of decay while inspecting the tree with binoculars.

Holes in a tree are normal, and result in many cases from old damage that can last for years. It is not a reason to remove trees.

In this tree I noted a hole at the top of one leader that is probably the home of a squirrel or raccoon, and does not affect the health of the tree. The hole has probably been there for 15 years. Up and down the trunk there is no indication of decay.

I noted a 4-foot area of staining indicative of some activity of borers. That problem can -- and should -- be easily remedied with an insecticide treatment, and is in no way a justification for the tree's removal in any form.

Furthermore the tree has numerous buds indicative of good health.

I urge you to preserve this tree absent clear documentary evidence of structural issues -- not the presence of decay in a few limbs that were removed already.

1 Barberry Lane

I inspected all the tagged and untagged trees today.

I saw no evidence of disease on any of the trees or structural defects that would require or justify their removal.

Some of the Maple trees require some pruning but they are solid and in good health.

Five of the six trees identified as Hemlocks are in fact Eastern red cedars, a robust tree.

The Hemlock woolly adelgid does not affect them. These trees are healthy and are attractive elements of the street landscape and should be preserved.

The Hemlock tree was also healthy but would benefit from pruning and fertilizer to increase its robustness.

Even were the trees to be affected, that is no reason to remove them.

I pass this location at least once a day and find these trees valuable aesthetic and natural assets of the neighborhood. I live several blocks away.

In the event there is were any infestation of the woolly adelgid as said to be stated in the tree application, this problem can be remedied with pesticide and does not necessitate removal. To quote from one source

"Insecticidal soap/horticultural oil is the environmentally safest chemical control method for hemlock woolly adelgid. These insecticides are non-toxic. They are applied to the foliage and kill the insect by smothering it as the spray dries. Most trees will need to be treated on a yearly basis.

Tree foliage insecticides are applied to the foliage of the tree and will persist on the foliage and continue killing hemlock woolly adelgid for up to two to three years after application. However, these materials are more toxic than insecticidal soaps/horticultural oils."

I am deeply dissatisfied with the excessive way this Board has been permitting trees to be removed. It contradicts the law as I helped write it and as the Village board expressed its intent in passing it.

I urge you to deny applications that ask to remove healthy trees when there are other alternatives -- insecticide application, alternate patio designs, alternate house configurations etc.

This community is losing trees at an unsustainable rate. It should stop.

I would note that there is a severe issue of borers across East Hills that should be addressed. The law as I helped write it gives the Village the authority to require residents to address tree problems and this is one instance where that should be considered. There is an epidemic that needs to be addressed to preserve the health of our remaining canopy.

I have consulted with advocate Richard Brummel on these comments and refer you to his own letter to the Board and testimony.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Richard Oberlander, Certified Arborist, (516) 456-3968