## Guide for Plant Appraisal Corrigenda

The items in this table represent corrections to the Guide for Plant Appraisal, 10th edition, since its first printing in 2018. Revisions that were made between the 10th edition, second printing (2019), and the revised 10th edition (third printing; Oct. 2020) are shown in the rows for pages 84 and 86.

| Page / Line or \# | Original Text | Corrected Text (Minor grammatical errors are not addressed here.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 / 10$ | 1977 | 1975 |
| 4/30-31 | The Guide is not an ANSI standard, even though it is produced through a similar consensus-driven process. | The Guide is not an ANSI standard, even though it is produced through a consensus-driven process. |
| 5/8-9 | ...marketplace. The Guide meets this standard. It has a long history of... | ...marketplace. The Guide has a long history of... |
| $9 / 25$ | ...it represents market value. | ...it may represent market value. |
| $10 / 2$ and throughout | ...inferred from software application systems like i-Tree Eco... | ...inferred from tree management software applications like i-Tree Eco... |
| 11/6 | Cost Estimates Versus Value Estimates | Cost Estimates Versus Market Value Estimates |
| $11 / 13$ | Where market value is sought, evidence of WTP derives from transactions. | --- |
| 22 / 13 | - Contractual value. | --- |
| 22 / 19 | Uniform Standards of Appraisal Practice (USPAP) | Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) |

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline 28 / 30 & \begin{array}{l}\text { No reconciliation was needed. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { No reconciliation was } \\ \text { necessary. }\end{array} \\ \hline 30 / 12,14 & \begin{array}{l}25 \text { feet }(7.6 \mathrm{~m}) \\ 3.5 \text { feet }(1.5 \mathrm{~m})\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { 25 feet }(7.62 \mathrm{~m}) \\ 3.5 \text { feet }(1.07 \mathrm{~m})\end{array} \\ \hline 35 / \text { footnote } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Palm trunk height is measured from grade } \\ \text { to the base of the newest, youngest leaf } \\ \text { (also known as the spear leaf). }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Trunk height is measured } \\ \text { from the ground line, which } \\ \text { should be at or near the top } \\ \text { of the root zone to the base } \\ \text { of the heart leaf (ANSI Z60- } \\ \text { 2014). }\end{array} \\ \hline 37 / 9-22 & \begin{array}{l}\text { The trunk measurement of a leaning tree on } \\ \text { level ground should be made 4.5 feet from } \\ \text { the ground on the compression or underside } \\ \text { of the trunk. } \\ \text { Measurement should be perpendicular to } \\ \text { the trunk (Figure 4.3b). }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { The trunk measurement of a } \\ \text { leaning tree on level ground } \\ \text { should be made 4.5 feet from } \\ \text { the ground on the compression } \\ \text { or underside of the trunk. } \\ \text { Measurement of the trunk }\end{array} \\ \text { diameter should be } \\ \text { perpendicular to the trunk }\end{array}\right\}$

| 39 / 2-3 | 3 to 5 feet ( 1 to 1.5 m ) | 3 to 5 feet (1 to 1.07 m ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44 / Table 4.1 | Excellent [Percent Rating] 100\% | Excellent [Percent Rating] $81 \%$ to $100 \%$ |
| 49 / Table 4.3 | Component Rating Weighting Product <br> Health 1.000 .150 .15 <br> Structure 0.600 .700 .42 <br> Form 0.400 .150 .06 <br> Weighted average condition rating (sum of product) 0.63 <br> Note: Weighting factors must add up to 1.00 or $100 \%$. | Component Rating Weighting Product <br> Health 1.000 .150 .15 <br> Structure 0.600 .700 .42 <br> Form 0.400 .150 .06 <br> Sum 2.01 .00 .63 <br> Weighted average condition rating (sum of product/sum of ratings) $0.63 \div 1$ <br> Weighted average <br> condition rating 0.63 |
| 50/5-13 | A third approach employs a weighted average of the three components (Table 4.3; Figure 4.10). This process involves four steps. First, health, structure, and form are evaluated. Second, the appraiser considers whether one of these components is more important than any other, and, if so, applies a weighting factor. Third, the ratings of health, structure, and form are multiplied by the weighting factor. Fourth, the product of the rating and weighting are totaled. <br> For example, the Deodar cedar in Figure 4.10 was assessed with a health rating of $1.00(100 \%)$, a structure rating of 0.60 ( $60 \%$ ), and a form rating of $0.40(40 \%)$. In the second step... | A third approach employs a weighted average of the three components (Table 4.3; Figure 4.10). This process involves four steps. First, health, structure, and form are evaluated in decimal form and the results added together. Second, the appraiser considers whether one of these components is more important than any other, and, if so, applies a weighting factor. Third, the ratings of health, structure, and form are multiplied by the weighting factor. Fourth, the product of the rating and weighting are added together and divided by the sum of the original ratings. <br> For example, the Deodar cedar in Figure 4.10 was assessed with a health rating of $1.00(100 \%)$, a structure rating of $0.60(60 \%)$, and a form rating of $0.40(40 \%)$. In the second step... |


| 51/1-3 | Fourth, the result was totaled to calculate the weighted average of $63 \%$, equivalent to good condition (as suggested in Table 4.1). | Fourth, the product of each component is added together and divided by the sum of the original $(0.15+0.42+0.06) /$ 1.0. In this example, the result was a weighted average of $63 \%$, equivalent to poor condition (Table 4.1). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54 / Figure 5.1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Original text Replacement text <br> Functional Reproduction <br> Reproduction <br> Replacement <br> Functional Replacement  |  |
| 57/27-30 | Estimates of tree value may be greatly out of proportion to the value of the land and other property improvements, or to what people would actually pay for a replacement tree. | Cost estimates may be greatly out of proportion to the value of the land and other property improvements, or to what people would actually pay for a replacement tree. |
| 57 / 68-69 | To apply the TFT using trunk diameter, compute the cross- sectional area of the subject plant then multiply it by the unit price. | To apply the TFT using trunk diameter, compute the crosssectional area of the subject plant then multiply it by the unit price (see Appendix 2). |
| 58/15-16 | ...important than overall tree size. After all, tree diameter is simply a proxy for tree size. In most cases, tree diameter in and of itself confers little in the way of direct benefits. | ...important than overall trunk diameter. |


| 59-60 / 36 1-3 | (present cost, $P C$ ) | (present installed cost, $P C$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64 / 23 | water use limitations, restrictions on irrigation; | water use limitations, restrictions on irrigation; competing infrastructure (utilities); |
| 65 / 11-13 | Appraisers may find that some features fit into more than one depreciation category. For example, overhead electrical wires are a functional limitation because they are over the property, but were a tree has been topped because of the powerline, the appraiser may depreciate for both condition (form) and functional limitations that will limit future height growth. The appraiser should not also depreciate for the decision to install the powerlines over the property that was out of the control of the property owner because the physical structure (powerline) is already in place. | Appraisers may find that some features fit into more than one depreciation category. For example, overhead electrical wires can be either a functional limitation or an external limitation. In this case, the appraiser should depreciate in only one category. |
| 65 / 21-2 | ...prepared by contractors or other professionals. | ...prepared by contractors, other professionals, or the appraiser, if qualified and not conflicted. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67-68 \& 70-72 / 25, } \\ & 20,7,24, \& 13 \end{aligned}$ | total (accrued) depreciation | total depreciation |
| 71/4-7 | 3. Weighted average: $47 \%$ <br> a) Weighting: structure, 0.40 ; health, 0.30 ; form 0.30 <br> b) Weighted average: $(50 \% \times 0.40)+$ $(50 \% \times 0.30)+(30 \% \times 0.30)=20 \%$ $20 \%+15 \%+9 \%=44 \%$ | 3. Weighted average: $34 \%$ <br> a) Weighting: structure, 0.40 ; health, 0.30 ; form 0.30 <br> b) Weighted average: $\begin{aligned} & (50 \% \times 0.40)+(50 \% \times 0.30) \\ & +(30 \% \times 0.30)= \\ & 20 \%+15 \%+9 \%=44 \% \div 1 \\ & =44 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| 71/36-38 | 3. Weighted average: $82 \%$ <br> a)Weighting: structure, 0.40 ; health, 0.40; form, 0.20 <br> b) Weighted average: $(90 \% \times 0.40)+$ $\begin{aligned} & (70 \% \times 0.40)+(90 \% \times 0.20)=36 \%+28 \% \\ & +18 \%=82 \% \end{aligned}$ | 3. Weighted average: $35 \%$ <br> a)Weighting: structure, 0.80 ; health, 0.10 ; form, 0.10 <br> b) Weighted average: $\begin{aligned} & (90 \% \times 0.80)+(70 \% \times 0.10) \\ & +(90 \% \times 0.10)=72 \%+7 \%+ \\ & 9 \%=88 \% \div 1.0=88 \% \end{aligned}$ |


| 74 / 5 | ...benefit was to screen Ms. Peabody's home. | ...benefit was to screen Mr. Butler's view of Ms. Peabody's home. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75 / 39 | Installation cost. 10 trees @ $\$ 10$. | Installation cost. 10 trees @ $\$ 100$. |
| 77 / 22-24 | The principle of substitution might otherwise argue for using the lowest estimate, of $\$ 40$, but in this case, the appraiser selects a higher number reflecting intangible benefits of superior tree quality and service. | The principle of substitution might otherwise argue for using the lowest estimate (Nursery 1, \$40.74), but in this case the appraiser selects a higher estimate (Nursey 3, $\$ 44.56$ ) because of its superior tree quality and reputation for excellent customer service. |
| $79 / 12$ | \$42,316 | \$8,458 |
| 79 / 17-18 | \$44/in ${ }^{2}$ | \$44.56/in ${ }^{2}$ |
| $80 / 6$ | 20-foot dbh (2.5-m) | 20 -inch dbh ( 0.58 cm ) |
| 83 / 28-30 | ...computed as follows: <br> Year $1=\$ 400$ (o discount for Year 1) <br> Year $2=\$ 400 \div 1.05$ | ..computer as follows: <br> Year $1=\$ 400(0$ discount for Year 1) <br> Year $2=\$ 400 \div 1.05^{1}$ |
| 84 / 6 through end of page |  | Except for the first lines, from Client name through Address, this form has been revised in its entirety. See page 11 of this Corrigenda for the original form, and page 12 for the revised form. |
| 85 / \#2 | 2. Cross-sectional area (line 1) ${ }^{2} \times 0.7854=$ | 2. Cross-sectional area (line $1)^{2} \times 0.7854$ |
| 85 / \#7 | 7. Cross-sectional area (line 6$)^{2} \times 0.7854$ | 7. Cross-sectional area (line $6)^{2} \times 0.7854$ |
| 85 / \#11 | 11. Depreciated reproduction cost (line 3 $\times$ line $4 \times$ line $5 \times$ line 10 ) | 11. Depreciated reproduction cost $^{\ddagger}$ (line $10 \times$ line $3 \times$ line $4 \times$ line 5) |
| 85 / footnote | *dbh and growth rate may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate. | *diameter and cross-sectional area may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate |


| 86/\#1-\#3 | 1. Trunk diameter* (D) $\qquad$ @ $\qquad$ <br> 2. Cross-sectional area $(\text { line } 1)^{2} \times 0.7854$ $\qquad$ in $^{2}$ <br> 3. Condition rating $\qquad$ \% | 1. Trunk diameter* (D) $\qquad$ @ $\qquad$ <br> 2. Condition rating $\qquad$ \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 86 / 19 through end of page |  | From Species through the end of the page, this form has been revised in its entirety. See page 13 of this Corrigenda for the original form, and page 14 for the revised form. |
| 87 / \#11 | 11. Basic compounded cost (line $8[1+$ line 10] ${ }^{\text {line } 9}$ ) | 11. Basic compounded cost (line $8 \times[1+\text { line } 10]^{\text {line } 9}$ ) |
| 87 / \#12 | 12. Depreciated compounded cost (line 3 $\times$ line $4 \times$ line $5 \times$ line 11 ) | 12. Depreciated compounded cost $^{\ddagger}$ (line $11 \times$ line $2 \times$ line 3 $\times$ line 4) |
| $88 / \# 12$ | 12. Depreciated compounded cost (line 3 $\times$ line $4 \times$ line $5 \times$ line 12$)^{\ddagger}$ | 12. Depreciated compounded cost $^{\ddagger}($ line $11 \times$ line $2 \times$ line $3 \times$ line 4) |
| 88 / footnote | *dbh and growth rate may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate. <br> ** the age and diameter growth of the subject tree are not necessarily relevant. Its size (dbh, volume, and/or height) is relevant. Years to parity should reflect the appraise r's best estimate of the time for a healthy specimen to grow to the same basic size as the subject tree. | *diameter and cross-sectional area may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate. <br> **The age and cross-sectional area of the subject tree are not necessarily relevant. Its size (diameter, volume, and/or height) is relevant. Years to parity should reflect the appraiser's best estimate of the time for a healthy specimen to reach a size where it provides equal utility or benefits. |
| 98/2-3 | Highest and best use is foundational for estimating market value... | Highest and best use should be considered a function of the appraisal problem.. |


| 98/17-19 | The price paid for plants at a nursery or for landscape services is the market value of those goods and services. It is set based on supply, demand, and other factors. Estimating the cost of these goods and services is an application of the SCA, but that is not the emphasis in this chapter. | --- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101 / 1 | Overall, these studies show... | These studies show... |
| 101/6-7 | SOURCES FOR PROPERTY VALUE <br> Sources for property value include: | SOURCES FOR MARKET VALUE OF PROPERTY <br> Sources for market value of property include: |
| 112 / 1-4 | While the plant appraisal profession may not be highly developed..., | -- |
| 126 / 21 | Other terms applied to trees are ancient, veteran, landmark, legacy, and... | Other terms applied to trees are ancient, veteran, landmark, legacy, specimen tree, and... |
| 127 / 5 | At the global level, the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) designates heritage sites (e.g., Yellowstone National Park). | At the global level, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) designates World Heritage Sites (e.g., Yellowstone National Park, Mammoth Cave National Park, etc.). |


| 128 / 5-7 | The limit of insurance (liability) of this coverage for all trees, shrubs, plants, and lawns may not exceed $5 \%$ of the limit of liability that applies to the dwelling, or more than $\$ 500$ for any one tree, shrub, or plant. | There are limits to insurance (liability) for all trees, shrubs, plants, and lawns. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 131/17 | ...casualty loss purposes. | ...casualty loss purposes. If you encounter a situation that involves the tax code, consult a tax professional. |
| 136 / 28-29 | Betula nigra Heritage $^{\text {™ }}$ | Betula nigra 'Cully' <br> The (trademarked) common name is Heritage ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ River Birch. |
| 136 / 35-39 | Betula nigra <br> Dura-Heat ${ }^{T M}$ (Actual cultivar name is <br> Betula nigra 'Cully') | Betula nigra <br> The (trademarked) common name is Dura-Heat ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ River Birch. |
| 142 / 9-10 | Only basic statistics, commonly employed in forestry, are presented. | --- |
| 142/12 | ...appraiser should enlist the services of a professional forester skill in forest inventory... | ..should follow industrystandard forest inventory sampling and design. |
| 143 / Table A3.1* |  | *Significant digits throughout have been updated for consistent accuracy and precision. |
| $151 / 24$ | Shady Grove Nursery | Shady Creek Nursery |
| 158/36 | form: (Ch. 4) A description of a plant' s habitat. | form: (Ch. 4) A description of a plant's habit. |
| 161/19-22 | trunk formula technique (TFT): (Ch. 5) A technique for developing a cost basis that involves extrapolating the acquisition cost of a nursery-grown tree up to the size of the subject tree being valued. | trunk formula technique (TFT): (Ch. 5) A technique for developing a cost basis that involves extrapolating the purchase cost of a nurserygrown tree up to the size of the subject tree being valued. |


| $161 / 23-24$ | Uniform Standards of <br> Professional Practice (USPAP) | Uniform Standards of <br> Professional Appraisal <br> Practice (USPAP) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $170 / 20$ | unit rule, 129 | unit rule, 123, 129-130 |

# Original Form (p. 84) 

## Repair Method

Direct Cost Technique

Client name $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ Case \# $\qquad$
Phone $\qquad$ E-mail $\qquad$
Address $\qquad$
Repair plan $\qquad$

Subject tree
Species $\qquad$

1. Trunk diameter* (D) $\qquad$ @ $\qquad$
2. Cross-sectional area (line 1$)^{2} \times 0.7854 \ldots$ in $^{2}$
3. Condition rating $\qquad$ \%
Health $\qquad$
Structure $\qquad$
Form $\qquad$
4. Functional limitations $\qquad$ \%
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ \%

## Replacement tree

6. Purchase price $\qquad$
$\qquad$
7. Depreciated purchase cost ${ }^{\dagger}$ (line $6 \times$ line $3 \times$ line $4 \times$ line 5)
8. Installation $\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$
S. $\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$
9. Site preparation $\qquad$
10. Aftercare $\qquad$
$\qquad$
11. Subtotal, subject tree (line 6 or $7+$ line $8+$ line $9+$ line 10) $\qquad$
Other items
12. Turf $\qquad$
13. Hardscape $\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$
14. Clean-up $\qquad$
$\$$ $\qquad$
15. Repair $\qquad$
$\$$ $\qquad$
16. Aftercare $\qquad$
$\qquad$
17. Other $\qquad$
18. Subtotal, other items (lines $12+13+14+15+16+17$ )

Total repair cost (line $11+$ line 18)
$\qquad$

* diameter and cross-sectional area may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate.
${ }^{*}$ Apply depreciation if it is appropriate for the assignment.


## Revised Form (p. 84)

Current as of October 2020


$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Repair plan
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Repair items

$\qquad$
2. Wound repair___ $\qquad$
3. Pruning __ \$ $\qquad$
4. Support system $\longrightarrow$ \$ $\qquad$
5. Irrigation $\quad$ _ $\$$ $\qquad$
6. Mulch ___ \$ $\qquad$
7. Turf__ \$ $\qquad$
8. Shrubs _ \$ $\qquad$
9. Other plantings ___ \$__
10. Soil __ \$ $\qquad$
11. Hardscape __ \$ $\qquad$
12. Debris removal__ \$ $\qquad$
13. Aftercare __ \$ $\qquad$
14. Other__ \$ $\qquad$
Total repair cost ${ }^{\ddagger}$ (sum lines 1 through 14)
\$ $\qquad$
Rounded
\$ $\qquad$

[^0]
# Original Form (p. 86) 

# Functional Replacement Method <br> Trunk Formula Technique 

$\qquad$
Client name Date Case \#

Phone $\qquad$ E-mail $\qquad$
Address $\qquad$

## Subject tree

Species $\qquad$

1. Trunk diameter* (D) $\qquad$ @ $\qquad$
2. Cross-sectional area (line 1$)^{2} \times 0.7854 \ldots \mathrm{in}^{2}$
3. Condition rating $\quad$ \% Health $\qquad$
Structure $\qquad$
Form $\qquad$
4. Functional limitations $\qquad$
$\qquad$ \%
5. External limitations $\qquad$
$\qquad$ \%

## Functional replacement tree

Utility or benefit to be replaced $\qquad$
Replacement plan $\qquad$
Species $\qquad$
6. Size (specify diameter or height) $\qquad$
7. If diameter, cross-sectional area (line 6 ) ${ }^{2} \times 0.7854$ $\qquad$ in $^{2}$
8. Functional replacement tree cost Source: $\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$

## Calculations

9. Unit tree cost (line 8 / line 7 or RPAC) $\qquad$
10. Basic functional replacement cost (line $2 \times$ line 9)
11. Depreciated functional replacement cost ${ }^{\ddagger}$ (line $10 \times$ line $3 \times$ line $4 \times$ line 5)
\$ $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Additional costs

Cleanup $\qquad$
Replacement tree installation $\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$

Aftercare $\qquad$
Hardscape (specify) $\qquad$
12. Total additional costs
\$ $\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$
13. Total functional replacement cost (line $11+$ line 12)
14. Rounded
$\qquad$
$\$$
\$ $\qquad$
$\qquad$

[^1]
## Revised Form (p. 86)

Current as of October 2020

Functional Replacement Method
Trunk Formula Technique
Trunk Formula Technique

| Client name | Date | Case \# |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phone | E-mail |  |

Address $\qquad$

## Subject tree

Species $\qquad$

1. Trunk diameter* (D) $\qquad$ in. @ $\qquad$
2. Condition rating
Health $\qquad$ $\longrightarrow$
$\qquad$ \%
$\qquad$
3. Functional limitations $\qquad$ \%
4. External limitations $\qquad$
$\qquad$ \%

## Functional replacement tree

Utility or benefit to be replaced $\qquad$
Replacement plan
5. Trunk diameter* (D) $\qquad$ in. @ $\qquad$
6. Cross-sectional area $(\text { line } 5)^{2} \times 0.7854=$
$\qquad$ in $^{2}$

## Replacement nursery tree

7. Trunk diameter* (D) $\qquad$ in. @ $\qquad$
8. Cross-sectional area $(\text { line } 7)^{2} \times 0.7854=$
9. Nursery tree cost Source: $\qquad$
$\qquad$ in ${ }^{2}$

## Calculations

10. Unit nursery tree cost (line $9 \div$ line 8 or from RPAC)
\$ $\qquad$ $/$ in $^{2}$
11. Basic functional replacement cost (line $6 \times$ line 10)
12. Depreciated basic cost (line $11 \times$ line $2 \times$ line $3 \times$ line 4 )
$\qquad$
\$ $\qquad$

## Additional costs

| Cleanup | $\$$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Nursery tree installation | \$ |
| Aftercare | \$ |
| Hardscape | \$ |
| Other | \$ |
| Total additional costs ${ }^{\ddagger}$ (sum additional costs) | \$ |
| nctional replacement cost (line 11 or $12+$ line 13) | \$ |
| d | \$ |

## Rounded

\$ $\qquad$

* Diameter and cross-sectional area may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate.
${ }^{\text {* Apply depreciation and add additional costs if appropriate for the assignment. }} 86$


[^0]:    * Diameter and cross-sectional area may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate.
    ${ }^{\ddagger}$ Apply depreciation if it is appropriate for the assignment.

[^1]:    * diameter and cross-sectional area may be replaced with plant area, volume, or height as appropriate.
    ${ }^{*}$ Apply depreciation if it is appropriate for the assignment.

